

**Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County
CAP Workbook Threats Assessment Summary Tables
2008**

Assessment of Target Viability
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Assessment of Target Viability | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Indicator Ratings | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | <i>Italics = Desired</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Bold = Current | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Indicator Ratings | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conservation Target | | Category | Key Attribute | Indicator | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Current Indicator Status | Current Rating | Desired Rating | Date of Current Rating | Date for Desired Rating |
| 1 | Egg | Landscape Context | Flow during incubation period | Baseflow in relation to avg. annual daily flow | < 25% of avg. annual daily flow | 26-50% of avg. annual daily flow | | > 50% of avg. annual daily flow | highly variable flow | Fair | | Nov-02 | |
| 1 | Egg | Landscape Context | Non-native species | Non-native egg predators | present throughout | present in >50% of stream reaches | present; isolated reaches | absent | present; >50% of reaches | Fair | | | |
| 1 | Egg | Landscape Context | Water temperature | Mean weekly avg. | < 5 C. and > 13 C. | 11.1-13 C. | 10.1-11 C. | 6-10 C. | | | | | |
| 1 | Egg | Condition | Substrate quality | Avg. percent fines (<0.85mm) in potential | > 17% fines | 11-17% fines | 5-10 % fines | < 5% fines | Low abundance of spawning substrate | Fair | | Nov-02 | |
| 1 | Egg | Condition | Substrate quality | Embeddedness | > 75% embedded | 50-75% embedded | 25-49% embedded | < 25% embedded | > 75% embedded | Poor | | Nov-02 | |
| 2 | Fry | Landscape Context | Dispersal | Barriers between redds and rearing habitat | complete barrier | partial barriers common | partial barriers scarce | no barriers | | | | Dec-02 | |
| 2 | Fry | Landscape Context | Non-native species | Non-native fry predators | present throughout | present in >50% of stream reaches | present; isolated reaches | absent | | Fair | | Sep-07 | |
| 2 | Fry | Landscape Context | Sediment supply | Turbidity (no. days turbidity is > 25 NTUs) | > 30 days during fry development period | 20-30 days | 10-19 days | < 10 days | | | | | |
| 2 | Fry | Condition | Habitat complexity/refugia | Amount of functional high velocity refuge habitat with flows < 15 cm/sec | none; watercourse in rearing habitat is channelized | some | common | abundant | Low amount of instream cover | Fair | | Nov-02 | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Landscape Context | Dispersal | Barriers between rearing habitat and | present | | | absent | present; >50% of reaches | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Landscape Context | Flow during rearing period | Pool habitat > 2 feet in depth | pools scarce or absent | low abundance of pools | high abundance of pools | high abundance of pools with multiple "refuge pools" (> 5 ft deep) | | Fair | | Dec-02 | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Landscape Context | Non-native species | Non-native juvenile predators | present throughout | present in >50% of stream reaches | present; isolated reaches | absent | | Poor | | | |

Assessment of Target Viability
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Conservation Target | | Category | Key Attribute | Indicator | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Current Indicator Status | Current Rating | Desired Rating | Date of Current Rating | Date for Desired Rating |
|---------------------|----------|-------------------|---|---|-----------|------------|------------|-------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 3 | Juvenile | Landscape Context | Summer flow | Percent of unimpaired median summer baseflow (based on long-term) | < 70% | 70-90% | > 90% | 100% over all IP-km | | Poor | | | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Landscape Context | Water temperature | Median weekly average temperature | > 21 C. | 18-21 C. | < 18 C. | < 17 C. | | | | | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Condition | Estuarine freshwater inflows | Percentage of unimpaired freshwater inflow to estuary (necessary for maintaining) | < 25% | 25-49% | 50-75% | > 75% | salinity 2.8 to 4.8 ppt in late May 2002 | Good | | Sep-02 | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Condition | Estuarine freshwater inflows | Persistence of hypoxic or anoxic saline layer (> 15 ppt) in potential rearing habitat | 3 months | 1 month | 1 week | < 3 days | | Very Good | | May-02 | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Condition | Food availability | Species | < 25 taxa | 25-29 taxa | 30-40 taxa | > 40 taxa | | | | | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Condition | Habitat complexity/refugia | Instream refugia | absent | scarce | common | abundant instream cover | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 3 | Juvenile | Condition | Riparian corridor species composition and structure | Mean percent native, undisturbed composition and structure in | < 25% | 25-50% | 51-75% | historic conditions | | Poor | | | |
| 4 | Smolt | Landscape Context | Dispersal | Number of days when depths are < 0.4 ft anywhere in migration corridor during | > 10 days | 6-10 days | 1-5 days | 0 days | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 4 | Smolt | Landscape Context | Flow for downstream passage March through June | Maximum potential rate of diversion by pumping during April and May (expressed as | > 150% | 100-150% | 50-99% | < 50% | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 4 | Smolt | Landscape Context | Passage to ocean | Number of days stream mouth is open with adequate flow during | < 30 days | 30-60 days | 60-90 days | > 90 days | | | | | |

**Assessment of Target Viability
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County**

| Conservation Target | | Category | Key Attribute | Indicator | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Current Indicator Status | Current Rating | Desired Rating | Date of Current Rating | Date for Desired Rating |
|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5 | Adult | Landscape Context | Dispersal | Accessibility of suitable spawning areas (based on TRT criteria) | accessible sites are clumped in one location or < 25% of all tributaries are accessible | 25-50% of all tributaries are accessible | 50-75% of all tributaries are accessible | > 75% of all tributaries are accessible | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 5 | Adult | Landscape Context | Dispersal | Number of days stream mouth is open with adequate flow during entry | < 30 days | 30-60 days | 60-90 days | > 90 days | | | | | |
| 5 | Adult | Landscape Context | Flow during spawning period (spawning and upstream/down stream passage) | Percent of net discharge (unimpaired flow minus total diversions) occurring between 1 | > 10% | 6-10% | 3-5% | < 3% | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 5 | Adult | Landscape Context | Water temperature | Median weekly average temperature in | > 17 C. | 15-16.9 C. | 13-14.9 C. | 10-12.9 C. | | | | | |
| 5 | Adult | Size | Population size | Mean annual adult spawner abundance | | TRT criteria for low extinction risk (by watershed) | | | | Poor | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Barriers/diversions | Stream crossings/strea | > two/mile | | | < two/mile | | Poor | | Sep-07 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Fire regime/vegetation maturity | Percent of watershed affected by high intensity fire | > 25% | 10-24% | 5-9% | < 5% | | Fair | | Sep-07 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Floodplain connectivity | Floodplain connectivity | < 50% of response reaches in watershed have inundation of historic floodplains by bankfull flows (connectivity) | 50-65% of response reaches in watershed demonstrate floodplain connectivity | 66-80% of response reaches in watershed demonstrate floodplain connectivity | > 80% of response reaches in watershed demonstrate connectivity | | Poor | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Flow and channel morphology | Percent of total watercourse length | > 25% | 16-25% | 5-15% | < 5% | | Poor | | Sep-07 | |

Assessment of Target Viability
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Conservation Target | | Category | Key Attribute | Indicator | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Current Indicator Status | Current Rating | Desired Rating | Date of Current Rating | Date for Desired Rating |
|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Historic vs Current Spawning Habitat | Fraction of historic spawning tributaries | < 15% available | 16-50% available | 51-90% available | >90% available | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Hydrology | Dry stream reaches | > 75% dry reaches | 26-75% dry reaches | 1-25% dry reaches | no dry reaches; perennial surface flows | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Hydrology | Modified hydrograph | severe (dams present) | | | natural | | Poor | | Dec-02 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Land use | Distribution of public ownership along main stem of watercourse | < 25% of land bordering main stem of drainage is publicly owned | 25-50% | 51-75% | > 75% | | Poor | | Sep-07 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Land use | Miles of road per square mile of watershed within 100 | > 1 mi | 0.5-1.0 mi | 0.1-0.49 mi | < 0.1 mi | | | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Land use | Miles of roads per square mile of watershed | > 3.0 mi | 2.6-3.0 mi | 1.6-2.5 mi | < 1.6 mi | | | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Land use | Percent of watershed area | > 30% | 20-29% | 10-19% | < 10% | | Poor | | Sep-07 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Land use | Percent of watershed area in agriculture within 100 | > 20% | 11-20% | 5-10% | < 5% | | Fair | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Land use | Percent of watershed area in public | < 25 % public ownership | 25-50% | 51-75% | > 75% | | Poor | | Sep-07 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Land use | Percent of watershed area in | > 25% | 10-25% | 5-9% | < 5% | | Very Good | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Water quality | General index of toxicity based on severity of adverse effects on fish | Acute lethal effects (fish kill) | Sublethal effects (reduced growth, altered behavior, etc.) | Toxins detected but no sublethal effects | No toxins or contaminants detected | | | | Sep-03 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Landscape Context | Water quality | Percent total impervious surfaces as % | >40% | 21-40% | 5-20% | < 5% | | Very Good | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Condition | Estuarine habitat quality | Current lagoon area as percentage of | < 25% | 26-50% | 51-75% | > 75% | | | | | |

Assessment of Target Viability
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Conservation Target | | Category | Key Attribute | Indicator | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Current Indicator Status | Current Rating | Desired Rating | Date of Current Rating | Date for Desired Rating |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Condition | Estuarine habitat quality | Depth, LWD, and other habitat elements (e.g. eelgrass) | depth < 1 meter; LWD and/or overhanging banks absent | | depth > 1 meter; LWD and/or overhanging banks present | | | Good | | Nov-02 | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Condition | Riparian corridor quality | Riparian canopy cover | < 25% canopy cover | 25-49% cover | 50-75% cover | > 75% cover | | Poor | | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Condition | Riparian corridor quality | Riparian corridor species composition | < 25% native composition | 25-49% native composition | 50-75% native composition | > 75% native composition | | Very Good | | | |

Overall Viability Summary
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Summary of Threats Click the page-down icon ▼ to the right to view more summary tables. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------|
| Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County | | | | | | | | | | |
| Threats Across Targets | | Egg | Fry | Juvenile | Smolt | Adult | Multiple Life Stages | | | Overall Threat Rank |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| 1 | Groundwater extraction | - | High | Very High | Very High | Very High | Very High | | | Very High |
| 2 | Dams and/or diversions | - | Medium | High | Very High | Very High | Very High | | | Very High |
| 3 | Conversion of watershed lands to row crop agriculture | | Medium | Medium | Very High | Very High | Very High | | | Very High |
| 4 | Urban development | Medium | Low | Very High | Very High | Very High | - | | | Very High |
| 5 | Channel maintenance, dredging, and vegetation control | | High | Very High | High | High | Very High | | | Very High |
| 6 | Non-native species present and/or hatchery fish stocking | | High | Very High | - | High | Very High | | | Very High |
| 7 | Mining and quarrying | - | - | Very High | High | Very High | - | | | Very High |
| 8 | Urban wastewater effluents (incl. industrial and commercial effluents) | High | High | Very High | High | High | - | | | Very High |
| 9 | Livestock farming and ranching | Medium | Medium | High | High | Medium | Very High | | | High |
| 10 | Levees and channelization | - | Medium | High | Medium | - | Very High | | | High |
| 11 | Recreation facilities and activities (e.g., ORV use, campgrounds, etc.) | Low | Low | High | Medium | - | Very High | | | High |
| 12 | Wildland fires (incl. debris flows following fires) | - | Very High | Medium | - | High | - | | | High |
| 13 | Culverts, crossings, and bridges | Low | - | Medium | - | - | Very High | | | High |
| 14 | Artificial lagoon breaching | - | Medium | Very High | - | - | - | | | High |
| 15 | Conversion of natural habitats to row-crop agriculture | - | | Very High | | | | | | High |
| 16 | Agricultural effluents | Medium | High | Medium | High | - | - | | | High |
| Threat Status for Targets and Project | | High | Very High | Very High | Very High | Very High | Very High | - | - | Very High |

Overall Viability Summary
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Threats Across Targets | | Egg | Fry | Juvenile | Smolt | Adult | Multiple Life Stages | | | Overall Threat Rank |
|--|---|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| 17 | Non-point pollution from roads | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | | | | Medium |
| 18 | Oil and gas drilling | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | - | | | Medium |
| 19 | Illegal collecting, poaching, and/or unauthorized angling | - | High | Medium | - | - | - | | | Medium |
| 20 | Channel and/or estuary maintenance, dredging, and vegetation control (incl. flood control activities) | Low | Low | Medium | Medium | - | | | | Medium |
| 21 | Gas, water and other utility pipelines, and/or electrical transmission lines | Low | Low | Medium | - | - | - | | | Low |
| 22 | Non-native species present (incl. hatchery fish) | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 23 | Oil & Gas Drilling | | | | | | | | | - |
| 24 | Roads in watershed and/or within 300 feet of watercourses | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| Threat Status for Targets and Project | | High | Very High | - | - | Very High |

Overall Viability Summary
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Stress Matrix | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|---|---|
| Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County | | | | | | | | | |
| Stresses (Altered Key Ecological Attributes) Across Targets | | Egg | Fry | Juvenile | Smolt | Adult | Multiple Life Stages | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | Impaired access to spawning and/or rearing habitat | - | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - |
| 2 | Impaired instream habitat complexity | - | - | Very High | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | Impaired hydrograph | - | - | Very High | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Altered base flows during incubation | Very High | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Decreased riparian canopy cover | - | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - |
| 6 | Decreased riparian corridor habitat quality | - | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - |
| 7 | Impaired flows during spawning period | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - | - |
| 8 | Decreased access to potential spawning areas | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - | - |
| 9 | Impaired instream flows during outmigration period (March-June) | - | - | - | Very High | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | Dispersal barriers between rearing habitat and estuary | - | - | Very High | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | Altered hydrograph | - | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - |
| 12 | Altered land use from natural condition | - | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - |
| 13 | Impaired riparian habitat quality | - | - | - | - | - | Very High | - | - |
| 14 | Sedimentation | High | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 15 | Altered riparian habitat quality | - | - | High | - | - | - | - | - |
| 16 | Predation by non-native species | - | - | High | - | - | - | - | - |

Overall Viability Summary
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Stress Matrix | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|------|----------|-------|-------|----------------------|---|---|
| Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County | | | | | | | | | |
| Stresses (Altered Key Ecological Attributes) Across Targets | | Egg | Fry | Juvenile | Smolt | Adult | Multiple Life Stages | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 17 | Embeddedness | High | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | Increased mortality by non-native species | - | High | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 19 | Decreased instream habitat complexity | - | High | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | Impaired water quality | - | - | - | - | - | Medium | - | - |
| 21 | Impaired estuarine habitat quality | - | - | - | - | - | Medium | - | - |
| 22 | Altered fire regime/recent fire in watershed | - | - | - | - | - | Medium | - | - |
| 23 | Egg mortality due to predation | Medium | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 24 | Impaired floodplain connectivity | - | - | - | - | - | Medium | - | - |
| 25 | Impaired estuarine inflows | - | - | Low | - | - | - | - | - |
| 26 | Insufficient flows to keep estuary mouth open during outmigration period (April-June) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | Decreased estuarine habitat quality | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | Impaired water temperatures in migration corridor | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 29 | Decreased size of estuary | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 30 | Impaired water temperatures in spawning areas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 31 | Increased sedimentation | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 32 | Dispersal barriers | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Overall Viability Summary
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Stress Matrix | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----|-----|----------|-------|-------|----------------------|---|---|
| Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County | | | | | | | | | |
| Stresses (Altered Key Ecological Attributes) Across Targets | | Egg | Fry | Juvenile | Smolt | Adult | Multiple Life Stages | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 33 | Impaired water temperature | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 34 | Impaired food resources | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 35 | Low adult population size | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 36 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 37 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 38 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 39 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 40 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 41 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 42 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 43 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 44 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 45 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 46 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 47 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 48 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Overall Viability Summary
Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Overall Viability Summary | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County | | | | | | | | |
| Conservation Targets | | Landscape Context | | Condition | | Size | | Viability Rank |
| | | Grade | Weight | Grade | Weight | Grade | Weight | |
| 1 | Egg | Fair | 1 | Fair | 1 | - | 1 | Fair |
| 2 | Fry | Fair | 1 | Fair | 1 | - | 1 | Fair |
| 3 | Juvenile | Poor | 1 | Poor | 1 | - | 1 | Poor |
| 4 | Smolt | Poor | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | Poor |
| 5 | Adult | Poor | 1 | - | 1 | Poor | 1 | Poor |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | Poor | 1 | Fair | 1 | - | 1 | Fair |
| 7 | | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 8 | | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Project Biodiversity Health Rank | | | | | | | | Fair |

Overall Viability Summary

Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

Detailed Viability Summary

Cuyama River, Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo County

| Conservation Targets | | Key Ecological Attributes | | | | Indicators | | | | Calculated Rank | User Override | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|-----------|------------|------|------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | | | |
| 1 | Egg | | | | | | | | | | Fair | |
| | Landscape Context | | 2 | | | | 2 | | | Fair | | |
| | Condition | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | Fair | | |
| | Size | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 2 | Fry | | | | | | | | | | Fair | |
| | Landscape Context | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | Fair | | |
| | Condition | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | Fair | | |
| | Size | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 3 | Juvenile | | | | | | | | | | Poor | |
| | Landscape Context | 3 | 1 | | | 3 | 1 | | | Poor | | |
| | Condition | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | Poor | | |
| | Size | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 4 | Smolt | | | | | | | | | | Poor | |
| | Landscape Context | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | Poor | | |
| | Condition | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | Size | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 5 | Adult | | | | | | | | | | Poor | |
| | Landscape Context | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | Poor | | |
| | Condition | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | Size | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | Poor | | |
| 6 | Multiple Life Stages | | | | | | | | | | Fair | |
| | Landscape Context | 5 | 2 | | 1 | 9 | 2 | | 2 | Poor | | |
| | Condition | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | Fair | | |
| | Size | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | Landscape Context | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | Condition | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | Size | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | Landscape Context | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | Condition | | | | | | | | | - | | |
| | Size | | | | | | | | | - | | |