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*\*Note: this is the first in a series of two articles addressing the state of salmon habitat mapping efforts in Alaska. The first article is for a more general audience, and the second is for a more technical audience and may be accessed here:*

90% of Alaskans will tell you that wild salmon are either “important” or “very important” in their lives, according to a 2013 poll. It’s easy to imagine this love in the form of a fly cast into a glimmering river, or a setnet buoyed along a beach, or a filet in our freezers.

But wild salmon rely on more than just picturesque wilderness settings. What about a small trickle of water seeping from a bluff behind a parking lot? An impenetrable swamp? A stagnant puddle? These are all places that I have found to be teeming with salmon and other fish in my work as a biologist. It is in these corners of the watershed that many of them grow and feed, preparing for a long journey out to the ocean and back.

But it can be easy to overlook these humbler waterbodies. Frequently, these smaller salmon streams do not appear on even our best maps that land managers use to understand their habitat. When it comes to balancing the needs of development with wildlife, our maps of salmon streams are often only showing half the picture. Our best-intended, best-designed regulations are only as good as our best information, and too often we’re using incomplete details to make irreversible decisions. As a result, Alaska has a king-sized regulatory gap that can inadvertently allow even the most fish-minded among us to allow damage to salmon habitat. How can we take care of our “wild infrastructure” when we don’t yet know where exactly it exists?

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game website describes this gap in its overview of the Anadromous Waters Catalog, the map which serves as the official inventory for Alaskan salmon habitat. (“Anadromous” means any fish that is born and spawns in freshwater, but migrates to the ocean to grow into an adult, as do salmon):

“**The Catalog […]** currently lists almost 20,000 streams, rivers or lakes around the state which have been specified as being important for the spawning, rearing or migration of anadromous fish. However […] it is believed that this number represents a fraction of the streams, rivers, and lakes actually used by anadromous species. Until these habitats are inventoried, they will not be protected under State of Alaska law.

“The Catalog […] specif[ies] which streams, rivers and lakes are important to anadromous fish species and therefore afforded protection […] Water bodies that are not "specified" within the Catalog […] are not afforded that protection.” [[1]](#footnote-1)

Put in other words: rivers and lakes in Alaska are presumed to *not* be salmon habitat unless otherwise proven. Unless someone, usually a trained biologist, has taken the time to visit a possible salmon stream in person and document the presence of juvenile or adult salmon, disturbing the waterbody does not require a fish habitat permit from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. This means that if a road is to be built, it may not necessarily require that new culverts allow for fish passage. If land clearing planned, local riparian buffer ordinances might not apply. Given how widespread salmon habitat is throughout Alaska, the presumption that waters are not salmon habitat unless otherwise proven is a kind of “guilty until proven innocent approach” to habitat management.

Every summer a small but dedicated cadre of biologists work with state, federal, tribal and nonprofit groups to expand the map of Alaska salmon streams. They are to be commended for their yeoman’s labor. But their task is gargantuan, not unlike attempting to build a towering birch tree out of twigs and twine. It can be done, slowly and with difficulty, but not soon enough.

*A way forward*

So, what are the alternatives to our current situation? There are options at all ends of the spectrum, and somewhere in the middle is the best approach to mapping Alaska’s salmon streams. The good news is that there are alternative ways forward, and the tools to address the challenge are ready at hand. Some researchers are already changing the game as we speak.

*Option 1: Change our assumptions*

At the most progressive end of the spectrum, we could *reverse* our current assumption that waters are not salmon-bearing until proven otherwise. Such a shift was proposed as part of Ballot Measure 1, also known as the “Stand for Salmon” campaign in 2018[[2]](#footnote-2). The shift could have placed the responsibility on developers to assess the status of streams, lakes, and wetlands that may be disturbed by their proposed activities, and file for the appropriate fish habitat permits based on their findings. Today, in many cases such proactive steps are voluntary for private landowners. While such a vision may be well intentioned, enforcing it could represent a sea change at a scale that Alaska may not be ready to accept, and pursuing this path could be ineffective.

*Option 2: Status quo*

At the other end of the spectrum is our current approach to documenting salmon habitat. Today, we rely on a dedicated but small array of state and federal agencies, nonprofits, tribal entities, and a few volunteer citizens to do the important work of documenting salmon habitat. Scientists pore over maps searching for rivers, streams, and lakes not yet registered the Anadromous Waters Catalog. They travel to where they estimate are the uppermost headwaters in a stream that salmon may be found, sometimes a high mountain stream or sometimes a swampy rivulet. They use tools to survey the potential fish habitat, then submit their data to be assessed by the Department of Fish and Game each fall.

Our current approach, while straightforward, is slow, labor-intensive, and will never document every salmon stream. As our communities grow, more streams and wetlands that serve as salmon habitat are likely to be inadvertently crushed in our expanding footprint.

*Option 3: Use better maps to make better maps*

There may be more efficient ways to inventory Alaska’s salmon streams, and some researchers are already using them.

Under our current regulations, guessing the “uppermost point of anadromy” is a critical but complex task for biologists preparing to head out to the field. Our methods for choosing where to perform fish surveys range from interviewing local people, squinting at topo lines, or checking computer databases. It’s often a semi-informed shot in the dark as to whether or not many miles of additional salmon habitat lie upstream from a field survey site reached after an arduous journey.

In the last decade, scientists have begun to develop detailed watershed maps using high-resolution imagery and computer models that do a much better job of predicting where salmon habitat may lay. These maps have been applied in southeast Alaska by the U.S. Forest Service in recent fish habitat survey efforts. The results so far are striking to a biologist’s eyes: these models can predict with ~90% accuracy the furthest-upstream location of where anadromous fish may be found, within ±66 meters1. Such efforts can result in identifying dozens or hundreds of miles of previously undocumented salmon streams. A map that can so efficiently predict the extent of salmon habitat suggests that one day, we could come closer to knowing their full range without having to physically set foot in every single headwater.

In most of Alaska, these advanced mapping techniques have yet to be applied. But initial results from southeast Alaska are promising.

Several years experience has shown that the Alaskan public has a strong interest in contributing to the cause.

The experience offers a hands-on experience to seek and find "baby salmon" in surprising places,

In working to solve local challenges, the question we should be asking is “do our environmental standards serve local needs?”

Explorers are those of us who see maps and think, "There most be more to it than what's shown here…"

A few summers ago, a call came into our office about a just-cleared property near a local creek. Neighbors were concerned that the land-clearing had disturbed wetlands and streams that feed into a nearby stream that in short order flows into the Kenai River. Land clearing and developments of this nature are not infrequent at the suburban-rural boundary into which southcentral Alaskans are quickly expanding, an in most cases they are likely to be in compliance with permitting requirements. Some developers even go beyond what's minimally required to help mitigate the impact of new impervious surfaces and stream crossings. Here, it was unclear what we were walking into.

We arrived on site to find a quarter-mile length of freshly ditched and straightened stream denuded of riparian and benthic structure. We found dozens of juvenile coho salmon and Dolly Varden residing both above and below the disturbed section of stream, which we later successfully nominated to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's (ADF&G) Anadromous Waters Catalog (AWC).

Now that this particular stream is included on the map, in the future if a developer submits plans to local permitting offices that involve significant earth-moving it will appear in their review. Those plans will ideally be reviewed for compliance with a Fish Habitat Permit from ADF&G, and reviewers will ideally make recommendations to help mitigate impacts of the planned development.

Identifying a salmon stream post-hoc after it has been bulldozed is a situation no one wants to see. Not landowners, not neighbors, not the general public, and not the fish. Arguably not every single wild salmon stream is destined for indefinite preservation as we balance the needs of growing communities and wild fish habitat in our backyards. But we owe it to ourselves to have good information about where wild salmon live to make informed decisions.

So how do we prevent this sort of uninformed travesty from repeating in more yet-unidentified salmon streams? What can we do to at least get these streams on the map?

Currently, Alaska regulations are such that we assume streams and lakes are not salmon-bearing unless otherwise proven. For our bulldozed example above, for this stream to have appeared beforehand on the Anadromous Waters Catalog map the following would have to have occurred:

* Someone would have had to known that this tiny stream existed and might have salmon
* Someone would gain permission from the landowner to visit the property
* Someone would perform a field survey to determine the presence or absence of salmon
* The data would be submitted to ADF&G review as a nomination to the Anadromous Waters Catalog

Aside from working biologists, even the most dedicated Alaskans are unlikely to be able to follow through on all the above steps. And even with a small army of people out performing expensive fieldwork it could take decades to catalog every salmon stream.

Yet, we are beginning to see just these sort of efforts blossom in Alaska
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As an initial project, Rivulet intends to tackle a challenge related to freshwater salmon habitat management in Alaska. Today, there is an enormous gap between our knowledge of salmon habitat geography and the needs of Alaska's fish habitat managers.

It is estimated that less than half of Alaska's freshwater salmon habitat is documented and mapped; and as a result these streams and lakes lack the legal protection afforded by inclusion in the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's (ADF&G) Anadromous Waters Catalog. When environmental impacts are reviewed prior to development projects, undocumented anadromous streams do not require a Fish Habitat Permit issued by ADF&G. As a result, thousands of stream miles outside of protected areas are vulnerable to development impacts such blockages from road crossings, erosion and runoff from impervious surfaces, and riparian denudement. Threats to these undocumented anadromous habitats come from both small scale developments such as driveway crossings as well as on a large scale such as a mining developments. In order to nominate salmon habitat for inclusion in the Anadromous Waters Catalog, ADF&G requires in-person visual confirmation of anadromous fish at the site location. The work requires hands-on fieldwork by fisheries technicians and volunteers, frequently via little-traveled routes crossing a complex patchwork of land ownership.

Thesis chapters Proof of concept for creating and using "treasure map" with volunteer labor

Existing municipal, state, and federal laws - how and where are there gaps, how could it change? Focus on regional examples in misc places Exploration for how to reverse assumptions on anadromy - what would it take for legal framework to change such that we assume waters "are" anadromous unless evidence suggests otherwise? Upstream: lit review of headwater contributions and their function in downstream nutrition

People to contact: Bidlack Falke Benda Romey

1. Romey, B. & Martin, D. *Landscape-Level Extent of Resident Fish Occupancy in the Alexander Archipelago*. (2022).

1. https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/sf/SARR/AWC/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The statewide initiative failed in the face of well-funded opposition, which both raised valid concerns about the initiative, and was also able to outspend the Stand for Salmon campaign by a margin of 7:1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)