FS - FISH SCREENING of DIVERSIONS   POST-TREATMENT

Grant #:   **Project title:**

Date :   **Evaluator:**   **Site ID:**   page ___ of ___

		Project Feature Number		**Comments**
		Feature Type Code		
Fish Access	1. Do adult fish of the targeted species have access into the diversion?			
	a. Targeted fish species: COHO, CHIN, CT, SH, etc.			
	2. Did the feature eliminate adult fish access into the diversion?			
	3. Do juvenile fish of the targeted species have access into the diversion?			
	a. Targeted fish species: COHO, CHIN, CT, SH, etc.			
	4. Did the feature eliminate juvenile fish access into the diversion?			
	5. Are fish prevented from being pinned against the screen?			
Fish screen	6. If an objective, is diversion flow regulated by a headgate and streamflow gauge?			
	7. If an objective, does the fish screen meet all current DFG screen criteria?			
	a. Problems: ALN, ANC, BBB, COR, MAT, MEC, PLG, UND, UNS, NON, OTH			
	b. Structural condition of fish screen: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail			
Place.	8. If an objective, has the distance between the stream and screen been reduced?			
	a. Distance along diversion canal from stream to screen: (ft)			
Bypass	9. If applicable, does the bypass provide adequate escape for fish?			
	a. Does the bypass appear to be easy to locate and enter for fish?			
	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?			
	10. If an objective, was the bypass improved?			
	11. If an objective, was the length of the bypass reduced?			
	a. Distance along bypass canal from bypass inlet to stream: (ft)			
Criteria	12. Does screen appear to have uniform flow over the screen surface?			
	13. 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?			
Channel	14. If an objective, was the need for a push-up or other seasonal dam eliminated?			
	15. If a weir was installed, is it functioning as designed? If Y, use FB.			
	16. Stream channel problems in the vicinity of the diversion: AGG, BRD, FLO, GRC, HDC, INC, NAR, SCU, STT, WID, NON, OTH			
	17. If an objective, did the feature achieve the targeted stream channel conditions?			
	a. Condition: AGG, FPD, GRC, INC, NAR, SCU, SIN, STB, TOG, WID, OTH			
	18. Were there any unintended stream channel effects? If Y, comment.			
Banks	19. Is there streambank erosion or instability in the vicinity of the diversion/screen?			
	a. Locations: UPS, DNS, WIN and LBK, RBK			
	b. Apparent causes: BAR, CNR, EMG, GRZ, HYD, UND, USG, OTH			
	20. If an objective, was streambank instability and/or bank erosion reduced?			
	21. Were there unintended effects on streambanks? If Y, comment.			
Rating	22. Has the screen been regularly maintained as planned?			
	23. **Feature Effectiveness Rating: Excl, Good, Fair, Poor, Fail**			
	24. Does this feature need: DEC, ENH, MNT, REP, NON, OTH			
	25. Are additional restoration treatments recommended at this location?			