

FC - FISH PASSAGE at STREAM CROSSINGS

PRE-TREATMENT

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ___ of ___

| | | Project Feature Number | | Comments |
|--|--|------------------------|--|----------|
| | | Feature Type Code | | |
| Fish | 1. If applicable, fish passage evaluation filter: GREEN, GRAY, RED | | | |
| | 2. Is increasing adult fish passage an objective of the feature? | | | |
| | a. Targeted adult fish species: CHIN, COHO, CT, SH, etc. | | | |
| | 3. Is there currently a barrier to adult fish of the targeted species? | | | |
| | a. Current barrier category: PAR, TEM, TOT, OTH | | | |
| | b. Target barrier category: PAR, TEM, NON, OTH | | | |
| | c. Types of passage problems: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, OTH | | | |
| | d. Targeted improvements: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, OTH | | | |
| | 4. Is increasing juvenile fish passage an objective of the feature? | | | |
| | a. Targeted juvenile fish species: CHIN, COHO, CT, SH, etc. | | | |
| | 5. Is there currently a barrier to juvenile fish of the targeted species? | | | |
| | a. Current barrier category: PAR, TEM, TOT, OTH | | | |
| | b. Target barrier category: PAR, TEM, NON, OTH | | | |
| | c. Types of passage problems: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, OTH | | | |
| d. Targeted improvements: CGA, FJH, NRP, WTD, WTV, OTH | | | | |
| Sediment Delivery | 6. Has there been sediment delivery from the crossing in the last 10 years? | | | |
| | a. Sediment sources: SFE, FLS, LAN, CUT, SBL, NRL, EFL, SCW, DIV, RRG, NRG, SBE, OTH | | | |
| | b. Estimate total past delivery: (cy/10 yr) | | | |
| | 7. 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. Minimum future delivery volume or "sediment savings": (cy/10 yr) | | | |
| Channel | 8. Is decreasing potential for future sediment delivery an objective? | | | |
| | 9. Is there localized channel aggradation upstream of the crossing? | | | |
| | 10. Is there localized channel incision or scour downstream of the crossing? | | | |
| | 11. Are there other channel problems in the vicinity of the crossing? | | | |
| Banks | 12. Is correcting or stabilizing localized channel problems an objective? | | | |
| | 13. Is there streambank erosion or instability in the vicinity of the crossing? | | | |
| | a. Locations: UPS, DNS, WIN and LBK, RBK | | | |
| Banks | b. Apparent causes: BAR, CNR, EMG, GRZ, HYD, UND, USG, OTH | | | |
| | 14. Is stabilizing the streambank and/or reducing bank erosion an objective? | | | |
| Products | 15. Is downstream movement of watershed products impaired at the barrier? | | | |
| | a. Movement currently impaired: DBR, SUB, WTR, OTH | | | |
| Products | 16. Is improving downstream movement of watershed products an objective? | | | |
| | | | | |
| Comments | | | | |