

FC - FISH PASSAGE at STREAM CROSSINGS

IMPLEMENTATION

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ___ of ___

Project Feature Number		Comments
Feature Type Code		
Stream Crossing	1. Was the new or upgraded crossing installed as approved?	
	a. Materials: CON, MTL, NTR, OFR, PLA, WOO, OTH	
	b. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail	
	c. Problems: ALN, APP, CRS, NTG, UNS, NON, OTH	
	d. Estimated sediment volume prevented from entering a stream: (cy/10 yr)	
	2. Does the crossing structure meet CDFG fish passage criteria?	
	3. Does fish passage rely on a correctly functioning back flooding weir(s)?*	
	4. Were the fill or side slopes constructed at stable angles?	
	5. Were the fill or side slopes treated to prevent erosion as approved?	
	a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, PLN**, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH	
	6. Were treatments to prevent plugging & inlet erosion installed as approved?	
	a. Installed at inlet: ARM, DBB, FLA, GRC, MIT, WGW, OTH	
	7. Were treatments to protect the outlet from erosion installed as approved?	
	a. Installed at outlet: ARM, DSP, GRC, OTH	
Channel	8. If a bridge, were bridge abutments constructed as approved?	
	9. Was road surface/ditch runoff disconnected from streams as approved?	
	10. Did channel conditions at the crossing require grade control weirs/structures?*	
	11. Was the channel adjacent to the crossing excavated to a stable shape?	
Spoils	a. Location of excavation relative to crossing: DNS, UCR, UPS, OTH	
	12. Was all fill and trapped sediment in the channel removed or stabilized?	
Metrics	a. If not, were measures to control sediment release applied as approved?	
	13. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?	
Implementation	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)	
	14. Length of habitat made accessible by the feature: (mi)	
	15. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed at the feature: (ft)	
	16. Area of the feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft ²)	
	17. Does the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications?	
	a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?	
Comments	b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?	
	c. Are corrections needed?	
	18. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.	
	19. Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail	

* Weirs are separate features, use FB checklist. ** If planted, use RT. Y=Yes, N=No, P=Partially, D=Don't know, A=Not Applicable. CRMEP 03/31/07 Draft