CU - STREAM CROSSING UPGRADE

POST-TREATMENT page ___ of ___

Contract #: **Contract name:**

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

	Project Feature Number			
	Proposed Feature Type Code			
Stream Crossing	1. If a goal, was a new crossing or new type of crossing installed?			
	a. Crossing type: AFD, AFW, ARZ, BAC, BRI, CUL, UAF, OTH			
	b. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
	c. Problems: ALN, APP, COR, CRS, INL, LNG, OTL, OVT, PIP, PLG, NTG, SLA, UNS, WSH, NON, OTH			
	2. Is the upgraded crossing structure performing as designed?			
	3. If a goal, was the stream crossing "storm-proofed" (Y to all applicable 3a-k)?			
	a. Is the crossing designed to pass at least a 100-yr flow?			
	b. If an undersized culvert in deep fill, is there an overflow culvert?			
	c. Is the crossing constructed or treated to eliminate diversion potential?			
	d. Does the crossing inlet have a low plug potential?			
	e. Is the crossing outlet protected from erosion?			
	f. Are the culvert inlet, outlet, and bottom open and in sound condition?			
	g. If a bridge, are bridge abutments stable and not restricting flow?			
	h. Is the crossing fill stable?			
	i. Are road surfaces/ditches disconnected to the greatest extent possible?			
	j. Length of road surface or ditch draining to this crossing: (ft)			
	k. If a class I stream, does crossing meet DFG/NMFS fish passage criteria?			
Sediment Delivery	4. 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):			
	5. 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):			
	6. If a goal, was potential for future sediment delivery reduced?			
	7. Has sediment eroded from spoils areas been delivered to streams?			
	a. Estimate delivery since implementation (cy):			
Channel	8. Does any aggraded sediment upstream of the crossing remain?			
	9. Has any channel incision downstream of the crossing stabilized?			
	10. Are there other channel problems in the vicinity of the crossing?			
	11. If a goal, were localized channel problems corrected or stabilized?			
	12. Were there unintended effects on the channel? If Y, comment.			
Banks	13. 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			
	14. If a goal, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?			
	15. Were there unintended effects on banks? If Y, comment.			
Rating	**16. Feature Effectiveness Rating** *(Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail)*			
	17. Does this feature need: *ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH*			
	18. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location?			

Comment on back. **Y**=Yes, **N**=No, **P**=Partially, **D**=Don't know, **A**=Not Applicable. CRMEP June 2006 Draft