CD - STREAM CROSSING DECOMMISSIONING

PRE-TREATMENT

| Grant #: Project title: | | | | KE-IKEA | |
|-------------------------|---|---|------------|---------|----|
| Dat | e: Evaluator: | Site ID: | | page _ | of |
| | | Project Feature Number | | | |
| | | Feature Type Code | | | |
| Stream Crossing | 1. Is there currently a stream crossing at the | e treatment site? | | | |
| | a. Crossing type: AFD, AFW, ARZ, | BAC, BRI, CUL, HUM, UAF, OTH | | | |
| | b. Structure condition: Excl, Good, | | | | |
| | c. Is the stream crossing still functioning? | | | | |
| | d. Is the crossing mostly (Y) or partially (P) washed out? | | | | |
| | 2. Is removing the crossing and all associated fill an objective? | | | | |
| | 3. Is reducing (P) or eliminating (Y) diversion potential an objective? | | | | |
| Str | 4. Is realigning a stream channel to its "natural" drainage an objective? | | | | |
| | 5. If a Class I stream, does the crossing meet CDFG fish passage criteria?* | | | | |
| | 6. Is reducing the length of road/ditch draining to this crossing an objective? | | | | |
| | a. Length of road surface or ditch draining to this crossing: (ft) | | | | |
| ery | 7. Has there been sediment delivery from the crossing in the last 10 years? | | | | |
| | a. Sediment sources: SFE, FLS, LAI | | | | |
| | RRG, NRG, SBE, OTH | | | | |
| Jeliv | b. Estimate total past delivery (cy/10 | | | | |
| nt I | 8. Is there potential for sediment delivery from the crossing in the next 10 yrs? | | | | |
| Sediment Delivery | a. Erosion potential: LOW, MOD/LOW, MOD, MOD/HIG, or HIG | | | | |
| | b. Minimum future delivery volume or "sediment savings": (cy/10 yr) | | | | |
| | 9. Is decreasing the potential for future sediment delivery an objective? | | | | |
| | 10. Is decreasing the potential delivery volume an objective? | | | | |
| Channel | 11. Is there localized stream channel aggradation upstream of the crossing? | | | | |
| | 12. Is there localized channel incision or scour downstream of the crossing? | | | | |
| | 13. Are there other stream channel problems in the vicinity of the crossing? | | | | |
| | 14. Is correcting or stabilizing localized stream channel problems an objective? | | | | |
| Banks | 15. Is there streambank 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 | | | | |
| | 16. Is stabilizing the streambank and/or reducing bank erosion an objective? | | | | |
| Comments | Feature #: | Feature #: | Feature #: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | zliet V-Ves N-No P-Partially D-Don't know A-Not | | | |

* 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