# Ecological site F090AY020WI
# Dry Loamy Bedrock Upland

Last updated: 10/02/2023
Accessed: 05/12/2025

## 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): 090A–Wisconsin and Minnesota Thin Loess and Till

MLRA 90A is part of the recently glaciated till and outwash plains of central Minnesota and northern Wisconsin. The area was covered with loamy alluvium or loess after glaciation. It is in Wisconsin (56 percent), Minnesota (40 percent), and Michigan (4 percent). It makes up about 21,967 square miles (56,901 square kilometers).

This MLRA has distinct boundaries to the north where it borders tills of a dissimilar origin on the less morainic landscapes of MLRAs 88, 92, and 93A. The boundary to the west is where the MLRA transitions to the calcareous tills of the Des Moines Lobe, in MLRA 57. To the south, MLRA 90A borders MLRA 90B, which has older soils and better-defined drainage patterns, and MLRA 91, which has the distinct lower landscape relief of an outwash channel.

The part of this area in Minnesota is mostly in the Western Lake section of the Central Lowland province of the Interior Plains. Nearly all the parts in Wisconsin and Michigan are in the Superior Upland province of the Laurentian Upland. Four distinct lobes of the Laurentide Ice Sheet (Rainy, Superior, Chippewa, and Green Bay) played major roles in shaping the landscape in this area. The landscape is characterized by gently undulating to rolling, loess-mantled till plains, drumlin fields, and end moraines mixed with outwash plains associated with major glacial drainageways, swamps, bogs, and fens. In some areas lake plains and ice-walled lakes are significant. Steeper areas occur mostly as valley side slopes along flood plains and as escarpments along the margins of lakes.

Lakes, ponds, and marshes are common throughout the area, and streams generally have a dendritic pattern. The major rivers in this area are the Chippewa, St. Croix, Mississippi, and Wisconsin Rivers. Elevation ranges from 1,100 to 1,950 feet (335 to 595 meters). Local relief is mainly less than 10 feet to 20 feet (3 to 6 meters), but some major valleys and hills are 200 feet (60 meters) above the adjacent lowland.

Precambrian-age bedrock underlies most of the glacial deposits in this MLRA. The bedrock is a complex of folded and faulted igneous and metamorphic rocks. The bedrock terrain has been modified by glaciation and is covered in most areas by Pleistocene deposits and windblown silts. The glacial deposits form an almost continuous cover in most areas. The drift is several hundred feet thick in many areas. Loess covered the area shortly after the glacial ice melted.

Ground water is abundant in deep glacial deposits in most of this area. It also occurs in sedimentary and volcanic rock in the western part of the area. It is scarce where the layer of drift is thin. The water meets the domestic, agricultural, municipal, industrial, rural, and irrigation needs of the area. The content of dissolved solids in the ground water from all the various aquifers in this area is low, and the water generally is moderately hard or hard. The level of total dissolved solids in some of the water can be much higher because of a high content of limestone in some of the glacial deposits. Most of this area obtains ground water from unconsolidated glacial sand and gravel deposits on or very near the surface. Some wells tap the Cambrian sandstone in the southwestern part of the area, in Wisconsin.

In northwest Wisconsin (Ashland and Bayfield Counties) where there are no glacial deposits and in much of the part of this area in Minnesota, ground water from sedimentary and volcanic rock aquifers is used. This water is of very good quality; however, many soils have very porous layers that are poor filters of domestic waste and agricultural chemicals, so there is a risk of contamination from development and agriculture. Minor water concerns are hardness and, in some areas, high concentrations of iron. Yields of water from the glacial deposits vary.

The dominant soil orders are Alfisols, Entisols, Histosols, and Spodosols. The soils in the area have a frigid temperature regime, a udic or aquic moisture regime, and mixed mineralogy.

This area has a significant acreage of public and private forestland used to support the paper and lumber industry Sap collection from sugar maple and syrup production are important forestry enterprises. Agricultural enterprises include row crops, dairy farms, and beef operations. Crops include corn, soybeans, oats, wheat, and alfalfa. Tourism, recreation, and wildlife management are important. Hunting, fishing, snowmobiling, hiking, and skiing are popular activities because of the area's abundance of water, the many acres of national and county forests, and public hunting grounds. (United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2022)

## Classification relationships

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA 90A): Wisconsin and Minnesota Thin Loess and Till

USFS Subregions: Mille Lacs Uplands (212Kb), Perkinstown End Moraine (212Xe)

Wisconsin DNR Ecological Landscapes: Northwest Lowlands, North Central Forest

## Ecological site concept

The Dry Loamy Bedrock Upland ecological site not particularly extensive but may be found in the northwest portion of MLRA 90A on moraines and monadnocks. These sites are characterized by moderately deep, somewhat excessively to excessively drained soils that formed in loess and loamy till deposits over bedrock. Bedrock types include basalt and quartzite. Precipitation and runoff from adjacent uplands are the primary sources of water. Soils range from very strongly acid to strongly acid.

Dry Loamy Bedrock Upland is distinguished from other sites based on drainage and a moderately deep profile. The underlying bedrock can perch water and cause limitations to growth as a root restricting layer. These sites may be more vulnerable to tree tips. Loamy materials often have higher pH and available water capacity than sand.

## Associated sites

| | |
|---|---|
| F090AY014WI | **Loamy Bedrock Upland**<br>Loamy Bedrock Upland consist of loamy till, alluvium, or eolian deposits underlain by sandy to loamy residuum. Some sites may also contain sandy outwash or clayey pedisediment. Bedrock contact occurs within two meters of the surface. They have a seasonally high water table within one meter of the surface, though they don't remain saturated for extended periods of time. They are somewhat wetter and occur lower on the drainage sequence than Dry Loamy Bedrock Upland. |

## Similar sites

| | |
|---|---|
| F090AY021WI | **Dry Loamy Upland**<br>Dry Loamy Upland consist of deep sandy to loamy outwash, alluvium, or till. The water table is deeper than two meters year-round. They are found in similar landscape positions and share both drainage class and particle size with Dry Loamy Bedrock Upland but lack bedrock contact within two meters of the surface. |
| F090AY018WI | **Dry Sandy Bedrock Uplands**<br>Dry Sandy Bedrock Uplands consist sandy alluvium or outwash, sometimes underlain by sandy residuum. Contact with igneous or sandstone bedrock typically occurs within one meter of the surface. These soils show no evidence of a seasonally high water table. They are found in similar landscape positions and share bedrock contact and drainage class and with Dry Loamy Bedrock Upland but have coarser particle sizes. |

**Table 1. Dominant plant species**

| | |
|---|---|
| Tree | (1) *Acer saccharum*<br>(2) *Quercus rubra* |
| Shrub | (1) *Ostrya virginiana* |
| Herbaceous | (1) *Eurybia macrophylla*<br>(2) *Desmodium glutinosum* |

## Physiographic features

These sites formed on hills, till plains, and stream terraces. Slopes range from 0 to 50 percent. Sites are on summit, shoulder, and backslope positions.

These sites are not subject to ponding or flooding. They show no evidence of a seasonally high water table within 80 inches. Surface runoff is very low to high.

**Table 2. Representative physiographic features**

| | |
|---|---|
| Hillslope profile | (1) Summit<br>(2) Shoulder<br>(3) Backslope |
| Slope shape across | (1) Convex |
| Slope shape up-down | (1) Linear |
| Landforms | (1) Moraine<br>(2) Monadnock |
| Runoff class | Low to very high |
| Flooding frequency | None |
| Ponding frequency | None |
| Elevation | 215–275 m |
| Slope | 1–40% |
| Aspect | Aspect is not a significant factor |

## Climatic features

The climate of the expansive Wisconsin and Minnesota Thin Loess and Till Plain is highly variable. The eco-climatic zone (the “Tension Zone”) that runs southeast-northwest across the state splits the MLRA. In general, the MLRA has cold winters and warm summers with an adequate amount of precipitation. Near Lake Superior, precipitation and temperature tend to increase. The far western section of the MLRA, known as the western prairie ecological landscape by the Wisconsin DNR, has warmer temperatures compared to the rest of the MLRA because it falls below the eco-climatic zone. The soil moisture regime of MLRA is udic (humid climate). The soil temperature regime is frigid and cryic.

The average annual precipitation for this ecological site is 32 inches. The average annual snowfall is 50 inches. The annual average maximum and minimum temperatures are 52°F and 30°F, respectively.

**Table 3. Representative climatic features**

| | |
|---|---|
| Frost-free period (characteristic range) | 91-113 days |
| Freeze-free period (characteristic range) | 122-138 days |
| Precipitation total (characteristic range) | 737-813 mm |
| Frost-free period (actual range) | 45-116 days |
| Freeze-free period (actual range) | 89-146 days |

| | |
|---|---|
| Precipitation total (actual range) | 711-889 mm |
| Frost-free period (average) | 93 days |
| Freeze-free period (average) | 127 days |
| Precipitation total (average) | 787 mm |




**Figure 1. Monthly precipitation range**




**Figure 2. Monthly minimum temperature range**




**Figure 3. Monthly maximum temperature range**




**Figure 4. Monthly average minimum and maximum temperature**




**Figure 5. Annual precipitation pattern**




**Figure 6. Annual average temperature pattern**

## Climate stations used

- (1) HOLCOMBE [USC00473698], Holcombe, WI
- (2) ROSHOLT 9 NNE [USC00477349], Wittenberg, WI
- (3) STAMBAUGH 2SSE [USC00207812], Iron River, MI
- (4) BIG FALLS HYDRO [USC00470773], Glen Flora, WI
- (5) COUDERAY 7 W [USC00471847], Stone Lake, WI
- (6) ISLE 12N [USC00214103], Isle, MN
- (7) MILACA [USC00215392], Milaca, MN
- (8) LAKEWOOD 3 NE [USC00474523], Lakewood, WI
- (9) MINONG 5 WSW [USC00475525], Minong, WI
- (10) AMERY [USC00470175], Amery, WI
- (11) BRUNO 7ENE [USC00211074], Bruno, MN
- (12) AITKIN 2E [USC00210059], Aitkin, MN

## Influencing water features

Water is received through precipitation, runoff from adjacent uplands, and groundwater discharge. Water levels are greatly influenced by precipitation rates and runoff from upland sites. Water leaves the site primarily through runoff,

evapotranspiration, and groundwater recharge. Subsurface flow may occur where water perches on bedrock.

## Wetland description

Permeability of these sites is impermeable to moderately slow.
Hydrologic Group: C, D
Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification: None
Cowardin Wetland Classification: None

## Soil features

These sites are represented by the Haustrup and Ribhill soil series classified as a Humic Lithic Dystrudepts and Haplic Glossudalfs, respectively.

These soils formed in loess and till over basalt or quartzite bedrock. Soil depth ranges from shallow to deep. Bedrock occurs between 16 and 38 inches. Soils are somewhat excessively or excessively drained. Sites do not meet hydric soil requirements.

Surface textures of these sites are silt loam and moderately decomposed plant material. Subsurface texture is silt loam. Some horizons have cobbly or very cobbly modifiers. Soil pH ranges from very strongly acid to strongly acid with values of 4.4 to 5.3. Carbonates are absent within 80 inches.

**Figure 7. Ribhill soil series photograph courtesy of UWSP taken on 7/9/2019 in Rusk County, WI.**

**Table 4. Representative soil features**

| | |
|---|---|
| Parent material | (1) Eolian deposits<br>(2) Till<br>(3) Metamorphic rock |
| Surface texture | (1) Silt loam |
| Drainage class | Somewhat excessively drained to excessively drained |
| Permeability class | Very slow to moderately slow |
| Soil depth | 41–97 cm |
| Surface fragment cover <=3" | 0% |
| Surface fragment cover >3" | 0–2% |
| Available water capacity (0-154.9cm) | 3.71–5.05 cm |
| Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-100.1cm) | 0% |

| | |
|---|---|
| Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-100.1cm) | 4.4–5.3 |
| Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified) | 5–9% |
| Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified) | 0–26% |

## Ecological dynamics

Historically, this site was dominated by mesic hardwoods in a landscape adapted to fire disturbance that allowed for a strong presence of oaks. In pre-European settlement time wildfire was the main controlling factor of forest community dynamics. Following a severe, stand-replacing fire, any of the species present on the landscape could become established, depending on seed source availability and specific conditions of post-fire seedbed. The newly established young stands of any species were easily eliminated by recurring fires, but differences in fire-resisting properties among the species began to play a role in any species' survival success. Many pine and oak species were dominant in the region because of their fire-resistant properties and successful regeneration post-fire. With clear cutting and continued fire suppression, many of these species adapted to fire and intolerant of shade are replaced by other species. Species such as white pine and red oak are still common on the landscape based on their tolerance to some shade; these species to establish under a canopy, and in time, may become a component of the canopy. Mesic hardwoods are sensitive to fire, but in its absence, the have the ability to dominate sites based on their shade tolerance and prolific seed production.

Today, these forests most commonly include stands of sugar maple, and other mesic hardwoods. Some sites have a strong presence of red oak. These sites have the conditions to support shade tolerant mesic hardwoods, but these sites have dry soil moisture regime. Red oak can compete with the mesic hardwoods based on its ability to grow in drier soils. Historically, these sites had significant wind throw and fire disturbance that allowed for a strong presence of oak species. As long as fire is continually suppressed, maples and other mesic hardwoods will continue to dominate the canopy with oak as an associate.

## State and transition model

**Ecosystem states**




**T1A** - Major stand replacing disturbance e.g. blow-down and fire, or clear-cutting, followed by fire.

**T1B** - Removal of forest vegetation and tilling.

**R2A** - Time and natural succession.

**T2A** - Removal of forest cover and tilling for agricultural crop production.

**T3A** - Cessation of agricultural practices, natural, or artificial afforestation.

**State 1 submodel, plant communities**




**1.1A** - Natural mortality in the oldest age classes, sporadic small-scale blow-downs and ice storms, create openings for entry of mid-tolerant species, such as red oak and red maple.

**1.2A** - Time and natural succession.

**State 2 submodel, plant communities**




**2.1A** - Red oak and red maple regenerating under aspen -- paper birch canopy

**2.2A** - Time and natural succession.

**2.3A** - Major stand replacing disturbance e.g. blow-down and fire, or clear-cutting, followed by fire.

**State 3 submodel, plant communities**




## State 1
## Reference State

Reference state is a forest community dominated by sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*). Depending on history of disturbance, two community phases can be distinguished largely by differences in dominance of tree species and community age structure.

## Community 1.1
## Advanced Success Community Phase

**Figure 8. Photo courtesy of UWSP taken on 7/9/2019 in Rusk County, WI.**

In the absence of any major disturbance, specifically fire, this community is dominated by sugar maple. Common associates include other mesic hardwoods like white ash (*Fraxinus americana*), basswood (Tilia Americana), and on some sites may include red oak (*Quercus rubra*). Red oak requires some disturbance to create gaps for regeneration; with the absence of disturbance, they are less common in the canopy. The shrub layer is often dominated by ironwood (*Ostrya virginiana*) and maple saplings. The ground layer is dominated by pointed-leaf tick trefoil (*Desmodium glutinosum*), large-leaf aster (*Eurybia macrophylla*), and sedges (Carex, spp.).

**Dominant plant species**

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), tree
- white ash (*Fraxinus americana*), tree
- hornbeam (*Carpinus*), shrub
- bigleaf aster (*Eurybia macrophylla*), other herbaceous
- pointedleaf ticktrefoil (*Desmodium glutinosum*), other herbaceous

## Community 1.2
## Rejuvenated Phase

**Figure 9. Photo courtesy of UWSP taken on 7/9/2019 in Rusk County, WI.**

This community is often dominated by sugar maple and red oak. The shrub and ground layers are similar to the advanced succession phase, but may include the establishment of new seedlings.

**Dominant plant species**

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), tree
- hophornbeam (*Ostrya*), shrub
- black cherry (*Prunus serotina*), shrub
- Missouri gooseberry (*Ribes missouriense*), shrub
- bigleaf aster (*Eurybia macrophylla*), other herbaceous
- pointedleaf ticktrefoil (*Desmodium glutinosum*), other herbaceous

## Pathway 1.1A
## Community 1.1 to 1.2

**Advanced Success Community Phase**

**Rejuvenated Phase**

Light intensity fires, crown breakage from ice and snow, and small scale blow-downs create canopy openings, releasing advance regeneration and stimulating new seedling establishment. Some additional less shade tolerant species such as red oak may be able to enter the community.

## Pathway 1.2A
## Community 1.2 to 1.1

Rejuvenated Phase

Advanced Success Community Phase

A long period without major canopy disturbance allows gradual replacement of oldest canopy trees by younger cohorts. Lacking a major disturbance, the canopy will likely be replaced with sugar maple, but red oak can compete to maintain its place in the canopy. Small scale disturbances may still occur periodically, but once second or third canopies are established there is minimal new regeneration taking place and the forest gradually returns to mature state.

## State 2
## Early to Mid-Successional State

Following disturbances described in Transition T1A a wide range of forest community phases may come into temporary existence, the three most common ones are described here.

### Community 2.1
### Aspen-Birch Phase

These two species have a very narrow window of environmental and ecological conditions for successful establishment. The main requirements are exposed mineral soil and elimination—most effectively by fire—of on-site seed sources of potential competing vegetation. In addition, adequate soil moisture must be available for initial seedling development. Once seedlings are firmly established, height growth of both species is relatively rapid and able to outgrow most competitive species. Paper birch seedlings and saplings tolerate partial shade and often become members of mixed species communities. This is not true for aspen which requires continuous full-sun exposure for survival. Aspen stands are initially very dense due to sprouting from extensive lateral roots, but rapid natural thinning ensues as stems compete for available light.

#### Dominant plant species

- quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), tree
- paper birch (*Betula papyrifera*), tree

### Community 2.2
### Red Oak- Red Maple Phase

This community phase occurs by invading and succeeding a pioneer aspen-birch community. Stand structure consists of dominant red oak and red maple in combination with a modest, or strong presence of mature, or decaying, aspen and/or paper birch. The shrub layer, dominated by beaked hazelnut (*Corylus cornuta*), typically reaches its best development in this community phase.

#### Dominant plant species

- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), tree
- red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tree

### Community 2.3
### Red oak – Red maple/Sugar maple – Gooseberries/Large-leaf aster – Pointed-leaf tick trefoil

This community phase represents distinct transition into mid-successional state, by strong presence in second canopy, or in reproductive layers, of shade-tolerant species, sugar maple, basswood, white ash.

#### Dominant plant species

- northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), tree
- red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tree

- sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), tree
- Missouri gooseberry (*Ribes missouriense*), shrub
- bigleaf aster (*Eurybia macrophylla*), other herbaceous
- pointedleaf ticktrefoil (*Desmodium glutinosum*), other herbaceous

### Pathway 2.1A
### Community 2.1 to 2.2

Time and the immigration, establishment, and growth of red oak and red maple seedlings. These moderately shade tolerant species seed in beneath the aspen and birch and eventually outcompete these intolerant species.

### Pathway 2.2A
### Community 2.2 to 2.3

Time and natural succession. Red oak and red maple have succeeded the aspen-birch community. Depending on seed source, sugar maple begins growth and establishment in the understory.

### Pathway 2.3A
### Community 2.3 to 2.1

Clear cutting or stand-replacing fire that allows for the reinvasion of the aspen—birch community.

## State 3
## Agricultural State

Indefinite period of applying agricultural practices. Primary crops include row crops, hay, and pasture.

### Community 3.1
### Agricultural Phase

The agricultural phase consists of planted row crops, hay, or pasture.

### Transition T1A
### State 1 to 2

Clear cutting with initial control of competing vegetation, or stand-replacing fire, prepare the site for occupancy by shade intolerant species. This may occur through natural regeneration or by planting.

### Transition T1B
### State 1 to 3

Removal of forest cover, tilling and application of other agricultural techniques to grow agricultural crops.

### Restoration pathway R2A
### State 2 to 1

A period of some 70-100 years without major stand disturbance, especially fire, leads to decreased presence, through natural mortality, of early successional species and the dominance of moderately shade tolerant red maple and red oak and a sub-canopy of shade tolerant sugar maple, returning the community to Reference State.

### Transition T2A
### State 2 to 3

Removal of forest cover, tilling and application of other agricultural techniques to grow agricultural crops.

### Transition T3A

### State 3 to 2

Abandonment of agricultural practices and allowing natural vegetation to colonize the site or apply artificial afforestation. Whether re-vegetation or planting is allowed it is likely to require over 100 years to return to the reference state via the early to mid-successional state.

## Additional community tables

## Inventory data references

Plot and other supporting inventory data for site identification and community phases is located on a NRCS North Central Region shared and one drive folder. University Wisconsin-Stevens Point described soils, took photographs, and inventoried vegetation data at community phases within the reference state.

The data sources include WI ESD Plot Data Collection Form - Tier 2, Releve Method, NASIS pedon description, NRCS SOI 036, photographs, and Kotar Habitat Types.

Habitat Types of N. & S. Wisconsin (Kotar, 2002 & 1996): The sites of this ES keyed out to four habitat types: *Acer saccharum*/Hydrophyllum; Acer-Tilia/Caulophyllum-Laportea variant (ATiCa-La); *Acer saccharum*-Tsuga/Maianthemum (ATM); Pinus-Acer rubrum/Vaccinium-Aralia (PArVAa)

Biophysical Settings (Landfire, 2014): This ES is largely mapped as Laurentian-Acadian Northern Hardwoods Forest and Boreal White Spruce-Fir Forest

## Other references

Cleland, D.T.; Avers, P.E.; McNab, W.H.; Jensen, M.E.; Bailey, R.G., King, T.; Russell, W.E. 1997. National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units. Published in, Boyce, M. S.; Haney, A., ed. 1997. Ecosystem Management Applications for Sustainable Forest and Wildlife Resources. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. pp. 181-200.

County Soil Surveys from St. Croix, Polk, Barron, Rusk, Chippewa, Clark, Marathon, Taylor, Price, Sawyer, Burnett, Washburn, Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Lincoln, Oneida, Langlade, Shawano, Menominee, Forest, Florence, Marinette, and Pierce Counties.

Curtis, J.T. 1959. Vegetation of Wisconsin: an ordination of plant communities. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. 657 pp.

Davis, R.B. 2016. Bogs and Fens, A Guide to the Peatland Plants of Northeastern United States and Adjacent Canada. University Press of New England, Hanover and London. 296 pp.

Finley, R. 1976. Original vegetation of Wisconsin. Map compiled from U.S. General Land Office notes. U.S. Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Hvizdak, David. Personal knowledge and field experience.

Jahnke, J. and Gienccke, A. 2002. MLRA 92 Clay Till Field Investigations. Summary of field day investigations by Region 10 Soil Data Quality Specialists.

Kotar, J. 1986. Soil – Habitat Type relationships in Michigan and Wisconsin. J. For. and Water Cons. 41(5): 348-350.

Kotar, J., J.A. Kovach and G. Brand. 1999. Analysis of the 1996 Wisconsin Forest Statistics by Habitat Type. U.S.D.A. For. Serv. N.C. Res. Stn. Gen. Tech. Rept. NC-207.

Kotar, J., J. A. Kovach, and T. L. Burger. 2002. A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Northern Wisconsin. Second edition. University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Madison.

Kotar, J., and T. L. Burger. 2017. Wetland Forest Habitat Type Classification System for Northern Wisconsin: A Guide for Land Managers and landowners. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, PUB-FR-627 2017, Madison.

Martin, L. 1965. The physical geography of Wisconsin. Third edition. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

McNab, W.H. and P.W. Avers. 1994. Ecological Subregions of the United States: Section Descriptions. USDA For. Serv. Pun. WO-WSA-5, Washington, D.C.

NatureServe. 2018. International Ecological Classification Satandard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NautreServe Centreal Databases. Arlington, VA. U.S.A. Data current as of 28 August 2018.

Radeloff, V.C., D.J. Mladenoff, H.S. He and M.S. Boyce. 1999. Forest landscape change in Northwestern Wisconsin Pine Barrens from pre-European settlement to the present. Can. J. For. Res. 29: 1649-1659.

Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2001. The original U.S. public land survey records: their use and limitations in reconstructing pre-European settlement vegetation. Journal of Forestry 99:5–10.

Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2005. Severe wind and fire regimes in northern forests: historical variability at the regional scale. Ecology 86(2):431–445.

Soil Survey Staff. Input based on personal experience. Tim Miland, Scott Eversoll, Ryan Bevernitz, and Jason Nemecek.

Stearns, F. W. 1949. Ninety years change in a northern hardwood forest in Wisconsin. Ecology, 30: 350-58.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1989. Proceedings – Land Classification Based on Vegetation: Applications for Management. Gen. Tech. Report INT-527.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1990. Silvics of North America, Vol. 1, Hardwoods. Agricultural Handbook 654, Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1990. Silvics of North America, Vol. 2, Conifers. Agricultural Handbook 654, Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2022. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Handbook 296.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2008. Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification System: An Overview and Modification to Better Meet the Needs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Technical Note No. 190-8-76. Washington D.C.

Wilde, S.A. 1933. The relation of soil and forest vegetation of the Lake States Region. Ecology 14: 94-105.

Wilde, S.A. 1976. Woodlands of Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension, Pub. G2780, 150 pp.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 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.

## Contributors

Bryant Scharenbroch, Assistant Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point
Jacob Prater, Associate Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point
John Kotar, Ecological Specialist, independent contractor

## Approval

Suzanne Mayne-Kinney, 10/02/2023

## Acknowledgments

NRCS contracted UWSP to write ecological sites in MLRA 90A, completed in 2021.

## 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 | 05/12/2025 |
| Approved by | Suzanne Mayne-Kinney |
| 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:**