

# Ecological site R104XY018IA Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadow

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 (CES202.033) (NatureServe 2015)

National Vegetation Classification - Plant Associations: *Carex* spp. – (*Carex pellita*, *Carex vulpinoidea*) Wet Meadow (CEGL005272) (Nature Serve 2015)

Biophysical Settings: Eastern Great Plains Floodplain Systems (BpS 4214710) (LANDFIRE 2009)

Natural Resources Conservation Service – Iowa Plant Community Species List: Sedge Meadow, Central Midwest (USDA-NRCS 2007)

Iowa Department of Natural Resources: Wet Meadow (INAI 1984)

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: WMs83 Southern Seepage Meadow/Carr (MDNR 2005)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Sedge Meadows (Eggers and Reed 2015)

## Ecological site concept

Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows are located within the green areas on the map (Figure 1). They occur on low floodplains in river valleys. The soils are Mollisols that are poorly-drained and deep, formed in alluvium. The site can experience occasional flooding from overbank flow, surface runoff from adjacent uplands, and precipitation.

The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation. Broom sedge (*Carex scoparia* Schkuhr ex Willd.) and Hayden's sedge (*Carex haydenii* Dewey) are common species on Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows. Other sedges that may occur include crested sedge (*Carex cristatella* Britton), upright sedge (*Carex stricta* Lam.), and Sartwell's sedge (*Carex sartwellii* Dewey). Species typical of an undisturbed plant community associated with this ecological site include northern bedstraw (*Galium boreale* L.) (Drobney et al. 2001). Flooding and periodic fire are the primary disturbance factors that maintain this site, while drought is a secondary factor (LANDFORE 2009; NatureServe 2018).

## Associated sites

R104XY016IA	<b>Wet Terrace Sedge Meadow</b> Alluvial soils on stream terraces that are somewhat poorly to excessively-drained including Bertrand, Bixby, Coloma, Curran, Dakota, Dells, Ely, Finchford, Hayfield, Hoopston, Judson, Lawler, Nevin, Oakton, Raddle, Radford, Richwood, Snider, Terril, Wapsie, Wapsie variant, Waukee, Waukegan, Wiota, and Worthen soils
R104XY017IA	<b>Floodplain Prairie</b> Alluvial soils that are somewhat poorly to well-drained including Ankeny, Turlin, and Turlin variant soils

## Similar sites

R104XY016IA	<b>Wet Terrace Sedge Meadow</b> Wet Terrace Sedge Meadows occur on low stream terraces
-------------	---

**Table 1. Dominant plant species**


Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Carex scoparia</i> (2) <i>Carex haydenii</i>

### Physiographic features

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



**Figure 2. Figure 1. Location of Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadow ecological site within MLRA 104.**



**Figure 3. Figure 2. Representative block diagram of Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadow and associated ecological sites.**

**Table 2. Representative physiographic features**

Slope shape across	(1) Linear
Slope shape up-down	(1) Linear
Landforms	(1) River valley > Flood plain
Runoff class	Low
Flooding duration	Very brief (4 to 48 hours) to long (7 to 30 days)

Flooding frequency	Occasional
Elevation	499–2,826 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) BYRON 4NORTH [USC00211174], Byron, MN
- (2) AUSTIN WWT FAC [USC00210355], Austin, MN
- (3) OSAGE [USC00136305], Osage, IA
- (4) TRIPOLI [USC00138339], Tripoli, IA
- (5) ANAMOSA 1 WNW [USC00130213], Anamosa, IA
- (6) CEDAR RAPIDS NO 1 [USC00131319], Marion, IA

## Influencing water features

Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows are classified as a RIVERINE: bottomland, flooded, herbaceous wetland under the

Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classification system (Smith et al. 1995; USDA-NRCS 2008) and as a Palustrine, Persistent Emergent, Seasonally Flooded Wetland under the National Wetlands Inventory (FGDC 2013). Overbank flow from the stream and subsurface hydraulic connections are the main sources of water for this ecological site, but additional sources can include overland flow from adjacent uplands and precipitation (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 Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadow may include: A1 Surface water, A2 High water table, A3 Saturation, and B10 Drainage patterns. Secondary wetland hydrology indicators may include: C2: Dry-season water table, D5 FAC-neutral test (USACE 2010).




Figure 10. Figure 5. Hydrologic cycling in Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadow ecological site.

## Soil features

Soils of Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows are in the Entisols and Mollisols orders, further classified as Typic Udipsamments, Cumulic Endoaquolls, and Cumulic Vertic Endoaquolls with very slow infiltration and low runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Calco, Coland, Colo, 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 slightly acid to moderately 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 Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadow.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Alluvium
Family particle size	(1) Fine-silty (2) Fine-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.

### Ecological Dynamics

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. Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on floodplains on poorly-drained soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation.


Flooding and fire are the most important ecosystem drivers for maintaining this ecological site. The frequency and duration of flooding affect species composition, cover, and vegetative production due to alternating aerobic and anaerobic surface substrate conditions. Replacement fires likely occurred on a regular rotation interval and helped to reduce the accumulation of peat. The combination of fire and saturated soil conditions prevented the establishment of shrubs for any significant amount of time.

Drought has also played a role in shaping this ecological site. The periodic episodes of reduced soil moisture in conjunction with the poorly-drained soils have favored the proliferation of plant species tolerant of such conditions. Drought can slow the growth of plants and result in dieback of certain species. When coupled with fire, periods of drought can eliminate or greatly reduce the occurrence of woody vegetation, substantially altering the extent of shrubs and trees (Pyne et al. 1996).

Today, Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows have been greatly reduced as the land has mostly been converted to agricultural production. Corn (*Zea mays* L.) and soybeans (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) are the dominant crops grown, but patches of forage land are also present on the landscape. A return to the historic plant community is likely not possible due to significant hydrologic and water quality changes in the watershed, but long-term conservation agriculture or habitat reconstruction efforts can help to restore some natural diversity and ecological functioning. 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

## R104XY018IA WET FLOODPLAIN SEDGE MEADOW



Code	Process
1.1A	Extended fire return interval
1.2A	Replacement fire
T1A, T3A, T4A, T5A	Changes to natural hydroperiod and/or land abandonment
2.1A	Increasing changes to hydrology and increasing sedimentation
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, non-native species control, and native seeding
5.1A	Invasive species control and implementation of disturbance regimes
5.2A	Drought or improper timing/use of management actions

### State 1 Reference State

The reference plant community is categorized as a sedge meadow community, dominated by hydrophytic, herbaceous vegetation. The two community phases within the reference state are dependent on flooding and

periodic fire. The frequency and duration of flooding alter species composition, cover, and extent, while periodic fires prevent woody species from dominating. Drought and herbivory have more localized impacts in the reference phases, but do contribute to overall species composition, diversity, cover, and productivity.

## **Community 1.1**

### **Broom Sedge – Hayden’s Sedge**

Sites in this reference community phase are composed of sedges and hydrophytic grasses and forbs. Vegetative cover is generally continuous and dense with plants reaching heights between 1.5 and 5 feet tall (NatureServe 2015). Broom sedge and Hayden’s sedge are the dominant species, but other sedges can be present including crested sedge, upright sedge, and Sartwell’s sedge. Common forbs may include Virginia mountainmint (*Pycnanthemum virginianum* (L.) T. Dur & B.D. Jacks. ex B.L. Rob. & Fernald), Canada goldenrod (*Solidago canadensis* L.), and giant goldenrod (*Solidago gigantea* Aiton). Seasonal flooding maintains the wetland plant community, while periodic fires maintain the herbaceous dominance. However, an extended fire return interval allows some wetland shrubs to establish shifting the community to phase 1.2.

## **Community 1.2**

### **Sandbar Willow/Broom Sedge – Hayden’s Sedge**

This reference community phase represents natural succession as a result of an extended fire return interval. Shrubs, such as sandbar willow (*Salix interior* Rowlee), can form a scattered canopy across the sedge meadow. The prolonged absence of fire will maintain this state, but a replacement fire will shift the community back to phase 1.1.

## **Pathway 1.1A**

### **Community 1.1 to 1.2**

Extended fire return interval.

## **Pathway 1.2A**

### **Community 1.2 to 1.1**

Replacement fire.

## **State 2**

### **Hydrologically-altered State**

Hydrology is the most important determinant of wetlands and wetland processes. Hydrology modifies and determines the physiochemical environment (i.e., sediments, soil chemistry, water chemistry) which in turn directly affects the vegetation, animals, and microbes (Mitsch and Gosselink 2007). Human activities on landscape hydrology have greatly altered Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows. Alterations such as agricultural tile draining and conversion to cropland on adjacent lands have changed the natural hydroperiod, increased the rate of sedimentation, and intensified nutrient pollution (Werner and Zedler 2003; Mitsch and Gosselink 2007).

## **Community 2.1**

### **Reed Canarygrass – Broom Sedge**

This community phase represents the early changes to the natural wetland hydroperiod, sedimentation, and nutrient runoff. Sedimentation results in a reduction of soil organic matter and high dry bulk density. It also leads to a homogenization of the local microtopography, reducing the surface area and associated species diversity (Green and Galatowitsch 2002; Werner and Zedler 2002). Native sedges continue to form a component of the herbaceous layer, but the highly-invasive reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.) co-dominates.

## **Community 2.2**

### **Reed Canarygrass**

Sites falling into this community phase have experienced significant sedimentation and are dominated by a



monoculture of reed canarygrass (NatureServe 2015). Reed canarygrass stands can significantly alter the physiochemical environment as well as the biotic communities, making the site only suitable to reed canarygrass. These monotypic stands create a positive feedback loop that perpetuates increasing sedimentation, altered hydrology, and dominance by this non-native species, especially in sites affected by nutrient enrichment from agricultural runoff (Vitousek 1995; Bernard and Lauve 1995; Green and Galatowitsch 2002; Werner and Zedler 2002; Kercher et al. 2007; Waggy 2010).

### **Pathway 2.1A**

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

Continuing alterations to the natural hydrology and increasing sedimentation.

### **State 3**

#### **Forage State**

The forage state occurs 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, such 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, the non-native 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 low topographic relief across the MLRA has resulted in nearly the entire area being converted to agriculture (Eilers and Roosa 1994). 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 and soybeans are the dominant crops for the site, and oats (*Avena L.*) and alfalfa (*Medicago sativa L.*) may be rotated periodically. 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 improve soil ecosystem function by reducing soil erosion, increasing organic matter and water availability, improving water quality, and reducing soil compaction.

### **Community 4.3**

#### **Conservation Tillage with Cover Crop Field**

This community phase 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 ecosystem. 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 interval, and crop residue remains on the soil surface.

#### **Pathway 4.1B**

##### **Community 4.1 to 4.3**

Tillage operations are greatly reduced or eliminated, alternating crops occurs on a regular interval, crop residue remains on the soil surface, and cover crops are planted following crop harvest.

#### **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 minimize 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 Sedge Meadow State**

Sedge meadow habitats provide multiple ecosystem services including flood abatement, water quality improvement, and biodiversity support. However, many sedge meadow communities have been stressed from watershed-scale changes in hydrology or eliminated as a result of type conversions to agricultural production, thereby significantly reducing these services (Zedler 2003). The extensive alterations of lands adjacent to Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadows may not allow for restoration back to the historic reference condition. However, ecological reconstruction can aim to aid the recovery of degraded, damaged or destroyed functions. A successful reconstruction will have the ability to structurally and functionally sustain itself, demonstrate resilience to the natural ranges of stress and disturbance, and create and maintain positive biotic and abiotic interactions (SER 2002; Mitsch and Jørgensen 2004).

### **Community 5.1**

#### **Early Successional Sedge Meadow**

This community phase represents the early community assembly from sedge meadow reconstruction and is highly dependent on seed viability, hydroperiod, soil organic matter content, and site preparation. Successful establishment of sedges can be maximized by using seed collected during the same growing season, utilizing genotypes adapted to the environmental location, ensuring soil moisture is saturated at the time of seeding, and improving the water holding capacity and fertility of the soil (Budelsky and Galatowitsch 1999; van der Valk et al. 1999; Mitsch and Gosselink 2007; Hall and Zedler 2010). In addition, suppression and removal of non-native species is essential for reducing competition (Perry and Galatowitsch 2003).

### **Community 5.2**

#### **Late Successional Sedge Meadow**

Appropriately timed disturbance regimes (e.g., hydroperiod, prescribed fire) and nutrient management applied to the early successional community phase can help increase the species richness, pushing the site into a late successional community phase over time (Mitsch and Gosselink 2007).

### **Pathway 5.1A**

#### **Community 5.1 to 5.2**

Maintenance of proper hydrology and nutrient balances in line with a developed wetland 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**

Direct and indirect alterations to the landscape hydrology from human-induced land development transition the site to the hydrologically-altered state (2).

### **Transition T1B**

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

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

### **Transition T1C**

#### **State 1 to 4**

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

## **Transition T2A**

### **State 2 to 3**

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

## **Transition T2B**

### **State 2 to 4**

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

## **Restoration pathway R2A**

### **State 2 to 5**

Hydroperiod restoration, site preparation, non-native species control, and seeding native species transition the site to the reconstructed sedge meadow state (5).

## **Transition T3A**

### **State 3 to 2**

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

## **Transition T3B**

### **State 3 to 4**

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

## **Restoration pathway R3A**

### **State 3 to 5**

Site preparation, tree planting, invasive species control, and seeding native species transition this site to the reconstructed sedge meadow 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 transitions the site to the forage state (3).

## **Restoration pathway R4A**

### **State 4 to 5**

Site preparation, tree planting, invasive species control, and seeding native species transition this site to the reconstructed sedge meadow state (5).

## **Transition T5A**

### **State 5 to 2**

Fire suppression and removal of active management transitions this site to the hydrologically-altered (2).

## **Transition T5B**

## State 5 to 3

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

## Transition T5C

### State 5 to 4

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

## Additional community tables

### Inventory data references

Tier 3 Sampling Plot used to develop the reference state, community phase 1.1:

State County Ownership Easting Northing

Iowa Butler Leeper Prairie – Butler County Conservation Board 524854 4731458

### 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.

Bernard, J.B. and T.E. Lauve. 1995. A comparison of growth and nutrient uptake in *Phalaris arundinacea* L. growing in a wetland and a constructed bed receiving landfill leachate. *Wetlands* 15: 176-182.

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.

Budelsky, R.A. and S.M. Galatowitsch. 1999. Effects of moisture, temperature, and time on seed germination of five wetland Carices: implications for restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 7: 86-97.

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 Coterminous United States*. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report WO-76. Washington, DC. 92 pps.

Drobney, P.D., G.S. Wilhelm, D. Horton, M. Leoschke, D. Lewis, J. Pearson, D. Roosa, and D. Smith. 2001. *Floristic Quality Assessment for the State of Iowa*. Neal Smith National Wildlife Refuge and Ada Hayden Herbarium, Iowa State University, Ames, IA. 123 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.

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.

- Green, E.K. and S.M. Galatowitsch. 2002. Effects of *Phalaris arundinacea* and nitrate-N addition on the establishment of wetland plant communities. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 39: 134-144.
- Hall, S.J. and J.B. Zedler. 2010. Constraints on sedge meadow self-restoration in urban wetlands. *Restoration Ecology* 18: 671-680.
- 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.
- Kercher, S.M. A. Herr-Turnoff, J.B. Zedler. 2007. Understanding invasion as a process: the case of *Phalaris arundinacea* in wet prairies. *Biological Invasions* 9: 657-665.
- LANDFIRE. 2009. Biophysical Setting 4214690 Eastern Great Plains Floodplain Systems. 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.
- 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.
- Mitsch, W.J. and S.E. Jørgensen. 2004. *Ecological Engineering and Ecosystem Restoration*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, NJ. 428 pps.
- Mitsch, W.J. and J.G. Gosselink. 2007. *Wetlands*, Fourth Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, NJ. 582 pps.
- 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 1 February 2018).
- 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.
- Perry, L.G. and S.M. Galatowitsch. 2003. A test of two annual cover crops for controlling *Phalaris arundinacea* invasion in restored sedge meadow wetlands. *Restoration Ecology* 11: 297-307.
- 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.
- 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.
- Smith, D.D. 1998. Iowa prairie: original extent and loss, preservation, and recovery attempts. *The Journal of the Iowa Academy of Sciences* 105: 94-108.

- 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](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-and-iv-ecoregions-continental-united-states>. (Accessed 1 March 2017).
- Van der Valk, A.G., T.L. Bremholm, and E. Gordon. 1999. The restoration of sedge meadows: seed viability, seed germination requirements, and seedling growth of *Carex* species. *Wetlands* 19: 756-764.
- Vitousek, P.M. 1990. Biological invasions and ecosystem processes: towards an integration of population biology and ecosystem studies. *Oikos* 57: 7-13.
- Waggy, M.A. 2010. *Phalaris arundinacea*. In: *Fire Effects Information System [Online]*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Available at: <https://www.feis-crs.org/feis/>. (Accessed 1 February 2017).
- Werner, K.J. and J.B. Zedler. 2002. How sedge meadow soils, microtopography, and vegetation respond to sedimentation. *Wetlands* 3: 451-466.
- 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.
- Zedler, J.B. 2003. Wetlands at your service: reducing impacts of agriculture at the watershed scale. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 1: 65-72.

## 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:**
-