Standard Checklist

Name of Riparian-Wetland Area: Tularcitos Creek

Date: August 11, 2004 Segment/Reach ID: Reach 3 PFC 903

Miles:_____ Elevation:_____ GPS: N 36 . 26 . 668 ' W 121 . 40 . 271 '

ID Team Observers: Danica Zupic, Ben Eichorn Time:_____

Yes	No	N/A	HYDROLOGY
X			1) Floodplain above bankfull is inundated in "relatively frequent" events
		X	2) Where beaver dams are present they are active and stable
X			3) Sinuosity, width/depth ratio, and gradient are in balance with the landscape setting (i.e., landform, geology, and bioclimatic region)
X			4) Riparian-wetland area is widening or has achieved potential extent
	X		5) Upland watershed is not contributing to riparian-wetland degradation

Yes	No	N/A	VEGETATION
X			6) There is diverse age-class distribution of riparian-wetland vegetation (recruitment for maintenance/recovery)
X			7) There is diverse composition of riparian-wetland vegetation (for maintenance/recovery)
X			8) Species present indicate maintenance of riparian-wetland soil moisture characteristics
X			9) Streambank Vegetation is comprised of those plants or plant communities that have root masses capable of withstanding high-streamflow events
X			10) Riparian-wetland plants exhibit high vigor
X			11) Adequate riparian-wetland vegetative cover is present to protect banks and dissipate energy during high flows
X			12) Plant communities are an adequate source of coarse and/or large woody material (for maintenance/recovery)

Yes	No	N/A	EROSION/DEPOSITION
X			13) Floodplain and channel characteristics (i.e., rocks, overflow channels, coarse and/or large woody material) are adequate to dissipate energy
X			14) Point bars are revegetating with riparian-wetland vegetation
X			15) Lateral stream movement is associated with natural sinuosity
X			16) System is vertically stable
	X		17) Stream is in balance with the water and sediment being supplied by the watershed (i.e., no excessive erosion or deposition)

Summary Determination

Functional Rating:

Proper Functioning Condition	☐
Functional—At Risk	☒
Nonfunctional	☐
Unknown	☐

Trend for Functional—At Risk:

Upward	☐
Downward	☐
Not Apparent	☒

Are factors contributing to unacceptable conditions outside the control of the manager?

Yes	☐
No	☐

If **yes, what are those factors?**

☐ Flow regulations	☐ Mining activities	☐ Upstream channel conditions
☐ Channelization	☐ Road encroachment	☐ Oil field water discharge
☐ Augmented flows	☐ Other (specify)_____	

Picture 1

Remarks

This reach was observed from the roadside of Carmel Valley Road starting at county bridge 524, while the stretch from bridge 522 to the end was observed first hand in the creek bed.

The vegetation is composed of dense vigorous willows and sycamores, alders with an abundance of grasses and vines. There were some recruits noted (See Pictures 1 and 2).

There are no cobbles or rocks visible. There was some seepage. Up to a half foot of thick mud was observed after bridge 522. The hillside upstream of bridge 522 is eroding and several large sediment deposits lay under bridge 522.

The reach ended where the creek diverges from the road at GPS: N36,26.881 W121,41.040.

Picture 2

Checklist Comments

#5, 17 There was excess sediment throughout the reach. No cobbles or rocks were visible only a muddy creek bed.

#13 There were no overflow channels or large rocks or boulders observed, however, the large accessible floodplain and presence of LWD would adequately dissipate energy.