FB - FISH PASSAGE at BARRIERS   POST-TREATMENT

Grant #:   **Project title:**

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

		Project Feature Number		Comments
		Feature Type Code		
Structure	1. Is the structure functioning as designed?			
	a. Structural condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
	b. Problems: ANC, BBB, CRF, MAT, SHF, STR, SWA, UND, UNS, WSH, NON, OTH			
	2. Is the structure still in its original location and position?			
	3. If applicable, are back flooding weirs functioning as designed?*			
Barrier	4. Has a new barrier accumulated at the site of the removed barrier?			
	5. Has the modified barrier remained in the as-built configuration?			
	a. Are there problems visible with the modified barrier? If Y, comment.			
Fish	6. If an objective, does the feature provide adult fish passage?			
	a. If yes, for which targeted species: CHIN, COHO, CT, SH, etc.			
	7. Does any barrier to targeted adult species remain at the feature?			
	a. Current barrier catagory: PAR, TEM, TOT, OTH			
	b. Remaining passage problems: FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, OTH			
	8. If an objective, does the feature provide juvenile fish passage?			
	a. If yes, for which fish species: CHIN, COHO, CT, SH, etc.			
	9. Does any barrier to targeted juvenile species remain at the feature?			
	a. Current barrier category: PAR, TEM, TOT, OTH			
	b. Remaining passage problems: FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, OTH			
Channel	10. Are grade control weirs/structures functioning as designed?*			
	11. If sediment had aggraded upstream of the barrier, does any remain?			
	12. If there was incision/scour downstream of the barrier, has it stabilized?			
	13. Are there other channel problems in the vicinity of the feature?			
	14. If an objective, were localized channel problems corrected or stabilized?			
	15. Were there unintended effects on the stream channel? If Y, comment.			
Banks	16. Is there bank erosion or instability in the vicinity of the feature?			
	a. Locations: UPS, DNS, WIN and LBK, RBK			
	b. Apparent causes: BAR, CNR, EMG, GRZ, HYD, UND, USG, OTH			
	17. If an objective, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?			
	18. Were there unintended effects on streambanks? If Y, comment.			
Products	19. Is downstream movement of watershed products impaired at the feature?			
	a. Movement currently impaired: DBR, SUB, WTR, OTH			
	20. If an objective, did the feature improve watershed product movement?			
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				