

Ecological site R055DY040SD

Loamy Floodplain

Last updated: 4/22/2025
Accessed: 09/02/2026

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): 055D—Glacial Lake Dakota

MLRA 55D is in South Dakota (92 percent) and southeastern North Dakota (8 percent). It makes up about 3,059 square miles (7,923 square kilometers). This area, which is part of the glacial till plain region, consists of a large, glacial lake plain that was drained by the James River, which flows southward through the area. The MLRA is dominantly farmland converted from prairie, but some areas of grassland remain. Agricultural drainage practices have impacted shallow depressions in many areas. MLRA 55D has distinct boundaries. Till plains are on all sides. MLRA 55B borders the area largely to the north and is also between the Lake Dakota Plain and two prominent coteaus—the Missouri Coteau on the west and the Prairie Coteau on the east. To the south is MLRA 55C (Southern Black Glaciated Plains), which has a mesic soil temperature regime. This area is in the Central Lowland province of the Interior Plains. Elevation ranges from 1,250 to 1,330 feet (380 to 405 meters), generally increasing from south to north. The area is characterized by mostly level to moderately sloping lake plains with many depressions and drainages. Much of the area has integrated drainage; drainage channels are poorly to moderately defined. The glaciolacustrine sediments of the Lake Dakota Plain range from sandy to clayey and are commonly stratified. Some areas of the lake plain are mantled with wind-deposited materials, which are moderately coarse textured or sandy. Alluvial deposits and low terraces are common along the James River and its major tributaries but also occur in narrow and discontinuous strips along other streams.

Classification relationships

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): Southern Black Glaciated Plains (55D) (USDA-NRCS, 2022) USFS Sub-region: Located mainly within unit 332Bc and 332Ba (Cleland et al., 2007).

Ecological site concept

The Loamy Floodplain ecological site occurs in high floodplain areas. Soils are moderately well drained which have water flow into and over/through the site and have occasional to frequent flooding. Vegetation in the Reference State is dominated by warm season grasses including big bluestem and switchgrass. Trees may be common on this site, including green ash and bur oak. The site may become invaded by non-native grasses including Kentucky bluegrass and smooth brome grass.

Associated sites

R055DY002SD	Linear Meadow These sites occur on lower floodplain area. Soil are poorly to very poorly drained which have a water table within 2 feet of the soil surface that persists longer than the wettest part of the growing season typically until the month of August.
-------------	--

Similar sites

R055DY020SD	Loamy Overflow The Loamy Overflow site occurs in upland swales. Soils are moderately well drained which have water flow into and over/through the site. The Loamy Overflow site will have less shrubs and trees compared to the Loamy Floodplain site.
--------------------	--

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Andropogon gerardii</i> (2) <i>Panicum virgatum</i>

Physiographic features

This site occurs on flats, rises, and low terraces on floodplains.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Lowland > Flood plain
Runoff class	Low
Flooding duration	Brief (2 to 7 days) to long (7 to 30 days)
Flooding frequency	Occasional to frequent
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	380 – 410 m
Slope	0 %
Water table depth	80 – 150 cm

Climatic features

The average annual precipitation is 22 to 28 inches. Half or more of the precipitation falls during the growing season. Rainfall typically occurs during high-intensity, convective thunderstorms in summer. In the western part of the MLRA, rainfall is less abundant and not always adequate for full maturation of crops. Precipitation in winter is typically snow. The average annual temperature is 42 to 45 degrees F. The freeze-free period averages 143 days and ranges from 131 to 151 days.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	110-120 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	130-130 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	560-580 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	110-120 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	130-130 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	560-580 mm
Frost-free period (average)	120 days
Freeze-free period (average)	130 days
Precipitation total (average)	580 mm

- (1) TURTON [USC00398420], Turton, SD
- (2) REDFIELD [USC00397052], Redfield, SD
- (3) BRITTON [USC00391049], Britton, SD
- (4) COLUMBIA 8 N [USC00391873], Columbia, SD
- (5) ABERDEEN [USW00014929], Aberdeen, SD
- (6) ANDOVER #2 [USC00390120], Andover, SD
- (7) MELLETTE 4 W [USC00395456], Northville, SD
- (8) CONDE [USC00391917], Conde, SD

Influencing water features

The Loamy Floodplain ecological site occurs in high floodplain areas. Soils are formed through alluvial processes as water flows into and over/through the site and have occasional to frequent flooding.

Soil features

Soils are typically formed in alluvium, with loam surface textures. These soils are moderately well drained, with occasional to frequent flooding. The representative soil series for this site are La Prairie and Ladelle.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Alluvium
Surface texture	(1) Loam
Drainage class	Moderately well drained

Permeability class	Moderate
Soil depth	200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	19.56 – 20.07 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-25.4cm)	6.6 – 8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0cm)	Not specified
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0cm)	Not specified

Ecological dynamics

The site developed under Northern Great Plains climatic conditions and included natural influence of large herding herbivores and frequent fire. Changes will occur in the plant communities due to weather fluctuations and/or management actions. Under adverse impacts, a slow decline in vegetative vigor and composition will occur. Under favorable conditions, the site has the potential to resemble the reference state. Interpretations for this site are based primarily on the 1.1 Big Bluestem-Switchgrass Plant Community Phase. This community phase and the Reference State have been determined by study of rangeland relic areas, areas protected from excessive disturbance, and areas under long-term rotational grazing regimes. Trends in plant community dynamics ranging from heavily grazed to lightly grazed areas, seasonal use pastures, and historical accounts also have been considered.

This ecological site (ES) has been grazed by domestic livestock since they have been introduced into the area. The introduction of domestic livestock and the use of fencing and reliable water sources have changed the ecological dynamics of this site. Continuous grazing without adequate recovery periods following each grazing occurrence over several years, and lack of fire frequency cause this site to depart from the interpretive plant community. Species such as green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), and bur oak (*Quercus macrocarpa*) will initially increase. Big bluestem and switchgrass will decrease in frequency and production. Increased woody and tree species and Heavy continuous grazing causes shade tolerant species like Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*) to increase and eventually develop into a sod condition. Extended periods of nonuse and no fire will result in a plant community of mature bur oak with a shaded understory of Kentucky bluegrass creating a park like appearance.

Mechanical removal, catastrophic fire, or inundation of woody species will create a community dominated by big bluestem, indiangrass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), and switchgrass which will be invaded with lesser amounts of non-native species such as Kentucky bluegrass and smooth brome grass (*Bromus inermis*).

Following the state and transition diagram are narratives for each of the described states and community phases. These may not represent every possibility, but they are the most prevalent and repeatable states/community phases. The plant composition tables shown below have been developed from the best available knowledge at the time of this revision. As more data are collected, some of these community phases and/or states may be revised or removed, and new ones may be added. The main purpose for including the descriptions here is to capture the current knowledge and experience at the time of this revision.

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 (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

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 (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 15. Community 4.3 plant community composition

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

Table 16. Community 5.1 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

Information presented here has been derived from NRCS and other federal/state agency clipping and inventory data. Also, field knowledge of range-trained personnel was used. All descriptions were peer reviewed and/or field-tested by various private, state and federal agency specialists. Those involved in developing this site description include: Stan Boltz, NRCS Range Management Specialist; David Dewald, NRCS State Biologist; Jody Forman, NRCS Range Management Specialist; Jeff Printz, NRCS State Range Management Specialist; Kevin Sedivec, Extension Rangeland Management Specialist; Shawn Dekeyser, North Dakota State University; Rob Self, The Nature Conservancy and Lee Voigt, NRCS Range Management Specialist. MLRA 55D was split from MLRA 55B in 2022. Many of the site concepts for this MLRA are borrowed from neighboring MLRA 55B pending further vegetation and soils validation. This provisional site description concept was taken from the neighboring MLRA 102D Loamy Floodplain ESD. Additional work is needed to verify the concepts of this ESD in MLRA 55D.

Other references

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.

Gilbert, M. C., Whited, P. M., Clairain Jr, E. J., & Smith, R. D. (2006). A Regional Guidebook for Applying the Hydrogeomorphic Approach to Assessing Wetland Functions of Prairie Potholes. Washington DC.

High Plains Regional Climate Center, University of Nebraska, 830728 Chase Hall, Lincoln, NE 68583-0728. (<http://hpccsun.unl.edu>)

Meehan et al (2011) Riparian Ecosystems of the Middle Sheyenne River in Eastern North Dakota. Fargo, North Dakota. NDSU Dept of Ag and Applied Science Graduate Program.

Samson, F. B., & Knopf, F. L. (1996). Prairie Conservation Preserving North America's Most Endangered Ecosystem. Washington D.C.: Island Press.

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Official Soil Series Descriptions. Available online. Accessed March 2018.

United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resource 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. 672pps.

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

USDA, NRCS. National Water and Climate Center, 101 SW Main, Suite 1600, Portland, OR 97204-3224. (<http://wcc.nrcs.usda.gov>)

USDA, NRCS. National Range and Pasture Handbook, September 1997

USDA, NRCS. National Soil Information System, Information Technology Center, 2150 Centre Avenue, Building A, Fort Collins, CO 80526. (<http://nasis.nrcs.usda.gov>)

USDA, NRCS. 2001. The PLANTS Database, Version 3.1 (<http://plants.usda.gov>). National Plant Data Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70874-4490 USA.

USDA, NRCS, Various Published Soil Surveys.

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 2018).

Contributors

Lance Howe
Steve Winter
Landon Wolter, USDA-NRCS MLRA Rangeland Management Specialist

Approval

Suzanne Mayne-Kinney, 4/22/2025

Acknowledgments

Contact for Lead Authors: Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS), Redfield Soil Survey Office Redfield, SD; Lance Howe (Lance.Howe@usda.gov), Soil Survey Office Leader, USDA-NRCS, Redfield, SD; and Steve Winter (Steven.Winter@usda.gov), Soil Scientist, USDA-NRCS, Redfield, SD; Landon Wolter (Landon.Wolter@usda.gov), MLRA Rangeland Management Specialist, USDA-NRCS, Redfield, SD Additional Information Acknowledgment: Jason Hermann (Jason.Hermann@usda.gov), Area Rangeland Management Specialist, USDA-NRCS, Redfield, SD; Emily Rohrer (Emily.Rohrer@usda.gov), South Dakota NRCS State Rangeland Management Specialist

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	04/22/2025
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:
