

FB - FISH PASSAGE at BARRIERS

IMPLEMENTATION

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ___ of ___

Project Feature Number		Comments	
Feature Type Code			
Structure Installation	1. Does the structure meet design specifications? <i>a. Structural condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail</i> <i>b. Problems: ANC, BBB, CRF, MAT, SHF, STR, SWA, UND, UNS, WSH, NON, OTH</i>		
	2. Was the structure installed in the approved location and position?		
	3. Were approved materials used for the structure? <i>a. Materials: CON, LWD, MTL, NTR, OFR, PLA, RTW, WOO, OTH</i>		
	4. Were the approved sizes of materials used for the structure?		
	5. Was the structure secured or anchored as approved? <i>a. Methods: BUR, CBL, REB, STK, TIE, UNA, WDG, OTH</i>		
	6. Does fish passage rely on a functioning back flooding weir(s)?*		
	Barrier	7. Was the barrier removed as approved?	
		8. Was the barrier modified as approved? <i>a. Are there problems visible with the modified barrier? If Y, comment.</i>	
Channel		9. Was the channel adjacent to the barrier excavated to a stable shape? <i>a. Location of excavation relative to barrier: DNS, UPS, WIN, OTH</i>	
	10. Was all fill and trapped sediment in the channel removed or stabilized? <i>a. If not, were measures to control sediment release applied as approved?</i>		
	11. Did channel conditions at the barrier require grade control weirs/structures?*		
	Metrics	12. Length of habitat made accessible: (mi)	
13. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed at the feature: (ft)			
14. Area of feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft ²)			
Implementation	15. Does the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications? <i>a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?</i> <i>b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?</i> <i>c. Are corrections needed?</i>		
	16. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.		
	17. Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail		
	Comments		