

## Ecological site F099XY004MI Warm Dry Sandy Ridge

Last updated: 1/25/2024  
Accessed: 05/18/2024

### 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): 099X–Erie-Huron Lake Plain

This area is in the Eastern Lake Section of the Central Lowland Province of the Interior Plains (USDA-NRCS, 2022). It is a nearly level glacial lake plain with a few scattered ridges of sand that represent past shorelines and moraines. The Saginaw, Clinton, and Huron Rivers empty into the Great Lakes in the part of the area in Michigan. The southern half of this area is covered with glacial deposits of till, lake sediments, and outwash from the Wisconsin and older glacial periods. The area also has some low moraines. Mississippian- to Silurian-age shale, limestone, and dolomite rocks are at or near the surface close to Lake Erie and Lake Huron. Sandstone comes near the surface in the Thumb area east of Saginaw Bay, and a sandstone headland exists on a short stretch of Lake Huron shoreline. An extensive swamp in proximity the Maumee River prevented overland travel prior to its drainage by early settlers. Remnant marshes are near the Lake Erie shore.

The dominant soils in this MLRA are Alfisols, Inceptisols, Mollisols, and Spodosols. The soils in the area dominantly have a mesic soil temperature regime, an aquic soil moisture regime, and mixed or illitic mineralogy. Most soils in MLRA 99 are very deep, generally somewhat poorly drained to very poorly drained, and loamy or clayey. Epiaqualfs (Blount, Hoytville, Nappanee, and Shebeon series) and Glossudalfs (Capac series) formed in till (some of which is dense) on till plains, moraines, and lake plains. Epiaquepts formed in loamy till on till plains and moraines (Kilmanagh series) and in lacustrine deposits on lake plains (Lenawee and Paulding series). Endoaquepts formed in lacustrine deposits on lake plains (Latty and Toledo series) and in loamy till on moraines (Parkhill series).

Endoaquolls formed in outwash deposits on outwash plains and lake plains, in drainageways (Granby series), and in loamy till on till plains and moraines (Tappan series). Endoaquods (Pipestone series) formed in outwash deposits on outwash plains, lake plains, and beach ridges. Epiaquods (Wixom series) formed in sandy sediments over till or lacustrine deposits on till plains, outwash plains, and lake plains.

Broad flat areas of somewhat poorly drained soils support Landfire (2017) systems: North-Central Interior Beech-Maple Forest, with wetter patches of North-Central Interior Wet Flatwoods, and Central Interior and Appalachian Swamp. Sandy beach ridges and thin sand flats have Landfire (2017) systems: North-Central Interior Dry-Mesic Oak Forest and Woodland and Great Lakes Wet-Mesic Lakeplain Prairie. Central Interior and Appalachian Floodplain Systems occur adjacent to rivers that flow through the area. To the north, oak systems decline in coverage. Thin sandy flats in the north have Laurentian-Acadian Pine-Hemlock-Hardwood Forest. The north and south are best separated as ecological inference areas due to floristic and dominant vegetation contrasts which also correspond to generally lower summer and winter temperatures northward. This north-south break is approximated by the drainage divide between the Lake Huron and Lake Erie/Lake St. Clair basins.

Nearly three-fourths of this MLRA is in farms. About three-fifths of the area is cropland. The rest of the farmland is mostly in small farm woodlots, but some of the farmland is used for permanent pasture or other purposes. Cash crops are important. Corn, winter wheat, soybeans, and hay are the major crops. Sugar beets and canning crops also are important. Some fruit and truck crops are grown on the coarse textured soils. Dairying is an important enterprise on some farms near the larger cities. Almost one-fifth of the area is used for urban development. Shiawassee National Wildlife Refuge, Cedar Point National Wildlife Refuge, Oak Openings Preserve Metropark (Ohio) are among the more notable conservation lands.

#### Summary of existing land use (South):

Upland Forest (7%)

Hardwood (6%)

Agricultural (60%)

Developed (28%)

#### Summary of existing land use (North):

Upland Forest (14%)

Hardwood (13%)

Agricultural (58%)

Developed (13%)

Swamps and Marshes (13%)

### Classification relationships

The USFS ecoregion classification (Cleland et al., 2007) for the majority of MLRA 99 is the Humid Temperate, Hot Continental Division, Midwest Broadleaf Forest Province 222, Lake Whittlesey Glaciolacustrine Plain Section 222U. The ecoregion subsection composition is 222Ud (Sandusky Lake Plain) and 222Ue (Saginaw Clay Lake and Till Plain) in the north near Lake Huron and Saginaw Bay. In the south near Lake Erie, the area is composed of subsections 222Ua (Maumee Lake Plain), 222Ub (Paulding Plains), and 222Uc (Marblehead Drift/Limestone Plain). A mix of interlobate deposits extends into MLRA 99 as subsection 222Jf (Lum Interlobate Moraine) of South Central Great Lakes Section 222J. Sandy deposits extend south from adjacent MLRA are part the Warm Continental Division, Laurentian Mixed Forest Province 212, Northern Lower Peninsula Section 212H, subsection 212Hh (Gladwin Silty Lake Plain).

The Saginaw Bay and Lake Huron lake plains is coextensive with EPA ecoregion 57e (Saginaw Lake Plain) (Omernik and Griffith, 2014). The majority of the Lake Erie or Maumee Lake Plain includes EPA ecoregion 57a (Maumee Lake Plain), extending east to include 57d (Marblehead Drift/Limestone Plain). Large inclusions of sand are delineated as ecoregion 57b (Oak Openings). A significant area of higher clay is designated as 57c (Paulding Plains).

### Ecological site concept

The central concept of the Warm Dry Sandy Ridge is sands (>70% sands >200 cm deep), generally on former beach ridges and dunes, and water tables usually deeper than 150 cm (well drained). Sites support vegetation

composed of species of moderate to low nutrient requirements and moderate to high drought tolerance. This site has a more southerly distribution in the MLRA and has warmer summer temperatures (warmest 6 months > 17°C). A high frequency of low to medium intensity wildfires maintains oak barrens.

## Associated sites

|             |                                    |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| F099XY002MI | <b>Shallow Limestone Drift</b>     |
| F099XY003MI | <b>Warm Moist Sandy Depression</b> |

## Similar sites

|             |                             |
|-------------|-----------------------------|
| F099XY006MI | <b>Cool Dry Sandy Ridge</b> |
|-------------|-----------------------------|

**Table 1. Dominant plant species**

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| Tree       | (1) <i>Quercus velutina</i><br>(2) <i>Quercus alba</i> |
| Shrub      | (1) <i>Vaccinium pallidum</i>                          |
| Herbaceous | (1) <i>Carex pensylvanica</i>                          |

## Physiographic features

Site is upper crests of inland beach ridges formed at formerly high lake levels and shorelines of proglacial lakes.

**Table 2. Representative physiographic features**

|                   |                                    |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| Landforms         | (1) Beach ridge                    |
| Runoff class      | Negligible to low                  |
| Elevation         | 173–268 m                          |
| Water table depth | 99 cm                              |
| Aspect            | Aspect is not a significant factor |

## Climatic features

This ecological site experiences a humid continental climate with mild summers and cold winters. Precipitation is moderately well distributed through the year with higher amounts during the growing season than the winter.

Temperature extremes are moderated in immediate proximity to the Great Lakes, but this moderation has minimal effect inland due to prevailing winds blowing mainly offshore. Mean annual extreme minimum temperatures range from -26.6 to -18.8 °C (-16 to -2 °F), which falls within hardiness zones 5a to 6a (USDA, 2009). In general, temperatures are cooler northward, though local city heat island effects may interrupt this pattern.

The lack of significant topographic relief and general downwind direction to the Great Lakes likely contribute to this MLRA having lower annual precipitation and snowfall compared to the MLRA to the west. Mean annual snowfall ranges from 0.7 to 1.5 m (25 to 55 in). In general, snowfall is highest northward.

**Table 3. Representative climatic features**

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Frost-free period (characteristic range)   | 134-149 days |
| Freeze-free period (characteristic range)  | 167-186 days |
| Precipitation total (characteristic range) | 864-940 mm   |
| Frost-free period (actual range)           | 129-160 days |
| Freeze-free period (actual range)          | 158-193 days |

|                                    |            |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Precipitation total (actual range) | 838-940 mm |
| Frost-free period (average)        | 143 days   |
| Freeze-free period (average)       | 178 days   |
| Precipitation total (average)      | 889 mm     |

## Climate stations used

- (1) DEARBORN [USC00202015], Dearborn, MI
- (2) DEFIANCE [USC00332098], Defiance, OH
- (3) FINDLAY WPCC [USC00332791], Findlay, OH
- (4) TOLEDO EXPRESS AP [USW00094830], Monclova, OH
- (5) HOYTVILLE 2 NE [USC00333874], Cygnet, OH
- (6) WAUSEON WTP [USC00338822], Wauseon, OH
- (7) MT CLEMENS ANG BASE [USW00014804], Harrison Township, MI
- (8) MONROE [USC00205558], Monroe, MI
- (9) FREMONT [USC00332974], Fremont, OH
- (10) PANDORA [USC00336405], Pandora, OH
- (11) PAULDING [USC00336465], Paulding, OH
- (12) TIFFIN [USC00338313], Tiffin, OH
- (13) SANDUSKY [USW00014846], Sandusky, OH
- (14) FREMONT AG STN [USC00332976], Fremont, OH
- (15) NAPOLEON [USC00335669], Napoleon, OH
- (16) DETROIT METRO AP [USW00094847], Romulus, MI

## Influencing water features

Site is well drained with no water table within 100 cm of the surface.

## Soil features

Soils are excessively drained to well drained sand. They are commonly classified Lamellic Hapludalfs, Typic Udipsamments, and Typic Hapludalfs, and commonly mapped as Spinks, Oakville, and Boyer series or components.

**Table 4. Representative soil features**


|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Parent material                                | (1) Lacustrine deposits             |
| Surface texture                                | (1) Sand                            |
| Drainage class                                 | Excessively drained to well drained |
| Soil depth                                     | 201 cm                              |
| Surface fragment cover <=3"                    | 0–1%                                |
| Surface fragment cover >3"                     | 0%                                  |
| Available water capacity<br>(0-100.1cm)        | 3.99–10.01 cm                       |
| Soil reaction (1:1 water)<br>(0-50cm)          | 4.5–6                               |
| Subsurface fragment volume <=3"<br>(0-150.1cm) | 0–10%                               |
| Subsurface fragment volume >3"<br>(0-150.1cm)  | 0–5%                                |

## Ecological dynamics


Warm Dry Sandy Ridge tends to share the same ecological dynamics as Natureserve/Landfire systems, North-Central Interior Dry Oak Forest and Woodland or North-Central Oak Barrens (Landfire, 2017). Stand replacing fires occurred every 20-2000 years, while light surface fires happened every 2-20 years. Overstory was dominated by fire tolerant oaks like black oak (*Quercus velutina*) and white oak (*Quercus alba*). Understory vegetation reflects the xeric and poor nutrient conditions with hillside blueberry (*Vaccinium pallidum*) and Penn sedge (*Carex pensylvanica*).

## State and transition model


### Ecosystem states




### State 1 submodel, plant communities




### Communities 1 and 5 (additional pathways)



### State 2 submodel, plant communities



### State 3 submodel, plant communities



## State 1

### Reference State

The Reference State consists of plant-community-types in settings where natural ecological processes are operating that are unmanaged or only minimally-managed by land-use conditioning, e.g., ranging from old-growth plant community-types (sometimes construed as mature, or pre-settlement vegetation) to inherent transitional ruderal plant community-type phases.

### Dominant plant species

- black oak (*Quercus velutina*), tree
- white oak (*Quercus alba*), tree
- Blue Ridge blueberry (*Vaccinium pallidum*), shrub
- Pennsylvania sedge (*Carex pensylvanica*), grass

### Community 1.1

**Xerophytic Forest: *Quercus velutina* - *Quercus alba* / *Vaccinium* (*angustifolium*, *pallidum*) / *Carex pensylvanica* Forest**

### Community 1.2

**Wooded Grassland: *Quercus velutina* - *Quercus ellipsoidalis* - (*Quercus alba*) / *Schizachyrium scoparium* - *Lupinus perennis* Wooded Grassland**

### Community 1.3

**Prairie: *Schizachyrium scoparium* - *Carex muehlenbergii* - *Lithospermum caroliniense* - *Opuntia humifusa* Sand Grassland**

### Community 1.4

**Regenerating Forest**

### Community 1.5

**Mesophytic Forest: *Quercus rubra* - (*Acer saccharum*, *Quercus alba*) Forest**

**Pathway 1.1A**  
**Community 1.1 to 1.2**

Blowdown; increased fire/drought.

**Conservation practices**

|   |
|---|
| Prescribed Burning                                |
| Early Successional Habitat Development/Management |
| Forest Stand Improvement                          |

**Pathway 1.1B**  
**Community 1.1 to 1.3**

Blowdown/clearcut.

**Conservation practices**

|   |
|---|
| Early Successional Habitat Development/Management |
| Forest Stand Improvement                          |

**Pathway 1.1C**  
**Community 1.1 to 1.4**

Blowdown/clearcut.

**Conservation practices**

|                          |
|--------------------------|
| Forest Stand Improvement |
|--------------------------|

**Pathway 1.1D**  
**Community 1.1 to 1.5**

Succession; decreased fire/drought.

**Pathway 1.2A**  
**Community 1.2 to 1.1**

Reduced fire frequency; succession.

**Pathway 1.2B**  
**Community 1.2 to 1.3**

Decreased fire/drought; succession.

**Pathway 1.3A**  
**Community 1.3 to 1.1**

Fire suppression; succession.

**Pathway 1.3B**  
**Community 1.3 to 1.2**

Reduced fire frequency; succession.

**Conservation practices**

|                          |
|--------------------------|
| Prescribed Burning       |
| Forest Stand Improvement |

### **Pathway 1.3D** **Community 1.3 to 1.5**

Reduced fire frequency; succession.

### **Pathway 1.4A** **Community 1.4 to 1.1**

Succession.

### **Pathway 1.4B** **Community 1.4 to 1.2**

Blowdown; increased fire/drought.

### **Pathway 1.4D** **Community 1.4 to 1.5**

Succession; decreased fire/drought.

### **Pathway 1.5A** **Community 1.5 to 1.1**

Increased fire/drought with mortality.

#### **Conservation practices**

|                          |
|--------------------------|
| Prescribed Burning       |
| Forest Stand Improvement |

### **Pathway 1.5C** **Community 1.5 to 1.3**

Blowdown/clearcut followed by increased fire frequency.

#### **Conservation practices**

|   |
|---|
| Prescribed Burning                                |
| Early Successional Habitat Development/Management |
| Forest Stand Improvement                          |

### **Pathway 1.5D** **Community 1.5 to 1.4**

Blowdown/clearcut.

#### **Conservation practices**

|                          |
|--------------------------|
| Forest Stand Improvement |
|--------------------------|

## **State 2**



Cultural State

The Cultural State includes settings where natural ecological processes are absent or eclipsed by significant land-use conditioning and the conversion/transformation of plant cover is considered as Cultivated/Pasture/Plantation.

Community 2.1  
Sustainable Crop, Pasture, or Plantation

Community 2.2  
Unsustainable Crop, Pasture, or Plantation

Community 2.3  
Conservation Feature

Can be a grassed waterway, conservation reserve, a small patch pollinator garden, or other land taken out of its primary cultural production to mitigate or reduce impacts of adjacent land use, and is not by itself a permanent restoration of a complete native biological community and associated ecosystem services.

Pathway 2.1A  
Community 2.1 to 2.2

Revert to unsustainable cultural practices.

Pathway 2.1B  
Community 2.1 to 2.3

Establish conservation feature.

Conservation practices

|                    |
|--------------------|
| Conservation Cover |
| Grassed Waterway   |

Pathway 2.2A  
Community 2.2 to 2.1

Implement sustainable cultural practices.

Conservation practices

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| Conservation Crop Rotation       |
| Cover Crop                       |
| Nutrient Management              |
| Integrated Pest Management (IPM) |

Pathway 2.2B  
Community 2.2 to 2.3

Establish conservation feature.

Conservation practices

|                    |
|--------------------|
| Conservation Cover |
| Grassed Waterway   |

## **Pathway 2.3A**

### **Community 2.3 to 2.1**

Implement sustainable cultural practices.

#### **Conservation practices**

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| Conservation Cover               |
| Conservation Crop Rotation       |
| Nutrient Management              |
| Integrated Pest Management (IPM) |

## **Pathway 2.3B**

### **Community 2.3 to 2.2**

Revert to unsustainable cultural practices.

## **State 3**

### **Semi-natural State**

The Semi-natural State consists of plant community-types in settings where natural ecological processes are primarily still operating but with some land-use conditioning in the past or present, e.g., varieties of managed sites with replacement plant community-types such as results of harvests or planting, or settings that possess a significant artifact of land management e.g., predominately invasive plants.

## **Community 3.1**

### **Ruderal Meadow & Shrubland**

## **Community 3.2**

### **Exotic Ruderal Forest**

## **Pathway 3.1A**

### **Community 3.1 to 3.2**

Succession.

## **Pathway 3.2A**

### **Community 3.2 to 3.1**

Blowdown/clearcut.

## **Transition T1A**

### **State 1 to 2**

Clear vegetation; cultivate domesticated species

## **Transition T1B**

### **State 1 to 3**

Clear vegetation, invasive species introduced

## **Restoration pathway R2**

### **State 2 to 1**

Remove domesticated species; restore native species.

### **Conservation practices**

|   |
|---|
| Brush Management  |
| Tree/Shrub Site Preparation                               |
| Tree/Shrub Establishment                                  |
| Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats |
| Upland Wildlife Habitat Management                        |
| Herbaceous Weed Control                                   |

### **Transition T2A**

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

Abandoned, succession.

### **Restoration pathway R3**

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

Control invasive species; restore native species

### **Conservation practices**

|   |
|---|
| Brush Management  |
| Tree/Shrub Site Preparation                               |
| Tree/Shrub Establishment                                  |
| Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats |
| Upland Wildlife Habitat Management                        |
| Herbaceous Weed Control                                   |

### **Restoration pathway T3A**

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

Clear vegetation; cultivate domesticated species

### **Additional community tables**

### **Inventory data references**

Future work, as described in a future project plan, to validate the information in this provisional ecological site description is needed. This will include field activities to collect low and medium intensity sampling, soil correlations, and analysis of that data. Annual field reviews should be done by soil scientists and vegetation specialists. A final field review, peer review, quality control, and quality assurance reviews of the ESD will be needed to produce the final document. Annual reviews of the project plan are to be conducted by the Ecological Site Technical Team.

### **Other references**

References consulted for MLRA 99 PES:

Albert, D. A. et al., 1995. Vegetation circa 1800 of Michigan. Michigan's native landscape as interpreted from the General Land Office Surveys 1816-1856 (digital map), Lansing: Michigan Natural Features Inventory.

Barnes, B. V. and Wagner, W. H., 2004. Michigan trees: a guide to the trees of the Great Lakes region. Ann Arbor (Michigan): University of Michigan Press.

Brewer, L.G. and Vankat, J.L., 2004. Description of Vegetation of the Oak Openings of Northwestern Ohio at the

Time of Euro-American Settlement1. The Ohio Journal of Science, 104(4):76-85.

Cleland, D.T., J.A. Freeouf, J.E. Keys, G.J. Nowacki, C.A. Carpenter, and W.H.McNab. 2007. Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections for the conterminous United States. [Map. presentation scale 1:3,500,000, colored; A.M. Sloan, cartographer] Gen. Tech. Report WO-76D. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC. (<https://www.fs.fed.us/research/publications/misc/73326-wo-gtr-76d-cleland2007.pdf>)

Forsyth, J.L., 1970. A geologist looks at the natural vegetation map of Ohio. Ohio Journal of Science 70(3): 180-190.

GHCN, 2016. Global Historical Climatology Network Monthly Versions 2 and 3 (temperature and precipitation data). NOAA. <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/ghcnm/>

Knopp, P.D., 2012. The Distribution of *Quercus rubra* in the Maumee Lake Plain of Southeastern Michigan. The American Midland Naturalist, 168(1):70-92.

Kost, M. A. et al., 2010. Natural Communities of Michigan: Classification and Description, Lansing, MI: Michigan Natural Features Inventory.

Landfire, 2017. Landfire Biophysical Settings Review Site. Accessed May, 2017  
<http://www.landfirereview.org/descriptions.html>.

Omernik, J.M. and G.E. Griffith. 2014. Ecoregions of the conterminous United States: evolution of a hierarchical spatial framework. Environmental Management 54:1249–1266.

PRISM Climate Group. 2013. Gridded 30 Year Normals, 1981-2010. Oregon State University, <http://prism.oregonstate.edu>

Shanks, R.E., 1953. Forest Composition and Species Association in the Beech-Maple Forest Region of Western Ohio. Ecology, 34(3), pp.455-466.

USDA-NRCS, 2022. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Handbook 296.

USDA, 2009. Plant Hardiness Zone Map, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, 2011. LANDFIRE: LANDFIRE 1.1.0 Existing Vegetation Type layer. <http://landfire.cr.usgs.gov/viewer/>

## Contributors

Greg J. Schmidt

## Approval

Nels Barrett, 1/25/2024

## 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) |  |
|--------------------------|--|

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| Contact for lead author                     |                   |
| Date  | 01/25/2024        |
| Approved by                                 | Nels Barrett      |
| 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:**
-