Fish Passage, Screening, Diversion, Inventory, & Design Projects - 5th Round WDFW Evaluation Form

Instructions: Complete one form for each project.

WDFW Reviewer: Pat Powers, Dave Collins
Lead Entity: **Chelan County Lead Entity**
Project Rank: **5 of 8**
Project Sponsor: **Chelan County**
Project Type: **Restoration**

Project Name: **Peshastin Creek Fish Barrier Removal**
Project Number: **04-1509 R**

1. WDFW Biological review
   Priority Index number established? Y☐/N☒
   Data provided by sponsor? Y☐/N☒
   PI work verified/reviewed by WDFW Y☐/ N☒
   a. If no Priority Index number completed – WDFW assigned generic PI number is **__21.17____**

Comments:

A surrogate PI was calculated based on stream length and width provided by the applicant. A multiplier of ".55" was applied to the PI, indicating that the stream was not walked and the habitat gain was map generated. The applicant claimed that there were no additional upstream barriers on Peshastin Creek. There looks to be multiple road crossings upstream of the project site. If these road crossings are barriers to fish passage, they will need to be addressed in order to realize the full gain indicated by the PI.

2. WDFW engineering review of the proposed fix
   ☐ Proposed project appears appropriate for site
   ☐ Conceptual design appears adequate
   ☐ Data design form appears adequate
   Comments:

There were no forms submitted to document the extent of the barrier at various flows. The roughened channel design is a new concept which may be applicable here, but the design conditions and maintenance required is not well understood. For a three foot drop there are other style of fishways which may be more appropriate. The proposed fish passage channel seems to be a high risk for sediment management. Also, it is not clear how the flash boards will be incorporated into the roughened channel.

Note on Roughened Channels:
WDFW has established design guidance for roughened channels in Appendix E of the Fish Passage at Road Crossing Manual. Even though this isn't a culvert the science could still apply. If this guidance is deemed inappropriate for this site, alternative criteria needs to be developed by the project proponent and submitted to the agencies for review. Several roughened channels (6% slope) have been built in a channel downstream of a culvert to provide a backwater. These examples could be used.

3. Review of Cost Estimate

☐ Cost estimate appears to be in-line with similar projects

☐ Cost estimate incomplete

Comments:

4. Overall Recommendation

Recommendation:

Other Comments:
