# Prioritization of River Barriers





WWF

Restoring free-flowing European Rivers: Prioritization Methods & Tools

Tuesday, 8th June 2021 (Virtual Event)

14:00 - 17.00

and the second second

Joshua Royte, Senior Scientist The Nature Conservancy in Maine



Balkan landscape images thanks to C Chip Caroon



### **Importance of Connectivity** River health and long-term resilience

- Access to more kilometers/ha of habitat more abundance
- Increased species/habitat diversity- more robust webs of life
- Access to critical habitats for life histories:
  - Need for warm and cold-water
  - Avoiding flood and drought
  - Access diverse geology (chemistry, substrates, slope, patterns)
- Fulfill life-history options
  - Searun fish (shads, salmons, eel, etc.)
  - Headwater species (rare fish, mussels, insects...)

- Floodplain interaction fortifies river and land
- Groundwater: water quality and temperature

Interconnected Systems























### Cost of NOT Reconnecting Rivers barrier removal/road upgrade

- Shortened design-life of structures (dams, road crossings)
- Annual maintenance
- Fish passage installation/maintenance and impact on fisheries
- Emergency storm damage repair costs
- Downstream infrastructure damage
- Ecological damage
- Transportation network disruption
- Loss of life (impoundments & floods)



## TNC Connectivity Projects in North America, so far...

- Data: Assessed >55.000 barriers & stream habitat
- Tools: Interactive webtools for barrier prioritization/selection
- Policy: permitting, dam liability and water extraction
- 4. Finance Mechanisms: for barrier removal & protection >95 M USD public & private funds\*

### 5. Implementation:

2.

3.

6.

- Protect >1.000 km riparian and whole watersheds
- Remove 100s of stream barriers
- Restore access to >10.000 km of habitat
- Monitoring: track success/failure and fish trends

\* 2008-2020



# **Economic Response**

# river herring

### 64,500 Euros

Town revenue quadruples over a 10 year period.

# resource AVAILABILITY



Emergencies, Design Life, Overall Cost



# Barriers to Barriers to Barrier Removal

- #1 Cultural attachment to dam & impoundment Therefore lack of local or national will power
- Need for guiding policy
- Lack of technical expertise (multiple stages)
- Misunderstanding of risks and true costs
  - Ecological, Safety, Maintenance
- Lack of predictable funding mechanisms
- Pressure for new hydropower
  - growing need to avoid and protect against
- Bias/hidden costs in hydropower economics
- Potential impact of invasive species spreading
- Excessive sediment and potential contaminants

The challenge requires prioritisation start with a broad set of potential projects, 1/10 - 1/20<sup>th</sup> may be implemented, often over 5-10 years to completion Global Prioritisation for Restoration & Protection

- At risk biodiversity/rarity –global importance
- Stratify by major habitat types
- Efficient option for fully-functioning systems
- Balance institutional/historic inequities
- Enabling Conditions/governance
- Project <u>and overall kilometers possible</u>
- Representation
- Feasibility to restore and/or protect

EXERCISE AND A CONTRACT OF A



Hydro by Design: Prioritisation to Avoid Dams in the worst places: TNC work in Amazon, Gabon, DR Congo, Angola, Mexico, Nepal, Angola

Same type of metrics and process for avoidance as restore and protect

Scoring values important to ecosystems AND local and national stakeholders



Key Partner: International Finance Corporation (IFC), Sounda HPP Alternatives Analysis

### **Prioritization for Barrier Removal** Over 1.2 Million Barriers in Europe's Rivers



# 0.74 barriers/km

Field-estimated barrier density (barriers per kilometre)

<0.01 0.01-0.25 0.25-0.5 0.5-0.75 0.75-1 >1





## Importance of Restoration Focus on Small Barriers

Most are smaller barriers

5% of Europe's Barriers cause 50% of damage

13% (~156,000) obsolete low-head structures

Only 1,200 are larger dams, but have MUCH smaller overall impact

Garcia de Leaniz, Jones, and Börger 2020



### **Barrier Prioritisation** Small barriers like Road Crossings

LasFide

Small barriers dominate stream networks

Habitat gains are smaller but important

Relatively cheaper and less controversial to fix.



## Catchment and Barrier(s) Prioritisation common metrics from global to local

- Priority biodiversity
- Representation (where feasible)
- Right scale for functional, lasting impact
- Connected diverse & resilient habitat types
- Added & overall km & ha. of habitat
- Likelihood of *ecological* success for catchment
- Good enabling socio-political conditions
- Efficiency of project(s) km/Euro

### Strategic Prioritisation: What Will Leverage More Restoration?

- <u>Policy</u> and <u>Tools</u> that will help others quantify, justify, embrace & expand on positive work.
- Demonstrate that communities connected with rivers have better sense of human well-being.
- Promote public amenities (parks, water access, historic recognition).
- Ensure learning of safe & efficient restoration methods
- Success brings success (public & private funders)
- Focus where fish, birds & other nature rebound quickly
- Revitalized rivers attract people & business

### Optimization Scenarios: Benefits by country



Garcia de Leaniz et al (2021)

# DAMROS

# **Dam Removal Opportunity Score**

(multiple scenarios this is example run 4)

Benefits and opportunities for barrier removal differ widely across Europe

A multi-scale spatial approach is recommended: Long list > Short list



### **Optimization Systems**

Best solutions for given investment



Be clear about your funding approach since, there is never enough funding.

Most bang for your buck?
 (most river miles or habitat for set value)

OR

2. Least bucks for the desired bang?

### Carlos Garcia de Leaniz



## **WWF Prioritization:**

Europe-Scale Barrier Scoring



THE POTENTIAL OF Barrier Removal to Reconnect Europe's Rivers

Schwarz, FLUVIS 2020

### Key criteria for screening and ranking via workflow stream

- Kilometers potentially reconnected
- % of upstream reach in natural cover
- % of upstream reach in riparian/floodplain
- % of upstream reach in protected area
- Position, in/out of protected area

European-scale planning, helping to advocate for focused dam removal at the right scale to meet EU Goals

Excludes large hydro, drinking water supplies, road crossings, & barriers <0,5 m

### **Prioritization System: WWF**

Barrier Selection: Filter and Rank

#### Figure 1: Distribution of barriers with reconnection potential in Europe



Reconnection potential



All barriers





- Penobscot (2016) / Maine Statewide (2019) Protecting nature. Preserving life.
  - <u>https://maps.coastalresilience.org/maine/</u>
- Northeast Aquatic Connectivity (2011/2017)
  - <u>https://maps.freshwaternetwork.org/northeast/</u>
- Chesapeake Fish Passage Prioritization (2013, 2019)
  - <u>https://maps.freshwaternetwork.org/chesapeake/</u>
- Southeast Aquatic Connectivity Assessment Project (SEACAP) (2014)
  - <u>http://maps.tnc.org/seacap</u>
  - <u>https://connectivity.sarpdata.com/priority</u>

Outcomes for project applicants & private and governmental funding programs

Open-source tools create transparency in project scoring *and* inspire the collection of additional data to inc

### **Prioritization Tool** *In development: Slovenia*

Interactive platform for diverse user groups:

- # barriers up & downstream
- # dams to the ocean
- Km to connect upstream
- Overall km (basin potential)
- Habitat for key species
- Proximity to protected areas



# Four West Atlantic Examples: Variations on a unified approach

• Calculate metrics for barriers, weight relative importance of each based on up and downstream physical and ecological and social values



- Variable user needs
- Focal species
- Functional habitat
- Highway projects→
  linear prioritization
- Basin restoration groups for their local scale
- Metric availability vary by geography:
  - Maine: road crossings
  - Southeast: headwater biodiversity
  - Connecticut: project scoring

**TNC's West Atlantic Examples** Variations on a unified approach

Resource Managers/Experts define metrics to quantify, qualify and combine Users apply Rank/scoring and Weighting of metrics for their priorities

### Example high priority project:

- the most upstream habitat overall
- critical salmon sub-watersheds
- Hectares of herring spawning ponds
- Climate resilient settings
  - cold water
  - diversity of gradients
  - access to multiple habitat types
- Catchment supporting conditions
  - No storage  $\rightarrow$  natural flows
  - 80% natural land-cover types
  - No point-source pollution discharge

# Example System

Pacific Northwest Salmon catchments



12-18 Salmon watersheds customize metrics and weightings based on key filters:

### **Biological Filter:**

- Restores watershed processes
- Restores or improves watershed connectivity
- Removes limiting factor/s
- Has long lasting effects
- Restores or expands unique habitat
- Has well proven effectiveness

### Socio-economic Filter:

- High likelihood of success
- Provides educational benefits
- Addresses landowner concerns
- Has measurable effects
- Feasible (no socio-political opposition)
- Likely to be funded
- Acceptable cost/benefit ratio

### Example System: Pacific Northwest Salmon catchments

## Step 1. Scoring Rubric (adaptable)

- Team develops attribute definitions & descriptions
- Data Sources must cover whole watersheds
- Scoring Chart: 0 to 4 scale

## **Step 2. <u>Aggregate Weighted Scores</u>**

- Bio-Physical (Benefits)
- Socio-Economic (Feasibility)

 $\frac{\text{Bio-}}{\text{Physical}} \ge 2$ 

Socio-

Economic

≥2

## **WWF-AquaViva Prioritization: Basin-Scale Barrier Scoring**





### Toolbox in ArcMap:

Workflow FlussFrei.tbx

🛐 01 Aufbau Gewässernetz

033 Filterung nach HVI

06 Erstelle Factsheet

02 EZGGrösse und Sohlengefälle 031 Filter Hindernisse und Bauwerke

034 Filterung der Hindernisketten

04 Export Hindernisse nach Excel 05 Import- und Bewertungsskript

032 Quantifizierung Habitatsvergrösserungsindex

Already adopted by a river basin

Christian Hossli, project leader Fluss frei!

christian.hossli@aquaviva.ch

Klassierung im Feid		Vernetzu	
Gewässergrösse	4.5 m	Mindune	
Einzugsgebietsgrösse	13.5 km²	TACH DOLLE	
Ökomorphologie	rphologie künstich / naturfremd		
Bauwerkstvp	kunstich	Natursch	
Abstutzhöhe	Absturz < 40 cm	Leitunge	
Baustoff		Anlagen	
Uferbeschaffenheit		Zugăngi	
Sohlenbeschaffenheit		Grundwa	
Gefälle	2.2%	Staatspa	
D's in derselben	in 470, 843, 709, 220, 581, 107 elben		

Vernetzung	Die Schwelle liegt in einem Abschnitt, welche nit dem Hauptgerinne vernetzt ist.
Mündungsbereich	
HVI	2666
Naturschutzgebiet	
Leitungen	0
Anlagen	
Zugänglichkeit	
Grundwasserschutzzon	4
Staatsparzelle	3
Feldbemerkungen	2

### Fact sheet:

ID:	107	Bachrame:		Bachnummer:	30507	Bauwerk- bzw. Absturznr:	1101
2. Prooferenz		Oekologisches Potenzial mittel Re		Realisia	Realisierung erschwert und weniger guensig		
Geme	ande: Mo	nchaltorf	CH1903+ / LV95:	2697021/1240541	WGS84	4: 47.30951 / 8.721734	





# **Example Systems** Finland's Dams ranking methods



### Responsive to Opportunities: willing dam owners

- Fish population potential
- Water Framework: Status
  - > Ecological, Water quality, Hydromorphic
- New habitat connected (km and type)
- Hydropower cost/benefits
- Cultural/Recreational values

- 5,200 inventoried dams in Finland
- Most are small hydro or obsolete dams
- Only 4% are grid-based hydro
- Small barriers: road crossings not in database

Natural Resources and Bioeconomy Research Report: 29/2021



# TNC Barrier Removal Prioritization Existing Program Examples

### Mitigation Funding Programme

(managed for US and State Agencies) \$20M from 2008-2020

- Creates most functional systems (35 point)
- Project readiness/feasibility (30 points)
- Cost effectiveness (area restored/\$) (10 points)
- Other Benefits (education, scenic, recreation, community "sense of place") (5 points)

### US Dept. of Agriculture – TNC Grant \$26M from 2015-2025 (+partner match)

- Screening (project in or out)
  - Ownership, permitting, historic, minimum habitat, stream network position
- Project Ranking (best scores get most funding)
  - Miles of habitat
  - At-risk species habitat
  - Local, Regional and State Priority
  - Cost effectiveness (\$/mile)
  - Complimentary projects
  - Reduces vulnerability of site
  - Proximity to other projects
  - Proximity to protected lands/waters
  - Enhances Carbon sequestration

### Summary

Optimization, screening and selection systems

- All require data and acknowledge gaps
  - Barriers: many small ones like road crossings
  - Social: acceptance, legal mechanisms, and political will
  - o Surrounding Infrastructure
- Optimization helps focus on high potential networks
- Filtering, Ranking/scoring for evaluating potential removals

...... "But I still, haven't found, what I'm looking for" - Bono

- Combined optimize, screen & scoring (NOAA economist trying)
- Provide functional ecological benefit
- Stronger data for feasibility and leverage
- Create momentum to <u>exceed</u> EU goals

# Thank you

Joshua Royte

jroyte@tnc.org

HOLD THE DATE June 8<sup>th</sup> 14:00-17:00 European Barrier Prioritization Methods and Tools Workshop

