

January 2016



Pasture Condition Score Sheet Instructions

Pasture Condition Score Sheet

Purposes

- Evaluate current pasture productivity and the stability of its plant community, soil, and water resources.
- Identify what treatment needs, if any, are required to improve a pasture's productivity and protect soil, water, and air quality.

Suggested uses

This score sheet may be used to rate different pastures in a single growing season or the same pasture over a period of years. Rating a pasture yearly can track trends, either improvement or decline, in its condition. Some indicators change slowly in response to stresses caused by management or climate. Also, some indicators may change as each season progresses. An indicator or causative factor may rank high at one time and low another. Uniformity of use, plant residue, percent legume, severity of use, weather, and insect or disease pressure can vary widely on the same pasture depending on when they are scored during the year and the degree of management the pasture receives.

Therefore, it is often wise to score a pasture at different, key times during the year before deciding to make changes in management. Indicate on the form the date the scoring occurred.

Procedure

Step 1 - Rate each pasture one by one that is occupied all at the same time by a herd or flock and separated from other pasture areas by portable or fixed fencing. Paddocks in rotational pastures may be rated separately or as a combined unit. It depends on how alike they are. If any indicator looks markedly different from paddock to paddock, it may pay to rate each one separately.

Step 2 - Score all 10 indicators regardless of your feelings of their relative worth.

Step 3 - Using the attached score sheet and indicator criteria, read the scoring criteria for each of the 10 pasture condition indicators one at a time and rate before moving onto the next. Use the 1 to 5 scale provided. Estimate by eye or measure as precisely as you feel is needed to rate the indicator reliably. **Step 4** - When scoring plant vigor, enter a score based on the general criteria. If the plant vigor score is less than 4, refer to the plant vigor causative factors' criteria on page 2 of the scoresheet to identify the plant stress(es) causing reduced vigor. Rate each causative factor independently. Do not average to adjust the original vigor score.

Step 5 - When scoring erosion, rate sheet and rill erosion every time. Rate other types of erosion only if present.

When present, indicate which one(s) by identifying the erosion type with a unique symbol next to its score. Divide the box as needed to score them separately. Erosion is rated by averaging the individual scores. A need remains to prioritize which erosion problem is controlled first and how.

Step 6—Total the score for each pasture and compare to the following chart. Also, focus on any low scoring individual indicators or causative factors.

| Overall Pasture Condition Score | Individual Indicator Score | Management Change Suggested |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Greater than | | Few or no changes in |
| 46 | 5 | management needed. |
| | | Minor changes in |
| | | management would |
| | | enhance resource and |
| 36 to 45 | 4 | productivity concerns. |
| | | Improvements would |
| | | significantly benefit |
| | | resource conservation and |
| 26 to 35 | 3 | productivity. |
| | | Significant management |
| | | changes needed to address |
| | | resource and productivity |
| 16 to 25 | 2 | concerns. |
| | | Major effort required in |
| | | time, management and |
| | | expenses to address |
| | | resource and productivity |
| 10 to 15 | 1 | concerns. |

Step 7 - When an individual indicator's score falls below a 5, determine its worth to your operation. Then, decide whether to correct the cause or causes for the low rating. If you choose to correct, apply the most suitable management options for your area and operation.

NRCS - GEORGIA - PASTURE CONDITION SCORE - PASTURE PLANTS - FUNCTIONAL GROUPS and DESIRABILITY

Desirable Species

Functional Group 1 Cool Season Grasses

Kentucky bluegrass Orchardgrass Red Top Reed Canarygrass Rescuegrass (also call Prairie grass) "Matua" Ryegrass, annual and perennial Smallgrains (barley, oats, rye, triticale, wheat) Tall Fescue Timothy

Functional Group 2 Warm Season Grasses Bahiagrass

Bermudagrass, hybrid or improved seed type Bluestem, Big Bluestem, Little Crabgrass Dallisgrass Eastern gamagrass Indiangrass Johnsongrass Millet, Browntop Millet, Foxtail Millet, Pearl Sorghum-sudangrass hybrids Sudangrass Switchgrass

Functional Group 3 Legumes

Alfalfa Clover, Crimson Clover, Red Clover, Subterranean Clover, White (ladino and intermediates) Hairy vetch Lespedeza, Kobe Lespedeza, Korean Lespedeza, Sericea Vetch, Common Vetch, Hairy

Functional Group 4 Forbs

Brassicas (i.e. Rape, Kale, Turnips) Chicory

Less Desirable Species

Intermediate Grasses

Barnyardgrass Bermudagrass, common Carpetgrass Cheatgrass Signalgrass, broadleaf

Intermediate Legumes

Black Medic Clover, Hop Clover, Rabbitsfoot Clover, White Dutch Florida beggarweed Kudzu

Intermediate Forbs

Chickweed Dandelion

Undesirable Grasses/Sedges/Rushes

Broomsedge Foxtail, (giant, green or yellow) Goosegrass Little barley Japanese stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*) Nimblewill Nutsedge Purpletop (*Tridens* flavus) Rushes, most types Sweet vernalgrass Velvetgrass

Undesirable Forbs

Buttercup Cocklebur Cypress weed (dogfennel) Dock Henbit Horsenettle Marestail Perilla mint Plaintains Spiny amaranth Thistles, all types White snakeroot

| United States Department of Agriculture | Ion Service | Georgia Pasture Condition Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|----------|--------|---------|----------|
| | Farm Name: | | | | Date: Pasture Number / Identification (edit as needed) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Indicators | | | | | Pas | ture | Nu | mbe | r / I | den | tific | atio | ۱ (edi | t as ne | eded) | | |
| | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| PERCENT DESIRA | ABLE PLANTS | | | | I | | | I | I | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | I | | | - |
| . , | weight that is desir | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| 1 <20 | 2 20-40 | 3 40-60 | 4 60-80 | 5 >80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Plant Cover - Perc | ent live, leafy canop | y cover of desirab | les and intermedia | tes is: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <50 PLANT DIVERSIT | 50-70 Y | 70-90 | 90-95 | 95-100 | | | | I | | I | I | | I | | | I | | | <u> </u> |
| The diversity of we | II-represented for | | y matter weight is: | - | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| 1 1 dominant forage | 2 2+ Species; from | 3 3 + Species from | 4 3 + Species, 20% | 5 4 + Species, 20% Dm | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ĺ |
| species: from one | one functional group; | one functional | + Dm wt. ea from | wt. ea from three | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| functional group; not | different palatability, | group; none | two functional | functional groups. At | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| uniformly grazed | distributed in patches | avoided. Or two species each from | groups with one being a legume | least one legume. Intermixed well. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | pateries | different functional | | internixed weil. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | (rate % cover and ganic residue betwee | | | l average the score | es) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0%; > 1" | 1-10%; 0.5 to 1" | 10-20%; <.5" | 20-30%; none | 30-70%; none | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | i |
| | | | | on second page to d | etermi | ne reas | son foi | r poor | vigor. | Note p | lant co | lor for | nitrog | en defi | ciencie | es, inse | ct dam | iage, a | ind |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No recovery after | Slow-2+week lag. | Moderate recovery | | Optimum-no lag. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| grazing. Productivity < 30% of potential | Productivity very low 30-50% of potential | 1 week lag. Productivity 50- 75% potential | Productivity 75% - 90% potential | Productivity at site potenial | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LEGUME CONTEN Percentage of legur | | | eason pasture sc | ore values above a | nd wa | arm se | ason | pastu | re sco | ore val | ues b | elow) | : | I | | <u> </u> | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <10% or>60% | 10-19% | 20-29% | 30-39% | 40-60% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <4% UNIFORMITY OF | 5-9% | 10-19% | 20-29% | 30-40% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | of area showing spo | ot or patch grazing | in the pasture: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| >50% ungrazed | 25-50% ungrazed | 10-25% ungrazed | Few patches. Minor rejection | No patches only urine and dung patches | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ĺ |
| | | | , | ungrazed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ĺ |
| SEVERITY OF US | E - Intensity and free | quency of forage re | emoval is: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Continuously below | Continuously to | To minimum | To minimum | Grazed above | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| minimum height. Or ungrazed | minimum height | height. Limited / Slow rotation of | height. Frequency based on | minimum height. Frequency based on | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| brush/weeds | | livestock | availablity | availablity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| invading | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | ENTRATION AREA | | surface water: | _ | - | - | | - | - | | | | | | | - | | | |
| 1 >10% and/or all | 2 5-10% most near | 3 <5% some near | 4 Few areas. All | 5 None. Or all sited | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ì |
| drain directly to | water no veg. buffer | water no veg. | with veg. buffer | and treated to | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| water | | buffer | | minimize impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | None near water with veg. buffer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ì |
| SOIL COMPACTIO | DN - Probe moist soil | compared to an u | ungrazed area bene | 5 | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | I | I | I | I | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Very Severe EROSION | Severe | Moderate | Slight | None | | | | | | I | I | I | I | | | | | | |
| | & rill. Score the foll | owing when prese | ent, gully, streamba | nk, shoreline, wind | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Mary Sayara | 2 | 3 Madarata | 4 Cliabt | 5 None Visible | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Very Severe | Severe | Moderate | Slight | None Visible | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FASTORE CONDI | TION SCORE, total | tor each neid | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| FACTORS AFFECTING PLANT VIGOR, | | | | | Pasture Number / Identification (edit as needed) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------|--|---------|----------|---|----------|---|---|---|---------|---|--------|---|----------|-----------|----------|
| Used | to identify | causes of | poor plant | t vigor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (do not average these scores into previous page) | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| P & K Status of Phosphorus and u | soil potassium status of | the soil is: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Near Zero or Imbalanced | Severely Limiting | Moderately Limiting | Slightly Limiting | Not Limiting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N Status in plan Nitrogen status o | nt tissue f the plant tissue is: | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yellow-Brown | Yellow-Pale Green | Pale Green | Pale-Natural Green | Natural Green | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SOIL pH | | | | • | <u>, </u> | | <u> </u> | <u>, </u> | <u> </u> | <u>, </u> | <u>, </u> | <u>, </u> | , | <u>, </u> | , | <u>, </u> | | | |
| | soil for the upper 4" | | | _ | r | Г – Т | I | 1 | Г – Т | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | _ | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| pH<4.5 | pH=4.5-5.0 | pH=5.1-5.5 | pH=5.6-6.0 | pH=6.0-7.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Long term climate | | naracteristics play | | daptation; rank site | for de | esired | specie | s. | 1 | [| | 1 | 1 | 1 | | [| | | |
| 1 Very Poor | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Very Good | 5 Excellent | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y | tress due to recent | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 Soucro no night | 3 Moderate, mid- | 4 Slight wilt or | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | ĺ | | |
| Very Severe, dying | Severe, no night recovery | day stress | Slight wilt or discolor | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | ĺ | | ĺ |
| | EASE PRESSURE ess due to insect or | disease pressure | e is: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | [| | | | [| [| [| | | | | |
| Severe | Threshold | <threshold< td=""><td>Slight</td><td>None</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><u> </u></td><td><u> </u></td><td><u> </u></td></threshold<> | Slight | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| (do r | Biological A not average the | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | DUNG BEETLE A not an official part o | | lp characterize p | pastures: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | 3 | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor % Soil Organic | Matter | Medium | | Good | | | | | | | | | | | | | ├ | ┟──┦ | ├ |
| | Record % soil organic matter values from soil tests if available (Purpose of this category is to | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| set a monitoring bas | eline for future compari | ison as management | changes): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | General management changes based on overall score for individual pasture or whole farm. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Pasture | Condition Score | Individual In | dicator Score | | | | | | igeme | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | |
| | r than 46 | | 5 | Few or no changes i | | | | | | | | | | | cerns. | | | | |
| | to 45 | | 4 | Minor changes in ma | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | to 35 | | 3 | Improvements would | | | | | | | | | | | nc | | | | |
| | to 25 | | 2 | Significant manager | | | | | | | | | | | | ity con | Corne | | |
| 10 to 15 1 Major effort require | | | | a ni i Ull | io, ma | nayeill | on all | u cyhe | าวบว เป | , addit | 22102 | | ana pri | วนนบแข | 10 001 | | | | |

10 to 15

Authors: Dennis Cosgrove, Univ WI. Dan Undersander, Univ WI. James Cropper, NRCS. July 2012, Modified by James T. Green, Jr., NRCS-NC. December 2015, Modified by Philip Brown NRCS - GA.

| USDA Department of Agriculture | | | Description of GA Pasture Condition Scores | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Natural Resources Conservation Service | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator | Score | Descriptor Range | Detailed Description of the Score | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | <20% | Productive species desirable for animal use < 20 % of stand. Weedy annuals and/or brush species dominate. | | | | | | | |
| % Desirable Plants | 2 | 20-40% | Productive species desirable for animal use 20-40%stand. Mostly weedy annuals and/or brush species present and expanding. | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | 40-60% | Species desirable for animal use 40-60% stand. Undesireable broadleaf weeds and annual weedy grasses invading. Some brush species. | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 60-80% | Species desirable for animal use 60-80% stand. Remainder mostly intermediates and a few undesirables present. | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | >80% | Species desirable for animal use >80% stand. Scattered intermediates. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | <50% | Plant canopy cover by live stems and green leaves is < 50%; Very high potential for runoff. Photosynthetic leaf area very low. | | | | | | | |
| Plant Cover (Live stems and green leaf cover of all desirable and intermediate | 2 | 50-70% | Plant canopy cover by live stems and green leaves is 50-70%; Relatively high potential for runoff. Low photosynthetic potential. Plant canopy cover by live stems and green leaves is 70-90%; Most forages grazed close; Moderate | | | | | | | |
| species) | 3 | 70-90% | runoff potential. Moderate photosynthetic potential. | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 90-95% | Plant canopy cover by live stems and green leaves is 90-95%; Some spot grazing; Very little runoff potential. Good photosynthetic potential. | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 95-100% | Plant canopy cover by live stems and green leaves is >95-100%; Thick stand; Very slow or no runoff flows under normal rainfall intensities. Excellent photosynthetic potential. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 dominant forage species: from one functional group; not uniformly grazed | One dominant forage species making up > 75% of DM by wt. Species not uniformly grazed. | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 2+ Species; from one functional group; different palatability, distributed in patches | Two + forage species making up more than 75% of DM by wt, all from one functional group. Un-even palatability resulting in uneven utilization and scattered patches of certain species. Species not mixed but are distributed in patches allowing for widespread avoidance or non-uniform selection by animals. | | | | | | | |
| Plant Diversity (By dry matter weight) | 3 | 3 + Species from one functional group; none avoided. Or two species each from different functional groups | 3 + forage species (each 20% of DM wt.) from one functional group. All well utilized . Or, two forage species each from different functional group; both supply 25-50% of DM by wt. | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 3 + Species, 20% Dm wt. ea from two functional groups with one being a legume | Three + forage species (each 20+% of DM wt.) from two functional groups with at least one being a legume. Well inter-mixed. | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 + Species, 20% Dm wt. ea from three functional groups. At least one legume. Intermixed well | Four + forage species representing three functional groups (each making up 20+% of DM wt.) with at least one legume. Intermixed well. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 0% Cover: > 1" thatch | No ground cover of soil surface between live plants by decaying vegetation, or thatch > 1" thick. | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 1-10% Cover. 0.5 to 1" thick thatch | 1 - 10% ground cover by vegetative organic litter in various stages of decay on soil surface between plants. Thatch 0.5 to 1" thick. | | | | | | | |
| Plant Residue (Ground cover of organic residue between plants & thickness of thatch) | d 3 | 10-20% Cover. < 0.5" thatch | 10-20% ground cover by vegetative organic litter in various stages of decay on soil surface between plants. Thatch < 0.5". | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | 20-30% Cover. No thatch | 20-30% ground cover by vegetative organic litter in various stages of decay on soil surface between plants. No thatch | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 30-70% Cover. No thatch | >30% ground cover by vegetative organic litter in various stages of decay on soil surface between plants. No thatch | | | | | | | |

| Indicator | Score | Descriptor Range | Detailed Description of the Score |
|---|-------|--|---|
| | 1 | No recovery after grazing. Productivity < 30% of potential | Recovery following grazing very slow or negligible, even under favorable growing conditions. Plant leaves may be pale yellow or brown. Very few photosynthetically active leaves in canopy. Leaves may appear stressed from fertility, pests, climate or animal or insect damage. Canopy is not very competitive with undesirable species. |
| Plant Vigor | 2 | Slow-2+week lag. Productivity very low 30- 50% of potential | Recovery from grazing may take 2 or more weeks longer than normal under favorable growing conditions. Plant leaves may be yellowish green. Leaves may appear stressed from fertility, pests, climate or animal or insect damage. Productivity may be only 30-50% of site potential. |
| (Degree of stress which affects plant recovery. If <4, score the causative factors that help determine reason for poor vigor) | 3 | Moderate recovery-1 week lag. Productivity 50-75% potential | Recovery following grazing may take 1 week longer than normal under favorable growing conditions. Plants may show minor signs of stress due to lack of fertility, climatic stress, competition from undesirable species, pests or animal damage. Plants appear reasonably healthy and photosynthetically active. Very noticeable color contrast between urine/dung patches and surrounding pasture. Productivity may be 50-75% of site potential. |
| | 4 | Rapid-1-2 day lag. Productivity 75% - 90% potential | Recovery following grazing may take 1-2 days longer than normal for healthy, vigorous plants growing under favorable conditions. 75-90% of plants appear to be turgid, have favorable color, with very minor stress from pests or fertility. Productivity is >75% of site potential. |
| | 5 | Optimum-no lag. Productivity at site potenial | Recovery following grazing is very rapid. Plants appear healthy with the natural green color for the species and weather conditions. Species appear very competitive with invading species and adapted to the site's soil and climate. Productivity would match site potential. |
| Legume Content | 1 | <10 or >60% / <4% | < 10% by wt. in the mixture or greater than 60%. Warm Season Pasture (WS) <4% |
| (Percentage of legume | 2 | 10-19% / 5-9% | 10 to 19% by wt. in the mixture of legumes. WS Pasture 5-9% |
| present as total dry weight. Note: Cool Season Pasture | 3 | 20-29% / 10-19% | 20 -29% by wt in the mixture of legumes. WS Pasture 10-19% |
| Scores / Warm Season | 4 | 30-39% / 20-29% | 30-39% by wt legumes. WS Pasture 20-29% |
| Pasture Scores) | 5 | 40-60% / 30-40% | 40-60% by wt legumes. WS Pasture 30-40% |
| | 1 | >50% of area ungrazed | "Spot" grazing (ungrazed or slightly grazed areas) is evident on more than 50% of the pasture. Mosaic grazing pattern throughout or identifiable areas have been avoided. |
| | 2 | 25-50% area ungrazed | "Spot" grazed patches cover 25-50% of the pasture either in a mosaic pattern or obvious portion of pasture not grazed very often. |
| Uniformity of Grazing | 3 | 10-25% area ungrazed | "Spot" grazed patches cover 10-25% of the pasture either in a mosaic pattern or obvious portion is not grazed often. |
| | 4 | Few patches. Minor rejection | "Spot" grazed patches cover small percentage of pasture where isolated forage types or areas have been rejected. Most ungrazed areas are surrounding urine and dung spots. |
| | 5 | No Patches. Only urnine and dung patches ungrazed | Very few forage species have been rejected. Ungrazed or under-grazed areas are directly related to urine and dung spots. |
| | 1 | Continuously below minimum height. Or ungrazed brush/weeds invading | All plants continuously grazed as close to the soil as possible and very little leaf area available. Generally less desirable species have survived this management. There is usually significant bare soil exposed. Or no grazing, resulting in thatch or accumulation of dead tissue or non desirable species invasion. |
| | 2 | Continuously to minimum height | Plants grazed to 2-3" often, resulting in thin stands and less desirable surviving plants. Pasture may resemble mown lawn look. |
| Severity of Use (intensity and frequency of forage removal) | 3 | To minimum height. Limited / Slow rotation of livestock | Spot Grazing Common. Some areas heavily utilzed; Some areas not utilized. Pasture may have patches with mown lawn look. Limited / Slow rotation of livestock. |
| | 4 | To minimum height. Frequency based on availablity | Forages are not grazed below the target height for respective species. Manager rotates livestock into area based on forage availability. |
| | 5 | Grazed above minimum height. Frequency based on availablity | Forage species grazed above desired target height for respective species. Manager rotates livestock into area based on forage availability. |
| | 1 | >10% and/or all drain directly to water | Livestock concentration areas cover >10% of the pasture; and/or all drain directly into water channels. |
| | 2 | 5-10% and/or most near water no veg. buffer | Livestock concentration areas cover 5-10% of pasture; and/or most near water channels and drain into them unbuffered by vegetation. |
| Livestock Concentration Areas (% cover of livestock | 3 | <5% and/or some near water no veg. buffer | Livestock concentration areas cover <5% of area; and/or some near water channels and drain into them unbuffered by vegetation. |
| concentration areas and proximity to surface water) | 4 | Few areas. All with veg. buffer | Some livestock trails and one or two small lounging sites present. Not near water channels. Drainage from these areas is filtered by good vegetative buffer. |
| | 5 | None. Or all sited and treated to minimize water quality impact. None near water. All with veg. buffer. | No presence of concentration areas or all are sited and treated to minimize water quality impacts. None near water. Drainage from all areas filterd by good vegetative buffer. |

| Indicator | Score | Descriptor Range | Detailed Description of the Score | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 1 | Very Severe | Excessive traffic. Pushing a pin flag wire into upper 2 inches of soil is very difficult. Infiltration capacity and surface runoff is unsatisfactory. | | | | | | | | |
| Soil Compaction | 2 | Severe | Livestock trails common throughout. Off trail hoof prints common. It is difficult to push pin flag wire past the upper 2-4 inches of soil. | | | | | | | | |
| (Probe moist soil with pin flag compared to an | 3 | Moderate | Scattered signs of livestock trails and hoof prints, mainly confined to paths to water, shade or lounging areas. Resistance to pushing a pin flag wire below 4-8 inches into the soil. | | | | | | | | |
| ungrazed area (i.e. beneath fence)) | 4 | Slight | Scattered signs of livestock trails and hoof prints, mainly confined to paths to water, shade or loungin areas. Almost no resistance to pin flag wire penetration into the upper 6-8 inches of soil. | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | None | Very few signs of trails or hoof prints on bare soil. No resistance to pin flag wire penetration into soil. | | | | | | | | |
| Always score Sheet a | and Rill Er | rosion. Score other eros | sion types when present. | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | Very Severe | Sheet and rill erosion is active throughout pasture; rills 3-8 inches deep at close intervals and/or grazing terracettes are close-spaced with some slope slippage. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | Severe | Most sheet and rill erosion confined to steepest terrain of pasture; well defined rills 0.5-3 inches deep at close intervals and/or grazing terracettes present. | | | | | | | | |
| Sheet and Rill | 3 | Moderate | Most sheet and rill erosion confined to heavy use areas, especially in lounging areas & near drinking water tanks. Rills 0.5-3 inches deep. Plant / soil debris dams piled at down slope edge. | | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Slight | No current formation of rills; some evidence of past historic rill formation but are covered with vegetation. Scattered plant / soil debris dams are present. | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | None Visible | No evidence of current or past formation of sheet flow, rills or "soil scours". | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | Very Severe | Mass movement of soil, rock, plants, and other debris; occurrence of landslides, debris avalanches, slumps and earth-flow, creep and debris torrents. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | Severe | Gully(s) advancing upslope cutting longer channel(s). Revegetating difficult without using constructed structures & livestock exclusion; continuous gully(s) with many finger-like extensions into the slope. | | | | | | | | |
| Gully | 3 | Moderate | Gully(s) present with scattered active erosion, no vegetation at heavy use slopes and/or on bed below overfalls. New eroding channels present and new overfalls appearing along sides and bed of main channel. | | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Slight | One or more existing stable gullies present, vegetation covers gully bottom and slopes reasonably well; no visual signs of active cutting at gully head or sides. Some soil moved in channel bottom. | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | None Visible | No gullies; natural drainage ways are stable vegetated channels. Spring or seep fed bare channels are often covered with overhanging vegetation. | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | Very Severe | Stream banks are bare and sloughing. No native vegetation remaining. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | Severe | Stream banks are heavily grazed and trampled. Bank sloughing and erosion is quite evident. Little native vegetation remaining. | | | | | | | | |
| Stroom bank 8 | 3 | Moderate | Stream bank vegetation is grazed close but slopes not heavily trampled nor actively eroding. Some native vegetation remaining. Heavy livestock traffic at a few specific points. Remote alternative drinking water facilities may be present usually not sited well to facilitate good livestock distribution. | | | | | | | | |
| Stream bank & Shoreline | 4 | Slight | Stream bank vegetation is grazed but slopes are stable. Mix of pasture plants, native or naturalized species along water's edge. Muddy livestock stream crossing(s) or pond entrance(s) not used heavily. Alternative drinking water facilities are present and sited to allow for good livestock distribution. | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | None Visible | Stream bank vegetation is ungrazed or grazed infrequently. Abundant mixture of pasture plants, native or naturalized species along water's edge. Stabilized or constructed livestock stream crossing or watering ramps. Alternative drinking water facilities are used by livestock and sited to allow for good livestock distribution. | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | Very Severe | Blowouts or dunes present or being formed by wind. | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | Severe | Soil swept from the established pasture causing plant death by burial or abrasion. | | | | | | | | |
| Wind | 3 | Moderate | Soil swept from adjacent fields or pasture during seedbed preparation and early seedling establishment causing plant death by burial or abrasion. | | | | | | | | |
| | 4 | Slight | Some vegetative debris windrowed. Some dust deposition from offsite source. Minor wind damage to plant leaves. | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | None Visible | No visible signs of windblown soil or litter. No wind related leaf damage. | | | | | | | | |

| Indicator | Score | Descriptor Range | Detailed Description of the Score |
|--|----------|---------------------------|--|
| The following pos | sible ca | uses for poor plant v | igor should be evaluated if Vigor Score < 4. |
| | 1 | Near zero or Imbalanced | No soil testing management; Very low P & K, or very high P & K. |
| | 2 | Severely limiting | No soil testing management; Low P and K. Confirm with soil testing. |
| and K Status | 3 | Moderately limiting | No soil testing management; Low P, optimum K; or low P, high K; or optimum P, low K; high P, low K or high P, high K. |
| | 4 | Slightly limiting | Soil testing practiced every 3-6 years; Optimum P, high K; or high P, optimum K. |
| | 5 | Not limiting | Soil testing practiced every 2-3 yrs; Optimum P and K. |
| | 1 | Yellow-Brown | Visually, leaves appear yellowish or brownish color relative to natural color for the species. Leaf tips may be brown or withering. N is deficient. However, excessive N may result in dark green appearance and potentially toxic concentrations. |
| Tissue N Status | 2 | Yellow-Pale Green | Leaves are yellowish to pale green. Tissue testing indicates limited for optimum growth. |
| | 3 | Pale Green | Leaf tissue is pale green or slightly yellowish in color for the specific species. Moderately N deficient based on tissue testing. |
| - | 4 | Pale-Natural Green | Leaf color is slightly pale but generally of the natural green color for the species. |
| | 5 | Natural Green | Leaf tissue has natural green color specific for the crop. Optimum N concentration based on tissue testing. |
| | 1 | pH <4.5 | pH < 4.5, or > 9.0 based on Soil Testing. |
| o | 2 | pH 4.5-5.0 | pH=4.5-5.0, or 8.5-9.0 based on Soil Testing. |
| Soil pH | 3 | pH 5.1-5.5 | pH=5.1-5.5, or 7.9-8.4 based on Soil Testing. pH=5.6-6.0, or 7.4-7.8 based on Soil Testing. |
| | 4 | pH 5.6-6.0 | |
| | 5 | рН 6.0-7.3 | pH=6.0-7.3 based on Soil Testing. |
| | 1 | Very Poor | Properly planted and established desired species are no longer present. |
| Site Adaptation [Long term climate and natural soil characteristics affect adaptation of desired species.] | 2 | Poor | Properly planted and established desired species are nearly gone. Volunteer unwanted species dominate. |
| | 3 | Good | One or more properly planted and established, or recruited desired species are missing. Unwanted species invading. |
| | 4 | Very Good | Properly planted and established, or recruited desired species still represented, but not in desired proportions |
| | 5 | Excellent | Properly planted and established, or recruited desired species are present in desired proportions |
| | 1 | Very Severe, dying | Brown and dying leaf tips due to stress from temperature (cold or hot) or moisture. Frost heaved plants, most with severed roots and dying. Major plant loss due to flooding, submergence or ice sheets. Stress may be from recent or extended weather patterns. |
| Climatic Stresses | 2 | Severe, no night recovery | Wilted plants, very little recovery during night. Or, some frost heaved plants, recovery slow. Some spotty stand loss due to flooding or ice sheets. Stress may be from recent or extended weather patterns. |
| [mainly considered as recent "weather" effects] | 3 | Moderate, mid-day stress | Wilting during heat of the day but recovery at night. Or, weak plants from winter damage or short-term submergence. Or, freezing damage to foliage. Stress may be from recent or extended weather patterns. |
| | 4 | Slight wilt or discolor | Dry conditions, but only slight wilting. Temperatures just outside the favorable range for optimum growth. Or, slight leaf yellowing due to cold, hot or wet conditions. Stress is most likely from recent weather patterns. |
| | 5 | None | No evidence of stress due to recent or long-term weather patterns. |
| | 1 | Severe | Insects or diseases have consumed or damaged more than 50% of the leaf surface area. |
| | 2 | At Threshold | Insect or disease outbreak at economic threshold; treatment needed immediately. |
| Insects/Disease | 3 | Near Threshold | Insect or disease outbreak near economic threshold, continue to watch and weigh options for treatment. |
| | 4 | Slight | Some insect and/or disease is present, but little impact on forage quality or growth rates. |
| | 5 | None | No visible signs of plant damage due to pest or diseases. |
| | | E | Biological Activity Assessment |
| Earthworms & Dung | 1 | Poor | No evidence of worms or castings. 0-1 earthworm per per shovelful of soil taken from upper 12 inches. No dung beetle evidence. Manure paddies intact and not decomposing |
| Beetles (Not an official PCS Category but useful | 3 | Medium | Scattered worm castings are found in the pasture. 2-10 earthworms per shovelful of soil taken from upper 12 inches. Some manure paddies have beetle activity. |
| for soil health evaluation) | 5 | Good | Worm castings evident throughout. 10 + earthworms per shovelful of soil taken from upper 12 inches.Beetles easily found in manure. Manure paddies disintegrated in a few days. |