MN WHEP VEGETATION SURVEY METRIC SCORING SHEET

Site Name:_____ Date Sampled:_____
Team Leader/Observer:_____ Date Scored:_____
Team Name:_____ County:_____
Local Sponsor:

1) Vascular Genera

-Count the number of different genera of low vascular plants (Ferns & Horsetails), woody plants, grasslikes, & forbs observed within the sample plot. Be careful not to count the same genus twice.

a. Number of **Low Vasculars**: _____

b. Number of **Woody Plants**: _____

c. Number of **Grasslikes**: _____

d. Number of **Forbs**: _____

e. **Plot Tally** (sum of a - d): _____

f. **Metric #1 Score**: _____

Scoring criteria for Vascular Genera

Plot Tally	Score
≥ 20	5
9 - 19	3
0 - 8	1

Comments:

2) Nonvascular Taxa

-Count the number of different kinds of nonvascular taxa observed within the sample plot. Do not count slimy filamentous algae, but note in the comments section.

a. **Plot Tally**: _____

b. **Metric #2 Score**: _____

Scoring criteria for Nonvascular Taxa

Plot Tally	Score
≥ 2	5
1	3
0	1

Comments:

MN WHEP VEGETATION SURVEY METRIC SCORING SHEET

Site Name:_____ Team Name:_____ Date Sampled:_____

3) Grasslike Genera

-Count the number of different kinds of grasslike genera observed within the sample plot (refer to metric #1, part c).

a. Plot Tally: _____

b. Metric #3 Score: _____

Comments:

Scoring criteria for Grasslike Genera

Plot Tally	Score
≥ 5	5
2 - 4	3
0 - 1	1

4) *Carex* Cover

-Estimate the percent cover of *Carex* within the sample plot.

a. *Carex* Cover Class Value: _____

b. Metric #4 Score: _____

Comments:

Scoring criteria for *Carex* Cover

CC Value	Percent	Score
3 - 6	≥ 5%	5
2	1 - 5%	3
0 - 1	0 - 1%	1

5) *Utricularia* Presence

a. Was *Utricularia* present in the plot? **Yes No**

b. Metric #5 Score: _____

Comments:

Scoring criteria for *Utricularia* Presence

Presence/Absence	Score
Present	5
Absent	1

6) Aquatic Guild

-Count the number of different Aquatic Guild genera. This includes the submergent aquatic forbs and floating leaved aquatic forbs listed on the releve data sheet ***and*** *Chara, Riccia fluitans,* and *Ricciocarpus natans*

a. Plot Tally: _____

b. Metric #6 Score: _____

Comments:

Scoring criteria for Aquatic Guild

Plot Tally	Score
≥ 6	5
3 - 5	3
0 - 2	1

MN WHEP VEGETATION SURVEY METRIC SCORING SHEET

Site Name:_____ Team Name:_____ Date Sampled:_____

7) Persistent Litter

-Record the cover class (CC) of each plant taxa listed below that was found in your plot. Determine the midpoint % cover and sum all of the values to score this metric. The midpoint % cover is the middle percentage of the range that a CC represents. Data must be converted from CC to midpoint % before being added together, because the ranges that CC's represent are not equal.

a. Sum of midpoint percent cover:

Plant	CC	Midpoint %
Typha (Cat Tail)	___	_____
Sparganium (Bur-Reed)	___	_____
Lythrum (Loosestrife)	___	_____
Phragmites australis (Giant Reed)	___	_____
Scirpus (Bulrush)	___	_____
Polygonum (Smartweed)	___	_____

Total Midpoint %: _____ (%)

CC	Percent Cover Range	Midpoint %
6	75-100	87
5	50-75	63
4	25-50	38
3	5-25	15
2	1-5	3
1	0-1	0.5

b. Metric #7 Score: _____

Scoring criteria for Persistent Litter

Total Midpoint %	Score
≤ 27%	5
28 - 54%	3
≥ 54%	1

Comments:

IBI Summary

-Tally your results from the seven metrics and add them together to arrive at a wetland vegetation IBI score and condition assessment for the site.

Metric	Score
1) Vascular Genera	_____
2) Nonvascular Taxa	_____
3) Grasslike Genera	_____
4) *Carex* Cover	_____
5) *Utricularia* Presence	_____
6) Aquatic Guild	_____
7) Persistent Litter	_____
Total:	_____

Site Score Interpretation

IBI Score	Wetland assessment
26 - 35	Excellent
16 -25	Moderate
7 - 15	Poor

Wetland Condition Assessment:_____

MN WHEP VEGETATION SURVEY METRIC SCORING SHEET

Site Name:_____ Team Name:_____ Date Sampled:_____

Additional Site Remarks

-Please provide any additional information about this site and/or the vegetation survey. Do you think the methods for evaluating the vegetation are adequate for this site? Does the condition assessment reflect your impressions of the site? Are there any potential threats to the site (e.g. new developments, stormwater inputs, roads, etc)?