

Ecological site R110XY027IL

Ponded Floodplain Marsh

Last updated: 4/22/2020
Accessed: 11/06/2024

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 Wisconsin glacialiation – 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 Floodplain (CES202.694) , Eastern Great Plains Wet Meadow, Prairie and Marsh (CES205.687) (NatureServe 2018)

National Vegetation Classification – Plant Associations: Schoenoplectus fluviatilis – Schoenoplectus spp. Marsh (CEGL002221), Carex lacustris Wet Meadow (CEGL002256) (Nature Serve 2018)

Biophysical Settings: Central Interior and Appalachian Floodplain Systems (BpS 4214710), Eastern Great Plains Wet Meadow-Marsh-Prairie System (BpS 4214880) (LANDFIRE 2009)

Illinois Natural Areas Inventory: Marsh (White and Madany 1978)

Ecological site concept

Ponded Floodplain Marshes are located within the green areas on the map. They occur on river valleys on floodplains. The soils are Histosols, Mollisols, and Inceptisols that are very poorly to poorly drained and very deep, formed in organic material and alluvium. The site experiences seasonal flooding and ponding for a significant portion of the growing season.

The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by emergent herbaceous vegetation adapted to flooded and saturated conditions. Hairy sedge (*Carex lacustris* L.) and broadleaf arrowhead (*Sagittaria latifolia* Willd.) are the dominant and characteristic species for the site, respectively. River bulrush (*Bolboschoenus fluviatilis* (Torr.) Soják), softstem bulrush (*Schoenoplectus tabernaemontani* (C.C. Gmel.) Palla), and broadleaf cattail (*Typha latifolia* L.) are other common emergent associates. An herbaceous species typical of an undisturbed plant community associated with this ecological site is swamp loosestrife (*Decodon verticillatus* (L.) Elliott) (White and Madany 1978; Taft et al. 1997). Depth and duration of flooding are the primary disturbance factors that maintain this ecological site, while native mammal herbivory is a secondary factor (LANDFIRE 2009).

Associated sites

F110XY028IL	Silty-Loamy Floodplain Forest Somewhat poorly to well-drained alluvium that experiences rare to occasional flooding including Allison, Dorchester, Du Page, Lawson, Lawson variant, Ross, and Tice soils
R110XY029IL	Wet Floodplain Sedge Meadow Very poorly to poorly drained alluvium that experiences rare to frequent flooding including Ambraw, Comfrey, Millington, Sawmill, Sawmill variant, Titus, and Zook soils

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Carex lacustris</i> (2) <i>Sagittaria latifolia</i>

Physiographic features

Ponded Floodplain Marshes occur on river valleys on floodplains. They are situated on elevations ranging from approximately 420 to 1020 feet ASL. The site experiences occasional to frequent flooding and frequent ponding




Figure 1. Representative block diagram of Ponded Floodplain Marsh and associated ecological sites.



Figure 2.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Slope shape across	(1) Concave
Slope shape up-down	(1) Concave
Landforms	(1) River valley > Flood plain
Runoff class	Negligible
Flooding duration	Brief (2 to 7 days) to long (7 to 30 days)
Flooding frequency	Occasional to frequent
Ponding duration	Long (7 to 30 days) to very long (more than 30 days)
Ponding frequency	Frequent
Elevation	420–1,020 ft
Slope	0–2%
Ponding depth	0–12 in
Water table depth	4–6 in
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 177 days, while the frost-free period is about 139 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 40.0 and 59.6°F, respectively.

Table 3. Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	137-142 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	174-181 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	38-39 in
Frost-free period (actual range)	135-144 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	168-184 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	37-40 in
Frost-free period (average)	139 days
Freeze-free period (average)	177 days
Precipitation total (average)	38 in




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) MINONK [USC00115712], Minonk, IL
- (3) MORRIS 1 NW [USC00115825], Morris, IL
- (4) PARK FOREST [USC00116616], Chicago Heights, IL
- (5) ANTIOCH [USC00110203], Antioch, IL

Influencing water features

Ponded Floodplain Marshes are classified as a RIVERINE: flooded, ponded, herbaceous wetland under the Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classification system (Smith et al. 1995; USDA-NRCS 2008) and as a Palustrine, Persistent, Emergent, Seasonally Flooded-Saturated wetland under the National Wetlands Inventory (FGDC 2013). Overbank flow and subsurface hydraulic connections are the main sources of water for this ecological site, but other sources may be from surface runoff from adjacent uplands and precipitation (Smith et al. 1995). Infiltration is very slow (Hydrologic Group D) for undrained soils, and surface runoff is negligible to low.

Wetland description

Primary wetland hydrology indicators for an intact Pondered Floodplain Marsh may include: A1 Surface water, A2 High water table, A3 Saturation, and B14 True aquatic plants. 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 9. Hydrologic cycling in Pondered Floodplain Marsh ecological site.

Soil features

Soils of Pondered Floodplain Marshes are in the Histosols, Mollisols, and Inceptisols orders, further classified as Typic Haplosaprists, Cumulic Endoaquolls, and Fluvaquentic Humaquepts with very slow infiltration and negligible runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Houghton, Millington, Sawmill, and Walkkill. The parent material is organic matter and alluvium, and the soils are very poorly to poorly drained and very deep 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, 3, or 4 of the hydric soils list (77 FR 12234).




Figure 10. Profile sketches of soil series associated with Pondered Floodplain Marsh.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Organic material (2) Alluvium
Family particle size	(1) Fine-silty (2) Fine-loamy
Drainage class	Very poorly drained to poorly drained

Permeability class	Slow to moderately slow
Depth to restrictive layer	80 in
Soil depth	80 in
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0%
Surface fragment cover >3"	0%
Available water capacity (Depth not specified)	8–16 in
Calcium carbonate equivalent (Depth not specified)	0–30%
Electrical conductivity (Depth not specified)	0–2 mmhos/cm
Sodium adsorption ratio (Depth not specified)	0
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (Depth not specified)	5.1–8.1
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	1–7%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0%

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. Pondered Floodplain Marshes form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on floodplains on very poorly and poorly drained soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation.


Flooding and ponding are the dominant disturbance factors in Pondered Floodplain Marshes (LANDFIRE 2009). Seasonal flooding likely occurred annually from spring snow melt and heavy rains. The depth and duration of ponded water affects species diversity, composition, and productivity. Little to no ponded water allows more of a sedge meadow community to dominate, while deep water depths create a shallow to deep marsh community populated with emergent and aquatic vegetation.

Animal herbivory also played a role in shaping this ecological site. Foraging muskrats can alter the extent of emergent vegetation, creating larger patches of open water. Left unchecked, muskrats can remove all the emergent vegetation, which won't re-establish until the next drought or drawdown event (White and Madany 1978).

Today, Pondered Floodplain Marshes have been greatly reduced as the land has mostly been converted for agricultural production. Some areas may have been converted to other human-modified landscapes. Remnants that do exist show evidence of indirect anthropogenic influences from hydrological alterations as non-native species have replaced the natural vegetation. A return to the historic plant community may not be 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 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

R110XY027IL PONDED FLOODPLAIN MARSH



Code	Process
1.1A, 1.3A	Ponded water depths 12-24 inches
1.2A	Ponded water depths <12 inches
1.2B	Ponded water depths >24 inches
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-marsh community, dominated by hydrophytic vegetation. The three community phases within the reference state are dependent on seasonal flooding and subsequent ponding. The depth and duration of ponding alters species composition, cover, and extent. Animal

herbivory has more localized impacts in the reference phases, but does contribute to overall species composition, diversity, cover, and productivity.

Community 1.1

Hairy Sedge - Broadleaf Arrowhead

This reference community phase can occur when the frequency and depth of ponding are reduced to less than 1 foot. Hairy sedge is the dominant monocot, but bulrushes can also be present. Broadleaf arrowhead is still the dominant forb, but forb diversity is greatest in this phase with species such as marsh skullcap (*Scutellaria galericulata* L.), longroot smartweed (*Polygonum amphibium* L. var. *emersum* Michx.), spotted joe pye weed (*Eutrochium maculatum* (L.) E.E. Lamont), and jewelweed (*Impatiens capensis* Meerb.) (White and Madany 1978; NatureServe 2018). Shallow ponded water depths (less than 1 foot) will maintain this phase, but an increase in water depths can shift the community to phase 1.2.

Dominant plant species

- hairy sedge (*Carex lacustris*), other herbaceous
- broadleaf arrowhead (*Sagittaria latifolia*), other herbaceous

Community 1.2

River Bulrush - Broadleaf Arrowhead

Sites in this reference community phase are dominated by hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation. River bulrush and broadleaf arrowhead are the dominant species. Some sites may be dominated by other bulrushes, such as softstem bulrush. Characteristic forbs can include broadfruit bur-reed (*Sparganium eurycarpum* Engelm.) and American water plantain (*Alisma subcordatum* Raf.) (NatureServe 2018). Water depths between 1 and 2 feet will maintain this phase, but a reduced water level (below 1 foot) will shift the community to phase 1.1 while an increase in water level (above 2 feet) will shift the community to phase 1.3.

Dominant plant species

- river bulrush (*Bolboschoenus fluviatilis*), other herbaceous
- broadleaf arrowhead (*Sagittaria latifolia*), other herbaceous

Community 1.3

River Bulrush - Common Duckweed

This reference community phase can occur when the frequency and depth of ponding are greater than 2 feet. Bulrushes and cattails are the dominant monocots. Aquatic vegetation becomes important characteristic species during this phase and can include species such as common duckweed (*Lemna minor* L.), common duckmeat (*Spirodela polyrrhiza* (L.) Schleid), and American white waterlily (*Nymphaea odorata* Aiton ssp. *tuberosa* (Paine) Wiersma & Hellquist) (NatureServe 2018). Deep ponded water depths (greater than 2 feet) will maintain this phase, but a decrease in water depths can shift the community back to phase 1.2.

Dominant plant species

- river bulrush (*Bolboschoenus fluviatilis*), other herbaceous
- common duckweed (*Lemna minor*), other herbaceous

Pathway 1.1A

Community 1.1 to 1.2

Ponded water depths increase to 12 - 24 inches.

Pathway 1.2A

Community 1.2 to 1.1

Ponded water depths decrease to < 12 inches.

Pathway 1.2B

Community 1.2 to 1.3

Ponded water depths increase to > 24 inches.

Pathway 1.3A

Community 1.3 to 1.2

Ponded water depths decrease to 12 - 24 inches.

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 Pondered Floodplain Marshes. Alterations such as agricultural tile draining and conversion to cropland on adjacent lands in addition to stream channelization and damming 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 - Hairy Sedge

This community phase represents the early changes to the natural wetland hydroperiod, increasing sedimentation, and unabated nutrient runoff. Native monocots, such as river bulrush, softstem bulrush, and cattails, 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). Common reed (*Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. Ex Steud.) may be a non-native invader in conjunction with or in place of reed canarygrass.

Dominant plant species

- reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), grass
- hairy sedge (*Carex lacustris*), other herbaceous

Community 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. 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). As in community phase 2.1, common reed may be present, dominant, or monotypic on the site.

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 Marsh State**

Marsh habitats provide multiple ecosystem services including flood abatement, water quality improvement, and biodiversity support (Mitsch and Gosselink 2007). However, many marsh communities have been eliminated as a result of type conversions to agricultural production, 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 Pondered Floodplain Marshes 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 5.1 **Early Successional Reconstructed Marsh**

This community phase represents the early community assembly from marsh habitat reconstruction and is highly dependent on invasive species control, hydroperiod repair, and planting (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).

Community 5.2

Late Successional Reconstructed Marsh

Appropriately timed disturbance regimes (e.g. hydroperiod, 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 5.1A

Community 5.1 to 5.2

Maintenance of proper hydrology and nutrient balances in line with a developed wetland management plan.

Pathway 5.2A

Community 5.2 to 5.1

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

Transition T1A

State 1 to 2

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

Transition T1B

State 1 to 3

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, tillage, 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, tillage, 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 marsh 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 transitions 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 marsh 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

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.

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.

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.

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 Conterminous 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 4214880 Eastern Great Plains Wet Meadow-Marsh-Prairie System. 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 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 13 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.
- 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.
- 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.

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

Van der Valk, A.G., T.L. Bremholm, and E. Gordon. 1999. The restoration of sedge meadows: seed viability, seed germination requirements, and seedling growth of *Carex* species. *Wetlands* 19: 756-764.

Vitousek, P.M. 1990. Biological invasions and ecosystem processes: towards an integration of population biology and ecosystem studies. *Oikos* 57: 7-13.

Waggy, M.A. 2010. *Phalaris arundinacea*. In: Fire Effects Information System [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Available at: <https://www.feis-crs.org/feis/>. (Accessed 1 February 2017).

Werner, K.J. and J.B. Zedler. 2002. How sedge meadow soils, microtopography, and vegetation respond to sedimentation. *Wetlands* 3: 451-466.

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	11/06/2024
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:
