

Ecological site F104XY019IA Floodplain Swamp Forest

Last updated: 5/18/2020
Accessed: 04/20/2024

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): 104X–Eastern Iowa and Minnesota Till Prairies

The Eastern Iowa and Minnesota Till Prairies (MLRA 104) includes the Iowan Surface, Oak Savanna, and Western Coulee and Ridges landforms (Prior 1991; MDNR 2005; WDNR 2015). It spans three states (Iowa, 74 percent; Minnesota, 22 percent; Wisconsin, 4 percent), encompassing approximately 9,660 square miles (Figure 1). The elevation ranges from approximately 1,310 feet above sea level (ASL) on the highest ridges to about 985 feet ASL in the lowest valleys. Local relief is mainly 10 to 20 feet. Glacial till and outwash deposits cover the uplands of the MLRA with recent alluvium located in the major river valleys. Paleozoic bedrock sediments, comprised primarily of shale and limestone, lies beneath the glacial material. The depth to limestone is shallow, resulting in karst topography across much of the area (USDA-NRCS 2006).

The vegetation in the MLRA has undergone drastic changes over time. Spruce forests dominated the landscape 30,000 to 21,500 years ago. As the last glacial maximum peaked 21,500 to 16,000 years ago, they were replaced with open tundras and parklands. The end of the Pleistocene Epoch saw a warming climate that initially prompted the return of spruce forests, but as the warming continued, spruce trees were replaced by deciduous trees (Baker et al. 1990). Not until approximately 9,000 years ago did the vegetation transition to prairies as climatic conditions continued to warm and subsequently dry. Between 4,000 and 3,000 years ago, oak savannas began intermingling within the prairie landscape, while the more wooded and forested areas maintained a foothold in sheltered areas. This prairie-forest transition ecosystem formed the dominant landscapes until the arrival of European settlers (Baker

et al. 1992).

Classification relationships

USFS Subregions: North Central U.S. Driftless and Escarpment (222L), Minnesota and Northeast Iowa Morainal-Oak Savannah (222M), Central Dissected Till Plains (251C) Sections; Menominee Eroded Pre-Wisconsin Till (222La), Oak Savannah Till and Loess Plains (222Me), Southeast Iowa Rolling Loess Hills (251Ch) Subsections (Cleland et al. 2007)

U.S. EPA Level IV Ecoregion: Eastern Iowa and Minnesota Drift Plains (47c), Rolling Loess Prairies (47f), Lower St. Croix and Vermillion Valleys (47g), Rochester/Paleozoic Plateau Upland (52c) (USEPA 2013)

National Vegetation Classification – Ecological Systems: North-Central Interior Floodplain (CES202.694) (NatureServe 2015)

National Vegetation Classification - Plant Associations: *Acer saccharinum* – *Fraxinus pensylvanica* – *Ulmus americana* Floodplain Forest (CEGL002586) (Nature Serve 2015)

Biophysical Settings: Central Interior and Appalachian Floodplain Systems (BpS 4214710) (LANDFIRE 2009)

Natural Resources Conservation Service – Iowa Plant Community Species List: Forest, Silver Maple - Elm (USDA-NRCS 2007)

Iowa Department of Natural Resources: Floodplain Forest (INAI 1984)

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: FFs68 Floodplain Forest (MDNR 2005)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Floodplain Forests (Eggers and Reed 2015)

Ecological site concept

Floodplain Swamp Forests are located within the green areas on the map (Figure 1). They occur on floodplains in river valleys. The soils are Mollisols and Entisols that are poorly-drained and deep with a seasonal high-water table, formed in alluvium. The site experiences rare to occasional flooding, lasting up to 30 days.

The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by deciduous trees and a sparse understory of shade-tolerant herbaceous plants. The tree canopy is comprised of black ash (*Fraxinus nigra* Marshall) and silver maple (*Acer saccharinum* L.). Other tree species that may occur include green ash (*Fraxinus pensylvanica* Marshall), bur oak (*Quercus macrocarpa* Michx.), American elm (*Ulmus americana* L), and boxelder (*Acer negundo* L.). The understory is mostly bare ground and leaf litter, but few herbaceous species are present. Fowl mannagrass (*Glyceria striata* (Lam.) Hitchc.) and hairy sedge (*Carex lacustris* Willd.) are the most frequently encountered herbaceous species. Flooding is the primary disturbance factor that maintains this site, while damage from storms is a secondary disturbance (LANDFIRE 2009).

Associated sites

| | |
|-------------|--|
| F104XY020IA | Loamy Floodplain Forest Alluvial soils that are somewhat poorly to moderately well-drained including Ackmore, Alluvial land, Arenzville, DuPage, Huntsville, Kennebec, Lawson, and Spillville. |
| F104XY021IA | Sandy Floodplain Forest Alluvial soils that are somewhat poorly to excessively-drained including Hanlon, Klum, Perks, Shellwood, and Sigglekov |

Similar sites

| | |
|-------------|---|
| F104XY020IA | Loamy Floodplain Forest Loamy Floodplain Forests are similar in landscape position, but the soils are somewhat poorly to moderately well-drained and occasionally flooded |
| F104XY021IA | Sandy Floodplain Forest Sandy Floodplain Forests are similar in landscape position, but the soils are somewhat poorly to excessively-drained and are frequently flooded |

Table 1. Dominant plant species

| | |
|------------|---|
| Tree | (1) <i>Fraxinus nigra</i> (2) <i>Acer saccharinum</i> |
| Shrub | Not specified |
| Herbaceous | (1) <i>Glyceria striata</i> (2) <i>Carex lacustris</i> |

Physiographic features

Floodplain Swamp Forests occur on floodplains in river valleys (Figure 2). They are situated on elevations ranging from approximately 499 to 2886 feet ASL. The site experiences rare to occasional flooding that can last up to 30 days (Table 1).



Figure 2. Figure 1. Location of Floodplain Swamp Forest ecological site within MLRA 104.




Figure 3. Figure 2. Representative block diagram of Floodplain Swamp Forest and associated ecological sites.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

| | |
|--------------------|------------|
| Slope shape across | (1) Linear |
|--------------------|------------|

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Slope shape up-down | (1) Linear |
| Landforms | (1) Flood plain |
| Runoff class | Low |
| Flooding duration | Very brief (4 to 48 hours) to long (7 to 30 days) |
| Flooding frequency | Rare to occasional |
| Elevation | 499–2,886 ft |
| Slope | 0–2% |
| Water table depth | 0–6 in |
| Aspect | Aspect is not a significant factor |

Climatic features

The Eastern Iowa and Minnesota Till Prairies falls into the hot-summer humid continental climate (Dfa) and warm-summer humid continental climate (Dfb) Köppen-Geiger climate classifications (Peel et al. 2007). In winter, dry, cold air masses periodically shift south from Canada. As these air masses collide with humid air, snowfall and rainfall result. In summer, moist, warm air masses from the Gulf of Mexico migrate north, producing significant frontal or convective rains. Occasionally, hot, dry winds originating from the Desert Southwest will stagnate over the region, creating extended droughty periods in the summer from unusually high temperatures. Air masses from the Pacific Ocean can also spread into the region and dominate producing mild, dry weather in the autumn known as Indian Summers (NCDC 2006).

The soil temperature regime of MLRA 104 is classified as mesic, where the mean annual soil temperature is between 46 and 59°F (USDA-NRCS 2006). Temperature and precipitation occur along a north-south gradient, where temperature and precipitation increase the further south one travels. The average freeze-free period of this ecological site is about 154 days, while the frost-free period is about 127 days (Table 2). The majority of the precipitation occurs as rainfall in the form of convective thunderstorms during the growing season. Average annual precipitation is approximately 36 inches, which includes rainfall plus the water equivalent from snowfall (Table 3). The average annual low and high temperatures are 36 and 57°F, respectively.

Climate data and analyses are derived from 30-year averages gathered from six National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) weather stations contained within the range of this ecological site (Table 4).

Table 3. Representative climatic features

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Frost-free period (characteristic range) | 119-135 days |
| Freeze-free period (characteristic range) | 141-167 days |
| Precipitation total (characteristic range) | 35-38 in |
| Frost-free period (actual range) | 115-137 days |
| Freeze-free period (actual range) | 139-169 days |
| Precipitation total (actual range) | 34-38 in |
| Frost-free period (average) | 127 days |
| Freeze-free period (average) | 154 days |
| Precipitation total (average) | 36 in |

Climate stations used

- (1) TRIPOLI [USC00138339], Tripoli, IA
- (2) OSAGE [USC00136305], Osage, IA
- (3) CEDAR RAPIDS NO 1 [USC00131319], Marion, IA
- (4) BYRON 4NORTH [USC00211174], Byron, MN

- (5) AUSTIN WWT FAC [USC00210355], Austin, MN
- (6) ANAMOSA 1 WNW [USC00130213], Anamosa, IA

Influencing water features

Floodplain Swamp Forests are classified as a RIVERINE: Frequently Flooded; forested wetland under the Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classification system (Smith et al. 1995; USDA-NRCS 2008) and as a Palustrine, Forested, Broad-leaved Deciduous, Temporarily Flooded wetland under the National Wetlands Inventory (FGDC 2013). Overbank flow from the channel and subsurface hydraulic connections are the main sources of water for this ecological site (Smith et al. 1995). Infiltration is very slow (Hydrologic Group D) for undrained soils, and surface runoff is low (Figure 5).

Primary wetland hydrology indicators for an intact Floodplain Swamp Forest may include: A1 Surface water, A2 High water table, A3 Saturation, B1 Water marks, B2 Sediment deposits, B3 Drift deposits, B8 Sparsely vegetated concave surface, and B9 Water-stained leaves. Secondary wetland hydrology indicators may include: D5 FAC-neutral test (USACE 2010).




Figure 10. Figure 5. Hydrologic cycling in Floodplain Swamp Forest ecological site.

Soil features

Soils of Floodplain Swamp Forests are in the Mollisols and Entisols orders, further classified as Cumulic Endoaquolls, Cumulic Vertic Endoaquolls, and Mollic Fluvaquents with very slow infiltration and low runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Calco, Coland, Colo, Kalmarville, Sawmill, Udifluvents, and Zook. The parent material is alluvium and the soils are poorly-drained and deep with seasonal high-water tables. Soil pH classes are moderately acid to strongly alkaline. No rooting restrictions are noted for the soils of this ecological site (Table 5).

Some soil map units in this ecological site, if not drained, may meet the definition of hydric soils and are listed as meeting criteria 2 of the hydric soils list (77 FR 12234).




Figure 11. Figure 6. Profile sketches of soil series associated with Floodplain Swamp Forest.

Table 4. Representative soil features

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Parent material | (1) Alluvium |
| Family particle size | (1) Fine (2) Fine-silty (3) Coarse-loamy |
| Drainage class | Poorly drained |
| Permeability class | Slow |
| Depth to restrictive layer | 80 in |
| Soil depth | 80 in |

Ecological dynamics

The information in this Ecological Site Description, including the state-and-transition model (STM), was developed based on historical data, current field data, professional experience, and a review of the scientific literature. As a result, all possible scenarios or plant species may not be included. Key indicator plant species, disturbances, and ecological processes are described to inform land management decisions.


The MLRA lies within the transition zone between the eastern deciduous forests and the tallgrass prairies. The heterogeneous topography of the area results in variable microclimates and fuel matrices that in turn support prairies, savannas, woodlands, and forests. Floodplain Swamp Forests form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on floodplains on poorly-drained alluvial soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of hydrophytic woody and herbaceous vegetation.

Flooding is the dominant disturbance factor in Floodplain Swamp Forests, and storm damage is a secondary disturbance. Periodic flooding occurs seasonally, sometimes lasting up to a month at a time. Damage to trees from wind storms can vary from minor, patchy effects of individual trees to stand effects that temporarily affect community structure and species richness and diversity (Irland 2000; Peterson 2000).

Today, many Floodplain Swamp Forests have been reduced as a result of conversion to pasture. A few sites have been cleared and drained for agricultural production. Remnant sites have been degraded due to significant changes to the natural hydrologic regime and diminished water quality in the watershed. The state-and-transition model that follows provides a detailed description of each state, community phase, pathway, and transition. This model is based on available experimental research, field observations, literature reviews, professional consensus, and interpretations.

State and transition model

F104XY019IA FLOODPLAIN SWAMP FOREST



| Code | Process |
|--------------------|---|
| 1.1A | Major flood event |
| 1.2A | Natural succession as a result of no disturbances |
| T1A, T3A, T4A, T5A | Changes to natural hydroperiod and/or land abandonment |
| T1B, T2A, T4B, T5B | Cultural treatments are implemented to increase forage quality and yield |
| 3.1A | Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock and continuous grazing |
| 3.1B | Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock and rest-rotational grazing |
| 3.2A, 3.3B | Tillage, forage crop planting, and mechanical harvesting replace grazing |
| 3.2B | Implementation of rest-rotational grazing |
| 3.3A | Implementation of continuous grazing |
| T1C, T2B, T3B, T5C | Agricultural conversion via tillage, seeding, and non-selective herbicide |
| 4.1A | Less tillage, residue management |
| 4.1B | Less tillage, residue management, and implementation of cover cropping |
| 4.2B | Implementation of cover cropping |
| 4.2A, 4.3B | Intensive tillage, remove residue, and reinitiate monoculture row cropping |
| 4.3A | Remove cover cropping |
| R2A, R3A, R4A | Site preparation, tree planting, repair hydrology, non-native species control |
| 5.1A | Timber stand improvement practices implemented |
| 5.2A | Setback from extreme weather event or improper timing of management actions |

State 1 Reference State

The reference plant community is categorized as a floodplain forest community, dominated by hydrophytic woody

and herbaceous vegetation. The two community phases within the reference state are dependent on periodic flooding. The amount and duration of floodwaters alters species composition, cover, and extent. Damage from storms have more localized impacts in the reference phases, but does contribute to overall species composition, diversity, cover, and productivity.

Community 1.1

Black Ash – Silver Maple/Fowl Mannagrass – Hairy Sedge

Sites in this reference community phase are a closed canopy forest (80 to 100 percent cover) dominated by black ash and silver maple, with subdominants including American elm, green ash, bur oak, and boxelder. Trees are large (21 to 33-inch DBH) and range in height from 30 to over 80 feet tall (LANDFIRE 2009). The herbaceous layer is sparse and lacking in species diversity. Fowl mannagrass and hairy sedge may be the dominant species present, but bare ground and litter comprise the majority of the ground cover. Periodic flooding will maintain this phase, but over time the site may accumulate more sediments causing it to become more elevated and thereby shifting the community to phase 1.2.

Community 1.2

Black Ash – Bur Oak/Common Hackberry/Virginia Wildrye – Eastern Waterleaf

This reference community phase represents the plant community following long-term sediment accumulation and site elevation increases. Black ash and silver maple are still present, but bur oak and American elm become co-dominant. Common hackberry can be a common canopy and sub-canopy component. The elevation increase on the site reduces the frequency of flooding and allows the herbaceous layer to become more continuous with species such as Virginia wildrye (*Elymus virginicus* L.), eastern waterleaf (*Hydrophyllum virginianum* L.), Canadian clearweed (*Pilea pumila* (L.) A. Gray), and Canadian woodnettle (*Laportea canadensis* (L.) Weddell).

Pathway 1.1A

Community 1.1 to 1.2

Natural succession from sediment accumulation.

Pathway 1.2A

Community 1.2 to 1.1

Major disturbance event such as flood or windthrow.

State 2

Hydrologically-altered State

Agricultural tile drainage, stream channelization, and levee construction in hydrologically-connected waters have drastically changed the natural hydrologic regime of Floodplain Swamp Forests. In addition, increased amounts of precipitation and intensity have amplified flooding events (Pryor et al. 2014). This has resulted in a type conversion from the species-rich forest to a ruderal floodplain forest state. In addition, exotic species have encroached and continuously spread, reducing native diversity and ecosystem stability (Eggers and Reed 2015).

Community 2.1

Silver Maple – American Elm/Green Ash – Common Hackberry/Canadian Woodnettle – Creeping Jenny

This community phase represents a transition in plant community composition as a result of an altered hydrologic regime. Silver maple and American elm are the dominant canopy species, and green ash, common hackberry, and boxelder are common canopy and subcanopy associates. The herbaceous layer may be nearly continuous but lacks in species diversity. Disturbance-tolerant natives, such as Canadian woodnettle, can be accompanied by aggressive non-native invaders, such as creeping jenny (*Lysimachia nummularia* L.) and garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata* (M. Bieb.) Cavara & Grande).

State 3

Forage State

The forage state arises when the site is converted to a farming operation that emphasizes domestic livestock production, known as grassland agriculture. Fire suppression, periodic cultural treatments (e.g., clipping, drainage, soil amendment applications, planting new species and/or cultivars, mechanical harvesting), hydrologic alterations and grazing by domesticated livestock transition and maintain this state (USDA-NRCS 2003). Early settlers seeded non-native species, as smooth brome (*Bromus inermis* Leyss.) and Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis* L.), to help extend the grazing season (Smith 1998). Over time, as lands were continuously harvested or grazed by herds of cattle, these species were able to spread and expand across the landscape, reducing the native species diversity and ecological function.

Community 3.1

Hayfield

Sites in this community phase consist of forage plants that are planted and mechanically harvested. Mechanical harvesting removes much of the aboveground biomass and nutrients that feed the soil microorganisms (Franzluebbers et al. 2000; USDA-NRCS 2003). As a result, soil biology is reduced leading to decreases in nutrient uptake by plants, soil organic matter, and soil aggregation. Frequent biomass removal can also reduce the site's carbon sequestration capacity (Skinner 2008).

Community 3.2

Continuous Pastured Grazing

This community phase is characterized by continuous grazing where domestic livestock graze a pasture for the entire season. Depending on stocking density, this can result in lower forage quality and productivity, weed invasions, and uneven pasture use. Continuous grazing can also increase the amount of bare ground and erosion and reduce soil organic matter, cation exchange capacity, water-holding capacity, and nutrient availability and retention (Bharati et al. 2002; Leake et al. 2004; Teague et al. 2011). Smooth brome, Kentucky bluegrass, and white clover (*Trifolium repens* L.) are common pasture species used in this phase. Their tolerance to continuous grazing has allowed these species to dominate, sometimes completely excluding the native vegetation.

Community 3.3

Periodic-rest Pastured Grazing

This community phase is characterized by periodic-rest grazing where the pasture has been subdivided into several smaller paddocks. Subdividing the pasture in this way allows livestock to utilize one or a few paddocks, while the remaining area is rested allowing plants to restore vigor and energy reserves, deepen root systems, develop seeds, as well as allow seedling establishment (Undersander et al. 2002; USDA-NRCS 2003). Periodic-rest pastured grazing includes deferred periods, rest periods, and periods of high intensity – low frequency, and short duration methods. Vegetation is generally more diverse and can include orchardgrass (*Dactylis glomerata* L.), timothy (*Phleum pratense* L.), red clover (*Trifolium pratense* L.), and alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.). The addition of native prairie species can further bolster plant diversity and, in turn, soil function. This community phase promotes numerous ecosystem benefits including increasing biodiversity, preventing soil erosion, maintaining and enhancing soil quality, sequestering atmospheric carbon, and improving water yield and quality (USDA-NRCS 2003).

Pathway 3.1A

Community 3.1 to 3.2

Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock utilizing continuous grazing.

Pathway 3.1B

Community 3.1 to 3.3

Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock utilizing periodic-rest grazing.

Pathway 3.2A

Community 3.2 to 3.1

Domestic livestock are removed, and mechanical harvesting is implemented.

Pathway 3.2B

Community 3.2 to 3.3

Periodic-rest grazing replaces continuous grazing.

Pathway 3.3B

Community 3.3 to 3.1

Domestic livestock are removed, and mechanical harvesting is implemented.

Pathway 3.3A

Community 3.3 to 3.2

Continuous grazing replaces periodic-rest grazing.

State 4

Cropland State

The Midwest is well-known for its highly-productive agricultural soils, and as a result, much of the MLRA has been converted to cropland, including portions of this ecological site. Hydrologic alterations and the continuous use of tillage, row-crop planting, and chemicals (i.e., herbicides, fertilizers, etc.) have effectively eliminated the reference community and many of its natural ecological functions in favor of crop production. Corn (*Zea mays* L.) and soybeans (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) are the dominant crops for the site. These areas are likely to remain in crop production for the foreseeable future.

Community 4.1

Conventional Tillage Field

Sites in this community phase typically consist of monoculture row-cropping maintained by conventional tillage practices. They are cropped in either continuous corn or alternating periods of corn and soybean crops. The frequent use of deep tillage, low crop diversity, and bare soil conditions during the non-growing season negatively impacts soil health. Under these practices, soil aggregation is reduced or destroyed, soil organic matter is reduced, erosion and runoff are increased, and infiltration is decreased, which can ultimately lead to undesirable changes in the hydrology of the watershed (Tomer et al. 2005).

Community 4.2

Conservation Tillage Field

This community phase is characterized by periodically alternating crops and utilizing various conservation tillage methods to promote soil health and reduce erosion. Conservation tillage methods include strip-till, ridge-till, vertical-till, or no-till planting operations. Strip-till keeps seedbed preparation to narrow bands less than one-third the width of the row where crop residue and soil consolidation are left undisturbed in-between seedbed areas. Strip-till planting may be completed in the fall and nutrient application either occurs simultaneously or at the time of planting. Ridge-till uses specialized equipment to create ridges in the seedbed and vegetative residue is left on the surface in between the ridges. Weeds are controlled with herbicides and/or cultivation, seedbed ridges are rebuilt during cultivation, and soils are left undisturbed from harvest to planting. Vertical-till operations employ machinery that lightly tills the soil and cuts up crop residue, mixing some of the residue into the top few inches of the soil while leaving a large portion on the surface. No-till management is the most conservative, disturbing soils only at the time of planting and fertilizer application. Compared to conventional tillage operations, conservation tillage methods can reduce soil erosion, increase organic matter and water availability, improve water quality, and reduce soil compaction.

Community 4.3

Conservation Tillage with Cover Crop Field

This condition applies conservation tillage methods as described above as well as adds cover crop practices. Cover crops typically include nitrogen-fixing species (e.g., legumes), small grains (e.g., rye, wheat, oats), or forage covers (e.g., turnips, radishes, rapeseed). The addition of cover crops not only adds plant diversity but also promotes soil health by reducing soil erosion, limiting nitrogen leaching, suppressing weeds, increasing soil organic matter, and improving the overall soil. In the case of small grain cover crops, surface cover and water infiltration are increased, while forage covers can be used to graze livestock or support local wildlife. Of the three community phases for this state, this phase promotes the greatest soil sustainability and improves ecological functioning within a row crop operation.

Pathway 4.1A

Community 4.1 to 4.2

Tillage operations are greatly reduced, alternating crops occurs on a regular schedule, and crop residue is allowed to remain on the soil surface.

Pathway 4.1B

Community 4.1 to 4.3

Tillage operations are greatly reduced or eliminated, alternating crops is either reduced or eliminated, and crop residue is allowed to remain on the soil surface, and cover crops are implemented to prevent soil erosion.

Pathway 4.2A

Community 4.2 to 4.1

Intensive tillage is utilized, and monoculture row-cropping is established.

Pathway 4.2B

Community 4.2 to 4.3

Cover crops are implemented to prevent soil erosion.

Pathway 4.3B

Community 4.3 to 4.1

Intensive tillage is utilized, cover crops practices are abandoned, monoculture row-cropping is established on a more-or-less continuous basis.

Pathway 4.3A

Community 4.3 to 4.2

Cover crop practices are abandoned.

State 5

Reconstructed Floodplain Forest State

The combination of natural and anthropogenic disturbances occurring today has resulted in numerous ecosystem health issues, and restoration back to the historic reference state may not be possible. Many natural forest communities are being stressed by non-native diseases and pests, habitat fragmentation, permanent changes in hydrologic regimes, and overabundant deer populations on top of naturally-occurring disturbances (severe weather and native pests) (Flickinger 2010). However, these habitats provide multiple ecosystem services including carbon sequestration; clean air and water; soil conservation; biodiversity support; wildlife habitat; as well as a variety of cultural activities (e.g., hiking, hunting) (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005; Flickinger 2010). Therefore, conservation of floodplain forests should still be pursued. Habitat reconstructions are an important tool for repairing natural ecological functioning and providing habitat protection for numerous species of Floodplain Swamp Forests.

Therefore, ecological restoration should aim to aid the recovery of degraded, damaged, or destroyed ecosystems. A successful restoration will have the ability to structurally and functionally sustain itself, demonstrate resilience to the ranges of stress and disturbance, and create and maintain positive biotic and abiotic interactions (SER 2002). The reconstructed forest state is the result of a long-term commitment involving a multi-step, adaptive management process.

Community 5.1 Early Successional Reconstructed Forest

This community phase represents the early community assembly from forest reconstruction. It is highly dependent on the current condition of the site based on past and current land management actions, invasive species, and proximity to land populated with non-native pests and diseases. Therefore, no two sites will have the same early successional composition. Technical forestry assistance should be sought to develop suitable conservation management plans.

Community 5.2 Late Successional Reconstructed Forest

Appropriately timed management practices (e.g. forest stand improvement, continuing integrated pest management) applied to the early successional community phase can help increase the stand maturity, pushing the site into a late successional community phase over time. A late successional reconstructed forest will have an uneven-aged, closed canopy and a well-developed understory.

Pathway 5.1A Community 5.1 to 5.2

Application of stand improvement practices in line with a developed management plan.

Pathway 5.2A Community 5.2 to 5.1

Reconstruction experiences a setback from extreme weather event or improper timing of management actions.

Transition T1A State 1 to 2

Altered hydrology throughout the watershed transitions the site to the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition T1B State 1 to 3

Woody species removal and cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transition the site to the forage state (3).

Transition T1C State 1 to 4

Woody species removal, tillage, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the site to the cropland state (4).

Transition T2A State 2 to 3

Woody species removal and cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transition the site to the forage state (3).

Transition T2B
State 2 to 4

Woody species removal, tillage, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the site to the cropland state (4).

Restoration pathway R2A
State 2 to 5

Site preparation, tree planting, timber stand improvement, non-native species control, and water control structures installed to improve and regulate hydrology transition this site to the reconstructed forest state (5).

Restoration pathway T3A
State 3 to 2

Land is abandoned and left fallow; natural succession by opportunistic species transition this site the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition T3B
State 3 to 4

Tillage, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the site to the cropland state (4).

Restoration pathway R3A
State 3 to 5

Site preparation, tree planting, timber stand improvement, non-native species control, and water control structures installed to improve and regulate hydrology transition this site to the reconstructed forest state (5).

Transition T4A
State 4 to 2

Land abandonment transitions the site to the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition T4B
State 4 to 3

Cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transition the site to the forage state (3).

Restoration pathway R4A
State 4 to 5

Site preparation, tree planting, timber stand improvement, non-native species control, and water control structures installed to improve and regulate hydrology transition this site to the reconstructed forest state (5).

Transition T5A
State 5 to 2

Removal of water control structures and unmanaged invasive species populations transition this site to the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition T5B
State 5 to 3

Tree removal and cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transition the site to the forage state (3).

Transition T5C State 5 to 4

Tree removal, tillage, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition this site to the cropland state (4).

Additional community tables

Inventory data references

No field plots were available for this site. A review of the scientific literature and professional experience were used to approximate the plant communities for this provisional ecological site. Information for the state-and-transition model was obtained from the same sources. All community phases are considered provisional based on these plots and the sources identified in ecological site description.

Other references

Baker, R.G., C.A. Chumbley, P.M. Witinok, and H.K. Kim. 1990. Holocene vegetational changes in eastern Iowa. *Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science* 97: 167-177.

Baker, R.G., L.J. Maher, C.A. Chumbley, and K.L. Van Zant. 1992. Patterns of Holocene environmental changes in the midwestern United States. *Quaternary Research* 37: 379-389.

Bharati, L., K.-H. Lee, T.M. Isenhardt, and R.C. Schultz. 2002. Soil-water infiltration under crops, pasture, and established riparian buffer in Midwestern USA. *Agroforestry Systems* 56: 249-257.

Changes in Hydric Soils Database Selection Criteria. 77 *Federal Register* 12234 (29 February 2012), pp. 12234-12235.

Cleland, D.T., J.A. Freeouf, J.E. Keys, G.J. Nowacki, C. Carpenter, and W.H. McNab. 2007. *Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections of the Conterminous United States*. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report WO-76. Washington, DC. 92 pps.

Eggers, S.D. and D.M. Reed. 2015. *Wetland Plants and Plant Communities of Minnesota and Wisconsin, Version 3.2*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch, St. Paul District. St. Paul, MN. 478 pps.

Eilers, L. and D. Roosa. 1994. *The Vascular Plants of Iowa: An Annotated Checklist and Natural History*. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, IA. 319 pps.

Federal Geographic Data Committee. 2013. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. FGDC-STD-004-2013. Second Edition. Wetlands Subcommittee, Federal Geographic Data Committee and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 90 pps.

Flickinger, A. 2010. *Iowa Forests Today: An Assessment of the Issues and Strategies for Conserving and Managing Iowa's Forests*. Iowa Department of Natural Resources. 329 pps.

Franzluebbers, A.J., J.A. Stuedemann, H.H. Schomberg, and S.R. Wilkinson. 2000. Soil organic C and N pools under long-term pasture management in the Southern Piedmont USA. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 32:469-478.

Iowa Natural Areas Inventory [INAI]. 1984. *An Inventory of Significant Natural Areas in Iowa: Two year Progress Report of the Iowa Natural Areas Inventory*. Iowa Natural Areas Inventory, Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Des Moines, IA.

Ireland, L.C. 2000. Ice storms and forest impacts. *The Science of the Total Environment* 262:231-242.

LANDFIRE. 2009. *Biophysical Setting 4214710 Central Interior and Appalachian Floodplain*. In: *LANDFIRE National Vegetation Dynamics Models*. USDA Forest Service and US Department of Interior. Washington, DC.

- Leake, J., D. Johnson, D. Donnelly, G. Muckle, L. Boddy, and D. Read. 2004. Networks of power and influence: the role of mycorrhizal mycelium in controlling plant communities and agroecosystem functioning. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 82: 1016-1045.
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current States and Trends*. World Resources Institute. Island Press, Washington, D.C. 948 pages.
- Minnesota Department of Natural Resources [MDNR]. 2005. *Field Guide to the Native Plant Communities of Minnesota: The Eastern Broadleaf Forest Province*. Ecological Land Classification Program, Minnesota County Biological Survey, Natural Heritage and Nongame Research Program, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, St. Paul, MN.
- National Climate Data Center [NCDC]. 2006. *Climate of Iowa*. Central Region Headquarters, Climate Services Branch, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC.
- NatureServe. 2018. *NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life* [web application]. Version 7.1 NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available at <http://explorer.natureserve.org>. (Accessed 16 January 2019).
- Peel, M.C., B.L. Finlayson, and T.A. McMahon. 2007. Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 11: 1633-1644.
- Peterson, C.J. 2000. Catastrophic wind damage to North American forests and the potential impact of climate change. *The Science of the Total Environment* 262: 287-311.
- Prior, J.C. 1991. *Landforms of Iowa*. University of Iowa Press for the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Iowa City, IA. 153 pps.
- Pyne, S.J., P.L. Andrews, and R.D. Laven. 1996. *Introduction to Wildland Fire, Second Edition*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, New York. 808 pps.
- Pryor, S.C., D. Scavia, C. Downer, M. Gaden, L. Iverson, R. Nordstrom, J. Patz, and G.P. Robertson. 2014. Chapter 18: Midwest. In: J.M. Melillo, T.C. Richmond, and G.W. Yohe, eds. *Climate Change Impacts in the United States: The Third National Climate Assessment*. U.S. Global Change Research Program, 418-440. Doi:10.7930/J0J1012N.
- Skinner, R.H. 2008. High biomass removal limits carbon sequestration potential of mature temperate pastures. *Journal for Environmental Quality* 37: 1319-1326.
- Smith, R.D., A. Ammann, C. Bartoldus, and M.M. Brinson. 1995. *An Approach for Assessing Wetland Functions Using Hydrogeomorphic Classification, Reference Wetlands, and Functional Indices*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report WRP-DE-9. 78 pps.
- Society for Ecological Restoration [SER] Science & Policy Working Group. 2002. *The SER Primer on Ecological Restoration*. Available at: <http://www.ser.org/>. (Accessed 28 February 2017).
- Teague, W.R., S.L. Dowhower, S.A. Baker, N. Haile, P.B. DeLaune, and D.M. Conover. 2011. Grazing management impacts on vegetation, soil biota and soil chemical, physical and hydrological properties in tall grass prairie. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 141: 310-322.
- Tomer, M.D., D.W. Meek, and L.A. Kramer. 2005. Agricultural practices influence flow regimes of headwater streams in western Iowa. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 34:1547-1558.
- Undersander, D., B. Albert, D. Cosgrove, D. Johnson, and P. Peterson. 2002. *Pastures for Profit: A Guide to Rotational Grazing (A3529)*. University of Wisconsin-Extension and University of Minnesota Extension Service. 43 pps.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE]. 2010. *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region (Version 2.0)*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Regulatory Assistance

Program, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. 141 pps.

United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2003. National Range and Pasture Handbook, Revision 1. Grazing Lands Technology Institute. 214 pps.

United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. 682 pps.

United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2007. Iowa NRCS Plant Community Species Lists. Des Moines, IA. Available at https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/ia/technical/ecoscience/bio/?cid=nrcs142p2_008160. (Accessed 19 January 2018).

United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2008. Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification: An Overview and Modification to Better Meet the Needs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Technical Note No. 190-8-76. Washington, D.C. 8 pps.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. 2013. Level III and Level IV Ecoregions of the Continental United States. Corvallis, OR, U.S. EPA, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, map scale 1:3,000,000. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/eco-research/level-iii-andiv-ecoregions-continental-united-states>. (Accessed 1 March 2017).

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). 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, WI.

Contributors

Lisa Kluesner
Ryan Dermody

Approval

Chris Tecklenburg, 5/18/2020

Acknowledgments

This project could not have been completed without the dedication and commitment from a variety of partners and staff. Team members supported the project by serving on the technical team, assisting with the development of state and community phases of the state-and-transition model, providing peer review and technical editing, and conducting quality control and quality assurance reviews.

Drake University:

Dr. Tom Rosburg, Professor of Ecology and Botany, Des Moines, IA

Iowa Department of Natural Resources:

John Pearson, Ecologist, Des Moines, IA

Greg Schmitt, Private Lands Biologist, West Union, IA

Conservation Districts of Iowa:

Sean Kluesner, Private Lands Wetland Easement Team Specialist, New Hampton, IA

LANDFIRE (The Nature Conservancy):

Randy Swaty, Ecologist, Evanston, IL

Natural Resources Conservation Service :

Rick Bednarek, Iowa State Soil Scientist, Des Moines, IA

Scott Brady, Acting Regional Ecological Site Specialist, Havre, MT
 Leland Camp, Soil Scientist, Waverly, IA
 Patrick Chase, Area Resource Soil Scientist, Fort Dodge, IA
 Stacey Clark, Regional Ecological Site Specialist, St. Paul, MN
 James Cronin, State Biologist, Des Moines, IA
 Ryan Dermody, Soil Survey Leader, Waverly, IA
 Tonie Endres, Senior Regional Soil Scientist, Indianapolis, IN
 Gregg Hadish, GIS Specialist, Des Moines, IA
 John Hammerly, Soil Data Quality Specialist, Indianapolis, IN
 Lisa Kluesner, Ecological Site Specialist, Waverly, IA
 Jeff Matthias, State Grassland Specialist, Des Moines, IA
 Louis Moran, Area Resource Soil Scientist, Sioux City, IA
 Kevin Norwood, Soil Survey Regional Director, Indianapolis, IN
 James Phillips, GIS Specialist, Des Moines, IA
 Neil Sass, Area Resource Soil Scientist, West Union, IA
 Jason Steele, Area Resource Soil Scientist, Fairfield, IA

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 | 04/20/2024 |
| Approved by | Chris Tecklenburg |
| 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:**
