

Article

Nature-Like Fishways in Spain: A National Overview of Design, Construction Costs, and Effectiveness

Asier Saiz-Rojo ^{1,*}, Ana García-Vega ², Francisco Javier Bravo-Córdoba ¹ and Francisco Javier Sanz-Ronda ^{2,*}

¹ Centro Tecnológico Agrario y Agroalimentario ITAGRA.CT, Avenida de Madrid 44, Campus La Yutera, 34004 Palencia, Spain; fjbravo@itagra.com

² Group of Applied Ecohydraulics, Sustainable Forest Management Research Institute, Department of Agricultural and Forest Engineering, ETSIIAA, University of Valladolid, Avenida de Madrid 44, Campus La Yutera, 34004 Palencia, Spain; ana.garcia.vega@uva.es

* Correspondence: asaiz@itagra.com (A.S.-R.); jsanz@uva.es (F.J.S.-R.)

Abstract

Nature-like fishways (NLFs) are a key restoration measure for fragmented rivers at low-head barriers, yet their economic and functional performance is poorly documented. This study provides a comprehensive analysis of 134 NLF projects in Spain (2003–2025), classifying them by typology, energy dissipation elements, and construction method. We quantified construction costs using standardized indicators and assessed available hydraulic and biological efficiency data. Results show a predominance of public funding schemes and a strong geographical concentration of NLFs in the northern half of the country, with ramps (76.1%) being more frequent than bypass channels (23.9%). Construction costs varied markedly among designs, with concrete boulder ramps consistently representing the most cost-intensive NLF configurations, while also being strongly influenced by local site conditions and construction constraints. Only a small fraction of projects (13.4%) underwent post-construction efficiency assessments, but those evaluated generally showed favorable performances for multiple fish species. Our findings provide a state-of-the-art overview of NLFs in Spain, together with a practical classification framework and standardized cost indicators to support the planning and prioritization of river connectivity restoration projects.

Keywords: fish passage; river connectivity; ecological restoration; cost-effectiveness; construction

1. Introduction

Transversal barriers such as weirs, dams, culverts, and gauging stations are among the primary causes of river habitat fragmentation and disruption of fish migration routes [1,2]. These structures modify the natural hydromorphological and ecological processes of river systems, altering flow regimes and connectivity, and therefore threatening the conservation of freshwater fish biodiversity [3,4]. When barrier removal is not feasible, fishways represent the most effective mitigation measure to restore longitudinal connectivity and allow the upstream and downstream movements of aquatic fauna [5,6].

Among the available typologies, nature-like fishways (NLFs)—including rock ramps and bypass channels—are increasingly used for low-head barriers (typically <4 m) due to their hydraulic simplicity, ecological compatibility, and landscape integration [7,8]. These fishways mimic the physical and hydraulic conditions of natural rivers, using gentle slopes and coarse substrates (rocks, boulders, gravels, logs) to create a heterogeneous flow field that provides multiple migration pathways and resting areas for fish [9]. As a result, they



Academic Editor: Tiegang Zheng

Received: 11 February 2026

Revised: 20 March 2026

Accepted: 24 March 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

tend to be less selective for species and body sizes than conventional technical fishways, and usually require less maintenance once built [10,11].

In recent years, several studies have analyzed the biological efficiency and hydraulic performance of nature-like fishways across different regions [12–18]. More recently, comprehensive assessments have addressed some cost-effectiveness and engineering aspects [19,20]. Despite these advances, the economic dimension of such systems remains underrepresented in scientific literature [21]. Construction costs are highly variable, influenced by local geology, material availability, site accessibility, and design typology, but few studies have attempted to quantify these relationships systematically. This information is critical for managers and planners, as financial feasibility is often a decisive factor when prioritizing restoration projects and allocating limited conservation budgets.

While cost databases and standard indicators are available for technical fishways—such as pool weir, or vertical slot designs [22]—equivalent references for nature-like structures are lacking. Consequently, project planners often rely on rough empirical estimates or case-specific budgets, which can hinder the optimization of fish passage solutions. Developing robust economic indicators that relate construction cost to easily measurable variables (e.g., dam height, total length, or constructed area) would improve the transparency and comparability of future projects.

In Spain, the construction of NLFs has grown considerably in the last two decades, driven by the implementation of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) [23] and associated river restoration programs. However, there has been limited discussion regarding their technical and biological performance or their true cost-effectiveness. Current design practices vary widely between regions, and post-construction fish efficiency assessments remain scarce. Moreover, there is little quantitative information on their geographical distribution, typological variability, and economic trends.

Therefore, the objectives of this study are: (1) to develop and apply a systematic descriptive design framework for nature-like fishways implemented in Spain, encompassing their geographical distribution as well as their main typological, spatial, and geometric characteristics; (2) to quantify their construction costs through standardized and comparable indicators; and (3) to analyze available data on their biological and hydraulic performance for fish passage. Together, these results will contribute to a better understanding of the cost-effectiveness of NLFs and provide a practical tool for decision-making in river connectivity planning and management.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Data Acquisition

Technical information on the construction costs and geometric characteristics of NLFs was obtained from official inquiries to public administrations (the National Ministry of Environment, the Spanish Water Authorities, and regional fish management services), as well as through contacts with consulting companies and universities. In addition, all available information on hydraulic and/or biological performance evaluations of the fishways analyzed in this study were requested and compiled.

This dataset was complemented with targeted web searches using Google, employing both Spanish and English keywords such as “*presupuesto*” (budget), “*proyecto constructivo*” (construction project), “*paso naturalizado*” (nature-like fishway), “*rampa para peces*” (rock/y ramp), “*río artificial*” (bypass channel), “*evaluación hidráulica/hidrológica*” (hydraulic/biological assessment), and “*continuidad fluvial*” (river continuity).

A database was then developed in which each project was assigned a unique code according to the nature-like fishway typology (see Section 2.2, Figures 1 and 2 and Supplementary Materials). For each project, the following information was compiled:

(i) location (province, municipality, river, river basin authority, and coordinates); (ii) year of project development; (iii) geometric characteristics, including dam height—understood as hydraulic head—and fishway width, length, area, and slope; (iv) design characteristics (see Section 2.2), including 10 partial or full-width implementation and upstream or downstream positioning relative to the dam (Figure 2); (v) Direct Building Cost (DBC), updated to 2024 prices and excluding overheads (6–16%), contractor profit (6%), and taxes (e.g., VAT, 16–21% between 2003 and 2024); (vi) data suitability for analysis (Yes/No; see Section 2.3); (vii) construction status (Yes/No); (viii) type of project funding (public/private); and (ix) efficiency assessment, including the presence and type of post-construction evaluation, applied monitoring methods, key outcomes, and data sources.




Figure 1. Classification of nature-like fishways according to the three hierarchical levels considered in this study.




Figure 2. Left: bottom semi-dry bottom ramp [R-*bt-sd*] in Azkoitia (Gipuzkoa). Center: boulder ramp [R-*bl-c*] in the Najerilla River, La Rioja. Right: concrete pool-and-weir ramp [R-*pw-c*] in the Pisuega River, northern Palencia. All of them are full-width NLFs—the device extends across the entire width of the river channel, from one bank to the other—and the structures are positioned downstream relative to the barrier.

2.2. Classification of Nature-Like Fishways

The proposed classification is structured into three hierarchical levels that describe complementary aspects of fishway design: (i) spatial location within the river system, (ii) the type of hydraulic energy dissipation system—defined by the roughness elements used to control flow velocity and create suitable passage conditions for fish—and (iii) the construction method. Although these levels represent different conceptual dimensions, their combined use provides a consistent and standardized framework to characterize nature-like fishways. This approach facilitates comparison among projects with diverse designs and supports subsequent economic analyses.

Thus, the first level is based on the fishway position relative to the dam, distinguishing between ramps and bypass channels [24] (Figure 1).

- Ramps (R) are channels with slopes up to 10% that are placed within the main river channel, typically attached to the weir. They can be constructed downstream of the obstacle (most common), upstream (less frequent), or embedded within the structure. Moreover, they may span the entire dam or only a portion of it.
- Bypass channels (BC), or artificial rivers, are side channels built outside the main riverbed that circumvent the barrier, providing an alternative low-slope (usually <5%) route for fish migration.

The second level focuses on the energy dissipation system, understood as the set of structural elements—typically sourced off-site—used to reduce flow velocity and turbulence within the fishway while providing suitable hydraulic conditions for fish passage [24] (Figures 1–3):

- The bottom type (*bt*) uses natural bed material—gravel, rocks and even boulders—to construct a uniform rough channel bottom that slows down flow velocity and provides refuge areas for fish within the interstitial spaces.
- The boulder type (*bl*) adds large—staggered/random/row-aligned/grouped—perturbation rocks (boulders) on the rough channel bed to further increase energy dissipation and allow fish passage for steeper slopes; these boulders create shadow zones and hydraulic shelters behind them. The distinction between bottom (*bt*) and boulder (*bl*) types is sometimes ambiguous due to overlapping material sizes and grain composition.
- Additionally, the pool-and-weir system (*pw*) replicates a conventional technical fishway, using rock weirs of different sizes to form a sequence of pools where fish can rest during their ascent.




Figure 3. (a) Cross-section of a semi-dry bottom ramp [R-bt-sd]; (b) cross-section of a boulder ramp with concrete slab and sidewalls [R-bl-c]; (c) cross-section of a pool-and-weir system with concrete [R-pw-c].

The third level of classification is based on the construction method. This study considers three categories (Figures 1 and 3):

- Concrete structures (c) consist of placing rocks and boulders on a gravel or concrete foundation and grouting the cavities between them with concrete mortar to stabilize materials. This approach, normally used in boulder ramps and pool-and-weir systems, ensures structural stability under high flows or steeper gradients.
- Semi-dry structures (sd) use concrete only at the base of the main boulders (usually larger and closer together than in concrete structures), leaving the upper joints ungrouted. The remaining cavities serve as cover and resting areas for ascending fish and are often partially filled by gravel after floods. This assembly is more related to large boulder bottom ramps.
- Dry structures (d) are built entirely without concrete, using large rocks and blocks to stabilize the fishway channel. They are typically applied to low-slope ramps or small bypasses, either bottom or boulder type, at remote or difficult-to-access sites (e.g., road crossings or culverts with bed scouring that hinders fish passage).

2.3. Data Curation

The fishway projects analyzed were designed and built between 2003 and 2025. To ensure comparability of construction costs, all monetary values were updated using the last published version of the “Construction Cost Index for the Civil Engineering Sector”

published by the Spanish Ministry of Transport, Mobility, and Urban Agenda [25]. This index reflects the annual evolution of construction costs in Spain based on a 2021 baseline, and accounts for both material and labor costs. Each project's budget was normalized to 2024 by multiplying its original DBC by the cost updating index—the ratio between the 2024 index value and that of its year of drafting (Table 1). The 2025 index was not available at the time of the study and was considered the same as 2024.

Table 1. Cost updating indices used to convert project budgets to 2024 values.

Year	Cost Updating Index	Year	Cost Updating Index
2003	1.522	2014	1.264
2004	1.480	2015	1.277
2005	1.429	2016	1.288
2006	1.380	2017	1.261
2007	1.332	2018	1.238
2008	1.280	2019	1.238
2009	1.312	2020	1.249
2010	1.301	2021	1.172
2011	1.262	2022	1.034
2012	1.255	2023	1.009
2013	1.261	2024/25	1.000

Projects that did not meet the functional and design criteria established in fishway design manuals [5,24,26]—such as high cost due to undefined complementary works or the inclusion of other works (i.e., dam rehabilitation, pipelines, or urban development), excessive slope, insufficient depth, or inadequate width—were excluded from the analysis.

2.4. Data Analysis

Economic indicators were designed to allow for a rapid and reliable estimation of construction costs, as well as for comparison among similar projects. Based on the main geometric fishway variables:

- Height (H in m), i.e., the hydraulic head across the obstacle (water level difference) to be overcome by fish.
- Width (B in m), understood as the whole fishway width, from side to side of lateral walls (Figure 3).
- Horizontal length (L in m), which depends on the overall slope of the structure.
- Slope (S in %), assumed as the ratio H/L .
- Area (A in m^2), considered as $B \times L$.

Each of these dimensions is directly related to DBC. Nevertheless, a unique standardized indicator of DBC was selected: €/m² of constructed area (A), because of its independence from fishway size (H , B , L - S), which makes it easy and reliable to extrapolate across all types of devices. All geometric variables were used to describe the typological and spatial characteristics of nature-like fishways.

On the other hand, for comparison with other fishway cost data [22], DBC were also expressed as € per meter of head difference (€/m). However, total fishway cost is strongly influenced by geometric characteristics, particularly fishway width and slope, which determine both the discharge capacity and the total length of the structure. To improve comparability among projects with different dimensions, costs were therefore normalized to a reference width of 5 m. This width represents a typical design dimension for medium-sized nature-like fishways in Spain and corresponds approximately to design discharges of about 1–1.5 m³/s for bottom and boulder ramps (R - bt and R - bl), and 0.4–0.8 m³/s for pool-and-weir artificial rivers or ramps (BC - pw and R - bw). By standardizing costs to this reference width, the resulting indicator (€/m of head difference for a 5 m wide fishway)

provides a consistent metric for comparing projects with different geometries and for benchmarking results with previously published fishway cost studies.

Comparisons among different fishway typologies were performed using the Kruskal–Wallis (KW) test to evaluate median differences, as cost data (€/m²) did not follow a normal distribution. In addition, boxplots, together with the KW test, were used to find the differences in cost data (€/m²) by type, roughness, and construction method. When the KW test was significant, post hoc Dunn’s multiple comparison test with Holm correction was performed. All data processing and statistical analyses were performed using R version 2025.05.1+513 [27], and the significance level was established at $\alpha = 0.05$ for all the analyses.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Framework

Information was obtained for a total of 134 NLFs, including 102 ramps and 32 bypass channels. The complete dataset is presented in the Supplementary Materials. The projects are distributed heterogeneously across different regions and river basins in Spain, with the highest concentration (88.8%) located in the northern part of the country—particularly within the Duero, Gipuzkoa, Catalanian, Ebro, Miño-Sil, and Cantabrian basins (Figure 4). Most of the projects (around 84%) were constructed after 2010 and are associated with public investment (128/134; 95.5% of all studied projects).



Figure 4. Location map of the projects used in the study: “ramps” (R) in blue and “bypass channels” (BC) in brown.

Ramps were by far the most common solution (76.1%, 102 of 134 cases) across all geographical areas, compared to 23.9% for bypass channels (Figure 4).

A total of 39 projects (29.1%) were excluded from the technical and economic analyses (see Supplementary Materials) because (1) they did not meet the design and construction requirements necessary to ensure fish passage functionality (6/39); (2) they corresponded to highly site-specific, excessively costly, small-scale interventions with neither comparable geometric nor cost data, such as non-concrete boulder and bottom type roughness ramps (*R-bl-d* and *R-bt-d*; $n = 12/39$); or (3) there was insufficient economic data available to assess the cost of the projects (21/39).

Consequently, 95 projects were selected for the core analysis: 67 ramps and 28 bypass channels representing a total DBC of 12.6 M€, updated to 2024 values.

Within ramps (level 2 typology), the three design types showed a relatively balanced occurrence: boulder ramps (*R-bl*; $n = 18$; 26.9%), pool-and-weir ramps (*R-pw*; $n = 20$; 29.8%), and roughness bottom-type ramps (*R-bt*; $n = 29$; 43.3%).

Most of the selected ramps were built downstream of the weir and directly attached to the structure ($n = 64$ downstream vs. $n = 3$ upstream). In ramp construction, two alternatives can be implemented. The structure may extend across the entire width of the river channel, from one bank to the other (full or total-width ramps; Figure 2), or it may occupy only part of the channel (first picture at Figure 1). In our dataset, 37 ramps were partial-width (median $B = 6.5$ m), whereas total-width ramps ($n = 30$) had a median width of 8 m. However, no significant differences in median width were detected between both configurations (Kruskal–Wallis test, $p = 0.29$). In general, the ramp width ranged from 2.7 to 36 m, with a median of 8 m, with no differences at level 2 ($p = 0.96$).

The dam height to be overcome by ramps varied from 0.3 m to 5.5 m, with a median of 1.5 m; only two projects exceeded 4 m. Ramp slopes ranged between 2.0% and 10.3%, with a median of 4.9%. No significant differences were detected at level 2 (neither for H ($p = 0.11$) nor for S ($p = 0.61$)) (Figure 5).

From a construction standpoint, concrete designs (*c*) predominated in boulder (18/18) and pool-and-weir ramps (20/20), whereas semi-dry structures (*sd*) were more common among roughness ramps (28/29).

For bypass channels ($n = 28$), the most frequent configurations were boulder channels (*BC-bl*; $n = 16$; 57.1%) and pool-and-weir channels (*BC-pw*; $n = 12$; 42.9%), with no available data for bottom-type roughness-based systems (*BC-bt*).

Bypass channel width was more homogeneous than ramps, with a median value of 4.6 m and a range of 1.8–14 m. By construction type, the median ranges from 4.5 m for boulder channels, to 5.7 m for pool-and-weir channels.

Dam height for *BC* was similar at level 2 ($p = 0.96$), ranging from 0.6 m to 10.0 m with a median of 1.95 m, slightly higher than ramps ($p = 0.01$). Only two projects exceeded 4 m height (5 and 5.5 m, respectively).

Their slopes ranged between 1.2% and 9.6%, with a median of 3.9%—slightly lower ($\text{emph} = 0.14$) in boulder types (3.6%) compared to pool-and-weir types (4.3%) (Figure 5).

No significant differences were found in B , H , or S at level 2 for bypass channels (p -values: 0.61, 0.96, and 0.14, respectively).

Nearly all artificial rivers were concrete structures (*BC-bl-c* and *R-bt-c*), while only two projects were constructed without concrete (*BC-bl-d* and *BC-pw-d*), both associated with low slopes (<3%) and small-scale applications.




Figure 5. Box-plots for width, height, and slope by construction type: *bl* (boulder), *bt* (roughness bottom), and *pw* (pool-and-weir) for ramps (a–c) and bypass channels (d–f). The centerline corresponds to the median and dots represent the outliers.

3.2. Construction Costs and Economic Indicators

Construction costs are summarized in Table 2 and the Supplementary Materials. No statistically significant differences were observed in the median DBC per square meter (€/m²) between the two main typologies considered (level 1): ramps (308 €/m²) and bypass channels (338 €/m²) ($p = 0.86$; Figure 6).

Table 2. Median values and interquartile ranges of construction costs (DBC) per area (€/m²) for combinations of fishway typology (level 1), energy dissipation system (level 2), and construction method (level 3).

Level	<i>n</i>	Category	Min	Q1	Median (Q2)	Q3	Max	Mean	SD
Level 1	67	R	97.52	186.69	307.73	537.66	1372.42	388.14	262.45
	28	BC	90.37	204.91	337.97	432.65	765.87	350.83	186.77
Level 1 + 2	29	R-bt	97.52	161.66	245.95	379.90	957.84	317.54	234.18
	18	R-bl	148.47	404.02	482.32	564.51	1372.42	529.06	296.69
	20	R-pw	119.40	178.37	299.84	472.96	920.48	363.69	229.43
	16	BC-bl	90.37	202.95	373.74	504.30	765.87	379.01	218.37
	12	BC-pw	129.33	209.68	321.01	364.13	619.84	313.25	133.80

Table 2. Cont.

Level	<i>n</i>	Category	Min	Q1	Median (Q2)	Q3	Max	Mean	SD
Level 1 + 2 + 3	1	R-bt-c	824.40	824.40	824.40	824.40	824.40	824.40	NA
	28	R-bt-sd	97.52	156.49	239.78	326.73	957.84	299.44	216.83
	18	R-bl-c	148.47	404.02	482.32	564.51	1372.42	529.06	296.69
	20	R-pw-c	119.40	178.37	299.84	472.96	920.48	363.69	229.43
	15	BC-bl-c	90.37	224.61	382.48	525.97	765.87	398.02	211.88
	1	BC-bl-d	93.80	93.80	93.80	93.80	93.80	93.80	NA
	11	BC-pw-c	129.33	241.85	325.89	375.13	619.84	323.04	135.74
	1	BC-pw-d	205.52	205.52	205.52	205.52	205.52	205.52	NA




Figure 6. Box-plots for construction costs per area (€/m²) by levels. 1: ramp (R), bypass channel (BC); 2: boulder type (bl), bottom type (bt), pool-and-weir system (pw); 3: concrete structures (c), semi-dry structures (sd). Category “dry structures” (d) is not included because it contains only a single data point. The centerline corresponds to the median and dots represent the outliers.

In contrast, significant cost differences were detected among the energy dissipation systems (level 2; $p = 0.03$). Fishways incorporating large boulders (bl) exhibited significantly higher construction costs than pool-and-weir (pw) and bottom-type roughness (bt) systems (Figure 6).

Significant differences were also found among construction methods, highlighting the influence of concrete use on total cost (concrete > semi-dry > dry; $p = 0.02$; Figure 6).

Within ramps, the most expensive solutions corresponded to boulder ramps (R-bl) characterized by a high density of large blocks arranged in structured patterns (e.g., staggered, random, rowed, or grouped) and relatively gentle slopes (around 5%) (Figure 7). These configurations almost doubled the construction cost compared to other ramp typologies. The use of concrete increases the cost, which is why semi-dry (sd) devices showed lower costs.




Figure 7. Box-plots for construction costs (a) per area (€/m²) and costs (b) per height for a width of 5 m (€/m) for each type of solution (level 1 + 2 and level 1 + 2 + 3). Categories “BC-bl-d”, “BC-pw-d” and “R-bt-c” are not included because they contain only a single data point. The centerline corresponds to the median and dots represent the outliers.

Conversely, bypass channels showed similar costs among *BC-pw*, *BC-bl*, and *BC-bt* typologies (Figure 7). Likewise, when comparing ramps and bypass channels within the same classification level, no differences were detected (e.g., *R-pw* vs. *BC-pw* and *R-bl* vs. *BC-bl*). Concrete-based structures also tended to show lower costs, as observed in ramp configurations.

Construction cost data can also be expressed as €/m of head difference, normalized to a standard fishway width of 5 m (see Supplementary Materials). Cost differences among typologies remain consistent with those described above (Figure 7).

3.3. Nature-like Fishways' Efficiency Assessment

Results are presented as a structured inventory rather than a quantitative synthesis due to the methodological variability and the predominantly qualitative or semi-quantitative

nature of the available data. All identified assessments, including methodological details and references, are compiled in the Supplementary Materials.

Only a limited number of all NLFs—18 out of 134 projects (13.4%)—had any form of post-construction efficiency assessment. Within the peer-reviewed literature, just one paper was identified that qualitatively assessed fish passage in two studied NLFs using mark–recapture techniques [28], along with three conference proceedings: one based on fish capture data [29] and the other two based on PIT tagging [30,31]. In addition, several fishways included in the present study ($n = 11$) were evaluated using the AEPS rapid hydraulic coarse assessment methodology [26]. A smaller subset ($n = 7$, of which four were also hydraulic-assessed), were subject to more detailed biological monitoring, including mark–recapture techniques, PIT-tag tracking, and/or radiotelemetry. Most of these evaluations belong to gray literature, typically contained in internal reports from national or regional agencies, and are therefore difficult to access. Functionality assessments were conducted under representative flow conditions during fish migration periods, when fish passage is most relevant from an ecological perspective.

Overall, the majority of assessed fishways obtained favorable performance evaluations (16/18). Nevertheless, several recurring issues were identified, including insufficient water depth in specific sections (particularly in ramps near the junction with the weir crest), and in some cases, excessive flow velocities (>3 m/s), poor entrance location, and local scouring (perching) at the downstream junction between the fishway and the riverbed.

Despite these shortcomings, most evaluated structures showed a high degree of naturalization, supported the passage of multiple fish species, and facilitated a wide range of movements throughout the year, including both upstream and downstream movements.

4. Discussion

4.1. Descriptive Framework

Nature-like fishways represent an effective technical solution to mitigate the ecological impacts of transverse river barriers, particularly at low-head structures (<4 m) [16,24]. In the Iberian Peninsula, their implementation has increased markedly since 2010, largely driven by public funding and the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) [23]. At present, NLFs account for a substantial proportion—estimated as 15 to 25%—of the total number of inventoried fish passes in Spain ($n = 612$ [32]). At the river-basin scale, available data are limited, but, for example, in the Spanish Duero basin, NLFs represent 53 out of 184 fishways (28.8%) [33]. A similar increasing trend has also been reported in Portugal (18% NLFs; 18/100) [2].

Despite this growing relevance, their construction techniques, economic performance, and functional efficiency have received comparatively limited attention in the national literature [26,28,34]. The hierarchical classification proposed in this study provides a structured framework to systematize the diversity of NLFs designed in Spain, distinguishing position, energy dissipation system, and construction method. This approach has proven useful to organize heterogeneous designs and to relate them consistently to cost and performance indicators. Overall, 134 NLFs have been collected for this study. In the case of the Duero basin, the largest river basin in the Iberian Peninsula where well documented inventories are accessible, this means that 50.9% of NLFs were incorporated into our work.

The compiled dataset indicates that NLFs in Spain are mostly publicly funded and unevenly distributed, with a strong concentration in northern river basins, the same as overall fishways [32]. Both patterns likely reflect higher institutional awareness and proactive river basin management. The marked northern concentration appears to reflect historical management priorities. In northern basins, river connectivity restoration has traditionally received greater attention due to the presence of diadromous and recreational fish species

such as Atlantic salmon and brown trout, which have long been central to fisheries' management and conservation initiatives. This historical focus has also indirectly contributed to the conservation of native fish communities, including endemic species. In contrast, although southern Iberian basins host a higher number of endemic freshwater fish species, water management in these regions has historically been strongly oriented toward irrigation supply and agricultural uses. As a result, river connectivity restoration has received less priority despite the high conservation value of the native ichthyofauna.

The predominance of relatively small hydraulic heads of the obstacles (median $H < 2$ m) and low-to-moderate slopes (median $S < 5\%$) indicates that these solutions are primarily applied to low-head barriers. These patterns are consistent with international design recommendations [24]. Slope is a key design parameter governing hydraulic performance and fish passage efficiency [13,17,35]. Similar slope ranges have been reported in NFLs worldwide [13,15–17], reflecting broadly consistent design criteria despite regional differences in species and environmental conditions.

Ramps are the predominant solution (approximately 76.1%), typically built downstream and attached to the weir, often as either partial- or total-width structures. Boulder, pool-and-weir, and bottom-type ramps show a relatively balanced distribution, although bottom-type ramps are mainly concentrated in specific regions (e.g., Gipuzkoa). Bypass channels represent around 23.9% of the cases—either pool-and-weir (42.9%) or boulder-based (57.1%)—and are mostly implemented where lateral space allow for longer, lower-slope alignments than ramps. This distinction between steeper ramp configurations and lower-gradient bypass channels has been widely reported in international studies and guidelines [13,17,20,24], highlighting the consistency of design principles across geographical contexts.

Construction practices commonly combine boulders and coarse gravels with extensive concrete stabilization. An emerging approach consists of constructing the ramp channel in concrete and installing prefabricated baffle or ridge units that act as hydraulic roughness elements, replacing natural rocks (three devices located in Spain since 2024; see Supplementary Materials). Similar precast rock-ramp systems have been widely implemented in Australia [20,36], and are also reported in Portugal [2,20,37]. This increasing reliance on concrete challenges the conceptual boundary between nature-like and technical fishways.

4.2. Construction Costs and Economic Indicators

The economic aspects of NFLs are still poorly covered in research [21,22]. While construction costs vary widely based on local geology, materials, accessibility, and design, few studies have systematically analyzed these cost drivers. This gap is critical for decision-makers, as financial viability often determines which restoration projects are prioritized within constrained conservation budgets.

Construction costs of nature-like fishways are highly variable across regions and design contexts. Published international estimates range from 5 to 20 k€/m per meter of head difference in Europe [38], to 28–42.5 k€/m in the Lower Mekong River [39]. Substantially higher values have been reported for large-bodied fish passage projects, such as 190 k€/m for bypass channels and up to 280 k€/m for ramps in low-gradient U.S. rivers designed for sturgeon passage [40]. In Australia, mean construction costs are on the order of 100 k€/m, with exceptionally wide ranges spanning 4–275 k€/m, reflecting strong site- and design-specific effects [20]. In Spain, the cost ranges identified in this study are approximately 9–145 k€/m for ramps and 20–122 k€/m for bypass channels, values that fall within the lower to intermediate ranges reported internationally.

Nevertheless, direct comparisons among studies remain limited as published cost figures often lack standardized reporting of fishway dimensions and cost components, particularly with respect to the inclusion or exclusion of overheads, taxes, and other indirect costs. Thus, by focusing on Direct Building Cost (DBC) and introducing standardized indicators expressed as €/m² and €/m normalized to a 5 m width, this study provides more robust and transferable cost metrics. These indicators reduce the influence of fishway dimensions and allow meaningful comparisons among different typologies and construction methods for practitioners and river managers, enabling rapid cost estimation. Although developed for Spain, the proposed cost indicators are transferable to other regions, provided that local design, construction, and economic conditions are considered.

Our results show that ramps and bypass channels exhibit similar relative construction costs once normalized, suggesting that neither solution is intrinsically more economical. Geometric characteristics differ between the two solutions, but these differences tend to be balanced in terms of construction effort. Ramps usually require steeper slopes and more complex in-channel works, whereas bypass channels demand longer alignments and greater excavation volumes.

Among typologies, boulder ramps constructed with concrete (*R-bl-c*) are consistently the most expensive solutions, reflecting the high material volume, block size, and construction complexity involved. In contrast, bottom-type and pool-and-weir systems generally show lower median costs.

The construction of NLFs is generally simpler than other fishways; however, this does not necessarily imply lower construction costs. When NLFs are compared with stepped technical fishways—specifically vertical slot (VS) and submerged notch and bottom orifice (SNBO) designs—the latter tend to exhibit intermediate values between ramp and bypass channel solutions. For example, translating the values reported by [22] in Spain into the economic indicators used in the present study, the DBC for a VS fishway is approximately 0.93 k€/m² (design discharge 0.5 m³/s; slope 7%) and 1.02 k€/m² for the SNBO configuration at a 10% slope and the same discharge. Although these relative costs per unit area are higher than those observed for nature-like fishways, technical fishways generally require a much smaller construction footprint. Thus, a NLF designed to overcome a 2 m head difference with a 5 m width requires approximately 200 m² of ramp or bypass channel at a 5% slope (~1.0 m³/s for ramps; ~0.5 m³/s for bypass channels), compared to only 72.2 m² for an SNBO fishway operating at a 10% slope and 0.5 m³/s, or 91.6 m² for a 7% slope VS fishway. This translates into an estimated DBC of approximately 74 k€ for the SNBO solution and 85 k€ for a VS fishway, compared with 96 k€ for a 5 m width concrete boulder ramp (*R-bl-c*) or 66 k€ for a concrete pool-and-weir bypass channel (*BC-pw-c*).

Therefore, beyond purely economic considerations, the selection of a fish passage solution should also be guided by space availability, site accessibility, and constructability constraints, which often play a decisive role in the feasibility of nature-like designs.

4.3. Hydraulic and Biological Efficiency

Despite their increasing implementation, post-construction efficiency assessments of nature-like fishways remain scarce. Only a small fraction of the inventoried projects included any form of hydraulic or biological evaluation, and most of these assessments belong to gray literature. Nevertheless, the available evidence suggests a generally favorable performance, with approximately 90% of evaluated structures considered effective for fish passage. In a more conservative estimate, based on expert judgment, approximately 60% of the NLF projects implemented by the Duero River Basin Authority are considered functionally effective [33].

Overall, when properly designed, NLFs in Spain appear to achieve efficiency levels comparable to those of conventional stepped fishways constructed after 2010 [35,41]. This finding is consistent with broader syntheses indicating that nature-like and technical fishways generally exhibit similar total passage efficiencies [13,17,18]. Nevertheless, those meta-analyses have reported lower attraction efficiency in NLFs compared to technical designs. It should be noted, however, that attraction efficiency is strongly influenced by site-specific factors, particularly fishway entrance location and the proportion of river discharge allocated to the fishway [24,41], which are not always consistently accounted for in comparative analyses. As a result, differences in attraction performance may partly reflect design and hydraulic context rather than intrinsic limitations of the typology. In this regard, NLFs may provide more favorable attraction conditions due to their larger width, higher discharge capacity, and improved hydraulic and morphological integration with the main channel under different flow conditions.

Recurring deficiencies of NLFs—such as insufficient water depth, excessive local velocities, poor entrance positioning, or downstream perching—are consistent with those reported for general fishway types [2,13,41] and highlight the importance of rigorous design and construction control.

4.4. Implications for Planning and Management

The cost indicators and typological patterns presented in this study are intended as decision-support tools for the early planning stages of river connectivity projects, rather than as substitutes for detailed design and budgeting. They allow rapid, transparent, and comparable cost estimates, helping managers prioritize interventions and allocate limited resources more efficiently.

While NLFs may offer ecological and landscape integration advantages, particularly improved attraction and entrance conditions due to their larger width and discharge, their economic and functional performance ultimately depends on site-specific constraints. Therefore, future efforts should focus on expanding standardized monitoring programs and integrating economic, hydraulic, and biological evaluations to improve adaptive management and evidence-based decision-making in river restoration.

5. Conclusions

This study provides a standardized assessment of NLFs implemented in Spain, focusing on their typological characteristics, construction costs, and available performance evidence.

First, the hierarchical classification descriptive framework developed in this study proved useful to consistently describe NLFs by integrating geographical, typological, spatial, and geometric features. Most projects are located in the northern half of the country and have been implemented under public funding schemes. Ramps were the predominant solution, although bypass channels were also widely applied where site conditions allowed. Construction practices frequently relied on concrete stabilization.

Second, construction costs showed high variability and were mainly driven by typology and construction methods. Boulder ramps built with concrete were consistently the most expensive solutions, whereas bottom-type and pool-and-weir configurations showed lower median costs. The standardized cost indicators proposed (€/m² and €/m of head difference, normalized to a 5 m width) provide transferable metrics for comparing projects and supporting early-stage planning.

Third, although post-construction monitoring remains limited, available evidence indicates that properly designed NLFs achieve efficiencies comparable to those of technical fishways. Recurring deficiencies related to entrance conditions and local hydraulics highlight the need for rigorous design, construction control, and systematic evaluation.

Overall, NLFs are an effective option for restoring connectivity at low-head barriers, but their selection should jointly consider ecological suitability, space availability, construction feasibility, and standardized cost-effectiveness criteria. Expanding post-implementation monitoring and integrating economic and efficiency assessments will be essential to optimize future restoration strategies.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at: <https://www.mdpi.com/article/10.3390/w18070834/s1>: S1: Table of data and information used in the research work; S2: Table and box plot of median values and interquartile ranges of construction costs per height for a width of 5 m (€/m). Refs. [42–46] cited in supplementary.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.S.-R. and F.J.S.-R.; methodology, A.S.-R. and F.J.S.-R.; investigation, A.S.-R.; data acquisition A.S.-R. and F.J.S.-R.; data curation, A.S.-R., A.G.-V., F.J.B.-C. and F.J.S.-R.; writing—original draft preparation, A.S.-R., A.G.-V., F.J.B.-C. and F.J.S.-R.; writing—review and editing, A.S.-R., A.G.-V., F.J.B.-C. and F.J.S.-R.; project administration, A.S.-R. and F.J.S.-R. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: The work has been partially funded by the IV Agreement between the Duero River Basin Authority, Itagra Technological Center and the University of Valladolid.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in this study are included in the Supplementary Materials. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank the technicians and public and private entities that provided us with the information necessary for carrying out this study, such as: Pedro Castillo and Ismael Pérez in Orekan company (Navarra); Pedro Boné in Typsa (Zaragoza); Arturo Prieto, Ignacio Rodriguez and Henar de Meer of the Duero River Basin Authority (CHD); Felipe Álvarez and Arantza Unzuurrungaza of the Gipuzkoa Hydraulic Works Service; Víctor Manuel Pérez Goya of the Tajo River Basin Authority (CHT); Pablo Fernández (Zamora), Rosa Olivo (Murcia), José Alberto Alcaraz, Eugenio Cano and José Ángel Gómez (Granada) in Tragsa company; Gonzalo Magdaleno in the Ministry for Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge, Jesús Carasa of the Cantabrian Basin Authority (CHC); Agustín Sevilla of the Miño-Sil Water Authority (CHMS); Eduardo Lafuente of the Segura River Basin (CHS); Rosa Olivo Juan José Villegas, Mónica Bardina and Emilio Sánchez of the Catalanian Water Agency (ACA). During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) using version GPT-5, to assist with language editing and the rephrasing of text. All scientific content, data analysis, and interpretation were performed by the authors. The authors have reviewed and edited the output and take full responsibility for the content of this publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest. They have no known financial conflicts of interest or personal relationships that could have influenced the work presented in this article.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

NLFs	Nature-like fishways
R	Ramp
BC	Bypass channel
bl	Boulder type
pw	Pool-and-weir system
bt	Bottom type
c	Concrete structures
sd	Semi-dry structures
d	Dry structures
DBC	Direct Building Cost
VS	Vertical slot fishway
SNBO	Submerged notch and bottom orifice fishway

References

1. Fencl, J.S.; Mather, M.E.; Costigan, K.H.; Daniels, M.D. How big of an effect do small dams have? Using geomorphological footprints to quantify spatial impact of low-head dams and identify patterns of across-dam variation. *PLoS ONE* **2015**, *10*, e0141210. [CrossRef]
2. Santos, J.M.; Quaresma, A.L.; Romão, F.; Amaral, S.D.; Mameri, D.; Santo, M.; Bochechas, J.; Telhado, A.; Godinho, F.N.; Pádua, J. Fishways in Portugal: Status, Main Findings and Research Needs. *Water* **2025**, *17*, 2898. [CrossRef]
3. Reid, A.J.; Carlson, A.K.; Creed, I.F.; Eliason, E.J.; Gell, P.A.; Johnson, P.T.J.; Kidd, K.A.; MacCormack, T.J.; Olden, J.D.; Ormerod, S.J.; et al. Emerging threats and persistent conservation challenges for freshwater biodiversity. *Biol. Rev.* **2019**, *94*, 849–873. [CrossRef]
4. Branco, P.; Amaral, S.D.; Ferreira, M.T.; Santos, J.M. Do small barriers affect the movement of freshwater fish by increasing residency? *Sci. Total Environ.* **2017**, *581*, 486–494. [CrossRef]
5. Larinier, M. Pool fishways, pre-barrages and natural bypass channels. *Bull. Fr. Pêche Piscic.* **2002**, *364*, 54–82. [CrossRef]
6. Schwevers, U.; Adam, B. *Fish Protection Technologies and Fish Ways for Downstream Migration*; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2020.
7. Steffensen, S.M.; Thiem, J.D.; Stamplecoskie, K.M.; Binder, T.R.; Hatry, C.; Langlois-Anderson, N.; Cooke, S.J. Biological effectiveness of an inexpensive nature-like fishway for passage of warmwater fish in a small Ontario stream. *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **2013**, *22*, 374–383. [CrossRef]
8. Katopodis, C.; Kells, J.A.; Acharya, M. Nature-Like and Conventional Fishways: Alternative Concepts? *Can. Water Resour. J.* **2013**, *26*, 211–232. [CrossRef]
9. Raabe, J.K.; Hightower, J.E.; Ellis, T.A.; Facendola, J.J. Evaluation of fish passage at a nature-like rock ramp fishway on a large coastal river. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **2019**, *148*, 798–816. [CrossRef]
10. Landsman, S.J.; McLellan, N.R.; Platts, J.; van den Heuvel, M.R. Fishway effectiveness and upstream residency of three fish species at four fishways in Prince Edward Island, Canada. *Northeast. Nat.* **2020**, *27*, 48–76. [CrossRef]
11. Cooke, S.J.; Hinch, S.G. Improving the reliability of fishway attraction and passage efficiency estimates to inform fishway engineering, science, and practice. *Ecol. Eng.* **2013**, *58*, 123–132. [CrossRef]
12. Aarestrup, K.; Lucas, M.C.; Hansen, J.A. Efficiency of a nature-like bypass channel for sea trout (*Salmo trutta*) ascending a small Danish stream studied by PIT telemetry. *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **2003**, *12*, 160–168. [CrossRef]
13. Bunt, C.M.; Castro-Santos, T.; Haro, A. Performance of fish passage structures at upstream barriers to migration. *River Res. Appl.* **2012**, *28*, 457–478. [CrossRef]
14. Richer, E.E.; Fetherman, E.R.; Krone, E.A.; Wright, F.B., III; Kondratieff, M.C. Multispecies Fish Passage Evaluation at a Rock-Ramp Fishway in a Colorado Transition Zone Stream. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **2020**, *40*, 1510–1522. [CrossRef]
15. Calles, E.O.; Greenberg, L.A. Evaluation of nature-like fishways for re-establishing connectivity in fragmented salmonid populations in the river Emån. *River Res. Appl.* **2005**, *21*, 951–960. [CrossRef]
16. Tomanova, S.; Courret, D.; Richard, S.; Mercier, O.; Guillemain, A.; Labedan, M.; Sagnes, P. Efficiency of a macroroughness block ramp in reducing the impact of low-head dams on riverine fish dispersion. *Knowl. Manag. Aquat. Ecosyst.* **2025**, *426*, 5. [CrossRef]
17. Noonan, M.J.; Grant, J.W.A.; Jackson, C.D. A quantitative assessment of fish passage efficiency. *Fish Fish.* **2012**, *13*, 450–464. [CrossRef]
18. Hershey, H. Updating the consensus on fishway efficiency: A meta-analysis. *Fish Fish.* **2021**, *22*, 735–748. [CrossRef]
19. Venus, T.E.; Smialek, N.; Pander, J.; Harby, A.; Geist, J. Evaluating Cost Trade-Offs between Hydropower and Fish Passage Mitigation. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 8520. [CrossRef]
20. Stuart, I.G.; Marsden, T.J.; Jones, M.J.; Moore, M.T.; Baumgartner, L.J. Rock fishways: Natural designs for an engineered world. *Ecol. Eng.* **2024**, *206*, 107317. [CrossRef]
21. Nieminen, E.; Hyytiäinen, K.; Lindroos, M. Economic and policy considerations regarding hydropower and migratory fish. *Fish Fish.* **2017**, *18*, 54–78. [CrossRef]
22. Saiz-Rojo, A.; García-Vega, A.; Bravo-Córdoba, F.J.; Sanz-Ronda, F.J. Estimación de costes en escalas para peces de estanques sucesivos. *Modelo SECEP. Inf. Constr.* **2025**, *77*, 7153. [CrossRef]
23. European Commission Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council Establishing A Framework for the Community Action in the Field of Water Policy. 2000. Available online: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2000/60/oj/eng> (accessed on 23 January 2026).
24. FAO/DVWK. *Fish Passes: Design, Dimensions, and Monitoring*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2002.
25. MTMS. *Metodología Índice de Costes del Sector de la Construcción. Base 21*; Ministerio de Transportes y Movilidad Sostenible: Madrid, Spain, 2024.
26. Fuentes-Pérez, J.F.; Valbuena-Castro, J.; Bravo-Córdoba, F.J.; García-Vega, A.; Martínez de Azagra, A.; Sanz-Ronda, F.J. *Manual de Evaluación de Pasos Naturalizados Mediante la Metodología AEPS*; Confederación Hidrográfica del Duero: Valladolid, Spain, 2021.
27. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. 2023. Available online: <https://cran.r-project.org/doc/manuals/r-release/fullrefman.pdf> (accessed on 13 January 2026).

28. Sánchez-Pérez, A.; Torralva, M.; Zamora-Marín, J.M.; Bravo-Córdoba, F.J.; Sanz-Ronda, F.J.; Oliva-Paterna, F.J. Multispecies fishways in a Mediterranean river: Contributions as migration corridors and compensatory habitat for fish. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, *830*, 154613. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
29. Sanz-Ronda, F.J.; García-Vega, A.; Fuentes-Pérez, J.F. Evaluación hidráulica y biológica de un paso naturalizado (río artificial) en El Marín (río Tormes, Salamanca). In Proceedings of the I Congreso Ibérico de Restauración Fluvial, León, Spain, 18–20 October 2011.
30. Carrero-Díez, L.; Martínez Santa-María, C.; Fernández-Yuste, J.A. ¿El tamaño importa? Las rampas con flujo ascendente nos dicen que sí—MT8: Agua y Suelo. In Proceedings of the IX Congreso Forestal Español, Gijón, Spain, 16–20 June 2025; p. 2.
31. Pedescoll, A.; Aguado, R.; Marcos, C.; González, G. Reconnecting the Tormes river (Spain): 3 years monitoring results. In Proceedings of the III Congreso Ibérico de Restauración Fluvial RESTAURARIOS, Murcia, Spain, 12–14 June 2019; pp. 790–796.
32. MITECO. *Estrategia Nacional de Restauración de Ríos 2022–2030*; Ministerio para la Transición Ecológica y el Reto Demográfico: Madrid, Spain, 2022.
33. CHD. Inventory of River Obstacles in the Spanish Part of the Duero River Basin. Information System “Mírame IDEDuero”. Available online: <https://mirame.chduero.es/chduero/public/infrastructures/dam/data> (accessed on 16 December 2025).
34. Fernández Yuste, J.A.; Martínez Santa-María, C. *Manual de Diseño y Cálculo de Rampas de Flujo Ascendente*; Confederación Hidrográfica del Duero: Madrid, Spain, 2019.
35. Bravo-Córdoba, F.J.; Valbuena-Castro, J.; García-Vega, A.; Fuentes-Pérez, J.F.; Ruiz-Legazpi, J.; Sanz-Ronda, F.J. Fish passage assessment in stepped fishways: Passage success and transit time as standardized metrics. *Ecol. Eng.* **2021**, *162*, 106172. [CrossRef]
36. Stuart, I.G.; Marsden, T.J. Evaluation of cone fishways to facilitate passage of small-bodied fish. *Aquac. Fish.* **2021**, *6*, 125–134. [CrossRef]
37. Universidade de Évora. Habitat Restoration for Diadromous Fish in River Mondego, Portugal. Available online: <http://www.rhpdm.uevora.pt/index.html> (accessed on 29 December 2025).
38. FIThydro. FIThydro Wiki. Available online: https://www.fithydro.wiki/index.php/Main_Page (accessed on 9 January 2026).
39. Cooper, B.; Crase, L.; Baumgartner, L.J. Estimating benefits and costs: A case of fish passages in Lao PDR and the development of the Lower Mekong Fishway Support Tool. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* **2019**, *70*, 1284–1294. [CrossRef]
40. Bruch, R.M.; Haxton, T.J. Cost and relative effectiveness of Lake Sturgeon passage systems in the US and Canada. *Fish. Res.* **2023**, *257*, 106510. [CrossRef]
41. Valbuena-Castro, J.; Fuentes-Pérez, J.F.; García-Vega, A.; Bravo-Córdoba, F.J.; Ruiz-Legazpi, J.; Martínez de Azagra-Paredes, A.; Sanz-Ronda, F.J. Coarse fishway assessment to prioritize retrofitting efforts: A case study in the Duero River basin. *Ecol. Eng.* **2020**, *155*, 105946. [CrossRef]
42. EUROFINS CIMERA. Evaluación de los pasos para peces en el río Ebro en los términos municipales de Fuenmayor (la Rioja) y Laguardia (Álava). Technical report. 2019.
43. EKOLUR. Seguimiento de la población de salmón y estudio de permeabilidad del corredor Oria-Leitzaran (cuenca del Oria). Technical report. 2016; LIFE IREKIBAI (N10/16-SE/N).
44. EKOLUR. Evaluación biológica de los pasos de peces del azud de la Central Hidroeléctrica de Buicio, río Ebro. Technical report. 2023.
45. González, G.; Pedescoll, A.; Aguado, R.; Arias, L.C.; Cepa, M.M. ¡No solo para especialistas! Evaluación de la primera rampa de flujo ascendente en el río Manzanares mediante PIT tags. 2023; IV Congreso Ibérico Restauración fluvial Restaurarios, Toledo.
46. Pérez-Salinero, Á. Análisis de las poblaciones piscícolas en pasos para peces de la cuenca del Duero. Aplicación en un río artificial: Río Tormes-El Marín. 2017; Trabajo Fin de Máster, Universidad de Valladolid.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.