

## Ecological site F094BY010MI Clayey Upland

Last updated: 11/16/2023  
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.

### MLRA notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 094B—Michigan Eastern Upper Peninsula Sandy Glacial Deposits

The Michigan Eastern Upper Peninsula MLRA (94B) corresponds closely with the Northwestern Sands Ecological Landscape. Some of the following brief overview is borrowed from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources ecological landscape publication (2015).

The Michigan Eastern Upper Peninsula MLRA is in northeast Wisconsin on the border of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, with a very small portion on the Lake Michigan coast disjoined from the rest of the MLRA. The Wisconsin portion of the MLRA is a bit shy of 1.1 million acres (1,668 square miles). This region, which was covered entirely by the Green Bay Lobe in Wisconsin's most recent glaciation, has a unique glacial landscape defined by intermingled loamy moraines and sandy heads-of-outwash. Extensive pitted outwash plains dominate the region, with significant glaciolacustrine sediments in the southeast portion of this region.

A prominent landform in this MLRA is the hummocky ridges of intermingled loamy moraines and sandy heads-of-outwash that protrude from extensive pitted outwash plains. These north-south trending, loamy morainal ridges were deposited as the Green Bay Lobe was stagnant—the rate of melting was relatively equal to the rate of advancement. This stagnation allowed the deposition of a ridge of sandy loam materials. Supraglacial till was deposited unevenly, and buried ice blocks melted and collapsed the surface to form hummocky topography on the moraines. The heads-of-outwash formed while the ice was melting and thinning rapidly. Large amounts of sand and gravel outwash materials, and some till and loamy debris-flow sediment, were deposited on top of the thin edge of ice. They, too, have hummocky topography resulting from the collapse of buried ice. The topographically similar appearances of the moraines and heads-of-outwash make them difficult to distinguish superficially, but they are formed in different-textured materials and the vegetation divergence is often evident. These moraines and heads-of-outwash mark the western extent of the Green Bay Lobe and are sometimes referred to as the Athelstane Moraines.

As the Green Bay Lobe receded, meltwaters carried sand and gravel outwash sediments to lower-lying areas. The outwash buried broken ice that melted, collapsed the surface, and created extensive pitted outwash plains that occur between the high elevation moraines and heads-of-outwash. More than 50% of this land region is covered in outwash sediments, and most of the outwash is pitted or collapsed.

The southeast portions of this MLRA are dominated by glacial lake sediments. Glacial Lake Oshkosh covered a portion of this MLRA when it was at its largest extent (1.4 million acres). The lake deposited silts and clays along the southeast portion of the inland section of this MLRA. Beach terraces, ridges, and dunes were also formed by the lake. In the Lake Michigan coastal section of this MLRA, Glacial Lake Nipissing deposited a level lake plain full of sandy lacustrine material that overlies dolomite and limestone bedrock. Glacial Lake Nipissing was a postglacial lake that occurred in the Lake Michigan Basin as the Lake Michigan Lobe was receding. Wetlands are abundant in this area of the MLRA. In the north section, Glacial Lake Dunbar formed when ice dams impounded glacial meltwater between the Athelstane Moraine and the Inner Athelstane Moraine. This glacial lake deposited small areas of level sandy lacustrine materials.

The northeast section of this MLRA is a till plain that formed in later advances of the Green Bay Lobe. Some pitted outwash is present, but the till plain is much more exposed here than elsewhere in the MLRA. The till deposited throughout 94B is primarily sandy, dolomitic till. The dolomite was scraped off the Niagara Escarpment as the Green Bay Lobe moved across it. In some areas, the carbonates are deeply leached.

Historically, this MLRA was dominated by a mixture of northern hardwood forests, Jack pine-scrub oak barrens, and forested coniferous wetlands at 30%, 29%, and 20%, respectively. White pine (*Pinus strobus*) and red pine (*Pinus resinosa*) were dominant tree species and covered an estimated 15% of the area. Northern hardwood forests were dominated by eastern white pine, eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*), and American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*). The Jack pine-scrub oak barrens were dominant in the sandy portions of this MLRA. Forested coniferous wetlands were occupied by northern white-cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*), black spruce (*Picea mariana*), and tamarack (*Larix laricina*).

## Classification relationships

Relationship to Established Framework and Classification Systems:

Habitat Types of N. Wisconsin (Kotar, 2002): Acer/Viburnum (AVb), Acer-Fagus/Viburnum (AFVb)

Biophysical Settings (Landfire, 2014): Laurentian-Acadian Northern Hardwoods Forest, Laurentian-Acadian Sub-boreal Aspen-Birch Forest

WDNR Natural Communities (WDNR, 2015): Northern Mesic Forest

Hierarchical Framework Relationships:

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): Michigan Eastern Upper Peninsula MLRA (94B)

USFS Subregions: Athelstane Sandy Outwash and Moraines (212Tc)

Wisconsin DNR Ecological Landscapes: Northeast Sands

## Ecological site concept

The Clayey Upland ecological site accounts for approximately 21,000 acres in MLRA 94B, or about 2% of total land area. It is found on clayey moraines and lake plains, mostly in the far northern and southern portions of this MLRA (Florence, Menominee, and Oconto counties).

This site is characterized by moderately well to well drained, clayey soils. Precipitation, runoff from adjacent uplands, and groundwater discharge are the primary sources of water. Soils are very strongly acid to moderately alkaline.

## Associated sites

F094BY002MI	<p><b>Mucky Swamp</b></p> <p>Mucky Swamps occupy landscape depressions and drainageways. They form in deep, herbaceous organic deposits and are very poorly drained. They occupy the lowest, wettest positions along the same drainage sequence as Clayey Upland.</p>
F094BY005MI	<p><b>Wet Loamy Lowland</b></p> <p>Wet Loamy Lowlands are wetland sites that occupy landscape depressions on moraines, lake plains, or outwash plains. They are very poorly to poorly drained. They occupy the lower, wetter positions along the same drainage sequence as Clayey Upland.</p>
F094BY007MI	<p><b>Moist Loamy Lowland</b></p> <p>Moist Loamy Lowlands are found in lower landscape positions on moraines, lake plains, or outwash plains. They are somewhat poorly drained. They occupy the lower, wetter positions along the same drainage sequence as Clayey Upland.</p>

## Similar sites

F094BY009MI	<b>Loamy Upland</b> Loamy Upland are found in upland landscape positions on moraines, lake plains, and outwash plains. They are moderately well to somewhat excessively drained. They are very similar to Clayey Upland except have coarser soil textures and improved drainage.
-------------	---

**Table 1. Dominant plant species**

Tree	(1) <i>Acer saccharum</i> (2) <i>Acer rubrum</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Corylus cornuta</i> (2) <i>Hamamelis</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Viburnum acerifolium</i> (2) <i>Maianthemum canadense</i>

## Physiographic features

This site is found on moraines, drumlins, and lake plains. It is common to the Homestead Moraines in southeastern Florence county and to the Hayes Moraines in western Oconto county. Slopes range from 0 to 35 percent.

These sites are subject to neither flooding nor ponding. When perched (episaturated), the seasonally-high water table may be found as high as 12 inches (30 cm) from the soil surface. Runoff potential ranges from high to very high.

**Table 2. Representative physiographic features**

Hillslope profile	(1) Summit (2) Shoulder (3) Backslope
Slope shape across	(1) Linear
Slope shape up-down	(1) Convex
Landforms	(1) Moraine (2) Drumlin (3) Lake plain
Runoff class	High to very high
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	186–256 m
Slope	0–35%
Water table depth	30–203 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor


## Climatic features

The continental climate of the Michigan Eastern Upper Peninsula MLRA is typical of northern Wisconsin: cooler summers, colder winters, and shorter growing seasons.


**Table 3. Representative climatic features**

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	101-108 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	126-139 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	762-813 mm


Frost-free period (actual range)	99-110 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	122-143 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	762-813 mm
Frost-free period (average)	100 days
Freeze-free period (average)	125 days
Precipitation total (average)	787 mm




**Figure 1. Monthly precipitation range**




**Figure 2. Monthly minimum temperature range**




**Figure 3. Monthly maximum temperature range**



**Figure 4. Monthly average minimum and maximum temperature**



**Figure 5. Annual precipitation pattern**



**Figure 6. Annual average temperature pattern**

### Climate stations used

- (1) CRIVITZ HIGH FALLS [USC00471897], Crivitz, WI
- (2) SURING [USC00478376], Suring, WI
- (3) PESHTIGO [USC00476510], Peshtigo, WI

### Influencing water features

Water is received through precipitation, runoff from adjacent uplands, and groundwater discharge. Water levels are greatly influenced by precipitation rates and runoff from upland sites. Water leaves the site primarily through runoff, evapotranspiration, and groundwater recharge.

### Wetland description

Permeability of these sites is impermeable to moderately slow.  
 Hydrologic Group: B, C, C/D  
 Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification: None  
 Cowardin Wetland Classification: None

## Soil features

The soils of this site are represented by the Ellwood, Hibbing, Keshena, Onaway, Ossineke, Pecore, and Tilleda soil series, and by a variant of the Tilleda soil series. Glossudalfs make up most of the acreage of this site.

These sites form in loamy to clayey till deposits. They are sometimes underlain by sandy outwash or clayey lacustrine materials. They typically lack bedrock contact within 6.5 feet (two meters) of the soil surface. They are moderately well to well drained and do not meet hydric soil requirements.

The surfaces of these soils may be sandy loam to silt loam. Subsurface textures range from sand to clay. Small fragments (gravel) may occupy up to 20 percent volume of the substratum. Soils are very strongly acid to moderately alkaline. Accumulations of secondary carbonates are common. They may occupy up to 20 percent volume and be found as high as 64 cm from the surface.



Figure 7. Tilleda Soil Series sample taken in Oconto County, WI on 06/27/2020. Courtesy of UWSP.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Till (2) Outwash (3) Lacustrine deposits
Surface texture	(1) Sandy loam (2) Loam (3) Silt loam
Drainage class	Moderately well drained to well drained
Permeability class	Very slow to moderately slow
Soil depth	203 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0%
Surface fragment cover >3"	0%
Available water capacity (0-152.4cm)	14.99–24.38 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-101.6cm)	0–20%
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	4.8–7.9
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	5–20%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	1–3%


## Ecological dynamics

Historically, this site was dominated by mesic hardwoods in a landscape adapted to fire disturbance that allowed for a strong presence of oaks. In pre-European settlement time wildfire was the main controlling factor of forest community dynamics. Following a severe, stand-replacing fire, any of the species present on the landscape could become established, depending on seed source availability and specific conditions of post-fire seedbed. The newly established young stands of any species were easily eliminated by recurring fires, but differences in fire-resisting properties among the species began to play a role in any species' survival success. Many pine and oak species were dominant in the region because of their fire-resistant properties and successful regeneration post-fire. With clear cutting and continued fire suppression, many of these species adapted to fire and intolerant of shade are replaced by other species. Species such as white pine and red oak are still common on the landscape based on their tolerance to some shade; these species to establish under a canopy, and in time, may become a component of the canopy. Mesic hardwoods are sensitive to fire, but in its absence, they have the ability to dominate sites based on their shade tolerance and prolific seed production.

Today, these forests most commonly include stands of sugar maple although red oak, and other mesic hardwoods may be present as well. Some sites have a strong presence of red oak, and white pine is successfully reinvading the landscape in some areas. These sites have the conditions to support shade tolerant mesic hardwoods, but historically had significant wind throw and fire disturbance that allowed for a strong presence of oak species and white pine. As long as fire is continually suppressed, maples and other mesic hardwoods will continue to dominate the canopy.

## State and transition model

### Ecosystem states



**T1A** - Clear cutting or stand-replacing fire.

**T1B** - Removal of forest vegetation and tilling.


**R2A** - Disturbance-free period 70+ years.

**T2A** - Removal of forest vegetation and tilling.

**R3A** - Cessation of agricultural practices, natural or artificial afforestation.

**R1A** - Cessation of agricultural practices, natural or artificial afforestation.


### State 1 submodel, plant communities



1.1A - Natural mortality in the oldest age classes, sporadic small-scale blow-downs and ice storms, create openings for entry of mid-tolerant species, such as red oak and red maple.

1.2A - Time and natural succession.

### State 2 submodel, plant communities




2.1A - Immigration and establishment of red oak and red maple.

2.2A - Immigration and establishment of red oak and red maple.

2.3A - Clear cutting or stand-replacing fire.

### State 3 submodel, plant communities



## State 1 Reference State

Reference state is a forest community dominated by sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*). Depending on history of disturbance, two community phases can be distinguished largely by differences in dominance of tree species and community age structure.

### Community 1.1 Advanced Succession Community Phase

In the absence of any major disturbance, specifically fire, this community is dominated by sugar maple. Common associates include other mesic hardwoods like basswood (*Tilia Americana*), American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*), and green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), and on some sites may include red oak (*Quercus rubra*) and white pine (*Pinus strobus*). Red oak and white pine require some disturbance to create gaps for regeneration; with the absence of disturbance, they are less common in the canopy. The shrub layer is often well developed and likely to contain Ironwood (hophornbeam *Ostrya virginiana*), Mapleleaf viburnum (*Viburnum acerifolium*), and Beaked hazelnut (*Corylus cornuta*). The ground layer is dominated by Canada mayflower, Hogpeanut, and other species commonly found in medium to rich soils such as trilliums.

#### Dominant plant species

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- beaked hazelnut (*Corylus cornuta*), shrub
- hophornbeam (*Ostrya*), shrub



- witchhazel (*Hamamelis*), shrub
- mapleleaf viburnum (*Viburnum acerifolium*), other herbaceous
- Canada mayflower (*Maianthemum canadense*), other herbaceous
- hogpeanut (*Amphicarpaea*), other herbaceous

## Community 1.2

### Rejuvenated Community Phase



Figure 8. Photo courtesy of UWSP taken on 08/25/2020 in Oconto County, WI

This community is often dominated by sugar maple, red oak, and red maple. The shrub and ground layers are similar to the advanced succession phase, but may include the establishment of new seedlings.

#### Dominant plant species

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tree
- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), tree
- beaked hazelnut (*Corylus cornuta*), shrub
- hophornbeam (*Ostrya*), shrub
- witchhazel (*Hamamelis*), shrub
- mapleleaf viburnum (*Viburnum acerifolium*), other herbaceous
- Canada mayflower (*Maianthemum canadense*), other herbaceous
- hogpeanut (*Amphicarpaea*), other herbaceous

#### Pathway 1.1A

#### Community 1.1 to 1.2

Light intensity fires, crown breakage from ice and snow, and small scale blow-downs create canopy openings, releasing advance regeneration and stimulating new seedling establishment. Some additional less shade tolerant species such as red oak and white pine may be able to enter the community.

#### Pathway 1.2A

#### Community 1.2 to 1.1

A long period without major canopy disturbance allows gradual replacement of oldest canopy trees by younger cohorts. Lacking a major disturbance, the canopy will likely be replaced with red and sugar maple. Small scale disturbances may still occur periodically, but once second or third canopies are established there is minimal new regeneration taking place and the forest gradually returns to mature state.

## State 2

### Early to Mid-Successional State

Following disturbances described in Transition T1A a wide range of forest community phases may come into

temporary existence, the three most common ones are described here.

## **Community 2.1 Aspen-Birch Phase**

These two species have a very narrow window of environmental and ecological conditions for successful establishment. Main requirements are exposed mineral soil and elimination, most effectively by fire, of on-site seed sources of potential competing vegetation. In addition, adequate soil moisture must be available for initial seedling development. Once seedlings are firmly established, height growth of both species is relatively rapid and able to outgrow most competitive species. Paper birch seedlings and saplings tolerate partial shade and often become members of mixed species communities. This is not true for aspen which requires continuous full-sun exposure for survival. Aspen stands are initially very dense due to sprouting from extensive lateral roots, but rapid natural thinning ensues as stems compete for available light.

### **Dominant plant species**

- quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), tree
- paper birch (*Betula papyrifera*), tree

## **Community 2.2 Red Oak - Red Maple Phase**

This community phase occurs by invading and succeeding a pioneer aspen-birch community.

### **Dominant plant species**

- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), tree
- red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tree

## **Community 2.3 Red Oak – Red Maple/Sugar Maple Phase**



Figure 9. Photo courtesy of UWSP taken on 06/26/2020 in Oconto County, WI.

Stand structure consists of dominant red oak and red maple in combination with a modest, or strong presence of mature, or decaying, aspen and/or paper birch. The shrub layer typically reaches its best development in this community phase. Depending on seed source, sugar maple has become established and a young cohort exists in the subcanopy.

### **Dominant plant species**

- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), tree
- red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tree
- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree

### **Pathway 2.1A**

#### **Community 2.1 to 2.2**

Time and the immigration, establishment, and growth of red oak and red maple seedlings. These moderately shade tolerant species seed in beneath the aspen and birch and eventually outcompete these intolerant species.

### **Pathway 2.2A**

#### **Community 2.2 to 2.3**

Time and natural succession. Red oak and red maple have succeeded the aspen-birch community. Depending on seed source, sugar maple begins growth and establishment in the understory.

### **Pathway 2.3A**

#### **Community 2.3 to 2.1**

Clear cutting or major fire disturbance allows for the reinvasion of the shade intolerant aspen-birch community.

## **State 3**

### **Agriculture State**

Indefinite period of applying agricultural practices.

### **Community 3.1**

#### **Agricultural Phase**

The agricultural phase constitutes tillage and the planting of row crops or hay or pasture.

### **Transition T1A**

#### **State 1 to 2**

Clear cutting with initial control of competing vegetation, or stand-replacing fire, prepare the site for occupancy by shade intolerant species. This may occur through natural regeneration or by planting.

### **Transition T1B**

#### **State 1 to 3**

Removal of forest cover, tilling and application of other agricultural techniques to grow agricultural crops.

### **Restoration pathway R2A**

#### **State 2 to 1**

A period of some 70-100 years without major stand disturbance, especially fire, leads to decreased presence, through natural mortality, of early successional species and the dominance of shade tolerant sugar maple with less tolerant associates of red oak and white ash, returning the community to Reference State.

### **Transition T2A**

#### **State 2 to 3**

Removal of forest cover, tilling and application of other agricultural techniques to grow agricultural crops.

### **Restoration pathway R3A**

#### **State 3 to 1**

Abandonment of agricultural practices and allowing natural vegetation to colonize the site or apply artificial afforestation.

## **Restoration pathway R1A**

### **State 3 to 2**

Abandonment of agricultural practices and allowing natural vegetation to colonize the site or apply artificial afforestation.

### **Additional community tables**

#### **Inventory data references**

Plot and other supporting inventory data for site identification and community phases is located on a NRCS North Central Region shared and one drive folder. University Wisconsin-Stevens Point described soils, took photographs, and inventoried vegetation data at community phases within the reference state. The data sources include WI ESD Plot Data Collection Form - Tier 2, Releve Method, NASIS pedon description, NRCS SOI 036, photographs, and Kotar Habitat Types.

Habitat Types of N. Wisconsin (Kotar, 2002): Acer/Viburnum (AVb), Acer-Fagus/Viburnum (AFVb)

Biophysical Settings (Landfire, 2014): Laurentian-Acadian Northern Hardwoods Forest, Laurentian-Acadian Sub-boreal Aspen-Birch Forest

WDNR Natural Communities (WDNR, 2015): Northern Mesic Forest

#### **Other references**

Cleland, D.T.; Avers, P.E.; McNab, W.H.; Jensen, M.E.; Bailey, R.G., King, T.; Russell, W.E. 1997. National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units. Published in, Boyce, M. S.; Haney, A., ed. 1997. Ecosystem Management Applications for Sustainable Forest and Wildlife Resources. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. pp. 181-200.

County Soil Surveys from St. Croix, Polk, Barron, Rusk, Chippewa, Clark, Marathon, Taylor, Price, Sawyer, Burnett, Washburn, Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Lincoln, Oneida, Langlade, Shawano, Menominee, Forest, Florence, Marinette, and Pierce Counties.

Curtis, J.T. 1959. Vegetation of Wisconsin: an ordination of plant communities. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. 657 pp.

Davis, R.B. 2016. Bogs and Fens, A Guide to the Peatland Plants of Northeastern United States and Adjacent Canada. University Press of New England, Hanover and London. 296 pp.

Finley, R. 1976. Original vegetation of Wisconsin. Map compiled from U.S. General Land Office notes. U.S. Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Hvizdak, David. Personal knowledge and field experience.

Jahnke, J. and Gienccke, A. 2002. MLRA 92 Clay Till Field Investigations. Summary of field day investigations by Region 10 Soil Data Quality Specialists.

Kotar, J. 1986. Soil – Habitat Type relationships in Michigan and Wisconsin. J. For. and Water Cons. 41(5): 348-350.

Kotar, J., J.A. Kovach and G. Brand. 1999. Analysis of the 1996 Wisconsin Forest Statistics by Habitat Type. U.S.D.A. For. Serv. N.C. Res. Stn. Gen. Tech. Rept. NC-207.

Kotar, J., J.A. Kovach and T. L. Burger. 2002. A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Northern Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Madison.

Kotar, J., and T. L. Burger. 2017. Wetland Forest Habitat Type Classification System for Northern Wisconsin: A Guide for Land Managers and landowners. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, PUB-FR-627 2017, Madison.

- Martin, L. 1965. The physical geography of Wisconsin. Third edition. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- McNab, W.H. and P.W. Avers. 1994. Ecological Subregions of the United States: Section Descriptions. USDA For. Serv. Pun. WO-WSA-5, Washington, D.C.
- NatureServe. 2018. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, VA. U.S.A. Data current as of 28 August 2018.
- Radeloff, V.C., D.J. Mladenoff, H.S. He and M.S. Boyce. 1999. Forest landscape change in Northwestern Wisconsin Pine Barrens from pre-European settlement to the present. *Can. J. For. Res.* 29: 1649-1659.
- Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2001. The original U.S. public land survey records: their use and limitations in reconstructing pre-European settlement vegetation. *Journal of Forestry* 99:5–10.
- Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2005. Severe wind and fire regimes in northern forests: historical variability at the regional scale. *Ecology* 86(2):431–445.
- Soil Survey Staff. Input based on personal experience. Tim Miland, Scott Eversoll, Ryan Bevernitz, and Jason Nemecek.
- Stearns, F. W. 1949. Ninety years change in a northern hardwood forest in Wisconsin. *Ecology*, 30: 350-58.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1989. Proceedings – Land Classification Based on Vegetation: Applications for Management. Gen. Tech. Report INT-527.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1990. Silvics of North America, Vol. 1, Hardwoods. Agricultural Handbook 654, Washington, D.C.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1990. Silvics of North America, Vol. 2, Conifers. Agricultural Handbook 654, Washington, D.C.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land Resource and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2008. Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification System: An Overview and Modification to Better Meet the Needs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Technical Note No. 190-8-76. Washington D.C.
- Wilde, S.A. 1933. The relation of soil and forest vegetation of the Lake States Region. *Ecology* 14: 94-105.
- Wilde, S.A. 1976. Woodlands of Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension, Pub. G2780, 150 pp.
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2015. The ecological landscapes of Wisconsin: An assessment of ecological resources and a guide to planning sustainable management. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, PUB-SS-1131 2015, Madison.

## **Contributors**

Bryant Scharenbroch, Assistant Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point  
Jacob Prater, Associate Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point  
John Kotar, Ecological Specialist, independent contractor

## **Approval**

Suzanne Mayne-Kinney, 11/16/2023

## Acknowledgments

NRCS contracted UWSP to write ecological sites. Completed in 2021.

## 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)	
Contact for lead author	
Date	05/19/2024
Approved by	Suzanne Mayne-Kinney
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 annual-production):**

---

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:**

---