FS - FISH SCREENING of DIVERSIONS

Contract name:

Contract #:

Stream/Road: **Evaluator:** Date (mm/dd/yy): Comments **Project Feature** Feature Type Code 1. If a goal, is diversion flow regulated by a headgate and streamflow gauge? 2. If a goal, was a screen installed or upgraded to meet DFG fish screen criteria? Screen 3. Visible problems with the screen: ALN, ANC, BUR, COR, PLG, MAT, MEC, UND, UNS, NON, OTH Fish 4. Structural condition of fish screen: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail 5. Does the fish screen now meet all current DFG screen criteria? 6. Is the screen located in a diversion canal? **Placement** a. Distance along diversion canal from stream to screen (ft): 7. If a goal, has the distance between the stream and screen been reduced? 8. Does the bypass provide adequate escape for fish? a. Does the bypass appear to be easy to locate and enter for fish? Bypass b. Does the bypass appear to be free of safety hazards to fish? c. Does the bypass appear to be adequately sized to pass debris? 9. If a goal, was the length of the bypass been reduced? a. Distance along bypass canal from bypass inlet to stream (ft): 10. Does screen appear to have uniform flow over the screen surface? Velocity Cri. 11. Is the self-cleaning mechanism functioning? a. Is the cleaning cycle adequate to avoid debris accumulation? b. Is the cleaning mechanism cleaning the entire screen? 12. Since implementation, has there been construction of a seasonal dam? a. Did a back flooding weir replace that practice?* 13. Channel problems in the vicinity of the treatment area: AGG, BRD, FLO, Channel GRC, HDC, INC, NAR, SCU, STT, WID, NON, OTH 14. If a goal, did the feature achieve the targeted stream channel conditions? a. Condition: AGG, FPD, GRC, INC, NAR, SCU, SIN, STB, TOG, WID, OTH 15. Were there any unintended channel effects? If Y, comment. 16. Is there bank erosion or instability in the vicinity of the treatment area? a. Locations: UPS, DNS, WIN and LBK, RBK Banks b. Apparent cause: BAR, CNR, EMG, GRZ, HYD, UND, USG, OTH 17. If a goal, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced? 18. Were there unintended effects on banks? If Y, comment. 19. Do **adult** fish of the targeted species have access into the diversion? a. Targeted fish species: COHO, CHIN, CT, SH, etc. Fish Access 20. Did the feature eliminate adult fish access into the diversion? 21. Do **juvenile** fish of the targeted species have access into the diversion? a. Targeted fish species: COHO, CHIN, CT, SH, etc. 22. Did the feature eliminate juvenile fish access into the diversion? 23. Has the screen been regularly maintained according to plan? Rating 24. Feature Effectiveness Rating (Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail) 25. Does this feature need: ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH 26. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location? * Use FB checklist to evaluate weir if applicable. Y=Yes, N=No, P=Partially, D=Don't know, A=Not Applicable. CRMEP May 2006 Draft