

Ecological site VX159A01X009 Isothermic Aquic Bog

Last updated: 11/05/2018 Accessed: 04/29/2024

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)	David Clausnitzer
Contact for lead author	NRCS PIA Regional Office, Honolulu, HI.
Date	04/12/2016
Approved by	
Approval date	
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Foliar Cover

nc	ndicators		
1.	Number and extent of rills: Not applicable.		
2.	Presence of water flow patterns: Not applicable.		
3.	Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes: Not applicable.		
4.	Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground): Not applicable; site is submerged under shallow surface water.		
5.	Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies: Not applicable.		
6.	Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas: Not applicable.		
7.	Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel): Not applicable.		

8.	Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values): Not applicable.	
9.	Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness): The surface soil horizon (Oa) is runs from 0 to 6 inches (0 to 15 centimeters depth. It is very dark brown (10YR 2/2) rubbed, consists of muck, and is massive.	
	The Ag horizon runs from 6 to 14 inches (15 to 35 centimeters) depth. It is very dark brown (10YR 2/2) crushed, consists of mucky hydrous silt loam, and has weak fine subangular blocky structure.	
10.	Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff: The differences in relative proportions of functional groups and plant spatial distribution among different community phases is unknown but is likely to be similar. There is probably no effect 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): None.	
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: By foliar cover, Grass/grasslikes >> Forb/herbs.	
13.	Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence): Not applicable.	
14.	Average percent litter cover (%) and depth (in): This small amount of litter sinks below the surface water and lodges on the soil surface.	
15.	Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annual-production): Unknown.	
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

	tapertip rush (Juncus acuminatus)			
17.	Perennial plant reproductive capability: There are no known inhibiting factors.			

invasive plants. Note that unlike other indicators, we are describing what is NOT expected in the reference state

for the ecological site: Haspan flatsedge (Cyperus haspan)