CU - STREAM CROSSING UPGRADING

IMPLEMENTATION

Gra	nt #: Project title:		
Dat	e: Evaluator: Site ID:	page_	of
	Project Feature Number		
	Feature Type Code		
	1. Was the new or upgraded crossing installed as approved?		
	a. Crossing type: AFD, AFW, ARZ, BAC, BRI, CUL, HUM, UAF, OTH		
	b. Materials: CON, MTL, NTR, OFR, PLA, WOO, OTH		
	c. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail		
	d. Problems: ALN, APP, CRS, INL, LNG, OTL, NTG, SLA, UNS, OTH		
	e. Estimated sediment volume prevented from entering a stream: (cy/10 yr)		
	2. Is the upgraded crossing designed to pass at least a 100-yr flow?		
	3. Were treatments to reduce diversion potential installed as approved?		
ing	a. Installed: CDP, EOC, DRC, OTH		
ross	4. Were treatments to prevent plugging & inlet erosion installed as approved?		
n Ci	a. Installed at inlet: ARM, DBB, FLA, GRC, MIT, WGW, OTH		
ean.	5. Were treatments to prevent erosion at the outlet installed as approved?		
Str	a. Installed at outlet: ARM, DSP, GRC, OTH		
	6. If a bridge, were bridge abutments constructed as approved?		
	7. Were the fill slopes constructed at a stable angle (usually 2:1 or ~ 27°)?		
	8. Were fill slopes and bare soil areas treated to prevent erosion as approved?		
	a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, PLN**, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH		
	9. Were road surface/ditch runoff disconnected from crossings as approved?		
	10. If a Class I stream, does crossing meet CDFG fish passage criteria?*		
	11. Was the road surfaced at the crossing as approved?		
	a. Surfacing: DRT, PAV, ROC, OTH		
12. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?			
\mathbf{Sp}	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)		
	13. Was the channel adjacent to the crossing excavated to a stable shape?		
nel	a. Location of excavation relative to crossing: DNS, UCR, UPS, OTH		
han	14. Was all fill and trapped sediment in the channel removed or stabilized?		
C	a. If not, were measures to control sediment release applied as approved?		
	15. Were approved erosion prevention methods applied to the channel?		
	16. Does the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications?		
ы	a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?		
ating	b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?		
Rź	c. Are corrections needed?		
	17. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.		
	18. Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail		
	Feature #: Feature #:	Feature #:	
ıts			
men			
om			
C			

RU - ROAD SEGMENT UPGRADING

IMPLEMENTATION

Gra	nt #: Project title:	
Dat	e : Evaluator: Site ID:	page of
	Project Feature Number	Comments
	Feature Type Code	
S	1. Length of road segment (site) upgraded: (ft)	
tric	a. Length of road actually upgraded, if different: (ft)	
Me	2. Number of stream crossings upgraded along segment: (#)	
	3. Road segment physical condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail	
	4. Were existing gullies & active or potential landslides dewatered as approved?*	
	5. Were fill slopes, landings and side cast excavated as approved?*	
	6. Have approved erosion control measures been applied to bare areas?	
	a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, PLN**, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH	
	7. Was the road surfaced as approved?	
	a. Road surfaces: DRT, PAV, ROC, OTH	
age	8. Was the road surface shaped as approved?	
ain.	a. Road surface shapes: CRN, FLT, INS, OUT, TCU, OTH	
e Dr	9. Were ditches cleaned or added as approved?	
fac	10. Were berms removed or breached as approved?	
Sur	11. Was road drainage disconnected from streams as approved?	
oad	12. Were drainage structures installed as approved?	
Ŗ	a. Components installed or upgraded: DRC, RLD, NON, OTH	
	b. Were drainage components installed at the approved interval?	
	c. Do all structures drain onto stable and erosion resistant hill slopes?	
	d. Were drainage features installed in the approved locations?	
	e. Are rolling dips drivable and not inhibiting traffic and road use?	
	e. Problems: ALN, APP, CRS, INL, LNG, NTG, OTL, UNS, NON, OTH	
	g. Do all ditch relief culverts drain properly, at the base of the fill?	
poils	13. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?	
S	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)	
uc	14. Does the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications?	
tatio	a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?	
nen	b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?	
plen	c. Are corrections needed?	
Imj	15. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.	
	16. Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail	
Comments		

US - UPSLOPE STABILIZATION & DELIVERY PREVENTION

IMPLEMENTATION

Grant #: Project title:			
Date	: Evaluator: Site ID:	page	_ of
	Project Feature Number		
	Feature Type Code		
	1. Location of treatment: BFC, FLD, LBK, RBK, UPL, OTH		
cs	2. Was the approved amount of area treated?		
[etri	a. Amount of upland area treated: (ft^2)		
M/n	3. Was streambank or channel treated to stabilize the toe of an unstable slope?		
atio	a. Length of stream channel treated: (ft)		
Loc	b. Length of streambank treated or stabilized: (ft)		
Γ	c. Area of feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft ²)		
	d. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed at the feature: (ft)		
	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)		
nt	7. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?		
ime	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)		
Sed	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, NIM, SEE, SLF, SIM, OIH		
e	13. Was a structure installed as approved?		
ctur	a. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fair		
truc	b. were approved materials used for the feature?		
S	c. Materials: CON, LWD, MIL, NIR, OFR, PLA, RIW, VEG, WOO, OIH		
	a. Were the sizes of materials used the same as approved?		
ion	a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?		
ntati	a. If not, were monifications beneficial to performance:		
mei	c. Are corrections needed?		
nple	15 Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If V comment		
Im	16 Feature Implementation Rating: Excl. Good. Fair. Poor. Fail		
	Facture #	Footure #:	
	reature #.	reature #.	
s			
nent			
Comm			

RD - ROAD SEGMENT DECOMMISSIONING

IMPLEMENTATION

	0
Evaluator: Site ID:	page of
Project Feature Number	Comments
Feature Type Code	
ength of road segment (site) decommissioned: (ft)	
Length of road actually decommissioned, if different: (ft)	
umber of stream crossings decommissioned along this segment: (#)	
as access to the road segment been blocked as approved?	
Vas the road surface shaped as approved?	
Road surface shapes: CRN, FLT, FUL, INS, OUT, PAR, TCU, OTH	
Vas the road surface decompacted as approved?	
Vas road drainage disconnected from streams as approved?	
Vere drainage structures installed as approved?	
Drainage structures installed: CRD, DIT, WTB, NON, OTH	
Have all ditch relief culverts been decommissioned?	
Do all structures drain onto stable and erosion resistant hill slopes?	
Were drainage structures installed at the approved interval?	
Were drainage structures installed in the approved locations?	
Are cross road drains constructed so they fully block remaining ditches?	
Problems: ALN, APP, CRS, NIG, OVI, PLG, UNS, WSH, OIH	
ave approved erosion control measures been applied to drainage outlets?	
Method: ARM, COM, FAB, NIM, PLN, SEE, SLF, SIM, OIH	
Mathed A APM BNC COM NTM DINK* SEE SLE STM OTH	
<i>Lineinoa: ARM, BIVC, COM, NTM, PLN^{44,}, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH</i>	
Vere fill slopes landings and side cast excavated as approved?*	
Vere spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment as approved?	
Spoils volume estimate: (cv)	
Opes the feature meet design contract & permit specifications?	
If not were modifications beneficial to performance?	
Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?	
Are corrections needed?	
Yould a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.	
eature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail	
r r r r r r r r r r	
	ave approved erosion control measures been applied to bare areas? <i>Method: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, PLN**, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH</i> Vere gullies & active or potential landslides dewatered as approved?* Vere fill slopes, landings and side cast excavated as approved?* Vere spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved? <i>Spoils volume estimate: (cy)</i> oes the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications? <i>If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?</i> <i>Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?</i> <i>Are corrections needed?</i> Vould a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment. eature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail

* Use US checklist for other landslide/gully treatments. **If planted, use RT. Y=Yes, N=No, P=Partially, D=Don't know, A=Not Applicable. CRMEP 03/31/07 Draft

CD - STREAM CROSSING DECOMMISSIONING

IMPLEMENTATION

Gra	nt #: Project title:				
Dat	e: Evaluator:	Site ID:		page	of
		Project Feature Number			
		Feature Type Code			
	1. Was the stream crossing decommiss	ioned as approved?			
	a. Was the crossing and fill complet	ely (Y) or partially (P) removed?			
	b. Was the crossing decommissioned	d with diversion prevention ditches?			
	c. Estimated sediment volume preve	nted from entering a stream:(cy/10 yrs)			
	2. If a Class I stream, does the crossing	g meet CDFG fish passage criteria?*			
gu	3. Do the angles of the excavated side	slopes meet CDFG standards?			
oni	a. Are the side slope shapes either s	traight or slightly concave in profile?			
issi	4. Does the extent of the excavation m	eet CDFG standards?			
mm	a. Was the channel immediately UP	S of the former crossing excavated?			
eco	5. Does the excavated channel profile	meet CDFG standards?			
n D	a. If not, is there a pre-existing cons	traint precluding this profile shape?			
sing	b. Does the new channel match the r	natural channel gradient?			
ros	6. Does the excavated channel width n	neet CDFG standards?			
m C	7. Are the top and bottom excavation t	ransitions as smooth as possible?			
real	8. Were the road approaches disconnect	cted to the maximum extent possible?			
St	9. Were erosion and/or instability cont	rols applied as approved?			
	a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTN	I, PLN**, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH			
	b. If applied, does rock armor size a	nd placement meet CDFG standards?			
	10. Are there indicators of potential inst	ability in the excavated area?			
	11. Were spoils placed where they cann	ot deliver sediment, as approved?			
	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)				
	12. Does the feature meet design, contra	act & permit specifications?			
	a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?				
ting	b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?				
Rai	c. Are corrections needed?				
	13. Would a different treatment or desig	n have been preferable? If Y, comment.			
	14. Feature Implementation Rating: I	Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
	Feature #:	Feature #:	Feature #:		
nts					
meı					
Com					

* If primarily for fish passage, use FC. **If planted, use RT. Y=Yes, N=No, P=Partially, D=Don't know, A=Not Applicable. CRMEP 03/31/07 Draft