

US - UPSLOPE STABILIZATION & DELIVERY PREVENTION

IMPLEMENTATION

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ____ of ____

		Project Feature Number			
		Feature Type Code			
Location/Metrics	1. Location of treatment: BFC, FLD, LBK, RBK, UPL, OTH				
	2. Was the approved amount of area treated?				
	a. Amount of upland area treated: (ft ²)				
	3. Was streambank or channel treated to stabilize the toe of an unstable slope?				
	a. Length of stream channel treated: (ft)				
	b. Length of streambank treated or stabilized: (ft)				
	c. Area of feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft ²)				
	d. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed at the feature: (ft)				
Sediment	5. Was the slope, streambank or stream channel excavated as approved?				
	a. Was the slope or bank excavated to a stable shape?				
	b. Was the stream channel reconfigured to stabilize the toe of a landslide?				
	6. Was the treatment designed to prevent sediment delivery?				
	a. Estimated sediment volume prevented from entering a stream: (cy/10 yr)				
	7. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?				
	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)				
	8. Was a settling basin installed to prevent sediment delivery as approved?				
	a. Is there a maintenance plan or agreement for the settling basin?				
	9. Was the slope treated by revegetation? If Y, use RT also.				
	10. Were road problems causing slope instability treated as approved?*				
	11. Were the approved slope or gully dewatering treatments employed?				
	12. Were bare soil areas treated to prevent erosion as approved?				
a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH					
Structure	13. Was a structure installed as approved?				
	a. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail				
	b. Were approved materials used for the feature?				
	c. Materials: CON, LWD, MTL, NTR, OFR, PLA, RTW, VEG, WOO, OTH				
Implementation	d. Were the sizes of materials used the same as approved?				
	14. Does the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications?				
	a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?				
	b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?				
	c. Are corrections needed?				
Implementation	15. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.				
	16. Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail				
Comments	Feature #:	Feature #:	Feature #:		