2021-2023 Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board - Review of Draft Proposals

Scores are based on office and field reviews

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Project Funded in |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|-----|----------------|------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | Barrier | | | | Linear | Habitat De | | | Anticipated \$ | | | Priority | а |
| David FREE | ID FDDCLCA | . 10 | Channe | 0/ Dans | | | Downstream | | | | | | Request (for | Commission Cont | Anticipated | Watershed | Previous |
| Rank FBRB I | 42 | | NF Ostrander Creek | % Pass 67 | Score | * | Barriers Score | (miles) 18.75 | Score Score | Score Sco | ore Scope 5 Restoration | | entire pkg.) \$ 1,645,600.00 | \$ 1,645,600.00 | Costs Score | Score 20 | Total Score Biennia 66 Yes |
| 2 | | | MF Newaukum River | 33 | _ | 5 0 | | | | 2 4 | 5 Restoration | | \$ 689,195.00 | | | | |
| 3 | 21 | | Beaver Creek | 67 | | | | 1.55 | | 3 7 | 5 Restoration | | \$ 251,110.00 | | | | |
| 4 | 73 | | Coleman Creek | 0 | | 3 0 | | 1 | | 4 5 | 4 Restoration | 3 | \$ 1,583,321.00 | | | | |
| 5 | 80 | 810283 | Unnamed | 33 | 4 | 1 0 | | 0.61 | 1 | 1 4 | 3 Planning | 2 | \$ 265,200.00 | \$ 4,434,426.00 |) 8 | 20 | |
| 6 | 06 | | Stillwater Creek | 0 | | 3 0 | | | | 4 6 | 5 Planning | | \$ 351,900.00 | | | | 53 No |
| 7 | 43 | | Delameter Creek | 33 | | | | 3.11 | | 4 4 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 1,303,050.00 | | | | |
| 8 | 36 | | Hungry Harbor Creek | 0 | | 3 0 | | 1.2 | | 5 6 | 5 Restoration | 5 | \$ 89,098.00 | | | | 51 No |
| 9 | 51 16 | | Naches River Wildboy Creek | 33 | | 8 0 | | 233 6.5 | | 4 7 | 5 Restoration 5 Restoration | | \$ 4,134,000.00 \$ 1,500,000.00 | | | - | 51 No 50 No |
| 11 | 84 | | Johnson Creek | Unknown | 1 | - | | 2.4 | | 2 5 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 7,124,700.00 | | | <u> </u> | |
| 12 | 63 | | Thorndyke Creek | 33 | | 5 0 | | | | 3 8 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 1,984,000.00 | | | | |
| 13 | | | McDonald Creek | 33 | | | | 6 | | 3 4 | 3 Restoration | | \$ 420,341.00 | | | 0 | 49 No |
| 14 | 72 | 600616 | Naneum Creek | 0 | 8 | 3 0 | 10 | 0.6 | 1 | 4 4 | 4 Restoration | 2 | \$ 770,080.00 | \$ 22,111,595.00 |) 5 | 10 | 48 No |
| 15 | 68 60229 | 3 - 602297 | Mill Creek | 33 | | 6+ | 0 | | | 3 5 | 3 Restoration | 3 | \$ 2,040,000.00 | \$ 24,151,595.00 | 6 | 20 | 47 No |
| 16 | 58 | | Beaver Creek | 67 | | | | | | 2 3 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 241,500.00 | | | | |
| 17 | 99 | 934498 | | 0 | 8 | + | | 9 | | 4 4 | 3 Planning | | | | | _ | 46 No |
| 18 | 47 | 601597 | | 33 | | 5 0 | | 1 | | 2 6 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 225,000.00 | | | | 46 No |
| 19 20 | 04 48 25.0 | | Cougar Creek | 33 | | 8 0 | | 2.2 3.3 | | 3 4 | 1 Restoration 4 Restoration | | \$ 485,000.00 \$ 721,071.00 | | | , | 45 No 45 No |
| 21 | | | Clear Creek Unnamed | 33 | | 6 0 | | 1.36 | | 2 5 | 4 Restoration | 5 | \$ 966,920.00 | | | | 45 No |
| 22 | | - / · · · / | Unnamed | 67 | | _ | | | | 2 4 | 5 Restoration | 3 | \$ 814,686.00 | | | _ | |
| 23 | 82 | | Boone Creek | 0, | 6 | | | 1 | 2 | 3 5 | 4 Planning | _ | | | | | 44 No |
| 24 | | 05)(04386) | | 33 | 6 | 5 0 | | 1.88 | 2 | 2 5 | 3 Restoration | | \$ 841,671.00 | | | 5 | 44 No |
| 25 | 75 | 040071 | Derby Canyon | 33 | 5 | 5 0 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 1 4 | 5 Planning | 2 | \$ 113,750.00 | \$ 28,934,693.00 |) 7 | 5 | 44 No |
| 26 | 65 | | Derby Canyon | 33 | | 5 0 | | 3 | | 1 3 | 4 Planning | 2 | \$ 80,000.00 | \$ 29,014,693.00 | 7 | 5 | 43 No |
| 27 | | | Kenny Creek | 33 | | 5 0 | | 3.6 | | 6 8 | 5 Restoration | | \$ 3,825,000.00 | | | . 0 | 43 Yes |
| 28 | | | Jested Creek | 0 | | 3 0 | | 1.26 | | 2 4 | 4 Planning | | \$ 118,823.00 | | | | 43 No |
| 29 | 78 | | Sexton Creek | 67 | | | | 0.91 | | 2 3 | 4 Restoration | | | | _ | | |
| 30 | 20 15 | 931825 | Ennis Creek Tucker Creek | 33 | | 3 0 | | 3.75 1.5 | | 5 3 | 3 Planning 3 Planning | | \$ 191,260.00 \$ 76,950.00 | | | | 42 No 42 No |
| 32 | | | Boone Creek | 33 | | | 10 | 1.11 | | 3 5 | 3 Planning | | \$ 259,894.00 | | | U | 42 No |
| 33 | 77 | | Williams Creek | 33 | | 5 0 | | 0.13 | | 1 3 | 4 Planning | 3 | <u> </u> | | | | 42 Alternate |
| 34 | 24 | | Mason Creek | 0 | | 3 0 | | 2.44 | | 2 6 | 5 Restoration | | \$ 892,500.00 | | | 0 | 41 Yes |
| 35 | 66 | 932931 | Unnamed | 33 | 6 | 5 0 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 6 4 | 5 Restoration | 5 | \$ 4,090,333.00 | \$ 39,173,903.00 |) 3 | 0 | 41 No |
| 36 | 08 | | Butler Creek | 0 | | | | | | 2 6 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 2,125,000.00 | | | | |
| 37 | 89 | | Eagle Creek | 33 | | 5 1 | . 5 | | | 4 4 | 5 Planning | | \$ 200,000.00 | | | | 40 No |
| 38 | 23 | | Coal Creek | 33 | | | | 1.61 | | 2 5 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 240,000.00 | | | | 40 No |
| 39 40 | 09 13.0 | | Green Cove Creek | 67 | 3 | | - | 0.4 | | 5 4 | 4 Planning | 2 | | | | | 39 No 39 No |
| 41 | | | Midway Creek Carey Creek | 67 | | | | 2.93 | | 5 5 | 5 Restoration 5 Planning | | \$ 23,251.00 \$ 1,000,000.00 | | | 0 | 39 No |
| 42 | 87 | | Unnamed | 0 | | 3 0 | | | | 6 5 | 2 Restoration | 2 | | | | - | 39 No |
| 43 | 92 | | Little Minter Creek | 0 | | | | 0.2 | | 3 3 | 4 Restoration | 2 | | | | | 39 No |
| 44 | 02 | 603181 | Beaver Creek | 67 | 3 | 1 | . 5 | 4.37 | 6 | 1 6 | 4 Planning | 1 | \$ 86,600.00 | \$ 43,651,473.00 |) 7 | 5 | 38 No |
| 45 | 05 | CR28 | Carpenter Creek | 33 | 6 | 6 0 | 10 | 2.12 | 4 | 2 3 | 5 Planning | 2 | \$ 182,500.00 | \$ 43,833,973.00 | 6 | 0 | 38 No |
| 46 | | | Schoolhouse Creek | Unknown | 1 | | | 2 | - | 6 4 | 4 Planning | 2 | | | | | 50 1.10 |
| 47 | 18 | | Cooper Creek | 67 | 3 | - | | 0.61 | | 3 4 | 5 Restoration | 4 | | | | 0 | 38 No |
| 48 | 29 | | Pup Creek | 67 | | - | | 1.7 | | 5 7 | 5 Planning | 0 | | | | | 38 No |
| 49 50 | | | Unnamed | Unknown | 1 | - | | 0.55 0.47 | | 2 5 | 3 Planning | 2 | , | | | 0 | 38 No 38 No |
| 51 | 52 62 | | SF Dogfish Creek Naylors Creek | Unknown 33 | | 5 1 | 5 | 2.6 | | 4 4 | 5 Restoration 5 Restoration | | \$ 400,000.00 \$ 1,323,620.00 | | | | 38 NO 37 Yes |
| 52 | 01 | | Carpenter Creek | 67 | | | - | 3.95 | | 2 4 | 5 Planning | | \$ 1,323,620.00 | | | | 37 No |
| 53 | 37 | | Huge Creek | 67 | 3 | | | 1.2 | | 6 2 | 3 Planning | 2 | | | | | 37 No |
| 54 | 83 | | Lower Hoko Wetland | Unknown | 1 | L C | | 0.4 | | 1 5 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 2,950,150.00 | | | 10 | |
| 55 | 19 | | Panther Creek | 0 | 8 | | 10 | 0.6 | | 3 5 | 5 Planning | 2 | \$ 467,500.00 | | | 0 | 37 No |
| 56 | | | Unnamed | 33 | | 5 0 | | | | 2 3 | 4 Restoration | | \$ 81,000.00 | | | | |
| 57 | | | Mill Creek | 33 | | 6+ | 0 | 0.2 | | 3 5 | 3 Restoration | - | \$ 2,770,000.00 | ,, ., | | | |
| 58 | 22 | CR100 | Carpenter Creek | 33 | 3 | 3 0 | 10 | 1.3 | 2 | 2 6 | 4 Restoration | 3 | \$ 302,828.00 | \$ 54,031,843.00 | 7 ار | 0 | 37 No |

| 59 | 27 | HC41 Dairy Creek | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0.71 | 1 1 | 6 | 3 Planning | 2 \$ 130,000.00 | \$ 54,161,843.00 | 6 | 0 | 37 No |
|----|-----|--|----|---|----|----|------|-----|---|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-----|---|----------------|
| 60 | 70 | 920409 Annapolis Creek | 33 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 0.3 | 1 3 | 6 | 4 Planning | 3 \$ 425,000.00 | \$ 54,586,843.00 | 4 | 0 | 37 No |
| 61 | 41 | 920108 Ebright Creek | 67 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 1.3 | 2 3 | 7 | 5 Restoration | 1 \$ 450,000.00 | \$ 55,036,843.00 | 5 | 0 | 36 Yes |
| 62 | 26 | 604246 Dairy Creek | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0.28 | 1 1 | 5 | 3 Planning | 2 \$ 123,805.00 | \$ 55,160,648.00 | 6 | 0 | 36 No |
| 63 | 38 | 115 TC044 Unnamed | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0.57 | 1 3 | 2 | 2 Planning | 3 \$ 65,000.00 | \$ 55,225,648.00 | 7 | 0 | 36 No |
| 64 | 90 | 938435 Gilliam Creek | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0.18 | 1 5 | 2 | 5 Planning | 2 \$ 1,530,000.00 | \$ 56,755,648.00 | 3 | 0 | 36 No |
| 65 | 101 | 101SC-07 Langlois Creek | 33 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0.28 | 1 2 | 6 | 5 Restoration | 2 \$ 1,260,870.00 | \$ 58,016,518.00 | 6 | 0 | 36 Yes |
| 66 | 71 | 1320082 Ruby Creek | 33 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 0.65 | 1 3 | 4 | 3 Restoration | 3 \$ 1,615,000.00 | \$ 59,631,518.00 | 6 | 0 | 36 No |
| 67 | 61 | 160253 Chimacum Creek | 33 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 4 | 4 | 4 Planning | 2 \$ 202,300.00 | \$ 59,833,818.00 | 8 | 0 | 35 No |
| 68 | 10 | LP18 Unnamed | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0.13 | 1 2 | 3 | 2 Planning | 2 \$ 49,845.00 | \$ 59,883,663.00 | 7 | 0 | 35 No |
| 69 | 85 | 80001307 Lamb Creek | 67 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 3.11 | 5 1 | 5 | 1 Restoration | 1 \$ 2,915,050.00 | \$ 62,798,713.00 | 4 | 5 | 35 Yes |
| 70 | 91 | 105 K050122a Little Minter Creek | 67 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 1.3 | 2 3 | 3 | 4 Planning | - 7, | \$ 62,912,103.00 | 8 | 0 | 35 No |
| 71 | 07 | NC213 Norway Park Creek | 33 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 0.75 | 1 2 | 2 | 5 Restoration | 2 9 33 1, 100.00 | \$ 63,306,503.00 | 6 | 0 | 34 No |
| 72 | 97 | 991974 Secret Creek | 33 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0.12 | 1 2 | 5 | 4 Planning | , y 05 1,025.00 | \$ 64,000,528.00 | 7 | 0 | 34 No |
| 73 | 76 | 040067 Derby Canyon | 33 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1.27 | 2 1 | 4 | 5 Restoration | 2 9 257,000.00 | \$ 64,298,128.00 | 8 | 5 | 34 No |
| 74 | 57 | 3410304 Percival Creek | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1.38 | 2 5 | 5 | 5 Restoration | 3 \$ 531,250.00 | \$ 64,829,378.00 | 6 | 0 | 34 No |
| 75 | 31 | 601848 Cedar Creek | 33 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0.16 | 1 3 | 4 | 4 Restoration | 5 \$ 995,350.00 | \$ 65,824,728.00 | 6 | 0 | 34 No |
| 76 | 67 | 08.0268 0.82 Coal Creek | 67 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0.25 | 1 4 | 5 | 4 Planning | 3 \$ 600,000.00 | \$ 66,424,728.00 | 3 | 0 | 33 No |
| 77 | 79 | 992167 Secret Creek | 67 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2.0 | 3 2 | 5 | 4 Planning | 2 \$ 266,985.00 | \$ 66,691,713.00 | 8 | 0 | 33 Alternate |
| 78 | 86 | 101SIST-02 Sister of Friar Creek | 33 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 0.06 | 1 1 | 4 | 3 Restoration | 2 \$ 263,000.00 | \$ 66,954,713.00 | 6 | 0 | 33 No |
| 79 | 32 | 132142259A Unnamed | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1.5 | 3 2 | 4 | 5 Restoration | 2 \$ 196,699.00 | \$ 67,151,412.00 | 8 | 0 | 32 No |
| 80 | 60 | 125 1302W12E Berwick Creek | 67 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3.29 | 5 2 | 4 | 3 Restoration | 6 \$ 159,559.00 | \$ 67,310,971.00 | 9 | 0 | 32 No |
| 81 | 11 | 101SORG-02 Sorgenfrei Creek | 33 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 0.42 | 1 2 | 3 | 2 Restoration | 2 \$ 198,900.00 | \$ 67,509,871.00 | 6 | 0 | 32 No |
| 82 | 98 | 700198 Fauntleroy Creek | 0 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 0.46 | 1 1 | 4 | 4 Planning | | \$ 67,759,871.00 | 6 | 0 | 32 No |
| 83 | 12 | 102 N196 North Creek | 67 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0.82 | 1 5 | 2 | 2 Restoration | 2 \$ 219,300.00 | \$ 67,979,171.00 | 6 | 0 | 31 No |
| 84 | 64 | 700197 Fauntleroy Creek | 0 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 0.38 | 1 1 | 4 | 3 Restoration | 2 \$ 1,750,000.00 | \$ 69,729,171.00 | 6 | 0 | 30 No |
| 85 | 69 | 983173 Little Soos Creek | 33 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0.6 | 1 4 | 5 | 4 Restoration | 5 \$ 2,400,000.00 | \$ 72,129,171.00 | 6 | 0 | 29 No |
| 86 | 33 | 101SC-02 Langlois Creek | 33 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0.36 | 1 1 | 5 | 3 Restoration | 1 9 000,000.00 | \$ 72,809,171.00 | 8 | 0 | 28 No |
| 87 | 74 | 162063 Swansonville Creek | 67 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3.1 | 5 2 | 4 | 4 Restoration | 2 9 100,000.00 | \$ 73,297,171.00 | / | 0 | 27 No |
| 88 | 17 | 994370 Padden Creek | 33 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0.85 | 1 3 | 6 | 2 Planning | 5 9 170,100.00 | \$ 73,467,571.00 | 6 | U | 27 No |
| 89 | 59 | 993125 Thornton Creek | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0.09 | 1 1 | 4 | 4 Planning | 5 \$ 100,000.00 | \$ 73,655,571.00 | 6 | 0 | 27 No |
| 90 | 88 | 105 K050416b Minter Creek | 33 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0.11 | 1 6 | 3 | 1 Restoration | 1 7 1,303,002.00 | \$ 75,619,453.00 | 3 | 0 | 26 No |
| 91 | 94 | 105 K050920c Purdy | 33 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0.4 | 1 3 | 4 | 4 Restoration 1 Planning | 2 \$ 3,000,000.00 | \$ 78,619,453.00 | 6 | 0 | 24 No 23 No |
| 92 | 30 | 01.0560 0.10 Toad Lake Creek | 67 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0.5 | 2 2 | 2 | | 1 7 | \$ 78,671,453.00 | 6 | 0 | 23 No 22 No |
| 93 | 39 | 102 Q015 Edgecomb Creek 07.0073 1.30 Munson Creek | 67 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0.4 | 2 3 | 4 | 2 Planning 2 Planning | - 7 | \$ 78,871,453.00 \$ 78,936,956.00 | 5 | U | 22 No 22 No |
| 95 | 13 | 07.0073 1.30 Munson Creek 07.0267 1.80 Tuck Creek | 67 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0.4 | 1 3 | 4 | | - 7 | ,, | / | 0 | 22 No 21 No |
| 95 | 34 | | 67 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0.77 | 1 2 | 6 | 2 Restoration | 1, | \$ 79,846,456.00 | 5 | U | |
| 96 | 35 | 102 LY008 Lyon Creek | 6/ | 3 | / | U | 0.16 | 1 2 | 2 | 4 Restoration | 3 \$ 961,000.00 | \$ 80,807,456.00 |] 5 | U | 20 No |

INELIGIBLE

| FBRB ID | FPDSI Site ID | Stream | Reason |
|---------|---------------|------------------|---|
| 14 | 1 | Allen Creek | Has a total downstream barrier. |
| 40 | 932021 | Unnamed | Structure was reassessed to be 100% passable. |
| 50 | 0 1001 | Garrison Creek | Has a total downstream barrier. |
| 56 | 935067 | Centennial Creek | Structure was reassessed to be 100% passable. |
| 81 | 1 999648 | Great Dane Creek | FBRB determined that the proposed alternative would not be suitable at this site and sponsor was not able to accommodate alternative designs. |

Brian Abbott Fish Barrier Removal Board 2021 - 2023 Grant Program

Approved Proposal Scoring Criteria - 84 points possible



| Question 1 | |
|--|--------------|
| Barrier Severity (8 points) | |
| 0% passability | 8 points |
| 33% passability | 6 points |
| 67% passability | 3 points |
| Unknown passability (applicant must demonstrate that structure is a barrier) | 1 point |
| 100% passability | ineligible |
| Linear Gain (10 points) | |
| 0.00 - 0.99 miles | 1 point |
| 1.00 - 1.49 miles | 2 points |
| 1.50 - 1.99 miles | 3 points |
| 2.00 - 2.99 miles | 4 points |
| 3.00 - 3.99 miles | 5 points |
| 4.00 - 4.99 miles | 6 points |
| 5.00 - 5.99 miles | 7 points |
| 6.00 - 7.99 miles | 8 points |
| 8.00 - 10.99 miles | 9 points |
| ≥ 11.00 miles | 10 points |
| Note: calculated as upstream miles, to first barrier (partial or full) | |
| Question 2 | |
| Anticipated costs (10 points) | |
| Detailed, clear answer | 2 points |
| Low cost relative to predicted benefits | 4 points |
| Sponsor has clearly leveraged available resources to reduce costs and maximize benef | its 4 points |
| Question 3 | |
| Project readiness (6 points) | |
| Landowner willingness | 1 point |
| Completed conceptual or preliminary designs | 1 point |
| Active permit applications or well laid out permit schedule (cultural resources, Corps permits, FPA/HPA, ESA consultation, etc.) | 1 point |
| Resource commitments identified (match) | 1 point |

| Additional 2 points possible for restoration projects (i.e., construction) | |
|---|------------|
| 60% to Final Designs | 1 point |
| • Permits | 1 point |
| Note: Planning projects can score 0-4 points. Restoration projects can score 0-6 points. | its. |
| Question 4 | |
| Habitat quality (8 points) | |
| Clear, complete answer | 2 points |
| Quality of habitat, as described by applicant: | 6 points |
| Riparian / Thermal cover | |
| Availability of spawning gravels Paging high interviews assessed. | |
| Rearing habitat / Instream cover Habitat complexity: e.g., channel sinuosity, pool, riffle, large wood | |
| Question 5 | |
| Design Approach (5 points) | |
| Detailed, clear answer | 1 point |
| Described how project will meet Water Crossing Design Guidance | 3 points |
| Described how project addresses future climate change | 1 point |
| Question 6 | |
| Downstream Barriers (10 points) | |
| No downstream barriers | 10 points |
| Single downstream partial barrier (67% or 33% passability) | 5 points |
| More than 1 downstream partial barrier (67% or 33% passability) | 0 points |
| 1 or more downstream 0% passable barriers | ineligible |
| Question 7 | |
| Number of salmon/steelhead species affected by barrier (7 points) | |
| Chinook | 2 points |
| Sockeye | 1 point |
| Pink | 1 point |
| Coho | 1 point |
| Steelhead | 1 point |
| Chum | 1 point |
| Question 8 | |
| Priority Watershed (20 points) | |
| Project is ranked number 1 in a statewide approved priority watershed | 20 points |
| Project is ranked number 2 in a statewide approved priority watershed | 10 points |
| | <u> </u> |
| Project is located in a statewide approved priority watershed | 5 points |

2020 Supplemental Capital Budget, ESSB 6248

March 11th, 2020

From Pages 93-95

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE5

- (1) Nothing in this section alters the obligation set forth in the permanent injunction, including the compliance deadline, entered on March 29, 2013, in United States v. Washington, sub-proceeding 01-1 (Culverts), or the guidelines for compliance within the specified timeline with the permanent injunction as developed by the state agencies during the implementation process.
- (2) Nothing in this section creates an obligation on the part of the state to provide funding for corrections for nonstate-owned culverts. Nothing in this section precludes the state from providing funding for corrections for nonstate-owned culverts.
- (3) In order to provide recommendations, the Brian Abbott fish barrier removal board must develop a comprehensive statewide culvert remediation plan that works in conjunction with the state approach and that fully satisfies the requirements of the United States v. Washington permanent injunction and makes both local and state funding recommendations for additional nonstate barrier corrections across state culvert correction programs that maximize the fisheries habitat gain and other benefits to prey available for southern resident killer whale and salmon recovery.
- (4) The comprehensive statewide culvert remediation plan must be consistent with the principles and requirements of the United States v. Washington permanent injunction and RCW 77.95.180 and must achieve coordinated investment strategy goals of permanent injunction compliance and the following additional resource benefits. The Brian Abbott fish barrier removal board chair, representing the board and the appropriate department of fish and wildlife executive management, shall consult with tribes to develop a watershed approach. Provided it is consistent with the United States v. Washington permanent injunction, prioritization of barrier corrections must be developed on a watershed basis and must maximize the following resource priorities:
- (a) Stocks that are listed as threatened or endangered under the federal endangered species act;
- (b) Stocks that contribute to protection and recovery of southern resident orca whales;
- (c) Critical stocks of anadromous fish that limit or prevent harvest of anadromous fish, as identified in the Pacific salmon treaty; and
- (d) Weak stocks of anadromous fish that limit or prevent harvest of anadromous fish, as determined in North of Cape Falcon process.
- (5) The comprehensive statewide culvert remediation plan must include recommendations on methods and procedures for state agencies and local governments to complete and maintain accurate barrier inventories. This plan must also allow for efficient bundling of projects to minimize disruption to the public due to construction as well as adjustments in response to obstacles and opportunities encountered during delivery.

- (6) The Brian Abbott fish barrier removal board must also:
- (a) Provide to the office of financial management and the fiscal committees of the legislature its recommendation as to statutory or policy changes, or budget needs for the board or state capital budget programs, for better implementation and coordination among the state's culvert correction programs by January 15, 2021; and
- (b) Develop a plan to seek and maximize the chances of success of significant federal investment in the comprehensive statewide culvert remediation plan.
- (7) It is the intent of the legislature that, in developing future budgets, state agencies administering state culvert correction programs will recommend, to the maximum extent possible, funding in their culvert correction programs for correction of barriers that are part of the comprehensive statewide culvert remediation plan developed by the Brian Abbott fish barrier removal board under this section.
- (8) By November 1, 2020, and March 1, 2021, the Brian Abbott fish barrier removal board and the department of transportation must provide updates on the development of the statewide culvert remediation plan to the office of financial management and the legislative fiscal committees. The first update must include a project timeline and plan to ensure that all agencies with culvert correction programs are involved in the creation of the comprehensive plan.
- (9) Prior to presenting the comprehensive statewide culvert remediation plan, the Brian Abbott fish barrier removal board must

Present the status of the plan to the annual Washington state and Western Washington treaty tribes fish passage barrier repair progress and coordination meeting. The board must submit the comprehensive statewide culvert remediation plan and the process by which it will be adaptively managed over time to the governor and the legislative fiscal committees by January 15, 2021.

2020 SUPPLEMENTAL OPERATING BUDGET ESSB 6168

March 11th, 2020

Page 341

(34) \$142,000 of the general fund—state appropriation for fiscal year 2021 is provided solely for work addressing fish passage barriers, including data analysis and mapping to identify streams and barriers that have the greatest potential benefit to listed salmon populations, southern resident orca whales, and fisheries. In conducting this work, the department must consult with tribes and coordinate with the department of transportation's fish barrier work plans.