

FC - FISH PASSAGE IMPROVEMENT at STREAM CROSSINGS IMPLEMENTATION

Contract #:

Contract name:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site name:

page ____ of ____

		Project Feature Number		Comments
		Feature Type Code		
Stream Crossing	1. Does the crossing structure meet DFG/NMFS fish passage criteria?			
	2. Was the new or upgraded crossing installed as approved?			
	a. Materials: CON, MTL, NTR, OFR, PLA, WOO, OTH			
	b. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
	c. Estimated sediment volume prevented from entering a stream: (cy/10 yr)			
	3. Are problems with the crossing structure visible?			
	a. Type: ALN, APP, COR, CRS, DIV, NTG, OVT, PLG, UNS, OTH			
	4. Does fish passage rely on a correctly functioning back flooding weir(s)?*			
	5. Were the fill or side slopes constructed at a stable angle?			
	6. Were the fill or side slopes treated to prevent erosion as approved?			
a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, PLN*, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH				
7. Were treatments to prevent plugging & inlet erosion installed as approved?				
a. Installed at inlet: ARM, DBB, FLA, GRC, MIT, WGW, OTH				
8. Were treatments to protect the outlet from erosion installed as approved?				
a. Installed at outlet: ARM, DSP, GRC, OTH				
9. If a bridge, were bridge abutments constructed as approved?				
10. Was road surface & ditch runoff disconnected from crossings as approved?				
Channel	11. Was the channel adjacent to the crossing excavated to a stable shape?			
	a. Location of excavation relative to crossing: DNS, UCR, UPS, OTH			
	12. Was all fill and trapped sediment in the channel removed or stabilized?			
	a. If not, were measures to control sediment release applied as approved?			
Spoils	13. Did channel conditions at the crossing require grade control weirs/structures?*			
	14. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?			
Required	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)			
	15. Length of habitat made accessible: (mi)			
	16. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed at feature? (ft)			
Implementation	17. Area of the feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft²)			
	18. Does the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications?			
	a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?			
	b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?			
	c. Are corrections needed?			
Comments	19. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.			
	20. Feature Implementation Rating (Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail)			