

HHP Bog and Heath Scorecard

Landowner: _____ **Herd No.** _____ **Surveyor:** _____
Field Number: _____

A. Ecological Integrity

A. 1 Bog/Heath structure integrity

A.1.1. Habitat structure

	Poor	Moderate	Good
	<p>Bog Cotton, Heathers, Sphagnum and Cladonia lichens rare. Heather cover is low or absent. Parcel dominated by a single species, e.g. Molinia. No heather taller than 30cm present. Areas of bare ground or peat hags frequent. High proportion of site recently (in last 12 months) burned (unprescribed).</p>	<p>Bog Cotton, Heathers, Shagnum and Cladonia lichens occur but cover is low. Little mature Heather present. Sphagnum occurs but not in large hummocks. Ground is soft or spongy to walk on, Very little or no evidence of grazing with litter building up. Heather becoming rank and high cover of Molinia OR Signs of overgrazing present but not throughout. Heathers and other vegetation grazed to short carpet-like vegetation in places.</p>	<p>Bog Cotton, Heathers, Sphagnum and Cladonia lichens throughout and abundant. Sward in good condition with undamaged Sphagnum layer, abundance of grass and sedge-like vegetation on blanket bog and a good mix of heathers and typical grasses and sedges on wet heath areas. On Heath, all stages of Heather growth present, with areas of mature heathers present (height > 45cm). Mix of bog and/or heath vegetation at varying heights throughout.</p>
	Overgrazed 0	Moderately Overgrazed 20	40
	Undergrazed 0	Moderately Undergrazed 20	

A.1.2 Scrub structure

	Poor	Moderate	Good
	<p>Gorse-dominated scrub occurring throughout the site or concentrated in large areas (>0.2ha) with a clear impact on the hydrology</p>	<p>Small areas (<0.1ha) of Gorse-dominated scrub occur occasionally throughout the site</p>	<p>No scrub OR some natural areas of Willow-dominated scrub in river valleys or on slopes OR some natural areas dominated by Bog myrtle</p>
	-10	0	10

A.2 Soil integrity

	Poor	Moderate	Good
	<p>Refer to guidance document for details on soil integrity</p>	<p>Refer to guidance document for details on soil integrity</p>	<p>Little or no bare soil seen over the assessment area other than isolated hoof prints. Some bare soil at 'pinch' points along regularly used routes (e.g. gateways, gaps in walls) is acceptable as long as no signs of erosion are visible.</p>
<i>Comment</i>			
	-20	0	10

A.3 Hydrological integrity

A.3.1 Drainage

	High	Medium	Low
	<p>Drains have been dug out recently to increase drainage on site. Drains actively managed to maintain drain function</p>	<p>Drains present but no new drains or evidence of recent maintenance to enhance drainage function (in the last three years). Maintenance of roadside drains permitted.</p>	<p>No evidence of drains ever being dug out on site or all drains blocked</p>
<i>Comment</i>			
<i>Score</i>	-20	0	10

A.3.2 Impact on Natural Water Sources.

	High	Medium	Low
	<p>Livestock have complete access to waterways. Damage to watercourse as a result of trampling/dunging. Livestock cross waterway, eroding banks and disturbing waterway. Direct routes from damaged areas to receiving channels</p>	<p>Natural water supply but limited access by livestock. Some poaching but no significant effect. Access to lakes with no water flow and no visible damage. Damaged areas if present are remote from watercourse with no direct linkages.</p>	<p>No obvious damage. Water supply through troughed system or via natural water source but allows no dunging or trampling of waterway</p>
<i>Comment</i>			
<i>Score</i>	-20	5	10

B. Threats and Future Prospects

B.1 What is the total cover of negative indicators/agriculturally favoured weeds throughout the site?

Cover Score	High: >30%	Moderate: 16-30%	Low: 6-15%	Negligible: 0-5%
	-20	-10	0	10
A	Rhododendron ponticum			
B	Self-sown conifers (Forestry escapes)			
C	Soft Rush (Juncus effusus)			
D	Gorse (Ulex europaeus)			
E	Japanese Knotweed (Reynoutria japonica)			
F	Negative indicators (Nettles, Creeping Thistle, Docks)			

B.2 Presence of Rhododendron or self-sown conifers

Number Score	Present	Absent
	-10	0

B.3 Burning damage

Comment	Very High	High	Moderate	Low
	-30	-20	0	10
	Unprescribed burning causing extensive damage to >10% of the site or >2ha. Moss layer damaged	Unprescribed burning causing extensive damage to <10% or <2ha of the site. Moss layer damaged	Burning only takes place in accordance with prescribed burning programme. No damage caused to moss layer. Up to 5% of the site affected by burning in the previous 3 years	No burning evident on site.

B.4 Turbary

Comment	High	Moderate	Low
	-30	-20	0
	>30% of the site affected. Active sausage machine cutting taking place. High proportion of bare peat.	>5% but less than 30% of the site affected. Any sausage machine cutting or >5% cutting on vertical face with hopper or hand-cutting	No evidence of turbary activity on site or Historic turbary or very small (<5% of site) being cut on the vertical face only.

B.5 Damage due to supplementary feeding

Comment	High	Moderate	Low
	-30	-10	0
	Refer to the guidance for details on supplementary feeding	Refer to the guidance for details on supplementary feeding	No damage due to supplementary feeding.

B.6 Are there any damaging activities to vegetation, soil or water? If yes, list all activities in comment box below.

Comment	High	Moderate	Low
	-30	-10	0
	Refer to guidance document for details on damaging activities	Refer to guidance document for details on damaging activities	Refer to guidance document for details on damaging activities

B.7 Bracken cover

Comment	Very high: >50%	Moderate: 11-25%	Low: <10%
	-30	-10	0
	Very dense stands of bracken over more than half of the field forming closed canopy. Very little vegetation underneath the canopy in mid- summer.	Bracken obvious within the field, scattered and in the main, not forming closed canopy. Often includes woodland plants underneath the Bracken.	Bracken absent or cover negligible or in very small patches.

Score A+B:

Comments or any recommended actions which may increase field score: