CU - STREAM CROSSING UPGRADING

IMPLEMENTATION

Grant #: **Project title:**

Date : **Evaluator:** **Site ID:** page ___ of ___

	Project Feature Number			
	Feature Type Code			
Stream Crossing	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?			
	a. Installed: CDP, EOC, DRC, OTH			
	4. Were treatments to prevent plugging & inlet erosion installed as approved?			
	a. Installed at inlet: ARM, DBB, FLA, GRC, MIT, WGW, OTH			
	5. Were treatments to prevent erosion at the outlet installed as approved?			
	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			
Spoils	12. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?			
	a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)			
Channel	13. Was the channel adjacent to the crossing excavated to a stable shape?			
	a. Location of excavation relative to crossing: DNS, UCR, UPS, OTH			
	14. Was all fill and trapped sediment in the channel removed or stabilized?			
	a. If not, were measures to control sediment release applied as approved?			
	15. Were approved erosion prevention methods applied to the channel?			
Rating	16. 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?			
	17. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.			
	18. **Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail**			

Comments			
	Feature #:	Feature #:	Feature #:

* 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