

# Ecological site R023XF092CA CLAY FLOODPLAIN 9-16"

Last updated: 4/10/2025

Accessed: 09/21/2026

## 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.

## Ecological site concept

Currently there is only a draft of the initial concept for this ecological site. The initial concept for this site places it within the Seasonally Flooded Closed Clay Basins Ecological Site Group. To view the General STM and other information available for this ESG please go to <https://edit.jornada.nmsu.edu/catalogs/esg/023X/R023XY912NV> This California ecological site correlates most closely to the Clay Basin (023XY003NV) site in Nevada. It is more productive than the group modal with an average of 1100 lb/ac in normal years. Like the Clay Basin site, the Clay Floodplain may stand alone or may surround the wetter Wet Clay Basin site that is more frequently flooded. This site is also dominated by Nevada bluegrass but can see an increase in silver sagebrush with long-term drought or long-term inappropriate grazing management.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

|            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| Tree       | Not specified |
| Shrub      | Not specified |
| Herbaceous | Not specified |

## Physiographic features

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

## Climatic features

## Influencing water features

## Soil features

## Ecological dynamics

## State and transition model

## Additional community tables

## Other references

## Contributors

T Stringham (UNR under contract with BLM)

## Approval

Kendra Moseley, 4/10/2025

## 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                                        | 09/21/2026        |
| Approved by                                 |                   |
| 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:**

---