

# Ecological site F110XY012IL

## Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forest

Last updated: 4/22/2020  
Accessed: 01/13/2025

---

### General information

**Provisional.** A provisional ecological site description has undergone quality control and quality assurance review. It contains a working state and transition model and enough information to identify the ecological site.

### MLRA notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 110X–Northern Illinois and Indiana Heavy Till Plain

The Northern Illinois and Indiana Heavy Till Plain (MLRA 110) encompasses the Northeastern Morainal, Grand Prairie, and Southern Lake Michigan Coastal landscapes (Schwegman et al. 1973, WDNR 2015). It spans three states – Illinois (79 percent), Indiana (10 percent), and Wisconsin (11 percent) – comprising about 7,535 square miles (Figure 1). The elevation is about 650 feet above sea level (ASL) and increases gradually from Lake Michigan south. Local relief varies from 10 to 25 feet. Silurian age fractured dolomite and limestone bedrock underlie the region. Glacial drift covers the surface area of the MLRA, and till, outwash, lacustrine deposits, loess or other silty material, and organic deposits are common (USDA-NRCS 2006).

The vegetation in the MLRA has undergone drastic changes over time. At the end of the last glacial episode – the Wisconsin glacial episode – the evolution of vegetation began with the development of tundra habitats, followed by a phase of spruce and fir forests, and eventually spruce-pine forests. Not until approximately 9,000 years ago did the climate undergo a warming trend which prompted the development of deciduous forests dominated by oak and hickory. As the climate continued to warm and dry, prairies began to develop approximately 8,300 years ago. Another shift in climate that resulted in an increase in moisture prompted the emergence of savanna-like habitats from 8,000 to 5,000 years before present (Taft et al. 2009). Forests maintained footholds on steep valley sides, morainal ridges, and wet floodplains. Fire, droughts, and grazing by native mammals helped to maintain the prairies and savannas until the arrival of European settlers, and the forests were maintained by droughts, wind, lightning, and occasional fire (Taft et al. 2009; NatureServe 2018).

### Classification relationships

USFS Subregions: Southwestern Great Lakes Morainal (222K) and Central Till Plains and Grand Prairies (251D) Sections; Kenosha-Lake Michigan Plain and Moraines (222Kg), Valparaiso Moraine (Kj), and Eastern Grand Prairie (251Dd) Subsections (Cleland et al. 2007)

U.S. EPA Level IV Ecoregion: Kettle Moraines (53b), Illinois/Indiana Prairies (54a), and Valparaiso-Wheaton Morainal Complex (54f) (USEPA 2013)

National Vegetation Classification – Ecological Systems: North-Central Interior Maple-Basswood Forest (CES202.696) (NatureServe 2018)

National Vegetation Classification – Plant Associations: *Acer saccharum* – *Tilia Americana/Ostrya virginiana* – *Carpinus caroliniana* Forest (CEGL002062) (Nature Serve 2018)

Biophysical Settings: North-Central Interior Maple-Basswood Forest (BpS 4213140) (LANDFIRE 2009)

Illinois Natural Areas Inventory: Mesic forest (White and Madany 1978)

## Ecological site concept

Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests are located within the green areas on the map (Figure 1). They occur on uplands. The soils are Alfisols that are somewhat poorly to moderately well drained and very deep, formed in loess or other silty or loamy material, loamy outwash, glacial till, or lacustrine deposits.

The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by a closed canopy maple-basswood forest. Sugar maple (*Acer saccharum* Marshall) and American basswood (*Tilia americana* L.) are the dominant species in the tree canopy, but American beech (*Fagus grandifolia* Ehrh.) is an important canopy associate (White and Madany 1978; WDNR 2015). American hornbeam (*Carpinus caroliniana* Walter) is an important gap-phase shrub. Dutchman's breeches (*Dicentra cucullaria* (L.) Bernh.) and white trillium (*Trillium grandiflorum* (Michx.) Salisb.) are characteristic herbaceous species of this closed canopy forest (White and Madany 1978; WDNR 2015). Herbaceous species characteristic of an undisturbed plant community associated with this ecological site include snow trillium (*Trillium nivale* Riddell), wreath goldenrod (*Solidago caesia* L.), and threebirds (*Triphora trianthophora* (Sw.) Rydb.) (Taft et al. 1997; Bernthal 2003; WDNR 2015). Damage from storms and pest infestation characterize the natural disturbance regime of this site (WDNR 2015).

## Associated sites

F110XY011IL	<p><b>Dry Glacial Drift Upland Forest</b> Loess or other silty or loamy material, loamy outwash, glacial till, or lacustrine deposits that are not shallow to a seasonal water table including Fox, Hebron, Martinsville, Ockley, Ozaukee, Rush, Saylesville, Senachwine, Sisson, Somonauk, Strawn, St. Clair, and Zurich soils</p>
-------------	---

## Similar sites

F110XY011IL	<p><b>Dry Glacial Drift Upland Forest</b> Dry Glacial Drift Upland Forests occur on adjacent, higher landscapes and are influenced by a fire regime</p>
-------------	---

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Acer saccharum</i> (2) <i>Tilia americana</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Dicentra cucullaria</i> (2) <i>Trillium grandiflorum</i>

## Physiographic features

Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests occur on uplands. They are situated on elevations ranging from approximately 470 to 3332 feet ASL. The site does not experience flooding but rather generates runoff to adjacent, downslope ecological sites



Figure 1.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Slope shape across	(1) Convex
Slope shape up-down	(1) Convex
Landforms	(1) Upland
Runoff class	Negligible to very high
Elevation	143–1,016 m
Slope	0–20%
Water table depth	46–183 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

### Climatic features


The Northern Illinois and Indiana Heavy Till Plain falls into the hot-summer humid continental climate (Dfa) and warm-summer humid continental climate (Dfb) Köppen-Geiger climate classifications (Peel et al. 2007). The two main factors that drive the climate of the MLRA are latitude and weather systems. Latitude, and the subsequent reflection of solar input, determines air temperatures and seasonal variations. Solar energy varies across the seasons, with summer receiving three to four times as much energy as opposed to winter. Weather systems (air masses and cyclonic storms) are responsible for daily fluctuations of weather conditions. High-pressure systems are responsible for settled weather patterns where sun and clear skies dominate. In fall, winter, and spring, the polar jet stream is responsible for the creation and movement of low-pressure systems. The clouds, winds, and precipitation associated with a low-pressure system regularly follow high-pressure systems every few days (Angel n.d.).

The soil temperature regime of MLRA 110 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 175 days, while the frost-free period is about 144 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 38 inches, which includes rainfall plus the water equivalent from snowfall (Table 3). The average annual low and high temperatures are 40.1 and 59.3°F, respectively.


Table 3. Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	142-147 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	172-181 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	914-1,041 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	138-148 days


Freeze-free period (actual range)	163-182 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	838-1,067 mm
Frost-free period (average)	144 days
Freeze-free period (average)	175 days
Precipitation total (average)	965 mm




**Figure 2. Monthly precipitation range**




**Figure 3. Monthly minimum temperature range**




**Figure 4. Monthly maximum temperature range**



**Figure 5. Monthly average minimum and maximum temperature**



**Figure 6. Annual precipitation pattern**



**Figure 7. Annual average temperature pattern**

### Climate stations used

- (1) DANVILLE [USC00112140], Danville, IL
- (2) MARSEILLES LOCK [USC00115372], Marseilles, IL
- (3) VALPARAISO WTR WKS [USC00128999], Valparaiso, IN
- (4) MUNDELEIN 4WSW [USC00115961], Lake Zurich, IL
- (5) MILWAUKEE MT MARY CLG [USC00475474], Milwaukee, WI

### Influencing water features

Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests are not influenced by wetland or riparian water features. Precipitation is the main source of water for this ecological site. Infiltration is slow (Hydrologic Group C), and surface runoff is negligible to very high. Surface runoff contributes some water to downslope ecological sites.




Figure 8. Hydrologic cycling in Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forest ecological site.

### Soil features

Soils of Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests are in the Alfisols order, further classified as Aeric Endoaqualfs, Aeric Epiaqualfs, Aquic Hapludalfs, and Oxyaquic Hapludalfs with slow infiltration and negligible to very high runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Aptakistic, Blount, Del Rey, Nappanee, Ozaukee, Sabina, Starks, St. Clair, Tuscola, and Whitaker. The parent material is loess or other silty or loamy material, loamy outwash, glacial till, or lacustrine deposits, and the soils are somewhat poorly to moderately well drained and very deep. Soil pH classes are very strongly acid to moderately alkaline. No rooting restrictions are noted for the soils of this ecological site.




Figure 9. Profile sketches of soil series associated with Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forest.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Loess (2) Outwash (3) Till (4) Lacustrine deposits
Family particle size	(1) Fine (2) Fine-silty (3) Fine-loamy (4) Fine-loamy over sandy or sandy-skeletal
Drainage class	Somewhat poorly drained to moderately well drained
Permeability class	Moderately slow
Depth to restrictive layer	203 cm

Soil depth	203 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0%
Surface fragment cover >3"	0%
Available water capacity (Depth not specified)	2.54–20.32 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (Depth not specified)	0–40%
Electrical conductivity (Depth not specified)	0–2 mmhos/cm
Sodium adsorption ratio (Depth not specified)	0
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (Depth not specified)	4.5–8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0–20%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	1–3%

## 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 tallgrass prairie ecosystem of the Midwest, but a variety of environmental and edaphic factors resulted in landscape that historically supported prairies, savannas, forests, and various wetlands. Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on uplands on somewhat poorly to moderately well drained soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of a closed canopy maple-basswood forest with shade-tolerant herbaceous vegetation.

Damage from wind and ice storms as well as pest infestations are importance disturbance regimes that maintain Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests. Storm damage and pest infestation to trees can vary from minor, patchy effects of individual trees to stand effects that temporarily affect community structure and species richness and diversity (Irland 2000; Peterson 2000). This results in gap-phase replacement, where the patchy gaps quickly fill in with sapling trees or shrubs (WDNR 2015).

Today, Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests have been reduced as they have been type-converted to agricultural or other human-modified landscape. Remnants that do exist have experienced extensive fragmentation, infestations of invasive plants and diseases, and overbrowsing resulting in significant changes to the forest structure. A return to the historic plant community may not be possible following extensive land modification, but long-term conservation agriculture or forest 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 and transition model

## F110XY012IL MOIST GLACIAL DRIFT UPLAND FOREST



Code	Process
1.1A	Natural succession following lack of community disturbances
1.2A	Storm damage or minor, native pest infestation
T1A, T4A, T5A	Fragmentation and invasive pests
2.1A	Fragmentation, invasive species, increasing deer populations
T1B, T2A, T4B, T5B	Vegetation removal and human alterations/transportation of soils
T1C, T2B, 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, R4A	Site preparation, tree planting, 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 maple-basswood forest community, dominated by mesic deciduous trees and shade-tolerant herbaceous vegetation. The two community phases within the reference state are dependent on storm damage and periodic pest outbreaks. The size and duration of disturbances alters species composition, cover, and extent.



## Community 1.1

### Sugar Maple – American Basswood/American Hornbeam/Dutchman’s Breeches – White Trillium

Sites in this reference community phase are a closed canopy forest. Sugar maple and American basswood are the dominant species, but American beech is a common canopy associate. Trees are large (21 to 33-inch DBH), and cover is approximately 80 percent (LANDFIRE 2009). American hornbeam, American hazelnut (*Corylus americana* Walter), and American witchhazel (*Hamamelis virginiana* L.) are indicative of gap-phase replacement. The herbaceous layer is nearly continuous with shade-tolerant species such as dutchman’s breeches, white trillium, mayapple (*Podophyllum peltatum* L.), bloodroot (*Sanguinaria canadensis* L.), and eastern waterleaf (*Hydrophyllum virginianum* L.). Continuing, patchy disturbances from storms or native pests will maintain this phase, but an extended period of no disturbances will shift the community to phase 1.2 (WDNR 2015).

#### Dominant plant species

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- American basswood (*Tilia americana*), tree
- American hornbeam (*Carpinus caroliniana*), shrub
- dutchman's breeches (*Dicentra cucullaria*), other herbaceous
- white trillium (*Trillium grandiflorum*), other herbaceous

## Community 1.2

### Sugar Maple – American Basswood/Dutchman’s Breeches – White Trillium

This reference community phase represents a successional shift following an extended period of no natural disturbances. The gaps once occupied by shrubs eventually become shaded out by a maturing canopy of sugar maple, American basswood, and American beech. Spring ephemerals continue to remain the characteristic species of the herbaceous layer. Damage to trees from a wind or ice storm or localized pest outbreak will transition the site to community phase 1.1.

#### Dominant plant species

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- American basswood (*Tilia americana*), tree
- dutchman's breeches (*Dicentra cucullaria*), other herbaceous
- white trillium (*Trillium grandiflorum*), other herbaceous

## Pathway 1.1A

### Community 1.1 to 1.2

Natural succession following lack of community disturbances

## Pathway 1.2A

### Community 1.2 to 1.1

Storm damage or minor, native pest infestation

## State 2

### Degraded Forest State

Severe fragmentation from human activities and invasion of non-native invasive plants, pests, and diseases have resulted in significant degradation to the reference community in many stands (WDNR 2015). Overbrowsing by an unnaturally abundant deer population can also lead to changes in the composition, diversity, and production of the forest. Continuous browsing has been reported to prevent the regeneration of the historic canopy, which is replaced by mid-level and invasive species (Gubanyi et al. 2008; VerCauteren and Hygnstrom 2011). Similarly, herbaceous diversity and composition is also affected by selective browsing pressure (Gubanyi et al. 2008).

## Community 2.1

## **Sugar Maple - American Basswood/Mayapple - Garlic Mustard**

This community phase represents the early stages of forest degradation. The tree canopy closes to 100 percent cover and basal area increases (LANDFIRE 2009). American beech becomes greatly reduced due to beech bark disease. The herbaceous layer continues to support shade-tolerant species, but diversity is reduced as the fully closed canopy results in favorable conditions mostly by spring ephemerals. Grazing pressure alters species composition, allowing plants such as mayapple to increase as it is commonly avoided by deer (Gubanyi et al. 2008; Rawbinski 2008). Non-native invasive species, such as garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata* (M. Bieb.) Cavara & Grande), can begin to gain a foothold in the understory community as well.

### **Dominant plant species**

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- American basswood (*Tilia americana*), tree
- mayapple (*Podophyllum peltatum*), other herbaceous
- garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*), other herbaceous

## **Community 2.2**

### **Sugar Maple - American Basswood/Garlic Mustard - Litter**

Sites falling into this community phase have a well-established maple-basswood canopy. Downed woody debris and leaf litter are frequently encountered on the forest floor.

### **Dominant plant species**

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- American basswood (*Tilia americana*), tree
- garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*), other herbaceous

## **Pathway 2.1A**

### **Community 2.1 to 2.2**

Fragmentation, invasive species, increasing deer populations.

## **State 3**

### **Anthropogenic State**

The anthropogenic state occurs when the reference state is cleared and developed for human use and inhabitation, such as for commercial and housing developments, landfills, parks, golf courses, cemeteries, earthen spoils, etc. The native vegetation has been removed and soils have either been altered in place (e.g. cemeteries) or transported from one location to another (e.g. housing developments). Most of the soils in this state have 50 to 100 cm of overburden on top of the natural soil. This natural material can be determined by observing a buried surface horizon or the unaltered subsoil, till, or lacustrine parent materials. This state is generally considered permanent.

## **Community 3.1**

### **Human-altered land**

Sites in this community phase have had the native plant community removed and soils heavily re-worked in support of human development projects.

## **State 4**

### **Cropland State**

The continuous use of tillage, row-crop planting, and chemicals (i.e., herbicides, fertilizers, etc.) has 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 common wheat (*Triticum aestivum* 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 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).

## **Community 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.

## **Community 4.3**

### **Conservation Tillage Field/Alternative 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 4.1A**

#### **Community 4.1 to 4.2**

Tillage operations are greatly reduced, crop rotation 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, crop rotation 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 crop practices are abandoned, monoculture row-cropping is established, and crop rotation is reduced or eliminated.

## **Pathway 4.3A**

### **Community 4.3 to 4.2**

Cover crop practices are abandoned.

## **State 5**

### **Reconstructed Maple-Basswood Forest State**

The combination of natural and anthropogenic disturbances occurring today has resulted in numerous forest health issues, and restoration back to the historic reference condition may not be possible. Forests are being stressed by non-native diseases and pests, habitat fragmentation, changes in soil conditions, and overabundant deer populations on top of naturally occurring disturbances (severe weather and native pests) (IFDC 2018). However, these habitats provide multiple ecosystem services including carbon sequestration; clean air and water; soil conservation; biodiversity support; wildlife habitat; timber, fiber, and fuel products; as well as a variety of cultural activities (e.g., hiking, camping, hunting) (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005; IFDC 2018). Therefore, conservation of forests and woodlands should still be pursued. Forest reconstructions are an important tool for repairing natural ecological functioning and providing habitat protection for numerous species associated with Moist Glacial Drift Upland Forests. Therefore, ecological restoration should aim to aid the recovery of degraded, damaged, or destroyed ecosystems. A successful restoration will have the ability to structurally and functionally sustain itself, demonstrate resilience to the ranges of stress and disturbance, and create and maintain positive biotic and abiotic interactions (SER 2002). The reconstructed maple-basswood forest state is the result of a long-term commitment involving a multi-step, adaptive management process.

## **Community 5.1**

### **Early Successional Reconstructed Forest**

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

## **Community 5.2**

### **Late Successional Reconstructed Forest**

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

## **Pathway 5.1A**

### **Community 5.1 to 5.2**

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

## **Pathway 5.2A**

### **Community 5.2 to 5.1**

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

#### **Transition T1A**

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

Degradation due to fragmentation and invasion by non-native pests transition the site to the degraded forest state (2).

#### **Transition T1B**

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

Vegetation removal and human alterations/transportation of soils transitions the site to the anthropogenic state (3).

#### **Transition T1C**

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

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

#### **Transition T2A**

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

Vegetation removal and human alterations/transportation of soils transitions the site to the anthropogenic state (3).

#### **Transition T2B**

##### **State 2 to 4**

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

#### **Restoration pathway R2A**

##### **State 2 to 5**

Site preparation, tree planting, invasive species control, seeding native species, and deer management transition this site to the reconstructed maple-basswood forest state (5).

#### **Transition T4A**

##### **State 4 to 2**

Land abandonment transitions the site to the degraded forest state (2).

#### **Transition T4B**

##### **State 4 to 3**

Vegetation removal and human alterations/transportation of soils transitions the site to the anthropogenic 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 maple-basswood forest state (5).

#### **Transition T5A**

##### **State 5 to 2**

Removal of active management transitions this site to the degraded forest state (2).

## **Transition T5B**

### **State 5 to 3**

Vegetation removal and human alterations/transportation of soils transitions the site to the anthropogenic 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**

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

### **Other references**

Angel, J. No date. Climate of Illinois Narrative. Illinois State Water Survey, Prairie Research Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Available at <https://www.isws.illinois.edu/statecli/General/Illinois-climate-narrative.htm>. Accessed 8 November 2018.

Bernthal, T.W. 2003. Development of a Floristic Quality Assessment Methodology for Wisconsin: Final Report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region V. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Fisheries Management and habitat Protection, Madison, WI. 96 pps.

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.

Gubanyi, J., J. Savidge, S.E. Hygnstrom, K. VerCauteren, G.W. Garabrandt, and S. Korte. 2008. Deer impact on vegetation in natural areas in southeastern Nebraska. USDA National Wildlife Research Center – Staff Publications. 913. Available at [http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/icwdm\\_usdanwrc/913](http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/icwdm_usdanwrc/913). (Accessed 6 April 2017).

Illinois Forestry Development Council (IFDC). 2018. Illinois Forest Action Plan: A Statewide Forest Resource Assessment and Strategy, Version 4.1. Illinois Forestry Development Council and Illinois Department of Natural Resources. 80 pps.

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

LANDFIRE. 2009. Biophysical Setting 4213140 North-Central Interior Maple-Basswood Forest. In: LANDFIRE National Vegetation Dynamics Models. USDA Forest Service and US Department of Interior. Washington, DC.

Leake, J., D. Johnson, D. Donnelly, G. Muckle, L. Boddy, and D. Read. 2004. Networks of power and influence: the role of mycorrhizal mycelium in controlling plant communities and agroecosystem functioning. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 82: 1016-1045.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current States and Trends*. World Resources Institute. Island Press, Washington, D.C. 948 pages.

NatureServe. 2018. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1 NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available at <http://explorer.natureserve.org>. (Accessed 16 January 2020).

Peel, M.C., B.L. Finlayson, and T.A. McMahon. 2007. Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate

classification. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 11: 1633-1644.

Peterson, C.J. 2000. Catastrophic wind damage to North American forests and the potential impact of climate change. *The Science of the Total Environment* 262: 287-311.

Rawbinski, T.J. 2008. Impacts of White-tailed Deer Overabundance in Forest Ecosystems: An Overview. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. Newton Square, PA, USA. Available at [https://www.na.fs.fed.us/fhp/special\\_interests/White-tailed\\_deer.pdf](https://www.na.fs.fed.us/fhp/special_interests/White-tailed_deer.pdf) (Accessed 17 April 2017).

Schwegman, J.E., G.B. Fell, M. Hutchinson, G. Paulson, W.M. Shepherd, and J. White. 1973. Comprehensive Plan for the Illinois Nature Preserves System, Part 2 The Natural Divisions of Illinois. Illinois Nature Preserves Commission, Rockford, IL. 32 pps.

Society for Ecological Restoration [SER] Science & Policy Working Group. 2002. The SER Primer on Ecological Restoration. Available at: <http://www.ser.org/>. (Accessed 28 February 2017).

Taft, J.B., G.S. Wilhelm, D.M. Ladd, and L.A. Masters. 1997. Floristic Quality Assessment for vegetation in Illinois, a method for assessing vegetation integrity. *Erigenia* 15: 3-95.

Taft, J.B., R.C. Anderson, L.R. Iverson, and W.C. Handel. 2009. Chapter 4: Vegetation ecology and change in terrestrial ecosystems. In: C.A. Taylor, J.B. Taft, and C.E. Warwick (eds.). *Canaries in the Catbird Seat: The Past, Present, and Future of Biological Resources in a Changing Environment*. Illinois Natural Heritage Survey Special Publication 30, Prairie Research Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 306 pps.

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.

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.

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).

VerCauteren, K. and S.E. Hygnstrom. 2011. Managing white-tailed deer: Midwest North America. *Papers in Natural Resources*. Paper 380. Available at <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/natrespapers/380>. (Accessed 17 April 2017).

White, J. and M.H. Madany. 1978. Classification of natural communities in Illinois. In: J. White. Illinois Natural Areas Inventory Technical Report. Illinois Natural Areas Inventory, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign. 426 pps.

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. 293 pps.

## **Contributors**

Lisa Kluesner  
Kristine Ryan  
Sarah Smith  
Tiffany Justus

## Approval

Chris Tecklenburg, 4/22/2020

## Acknowledgments

This project could not have been completed without the dedication and commitment from a variety of staff members. 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.

Table 6. List of primary contributors and reviewers.

Organization Name Title Location

Natural Resources Conservation Service Ron Collman State Soil Scientist Champaign, IL

Tonie Endres Senior Regional Soil Scientist Indianapolis, IN

Tiffany Justus Soil Scientist Aurora, IL

Lisa Kluesner Ecological Site Specialist Waverly, IA

Rick Neilson State Soil Scientist Indianapolis, IN

Jason Nemecek State Soil Scientist Madison, WI

Kevin Norwood Soil Survey Regional Director Indianapolis, IN

Kristine Ryan MLRA Soil Survey Leader Aurora, IL

Stanley Sipp Resource Inventory Specialist Champaign, IL

Sarah Smith Soil Scientist Aurora, IL

Chris Tecklenberg Acting Regional Ecological Site Specialist Hutchinson, KS

## Rangeland health reference sheet

Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health is a qualitative assessment protocol used to determine ecosystem condition based on benchmark characteristics described in the Reference Sheet. A suite of 17 (or more) indicators are typically considered in an assessment. The ecological site(s) representative of an assessment location must be known prior to applying the protocol and must be verified based on soils and climate. Current plant community cannot be used to identify the ecological site.

Author(s)/participant(s)	
Contact for lead author	
Date	01/13/2025
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:**
-