

FC - FISH PASSAGE at STREAM CROSSINGS

POST-TREATMENT

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ___ of ___

		Project Feature Number		Comments
		Feature Type Code		
Crossing	1. Is the upgraded, removed or retrofitted crossing performing as designed?			
	a. Structural condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
	b. Problems: ALN, APP, COR, CRS, DIV, NTG, OVT, PIP, PLG, UND, UNS, WSH, NON, OTH			
	2. If applicable, are back flooding weirs functioning as designed?*			
Fish	3. If applicable, fish passage evaluation filter: GREEN, GRAY, RED			
	4. If an objective, did the feature increase adult fish passage?			
	a. If yes, for which targeted species: CHIN, COHO, CT, SH, etc.			
	5. Does any barrier to targeted adult species remain at the feature?			
	a. Current barrier category: PAR, TEM, TOT, NON, OTH			
	b. Remaining passage problems: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, NON, OTH			
	6. If an objective, did the feature increase juvenile fish passage?			
	a. If yes, for which targeted species: CHIN, COHO, CT, SH, etc.			
	7. Does any barrier to targeted juvenile species remain at the feature?			
	a. Current barrier category: PAR, TEM, TOT, NON, OTH			
	b. Remaining passage problems: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, NON, OTH			
Sediment Delivery	8. 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):			
	9. 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):			
	10. If an objective, was potential for future sediment delivery reduced?			
Channel	11. If applicable, are associated grade control structures functioning as designed?*			
	12. If sediment had aggraded upstream of the crossing, does any remain?			
	13. If there was channel incision/scour downstream of the crossing, has it stabilized?			
	14. Are there other channel problems in the vicinity of the crossing?			
	15. If an objective, were localized channel problems corrected or stabilized?			
	16. Were there unintended effects on the channel? If Y, comment.			
Banks	17. Is there bank erosion or instability in the vicinity of the crossing?			
	a. Locations: UPS, DNS, WIN and LBK, RBK			
	b. Apparent causes: BAR, CNR, EMG, GRZ, HYD, UND, USG, OTH			
	18. If an objective, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?			
	19. Were there unintended effects on banks? If Y, comment.			
Products	20. Is downstream movement of watershed products impaired at the crossing?			
	a. Movement currently impaired: DBR, SUB, WTR, OTH			
	21. If an objective, did the feature improve watershed product movement?			
Rating	22. Feature Effectiveness Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
	23. Does this feature need: DEC, ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH			
	24. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location?			

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