

## **Ecological site R108XB015IL Wet Loamy Outwash Prairie**

Last updated: 11/05/2024  
Accessed: 05/11/2025

---

### **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): 108X—Illinois and Iowa Deep Loess and Drift

The Illinois and Iowa Deep Loess and Drift, East-Central Part (MLRA 108B) includes the Rock River Hill Country, Grand Prairie, and Western Forest-Prairie physiographic divisions (Schewman et al. 1973). It falls entirely in one state (Illinois), encompassing approximately 7,450 square miles (Figure 1). The elevation ranges from approximately 985 feet above sea level (ASL) in the northern and western parts to 660 feet ASL in south and west. Local relief is mainly 3 to 10 feet on the broad, upland flats and about 160 feet along the major streams and dissected drainageways. Wisconsin-aged loess forms a moderately thin to thick layer across the entire area with Illinoian glacial drift below. Bedrock lies beneath the glacial material with Pennsylvania shales, siltstones, and limestones in the south and west and Ordovician and Silurian limestone in the extreme north. This bedrock can be exposed on bluffs along the major rivers (USDA-NRCS 2006).

The vegetation in the MLRA has undergone drastic changes over time. At the end of the last glacial episode – the Wisconsin glacial episode – the evolution of vegetation began with the development of tundra habitats, followed by a phase of spruce and fir forests, and eventually spruce-pine forests. Not until approximately 9,000 years ago did the climate undergo a warming trend which prompted the development of deciduous forests dominated by oak and hickory. As the climate continued to warm and dry, prairies began to develop approximately 8,300 years ago. Another shift in climate that resulted in an increase in moisture prompted the emergence of savanna-like habitats from 8,000 to 5,000 years before present. Moisture continued to increase in the southernmost region 5,000 years ago, resulting in an increase of forested systems (Taft et al. 2009). 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), Central Till Plains-Oak Hickory Section (223G), Central Dissected Till Plains (251C), and Central Till Plains and Grand Prairies (251D) Sections; Rock River Old Drift Country (222Kh), Effingham Plain (222Ga), Mississippi River and Illinois Alluvial Plains (251 Cf), East Mississippi River Hills (251Ci), Galesburg Dissected Till Plain (251Cj), Carlinville Dissected Till Plain (251Ck), Green River Lowland (251Da), Western Grand Prairie (251Db), Northern Grand Prairie (251Dc), Southern Grand Prairie (251De), and Springfield Plains (251Df) Subsections (Cleland et al. 2007)

U.S. EPA Level IV Ecoregion: Illinois/Indiana Prairies (54a), Sand Area (54d), Rock River Hills (54g), and Western Dissected Illinoian Till Plain (72i) (USEPA 2013)

National Vegetation Classification – Ecological Systems: Eastern Great Plains Wet Meadow, Prairie and Marsh (CES205.687) (NatureServe 2018)

National Vegetation Classification – Plant Associations: *Spartina pectinata* – *Carex* spp. – *Calamagrostis canadensis* Sand Wet Meadow (CEGL005178) (Nature Serve 2018)

Illinois Natural Areas Inventory: Wet sand prairie (White and Madany 1978)

Ecological site concept

Wet Loamy Outwash Prairies are located within the blue areas on the map (Figure 1). They occur on outwash plains. The soils are Alfisols and Mollisols that are very poorly to somewhat poorly-drained and deep, formed in outwash. Sites can experience periodic ponding that can last up to seven days.

The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by herbaceous vegetation adapted to temporary ponding and saturated soil conditions. Prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata* Bosc ex Link) and bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis* L.) are the dominant species on the site, but various sedges are present as well. A species characteristic of an undisturbed plant community associated with this ecological site includes eastern marsh fern (*Thelypteris palustris* Schott) (White and Madany 1978; Taft et al. 1997). Fire is the primary disturbance regime that maintains the structure of this ecological site, while saturated soil conditions and herbivory are secondary factors (LANDFIRE 2009).

Associated sites

R108XB013IL	<b>Loamy Outwash Prairie</b> Loess over outwash or eolian sand parent material that is not shallow to the water table including Coyne, Jasper, Pillot, Waukee, and Waukegan soils
R108XB016IL	<b>Sand Prairie</b> Sandy eolian deposit parent material including Dickinson soils

Similar sites


R108XB018IL	<b>Wet Lacustrine Prairie</b> Wet Lacustrine Prairies are in a similar landscape position, but the parent material is lacustrine sediments
-------------	---

Table 1. Dominant plant species


Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Spartina pectinata</i> (2) <i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>

Physiographic features

Wet Loamy Outwash Prairies occur on outwash plains (Figure 2). They are situated on elevations ranging from approximately 361 to 1401 feet ASL. The site can experience ponding that can last up to seven days (Table 1).



**Figure 1.** Figure 1. Location of Wet Loamy Outwash Prairie ecological site within MLRA 108B.



**Figure 2.** Figure 2. Representative block diagram of Wet Loamy Outwash Prairie and associated ecological sites.

**Table 2. Representative physiographic features**

Slope shape across	(1) Linear (2) Concave
Slope shape up-down	(1) Linear (2) Concave
Landforms	(1) Outwash plain
Runoff class	Negligible to low
Ponding duration	Brief (2 to 7 days)
Ponding frequency	None to frequent
Elevation	361–1,401 ft
Slope	0–2%
Ponding depth	0–6 in
Water table depth	6–18 in
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

### Climatic features

The Illinois and Iowa Deep Loess and Drift, East-Central Part falls into the hot-summer humid continental climate (Dfa) and the humid subtropical continental climate (Cfa) 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 108B 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 178 days, while the frost-free period is about 141 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 approximately 36 inches, which includes rainfall plus the water equivalent from snowfall (Table 3). The average annual low and high temperatures are 40 and 60°F, respectively.

Climate data and analyses are derived from 30-year averages gathered from three National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) weather stations contained within the range of this ecological site (Table 4).

Table 3. Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	133-151 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	173-183 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	35-37 in
Frost-free period (actual range)	126-152 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	169-185 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	35-38 in
Frost-free period (average)	141 days
Freeze-free period (average)	178 days
Precipitation total (average)	36 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) GENESEO [USC00113384], Geneseo, IL
- (2) ROCHELLE [USC00117354], Rochelle, IL
- (3) MASON CITY 2N [USC00115413], Mason City, IL

## Influencing water features

Wet Loamy Outwash Prairies are classified as a MINERAL SOIL FLATS: saturated, recharge, herbaceous wetland under the Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classification system (Smith et al. 1995; USDA-NRCS 2008) and as a Palustrine, Persistent Emergent, Seasonally Saturated wetland under the National Wetlands Inventory (FGDC 2013). Precipitation is the main source of water for this ecological site (Smith et al. 1995). Infiltration is very slow to moderate (Hydrologic Groups D and B) for undrained soils, and surface runoff is negligible to low (Figure 5).

Primary wetland hydrology indicators for an intact Wet Loamy Outwash Prairie may include: A2 High water table and A3 Saturation. Secondary wetland hydrology indicators may include: C2 Dry-season water table and D5 FAC-neutral test (USACE 2010).



**Figure 9. Figure 5. Hydrologic cycling in Wet Loamy Outwash Prairie ecological site.**

## Soil features

Soils of Wet Loamy Outwash Prairies are in the Alfisols and Mollisols orders, further classified as Aquollic Hapludalfs, Aquic Hapludolls, Mollic Endoaqualfs, and Typic Endoaquolls with very slow to moderate infiltration and negligible to low runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Binghampton, Clyde, Lawler, Hooppole, Marshan, and Orio. The parent material is outwash, and the soils are very poorly to somewhat poorly-drained and deep. Some mapunits have a high-water table. Soil pH classes are very strongly acid to moderately alkaline. No rooting restrictions are noted for the soils of this ecological site (Table 5).

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




Figure 10. Figure 6. Profile sketches of soil series associated with Wet Loamy Outwash Prairie.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Outwash
Family particle size	(1) Fine-loamy (2) Fine-loamy over sandy or sandy-skeletal
Drainage class	Poorly drained to somewhat poorly drained
Permeability class	Slow to moderate
Depth to restrictive layer	80 in
Soil depth	80 in

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. The heterogeneous topography of the area results in variable microclimates and fuel matrices that in support prairies, savannas, and forests. Wet Loamy Outwash Prairies form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on outwash plains on very poorly to somewhat poorly-drained soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation.

Fire is a critical disturbance factor that maintains Wet Loamy Outwash Prairies. Fire intensity typically consisted of periodic, low-intensity surface fires occurring every 2 to 5 years (LANDFIRE 2009). Ignition sources included summertime lightning strikes from convective storms and bimodal, human ignitions during the spring and fall seasons. Native Americans regularly set fires to improve sight lines for hunting, driving large game, improving grazing and browsing habitat, agricultural clearing, and enhancing vital ethnobotanical plants (Barrett 1980).


Saturated soil conditions and herbivory by native ungulates have also played a role in shaping this ecological site. The high soil moisture conditions in conjunction with occasional ponding have favored the proliferation of plant species tolerant of such conditions. The high-water tables prevent woody species from establishing, thus maintaining the prairie structure. Grazing also likely contributed to woody species reduction (LANDFIRE 2009). When coupled with fire, saturated soils and herbivory can further delay the establishment of woody vegetation (Pyne et al. 1996).

Today, Wet Loamy Outwash Prairies have been greatly reduced as most areas have been converted to agricultural production. Corn (*Zea mays* L.) and soybeans (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) are the dominant crops grown, but small patches of forage land may be present. Remnants that do exist show evidence of indirect anthropogenic influences from fire suppression, subsurface drainage, and non-native species invasion. A return to the historic plant community may not be possible following extensive land modification, but long-term conservation agriculture or prairie reconstruction efforts can help to restore some biotic diversity and ecological function. The state-and-transition model that follows provides a detailed description of each state, community phase, pathway, and transition. This model is based on available experimental research, field observations, literature reviews, professional consensus, and interpretations.

## **State and transition model**



## R108BY015IL WET LOAMY OUTWASH PRAIRIE



Code	Process
T1A, T3A, T4A, T5A	Long-term fire suppression, hydrologic alterations, and/or land abandonment
2.1A	Continued fire suppression in excess of 20 years
2.2A	Single large disturbance event
T1B, T2A, T4B, T5B	Cultural treatments are implemented to increase forage quality and yield
3.1A	Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock and continuous grazing
3.1B	Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock and rest-rotational grazing
3.2A, 3.3B	Domestic livestock grazing is replaced by mechanical harvesting
3.2B	Implementation of rest-rotational grazing
3.3A	Implementation of continuous grazing
T1C, T2B, T3B, 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, R3A, 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 wet tallgrass prairie community, dominated by hydrophytic herbaceous vegetation. The one community phase within the reference state is dependent on periodic fire. The

intensity and frequency alter species composition, cover, and extent, while regular fire intervals keep woody species from dominating. Soil saturation and native mammal grazing have more localized impacts in the reference phases, but do contribute to overall species composition, diversity, cover, and productivity.

#### **Dominant plant species**

- prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), other herbaceous
- bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis*), other herbaceous

### **Community 1.1**

#### **Prairie Cordgrass – Bluejoint**

Prairie Cordgrass – Bluejoint – Sites in this reference community phase are dominated by a mix of hydrophytic grasses, sedges, and forbs. Vegetative cover is continuous (95 to 100 percent) and plants can reach heights between 3 and 6 feet tall (NatureServe 2018). Prairie cordgrass, bluejoint, and various sedges are the dominant monocots on the site. Characteristic forbs can include common boneset (*Eupatorium perfoliatum* L.), Virginia iris (*Iris virginica* L.), and hemlock waterparsnip (*Sium suave* Walter) (NatureServe 2018). Replacement fires every 2 to 5 years characterize the fire regime, maintaining this reference plant community (LANDFIRE 2009).

#### **Dominant plant species**

- prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), other herbaceous
- bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis*), other herbaceous

### **State 2**

#### **Degraded Wet Prairie State**

Long-term fire suppression and landscape hydrologic alterations can transition the reference wet tallgrass prairie community into a woody-invaded state. This state is evidenced by a well-developed shrub layer and sparse trees (LANDFIRE 2009). Proximity to lands that have been altered provide opportunities for non-native invasive species to readily colonize this state, thereby reducing the native biodiversity and changing the vegetative community.

#### **Dominant plant species**

- green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), tree
- silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*), tree
- silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), tree
- prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), other herbaceous
- reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), other herbaceous

### **Community 2.1**

#### **Green Ash – Silky Dogwood/Prairie Cordgrass – Reed Canarygrass**

Green Ash – Silky Dogwood/Prairie Cordgrass – Reed Canarygrass – This community phase represents the early stages of long-term fire-suppression. In as little as six fire-free years, the prairie can be disrupted and succeeded by woody shrubs. Native trees – e.g., green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica* Marshall), silver maple (*Acer saccharinum* L.), elm (*Ulmus* L.) – and shrubs – e.g. silky dogwood (*Cornus obliqua* Raf.) – can form dense thickets with cover reaching up to 30 percent and plant heights as tall as 9 feet (LANDFIRE 2009). Some native prairie plants will persist, but non-native herbaceous species, including reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.), smooth brome (*Bromus inermis* Leyss.), Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis* L.), and redtop (*Agrostis gigantea* Roth) can begin to encroach from adjacent, disturbed sites.

#### **Dominant plant species**

- green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), tree
- silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*), tree
- prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), other herbaceous
- reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), other herbaceous

## **Community 2.2**

### **Green Ash – Silver Maple/Silky Dogwood/Reed Canarygrass**

Green Ash – Silver Maple/Silky Dogwood/Reed Canarygrass– Sites falling into this community phase have a well-established shrub layer, and scattered trees begin to develop in the continued absence of fire and reduced water table.

#### **Dominant plant species**

- green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), tree
- silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), tree
- silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*), tree
- reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), other herbaceous

## **Pathway 2.1A**

### **Community 2.1 to 2.2**

Continued fire suppression in excess of 20 years

## **Pathway 2.2A**

### **Community 2.2 to 2.1**

Single large disturbance event

## **State 3**

### **Forage State**

The forage state occurs when the reference state is converted to a farming system that emphasizes domestic livestock production known as grassland agriculture. Fire suppression, periodic cultural treatments (e.g., clipping, drainage, soil amendment applications, planting new species and/or cultivars, mechanical harvesting) and grazing by domesticated livestock transition and maintain this state (USDA-NRCS 2003). Early settlers seeded non-native species, such as smooth brome (*Bromus inermis* Leyss.) and Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis* L.), to help extend the grazing season. Over time, as lands were continuously harvested or grazed by herds of cattle, the non-native species were able to spread and expand across the landscape, reducing the native species diversity and ecological function.

## **Community 3.1**

### **Hayfield**

Hayfield – Sites in this community phase consist of forage plants that are planted and mechanically harvested. Mechanical harvesting removes much of the aboveground biomass and nutrients that feed the soil microorganisms (Franzluebbers et al. 2000; USDA-NRCS 2003). As a result, soil biology is reduced leading to decreases in nutrient uptake by plants, soil organic matter, and soil aggregation. Frequent biomass removal can also reduce the site's carbon sequestration capacity (Skinner 2008).

## **Community 3.2**

### **Continuous Pastured Grazing System**

Continuous Pastured Grazing System – This community phase is characterized by continuous grazing where domestic livestock graze a pasture for the entire season. Depending on stocking density, this can result in lower forage quality and productivity, weed invasions, and uneven pasture use. Continuous grazing can also increase the amount of bare ground and erosion and reduce soil organic matter, cation exchange capacity, water-holding capacity, and nutrient availability and retention (Bharati et al. 2002; Leake et al. 2004; Teague et al. 2011). Smooth brome, Kentucky bluegrass, and white clover (*Trifolium repens* L.) are common pasture species used in this phase. Their tolerance to continuous grazing has allowed these species to dominate, sometimes completely excluding the native vegetation.

## **Community 3.3**

### **Rest-Rotation Pastured Grazing System**

Rest-Rotation Pastured Grazing System – This community phase is characterized by rotational grazing where the pasture has been subdivided into several smaller paddocks. Through the development of a grazing plan, livestock utilize one or a few paddocks, while the remaining area is rested allowing plants to restore vigor and energy reserves, deepen root systems, develop seeds, as well as allow seedling establishment (Undersander et al. 2002; USDA-NRCS 2003). Rest-rotation pastured grazing systems include deferred rotation, rest rotation, high intensity – low frequency, and short duration methods. Vegetation is generally more diverse and can include orchardgrass (*Dactylis glomerata* L.), timothy (*Phleum pratense* L.), red clover (*Trifolium pratense* L.), and alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.). The addition of native prairie species can further bolster plant diversity and, in turn, soil function. This community phase promotes numerous ecosystem benefits including increasing biodiversity, preventing soil erosion, maintaining and enhancing soil quality, sequestering atmospheric carbon, and improving water yield and quality (USDA-NRCS 2003).

#### **Pathway 3.1A**

##### **Community 3.1 to 3.2**

Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock and continuous grazing

#### **Pathway 3.1B**

##### **Community 3.1 to 3.3**

Mechanical harvesting is replaced with domestic livestock and rest-rotational grazing

#### **Pathway 3.2A**

##### **Community 3.2 to 3.1**

Domestic livestock grazing is replaced by mechanical harvesting

#### **Pathway 3.2B**

##### **Community 3.2 to 3.3**

Implementation of rest-rotational grazing

#### **Pathway 3.3B**

##### **Community 3.3 to 3.1**

Domestic livestock grazing is replaced by mechanical harvesting

#### **Pathway 3.3A**

##### **Community 3.3 to 3.2**

Implementation of continuous grazing

## **State 4**

### **Cropland State**

The continuous use of tillage, row-crop planting, and chemicals (i.e., herbicides, fertilizers, etc.) and subsurface tile drainage have 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 oats (*Avena* 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**

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**

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**

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**

Less tillage, residue management

### **Pathway 4.1B**

#### **Community 4.1 to 4.3**

Less tillage, residue management and implementation of cover cropping

### **Pathway 4.2A**

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

Intensive tillage, remove residue and reinitialize monoculture row cropping

### **Pathway 4.2B**

#### **Community 4.2 to 4.3**

Implementation of cover cropping

## **Pathway 4.3B**

### **Community 4.3 to 4.1**

Intensive tillage, remove residue and reinitialize monoculture row cropping

## **Pathway 4.3A**

### **Community 4.3 to 4.2**

Remove cover cropping

## **State 5**

### **Reconstructed Wet Prairie State**

Prairie reconstructions have become an important tool for repairing natural ecological functions and conserving biodiversity. Because the historic plant and soil biota communities of the tallgrass prairie were highly diverse with complex interrelationships, historic prairie replication cannot be guaranteed on landscapes that have been so extensively manipulated for extended timeframes (Kardol and Wardle 2010; Fierer et al. 2013). Therefore, ecological restoration should aim to aid the recovery of degraded, damaged, or destroyed ecosystems. A successful restoration will have the ability to structurally and functionally sustain itself, demonstrate resilience to the natural ranges of stress and disturbance, and create and maintain positive biotic and abiotic interactions (SER 2002). The reconstructed wet prairie state is the result of a long-term commitment involving a multi-step, adaptive management process that includes hydrologic restoration. Diverse, species-rich seed mixes are important to utilize as they allow the site to undergo successional stages that exhibit changing composition and dominance over time (Smith et al. 2010). On-going management via prescribed fire and/or light grazing can help the site progress from an early successional community dominated by annuals and some weeds to a later seral stage composed of native, perennial grasses, forbs, and a few shrubs. Establishing a prescribed fire regimen that mimics natural disturbance patterns can increase native species cover and diversity while reducing cover of non-native forbs and grasses. Light grazing alone can help promote species richness, while grazing accompanied with fire can control the encroachment of woody vegetation (Brudvig et al. 2007).

## **Community 5.1**

### **Early Successional Reconstructed Wet Prairie**

Early Successional Reconstructed Wet Prairie – This community phase represents the early community assembly from prairie reconstruction and is highly dependent on hydroperiod repair, a diverse seed mix, and the timing and priority of planting operations. The seed mix should look to include a diverse mix of cool-season and warm-season annual and perennial grasses and forbs typical of the reference state (e.g., big bluestem, switchgrass, prairie cordgrass, New England aster). Cool-season annuals can help provide litter that promotes cool, moist soil conditions to the benefit of the other species in the seed mix. The first season following site preparation and seeding will typically result in annuals and other volunteer species forming a majority of the vegetative cover. Control of non-native species, particularly perennial species, is crucial at this point to ensure they do not establish before the native vegetation (Martin and Wilsey 2012). After the first season, native warm-season grasses should begin to become more prominent on the landscape.

## **Community 5.2**

### **Late Successional Reconstructed Wet Prairie**

Late Successional Reconstructed Wet Prairie – Appropriately timed disturbance regimes (e.g., prescribed fire) applied to the early successional community phase can help increase the beta diversity, pushing the site into a late successional community phase over time. While prairie communities are dominated by grasses, these species can suppress forb establishment and reduce overall diversity and ecological function (Martin and Wilsey 2006; Williams et al. 2007). Reducing accumulated plant litter from perennial bunchgrasses allows more light and nutrients to become available for forb recruitment, allowing greater ecosystem complexity (Wilsey 2008).

## **Pathway 5.1A**

### **Community 5.1 to 5.2**

Invasive species control and implementation of disturbance regimes

**Pathway 5.2A**  
**Community 5.2 to 5.1**

Drought or improper timing/use of management actions

**Transition T1A**  
**State 1 to 2**

Long-term fire suppression, hydrologic alterations, and/or land abandonment

**Transition T1B**  
**State 1 to 3**

Cultural treatments are implemented to increase forage quality and yield

**Transition T1C**  
**State 1 to 4**

Agricultural conversion via tillage, seeding and non-selective herbicides

**Transition T2A**  
**State 2 to 3**

Cultural treatments are implemented to increase forage quality and yield

**Transition T2B**  
**State 2 to 4**

Agricultural conversion via tillage, seeding and non-selective herbicides

**Transition R2A**  
**State 2 to 5**

Site preparation, non-native species control and native seeding

**Restoration pathway T3A**  
**State 3 to 2**

Long-term fire suppression, hydrologic alterations, and/or land abandonment

**Transition T3B**  
**State 3 to 4**

Agricultural conversion via tillage, seeding and non-selective herbicide

**Transition R3A**  
**State 3 to 5**

Site preparation, non-native species control and native seeding

**Restoration pathway T4A**  
**State 4 to 2**

Long-term fire suppression, hydrologic alterations, and/or land abandonment

## **Restoration pathway T4B**

### **State 4 to 3**

Cultural treatments are implemented to increase forage quality and yield

## **Transition R4A**

### **State 4 to 5**

Site preparation, non-native species control and native seeding

## **Restoration pathway T5A**

### **State 5 to 2**

Long-term fire suppression, hydrologic alterations, and/or land abandonment

## **Restoration pathway T5B**

### **State 5 to 3**

Cultural treatments are implemented to increase forage quality and yield

## **Restoration pathway T5C**

### **State 5 to 4**

Agricultural conversion via tillage, seeding, and non-selective herbicides

## **Additional community tables**

### **Inventory data references**

No field plots have been developed 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.

Barrett, S.W. 1980. Indians and fire. *Western Wildlands Spring*: 17-20.

Bharati, L., K.-H. Lee, T.M. Isenhardt, and R.C. Schultz. 2002. Soil-water infiltration under crops, pasture, and established riparian buffer in Midwestern USA. *Agroforestry Systems* 56: 249-257.

Brudvig, L.A., C.M. Mabry, J.R. Miller, and T.A. Walker. 2007. Evaluation of central North American prairie management based on species diversity, life form, and individual species metrics. *Conservation Biology* 21:864-874.

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.

Brudvig, L.A., C.M. Mabry, J.R. Miller, and T.A. Walker. 2007. Evaluation of central North American prairie management based on species diversity, life form, and individual species metrics. *Conservation Biology* 21:864-874.

Franzluebbers, A.J., J.A. Stuedemann, H.H. Schomberg, and S.R. Wilkinson. 2000. Soil organic C and N pools under long-term pasture management in the Southern Piedmont USA. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 32:469-478.

Kardol, P. and D.A. Wardle. 2010. How understanding aboveground-belowground linkages can assist restoration ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 25: 670-679.

. 2009. Biophysical Setting 4914880 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.

Martin, L.M. and B.J. Wilsey. 2006. Assessing grassland restoration success: relative roles of seed additions and native ungulate activities. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 43: 1098-1110.

Martin, L.M. and B.J. Wilsey. 2012. Assembly history alters alpha and beta diversity, exotic-native proportions and functioning of restored prairie plant communities. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 49: 1436-1445.

NatureServe. 2018. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1 NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available at <http://explorer.natureserve.org>. (Accessed 21 February 2019).

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.

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.

Skinner, R.H. 2008. High biomass removal limits carbon sequestration potential of mature temperate pastures. *Journal for Environmental Quality* 37: 1319-1326.

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.

Teague, W.R., S.L. Dowhower, S.A. Baker, N. Haile, P.B. DeLaune, and D.M. Conover. 2011. Grazing management impacts on vegetation, soil biota and soil chemical, physical and hydrological properties in tall grass prairie. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 141: 310-322.

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.

Undersander, D., B. Albert, D. Cosgrove, D. Johnson, and P. Peterson. 2002. Pastures for Profit: A Guide to Rotational Grazing (A3529). University of Wisconsin-Extension and University of Minnesota Extension Service. 43

pps.

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 Resources Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2003. National Range and Pasture Handbook, Revision 1. Grazing Lands Technology Institute. 214 pps.

United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. 682 pps.

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).

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.

Williams, D.A., L.L. Jackson, and D.D. Smith. 2007. Effects of frequent mowing on survival and persistence of forbs seeded into a species-poor grassland. *Restoration Ecology* 15: 24-33.

Wilsey, B.J. 2008. Productivity and subordinate species response to dominant grass species and seed source during restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 18: 628-637.

## **Contributors**

Lisa Kluesner  
Rick Francen

## **Approval**

Suzanne Mayne-Kinney, 11/05/2024

## **Acknowledgments**

This project could not have been completed without the dedication and commitment from a variety of staff members (Table 6). 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.

Natural Resources Conservation Service :  
Scott Brady, Acting Regional Ecological Site Specialist, Havre, MT  
Stacey Clark, Regional Ecological Site Specialist, St. Paul, MN  
Tonie Endres, Senior Regional Soil Scientist, Indianapolis, IN  
Rick Francen, Soil Scientist, Springfield, IL  
John Hammerly, Soil Data Quality Specialist, Indianapolis, IN  
Frank Heisner, Resource Soil Scientist, Morrison, IL  
Lisa Kluesner, Ecological Site Specialist, Waverly, IA  
Kevin Norwood, Soil Survey Regional Director, Indianapolis, IN  
Bob Tegeler, MLRA Soil Survey Leader, Springfield, IL

This site was originally approved by Chris Tecklenburg, 5/27/2020.

## 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	07/02/2024
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:**
-