CD - STREAM CROSSING DECOMMISSIONING

POST-TREATMENT page ___ of ___

Contract #: **Contract name:**

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

	Project Feature Number			
	Feature Type Code			
Crossing	1. If a goal, was the crossing and all associated fill removed?			
	2. If a goal, did the treatment reduce diversion potential?			
	3. If a goal, was the stream returned to its "natural" drainage?			
	4. If a Class I stream, does the crossing meet DFG/NMFS fish passage criteria?*			
	5. Is road runoff disconnected from streams to the greatest extent possible?			
Erosion and Sedimentation	6. 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)			
	7. Is channel/bank erosion greater than the expected channel adjustment?			
	a. Apparent primary cause: EMG, FLO, NBA, NCA, OVF, OVS, PCA, PPT, RDS, UBE, UEF, USG, OTH			
	b. Apparently due to: DEC, NAT, RCP, OTH			
	c. Is excessive adjustment a result of not meeting CDFG standards?			
	8. Were there unintended effects of decommissioning (if Y, comment)?			
	9. 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)			
	10. If a goal, has the potential for sediment delivery decreased?			
	11. If a goal, has the potential delivery volume decreased?			
Spoils	12. Has sediment eroded from spoils areas been delivered to streams?			
	a. Spoils delivered to streams since implementation: (cy)			
Channel	13. Does any aggraded sediment upstream of the former crossing remain?			
	14. Has any channel incision downstream of the former crossing stabilized?			
	15. Are there other channel problems in the vicinity of the former crossing?			
	16. If a goal, were localized channel problems corrected or stabilized?			
	17. Were there unintended effects on the channel? If Y, comment.			
Banks	18. Is there bank erosion or instability in the vicinity of the former crossing?			
	a. Locations: UPS, DNS, WIN and LBK, RBK			
	b. Apparent cause: BAR, CNR, EMG, GRZ, HYD, UND, USG, OTH			
	19. If a goal, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?			
	20. Were there unintended effects on banks? If Y, comment.			
Rating	**21. Feature Effectiveness Rating** *(Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail)*			
	22. Does this feature need: *ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH*			
	23. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location?			
Comments				

*If for fish passage, use FC checklist. **Y**=Yes, **N**=No, **P**=Partially, **D**=Don't know, **A**=Not Applicable. CRMEP June 2006 Draft