CB - CHANNEL RECONSTRUCTION & BANK STABILIZATION IMPLEMENTATION

Gra	nt #: Project title:				
Dat	Date : Evaluator: Site ID:		page of		
	Project Feature Number				
	Feature Type Code				
Metrics	1. Was the length of channel or bank treated the same as approved?				
	a. Actual length of feature: (ft)				
	b. Length of bank stabilized by the feature: (ft)				
	c. Area of the feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft ²)				
	d. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed during implementation: (ft)				
	2. If applicable, was gravel added to the stream as approved?				
	a. Volume of gravel added to stream: (cy)				
	3. Was bioengineering used at this feature? If Y, use RT also.				
	4. Structural condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail				
	5. Are problems with the feature visible?				
	a. Types: ANC, BBB, CRF, MAT, SHF, STR, SWA, UND, UNS, WSH, OTH				
	6. Was the feature placed in the approved location along the channel?				
	7. Was the feature placed in the approved position?				
Structure	a. Position: LBK, MDC, RBK, SPN, OTH				
	8. Was the feature oriented as approved?				
	a. Orientation: DNS, MUL, PRL, PRP, UPS, OTH				
	9. Were approved materials used for the feature?				
	a. Materials: CON, LWD, MTL, NTR, OFR, RTW, VEG, WOO, OTH				
	10. Were the sizes of materials used the same as approved?				
	11. Was the feature anchored as approved?				
	a. Anchoring: BUR, CBL, REB, STK, TIE, NON, OTH				
	12. Number of pieces of large wood debris used in this feature: (#)				
Reconstruction	13. If applicable, was the approved bank or channel excavation carried out?				
	14. Was the channel recontoured as approved?				
	a. Was the channel reconstructed in a new location?				
	b. Length of channel recontoured: (ft)				
	15. Were streambanks reconstructed as approved?				
	a. Were the banks reconstructed in a new location?				
	b. Length of bank reconstructed (note if length includes both banks): (ft)				
	16. Was the bank constructed or recontoured to the approved angle?				
	a. Average as-built bank angle: (degrees)				
	17. Were approved erosion control measures applied to disturbed areas?				
	a. Type: FAB, NTM, PLN*, ROC, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH				
Implementation	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?				
	19. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.				
	20. Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail				
Com.					
ŭ					

Comment on back. * If planted, use RT also. Y=Yes, N=No, P=Partially, D=Don't know, A=Not Applicable. CRMEP 03/31/07 Draft