

# Prioritization Planning for Culvert Replacement

An Interactive Qualifying Project Proposal Submitted to the Faculty of WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Science.

> By: Maryam Al Hakeem Nathan Cloutier Timothy Ryan

Water Resource Outreach Center Massachusetts

> Date: May 2, 2023

#### Report Submitted to:

<u>Key Words:</u> Culverts Stormwater Municipal Vulnerability Program (MVP) Watershed Blackstone River Project Sponsor Blackstone Watershed Collaborative

> <u>WPI Faculty Advisors</u> Professor Corey Dehner Professor Paul Mathisen Worcester Polytechnic Institute

<u>Sustainability Development Goals</u>: SDG 3 – Good Health and Wellbeing SDG 11 – Sustainable Cities and Communities

This report represents work of WPI undergraduate students submitted to the faculty as evidence of a degree requirement. WPI routinely publishes these reports on its web site without editorial or peer review. For more information about the projects program at WPI, see <a href="https://www.wpi.edu/project-based-learning/global-project-program">https://www.wpi.edu/project-based-learning/global-project-program</a>

# Abstract

Culvert failure has been an increasing concern in Massachusetts municipalities due to increased rainfall and aging structures. The goal of our project was to develop a prioritization plan to help Massachusetts municipalities prioritize culvert repair and replacement. Using the town of Sutton, MA as a case study, we conducted background research, interviews, and field assessments and developed a prioritization plan, GIS map, and outreach material. The prioritization plan includes criteria to assist towns to prioritize culverts for repair or replacement.

## Acknowledgments

Our team would like to thank the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative for sponsoring this project. We also want to thank Clark University for providing us with a workspace for us to be more efficient. We also want to thank Stefanie Covino, our sponsor coordinator, for being our lead with the training and providing us with a lot of useful information for the project. In addition, we would like to thank all the people we interviewed from all the different organizations, including the Massachusetts Department of Public Works (MA DPW), PARE Corporation, GZA Environmental, Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission (CMRPC), Blackstone River Coalition, Fuss & O'Neill, and the volunteers from the Manchaug Pond Foundation, and the Blackstone River Watershed Association (BRWA). We would not have gathered all the useful and helpful information without your help. A list of our interviewees is presented in *Table 1*, located in *Appendix B*. Finally, we would like to thank Professor Dehner for giving us a head start on the project and our project advisor, Professor Mathisen, for helping us stay on track throughout our project.

# **Executive Summary**

Maintaining the health and quality of streams and allowing stormwater to flow effectively is crucial to the health and safety of our watersheds, but with climate change and storms becoming more intense, our systems that manage stormwater, such as culverts, are failing and are prone to catastrophic flooding. Our sponsor, the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative, a nonprofit organization, has identified stream crossings as a concern that has contributed to flooding in the past in the Blackstone River Watershed. The Blackstone River runs from Worcester, Massachusetts to Pawtucket, Rhode Island, and is credited as the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution (NPS, 2021), home to the first water-powered cotton mill. This region played a critical role in developing our nation. But due to rapid industrialization, we must deal with the consequences of unregulated industrial development and alteration.

Culverts are structures that allow the flow of stream water to flow under roadways. The failure of culverts poses a number of safety, economic, environmental, and ecological impacts. Through literature review, we have found that many of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' culverts were built in the early and mid-1900s. These culverts are aging, deteriorating, and causing issues such as floods and separation of aquatic habitats. We found through research that one of the goals of the North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative (NAACC) is to improve aquatic connectivity throughout the Eastern United States. NAACC supports restoration projects by providing information about where these projects are likely to bring the greatest improvements in aquatic connectivity. The NAACC developed common protocols for assessing culverts and stream crossings to aid in these efforts (Abbot and Jackson, 2015). Also, the NAACC developed considerations to prioritize which culverts needed to be listed as a priority for repair or replacement. However, these considerations did not come with a designated plan that communities could follow to prioritize replacing their own culverts. The goal of our project was to develop a prioritization plan to help Massachusetts municipalities prioritize culvert repair and replacement.

To achieve our goal, we followed five objectives. These included:

- Explore impacts and importance of culverts
- Develop understanding of variety of issues compromising integrity of culverts
- Identify other prioritization models and comparatively analyze
- Draft prioritization plan, seek feedback, and revise
- Create outreach material and develop recommendations

The first objective aims to explore the impacts and importance of culverts. In this objective, we did literature review by analyzing content of articles relevant to our project. We contacted experts in relevant professions to schedule interviews. Our team also studied environmental issues such as erosion and runoff from impervious surfaces and how these issues impacted the water quality of the Blackstone River. We conducted some online research on examples of failing culverts, culvert-related flooding and other effects of failing culverts, and ecological factors that relate to culverts.

The second objective developed an understanding of the variety of issues compromising the integrity of culverts throughout Central Massachusetts by considering the town of Sutton, MA as a case study. In this objective, we reviewed the Sutton Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness (MVP) report and action plan, conducted interviews with ten experts, participated in culvert assessment training following NAACC standards, and used our culvert assessment training to create a GIS map of Sutton's culvert.

The third objective identified other prioritization models and comparatively analyzed them to find common themes to use in our prioritization plan. The three plans that were analyzed are 1) the NAACC Prioritization Considerations, 2) the Culvert and Storm Drain Management Case Study Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles County, and 3) the CSCE Sustainability in Design, Construction and Rehabilitation of Culverts Plan in Ottawa and Ontario, Canada (*Prioritizing Projects*, 2018; Venner & Berger, 2014; Aghniaey & Rodgers, n.d.). Each prioritization plan had a different focus on specific criteria based on their needs, but overall some similarities that contributed to our prioritization plan.

For the fourth objective, we drafted a prioritization plan and reached out to the experts that were interviewed to seek feedback from them about our prioritization plan to revise it. This culvert repair and replacement prioritization plan considered a variety of factors for which we assigned ranks and developed a scoring system.

The fifth objective focused on finalizing our prioritization plan, creating outreach material, and developing recommendations. Using the feedback and suggestions from the experts we interviewed, the prioritization plan was refined and finalized. To create outreach material, we used our background research, data collected from our culvert assessments, and our interviews to create a brochure and a PowerPoint presentation to help raise awareness of the potential consequences of culvert failure and the importance of investing in repairs and replacement. This presentation was presented to residents of Sutton at a meeting regarding an ongoing Flooding Study. Finally, we developed a list of recommendations for the community of Sutton using the data collected from our culvert assessments and ranking. This list of recommendations was intended to be applied to both Sutton and surrounding communities.

Given the importance of proper culvert assessment in prioritizing culvert repair and replacement, our research focused on the process of assessing culverts using a set of criteria developed by the NAACC. In order to assess culverts using this criteria, our team was trained to be able to certify and assess culverts. We assessed twenty culverts. Our in-field assessments showed symptoms of aging metal pipe, as expected from the age of many of these culverts. Several of these culverts had their bottoms completely rusted out and showed signs of erosion in the soil below. However, other culverts were built recently and were in good condition. These culvert assessments gave ample data to develop additional considerations later in our project.

Meanwhile, we conducted interviews with ten local officials, volunteers, and engineers. One of the questions we asked pertained to issues related to being able to properly assess culverts. It was found that communities and organizations lacked the manpower and resources to assess culverts, given that town employees already have enough to focus on on a daily basis. As such, the length of the NAACC training would pose a significant barrier to communities getting trained and being able to assess culverts. Collectively, it was found that after a while the answers provided seemed to be somewhat repetitive. Based on one such repetitive answer, we would recommend that the NAACC lessen the length of training and focus on assessing a variety of culverts to make training easier and less of a barrier. In regard to resources, community buy-in is crucial to allow communities to reallocate funding or dedicate more manpower to assessing culverts, as will be discussed further below.

Initially, we were concerned that towns may not even be aware of the NAACC's criteria. While this was occasionally the case, we found that some of the communities whose officials we interviewed were aware of these criteria and even used them to assess and log assessments of their own culverts. One such community maintained a database similar to the NAACC database. On top of lessening training requirements, outreach to town employees to encourage them to get trained is also important. Holding more training sessions and advertising such sessions would likely draw in more trainees and bolster the relatively small population of individuals who are certified. Furthermore, we recommend that assessments done externally using the NAACC criteria should be considered as well. As long as the results are verified to be accurate, which can be done through analyzing photos of each culvert, resources could be saved by accepting these results rather than repeating the same assessments, which may number in the hundreds and would take several weeks of assessments to reassess.

The NAACC maintains an extensive and accurate map of culverts in Central Massachusetts, one that we took advantage of quite frequently for map related and assessment related tasks. Town officials in some communities pointed out that their own maps of culverts were outdated and incomplete. As mentioned previously, outreach would be key in resolving this issue. If the already-present map was more widely known, communities would not have to worry about updating their maps.

During our literature review and later through in-person observations done during the infield culvert assessments, we found that culvert failure could have severe consequences and the potential to cause more destruction and interruption than a replacement project would cost. We looked at a few different instances of culvert failure that occurred in recent years and found in one example that failure completely washed out a large section of road and caused property damage in the town of Belchertown, MA. The visible impacts of this failure were much more severe than a temporary detour and culvert replacement would be.

We also compared several different culvert prioritization plans from different regions and compared them. In one case study, the importance of proactive culvert repairs and replacement was discussed, citing the impact of storm seasons and comparing the impact of proactive repairs and unexpected failure. Based on our findings, we would recommend that communities focus on inspecting culverts annually to identify structural defects before heightened water flow begins to come during storm seasons. Based on these inspections, we would recommend that communities proactively repair culverts found to be deficient, rather than waiting for them to fail.

Based on criteria used for culvert assessments, the three other prioritization plans we researched, and in the field observations, we developed our own prioritization plan that considered five different aspects of a culvert that were not explicitly described in the NAACC stream crossing form. Our criteria included the impacts a road closure would have on movement and safety, the structural integrity of a culvert, the ability of aquatic and terrestrial organisms to pass through a culvert, and the constriction of culvert in terms of stream width and probability of

flooding. Through these criteria, we developed a scoring matrix to determine which culverts could be of highest priority.

Some information that was gathered from our interviews indicates that there is no type of outreach material regarding culvert awareness. To bring awareness, we created a brochure about culverts, assessments and training, information on disasters caused by culvert failures in Massachusetts, and details on how culvert repairs and replacements are funded. We focused on how culverts are an essential part of a town's infrastructure, as they allow for the proper drainage of waterways and prevent flooding. By educating residents about the potential risks associated with poorly maintained culverts, the towns can encourage them to report any issues observed. By increasing the quantity and quality of outreach materials, we can raise awareness of culvert issues and inspire more people to take action to ensure the proper maintenance and management of culverts.

# **Table of Authorship**

	Primary Author(s)	Primary Editor(s)
Abstract	All	All
Acknowledgements	Maryam	All
Executive Summary		
1.0 – Introduction	All	All
2.0 – Background	All	Maryam/Tim
2.1 – Climate Change, Watersheds, and the Role of	Maryam	Maryam/Tim
Curvents	Manuana /Mata	Marrian /Time
2.2 – Impacts of Culvert Failure	Maryam/Nate	Maryam/Tim
2.5 – Cuivert Inspection	Nate	Maryam/Tim
2.4 – Condition of the Blackstone River	Tim Tim	Maryam/11m
2.5 – Blackstone Watershed Collaborative	I im	Maryam/Tim
3.0 – Methodology	All	Maryam/ I im
3.1 – Objective 1: Explore Impacts and Importance of	Nate	Maryam/Tim
Culverts	<b>—</b> :	
3.2 – Objective 2: Develop Understanding of Variety of	Tim	Maryam/Tim
Issues Compromising Integrity of Culverts		
3.2.1 – Priorities and Challenges	Tim	Maryam/Tim
3.2.2 – Culvert Assessment Training	Tim	Maryam/Tim
3.2.3 – Developing our GIS Model and Ranking		Maryam/Tim
System		
3.3 – Objective 3: Identify Other Prioritization Models and Comparatively Analyze	Maryam	Maryam/Tim
3.4 – Objective 4: Draft Prioritization Plan. Seek	Marvam	Marvam/Tim
Feedback and Revise	1.1.1.1 j	1, 101 J 0011, 1111
3 5 – Create Outreach Material Finalize Plan and Develop	Nate	Marvam/Tim
Recommendations	1 valo	iviai y ann i mi
4.0 – Findings	A11	A11
41 – Background Research	Tim/Nate	All
$4 \ 1 \ -$ Human Impacts on the Blackstone River	Tim	All
4.1.2 – Municipal Vulnerability Program (MVP) and	Nate	All
Municipal Grants	1 (uto	
4 2.3 – Hydraulic Modeling and Flood Plains	Tim	A11
4.2 - Culvert Assessment and GIS Mapping	Tim/Nate	All
4.21 - NAACC Assessment Protocols	Nate	All
4 ? ? – Culvert Assessments	1 valo	7 111
4 3 – Prioritizing Replacement	Maryam	A11
4 3 1 – Comparative Analysis of Other Prioritization	Maryam	All
Plans	iviai y ann	7 111
4.3.1.1 – The NAACC Prioritization	Maryam	All
Considerations		
4.3.1.2 – The Culvert Management Case Studies in Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles	Maryam	All

4.3.1.3 – The CSCE Sustainability in Design,	Maryam	All
Construction, and Rehabilitation of Culverts		
Plan		
4.3.2 – Prioritization Criteria	Maryam	All
4.4 – Community Outreach	Nate	All
5.0 – Conclusions and Recommendations	All	All
5.1 – Culvert Training	Maryam/Tim	All
5.1.1 – Make Training More Accessible	Tim	All
5.1.2 – Encourage Town Employees to Get Trained	Maryam	All
5.1.3 – Consider External Assessments	Tim	All
5.2 – Regular Assessment and Proactive Repairs	Maryam	All
5.3 – Prioritization Criteria	Tim	All
5.3.1 – Take Advantage of Current Assessment Tools	Tim	All
5.3.2 – Prioritize Based on Broader Criteria	Tim	All
5.3.3 – Relying on the NAACC Database	Tim	All
5.4 – Applying for State and Federal Grants	Nate	All
5.5 – Community Outreach	Nate	All
-		

# **Table of Contents**

Abstract	Ι
Acknowledgments	II
Executive Summary	III
Table of Authorship	VII
List of Tables and Figures	XI
1.0 – Introduction	1
<ul> <li>2.0 – Background</li> <li>2.1 – Climate Change, Watersheds, and the Role of Culverts</li> <li>2.2 – Impacts of Culvert Failure</li> <li>2.3 – Culvert Inspection</li> <li>2.4 – Condition of the Blackstone River</li> <li>2.5 – Blackstone Watershed Collaborative</li> </ul>	3 3 4 5 6 7
<ul> <li>3.0 – Methodology</li> <li>3.1 – Objective 1: Explore Impacts and Importance of Culverts</li> <li>3.2 – Objective 2: Develop Understanding of Variety of Issues</li> <li>Compromising Integrity of Culverts</li> <li>3.2.1 – Priorities and Challenges</li> <li>3.2.2 – Culvert Assessment Training</li> <li>3.2.3 – Developing our GIS Model and Ranking System</li> <li>3.3 – Objective 3: Identify Other Prioritization Models and</li> <li>Comparatively Analyze</li> <li>3.4 – Objective 4: Draft Prioritization Plan, Seek Feedback, and</li> <li>Revise</li> <li>3.5 – Create Outreach Material, Finalize Plan and Develop</li> <li>Recommendations</li> </ul>	9 9 10 10 10 10 11 11 11 11
<ul> <li>4.0 - Findings</li> <li>4.1 - Blackstone River Watershed and Improvement Efforts <ul> <li>4.1.1 - Human Impacts on the Blackstone River</li> <li>4.1.2 - Municipal Vulnerability Program (MVP) and Municipal Grants</li> <li>4.2.3 - Proactive Culvert Replacement</li> </ul> </li> <li>4.2 - Culvert Assessment and GIS Mapping <ul> <li>4.2.1 - NAACC Assessment Protocols</li> <li>4.2.2 - Culvert Assessments</li> </ul> </li> <li>4.3 - Prioritizing Replacement <ul> <li>4.3.1 - Comparative Analysis of Other Prioritization Plans</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	13 13 13 15 16 16 16 17 18 18
4.3.1.1 – The NAACC Prioritization Considerations	18

4.3.1.2 – The Culvert Management Case Studies in	19
Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles	
4.3.1.3 – The CSCE Sustainability in Design, Construction,	19
and Rehabilitation of Culverts Plan	
4.3.2 – Prioritization Criteria	20
4.4 – Community Outreach	22
5.0 – Conclusions and Recommendations	23
5.1 – Culvert Training	23
5.1.1 – Make Training More Accessible	23
5.1.2 – Encourage Town Employees to Get Trained	23
5.1.3 – Consider External Assessments	23
5.2 – Regular Assessment and Proactive Repairs	24
5.3 – Prioritization Criteria	24
5.3.1 – Take Advantage of Current Assessment Tools	24
5.3.2 – Prioritize Based on Broader Criteria	24
5.3.3 – Relying on the NAACC Database	25
5.4 – Applying for State and Federal Grants	25
5.5 – Community Outreach	26
References	27
Appendix A: Informed Consent	30
Appendix B: List of Interviewees	32
Appendix C: Interview Questions	32
Appendix D: NAACC Aquatic Connectivity Stream Crossing Survey	33
Appendix E: Map of Culverts in Sutton, MA	37
Appendix F: Summary of Other Prioritization Plans	38
Appendix G: Prioritization Plan	40
Appendix H: Sample of Culvert Assessment Forms and Photos	47
Appendix I: Culvert Assessment Scores Based on Prioritization Plan	59
Appendix J: Massachusetts Stream Crossing Standards	60
Appendix K: Brochure for Community Outreach	61
Appendix L: Team Assessment	62

# List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Project Objectives	9
Table 2: List of Interviewees	31
Table 3: Assessed Culvert Scores Based on the Prioritization Plan Criteria	91
Figure 1: Culvert at Third Beach in Middletown, RI	3
Figure 2: Aftermath of East Road Culvert Failure, Belchertown, MA	5
Figure 3: Map of Blackstone Watershed	7
Figure 4: Bridge Near Manchaug Mills, Sutton, MA	14
Figure 5: Screenshot of Mass Mapper Dam Data, Sutton, MA	14
Figure 6: Culvert on West Sutton Rd, Sutton, MA	17
Figure 7: Culvert on Griggs Rd, Sutton	17
Figure 8: Poor Condition Culvert on Douglas Road in Sutton, MA	20
Figure 9: Perched Culvert on Mendon Road in Sutton, MA	21
Figure 10: Example of Free Fall from a Culvert on Douglas Road in Sutton, MA	21

### **1.0 - Introduction**

Maintaining the health and quality of streams and allowing stormwater to flow effectively is crucial to the health and safety of our communities. With storms becoming more intense, our aging stormwater management infrastructure is being put to the test. Failure of these systems, such culverts and other stormwater management infrastructure, could lead to catastrophic flooding. Stream continuity, or the ability of water to flow effectively without interruption, is a major part of keeping streams healthy and supporting a healthy ecosystem in a watershed. It also plays a crucial role in maintaining water quality. However, human needs have led to streams to be interrupted by stream crossings such as culverts that act as barriers to the fish and wildlife and have potential to flood or otherwise impact the surrounding communities (*Stream Crossings - Protecting and Restoring Stream Continuity*, n.d.).

The Blackstone Watershed Collaborative, a network of nonprofit organizations that focuses on the health of watersheds, has identified insufficient stream crossings as a significant problem in the Blackstone River Watershed, a vital watershed that runs from Worcester, Massachusetts to Pawtucket, Rhode Island. Many towns throughout Massachusetts have identified that their culverts, which are vital structures that channel stormwater under roadways and railroads, are in a concerning condition and may contribute to flooding during large rainfall events. For example, in the town of Sutton, Massachusetts, many culverts were built as early as the 1940s using steel pipes, which are prone to rusting and degrading over time (Sutton MVP) Report, 2019). This problem, coupled with storms becoming more intense and less predictable, makes culvert assessment and prioritization of replacement of culverts much more important. Though small and often hidden from plain sight, failure of culverts poses a number of hazards; in late 2018, Southborough, MA, saw a major culvert that passed under Northboro Road collapse, closing the road to the public and requiring an American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) grant of \$70,000 to make repairs necessary to reopen the road (Senator Eldridge Secures \$70,000 in ARPA Funds for Collapsed Culvert in Southborough, n.d.). If culverts are allowed to degrade and eventually fail, road collapses like this threaten public safety.

In an effort to get ahead of this issue and prepare for larger quantities of rainfall, communities have taken steps to assess and make prioritization plans to repair and replace aging culverts to avoid collapses that come with costly repairs and prevent worse disasters, to include catastrophic floods, from occurring. The North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative (NAACC) is a network of individual organizations from thirteen different states that work to improve aquatic connectivity throughout this area, spanning from Maine to West Virginia. This collaborative has created a culvert assessment program that includes a protocol to set standards for how culverts should be assessed and reported on. The NAACC has also developed a regional culvert GIS database where specific unassessed and assessed culvert locations in several towns of MA are spotted (*North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative*, 2018).

Unfortunately, many people are not familiar with or have not been trained on how to use the NAACC's culvert assessment tool and database. Only 295 out of approximately 5200 culverts in the Central Massachusetts region have been properly assessed and recorded into the database as of April 25, 2023. Few people in the whole state have been certified to do and record these culvert assessments. With this limited manpower, it is difficult to inspect culverts and locate culverts that need to be repaired or replaced. This makes it harder to prevent failure of culverts.

The goal of our project is to work in collaboration with the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative to assist Massachusetts municipalities in prioritizing culvert repair and replacement by developing a municipal prioritization plan that effectively integrates the prioritization tools available from the NAACC and other sources. Our project focused on Sutton, MA, using this community as a case study to apply our findings, eventually, to other communities. We initially conducted background research on the importance of culverts and unique problems related to them in local communities. In addition, we conducted interviews with experts that provided valuable information that helped us create our prioritization plan and helped us gain valuable insight into how professionals were working to solve similar problems. We then used the training we received to assess culvert structures in Sutton, MA, to identify what qualities were most important to look for when prioritizing culvert repair. With information gathered, we developed a prioritization plan and developed outreach materials to inform the public. Upon completion of the analysis, we provided our recommendations to the community of Sutton and presented our findings to members of the community at a Manchaug Village Flooding Study meeting on April 27, 2023.

## 2.0 - Background

In this chapter, we discuss relevant background research to aid in developing a prioritization plan for culvert replacement and repair. To create our prioritization plan, it was important to first understand the current condition of our area of focus, the Blackstone Rivershed. Then, we researched the consequences of culvert failure, an issue that we intend to help municipalities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts avoid. In this chapter, we discuss climate change and the impact of stormwater runoff on watersheds. Culverts and their use in managing stormwater runoff are also discussed. In our second section, the public safety and economic impacts of culverts that do not have sufficient capacity for current rainfall amounts are discussed. Next, we explain the process of culvert inspection. Then, we discuss the state of the Blackstone River Watershed and previous efforts to clean the Blackstone. Finally, we introduce the Blackstone Watershed Collaboration and how it is providing relief to the Blackstone River.

#### 2.1- Climate Change, Watersheds, and the Role of Culverts

Human behavior has played a significant role in accelerating the warming of our planet, speeding up the process of climate change. Climate change is the long-term natural shift that happens on earth, intensifying specific weather and temperature events such as extreme heat waves and heavy rainfall events (IPCC, 2021). While the impacts of climate change are vast, for the purposes of this project, we focus on its impacts in watersheds and in aging stormwater management infrastructure. A watershed is an area in which snowmelt and rainfall flow through the ground, over impervious surfaces, and into streams, all which flow to one common river (What Is a Watershed?, n.d.). For our project, this river is the Blackstone River. Stormwater runoff is water that flows over impervious surfaces such as roadways and other structures, as well as over permeable surfaces. Impervious surfaces obstruct water from soaking into the ground while permeable surfaces absorb a portion of the storm water that passes over it. Stormwater runoff flows directly into bodies of water and carries with its chemicals and pollutants from the surface of these impervious surfaces (US EPA, 2021). Culverts channel stormwater runoff and streams through and below roadways and railroads, thus allowing the water to bypass impervious surfaces and flow from place to place in a watershed ("Culvert", 2021).



#### Figure 1 - Culvert at Third Beach in Middletown, RI (US Fish and Wildlife Service, 2014)

Culverts are one way of managing stormwater and stream water, redirecting it under, around, or past manmade structures. They are tunnel structures that allow the flow of stream water to go from one place to another, bypassing obstructions, as shown in *Figure 1*. With increased precipitation due to climate change, culverts run the risk of not being able to channel the increased flows resulting from increased levels of rainfall. This can result in several consequences, such as erosion of soil, floods, property damage, and more. Roads flooded by rainfall that exceeds a culvert's capacity can also result in harmful substances being washed off roads and into streams, road closures that hinder travel and emergency services, and in some cases total road washout. Culvert flooding can have major effects on the environment and ecological habitats (Şen, 2020).

#### 2.2- Impacts of Culvert Failure

Culvert failure has many consequences, some of which are safety, economic and aquatic impacts. Culvert failure can describe a few different things; a culvert may be undersized for a rainstorm, forcing water to redirect over roads. Culverts can also collapse, causing sinkholes and road closures. Culvert failure can also come in the form of culverts becoming clogged with debris, resulting in similar consequences to an overloaded culvert. The State of Massachusetts, as a part of Executive Order 569, created the Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness (MVP) Planning Grant Program in 2017. This program sought to provide funding to municipalities to allow them to assess ecological vulnerabilities to mitigate the effects of climate change in their communities (Executive Order 569, 2016). Each municipality seeking funding had to identify key areas of improvement to secure funding to address these issues. When completing these reports, many towns in Massachusetts highlighted culverts and flooding as areas of concern, including Sutton, Massachusetts, our community of focus in this project. The roads near some culverts are at a high risk of flooding, which could hinder residents' and emergency vehicles' ability to get to their destination (Northbridge MVP Workshop, 2018). Moreover, clogged culverts were found to be responsible for floods, torrents, landslides, and the loss of eight lives during a thunderstorm in Northeastern Turkey (Celik et al., 2020). Culvert failure puts the safety of residents in jeopardy, but repairs are expensive, a factor which makes it difficult for towns to decide to replace culverts and to get public backing for such projects.

Despite the safety implications, culvert replacement is costly and requires years of applying for grants, winning over the public, and completing construction. However, repairs to roads and surrounding infrastructure damaged by failing culverts is even more costly than replacement before failure. The cost of repair for culverts is, on average, \$845,500, but can cost over \$4.2 million (Truhlar et al., 2020). As mentioned in our introduction, failure of culverts can limit or prevent travel altogether, which can be catastrophic should this occur on major roads. In the Southborough example, the repairs ended up costing a total of \$192,000, with state funding only covering \$70,000. Furthermore, the road was closed from late spring of 2021 until December 2022 while funding was secured, and repairs took place (Melo, 2022). Luckily, Northboro Road is not a major artery and detours around the site of the collapse would not have added too much time to residents traveling down the 0.6-mile-long road (Google, n.d.). Per our project sponsor, Stefanie Covino, had the imminent failure been detected before the collapse, it

would have been both cheaper, quicker, and less impactful to apply for and receive grants than to have to request emergency funds following a collapse.

Another example of a major failure took place in Belchertown in July 2021. In this case, a 3-foot-wide culvert became clogged when debris from rainfall overtopped a beaver dam. This undersized culvert, once blocked, forced water around the culvert and completely washed out a portion of East Road, leaving behind a large trench where the road used to be and a split-in-half culvert pipe (*Washed Out Undersized Culvert*, 2022). Though an extreme case, undersized culverts are prone to severe consequences due to blockages such as the one described. The aftermath is shown below in *Figure 2*. Many other examples of culvert failure can be found through a quick Google search.



Figure 2 - Aftermath of East Road Culvert Failure, Belchertown, MA (Washed Out Undersized Culvert, 2022)

Furthermore, culvert failures can affect the environment by impacting fish movement. The alewife and blueback herring are two coldwater species that are migratory fish. They have been found extinct in the Blackstone River Watershed due to four dams found at the mouth of the Blackstone River in Pawtucket, Rhode Island (Staff Writer, 2006). According to a UMass Amherst study, in recent years coldwater fish migration has decreased drastically from more than 76% of fish migrating to less than 33% due to inadequate culverts and dams that hinder their movement. The inability of the alewife and blueback herring to move and migrate freely decreases fish diversity and disrupts aquatic connectivity (Alcott et al., 2021). However, fish that exist in the Blackstone River Watershed, especially fish that live in cold water fisheries, are also affected by culverts because the poor stream water flow through the culverts can increase the water's velocity and make it shallower at the outlet, causing the fisheries water to warm up (US EPA, 2016). This is bad for freshwater species living in coldwater fisheries since the cold-water temperature cannot exceed 68° F (20°C) to be habitable (Cohen, 2017).

#### 2.3- Culvert Inspection

Many of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' thousands of culverts were built in the early and mid-1900s. These culverts were built to handle rainfall amounts at the time they were constructed when rainfall events were less severe. These culverts are aging, deteriorating, and

causing many issues to the water and environment. According to the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, culverts that were built in the 1950's and 1960's have caused flooding and destruction of aquatic habitats (Dexter 2020). They are causing these issues because after they were built, the culverts were never occasionally checked for issues or faulty designs and were instead left to deteriorate. The continuous failure of these aging culverts is endangering the Blackstone River Watershed communities and quality of the water in the Blackstone River (US EPA, 2021).

The North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative (NAACC) is a network of individuals focused on improving aquatic connectivity from Maine to West Virginia. The NAACC has been aiding federal agencies in the New England region dedicated to improving stream connectivity for the health and resilience of our aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. The NAACC has developed common protocols for assessing road-stream crossings such as culverts and bridges and a regional database for this field data. The NAACC has collected information that identified high priority bridges and culverts for upgrade and replacement. The NAACC will support planning and decision-making by providing information about where restoration projects are likely to bring the greatest improvements in aquatic connectivity (Abbot and Jackson, 2015). This will be done through assessment of culverts. Assessments will be conducted by individuals trained to use a set of criteria, as will be briefly discussed in the next section, to record information about each culvert based on the criteria to assess structural integrity, ability to channel water, and ability for organisms to move, to name a few.

#### 2.4- Condition of the Blackstone River

The Blackstone River, flowing for 48 miles from Worcester, Massachusetts to Pawtucket, Rhode Island, is often credited as the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution (NPS, 2021). Moreover, the river is culturally significant to the Nipmuc, Narragansett, and Wampanoag people. It was this river that fueled the rapid urbanization and industrialization that allowed Rhode Island and Central Massachusetts to prosper. This river was home to the first textile mill in the United States, built in Pawtucket in 1790. Being the site of this progress was not without a cost, though. In 1990, the United States Environmental Protection Agency stated that the Blackstone River was, in terms of toxic pollutants, the most polluted river in the country (US EPA, 2021). The Blackstone River Watershed, though cleaner than it was when that statement was made, now faces a new foe; climate change and increasing amounts of stormwater work to reverse the progress made over the last several decades in cleaning up this crucial body of water.

In 1972, the Clean Water Act was passed by the federal government, granting the government tools to regulate how industrial waste is managed. This prevented the dumping of untreated industrial and agricultural waste from being dumped into bodies of water. Furthermore, proper disposal that would not lead to run off polluting waterways was implemented. That same year, 10,000 volunteers took part in ZAP the Blackstone, credited as the largest one-day environmental cleanup in U.S. history. Over 10,000 tons of debris was removed from the river on that day (Lynch, 2022). And since this point in time, substantial progress has been made to clean up the Blackstone River. In 2021, the stretch of the Blackstone River in Rhode Island was no longer listed as being impaired for phosphorus and dissolved oxygen, a significant change from when the river was stated to be the most polluted river in the country. This cleanup event

was certainly a step in the right direction and has had a large enough impact that the event has been revived on multiple occasions.

Despite efforts like ZAP the Blackstone, the Blackstone River is still polluted, being deemed unsafe for direct human contact by the State of Rhode Island due to the presence of various heavy metals, such as Copper, Lead, and Cadmium, and various pathogens (RI DEM-OWR, 2013). Much of the 21<sup>s</sup> century pollution originates from stormwater runoff, rather than industrial waste being dumped directly into the river. Further pollution has occurred from various accidents on and around the Blackstone River, such as one that occurred in early March 2023, when the Woonsocket Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility was overloaded and began spilling wastewater into the river. For a few weeks, the river was elevated to a no-contact advisory, though has since been returned to being safe for indirect contact (Bouras, 2023). Events like this are hard to predict and run the risk of undoing some of the progress made on the Blackstone. With continued urbanization and climate change, more and more water end up flowing over impervious surfaces and bypasses stormwater management systems. The stormwater quickly becomes contaminated runoff, picking up pollutants from impervious surfaces and dumping them into the Blackstone River (NBEP, 2017).

#### 2.5- Blackstone Watershed Collaborative

From 2019 to 2021, the Narragansett Bay Estuary Program used funding from the EPA's Southeast New England Program to pursue the Blackstone River Watershed Needs Assessment report (NBEP, 2021). Over the course of these two years, eight meetings were held, and a report was developed outlining twenty action items to pursue between 2021 and 2025. This report is called the Blackstone River Watershed Needs Assessment Project Report. To meet the goals of this report, the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative, a partnership of 115 different private and public entities, was created. A Watershed Coordinator, Stefanie Covino, was hired to lead the Collaborative and the Collaborative would find its home at the George Perkins Marsh Institute at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts.



Figure 3 - Map of Blackstone Watershed (Massachusetts River Alliance, 2021)

The community of Sutton falls within the Blackstone Watershed, as highlighted in *Figure 3*, and has experienced issues related to excessive rainfall and outdated stormwater management

systems (MVP Workshop, 2018). Failing culverts were listed as priority items in Sutton's MVP Report. Findings such as this motivated communities to assess their own culverts to focus funding on repair projects and acquire grants from the state for repairs and replacements. To establish criteria to help standardize assessment amongst Massachusetts communities, the NAACC developed a protocol to assess structural integrity of culverts. A database was also created to store assessment data of the over 5,000 culverts in Central Massachusetts.

The goal of our project is to consider these culverts and develop a plan to help Massachusetts municipalities prioritize culvert repair and replacement as is discussed in the next chapter of this report. The NAACC protocol will be the basis for our criteria.

#### 3.0 - Methodology

In collaboration with our project sponsor the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative and its Watershed Coordinator, Stefanie Covino, the goal of our project was to develop a prioritization plan to help Massachusetts municipalities prioritize culvert repair and replacement. To achieve this goal, we identified the following five objectives (See *Table 1*).

Table 1 - Project Objectives

Objective 1	Explore impacts and importance of culverts
Objective 2	Develop understanding of variety of issues compromising integrity of culverts
Objective 3	Identify other prioritization models and comparatively analyze
Objective 4	Draft prioritization plan, seek feedback, and revise
Objective 5	Create outreach material and develop recommendations

Below, we discussed in detail the methods that we used to achieve each objective and to meet our project goal. All participants in this research were asked for their informed consent prior to their participation (see *Appendix A*).

#### 3.1- Objective 1: Explore impacts and importance of culverts

For this objective, we analyzed the content of articles relevant to our project goal found through online databases and reputable websites. Then, we contacted experts to schedule interviews which were completed in the next objective.

Our team studied environmental issues such as soil erosion and runoff from impervious surfaces and how these issues impact the water quality of the Blackstone River. These issues can be worsened by culverts in disrepair is one of the key factors that play a role in e culvert repair and replacement prioritization plan. We conducted online research on examples of failing culverts, culvert related flooding and other effects of failing culverts, and ecological factors that relate to culverts. It was identified in a Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness (MVP) report prepared by the towns of Grafton, Millbury and Northbridge, Massachusetts, that the streamflow and stormwater runoff in culverts was becoming a safety hazard in the communities (Community Resilience Building MVP Workshop, 2018). In this objective, we reached out to and interviewed ten environmental protection and stormwater experts, including MassDEP and town officials and individuals who worked with a variety of watershed-related non-profits. A complete list can be found in *Appendix B*. These individuals were suggested by our sponsor. A few of these experts referred us to other individuals in their respective organizations who were better qualified to answer our questions, so this portion of our project took longer than originally anticipated. Our list of interviewees and of interview questions can be found in Appendix C. These interviews were intended to help us understand the problem of aging and failing culverts in Massachusetts communities due to aging and failing culverts.

# 3.2- Objective 2: Develop understanding of variety of issues compromising integrity of culverts

This objective involved us gaining an understanding of issues that compromise the integrity of culverts throughout Central Massachusetts by considering the town of Sutton, MA as a case study. We participated in culvert assessment training following the North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity (NAACC) standards, analyzed culvert-related information sources, conducted interviews with experts, and used our culvert assessment training to assess culverts and produce a GIS map of Sutton's culverts, in which we defined our own criteria for a ranking system for culverts using a code system to identify which culverts should be prioritized.

#### 3.2.1 - Priorities and Challenges

In Sutton's MVP report, culverts and flooding were identified as areas of concern (Sutton MVP Workshop, 2019). We analyzed this MVP report to identify why the town considered culverts, flooding, and other stormwater related issues to be a priority. Given our 8-week time frame, we were not able to focus on every culvert in Sutton, but used a list provided by Sutton to focus our assessments on culverts that were known to need assessment, a topic that will be discussed in the next section. This gave us a variety of different data to analyze.

Furthermore, we conducted interviews with ten experts that helped us identify the specific assessment challenges facing Sutton and other Massachusetts communities. These questions were modified based on each individuals' expertise, positions, and background, though general themes remained consistent.

#### 3.2.2 - Culvert Assessment Training

A large part of Objective 2 involved culvert assessment training. We learned to assess culverts based on the NAACC's criteria and assessment sheet, a sheet which can be found in *Appendix D*. Completion of this training, which involved assessing twenty culverts, would allow one to become certified in culvert assessment. This training consisted of two parts, with an online knowledge-based portion being completed with a quiz and several days spent conducting in-field culvert assessments with a certified professional. This training served two purposes. First, we were able to help communities assess their culverts, and second, we gained a better understanding of the assessment challenges and collected valuable data to create our prioritization plan. For our training we visited stream crossings, a term which encompasses culverts, bridges, and other structures through which streams flow through, that were identified by the Town of Sutton as potentially problematic to execute our field-based assessments, supervised by our sponsor Ms. Covino. Our field-based investigation method helped our team have better knowledge and visualizations of culverts in need of repair or replacement.

We used systematic observation to document culvert problems we identified during the assessment. Our team photographed each culvert and the surrounding area to provide better visuals of the problems and ranked each culvert's condition. Systematic observation is a method used to collect quantitative data by observing events as they occur and recording observations using charts, checklists, ranking scales, or inventories ("Systematic Observation", 2007). We chose to use the systematic observation method because the quantitative data that was recorded demonstrated evidence of the culvert issues to accurately define what condition each culvert is

in. Quantitative data is data where researchers address the "what" or "how many" aspects of an issue or a research question (Hillemann, n.d.).

#### 3.2.3 - Developing our GIS Model and Ranking System

After our culvert assessments, our team created a Google map to pinpoint each stream crossing in Sutton and following later objectives we color coded points we identified based on our prioritization codes that were developed. Furthermore, we included XY codes provided to us, and uploaded pictures taken during our assessment to each point. As a reference for our points, we used the regional culvert GIS database map provided by the Central Massachusetts Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMMPO). The CMMPO was created to oversee planning processes as required by the United States Department of Transportation in Central Massachusetts and administers an interactive map for this region using NAACC data. For the culvert GIS map that we created, we also developed a system that considers a variety of factors that the NAACC form does not consider, such as the significance of roadways and stream crossings to name a few, though this is detailed in *Appendix G*.

#### 3.3- Objective 3: Identify other prioritization models and comparatively analyze

In our third objective, we analyzed data from our first two objectives and compared three prioritization models developed for different regions to find common themes to use in our prioritization plan.

To execute this objective, we first found and read through the culvert prioritization plans, taking notes on similar characteristics. Then, we comparatively analyzed those prioritization plans to see which aspects of each work for the needs of Sutton and Central Massachusetts. We identified the following three plans to analyze: 1) the NAACC Prioritization Plan, 2) the Culvert and Storm Drain Management Case Study Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles County, and 3) the CSCE Sustainability in Design, Construction and Rehabilitation of Culverts Plan in Ottawa and Ontario, Canada (*Prioritizing Projects*, 2018; Venner & Berger, 2014; Aghniaey & Rodgers, n.d.). These plans are summarized in *Appendix F*. Later in the project, we used criteria found in these prioritization plans to develop our own.

#### 3.4- Objective 4: Draft prioritization plan, seek feedback, and revise

In Objective 4, we drafted our prioritization plan and sought feedback on our plan from the experts we interviewed.

After comparing the different prioritization plans and considering both our assessment data and criteria mentioned by interviewees, we drafted a culvert repair and replacement prioritization plan that could be used by Sutton and surrounding communities to rank their own culverts. Our plan considered a variety of factors, factors which we assigned ranks to and developed a scoring system for. Once our draft plan was completed, we emailed it to our interviewees and asked for feedback, feedback which we intended to use to finalize our prioritization plan.

# 3.5- Objective 5: Create outreach material, finalize plan, and develop recommendations

In this objective, we finalized our plan and drafted a list of recommendations. To inform Massachusetts communities of what culverts are and why assessing them is important, we drafted and distributed outreach materials.

Using the feedback and suggestions from the experts we interviewed, we refined and finished our prioritization plan and created outreach material, including an in-person presentation. We used our background research, data collected during assessments, and interviews to develop our outreach materials and help raise awareness of the potential consequences of culvert failure and the importance of investing in repairs and replacement. We included information about culvert assessment and training, grants for culvert replacement and repair, information on what culverts are, how increasing rainfall and stormwater affect culverts, and examples of culvert failure. We developed a presentation discussing this material that was presented at Sutton's Manchaug Water Study Project meeting on April 27, 2023. Through this presentation, we were able to inform community members more specifically about culverts.

Finally, we developed our list of recommendations for the community of Sutton using the data we collected. These recommendations were based on our culvert assessments and included in our prioritization plan. We also included our rankings of the twenty culverts we assessed to serve as a basis for assessment work in Sutton. Our list was intended to be applied to both Sutton and surrounding communities.

### 4.0 – Findings

Through our in-person culvert assessments, interviews with experts, background research, and GIS mapping, we have identified several factors to consider when working with, assessing, and considering repairs to culverts in the Blackstone River Watershed. In this chapter, we discuss our findings from both our research and field work. As part of our first objective, we discuss the alterations made over time to the Blackstone River and how these alterations play into the presence of culverts, the consequences of culvert failure, and the Blackstone Watershed as a whole. In fulfilling our second object, we discuss assessment, training, and the difficulties of assessing culverts. Furthermore, we reference throughout this chapter interview results, with many interviews giving us information that spans the full scope of our project. Over several weeks, we conducted ten interviews. We discuss case studies researched in our third objective. To conclude our final two objectives, the importance of proper outreach in developing our list of recommendations and encouraging the communities to assess and proactively replace culverts. A set of criteria were developed to aid in our project goal of helping municipalities prioritize culvert replacement, as will be discussed further in our recommendations.

#### 4.1- Blackstone River Watershed and Improvement Efforts

To understand the historical and technical parts of this project, we began our project by conducting research into the region where our project takes place, the Blackstone River Watershed, as well as the importance and history of culverts in this region. Our background research supported observations we made during the in-field portions of this project. Furthermore, we gained an understanding about hydrology by attending the Manchaug Flooding Study meeting in Sutton, MA. We worked to gain an understanding of the different programs available for towns to use following completion of our project, satisfying goals from our first two project objectives.

#### 4.1.1 - Human Impacts on the Blackstone River

As a river that was the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution and a critical industrial/transportation hub along its banks, the Blackstone River has been modified vastly to harness the water through dams to power cotton spinning and other mills as well as the construction of a canal to facilitate transportation via the river and its footpaths. Man-made structures vastly redirected tributaries to the Blackstone River, creating ponds and providing few uninterrupted routes to the river.

From our starting point at Manchaug Mills, an old, converted mill structure in an historic section of Sutton known as Manchaug Village, we saw several dams in sequence on the Mumford River and man-made stone and concrete walls along the banks of portions of the river. These structures were all visible from the park across the street from the Mills. From researching and comparing the history of the Blackstone River to the area, this site alone demonstrates several ecological impacts of the area's development. The mill structure is a relic from a time when dumping of industrial waste was unregulated and mills regularly deposited heavy metals and other pollutants into the Blackstone and other rivers (EPA, 2021).



Figure 4 - Bridge Near Manchaug Mills, Sutton, MA

Sutton is home to several artificial ponds created by dams, many of which were built in the 19th century, as is reported in Sutton's Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness (MVP) Report. To direct water to these artificial bodies and natural streams, the town is home to over 100 culverts, many of which were constructed in the 1940s. With the presence of dams, it was obvious through observation that many of the town's ponds and streams and the Mumford River did not consistently flow through the town in an uninterrupted manner. Beyond our visual observations, the map of dams in Sutton shown in *Figure 5* shows the majority of the town's streams being obstructed by dams, with some forming artificial ponds and others simply obstructing the steady flow of water. In one of our culvert assessments, we noted a causeway dividing Merrill Pond, a causeway that did not have any culverts connecting the two halves of the lake. As such, aquatic organisms would not be able to pass from one side of the pond to the other and may present water quality challenges due to lack of water mixing. While some species of fish are content with living in the same body of water their whole lives, ponds like this are a prime example of Sutton's lack of ample avenues for aquatic organisms to move around.



Figure 5 - Screenshot of Mass Mapper Dam Data, Sutton, MA

Though the Blackstone River itself does not pass through Sutton, several of our interviewees stated that the Blackstone River has been altered so much that it is impossible to

know the natural path of the Blackstone River. Through interviews, it was noted that many of the migratory species of fish that were once present in the 19th century are not able to make their way into the Blackstone River, due to the dams down in Pawtucket, RI, let alone all the way up to Sutton. Coldwater fisheries do, however, remain in Sutton. Dams prevent their movement and several culverts we had the opportunity to assess also hindered fish passage. Programs do exist to help communities work to restore natural passage for fish and repair crossings, but communities do not always have capacity to plan ahead, apply for, and manage these grants, and there is greater demand than available funding.

#### 4.1.2 - Municipal Vulnerability Program (MVP) and Municipal Grants

While the majority of the municipal officials we interviewed were aware of the MVP program and associated grants, the process for getting grants can be somewhat time consuming. Furthermore, some municipalities are not necessarily aware of all of the funding and grant opportunities that the state has available to them. Beyond the MVP program, the Massachusetts Department of Ecological Restoration (DER) has grants available, too. For priority projects, DER has resources available to help municipalities with permitting and engineering work for projects. However, it was also noted in our interviews that grants rely on evidence to support grants, specifically grants outside of the MVP program. In terms of culvert assessment, it is beneficial to have multiple organizations do independent studies on culverts and return similar results. Completing assessments and applying them to multiple documents and grant applications can help secure funding and clarify where resources need to allocate, as stated by one interviewee. However, this is often not possible as municipalities may lack the funding to hire a consultant to do assessments, and are often stretched thin focusing on all of the different things a town may need to repair or maintain.

#### 4.1.3 - Hydraulic Modeling and Flood Plains

While dam removal is not viable in many cases, many dams do not meet Massachusetts standards for dam capacity and are also in disrepair. We attended a meeting in Sutton, MA in which the Manchaug Flooding Study was discussed and hydrology data that was collected and analyzed by engineers from PARE Group, who was contracted by the Town of Sutton. Modeling of current and future rainfall amounts shows increases in rainfall amounts for different types of storms. For example, in the Manchaug Flood Study presentation it was predicted that in the future 5-year storms could see 5.2 inches of rain versus present day averages of 4.3 inches. To clarify, a 5-year storm event describes a storm that has a 20% chance of occurring each year, being more severe than 2-year storms and 1-year storms. When discussing 100-yr storms, which have a 1% chance of occurring each year, rainfall amounts could grow from 8.0 inches to 11.1 inches in the future. Analysis of dams in Sutton by their engineer PARE Group showed that several dams only have capacity for 10-year storms using present day figures, with many having even more limited capacity. This could be due to dams being in disrepair or being engineered for past conditions. While outside the scope of our project, dam failure and improvements do play a role in how stormwater is managed and how effective or ineffective upstream and downstream culverts may be. Just like culverts are in need of upgrades, dams need to be upgraded to handle future rainfall amounts.

#### 4.2- Culvert Assessment and GIS Mapping for the Town of Sutton

To get a better understanding of the requirements of the culvert assessment process, we completed Culvert assessment training taught in accordance with the North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative. Using in-field work and review of online resources, our team mapped a majority of the culverts in the Town of Sutton and provided images to the database as well as assessing twenty culverts in the town.

#### 4.2.1 - NAACC Assessment Protocols

For our culvert assessments, we were trained in and used protocols developed by the North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative (NAACC), a standardized list of criteria for culvert assessments, as represented in *Appendix D*. The NAACC maintains a database with a linked GIS map that shows the assessment results for each culvert in Central Massachusetts. We used this data to map culverts located in Sutton MA, as shown in Appendix E. In our data collection, it was found that these criteria were known in some communities and were, in fact, used to assess each community's culverts. However, in other cases, officials didn't know how to access the database to see where all their local culverts were and most stated that they were not aware of training or how to become certified. In the Town of Holden, MA, our interviewee stated that the town maintained their own database of culvert assessments and assessed based on the NAACC protocols, but that they had developed their own set of protocols. And in interviews with other officials from different towns and members of non-profit organizations, it was stated that the training itself was a barrier. Training was time consuming (it took our group approximately three full days of field work and an online training to get certified), and with many organizations stating that they lacked the manpower to deal with culvert related issues they had already identified, it would not be logistically possible to send individuals to get trained. It was found that the biggest barrier to recording assessments of culverts was the certification itself and not necessarily a lack of awareness of the program.



Figure 6 - Culvert on West Sutton Rd, Sutton



Figure 7 - Culvert on Griggs Rd, Sutton

Before elaborating on issues related to mapping and culvert assessments, it is important to note some natural issues that may occur. Refer to *Figure 6* above on the left; older culverts may become buried over time or fill with debris. In the example above, it is likely that these stones, called riprap, were placed intentionally on the slope above the culvert when the road above the construction was repaired, but unintentionally fell down the slope to block the culvert's outlet. This issue was observed in several of our other assessments, as well. Accessibility was brought up in several of our interviews and is one of the criteria the NAACC protocols consider. Location is another barrier that poses an assessment challenge. Some culverts may be inaccessible due to the presence of plant growth, as demonstrated in *Figure 7*, where the inlet pipe was difficult to find due to natural debris, or other culverts that might be located somewhere that requires one to trek through poison ivy, thorns, and mud. Considering the time of year in which assessments are done is also important. Flow conditions and accessibility depend on the season, and as such periods of snowmelt or snow in general either increase flow substantially or prevent it altogether. Culvert assessments ideally take place during the summer during low-flow conditions.

Another challenging aspect is that culvert assessments are time-consuming in terms of receiving the training where that alone requires the assessment of 20 culverts, then finding the location of culverts that need to be assessed after getting certified and actually performing the assessment steps that include taking measurements, making observations to fill out the NAACC form and taking pictures. This is a challenge to especially smaller towns due to their limited capacity of workers. The smaller towns already have so much work and other projects to focus on that it will be time-consuming for them to have dedicated manpower for culvert assessments. Towns that are larger tend to not experience this challenge as they have enough manpower to perform several works, although they tend to not be consistent. Consistency helps with staying on top of the culvert assessments to know for sure which culverts need to be prioritized for repair or replacement in the future. But in order to properly assess culverts, it is important to keep track of locations.

Taking on a broader view of culvert assessments, we also considered mapping of culverts in general, and barriers that may exist to towns that follow the NAACC guidelines or their own set of protocols. In order to be able to assess culverts, it is important to first know where they are. Interviews with officials in several towns in the Blackstone River Watershed pointed to a similar problem; many maps they have of culverts are outdated and less prominent or significant culverts do not appear on maps. It is important to note that these culverts are just as critical to assess as a major crossing might be. Failure of a smaller culvert in a less traveled part of town can still cause property damage, close roads, and be a drain on resources. Recall the Belchertown example from the background chapter; East Street, the site of the failure, is a minor road that cuts through a forested area. And yet, the failure had a significant impact on nearby homeowners. In regards to culverts not being on maps, two of our municipal official interviewees attributed this to a lack of resources, namely manpower and funding, allocated to assessing culverts. Funding relies on residents being willing to allocate funding to a project, and the culvert issue is not a priority for many of them. The NAACC database maps many of these culverts that are unknown to communities. A key component of our project centers around developing a GIS map that aligns with our culvert assessments. The NAACC database was a crucial resource in mapping all of the culverts in Sutton. The database had precise coordinates for even the most unnoticeable culverts

and allowed us to develop a Google Map to pinpoint each culvert in Sutton. This resource would be useful to municipalities.

#### 4.2.2 - Culvert Assessments

We spent three days assessing the required twenty culverts with our sponsor as our certified trainer, both to collect data for our project and to receive a certification to assess culverts in the future. Upon completion of our assessments, we noticed the following trends:

- 12 of the 20 culverts assessed were made out of steel pipe
  - This was common practice in the 20th century
  - Because they were steel, this resulted in a lot of rusted out culverts
- Despite 8 out of the 20 culverts being in okay condition and 4 being new, there is still need for repair for most of the culverts
- A lot of aging/old culverts still in use, with only 4 out of the 20 culverts built within the last decade
  - Weakened material resulting in a smaller passage for passage
  - Leads to blockage
- There were not a lot of bank full width measurements because the inlets were being in wetlands or ponds being immediately upstream

There were many consistencies between assessed culverts, with many of the culverts having some less than ideal characteristics. *Appendix H* shows the culvert assessment process and the forms used.

#### 4.3- Prioritizing Replacement

To understand how to create our own prioritization plan, in objective 3, we comparatively analyzed three prioritization plans to distinguish the similarities and differences between the aspects used within each prioritization plan. In objective 4, we proceeded to use this information with the information gathered from the in-field culvert assessments and interviews to create the prioritization plan for culvert repair and replacement. Finally, culvert failure can lead to consequences, therefore, being proactive about repairs and replacement is important.

#### 4.3.1 - Comparative Analysis of Other Prioritization Plans

To consider the best approaches for prioritization of culvert repair, we comparatively analyzed the three different variations of prioritization models. The prioritization plans are: 1) The NAACC Prioritization Plan, 2) The Culvert Management Case Studies in Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles County, and 3) The CSCE Sustainability in Design, Construction and Rehabilitation of Culverts Plan. Each prioritization plan focused on different priority aspects, which are summarized in *Appendix F*.

#### 4.3.1.1 – The NAACC Prioritization Considerations

The NAACC used a weighted ranking approach for their prioritization plan which is favored by us as well because it is flexible and does not require specific engineers and/or mathematicians to create a prioritization plan (Burch et al., 2022). The NAACC prioritization

plan is based on ecological passage to identify those structures that create a barrier to aquatic and terrestrial passage. While it is run at a regional 14-state scale from Maine to Virginia, the data may also be used at a smaller scale to determine priority replacement. The NAACC website also has a page to assist municipalities and others determine how to prioritize their crossing replacement, which includes aspects such as structural conditions, vulnerability to flooding, historical and potential flooding, critical infrastructure presence, social impacts of flooding to roads, economic criteria, and water connectivity metrics regarding barriers to stream flow. The NAACC Prioritization recommendations also look at the ecological criteria such as quality of habitat, presence of rare species, water quality, local land use, condition of river shores, and stream importance for particular species (Prioritizing Projects, 2018).

4.3.1.2 – The Culvert Management Case Studies in Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles

The Culvert Management Case Studies in Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles County had their prioritization plan focus on many things. This document is a compilation of studies done in all four communities, and thus represents one larger case study. The county of Los Angeles placed higher priority on culverts located on routes with no alternative routes where if a culvert failed, the road became impassable. They also focused on the economic criteria to compare the costs of culvert replacement and improvement project results to reduce ongoing maintenance cost repairs in the future. However, the state of Ohio directed their focus on culverts that have streamflow, and culverts that are in abrasive conditions which can lead to scour. The Culvert Management Case Study in Ohio also mentioned the economic criteria in the sense where they dedicated funding to repair or replace identified, deficient culverts using a cost benefit analysis. Furthermore, the state of Oregon centered their prioritization plan to look at a variety of aspects such as the culvert condition, culvert locations, addressing and improving fish passage barriers, and overall cost of selected repair and replacement. The state has also considered culverts that are in "critical" or "poor" conditions, the severity of the problem at the location, freight routes and routes supported by key bridges, and the safety of field crew working along the highways as top priority. They have conducted a ranking system to help them with their prioritization plan and a benefit and risk analysis to understand which culverts are prioritized. Finally, the state of Vermont mostly focused on the assessment and structural aspects of culverts. They assessed culverts for the inlet condition, outlet condition, barrel condition, pipe joint section separation, projecting culvert ends, stone pad, sediment, erosion, road surface conditions, shoulder sinkholes, piping, and culvert size. They also considered looking at the fish passage, road washout, and level of deterioration seen with eroded inverts or flooding that was due to a beaver dam building. The Culvert Management Case Study of Vermont also revised the hydraulic design manual and conducted an analysis of increasing storm frequencies and flood vulnerabilities (Venner & Berger, 2014).

4.3.1.3 – The CSCE Sustainability in Design, Construction and Rehabilitation of Culverts Plan

Lastly, the CSCE Sustainability in Design, Construction and Rehabilitation of Culverts Plan focused on the physical characteristics of culverts, including dimensions and materials used. The plan looked at the type or shape of the culvert and whether it was a circular, box, arch, low profile arch, pipe arch, or elliptical culvert. The plan also looked at whether the culvert material was plastic, concrete, steel, etc., and the design of culverts in terms of allowable surcharging, and scour protection requirements. It was also mentioned that many of the culverts were manufactured to be in one common size and are not custom made depending on the region (Aghniaey & Rodgers, n.d.).

#### 4.3.2 Prioritization Criteria

From our interviews, we found that most individuals thought of similar considerations to include in a culvert assessment prioritization plan. One aspect that was commonly brought up by most of our interviewees was the structural condition of the culverts. Culvert structure plays a critical role in a culvert's condition, as poor structural condition can cause sudden failure and collapse. Good working conditions means that the culvert is in great condition, having no noticeable structural defects. Oftentimes, this was found solely in new culverts. Fair condition generally pertains to culverts that, though some wear and tear may be present, do not pose a significant risk of flooding. Poor conditions suggest that failure is imminent due to significant defects, such as if the bottom of the culvert was missing due to rust or other factors, as shown in *Figure 8*.



Figure 8 - Poor Condition Culvert on Douglas Road in Sutton, MA

An additional aspect of the prioritization plan that was considered from our interviews was flooding, which can be due to undersized culverts or significant blockages that are caused by debris and or other things which cannot be easily moved. Interviewees suggested that we look at the hydraulic capacity and whether or not the location in question had flooded before. To determine if a culvert is undersized, constriction is the most obvious characteristic that we looked for in our field assessments. Constriction refers to whether or not a culvert is significantly narrower or shallower than upstream. Additionally, another criteria that was discussed during our interviews was potential property damage and safety hazards that may arise due to failure of a culvert. If culvert failure were to occur on a dead end road, for example, home owners may become stranded until repairs or relief can take place in the future. It would also be troubling if culvert failure were to occur on a major artery or highway as it will have a significant impact on traffic flow and emergency response times.

Another important consideration addressed for a prioritization plan from our interviews was aquatic and terrestrial passage and connectivity. Aquatic passage is important in terms of fish movement and if there are barriers along the way where the fishes are trying to go, then fish may not be able to migrate through a crossing. Stream connectivity refers to the flow and pathway of the stream water coupled with the aquatic and terrestrial passage. For example, if a culvert was perched such as in *Figure 9*, both terrestrial and aquatic organisms would not be able to pass through the culvert. Physical barriers such as fences, free falls, and deformation can also hinder aquatic and terrestrial organism movement as shown in *Figure 10* because if a fish or small terrestrial organism were to go through a culvert that has physical barriers, it is more likely to go back or get stuck and/or eventually die.



Figure 9 - Perched Culvert on Mendon Road in Sutton, MA



Figure 10 - Example of Free Fall from a Culvert on Douglas Road in Sutton, MA

Altogether, from our literature review and interviews, we have decided to compile the critical elements of prioritization into something easily accessible without significant training. This culvert prioritization plan or tool can be used to influence a community's decision on which culverts to replace first with limited funding. Those criteria are:

- 1. Culvert Structural Condition: This criteria focuses on the overall condition of culverts and stream crossings, and whether it is in good, fair or poor condition. It will also look at the age of the culverts and material, as well as surrounding structures, to determine whether it is in imminent risk of failure or not.
- 2. Road Closure and Detours: This criteria focuses on the impacts of transit and safety on the community. In the transit impacts, roads are being classified by several criteria; how substantial would detours be to people, is the road a major artery or minor road, do residents and businesses rely heavily on a road for their livelihood, and will a road closure strand residents. In the safety impacts, we are focusing on critical infrastructure by focusing on emergency response times and access to critical infrastructure.
- 3. River Flow and Water Levels: This criteria targets whether the culvert has capacity to convey water flow without creating a constriction or backup depending on many factors, including the culvert's shape, size, material, slope, inlet and outlet conditions. This criteria represents an initial indicator for hydraulic analysis. Factors that should be considered for this criteria include whether the structure is in a known flood plain, whether the structure has a history of flooding, and whether structures exist upstream or downstream that have the potential to cause the structure in question to flood in the future.
- 4. Aquatic and Terrestrial Organism Passability: This criteria focuses on whether aquatic organisms and terrestrial organisms have passage through stream crossings. Some of the questions to think about when considering this criteria; Can fish pass through the culvert, or is this crossing a barrier to fish migration? Would a terrestrial organism use this stream crossing as a route of travel or would it avoid this passage?

The culvert prioritization plan will include 1 to 3 priority codes where the lower number indicates a good/great condition and the higher number indicates a poor condition. This prioritization plan will help MA municipalities prioritize culvert repair and replacement before catastrophic problems occur.

#### 4.4- Community Outreach

From our interviews, we made sure to question which type of outreach material will be suitable as well as the information being brought up in it. Outreach material is to inform the public on a certain matter to which the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative and our group are raising awareness to the Town of Sutton Massachusetts on the effects of culvert failures as well as the proper training and other significant factors to culvert assessment. The North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative has created Culvert Assessment Training however many communities aren't even aware that the training exists. Many people who we interviewed stated that they are interested in completing the training and made efforts to increase its popularity to the townspeople. Before the project started, members of our group had no idea what a culvert was, so informing the public more on what a culvert is and how it affects the community can change the actions taken before a culvert fails. Some of our interviews gave us some real examples of culvert failures that have happened in the close-by communities. One example is in the town that we are currently working in, Sutton Massachusetts. A dam blockage occurred and caused flooding of the culvert resulting in roadway closures, detours, and traffic of other

roadways. By providing real life examples of what will happen resulting from culvert failure, will increase the awareness of culvert assessment. Funding of projects is a major factor when it comes to culvert replacement or training, so explaining the process of applying for private or government grants could increase the readiness of culvert repairs when needed.

To actually provide this information to the communities, we have been provided with several examples of material types by the people we have interviewed. The first idea is creating handouts such as brochures and fact sheets. Another idea could be creating some type of presentation whether it's a video or a slideshow that will be available to the public via the internet. Some other ideas are we create a website and upload our information there, creating a news article and sending it to new organizations. Outreach material is a key factor to help solve many reoccurring issues of culverts by raising awareness to the public.

## **5.0 – Conclusions and Recommendations**

Based on our findings, we have compiled a list of recommendations for the Town of Sutton as well as surrounding communities and organizations. These recommendations are supported by our background research, interviews, and field observations. Our recommendations include deliverables such as our final outreach material and prioritization plan, as well as suggestions. The key areas include culvert training, assessment, proactive repairs, prioritization criteria, applying for grants, and community outreach.

#### 5.1- Culvert Training

The recommendations regarding culvert training involve accessibility of training, encouragement for towns, and consideration of assessments that have been completed already.

#### 5.1.1 - Make Training More Accessible

Although the training of the NAACC is valuable, it is not very accessible to many people and towns. Our team, over the course of several days, completed this training and became certified to assess culverts on our own. However, given the time constraints of our projects, we were not sure if we would be able to complete the training before the end of our seven weeks of project work. All in all, it is apparent that the length of this training, which consists of two hours of online presentation and assessment of twenty culverts, poses a significant barrier to encouraging individuals to get certified. Our interviews, though oftentimes not explicitly about the training, pointed out that one of the major barriers to assessing culverts by their own criteria and using manpower and resources to perform culvert repairs was time and a lack of manpower. Town resources are already spread thin dealing with problems more important to the community and cannot be allocated to the culvert issue. Collectively, our assessments took 24 hours, over the course of 3 days, to complete. In towns where employees are already spread thin, it is not practical to send someone to get trained. Furthermore, similarities existed between a lot of the culverts we assessed, meaning a portion of our training culverts did not teach us more about the protocol. As such, we recommend that the training be shortened to make it more accessible. Training would be more desirable if it took less time.

#### 5.1.2 - Encourage Town Employees to Get Trained

From our interviews, we found that many people who are assessing culverts are not certified, making it impossible for them to enter the culvert assessments into the NAACC database. Many of those people are volunteers assessing culverts for prioritization. By making the training more shortened and accessible to communities, more people will be able to get certified to perform culvert assessments, including town employees, to be able to input the assessment into the NAACC database, minimizing the number of unassessed culverts. We encourage town employees to complete the training and get certified to inspire the idea of doing regular culvert assessments in the future in their towns, even if it requires the data to be inputted into their own database.
#### 5.1.3 - Consider External Assessments

A common theme, it seemed, between interviewees from different towns was that they were aware of the need to assess culverts, and some were even familiar with and used the NAACC protocols. However, one such community, which used the very form we were trained on, maintained their own database of culverts and assessment results in a similar manner to how the NAACC does. It does not seem practical to make them reassess these culverts, especially given how sparse their resources and manpower are. As such, we recommend, given the number of unassessed culverts there are and the current barriers that exist to training, that communities that have already devoted time and resources to assessing their culverts be allowed to share this data and include it in the NAACC database.

#### 5.2- Regular Assessment and Proactive Repairs

Our comparative analysis findings showed that the three prioritization plans had many recommendations that our team thought were helpful. One of the recommendations that we seek every MA municipality to do is to conduct regular annual culvert assessments and repairs before storm seasons or in between storm seasons. These inspections and repairs were found to be efficient to prevent having to deal with the consequences of culvert failures during the storm season. The Culvert Management Case Studies in Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles suggested that routine annual inspections and maintenance for all culverts are worth being held to reduce the need for emergency repairs and prioritizations, and extend culvert life cycle (Venner & Berger, 2014).

#### 5.3- Prioritization Criteria

#### 5.3.1 - Take Advantage of Current Assessment Tools

While considering personal observation and the broader impacts of culvert failure is important and will be discussed in the next section, it is also important to take advantage of tools that already exist, namely the already-present NAACC database, once resources are available to commit to assessing culverts. Based on our field work assessing culverts using the NAACC's protocols, measurements taken did paint a picture of culvert limitations and could be used to assess and prioritize culverts. Our data from our field assessments provides measurements, descriptions, and other data that states specifically where a culvert is lacking. As such, we recommend that communities rely on this assessment tool to assess their culverts and log data following strict protocols before looking at the bigger picture.

#### 5.3.2 - Prioritize Based on Broader Criteria

One area where the NAACC protocol could be improved, though, is providing an easierto-follow, broader set of categories to base prioritization of culverts on. The NAACC assessment form logs only what the individual is looking at, relying on numbers and checkboxes to outline potential issues. What it does not consider but hopefully changes in the future are the impacts a culvert could have on the surrounding area and how the surrounding area may have negative impacts on the culvert. One of the major goals of our project was to develop a prioritization plan for communities to use to identify which culverts needed repairs or replacements the most. This plan considers criteria not defined in the NAACC culvert assessment protocol and criteria that are difficult to quantify. Criteria are based on the NAACC protocols as well as suggestions from interviews and observations made during field work. Ultimately, we chose to consider the list of criteria below:

- Potential for and Impact of Flooding
- Traffic Impacts of Road Closure and Detours
- Safety Impact of Road Closure and Detours
- Structural Condition
- Impacts on Aquatic and Terrestrial Organism Passage

These criteria were finalized based on feedback we received from several of our former interviewees. Each category could be rated using one of three scores: good, acceptable, or bad. As some categories had the potential for greater consequences, our priority code scores were weighted, and, as such, a score of bad in one category could be different in another category. Attached to our prioritization plan, found in *Appendix G*, is a grading matrix where the scores from each category could be added up to produce one final score for each stream crossing. To consider features not described on the NAACC assessment form, it is recommended that the list of criteria listed in our prioritization plan be used. Considering external factors is important, as repairs to a culvert that appear to be of the utmost priority based on the NAACC criteria could be overshadowed by one of slightly higher quality but with the potential of much greater consequences upon failure.

#### 5.3.3 - Relying on the NAACC Database

The NAACC maintains an extensive and accurate database of culvert assessments and locations. In our field work in Sutton, Massachusetts, we found that some culverts mapped on the NAACC's map were not on the map maintained by the town. One interviewee from another community stated that the town he worked for had a map of culverts, but that it had not been updated in years. When left to maintain their own maps, evidence shows that these maps are often overlooked or forgotten about altogether. Towns would not have to worry about updating their maps if they were to rely more on the NAACC's map. As such, we encourage community officials to take advantage of this tool.

#### 5.4- Applying for State and Federal Grants

The next recommendation is that communities should apply for grants to support culvert restoration, and should also develop culvert planning efforts that facilitate the grant preparation process. Grants are key factors for any type of project that requires any type of funding, as well as a culvert assessment. Assessment itself will need all kinds of equipment, thus requiring funding. There are multiple types of grants that could be given to anyone who applies for one. Public grants that come from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and other organizations run by the state. There are also private grants, which can be obtained by applying for them through private organizations. Grants can play a crucial role in culvert assessment by providing the necessary funding for conducting surveys, investigations, and assessments of culverts' condition and capacity. Resulting from our interviews, we found that applying for private grants is a lot easier than obtaining the funding. To resolve this issue, we recommend that the municipalities provide information or links that were provided by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

(Mass.gov). The process for applying for grants can be time-consuming and a hassle; in order to ease the process of applying for them, we recommend that Massachusetts municipalities provide reminders stating when the deadlines for grant applications are. Grants can provide the necessary financial resources to conduct regular inspections and assessments of culverts, identifying potential issues before they become major problems, and ensuring the safety of road users and the sustainability of infrastructure.

#### 5.5- Community Outreach

The final recommendation is to develop outreach material because it is essential in creating awareness about the importance of culverts and their proper maintenance. Despite the importance of culvert awareness, there is still a need for more outreach materials to educate the public on the critical role that culverts play in infrastructure and the environment. One way to increase outreach materials is to leverage digital platforms such as social media, websites, and online newsletters. These platforms allow for the creation and distribution of educational videos, infographics, and other engaging content that can reach a wide audience. Additionally, partnerships with local community organizations and other relevant stakeholders can help distribute these materials and amplify their impact. By increasing the quantity and quality of outreach materials, we can raise awareness of culvert issues and inspire more people to take action to ensure the proper maintenance and management of culverts. These materials can include brochures, flyers, posters, videos, and social media campaigns, among others. They are designed to educate the public on the significance of culverts in managing water flow and protecting infrastructure and the environment. After finalizing our first four objectives, we made a brochure stating the facts and safety of culverts and other useful information. Outreach materials also provide information on how to identify signs of culvert failure and how to report issues to relevant authorities. By raising awareness and promoting public engagement, outreach materials can encourage individuals and communities to take an active role in protecting culverts, leading to improved maintenance and better management of water resources, thereby promoting sustainable development.

# References

- Abbott, Alex, and Scott Jackson. North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative Stream Crossing Survey Instruction Guide. 2015, https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4125.7125.
- Aghniaey, N., & Rodgers, N. Sustainability in Design, Construction and Rehabilitation of Culverts. *GEN*, 125, 1.
- Alcott, Derrick, et al. "Culverts Delay Upstream and Downstream Migrations of River Herring ( *Alosa* Spp.)." *River Research and Applications*, vol. 37, no. 10, 2021, pp. 1400–12, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.385</u>9.
- Burch, C. A., Jardine, S. L., Lewis-Smith, C., & Deynze, B. V. (2022). Western Washington culvert prioritization indexes: A cross jurisdictional comparative analysis of management strategies for salmon recovery. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.07.515553
- Çelik, Hüseyin E., et al. "Identifying Causes of the 2015 Hopa Flash Flood in NE Turkey and Mitigation Strategies." *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, vol. 192, no. 12, Nov. 2020, p. 769, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-020-08737-w.
- *CMMPO Culvert Assessment Program.* https://culvertscmrpc.hub.arcgis.com/apps/CMRPC::cmmpo-regional-culverts-dashboard/explore. Accessed 20 Feb. 2023.
- Cohen, R. (2017, July 10). *10 Ways to Protect Cold Water Fishes and Streams*. Sea-Run Brook Trout Coalition. https://www.searunbrookie.org/conservation/10-ways-to-protect-cold-waterfishes-and-streams/
- Community Resilience Building MVP Workshop. "Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Program in Grafton, Milburry and Northbridge, Massachusetts." *Mass.Gov*, June 2018. https://www.mass.gov/doc/2017-2018-mvp-planning-grant-report-northbridge-graftonmillbury/download
- Culvert. (2021). In The Oxford Dictionary of Architecture. Oxford University Press. https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191918742.001.0001/acref-9780191918742-e-5489
- Google. (n.d.). [Google Maps directions from east end to west end of Northboro Rd, Southborough]. Retrieved March 23, 2023, from https://www.google.com/maps/dir/42.3074122,-71.5553225/Northboro+Rd,+Southborough,+MA+01772/@42.3090268,-71.5651266,1371m/data=!3m1!1e3!4m9!4m8!1m0!1m5!1m1!1s0x89e38acd4c2a2f23:0x1d3 ea568f9d55b04!2m2!1d-71.5659891!2d42.3115939!3e0
- Google Maps. (n.d.). [Sutton Prioritization Plan Culvert Locations]. Retrieved April 25, 2023, from https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/5/edit?mid=1epBSdiVJzAL6uf6qC7M2yJ5qWR1QKRU&ll= 42.14361456956223%2C-71.79118186292015&z=16

- Hillemann, B. (n.d.). All Guides: Data Module #1: What is Research Data?: Qualitative vs. Quantitative. Retrieved February 15, 2023, from https://libguides.macalester.edu/c.php?g=527786&p=3608639
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change Widespread, Rapid, and Intensifying – IPCC — IPCC*. https://www.ipcc.ch/2021/08/09/ar6-wg1-20210809-pr/. Accessed 28 Jan. 2023.
- Lynch, Melissa. "Blackstone Watershed Collaborative at Clark Highlights River's Needs through Expedition, Public Events." *Clark Now / Clark University*, 3 Aug. 2022, <u>https://clarknow.clarku.edu/2022/08/03/blackstone-river-collaborative-at-clark-highlights-</u> watershed-needs-through-expedition-public-events/.
- MassMapper. (2023). Screenshot of GIS Map of Sutton, MA with Dam's by Hazard Code [map].
- Melo, B. (2022, December 20). Northboro Road is reopened for use. My Southborough. https://www.mysouthborough.com/2022/12/20/northboro-road-is-reopened-for-use/
- National Park Service, Blackstone River Valley, Birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution (U.S. National Park Service). https://www.nps.gov/articles/000/brvnhc\_winter\_2021.htm. Accessed 3 Feb. 2023.
- No. 569: Establishing an Integrated Climate Change Strategy for the Commonwealth / Mass.Gov. https://www.mass.gov/executive-orders/no-569-establishing-an-integrated-climate-change-strategy-for-the-commonwealth. Accessed 7 Feb. 2023.
- *North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative*. (2018, November 6). Stream Continuity. <u>https://streamcontinuity.org/naacc</u>
- Northborough Road Culvert Replacement. (n.d.). Retrieved April 7, 2023, from https://www.constructionjournal.com/projects/details/68732218b8754fd481fc1dae0596a8d2. html
- *Prioritizing Projects.* (2018, November 29). North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative. https://streamcontinuity.org/naacc/toolkit/prioritizing-projects
- RI DEM-OWR. TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD ANALYSIS FOR Blackstone River Watershed and Trace Metals Impairments. Feb. 2013, https://dem.ri.gov/sites/g/files/xkgbur861/files/programs/benviron/water/quality/rest/pdfs/bla ckstn.pdf.
- Senator Eldridge Secures \$70,000 in ARPA Funds for Collapsed Culvert in Southborough. (n.d.). State Senator Jamie Eldridge. Retrieved March 21, 2023, from https://www.senatoreldridge.com/press-releases/senator-eldridge-secures-70000-in-arpafunds-for-collapsed-culvert-in-southborough
- Şen, Zekâi. "Water Structures and Climate Change Impact: A Review." Water Resources Management, vol. 34, no. 13, Oct. 2020, pp. 4197–216, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-020-02665-7.

- Staff Writer. (2006). *Blackstone fish migration planned*. The Worcester Telegram & Gazette. Retrieved April 10, 2023, from https://www.telegram.com/story/news/local/east-valley/2006/03/21/blackstone-fish-migration-planned/53117646007/
- Stream Crossings Protecting and Restoring Stream Continuity. Department of Environmental Conservation. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2023, from https://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits\_ej\_operations\_pdf/streamcrossbroch.pdf
- Sutton MVP Workshop. "MA Vulnerability Preparedness Workshop Findings, Town of Sutton, MA." *Mass.Gov*, 3 Sept. 2019, https://www.mass.gov/doc/sutton-report.
- Systematic Observation. (2007). In E. M. Vonk, T. Tripodi, & I. Epstein, *Research Techniques for Clinical Social Workers* (pp. 51–69). Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/vonk13388-003
- Truhlar, A. M., Marjerison, R. D., Gold, D. F., Watkins, L., Archibald, J. A., Lung, M. E., Meyer, A., & Walter, M. T. (2020). Rapid Remote Assessment of Culvert Flooding Risk. Journal of Sustainable Water in the Built Environment, 6(2), 06020001. https://doi.org/10.1061/JSWBAY.0000900
- US EPA. Flow Duration Curves: A New Model to Envision Healthy Watersheds and Resilient Communities. 8 Mar. 2021, <u>https://www.epa.gov/snep/flow-duration-curves-new-model-envision-healthy-watersheds-and-resilient-communities</u>.
- ---. (2016, April 15). *Pennsylvania Protects Coldwater Fisheries and Water Quality from Climate Change* [Overviews and Factsheets]. https://www.epa.gov/arc-x/pennsylvania-protects-coldwater-fisheries-and-water-quality-climate-change
- ---. *Re-Zapping the Blackstone: Keeping the River Recovery Going!* 5 May 2021, https://www.epa.gov/snep/re-zapping-blackstone-keeping-river-recovery-going.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Northeast. *Culvert at Third Beach*. photo, 2 July 2014, https://www.flickr.com/photos/usfwsnortheast/14626360571/.
- Venner, M., & Berger, L. (2014). Culvert management case studies: Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles county (No. FHWA-HIF-14-008). United States. Federal Highway Administration.
- Washed out undersized culvert. (2022, January 5). River Smart Communities. https://extension.umass.edu/riversmart/washed-out-undersized-culvert-0
- *What Is a Watershed?* https://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/watershed.html. Accessed 29 Jan. 2023.

# Appendix A - Informed Consent

This appendix displays the informed consent that was sent prior to conducting the interviews.

#### **Interviews Informed Consent:**

We are a group of students from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Massachusetts and we are working with the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative.

We are conducting this interview to learn more about the impacts of failing and/or aging culverts on stormwater management to help watersheds prioritize culvert replacement in Sutton, Massachusetts, and protect infrastructures.

The interview should take about an hour. Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time.

If you prefer, we will keep your identity confidential. No names will appear on the questionnaires or in any of the project reports or publications.

If you have questions, you may reach out to our faculty advisor (mathisen@wpi.edu). If you would like, we are happy to share a copy of our results at the conclusion of the study. Thank you for your participation!

# Appendix B - List of Interviewees

Name	Position	Organization	Date of Interview
David Pickart	Conservation Agent	Town Hall of Northbridge	March 31, 2023
Heather Parry	Environmental Scientist	Blackstone River Coalition	March 22, 2023
Isabel McCauley	Water and Sewer Superintendent	Holden, MA DPW	March 21, 2023
Julianne Busa	Sr. Project Manager	Fuss & O'Neil	March 24, 2023
Matthew Dunn	Sr. Project Engineer	PARE Corporation	April 4, 2023
Matthew Stencel	Highway Superintendent	Sutton, MA DPW	March 29, 2023
Phyllis Charpentier	Foundation President	Manchaug Pond Foundation, Sutton MA	April 4, 2023
Rosalie Starvish	Sr. Project Manager	GZA Environmental	March 22, 2023
Ted Beauvais	President and Policy Director	Blackstone River Watershed Association	March 24, 2023
Zach Blais	Transportation Planner	CMRPC	March 29, 2023

Abbreviations:

<u>CMRPC</u> - Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission <u>DPW</u> - Department of Public Works

# Appendix C - Interview Questions

This appendix lists the interview questions we generally asked our interviewees. The questions were modified based on the organizations our interviewee worked at.

#### **General Interview Questions:**

- 1. What makes you passionate about this topic? (warm up question)
  - a. We know that you work with the ...(mention the collaborative or organization they work in) but can you tell us a bit about what caught your attention about working here.
- 2. (Ask a question about the collaborative or organization they work at) Ex: We know that the ... was created in ... with the goal of ... Could you tell us a bit more about how it started? ... Something like that not entirely sure!
- 3. What do you see as the biggest challenges when it comes to assessing culverts?
  - a. What considerations do you think are important when developing a prioritization list?
- 4. What outreach material do you know that could potentially be helpful to raise awareness about this culvert issue?
- 5. Do you have any recommendations for resources that might be helpful to us and our project?
- 6. This is totally up to you, but would you consider meeting with us again to have a look at our findings and provide us with feedback? You can answer no to this question and we totally understand!
- 7. Thank you so much for taking the time to talk with us! We really appreciate it. It has been a pleasure. If we have any more questions, would it be okay to reach out? [If so] what would be the best way to contact you?

# Appendix D - NAACC Aquatic Connectivity Stream Crossing Survey

This appendix displays the NAACC Stream Crossing Assessment Sheet used during our training and assessments.

-	
	Crossing CodeLocal ID (Optional)
DAT	Date Observed (00/00/0000)Lead Observer
2	Town/CountyStream
SIN	RoadType MULTILANE PAVED UNPAVED DRIVEWAY TRAIL RAILRO
CROS	GPS Coordinates (Decimal degrees)
	Location Description
	Crossing Type       BRIDGE       CULVERT       MULTIPLE CULVERT       FORD       NO CROSSING       REMOVED CROSSING       Number of Culverts/ Bridge Cells         B BURIED STREAM       INACCESSIBLE       PARTIALLY INACCESSIBLE       NO UPSTREAM CHANNEL       BRIDGE ADEQUATE
	Photo IDs INLETOUTLETUPSTREAMDOWNSTREAMOTHER
	Flow Condition NO FLOW TYPICAL-LOW MODERATE HIGH Crossing Condition OK POOR NEW UNKNOWN
	Tidal Site YES NO UNKNOWN Alignment FLOW-ALIGNED SKEWED (>457) Road Fill Height (Top of culvert to road surface; birdge = q
	Bankfull Width (Optional) Confidence HIGH LOW/ESTIMATED Constriction SEVERE MODERATE SPANS ONLY BANKFULL/
	ACTIVE CHANNEL ACTIVE CHANNEL ACTIVE CHANNEL ACTIVE CHANNEL ACTIVE CHANNEL
	Consider Commande
5	Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE FREE FALL CASCADE FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKNOW
5	Outlet Dimensions A. Width B. Height C. Substrate/Water Width D. Water Depth
-	Outlet Drop to Water Surface Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only]
	L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet)
14 C	Inlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVED
ten -	Inlet Shape     1     2     3     4     5     6     7     FORD     UNKNOWN     REMOVED       Inlet Type     PROJECTING     HEADWALL     WINGWALLS     HEADWALL & WINGWALLS     MITERED TO SLOPE     OTHER     NONE
INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Fick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN
INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth
INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth
NS INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Fick one)       IAT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Slope % (Dptional)       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN
TIONS INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Slope % (Dptonal)       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER
NDITIONS INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Slope % (Ppstons)       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       NONE       SILT       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       25%       50%       75%       100%       UNKNOWN
CONDITIONS INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Fick one)       IAT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Slope % (Dptional)       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER
NAL CONDITIONS INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Slope % (Epstonal)       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       NONE       SILT       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       25%       50%       75%       100%       UNKNOWN       Precing       OTHER         Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       NONE       DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       DRY       OTHER     <
TIONAL CONDITIONS INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITTERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITTERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade       (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth
DDITIONAL CONDITIONS INLET	Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Grade (Fick one)       IAT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Slope % (Dptional)       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER

Е	Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE
2	Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE FREE FALL CASCADE FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKNOWN
0	Outlet Dimensions A. Width B. Height C. Substrate/Water Width D. Water Depth
	Outlet Drop to Water Surface Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
	L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet)
E.	Inlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVED
NLE	Inlet Type PROJECTING HEADWALL WINGWALLS HEADWALL & WINGWALLS MITERED TO SLOPE OTHER NONE
=	Inlet Grade (Pick one)
	Inlet Dimensions A. Width B. Height C. Substrate/Water Width D. Water Depth
	Slope % (Optional) Slope Confidence HIGH LOW Internal Structures NONE BAFFLES/WEIRS SUPPORTS OTHER
NS	Structure Substrate Matches Stream NONE COMPARABLE CONTRASTING NOT APPROPRIATE UNKNOWN
10	Structure Substrate Type (Pick one) NONE SILT SAND GRAVEL COBBLE BOULDER BEDROCK UNKNOWN
ğ	Structure Substrate Coverage NONE 25% 50% 75% 100% UNKNOWN
0	Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply) NONE DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK DEFORMATION FREE FALL FENCING DRY OTHER
AL	Severity (Choose carefully based on barrier type(s) above) NONE MINOR MODERATE SEVERE
0	Water Depth Matches Stream YES NO-SHALLOWER NO-DEEPER UNKNOWN DRY
5	Water Velocity Matches Stream YES NO-FASTER NO-SLOWER UNKNOWN DRY
-	
ADI	Dry Passage through Structure? YES NO UNKNOWN Height above Dry Passage
ST	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments       Comments       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE
TLET	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments       Comments       Concrete       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN
OUTLET ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
OUTLET	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
OUTLET	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
T OUTLET IS ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
NLET OUTLET IS ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
INLET OUTLET IN ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
INLET OUTLET IS ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
INLET OUTLET IN ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
NS INLET OUTLET IS ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
TIONS INLET OUTLET S ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
VDITIONS INLET OUTLET A	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET S ADI	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
IAL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET ADI	Ory Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE S       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Dimensions A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges antly)         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Snape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Snape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED
IONAL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
DITIONAL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET	Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNIXIOWN       Height above Dry Passage

31	Structure Material METAL CONCRETE PLASTIC WOOD ROCK/STONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION
	Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE
Ξ.	Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE FREE FALL CASCADE FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKNOWN
5	Outlet Dimensions A. Width B. Height C. Substrate/Water Width D. Water Depth
-	Outlet Drop to Water Surface Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
	L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet)
	Inlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVED
5	Inlet Type PROJECTING HEADWALL WINGWALLS HEADWALL & WINGWALLS MITERED TO SLOPE OTHER NONE
2	Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE INLET DROP PERCHED CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKNOWN
	Inlet Dimensions A. Width B. Height C. Substrate/Water Width D. Water Depth
	Slope % iContonal Slope Confidence HIGH LOW Internal Structures NONE BAFFLES/WEIRS SUPPORTS OTHER
s	Structure Substrate Matches Stream NONE COMPARABLE CONTRASTING NOT APPROPRIATE UNKNOWN
N N	
E I	
NO	
F	Physical barriers (Rick all mat appy) NONE DEBRIS/SELIMENT/NOCK DEFORMATION PREPARE PENCING DRY OTHER
NO	Severity (Choose carefully based on barrier type(s) above) NONE MINON MODERALE SEVERE
Ē	Water Depth Matches Stream YES NO-SHALLOWER NO-DEEPER UNKNOWN DRY
8	Dev Devene showed (Devene and Devene an
_	Holebit should be an a structure of the should be a structure of the should be a structure of the should be a structure of the structure of th
ST	Comments  RUCTURE 7  Structure Material METAL CONCRETE PLASTIC WOOD ROCK/STONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION  Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE
ST	Comments         RUCTURE 7       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth
ST	Comments         RUCTURE 7         Structure Material       METAL         CONCRETE       PLASTIC         WOOD       ROCK/STONE         FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1         2       3       4         5       6       7         FORD       UNKNOWN         REMOVED       Outlet Armoring         NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE         EXTENSIV         Outlet Grade (Pick one)         At STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL         CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED         UNKNOWN         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width         B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width         D. Water Depth         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         E. Abutment Height (type 7 bridges only)
ST	Comments       RUCTURE 7       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
ST	Comments         RUCTURE 7         Structure Material       METAL         CONCRETE       PLASTIC         WOOD       ROCK/STONE         FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1         2       3       4         5       6       7         FORD       UNKNOWN         REMOVED       Outlet Armoring         NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE         EXTENSIV       Outlet Grade (Pick one)         AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL         CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED         UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width         B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width         Dutlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet)
ILET OUTLET A	Ory rassage through structure?       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
INLET OUTLET A	Ury rassage through structurer       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
INLET OUTLET A	Ory rassage through structure?       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments       RUCTURE 7       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)         L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet)
INLET OUTLET A	Ory rassage through structure?       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
IS INLET OUTLET A	Dury rassage through structurer       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 7       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Dimensions A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)         L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet)       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       REMOVED         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height
IONS INLET OUTLET IS A	ury rassage through structure?       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 7       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Rick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       B. Height       C. Substrate/Water Width       D. Water Depth
DITIONS INLET OUTLET IS A	ory passage through structure?       TES       NO       UNINNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 7       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET A	ury ressage through structurer       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 7       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoning       NONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIVE         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
AL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET IS A	Dry Passage through structurer       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage
ONAL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET S	Intry reasage timougn structurer       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 7         Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXTENSIV         Outlet Grade (rick cent)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (type 7 bindges only)
DITIONAL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET A	Intry Passage turrough structure?       TES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 7         Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NOTE XTENSIVE       EXTENSIV         Outlet Grade (Inck cone)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS INLET OUTLET 1 A	Ory reasage through structure?       TES       NO       UNXNUMN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 7         Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE       NOT       EXTENSIV         Outlet Grade (hick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       E. Abutment Height (type 2 bridges only)

#### **Structure Shape & Dimensions**

- 1) Select the Structure Shape number from the diagrams below and record it on the form for Inlet and Outlet Shape.
- Record on the form in the approriate blanks dimensions A, B, C and D as shown in the diagrams;
   C captures the width of water or substrate, whichever is wider; for dry culverts without substrate, C = 0.
   D is the depth of water -- be sure to measure inside the structure; for dry culverts, D = 0.
- 3) Record Structure Length (L). (Record abutment height (E) only for Type 7 Structures.)
- 4) For multiple culverts, also record the Inlet and Outlet shape and dimensions for each additional culvert.

NOTE: Culverts 1, 2 & 4 may or may not have substrate in them, so height measurements (B) are taken from the level of the "stream bed", whether that bed is composed of substrate or just the inside bottom surface of a culvert (grey arrows below show measuring to bottom, black arrows show measuring to substrate).



# Appendix E - Map of Culverts in Sutton, MA

This appendix shows a picture of the GIS Map that we created using google maps to locate culvert locations (Google Maps, n.d.). The culverts that were assessed are color coded by their priority codes from *Appendix I*.



Priority 2 Culverts

Priority 1 Culverts

# Appendix F - Summary of Other Prioritization Plans

This appendix summarizes the three prioritization plans that we comparatively analyzed. For each prioritization plan, there is a list of criteria the prioritization plan focused on.

# The NAACC Prioritization Considerations

Common considerations:

- Aquatic organism passage field assessment results
- Water connectivity metrics regarding barriers to stream flow
- Ecological criteria including quality of particular species habitat, presence of particular species, water quality, local land use, condition of river shores (riparian zone), stream importance for particular species

Other considerations:

- Structural condition of culverts/crossings
- Vulnerability of region to flooding
- Criticalness and impact of flooding to roads
- Historical and potential flooding

# The Culvert Management Case Studies in Vermont, Oregon, Ohio, and Los Angeles

- Los Angeles County
  - Higher priority on culverts located on routes with no alternative route; if the culvert failed and the road became impassible.
  - Cost: compares the cost of a culvert replacement/improvement project and its resultant reduced maintenance cost with minor concrete repair and ongoing additional maintenance costs.
- Ohio
  - Culverts that have constant stream flow
  - Culverts in abrasive conditions which can lead to scour
  - Cost: Dedicated funding to repair or replace identified, deficient culverts
    - Cost benefit analysis

#### • Oregon

- Culverts that are in "critical" or "poor" conditions
- Addressing and improving fish passage barriers
- Culvert location
- Culvert condition
- Whether the culverts are new, ok, or poor in the ranking system
- Severity of problem at each culvert location
- Overall cost of a selected culvert repair or replacement
- Top priority for freight routes and those supported by key bridges
- Focus on safety of field crews working along Interstate Highways
- Benefit and risk analysis

#### • Vermont

- Assessment of structural aspects of culverts
  - Inlet treatment condition
  - Outlet treatment condition
  - Barrel condition
  - Pipe joint section separation
  - Projecting culvert ends
  - Stone pad
  - Sediment
  - $\circ$  Erosion
  - Road surface conditions
  - Shoulder sink holes
  - Piping
- Revised hydraulic design manual that requires a 1.2 bankfull-width standard
- Analysis of increasing storm frequencies and flood vulnerabilities
- Level of deterioration seen with eroded inverts or flooding due to beaver dam building
- Fish passage
- Road washout
- Culvert size

# The CSCE Sustainability in Design, Construction and Rehabilitation of Culverts Plan

- Provides info on culvert's characteristics such as the different sizes and materials.
- Explains the many types of culverts: Circular, Box, Arch, Low Profile Arch, Pipe Arch, and Elliptical.
- Many culverts are manufactured in one common size and usually aren't custom made, depending on the region. The culvert will usually get a list of its dimensions.
- Common culverts are made of concrete, plastic, and steel. With other culverts being made of timber and masonry (Older models).
- Concrete Culverts: If designed properly, they can last 75 years but can experience chemical attack, corrosion of reinforcement, cracking & spalling.
- Metal Culverts: Higher ductility and tensile strength making them suitable for wider projects. Prone to a series of defects such as corrosion, permanent deformation, cracking, and loose connections. Can purchase coating to protect against the defects.
- Also looks at the common culvert defects such as scaling, disintegration, erosion, corrosion, delamination, spalling, cracking, deformations, etc.

# Appendix G - Prioritization Plan

### **Culvert Assessment Prioritization Plan**

For Culverts in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with a focus on Sutton, MA

This prioritization plan is intended for use by municipalities to help prioritize the repair and replacement of their culverts and stream crossings, with the intent of applying for grants and completing preemptive repairs and replacements of deficient stream crossings.

This plan was created based on culvert assessment protocols developed by the North Atlantic Aquatic Connectivity Collaborative (NAACC). The plan was developed by students from Worcester Polytechnic Institute as a part of their Interactive Qualifying Project (IQP). This project was sponsored by the Blackstone Watershed Collaborative. For the project, a set of culvert assessments conducted in Sutton, MA, were used as a case study to gain insight into the considerations regarding culvert failure and practical aspects of culvert assessment when developing this plan.

This plan builds from the foundation of the NAACC culvert assessment criteria, the Massachusetts Stream Crossing Handbook, and references the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) roadway categories.<sup>1</sup> These resources were considered in our criteria below and help define certain terms that are used in our criteria.

The following criteria are assigned values based on in-person assessment. Values should be added up and crossings with the highest total point values typically are most in need of repair and replacement. This plan is designed to complement the NAACC assessment training, not to replace it, and offers a faster and more simplified approach to culvert assessment for those communities or individuals wanting to identify culverts to replace.

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Definitions

Interstate - highest classification of roadways in the United States. These arterial roads provide the highest level of mobility and the highest speeds over the longest uninterrupted distance.

Other Arterial - provide limited mobility and are the primary access to residential areas, businesses, farms, and other local areas.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>Collector</u> - major and minor roads that connect local roads and streets with arterials. Collectors provide less mobility than arterials at lower speeds and for shorter distances. They balance mobility with land access.

Local Road - include freeways, multilane highways, and other important roadways that supplement the Interstate System. They connect, as directly as practicable, the Nation's principal urbanized areas, cities, and industrial centers. Land access is limited.

#### Impacts of Road Closure and Detours

#### Transit Impacts

Road significance describes the traffic impacts that a road closure would have on the community. Roads are classified by several criteria; how substantial would detours be, is the road a major artery or minor road, do residents and businesses rely heavily on a road for their livelihood, and will a road closure strand residents. The level of overall traffic flow impacts is the basis for this category. For descriptions of road types, refer to AASHTO definitions on the previous page.



Priority Code	Description	Example
1	Road is either insignificant to overall traffic flow or is short enough where failure would not lead to substantial detours. (AASHTO Local Roads)	In the above map, the unnamed side streets branching off Boston Rd would fit this category as local roads. The only exception to this rule in this guide would be dead end roads
2	Road is a main road, meaning that closure would harm overall traffic flow and lead to detours, but not in a catastrophic manner. Detours are not substantial/roads are not the only way in and out of an area. In the case of dead- ends, failure would prevent access to or egress from their residences. (Dead End Roads, AASHTO Collector Roads)	Boston Rd, an important road through Sutton, MA, would fit this category as a collector road
3	Road is a major artery or highway. Failure of this crossing would severely impact traffic flow and create costly and impactful detours and road closures. (AASHTO Intestates and Arterial Roadways)	Multiple types of roadways would fit this category, but the most significant and noticeable in the map above would be Route 146, an important state highway and arterial road by AASHTO standards

#### Safety Impacts

Critical infrastructure is defined similarly to road significance but focuses on emergency response times and access to critical infrastructure. However, this category considers emergency services and their response times, schools, government buildings, and other locations of significance. While the first category focuses on economic impacts, this category focuses on safety implications.

Priority Code	Description	Example
1	Failure of this stream crossing would have minimal impact on public health, emergency response times, and safety.	This category is broad and applies to stream crossing for which failure would not threaten public health or safety.
2	Failure of this stream crossing would have some safety implications. Failure would lead to a marginal impact on public health and safety and emergency response times. However, failure of a crossing would impact the lives of residents and delay emergency response times.	This could apply to major roads that have readily available detours, side streets in the event of more severe flooding, and important but not vital infrastructure.
3	Failure of this crossing would have a high impact on public health and safety and emergency response times.	This code could apply to major arteries or streets that house police and fire stations, hospitals, dead-end roads, and other vital infrastructure

Note: Additional considerations for these first two categories would be to consider the impacts and potential for impact to homes, community assets, and buildings. Though not explicitly outlined in these first two categories, flooding of these kinds of structures and assets should be considered in ranking safety impacts, as even on a smaller local road, there may be more safety implications in densely populated areas.

## Structural Condition

This criteria focuses on the overall structural condition of the stream crossing. Age of culvert and material of culvert, as well as surrounding structures should be considered.

Priority Code	Description	Example
1	Stream crossing and roadway have little to no structural defects or deterioration. The deficiencies that do exist are minor and could be addressed with isolated repair approaches; full crossing replacement is not warranted	
2	Stream crossing and roadway have some minor and/or developing deficiencies that will likely need to be addressed soon. Full crossing and roadway replacement is likely the most appropriate way to address the deficiencies when the time comes to do so.	
3	Stream crossing and roadway have significant deficiencies that will likely need to be addressed soon as soon as funding is available. Full crossing and roadway replacement is needed to address the deficiencies. This could also include crossings for which the inlet or outlet are not able to be located/accessible.	

#### **Impacts on Aquatic and Terrestrial Organism Passability**

Aquatic and Terrestrial Organism Passability focuses on the ability of aquatic and terrestrial organisms to pass through stream crossings. Can fish pass through the culvert, or is this crossing a barrier to fish migration? Would a terrestrial organism use this stream crossing as a route of travel, or would it avoid this passage?

Priority Code	Description	Example
1	Crossing has open bottom culverts/bridges with a large enough span to support full passage. Water flows uninterrupted smoothly where aquatic and terrestrial organisms have sufficient room to pass.	
2	Crossing has open bottom culverts and/or spans the full stream but is not large enough to support full dry passage for terrestrial organisms.	
3	Crossing is perched, blocked, or is significantly constrictive, making it not appropriately passable to aquatic or terrestrial organisms.	

#### Impacts on River Flow and Water Levels

This category provides an indication of whether the culvert has capacity to convey flow. The ability of a culvert to convey a required flow without creating a constriction or backup depends on many factors, including the culvert's size, shape, material, slope, and inlet and outlet conditions. A full analysis of the ability the impacts on river flow and water levels requires knowledge of a design flow and a hydraulic analysis of the flow through the culvert. As such, this category represents an initial indicator. Factors that should be considered for this category include whether the structure is in a known flood plain, whether the structure has a history of flooding, and whether structures exist upstream or downstream that have the potential to cause the structure in question to flood in the future.

Priority Code	Description	Example
1	Crossing span is equal or greater than the river's bankfull width. Crossing height and overall geometry appears adequate to accommodate high/severe rain events without notably impacting water levels within the river. There is no history of impacted water (high head differentials, upstream flooding, roadway overtopping) during most storm events.	
2	Crossing span is 50-90% of the river's bankfull width. Crossing height and overall geometry appear adequate to accommodate low to moderate rain events without notably impacting water levels within the river; however, water levels within the river will likely be impacted by the crossing during moderate to high rain events. There is likely a history of impacted water levels during moderate to high rain events. Constriction is uncertain due to presence of pond and/or no bankfull width.	
3	Crossing span is less than 50% of the river's bankfull. Crossing height and overall geometry do not appear adequate and will likely impact water levels within the river during most rain events. There is a history of impacted water levels during most rain events.	

#### Other Important Considerations

Accessibility is an important consideration when assessing culverts. Culverts should be easily accessible for inspection and maintenance, but this does not warrant repair or replacement. In our assessment, there were several culverts for which one side of the culvert was unreachable due to being buried or otherwise and warranted additional study.

Whether or not a stream crossing falls within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Zones is another consideration as it states the probability of flooding for different levels of rainfall and should be considered in the capacity of stream crossings.

Hydraulic capacity should also be considered but is not included in the flooding section because it is outside of the scope of this project and involves hydraulic analysis and modeling, and other engineering work.

Finally, federal, state, and local regulations should be considered during replacement considerations. For instance, the Massachusetts Stream Crossing Standards Handbook has regulatory requirements for MA, and the Army Corp of Engineers has federal requirements for culvert replacement, such as a required openness factor and bankfull width requirements and prohibiting the act of sliplining a culvert or otherwise reducing its capacity without appropriate permitting.

		С	ulvert Scoring <b>N</b>	Aatrix		
To cal Cu	culate score, rate each culoters with higher scores	ulvert for each category s should be of higher pric condition and bu	on a scale of 1 to 3 and ac ority. By default, these ca oader picture. Total score	ld values from the same tegories are weighted e es will range from 5-15.	e culver ID to determine it qually but can be adjusted	s final score. based on
ID	Safety Impacts of Closure (20%)	Transit Impacts of Closure (20%)	Structural Condition (20%)	Organism Passage (20%)	Flooding and River Flow (20%)	Score

# Appendix H - Culvert Assessment Forms and Photos

This appendix displays a sample of the NAACC assessment sheets that were filled out during our in-field culvert assessments with the upstream, downstream, outlet, and inlet pictures of each location.

For digital viewers, all twenty assessments can be found here: <u>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uLF0nD1Hb91hz-73YwLmNCsY01D1Z6I\_mPPnyzIOt-</u> <u>c/edit?usp=sharing</u>

Stream Crossing Survey	DATABASE ENTRY BY	ENTRY DATE
NAACC <sup>3</sup>	DATA ENTRY REVIEWED BY	PEWEW DATE
Crossing Code	Local ID (Optional	
Date Observed 100/100/00 03/20/2023 Lead Observer 56-	Fanis Caul	nd
Town/County Satton	Stream Mamfo	id live
Road Main S.J. Type & MULTILANE	🐇 PAVED % UNPAVED	10 DRIVEWAY IN TRAIL IN RAILE
GPS Coordinates Decourd expect	-71.7	461 X W Longitude
Location Description		
Crossing Type X BRIDGE & CULVERT & MULTIPLE CULVERT #0 FORD # NO CROS	SSING 🛛 🛞 REMOVED CROSSING HANNEL 🛞 BRIDGE ADEQUATE	Number of Culverts/ Bridge Cel
Photo IDs INLETOUTLETUPSTREAM	DOWNSTREAM	OTHER 10:00 - 11
Flow Condition S NO FLOW TYPICAL-LOW X MODERATE S HIGH Crossin	g Condition 🛞 OK 🚿 POOF	i 🐹 new 🛞 unknown
Tidal Site 🛒 YES 🖌 NO 🛞 UNKNOWN Alignment 🕺 FLOW-ALIGNED 🐲 SKEWE	D (>45') Road Fill Height (Tag	s of culvert to road surface. bridge = 01
Bankfull Width Opened 31 Confidence SHIGH & LOW/ESTIMATED Cons	triction 🔅 SEVERE 🚿 MODE	RATE 🔅 SPANS ONLY BANKFULL/
Tailwater Scour Pool 😻 NONE 🔅 SMALL 🔅 LARGE 🕺 S	PANS FULL CHANNEL & BANKS	ACTIVE CHANNEL
Crossing Comments		
Crossing Comments		
Crossing Comments		
Crossing Comments  RUCTURE 1  Structure Material S METAL CONCRETE S PLASTIC  Outlet Share S1 S2 S3 SA S5 X6 S7 S EDD S INPODUM S PRIMA	S WOOD S ROCK/STONE	S FIBERGLASS S COMBINATION
Crossing Comments           Structure Material         METAL         CONCRETE         PLASTIC           Outlet Shape         2         3         4         5         26         7         FORD         UNKNOWN         REMOVI           Outlet Shape         2         3         24         5         26         7         FORD         UNKNOWN         REMOVI           Outlet Grade         Exercise         CASCADE         EREFEAN         CASCADE         EREFEAN	S WOOD ROCK/STONE	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION     NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE     COLLABEENCEMENTERS
Crossing Comments           RUCTURE 1         Structure Material         S METAL         CONCRETE         PLASTIC           Outlet Shape         2         3         4         5         6         7         FORD         UNKNOWN         REMOVI           Outlet Grade         Processed         XAT STREAM GRADE         FREE FALL         CASCADE         FREE FALL           Outlet Grade         Processed         XAT STREAM GRADE         FREE FALL         CASCADE         FREE FALL	WOOD      ROCK/STONE     D     Outlet Armoring      X     ONTO CASCADE      CLOGGED	S FIBERGLASS S COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE S EXT (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED S UNKN
Crossing Comments           Build Dimensions         Structure Material         S METAL         CONCRETE         PLASTIC           Outlet Shape         2         3         4         5         X6         7         FORD         UNKNOWN         REMOVI           Outlet Shape         2         2         3         4         5         X6         7         FORD         UNKNOWN         REMOVI           Outlet Grade         Processed         XAT STREAM GRADE         FREE FALL         CASCADE         FREE FALL           Outlet Dimensions         A. Width         4         5         B. Height         7         3         C. Substrate/Wa	Ø WOOD ₿ ROCK/STONE ED Outlet Armoring ¥ ONTO CASCADE ₿ CLOGGED Iter Width 252 D. V	S FIBERGLASS S COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE DEXTR (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED S UNKN Water Depth
Crossing Comments           Structure Material         SMETAL         CONCRETE         PLASTIC           Outlet Shape         2         3         24         5         X6         7         FORD         UNKNOWN         REMOVI           Outlet Grade         Pictered         XAT STREAM GRADE         FREE FALL         CASCADE         FREE FALL         CASCADE         FREE FALL         Outlet Dimensions         A. Width         4         5         B. Height         2         7         2         C. Substrate/Wa           Outlet Drop to Water Surface         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         6         9         2         2         2         2         3         4         9         9         3         10	WOOD ROCK/STONE D Outlet Armoring CONTO CASCADE CLOSGED ter Width LS L Abutment Height	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTIN COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Water Depth Q (Type 7 bindges unly)
Crossing Comments       RUCTURE 1     Structure Material     SMETAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC       Outlet Shape     2     3     4     5     6     7     FORD     UNKNOWN     REMOVI       Outlet Grade Instance     XAT STREAM GRADE     FREE FALL     CASCADE     FREE FALL       Outlet Dimensions     A. Width     4     5     B. Height     2     7     C. Substrate/Wa       Outlet Dimensions     A. Width     4     5     B. Height     2     7     C. Substrate/Wa       Outlet Drop to Water Surface     Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	Ø WOOD Ø ROCK/STONE ED Outlet Armoring ¥ ONTO CASCADE Ø CLOGGED ter Width 25 @ D. t E. Abutment Height	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTIN COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Nater Depth Q.C.C (Type * bidges unly)
Crossing Comments         Structure Material SMETAL CONCRETE SPLASTIC         Outlet Shape 1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVI         Outlet Grade (Pickene)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL         Outlet Dimensions       A.With 44       5       5       8. Height       2       3       c. Substrate/Wa         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       L.       49       3       1         Inlet Shape       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN	WOOD ROCK/STONE D Outlet Armoring CONTO CASCADE CLOGGED ter Width LS CLOGED REMOVED	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTIN COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Nater Depth (fype * bindges unly)
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1         Structure Material & METAL & CONCRETE & PLASTIC         Outlet Shape #1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 # FORD # UNKNOWN # REMOVI         Outlet Grade (Pickond)       AT STREAM GRADE # FREE FALL       CASCADE # FREE FALL         Outlet Dimensions A. With # 3       5       B. Height #7 #7 C. Substrate/Wa         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L. Structure Length (Overall length from whet to outlet to       4/9	WOOD ROCK/STONE D Outlet Armoring  CONTO CASCADE CLOGGED ter Width 25 20 D. E. Abutment Height REMOVED S MITERED TO SLOPE CO	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTIN COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Water Depth (Type * bridges unly) DTHER NONE
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1         Structure Material SMETAL & CONCRETE PLASTIC         Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 4 5 % 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVI         Outlet Grade Pickowe         Art STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL         Outlet Dimensions A. With 4 3 5       B. Height       7 7 7 C. Substrate/Wa         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L. Structure Length IDveral length from sole to codet)       49 3         Inlet Shape       1 2 2 3 4 4 5 % 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Shape       1 2 2 3 4 4 5 % 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Grade pickored       Art STREAM GRADE       WINGWALLS & HEADWALL & WINGWALLS	WOOD ROCK/STONE  D Outlet Armoring  CONTO CASCADE CLOGGED  ter Width 25 0 0.  E. Abutment Height  REMOVED  LS MITERED TO SLOPE CONTO	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE DEXT COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Water Depth (Type * bidges unly) DTHER DONE UNKNOWN
Crossing Comments         Structure Material SMETAL CONCRETE PLASTIC         Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVI         Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOVI         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       XAT STREAM GRADE         Vallet Dimensions A. Width 4 3 5       B. Height 2 7 % C. Substrate/Wa         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L. Structure Length (Drend) length from Water to outlet)       49 3         Inlet Shape       1 2 2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Shape       2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Shape       2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Shape       2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Shape       2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Shape       2 3 4 4 5 × 6 7 FORD       UNKNOWN         Inlet Grade (mak one)       AT STREAM GRADE       WINGWALLS       ¥ HEADWALL & WINGWALL         Inlet Grade (mak one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       ¥ PERCHED       © CLOGGI         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       4 1 4       B. Height       7 5 C. Substrate/Wa	WOOD 第 ROCK/STONE ED Outlet Armoning X ONTO CASCADE ※ CLOGGED ter Width 25 20 D. V	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Water Depth Q.O.O TType * bindges unly1
Crossing Comments         Structure Material S METAL CONCRETE PLASTIC         Outlet Shape 1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV.         Outlet Shape 1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV.         Outlet Grade (not cond)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL         Outlet Dimensions A. Width 4         B. Height       2       3       C. Substrate/Wa         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	WOOD  ROCK/STONE  Outlet Armoning  COULET Armoning  COULET Armoning  COULET Armoning  COULET Armoning  COULET ARMONED  AREMOVED  AREMO	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE DEXT COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Water Depth Q Q (Type * bindges unly) DTHER SI NONE UNKNOWN Water Depth 1 S FIRE SI SUPPORTS SO THER_
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1         Structure Material       SMETAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC         Outlet Shape       2       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Grade Processel       XAT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL       Outlet Diversel       C. Substrate/Wa         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	WOOD ROCK/STONE  D Outlet Armoring ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED  ter Width 25 2 D. V E. Abutment Height  REMOVED S REMOVED S NITERED TO SLOPE C D. V UNCOLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Ter Width 24 D. V UNCOLLAPSED/SUBMERGED NOT APPROPRIATE CUNKNON	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE DEXTH COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Water Depth (Type 7 bidges only).  DTHER S NONE UNKNOWN Water Depth EIRS S SUPPORTS S OTHER WN
Crossing Comments         Structure Material S METAL CONCRETE PLASTIC         Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 4 5 %6 7 # FORD UNKNOWN # REMOV         Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 4 5 %6 7 # FORD UNKNOWN # REMOV         Outlet Grade Instead         Outlet Dimensions A. Witch 4 9 5         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L. Structure Length Instead Instead Instead         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L. Structure Length Instead Instead Instead         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L. Structure Length Instead Instead Instead         Inlet Shape         Inlet Shape         A T STREAM GRADE         INIET DROP         PERCHED         C Substrate/Wa         Slope Confidence         HIGH I LOW         Internal Structure Substrate Matches Stream         NONE         COMPARABLE         COMPARABLE         COMPARABLE         COMPARABLE         COMPARABLE         ComparaBottom         NONE         Co	WOOD  ROCK/STONE  D Outlet Armoring  ONTO CASCADE  CLOSGED  ter Width 25 2 D. V  E. Abutment Height  REMOVED  S  MITERED TO SLOPE  ONTO LS  NOT APPROPRIATE  UINNOA  E  BOULDER  BEDROCK	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE DEXTIN NONE NOT EXTENSIVE DEXTIN COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED OF UNKN Water Depth  OTHER NONE UNKNOWN Water Depth EIRS SUPPORTS SOTHER VN SUNKNOWN
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1         Structure Material       SMETAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC         Outlet Shape       2       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Shape       2       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Grade       PLACE       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	WOOD ※ ROCK/STONE ED Outlet Armoring ※ ONTO CASCADE ※ CLOGGED ter Width 25 20 D. V E. Abutment Height REMOVED S ※ MITERED TO SLOPE ※ G ED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Ter Width 24 D. V URS ※ NONE ※ BAFFLES/A NOT APPROPRIATE ※ UNKNOX E ※ BOULDER ※ BEDROCK NOWN	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED INVININ Nater Depth  (Type 7 bindges uniy) THER INNNE UNKNOWN Nater Depth EIRS IN SUPPORTS IN OTHER WN UNKNOWN
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1         Structure Material       SMETAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC         Outlet Shape       2       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Shape       2       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Shape       2       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Grade       Processor	WOOD  ROCK/STONE  D Outlet Armoring  ONTO CASCADE  CLOGGED  ter Width 25 20 D. V CLASCADE  READOVED  S  REMOVED  S  MITERED TO SLOPE  ONTO COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED  Ter Width 24 D. V OT APPROPRIATE  UNKNOV  NOT APPROPRIATE  UNKNOV  REDVOLLER  BEDROCK NOWN  N  F  FREE FALL  FENCING	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FOR NOT EXTENSIVE FIELD COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED FILL FILL FILL FILL FILL FILL FILL FILL
Crossing Comments         Structure Material SMETAL CONCRETE PLASTIC         Outlet Shape 1 2 2 3 44 55 X6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOV         Outlet Shape 1 2 3 44 55 X6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOV         Outlet Grade Induction         Outlet Shape 1 2 3 44 55 X6 7 FORD UNKNOWN REMOV         Outlet Grade Induction         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L'Structure Length IDeerd Length from one to context         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L'Structure Length IDeerd Length from one to context         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L'Structure Length IDeerd Length from one to context         Inlet Shape         A T STREAM GRADE         INENDIECTING         HEADWALL         Inlet Grade Mich de Mich         Inlet Shape         Slope Confidence         INDE CONFIDENCE         Slope Confidence         MONE         Some Type (Mick and)         NONE         Some Type (Mick and)         NONE         Some Type (Mick and)         <td colspan="</td> <td>WOOD ROCK/STONE  D Utlet Armoring  ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED  ter Width CLOC D.  E. Abutment Height  REMOVED  S MITERED TO SLOPE  REMOVED  S MITERED TO SLOPE  NOT APPROPRIATE UNIXNOA  B BOULDER  B BOULDER  FED ROCK NOWN  N S FREE FALL FENCING  S SEVERE</td> <td>FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE COMBINATION NONE COMBINATION (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBIN</td>	WOOD ROCK/STONE  D Utlet Armoring  ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED  ter Width CLOC D.  E. Abutment Height  REMOVED  S MITERED TO SLOPE  REMOVED  S MITERED TO SLOPE  NOT APPROPRIATE UNIXNOA  B BOULDER  B BOULDER  FED ROCK NOWN  N S FREE FALL FENCING  S SEVERE	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE COMBINATION NONE COMBINATION (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION) (COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBIN
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1         Structure Material       SMETAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC         Outlet Shape       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Grade Inducted       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	WOOD     IN ROCK/STONE       ED     Outlet Armoring       QONTO CASCADE     IN CLOGGED       ter Width	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE NOT EXTENSIVE FIBERGLASS COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNKN Nater Depth 2
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1         Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Grade (Puscene)       XAT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	WOOD ROCK/STONE  D Utlet Armoring  CONTO CASCADE CLOGGED  ter Width CS CD D.  E. Abutment Height  REMOVED  S MITERED TO SLOPE C  ED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED  ter Width Q/ D.  Tares NONE BAFFLES/A NOT APPROPRIATE UNKNOX  E BOULDER BEDROCK NOWN  N S FREE FALL FENCING ESEVERE VN S DRY  D OP	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED COMBINATION COMPARING COMPARING COMBINATION COMPARING COMPARING COMBINATION COMPARING
Crossing Comments         RUCTURE 1       Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOV         Outlet Dimensions       A. Withh 4        5       B. Height       2       2       C. Substrate/Wa         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	WOOD ROCK/STONE D Utlet Armoring  CONTO CASCADE CLOGGED ter Width CASCADE CLOGGED ter Width CASCADE CLOGGED ter Width CASCADE CLOGED REMOVED REMOVED REMOVED S MITERED TO SLOPE CLOCE REMOVED S MITER	S FIBERGLASS COMBINATION NONE S NOT EXTENSIVE EXTENSIVE COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKN Water Depth  DTHER S NONE UNKNOWN Water DepthS EIRS S SUPPORTS S OTHER WN UNKNOWN S UNKNOWN DRY S OTHER





## AQUATIC CONNECTIVITY Stream Crossing Survey DATA FORM

	1/2
DAFABASE ENTRY 64	

REVIEW DATE

ENTRY DATE

UATA ENTRY REVIEWED BY

20100 - 1010	served inninganon 👘 🖅 🏒 🔾		cesa observer	press debelo la disa da di managene ana	The second s	
lowe /Co	Suton			Eherom		
own/Co	Mandal			stream		
load	TIETIAL T	8200 - 1030 1030 1	Туре	MULTILANE 🐘 PA	VED UNPAVED	DRIVEWAY TRAIL RAIL
SPS Coo	rdinates (Decimal degrees)	2.11	6 8 2 ·NL3	titude		0 2 6 W Longitude
ocation	Description					
Crossing	] Type 🚿 BRIDGE 🚿 CULVE ED STREAM 💖 INACCESSIBLI	ERT 🛛 🐒 MULTIPLE C E 🐵 PARTIALLY INJ	CULVERT 😸 FORD ACCESSIBLE 😸 NO U	# NO CROSSING # IPSTREAM CHANNEL	REMOVED CROSSING	Number of Culverts/ Bridge Ce
Photo ID	Ds INLET	OUTLET	UPSTREAM		OWNSTREAM	OTHER
low Cor	ndition 🛞 NO FLOW 🔅 Th	PICAL-LOW K M	DDERATE 🕸 HIGH	Crossing Conditi	on 🕱 OK 🛞 POOR	🔅 NEW 🏾 🕸 UNKNOWN
fidal Sit	e 🚿 YES 🗩 NO 🖄 UNKN	IOWN Alignmen	t 🏨 FLOW-ALIGNED		Road Fill Height (Top of	f culvert to road surface; bridge = 0, $\frac{2}{2}$ , $\frac{2}{2}$
3ankfuli	Width (Centeral) 13 Co	nfidence 🖄 HIGH	X LOW/ESTIMATED	Constriction	SEVERE @ MODER	ATE 🛛 SPANS ONLY BANKFULL/
Failwate	er Scour Pool 🛞 NONE 🚿	SMALL 💥 LARGE		 39 SPANS FUL	L CHANNEL & BANKS	ACTIVE CHANNEL
Crossing	Commente 7:2A					
Dutlet S Dutlet G Dutlet D	Structure Shape 2 1 2 2 2 3 3 4 2 Strade (Pick one) Structure Dimensions A. Width	e Material ¥ MET. 5 ∞ 6 ∞ 7 ∞ F GRADE ∞ FREE FA /.3 B. Height	AL IS CONCRETE IN IORD IS UNKNOWN LL I CASCADE IS I. 3 C.S	PLASTIC III WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width	D B ROCK/STONE B Outlet Armoring B N SCADE B CLOGGED/C D. Wa	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION
Outlet S Outlet G Outlet D Outlet D	Structur Shape 2 1 2 2 2 3 3 4 2 Strade (Pick one) Structur Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface	e Material ★ MET S ≈ 6 ≈ 7 ≈ F GRADE ≈ FREE FA C 7 Outlet I art = color	AL S CONCRETE S ORD UNKNOWN IL X CASCADE C.S Drop to Stream Botto	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width m	D % ROCK/STONE & Outlet Armoring % N SCADE % CLOGGED/C D.Wa E. Abutment Height (T	FIBERGLASS     COMBINATION       ONE     NOT EXTENSIVE     EXT       OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     UNKinger       ster Depth     O
Outlet S Outlet G Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct	Structuri shape & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 Srade (Pick one) & AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface ture Length (Overall length from sh	e Material X MET S 6 7 F GRADE FREE FA . 3 B. Height O 7 Outlet let to cullet) 3	AL S CONCRETE ORD UNKNOWN IL CASCADE CASCADE C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width m	D ROCK/STONE N Outlet Armoring N N SCADE CLOGGED/C D. D. Wa E. Abutment Height (T	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXT OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED DIVISION Ster Depth ype * bridges only]
Outlet S Outlet G Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha	Structure Shape & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 3 Srade (Pick one) & AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface ture Length (Overall length from on ape & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3	e Material ★ MET. S ≈ 6 ≈ 7 ≈ F GRADE ≈ FREE FA C 7 Outlet 1 let to cutlet) 3 4 ≈ 5 ≈ 6 ≈	AL S CONCRETE S ORD UNKNOWN IL CASCADE 1 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 2 FORD & U	PLASTIC @ WOO % REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width m 2 NKNOWN & REMO	D % ROCK/STONE & Outlet Armoring % N SCADE % CLOGGED/C D. Wz E. Abutment Height (T WED	FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EXT OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     O
Outlet S Outlet G Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha	shape 2 1 2 2 3 4 4 Grade (Pick one) 2 AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface ture Length (Overall length from sh ape 2 1 2 2 3 3 pe 2 PROJECTING 3 HEAD	e Material X MET S 6 7 F GRADE FREE FA 	AL & CONCRETE S ORD & UNKNOWN IL & CASCADE / 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 % FORD & UNKNOWN ALLS @ HEADWALL	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width m	D SCADE CLOGGED/C Dutlet Armoring N N SCADE CLOGGED/C D. Wa E. Abutment Height (T WED ITERED TO SLOPE C OT	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE FIELD OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNK ster Depth
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha Inlet Typ Inlet Gra	sinape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≥ 4 ≥ srade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width 1 Drop to Water Surface 3 ture Length (Overall length from online) ape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≥ 2 pe ≥ PROJECTING ≥ HEAD ade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM	e Material ★ MET S \$6 7 % F GRADE % FREE FA 	AL CONCRETE ORD UNKNOWN IL CASCADE / 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 PORD U ALLS PORD U ALLS PERCHED / 2	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA Ubstrate/Water Width M	D ROCK/STONE CONTRACTIONS ROCK/STONE CONTRACTOR ROCK/STONE ROCK/ST	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE KNOT EXTENSIVE EXT OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNK ster Depth O  ype 'bridges only;  THER NONE UNKNOWN
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha Inlet Typ Inlet Gra Inlet Dir	Structure Structure Strade (Pick one) Structure Strade (Pick one) Structure Structur	e Material X MET S 6 7 8 GRADE FREE FA C 7 Outlet I let to cullet) 4 8 5 6 6 DWALL WINGW GRADE INLET C 3 B. Height	AL & CONCRETE ORD & UNKNOWN IL & CASCADE / .3 C.5 Drop to Stream Botto .2 5 7 % FORD % U ALLS % HEADWALL IROP & PERCHED / .3 C.5 C.5 CONCRETE 3 C.5 C	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width M INKNOWN REMO WINGWALLS M CLOGGED/COLL ubstrate/Water Width	D % ROCK/STONE Outlet Armoring % N SCADE % CLOGGED/C D, Wa E. Abutment Height (T WED (TERED TO SLOPE % OT APSED/SUBMERGED % D, Wa	FIBERGLASS     COMBINATION       ONE     NOT EXTENSIVE     EXT       OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     UNKr       ster Depth     O       ype * bridges only:
Outlet S Outlet D Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha Inlet Typ Inlet Gra Inlet Dir Slope %	shape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≥ 4 ≥ 5 stattar srade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface ture Length (Overall length from online ape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≥ 5 pe ≥ PROJECTING ≥ HEAD ade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM mensions A. Width b (Optional) Slope Co	e Material X MET S 0.6 7 8 GRADE FREE FA C 7 Outlet O 7 Outlet A 0.5 0.6 0 DWALL WINGW GRADE NLET D B Height S 8. Hight	AL © CONCRETE S ORD © UNKNOWN IL © CASCADE © / _3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2_5 7 @ FORD @ U ALLS @ HEADWALL WROP © PERCHED 3 C.S BLOW INT	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width m	D SCADE CLOGGED/C CLOGGED/C C. D. Wa E. Abutment Height (T WED ITERED TO SLOPE CO APSED/SUBMERGED CO APSED/SUBMERGED CO C. D. Wa NONE C BAFFLES/WEI	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE COMBINATION OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNK ster Depth ype ? bridges only! THER IN NONE UNKNOWN ater Depth 0_0
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha Inlet Typ Inlet Gra Inlet Dir Slope % Structur	shape 2 1 2 2 3 3 4 2 Grade (Pick one) 2 AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width ture Length (Overall length from on ape 2 1 2 2 3 3 pe 2 PROJECTING 3 HEAD ade (Pick one) 2 AT STREAM mensions A. Width Slope Co re Substrate Matches Stream	e Material X MET S 8.6 7 8 F GRADE FREE FA . 3 B. Height O 7 Outlet 1 Met to curlet) 4 8 5 8 6 DWALL WINGW GRADE NILET D . 3 B. Height onfidence HIGH X NONE 8 CON	AL & CONCRETE S ORD & UNKNOWN IL & CASCADE 1 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 % FORD & U ALLS @ HEADWALL WROP & PERCHED 2 3 C.S 1 0 C.S	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width M R REMO NKNOWN R REMO WINGWALLS M CLOGGED/COLL ubstrate/Water Width ernal Structures X ASTING M NOT APP	D ROCK/STONE CURPTICIPATION CONTENTS OF The Content	S FIBERGLASS SCOMBINATION ONE Y NOT EXTENSIVE SCHEME OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED SCUNK Ster Depth ype 'bridges only THER SCOMPLETING SCOMPLETING OLD IRS SCUPPORTS SCOTHER N
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha Inlet Typ Inlet Gra Inlet Dir Slope % Structur Structur	shape 2 1 2 2 3 3 4 2 Grade (Pick one) 2 AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface 1 ture Length (Overail length from shi ape 2 1 2 2 3 3 2 pe 2 PROJECTING 3 HEAD ade (Pick one) 3 AT STREAM mensions A. Width Slope Co re Substrate Matches Stream re Substrate Type (Pick one) 3	e Material X MET S 6 7 8 GRADE FREE FA GRADE FREE FA C 7 Outlet O 7 Outlet Met to curket) 3 4 5 6 6 DWALL WINGW GRADE INLET D 3 B. Height MINGE CON S NONE CON C NONE S SILT	AL & CONCRETE ORD & UNKNOWN IL & CASCADE / 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 % FORD & UNKNOWN ALLS & HEADWALL IROP & PERCHED / 3 C.S 10W Int APARABLE © CONTR SAND © GRAVEL	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED  FREE FALL ONTO CA  ubstrate/Water Width  M  KNOWN  REMO  Ubstrate/Water Width  CLOGGED/COLL  ubstrate/Water Width  ernal Structures  ASTING  COBBLE  BC	D % ROCK/STONE Outlet Armoring % N SCADE % CLOGGED/C 	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE COMBINATION OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED OF UNKNOWN THER NONE UNKNOWN ater Depth O INS SUPPORTS OF OTHER N UNKNOWN
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Shi Inlet Typ Inlet Gri Inlet Dir Slope % Structur Structur Structur	shape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≥ 4 ≥ srade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width ture Length (Overall length from on ape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≥ pe ≥ PROJECTING ≥ HEAD ade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM mensions A. Width stopptonallSlope Co re Substrate Matches Stream re Substrate Type (Pick one) ≥ re Substrate Coverage ≥ NC	e Material ★ MET S \$ 6 7 5 GRADE FREE FA 	AL S CONCRETE S ORD W UNKNOWN IL CASCADE / 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 % FORD % U ALLS % HEADWALL WROP & PERCHED / 3 C.S M LOW INT APARABLE % CONTR SAND % GRAVEL 0% % 75% % 100	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width m	D ROCK/STONE CULTERED TO SLOPE CONSTANT OF	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE 20 EXT OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED 20 UNKI ster Depth
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet D Outlet D L. Struct Inlet Sha Inlet Typ Inlet Gra Inlet Dir Slope % Structur Structur Structur Physical	shape 2 1 2 2 3 3 4 2 Grade (Pick one) 2 AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width ture Length (Overall length from on ape 2 1 2 2 3 3 pe 2 PROJECTING 3 HEAD ade (Pick one) 3 AT STREAM mensions A. Width b (Optional) Slope Co re Substrate Matches Stream re Substrate Type (Pick one) 3 re Substrate Coverage 2 NC	e Material ★ MET. S 6 7 8 9 GRADE ★ FREE FA A 3 B. Height 0 7 Outlet I let to outlet 1 4 5 6 6 DWALL ↓ WINGW GRADE ↓ INLET D C 3 B. Height onfidence ↓ HIGH ↓ NONE ↓ CON & NONE ↓ SILT DNE ↓ 25% ↓ 5 NONE ↓ DEBRIS/5	AL & CONCRETE ORD & UNKNOWN IL & CASCADE / 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 % FORD % U ALLS % HEADWALL IROP & PERCHED / 3 C.S MARABLE % CONTR SAND % GRAVEL 0% % 75% % 100 EDIMENT/ROCK % 1	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED  FREE FALL ONTO CA  ubstrate/Water Width  M. 2  INKNOWN REMO  WINGWALLS M  CLOGGED/COLL  ubstrate/Water Width  ernal Structures  ASTING NOT APP  COBBLE 600  % UNKNOWN  DEFORMATION REF	D % ROCK/STONE Outlet Armoring % N SCADE % CLOGGED/C D, Wa E. Abutment Height (T WED ITERED TO SLOPE % OT APSED/SUBMERGED % D, Wa NONE % BAFFLES/WEI ROPRIATE % UNKNOWN ULDER % BEDROCK % REE FALL % FENCING	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE X NOT EXTENSIVE 20 EXT OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED 20 UNKI ster Depth
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet E L. Struct L. Struct Inlet Shi Inlet Typ Inlet Gri Slope % Structur Structur Structur Physical Severity	shape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ Grade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface ture Length (Overall length from sol ape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≥ pe ≥ PROJECTING ≥ HEAD ade (Pick one) ≥ AT STREAM mensions A. Width b (Optionall Slope Co re Substrate Matches Stream re Substrate Type (Pick one) ≥ re Substrate Coverage ≥ NC I Barriers (Pick all that apply) ≤	e Material ★ MET S \$ 6 7 5 GRADE FREE FA C 7 Outlet 0 7 Outle	AL & CONCRETE ORD & UNKNOWN IL & CASCADE / 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 % FORD & U ALLS # HEADWALL WROP & PERCHED / 3 C.S % EDW Int MPARABLE © CONTR SAND % GRAVEL 0% % 75% % 100 EDIMENT/ROCK % I	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width m	D SCADE CLOGGED/C SCADE CLOGGED/C C. D. Wa E. Abutment Height (T WED ITERED TO SLOPE CON APSED/SUBMERGED CON NONE BAFFLES/WEI ROPRIATE ONKNOWI ULDER BEDROCK CON REE FALL FENCING	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE SEXT OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UNKI ster Depth
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet C Outlet C L. Struct Inlet Shi Inlet Typ Inlet Gri Inlet Dir Slope % Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur Structur	shape ≥ 1 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 4 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 3 ≤ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2 ≥ 2	e Material ★ MET. S  S  S  S  S  S  S  S  S  S  S  S  S	AL © CONCRETE ORD © UNKNOWN IL © CASCADE © 1 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 © FORD © UN ALLS © HEADWALL WROP © PERCHED 7 0 PRCHED 7 0 C.S 1 CONTR APARABLE © CONTR SAND © GRAVEL 0% © 75% © 100 EDIMENT/ROCK © 1 E © MINOR © M ER © NO-DEEPER	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ubstrate/Water Width M. 2 INKNOWN REMO WINGWALLS M CLOGGED/COLL- ubstrate/Water Width ernal Structures A ASTING NOT APP COBBLE 60 COBBLE 70 COBBLE 70 COBLE 70 COBBLE 70 COBBLE 70 COBBLE 70 COBBLE 7	D % ROCK/STONE Outlet Armoring % N SCADE % CLOGGED/C D, Wa E. Abutment Height (T WED ITERED TO SLOPE % OT APSED/SUBMERGED % D, D, Wa NONE % BAFFLES/WEI ROPRIATE % UNKNOWT ULDER % BEDROCK % REE FALL % FENCING  DRY	FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EXT         OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKr         ster Depth       O       Image: Support of the second seco
Outlet S Outlet C Outlet C Outlet C L. Struct Inlet Sh: Inlet Typ Inlet Gra Inlet Dip Slope % Structur Structur Physical Severity Water D Water V	shape 2 1 2 2 3 3 4 2 Grade (Pick one) 2 AT STREAM Dimensions A. Width Drop to Water Surface ture Length (Overall length from one) ape 2 1 2 2 3 3 2 pe 2 PROJECTING 4 HEAD ade (Pick one) 3 AT STREAM mensions A. Width ade (Pick one) 3 AT STREAM mensions A. Width stopptonall Stope Co re Substrate Matches Stream re Substrate Coverage 2 NC I Barriers (Pick all that apply) 3 y [Choose carefully based on barrier by Depth Matches Stream 3 YE Velocity Matches Stream 3 YE	e Material ★ MET. S 0.6 07 00 GRADE ← FREE FA C 7 Outlet 0 7	AL & CONCRETE ORD & UNKNOWN IL & CASCADE / 3 C.S Drop to Stream Botto 2 5 7 % FORD % U ALLS # HEADWALL ROP & PERCHED / 3 C.S % DOP & PERCHED / 4 DOP & PERCHED / 4 DOP & PERCHED / 5 DOP & PERCHED / 5 DOP & PERCHED / 6 DOP & PERCHED / 7 DOP &	PLASTIC WOO REMOVED  FREE FALL ONTO CA  Ubstrate/Water Width  M. 2  INKNOWN REMO  UNKNOWN REMO  CLOGGED/COLL  Ubstrate/Water Width  ernal Structures  ASTING NOT APP  COBBLE BE  COBBLE  COBBLE BE  COBBLE  COBBLE COBBLE	D % ROCK/STONE & Outlet Armoring % N SCADE % CLOGGED/C 	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE COMBINATION OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED OF UNKrater Depth Price Comparison of the

Structure Material         X IDAL         CONCRETE         PLASTIC         WOOD         MOOD XIDD XIDD XIDD XIDD XIDD XIDD XIDD X			212
Outlet Shape       142       33       14       5       17000       UNKNOWN       RELIANCE       Outlet Armoning       NOTE       VIDE TENSOR       20         Outlet Dimensions       A. Widh       3.7       B. Height       2.1       C. Substrate/Water Widh       3.7       D. Witer Depth       D.3         Outlet Dimensions       A. Widh       3.7       D. Outlet Dopto Stream Boton       E. Abutment Height If (not Telescope Stream)       D.3         Intel Shape       40       S. Sono       Outlet Dopto Stream Boton       E. Abutment Height If (not Telescope Stream)       D.4         Shape       40       Y. Z. S. A. A. S. G. F. TONO       UNIXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	RUCTURE 2 Structure M	aterial 🎉 METAL 🎲 CONCRETE 💥 PLASTIC 🔅 W	YOOD 🕸 ROCK/STONE 🔅 FIBERGLASS % COMBINATION
Outlet Grade Horsenell       K. AT STREAM GRADE       EFREE FALL       C. SUBSTATE VIEWER WIGH,       J.       D. Water Depth,       J.         Outlet Drops to Water Surface       J.       D.       Outlet Drops to Water Surface,       J.       D.         Listrocture Length Orwalt       B.       S.       S.       T.       E. Alustment Height If the Temps only.       J.         Listrocture Length Orwalt       B.       S.       S.       T.       TORID       UNANDALIS       Material Structure         Listrocture Length Orwalt       B.       S.S.       T.       TORD       UNANDALIS       Material Structures         Intel State       B.       S.S.       T.       C. Substrate Water Width,       Z.       T.       D. Water Depth.       D.         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       M.ORE       B.       Height       D.       C. Substrate Water Substrate       D. Water Depth.       D.       G.         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       M.ORE       B.       HEIGHT       D.       D.       G.       D.         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       W.ORE       S.S.       T.S.       D.       D.       G.       D.       G.       D.       G.       D.       G.       D.       G. <td< td=""><td>Outlet Shape 1 2 2 3 4 5</td><td>86 87 8 FORD WUNKNOWN REMOVED</td><td>Outlet Armoring 🚳 NONE 🙀 NOT EXTENSIVE 🔬 EXT</td></td<>	Outlet Shape 1 2 2 3 4 5	86 87 8 FORD WUNKNOWN REMOVED	Outlet Armoring 🚳 NONE 🙀 NOT EXTENSIVE 🔬 EXT
Outlet Dimensions A. Width       3       2       Name       2       2       3       2       0. Water Depth       0       3       0       0. Water Depth       0       3       0       0       0. Water Depth       0       0       0       0. Water Depth       0	Outlet Grade (Pick one) KAT STREAM GR/	ADE 🛛 FREE FALL 🎲 CASCADE 🎘 FREE FALL ONTO	CASCADE In CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNKN
Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom         L Structure Length Downstream Key	Outlet Dimensions A. Width3	B. Height 2.   C. Substrate/Water Wi	idthD. Water Depth
3.0         5.0           Intel Shape         1         2.0         5.0         7         FOID         UNIXNOWN         REMOVED           Intel Shape         1         2.0         5.0         7         FOID         UNIXNOWN         REMOVED           Intel Grade Pro See         SAUSTAT         B. Height         C.         Substate Witch         2.7         D. Water Depth         D.C           Structure Substate Matches Stream         MONE         ENCIDE         COMPARABLE         CONTRASTING         MONE         BLATESTWEIN         SUPONTS         OTHER           Structure Substate Matches Stream         (KONE         52.0         5.0%         7.5%         MONE         BLATESTWEIN         MONE         BLATESTWEIN         MONE         MANNOWN           Structure Substate Matches Stream         (KONE         52.0%         7.5%         MONE         MONE         BLATESTWEIN         MONE         BLATESTWEIN         MONE         MANNOWN         MANNOWN         MANNOWN         MANNOWN         MONE         MONE         MANNOWN <td>Outlet Drop to Water Surface</td> <td>0 Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom</td> <td>E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)</td>	Outlet Drop to Water Surface	0 Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
Inited Shape       Image 1       22       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNINXNOWN       IMPROVED         Inited Shape       IPROLECTING       IMPROVALLA       WINGKMALLS       IMPROVED       IMPROVENCE       IMPROVED       IMPROVENCE       IMPROV	L. Structure Length (Overall length from Inlet to	30 <u>5</u>	
Inlet Type PROJECTING & HEADWALL & WINGWALLS & HEADWALLS & MITERED TO SLOPE & OTHER & NONE Inlet Grade Processing & KAT STREAM GRADE & INLET DROP & PERCHED & CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERCED & UNKNOWN Inlet Dimensions A. Width <u>3</u> , <u>7</u> , B. Height <u>1</u> , <u>C</u> . Substrate/Water Width <u>7</u> , <u>7</u> , D. Water Depth <u>0</u> , <u>6</u> Shope % proving	Inlet Shape 🖓 1 👷 2 🛞 3 🛞 4	※ 5 ※ 6 ※ 7 ※ FORD ※ UNKNOWN ※ RE	MOVED
Intel Grade intervand       XAT STREAM GRADE       INLEE DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERCED       UNXNOWN         Internal Dimensions       A. Width       3       7       B. Height       1       C. Substrate/Water Width       2       7       D. Water Depth       0       0         Stope Confidence       HIGH       ELOW       Internal Structures Width       2       7       D. Water Depth       0       0         Stope Confidence       HIGH       ELOW       Internal Structures Width       NONE       BLP Confidence       0 <td>Inlet Type PROJECTING MARADWA</td> <td>ALL 🔅 WINGWALLS 🚿 HEADWALL &amp; WINGWALLS 🚿</td> <td>MITERED TO SLOPE 28 OTHER 28 NONE</td>	Inlet Type PROJECTING MARADWA	ALL 🔅 WINGWALLS 🚿 HEADWALL & WINGWALLS 🚿	MITERED TO SLOPE 28 OTHER 28 NONE
Intel Dimensions       A. Width       3       7       B. Height       2       1       C. Substrate/Water Width       3       7       D. Water Depth       0       6         Slope % Provision       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures & NONE       BAFFLESS/VEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       & NONE       SLOPE Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures & NONE       BAFFLESS/VEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Type over one       & NONE       DESRIGS/SEDMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FAIL       FEMCINS       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Vocess candidy based as bases ruped) deval       & NONE       DESRIGS/SEDMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FAIL       FEMCINS       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Vocess candidy based as bases ruped) deval       & NONE       MERSIGS/SEDMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FAIL       FEE FAIL       FEE FAIL       FEE FAIL       FEE FAIL       FEE FAIL       Severity         Vocess candidy based as bases ruped) deval       & NONE       MERSIGS/SEDMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       REE       Collection       Collection       Devalue       Devalue       Devalue       Devalue       Devalue       Devalue	Inlet Grade (Pick one) XAT STREAM GR/	ADE 💥 INLET DROP 🚿 PERCHED 🚿 CLOGGED/CO	DLLAPSED/SUBMERGED 🛞 UNKNOWN
Slope % Provision       Slope Confidence       High       LOW       Internal Structures & NONE       BAFFLESWERKS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       & NONE       SLOPE CONFIDENCE       CONTRASTING       INOT APPROPRIATE       UNANOWN         Structure Substrate Overage       & NONE       25%       SD%       7.5%       LOG%       UNANOWN         Physical Barriers Mick at our age/of       & NONE       25%       SD%       7.5%       LOG%       UNANOWN         Physical Barriers Mick at our age/of       & NONE       DEBRISSEDMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FEEROOK       UNINOWN         Structure Substrate Overage       & NONE       DEBRISSEDMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FREE FALL       STRUCTURE       DRY       OTHER         Structure Provide Structure?       YES       & NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Outlet Shape x1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE xNOT EXTLINS/N         Outlet Shape x1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE <t< td=""><td>Inlet Dimensions A. Width</td><td>B. Height Q. C. Substrate/Water Wi</td><td>idth 3, 7 D. Water Depth D. 6</td></t<>	Inlet Dimensions A. Width	B. Height Q. C. Substrate/Water Wi	idth 3, 7 D. Water Depth D. 6
Structure Substrate Matches Stream # NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (normal # NONE       SSIE       SSIE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (normal # NONE       SSIE       SSIE       SSIE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NONE       DEPORATION       FREE FALL       FEEDROX       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (normal # NONE       SSIE       SSIE       SSIE       UNKNOWN       UNKNOWN         Physical Barriers Inc.ult Instructure       WINOS # NONE       SSIE       NONE       MORE       MORE       MORE       MORE         Severity (Vocce contributions of WINOS       WINOS       MORE       UNKNOWN       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Vocce contributions of WINOS       WINOS       MORE       WINNOWN       DRY       OTHER         Vater Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-STATER       NO-STATER       NO-STATER       NO-STATER       NO-STATER       NONE       Structure         Ory Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoning       NONE       NOT EXTENSE         Outlet TURE 3       Structure Matchial & METAL       CONCRE	Slope % Corisoli Slope Confi	dence BIGH I OW Internal Structures	
Succure Substrate Pacterial and an investigation of the Commentate Control of the Control of the Commentate Control of the Contro	Structure Substrate Matcher Stream		
Structure Substrate Overage & NORE 25% SO% 75% 10% WOREN EDUCK CONTROLMN Structure Substrate Coverage & NORE 25% SO% 75% 10% WORENNOWN Physical Barriers Provid Data each & NORE 25% SO% 75% 10% WODERATE SEVERE Severity Oceans and the same type/ductored & NORE MINOR & MODERATE SEVERE Water Depth Matches Stream YES & NO-SHALLOWER & NO-SEDVER & UNINOWN & DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream YES & NO-SHALLOWER & NO-SEDVER & UNINOWN & DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream & YES & NO-SHALLOWER & NO-SEDVER & UNINOWN & DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream & YES & NO-SHALLOWER & NO-SEDVER & UNINOWN & DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream & YES & NO-SHALLOWER & NO-SEDVER & UNINOWN & DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream & YES & NO-SHALLOWER & NO-SEDVER & UNINOWN & DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream & YES & NO-SHALLOWER & CONCRETE & PLASTIC & WOOD & ROCK/STONE & FIBERGLASS & COMBINAT Outlet Shape & 1 22 33 44 55 6 6 7 FORD & UNINOWN & REMOVED & Outlet Armoring & NONE & NOT EXTENSIVE Outlet Grade /nd-end & AT STREAM GRADE & FREE FALL CASCADE & FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE & CLOGGED/COLLArSED/SUBMERGED & TO Outlet Drop to Water Surface 0 3 Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom 1 0 E. Abutment Height (from / Inlight only). Listructure Length Orwell length from slet to code/, 33 0 Inliet Shape & 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Type & PROJECTING & HEADWALL & WINGWALLS & HEADWALL & WINGWALLS & MITERED TO SLOPE & OTHER & NONE Inliet Shape & 1 3 3 4 25 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 3 4 25 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 3 3 4 5 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 2 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 2 3 4 5 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 2 3 4 5 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 2 3 4 5 5 6 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVED Inliet Shape & 1 3 2 3 5 4 5 5 6 7 FORD & UNINNOWN & REMOVE	Structure Substrate Matches Stream	NONE & COMPANNEL SECONTRACTING SENIOR	
Structure Substrate Coverage       NORE       256       0.05	Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)	UNE 🔮 SILI 🔘 SAND 👋 GRAVEL 🚳 COBBLE 🚿	BOULDER 🐁 BEDROCK 🚿 UNKNOWN
Physical Barriers Provide Counter Special Adams (MONE © DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK © DEPORMATION © FREE FALL © FENCING © DRY © OTHER Severity Conceacentidy based on barrier topeda adams (MONE © MINOR © MODERATE © SEVERE Water Depth Matches Stream VES © MO-SHALLOWER © MO-DEEPER © UNKNOWN © DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream (VES © MO-SHALLOWER © MO-DEEPER © UNKNOWN © DRY Dry Passage through Structure? VES © MO © UNKNOWN Meter © UNKNOWN © DRY Dry Passage through Structure? VES © MO © UNKNOWN Meter © PLASTIC © WOOD © POCK/STONE © FREERGLASS © COMBINAT Outlet Shape © 1 © 2 © 3 © 4 © 5 © 6 © 7 © FORD © UNKNOWN © REMOVED Outlet Armoning NONE © NOT EXTENSIVE © Outlet Grade indo end (AT STREAM GRADE © FREE FALL © CASCADE © FREEFALL ONTO CASCADE © CLOSGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED © O Outlet Drane for the Structure Alterial © METER I CASCADE © FREEFALL ONTO CASCADE © CLOSGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED © O Outlet Drane for the Structure Length from relet to context. Structure Length Orient Height (Type / Integer anty). L. Structure Substrate Matches Stream © NONE © SIDE COMPARABLE © CONTRASTING NOT APPROPRIATE © UNKNOWN Intel Dimensions A. Width © B. Height © C.Substrate/Water Width O D. Water Depth O Stope % coloread. Stope Confidence © HIGH & LOW Internal Structures © NONE © BAFFLES/WEIRS SUPPORTS © OTHER Structure Substrate Matches Stream © NONE © SILT © SAND © GRAVEL © COBBLE © BOULDER © EDEROCK © UNKNOWN Structure Substrate Type Pile one © NONE © SILT © SAND © GRAVEL © COBBLE © BOULDER © EDEROCK © UNKNOWN Structure Substrate National Deputer (Type) down) © NONE © SILT © SAND © GRAVEL © COBBLE © BOULDER © EDEROCK © UNKNOWN Structure Substrate National Deputer (Type) down) © NONE © SILT © SAND © GRAVEL © COMPA	Structure Substrate Coverage 🕺 NONE	25% 25% 25% 75% 2100% E UNKNOW	1
Severity (Coose cardidy based on barrer hypels abare) (NINOR MINOR MINOR MODERATE SEVERE Water Depth Matches Stream (VES MINO-FASTER NINO-SEDVER NINONOVN) DRY Water Velocity Matches Stream (VES MINO-FASTER NINO-SEDVER NINONOVN) DRY Dry Passage through Structure? (VES MINO MINONN) Registration of the structure? (VES MINO MINON) Registration of the structure? (VES MINON) Registration of	Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply) R NO	NE 🛞 DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK 🔅 DEFORMATION 🔅	FREE FALL 💥 FENCING 💥 DRY 🛞 OTHER
Water Depth Matches Stream       WES       X NO-SHALLOWER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Water Velocity Matches Stream       WES       X NO-SASTER       IN NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Dry Passage through Structure?       WES       X NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage	Severity (Choose carefully based on barrier type(s)	above) 💸 NONE 🚿 MINOR 🚿 MODERATE 🗊 SEV	'ERE
Water Velocity Matches Stream       YES       W NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       WO       WINKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage	Water Depth Matches Stream 🛛 🕅 YES	🕷 NO-SHALLOWER 🚿 NO-DEEPER 🚿 UNKNOWN 👘	RY DRY
Dry Passage through Structure?       YES NO WINNOWN       Height above Dry Passage         Comments         RUCTURE 3       Structure Material & METAL CONCRETE       PLASTIC WOOD ROCK/STONE       FIBERGLASS COMBINAT         Outlet Shape & 1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD WINNOWN       REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       NONE & NOT EXTENSIVE       Outlet Drute Armoring       NONE       CLOSED/SUBAREGED       LOWERT Armoring       NONE       Duite Drute Armoring       NONE       Duite Drute Armoring       NONE       Duite Drute Armoring       NONE       Duite Drute Armoring       NO	Water Velocity Matches Stream 🛛 🔅 YES	🕷 NO-FASTER 🚿 NO-SLOWER 🛞 UNKNOWN 🛞	DRY
Comments         CUCTURE 3       Structure Material & METAL © CONCRETE © PLASTIC © WOOD © ROCK/STONE © PIBERGLASS © COMBINATION         Outlet Shape & 1 2 2 33 44 65 66 7 ° EORD © UNKNOWN © REMOVED Outlet Armoring © NONE & NOT EXTENSIVE ©         Outlet Grade (Rid, end) © AT STREAM GRADE © FREE FALL © CASCADE © FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE © CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED © 11         Outlet Dimensions A. Width / 3       B. Height / 3       C. Substrate/Water Width _ 0       D. Water Depth _ 0       O         Outlet Drop to Water Surface			
Outlet Grade (Pick one)       INISERAM GRADE       INTRE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL       INISERAM GRADE       INISERAM GRA	Dry Passage through Structure? RVCS Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N	NO 😥 UNKNOWN Height above Dr	vood 🛞 rock/stone 🚿 Fiberglass 🛞 combination
Outlet Dimensions A. Width       /       5       B. Height       /       S       C. Substrate/Water Width       //       0       D. Water Depth       0       0         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       0       3       0       E. Abutment Height (Figure 7 bridges anty/	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 2 3 4 5	taterial ₩ METAL ₩ CONCRETE ₩ PLASTIC ₩ M 146 ₩ 7 ₩ FORD ₩ UNKNOWN ₩ REMOVED	y Passage VOOD <sup>(()</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>()</sup> FIBERGLASS <sup>()</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>()</sup> NONE <sup>()</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>()</sup> EXT
Outlet Drop to Water Surface	Dry Passage through Structure?  VES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 21 2 23 94 25 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) 28 AT STREAM GR	NO         WINKNOWN         Height above Dr           Iaterial         Image: METAL         Image: Concrete         PLASTIC         Image: Winknown           Image: Im	y Passage VOOD & ROCK/STONE & FIBERGLASS & COMBINATION Outlet Armoring MONE & NOT EXTENSIVE & EXT D CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED & UNK
L. Structure Length (overall length from inter to outlet)332 Inlet Shape #1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & FORD & UNKNOWN & REMOVED Inlet Shape #1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & FORD & UNKNOWN & REMOVED Inlet Type # PROJECTING # HEADWALL & WINGWALLS # HEADWALL & WINGWALLS & INITERED TO SLOPE & OTHER & NONE Inlet Grade (Pick one) & AT STREAM GRADE # INLET DROP & PERCHED # CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED & UNKNOWN Inlet Dimensions A. Width	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape & 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR. Outlet Dimensions A. Width	NO     UNKNOWN     Height above Dr       Iaterial     METAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC     W       26     7     FORD     UNKNOWN     REMOVED       ADE     FREE FALL     CASCADE     FREE FALL ONTC       3     B. Height     3     C. Substrate/Water W	y Passage VOOD <sup>1</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>1</sup> FiBERGLASS <sup>1</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>1</sup> NONE <sup>2</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>1</sup> EXT O CASCADE <sup>1</sup> CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>1</sup> UNKI Idth D D. Water Depth D
Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       3       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       MINTERED TO SLOPE       OTHER       NONE         Inlet Type       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       1       3       B. Height       1       3       C. Substrate/Water Width       0       0       D. Water Depth       0       0         Slope % topstond       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       0	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape X 1 2 23 24 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) AT STREAM GR. Outlet Dimensions A. Width / Outlet Drop to Water Surface	MO     UNKNOWN     Height above Dr       Iaterial     METAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC     W       @6     7     FORD     UNKNOWN     REMOVED       ADE     FREE FALL     CASCADE     FREE FALL ONTC       3     B. Height     1     C. Substrate/Water W       3     Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom     1	y Passage         vood       @ ROCK/STONE         Outlet Armoring       @ NONE         Qutlet Armoring       @ NONE         CASCADE       @ CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED         CASCADE       @ CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED         Construction       D. Water Depth         Q       D. Water Depth         Q       E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
Inlet Type       IPROJECTING	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 21 2 23 24 25 Outlet Grade (Pick enel 2) AT STREAM GR. Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet 6	Interial     Image: Metal     Image: Concrete     PLASTIC     Image: Metal       Interial     Image: Metal     Image: Concrete     PLASTIC     Image: Metal       Image: Metal     Image: Concrete     Image: PLASTIC     Image: Metal     Image: Metal       Image: Metal     Image: Concrete     Image: PLASTIC     Image: Metal     Image: Metal       Image: Metal     Image: Concrete     Image: PLASTIC     Image: PLASTIC       Image: Metal     Image: Conconcrete     Image: PLASTIC<	y Passage VOOD <sup>®</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>®</sup> FIBERGLASS <sup>®</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>®</sup> NONE <sup>®</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>®</sup> EXT CASCADE <sup>®</sup> CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNKI Idth <u>0.0</u> D. Water Depth <u>0.0</u> <u>C</u> E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNKNOWN         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       1       3       B. Height       1       3       C. Substrate/Water Width       0       0       D. Water Depth       0       0         Slope % topstonds       Slope Confidence       High       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       NONE       SLIT       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       SLIT       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       NONE       DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Choose Carefully bised on barrier type(s) elsore)       NONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEVERE         Water Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-ESTIWE       UNKNOWN       DRY	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape & 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) = AT STREAM GR. Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Dimensions A. Width Untlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from mlet o Inlet Shape = & 1 = 2 = 3 = 4 = 4	NO     UNKNOWN     Height above Dr       Iaterial     METAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC     W       26     7     FORD     UNKNOWN     REMOVED       ADE     FREE FALL     CASCADE     FREE FALL ONTO       3     B. Height     1     3     C. Substrate/Water W       3     Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom     1     3       counterin     33     2     2       25     6     87     FORD     UNKNOWN     RE	y Passage VOOD <sup>®</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>®</sup> FIBERGLASS <sup>®</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>®</sup> NONE <sup>®</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>®</sup> EXT D CASCADE <sup>®</sup> CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNKP idth D. Water Depth D. E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges antry
Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       1       3       B. Height       1       3       C. Substrate/Water Width       0       0       D. Water Depth       0       0         Slope % topstond       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       0       OTHEL         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (Plck one)       NONE       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       SST       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Physical Barriers (Pick alf that apply)       NONE       SST       SO%       SO%       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Choose Carefully bised on barrier type(s) above)       NONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEVERE         Water Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-DEEPER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Water Velocity Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 1 2 2 3 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick enel 2 AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet 6 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 2 4 1 Inlet Shape PROJECTING X HEADW	Americal     Weight above Dr       Internal     METAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC     W       Internal     METAL     CASCADE     FREE FALL     Outlet       Internal     Internal     Internal     Internal	y Passage VOOD ◎ ROCK/STONE ◎ FIBERGLASS ◎ COMBINATION Outlet Armoring ◎ NONE ≪ NOT EXTENSIVE ◎ EXT D CASCADE ◎ CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED ◎ UNK idth 0.0 D. Water Depth 0.0 E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges ant/) E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges ant/) EMOVED MITERED TO SLOPE ◎ OTHER ◎ NONE
Slope % topstonute       Slope Confidence       MIRCH       LOW       Internal Structures       MONE       BAFFLES/WEIRS       SUPPORTS       OTHER         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       MONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       MON APPROPRIATE       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       NONE       SUPPORTS       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       NONE       SUPPORTS       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       SONE       SONE       SONE       SONE       OTHER         Severity IChoose Coverage       NONE       DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       DRY       OTHER         Severity IChoose Coverage       NONE       NONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEVERE         Water Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-DEEPER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Water Velocity Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       DRY       4-3 <td>Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape (I 2 3 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width 1. Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from relet o Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR</td> <td>NO     UNKNOWN     Height above Dr       Naterial     METAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC     W       Adderial     FORD     UNKNOWN     REMOVED       ADE     FREE FALL     CASCADE     FREE FALL ONTO       B. Height     1     3     C. Substrate/Water W       3     Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom     1     3       c outlets     3     2     3       %     5     6     7     FORD     UNKNOWN       %     5     6     7     FORD     UNKNOWN     RE       ALL     WINGWALLS     HEADWALL &amp; WINGWALLS     ADE     CLOGGED/CO</td> <td>y Passage VOOD <sup>®</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>®</sup> FIBERGLASS <sup>®</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>®</sup> NONE <sup>®</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>®</sup> EXT D CASCADE <sup>®</sup> CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNK Idth D. Water Depth D_ E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges anty) E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges anty) EMOVED <sup>®</sup> MITERED TO SLOPE <sup>®</sup> OTHER <sup>®</sup> NONE DLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNKNOWN</td>	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape (I 2 3 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width 1. Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from relet o Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR	NO     UNKNOWN     Height above Dr       Naterial     METAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC     W       Adderial     FORD     UNKNOWN     REMOVED       ADE     FREE FALL     CASCADE     FREE FALL ONTO       B. Height     1     3     C. Substrate/Water W       3     Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom     1     3       c outlets     3     2     3       %     5     6     7     FORD     UNKNOWN       %     5     6     7     FORD     UNKNOWN     RE       ALL     WINGWALLS     HEADWALL & WINGWALLS     ADE     CLOGGED/CO	y Passage VOOD <sup>®</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>®</sup> FIBERGLASS <sup>®</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>®</sup> NONE <sup>®</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>®</sup> EXT D CASCADE <sup>®</sup> CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNK Idth D. Water Depth D_ E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges anty) E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges anty) EMOVED <sup>®</sup> MITERED TO SLOPE <sup>®</sup> OTHER <sup>®</sup> NONE DLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNKNOWN
Structure Substrate Matches Stream       Image: NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       Image: NOT APPROPRIATE       Image: UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       Image: NONE       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       Image: BOULDER       Image: BEDROCK       Image: UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Coverage       Image: NONE       SAND       GRAVEL       Image: COBBLE       Image: BOULDER       Image: BEDROCK       Image: UNKNOWN         Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       NONE       Sofe       50%       75%       Image: Image: Unknown         Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       NONE       DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Inhose carefully bised on barrier (special etorye)       Image: NONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEVERE         Water Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-DEEPER       Image: Unknown       Dry         Water Velocity Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       Image: Unknown       Dry         Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO SUNKNOWN       Image: Unknown       Image: Unknown       Image: Unknown	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 2 1 2 23 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet 6 Inlet Shape 2 1 2 2 3 2 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING 2 HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Dimensions A. Width	MO     UNKNOWN     Height above Dr       Iaterial     METAL     CONCRETE     PLASTIC     W       Image: Stress of the stress	y Passage VOOD <sup>®</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>®</sup> FIBERGLASS <sup>®</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>®</sup> NONE <sup>®</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>®</sup> EXT D CASCADE <sup>®</sup> CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNK idth D. Water Depth D. E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges ant// E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges ant// MOVED <sup>®</sup> MITERED TO SLOPE <sup>®</sup> OTHER <sup>®</sup> NONE DLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNKNOWN idth D. D. Water Depth D.
Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       NONE       SELT       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       BOULDER       BEDROCK       UNKNOWN         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       25%       50%       75%       100%       UNKNOWN         Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       NONE       DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Choose carefully bised on barrier type(s) above)       NONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEVERE         Water Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Water Velocity Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage       Image: All above Dry Passage	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 21 2 23 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick enel 2 AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from milet o Inlet Shape 21 2 3 2 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING 2 HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Dimensions A. Width Slope % (Optional) Slope Confi	Image: Second	y Passage
Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       25%       50%       75%       100%       UNKNOWN         Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       NONE       DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       DEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       DRY       OTHER         Severity (Choose carefully bised on barrier (special etrove)       NONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEVERE         Water Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-DEEPER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Water Velocity Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       DRY	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from mlet 6 Inlet Shape 1 6 2 3 4 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING 4 HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Dimensions A. Width Slope % (Optional) Slope Confi Structure Substrate Matches Stream	MO       WINKNOWN       Height above Dr         Iaterial       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Ide in the internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Ide internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Ide internal       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         ADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO         Ide internal       Ide internal       Ide internal       Ide internal       Ide internal         Ide internal       Ide internal       Ide internal       Ide internal       Ide internal       Ide internal         Idence       HIGH       Idw       Internal       Internal       Internal       Internal         Internal       COMPARABLE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       MOT	y Passage
Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       INONE       DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       INDEFORMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING       NONE       OTHER         Severity (Choose Carefully bised on barrier type(s) ebove)       INONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEVERE         Water Depth Matches Stream       YES       NO-SHALLOWER       NO-DEEPER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Water Velocity Matches Stream       YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Dry Passage through Structure?       YES       NO       UNKNOWN       DRY	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure N Outlet Shape 2 1 2 23 24 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet o Inlet Shape 2 1 2 3 2 4 Inlet Shape 2 1 2 2 3 4 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Dimensions A. Width Slope % (Optional: Slope Confi Structure Substrate Matches Stream 2 Structure Substrate Type (Pick one) 2 N	MO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dr         Iaterial       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Ide ministry       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         ADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL       ONKNOWN         Image: Source of the stream Bottom       Image: Stream Bottom       Image: Stream Bottom       Image: Stream Bottom         Image: Stream Bottom       Image: Stream Bottom       Image: Stream Bottom       Image: Stream Bottom       Image: Stream Bottom         Image: Stream Bottom<	y Passage VOOD ◎ ROCK/STONE ◎ FIBERGLASS ◎ COMBINATION Outlet Armoring ◎ NONE ◎ NOT EXTENSIVE ◎ EXT D CASCADE ◎ CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED ◎ UNKN idth D. Water Depth C. E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges anty) E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges anty) MOVED MITERED TO SLOPE ◎ OTHER ◎ NONE DLLAPSED/SUBMERGED ◎ UNKNOWN idth D. D. Water Depth MONE ◎ BAFFLES/WEIRS ◎ SUPPORTS ◎ OTHER APPROPRIATE ◎ UNKNOWN BOULDER ◎ BEDROCK ◎ UNKNOWN
Severity (Choose Carefully based on barrier (special ebove)  NONE  NONE  NONE  NONE  NONDERATE  SEVERE Note that the stream  Nono-bear Nono-bear  Nono-bear Nono-bear  Nono-bear Nono-bear  Nono-bear	Dry Passage through Structure?	MO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dr         Iaterial       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Ide in the internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Ide internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Ide internal       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         ADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL ONTO         Ide internal       Internal       Internal       Internal       Internal         Idence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures       Internal Structures         Internal       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT /         ONE       SUM       GRAVEL       COBBLE       Internal Structures	y Passage
Water Depth Matches Stream       W YES       INO-SHALLOWER       NO-DEEPER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Water Velocity Matches Stream       W YES       NO-FASTER       NO-SLOWER       UNKNOWN       DRY         Dry Passage through Structure?       W YES       NO-SUNKNOWN       Height above Dry Passage       Image: Comparison of the structure of the struc	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure M Outlet Shape 2 1 2 23 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width / Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from relet of Inlet Shape 1 2 2 3 2 4 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Dimensions A. Width / Slope % Optional Slope Confi Structure Substrate Matches Stream Structure Substrate Coverage NONE Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply) NO	MO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dr         Internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Internal       FREE FALL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Internal       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         Internal       C. Substrate/Water W       Internal       Internal       Internal         Internal       Signal       Internal       CloggeD/CC       Internal       Signal       Internal         Internal       Internal       Signal       Internal       CloggeD/CC       Internal       Signal       Internal         Internal       Internal       Signal       Internal       Signal       Internal       Internal       Signal         Internal       Signal       Internal       Signal       Internal       Signal       Internal         Internal       Signal       Signal       Internal       Could and the internal       Internal       Internal         Internal       Signal       Signal       Internal       Internal <thinternal< th="">       Internal</thinternal<>	y Passage
Water Velocity Matches Stream       Image: YES       Image: NO-FASTER       Image: NO-SLOWER       Image: UNKNOWN       Image: NO-FASTER         Dry Passage through Structure?       Image: YES       Image: NO-SLOWER       Image: UNKNOWN       Image: Height above Dry Passage       Image: Height above Dry Passage	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure M Outlet Shape 2 1 2 3 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to Inlet Shape 2 1 2 2 3 2 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING 2 HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Type PROJECTING 2 HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Dimensions A. Width Slope % (Optional) Slope Confi Structure Substrate Matches Stream 2 Structure Substrate Type (Pick one) NONE Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply) \$ NO	MO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dr         Interial       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Image: State of the state of	y Passage
Dry Passage through Structure? 💥 YES 🛞 NO 🛞 UNKNOWN Height above Dry Passage / = 3	Dry Passage through Structure? YES Comments RUCTURE 3 Structure M Outlet Shape 2 1 2 23 4 5 Outlet Grade (Pick ene) AT STREAM GR Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Dimensions A. Width Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from relet t Inlet Shape 2 1 2 2 3 2 4 Inlet Shape 2 1 2 2 3 2 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING 2 HEADW Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GR Inlet Dimensions A. Width Slope % (Optional: Slope Confi Structure Substrate Matches Stream 2 Structure Substrate Coverage 2 NONE Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply) NO Severity (Choose Carefolly bised on harrier type) Water Depth Matches Stream 2 YES	MO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dr         Internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Internal       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Internal       FREE FALL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         Internal       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL       OUNKNOWN       REMOVED         ADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL       OUNKNOWN       REMOVED         Internal       Internal       Internal       Internal       Internal       Internal       Internal         Internal       SET       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE       Internal       Internal         Internal       SET       SAND       GRAVEL       Internal       Internal <thinternal< th=""></thinternal<>	y Passage VOOD <sup>®</sup> ROCK/STONE <sup>®</sup> FIBERGLASS <sup>®</sup> COMBINATION Outlet Armoring <sup>®</sup> NONE <sup>®</sup> NOT EXTENSIVE <sup>®</sup> EXT DCASCADE <sup>®</sup> CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED <sup>®</sup> UNKR idth <u>0</u> 0 D. Water Depth <u>0</u> 0 <sup>©</sup> E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges ant/) <sup>®</sup> MOVED <sup>®</sup> MOVED <sup>®</sup> MONE <sup>®</sup> BAFFLES/WEIRS <sup>®</sup> SUPPORTS <sup>®</sup> OTHER APPROPRIATE <sup>®</sup> UNKNOWN <sup>®</sup> BOULDER <sup>®</sup> BEDROCK <sup>®</sup> UNKNOWN N <sup>®</sup> FREE FALL <sup>®</sup> FENCING <sup>®</sup> DRY <sup>®</sup> OTHER <sup>®</sup> ZERE <sup>®</sup> DRY
	Dry Passage through Structure?	NO       UNKNOWN       Height above Dr         Interial       METAL       CONCRETE       PLASTIC       W         6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       REMOVED         ADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE       FREE FALL       ONTO         3       B. Height       1       3       C. Substrate/Water W         3       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       1       3         5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN       RE         ALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS       ALL       MINGWALLS       HEADWALL & WINGWALLS         ADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED       CLOGGED/CO         3       B. Height       1       3       C. Substrate/Water W         dence       HIGH       LOW       Internal Structures         (NONE       COMPARABLE       CONTRASTING       NOT /         ONE       SET       SAND       GRAVEL       COBBLE         2       25%       50%       75%       100%       UNKNOWN         Internal       MINOR       MODERATE       SEV         NONE       MINOR       MODERATE       SEV         NO-SHALLOWER       NO-DEEPER <th< td=""><td>y Passage</td></th<>	y Passage





# AQUATIC CONNECTIVITY Stream Crossing Survey Data form

ATABASE ENTRY BY	ENTRY DATE

REVIEW DATE

DATA ENTRY REVIEWED BY

20		

Crossing Code	Local ID (Opsionat
Date Observed (acreariacon 03/20/2023 Lead Observer	Stafayie Caulno
Town/County_Sutton	Stream Unnamed Trib - Mumt
Road West Sutton Road Type :	MULTILANE X PAVED UNPAVED DRIVEWAY TRAIL RAIL
Location Description	control control scales and/or scales and/or scales and/or in Ford/rolds
Crossing Type S REIDGE & CULVERT S MULTIPLE CULVERT S FORD	W. NO CROSSING A REMOVED CROSSING Number of Columns Perday Co
80 BURIED STREAM 20 INACCESSIBLE 40 PARTIALLY INACCESSIBLE 20 NO	UPSTREAM CHANNEL 22 BRIDGE ADEQUATE
Photo IDs INLETOUTLET_COUTLET	DOWNSTREAMOTHEROTHEROTHERO
Flow Condition 🛞 NO FLOW 🔅 TYPICAL-LOW 🦞 MODERATE 🛸 HIGH	Crossing Condition 😂 OK 🦞 POOR 🖄 NEW 🎯 UNKNOWN
Tidal Site 🛞 YES 🤹 NO 🛞 UNKNOWN Alignment 🎇 FLOW-ALIGNEI	D 🔅 SKEWED (5487) Road Fill Height (Top of culvert to read surface, bridge = 0.
Bankfull Width @psorat Confidence 🔅 HIGH 🚿 LOW/ESTIMATED	D Constriction K SEVERE R MODERATE R SPANS ONLY BANKFULL
Tailwater Scour Pool 🛞 NONE 😸 SMALL 🏋 LARGE	SPANS FUEL CHANNEL & BANKS
Crossing Comments Dan upstream of Calvert	
Structure Material         METAL         CONCRETE           Outlet Shape         1         2         3         4         9         6         7         FORD         UNKNOWN           Outlet Grade (Pick one)         X         AT STREAM GRADE         X         FREE FALL         CASCADE         S	PLASTIC IN WOOD IN ROCK/STONE IN FIBERGLASS OCOMBINATION     BREMOVED Outlet Armoring INONE IN NOT EXTENSIVE IN EXT     FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE IN CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNKI
Outlet Shape       1       2       3       8       4       95       6       6       7       8       FORD       2       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade       1       8       2       8       A       95       6       8       7       8       FORD       2       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade       1       8       AT STREAM GRADE       1       8       FREE FALL       2       CASCADE       2         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       4	PLASTIC IN WOOD ROCK/STONE IN FIBERGLASS COMBINATION     BREMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE IN EXT     FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE IN CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNK     Substrate/Water Width     D. Water Depth     D.     E. Abutment Height (Type * bridges only:
Outlet Shape       1       2       3       8       4       5       6       5       7       FORD       2       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       8       AT STREAM GRADE       5       FREE FALL       ©       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       4       B. Height       4       C. S         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto       L. Structure Length (overall length from inlet to outlet)       4       9       6	PLASTIC IN WOOD IN ROCK/STONE IN FIBERGLASS COMBINATION IN IN REMOVED Outlet Armoring INONE IN NOT EXTENSIVE IN EXT INFREE FALL ONTO CASCADE IN CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNK Substrate/Water Width D. Water Depth D. Water Depth D. Water Stridges only E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)
Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       2       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade intok one       ISAT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       4       B. Height       4       C. S         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto       C. S       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto       4       S       6       7       FORD       Image: Structure Length inverse inter to outlet)       4       9       6       1       FORD       1       1       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       1 <t< td=""><td>PLASTIC IN WOOD ROCK/STONE IN FIBERGLASS COMBINATION     REMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE IN EXT     FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     NONE     D. Water Depth     O     E. Abutment Height (Type 1 bridges only)</td></t<>	PLASTIC IN WOOD ROCK/STONE IN FIBERGLASS COMBINATION     REMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE IN EXT     FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     NONE     D. Water Depth     O     E. Abutment Height (Type 1 bridges only)
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       #AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width        B. Height        C. S         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto	PLASTIC WOOD ROCK/STONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION  N REMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE REXT  FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED  N WING WALLS  N TERED TO SLOPE COMPARING NONE
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       8       25       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       4       B. Height       4       C. S         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto       4       C. S       6       7       FORD       ©         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       4       5       6       6       7       FORD       ©       Inlet         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       4       5       6       6       7       FORD       ©       Inlet         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       # HEADWALL       # WINGWALLS       # HEADWALL       Inlet DROP       ERCHED         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       ERCHED       PROJECTINE	PLASTIC WOOD ROCK/STONE FIBERGLASS COMBINATION  REMOVED Outlet Armoring NONE NOT EXTENSIVE EXT  FREE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED  NUNKINGUATER Width D. Water Depth C.  E. Abutment Height (Type 7 bridges only)  UNKNOWN REMOVED  L& WINGWALLS MITTERED TO SLOPE OTHER NONE  CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED WUNKNOWN
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       MAT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width        B. Height        C. 4         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto	Image: Second
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       8       9       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       L       B. Height       C.S         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto         L. Structure Length       Inversal length from inlet to outlet)       4       9       6       7       FORD       1         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       5       4       5       6       7       FORD       1         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       MEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL       Inlet DROP       PERCHED         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       Q       D       B. Height       Q       C.S         Slope % (Opcords)       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Intert	PLASTIC IN WOOD IN ROCK/STONE IN FIBERGLASS COMBINATION  IN REMOVED Outlet Armoring INONE IN NOT EXTENSIVE IN EX  INFREE FALL ONTO CASCADE IN CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNK  Substrate/Water Width
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       MAT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width        B. Height        C. 4         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto	Image: Plastic Image: None Image: N
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       4       B. Height       4       C. S         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto       4       5       6       7       FORD       6       1         L. Structure Length       Overall length from Inlet to outlet)       4       9       6       7       FORD       6       1         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       6       4       5       6       7       FORD       6       1         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       C. S         Slope % (Optional	Image: Plastic in wood in Rock/Stone in Fiberglass in Combination         Image: Plastic in Wood in Rock/Stone in Fiberglass in Combination         Image: Plastic in Removed in Cascade in Clogged/CollaPsed/Submerged in Unk         Substrate/Water Width
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       8       2       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       H       B. Height       C. 1         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto         L. Structure Length       Overall length from inlet to outlet)       H       G         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       VINGWALLS         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       6       7       FORD       VINGWALLS         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL         Inlet Grade       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL         Inlet Grade       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINGWALLS       HEADWALL         Inlet Grade       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       O       B. Height       C       G         Slope % (Operation       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Ini       G       G </td <td>Image: Plastic intervention       Image: Plastic interventinterventinteristic intervention       Image: P</td>	Image: Plastic intervention       Image: Plastic interventinterventinteristic intervention       Image: P
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width        B. Height        C. 1         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto	Image: Plastic in wood in Rock/stone in Fiberglass in Combination         Image: Plastic in Wood in Rock/stone in Fiberglass in Combination         Image: Plastic in Removed in Rock/stone in Rock/sto
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       8       2       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       H       B. Height       C. 1         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto         L. Structure Length (Diveral length from inlet to outlet)       H       H       C. 1         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       5       6       6       7       FORD       MAT         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       5       6       6       7       FORD       MAT         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       WINIGWALLS       HEADWALL         Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       INLET DROP       PERCHED         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       O       B. Height       C. 1         Slope % (Optional       Slope Confidence       HIGH       LOW       Im         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       SUMPARABLE       CONTH         Structure	Image: Plastic intervention       Image: Plastic interventinterventinter       Image: Plastic interventin
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width        B. Height        C. 1         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       Outlet Drop to Stream Botto	Image: Plastic intervention       Image: Plastic interventinterventinterule       Image: Plastic interule
Structure Material       METAL       CONCRETE         Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       25       6       7       FORD       UNKNOWN         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       FREE FALL       CASCADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width        B. Height        C. 1         Outlet Drop to Water Surface        Outlet Drop to Stream Botto        C. 1         L. Structure Length       Overall length from the to outlet)	Image: Plastic in wood in Rock/stone in Fiberglass in Combination         Image: Plastic in Wood in Rock/stone in Fiberglass in Combination         Image: Plastic in Removed in Rock/stone in Rock/sto





# AQUATIC CONNECTIVITY Stream Crossing Survey DATA FORM

DATABASE ENTRY BY	ENTRY DATE
D4TA ENTRY REVIEWED BY	REVIEW CATE

DATA ENTRY REVIEWED BY

NUL MILLION AND	COSC PROPERTY	No. I CONTRACTOR	-	THORN MARKING

		CA C	
Date Observed (60/60/0000	Lead Observer	STEPENTE COME	
Town/County JULIEN		StreamV&knum	
Road <u>West</u> SVI Tan GPS Coordinates (Decimal degrees) 4 2.	Type M	iultilane Kraved unpaved ide - 71.80	DRIVEWAY TRAIL RAI
Location Description			
Crossing Type 18 BRIDGE 10 CULVERT 18 88 BURIED STREAM 18 INACCESSIBLE 18 P	MULTIPLE CULVERT 100 FORD 100 WARTIALLY INACCESSIBLE 100 NO UPS	NO CROSSING 🔅 REMOVED CROSSING TREAM CHANNEL 🛞 BRIDGE ADEQUATE	Number of Culverts/ Bridge C
Photo IDs INLETOUTLE	IUPSTREAM	DOWNSTREAM	OTHER
Flow Condition 🛞 NO FLOW 🐼 TYPICAL-L	.OW % MODERATE 🚿 HIGH	Crossing Condition CK POOR	S. NEW SS UNKNOWN
Fidal Site 😸 YES 😿 NO 🛒 UNKNOWN	Alignment 12/FLOW-ALIGNED	SKEWED (>45') Road Fill Height (Tap of	i culvert to road surface: bridge = 0)
Bankfull Width (Optional) Confidence	e 😸 HIGH 🧭 LOW/ESTIMATED	Constriction % SEVERE 🦽 MODER	ATE SPANS ONLY BANKFULL
Tailwater Scour Pool 😿 NONE 🔅 SMALL	S LARGE	37 SPANS FULL CHANNEL & BANKS	ACTIVE CHANNEL
Crossing Comments			
Dutlet Grade (Pick and) STREAM GRADE	AT METAL CONCRETE      FORD UNKNOWN     PREE FALL CASCADE F      B. Height Z. 5 C. Subs	PLASTIC SE WOOD SE ROCK/STONE S REMOVED Outlet Armoring SE M REE FALL ONTO CASCADE SE CLOGGED/O strate/Water Width S. D. Wa	FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     WINK ter Depth
Dutlet Shape     1     2     3     4     25     6       Dutlet Grade     (Pick and)     (Mathematical Structure Matter)       Dutlet Dimensions     A. Width     3     9       Dutlet Dimensions     A. Width     3     9	ai     METAL     CONCRETE       7     FORD     UNKNOWN       8     PREE FALL     CASCADE       8     Height     2     5       Cutlet Drop to Stream Bottom	PLASTIC     WOOD     ® ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     ® N       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     ® CLOGGED/O       strate/Water Width     4.5     D. Wa       1     5     E. Abutment Height (f)	FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     UNK ter Depth     O     Tendges only
Outlet Shape       1       2       3       64       25       66         Outlet Grade (Pick one)       (MAT STREAM GRADE)         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       1       1         L. Structure Length (Overall length from litter to outlide)       1       1       1       1	al METAL CONCRETE F	PLASTIC SE WOOD SE ROCK/STONE S REMOVED Outlet Armoning SE N REE FALL ONTO CASCADE SE CLOGGED/O strate/Water Width 4.5 D. Wa 1.5 E. Abutment Height (h)	FIBERGLASS @ COMBINATION ONE @ NOT EXTENSIVE @ Ex OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED @ UNK ter Depth
Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Outlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       1       1         L. Structure Length (Overall length from inter to outlent)       1       2       3       4       4	AT METAL CONCRETE AT A CONCRETE AT A CONCRETE AT A CASCADE A F A CASCADE A F A CASCADE A F A CASCADE A CAS	PLASTIC     WOOD     S ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     M N       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     CLOGGED/O       strate/Water Width     H     S       1     5     E. Abutment Height (%)	FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     UNK ter Depth     O     Tendges coly
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Dutlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE         Dutlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Dutlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       1       1         L. Structure Length (Overall Length from litter to autilitents)       3       4       2       3       4         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       2       3       4       2         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       1	AT WINGWALLS S HEADWALLS WINGWALLS WINGWALLS S HEADWALLS WINGWALLS S HEADWALLS WINGWALLS WINGWAL	PLASTIC     WOOD     ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     N       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     CLOGGED/O       strate/Water Width     4     5     D. Wa       1     5     E. Abutment Height (h)       NOWN     REMOVED	FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EX     CLLAPSED/SUBMERGED      UNK ter Depth     C     Tendages coly
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Dutlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Dutlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       1       9         Dutlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       1       1       1       1         L. Structure Length (Overall length from infer to outh       1       2       1       3       4       1         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       1         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       1       1       1       3       4       2         Inlet Grade (Rick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       1       AT STREAM GRADE       1 <td>AT WHETHER CONCRETE AT A CONCRETE AT A CONCRETE AT A CASCADE FREE FALL CASCADE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FR</td> <td>PLASTIC     WOOD     ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     N       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     CLOGGED/O       strate/Water Width    </td> <td>FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED      UNK ter Depth     O     Tendges only  HER      NONE UNKNOWN</td>	AT WHETHER CONCRETE AT A CONCRETE AT A CONCRETE AT A CASCADE FREE FALL CASCADE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FR	PLASTIC     WOOD     ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     N       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     CLOGGED/O       strate/Water Width	FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED      UNK ter Depth     O     Tendges only  HER      NONE UNKNOWN
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Dutlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE         Dutlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Dutlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       4         L. Structure Length (Overall length from inter to outlet Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       4         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       Inlet Grade (Pick one)       AT STREAM GRADE       1         Inlet Dimensions       A. Width       5       5       5	AT METAL CONCRETE AT A METAL CONCRETE AT A FORD WINKNOWN PREFAIL CASCADE FREEFAIL FR	PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE         REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       Milling         REE FALL ONTO CASCADE       SclogGED/O         strate/Water Width       4       5       D. Wa         I       5       E. Abutment Height (%)         NOWN       IS       REMOVED         VINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OT         CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       Strate/Water Width       4       9       D. Wa	FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EX     CLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNK ter Depth      //pe 7 bridges coly.      HER       NONE     UNKNOWN     ter Depth
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Dutlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Dutlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       2       8       4       8         Dutlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       2       8       4       8         L. Structure Length (Overall length from inter to auth Inlet Shape       1       2       8       4       8         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       1       5       5         Inlet Orade (Pick ane)       AT STREAM GRADE       Slope Confidence       5       5         Slope % (Optional)       Slope Confidence       5       5       5	all     METAL     CONCRETE       7     FORD     UNKNOWN       8     PREE FALL     CASCADE     F       8     Height     2     5     C. Substance       0     Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       1     3     7     FORD     UNKNOWN       8     Height     0     S     S     S     S       5     6     7     FORD     UNKNOWALLS     HEADWALL & W       WINGWALLS     HEADWALL & S     S     C. Substance       8     Height     5     C. Substance	PLASTIC     WOOD     ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     N       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     CLOGGED/O       strate/Water Width     H     S       D     E. Abutment Height       NOWN     REMOVED       VINGWALLS     MITERED TO SLOPE       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       strate/Water Width     H       Q     D. Wa	FIBERGLASS @ COMBINATION ONE @ NOT EXTENSIVE @ Ex OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED @ UNK ter Depth HER @ NONE UNKNOWN ter Depth RS @ SUPPORTS @ OTHER
Dutlet Shape 1 2 3 4 5 6 Dutlet Grade (Pick and) AT STREAM GRADE Dutlet Dimensions A. Width 3 9 Dutlet Drop to Water Surface 1 L. Structure Length (Overall length from inter to outh Inlet Shape 1 2 3 4 4 Inlet Type PROJECTING HEADWALL Inlet Grade (Pick and) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Dimensions A. Width 5 5 Slope % (Optional) Slope Confidence Structure Substrate Matches Stream NOP	A METAL CONCRETE      A METAL CONTRAST	PLASTIC     WOOD     ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     M       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     CLOGGED/CO       strate/Water Width     H     5     D. Wa       I     5     E. Abutment Height ()       NOWN     18     REMOVED       VINGWALLS     MITERED TO SLOPE     OT       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     Strate/Water Width     H       I     1     1     D. Wa       Structures     NONE     BAFFLES/WEI       ING     WINGT APPROPRIATE     UNKNOWN	FIBERGLASS      COMBINATION ONE      NOT EXTENSIVE      EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED      UNK ter Depth      //pe 7 bridges only      HER      NONE UNKNOWN ter Depth RS      SUPPORTS      OTHER
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Outlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       4         L. Structure Length (Overall length from litter to auth Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       4         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       4       4         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       4         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       4         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5         Solope % (Optional)       TSTREAM GRADE       5       5         Slope % (Optional)       Slope Confidence       Slope Confidence         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       Structure Substrate Type       NONE	aiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	PLASTIC     WOOD     ROCK/STONE       REMOVED     Outlet Armoring     N       REE FALL ONTO CASCADE     CLOGGED/O       strate/Water Width     H     S     D. Wa       I     5     E. Abutment Height       NOWN     REMOVED       VINGWALLS     MITERED TO SLOPE     OT       CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED     Strate/Water Width     H     Q     D. Wa       al Structures     V NONE     BAFFLES/WEI       ING     WROT APPROPRIATE     WINKNOWN       CO8BLE     BOULDER     BEDROCK	FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNK ter Depth  HER       NONE UNKNOWN ter Depth RS       SUPPORTS       OTHER
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Outlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       8         L. Structure Length (Overall length from infer to outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       1       2       3       4       4         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       4       4         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       5       5       5         Slope % HOption#D       Slope Confidence       Slope Confidence       Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NON         Structure Substrate Type       Pick onez       NONE       Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE	AT WETAL CONCRETE TO A CONCRETE TO A CONCRETE FALL CASCADE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FREE FR	PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE         REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       N         REE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/O         strate/Water Width       H       S         D       E. Abutment Height       N         NOWN       REMOVED       NITERED TO SLOPE         VINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OT         CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       Strate/Water Width       H         All Structures       NONE       BAFFLES/WEI         ING       WINT APPROPRIATE       WINKNOWN         CO88LE       80ULDER       BEDROCK         WINKNOWN       NONE       SEDROCK	FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE       EX     OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       UNK ter Depth      /pe 7 bridges only      HER       NONE     UNKNOWN ter Depth RS       SUPPORTS       OTHER      UNKNOWN
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Outlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       4         L. Structure Length (Overall length from inter to auth         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       4         Stope % iOptional       To Stope Confidence       Stope Confidence       NON         Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE       NONE       8         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       8       NONE	aiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	PLASTIC       WOOD       ROCK/STONE         REMOVED       Outlet Armoring       N         REE FALL ONTO CASCADE       CLOGGED/O         strate/Water Width       4       5       D. Wa         I       5       E. Abutment Height (f)         NOWN       REMOVED         VINGWALLS       MITERED TO SLOPE       OT         CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       Strate/Water Width       4       9       D. Wa         al Structures       V NONE       BAFFLES/WEI       D. Wa         al Structures       V NONE       BAFFLES/WEI         WINGT APPROPRIATE       WINKNOWN       WINKNOWN       WINKNOWN         COMMATION       FREE FALL       FENCING	FIBERGLASS @ COMBINATION ONE @ NOT EXTENSIVE @ Ex OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED @ UNK ter Depth      The 7 bridges coby.      HER @ NONE UNKNOWN ter Depth RS @ SUPPORTS @ OTHER      UNKNOWN      \$* DRY @ OTHER
Dutlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Outlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Dutlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       2       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       2       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       2       1       1       2       3       4       2         Inlet Shape       1       2       2       3       4       2       3       4       2         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       HEADWALL       1       1       5       5         Slope % (Optional)       MAT STREAM GRADE       Slope Confidence       Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE         Structure Substrate Type (Pick one)       Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       S         Physical Barriers (Pick all that apply)       NONE       Severity (Chosse carefully based on barrier (pick) abov	all     METAL     CONCRETE       7     FORD     UNKNOWN       PREE FALL     CASCADE     F       B. Height     2     5     C. Substance       Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	PLASTIC SWOOD ROCK/STONE S REMOVED Outlet Armoring N REE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/O strate/Water Width D. Wa E. Abutment Height () NOWN REMOVED VINGWALLS MITERED TO SLOPE OT CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED strate/Water Width D. Wa Strate/Water Width D. Wa al Structures NONE BAFFLES/WEI ING NOT APPROPRIATE UNKNOWN COBBLE BOULDER BEDROCK S UNKNOWN COMMATION FREE FALL FENCING ERATE SEVERE	FIBERGLASS @ COMBINATION ONE @ NOT EXTENSIVE # Ex OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED @ UNK ter Depth      /pe 7 bridges only  HER @ NONE UNKNOWN ter Depth RS @ SUPPORTS @ OTHER      UNKNOWN      ################################
Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Outlet Grade (Pick enel       AT STREAM GRADE         Outlet Drop to Water Surface	aii       METAL       CONCRETE       I         7       FORD       UNKNOWN         PREE FALL       CASCADE       F         B. Height       7       C. Substantion         at       3       7       C. Substantion         at       3       7       FORD       WINGWALLS         S       6       7       FORD       WINGWALLS         INLET DROP       PERCHED       S         B. Height       5       C. Substantion         B. Height       100%       Intern         VE       COMPARABLE       CONTRAST         SILT       SAND       GRAVEL         25%       50%       75%       100%         DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK       DEF       MOD         O-SHALLOWER       NONE       MINOR	PLASTIC SWOOD ROCK/STONE S REMOVED Outlet Armoring N REE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/O strate/Water Width <u>J</u> D. Wa <u>L</u> <u>5</u> E. Abutment Height (A NOWN REMOVED WINGWALLS MITERED TO SLOPE OT CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Strate/Water Width <u>J</u> D. Wa al Structures V NONE BAFFLES/WEI TING WINOT APPROPRIATE WUNKNOWN COBBLE BOULDER BEDROCK WUNKNOWN COMMATION FREE FALL FENCING ERATE SEVERE UNKNOWN DRY	FIBERGLASS @ COMBINATION ONE @ NOT EXTENSIVE @ Ex OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED @ UNK ter Depth      The 7 bridges celuy.      HER @ NONE UNKNOWN ter Depth  RS @ SUPPORTS @ OTHER      UNKNOWN      SUPPORTS @ OTHER
Outlet Shape       1       2       3       4       5       6         Outlet Grade (Pick ene)       AT STREAM GRADE         Outlet Dimensions       A. Width       3       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       8         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       9         Outlet Drop to Water Surface       1       2       3       4       9         Inlet Shape       1       2       3       4       4         Inlet Type       PROJECTING       HEADWALL       1       1       5         Inlet Grade (Rick ane)       AT STREAM GRADE       Slope Confidence       5       5         Stope % (Optionity)       Slope Confidence       Structure Substrate Matches Stream       NONE         Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE       Structure Substrate Coverage       NONE         Severity (Choste catefulty bated on barriet typeid abov       Water Depth Matches Strea	Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress         Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: Second Stress       Image: S	PLASTIC SWOOD ROCK/STONE S REMOVED Outlet Armoring N REE FALL ONTO CASCADE CLOGGED/O strate/Water Width D. D. Wa CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Strate/Water Width D. Wa CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Strate/Water Width D. Wa CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Strate/Water Width D. Wa CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Strate/Water Width D. Wa CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Strate/Water Width D. WA CLOGGED/COLLAPSED/SUBMERGED STRATE SEVERE UNKNOWN FREE FALL FENCING ERATE SEVERE UNKNOWN DRY	I FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE IN NOT EXTENSIVE FEX OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN UNK ter Depth IPP 7 Bridges cody) HER INNOWN Ter Depth INNOWN Ter Dep



2	Strop	c connectivity		Malyam AL	Hakeem 3/201 ENTRY DATE
ć	NAACC DATA F	ORM	ey	DATA ENTRY REVIEWED BY	REVIEW DATE
Ç	WIVEH #3 @ 12:30				
Ţ	Crossing Code XV 42115 441	371785165		Local ID (Optional)	
	Date Observed (00/00/0000023/20/202	3Lead Observer	Stefanie	Covino	
	Town/County_SUTTON		Stream	unnamed.	trib to Montord 1
	Road Old Mill Road	Type	MULTILANE 🚀 PA	VED % UNPAVED 🖗	DRIVEWAY 🔅 TRAIL 🎊 R
	GPS Coordinates Decinal degrees 4 2.	1   5 6 0 "N Latit	ude	71.78	534 WLongitude
1	Location Description				
	Crossing Type 20 BRIDGE CULVERT 20 BURIED STREAM 28 INACCESSIBLE 26 F	、MULTIPLE CULVERT )液 FORD 海RTIALLY INACCESSIBLE 一線 NO UP	NO CROSSING	REMOVED CROSSING	Number of Culverts/ Bridge
	Photo IDs INLETOUTLE	TUPSTREAM	D	OWNSTREAM	OTHER
10.00	Flow Condition 🛞 NO FLOW 🚿 TYPICAL-L	.ow 🗑 moderate 🚿 high	Crossing Conditi	on 🖋 OK 🚿 POOR	% NEW 🛞 UNKNOWN
	Tidal Site 🛞 YES 🚿 NO 🔅 UNKNOWN	Alignment Stow-ALIGNED	3 SKEWED (>45%)	Road Fill Height (Top of	cutvert to road surface; bridge = 01
	Bankfull Width (Optional) Confidence	e 🚳 HIGH 🏾 S LOW/ESTIMATED	Constriction	severe 🔅 moder/	ATE 😹 SPANS ONLY BANKFUL
	Tailwater Scour Pool IN NONE SMALL	徑 LARGE	SPANS FUL	L CHANNEL & BANKS	ACTIVE CHANNEL
100					
	Crossing Comments WUTAND U	pand Jown Stream	PLASTIC 缆 WOO	D ROCK/STONE	FIBERGLASS 🛞 COMBINATIO
	Crossing Comments Withand U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape of 10 2 483 44 485 186 Outlet Grade (Pick one) of AT STREAM GRADE	And Jown Stream al WMETAL © CONCRETE © 5 © 7 Ø FORD © UNKNOWN © FREE FALL © CASCADE ©	PLASTIC 32 WOO	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring R N SCADE & CLOGGED/CI	FIBERGLASS & COMBINATH ONE MOT EXTENSIVE & OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED & U
	Crossing Comments Withland U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape M @ 2 @3 @4 @5 @ 6 Outlet Grade (Pick one) WAT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0	P and Jown Stream ial WMETAL SCONCRETE S 5 57 € FORD SUNKNOWN SFREE FALL SCASCADE S B. Height 2.0 C. Suit	PLASTIC SW WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA	D ROCK/STONE Outlet Armoring N SCADE & CLOGGED/CI	2 FIBERGLASS 중 COMBINATH ONE €√NOT EXTENSIVE ⊗ OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED % U ter DepthO
	Crossing Comments Withand U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 2 3 6 4 6 5 6 6 Outlet Grade (Pickone) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface	p and bown Stream ial WMETAL SCONCRETE S 187 Ø FORD SUNKNOWN SFREE FALL SCASCADE S B. Height 2.0 C. Sul Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom	PLASTIC SE WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/C D.Wa E. Abutment Height (5)	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE COMBINATION OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED U ULTER Depth 0.6
	Crossing Comments Withland U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape M @ 2 @3 @4 @5 @ 6 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2_0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface	p and bown Stream ial WMETAL © CONCRETE S 5 €7 Ø FORD © UNKNOWN © FREE FALL © CASCADE © B. Height <u>2.0</u> C. Suit Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom = 3.9.1	PLASTIC SW WOO	D ROCK/STONE Outlet Armoring N SCADE & CLOGGED/CI D. Wa E. Abutment Height (1)	PIBERGLASS * COMBINATH ONE NOT EXTENSIVE  OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED  U ter Depth 06
	Crossing Comments With and U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 23 24 35 26 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outled) Inlet Shape 1 2 2 3 4 4	p and bown Stream ial WMETAL & CONCRETE ial WMETAL & CONCRETE is 7 FORD & UNKNOWN FREE FALL & CASCADE B. Height 2.0 C. Sub Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom D. 39.1 5 \$ 6 \$ 7 \$ FORD \$ UN	PLASTIC SE WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ostrate/Water Width	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/CI L.6. D.Wa E. Abutment Height 13 VED	FIBERGLASS & COMBINATH ONE NOT EXTENSIVE OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED U ter Depth 0.6
	Crossing Comments Withawd U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape M @ 2 @ 3 @ 4 @ 5 @ 6 Outlet Grade (Pickiona) WAT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2_0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outling the structure length (Verall length from inlet to outling the structure length from inlet to outling the structure length (Verall length from inlet to outling the structure length from inlet to outling the structure length (Verall length from inlet to outling the structure length from structure length from structure length from structure le	p and bown Stream ial wmetal © concrete © 7 FORD © UNKNOWN © FREE FALL © CASCADE B. Height 2.0 C. Sub- Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom 0.39.1 5 © 6 © 7 © FORD © UN © WINGWALLS √HEADWALL&	PLASTIC 22 WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ostrate/Water Width	D ROCK/STONE Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/CL L.6. D.Wa E. Abutment Height (1) VED VED	PIBERGLASS COMBINATH ONE NOT EXTENSIVE U OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED U U ter Depth 0.6  //pe ? bridges only: HER NONE
	Crossing Comments With Curve V RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 23 4 35 6 6 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 4 4 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 4 4 1 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE	p and bown Stream ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a concrete is 7 ≠ FORD a UNKNOWN FREE Fall a cascade B. Height 2.0 C. Sut Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom 39.1 5 ≤ 6 ≤ 7 ≈ FORD a UN Wingwalls wheadwall & is INLET DROP ≈ PERCHED	PLASTIC 32 WOO PLASTIC 32 WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA postrate/Water Width KNOWN 32 REMO WINGWALLS 32 M CLOGGED/COLLA	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/C L.6. D.Wa E. Abutment Height B VED ITERED TO SLOPE OT IPSED/SUBMERGED W	FIBERGLASS COMBINATH ONE ONT EXTENSIVE OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED Uter Depth Paridges only HER NONE UNKNOWN
	Crossing Comments Withawd U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape M @ 2 @ 3 @ 4 @ 5 @ 6 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outling) Inlet Shape M 1 @ 2 @ 3 @ 4 @ Inlet Shape PROJECTING @ HEADWALL Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0	p and bown Stream ial w/METAL © CONCRETE © 137 Ø FORD © UNKNOWN © FREE FALL © CASCADE © B. Height 2.0 C. Sult Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom 139.1 5 © 6 © 7 © FORD © UN © WINGWALLS √ HEADWALL & © INLET DROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult	PLASTIC 10 WOO PLASTIC 10 WOO REHOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ostrate/Water Width KNOWN 16 REMO WINGWALLS 00 M CLOGGED/COLL/ ostrate/Water Width	D ROCK/STONE CONTENTS OUT IN THE INFORMATION INFORMATION IN THE INFORMATION INTERPOLICOUNT INFORMATION INFORMATIONICI INTERPOLICIAL INTERPOLICIALIZIANIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIZIA INTERPOLICIALIA	FIBERGLASS COMBINATION ONE NOT EXTENSIVE IN OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED IN Unter Depth 0.6 HER NONE
	Crossing Comments Withlawd U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 33 4 35 2 6 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outled Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 4 32 Inlet Shape 2 1 2 3 3 4 32 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Stope Confidence	p and bown Stream ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a cascade is free fall a	PLASTIC SW WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA sstrate/Water Width KNOWN SW REMO WINGWALLS M M CLOGGED/COLL/ ostrate/Water Width nal Structures W	D ROCK/STONE CONTENT OF CONTENTS OF CONTENT OF CONTENT.	PIBERGLASS       COMBINATH         ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE         OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       U         Iter Depth       0         //pe * bridges onlyz
	Crossing Comments Withawd U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape M @ 2 @ 3 @ 4 @ 5 @ 6 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outling) Inlet Shape M 1 @ 2 @ 3 @ 4 @ Inlet Shape PROJECTING @ HEADWALL Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Slope % (Optional) Slope Confidence Structure Substrate Matches Stream MOD	p and bown Stream ial w/METAL & CONCRETE ial w/METAL & CONCRETE iiii 7 # FORD & UNKNOWN # FREE FALL & CASCADE B. Height 2.0 C. Sult Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom 0.39.1 5 \$ 6 \$ 7 \$ FORD \$ UN WINGWALLS ↓ HEADWALL & WINGWALLS ↓ HEADWALL & WINGWALLS ↓ HEADWALL & MINLET DROP \$ PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult WINGWALLS ↓ CONTRAST	PLASTIC # WOO PLASTIC # WOO PREE FALL ONTO CA pstrate/Water Width KNOWN # REMO WINGWALLS # M CLOGGED/COLL pstrate/Water Width nal Structures # TING # NOT APPI	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/CI CLOGG	FIBERGLASS COMBINATH ONE ONOT EXTENSIVE OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED UN ter Depth O FBridges only HER NONE UNKNOWN ter Depth O Ker Depth O Ker Combine C Ker Combine
	Crossing Comments With and W RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 33 44 55 26 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outled Inlet Shape 1 2 3 44 24 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 44 24 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Dimensions A. Width 2.3 Slope M: (Diptional) Slope Confidence Structure Substrate Matches Stream MOD	p and bown Stream ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a concrete is 7 FORD a UNKNOWN FREE FALL a CASCADE B. Height 2 0 C. Sub Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom m	PLASTIC 32 WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA sstrate/Water Width WINGWALLS M M CLOGGED/COLL/ ostrate/Water Width nal Structures STING 10 NOT APPI 20 COBBLE 30 BO	D ROCK/STONE # Outlet Armoring NI SCADE & CLOGGED/CO 	
	Crossing Comments With and W RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 33 44 55 56 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 64 56 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 64 56 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 64 56 Inlet Shape 1 82 5 3 66 4 56 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Dimensions A. Width 2.9 Slope 96.00000000 Structure Substrate Matches Stream NONE Structure Substrate Type (Pick one) NONE	p and bown Stream ial w METAL © CONCRETE ial w METAL © CONCRETE ial w METAL © CONCRETE ial w METAL © CASCADE FREE FALL © CASCADE B. Height 2.0 C. Sult 0 wingwalls w HEADwall & inlet DROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult inlet DROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult inlet OROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult is COMPARABLE © CONTRAS SILT © SAND © GRAVEL 25% © 50% © 75% © 1009	PLASTIC # WOO PLASTIC # WOO PREE FALL ONTO CA PSTATE/Water Width KNOWN # REMO WINGWALLS # M CLOGGED/COLL/ OSTRATE/Water Width CLOGGED/COLL/ STING # NOT APPI COBBLE # BO WINKWWN	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/C L. 6. D. Wa E. Abutment Height B VED TERED TO SLOPE OT NOSE DAFFLES/WEI NONE BAFFLES/WEI NONE BEDROCK S	FIBERGLASS       COMBINATH         ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE         OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       U         ter Depth       0         upe ? bridges only;       0         HER       NONE         UNKNOWN       0         ter Depth       0         Mater Depth       0         S       SUPPORTS         S       UNKNOWN         S       UNKNOWN
	Crossing Comments With and W RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 33 44 55 86 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface 7 L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outlet Inlet Shape 1 2 3 44 24 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 44 24 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Omensions A. Width 2.0 Slope % Doubloats Structure Substrate Matches Stream MOI Structure Substrate Coverage NONE Structure Substrate Coverage NONE	p and bown Stream ial w/METAL © CONCRETE ial w/METAL © CONCRETE ial w/METAL © CONCRETE ial w/METAL © CONCRETE is 7 FORD © UNKNOWN FREE FALL © CASCADE B. HeightO C. Sult outlet Drop to Stream Bottom m39.1 S © 6 © 7 © FORD © UN WINGWALLS w/HEADWALL & INLET DROP © PERCHED B. HeightO C. Sult is HIGH © LOW Inter NE © COMPARABLE © CONTRAC © SILT © SAND © GRAVEL 25% © SO% © 75% © 100% © DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK © DE	PLASTIC 12 WOO PLASTIC 12 WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA ostrate/Water Width KNOWN 16 REMO WINGWALLS M CLOGGED/COLL/ Structures 1 CLOGGED/COLL/ Structures 1 CLOGGED/COLL/ STING 10 NOT APPI COBBLE 10 BO S MUKNOWN FORMATION 12 FOR	D ROCK/STONE CONTENTS OUT IN THE INFORMATION INTENTION IN THE INFORMATION INTENTION IN THE INFORMATION INTENTION INTENTIAL INFORMATION INTENTIAL INTENTIALIA INTENTIALIA INTENTIALIA INTENTIALIA INTE	FIBERGLASS       COMBINATION         ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE         ILLAPSED/SUBMERGED       U         ter Depth       0         ILLAPSED/SUBMERGED       U         HER       NONE         UNKNOWN       U         ter Depth       0         UNKNOWN       UNKNOWN         SUNKNOWN       UNKNOWN         WORKNOWN       UNKNOWN         DRY       OTHER
	Crossing Comments With and W RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 33 44 55 26 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inler to outlet Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 4 36 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 3 4 36 Inlet Type PROJECTING HEADWALL Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Slope % (Deutonat) Slope Confidence Structure Substrate Matches Stream NOT Structure Substrate Type (Pick one) NONE Structure Substrate Coverage NONE Structure Substrate Coverage NONE	p and bown Stream ial wmetal a concrete ial wmetal a concrete 7 FORD a UNKNOWN FREE FALL & CASCADE B. Height 2.0 C. Sult 0 Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom 3 9.1 5 ≤ 6 ≤ 7 € FORD & UN WINGWALLS wmEADWALL & INLET DROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult inlet DROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult inlet DROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.0 C. Sult inlet OROP © PERCHED B. Height 100 Inter NE © COMPARABLE © CONTRAS © SULT © SAND © GRAVEL 25% © SO% 75% © 100% © DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK © DE	PLASTIC 32 WOO PLASTIC 32 WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA PSTRATE/Water Width CLOGGED/COLLA STING 10 NOT APPI CLOGGED/COLLA STING 10 NOT APPI COBBLE 10 BO S UNKNOWN FORMATION 12 FI DERATE 10 SEVERE	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/CI L.C.D.Wa E. Abutment Height By VED ITERED TO SLOPE OT ITERED TO SLOPE OT ITER	PIBERGLASS COMBINATH ONE NOT EXTENSIVE U OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED U ter Depth HER NONE UNKNOWN RS SUPPORTS OTHER UNKNOWN DRY OTHER
IONAL CONDITIONS	Crossing Comments With and With and With a second s	p and bown Stream ial w/METAL © CONCRETE ial w/METAL © CONCRETE 7 FORD © UNKNOWN FREE FALL © CASCADE B. Height 2.0 C. Sult Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom 0.39.1 5 ≤ 6 ≈ 7 ≈ FORD © UN © WINGWALLS w/HEADWALL & © INLET DROP © PERCHED B. Height 2.9 C. Sult © HIGH © LOW Inter NE © COMPARABLE © CONTRAS © SILT © SAND © GRAVEL 25% © 50% © 75% © 100% © DEBRIS/SEDIMENT/ROCK © DE e) w/ NONE © MINOR © MO O-SHALLOWER © NO-DEEPER	PLASTIC # WOO PLASTIC # WOO PREADUED FREE FALL ONTO CA postrate/Water Width KNOWN # REMO WINGWALLS # M CLOGGED/COLLA CLOGGED/COLLA STING NOT APPI CLOGGED/COLLA STING NOT APPI CLOBBLE # BO SUNKNOWN FORMATION # FI	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/CI CLOGG	FIBERGLASS       COMBINATH         ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE         OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       U         ter Depth       D
BITIONAL CONDITIONS	Crossing Comments Withawd U RUCTURE 1 Structure Mater Outlet Shape 1 2 33 44 55 26 Outlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Outlet Dimensions A. Width 2.0 Outlet Drop to Water Surface L. Structure Length (Overall length from inlet to outled Inlet Shape 1 2 3 44 26 Inlet Shape 1 2 3 44 26 Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) AT STREAM GRADE Inlet Grade (Pick one) Stope Confidence Structure Substrate Matches Stream NOO Structure Substrate Type (Pick one) NONE Structure Substrate Coverage NONE S	P A ∩ J       Jo WA Stream         Ial       VMETAL       CONCRETE         Ial       VMETAL       CONCRETE         Ial       VMETAL       CONCRETE         Ial       VMETAL       CANCRETE         Ial       VMETAL       CANCRETE         Ial       VMETAL       CANCRETE         Ial       VMETAL       CASCADE         IB       Height       2.0       C. Sult         Outlet Drop to Stream Bottom       III         III       3.4.1       IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	PLASTIC & WOO PLASTIC & WOO REMOVED FREE FALL ONTO CA Strate/Water Width KNOWN & REMO WINGWALLS & M CLOGGED/COLL/ OSTRATE/Water Width nal Structures & CLOGGED/COLL/ STRATE/Water Width nal Structures & CLOGGED/COLL/ STRATE/Water Width and Structures & CLOGGED/COLL/ STRATE/Water Width DEFORMATION & BO SUNKNOWN & DR	D ROCK/STONE P Outlet Armoring N SCADE CLOGGED/CO L. 6 D. Wa E. Abutment Height IIS VED ITERED TO SLOPE OT ITERED TO SLOPE OT ITERED TO SLOPE OT INDE BAFFLES/WEI ROPRIATE D. WA NONE BEDROCK C REE FALL SEFENCING	PIBERGLASS       COMBINATH         ONE       NOT EXTENSIVE         OLLAPSED/SUBMERGED       U         Iter Depth       0         //pe * bridges only;

AQUATIC CONNECTIVITY STREAM CROSSING SURVEY DATA FORM

5/20/16





# Appendix I - Culvert Assessment Scores Based on Prioritization Plan

This appendix shows the culvert scores table following the ranking system based in the prioritization plan criteria. These scores were used to make the priority code colors for the map displayed in *Appendix E*.

Table 3: Assessed Culvert Scores for Sutton, MA Based on the Prioritization Plan Criteria

	Culvert Scoring Matrix								
E	Each category below is weighted differently. To calculate score, rate on a scale of 1 to 3 and multiply by weight percent when adding final score.								
ID	Safety Impacts of Closure (20%)	Movement Impacts of Closure (20%)	Structural Condition (20%)	Organism Passage (20%)	Flooding and River Flow (20%)	Score			
1	2	2	1	1	1	7			
2	1	1	2	3	3	10			
3	2	2	2	3	3	12			
4	2	2	3	3	1	11			
5	1	1	2	2	1	7			
6	2	2	2	3	3	12			
7	1	1	3	3	3	11			
8	2	2	3	3	2	12			
9	1	1	2	2	1	7			
10	1	1	2	2	2	8			
11	1	1	3	3	2	10			
12	1	1	3	3	2	10			
13	2	2	2	2	2	10			
14	1	1	2	2	2	8			
15	1	1	3	3	3	11			
16	2	2	1	2	2	9			
17	2	2	2	2	1	9			
18	2	2	1	2	1	8			
19	1	1	1	2	1	6			
20						0			
# Appendix J - Massachusetts Stream Crossing Standards

## STREAM CROSSING STANDARDS

Stream crossing standards are based on six important variables. While the specifics of the regulations listed below may change over time, the crossing guidelines presented in the Massachusetts Stream Crossings Handbook remain effective for fish and wildlife.

#### 1. TYPE OF CROSSING

- General: Spans (bridges, 3-sided box culverts, openbottom culverts or arches) are strongly preferred.
- Optimum: Use a bridge.

### 2. EMBEDMENT

- All culverts should be embedded (sunk into stream) a minimum of 2 feet, and round pipe culverts at least 25%.
- If pipe culverts cannot be embedded this deep, then they should not be used.
- When embedment material includes elements >15 inches in diameter, embedment depths should be at least twice the D<sub>84</sub> (particle width larger than 84% of particles) of the embedment material.

#### 3. CROSSING SPAN

- General: Spans channel width (a minimum of 1.2 times the bankfull width of the stream).
- Optimum: Spans the streambed and banks (at least 1.2 times bankfull width) with suf.cient headroom to provide dry passage for wildlife.

#### 4. OPENNESS

- General: Openness ratio (cross-sectional area/crossing length) of at least 0.82 feet (0.25 meters). The crossing should be wide and high relative to its length.
- Optimum: Openness ratio of at least 1.64 feet (0.5 meters) and minimum height of 6 feet. If conditions significantly reduce wildlife passage near a crossing (e.g., steep embankments, high traf.c volumes, and physical barriers), maintain a minimum height of 8 feet (2.4 meters) and openness ratio of 2.46 feet (0.75 meters).

#### 5. SUBSTRATE

 Natural bottom substrate should be used within the crossing and it should match the upstream and downstream substrates. The substrate and design should resist displacement during floods and maintain an appropriate bottom during normal flows.

#### 6. WATER DEPTH AND VELOCITY

 Water depths and velocities are comparable to those found in the natural channel at a variety of flows.



#### A Well Designed Crossing

Large size suitable for handling high flows

Open-arch design preserves natural stream channel

Openness ratio greater than 0.5m, suitable for most settings

Crossing span helps maintain dry passage for wildlife

Water depth and velocity are comparable to conditions upstream and downstream

Natural substrates create good conditions for stream-dwelling animals

# Appendix K - Brochure for Community Outreach

This appendix presents one of the methods, a brochure, we used for community outreach to raise awareness about culverts.

## **Outside Page**



Cloutier and Tim Ryan

MA: cmrpc.org/cul

### **Inside Page**



# **Appendix L – Team Assessment**

## **Team Learned Strategies**

One team strategy that we found is that when we have some sort of conflict is that we always listen to everyone that has some sort of opinion before we end up having some sort of yelling competition. One example is that while we were working on our Findings and Conclusion, there were some disagreements about where certain parts go. We first listened to what everyone had to say and in less than five minutes, we resolved the issue.

Another strategy that we learned through the IQP that led to effective team outcomes was splitting the workload among team members. The equality of work lets team members feel relaxed and not feel too overwhelmed with the assignments given. One example of how we specifically did this for assignments was by having action items in our agendas, and each team member would be assigned a specific action item to work on until the next meeting. This way, each team member was given an equal number of sections to write.

Though we often gave basic feedback on each other's portions of assignments, it was not until we worked on our first formative assessment that we started to give more constructive feedback and made a plan to have a weekly meeting where we discuss areas of improvement for each of us. It helped each of us hold each other accountable and pointed out areas where we all struggled, allowing us to work together to ensure we all succeeded.

### **Team Areas of Improvement**

One area where we struggled was being willing to reach out to and schedule meetings with our advisor and sponsor when we had questions about stuff, instead waiting until we had the opportunity to see them during a regularly scheduled meeting or sending an email, a method of communication that has its limits. In the future, we could all be more willing to ask for help and communicate more freely and regularly with supervisors and advisors.

An area that team members need to improve on in future teamwork experience is sticking to internal deadlines. Internal deadlines are set up so that team members can finish their homework, consolidate it and revise it together before the actual assignment deadline. For example, our team has been setting up internal deadlines for assignments but not everyone is sticking to finishing up their homework before we meet to pass in the assignment. This causes the need to rush to work on the assignment, impacting the quality of work. Also, it usually causes a delay in terms of passing in the assignment. To improve this issue, we remind or ask each other to do our parts of the assignment. This has been effective, however, there is always room for improvement. Another area where we struggled is that many times each group member got carried away and lost concentration while we worked on many assignments. Due to this, we missed some internal deadlines but fortunately the assignments were completed however, they were slightly later than intended. To improve this issue, whether we are working together in person, we can hide all phones in one member's backpack and shut them down for the time being. We could also set deadlines and if they weren't accomplished, that specific person had to pay for coffee for the next in person meeting.