

CD - STREAM CROSSING DECOMMISSIONING

POST-TREATMENT

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ____ of ____

		Project Feature Number			
		Feature Type Code			
Stream Crossing	1. If an objective, was the crossing and all associated fill removed?				
	2. If an objective, was diversion potential reduced (P) or eliminated (Y)?				
	3. If an objective, was the stream realigned to return to its "natural" drainage?				
	4. If a Class I stream, does the crossing meet CDFG fish passage criteria?*				
	5. If an objective, was the length of road/ditch draining to this crossing reduced?				
	a. Length of road surface or ditch draining to this crossing: (ft)				
Sediment Delivery	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. Was 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 because of: DEC, NAT, RCP, OTH				
	c. Could excessive adjustment be a result of not meeting CDFG standards?				
	8. 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)				
	9. If an objective, has the potential for sediment delivery decreased?				
	10. If an objective, has the potential delivery volume decreased?				
11. Were there unintended effects of decommissioning? If Y, comment.					
12. Have spoils delivered sediment to streams?					
	a. Estimated delivery from spoils since implementation: (cy)				
Channel	13. Does any aggraded sediment upstream of the crossing remain?				
	14. Has stream channel incision/scour downstream of the crossing stabilized?				
	15. Are there other stream channel problems in the vicinity of the crossing?				
	16. If an objective, were localized channel problems corrected or stabilized?				
	17. Were there unintended effects on the stream 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 an objective, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?				
	20. Were there unintended effects on streambanks? If Y, comment.				
Rating	21. Feature Effectiveness Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail				
	22. Does this feature need: DEC, ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH				
	23. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location?				
Comments					

* If primarily for fish passage, use FC checklist. Y=Yes, N=No, P=Partially, D=Don't know, A=Not Applicable. CRMEP 03/31/07 Draft