CU - STREAM CROSSING UPGRADING

POST-TREATMENT

Grant #: **Project title:**

Date : **Evaluator:** **Site ID:** page ___ of ___

	Project Feature Number				
	Feature Type Code				
Stream Crossing	1. Is the new or upgraded crossing structure performing as designed?				
	a. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail				
	b. Problems: ALN, APP, COR, CRS, INL, LNG, OTL, OVT, PIP, PLG, NTG, SLA, UNS, WSH, NON, OTH				
	2. If an objective, was the stream crossing "storm-proofed" (Y or A to a-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 CDFG fish passage criteria?**				
Sediment Delivery	3. 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)				
	4. 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)				
	5. If an objective, was potential for future sediment delivery reduced?				
	6. Have spoils delivered sediment to streams?				
	a. Estimated delivery from spoils since implementation: (cy)				
Channel	7. Does any aggraded sediment upstream of the crossing remain?				
	8. Has stream channel incision/scour downstream of the crossing stabilized?				
	9. Are there other stream channel problems in the vicinity of the crossing?				
	10. If an objective, were localized channel problems corrected or stabilized?				
	11. Were there unintended effects on the stream channel? If Y, comment.				
Banks	12. 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				
	13. If an objective, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?				
	14. Were there unintended effects on streambanks? If Y, comment.				
Rating	15. **Feature Effectiveness Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail**				
	16. Does this feature need: DEC, ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH				
	17. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location?				
Com.					

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