

FC - FISH PASSAGE at STREAM CROSSINGS

IMPLEMENTATION

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ___ of ___

		Project Feature Number		Comments
		Feature Type Code		
Stream Crossing	1. Was the new or upgraded crossing installed as approved?			
	<i>a. Materials: CON, MTL, NTR, OFR, PLA, WOO, OTH</i>			
	<i>b. Structure condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail</i>			
	<i>c. Problems: ALN, APP, CRS, NTG, UNS, NON, OTH</i>			
	<i>d. Estimated sediment volume prevented from entering a stream: (cy/10 yr)</i>			
	2. Does the crossing structure meet CDFG fish passage criteria?			
	3. Does fish passage rely on a correctly functioning back flooding weir(s)?*			
	4. Were the fill or side slopes constructed at stable angles?			
	5. Were the fill or side slopes treated to prevent erosion as approved?			
	<i>a. Methods: ARM, BNC, COM, NTM, PLN**, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH</i>			
	6. Were treatments to prevent plugging & inlet erosion installed as approved?			
	<i>a. Installed at inlet: ARM, DBB, FLA, GRC, MIT, WGW, OTH</i>			
7. Were treatments to protect the outlet from erosion installed as approved?				
<i>a. Installed at outlet: ARM, DSP, GRC, OTH</i>				
8. If a bridge, were bridge abutments constructed as approved?				
9. Was road surface/ditch runoff disconnected from streams as approved?				
Channel	10. Did channel conditions at the crossing require grade control weirs/structures?*			
	11. Was the channel adjacent to the crossing excavated to a stable shape?			
	<i>a. Location of excavation relative to crossing: DNS, UCR, UPS, OTH</i>			
	12. Was all fill and trapped sediment in the channel removed or stabilized?			
<i>a. If not, were measures to control sediment release applied as approved?</i>				
Spoils	13. Were spoils placed where they cannot deliver sediment, as approved?			
	<i>a. Spoils volume estimate: (cy)</i>			
Metrics	14. Length of habitat made accessible by the feature: (mi)			
	15. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed at the feature: (ft)			
	16. Area of the feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft ²)			
Implementation	17. Does the feature meet design, contract & permit specifications?			
	<i>a. If not, were modifications beneficial to performance?</i>			
	<i>b. Is non-compliance significant enough to jeopardize performance?</i>			
	<i>c. Are corrections needed?</i>			
	18. Would a different treatment or design have been preferable? If Y, comment.			
	19. Feature Implementation Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
Comments				

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