

Meadow Condition Scorecard

Version: 10/6/19

Meadow Name <u>Carrizal Meadow</u>	Date: <u>06 / 07 / 2024</u> MM DD YYYY
GPS Location: <u>38° 6' 20.600" N - 120° 50' 35.884" W</u>	
GPS Datum (e.g., WGS 84, NAD 27) _____	
Elevation (m) _____ Slope (°) _____	County <u>Eldorado</u>
Watershed (HUC8) <u>Cosumnes</u>	Landowner <u>ENF</u>
USGS Quad Name _____	7.5' or 15' (circle one)
Observers: <u>MEG</u>	

Parameter	CONDITION CATEGORY			
	Natural Condition	Slightly impacted	Moderately Impacted	Heavily Impacted
1. Bank Height in Main Channel (measured in the riffle).	Little or no channel incision. Banks 0-2 feet high along >95% of the channel length.	Bank heights of 2-4 feet along less than 25% of the channel length; 0-2 feet elsewhere.	Bank heights of 2-4 feet along 25% or more of channel length; higher than 4 feet along less than 25% of channel length.	Bank heights > 4 feet along 25% or more of channel length. Note if sections of channel have banks 0-2 feet high.
Score:	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Second Channel (if present):	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
2. Bank Stability	<5% of bank length is unstable.	5-20% of bank length is unstable.	20-50% of bank is unstable	>50% of bank is unstable.
Score:	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Second Channel (if present):	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
3. Gullies/ditches outside of main channel	No gullies or ditches impacting hydrology outside of the main channel	Ditch or start of a gully outside of the main channel. Combined length of all gullies & ditches is less than 1/10 th meadow length.	Combined length of all gullies and ditches up to 1/2 of meadow length	Combined length of all gullies and ditches is greater than 1/2 of meadow length.
Score:	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
4. Vegetation Cover	Graminoids account for 75-100% of the area covered by vegetation	50-75% graminoid cover	Forbs dominate. 25-50% graminoid cover.	Forbs dominate. <25% graminoid cover.
Score:	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
5. Bare Ground	Bare ground covers less than 5% of the meadow area.	Bare ground covers 5-10% of meadow area	Bare ground covers 10-15% of meadow area.	Bare ground covers > 15% of meadow area.
Score:	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
6. Conifer or Upland Shrub Encroachment	No upland shrub or conifer encroachment. Raised, topographically distinct areas may have upland species present, but not the meadow surface.	Few encroaching upland species; <10% of total meadow area	Encroaching upland species cover 10-20% of total meadow area	Encroaching upland species cover >20% of total meadow area (Buried)
Score:	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Total		21		
Possible Points		32		
Total/Possible		21/32 = 66%		



American Rivers

Rivers Connect Us

Additional Observations:

1. Yes No Evidence of conservation or restoration efforts (check dams, stabilized headcuts, enclosure fencing, etc.) Photo Numbers: _____
Description: _____

2. Yes No Headcut present in meadow? Number of headcuts 5
Describe headcuts (Photo number, jump height, width, length, movement potential. GPS or record location on map):

3-6 ft headcuts (jump height) typically 1-2 ft wide
downstream headcut has high potential to move upstream,
upper 4 seem okay

3. Yes No Meadow contains inset floodplain surrounded by upland vegetation?
Describe _____

4. Yes No Invasive species observed? Describe potentially invasive thistle or but didn't get good look

5. Yes No Fish observed? Describe _____

6. Recent Old None Evidence of beavers? Describe _____

7. Yes No Aspen present in or adjacent to meadow?

8. Yes No Accessible by vehicle?

9. Grazing observations. Check all that are present:

Trails Stubble Dung in channels Hoof prints on banks

10. Human impacts. Check all that are present in the meadow:

Trail Evidence of OHV use Road Corral Building

11. Adjacent land use. Check all that are present within 200 yards of meadow:

Culvert Bridge Road Building

12. Gopher disturbance covers 0 % of meadow area (from toe-point transects).

13. Willow, alder and aspen cover 1 % of meadow area. (burned)

14. Comments on ease of/ barriers to restoration (e.g., are impacts localized or disbursed throughout meadow, access, adjacent land use)

Really good access, potential barrier include extensive gully system which would be difficult to restore. Possibility for treatment of headcuts to prevent further degradation but site of meadow probably cost prohibitive for full fill restoration to reactivate full floodplain.

Additional Notes & Comments:

