

Ecological site R008XY220OR North 10-14 PZ

Accessed: 04/11/2024

Rangeland health reference sheet

Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health is a qualitative assessment protocol used to determine ecosystem condition based on benchmark characteristics described in the Reference Sheet. A suite of 17 (or more) indicators are typically considered in an assessment. The ecological site(s) representative of an assessment location must be known prior to applying the protocol and must be verified based on soils and climate. Current plant community cannot be used to identify the ecological site.

Author(s)/participant(s)	Jeff Repp and Bruce Franssen
Contact for lead author	Oregon NRCS State Rangeland Management Specialist
Date	04/01/2007
Approved by	Bob Gillaspy
Approval date	
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production

Ind	ndicators					
1.	Number and extent of rills: Some to none.					
2.	Presence of water flow patterns: Some to none in interspaces.					
3.	Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes: Some to few - terracettes common from soil movement; held in check by deep rooted perennials; exacerbated from trailing by livestock and wildlife.					
4.	Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground): 5-10%.					
5.	Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies: None.					
6.	Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas: None.					

7. Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel): Fine - limited movement.

8.	Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values): Moderately resistant to erosion: aggregate stability = 4-6.
9.	Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness): Weak fine granular (may be platy or subangular blocky) structure, dry color value 4 - 5, depth 8 - 17 inches, moderate OM (2-4%).
10.	Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff: Significant ground cover (60-80%) limits rainfall impact and overland flow, steeper slopes (to 70%) have high potential for run off.
11.	Presence and thickness of compaction layer (usually none; describe soil profile features which may be mistaken for compaction on this site): None.
12.	Functional/Structural Groups (list in order of descending dominance by above-ground annual-production or live foliar cover using symbols: >>, >, = to indicate much greater than, greater than, and equal to):
	Dominant: Moderately deep-rooted perennial bunchgrasses.
	Sub-dominant: Shallow-rooted perennial bunchgrasses.
	Other: Forbs and Shrubs.
	Additional: Occassional, scattered Western Juniper (JUOC) may be present.
13.	Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence): Normal decadence and mortality expected
14.	Average percent litter cover (%) and depth (in):
15.	Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annual-production): Favorable: 1800, Normal: 1400, Unfavorable: 700 lbs/acre/year.
16.	Potential invasive (including noxious) species (native and non-native). List species which BOTH characterize degraded states and have the potential to become a dominant or co-dominant species on the ecological site if their future establishment and growth is not actively controlled by management interventions. Species that become dominant for only one to several years (e.g., short-term response to drought or wildfire) are not invasive plants. Note that unlike other indicators, we are describing what is NOT expected in the reference state for the ecological site: Cheatgrass and Medusahead invade sites that have lost moderately deep rooted perennial grass functional groups.

erennai piant rep	productive capability	/: All species snot	uld be capable of	reproducing annu	ually.