

Ecological site R025XY065OR

SHRUBBY LOAM

13-16 PZ

Last updated: 4/25/2024
Accessed: 08/22/2026

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.

MLRA notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 025X–Owyhee High Plateau

The Owyhee High Plateau, MLRA 25, lies within the Intermontane Plateaus physiographic province. The southern half is found in the Great Basin while the northern half is located in the Columbia Plateaus. The southern section of the Owyhee High Plateau is characterized by isolated, uplifted fault-block mountain ranges separated by narrow, aggraded desert plains. This geologically older terrain has been dissected by numerous streams draining to the Humboldt River. The northern section forms the southern boundary of the extensive Columbia Plateau basalt flows. Deep, narrow canyons drain to the Snake River across the broad volcanic plain. This MLRA is characteristically cooler and wetter than the neighboring MLRAs of the Great Basin. Elevation ranges from 3,000 to 7,550 feet on rolling plateaus and in gently sloping basins. It is more than 9,840 feet on some steep mountains. The average annual precipitation in most of this area is typically 11 to 22 inches. It increases to as much as 49 inches at the higher elevations. Precipitation occurs mainly as snow in winter. The supply of water from precipitation and streamflow is small and unreliable, except along major rivers. Streamflow depends largely on accumulated snow in the mountains. The dominant soil orders in this MLRA are Aridisols and Mollisols. The soils in the area dominantly have a mesic or frigid temperature regime and an aridic, arid bordering on xeric, or xeric moisture regime. Most of the soils formed in mixed parent material. Volcanic ash and loess mantle the landscape. Surface soil textures are loam and silt loam, and have ashy texture modifiers in some cases. Argillic horizons occur on the more stable landforms.

Ecological site concept

This ecological site is on plateaus and broad tablelands associated with volcanic plateau landscapes. Elevations range from 4,500 to 6,500 feet and slopes range from 2 to 15 percent. The soils associated with this site are moderately deep or deep to lithic or paralithic bedrock. The soil climate is frigid (soil temperature regime) and xeric (soil moisture regime). The reference plant community is characterized by bitterbrush and mountain big sagebrush in the overstory and Idaho fescue is dominant in the understory, bluebunch wheatgrass is also common in the understory.

Associated sites

R025XY018OR	SHALLOW CLAYPAN 13-16 PZ
R025XY063OR	SKELETAL CLAYPAN 11+ PZ
R025XY064OR	SHRUBBY SHALLOW CLAYPAN 13-16 PZ

Similar sites

R025XY011ID	LOAMY 13-16 Lower production
R025XY014OR	LOAMY 13-16 PZ Bedrock is less fractured; possibly different geologies. More likely to occur on lithic than paralithic soils.
R025XY066OR	SHRUBBY LOAM 11-13 PZ Warmer and drier (mesic, aridic bordering on xeric); lower production; species composition is dominated by bitterbrush and basin big sagebrush with a mix of bluebunch wheatgrass and Idaho fescue in the understory.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	(1) <i>Purshia tridentata</i> (2) <i>Artemisia tridentata subsp. vaseyana</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Festuca idahoensis</i> (2) <i>Pseudoroegneria spicata subsp. spicata</i>

Physiographic features

This site is on tablelands and plateaus. Slopes range from 2 to 15%. Elevation varies from 4,500 to 6,000 feet.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Plateau > Mountain (2) Tableland > Plateau (3) Mountains > Plateau
Runoff class	High to very high
Elevation	1,370 – 1,830 m
Slope	0 – 20 %
Water table depth	250 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The annual precipitation ranges from 13 to 16 inches, most of which occurs in the form of snow during the months of December through March. Localized convection storms occasionally occur during the summer. The soil temperature regime is frigid with a mean annual air temperature of 44 degrees F. Temperature extremes range from -20 to 100 degrees F. The frost free period ranges from less than 30 to 75 days. The optimum growth period for native plants is from April through July.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	30-80 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	90-120 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	330-410 mm
Frost-free period (average)	50 days
Freeze-free period (average)	100 days
Precipitation total (average)	360 mm

- (1) DANNER [USC00352135], Jordan Valley, OR
- (2) MC DERMITT 26 N [USC00355335], Jordan Valley, OR

Influencing water features

Site is not influenced by water features.
Site is not connected to a water table.

Soil features

The soils associated with this site are moderately deep or deep over paralithic or lithic bedrock and are well drained. The surface layer is ashy silt loam or loam. The subsoil is a silty loam to silty clay loam. Depth to weathered bedrock is about 20 to 60 inches. Permeability is moderate to moderately slow. The available water holding capacity is about 2 to 5 inches for the profile.

The soil series correlated with this site are Arcia and Fastjet.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Volcanic ash (2) Loess (3) Residuum – volcanic rock
Surface texture	(1) Ashy silt loam (2) Ashy loam (3) Loam

Family particle size	(1) Fine-loamy
Drainage class	Well drained
Permeability class	Moderate to moderately slow
Depth to restrictive layer	50 – 150 cm
Soil depth	50 – 150 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0 – 10 %
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	5.08 – 12.7 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	10
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0-101.6cm)	0 – 20 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0-101.6cm)	0 – 20 %

Ecological dynamics

The reference plant community is dominated by bitterbrush and mountain big sagebrush with an understory of Idaho fescue. Bluebunch wheatgrass is also common in the understory. The site has moderately high resilience to disturbance and moderate resistance to invasion. Resilience is a system's capacity to regain its structure, processes, and function following stressors or disturbance (e.g. drought or fire). Resistance is the capacity of the system to retain its structure, processes, and function despite stressors or disturbances (including pressure from invasive species) (Chambers 2014). Increased resilience increases with elevation, aspect, increased precipitation and increased nutrient availability (Stringham et al. 2015); where greater resource availability and more favorable environmental conditions exist for plant growth and reproduction (Chambers 2014).

This ecological site's relatively higher effective precipitation (xeric soil moisture regime) makes this site more productive than similar sites in lower precipitation zones. This added productivity results in fewer open spaces where invasive annual grasses can become established. While moderately resilient, this site is not immune to annual grass invasion. Timing of precipitation favors invasive annual grasses that are particularly well adapted to cool wet winters and warm dry summers; beginning growth and utilizing resources prior to native species breaking dormancy. The site's cooler soil temperature regime (frigid) does increase resistance compared to warmer sites but is not cold enough to inhibit invasive annual grasses (Chambers 2014).

This ecological site is dominated by deep-rooted cool season, perennial bunchgrasses and long-lived shrubs (50+ years) with high root to

shoot ratios. The dominant shrubs usually root to the full depth of the winter-spring soil moisture recharge, which ranges from 1.0 to over 3.0 m (Dobrowolski et al. 1990). Root length of mature sagebrush plants was measured to a depth of 2 meters in alluvial soils in Utah (Richards and Caldwell 1987). These shrubs have a flexible generalized root system with development of both deep taproots and laterals near the surface (Comstock and Ehleringer 1992).

Periodic drought regularly influences sagebrush ecosystems and drought duration and severity has increased throughout the 20th century in much of the Intermountain West. Major shifts away from historical precipitation patterns have the greatest potential to alter ecosystem function and productivity. Species composition and productivity can be altered by the timing of precipitation and water availability with the soil profile (Bates et al. 2006).

Mountain big sagebrush and antelope bitterbrush are generally long-lived; therefore it is not necessary for new individuals to recruit every year for perpetuation of the stand. Infrequent large recruitment events and simultaneous low, continuous recruitment is the foundation of population maintenance (Noy-Meir 1973). Survival of the seedlings is dependent on adequate moisture conditions.

In the Great Basin, the majority of annual precipitation is received during winter and early spring. This continental semiarid climate regime favors growth and development of deep-rooted shrubs and herbaceous cool season plants using the C3 photosynthetic pathway (Comstock and Ehleringer 1992). Winter precipitation and slow melting of snow results in deeper percolation of moisture into the soil profile. Herbaceous plants, more shallow-rooted than shrubs, grow earlier in the growing season and thrive on spring rains, while the deeper rooted shrubs lag in phenological development because they draw from deeply infiltrating moisture from snowmelt the previous winter.

Native insect outbreaks are also important drivers of ecosystem dynamics in sagebrush communities. Climate is generally believed to influence the timing of insect outbreaks especially with regard to Aroga moth (*Aroga websteri*), a sagebrush defoliator. Aroga moth infestations have occurred in the Great Basin in the 1960s, early 1970s, and have been ongoing in Nevada since 2004 (Bentz, et al 2008). Thousands of acres of big sagebrush have been impacted, with partial to complete die-off observed. Aroga moth can partially or entirely kill individual plants or entire stands of big sagebrush (Furniss and Barr 1975).

The Great Basin sagebrush communities have high spatial and temporal variability in precipitation both among years and within growing seasons. Nutrient availability is typically low but increases with elevation and closely follows moisture availability. The invasibility of plant communities is often linked to resource availability. Disturbance can decrease resource uptake due to damage or mortality of the native species and depressed competition or can increase resource pools by the decomposition of dead plant material following disturbance. The invasion of sagebrush communities by cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) has been linked to disturbances (fire, abusive grazing) that have resulted in fluctuations in resources (Chambers et al. 2007).

The introduction of annual weedy species, like cheatgrass, may cause an increase in fire frequency and eventually lead to an annual state. Conversely, as fire frequency decreases, sagebrush will increase and with inappropriate grazing management the perennial bunchgrasses and forbs may be reduced.

Fire Ecology:

Pre-settlement fire return intervals in mountain big sagebrush communities varied from 15 to 25 years (Burkhardt and Tisdale 1969, Houston 1973, Miller 2000). Mountain big sagebrush is killed by fire (Neuenschwander 1980, Blaisdell et al. 1982), and does not resprout (Blaisdell 1953). Post fire regeneration occurs from seed and will vary depending on site characteristics, seed source, and fire characteristics. Mountain big sagebrush seedlings can grow rapidly and may reach reproductive maturity within 3 to 5 years (Bunting et al. 1987). Mountain big sagebrush may return to pre-burn density and cover within 15-20 years following fire, but establishment after severe fires may proceed more slowly and can take up to 50 years (Bunting et al. 1987, Ziegenhagen 2003, Miller and Heyerdahl 2008, Ziegenhagen and Miller 2009).

Antelope bitterbrush is moderately fire tolerant (McConnell and Smith 1977). It regenerates by seed and resprouting (Blaisdell and Mueggler 1956, McArthur et al. 1982), however sprouting ability is highly variable and has been attributed to genetics, plant age, phenology, soil moisture and texture and fire severity (Blaisdell and Mueggler 1956, Blaisdell et al. 1982, Clark et al. 1982, Cook et al. 1994). Bitterbrush sprouts from a region on the stem approximately 1.5 inches above and below the soil surface; the plant rarely sprouts if the root crown is killed by fire (Blaisdell and Mueggler 1956). Low intensity fires may allow for bitterbrush to sprout; however, community response also depends on soil moisture levels at time of fire (Murray 1983). Lower soil moisture allows more charring of the stem below ground level (Blaisdell and Mueggler 1956), thus sprouting will usually be more successful after a spring fire than after a fire in summer or fall (Murray 1983, Busse et al. 2000, Kerns et al. 2006). If cheatgrass is present, bitterbrush seedling success is much lower. The factor that most limits establishment of bitterbrush seedlings is competition for water resources with the invasive species cheatgrass (Clements and Young 2002).

The effect of fire on bunchgrasses relates to culm density, culm-leaf morphology, and the size of the plant. The initial condition of bunchgrasses within the site along with seasonality and intensity of the fire all factor into the individual species response. For most forbs and grasses the growing points are located at or below the soil surface providing relative protection from disturbances which decrease above ground biomass, such as grazing or fire. Thus, fire mortality is more correlated to duration and intensity of heat which is related to culm density, culm-leaf morphology, size of plant and abundance of old growth (Wright 1971, Young 1983).

Idaho fescue response to fire varies with condition and size of the plant, season and severity of fire, and ecological conditions. Mature

Idaho fescue plants are commonly reported to be severely damaged by fire in all seasons (Wright et al. 1979). Initial mortality may be high (in excess of 75%) on severe burns, but usually varies from 20 to 50% (Barrington et al 1988). Rapid burns have been found to leave little damage to root crowns, and new tillers are produced with onset of fall moisture (Johnson et al. 1994). However, Wright and others (1979) found the dense, fine leaves of Idaho fescue provided enough fuel to burn for hours after a fire had passed, thereby killing or seriously injuring the plant regardless of the intensity of the fire (Wright et al. 1979).

Fire will remove aboveground biomass from bluebunch wheatgrass but plant mortality is generally low (Robberecht and Defossé 1995) because the buds are underground (Conrad and Poulton 1966) or protected by foliage. Uresk et al. (1976) reported burning increased vegetative and reproductive vigor of bluebunch wheatgrass. Thus, bluebunch wheatgrass is considered to experience slight damage to fire but is more susceptible in drought years (Young 1983). Plant response will vary depending on season, fire severity, fire intensity and post-fire soil moisture availability.

Sandberg bluegrass, a minor component of this ecological site, has been found to increase following fire likely due to its low stature and productivity (Daubenmire 1975). Sandberg bluegrass may retard reestablishment of deeper rooted bunchgrass. Reduced bunchgrass vigor or density provides an opportunity for Sandberg bluegrass expansion and/or cheatgrass and other invasive species to occupy interspaces, leading to increased fire frequency and potentially an annual plant community.

Adapted from: Stringham, T.K., P. Novak-Echenique, P. Blackburn, D. Snyder, and A. Wartgow. 2015. Final Report for USDA Ecological Site Description State-and-Transition Models by Disturbance Response Groups, Major Land Resource Area 25 Nevada. University of Nevada Reno, Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report 2015-02. p. 569

State and transition model

Additional community tables

Table 5. Community 1.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
Grass/Grasslike					
1	Dominant, perennial, deep rooted grasses			673-1009	
	Idaho fescue	FEID	<i>Festuca idahoensis</i>	673-1009	–
2	Sub-dominant deep rooted perennial grasses			252-420	
	bluebunch wheatgrass	PSSPS	<i>Pseudoroegneria spicata ssp. spicata</i>	252-420	–
3	Sub-dominant, perennial, shallow rooted grasses			34-84	
	Sandberg bluegrass	POSE	<i>Poa secunda</i>	34-84	–
4	All other perennial grasses			78-157	
	Thurber's needlegrass	ACTH7	<i>Achnatherum thurberianum</i>	17-34	–
	prairie Junegrass	KOMA	<i>Koeleria macrantha</i>	17-34	–
	basin wildrye	LECI4	<i>Leymus cinereus</i>	17-34	–
	Cusick's bluegrass	POCU3	<i>Poa cusickii</i>	17-34	–
	squirreltail	ELEL5	<i>Elymus elymoides</i>	11-22	–
Forb					
5	Dominant, perennial forbs			50-101	
	arrowleaf balsamroot	BASA3	<i>Balsamorhiza sagittata</i>	17-34	–
	buckwheat	ERIOG	<i>Eriogonum</i>	17-34	–
	lupine	LUPIN	<i>Lupinus</i>	17-34	–
6	All other perennial forbs			25-74	
	common yarrow	ACMI2	<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	2-7	–
	onion	ALLIU	<i>Allium</i>	2-7	–
	milkvetch	ASTRA	<i>Astragalus</i>	2-7	–
	tapertip hawksbeard	CRAC2	<i>Crepis acuminata</i>	2-7	–
	fleabane	ERIGE2	<i>Erigeron</i>	2-7	–

	stoneseed	LITHO3	<i>Lithospermum</i>	2-7	–
	desertparsley	LOMAT	<i>Lomatium</i>	2-7	–
	tansyaster	MACHA	<i>Machaeranthera</i>	2-7	–
	phlox	PHLOX	<i>Phlox</i>	2-7	–
	buttercup	RANUN	<i>Ranunculus</i>	2-7	–
	deathcamas	ZIGAD	<i>Zigadenus</i>	2-7	–
Shrub/Vine					
7	Dominant, perennial shrubs			252-336	
	antelope bitterbrush	PUTR2	<i>Purshia tridentata</i>	252-336	–
8	Sub-dominant, perennial shrubs			101-219	
	mountain big sagebrush	ARTRV	<i>Artemisia tridentata ssp. vaseyana</i>	56-112	–
	basin big sagebrush	ARTRT	<i>Artemisia tridentata ssp. tridentata</i>	28-56	–
	mountain snowberry	SYOR2	<i>Symphoricarpos oreophilus</i>	17-50	–
9	All other perennial shrubs			61-135	
	Saskatoon serviceberry	AMAL2	<i>Amelanchier alnifolia</i>	17-34	–
	wax currant	RICE	<i>Ribes cereum</i>	17-34	–
	rose	ROSA5	<i>Rosa</i>	7-17	–
	yellow rabbitbrush	CHVI8	<i>Chrysothamnus viscidiflorus</i>	7-17	–
	rubber rabbitbrush	ERNA10	<i>Ericameria nauseosa</i>	7-17	–
	bitter cherry	PREM	<i>Prunus emarginata</i>	7-17	–

Table 6. Community 1.2 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 7. Community 1.3 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 8. Community 2.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 9. Community 2.2 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 10. Community 2.3 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 11. Community 3.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 12. Community 3.2 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 13. Community 4.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 14. Community 4.2 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Animal community

This site is suitable for grazing. Grazing management considerations include timing, duration and intensity of grazing. Overgrazing leads to an increase in sagebrush, a decline in antelope bitterbrush, and a decline in understory plants like Idaho fescue and bluebunch wheatgrass. Squirreltail or Sandberg bluegrass will increase temporarily with further degradation. Invasion of annual weedy forbs and cheatgrass could occur with further grazing degradation, leading to a decline in squirreltail and bluegrasses and an increase in bare ground. A combination of overgrazing and prolonged drought leads to soil erosion, increased bare ground and a loss in plant production. Antelope bitterbrush is an important shrub species to a variety of animals, such as domestic livestock, antelope, deer, and elk. Bitterbrush is critical browse for mule deer, as well as domestic livestock, antelope, and elk (Wood 1995). Antelope bitterbrush is most commonly found on soils which provide minimal restriction to deep root penetration such as coarse textured soil, or finer textured soil with high stone content (Driscoll 1964, Clements and Young 2002). Grazing tolerance of antelope bitterbrush is dependent on site conditions (Garrison 1953). Idaho fescue is valuable forage for livestock and wildlife. However, Idaho fescue decreases under heavy grazing by livestock (Eckert and Spencer 1986, Eckert and Spencer 1987) and wildlife (Gaffney 1941). Bluebunch wheatgrass is moderately grazing tolerant and is very sensitive to defoliation during the active growth period (Blaisdell and Pechanec 1949, Laycock 1967, Anderson and Scherzinger 1975). Herbage and flower stalk production was reduced with clipping at all times during the growing season; however, clipping was most harmful during the boot stage (Blaisdell and Pechanec 1949, Britton et al. 1990) Tiller production and growth of bluebunch was greatly reduced when clipping was coupled with drought (Busso and Richards 1995). Mueggler (1975) estimated that low vigor bluebunch wheatgrass may need up to 8 years rest to recover. Although an important forage species, it is not always the preferred species by livestock and wildlife. Reduced bunchgrass vigor or density provides an opportunity for Sandberg bluegrass expansion and/or cheatgrass and other invasive species such as halogeton (*Halogeton glomeratus*), bur buttercup (*Ceratocephala testiculata*) and annual mustards to occupy interspaces. Sandberg bluegrass increases under grazing pressure (Tisdale and Hironaka 1981) and is capable of co-existing with cheatgrass. Excessive sheep grazing favors Sandberg bluegrass; however, where cattle are the dominant grazers, cheatgrass often dominates (Daubenmire 1970). Thus, depending on the season of use, the grazer and site conditions, either Sandberg bluegrass or cheatgrass may become the dominant understory with inappropriate grazing management.

Inventory data references

Vale District BLM Ecological Site Inventory NASIS component and pedon data Range Site Descriptions Field knowledge of range-trained personnel

Other references

Anderson, E. W. and R. J. Scherzinger. 1975. Improving quality of winter forage for elk by cattle grazing. *Journal of Range Management* 28:120-125.

Barrington, M., S. Bunting, and G. Wright. 1988. A fire management plan for Craters of the Moon National Monument. Cooperative Agreement CA-9000-8-0005. Moscow, ID: University of Idaho, Range Resources Department. 52 p. Draft.

Bates, J. D., T. Svejcar, R. F. Miller, and R. A. Angell. 2006. The effects of precipitation timing on sagebrush steppe vegetation. *Journal of Arid Environments* 64:670-697.

Bentz, B., D. Alston, and T. Evans. 2008. Great Basin Insect Outbreaks. In: J. Chambers, N. Devoe, A. Evenden [eds]. Collaborative Management and Research in the Great Basin -- Examining the issues and developing a framework for action Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-204. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO. p. 45-48

Blaisdell, J. P. and J. F. Pechanec. 1949. Effects of Herbage Removal at Various Dates on Vigor of Bluebunch Wheatgrass and Arrowleaf Balsamroot. *Ecology* 30:298-305.

Blaisdell, J. P. 1953. Ecological effects of planned burning of sagebrush-grass range on the upper Snake River Plains. US Dept. of Agriculture.

Blaisdell, J. P. and W. F. Mueggler. 1956. Sprouting of bitterbrush (*Purshia tridentata*) following burning or top removal. *Ecology* 37:365-370.

Blaisdell, J. P., R. B. Murray, and E. D. McArthur. 1982. Managing intermountain rangelands-sagebrush grass ranges. USDA Forest Serv. Intermountain Forest and Range Exp. Sta. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-134.

Britton, C. M., G. R. McPherson, and F. A. Sneva. 1990. Effects of burning and clipping on five bunchgrasses in eastern Oregon. *Great Basin Naturalist* 50:115-120.

Bunting, S. C., B. M. Kilgore, and C. L. Bushey. 1987. Guidelines for prescribed burning sagebrush-grass rangelands in the northern Great Basin. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station Ogden, UT, USA.

Burkhardt, J. W. and E. Tisdale. 1969. Nature and successional status of western juniper vegetation in Idaho. *Journal of Range Management*:264-270.

Busse, D., A. Simon, and M. Riegel. 2000. Tree-growth and understory responses to low-severity prescribed burning in thinned *Pinus ponderosa* forests of central Oregon. *Forest Science* 46:258- 268.

Busso, C. A. and J. H. Richards. 1995. Drought and clipping effects on tiller demography and growth of two tussock grasses in Utah. *Journal of Arid Environments* 29:239-251.

Chambers, J. C., B. A. Roundy, R. R. Blank, S. E. Meyer, and A. Whittaker. 2007. What makes great basin sagebrush ecosystems invisable by *Bromus tectorum*? *Ecological Monographs* 77:117-145.

Chambers, Jeanne C.; Pyke, David A.; Maestas, Jeremy D.; Pellant, Mike; Boyd, Chad S.; Campbell, Steven B.; Espinosa, Shawn; Havlina, Douglas W.; Mayer, Kenneth E.; Wuenschel, Amarina. 2014. Using resistance and resilience concepts to reduce impacts of invasive annual grasses and altered fire regimes on the sagebrush ecosystem and greater sage-grouse: A strategic multi-scale approach. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-326. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 73 p.

Clark, R. G., M. B. Carlton, and F. A. Sneva. 1982. Mortality of bitterbrush after burning and clipping in eastern Oregon. *Journal of Range Management* 35:711-714.

Clements, C. D. and J. A. Young. 2002. Restoring antelope bitterbrush. *Rangelands* 24:3-6.

Comstock, J. P. and J. R. Ehleringer. 1992. Plant adaptation in the Great Basin and Colorado plateau. *Western North American Naturalist* 52:195-215.

Conrad, C. E. and C. E. Poulton. 1966. Effect of a wildfire on Idaho fescue and bluebunch wheatgrass. *Journal of Range Management*:138-141.

Cook, J. G., T. J. Hershey, and L. L. Irwin. 1994. Vegetative response to burning on Wyoming mountain shrub big game ranges.. *Journal of Range Management* 47:296-302.

Daubenmire, R. 1970. *Steppe vegetation of Washington*. 131 pp.

Daubenmire, R. 1975. Plant succession on abandoned fields, and fire influences in a steppe area in southeastern Washington. *Northwest Science* 49:36-48.

Dobrowolski, J. P., M. M. Caldwell, and J. H. Richards. 1990. Basin hydrology and plant root systems. In: C. B. Osmand, L. F. Pitelka, G. M. Hildy [eds]. *Plant biology of the Basin and range*. *Ecological Studies*. 80: 243-292

Driscoll, R. S. 1964. A Relict Area in the Central Oregon Juniper Zone. *Ecology* 45:345-353.

Eckert Jr, R. E. and J. S. Spencer. 1986. Vegetation response on allotments grazed under rest-rotation management. *Journal of Range Management*:166-174.

Eckert, R. E., Jr. and J. S. Spencer. 1987. Growth and reproduction of grasses heavily grazed under restoration management. *Journal of Range Management* 40:156-159.

Furniss, M. M. and W. F. Barr. 1975. Insects affecting important native shrubs of the northwestern United States General Technical Report INT-19. Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Ogden, UT. p. 68

Gaffney, W. S. 1941. The effects of winter elk browsing, South Fork of the Flathead River, Montana. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 5:427-453.

Garrison, G. A. 1953. Effects of Clipping on Some Range Shrubs. *Journal of Range Management* 6:309-317.

Houston, D. B. 1973. Wildfires in northern Yellowstone National Park. *Ecology* 54:1111-1117.

Johnson, C. G., R. R. Clausnitzer, P. J. Mehringer, and C. Oilver. 1994. Biotic and abiotic processes of eastside ecosystems: The effects of management on plant and community ecology, and on stand and landscape vegetation dynamics. Forest Service general technical report. Forest Service, Portland, OR (United States). Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Kerns, B. K., W. G. Thies, and C. G. Niwa. 2006. Season and severity of prescribed burn in ponderosa pine forests: implications for understory native and exotic plants. *Ecoscience* 13:44-55.

Laycock, W. A. 1967. How heavy grazing and protection affect sagebrush-grass ranges. *Journal of Range Management*:206-213.

McArthur, E. D., A. Blaner, A. P. Plummer, and R. Stevens. 1982. Characteristics and hybridization of important Intermountain shrubs: 3.

Sunflower family. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. Research Paper INT-177 43.

McConnell, B. R. and J. G. Smith. 1977. Influence of grazing on age-yield interactions in bitterbrush. *Journal of Range Management* 30:91-93.

Miller, R. F. R. J. T. 2000. The role of fire in juniper and pinyon woodlands: a descriptive analysis. Pages p. 15-30 in *Proceedings of the invasive species workshop: the role of fire in the control and spread of invasive species.*, Tallahassee, Florida.

Miller, R. F. and E. K. Heyerdahl. 2008. Fine-scale variation of historical fire regimes in sagebrush-steppe and juniper woodland: an example from California, USA. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 17:245-254.

Mueggler, W. F. 1975. Rate and Pattern of Vigor Recovery in Idaho Fescue and Bluebunch Wheatgrass. *Journal of Range Management* 28:198-204.

Murray, R. 1983. Response of antelope bitterbrush to burning and spraying in southeastern Idaho. Tiedemann, Arthur R.; Johnson, Kendall L., compilers. *Research and management of bitterbrush and cliffrose in western North America*. General Technical Report INT-152. Ogden, UT: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station:142-152.

Neuenschwander, L. 1980. Broadcast burning of sagebrush in the winter. *Journal of Range Management*:233-236.

Noy-Meir, I. 1973. Desert Ecosystems: Environment and Producers. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. Vol. 4:25-51.

Richards, J. H. and M. M. Caldwell. 1987. Hydraulic lift: Substantial nocturnal water transport between soil layers by *Artemisia tridentata* roots. *Oecologia* 73:486-489.

Robberecht, R. and G. Defossé. 1995. The relative sensitivity of two bunchgrass species to fire. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 5:127-134.

Stringham, T.K., P. Novak-Echenique, P. Blackburn, D. Snyder, and A. Wartgow. 2015. Final Report for USDA Ecological Site Description State-and-Transition Models by Disturbance Response Groups, Major Land Resource Area 25 Nevada. University of Nevada Reno, Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report 2015-02. p. 569

Tisdale, E. W. and M. Hironaka. 1981. The sagebrush-grass region: A review of the ecological literature. University of Idaho, Forest, Wildlife and Range Experiment Station.

Uresk, D. W., J. F. Cline, and W. H. Rickard. 1976. Impact of wildfire on three perennial grasses in southcentral Washington. *Journal of Range Management* 29:309-310.

Wood, M. K., Bruce A. Buchanan, & William Skeet. 1995. Shrub preference and utilization by big game on New Mexico reclaimed mine land. *Journal of Range Management* 48:431-437.

Wright, H. A. 1971. Why Squirreltail Is More Tolerant to Burning than Needle-and-Thread. *Journal of Range Management* 24:277-284.

Wright, H.A., L.F. Neuenschwander, and C.M. Britton. 1979. The role and use of fire in sagebrush-grass and pinyon-juniper plant communities: A state-of-the-art review. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-58. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 48 p.

Young, R. P. 1983. Fire as a vegetation management tool in rangelands of the intermountain region. Pages 18-31 in *Managing intermountain rangelands - improvement of range and wildlife habitats*. USDA, Forest Service.

Ziegenhagen, L. L. 2003. Shrub reestablishment following fire in the mountain big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata* Nutt. ssp. *vaseyana* (Rydb.) Beetle) alliance. M.S. Oregon State University.

Ziegenhagen, L. L. and R. F. Miller. 2009. Postfire recovery of two shrubs in the interiors of large burns in the Intermountain West, USA. *Western North American Naturalist* 69:195-205.

Contributors

C.D. Tackman, A.V. Bahn
Jennifer Moffitt

Approval

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	08/22/2026
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:
