From Costly Failures to Fiscally Responsible Success: A Policy Blueprint for Reforming the U.S. Marine Mammal Stranding Network

Prepared by **Stranded No More:** A watchdog group looking after the interests of stranded whales and dolphins. **strandednomore.org**

1.0 Introduction: A Dual Crisis of Inefficiency and Fiscal Waste

The recent death of a juvenile humpback whale stranded in Yachats, Oregon, was more than a conservation tragedy; it was a stark symptom of a deeply inefficient and fiscally irresponsible federal program. This policy brief deconstructs the systemic failures of the U.S. Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Program (MMHSRP), not only through the lens of operational effectiveness but also through the significant and unnecessary cost to the American taxpayer.

The dysfunction within the U.S. stranding network is rooted in a guiding philosophy that predetermines its outcomes. As expertly described by Wiley et al. in *Marine Mammal Science* (2001), responses to strandings are shaped by one of two fundamental premises:

"Acceptance of the premise that animals cannot survive stranding might result in preparations and actions that aid in their death through euthanasia, neglect, or half-hearted/poorly designed rescue efforts. Acceptance of the premise that animals can survive stranding might lead to preparations and actions that favor their survival."

By implicitly adopting the first premise, the U.S. system creates a self-fulfilling prophecy of death. This approach not only leads to predictable and preventable animal deaths but also results in a demonstrable squandering of public funds on predetermined negative outcomes. A system oriented toward failure is inherently inefficient, wasting federal dollars, personnel hours, and invaluable community resources on half-hearted efforts that culminate in euthanasia and necropsy. This brief provides an actionable blueprint to reform this broken system, advocating for a new model that is both more humane and fundamentally more fiscally prudent.

The following case study of the Oregon stranding serves as the primary exhibit of these deep-rooted systemic flaws.

2.0 Case Study: The Financially Wasteful Failure of the "Pickles/Hope" Response

The multi-day response to the stranded humpback whale known as "Pickles/Hope" is a definitive case study in procedural failure and fiscal mismanagement. By dissecting the timeline of events and the decisions made by network officials, it becomes clear how the system's design predetermines not only fatal outcomes but also the excessive, wasteful expenditure of taxpayer funds on efforts that are structurally engineered to fail.

Chronology of Inaction and Squandered Resources

- **Saturday, Nov 15, after 2:00 PM:** The entangled juvenile humpback whale is first reported stranded in the shallow surf near Yachats.
- **Saturday, Nov 15, Evening/Overnight:** Despite being notified, the official network states it lacks resources for a nighttime response. Local volunteers mobilize, with one individual swimming out to successfully cut the whale's entangling lines while others remain to provide comfort care.
- **Sunday, Nov 16, ~9:30-10:00 AM:** The first officials arrive on the scene. They establish a perimeter with tape and instruct volunteers to stop all aid.
- **Sunday, Nov 16, ~11:00 AM:** During a high tide, officials actively intervene to halt a community-led attempt to refloat the whale.
- **Sunday, Nov 16, Afternoon:** A local business offers a donated excavator, personnel, and fuel at no cost; officials reject the offer. Veterinarians arrive and administer the first dose of sedatives.
- **Monday, Nov 17, ~6:30 AM:** Approximately 41 hours after the initial report, the first and only official rescue attempt is made. The effort lasts only 30 minutes before being abandoned, nearly three hours before the 10:48 AM peak high tide.
- **Monday, Nov 17, Morning:** A second dose of sedatives is administered just before the high tide, compromising the whale's last opportunity to self-rescue.
- **Monday, Nov 17, Afternoon:** The whale is euthanized.

Analysis of Critical Deficiencies: Operational and Fiscal

Delayed Response and Escalating Costs

The 41-hour delay between the first public report and the official rescue attempt represents a catastrophic failure of institutional urgency and a poor return on investment. While a rapid, decisive response could have capitalized on the whale's initial strength, the network's inertia allowed the animal's condition to deteriorate, making any subsequent rescue attempt more difficult and costly. For a federally funded network, this institutional delay is not just a tactical error; it is a fiscally irresponsible squandering of the critical window for a low-cost, successful intervention.

Rejection of Cost-Saving Community Resources

Officials not only failed to act swiftly but demonstrated a pattern of actively obstructing free and immediate community aid. Volunteers who had provided critical overnight care, including performing the initial disentanglement that the network failed to execute, were ordered to stand down upon the arrival of officials. These same officials then established a perimeter and physically halted a community-led refloat attempt during the Sunday high tide. The financial climax of this obstructionist philosophy was the rejection of a donated excavator, a high-value piece of equipment offered at no cost to taxpayers by a local business, while the network simultaneously cited a lack of its own resources. This approach was articulated by Lisa Ballance of the Marine Mammal Institute, who told the assembled crowd:

“People want to help the whale, and the truth is there is nothing we can do for the whale. Best thing we can do is to stay away from it, to stay back.” Refusing free, immediately available local assets in favor of a slow, centralized, and ultimately ineffective response is the epitome of fiscal irresponsibility.

Questionable Protocols and Unnecessary Expenditure

The veterinary decisions, particularly the administration of sedatives to a conscious-breathing animal twice, raise serious questions about the response's objectives. Sedating the whale immediately before its last high-tide window effectively undermined any chance of a successful self-rescue. The expenditure of federal and state resources on this multi-day, multi-agency response is directly contradicted by on-scene evidence. Blood work taken after the whale had been stranded for over 24 hours was described as "surprisingly normal," and the necropsy found the whale was in "fair body condition," had "injuries from the fishing gear wrapped around it, but nothing major, and it was not emaciated." These findings directly contradict the narrative of a hopelessly declining animal, calling into question both the financial and ethical justification for a response that cost taxpayers an estimated **$50,000** only to culminate in a preventable death.

The specific failures in this case are not isolated mistakes but direct products of the underlying philosophical doctrine that drives these costly outcomes across the entire network.

Deconstructing the Official Narrative: An Analysis of the Justification for Euthanasia

The official narrative presented to the public was that of a hopelessly declining animal for which euthanasia was the only humane and compassionate option. This justification, however, is directly challenged by medical evidence gathered on-site and by a pattern of similar decisions in past stranding events, suggesting that viable animals are being unnecessarily euthanized.

The physical evidence gathered from "Pickles/Hope" fails to support the claim of an animal beyond saving:

• **Blood Work:** After the whale had been stranded for over 24 hours, the SR³ veterinary technician Casey McLean stated that the initial blood work was **"surprisingly normal."** This clinical finding directly contradicts the public narrative of a rapidly declining animal and suggests the whale possessed the physiological resilience to survive a refloating attempt had one been made in a timely manner.

• **Preliminary Necropsy:** The official necropsy findings revealed the whale was in **"fair body condition,"** was not emaciated, and had no major injuries from the entanglement. The report, as summarized by advocates, **"failed to show any smoking gun or serious ailments incompatible with the whale's survival."**

The common justification that a whale's organs are irreversibly crushed under its own weight, a narrative frequently used by officials to discourage rescue attempts, is a powerful myth used to justify inaction. This claim is directly contradicted by numerous international cases where large whales have been successfully rescued and have survived long-term after being stranded for extended periods.

This incident is not an anomaly. It follows a troubling pattern within the U.S. network of euthanizing seemingly viable animals. In 2010 and 2019, two other healthy juvenile humpback whales were euthanized. In 2019, a healthy male humpback stranded in Waldport, Oregon, for 30 hours was also euthanized, with a subsequent necropsy showing no apparent injuries or wounds. This history suggests

a systemic bias towards euthanasia over rescue, a choice that is definitively refuted by the proven successes of international teams.

3.0 The Core Issue: A Guiding Philosophy That Guarantees Inefficient Outcomes

The operational failures in the Oregon case stem directly from the network's ingrained institutional philosophy: the presumption that large whale strandings are terminal. By operating on this premise of non-survival, the system is functionally optimized for biological data collection from deceased animals—a demonstrably inefficient allocation of public resources that should be directed toward life-saving intervention.

This "non-survival" narrative functions as a powerful self-fulfilling prophecy, perpetuating a cycle of expensive failures. When response teams assume an animal cannot be saved, their actions—delay, sedation, rejection of aid—naturally produce that outcome. This creates a circular logic that is impossible to challenge from within the current framework, as encapsulated by a critical question:

If the network delays response, administers sedatives to conscious breathers, does not refloat or delays refloating, and does not satellite tag to track outcomes, how can they argue the animal could not have survived?

The financial implications of this "data collection versus conservation" model are severe and systemic. The system is structured as a taxpayer-funded necropsy service rather than a rescue program. This creates a procedural conflict of interest where research opportunities—and the justification for funding—are contingent on an animal's death. This structure inherently disincentivizes the development of rapid, innovative, and cost-effective rescue techniques, as the primary institutional currency is samples, not survivors.

This costly and ineffective U.S. model is not the only option; it is directly contradicted by more successful and fiscally efficient international approaches that have proven survival is achievable.

4.0 The International Benchmark: Proving Survival is Achievable

The U.S. stranding network's deep-seated presumption of failure is invalidated by a growing body of evidence from successful international rescues. These documented cases prove that saving large whales is not a biological impossibility but a matter of institutional will, investment in proper techniques, and a core philosophical commitment to survival.

Compelling International Success Stories

• **Brazil (2000): Refuting the Myth of Irreversible Organ Damage** The common U.S. justification that prolonged stranding causes irreversible organ damage is scientifically invalidated by the case of a humpback whale in Ubatuba. After a 12-hour rescue, the whale was successfully returned to the sea.

Critically, DNA samples confirmed it was the same whale sighted alive and healthy eight years later, providing definitive proof of long-term survival.

• **Angola (2025): Rebutting the Excuse of Prolonged Strandings** The argument that strandings lasting more than a day are a death sentence is refuted by the successful refloating of a 14-meter humpback whale after **58 hours** on Caxiva Beach. The rescue was achieved through powerful collaboration using heavy machinery and real-time guidance from international experts.

• **Argentina (2021): A Model for Integrating Technology and Community** A 30-person team successfully rescued two stranded humpback whales near Buenos Aires. In a direct contrast to the rejection of local aid in Oregon, this operation integrated community efforts with technology, utilizing a backhoe tractor and special cables to guide the animals back to sea.

• **Tasmania (2007): A Showcase of Advanced Rescue Techniques** In a remarkable effort, rescue teams successfully saved seven stranded sperm whales over four days, demonstrating the power of persistence and innovation. They employed a modified aquaculture net, towed between two powerful jet boats, to gently support and guide the massive animals to deeper water.

• **Brazil (2023): Demonstrating the Importance of Adaptability** The U.S. network's rigid adherence to a fatalistic script is countered by a case in Brazil where a team reversed an initial decision to euthanize a stranded humpback calf. Upon sighting the presumed mother nearby, they adapted their strategy, successfully reuniting the pair, who were re-sighted together two days later.

• **Namibia & Mexico: Proving the Power of Rapid, Low-Tech Response** The U.S. claim of needing complex, slow-to-deploy resources is challenged by successful rescues where the Mexican Navy and Namibian conservationists, working alongside community members, used only their hands to push and guide stranded humpbacks with the waves back into the ocean.

The Critical Role of Post-Release Monitoring

A key component of these successful international models—and a glaring deficiency in the U.S. system—is the commitment to verifying survival. For smaller cetaceans like pilot whales and dolphins, satellite tagging is already a proven tool for monitoring post-release health and behavior. Advocates demand this same scientific rigor be applied to large whale rescues in the U.S. to gather the verifiable data needed to challenge outdated assumptions and prove that a different outcome is not only possible but achievable.

These international successes provide a clear and compelling benchmark. They are the foundation upon which a new, effective U.S. stranding network can and must be built.

The following table starkly illustrates the difference between the U.S. approach and the international standard.

U.S. Stranding Response (Oregon Case)	International Best Practices (Composite)
Response Philosophy: Assumes non-survival; prioritizes data collection.	**Response Philosophy:** Assumes survival is possible; prioritizes rescue.
Timeliness: Delayed response (41+ hours).	**Timeliness:** Rapid response (often within hours).
Community Role: Discouraged and rejected.	**Community Role:** Actively integrated and utilized.
Rescue Techniques: Minimal, brief, and easily abandoned attempts.	**Rescue Techniques:** Persistent, coordinated efforts using proven methods (nets, etc.).
Data Collection: No satellite tagging; necropsy confirms death.	**Data Collection:** Satellite tagging to confirm long-term survival.

To align with these more successful and fiscally responsible international standards, the U.S. requires a fundamental overhaul driven by concrete policy reform.

5.0 A Blueprint for Reform: Actionable Recommendations for a Fiscally Responsible Network

The following recommendations provide a comprehensive framework to overhaul the MMHSRP. The goal is not simply to improve outcomes but to create a system that is a more efficient, accountable, and responsible steward of taxpayer dollars.

1. **Mandate a Structural Overhaul to Eliminate Costly Conflicts of Interest.** The network must be restructured into distinct divisions: a **Rapid Response, Rescue, and Refloat Division**; a **Rehabilitation, Treatment, and Release Division**; and a **Biological Data Collection Division**. This separation ensures the live-response team has the single, clear mission of survival, preventing public funds and personnel from being inefficiently diverted from life-saving action to post-mortem research.
2. **Establish Critical Infrastructure for Rehabilitation.** Federal funds must be earmarked to create dedicated large cetacean rehabilitation facilities. This is a necessary capital investment to close a critical infrastructure gap that currently makes costly euthanasia a default outcome. Federal action is required to supersede restrictive state-level policies, like Oregon's Administrative Rule (OAR 635-062-0020) which prohibits marine mammal rehabilitation, that prevent the development of such life-saving capacity.
3. **Create a National Framework for Empowering Rapid Community Response.** New federal protocols are needed to formally integrate local assets and resolve liability issues that currently

hinder public assistance. This framework should empower, not obstruct, the rapid and effective mobilization of community resources.

4. **Amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) & Enact Good Samaritan Laws.** Current liability concerns are a major barrier to free community assistance. Amending the MMPA and enacting Good Samaritan protections for individuals and businesses acting in good faith will unlock significant cost-saving potential by allowing the network to accept donated resources without legal risk.
5. **Model a 'Volunteer Responder' Program on the Volunteer Firefighter Framework.** A new system should be established where trained and certified local rapid responders can be activated as temporary federal or state employees for the duration of a stranding event. This model solves the liability issue for NOAA, provides responders with protections like worker's compensation, and formally integrates local knowledge and assets into the official response structure.
6. **Enforce Absolute Transparency and Public Accountability.** As a matter of standard fiscal accountability, the full National Stranding Database and all drug protocols must be made public. This allows taxpayers and oversight bodies to evaluate the performance of the programs they fund. Furthermore, mandating independent, third-party necropsies will ensure impartial findings and eliminate conflicts of interest.
7. **Legislate a "Survival Data First" Mandate.** Legislation must require satellite tagging for all refloated large cetaceans. This is the only way to collect valid data on the return on investment of rescue efforts, scientifically validate new techniques, and definitively challenge the costly and outdated "non-survival" assumption.
8. **Implement Performance-Based Funding.** Federal funding for stranding network organizations must be directly tied to documented rescue success rates. This is the ultimate tool for fiscal responsibility, ensuring taxpayer money rewards efficient, effective organizations and divests from those that consistently fail to produce positive outcomes.

Together, these reforms will create a stranding response network that is not only more effective but also more accountable and economically prudent.

6.0 Conclusion: A Call for a New Philosophy of Fiscal and Ethical Responsibility

The death of the juvenile humpback whale in Oregon was the predictable outcome of a federal program that is not only philosophically oriented toward failure but also structurally designed for fiscal inefficiency. Its protocols—defined by delay, rejection of free community resources, and a focus on post-mortem data collection—ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent managing death rather than championing life.

This expensive U.S. model stands in stark contrast to the cost-effective successes of international programs, which have proven that saving large whales is a matter of policy and will, not a financial or biological impossibility. The United States has the resources and expertise to lead, yet it continues to lag behind, trapped in a cycle of wasteful, self-fulfilling prophecy.

We therefore issue a direct call to action for policymakers to implement the reforms outlined in this blueprint. It is time to transform the U.S. Marine Mammal Stranding Network from a passive, expensive observer of tragedy into a global leader in fiscally responsible marine conservation. Policymakers must abandon the philosophy of failure and legislate a clear, unambiguous, and fiscally sound mandate for survival.

7.0 Reference List

1.0 Scientific & Academic Publications

Peer-reviewed academic literature forms the bedrock of evidence-based analysis, providing scientifically rigorous data and case studies on marine mammal strandings and rescue techniques. This section lists the scholarly articles that contribute foundational knowledge on the subject.

• Gusman-Cunha, Ian, Catharina Valadares L. Armini, and Kamilla Avelino-de-Souza. "While There's Life, There's Hope: A Successful Case of Reintroduction of a Stranded Humpback Whale Calf in Espírito Santo, Brazil." *Aquatic Mammals* 51.3 (2025): 197-203.

• Thalmann, S., Gales, R., Greenwood, M., & Gedamke, J. (2008). A new technique for refloating and release of stranded sperm whales (Physeter macrocephalus). *Marine Mammal Science, 24*(4), 949–955.

• Wiley, David N., et al. "Rescue and release of mass stranded cetaceans from beaches on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, USA; 1990-1999: a review of some response actions." *Aquatic Mammals* 27.2 (2001): 162-171.

2.0 News Media & Press Reports

This section compiles reports from various news organizations that document specific marine mammal stranding events. These articles provide essential context, capture public and official reactions in real-time, and detail the on-the-ground efforts and outcomes of these incidents.

• AFP. (2021, October 6). Two stranded humpback whales rescued in Argentina. *phys.org*.

• Admin. (2015, May 28). 9 documented cases of stranded whales and dolphins that survived stranding. *StrandedNoMore*.

• Geismar, Erin. "Beached Whale in East Hampton Put Down; Euthanization Dart Missing on Main Beach." The East Hampton Press, 9 Apr.

2010, www.27east.com/news/article.cfm/East-Hampton/270877/Beached-whale-in-East-Hampton-put-down-euthanization-dart-missing-on-Main-Beach .

• Jaros, G. (2025, November 25). One last chance. *Philomath News*.
• McGuinness, H. (2025, November 20). Why the humpback stranded in Yachats couldn't be saved. *The Register-Guard*.
• Melore, C. (2025, November 18). Horror as stranded baby whale slaughtered and locals claim officials 'didn't let people try' to save it. *Daily Mail Online*.
• Messenger, S. (2010, November 18). Whale saved 10 years ago reunites with rescuers. *TreeHugger.*
• Oregon Coast Beach Connection. (2025, November 17). Latest on humpback whale rescue: Not expected to live. *Oregon Coast Beach Connection*.
• Oregon Coast Beach Connection. (2025, November 16). Stranded and struggling humpback whale on central Oregon coast draws crowds overnight. *Oregon Coast Beach Connection*.
• Ruark, J. C. (2025, November 17). Video - Photos - Stranded: Humpback whale at Yachts. *Tillamook Headlight Herald*.
• Smith, Q. (2019, August 17). Humpback whale euthanized after 30 hours on Waldport beach was healthy before stranding, necropsy shows. *Lincoln Chronicle*.
• Urness, Z. (2025, November 17). Effort to save stranded whale on Oregon coast fails; humpback will likely be euthanized. *Statesman Journal*.

Complementing media coverage, publications from official governmental and non-governmental organizations provide deeper, specialized analyses and policy perspectives.

3.0 Government & Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) Publications

This section includes official communications, policy briefs, and detailed analyses from government agencies and specialized non-profit organizations directly involved in marine mammal welfare and stranding response. These documents offer insight into official protocols, institutional perspectives, and advocacy efforts.

• **NOAA Fisheries Feature Story:** This feature story provides the official NOAA Fisheries account of the unsuccessful rescue attempt and subsequent euthanasia of a stranded humpback whale in Oregon.

(Source: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/feature-story/experts-euthanize-oregon-humpback-whale-after-unsuccessful-attempt-free-it beach#:~:text=On%20November%2017%2C%20veterinarians%20from,first%20stranded%20on%20November%2015.)

• **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**, National Marine Fisheries Service, Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Program. (2010). Case report summary: Humpback whale (Megaptera novaeangliae) stranding, East Hampton, NY (Case No. NY4236-10)

• **Stranded No More Article:** "The Story of 'Pickles/Hope,' a Stranded Humpback Whale" provides a detailed timeline and critical analysis of the official response to the Yachats stranding event. (Source: The Story of “Pickles/Hope,” a Stranded Humpback Whale | StrandedNoMore)

• **Consortium for the Conservation of the Atlantic Humpback Dolphin Report:** This report details the successful collaborative rescue of a 14-meter-long humpback whale that was stranded for 58 hours in Angola. (Source: Facebook post)

4.0 Video & Multimedia Content

This section lists video sources that provide visual documentation of whale stranding incidents and rescue efforts. These multimedia assets offer a dynamic and compelling view of the challenges and successes of returning these large animals to the ocean.

• **Video: "Successful Humpback Whale Rescue!"**
  ◦ **Source:** YouTube Channel "Ocean Conservation Namibia"
  ◦ **Description:** This video documents the successful, hands-on community effort to push a stranded juvenile humpback whale back into the ocean in Namibia.

• **Video: "whale.wmv"**
  ◦ **Source:** YouTube Channel "StrandedNoMore"
  ◦ **Description:** This video shows a sperm whale rescue effort where a specialized net and boat are used to gently tow the animal from shallow waters to safety.