Ecological site R110XY024IL
Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadow

Last updated: 4/22/2020
Accessed: 05/19/2024

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.

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 Wisconsinan glaciation – 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: Eastern Great Plains Wet Meadow, Prairie, and Marsh (CES205.687) (NatureServe 2018)

National Vegetation Classification – Plant Associations: Carex lacustris Wet Meadow (CEGL002256) (Nature Serve 2018)

Biophysical Settings: Central Interior and Appalachian Shrub-Herbaceous Wetland Systems (BpS 4314930) (LANDFIRE 2009)

Illinois Natural Areas Inventory: Sedge Meadow (White and Madany 1978)

Wisconsin Natural Communities: Sedge meadow (WDNR 2015)

Ecological site concept

Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadows are located within the green areas on the map. They occur on level to depressional areas on uplands. The soils are Mollisols and Alfisols that are very poorly to poorly drained and very deep, formed in organic material or loess or other silty material over outwash, glacial till, or lacustrine deposits. The site experiences ponding from precipitation, overland flow, and groundwater flow.

The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by herbaceous vegetation adapted to temporarily ponded conditions. Hairy sedge (Carex lacustris L.) and bluejoint (Calamagrostis canadensis (Michx.) P. Beauv.) are the dominant species on the site. Other monocots can include upright sedge (Carex stricta Lam.), water sedge (Carex aquatilis Wahlenb.), rushes (Juncus L.), and spikerushes (Eleocharis R. Br.) (White and Madany 1978; NatureServe 2018). Species typical of an undisturbed plant community associated with this ecological site can include white turtlehead (Chelone glabra L.) and Bebb's sedge (Carex bebbii Olney ex Fernald) (Taft et al. 1997). Few shrubs may be present in very low densities and can include silky dogwood (Cornus amomum Mill.) and white meadowsweet (Spiraea alba Du Roi). Depth and duration of ponding as well as periodic fire are the primary disturbance factors that maintain this site, while drought is a secondary factor (LANDFIRE 2009; NatureServe 2018).

Associated sites

R110XY008IL	**Wet Glacial Drift Upland Prairie** Loess or other silty or loamy material, loamy outwash, glacial till, lacustrine deposits or colluvium that is shallow to a high-water table including Ashkum, Bryce, Drummer, Dunham, Elpaso, Matherton, Milford, Monee, Montgomery, Pella, Reddick, Rowe, Selma, Selmass, Westland, and Will soils

Similar sites

R110XY025IL	**Ponded Calcareous Sedge Meadow** Ponded Calcareous Sedge Meadows are in a similar landscape position, but the site is a DEPRESSIONAL: discharge wetland

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) *Carex lacustris* (2) *Calamagrostis canadensis*

Physiographic features

Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadows occur on uplands on level to slightly depressional areas. They are situated on elevations ranging from approximately 430 to 1499 feet ASL. The site experiences ponding that can last up to seven days at a time.



Figure 1. Representative block diagram of Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadow and associated ecological sites.



Figure 2.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Slope shape across	(1) Concave
Slope shape up-down	(1) Concave
Landforms	(1) Upland > Depression
Runoff class	Negligible to low
Ponding duration	Brief (2 to 7 days) to long (7 to 30 days)
Ponding frequency	None to frequent
Elevation	131–457 m
Slope	0–2%
Ponding depth	0–30 cm
Water table depth	0–15 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 170 days, while the frost-free period is about 140 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 39.6 and 59.1°F, respectively.

Table 3. Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	132-145 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	169-175 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	940-991 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	132-148 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	157-176 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	889-991 mm
Frost-free period (average)	140 days
Freeze-free period (average)	170 days
Precipitation total (average)	965 mm



Figure 3. Monthly precipitation range



Figure 4. Monthly minimum temperature range



Figure 5. Monthly maximum temperature range



Figure 6. Monthly average minimum and maximum temperature



Figure 7. Annual precipitation pattern



Figure 8. Annual average temperature pattern

Climate stations used

- (1) PAXTON 2 WSW [USC00116663], Paxton, IL
- (2) MARSEILLES LOCK [USC00115372], Marseilles, IL
- (3) KANKAKEE WASTEWATER [USC00114603], Kankakee, IL

- (4) AURORA [USC00110338], Aurora, IL
- (5) UNION GROVE [USC00478723], Union Grove, WI

Influencing water features

Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadows are classified as a DEPRESSIONAL: Recharge, Ponded, Closed Depression; herbaceous wetland under the Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classification system (Smith et al. 1995; USDA-NRCS 2008) and as a Palustrine Persistent Emergent Wetland under the National Wetlands Inventory (FGDC 2013). Precipitation, overland flow from adjacent uplands, and groundwater discharge are the main sources of water for this ecological site (Smith et al. 1995). Infiltration is very slow (Hydrologic Group D) for undrained soils, and surface runoff is negligible.

Wetland description

Primary wetland hydrology indicators for an intact Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadow may include: A1 Surface water, A2 High water table, A3 Saturation, and B7 Inundation visible on aerial photography. Secondary wetland hydrology indicators may include: C2 Dry-season water table, D2 Geomorphic position, and D5 FAC-neutral test (USACE 2010).



Figure 9. Hydrologic cycling in Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadow ecological site.

Soil features

Soils of Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadows are in the Histosols and Mollisols orders, further classified as Limnic Haplosaprists, Typic Haplosaprists, Argiaquic Argialbolls, Typic Argiaquolls, Cumulic Vertic Endoaquolls, Typic Endoaquolls, and Vertic Endoaquolls with very slow infiltration and negligible to low runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Ashkum, Drummer, Dunham, Elpaso, Houghton, Lena, Muskego, Ogden, Pella, Peotone, Pewamo, Rantoul, Reddick, Selma, Streator, Thorp, and Will. The parent material is organic material or loess or other silty or loamy material over outwash, till, or lacustrine deposits, and the soils are very poorly to poorly drained with seasonal high-water tables. Soil pH classes are strongly acid to moderately alkaline. No rooting restrictions are noted for the soils of this ecological site.

Some soil map units in this ecological site, if not drained, may meet the definition of hydric soils and are listed as meeting criteria 1 or 2 of the hydric soils list (77 FR 12234).



Figure 10. Profile sketches of soil series associated with Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadow.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Organic material (2) Loess
Family particle size	(1) Clayey (2) Fine (3) Fine-silty (4) Fine-loamy
Drainage class	Very poorly drained to poorly drained
Permeability class	Moderate
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)	12.7–40.64 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)	5.1–8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0–28%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0–4%

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. Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadows form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on uplands on very poorly to poorly drained soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation.

Ponding and fire are the most important ecosystem drivers for maintaining this ecological site. The depth and duration of ponding affect species composition, cover, and vegetative production due to alternating aerobic and anaerobic surface substrate conditions. Replacement fires likely occurred on a ten-year rotation interval and helped to reduce the accumulation of peat. The combination of fire and high-water levels prevented the establishment of shrubs for any significant amount of time (LANDFIRE 2009).

Drought has also played a role in shaping this ecological site. The periodic episodes of reduced soil moisture in conjunction with the very poorly to 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, Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadows have been virtually eliminated 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. Some areas may have been converted to other human-modified landscapes. 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

R110XY024IL Ponded Depressional Sedge Meadow



Code	Process
1.1A	Increased fire return interval and/or reduction in average soil water levels
1.2A	Reduced fire return interval and/or average soil water levels increase
T1A, T4A, T5A	Changes to natural hydroperiod and/or land abandonment
2.1A	Increasing changes to hydrology and increasing sedimentation
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, 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 ponding and fire. The depth and duration of ponding alters species composition, cover, and extent, while regular fire intervals keep woody species from encroaching. Drought has more localized impacts in the reference phases, but does contribute to overall species composition, diversity, cover, and productivity.

Community 1.1

Hairy Sedge - Bluejoint

Sites in this reference community phase are dominated by sedges with grasses and forbs interspersed. Mature plants typically range between 1.5 and 3 feet tall, and ground cover is continuous (75 to 100 percent) (LANDFIRE 2009). Hairy sedge and bluejoint are the dominant species. Upright sedge, water sedge, rushes, and spikerushes area also present. Common forbs include spotted joe pye weed (*Eutrochium maculatum* (L.) E.E. Lamont), swamp milkweed (*Asclepias incarnata* L.), and white panicle aster (*Symphyotrichum lanceolatum* (Willd.) G.L. Nesom ssp. lanceolatum var. lanceolatum) (White and Madany 1978; NatureServe 2018).

Dominant plant species

- bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis*), grass
- hairy sedge (*Carex lacustris*), other herbaceous

Community 1.2
Silky Dogwood - White Meadowsweet/Hairy Sedge - Bluejoint

This reference community phase can occur when the frequency and depth of ponding are reduced such as from periodic drought. This phase can also occur when fire return intervals increase. The community assumes more of a shrub-carr assemblage, and shrubs, such as silky dogwood and white meadowsweet, become more prominent in the community encompassing at least 25 percent cover (NatureServe 2018). Sedges and forbs are still present but are likely reduced in areas where shrubs create pockets of shade (LANDFIRE 2009).

Dominant plant species

- silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*), shrub
- white meadowsweet (*Spiraea alba*), shrub
- bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis*), grass
- hairy sedge (*Carex lacustris*), other herbaceous

Pathway 1.1A
Community 1.1 to 1.2

Increased fire return intervals and/or periodic drying results in a reduction of the average soil water levels.

Pathway 1.2A
Community 1.2 to 1.1

Reduced fire return intervals and/or average soil water levels rise.

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 Ponded Depressional 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 - Bluejoint

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). Bluejoint and some sedges continues to form a component of the herbaceous layer, but the highly invasive reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.) co-dominates.

Dominant plant species

- reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), grass
- bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis*), grass

Community 2.2
Reed Canarygrass

Sites falling into this community phase have experienced significant sedimentation and are dominated by a monoculture of reed canarygrass. 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).

Dominant plant species

- reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), grass

Pathway 2.1A
Community 2.1 to 2.2

Continuing alterations to the natural hydrology and increasing sedimentation.

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, chemicals (i.e., herbicides, fertilizers, etc.), and subsurface tile drainage 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 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 due to type conversions to agricultural production, thereby significantly reducing these services (Zedler 2003). The extensive alterations of lands adjacent to Ponded Depressional 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 plant.

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

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

Vegetation removal and human alterations/transportation of soils transitions the site to the anthropogenic 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 T4A
State 4 to 2

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

Transition T4B
State 4 to 3

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

Restoration pathway R4A
State 4 to 5

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

Transition T5A
State 5 to 2

Land is abandoned and left fallow; natural succession by opportunistic species transition this site to the hydrologically-altered 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

Installation of drain tiles, seeding of agricultural crops, and non-selective herbicide transition the 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 4314930 Central Interior and Appalachian Shrub-Herbaceous Wetland 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.

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 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.

NatureServe. 2018. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1 NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available at http://explorer.natureserve.org. (Accessed 14 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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 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).

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.

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.

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
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.

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	05/19/2024
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:**
