

# Ecological site R083DY012TX Ramadero

Last updated: 9/21/2023 Accessed: 05/19/2024

#### **General information**

**Provisional**. A provisional ecological site description has undergone quality control and quality assurance review. It contains a working state and transition model and enough information to identify the ecological site.



#### Figure 1. Mapped extent

Areas shown in blue indicate the maximum mapped extent of this ecological site. Other ecological sites likely occur within the highlighted areas. It is also possible for this ecological site to occur outside of highlighted areas if detailed soil survey has not been completed or recently updated.

#### **MLRA** notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 083D-Lower Rio Grande Plain

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) 83D makes up about2,500 square miles (6,475 square kilometers). The towns of Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen, McAllen, and Raymondville are in this area. U.S. Highways 77 and 281 terminate in Brownsville and McAllen, respectively. The Santa Ana National Wildlife Area is along the Rio Grande in this area.

# **Classification relationships**

USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2006. -Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) 83A

# **Ecological site concept**

The Ramadero site is very deep with loamy soils. The sites are on upland drains and are in a water receiving position. This typically allows better moisture availability than nearby uplands.

# Associated sites

Gray Sandy Loam	R083DY019TX
Sandy Loam	R083DY023TX
Gravelly Ridge	R083DY003TX
Lakebed	R083DY007TX

#### **Similar sites**

R083BY012TX	Ramadero
R083CY012TX	Ramadero
R083AY012TX	Loamy Draw

#### Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	(1) Prosopis (2) Ulmus
Herbaceous	(1) Setaria vulpiseta (2) Digitaria californica

### **Physiographic features**

These nearly level soils are found on long narrow upland drainageways of the Rio Grande delta plain. Surfaces are concave to linear and slopes are commonly less than one percent. These soils formed in alkaline loamy alluvium. Slopes range from 0 to 1 percent. Runoff is negligible. Flooding is occasional with very brief durations.

Landforms	(1) Delta plain > Draw
Runoff class	Negligible
Flooding duration	Very brief (4 to 48 hours)
Flooding frequency	Occasional
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	30–183 m
Slope	0–1%
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

#### Table 2. Representative physiographic features

# **Climatic features**

MLRA 83 has a subtropical, subhumid climate. Winters are dry and warm, and the summers are hot and humid. Tropical maritime air masses predominate throughout spring, summer and fall. Modified polar air masses exert considerable influence during winter, creating a continental climate characterized by large variations in temperature. Peak rainfall occurs late in spring and a secondary peak occurs early in fall. Heavy thunderstorm activities increase in April, May, and June. July is hot and dry with little weather variations. Rainfall increases again in late August and September as tropical disturbances increase and become more frequent. Tropical air masses from the Gulf of Mexico dominate during the spring, summer and fall. Prevailing winds are southerly to southeasterly throughout the year except in December when winds are predominately northerly.

Table 3. Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	365 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	365 days

Precipitation total (characteristic range)	559-660 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	271-365 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	365 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	533-686 mm
Frost-free period (average)	348 days
Freeze-free period (average)	365 days
Precipitation total (average)	610 mm

# **Climate stations used**

- (1) HARLINGEN [USC00413943], Harlingen, TX
- (2) SANTA ROSA 3 WNW [USC00418059], Edcouch, TX
- (3) MERCEDES 6 SSE [USC00415836], Mercedes, TX
- (4) WESLACO [USC00419588], Weslaco, TX
- (5) LA JOYA [USC00414911], Mission, TX
- (6) RAYMONDVILLE [USC00417458], Raymondville, TX
- (7) RIO GRANDE CITY [USC00417622], Rio Grande City, TX
- (8) MCALLEN [USC00415701], McAllen, TX
- (9) MISSION 4 W [USC00415972], Mission, TX
- (10) BROWNSVILLE [USW00012919], Brownsville, TX
- (11) MCALLEN MILLER INTL AP [USW00012959], McAllen, TX

#### Influencing water features

This site is in a water receiving position on the landscape. It provides an avenue in which to transport water from the uplands to the bottomlands. This site does not contain wetlands.

#### Wetland description

N/A

#### **Soil features**

The Ramadero site is very deep, well drained and moderately permeable. These soils formed in alkaline loamy alluvium. The surface layer is brown to very dark grayish brown sandy clay loam. The surface alkalinity ranges from neutral to moderately alkaline. The only soil series correlated for the Ramadero ecological site is Ramadero.

#### Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Alluvium-sedimentary rock
Surface texture	(1) Sandy clay loam (2) Loam
Family particle size	(1) Fine-loamy
Drainage class	Well drained
Permeability class	Moderate
Soil depth	203 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0%
Surface fragment cover >3"	0%
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	15.24–17.78 cm

Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-101.6cm)	0–20%
Electrical conductivity (0-101.6cm)	0–4 mmhos/cm
Sodium adsorption ratio (0-101.6cm)	0
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	6.6–8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	2–4%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0%

# **Ecological dynamics**

The Lower Rio Grande (MLRA 83D) was a disturbance-maintained system. Prior to European settlement (pre-1825), fire and grazing were the two primary forms of disturbance. Grazing by large herbivores included antelope, deer, and small herds of bison. The infrequent but intense, short-duration grazing by these species suppressed woody species and invigorated herbaceous species. The herbaceous savannah species adapted to fire and grazing disturbances by maintaining belowground tissues. Wright and Bailey (1982) report that there are no reliable records of fire frequency for the Rio Grande Plains because there are no trees to carry fire scars from which to estimate fire frequency. Because savannah grassland is typically of level or rolling topography, a natural fire frequency of three to seven years seems reasonable for this area.

Historical accounts prior to 1800 identify grazing by herds of wild horses, followed by heavy grazing by sheep and cattle as settlement progressed. Grazing on early ranches changed natural graze-rest cycles to continuous grazing and stocking rates exceeded the carrying capacity. These shifts in grazing intensity and the removal of rest from the system reduced plant vigor for the most palatable species, which on this site were midgrasses and palatable forbs. Shortgrasses and less palatable forbs began to dominate the site. This shift resulted in lower fuel loads, which reduced fire frequency and intensity. The reduction in fires resulted in an increase in size and density of woody species.

The open grassland in this area supports mid prairie grasses with scattered woody plants, perennial forbs, and legumes on soils in the uplands. Twoflower and fourflower trichloris, plains bristlegrass, and lovegrass tridens are among the dominant grasses on these soils. Desert yaupon, spiny hackberry, and blackbrush are the major woody plants. In bottomland areas, tallgrasses and midgrasses, such as switchgrass, giant sacaton, fourflower trichloris, big sandbur, little bluestem, and southwestern bristlegrass, are dominant. Hackberry, mesquite, elm, and palm trees are the major woody plants. Forbs are important but minor components of all plant communities.

Most of this area is cropland or improved pasture that is extensively irrigated. Large acreages of rangeland are grazed mainly by beef cattle and wildlife. The major crops are cotton, grain sorghum, citrus, onions, cabbage, and other truck crops. Almost all the crops are grown under irrigation. Hunting leases for white-tailed deer, quail, white-winged dove, and mourning dove are an important source of income in the area. Some of the major wildlife species in this area are white-tailed deer, javelina, coyote, fox, bobcat, raccoon, skunk, opossum, jackrabbit, cottontail, turkey, bobwhite quail, scaled quail, white-winged dove, and mourning dove.

### State and transition model



T1A Heavy Continuous Grazing, No Fire

R2A Prescribed Grazing, Brush Management, Prescribed Burning

T1B Prescribed Grazing, Brush Management, Range Planting, Pasture Planting, Crop Cultivation

T2A Prescribed Grazing, Bruch Management, Range Planting, Pasture Planting, Crop Cultivation

T3A Abandonment, No Brush Management, Heavy Continuous Grazing, Brush Invasion, No Fire

3.1A Atandonment, No Brush Management, Heavy Continuous Grazing, Brush Invasion, No Fire

3.2A. Range Planting, Pasture Planting, Prescribed Grazing, Prescribed Burning, Brush Management

Figure 8. STM

### State 1 Savannah

#### **Dominant plant species**

- mesquite (Prosopis), shrub
- plains bristlegrass (Setaria vulpiseta), grass
- Arizona cottontop (Digitaria californica), grass

# Community 1.1 Midgrass Dominant

This community represents the reference plant community. The community is a fire climax, midgrass plant community that has less than a five percent canopy of woody plants. The grasses are multi-flowered false Rhodesgrass, plains bristlegrass, Southwestern bristlegrass, Arizona cottontop, sideoats grama (*Bouteloua curtipendula*), silver bluestem, lovegrass tridens (*Tridens eragrostoides*), big cenchrus, hooded windmillgrass, vine mesquite (*Panicum obtusum*), pappusgrass, buffalograss, and curlymesquite. The woody plants are mesquite, spiny hackberry, sugar hackberry, and elm. Forbs are Engelmann's daisy, bushsunflower, yellow neptunia, sensitivebriar, and numerous annuals. Recurrent fire and occasional grazing by small herds of bison (Bos bison) and other wildlife were natural components of the ecosystem.

Plant Type	Low (Kg/Hectare)	Representative Value (Kg/Hectare)	High (Kg/Hectare)
Grass/Grasslike	2438	4539	6053
Shrub/Vine	224	252	336
Forb	140	252	336
Tree	-	-	-
Total	2802	5043	6725

Figure 10. Plant community growth curve (percent production by month). TX4525, Midgrass Dominant, 5% woodies. Midgrass plant community with less than a 5 percent canopy of woody plants. Growth occurs with peak in spring and fall seasons..

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2	2	5	10	18	15	5	9	15	9	5	5

## Community 1.2 Mixed-grass Dominant

This phase of the Savannah State still exhibits a savannah plant structure with the woody species canopy being as high as 20 percent. This is a result of fire being removed as a component of the site. Heavy continuous grazing takes many of the midgrasses out of the site and they are replaced by shortgrasses such as hooded windmillgrass, pappusgrass, buffalograss, and curly-mesquite. If heavy continuous grazing occurs, tumble windmillgrass, whorled dropseed, Hall's panicum, perennial three-awn, and tumblegrass increase on the site. Other common woody increasers and invaders to the site are mesquite, whitebrush, huisache, lotebush, and spiny hackberry.

#### Table 6. Annual production by plant type

Plant Type	Low (Kg/Hectare)	Representative Value (Kg/Hectare)	High (Kg/Hectare)
Grass/Grasslike	1121	2242	3363
Shrub/Vine	673	560	560
Forb	280	560	560
Tree	_	-	_
Total	2074	3362	4483

Figure 12. Plant community growth curve (percent production by month). TX4527, Mixed-Grass Savannah with 5-20% Woodies. Mixed-Grass Savannah Community with the woody canopy cover may be as high as 20%..

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2	2	5	10	18	15	5	9	15	9	5	5

# Pathway 1.1A Community 1.1 to 1.2

The reference community (1.1) will transition to the Shortgrass Dominant Community (1.2) with lack of fire, continued overgrazing, insufficient rest cycles, and/or natural disturbances, like prolonged drought.

# Pathway 1.2A Community 1.2 to 1.1

This phase can still be managed back to the Midgrass Dominant Community (1.1) but will take the reintroduction of fire to the ecosystem or some method of brush management that allows selective removal of the plants. A prescribed grazing plan will be essential to reverse the trend toward the Shrubland State. Increasing the midgrasses

in the plant community over an extended time will take the application of sound grazing management principles.

# State 2 Shrubland

#### **Dominant plant species**

mesquite (Prosopis), shrub

## Community 2.1 Shortgrass/Shrubland

This plant community is a result of a transition from the Savannah State (1) to the Shrubland State (2). This threshold is passed when the woody canopy restricts herbaceous growth and insufficient fuel is produced to carry a fire that will control the woody canopy. The understory is very limited in production due to the competition for sunlight, water, and nutrients. There is an increase in mesquite, whitebrush, huisache, lotebush, and spiny hackberry to the point that they dominate the site. At this point there is very little understory production. There is much bare ground that has crusted to the point that there is little water infiltration and little seedling emergence. Water infiltration does occur directly under some of the woody species such as mesquite as it moves down the trunk of the tree to the base. During the growing season, light showers are captured in the canopy of the shrubs and evaporate. Energy flow and nutrient capture is predominantly by the shrubs. Winter rains can produce understory forage by the cool-season annual forbs and grasses.

#### Table 7. Annual production by plant type

Plant Type	Low (Kg/Hectare)	Representative Value (Kg/Hectare)	High (Kg/Hectare)
Shrub/Vine	757	1345	2522
Grass/Grasslike	224	841	1121
Forb	28	56	280
Tree	_	-	_
Total	1009	2242	3923

Figure 14. Plant community growth curve (percent production by month). TX4535, Shortgrass/Shrubland Community, 20-50% woodies. Shortgrasses and Shrubs dominate the plant community..

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2	2	5	10	18	15	5	9	15	9	5	5

#### State 3 Converted Land

#### **Dominant plant species**

Bermudagrass (Cynodon dactylon), grass

# Community 3.1 Converted Land

Any of the prior plant communities can be converted to alternative plants through brush management and seeding. The site can be planted to either native mixtures or to introduced plants depending upon management objective. Introduced grasses commonly seeded on the site include bermudagrass (*Cynodon dactylon*) and kleingrass (*Panicum coloratum*). The introduced species will require a concerted management effort to keep the stands pure because of the seedbank of woody species. Native plantings will require some form of brush removal such as individual plant treatment, prescribed fire, broadcast treatments, or mechanical treatments to maintain a grassland.

Plant Type	Low (Kg/Hectare)	Representative Value (Kg/Hectare)	High (Kg/Hectare)
Grass/Grasslike	2802	5044	6725
Shrub/Vine	-	-	-
Tree	-	-	-
Forb	-	-	-
Total	2802	5044	6725

Figure 16. Plant community growth curve (percent production by month). TX4530, Converted Land Community. Community converted into warmseason grass seed mixtures..

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2	2	5	10	18	15	5	9	15	9	5	5

Figure 17. Plant community growth curve (percent production by month). TX4531, Converted Land - Introduced Grass Seeding. Seeding Coverted Land into Introduced grass species..

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
0	0	5	10	20	15	5	10	15	10	5	5

## Community 3.2 Abandoned Land

This plant community develops from agriculture that has been abandoned. Due to the lack of fire or some other method of brush management, shrub seedlings establish and spread. If the seedlings are not controlled, this plant community will transition to the Shrubland State (2) and will require some form of brush management via machinery or herbicides to reduce the canopy. Production on the Abandoned Land Community depends on the grazing management and brush management that has been applied since seeding, and the canopy of the shrubs invading or spreading on the site. As the canopy of the shrubs expands, grasses and forb production will be reduced accordingly.

Table 9. Annual production by plant type

Plant Type	Low (Kg/Hectare)	Representative Value (Kg/Hectare)	High (Kg/Hectare)
Grass/Grasslike	2438	4539	6053
Shrub/Vine	224	252	336
Forb	140	252	336
Tree	-	-	-
Total	2802	5043	6725

Figure 19. Plant community growth curve (percent production by month). TX4534, Converted Land - Woody Seedlings Encroachment. Woody seedling encroachment on converted lands such as abandoned cropland, native seeded land, and introduced seeding lands..

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2	2	5	10	18	15	5	9	15	9	5	5

# Pathway 3.1A Community 3.1 to 3.2

The transition from can occur when crop fields are left to fallow without management. Generally, pastureland will transition to the Shrubland State (2) and not to the Abandoned Land Community (3.2).

## Pathway 3.2A Community 3.2 to 3.1

Many land managers may want to utilize this site as cropland or pastureland. To achieve this transition land clearing practices such as land clearing, dozing and raking will be necessary. After the land has been cleared and an appropriate seedbed prepared, the crop or pasture can be planted.

# Transition T1A State 1 to 2

If heavy continuous grazing occurs with the exclusion of fire, the phase will transition to the Shrubland State (2). Drought will hasten the process. Once the woody canopy exceeds approximately 20 percent, a threshold is crossed. In this case, energy in the form of heavy equipment and/or herbicides will be required along with prescribed grazing to shift the plant community back to the Savannah State (1). Once the woody plants pass this threshold, grazing management alone will not reverse the woody plant population.

# Transition T1B State 1 to 3

The Savannah State (1) can be converted to the Converted Land State (3) by controlling the brush and seeding to native or introduced grasses. It may also be plowed and converted to cropland.

# Restoration pathway R2A State 2 to 1

Brush management is the key driver in restoring the Shrubland State (2) back to the Savannah State (1). Reduction in woody canopy below 20 percent will take large energy inputs depending on the canopy cover. A prescribed grazing plan and prescribed burning plan will keep the state functioning.

# Transition T2A State 2 to 3

The Shrubland State (2) can be converted to the Converted Land State (3) by controlling the brush and seeding to native or introduced grasses. It may also be plowed and converted to cropland.

# Transition T3A State 3 to 2

If the Abandoned Land Community (3.2) is left alone, eventually the woody plants will create a moderate to heavy canopy. At this point, the desired understory grasses, forbs, and/or crops will be shaded out and the site will transition into a Shrubland State (2).

# Additional community tables

Table 10. Community 1.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production (Kg/Hectare)	Foliar Cover (%)
Grass	/Grasslike	-		·	
1	Midgrasses			1121–3475	
	plains bristlegrass	SEVU2	Setaria vulpiseta	1121–2802	_
	multiflower false Rhodes grass	TRPL3	Trichloris pluriflora	1121–2242	
	southwestern bristlegrass	SESC2	Setaria scheelei	560–1681	-
2	Midgrasses	-	-	841–1793	
	Arizona cottontop	DICA8	Digitaria californica	560–1345	-
	sideoats grama	BOCU	Bouteloua curtipendula	560–1345	-
	silver beardgrass	BOLAT	Bothriochloa laguroides ssp. torreyana	560–1345	_
	vine mesquite	PAOB	Panicum obtusum	280–1121	-
	big sandbur	CEMY	Cenchrus myosuroides	280–841	-
	hooded windmill grass	CHCU2	Chloris cucullata	280–841	-
	lovegrass tridens	TRER	Tridens eragrostoides	112–560	-
	pink pappusgrass	PABI2	Pappophorum bicolor	280–560	_
3	Shortgrasses	-		140–336	
	buffalograss	BODA2	Bouteloua dactyloides	56–336	-
	curly-mesquite	HIBE	Hilaria belangeri	56–336	_
4	Cool-season grasses	-	-	112–448	
	Forb, annual	2FA	Forb, annual	112–448	-
Forb					
5	Forbs			140–336	
	Engelmann's daisy	ENPE4	Engelmannia peristenia	28–140	-
	Nuttall's sensitive-briar	MINU6	Mimosa nuttallii	28–140	-
	yellow puff	NELU2	Neptunia lutea	28–140	_
	awnless bushsunflower	SICA7	Simsia calva	28–140	_
	Forb, annual	2FA	Forb, annual	0–56	_
Shrub	/Vine				
6	Shrubs/Vines			224–336	
	spiny hackberry	CEEH	Celtis ehrenbergiana	56–168	_
	netleaf hackberry	CELAR	Celtis laevigata var. reticulata	56–168	_
	mesquite	PROSO	Prosopis	56–168	-
	elm	ULMUS	Ulmus	56–168	_

# **Animal community**

As a historic tall/midgrass prairie, this site was occupied by bison, antelope, deer, quail, turkey, and dove. This site was also used by many species of grassland songbirds, migratory waterfowl, and coyotes. This site now provides forage for livestock and is still used by quail, dove, migratory waterfowl, grassland birds, coyotes, and deer.

Feral hogs (Sus scrofa) can be found on most ecological sites in Texas. Damage caused by feral hogs each year includes, crop damage by rutting up crops, destroyed fences, livestock watering areas, and predation on native wildlife, and ground-nesting birds. Feral hogs have few natural predators, thus allowing their population to grow to high numbers.

Wildlife habitat is a complex of many different plant communities and ecological sites across the landscape. Most animals use the landscape differently to find food, shelter, protection, and mates. Working on a conservation plan for the whole property, with a local professional, will help managers make the decisions that allow them to realize their goals for wildlife and livestock.

Savannah State (1): This state provides the maximum amount of forage for livestock such as cattle. It is also utilized by deer, quail and other birds as a source of food. When a site is in the reference plant community phase (1.1) it will also be used by some birds for nesting, if other habitat requirements like thermal and escape cover are near.

Shrubland State (2): This state can be maintained to meet the habitat requirements of cattle and wildlife. Land managers can find a balance that meets their goals and allows them flexibility to manage for livestock and wildlife. Forbs for deer and birds like quail will be more plentiful in this state. There will also be more trees and shrubs to provide thermal and escape cover for birds as well as cover for deer.

Converted Land State (3): The quality of wildlife habitat this site will produce is extremely variable and is influenced greatly by the timing of rain events. This state is often manipulated to meet landowner goals. If livestock production is the main goal, it can be converted to pastureland. It can also be planted to a mix of grasses and forbs that will benefit both livestock and wildlife. A mix of forbs in the pasture could attract pollinators, birds and other types of wildlife. Food plots can also be planted to provide extra nutrition for deer.

This rating system provides general guidance as to animal preference for plant species. It also indicates possible competition between kinds of herbivores for various plants. Grazing preference changes from time to time, especially between seasons, and between animal kinds and classes. Grazing preference does not necessarily reflect the ecological status of the plant within the plant community. For wildlife, plant preferences for food and plant suitability for cover are rated. Refer to habitat guides for a more complete description of a species habitat needs.

## Hydrological functions

This can be described as an upland drainage. The site occupies a position to receive both water and sediment, but rarely ponds water due to being well drained. The runoff water, along with the sediment received, makes this site productive in terms of plant biomass when compared to surrounding sites upslope. When the site is in the Shrubland State (2), much of the small rainfall events are trapped in the canopy only to evaporate before reaching the soil. In higher rainfall events, the rain is channeled down to the ground via the trunks and stems of the woody plants, fostering the development of cool-season plants.

# **Recreational uses**

The primary recreational activities include hunting and birdwatching.

### Inventory data references

Information presented was derived from the revised Range Site, literature, limited NRCS clipping data (417s), field observations, and personal contacts with range-trained personnel.

# **Other references**

AgriLife. 2009. Managing Feral Hogs Not a One-shot Endeavor. AgNews, April 23, 2009. http://agnews.tamu.edu/showstory.php?id=903.

Archer, S. 1995. Herbivore mediation of grass-woody plant interactions. Tropical Grasslands, 29:218-235.

Archer, S. 1995. Tree-grass dynamics in a Prosopis-thornscrub savanna parkland: reconstructing the past and predicting the future. Ecoscience, 2:83-99.

Archer, S. 1994. Woody plant encroachment into southwestern grasslands and savannas: rates, patterns and proximate causes. Ecological implications of livestock herbivory in the West, 13-68.

Archer, S. and F. E. Smeins. 1991. Ecosystem-level Processes. In Grazing Management: An Ecological Perspective. Edited by R.K. Heischmidt and J.W. Stuth. Timber Press, Portland, OR.

Baen, J. S. 1997. The growing importance and value implications of recreational hunting leases to agricultural land investors. Journal of Real Estate Research, 14:399-414.

Bailey, V. 1905. North American Fauna No. 25: Biological Survey of Texas. United States Department of Agriculture Biological Survey. Government Printing Office, Washington D. C.

Bestelmeyer, B. T., J.R. Brown, K. M. Havstad, R. Alexander, G. Chavez, and J. E. Herrick. 2003. Development and use of state-and-transition models for rangelands. Journal of Range Management, 56(2):114-126.

Box, T. W. 1960. Herbage production on four range plant communities in South Texas. Journal of Range Management, 13:72-76.

Briske, B B, B. T. Bestelmeyer, T. K. Stringham, and P. L. Shaver. 2008. Recommendations for development of resilience-based State-and-Transition Models. Rangeland Ecology and Management, 61:359-367.

Brown, J. R. and S. Archer. 1999. Shrub invasion of grassland: recruitment is continuous and not regulated by herbaceous biomass or density. Ecology, 80(7):2385-2396.

Diamond, D. D. and T. E. Fulbright. 1990. Contemporary plant communities of upland grasslands of the Coastal Sand Plain, Texas. Southwestern Naturalist, 35:385-392.

Dillehay T. 1974. Late quaternary bison population changes on the Southern Plains. Plains Anthropologist, 19:180-96.

Edward, D. B. 1836. The history of Texas; or, the immigrants, farmers, and politicians guide to the character, climate, soil and production of that country. Geographically arranged from personal observation and experience. J. A. James and Co., Cincinnati, OH.

Everitt, J. H., D. L. Drawe, and R. I. Leonard. 2002. Trees, Shrubs, and Cacti of South Texas. Texas Tech University Press, Lubbock, TX.

Everitt, J. H., D. L. Drawe, and R. I. Lonard. 1999. Field Guide to the Broad-Leaved Herbaceous Plants of South Texas. Texas Tech University Press. Lubbock, TX.

Foster, J. H. 1917. Pre-settlement fire frequency regions of the United States: a first approximation. Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference Proceedings No. 20.

Foster, W. C., ed. 1998. The La Salle Expedition to Texas: The Journal of Henry Joutel, 1684-1687. Texas State Historical Association, Austin, TX.

Frost, C. C. 1995. Presettlement fire regimes in southeastern marshes, peatlands, and swamps. In: Prodeedings, 19th Tall Timbers fire ecology conference, 39-60. Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, FL.

Fulbright, T. E. and S. L. Beasom. 1987. Long-term effects of mechanical treatment on white-tailed deer browse. Wildlife Society Bulletin, 15:560-564.

Fulbright, T. E., J. A. Ortega-Santos, A. Lozano-Cavazos, and L. E. Ramirez-Yanez. 2006. Establishing vegetation on migrating inland sand dunes in Texas. Rangeland Ecology and Management, 59:549-556.

Fulbright, T. E., D. D. Diamond, J. Rappole, and J. Norwine. The Coastal Sand Plain of Southern Texas. Rangelands, 12:337-340.

Gould, F. W. 1975. The Grasses of Texas. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, TX.

Grace, J. B., L. K. Allain, H. Q. Baldwin, A. G. Billock, W. R. Eddleman, A. M. Given, C. W. Jeske, and R. Moss. 2005. Effects of prescribed fire in the coastal prairies of Texas. USGS Open File Report 2005-1287.

Hamilton, W. and D. Ueckert. 2005. Rangeland Woody Plant Control: Past, Present, and Future. In: Brush Management: Past, Present, and Future, 3-16. Texas A&M University Press. College Station, TX.

Hansmire, J. A., D. L. Drawe, B. B. Wester and C.M. Britton. 1988. Effect of winter burns on forbs and grasses of the Texas Coastal Prairie. The Southwestern Naturalist, 33(3):333-338.

Heitschmidt R. K., Stuth J. W., eds. 1991. Grazing management: an ecological perspective. Timberline Press, Portland, OR.

Inglis, J. M. 1964. A history of vegetation of the Rio Grande Plains. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Bulletin No. 45, Austin, TX.

Kneuper, C. L., C. B. Scott, and W. E. Pinchak. 2003. Consumption and dispersion of mesquite seeds by ruminants. Journal of Range Management, 56:255-259.

Kramp, B., R. Ansley, and D. Jones. 1998. Effect of prescribed fire on mesquite seedlings. Texas Tech University Research Highlights - Range, Wildlife and Fisheries Management, 29:13.

Le Houerou, H. N. and J. Norwine. 1988. The ecoclimatology of South Texas. In Arid lands: today and tomorrow. Edited by E. E. Whitehead, C. F. Hutchinson, B. N. Timmesman, and R. G. Varady, 417-444. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Lehman, V. W. 1965. Fire in the range of Attwater's prairie chicken. Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference, 4:127-143.

Lehman, V. W. 1969. Forgotten Legions: Sheep in the Rio Grande Plain of Texas. Texas Western Press, El Paso, TX.

Mann, C. 2004. 1491. New Revelations of the Americas before Columbus. Vintage Books, New York City, NY.

Mapston, M. E. 2009. Feral Hogs in Texas. Rep. Texas Cooperative Extension. 23 Apr. 2009 http://icwdm.org/Publications/pdf/Feral%20Pig/Txferalhogs.pdf

McClendon, T. 1991. Preliminary description of the vegetation of South Texas exclusive of the Coastal Saline Zones. Texas Journal of Science, 43:13-32.

McGinty A., D. N. Ueckert. 2001. The Brush Busters success story. Rangelands, 23:3-8.

McLendon, T. 1991. Preliminary description of the vegetation of south Texas exclusive of coastal saline zones. Texas Journal of Science, 43:13-32.

Norwine, J. 1978. Twentieth-century semiarid climates and climatic fluctuations in Texas and northeastern Mexico. Journal of Arid Environments, 1:313-325.

Norwine, J. and R. Bingham. 1986. Frequency and severity of droughts in South Texas: 1900-1983, 1-17. In Livestock and wildlife management during drought. Edited by R. D. Brown. Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, Kingsville, TX.

Olmsted, F. L. 1857. A journey through Texas, or a saddle trip on the Southwest frontier: with a statistical appendix. Dix, Edwards, and co., New York, London.

Prichard, D. 1998. A User Guide to Assessing Proper Functioning Condition and the Supporting Science for Lentic Areas. Bureau of Land Management. National Applied Resource Sciences Center, CO.

Rappole, J. H. and G. W. Blacklock. 1994. A field guide: Birds of Texas. Texas A&M University Press, College

Station, TX.

Rhyne, M. Z. 1998. Optimization of wildlife and recreation earnings for private landowners. M. S. Thesis, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, Kingsville, TX.

Schindler, J. R. and T. E. Fulbright. 2003. Roller chopping effects on Tamaulipan scrub community composition. Journal of Range Management, 56:585-590.

Schmidley, D. J. 1983. Texas mammals east of the Balcones Fault zone. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, TX.

Scifres C. J., W. T. Hamilton, J. R. Conner, J. M. Inglis, and G. A. Rasmussen. 1985. Integrated Brush Management Systems for South Texas: Development and Implementation. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, College Station, TX.

Scifres, C. J. and W. T. Hamilton. 1993. Prescribed burning for brushland management: the South Texas example. Texas A&M Press, College Station, TX.

Scifres, C. J. 1975. Systems for improving McCartney rose infested coastal prairie rangeland. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin MP 1225.

Smeins, F. E., S. Fuhlendorf, and C. Taylor, Jr. 1997. Environmental and Land Use Changes: A Long Term Perspective. In Juniper Symposium, 1-21. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.

Smeins, F. E., D. D. Diamond, and W. Hanselka. 1991. Coastal prairie, 269-290. In Ecosystems of the World: Natural Grasslands. Edited by R. T. Coupland. Elsevier Press, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database.

Snyder, R. A. and C. L. Boss. 2002. Recovery and stability in barrier island plant communities. Journal of Coastal Research, 18:530-536.

Stiles, H. R., ed. 1906. Joutel's journal of La Salle's last voyage, 1686-1687. Joseph McDonough, Albany, NY.

Stringham, T. K., W. C. Krueger, and P. L. Shaver. 2001. State and transition modeling: and ecological process approach. Journal of Range Management, 56(2):106-113.

Texas A&M Research and Extension Center. 2000. Native Plants of South Texas http://uvalde.tamu.edu/herbarium/index.html.

Texas Agriculture Experiment Station. 2007. Benny Simpson's Texas Native Trees http://aggie-horticulture.tamu.edu/ornamentals/natives/.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. 2007. List of White-tailed Deer Browse and Ratings. District 8.

Tharp, B. C. 1926. Structure of Texas Vegetation east of the 98th meridian. Bulletin 2606. University of Texas, Austin. TX.

Thurow, T. L. 1991. Hydrology and Erosion. In: Grazing Management: An Ecological Perspective. Edited by R.K. Heitschmidt and J.W. Stuth. Timber Press, Portland, OR.

Urbatsch, L. 2000. Chinese tallow tree (Triadica sebifera (L.) Small. USDA-NRCS Plant Guide.

USDA-NRCS Plant Database. 2018. https://plants.usda.gov/.

Van't Hul, J. T., R. S. Lutz and N. E. Mathews. 1997. Impact of prescribed burning on vegetation and bird abundance on Matagorda Island, Texas. Journal of Range Management, 50:346-360.

Vines, R. A. 1984. Trees of Central Texas. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.

Wade, D. D., B. L. Brock, P. H. Brose, J. B. Grace, G. A. Hoch, and W. A. Patterson III. 2000. Fire in Eastern ecosystems. In Wildland fire in ecosystems: effects of fire on flora. Edited by. J. K. Brown and J. Kaplers. United States Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Ogden, UT.

Weltz, M. A. and W. H. Blackburn. 1995. Water budget for south Texas rangelands. Journal of Range Management, 48:45-52.

Whittaker, R. H., L. E. Gilbert, and J. H. Connell. 1979. Analysis of a two-phase pattern in a mesquite grassland, Texas. Journal of Ecology, 67:935-52.

Wright, B. D., R. K. Lyons, J. C. Cathey, and S. Cooper. 2002. White-tailed deer browse preferences for South Texas and the Edwards Plateau. Texas Cooperative Extension Bulletin B-6130.

Wright, H.A. and A.W. Bailey. 1982. Fire Ecology: United States and Southern Canada. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ.

#### Contributors

Gary Harris, MSSL, NRCS, Robstown, Texas

### Approval

Bryan Christensen, 9/21/2023

#### Acknowledgments

Reviewers and Contributors: Shanna Dunn, RSS, NRCS, Corpus Christi, Texas Mark Moseley, RMS, NRCS, San Antonio, Texas Justin Clary, RMS, NRCS, Temple, Texas

## 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.

$A_{\rm utb} a_{\rm r}(a)/a_{\rm utb} a_{\rm rt}(a)$	
Author(s)/participant(s)	
Contact for lead author	
Date	05/19/2024
Approved by	Bryan Christensen
Approval date	
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production

#### Indicators

1. Number and extent of rills:

- 2. Presence of water flow patterns:
- 3. Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes:
- 4. Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground):
- 5. Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies:
- 6. Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas:
- 7. Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel):
- 8. Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages most sites will show a range of values):
- 9. Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness):
- 10. Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff:
- 11. Presence and thickness of compaction layer (usually none; describe soil profile features which may be mistaken for compaction on this site):
- 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:

Sub-dominant:

Other:

Additional:

13. Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence):

- 14. Average percent litter cover (%) and depth ( in):
- 15. Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annualproduction):
- 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:
- 17. Perennial plant reproductive capability: