Ecological site R053AE067MT
Overflow (Ov) (Legacy)
RRU 53AE

Last updated: 6/14/2023
Accessed: 09/19/2026

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.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	Not specified

Physiographic features

This site usually occurs in swales, drainageways, low terraces and flood plains where it receives extra moisture from run-in from adjacent land. The site does not have a permanent water table within 42 inches of the soil surface. Slopes vary from 0-2% and occur on all exposures. Elevations generally range from 2,000 to 3,100 feet.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Depression (2) Swale (3) Flood plain
Flooding duration	Very brief (4 to 48 hours) to brief (2 to 7 days)
Flooding frequency	Occasional to frequent
Ponding duration	Long (7 to 30 days)
Ponding frequency	None to frequent
Elevation	570 – 950 m
Slope	0 %

Water table depth	110 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

A semi-arid, temperate climate characterizes the Glaciated Plains. The predominance of cool season species has evolved to take advantage of the precipitation regime that peaks in late spring-early summer (June). Seventy-five percent of the annual precipitation usually falls as steady, soaking, frontal system rains. Summer rains usually come with thunderstorms. Precipitation is the most important factor influencing production (Heitschmidt et al 2005). Severe drought occurs on average in two out of every ten years (Cooper, et al., 2001).

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (average)	130 days
Freeze-free period (average)	100 days
Precipitation total (average)	310 mm

Influencing water features

The run-in moisture to this site occurs following rain or snowmelt. This site is not influenced by water from wetlands or streams.

Soil features

Soils are well drained and more than 60 inches deep to bedrock. Permeability varies from moderate to very slow. The surface layer of these soils vary from 0-12 inches in depth and are typically a loam, silt loam, clay loam, silty clay loam or fine sandy loam. Textures of underlying layers also vary since these are alluvial soils, having been deposited by flowing water. Soil ph varies from 6.1-8.4. Soils such as Trembles and Cherry are non-hydric. Other soils found on this site include Havre, Havrelon, and Hanly. However, soils (such as Dimmick and Nishon) that are typically found in depressions are hydric. Lallie is another hydric soil. It is typically found in old oxbows that have been cut off from the main stream channel.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Surface texture	(1) Loam (2) Sandy loam (3) Clay loam
Family particle size	(1) Loamy
Drainage class	Moderately well drained to excessively drained
Permeability class	Moderately rapid to very slow

Soil depth	50 – 180 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	15.24 – 20.32 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-101.6cm)	0 – 10 %
Electrical conductivity (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Sodium adsorption ratio (0-101.6cm)	0 – 10
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	6.1 – 8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 10 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	Not specified

Ecological dynamics

This ecological site developed under Northern Great Plains climatic conditions, geological materials, fire, plants and animals. At the time that North America was settled by Europeans, the Glaciated Plains was the home of nomadic tribes of Native Americans and large numbers of bison, prairie dog, elk, pronghorn, bighorn sheep and deer. These herbivores have been present on the plains since the retreat of the Pleistocene glaciers and greatly influenced the mixed grass prairie ecosystem. However, research consistently shows that precipitation is the principal factor altering productivity on ecological sites in the Northern Great Plains (Heitschmidt et al. 2005). The same authors concluded that grazing reduces herbage standing crop, whereas its effects on above ground net primary production varies with timing of grazing and precipitation events, along with the functional and structural composition of the plant community.

It is theorized that these lands burned on a natural interval of 5-7 years, either as a result of lightning or Native Americans (Frost 1998). Most of the species present in the historic climax plant community (HCPL) are fire tolerant.

The HCPC is the basis for plant community interpretations. It is the plant community that is best adapted to the unique combination of factors associated with this ecological site. This site is highly resistant and resilient to disturbance. The HCPC has been determined by evaluating rangeland relic areas, and other areas protected from excessive disturbance.

.
The HCPC is dominated by a mixture of tall and medium height cool and warm season grasses and grasslike species. About 90% of the annual production is from grasses and grasslike plants. Forbs and shrubs each contribute about 5% to total annual production. Total vegetative production averages 2500 lbs/ac in normal years, 2000 lbs/ac in “unfavorable” years, and 3000 lbs/ac in “favorable” years.

Changes in the HCPC are brought about by frequency, timing and intensity of past grazing use, series of dry or wet years, or disturbances by fire, insect infestations, noxious weed colonization and recruitment, etc. Continual adverse impacts to the site over a period of years results in regression to lower seral stages. The deep-rooted cool season perennial grasses are replaced by warm season grasses (blue grama, sandberg bluegrass, etc), fringed sagewort, hoods phlox, threadleaf sedge, hairy gold aster, and annual grasses and forbs. The dominance of these short grasses, warm season forbs and half-shrubs, and low seral species in the plant community disrupts ecological processes, impairs the biotic integrity of the site, and adversely affects resiliency. The system’s ability to recover to higher seral states is restricted or impeded.

State and Transition Diagram

Traditional theories of plant succession leading to a single climax community can not satisfactorily describe the complex successional pathways of this site (Briske et al. 2005). As the HCPC regresses to an early seral state, it is theorized that a threshold is crossed somewhere within the mid-to-low seral state. Plant communities below this threshold are in a steady state. A “state” is an alternative, persistent vegetation community that is not simply reversible in the linear successional framework (Stringham 2003). States are depicted as seral stages, while pathways between states are “transitions.”

Two important plant communities and associated successional pathways for the reference state (State #1), are illustrated below for an Overflow 10-14” p.z. site in the Glaciated Plains. The transition from Plant Community A (State #1) across a threshold to Plant Community B (State #2), and the transition from Community B to Community C (State #3) are also shown.

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	**Native perennial grasses and grasslikes**			1-2242	
	green needlegrass	NAVI4	*Nassella viridula*	420-841	–
	western wheatgrass	PASM	*Pascopyrum smithii*	420-841	–
	basin wildrye	LECI4	*Leymus cinereus*	280-560	–
	Canada wildrye	ELCA4	*Elymus canadensis*	140-280	–
	bluegrass	POA	*Poa*	140-280	–
	prairie cordgrass	SPPE	*Spartina pectinata*	140-280	–
	beardless wheatgrass	PSSPI	*Pseudoroegneria spicata ssp. inermis*	73-140	–
	switchgrass	PAVI2	*Panicum virgatum*	1-140	–
	slender wheatgrass	ELTR7	*Elymus trachycaulus*	73-140	–
	needle and thread	HECOC8	*Hesperostipa comata ssp. comata*	1-140	–
	big bluestem	ANGE	*Andropogon gerardii*	1-140	–
2	**Native perennial grasses and grasslikes**			1-280	
	Grass-like, perennial	2GLP	*Grass-like, perennial*	1-101	–
	Grass, perennial	2GP	*Grass, perennial*	1-101	–
	blue grama	BOGR2	*Bouteloua gracilis*	1-101	–
	threadleaf sedge	CAFI	*Carex filifolia*	1-101	–
	plains reedgrass	CAMO	*Calamagrostis montanensis*	1-101	–
	prairie Junegrass	KOMA	*Koeleria macrantha*	1-101	–
	Sandberg bluegrass	POSE	*Poa secunda*	1-101	–
Forb					

3	**Native perennial forbs**			140-280	
	Maximilian sunflower	HEMA2	*Helianthus maximiliani*	140-280	–
	dotted blazing star	LIPU	*Liatris punctata*	140-280	–
	American vetch	VIAM	*Vicia americana*	140-280	–
4	**Native perennial forbs**			1-280	
	Forb, perennial	2FP	*Forb, perennial*	1-34	–
	common yarrow	ACMI2	*Achillea millefolium*	1-34	–
	pussytoes	ANTEN	*Antennaria*	1-34	–
	white sagebrush	ARLU	*Artemisia ludoviciana*	1-34	–
	aster	ASTER	*Aster*	1-34	–
	milkvetch	ASTRA	*Astragalus*	1-34	–
	bastard toadflax	COUM	*Comandra umbellata*	1-34	–
	buckwheat	ERIOG	*Eriogonum*	1-34	–
	northern bedstraw	GABO2	*Galium boreale*	1-34	–
	hairy false goldenaster	HEVI4	*Heterotheca villosa*	1-34	–
	beardtongue	PENST	*Penstemon*	1-34	–
	spiny phlox	PHHO	*Phlox hoodii*	1-34	–
	scurfpea	PSORA2	*Psoralidium*	1-34	–
	Missouri goldenrod	SOMI2	*Solidago missouriensis*	1-34	–
	scarlet globemallow	SPCO	*Sphaeralcea coccinea*	1-34	–
	prairie thermopsis	THRH	*Thermopsis rhombifolia*	1-34	–
Shrub/Vine					
5	**Native shrubs and half-shrubs**			78-280	
	chokecherry	PRVI	*Prunus virginiana*	101-224	–
	golden currant	RIAU	*Ribes aureum*	101-224	–
	American plum	PRAM	*Prunus americana*	78-112	–
6	**Native shrubs and half-shrubs**			1-112	
	silver sagebrush	ARCA13	*Artemisia cana*	1-28	–
	prairie sagewort	ARFR4	*Artemisia frigida*	1-28	–
	rose	ROSA5	*Rosa*	1-28	–
	snowberry	SYMPH	*Symphoricarpos*	1-28	–
	Shrub, broadleaf	2SB	*Shrub, broadleaf*	0-1	–
7	**Native shrubs and half-shrubs**			0-1	
	plains pricklypear	OPPO	*Opuntia polyacantha*	0-1	–

Table 6. Community 1.2 plant community composition

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

Table 7. Community 2.1 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 3.1 plant community composition

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

Animal community

Livestock Management This site evolved with trampling, defoliation (ungulates, grasshoppers and jackrabbits, and other herbivores), fire and drought. Potholes in ephemeral drainages tend to store run-off water following storm events, which would be accessible to animals

grazing on adjacent sites. Therefore, it is theorized that this site evolved with more animal impact than did the adjacent upland ecological sites. This site is highly resistant to disturbances which may alter its ecological processes. Within the Reference State (State #1) it is also resilient. Following perturbations such as drought, which allows blue grama and other warm season, lower successional species to increase at the expense of the mid and tall cool season grasses, succession occurs with subsequent rainfall and run-in. Thus, the HCPC and Community A may be present at any given time in State #1. The site has the potential to produce 2000 – 3000 lbs of vegetation per acre. Annual production shows far greater variations in response to changes in annual precipitation than to different grazing intensities (Hutchings and Stewart 1953). However, proper stocking rates and prescribed grazing are needed to ensure that the site remains in a high seral or HCPC state. Without proper grazing management the mid-to-tall grass community regresses to a blue grama, prairie junegrass, Kentucky bluegrass and low-successional forb community. Data from the recent range inventories indicate a significant Kentucky bluegrass population on nearly 20% of these sites. Kentucky bluegrass may be a mixed blessing. It produces high quality forage (but not much of it), it grows as a sod and its rhizomes protect the soil from erosion (but it provides less protection than species in the HCPC). Unless stressed by drought, the Kentucky bluegrass is resistant to grazing systems with limited rest periods. Additional ecological concerns are its tendencies to form a monoculture and persist as a steady state. Plant succession is slow to non-existent in Kentucky bluegrass communities on the Overflow site. In comparison to the high seral state, suggested stocking rates on sites dominated by Kentucky bluegrass represent a 2-fold reduction. Prescribed grazing is recommended to prevent further deterioration in States #2 and #3. Non-prescribed grazing reduces plant cover and litter, increases surface runoff, and often leads to gully formation and active head cutting. Down-cutting lowers water tables and/or reduces the effectiveness of run-in moisture. Thus, the Overflow site crosses a conservation threshold, where most or all of its ecological processes are severely impacted. Once the ecological processes (hydrologic cycle, nutrient cycling, and conversion of solar energy into carbohydrates for plant growth) are disrupted, significant plant succession will not occur within a reasonable time period. Death camas, horsetail, milkvetch and a few additional species of plants occurring on this site may be poisonous to livestock. However, livestock losses are unusual unless the range is overstocked and livestock are forced to consume the poisonous plants. This site is suitable for livestock grazing from May through October. Because of topographic position, proximity to water, and species composition, the site is better-suited for cattle, rather than sheep grazing. Wildlife Interpretations The Overflow 10-14” p.z. ecological site creates biodiversity in the Glaciated Plains. The run-in moisture and diversity of shrubs, grasses and forbs provides food and cover for resident and migratory wildlife species. The narrow irregular, meandering landforms serve as a corridor allowing big game and other species to move between adjacent upland habitats. State #1 (reference state) includes the HCPC and one additional community. This state supports the highest abundance of insects, invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, upland game birds and small mammals. It also provides forage for mule deer and antelope during most of the year. Communities that are in States #2 and #3 are much less suitable for big game, upland birds and most species of small mammals. The simplification of the plant community reduces the number of wildlife habitat niches. Because of less plant growth and litter, soil surface temperatures rise and soil moisture decreases. As the site becomes more xeric the insect and invertebrate population becomes less diverse, there is less cover, structure and food resources for upland birds and mammals. Springs and seeps may partially dry up.

Hydrological functions

Soils associated with this ecological site are in Hydrologic Soil Groups A, B, C and D. Infiltration rates are generally moderate. The runoff potential is usually negligible to very low, but varies with landscape and ground cover. Good hydrologic conditions exist on these sites when they are either in the Reference State (HCPC or Community A). Canopy cover (grass, forbs and shrubs) is greater than 90% in these communities, which is conducive to high infiltration rates and minimizes runoff and erosion. Communities B & C are generally considered to be in poor hydrologic condition. Concerns are valid, not because of the amount of bare ground, but because the short grass sod restricts the ability of the desirable tall and mid-grasses to utilize available moisture. When rills develop into a gully, erosion threatens resource productivity. Therefore, it is recommended that grazing management strategies be implemented to address the problem of rills and litter movement -- do not wait until the formation of gullies to change management strategies.

Recreational uses

Hunters are probably the most common recreational user of this ecological site. The site is also used by hikers and photographers.

Wood products

This site has no significant value for wood products.

Other information

The following is an example of how to calculate the recommended stocking rate. This example does not use production estimates from this specific ecological site. You will need to adjust the annual production values and run the calculations using total annual production values from the ecological sites encountered on each individual ranch/pasture. Before making specific recommendations, an on-site evaluation must be made.

Inventory data references

SCS-Range-417 (#515,#520) 1991-1992 MT Phillips ECS-1 Modified Double Sampling 24 2001-2004 MT Blaine, Roosevelt, Sheridan, Phillips, Valley USDA-SCS-MT 1981 Technical Range Site Descriptions

Other references

Briske, D. D., S. D. Fuhlendorf, and F. E. Smeins. 2005. State-and-transition models, thresholds, and rangeland health: a synthesis of ecological concepts and perspectives. Rangeland Ecol.Manage.58:1-10.

Frost, Cecil C. 1998. Presettlement fire frequency regimes of the United States: a first approximation. Pages 70-81 in Teresa L. Pruden and Leonard A. Brennan (eds.). Fire in ecosystem management: shifting the paradigm from suppression to prescription. Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference Proceedings, No. 20. Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, Fl.

Heitschmidt, R. K., K. D. Klement, and M. R. Haferkamp. 2005. Interactive effects of drought and grazing on Northern Great Plains rangelands. Rangeland Ecol. Manage. 58:11-19.

Stringham, T. K., W. C. Krueger, and P. L. Shaver. 2003. State and transition modeling: an ecological process approach. J. Range Manage. 56(2):106-113.

USDI BLM USGS and USDA NRCS. 2000. Interpreting indicators of rangeland health. Tech. Ref. 1734-6.

Approval

Kirt Walstad, 6/14/2023

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)	Dr. John Lacey, Maxine Rasmussen, Jon Siddoway & Rick Bandy
Contact for lead author	
Date	03/30/2005
Approved by	
Approval date	
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production

Indicators

1. **Number and extent of rills: Rills should not be present in HCPC or in plant community A.**

---

2. **Presence of water flow patterns:** **Water flow patterns should not be observable in HCPC or in plant community A.**

3. **Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes:** **Pedestals or terracettes would essentially be nonexistent in HCPC and in plant community A.**

4. **Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground):** **Bare ground would essentially be nonexistent in HCPC. Bare ground should be less than 2" in diameter. If in plant community A, less than 5% of the soil surface can be exposed.**

5. **Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies:** **Gullies are not associated with either of the State 1 reference plant communities.**

6. **Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas:** **Wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas are not associated with either of the State 1 reference plant communities.**

7. **Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel):** **Litter movement is not expected with HCPC or plant community A.**

8. **Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values):** **Stability class anticipated to be 5 or 6 under plant canopy.**

9. **Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness):** **The surface layer is 0-12" deep. The color ranges from light brownish gray, brownish gray, to gray as the soil becomes hydric. Surface textures include loam, silt loam, clay loam, silty clay loam or fine sandy loam. Soil organic matter ranges from 2-4% with a high of 8% and a low of 1%.**

10. **Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff:** **In HCPC, 90-95% plant canopy and 80-85% basal cover with small gaps between plants should reduce raindrop impact and slow overland flow, providing increased time for infiltration to occur. Healthy, deep rooted native grasses enhance infiltration and reduce runoff. Infiltration rate is moderate to very slow. If in plant community A, 90-95% plant canopy and 70-80% basal cover with small gaps between plants will still reduce raindrop impact and decrease overland flow.**

11. **Presence and thickness of compaction layer (usually none; describe soil profile features which may be mistaken for compaction on this site):** **No compaction layer or soil surface crusting should be evident in either of the State 1 plant communities.**

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: HCPC: Tall, cool season bunch grasses > mid-stature, cool season bunch grasses > mid-stature cool season rhizomatous grasses > tall warm season rhizomatous grasses > forbs =shrubs. Plant community A: Mid-stature, cool season rhizomatous grasses> > mid-stature cool season bunch grasses > tall, cool season bunch grasses > shrubs > forbs.

Sub-dominant:

Other:

Additional:

---

13. **Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence): Plant mortality and decadence very low in HCPC and Plant community A. In periods of drought, shrubs would exhibit decadence in the state 1 reference communities.**

---

14. **Average percent litter cover (%) and depth (in): Litter cover is in contact with soil surface. Litter decreases in Plant community A to 40-50% and depth is reduced to 0.5 inch.**

---

15. **Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annual-production): 2000 - 3000 #/acre from Plant community A to HCPC in the State 1 reference community.**

---

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: Needle and thread, western snowberry, smooth bromegrass, Kentucky bluegrass, Canada bluegrass, silver sagebrush, leafy spurge and Canada thistle.**

---

17. **Perennial plant reproductive capability: All species are capable of reproducing in HCPC. In Plant community A, plant seedlings will be weighed in favor of marginal and undesirable species. Replacement of desirable species will be very few.**
