# Stream Condition Rapid Assessment

| | |
|---|---|
| Stream name & location: | Assessed by: |
| Ecoregion: | Site visit date: |
| Watershed drainage area (sq mi): | Substrate (sand, gravel, cobble, bedrock): |
| Stream slope (ft/ft): | Stream reach length (ft): |
| Bankfull riffle area (sq ft): | Width/depth ratio (WDR): |
| Entrenchment ratio (ER): | Bank height ratio (BHR): |
| Sinuosity (K): | Streambank stability (BEHI): |

**Stream Condition and Function:** Score from 0 to 2 indicating natural stream integrity and health:
*2 = Good;  1 = Fair;  0 = Poor*

1. **Upstream watershed impacts from stormwater, wastewater, or sediment**   _____

| Good: no impacts from upstream sources | Fair: some minor impacts from upstream sources | Poor: major impacts from upstream sources |
|---|---|---|

2. **Local stream reach impacts from ditches, pipes, livestock, utilities, or roads**   _____

| Good: no impacts from local sources | Fair: some minor impacts from local sources | Poor: major impacts from local sources |
|---|---|---|

3. **Channel dimension related to bankfull cross-section measurements**   _____

| Good: natural equilibrium width, depth, and area dimensions expected for the watershed | Fair: some disequilibrium indicated by unnatural dimensions | Poor: major disequilibrium indicated by incision, widening, high variability, or channelized system |
|---|---|---|

4. **Channel pattern related to planform measurements**   _____

| Good: natural equilibrium meander pattern with sinuosity expected for the watershed | Fair: some disequilibrium indicated by unnatural pattern features | Poor: major disequilibrium indicated by tight bends, cutoffs, rapid down-valley meander migration, or straightening |
|---|---|---|

5. **Channel bed profile related to longitudinal profile measurements**   _____

| Good: natural equilibrium riffles, pools, steps, glides, and runs with bedform expected for the watershed | Fair: some disequilibrium indicated by unnatural or missing bedform features | Poor: major disequilibrium indicated by head cutting, plane bed, aggradation, or riffle migration into pools |
|---|---|---|

**6. Streambank stability and protection from erosion** _____

| Good: low erodibility resulting from covered soil, low banks, deep roots, low stress | Fair: moderate erodibility resulting from some bare soil or erodible bank conditions | Poor: high erodibility resulting from bare soil, eroding bends, steep banks, high banks, lack of roots, high stress |
|---|---|---|

**7. Floodplain connection for bankfull flood access** _____

| Good: regular floodplain access with BHR < 1.2 | Fair: some incision with BHR = 1.2–1.9 | Poor: severely incised channel with BHR > 2 |
|---|---|---|

**8. Floodplain morphology to dissipate flood energy and minimize erosion** _____

| Good: low entrenchment with ER > 5 and no contractions | Fair: moderate entrenchment with ER = 1.5–5 and/or minor contractions | Poor: severe entrenchment with ER < 1.5 and/or major contractions |
|---|---|---|

**9. Riparian vegetation to provide shade, nutrient uptake, and food sources** _____

| Good: healthy native plants growing in more than 90% of 50-ft buffer on both sides | Fair: healthy native plants growing in half to 90% of 50-ft buffer on both sides | Poor: healthy native plants growing in less than half of 50-ft buffer on both sides |
|---|---|---|

**10. Habitats including diverse bedform, large woody debris, leaf packs, root hairs** _____

| Good: healthy aquatic micro- and macro-habitat features expected for watershed | Fair: lacking up to half of expected aquatic habitat features | Poor: lacking more than half of expected aquatic habitat features |
|---|---|---|

**11. Water quality and stream bed sediments** _____

| Good: clear water with natural sediments expected for watershed | Fair: some turbidity and/or embeddedness affecting habitat conditions | Poor: excessive turbidity and/or embeddededness strongly affecting habitat conditions |
|---|---|---|

**12. Presence of desirable fish and macroinvertebrates expected for watershed** _____

| Good: healthy communities including intolerant taxa | Fair: missing some intolerant taxa | Poor: lacking expected communities and/or dominated by tolerant taxa |
|---|---|---|

**Total Score:** _____ ( < 9 Poor;  9 – 15 Fair;  16 – 21 Good;  > 21 Excellent)

**Notes:** _____

_____

_____

_____