

IN - INSTREAM HABITAT & BANK RESTORATION

IMPLEMENTATION

Grant #:

Project title:

Date :

Evaluator:

Site ID:

page ___ of ___

		Project Feature Number			
		Feature Type Code			
Metrics	1. Was the length of channel treated the same as approved?				
	a. Actual length of feature: (ft)				
	b. Length of bank stabilized by the feature: (ft)				
	c. Area of the feature installed within bankfull channel: (ft ²)				
	d. Length of aquatic habitat disturbed during implementation: (ft)				
Feature	2. Structural condition: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail				
	3. Are problems with the feature visible?				
	a. Types: ANC, BBB, CRF, MAT, SHF, STR, SWA, UND, UNS, WSH, OTH				
	4. Was the feature placed in the approved location along the channel?				
	5. Was the feature placed in the approved position?				
	a. Position: LBK, MDC, RBK, SPN, OTH				
	6. Was the feature oriented as approved?				
	a. Orientation: DNS, MUL, PRL, PRP, UPS, OTH				
	7. Were approved materials used for the feature?				
	a. Materials: CON, LWD, MTL, NTR, OFR, RTW, VEG, WOO, OTH				
	8. Were the sizes of materials used the same as approved?				
	9. Was the feature anchored as approved?				
	a. Anchoring: BUR, CBL, REB, STK, TIE, NON, OTH				
10. If applicable, was the approved bank or channel excavation carried out?					
11. Were approved erosion control measures applied to disturbed areas?					
a. Types: FAB, NTR, NTM, OFR, PLN*, SEE, SLF, STM, OTH					
Habitat	12. If applicable, was the habitat type modification completed as approved?				
	a. Habitat created: FLT, POO, RIF, OTH				
	13. If applicable, was gravel added to the stream as approved?				
	a. Volume of gravel added to stream: (cy)				
	14. Number of pieces of large wood debris used in this feature: (#)				
Bank	15. If applicable, was the bank constructed to the approved angle?				
	a. As-built bank angle: (degrees)				
Implementation	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					