

# CU - STREAM CROSSING UPGRADE

# IMPLEMENTATION

Contract #:

Contract name:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site name:

page \_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_

Project Feature Number				
Feature Type Code				
Stream Crossing	1. 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)			
	2. If a Class I stream, does crossing meet DFG/NMFS fish passage criteria?*			
	3. Is the upgraded crossing designed to pass at least a 100-yr flow?			
	4. Are problems with the crossing structure visible?			
	a. Problems: ALN, COR, CRS, INL, LNG, OTL, PIP, NTG, UNS, OTH			
	5. Were treatments to reduce diversion potential installed as approved?			
	a. Installed: CDP, EOC, DRC, OTH			
	6. Were treatments to prevent plugging & inlet erosion installed as approved?			
	a. Installed at inlet: ARM, DBB, FLA, GRC, MIT, WGW, OTH			
	7. Were treatments to prevent erosion at the outlet installed as approved?			
	a. Installed at outlet: ARM, DSP, GRC, OTH			
	Channel	8. If a bridge, were bridge abutments constructed as approved?		
9. Were the fill slopes constructed at a stable angle (usually 2:1 or 26.65°)?				
10. Were fill slopes and bare soil areas treated to prevent erosion as approved?				
a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, PLN**, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH				
Spoils	11. Were road surface/ditch runoff disconnected from crossings as approved?			
	12. Was the road surfaced at the crossing as approved?			
Rating	a. Surfacing: DRT, PAV, ROC, OTH			
	13. Was the channel adjacent to the crossing excavated to a stable shape?			
	a. Location of excavation relative to crossing: DNS, UCR, UPS, OTH			
	14. Was all fill and trapped sediment in the channel removed or stabilized?			
	a. If not, were measures to control sediment release applied as approved?			
Comments	15. Were approved erosion prevention methods applied to the channel?			
	16. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?			
	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)			
	17. 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?			
	18. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.			
19. Feature Implementation Rating (Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail)				
Comments				