

## **Ecological site R040XC318AZ** Sandy Wash 3"-7" p.z.

Accessed: 04/09/2024

## 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)	Dave Womack, Byron Lambeth, Dan Robinett, Emilio Carrillo			
Contact for lead author	NRCS Tucson Area Office			
Date	03/02/2005			
Approved by	S. Cassady			
Approval date				
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production			

no	ndicators				
1.	Number and extent of rills: None.				
2.	Presence of water flow patterns: Highly variable, function of upland overland flow input.				
3.	Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes: No accumulated or erosional pedestals on most perennial plants.				
4.	Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground): $15-40\%$				
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): Highly variable, function of upland overland flow input.

8.	Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values): No slake test done. Expect ratings of 1-3 across site.
9.	Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness): Weak Platy; color is 7.5-10YR6/4 dry, 7.5-10YR5/4 moist; thickness to 3 inches.
10.	Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff: Canopy 60-70%; 10-30% perennial grass, 40% shrubs, 10% subshrubs, 10% perennial forbs, 5-10% trees. Cover is well dispersed throughout site.
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: perennial grass = trees > shrubs > sub shrubs > perennial forbs (note: this after several years of regional drought. Annual forbs and grasses may be greater than trees in El Nino years.)
	Sub-dominant:
	Other:
	Additional:
13.	Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence): 20-30% canopy mortality of trees and shrubs; 90-100% mortality of perennial grasses.
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): 950 lbs/ac unfavorable precipitation; 1313 lbs/ac normal precipitation; 1675 lbs/ac favorable precipitation.
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: Sahara mustard.

Perennial plan and forbs.	t reproductive c	<b>apability:</b> Not i	mpaired for sh	rubs and trees	s; drought impa	aired for peren	nial grasse