FC - **FISH PASSAGE at STREAM CROSSINGS** **POST**-TREATMENT page ___ of ___

Contract #: **Contract name:**

Stream/Road: **Date (mm/dd/yy):** **Evaluator:**

	Project Feature Number		*Comments*
	Feature Type Code		
Crossing	1. Is the feature still in its original location and position?		
	2. Is the upgraded, removed or retrofitted crossing performing as designed?		
	3. Are problems with the crossing visible?		
	a. Type: ALN, APP, COR, CRS, DIV, NTG, OVT, PLG, UND, UNS, WSH, NON, OTH		
	4. Structural condition: *Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail*		
	5. If applicable, is the back flooding weir(s) functioning as designed?		
Channel	8. Are grade control weirs/structures functioning as designed?		
	6. Does any aggraded sediment upstream of the crossing remain?		
	7. Has any channel incision downstream of the crossing stabilized?		
	8. Are there other channel problems in the vicinity of the crossing?		
	9. If a goal, were localized channel problems corrected or stabilized?		
	10. Were there unintended effects on the channel? If Y, comment.		
Banks	11. Is there bank erosion or instability in the vicinity of the crossing?		
	a. Locations: UPS, DNS, WIN and LBK, RBK		
	b. Apparent cause: BAR, CNR, EMG, GRZ, HYD, UND, USG, OTH		
	12. If a goal, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?		
	13. Were there unintended effects on banks? If Y, comment.		
Sediment Delivery	14. Has there been sediment delivery from the crossing since implementation?		
	a. Sediment sources: SFE, FLS, LAN, CUT, SBL, NRL, EFL, SCW, DIV, RRG, NRG, SBE, OTH		
	b. Estimate delivery since implementation (cy):		
	15. Is there potential for sediment delivery from the crossing in the next 10 yrs?		
	a. Erosion potential: LOW, MOD/LOW, MOD, MOD/HIG, or HIG		
	b. Estimate future delivery (cy/10 yr):		
	16. If a goal, was potential for future sediment delivery reduced?		
Fish	17. Fish passage evaluation filter: *GREEN, GRAY, RED*		
	18. If a goal, did the feature increase **adult** fish passage?		
	a. If yes, for which fish species: COHO, CHIN, CT, SH, etc.		
	19. Does any barrier to targeted **adult** species remain at the feature?		
	a. Current barrier category: PAR, TEM, TOT, NON, OTH		
	b. Remaining passage problem: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, NON, OTH		
	20. If a goal, did the feature increase **juvenile** fish passage?		
	a. If yes, for which fish species: COHO, CHIN, CT, SH, etc.		
	21. Does any barrier to targeted **juvenile** species remain at the feature?		
	a. Current barrier category: PAR, TEM, TOT, NON, OTH		
	b. Remaining passage problem: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, NON, OTH		
Products	22. Is downstream movement of watershed products impaired at the crossing?		
	a. Movement currently impaired: DBR, SUB, WTR, OTH		
	23. If a goal, did the feature improve watershed product movement?		
Rating	**24. Feature Effectiveness Rating** *(Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail)*		
	25. Does this feature need: *ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH*		
	26. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location?		