
Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state

Sunny L. Jardine
University of Washington
School of Marine and Environmental Affairs

Daniel Holland
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Northwest Fishery Science Center

Robert Fonner
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Northwest Fishery Science Center

Mark Scheuerell
United States Geological Survey &
University of Washington
School of Aquatic and Fisheries Sciences

Braeden VanDeynze
University of Washington
School of Marine and Environmental Affairs

Short Title: Returns on investing in barrier culvert removal
Project Initiation: October 18, 2021
Project Completion: June 30, 2023
Project Type: Integrated Socio-Ecological Systems

PROJECT SUMMARY

Across Western Washington, thousands of poorly-designed culverts at road crossings prevent migratory salmon from accessing potential habitat, hampering recovery efforts for declining populations. In 2013, a federal court found that barrier culverts in Washington violate tribal treaty rights and issued an injunction requiring their replacement. While the injunction only applies to state-owned culverts, thousands of additional barrier culverts are owned by local governments and private landowners, often within the same watersheds, generate inter-dependencies between barrier correction activities.

Counties and other actors are independently ramping up efforts to correct barriers to fish passage in their jurisdiction resulting in prioritization frameworks that only allow for comparison within a given entity's jurisdiction, complicating the coordination of investments in fish passage across Western Washington. Our project will develop a consistent, data-driven framework for prioritizing fish passage barriers over multiple objectives, drawing from a rich literature on fish passage restoration plans that maximize return on investment.

Our optimization framework will enable us to characterize the tradeoffs associated with barrier culvert replacement, estimate gains from coordination across barrier culvert owners in Washington, explore how the nature of funding streams impact conservation outcomes associated with barrier culvert replacement, and investigate how path dependency affects optimal barrier culvert restoration strategies. The decision support tool we develop will serve a coordinating function between barrier owners and managers by allowing the consistent comparison of alternative barrier correction, complementing ongoing efforts to restore fish passage in the state of Washington.

PROJECT NARRATIVE

A. Background

Migratory anadromous salmon and steelhead native to Western Washington (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) rely on access to streams throughout the spawning and rearing phases of their complex life cycles. Barriers to fish passage, particularly poorly-designed culverts at road crossings, prevent fish from accessing potential habitat, hampering recovery efforts for declining populations. Reconnecting isolated habitat by correcting these culverts has been long identified as a crucial stage in watershed restoration [13]. However, until fairly recently, barrier correction efforts have been limited by a lack of available funds and political will.

In 2001, Washington state was sued by the United States Department of Justice on behalf of 21 Northwest tribes for violating treaty fishing rights. The plaintiffs argued that state-owned culverts restrict salmon and steelhead access to historical upstream spawning habitat, leading to declines in salmon abundance and violating the Stevens Treaties which guarantee a right to fish within usual and accustomed fishing areas. The lawsuit, focused on Western Washington, hereafter the "Case Area", resulted in a 2013 federal court injunction requiring the State remove barrier culverts under its jurisdiction such that 90% of blocked fish habitat is made accessible by 2030. The ruling mandates that the remainder of state-owned barrier culverts in the Case Area be restored for fish passage at the end of their life. The defendants filed an appeal, but after nearly two decades of legal battles, in 2018, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Tribes, upholding the 2013 federal injunction, ushering in a new era of fish passage policy in Western Washington.

As of 2020, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), responsible for the vast majority of state-owned culverts within the Case Area, has corrected 87 injunction barrier culverts opening up an estimated 383.3 miles of habitat at a cost of over \$159 million. Since the ruling, WSDOT has replaced an average of 12.4 culverts per year, including 13 in 2020. To satisfy the federal injunction, the rate of culvert replacements must ramp up dramatically. In 2021, Governor Jay Inslee signed a WSDOT budget for the 2021-2023 biennium with \$726.4 million specifically allocated for fish passage projects, an increase from \$100 million in the prior biennium.

Importantly, the 2013 injunction strictly applies to state-owned culverts, whereas there exist an estimated 3,000 and 1,300 additional barrier culverts owned by counties and cities respectively, along with barrier culverts on private lands, often on the same streams as state-owned culverts [3]. Figure 1 shows culvert barriers to fish passage recorded in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Fish Passage and Diversion Screening Inventory (FPDSI) database, for all of the Washington Case Area (panel A) and along the Skagit River near Concrete, WA (panel B) as an example of a watershed where barriers owned by several entities exist. Specifically, for this portion of the Skagit River, five of six ownership entity types are indicated (cities, counties, federal, private, state, and other), demonstrating the complexity in salmon restoration in Washington State. The presence of multiple barrier ownership entities within a single watershed means that the benefits of any one entity's culvert restoration actions depend on the culvert restoration actions of others, suggesting potential gains from coordination.

While non-state entities are not subject to the 2013 injunction, counties and cities across the region are ramping up their own barrier correction efforts in order to capitalize on the opportunity to restore habitat access throughout the Case Area [3]. However, counties and other actors are largely acting independently and there are differences between and within these ownership types in terms of goals, priorities, and resources for removing barriers to fish passage. For example, some counties conduct full habitat surveys in determining which barrier culverts to replace first, while others rely on GIS-based proxies. With regards to funding, while some cities and counties are able to access direct financial resources for fish passage projects, e.g. King County has used the surface water management fee to fund culvert restoration projects, other cities and counties do not have access to dedicated funding streams, primarily relying on competitive grant funding.

Fish passage restoration efforts in Washington state are not entirely uncoordinated. The Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board was established by the Washington State Legislature in 2014 to recommend priority projects to the Governor's Office and Legislature for funding, thereby promoting the coordinated and strategic removal of barriers to fish passage. In the 2021-2023 biennium, 87 ranked projects were recommended for funding at a total of \$61.3 million. Grant applicants include cities, counties, and non-profit organizations. There is demand from both the Legislature and grantees to better define the Board's selection criteria for potential projects and overall prioritization strategy. The Washington congressional delegation has also championed the introduction of a similar competitive grant program at the federal level; the INVEST




Figure 1: Barriers to fish passage in the WDFW Fish Passage and Diversion Screening Inventory database by ownership type. (A) shows the entire Case Area (red dotted line) and (B) shows the diversity of barrier ownership entities in the Concrete, WA area along the Skagit River. Solid red box in (A) shows the extent of (B). Dark red lines show roads (data source: OpenStreetMap) and light blue lines show rivers, streams and other water bodies (data source: National Hydrology Dataset High Resolution).

While non-state entities are not subject to the 2013 injunction, counties and cities across the region are ramping up their own barrier correction efforts in order to capitalize on the opportunity to restore habitat access throughout the Case Area [3]. However, counties and other actors are largely acting independently and there are differences between and within these ownership types in terms of goals, priorities, and resources for removing barriers to fish passage. For example, some counties conduct full habitat surveys in determining which barrier culverts to replace first, while others rely on GIS-based proxies. With regards to funding, while some cities and counties are able to access direct financial resources for fish passage projects, e.g. King County has used the surface water management fee to fund culvert restoration projects, other cities and counties do not have access to dedicated funding streams, primarily relying on competitive grant funding.

Fish passage restoration efforts in Washington state are not entirely uncoordinated. The Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board was established by the Washington State Legislature in 2014 to recommend priority projects to the Governor's Office and Legislature for funding, thereby promoting the coordinated and strategic removal of barriers to fish passage. In the 2021-2023 biennium, 87 ranked projects were recommended for funding at a total of \$61.3 million. Grant applicants include cities, counties, and non-profit organizations. There is demand from both the Legislature and grantees to better define the Board's selection criteria for potential projects and overall prioritization strategy. The Washington congressional delegation has also championed the introduction of a similar competitive grant program at the federal level; the INVEST

in America Act, recently passed by the U.S. House of Representatives, would create a new grant program to distribute \$800 million over the next five years.

There is a rich academic literature applying optimization tools to fish passage [11, 10, 4], i.e. researchers have developed robust methods for identifying restoration plans (combinations of barriers to correct) that maximize the return on investment for a given budget. Recently these tools have gained traction with resource managers. Examples include FISHPass, adopted by the California Fish Passage Forum in 2019, and FishWerks developed for the Great Lakes region as a collaboration between Cornell University and the University of Wisconsin.

Our proposed research will develop a data-driven optimization framework for project prioritization, within the Case Area of Washington State, that synthesizes multiple geospatial datasets with statistical economic and ecological models to identify fish passage restoration plans that maximize ecological, social, and economic objectives at a given funding level. Our project will draw on relevant features and methods from the rich literature in fish prioritization and from lessons learned from the rollout of FISHPass in California (see Letter of Support from Bob Pagliuco contributor to FISHPass).

With our framework, we will assess the tradeoffs between key management objectives (e.g. increasing salmon habitat, ensuring an equitable distribution of habitat gains across user groups, and mitigating investment risks), gains from coordinating barrier culvert replacement across key actors (e.g. the state, counties, and cities), and gains from alternative funding streams (e.g. allocating large sums of money upfront versus allocating those same dollars slowly over time). We will also use our framework to assess path dependency, i.e. how optimal barrier removal projects are determined by past actions, and explore how optimal barrier removal plans change when conditioned on assumed actions of key players (e.g. assuming all state-owned barriers are corrected by 2030).

We will make the data, models, and framework accessible to users through an online decision support tool (DST) similar to FISHPass developed for California and Fishwerks developed for the Great Lakes. To our knowledge, our fish passage optimization framework will be the first to include objectives of equity and risk mitigation, allowing resource managers to compare how plans address potentially competing priorities.

The utility of our framework and DST critically depends on how well real-world priorities and constraints are reflected. Thus, in the initial phase of the project we will catalog the factors included in PI scores across all relevant entities and organize a series of workshops where we elicit key objectives and constraints from user groups (see Engagement and Communication Plan). For purposes of illustration, here we describe potential factors to be included and the data and models to support their inclusion. As the project progresses, specifics will be adapted to meet tribe and stakeholder expectations as discussed during the workshop series.

B. Approach

This section is organized as follows. First we discuss our cost model, a necessary input to our optimization framework. Next, we discuss three potential objectives in restoring barrier culverts (habitat, equity, and risk mitigation). We then discuss our optimization framework and the online DST that will make our framework accessible to target users. Finally, we discuss the research questions that our project can inform.

Cost model

Barrier correction is costly and managers are budget constrained. To incorporate this constraint, we will estimate the cost of culvert restoration for all known existing fish passage-blocking culverts within the Case Area. Culverts in need of restoration will be identified using the FPDSI database maintained by WDFW. Cost estimates will utilize predictive models based on data from over 1,200 culvert projects completed between 2001 and 2015 across Oregon and Washington, documented in the Pacific Northwest Salmonid Habitat Projects (PNSHP) dataset. Project records are paired with several predictor variables derived through geospatial matching, including physical features of the worksite (i.e. stream slope (%), bankfull width, road

class, elevation, etc.) as well as socioeconomic features (i.e. distance to urbanized areas, housing density, proximity to equipment and material suppliers, ownership of nearby land, etc.). In total, over 230 features have been identified as proxies for potential cost drivers and are linked to project records using geospatial matching methods.

Predictive cost models are currently being finalized by our research team. Figure 2 illustrates preliminary predicted cost percentiles using a fit from a boosted regression tree (BRT), one method under consideration. The BRT method builds an ensemble model of iterative regression trees fit on the residuals of earlier fits, systematically identifying variables useful for improving out-of-sample predictive power [5]. In our team's ongoing work, we have found that such models can improve predictive accuracy (measured as training set root-mean square error) by 11% over predictions from an ordinary least squares fit with variables selected by the analysts.

For the proposed project, we will leverage the datasets and code we have already developed to explore the predictive performance of several parametric and non-parametric cost models, selecting the model that provides superior out-of-sample predictive power specifically in the Case Area. We will also seek out additional administrative data (i.e. project records) from state agencies and large private forestland owners to supplement the PNSHP with region-specific data. In doing so, we will provide consistent and granular barrier correction cost estimates that are applicable over the full Case Area.

Importantly, our cost estimates will reflect inherent variability in correction costs between barriers. Accounting for heterogeneity in conservation/restoration costs often leads to efficiency gains, as a failure to do so implicitly assumes that all alternatives have the same costs. For example, a recent study found that including cost information in a conservation planning tool increased habitat gains per dollar by as much as an order of magnitude [7].

Habitat model

A primary objective in culvert barrier correction is increased access to quality salmon habitat. For each culvert restoration plan, defined as a combination of multiple culverts restored, we will quantify the expected increase in habitat quantity, measured as lineal distance, for the five species of Pacific salmon. Spatial dependence will drive restoration benefits, because the culvert restoration downstream determines the benefits from culvert restoration upstream. Estimated habitat quantity gains will be calculated using the USGS National Hydrography Dataset, NDHPlus High Resolution, and the WDFW FPDSI database, which contains information about fish species affected by culvert blockages. Our team has developed code to estimate similar lineal distance metrics for culvert restoration projects in the PNSHP database, which will be leveraged to estimate upstream habitat gained by correcting barriers within the Case Area catalogued in the FPDSI database.

In addition to habitat quantity (measured here as lineal distance), habitat quality plays an important role in the growth and survival of salmon [12]. The quality of salmon habitat is a function of many interacting attributes, including water temperature, instream flows, the presence of coarse woody debris, and the amount




Figure 2: Predicted cost percentiles for barrier culverts in the Case Area. Dashed red line indicates Case Area boundary.

of fine sediment [1, 8]. All of these features of habitat quality are further affected by climatology, watershed geomorphology, and the connectivity of different habitat areas, which means they may vary over time. For example, Battin et al. [2] found that future climate change and coordinated habitat restoration working together are likely to cause a shift in the distribution of salmon in Puget Sound as the quality of their habitat shifts around the landscape.

In a habitat restoration context, one of the key uncertainties is relating land use and land cover characteristics to the quality of salmon habitat [1, 9]. We will use statistical models to relate measures of salmon habitat quality to features of the environment sensu Bartz et al. [1] and Jorgensen et al. [9]. Specifically, our Research Scientist will work with co-PI Scheuerell to build upon these earlier efforts to develop a unitless metric of salmon habitat quality based on instream temperature and flow data, as well as upland features related to riparian forest density and composition, road density, elevation, and watershed area. In addition, we will consult with regional experts in salmon habitat restoration (e.g., Drs. George Pess and Tim Beechie, NOAA Fisheries) to ensure that we are capturing those features of the environment most likely to reflect the quality of salmon habitat.

Equity

Equity is another important dimension to consider. In fact, the Coldwater Connection Campaign, a partnership between tribes, environmental NGOs, and counties on the Olympic Coast, chose to develop rank-and-score methods for barrier prioritization rather than optimization based on equity concerns expressed by tribal co-managers. The concern was that an optimization framework that simply maximizes expected salmon habitat given a budget constraint could potentially lead to a culvert restoration plan that only benefits a single user group. We will explore alternative equity strategies that prioritize restoration plans that provide an equitable distribution of habitat gains across user groups. While ideally we would explore solutions that achieve equity in allocating habitat gains across tribal usual and accustomed fishing areas, there is a lack of consensus around the usual and accustomed area boundaries. Thus, we will explore solutions that allocate habitat gains across alternative spatial units, e.g. watersheds and/or counties. We will also explore various equity metrics, e.g. a Gini coefficient, using geospatial data on all salmon runs in the injunction area together with geospatial data delineating user groups (e.g. proxied by watersheds) in the Case Area.

Risk mitigation

Risk mitigation is yet another important factor to consider when selecting portfolios of barrier culverts to correct. Returns to investments in barrier culvert correction are risky, driven by the possibility of low salmon returns to habitat, population extinction driven by environmental shocks, the risk of future human impacts including impacts to water quality through urbanization [6], the risk of investing in barriers with a high probability of being damaged in a flood event, and the risk of introducing invasive species when opening up habitat for salmon.

Working with managers, tribes, and stakeholders we will identify key elements of risk that are more important to our user groups. Then, drawing from the literature on restoration portfolio diversification, we will estimate the degree to which the risk in returns to barrier culvert removal plans can be mitigated through diversification. For example, we will explore diversification over salmon stocks and diversification over the risk of negative impacts to salmon through urban growth. Geospatial data sources for salmon stocks and urban growth, respectively, include the WDFW SalmonScape and Washington State City Urban Growth Areas.

Optimization framework

There are several methods for defining cost-effective restoration plans that meet multiple planning goals (e.g. salmon habitat gains, equity considerations, and risk mitigation). We will explore alternative methods, selecting the approach that is most accessible and intuitive for our target users. One candidate method is the

weighted objective function approach where managers specify importance weights for each of the objectives and the weighted sum of the objectives is maximized. Weights are constrained to the interval $[0, 1]$ and sum to one, e.g. a manager solely interested in habitat would set the habitat importance weight to one and all other weights to zero. The problem will also include a budget constraint, such that expenditures on barrier restoration are less than or equal to a fixed budget B , and a hydrography constraint such that habitat gains from restoring any one barrier cannot be realized if there exist any downstream barriers to fish passage.

In an alternative approach, one objective function is maximized and lower bounds are provided for all remaining objectives. For example, the problem can be defined to maximize habitat gains subject to each user group receiving some minimum fraction of the habitat gains or some minimum fraction of total expenditures, or a constraint such that habitat gains are distributed across some minimum number of salmon stocks. We will refer to this approach as the “constraint-based” method.

Finally, we will explore methods for identifying the Pareto Frontier, or the set of restoration plans for which no individual objective can be improved without making at least one objective worse off. Pareto Frontier analyses have been applied in the fish passage literature [e.g. 4] and, by plotting restoration plans on the frontier along with interior solutions, the analysis allows managers to visually inspect tradeoffs between various objectives, which can make tradeoffs more transparent.

All problems will be solved using R, a free software environment that supports integer programming. A growing number of modern solvers are accessible through the R software environment, e.g. the R Optimization Infrastructure or ROI package in R provides a wrapper to powerful solvers such as COIN-OR CBC, GLPK, or lp_solve and even to the NEOS server used by GAMS.

Research questions

Our project will explore the following research questions:

1. **Environmental Conditions:** What environmental factors emerge from the literature as key drivers of salmon habitat quality?
2. **Path Dependency:** Assuming that WSDOT addresses those barrier culverts blocking 90% of habitat by 2030, what is the optimal restoration plan for all remaining barriers in the Washington Case Area? How does this compare with an optimal restoration plan that ignores the actions of WSDOT?
3. **Coordination:** What are the gains in benefits, e.g. habitat, equity, and risk avoidance, associated with coordination across actors (state agencies, local government, private landowners) and which of these multiple objectives is most affected by a lack of coordination across actors?
4. **Tradeoffs:** Where in the Case Area (sub-basins/watersheds) are culvert restoration plans associated with trade-offs between potentially competing priorities (e.g., risk versus total habitat, equity versus total habitat), and where can “win-wins” occur (i.e., plans that meet multiple objectives without reducing others)?
5. **Optimization versus Rank and Score:** What are the gains from optimization methods as compared to “rank and score” methods?
6. **Equity:** Is it possible to address equity issues in optimization methods for barrier culvert removal in Western Washington given a lack of agreement over boundaries of tribal usual and accustomed areas?

Decision Support Tool (DST)

To support the accessibility of our optimization framework for fish passage in Washington State, we will design and deploy an online user interface. While the central application DST is to determine restoration plans that maximize return on investment throughout the Case Area, given user preferences over multiple objectives and drawing from publicly-available datasets, we will also include several customizable features in the DST. For example, users will be able to input alternative culvert restoration plans to the DST to generate a report on how objectives (e.g. habitat miles, equity, and risk) compare between the user-selected

restoration plan and the plan determined by our optimization framework. Users will also be able to select barrier owners (e.g. Kitsap county) and/or salmon species (e.g. Chinook) to focus the problem by excluding other owners/species.

We will also explore enabling user data edits, e.g. user information on the existence of barrier culverts missing from the FPDSI database, similar to the “Wild West” option in FishWerks, and user information on barrier culverts on private lands where the landowner is unwilling to engage in fish passage restoration. Further options for user-provided data will be discussed and determined in workshops with key user groups (see Engagement and Communication Plan).

Defining gains to objectives (e.g. habitat) consistently across all barrier culverts in the Case Area allows for comparison and coordinated restoration planning. However, we also strive to support existing efforts by cities and counties in Washington who are working on constructing prioritization indices tailored for their own specific needs. Through cataloging the methods and datasets for fish passage prioritization indices for all relevant entities in Washington, we will explore the possibility of including adopted prioritization indices in our optimization framework. In order to include these indices, we would modify the indices to remove any components of the index related to restoration costs or upstream/downstream configuration as our framework explicitly accounts for these culvert characteristics. Users could select the modified prioritization index of interest to them (e.g. the modified prioritization index from King County) and use the tool to determine the culvert restoration package in King County that maximizes the modified prioritization index (from the perspective of King County) subject to a budget constraint and the hydrography of the system.

Finally, we will incorporate a number of scenario-planning tools based on needs identified by key user groups (See Engagement and Communication Plan). These features will allow users to explore how plans identified by the optimization tool vary based on alternative futures determined by factors external to the decision-maker. For example, given that WSDOT is mandated to correct enough barriers to open 90% blocked habitat by 2030, counties and other entities may want to consider scenarios where all state-owned culverts have been fixed, or alternative subsets that represent the 90% habitat target. In doing so, users can better capitalize on the massive infrastructure investments WSDOT is expected to make in order to comply with the injunction. We will also consider, as a starting point, climate and urbanization scenarios, two factors which are likely to affect both the value and costs of specific barrier correction actions.

The online app created with the Shiny package for R and hosted on the Shiny Server. Similar tools have been built using various proprietary software programs. Through using an open-source optimization framework coupled with an open-source user interface we maximize accessibility and customizability.

C. Project Evaluation

Our project objectives can be grouped into three broad categories that will be evaluated independently as described here. First, a primary objective of the project is to utilize our framework to explore critical research questions related to the science and economics of barrier culvert removal in Washington State. Specifically, we will characterize the tradeoffs associated with barrier culvert replacement, evaluate the performance of PI methods, which are widely used throughout the Washington Case Area, and estimate gains from coordination across barrier culvert owners in Washington (e.g. additional habitat realized when the state works in coordination with counties). These questions will be explored in journal publications, which will be evaluated according to the quality of the journal, popular press coverage of the publications, and standard citation metrics.

A second primary objective of the project is to produce a DST that can inform decisions regarding fish passage projects in Washington State. We will evaluate the effectiveness of these efforts through evaluating workshop attendance and post-workshop surveys collected in Workshops 1 and 3 (see Engagement and Communication Plan), and through analytics collected through the R Shiny application (e.g. the number of unique users, length of use, user location, etc.).

We also seek to use the project to train junior scientists to produce research that is actionable, publishable, and reproducible. We will evaluate these efforts based on both inputs and outputs. Inputs to student training are the opportunities that the PIs offer students (e.g. to speak at meetings, present results, join meetings, attend conferences) and approaches to engaging students. Outputs are the quality of student work, the quality of the questions and concerns raised by students as related to the research project, and the student engagement in the project (e.g. is the student excited to attend workshops with managers, tribes, and stakeholders).

D. Timeline

| | Oct/Dec Q1 | Jan/Mar Q2 | Apr/Jun Q3 | Jul/Sept Q4 | Oct/Dec Q5 | Jan/Mar Q6 | Apr/Jun Q7 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Workshop 1: Gathering Input | | | | | | | |
| Catalog prioritization indices | | | | | | | |
| Generate salmon habitat quantity dataset building off existing work products | | | | | | | |
| Generate barrier removal cost estimates building off existing work products | | | | | | | |
| Generate habitat quality dataset | | | | | | | |
| Generate equity metrics and data | | | | | | | |
| Generate risk mitigation metrics and data | | | | | | | |
| Develop optimization code building off existing template code | | | | | | | |
| Analyze optimal solutions | | | | | | | |
| Workshop 2: Soliciting Feedback | | | | | | | |
| Integrate feedback from Workshop 2 | | | | | | | |
| Develop the R Shiny app | | | | | | | |
| Prepare manuscripts for publication | | | | | | | |
| Workshop 3: DST Demonstration and Launch | | | | | | | |

SCIENCE WORK PLAN RELEVANCE AND BROADER IMPACTS

Our project is most directly aligned with Priority Science Action 1 “Evaluate how current and future social, economic, and political factors, such as population growth and urban development, will affect habitat quality and quantity, both negatively and positively as gauged by salmon viability.” and Priority Science Action 12: “Refine risk assessment tools and scenario development and analyses to improve our understanding of highly uncertain, complex and inter-related challenges and solutions to provide information that can be used to identify actions to achieve a more resilient Puget Sound ecosystem.”

Culvert barrier corrections are expected to have large impacts on salmon habitat and viability and will be shaped by political factors as well as future population growth. Our analysis will compare habitat outcomes generated by independent actors using “rank and score” methods to those from coordinated conservation planning based on principles of optimization. Additionally, coordinating culvert barrier correction across

multiple agencies with distinct and limited budgets is inherently a complex challenge. Our project will develop a novel framework that will demonstrate trade-offs between potentially competing priorities shared with stakeholders via an online DST. Our approach is consistent with a number of recommendations set forth by the Science Panel, including incorporation of indigenous knowledge, coordination of efforts across entities, communication targeted to appropriate audiences, and the evaluation of trade-offs between approaches.

ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION PLAN

Our project will be guided by a Fish Passage Policy Advisory Committee (FPPAC) (Table 1) comprised of community collaborators, who are fish passage scientists and practitioners and leaders in fish passage in Washington State. At each phase of our engagement plan, outlined below, we will rely on advice from our Advisory Committee. Members of FPPAC will include individuals working directly in the area of barrier culvert restoration, individuals working with tribal nations impacted by fish passage in the Case Area, individuals with a history of engaging with our key stakeholder groups, and individuals generating science relevant to our study problem. At the time of the submission of this proposal, we are actively seeking to expand this group to representation from other tribes, barrier ownership entities, and stakeholders. In addition to community collaborators serving on our FPPAC we will collaborate with fish passage scientists at The Nature Conservancy and scientists at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration involved in the creation of FISHPass (see Letters of Commitment).

Table 1: Fish Passage Policy Advisory Committee (FPPAC)

| Name | Job Title | Affiliation |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Jeff Dickison | Assistant Natural Resources Director | Squaxin Island Tribe Natural Resource Center |
| Steve R Hinton | Conservation Scientist | Tulalip Tribes Treaty Rights & Government Affairs |
| Marc Duboiski | Outdoor Grants Manager | Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office |
| Dave Caudill | Outdoor Grants Manager | Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office |
| Evan Lewis | Fish Passage Projects Manager | King County Fish Passage Restoration Program |

In the beginning of YR1, in the initial phase of the project, we will organize a workshop, Workshop 1, intended to uncover the objectives and challenges in culvert barrier replacement for key user groups including representatives from relevant tribal nations, city and county governments, restoration funding agencies such as the Fish Barrier Removal Board, WDFW, and WSDOT. The workshops will begin with a presentation of our proposed framework and online tool as a straw-man proposal in order to generate discussion and elicit ideas on how to capture fundamental real-world priorities and constraints in barrier culvert removal. We will gather feedback during the workshops and through post-workshop surveys. Ideas coming from Workshop 1 will be incorporated into our project to the extent possible given data and computational limitations, which will be made clear to workshop participants.

In a second phase, at the beginning of YR2, we will organize a second workshop, Workshop 2, to present preliminary results (e.g. tradeoffs between various objectives) and demonstrate the functionality of three preliminary working versions of the online tool. One version of the tool will be based on the weighted objective function, another will be based on the constraint-based method, and the third version will be based on the Pareto Frontier approach. This second workshop will demonstrate how feedback from Workshop 1 was incorporated in our framework and tool and provide a more in-depth discussion of our data inputs

to the tool, e.g. a demonstration of the quality of our cost estimates, and a visual demonstration of results from various optimization methods. Workshop 2 will provide stakeholders with a final opportunity to guide key features of the framework and solicit feedback on the usability of the online DST and the optimization approach perceived to be most intuitive.

Finally, at the end of YR2, we will host a third workshop, Workshop 3, which will be an interactive workshop to launch our finalized online tool letting potential users directly engage with the tool. In preparation for this workshop, we will develop a video tutorial that will present content from the DST user guide in a way that is accessible and engaging. The workshop will begin with a screening of the video tutorial. Then, we will engage participants with exercises that highlight the tradeoffs between various objectives, gains from coordination, and how alternative budget/funding scenarios (defined by budget levels and their distribution across time) impact the culvert restoration packages with the highest return on investment. As with Workshop 1, participant feedback will be collected through post-workshop surveys.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The proposed project has been co-developed by the project PIs and members of the FPPAC. The PIs and FPPAC will continue to collaborate to produce an integrated project leading to both actionable and publishable science.

PI Jardine will serve as the lead administrator of the grant where administrative responsibilities include organizing meetings both internally and with the scientific advisory board to ensure the project is on track to deliver work products on time, tracking project performance, facilitating project design decisions, and supervising and mentoring the postdoctoral scholar and the two Research Assistants (one funded with PSP funds and the other with leveraged SMEA funds). PI Jardine will also provide technical assistance with optimization in R and developing the R Shiny app including providing template code for various optimization algorithms along with sensitivity analyses and model selection, and providing template code for the DST user app features.

Co-PI Van Deynze will co-administer the grant, with PI Jardine, where administrative responsibilities include organizing meetings both internally and with the scientific advisory board to ensure the project is on track to deliver work products on time, tracking project performance, facilitating project design decisions, and mentoring the two Research Assistants. Co-PI Van Deynze will also assist with developing and deploying the optimization algorithm and the R Shiny app. As a post-doctoral research associate, co-PI Van Deynze will receive training from PI Jardine in the development of applied optimization algorithms, in project administration, and in mentorship of students, furthering development as an independent researcher.

Co-PI Scheuerell will co-supervise the Research Scientist and provide assistance for development of the habitat quality index and measures of risk with respect to salmon. He will also support the engagement and outreach effort, focusing on the benefits to salmon and stakeholders. Additionally, co-PI Scheuerell will liaise with state and tribal co-managers regarding ongoing salmon conservation and recovery efforts.

Co-PIs Fonner and Holland will provide assistance as needed for development and deployment of the multi-criteria optimization framework and corresponding algorithm. They will also support the engagement and outreach effort, facilitating incorporation of best practices and paradigms from conservation social sciences and provide guidance on the institutional environment and human dimensions associated with salmon conservation and recovery.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] K. K. Bartz, K. M. Lagueux, M. D. Scheuerell, T. Beechie, A. D. Haas, and M. H. Ruckelshaus. Translating restoration scenarios into habitat conditions: an initial step in evaluating recovery strategies for chinook salmon (*oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 63(7):1578–1595, jul 2006. doi: 10.1139/f06-055. URL <https://doi.org/10.1139/f06-055>.

- [2] J. Battin, M. W. Wiley, M. H. Ruckelshaus, R. N. Palmer, E. Korb, K. K. Bartz, and H. Imaki. Projected impacts of climate change on salmon habitat restoration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(16):6720–6725, apr 2007. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0701685104. URL <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0701685104>.
- [3] Brown, Alex. Coming Down the Pipe: Saving Washington’s Salmon May Require Replacing Tens of Thousands of Culverts, and Nobody Knows Where the Money Will Come From. *The Daily Chronicle*, Aug. 2019.
- [4] T. B. Couto, M. L. Messager, and J. D. Olden. Safeguarding migratory fish via strategic planning of future small hydropower in Brazil. *Nature Sustainability*, pages 1–8, 2021. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [5] J. Elith, J. R. Leathwick, and T. Hastie. A working guide to boosted regression trees. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(4):802–813, 2008. ISSN 1365-2656. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01390.x>.
- [6] A. Ettinger, E. Buhle, B. Feist, E. Howe, J. Spromberg, N. Scholz, and P. Levin. Prioritizing conservation actions in urbanizing landscapes. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):1–13, 2021. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [7] C. R. Field and C. S. Elphick. Quantifying the return on investment of social and ecological data for conservation planning. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14(12):124081, Dec. 2019. ISSN 1748-9326. Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [8] D. J. Isaak, R. F. Thurow, B. E. Rieman, and J. B. Dunham. Chinook salmon use of spawning patches: relative roles of habitat quality, size, and connectivity. *Ecological Applications*, 17(2):352–364, mar 2007. doi: 10.1890/05-1949. URL <https://doi.org/10.1890/05-1949>.
- [9] J. C. Jorgensen, J. M. Honea, M. M. McClure, T. D. Cooney, K. Engle, and D. M. Holzer. Linking landscape-level change to habitat quality: an evaluation of restoration actions on the freshwater habitat of spring-run chinook salmon. *Freshwater Biology*, 54(7):1560–1575, jul 2009. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02207.x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02207.x>.
- [10] M. J. Kuby, W. F. Fagan, C. S. ReVelle, and W. L. Graf. A multiobjective optimization model for dam removal: an example trading off salmon passage with hydropower and water storage in the Willamette basin. *Advances in Water Resources*, 28(8):845–855, 2005. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [11] J. R. O’Hanley and D. Tomberlin. Optimizing the removal of small fish passage barriers. *Environmental Modeling & Assessment*, 10(2):85–98, 2005. Publisher: Springer.
- [12] G. R. Pess, P. M. Kiffney, M. C. Liermann, T. R. Bennett, J. H. Anderson, and T. P. Quinn. The influences of body size, habitat quality, and competition on the movement and survival of juvenile coho salmon during the early stages of stream recolonization. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 140(4):883–897, jul 2011. doi: 10.1080/00028487.2011.587752. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028487.2011.587752>.
- [13] P. Roni, T. J. Beechie, R. E. Bilby, F. E. Leonetti, M. M. Pollock, and G. R. Pess. A Review of Stream Restoration Techniques and a Hierarchical Strategy for Prioritizing Restoration in Pacific Northwest Watersheds. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 22(1):1–20, 2002. ISSN 1548-8675.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

Project YR 1 (10/1/21-6/30/22)

1. Salary Cost

- \$15,122 is requested for 1 month of effort from PI Jardine. Jardine will serve as the lead administrator of the grant where administrative responsibilities include organizing meetings both internally and with the scientific advisory board to ensure the project is on track to deliver work products on time, tracking project performance, facilitating project design decisions, and supervising and mentoring the postdoctoral scholar and the two Research Assistants (one funded with PSP funds and the other with leveraged SMEA funds). PI Jardine will also provide technical assistance with optimization in R and developing the R Shiny app including providing template code for various optimization algorithms along with sensitivity analyses and model selection, and providing template code for the DST user app features.
- \$55,800 is requested for 9 months of effort from co-PI and postdoctoral scholar VanDeynze. VanDeynze will co-administer the grant, with PI Jardine, where administrative responsibilities include organizing meetings both internally and with the scientific advisory board to ensure the project is on track to deliver work products on time, tracking project performance, facilitating project design decisions, and mentoring the two Research Assistants. Co-PI Van Deynze will also assist with developing and deploying the optimization algorithm and the R Shiny app. As a post-doctoral research associate, co-PI Van Deynze will receive training from PI Jardine in the development of applied optimization algorithms, in project administration, and in mentorship of students, furthering development as an independent researcher.
- \$38,925 is requested for 9 months of effort from a post-graduate Research Scientist. The Research Scientist will develop the habitat quality index under the supervision of co-PI Scheuerell. Efforts include reviewing the relevant literature, gathering data, calculating the index for all barrier culverts in the Washington Case Area, and documenting all analyses such that they are reproducible. Additionally, the Research Scientist will collaborate with PI Jardine and co-PI VanDeynze to publish a streamlined version of the R shiny app. Thus, we will recruit a Research Scientist with a strong background in fisheries sciences and strong quantitative skills.
- \$22,590 is requested for 4.5 months of effort of a graduate student Research Assistant. The Research Assistant will utilize the optimization framework to explore the research questions identified in the Project Narrative as a basis for a thesis, exploring the research questions laid out in the proposal. In the first year, prior to the optimization framework being finalized, the Research Assistant will familiarize themselves with all aspects of the project including the relevant literature, the data, optimization algorithms, and co-develop code to analyze preliminary results based on maximizing habitat quantity subject to a budget constraint and potential coordination constraints (e.g. budgets must be spent entirely in a single county). The code will serve as a template for analyzing results once other dimensions of the problem are incorporated. Thus we will recruit a Research Assistant with interdisciplinary training or interests in political economy, economics, and fisheries as well as someone with strong quantitative skills and coding experience.

2. Benefits

- Fringe benefits are charged at the standard UW rates of 23.2% for faculty and postdoctoral scholars, 29.4% for professional employees, and 21.6% for graduate student research assistants. Total fringe benefits are equal to \$32,777.

3. Overhead

- Indirect costs, for on-campus research projects, are 55.5% of salaries, benefits, expendable supplies and equipment, travel, and publication costs. Total indirect costs are \$94,746.

4. Supplies

- We have budgeted \$2,000 for a laptop computer for PI Van Deynze based on the cost (Education Pricing) of a MacBook pro with 16 GB of RAM and 1 TB of storage. Van Deynze's current postdoctoral position at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center and associated access to a laptop computer will end prior to the project start date and thus a laptop computer is needed for the entire project period.

5. Travel

- We have budgeted \$500 for a one-day field trip to allow the project team to visit multiple barrier restoration projects throughout the Case Area representing high-, medium- and low-cost projects. Associated field trip costs include vehicle transportation costs, fuel cost (estimated at \$45), and per-diem meals and incidentals expenses for the PI, co-PIs, and two students (7 people * \$57.00 ~ \$400).

6. Other direct costs

- We have budgeted \$16,842 for tuition for the Research Assistant (see description of the Research Assistant's role in the itemized Salary section).
- We have budgeted \$3,000 for Workshop 1, held at the beginning of Year 1, is intended to uncover the objectives and challenges in culvert barrier replacement for key user groups and present our proposed framework and online tool to solicit feedback. The workshop will also assist our research team with cultivating a strong professional relationship within the community of stakeholders engaged in working on fish passage in the state of Washington. Workshop costs include event facility rental (estimated at \$440 based on the Walker Ames Room at the University of Washington campus), catering including breakfast, lunch, and snacks for ? 45 participants (estimated at \$34.50 per person * 45 participants = \$1552.5 based on an estimate from Arista Catering in Seattle), and the reimbursement of transportation costs for participants needing reimbursement (\$1,007.5 budgeted for transportation cost at \$22 per person).

Project YR 2 (7/1/22-6/30/23)

1. Salary Cost

- \$15,727 is requested for 1 month of effort from PI Jardine. Jardine will serve as the lead administrator of the grant where administrative responsibilities include organizing meetings both internally and with the scientific advisory board to ensure the project is on track to deliver work products on time, tracking project performance, facilitating project design decisions, and supervising and mentoring the postdoctoral scholar and the two Research Assistants (one funded with PSP funds and the other with leveraged SMEA funds). PI Jardine will also provide technical assistance with optimization in R and developing the R Shiny app including providing template code for various optimization algorithms along with sensitivity analyses and model selection, and providing template code for the DST user app features.
- \$77,376 is requested for 12 months of effort from co-PI and postdoctoral scholar VanDeynze. VanDeynze will co-administer the grant, with PI Jardine, where administrative responsibilities include organizing meetings both internally and with the scientific advisory board to ensure the project is on track to deliver work products on time, tracking project performance, facilitating project design decisions, and mentoring the two Research Assistants. Co-PI Van Deynze will

also assist with developing and deploying the optimization algorithm and the R Shiny app. As a post-doctoral research associate, co-PI Van Deynze will receive training from PI Jardine in the development of applied optimization algorithms, in project administration, and in mentorship of students, furthering development as an independent researcher.

- \$26,988 is requested for 6 months of effort from a post-graduate Research Scientist. The Research Scientist will collaborate with PI Jardine and co-PI VanDeynze to publish and deploy a finalized version of the R shiny app.
- \$23,495 is requested for 4.5 months of effort of a graduate student Research Assistant. The Research Assistant will utilize the optimization framework to explore the research questions identified in the Project Narrative as a basis for a thesis, exploring the research questions laid out in the proposal.

2. Benefits

- Fringe benefits are charged at the standard UW rates of 23.2% for faculty and postdoctoral scholars, 29.4% for professional employees, and 21.6% for graduate student research assistants. Total fringe benefits are equal to \$34,609.

3. Overhead

- Indirect costs, for on-campus research projects, are 55.5% of salaries, benefits, expendable supplies and equipment, travel, and publication costs. Total indirect costs are \$106,113.

4. Supplies

- None

5. Travel

- We have budgeted \$3,000 for PI Jardine and the Research Assistant to travel to one domestic academic conference. For example, the AERE Annual Summer Conference, which is held in June each year. The 2023 location has not yet been announced.

6. Other direct costs

- We budget \$3,000 in Year 2 to cover the costs associated with publishing our results in peer-reviewed literature and host our R Shiny app on the Shiny server for 1 year starting on the app launch date and near the end of Year 2 (pricing ranges from \$440-\$1,100 per year for the anticipated level of active hours logged for the app <https://www.shinyapps.io>). Note at the time of writing this proposal, we are actively exploring options for long-term hosting of our app to ensure longevity in our research impact. One possibility is the NOAA toolbox <https://noaa-fisheries-integrated-toolbox.github.io/>.
- We have budgeted \$17,346 for tuition for the Research Assistant (see description of the Research Assistant's role in the itemized Salary section).
- We have budgeted \$3,000 for workshop 2 and 3 and a video tutorial. Workshops 2 and 3 will be held in Year 2 of the project. Workshop 2 will be an online workshop and Workshop 3 will be an in-person workshop. Workshop 2 is intended to present our preliminary findings and Workshop 3 is intended to launch our finalized online tool in an interactive session. The workshop will also assist our research team with cultivating a strong professional relationships with tribes and within the community of stakeholders engaged in working on fish passage in the state of Washington. Workshop costs include event facility rental (estimated at \$440 based on the Walker Ames Room at the University of Washington campus), catering including breakfast, lunch, and snacks for ~45 participants (estimated at \$34.50 per person * 45 participants = \$1552.5 based on an estimate from Arista Catering in Seattle), and the reimbursement of transportation costs for participants

needing reimbursement (\$1,007.5 budgeted for transportation cost \sim \$22 per person). The budget also includes the cost of video production to generate a tutorial for the online tool. Video production services will be contracted out, e.g. to the University of Washington Video Production team (estimated cost of \$4,000; see <https://www.washington.edu/video/our-services/production/>).

PROJECT TITLE: Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state

| | | | | YR 1 | | YR 2 | | TOTAL | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------|---------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| | | | | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | | |
| | Job Classification | UNIT | RATE | UNITS | COST | UNITS | COST | UNITS | COST |
| SALARY COST | Faculty, PI | HR | \$15,122.00 | 1 | \$ 15,122.00 | 1 | \$ 15,727.00 | 2 | \$ 30,849.00 |
| | Postdoc, co-PI | HR | \$6,200.00 | 9 | \$ 55,800.00 | 12 | \$ 77,376.00 | 21 | \$ 133,176.00 |
| | Grad. Research Assistant | HR | \$5,020.00 | 4.50 | \$ 22,590.00 | 4.50 | \$ 23,495.00 | 9 | \$ 46,085.00 |
| | Research Scientist | HR | \$4,325.00 | 9 | \$ 38,925.00 | 6 | \$ 26,988.00 | 15 | \$ 65,913.00 |
| | | HR | \$0.00 | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - |
| | | HR | \$0.00 | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - |
| TOTAL SALARY | | | | 24 | \$ 132,437.00 | 24 | \$ 143,586.00 | 47 | \$ 276,023.00 |
| BENEFITS | Faculty, PI | HR | 23.20% | | \$ 3,508.00 | | \$ 3,649.00 | | \$ 7,157.00 |
| | Postdoc, co-PI | HR | 23.30% | | \$ 12,946.00 | | \$ 17,951.00 | | \$ 30,897.00 |
| | Grad. Research Assistant | HR | 21.60% | | \$ 4,879.00 | | \$ 5,075.00 | | \$ 9,954.00 |
| | Research Scientist | HR | 29.40% | | \$ 11,444.00 | | \$ 7,934.00 | | \$ 19,378.00 |
| | 0 HR | 0% | | | \$ - | | \$ - | | \$ - |
| | 0 HR | 0% | | | \$ - | | \$ - | | \$ - |
| TOTAL BENEFITS | | | | - | \$ 32,777.00 | - | \$ 34,609.00 | 0 | \$ 67,386.00 |
| OVERHEAD | | | 55.50% | | \$ 94,746.00 | | \$ 106,113.00 | | \$ 200,859.00 |
| OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODC) | Workshop | | | | | | | | |
| | Publication | | | | | | | | |
| | Tuition | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Total ODCs | | | | | \$ 19,842.00 | | \$ 27,346.00 | | \$ 47,188.00 |
| SUPPLIES | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL SUPPLIES | | | | | \$ 2,000.00 | | | | \$ 2,000.00 |
| SUBCONTRACTS | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL SUBCONTRACTORS | | | | | \$ - | | \$ - | | \$ - |
| TRAVEL EXPENSES | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL TRAVEL | | | | | | | | | \$ 3,500.00 |
| TOTAL COSTS | | | | | | | | | \$ 596,956.00 |

Sunny L. Jardine

University of Washington, School of Marine and Environmental Affairs

3707 Brooklyn Ave NE, Seattle WA 98105, United States

206.616.4952

jardine@uw.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California at Davis, 2013

M.A., International Development Economics, University of San Francisco, 2008

B.S., Environmental Studies, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, 2002

EMPLOYMENT

Assistant Professor, School of Marine and Environmental Affairs, University of Washington, September 2016-Present

Faculty member, Quantitative Ecology and Resource Management Interdisciplinary Graduate Program, 2018-Present

Assistant Professor, School of Marine Science and Policy, University of Delaware, September 2013-August 2016

Faculty member, Department of Applied Economics and Statistics, University of Delaware, April 2014-August 2016

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION

Associate Editor, Marine Resource Economics, July 2015-Present

Scientific and Statistical Committee, Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, 2013 - 2016

GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POST-DOCTORATES SUPERVISED

M.M.A., University of Washington, School of Marine and Environmental Affairs

Graduation Expected 2021: Kathryn Bland and Stuart Jones

Graduated in 2020: Louis Forristall, Brittany Hoedemaker, Elise Lasky, Jon McVeigh, Angela Moran, Nicholas Nagengast, and Stephanie Wolek

Graduated in 2019: Katie Chicojay, Emilie Franke, Kelly Martin, Priscilla Rivas, and Alexandra Stote

Graduated in 2018: Diana Perry and Lange Solberg

M.A., University of Delaware, School of Marine Science and Policy

Graduated in 2017: Meredith Kurz

Graduated in 2016: Jefferson Flood

Ph.D., University of Delaware, School of Marine Science and Policy

Graduated in 2019: Lingxiao Yan

Post-doctoral Scholars

2019 - Present: Braeden VanDeynze and Adam L. Hayes

PRINCIPAL PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THIS PROPOSAL

Fisher, M.C., Moore, S.K., Jardine, S.L., Watson, J.R., Samhouri, J.F. (2020) Climate Shock Effects and Mediation in Fisheries, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(2).

Kroetz, K., Luque, G.M., Gephart, J.A., Jardine, S.L., Lee, P., Chicojay Moore, K., Colef C., Steinkruger, A., and Donlan, C.J. (2020). Consequences of seafood mislabeling for marine populations and fisheries management, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(48), pp.30318-30323.

Jardine, S.L., Fisher, M., Moore, S., Samhouri, J. (2020). Inequality in the economic impacts from climate shocks in fisheries: the case of harmful algal blooms. *Ecological Economics*, 176, 106691.

Mao, J., and Jardine, S.L. (2020). Market Impacts of a Toxic Algae Event: The Case of California Dungeness Crab, *Marine Resource Economics*, 35(1), 1-20.

Moore, K.M., Allison, E.H., Dreyer, S.J., Ekstrom, J.A., Jardine, S.L., Klinger, T., Moore, S.K. and Norman, K.C. (2020). Harmful algal blooms: identifying effective adaptive actions used in fishery-dependent communities in response to a protracted event. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 6, 1-12.

Tan, Y., and Jardine, S.L. (2018). Considering economic efficiency in ecosystem-based management: The case of horseshoe crabs in Delaware Bay, *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 72(2), 511-538.

Jardine, S.L., and Sanchirico, J.N. (2017). Estimating the cost of invasive species control, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 87, 242-257.

Jardine, S.L., and Sanchirico, J.N. (2015). Fishermen, markets, and population diversity. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 74, 37-54.

Jardine, S.L., C.-Y. C. Lin, and Sanchirico, J.N. (2014). Measuring the benefits from a marketing cooperative in the Copper River fishery. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 96(4), 1084-1101.

Lampert, A., A. Hastings, E.D. Grosholz, Jardine, S.L., and Sanchirico, J.N. (2014). Optimal approaches for balancing invasive species eradication and endangered species management. *Science* 344(6187), 1028-1031.

Daniel S. Holland
Northwest Fishery Science Center
2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112
Phone: (206) 302-1752 , dan.holland@noaa.gov

Education

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------|------|
| University of Utah | Economics | B.A. | 1988 |
| University of Illinois | Agricultural Economics | M.S. | 1993 |
| University of Rhode Island | Resource Economics | Ph.D. | 1998 |

Professional History

- 2017-present Senior Scientists, Supervisory Economist (ZP-V): Northwest Fishery Science Center (NWFSC), Seattle, Supervisor: Mike Ford
- 2013-present Affiliate Professor, University of Washington, School of Aquatic & Fishery Sciences.
- 2014-2017 Supervisory Economist (ZP-IV): Northwest Fishery Science Center (NWFSC), Seattle, Supervisor: Jameal Samhouri
- 2010-2014: Economist (ZP-IV): Northwest Fishery Science Center (NWFSC), Seattle, WA Supervisor: Mark Plummer
- 2005-2010 Research Scientist: Gulf of Maine Research Institute (GMRI), Portland, ME Supervisor: John Annala
- 2003-2005 Senior Economist: New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC), Wellington, New Zealand, Supervisor: Kevin Stokes
- 2000-2002 Assistant Professor: School for Marine Science and Technology (SMAST), University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, New Bedford, MA., Supervisor: Brian Rothschild
- 1998-2000: Industry Economist: Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC), Seattle, WA. Supervisor: Joe Terry

Professional Recognition and Service

- Vice Chair, Pacific Fishery Management Council Science and Statistical Committee (current)
- President, International Institute for Fisheries Economics and Trade (IIFET) 2014-2016
- Board Member, North American Association of Fishery Economists (NAAFE) 2009-2013
- Marine Resource Economics Foundation: Vice President 2015-present, Board 2013-2015
- Associate Editor, *Marine Resource Economics*, 2003-present
- National Research Council Committee on the Development of an Integrated Science Strategy of Ocean Acidification Monitoring, Research and Impacts Assessment 2010.
- Publication of Enduring Significance Award - *Marine Resource Economics* 2016 for 1996 article "Marine Reserves for Fisheries Management." *Marine Resource Economics* 11(3):157-171
- Honorable Mention: Outstanding Article Award - *Marine Resource Economics* 2013. Holland, D.S. 2013. Making Cents Out of Barter Data from the British Columbia Groundfish ITQ Market. *Marine Resource Economics* 28(4):311-330.

Post-Doctorates Supervised

Ridouan Bani, University of Washington, SAFS 2020-Present
Kiva Oken, University of Washington, SAFS 2018-2019
Kate Richerson, University of Washington, SAFS 2015-2017
Pamela Woods, Nordic Centre for Research on Marine Ecosystems and Resources under Climate Change (NorMER). 2011-2013
Sigrid Lehuta, Gulf of Maine Research Institute. 2010-2011

5 Publications Most Relevant to Proposal

- Holland, D.S. and K.E. Schnier 2006. Individual Habitat Quotas for Fisheries. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*. 51:72-92.
- Holland, D.S. and K.E. Schnier 2006. Protecting Marine Biodiversity: A Comparison of Individual Habitat Quotas (IHQs) and Marine Protected Areas. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 63(7):1481-1495.
- Bellanger, M., R. Fonner, D.S. Holland, G. Libecap, D. Lipton, P. Scemama, C. Speir and O. Thebaud. Cross-sectoral Externalities Related to Natural Resources and Ecosystem Services. Forthcoming in *Ecological Economics*.
- Bellanger, M., Speir, C., Blanchard, F., Brooks, K., Butler, J.R., Crosson, S., Fonner, R., Gourguet, S., Holland, D.S., Kuikka, S. and Le Gallic, B., 2020. Addressing Marine and Coastal Governance Conflicts at the Interface of Multiple Sectors and Jurisdictions. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 7, p.743.
- Richerson, K., J. Leonard, D.S. Holland 2018. Predicting the economic impacts of the 2017 West Coast salmon troll ocean fishery closure. *Marine Policy* 95:142-152

5 Additional Publications

- Holland, D.S. 2018. Collective Rights-Based Fishery Management A Path to Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 10:469-85.
- Holland, D.S., J. Agar, S. Crosson, G. DePiper, S. Kasperski, D. Kitts, L. Perruso, and C. Speir 2017. The Impact of Catch Shares on Diversification of Fishers' Income and Risk. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 114 (35) 9302-9307
- Holland, D.S. 2000. A bioeconomic model of marine sanctuaries on Georges Bank. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 57:1307-1319
- Holland, D.S. and J.G. Sutinen. 2000. Location Choice in New England Trawl Fisheries: Old Habits Die Hard. *Land Economics* 76(1):133-149. 47
- Kasperski, S. and D.S. Holland 2013. Income Diversification and Risk for Fishermen. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*. 100(6):2076-2081. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1212278110.

ROBBY FONNER

2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112

robby.fonner@noaa.gov

CURRENT POSITION

Economist (August 2015 – present)
Conservation Biology Division
Northwest Fisheries Science Center, NOAA Fisheries

EDUCATION

Ph.D. – Economics, *University of New Mexico* (July 2014)

M.S. – Natural Resource Economics, Water Resources minor, *Oregon State University* (March 2008)

B.A. – Environmental Studies, Economics, *University of Colorado* (August 2004)

RESEARCH & PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Senior Economist – Oregon Public Utility Commission, Salem, OR, June 2014 – July 2015

Research Assistant – University College, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, January 2012 – May 2012

Research Assistant – Science Impact Laboratory for Policy and Economics, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, August 2010 – August 2011

Economist – Cardno ENTRIX Environmental Consultants, Vancouver, WA, January 2007 – August 2009

Research Assistant – Coastal Oregon Marine Experiment Station, Oregon State University, Newport, OR, September 2004 – December 2006

Field Scientist – Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, CO, June 2003 – August 2003

PUBLICATIONS

Peer-reviewed articles

M. Bellanger, **R. Fonner**, D.S. Holland, G.D. Libecap, D.W. Lipton, P. Scemama, C. Speir, and O. Thébaud. 2021. “Cross-sectoral Externalities Related to Natural Resources and Ecosystem Services” *Ecological Economics*, 184, 106990.

R. Fonner, M. Bellanger, and A. Warlick, 2020. “Economic analysis for marine protected resources management: Challenges, tools, and opportunities” *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 194, 105222

S.H. Munsch, K.S. Andrews, L.G. Crozier, **R. Fonner**, J.L. Gosselin, C.M. Greene, C.J. Harvey, J.I. Lundin, G.R. Pess, J.F. Samhouri, and W.H. Satterthwaite, 2020. “Potential for ecological nonlinearities and thresholds to inform Pacific salmon management” *Ecosphere*, 11(12), e03302.

M. Bellanger, C. Speir, F. Blanchard, K. Brooks, J.R. Butler, S. Crosson, **R. Fonner**, S. Gourguet, D.S. Holland, S. Kuikka, B. Le Gallic, R. Lent, G.D. Libecap, D.W. Lipton, P.K. Nayak, D. Reid, P. Scemama, R. Stephenson, O. Thébaud, and J.C. Young. 2020. "Addressing marine and coastal governance conflicts at the interface of multiple sectors and jurisdictions" *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 7, 743.

R. Fonner, A.K. Bohara, and S. Archambault. 2018. "Migration Choices during Conflict in Nepal: Pull forces and landscape interactions" *International Journal of Development and Conflict*, 8(2), 46-61.

R. Fonner and A.K. Bohara. 2017. "Optimal population control of wild horse populations with non-lethal methods" *Land Economics*, 93(3), 390-412.

J.T. Thorson, **R. Fonner**, M. A. Haltuch, K. Ono, and H. Winker. 2017. "Accounting for spatio-temporal variation and fisher targeting when estimating abundances from multispecies fishery data" *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 74(11), 1794-1807.

R. Fonner and G. Sylvia. 2015. "Willingness to pay for multiple seafood labels in a niche market" *Marine Resource Economics*, 30(1), 51-70.

R. Fonner and R. Berrens. 2014. "A hedonic pricing model of lift tickets for US alpine ski areas: Examining the influence of crowding" *Tourism Economics*, 20(6), 1215-1233.

Reports

R. Fonner and A. Warlick. 2018. "Marine Protected Resources on the West Coast of the United States: current management and opportunities for applying economic analysis" U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-144. <https://doi.org/10.25923/vprp-1507>

ADVISEMENT & HOSTING

- Advisor, Braeden Van Deynze, University of Washington / NWFSC postdoc, Jan. 2020 – present, Co-advised with Dan Holland and Sunny Jardine
- Advisor, Brittany King (Oregon State University PhD candidate), NERTO internship, Sep. 2020 – Dec. 2020
- Host Researcher, Manuel Bellanger (Ifremer), June 2018 – June 2019
- Advisor, Casey Lilley (Middlebury), NOAA Summer Internship, June 2017 – Aug. 2017

ACTIVITIES & AWARDS

- Social Sciences Advisory Council to Puget Sound Partnership, 2018 – present
- Journal Reviewing: *Coastal Management*, *Economic Inquiry*, *Fisheries Research*, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, *Land Economics*, *Leisure Sciences*, *Marine Policy*, *Marine Resource Economics*, *Ocean and Coastal Management*, *Tourism Economics*.
- Dissertation defense passed with distinction, University of New Mexico, 2014
- Graduate School scholarship, University of New Mexico, 2009-2013
- Alumni Scholarship, University of Colorado, 2000-2003
- Semester of upper-division coursework in ecology at University of Otago, New Zealand, 2002

Mark D. Scheuerell
USGS Washington Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit
School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-5020
scheuerl@uw.edu
206.543.5997

Education

- Ph.D., Zoology, University of Washington (2002)
M.S., Fishery and Aquatic Science, Cornell University (1995)
B.S., Zoology, University of Wisconsin (1991)

Employment

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Assistant Unit Leader</i> | |
| USGS Washington Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit | 2019 - present |
| <i>Associate Professor</i> | |
| School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington | 2019 - present |
| <i>Research Fisheries Biologist</i> | |
| Northwest Fisheries Science Center, NOAA Fisheries | 2003 - 2019 |
| <i>Affiliate Associate Professor</i> | |
| School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington | 2016 - 2019 |
| <i>Affiliate Assistant Professor</i> | |
| School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington | 2007 - 2016 |

Professional recognition

- Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Washington, District of Columbia (2006)
Member, Ecological Society of America
Member, Association for the Sciences of Limnology and Oceanography
Member, American Fisheries Society

Graduate students and post-doctorates supervised

Post-doctoral

- Guillaume Bal (2012-2013, co-advised with EJ Ward)
Daniel Pendleton (2010-2012, co-advised with EE Holmes)
Jim Thorson (2011, co-advised with EE Holmes & EJ Ward)
Daniel Pendleton (2010-2012, co-advised with EE Holmes)
Jim Thorson (2011, co-advised with EE Holmes & EJ Ward)
Kirstin Holsman (2007-2010)
Eric Buhle (2007-2009)

M.S. students

Kelly Mistry, Univ Washington (2020-present)
Markus Min, Univ Washington (2020-present)

Principal publications related to this proposal

- Magel C, **Scheuerell MD**, Buhle ER, Lewis DJ, Weeber M, Hacker SD. In review. Estuary and upland habitats are equally important for the production of threatened Oregon Coast coho salmon populations
- DeFilippo LB, Buehrens TW, **Scheuerell MD**, Kendall NW, Schindler DE. In review. Improving short-term recruitment forecasts for coho salmon using a spatiotemporal integrated population model
- Scheuerell MD**, Ruff CP, Anderson JH, Beamer EM. 2021. An integrated population model for estimating the relative effects of natural and anthropogenic factors on a threatened population of steelhead trout. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 58:114-124
- Thorson JT, **Scheuerell MD**, Olden JD, Schindler DE. 2018. Spatial heterogeneity contributes more to portfolio effects than species differences in bottom-associated marine fishes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 285:20180915
- Buhle ER, **Scheuerell MD**, Cooney TD, Ford MJ, Zabel RW, Thorson JT. 2018. Using Integrated Population Models to Evaluate Fishery and Environmental Impacts on Pacific Salmon Viability. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-140.
- Ward EJ, Oken K, Rose KA, Sable S, Watkins K, Holmes EE, **Scheuerell MD**. 2018. Applying spatiotemporal models to monitoring data to quantify fish responses to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 190:530
- Bal G, **Scheuerell MD**, Ward EJ. 2018. Characterizing the strength of density dependence in at-risk species through Bayesian model averaging. *Ecological Modelling* 381:1-9
- Ardón M, Helton AM, **Scheuerell MD**, Bernhardt ES. 2017. Fertilizer legacies meet saltwater incursion: challenges and constraints for coastal plain wetland restoration. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* 5:41
- Honea JM, McClure MM, Jorgensen JC, **Scheuerell MD**. 2016. Assessing the vulnerability of freshwater life stages of Chinook salmon to climate change. *Climate Research* 71:127-137
- Scheuerell MD**, Buhle ER, Semmens BX, Ford MJ, Cooney T, Carmichael RW. 2015. Analyzing large-scale conservation interventions with Bayesian hierarchical models: A case study of supplementing threatened Pacific salmon. *Ecology and Evolution* 5:2115–2125
- Griffiths JR, Schindler DE, Armstrong JB, **Scheuerell MD**, Whited DC, Clarke RA, Hilborn R, Holt CA, Lindley ST, Stanford JA, Volk EC. 2014. Performance of salmon fishery portfolios across western North America. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 51:1554–1563
- Thorson JT, **Scheuerell MD**, Buhle ER, Copeland T. 2014. Spatial diversity buffers temporal variability in early juvenile survival for an endangered Pacific salmon. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 83:157–167

BRAEDEN VAN DEYNZE

University of Washington, School of Marine and Environmental Affairs
3707 Brooklyn Ave NE,
Seattle, WA 98105
(530) 220-5287
vandeynz@uw.edu

EDUCATION

- Ph.D., Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics, Michigan State University, 2020
- B.S., Economics, Gonzaga University, 2015
- B.A., Biology, Gonzaga University, 2015

EMPLOYMENT

- Postdoctoral Research Associate, School of Marine and Environmental Affairs, University of Washington (on contract with Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), January 2020-Present
- Graduate Research Assistant, Kellogg Biological Station – Long-Term Ecological Research Program and Dept. of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics, Michigan State University, August 2015-December 2019
- Instructor, Dept. of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics, Michigan State University, August 2018-December 2018
- Research Intern, National Parks Conservation Association – Northwest Regional Office, May 2015-August 2015

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION

- Michigan State University Dept. of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics
Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation Award, 2020
- Kellogg Biological Station – Long-Term Ecological Research All-Scientists’ Meeting
Planning Committee, 2016-2019
- Kellogg Biological Station – Long-Term Ecological Research Graduate Student
Representative, 2015-2019
- Long-Term Ecological Research Network Graduate Student Committee, 2018-2019
- Kellogg Biological Station – Long-Term Ecological Research Summer Research Fellowship, 2018 (\$5,000)
- AAEA Graduate Student Case Study Competition, First Place, 2018
- Referee for: Agricultural and Applied Economics Association annual meeting, 2019 & 2021;
Journal of Agricultural Economics; Journal of Soil and Water Conservation

GRADUATE STUDENTS SUPERVISED

Michigan State University: Zachary Luther (M.S. 2020, co-advised with Scott M. Swinton, current Ph.D. student at Vanderbilt University Dept. of Economics, awarded department's Outstanding Master's Thesis Award, 2020)

PRINCIPAL PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THIS PROPOSAL (†*advisee co-author*)

Peer-reviewed

Luther, Z. †, S.M. Swinton, and **B. Van Deynze**. "What Incentives Are Needed to Encourage Farmers to Plant Biodiversity-Promoting Prairie Strips?" Conditionally accepted at *Land Economics*.

Van Deynze, B., S.M. Swinton, and D.A. Hennessy. 2021. "Are Glyphosate-Resistant Weeds a Threat to Conservation Agriculture? Evidence from Tillage Practices in Soybean." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*: 10.1111/ajae.1224.

Luther, Z. †, S.M. Swinton, and **B. Van Deynze**. 2020. "What Drives Voluntary Adoption of Farming Practices that Can Abate Nutrient Pollution?" *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 75(5): 640-650.

Swinton, S.M. and **B. Van Deynze**. 2017. "Hoes to Herbicides: Economics of Evolving Weed Management in the United States." *European Journal of Development Research* 29(3): 560-574.

In-prep

Van Deynze, B., R. Fonner, B. Feist, S. Jardine, and D. Holland. "Predicting Culvert Replacement Costs for Salmon Habitat Restoration." *In prep.*

- Presentations at: 2021 Salmon Recovery Conference, 2021 Association of Environmental and Resource Economists, and 2021 Northeastern Agricultural and Resource Economics Association

Van Deynze, B., S.M. Swinton, D.A. Hennessy, and L. Ries. "Changing Patterns of Pest Control Influence Butterfly Abundance and Diversity Across Midwestern Agricultural Landscapes." *In prep.*

July 26, 2021

Puget Sound Partnership Review Panel
210 11th Ave SW #401
Olympia, WA 98501

RE: Letter of agreement to serve on Fish Passage Policy Advisory Committee

Dear Puget Sound Partnership Proposal Review Panel Members:

I agree to serve on the Fish Passage Policy Advisory Committee (FPPAC) for the proposed Puget Sound Partnership project entitled: "*Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state*".

I am currently the Assistant Director of Natural Resources for the Squaxin Island Tribe. In my position I have been involved for literally decades in addressing blockages to anadromous fish migration, including the sub-proceeding in US v Washington which resulted in an injunction requiring the repair and replacement of state-owned barrier culverts.

Thousands of fish passage barriers, primarily outdated culverts at road crossings, limit access to hundreds of miles of riparian salmon habitat throughout Washington. State agencies, local governments, and private landowners have accelerated the removal of these barriers in order to encourage the recovery of declining wild salmon stocks protected by legislation and tribal treaty rights. This project will provide tools to evaluate alternative barrier correction strategies that account for the diverse priorities of agencies and stakeholder groups. Such a tool will allow stakeholders and funding agencies communicate their priorities and evaluate tradeoffs using a consistent, science-based framework. To be effective this project requires close coordination with envisioned users of the proposed tool: grant managers, state and local policymakers, and tribal stakeholders.

As a member of the FPPAC I will provide practical expertise and knowledge of barrier correction projects and prioritization policy. I will provide advice on the analysis and models that will be developed by the research team to evaluate correction strategies and will help disseminate research findings from this project to facilitate uptake of the resulting decision support tool among policymakers and stakeholders. I understand that the FPPAC is expected to meet for biannual project-update meetings and promote two stakeholder outreach workshops.

The Squaxin Island Tribe recognizes the importance of a coordinated strategy across multiple ownerships to correct barriers to fish migration. The fish do not recognize jurisdiction or ownership. They simply must have access to their full range of habitat to survive.

Sincerely,



Jeff Dickison

July 15, 2021, 2021

Puget Sound Partnership Review Panel
210 11th Ave SW #401
Olympia, WA 98501

RE: Letter of agreement to serve on Fish Passage Policy Advisory Committee

Dear Puget Sound Partnership Proposal Review Panel Members:

I agree to serve on the Fish Passage Policy Advisory Committee (FPPAC) for the proposed Puget Sound Partnership project entitled: "*Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state*".


I am currently a Conservation Scientist for the Tulalip Tribes of Washington. I have nearly 30 years of experience working in the field of Restoration Ecology and have planned and performed numerous fish passage projects and assessments over the course of my career.

Thousands of fish passage barriers, primarily outdated culverts at road crossings, limit access to hundreds of miles of riparian salmon habitat throughout Washington. State agencies, local governments, and private landowners have accelerated the removal of these barriers in order to encourage the recovery of declining wild salmon stocks protected by legislation and tribal treaty rights. This project will provide tools to evaluate alternative barrier correction strategies that account for the diverse priorities of agencies and stakeholder groups. Such a tool will allow stakeholders and funding agencies communicate their priorities and evaluate tradeoffs using a consistent, science-based framework. To be effective this project requires close coordination with envisioned users of the proposed tool: grant managers, state and local policymakers, and tribal stakeholders.

As a member of the FPPAC I will provide practical expertise and knowledge of barrier correction projects and prioritization policy. I will provide advice on the analysis and models that will be developed by the research team to evaluate correction strategies and will help disseminate research findings from this project to facilitate uptake of the resulting decision support tool among policymakers and stakeholders. I understand that the FPPAC is expected to meet for biannual project-update meetings in years 1 and 2, and promote two stakeholder outreach workshops.

I believe having over 20 years of experience working with local Tribal communities in addressing and advancing culvert policy in the region allows me to bring a honed outlook to the discussion. I look forward to engaging in this important project that helps correct fish passage barriers in the most efficient way possible.

Sincerely,


Steve Hinton, Conservation Scientist



Puget Sound Partnership
PO BOX 40900
Olympia WA 98504

Dear Puget Sound Partnership Proposal Review Panel Members:

We are writing to strongly support the proposed Puget Sound Partnership project entitled: "Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state."

As scientists at The Nature Conservancy, which has a mission to conserve the lands and waters on which all life depends, we count on projects like this to improve our ability to craft enduring solutions to recover rivers. We work with other scientists and natural resource managers globally to better understand and address the complex problem of barriers to fish passage. The largest hurdle with stream barriers is the scale of the problem: millions of barriers in the US, and hundreds of millions of road stream crossings. Our intensive surveys found that 40% of road stream crossings are barriers to fish passage and stream function. The impact of this fragmentation is tragic; 67% of global freshwater migratory fish populations around the world have disappeared since 1970¹. Where there are barriers in rivers there are also growing human risks from infrastructure (e.g., dams and road) failures. To address this large-scale problem with limited dollars, it is critical to develop systems of prioritization that are both ecologically effective and socially equitable.

This global threat is just as acute in Washington, where culverts and other barriers limit access to hundreds of miles of riparian salmon habitat throughout the state. We have success in growing restoration programs in Maine and provide guidance to the European Commission and newly established European Open Rivers Programme (private funds for dam removal). We all experience similar challenges at an equally large scale. This project will develop valuable tools to evaluate alternative barrier removal strategies while accounting for diverse priorities of multiple agencies and communities. These tools will facilitate recovery of wild salmon stocks in Washington state, as well as benefitting rivers in Maine, Europe, and around the world.

Please reach out with additional questions.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ailene K. Ettinger".

Ailene Ettinger
Quantitative Ecologist
Washington Chapter, The Nature Conservancy
74 Wall Street
Seattle, WA 98121

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joshua L. Royte".

Joshua L. Royte
Senior Scientist
Maine Chapter and Europe Freshwater,
The Nature Conservancy
Brunswick, ME 04011

¹ Living Planet Index for Freshwater migratory fish (World Fish Migration Foundation 2020)



King County

Water and Land Resources Division

Department of Natural Resources and Parks

King Street Center

201 South Jackson Street, Suite 5600

Seattle, WA 98104-3855

206-477-4800 Fax 206-296-0192

TTY Relay: 711

August 2, 2021

Puget Sound Partnership
PO Box 40900
Olympia, WA 98504

RE: Letter of support for the grant proposal “Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state.”

Dear Puget Sound Partnership Grant Proposal Review Panel Members:

I strongly support the proposed project entitled: *“Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state”* and look forward to serving on the Fish Passage Policy Advisory Committee (FPPAC) for the proposed project.

I currently work as a special project manager for the Water and Land Resources Division in the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, leading King County’s efforts to accelerate the pace of fish passage restoration in King County. The goal of the program is to get the most salmon to the best habitat as quickly as possible. To do that, the county has identified all county fish passage barriers and will soon prioritize which barrier remedies will open access to the best habitat. By investing in the highest benefit barrier remedies first, preliminary analysis indicates that it may be possible to realize most of the available habitat benefits from barrier remedies within the next 20 to 30 years. This contrasts with more random approach to barrier remedies where it could take more than a century to realize equivalent habitat benefits.

Thousands of fish passage barriers, primarily outdated culverts at road crossings, limit access to hundreds of miles of riparian salmon habitat in basins draining to Puget Sound. State agencies, local governments, and private landowners have accelerated the removal of these barriers in order to encourage the recovery of declining wild salmon stocks protected by legislation and tribal treaty rights. This proposed project will provide tools to evaluate alternative barrier correction strategies that account for the diverse priorities of agencies and stakeholder groups. Such a tool will allow stakeholders and funding agencies use consistent, evidence-based tools to better communicate their priorities, allocate funding, and evaluate tradeoffs.

As a member of the FPPAC, I will provide practical expertise and knowledge of barrier correction projects and prioritization policy. I will provide advice on the analysis and models that will be developed by the research team to evaluate correction strategies and will help disseminate

Puget Sound Partnership

August 2, 2021

Page 2

research findings from this project to facilitate uptake of the resulting decision support tool among policymakers and stakeholders. I understand that the FPPAC is expected to meet for biannual project-update meetings, provide guidance on how project results and tools can be adapted for use in practice, and promote two stakeholder outreach workshops.

King County envisions that the tools resulting from this project will be a huge help in ensuring that investments in fish passage restoration provide better habitat outcomes than would be possible without this kind of science-based support for implementation decisions.

If I can be of assistance or answer any questions, please feel free to contact me at, 206-477-9738 or by email at, evlewis@kingcounty.gov.

Sincerely,

Evan Lewis

Evan Lewis

Special Project Manager for Fish Passage

July 26, 2021



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOAA Restoration Center
1655 Heindon Road
Arcata, California 95521-4573

Puget Sound Partnership Proposal Review Panel
Puget Sound Partnership
PO BOX 40900
Olympia WA 98504

RE: Letter of support for culvert correction project

Dear Puget Sound Partnership Review Panel Members:

We are writing to strongly support the proposed Washington Sea Grant project entitled: "*Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington State*". Fish passage barrier identification, remediation and prioritization is a high priority for the NOAA Restoration Center (RC). Our involvement in fish passage includes funding barrier removal projects, working on the NMFS National Fish Passage Team, participating in the CA Fish Passage Forum, developing standardized monitoring protocols for fish passage projects and developing a barrier optimization tool (FISHPass) to help guide our restoration efforts.

Much like in California, thousands of fish passage barriers, primarily outdated culverts at road crossings, limit access to hundreds of miles of riparian salmon habitat throughout Western Washington. State agencies, local governments, and private landowners have accelerated the removal of these barriers in order to encourage the recovery of declining wild salmon stocks protected by legislation and tribal treaty rights. This project will provide tools to evaluate alternative barrier correction strategies that account for the diverse priorities of agencies and stakeholder groups. Such a tool will allow stakeholders and funding agencies to better communicate their priorities and evaluate tradeoffs using a consistent, science-based framework.

This project will build on lessons learned from existing fish passage planning tools like FISHPass and provide tailored features that address the unique challenges in Western Washington. By incorporating a multi-objective framework, the tools developed by the project team will provide a model for potential features in future versions of FISHPass and other fish passage planning tools. Based on our experience with the project team, we have full confidence that they will produce a first-class planning tool that will be valuable not only for stakeholders and resource managers in the Western Washington region but also for those working in fish passage policy throughout the country.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bob Pagliuco".

Bob Pagliuco
Habitat Restoration Specialist
NOAA Restoration Center
Arcata, CA 95521
Bob.pagliuco@noaa.gov
707-825-5166





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
2725 Montlake Boulevard East
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98112-2097

F/NWC1

August 2, 2021

Puget Sound Partnership

To Whom it May Concern:

This letter is to confirm my support and intent to collaborate on the project “Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington state” led by Sunny Jardine that is being proposed for the Puget Sound Partnership call for proposals on Integrated Socio-Ecological Systems. This proposal is well aligned with objectives of NOAA and the Northwest Fisheries Science Center where I serve as supervisor of the Human Dimensions team in the Conservation Biology Division. I intend to participate in the project directly. I supervise Robby Fonner, and I am also highly supportive of Robby Fonner’s direct participation in this project.

Sincerely,

Dan Holland , Senior Scientist



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Northwest Fisheries Science
Center 2725 Montlake Blvd. East
Seattle, Washington, 98112

August 3, 2021

Puget Sound Partnership

To Whom it May Concern,

This letter is to express my support and intent to collaborate on the proposed project “*Maximizing returns on investing in barrier culvert removal in Washington State*,” led by Sunny Jardine and the University of Washington and submitted in response to the Puget Sound Partnership’s 2021 request for proposals under the Integrated Socio-Ecological Systems project type.

The project is aligned with the mission of NOAA Fisheries and the research objectives set out by the Northwest Fisheries Science Center, where I serve as an Economist and conduct research primarily on the economics of salmon recovery. The proposed research is well integrated with, and builds upon work being done at Northwest Fisheries Science Center and I am excited at the prospect of participating in the proposed project should it be funded.

Sincerely,

Robby Fonner

Robby Fonner, PhD
Economist
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Conservation Biology Division
Phone: (206) 302-2469
Email: robby.fonner@noaa.gov