Fish Passage, Screening, Diversion, Inventory, & Design Projects - 2006 Grant Round -- WDFW Evaluation Form

Instructions: Complete one form for each project.

WDFW Reviewer: Collins /
Lead Entity: **Chelan County LE**
Project Rank:
Project Sponsor: **Chelan Co Natural Resource**
Project Type: **Restoration**
Project Name: **Beaver Creek Passage Program**
Project Number: **06-2248**

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 **_8.65 / 8.6 / 7.25_____**

Comments:

This application proposes to replace 4 instream structures on Beaver Cr. Surrogate Priority Index numbers were calculated for 3 of the crossings by WDFW. The PI numbers ascending from the lowest crossing are **8.65**, **8.6** and **7.25**. A PI was not calculated for the fourth repair proposed (project 3 in the application materials). Based on the data provided by the applicant and the data that resides in the statewide fish passage database, the barrier status of this crossing is unknown. Under current WDFW protocol, a slope of .9% and an outfall drop of 0m requires a Level B analysis to determine barrier status. Further investigation of this crossing should be considered to determine if it actually is a barrier before pursuing any correction activities. The PI numbers were calculated for Steelhead, Bull Trout and Resident Trout. WDFW staff used the stream widths from the application to calculate the PI numbers but used stream lengths derived from GIS. The applicant claimed a gain of only 2 miles while there looks to be over 8 miles of usable habitat above the proposed fixes. DFW methodologies take into account all fish bearing waters upstream of a project when considering habitat gain. A modifier of .65 was applied to the PI numbers to indicate that the habitat areas were map generated but at least some of the habitat had been walked. Had a full physical survey been conducted, the PI for these projects would have been substantially higher.

2. Engineering review of the proposed fix

☒ Proposed project appears appropriate for site
☒ Conceptual design appears adequate
☒ Data design form appears adequate

Comments:

The proposal is to replace 3 culverts with steel prefab bridges and remove a small drop over a timber dam. Based on the culvert size, outfall and fill heights it appears the bridge lengths will be adequate without encroaching on the channel.

3. Review of Cost Estimate

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

Comments:

There is a fishway cost shown for the bridge option?

4. Overall Recommendation

Recommendation:

The overall pre-project information submitted was excellent. Would should a short paragraph be added to the section on design to document how the bridge spans are being selected.

Other Comments: