

Ecological site F062XB059SD

Highland Hills Pine Forest (60+% Slope)

Last updated: 2/06/2025
Accessed: 08/16/2026

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): 062X–Black Hills

The Black Hills (MLRA 62) is a unique, low lying mountain range situated in the midst of a mixed short and mid-grass prairie. It is a true Island in the Plains, as it has geophysical and biological attributes that are unlike the surrounding area. The Black Hills have strong floristic ties to four of the North American biomes: Cordilleran (Rocky Mountain) Forest, Northern Coniferous Forest, Eastern Deciduous Forest, and Grasslands. MLRA 62 is approximately 3,040 square miles in size; 74 percent is located in South Dakota, and 26 percent is in Wyoming. The towns of Lead, Deadwood, Hill City, and Custer, South Dakota, are in this area. U.S. Highways 16 and 385 cross the MLRA. The Black Hills National Forest, Custer State Park, Mt. Rushmore National Monument, Jewel Cave National Monument, and Wind Cave National Park are located in this MLRA. This area forms the core of the Black Hills and the Bear Lodge Mountains where the elevation ranges between 3,600 to 6,565 feet, however, Black Elk Peak (Harney Peak) rises to 7,242 feet. Slopes range from moderately sloping on some of the high plateaus to very steeply sloping along drainageways and on peaks and ridges. Narrow valleys generally are gently sloping to strongly sloping. The Black Hills uplift is the product of the Laramide mountain-building episodes that produced most of the ranges in the Rocky Mountains. Uplift began near the end of the Cretaceous period, 65 million years ago and ended by 35 million years ago (Froiland 1999). The core of the Black Hills is a plutonic mass of granite with steeply dipping metamorphic rocks, primarily slate and schist, which directly surrounds the granite core. A plateau of Mississippian limestone surrounds the igneous and metamorphic rock core. The Madison limestone is broken around the outer edges of the uplifted area. The Permian Minnekahta limestone forms the outermost boundary of the area. Many other tilted sandstone, shale, and limestone units are exposed like a bathtub ring inside the steeply dipping Madison limestone. The dominant soil orders in this MLRA are Alfisols (forest soils) and Mollisols (grassland soils). The soils in the area have a frigid or cryic soil temperature regime, a udic or ustic soil moisture regime, and mixed, micaceous, or smectitic mineralogy. They are shallow to very deep, generally well drained, and loamy in texture. The Black Hills MLRA supports open to dense forest vegetation. Ponderosa pine is the dominant species across the Black Hills. White spruce grows at the higher elevations and along the major drainageways. Bur oak is found intermixed with pine in the northern and eastern fringes of the Black Hills, and Rocky Mountain Juniper is most common in the southern portion of the Black Hills. Aspen is of minor extent throughout the Black Hills area. Roughleaf ricegrass, slender wheatgrass, bearded wheatgrass, poverty oatgrass, Richardson's needlegrass, and mountain ricegrass are the most common native grasses under open forest stands. The most common native shrubs are common snowberry, bearberry, common juniper, Oregon grape, and Saskatoon serviceberry. MLRA 62 land ownership is approximately 47 percent private and 53 percent federal. Rangeland and forestland are split almost equally between private and federal ownership (47 percent each). Minor areas of land are privately owned cropland and urban development. The forestland in this area is used mainly for timber production, recreation, and grazing. The major resource concerns are soil erosion and surface compaction caused by logging, mining, wildfires, grazing, and urban expansion. The quality of ground and surface water is another concern, especially in the northern part of the Black Hills. The primary cause is contamination from mine waste and septic systems in areas of rural development and urban expansion (USDA-NRCS, 2006: Ag Handbook 296).

LRU notes

For development of ecological sites, MLRA 62 is divided into three Land Resource Units (LRU's) or physiographic zones (A, B, C, and Y). Each LRU has a set of ecological sites that represents these zones. The LRU is identified in the Ecological Site ID: R062XY000SD; "062X" identifies the MLRA, the next letter "Y" identifies the LRU. Note: The organization of Ecological Site ID's will likely change in the future. LRU-A includes the northern Black Hills and Bear Lodge Mountains (22-30" PZ); LRU-B includes the high elevation central core of the Black Hills (25-35" PZ); and LRU-C includes the southern portion of the Black Hills (17-21" PZ). The Forest ecological sites are representative of sites in the Black Hills, Bear Lodge Mountains (MLRA-62), and the surrounding Dakota Hogback (MLRA-61). These sites are separated by elevation, soil temperature regimes, and slope. The Low Mountain area includes all of the Black Hills, Bear Lodge Mountains, and Dakota Hogback below 6,200 feet in elevation (LRU's A and C). The soils in this area have a frigid soil temperature regime. The High Mountain area includes all of the Black Hills above 6,200 feet elevation (LRU-B). The soils in this area have a cryic soil temperature regime.

Classification relationships

USDA Land Resource Region G—Western Great Plains Range and Irrigated Region: Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) 61—Black Hills Foot Slopes Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) 62—Black Hills US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Level IV Ecoregions of the Conterminous United States: Black Hills Foothills—17a Black Hills Plateau—17b Black Hills Core Highlands—17c USDA Forest Service Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections of the Conterminous United States: Black Hills Coniferous Forest Province—M334: Black Hills Section—334A Black Hills Foothills Subsection—M334Aa Black Hills Limestone Plateau-Core Highlands Subsection—M334Ab

Ecological site concept

Occurring throughout the Black Hills, ponderosa pine is the dominant species for most of the area occurring across a variety of landforms and soils. The central concept of this ecological site focuses on dividing the region into three LRU's, and three slope classes. This ecological site encompasses the higher elevation of the MLRA, LRU B, reaching from 6,200-7,200 feet with slopes of 60% or more on what is considered the high Limestone Plateau. In the higher elevations, there exists cooler and moister conditions than in most of the surrounding hills. Often this site is dominated by an understory of shrubs, along with forbs and cool season bunchgrasses- with less frequent fires compared to the dryer and warmer lower elevations.

Associated sites

F062XB056SD	Highland Cool Valley Slopes and Depressions This ecological site occurs in the same region as the Highland Hills ecological site, often on cool steep slopes or areas of increased moisture.
F062XY057SD	Cool Fringe Mixed Hardwood Forest This ecological site often occurs adjacent to or intermixed with the Highland Hills ecological site in areas of increased moisture.

Similar sites

F062XA051SD	Low Elevation Northern Hills Pine Forest(0-15% Slope) This site occurs in the northern range of the Black Hills and is warmer.
F062XC053SD	Low Elevation Dry Southern Hills Pine Forest This site occurs in the southern range of the Black Hills, and is dryer and warmer.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Pinus ponderosa</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Symphoricarpos albus</i> (2) <i>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Oryzopsis asperifolia</i> (2) <i>Elymus trachycaulus ssp. subsecundus</i>

Physiographic features

The Highland Hills ecological site occupies elevation ranging from 6200-7200 feet across a wide variety of landforms and slopes commonly of 60%- 90%, or possibly higher, encompassing the central region of the Black Hills known as LRU B and the high limestone

plateau.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Hills > Hillslope (2) Ridge (3) Hill
Runoff class	Medium to very high
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	1,890 – 2,200 m
Slope	60 – 90 %
Ponding depth	0 cm
Water table depth	200 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

MLRA 62 is in a microclimate caused by the influence of increased elevation which leads to increased precipitation, moderate air temperature, and lower wind velocities compared to the surrounding Great Plains. In general, the Black Hills climate is a continental type, cold in the winter and hot in the summer.

Growth of cool-season plants begins in April, slowing or ceasing growth by mid-August. Warm-season plants begin growth in May and continue to mid-September. Regrowth of cool-season plants may occur in September and October, depending upon soil moisture availability.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	20 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	50 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	530 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	20 days

Freeze-free period (actual range)	50 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	530 mm
Frost-free period (average)	20 days
Freeze-free period (average)	50 days
Precipitation total (average)	530 mm

- (1) DEERFIELD 3 SE [USC00392231], Hill City, SD

Influencing water features

Riparian areas and wetland features are not associated with this site.

Wetland description

Not Applicable.

Soil features

This site is represented by the Riflepit and Stovho Soils of map units with 60% slope or more. Soils in this region that were historically forest often show evidence of an “E” eluviated horizon from decades of eluviation of acidic materials from needle and leaf litter. Acidity at the surface is often in the range of 5.0-6.5 pH while the subsurface from 0-40 inches is within the 5.1 to 8.4 pH range. A thin organic horizon is commonly present at the surface.

More information regarding the soil is available in soil survey reports. Contact the local USDA Service Center for details specific to your area of interest, or go online to access USDA's Web Soil Survey.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Residuum – limestone and sandstone (2) Colluvium – schist (3) Alluvium – rhyolite
Surface texture	(1) Loam (2) Channery silt loam (3) Very gravelly sandy loam (4) Clay
Family particle size	(1) Loamy
Drainage class	Well drained

Permeability class	Very slow to rapid
Soil depth	50 – 200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0 – 10 %
Surface fragment cover >3"	0 – 10 %
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	2.54 – 21.59 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-101.6cm)	0 – 40 %
Electrical conductivity (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Sodium adsorption ratio (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	5.1 – 8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 70 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 70 %

Ecological dynamics

Dominated by ponderosa pine, the Highland Hills (60+% Slope) ecological site occupies much of the area of LRU B. There exists a historic reference state, a native/invaded state, and a managed state. Given the history of intensive use of the Black Hills and its forestry resources, much of the area today would be found in a managed state with few areas remaining in either the native or native/invaded states. This LRU is defined by the cooler temperatures, increased moisture, and a long stretching portion of limestone as the base parent material over much of the area. Natural disturbances such as fire, wind, ice storms, and pests determined the structure and appearance of this ecological site. Fires in this region occurred less often than the surrounding areas due to the increased moisture and cooler temperatures.

Historically the Black Hills consisted of a diverse landscape mosaic that varied from grasslands, open stands of ponderosa pine forest with small numbers of large trees, and dense stands of ponderosa pine, with many similar-sized and -aged trees. Spatial heterogeneity

was present not only across the Black Hills but also within the smaller dense pine patches (Brown, 2006). Ponderosa pine is the dominant tree species in the Black Hills and tends to have dark colored bark (blackjacks) until it reaches 75 to 100 years of age, after which the bark progressively changes to a buff or orange color.

Fires in this region occurred less often than the surrounding areas due to the increased moisture and cooler temperatures, often with an interval ranging from 30-33 years (Hunter et al. 2007). Prior to Euro-American settlement, the Black Hills fire regime was mixed-severity, with both surface and crown fires being components of the ecosystem (Hunter et al. 2007). "Long fire-free periods were historically common in the Black Hills (Brown and Sieg 1996), which may have led to fuel build-up and high tree density - conditions conducive to crown fire spread (Hunter et al. 2007)". The occurrence of surface fires and stand-replacing fires, coupled with other disturbance agents, led to a complex mosaic of forest structure composed of dense forests, moderately stocked forests, and treeless openings (Hunter et al. 2007).

Pests, disease, and other natural disturbances played integral roles in maintain diversity in structure and density of this area. The mountain pine beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*) plays an important part in the natural disturbance regime in the Black Hills and have long been a driver of forest structure. The mountain pine beetle was first described in the Black Hills in 1901 by Andrew D. Hopkins and the first documented epidemic of bark beetles in the Black Hills occurred in 1895 (Graham et al. 2016). These beetles are native in the Black Hills and have cyclical events of emergence, there has been a continuous endemic and several epidemics in the Black Hills over the last 129 years (Graham et al. 2016). "Mountain pine beetle outbreaks in the Black Hills from 1894 through 2014 had a mean return interval of 20 years and a mean duration of 13 years" (Graham et al. 2016). The latest mountain pine beetle occurred in the early 2000's and caused massive damage due to an abundance of dense stands and drought, allowing the insects to multiply in favorable years. In addition to the mountain pine beetle pine engraver (*Ips pini*) are also present and native to the Black Hills. Pine engraver beetles are non-aggressive and breed in windthrown ponderosa pine trees, trees damaged by wind, ice storms, or other non-standing tree's. *Armillaria* (*Armillaria ostoyae*) has been seen as a potentially important root disease of ponderosa pine in the Black Hills since the 1930s, however it is just a part of this ecological sites natural disturbances (Boldt and Van Deusen 1974; Holah 1993; Lundquist 1991; Shepperd, Wayne D.; Battaglia, Michael A. 2002).

Studies have shown the current forest contains about the same basal area (ft²/ac) on average as the historic forest. The difference, however, is that the historic forest was dominated by fewer, but much larger trees, than those present today. This suggests that there has been a simplification in structure at stand to landscape scales, with increased tree density leading to fewer gaps and more even spacing and size distributions within groups (Brown, 2008).

Relative increases in tree density and simplification of structure have contributed to greater vertical and horizontal fuel continuity, and thus increased likelihood for incidence and extent of crown fires. More pole-sized trees (5-to-9-inch DBH) within stands also increases the likelihood of bark beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*) outbreaks. This is a concern in the Black Hills where pine beetle outbreaks have been a major disturbance agent during the 20th and early 21st centuries.

It is also important to note the change in composition in recent decades of ponderosa pine stands, whereby mainly through the mechanism of fire suppression, the dominance of white spruce has grown by an estimated 5% or more from the original 1.5% composition covered historically (Tatina R.E., Hanberry B.B., 2022).

Due to the spread and establishment of non-native cool-season grasses and other anthropogenic disturbances in MLRA 62, the Reference Plant Community (1.1) will only be a close analogy of the pre-settlement plant community.

The following state-and-transition diagram illustrates the common plant communities on the site and the transition pathways between communities. The ecological processes are discussed in more detail in the plant community descriptions following the diagram.

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	Cool-Season Bunchgrass			135-269	
	slender wheatgrass	ELTRS	<i>Elymus trachycaulus ssp. subsecundus</i>	13-101	–
	slender wheatgrass	ELTR7	<i>Elymus trachycaulus</i>	13-101	–
	roughleaf ricegrass	ORAS	<i>Oryzopsis asperifolia</i>	13-101	–
	poverty oatgrass	DASP2	<i>Danthonia spicata</i>	13-67	–
	Richardson's needlegrass	ACRI8	<i>Achnatherum richardsonii</i>	7-67	–
	Porter brome	BRPO2	<i>Bromus porteri</i>	7-34	–
	Columbia needlegrass	ACNE9	<i>Achnatherum nelsonii</i>	7-34	–

	mountain brome	BRMA4	<i>Bromus marginatus</i>	7-34	–
	false melic	SCHIZ	<i>Schizachne</i>	7-13	–
	Canada wildrye	ELCA4	<i>Elymus canadensis</i>	0-13	–
	Rocky Mountain fescue	FESA	<i>Festuca saximontana</i>	7-13	–
	timber oatgrass	DAIN	<i>Danthonia intermedia</i>	0-13	–
	green needlegrass	NAVI4	<i>Nassella viridula</i>	0-7	–
	bluebunch wheatgrass	PSSP6	<i>Pseudoroegneria spicata</i>	0-7	–
	needle and thread	HECOC8	<i>Hesperostipa comata ssp. comata</i>	0-7	–
	porcupinegrass	HESP11	<i>Hesperostipa spartea</i>	0-7	–
	Scribner's rosette grass	DIOLS	<i>Dichanthelium oligosanthes var. scribnerianum</i>	0-7	–
2	Mid-Warm-Season Grasses			13-67	
	prairie dropseed	SPHE	<i>Sporobolus heterolepis</i>	7-34	–
	spiked muhly	MUGL3	<i>Muhlenbergia glomerata</i>	7-34	–
	little bluestem	SCSC	<i>Schizachyrium scoparium</i>	0-13	–
	sideoats grama	BOCU	<i>Bouteloua curtipendula</i>	0-13	–
3	Other Native Grasses			13-34	
	inland bluegrass	PONEI2	<i>Poa nemoralis ssp. interior</i>	7-20	–
	Grass, perennial	2GP	<i>Grass, perennial</i>	0-20	–
	prairie Junegrass	KOMA	<i>Koeleria macrantha</i>	7-20	–
	big bluestem	ANGE	<i>Andropogon gerardii</i>	0-13	–
	Cusick's bluegrass	POCU3	<i>Poa cusickii</i>	0-7	–
	downy ryegrass	LEIN6	<i>Leymus innovatus</i>	0-7	–
	onespike danthonia	DAUN	<i>Danthonia unispicata</i>	0-7	–
	Sandberg bluegrass	POSE	<i>Poa secunda</i>	0-7	–
	western wheatgrass	PASM	<i>Pascopyrum smithii</i>	0-7	–
4	Grass-Likes			67-135	
	Hood's sedge	CAHO5	<i>Carex hoodii</i>	7-34	–
	Richardson's sedge	CARI	<i>Carex richardsonii</i>	7-34	–
	Sprengel's sedge	CASP7	<i>Carex sprengelii</i>	0-20	–
	sun sedge	CAINH2	<i>Carex inops ssp. heliophila</i>	0-13	–
	Grass-like (not a true grass)	2GL	<i>Grass-like (not a true grass)</i>	0-13	–
5	Non-Native Cool-Season Grasses			0	
Forb					
6	Forbs			101-202	
	alpine milkvetch	ASAL7	<i>Astragalus alpinus</i>	7-34	–
	American vetch	VIAM	<i>Vicia americana</i>	7-34	–
	cream pea	LAOC2	<i>Lathyrus ochroleucus</i>	7-34	–
	goldenrod	SOLID	<i>Solidago</i>	7-34	–
	larkspur	DELPH	<i>Delphinium</i>	0-34	–
	looseflower milkvetch	ASTE5	<i>Astragalus tenellus</i>	7-34	–
	lupine	LUPIN	<i>Lupinus</i>	7-34	–
	prairie milkvetch	ASLAR	<i>Astragalus laxmannii var. robustior</i>	7-34	–
	pussytoes	ANTEN	<i>Antennaria</i>	7-34	–
	smooth blue aster	SYLA3	<i>Symphyotrichum laeve</i>	7-34	–
	western yarrow	ACMIO	<i>Achillea millefolium var. occidentalis</i>	7-34	–
	Forb, native	2FN	<i>Forb, native</i>	0-13	–

	northern bedstraw	GABO2	<i>Galium boreale</i>	7-13	–
	bluebell bellflower	CARO2	<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i>	7-13	–
	western brackenfern	PTAQ	<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>	0-13	–
	cinquefoil	POTEN	<i>Potentilla</i>	0-13	–
	gentian	GENTI	<i>Gentiana</i>	0-7	–
	prairie thermopsis	THRH	<i>Thermopsis rhombifolia</i>	0-7	–
	shootingstar	DODEC	<i>Dodecatheon</i>	0-7	–
	mountain deathcamas	ZIEL2	<i>Zigadenus elegans</i>	0-7	–
Shrub/Vine					
7	Shrubs			135-269	
	common snowberry	SYAL	<i>Symphoricarpos albus</i>	34-67	–
	kinnikinnick	ARUV	<i>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</i>	34-67	–
	russet buffaloberry	SHCA	<i>Shepherdia canadensis</i>	13-67	–
	Saskatoon serviceberry	AMAL2	<i>Amelanchier alnifolia</i>	13-67	–
	ninebark	PHYSO	<i>Physocarpus</i>	7-34	–
	creeping barberry	MARE11	<i>Mahonia repens</i>	13-34	–
	rose	ROSA5	<i>Rosa</i>	13-34	–
	Shrub (>.5m)	2SHRUB	<i>Shrub (>.5m)</i>	7-34	–
	American red raspberry	RUID	<i>Rubus idaeus</i>	7-34	–
	beaked hazelnut	COCO6	<i>Corylus cornuta</i>	7-13	–
	western snowberry	SYOC	<i>Symphoricarpos occidentalis</i>	7-13	–
	grouse whortleberry	VASC	<i>Vaccinium scoparium</i>	7-13	–
	Jersey tea	CEHE	<i>Ceanothus herbaceus</i>	0-7	–
	leadplant	AMCA6	<i>Amorpha canescens</i>	0-7	–
	white spirea	SPBE2	<i>Spiraea betulifolia</i>	0-7	–
	western poison ivy	TORY	<i>Toxicodendron rydbergii</i>	0-7	–
	common juniper	JUCO6	<i>Juniperus communis</i>	0-7	–

Table 6. Community 1.1 forest overstory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height M	Canopy Cover (%)	Diameter Cm	Basal Area (square M/hectare)
Tree							
ponderosa pine	PIPOS	<i>Pinus ponderosa var. scopulorum</i>	Native	3-16.8	30-60	22.9-38.1	–
Rocky Mountain juniper	JUSC2	<i>Juniperus scopulorum</i>	Native	1.5-4.6	0-10	2.5-12.7	–
white spruce	PIGL	<i>Picea glauca</i>	Native	2.7-15.2	0-5	12.7-25.4	–
bur oak	QUMA2	<i>Quercus macrocarpa</i>	Native	1.5-4.6	0-5	2.5-12.7	–
quaking aspen	POTR5	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	Native	3-10.7	1-5	2.5-22.9	–
Tree	2TREE	<i>Tree</i>	Native	–	0-1	–	–

Table 7. Community 1.2 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 1.3 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 1.4 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

Information presented here has been derived from NRCS clipping data and other inventory data. Field observations from range-trained personnel were also used. Those involved in developing this site include: Stan Boltz, range management specialist (RMS), NRCS; Dan Brady, soil scientist (SS), NRCS; Mitch Faulkner, RMS, NRCS; Rick Peterson, (RMS), NRCS, Ezra Hoffman (Ecological Site Specialist) NRCS; and Jim Westerman, (SS), NRCS. All inventory information and data records are compiled within the Rapid City, SD USDA-NRCS Shared "S" network drive.

Other references

Blodgett, J.T., K.K. Allen, K. Schotzko, and A. Dymerski. 2017. Aspen Health on National Forests in the Northern Rocky Mountain Region. Rep. RCSC-17-06. Golden, CO: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Health Protection. 19 p.

Brown, P. M. and C. Hull-Sieg. 1996. Fire History in Interior Ponderosa Pine Communities of the Black Hills, South Dakota, USA, *Int. J. Wildland Fire* 6(3): 97-105.

Brown, P. M. and C. Hull-Sieg. 1999. Historical variability in fire at the ponderosa pine – Northern Great Plains prairie ecotone, southeastern Black Hills, South Dakota, *Ecoscience*, 6(4):539-547.

Brown, P. M. and B. Cook. 2006. Early settlement forest structure in Black Hills ponderosa Pine Forest. *Forest Ecology and Management* 223 (2006) 284–290.

Brown, P. M., C. L. Wienk, A. J. Symstad. 2008. Fire and forest history at Mount Rushmore. *Ecological Applications*, 18(8):1984-1999

Cleland, D.T., J.A. Freeouf, J.E. Keys, G.J. Nowacki, C.A. Carpenter, and W.H McNab. 2007. Ecological subregions: Sections and subsections of the conterminous United States. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report WO-76D. <https://www.fs.fed.us/research/publications/misc/73326-wo-gtr-76d-cleland2007.pdf> (accessed 31 January 2019).

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.

DeBlander, L.T. 2002. Forest Resources of the Black Hills National Forest. Ogden, UT: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 16 p.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2018. EPA level III and level IV ecoregions of the conterminous United States. <https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/level-iii-and-iv-ecoregions-conterminous-united-states> (accessed 26 April 2018).

Froiland Sven G. and Ronald R. Weedon. 1999. Natural History of the Black Hills and Badlands. Center for Western Studies, Augustana College, Sioux Falls SD.

Gartner F. R. and W. W. Thompson. 1972. Fire in the Black Hills forest-grass ecotone, South Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, Journal Series No 1115.

Graham, Russell T.; Asherin, Lance A.; Battaglia, Michael A.; Jain, Theresa B.; Mata, Stephen A. 2016. Mountain pine beetles: A century of knowledge, control attempts, and impacts central to the Black Hills. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-353. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 193 p.

Hall, J. S.; Marriott, J. H.; Perot, J. K. 2002. Ecological Conservation in the Black Hills. Minneapolis, MN: The Nature Conservancy.

High Plains Regional Climate Center, University of Nebraska. 2018. <http://www.hprcc.unl.edu/> (accessed 6 April 2018).

Hoffman, George R., Alexander, Robert R. 1987. Forest Vegetation of the Black Hills National Forest of South Dakota and Wyoming: a habitat type classification. Res. Pap. RM-276. USDA-USFS, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Hunter, M.E.; Shepperd, W.D.; Lentile, J.E.; Lundquist, J.E.; Andreu, M.G.; Butler, J.L.; Smith, F.W. 2007. A comprehensive guide to fuels treatment practices for ponderosa pine in the Black Hills, Colorado Front Range, and Southwest. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-198. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 93 p.

Larson, Gary E. and James R. Johnson. 1999. Plants of the Black Hills and Bear Lodge Mountains. South Dakota State University, College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences and Agriculture Experiment Station, Bulletin 732, Brookings, SD.

McIntosh, A. C. 1949. A botanical survey of the Black Hills of South Dakota. *Black Hills Engineer*. 28 (4): 3-75.

Parrish, J. B., D. J. Herman, D. J. Reyher, and F. R. Gartner. 1996. A Century of Change in the Black Hills and Riparian Ecosystems. *Open Prairie: Bulletins 726, Agriculture Experiment Station, South Dakota State University*. https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/agexperimentsta_bulletins/726

Shepperd, W. D. and M. A. Battaglia. 2002. Ecology, silviculture, and management of Black Hills ponderosa pine. *Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-97*. Fort Collins, CO: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 112 p.

Severson, K.E. and J.F. Thilenius. 1976. Classification of quaking aspen stands in the Black Hills and Bear Lodge Mountains. U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station Forest Service, Research Paper RM-166. 24p.

Toledo, D., M. Sanderson, K. Spaeth, J. Hendrickson, and J. Printz. 2014. Extent of Kentucky bluegrass and its effect on native plant species diversity and ecosystem services in the Northern Great Plains of the United States. *Invasive Plant Science and Management*. 7(4):543–522. Weed Science Society of America.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service. 2018. Black Hills Resilient Landscape Project, Final Environmental Impact Statement.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2020. Electronic field office technical guide. <https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov> (accessed 11 June 2020).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1993. Electronic field office technical guide. <https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov> (accessed 11 June 2020).

Soil Survey Staff. 2019. Official soil series descriptions. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/home/?cid=nrcs142p2_053587 (accessed 16 June 2020).

Soil Survey Staff. 2019. Web Soil Survey. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx> (accessed 11 June 2020).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. *Agriculture Handbook 296*. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_050898.pdf (accessed 27 January 2018).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2014. National ecological site handbook, 1st ed. <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/ref/?cid=nrcseprd1291232> (accessed 27 January 2018).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2012. National engineering handbook, part 630. Hydrology chapters from e-Directives. <https://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/viewerFS.aspx?hid=21422> (accessed 16 June 2020).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2018. Climate data. National Water and Climate Center. <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/> (accessed 2 December 2018).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1997. National range and pasture handbook, rev. 1, 2003. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb1043055.pdf (accessed 7 January 2018).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2019. National Soil Information System, Information Technology Center. <http://nasis.nrcs.usda.gov> (accessed 30 July 2019).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2014. Key to Soils Taxonomy. <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/survey/class/> (accessed 27 August 2020).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2019. PLANTS database. National Plant Data Team, Greensboro, NC. <http://plants.usda.gov> (accessed 16 June 2020).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2007. National engineering handbook, part 654. Rosgen Stream Classification Technique – Supplemental Materials, Technical Supplement 3E. <https://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/OpenNonWebContent.aspx?content=17833.wba> (accessed 16 June 2020).

Walters, B.F., C.W. Woodall, R.J. Piva, M.A. Hatfield, G.M. Domke, and D.E. Haugen. 2013. Forest of the Black Hills National Forests 2011. Resource Bulletin NRS-83. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 36 p.

Wrage, K. J. 1994. The effects of ponderosa pine on soil moisture, precipitation, and understory vegetation in the Black Hills of South Dakota. 158 p. Thesis.

Tatina R.E., Hanberry B.B. (2022). Historical forests of the Black Hills, South Dakota, USA, determined using General Land Office surveys. *Silva Fennica* vol. 56 no. 3 article id 10754. 17 p. <https://doi.org/10.14214/sf.10754>

Contributors

Rick L. Peterson, Rangeland Management Specialist-NRCS(Retired)

Mitch D. Faulkner, Rangeland Management Specialist-NRCS

Stan C. Boltz, Rangeland Management Specialist-NRCS

Ezra Hoffman, Ecological Site Specialist-NRCS

Laura Bosworth, State Forester, NRCS

Nancy Bane, Silviculturist, USFS(Retired)

Kara Dunlap, Timber Program Manager, USFS

David Jalali, MLRA Soil Scientist, NRCS

Dan Brady, Soil Scientist, NRCS

Jonas Feinstein, Western Tech Center Forester, NRCS

Approval

Suzanne Mayne-Kinney, 2/06/2025

Acknowledgments

Nondiscrimination Statement: In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident. Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English. To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, available online at <https://www.ascr.usda.gov/filing-program-discrimination-complaint-usda-customer> and at any USDA office, or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov. USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

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	08/16/2026
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:
