

# Ecological site R108XC519IA

## Wet Upland Drainageway Prairie

Last updated: 7/01/2019  
Accessed: 05/03/2024

---

### 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): 108X–Illinois and Iowa Deep Loess and Drift

The Illinois and Iowa Deep Loess and Drift, West-Central Part (MLRA 108C) encompasses the eastern portion of the Southern Iowa Drift Plain and the Lake Calvin basin of the Mississippi Alluvial Plain landforms (Prior 1991). It lies entirely in one state (Iowa), containing approximately 9,805 square miles (Figure 1). The elevation ranges from approximately 1,110 feet above sea level (ASL) on the highest ridges to about 505 feet ASL in the lowest valleys. Local elevation difference is mainly 10 to 20 feet. However, some valley floors can range from 80 to 200 feet, while some upland flats and valley floors only range between 3 and 6 feet. The MLRA is underlain by Pre-Illinoian glacial till, deposited more than 500,000 years ago and since undergone extensive erosion and dissection. In the northern half of the area the till thickness ranges from 150 to 350 feet and grades to less than 150 feet thick in the southern half. The till is covered by a mantle of Peoria Loess on the hillslopes and Holocene alluvium in the drainageways. Paleozoic bedrock, comprised of limestone, shale, and mudstones, lies beneath the glacial material (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: Central Dissected Till Plains (251C) Section, Central Dissected Till and Loess Plain (251Cc), Mississippi River and Illinois Alluvial Plains (51Cf), Southeast Iowa Rolling Loess Hills (251Ch) Subsections (Cleland et al. 2007)

U.S. EPA Level IV Ecoregion: Rolling Loess Prairies (47f), Upper Mississippi Alluvial Plain (72d) (USEPA 2013)

National Vegetation Classification – Ecological Systems: Central Tallgrass Prairie (CES205.683) (NatureServe 2015)

National Vegetation Classification - Plant Associations: *Andropogon gerardii* – *Panicum virgatum* – *Helianthus grosseserratus* Wet Meadow (CEGL002024) (Nature Serve 2015)

Biophysical Settings: Central Tallgrass Prairie (BpS 4214210) (LANDFIRE 2009)

Natural Resources Conservation Service – Iowa Plant Community Species List: Prairie, Central Wet-Mesic Tallgrass (USDA-NRCS 2007)

Iowa Department of Natural Resources: Clay Loam Tallgrass Prairie (INAI 1984)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Wet to Wet-Mesic Prairies (Eggers and Reed 2015)

## Ecological site concept

Wet Upland Drainageway Prairies are located within the green areas on the map (Figure 1). They occur on drainageways on uplands. The soils are Mollisols and Entisols that are poorly to somewhat poorly-drained and deep, formed in colluvium and alluvium. Occasional flooding can occur from precipitation, overland flow, and groundwater return flow, lasting from just a few hours to 30 days.

The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by tallgrass prairie species adapted to temporarily flooded and saturated conditions. Bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis* (Michx.)) and sawtooth sunflower (*Helianthus grosseserratus*) are the dominant and diagnostic species, respectively. Other grasses present can include prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata* Bosc ex Link), big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii* Vitman), and switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum* L.) (Eggers and Reed 2015; NatureServe 2015). Species characteristic of an undisturbed plant community associated with this ecological site can include hairyfruit sedge (*Carex trichocarpa* Muhl. ex Willd.) and bluntleaf bedstraw (*Galium obtusum* Bigelow) (Drobney et al. 2001). Fire is the primary disturbance factor that maintains this site, while herbivory and drought are secondary factors (LANDFIRE 2009).

## Associated sites

R108XC503IA	<b>Loess Upland Prairie</b> Loess parent material on upland summits and shoulders that are not associated with flooding including Killduff, Nira, Osco, Otley, Port Byron, Tallula, and Tama soils
R108XC504IA	<b>Loess Upland Savanna</b> Loess parent material that classifies as a Mollic subgroup of an Alfisol including Downs, Downs variant, Greenbush, Hedrick, Ladoga, and New Vienna soils
R108XC509IA	<b>Till Backslope Prairie</b> Glacial till parent material on lower backslopes that are not associated with flooding including Adair and Shelby soils
R108XC511IA	<b>Till Backslope Savanna</b> Glacial till parent material that classifies as a Mollic subgroup of an Alfisol including Armstrong, Caleb, Gara, Mystic, and Waubeek soils

## Similar sites

R108XC510IA	<b>Till Backslope Seepage Meadow</b> Till Backslope Seepage Meadows occur higher on the landscape and are a SLOPE: stratigraphic, discharge wetland
R108XC515IA	<b>Ponded Upland Depression Sedge Meadow</b> Ponded Upland Depression Sedge Meadows occur high on the landscape are a DEPRESSIONAL wetland
R108XC516IA	<b>Wet Loess Upland Flat Prairie</b> Wet Loess Upland Flat Prairies occur higher on the landscape and are a MINERAL SOIL FLATS wetland

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
------	---------------

Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i> (2) <i>Helianthus grosseserratus</i>

## Physiographic features

Wet Upland Drainageway Prairies occur on drainageways in uplands (Figure 2). They are situated on elevations ranging from approximately 499 to 1532 feet ASL. The site experiences occasional flooding that can last from a few hours up to 30 days.




Figure 2. Figure 1. Location of Wet Upland Drainageway Prairie ecological site within MLRA 108C.




Figure 3. Figure 2. Representative block diagram of Wet Upland Drainageway Prairie and associated ecological sites.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Slope shape across	(1) Concave
Slope shape up-down	(1) Linear
Landforms	(1) Upland > Drainageway
Runoff class	Low to high
Flooding duration	Very brief (4 to 48 hours) to long (7 to 30 days)
Flooding frequency	None to occasional
Elevation	152–467 m
Slope	0–9%
Water table depth	0–30 cm

Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor
--------	------------------------------------

## Climatic features

The Illinois and Iowa Deep Loess and Drift, West-Central Part falls into the hot humid continental climate (Dfa) Köppen-Geiger climate classification (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 108C 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 180 days, while the frost-free period is about 162 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 38 inches, which includes rainfall plus the water equivalent from snowfall (Table 3). The average annual low and high temperatures are 39 and 60°F, respectively.

Climate data and analyses are derived from 30-year averages gathered from five 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)	135-150 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	167-182 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	889-940 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	134-152 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	165-184 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	889-965 mm
Frost-free period (average)	142 days
Freeze-free period (average)	174 days
Precipitation total (average)	914 mm

## Climate stations used

- (1) NEWTON [USC00135992], Newton, IA
- (2) TIPTON [USC00138266], Tipton, IA
- (3) WASHINGTON [USC00138688], Washington, IA
- (4) IOWA CITY [USC00134101], Iowa City, IA
- (5) WILLIAMSBURG 3SE [USC00139067], Williamsburg, IA

## Influencing water features

Wet Upland Drainageway Prairies are classified as a SLOPE: topographic, flow-through, occasionally flooded; herbaceous wetland under the Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classification system (Smith et al. 1995; USDA-NRCS 2008) and as a Palustrine, Persistent, Emergent, Temporarily Flooded Wetland under the National Wetlands Inventory (FGDC 2013). Precipitation, overland flow, and groundwater return flow are the main sources of water for this ecological site (Smith et al. 1995). Infiltration is slow to high (Hydrologic Groups A, B, and C) for undrained soils, and surface runoff is low to high (Figure 5).

Primary wetland hydrology indicators for an intact Wet Upland Drainageway Prairie may include: A1 Surface water, A2 High water table, and A3 Saturation. Secondary wetland hydrology indicators may include: B10: Drainage

patterns, C2 Dry-season water table, D2 Geomorphic position, and D5 FAC-neutral test (USACE 2010).




Figure 8. Figure 5. Hydrologic cycling in Wet Upland Drainageway Prairie ecological site.

### Soil features

Soils of Wet Upland Drainageway Prairie are in the Mollisols and Entisols orders, further classified as Aquic Cumulic Hapludolls, Argiaquic Argialbolls, Cumulic Endoaquolls, Cumulic Vertic Endoaquolls, Cumulic Hapludolls, Fluvaquentic Hapludolls, and Mollic Fluvaquents with slow to high infiltration and low to high runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Ackmore, Colo, Dockery, Ely, Judson, Radford, Spillville, Vesser, and Zook (Figure 6). The parent material is alluvium and colluvium, and the soils are poorly to somewhat poorly-drained and deep with seasonal high-water tables. Soil pH classes are moderately 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 9. Figure 6. Profile sketches of soil series associated with Wet Upland Drainageway Prairie.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Alluvium (2) Colluvium
Family particle size	(1) Fine (2) Fine-silty
Drainage class	Poorly drained to somewhat poorly drained
Permeability class	Moderately slow

## 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 are able to support prairies, savannas, woodlands, and forests. Wet Upland Drainageway Prairies form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on upland drainageways on poorly to somewhat poorly-drained soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of a mix of wet-mesic and wet herbaceous vegetation.

Fire is a critical disturbance factor that maintains Wet Upland Drainageway Prairies. Fire intensity typically consisted of periodic, low-intensity surface fires occurring every 1 to 3 years (LANDFIRE 2009). Ignition sources included summertime lightning strikes from convective storms and bimodal, human ignitions during the spring and fall seasons. Native Americans regularly set fires to improve sight lines for hunting, driving large game, improving grazing and browsing habitat, agricultural clearing, and enhancing vital ethnobotanical plants (Barrett 1980).

Drought and herbivory by native ungulates have also played a role in shaping this ecological site. The periodic episodes of reduced soil moisture in conjunction with the poorly to somewhat poorly-drained soils have favored the proliferation of plant species tolerant of such conditions. Drought can also slow the growth of plants and result in dieback of certain species. Bison (*Bos bison*) grazing, while present, served a more limited role in community composition and structure than lands further west. Prairie elk (*Cervus elaphus*) and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) likely contributed to woody species reduction but are also considered to be of a lesser impact compared to the west (LANDFIRE 2009). When coupled with fire, periods of drought and herbivory can further delay the establishment of woody vegetation (Pyne et al. 1996).

Today, Wet Upland Drainageway Prairies are limited in their extent, having been type-converted to agricultural production land. Remnants that do exist show evidence of indirect anthropogenic influences from fire suppression, non-native species invasion, and hydrologic alterations. A return to the historic plant community may not be possible following extensive land modification, but long-term conservation agriculture or prairie reconstruction efforts can help to restore some biotic diversity and ecological function. 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 1 – REFERENCE STATE

The reference plant community is categorized as a wet-mesic to wet tallgrass community, dominated by herbaceous vegetation. The two community phases within the reference state are dependent on periodic fires. The intensity and frequency alter species composition, cover, and extent, while regular fire intervals keep woody species from encroaching. Drought and herbivory have more localized impacts in the reference phases, but do contribute to overall species composition, diversity, cover, and productivity.

Community Phase 1.1 Bluejoint – Sawtooth Sunflower – Sites in this reference community phase are dominated by a mix of grasses and forbs. Vegetative cover is continuous (95 to 100 percent) and plants can reach heights between 3 and 6 feet tall (LANDFIRE 2009; NatureServe 2015). Bluejoint, prairie cordgrass, big bluestem, and switchgrass are the dominant grasses present on the site. Characteristic forbs can include sawtooth sunflower, New England aster (*Symphotrichum novae-angliae* (L.) G.L. Nesom), fringed loosestrife (*Lysimachia ciliata* L.), Canada goldenrod (*Solidago canadensis* L.), and cup plant (*Silphium perfoliatum* L.). Cool, low-intensity fires will maintain this phase, but a reduced fire interval will allow woody species to develop, shifting the community to phase 1.2.

Pathway 1.1A – Natural succession following an extended fire return interval.

Community Phase 1.2 Pussy Willow/Bluejoint – Sawtooth Sunflower – This community phase represents natural

succession as a result of an extended fire return interval. Vegetative cover is still continuous, but the prolonged absence of fire allows sparse shrubs to inhabit the site, such as pussy willow (*Salix discolor* Muhl.) (LANDFIRE 2009; Eggers and Reed 2015). Cool, low-intensity fires will maintain this phase, but a higher intensity fire will shift the community back to phase 1.1 (LANDFIRE 2009).

Pathway 1.2A – Increased fire return interval.

Transition 1A – Direct and indirect alterations to the landscape hydrology from human-induced land development transition the site to the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition 1B – Cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transitions this site to the forage state (3).

Transition 1C – Installation of drain tiles, tillage, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the site to the cropland state (4).

## 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 Upland Drainageway Prairies. Alterations such as agricultural tile draining and conversion to cropland on adjacent lands have changed the natural hydroperiod and rate of sedimentation as well as increased nutrient pollution (Mitsch and Gosselink 2007; Eggers and Reed 2015).

Community Phase 2.1 Reed Canarygrass – Bluejoint – This community phase represents the early changes to the natural wetland hydroperiod, increasing sedimentation, and unabated nutrient runoff. Native grasses, such as bluejoint, northern reedgrass, and prairie cordgrass, continue to form a component of the herbaceous layer, but the highly invasive reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.) co-dominates (Waggy 2010). As reed canarygrass invades, it can not only alter species composition, but vegetation structure as well (Annen et al. 2008).

Pathway 2.1A – Continuing alterations to the natural hydrology and increasing sedimentation

Community Phase 2.2 Reed Canarygrass – Sites falling into this community phase have experienced significant sedimentation and nutrient enrichment and are dominated by a monoculture of reed canarygrass (Eggers and Reed 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; Kercher et al. 2007; Waggy 2010; Eggers and Reed 2015).

Transition 2A – Cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transition the site to the forage state (3).

Transition 2B – Installation of drain tiles, tillage, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the site to the cropland state (4).

Restoration 2A – Hydroperiod restoration, site preparation, non-native species control, and seeding native species transition the site to the reconstructed wet prairie state (5).

## STATE 3 – FORAGE STATE

The forage state arises when the site is converted to a farming system 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) 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 Phase 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).

Pathway 3.1A – Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock utilizing continuous grazing.

Pathway 3.1B – Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock utilizing rotational grazing.

Community Phase 3.2 Continuous Pastured Grazing System – 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.

Pathway 3.2A – Domestic livestock are removed and mechanical harvesting is implemented.

Pathway 3.2B – Rotational grazing replaces continuous grazing.

Community Phase 3.3 Rest-Rotation Pastured Grazing System – This community phase is characterized by rotational grazing where the pasture has been subdivided into several smaller paddocks. Through the development of a grazing plan, livestock 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). Rest-rotation pastured grazing systems include deferred rotation, rest rotation, 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 3.3A – Continuous grazing replaces rotational grazing.

Pathway 3.3B – Domestic livestock are removed and mechanical harvesting is implemented.

Transition 3A – Land is abandoned and left fallow; natural succession by opportunistic species transition this site the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition 3B – Installation of drain tiles, tillage, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the site to the cropland state (4).

Restoration 3A – Hydroperiod restoration, site preparation, non-native species control, and seeding native species transition the site to the reconstructed wet prairie state (5).

## 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). Agricultural tile drains used to lower the water table 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 Phase 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 corn-soybean rotations. 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).

Pathway 4.1A – Tillage operations are greatly reduced, crop rotation occurs on a regular interval, and crop residue remains on the soil surface.

Pathway 4.1B – Tillage operations are greatly reduced or eliminated, crop rotation occurs on a regular interval, crop residue remains on the soil surface, and cover crops are planted following crop harvest.

Community Phase 4.2 Conservation Tillage Field – This community phase is characterized by rotational crop production that utilizes 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 systems. 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 systems 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 systems, 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.

Pathway 4.2A – Intensive tillage is utilized and monoculture row-cropping is established.

Pathway 4.2B – Cover crops are implemented to minimize soil erosion.

Community Phase 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 cropland system.

Pathway 4.3A – Cover crop practices are abandoned.

Pathway 4.3B – Intensive tillage is utilized, cover crops practices are abandoned, monoculture row-cropping is established, and crop rotation is reduced or eliminated.

Transition 4A – Agricultural production abandoned and left fallow; natural succession by opportunistic species transition this site to the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition 4B – Cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transition the site to the forage state (3).

Restoration 4A – Hydroperiod restoration, site preparation, non-native species control and seeding native species transition this site to the reconstructed wet prairie state (5).

## STATE 5 – RECONSTRUCTED WET PRAIRIE STATE

Wet prairie habitats provide multiple ecosystem services including flood abatement, water quality improvement, and biodiversity support (Mitsch and Gosselink 2007). However, many wet prairie communities have been eliminated as a result of type conversions to agricultural production, wildfire suppression, changes to the natural hydrologic regime, and invasion of non-native species, thereby significantly reducing these services (Annen et al. 2008). The extensive alterations of lands adjacent to Wet Upland Drainageway Prairies may not allow for restoration back to the historic reference condition. But 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 Phase 5.1 Early Successional Wet Prairie – This community phase represents the early community assembly from wet prairie reconstruction and is highly dependent on invasive species control, hydroperiod repair, planting, and properly timed prescribed fire activities (Adams and Galatowitsch 2006). In addition, adaptive restoration tactics that incorporate multiple restoration methods should be implemented in order to more clearly identify cause-effect relationships of vegetative development (Zedler 2005).

Pathway 5.1A – Maintenance of proper hydrology, fire, and nutrient balances in line with a developed wetland management plan.

Community Phase 5.2 Late Successional Wet Prairie – Appropriately timed disturbance regimes (e.g. hydroperiod, prescribed fire, invasive species control) and nutrient management applied to the early successional community phase can help increase the species richness and improve ecosystem function, pushing the site into a late successional community phase over time (Mitsch and Gosselink 2007).

Pathway 5.2A – Reconstruction experiences a setback from extreme weather event or improper timing of management actions.


Transition 5A – Land is abandoned and left fallow; natural succession by opportunistic species transition this site the hydrologically-altered state (2).

Transition 5B – Cultural treatments to enhance forage quality and yield transition the site to the forage state (3).

Transition 5C – Installation of drain tiles, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the site to the cropland state (4).

### **State and transition model**

## R108CY5191A WET UPLAND DRAINAGEWAY PRAIRIE



Code	Process
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
T1C, T2B, T3B, T5C	Agricultural conversion via tillage, seeding, and non-selective herbicide
1.1A	Depth to water table and associated soil saturation is reduced
1.2A	Depth to water table and associated soil saturation is increased
2.1A	Increasing changes to hydrology and increasing sedimentation
R2A, R3A, R4A	Site preparation, non-native species control, and native seeding
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
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
5.1A	Maintenance of proper hydrology, fire, and nutrient balances
5.2A	Drought or improper timing/use of management actions

### Inventory data references

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

State County Ownership Legal Description Easting Northing

Iowa Jasper A.C. Morrison Prairie – Jasper County Conservation Board T80N R18W S5 503205 4624397

## Other references

- Adams, C.R. and S.M. Galatowitsch. 2006. Increasing the effectiveness of reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.) control in wet meadow restorations. *Restoration Ecology* 14: 441-451.
- Annen, C.A., E.M. Kirsch, and R.W. Tyser. 2008. Reed canarygrass invasions alter succession patterns and may reduce habitat quality in wet meadows. *Ecological Restoration* 26: 190-193.
- 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.
- Barret, S.W. 1980. Indians and fire. *Western Wildlands* Spring: 17-20.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 4214210 Central Tallgrass Prairie. 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.

Mitsch, W.J. and J.G. Gosselink. 2007. *Wetlands*, Fourth Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, NJ. 582 pps.

Mitsch, W.J. and S.E. Jørgensen. 2004. *Ecological Engineering and Ecosystem Restoration*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, NJ. 428 pps.

National Climate Data Center [NCDC]. 2006. *Climate of Iowa*. Central Region Headquarters, Climate Services Branch, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC.

NatureServe. 2015. *NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life* [web application]. Version 7.1 NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available at <http://explorer.natureserve.org>. (Accessed 13 February 2017).

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.

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-andiv-ecoregions-continental-united-states>. (Accessed 1 March 2017).

Vitousek, P.M. 1995. 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 2 March 2018).

Zedler, J.B. 2005. Restoring wetland plant diversity: a comparison of existing and adaptive approaches. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* 13: 5-14.

## Contributors

Lisa Kluesner  
Ryan Dermody

## Approval

lisa kluesner, 7/01/2019

## Acknowledgments

This project could not have been completed without the dedication and commitment from a variety of partners and staff (Table 6). 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.

Organization Name Title Location

Drake University:

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

Iowa Department of Natural Resources:

Kevin Andersen Private Lands Biologist Fairfield, IA

John Pearson Ecologist Des Moines, IA

LANDFIRE (The Nature Conservancy):

Randy Swaty Ecologist Evanston, IL

Natural Resources Conservation Service:

Rick Bednarek Iowa State Soil Scientist Des Moines, IA

Leland Camp Soil Scientist Waverly, IA

Stacey Clark Regional Ecological Site Specialist St. Paul, MN

Ryan Dermody Soil Survey Leader Waverly, IA

Tonie Endres Senior Regional Soil Scientist Indianapolis, IN

John Hammerly Soil Data Quality Specialist Indianapolis, IN

Lisa Kluesner Ecological Site Specialist Waverly, IA

Sean Kluesner Earth Team Volunteer Waverly, IA

Jeff Matthias State Grassland Specialist Des Moines, IA

Kevin Norwood Soil Survey Regional Director Indianapolis, IN  
Doug Oelmann Soil Scientist Des Moines, IA  
James Phillips GIS Specialist Des Moines, IA  
Jason Steele Area Resource Soil Scientist Fairfield, IA  
Doug Wallace Ecologist ACES Program Columbia, MO

## 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	
Approved by	
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:**

---