Ecological site R081CY561TX
Loamy Bottomland
29-35 PZ

Last updated: 9/19/2023
Accessed: 09/01/2026

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): 081C–Edwards Plateau, Eastern Part

This area represents the eastern part of the Edwards Plateau region. Limestone ridges and canyons and nearly level to gently sloping valley floors characterize the area. Elevation is 400 feet (120 meters) at the eastern end of the area and increases westward to 2,400 feet (730 meters) on ridges. This area is underlain primarily by limestones in the Glen Rose, Fort Terrett, and Edwards Formations of Cretaceous age. Quaternary alluvium is in river valleys.

Classification relationships

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) and Land Resource Unit (LRU) (USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2006) National Vegetation Classification/Shrubland & Grassland/2C Temperate & Boreal Shrubland and Grassland/M051 Great Plains Mixedgrass Prairie & Shrubland/ G133 Central Great Plains Mixedgrass Prairie Group.

Ecological site concept

These sites occur on drainages with deep alluvial soils. Reference vegetation includes a mixture of trees, shrubs and herbaceous plants. Overtime, without fire or brush management, woody species may dominate the site.

Associated sites

R081CY355TX	**Adobe 29-35 PZ** The Adobe ecological site is upslope with shallower soils and lower production.
R081CY357TX	**Clay Loam 29-35 PZ** The Clay Loam ecological site is upslope from the Loamy Bottomland ecological site.
R081CY360TX	**Low Stony Hill 29-35 PZ** The Low Stony Hill ecological site is upslope from the Loamy Bottomland ecological site.

Similar sites

R081CY357TX	**Clay Loam 29-35 PZ** The Clay Loam ecological site is upslope from the Loamy Bottomland ecological site, but is not flooded.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) *Carya illinoinensis* (2) *Quercus fusiformis*
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) *Tripsacum dactyloides*

Physiographic features

This site is located in the 81C, Eastern Edwards Plateau Major Land Resource Area (MLRA). This site is well drained and has high water holding capacity. The site receives overflow from adjacent sites and from flooding creeks and rivers. These sites generally flood once every two years for periods of four hours to less than 48 hours.

Figure 1. Diagram showing how the Loamy Bottomland occurs in

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Plateau > Flood plain (2) River valley > Flood plain (3) Plateau > Draw
Runoff class	Negligible to low
Flooding duration	Very brief (4 to 48 hours)
Flooding frequency	Frequent
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	120 – 440 m
Slope	0 %
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Table 3. Representative physiographic features (actual ranges)

Runoff class	Not specified
Flooding duration	Not specified

Flooding frequency	Not specified
Ponding frequency	Not specified
Elevation	Not specified
Slope	0 – 10 %

Climatic features

The climate is humid subtropical and is characterized by hot summers and relatively mild winters. The average first frost should occur around November 15 and the last freeze of the season should occur around March 19.

The average relative humidity in mid-afternoon is about 50 percent. Humidity is higher at night, and the average at dawn is about 80 percent. The sun shines 70 percent of the time possible during the summer and 50 percent in winter. The prevailing wind direction is southeast.

Drought is calculated as 75% below average rainfall. It should be noted that timing of rainfall may be more significant than average rainfall.

Approximately two-thirds of annual rainfall occurs during the April to September period. Rainfall during this period generally falls during thunderstorms, and fairly large amount of rain may fall in a short time. Hurricanes provide another source of extremely high rains in a short time. A review of the rainfall records suggest that rainfall is below “normal” at least 60 percent of the time. Therefore, the erratic nature of the rainfall should be considered when developing any land management plans.

The impact of droughts in the Edwards Plateau cannot be under-estimated. Not only are droughts devastating to the land but also to those that manage the land. Droughts occur roughly every 20 years but not always. A severe drought in 2012 coupled with extreme heat resulted in a die off of juniper over millions of acres as well as other native plants.

Table 4 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	220-260 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	230-270 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	810-940 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	190-270 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	220-330 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	790-940 mm
Frost-free period (average)	240 days
Freeze-free period (average)	260 days

Precipitation total (average)	860 mm

- (1) MEDINA 1NE [USC00415742], Medina, TX
- (2) SAN ANTONIO/SEAWORLD [USC00418169], San Antonio, TX
- (3) KERRVILLE 3 NNE [USC00414782], Kerrville, TX
- (4) BLANCO [USC00410832], Blanco, TX
- (5) CANYON DAM [USC00411429], Canyon Lake, TX
- (6) BURNET MUNI AP [USW00003999], Burnet, TX
- (7) AUSTIN GREAT HILLS [USC00410433], Austin, TX
- (8) GEORGETOWN LAKE [USC00413507], Georgetown, TX
- (9) PRADE RCH [USC00417232], Leakey, TX

Influencing water features

This site is adjacent to rivers and streams. It receives water from overflow from watercourses and runoff from higher adjacent sites. Flooding of this site coupled with the dense tall grass vegetation would allow for sediment and nutrients to be trapped or held in place from the upslope watershed and keep them from being transported downstream.

Wetland description

This site may have inclusions of hydric soils or hydric soils that are wetlands that usually occur as oxbows or stream meanders.



Figure 8.

Soil features

In a representative profile for the Loamy Bottomland ecological site, the soils are very deep, loamy, and calcareous. They are well drained, and permeability is moderate to rapid. The site receives extra water from stream flooding and as runoff from adjacent higher sites. Surface runoff is slow and some areas are flooded for short periods. The soils have a high water holding capacity for plant use and are naturally fertile. The soil maybe underlain with material comprised of 65 to 90 percent rounded alluvial gravels, cobbles, and stones at depths of 12 to greater than 80 inches. The site produces high yields of palatable and nutritious forage.

Due to the scale of mapping, there are inclusions of minor components of other soils within these mapping units. Before performing any inventories, conduct a field evaluation to ensure the soils are correct for the site. Riverwash is a miscellaneous minor component which is found in or next to the stream channel.

The following representative soils associated with the Loamy Bottomland ecological site are Oakalla and Orif. These are the representative map units associated with the Loamy Bottomland ecological site:

Oakalla silty clay loam, flooded
Oakalla silty clay loam, occasionally flooded
Oakalla silty clay, occasionally flooded
Oakalla silty clay loam, occasionally flooded
Orif-Riverwash complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes, frequently flooded

Table 5. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Alluvium – limestone
Surface texture	(1) Silty clay loam (2) Very gravelly clay loam (3) Fine sandy loam (4) Very gravelly loam
Drainage class	Well drained
Permeability class	Moderately slow to moderately rapid
Soil depth	200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0 – 10 %
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	4.32 – 18.03 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-101.6cm)	20 – 90 %
Electrical conductivity (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Sodium adsorption ratio (0-101.6cm)	Not specified

Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	7.4 – 8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (10.2-101.6cm)	10 – 60 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (10.2-101.6cm)	0 – 10 %

Ecological dynamics

The reference plant community is perceived as a mixture of tall grasses and hardwood trees. The site is typical of the first level of bottomland near a river and perennial creek. Also included are the riparian plants growing at the juncture of the stream and the first bottomland that are directly influenced by subsurface water. The site evolved under a natural wildfire regime. The anticipated result is an ecological site that is variable but generally was an open savannah. At any given point in time, depending upon the last fire or possibly flood, there could exist open savannah as well as some overstory with dense understory. The high fuel loads of this site coupled with wildfire kept woody vegetation at a low level.

The deep soils with high organic matter stored a large amount of water for plant growth. The production of the tall grasses kept soil erosion to a minimum. During flood events, these grasses would bend over and protect the soils much the same as shingles protect the roof of a house. Flooding of this site would bring in new soil and nutrients from the upslope watershed. Flooding could also re-work the channel depending upon severity. Severe droughts increase this vulnerability.

The dominant grasses were big bluestem (Andropogon gerardii), Indiangrass (Sorghastrum nutans), switchgrass (Panicum virgatum), eastern gamagrass (Tripsacum dactyloides), little bluestem (Schizachyrium scoparium), sideoats grama (Bouteloua curtipendula), Indian woodoats, (Chasmanthium latifolium), wildryes (Elymus spp.), three-flowered melicgrass (Melica nitens), and feathery bluestems (Bothriochloa spp.). Major forbs include Maximilian sunflower (Helianthus maximiliani), Illinois bundleflower (Desmanthus illinoensis), Engelmann’s daisy (Engelmannia peristenia), gaura (Gaura spp.), western indigo (Indigofera miniata var. leptosepala), and blazing star (Liatris spp.). Shrubs included elbowbush (Forestiera pubescens), Mexican buckeye (Ungnadia speciosa), buttonbush (Cephalanthus occidentalis), and willow Baccharis (Baccharis salicina). Major trees included pecan (Carya illinoinensis), walnut species (Juglans spp.), Texas live oak (Quercus fusiformis), Sycamore (Platanus occidentalis), and cottonwood (Populus deltoids). Cypress (Taxodium distichum) occurred in some watersheds of the MLRA. The endemic woody plants historically shaded 10 to 20 percent of the soil surface, either as small mottes or individual trees that were either resistant to fire or occupied areas where fires were less frequent or intense.

Natural plant mortality is very low with the major species producing seeds and vegetative structure each year in normal years. Litter cover is 100 percent. Physical soil crust is largely absent.

A study of early photographs of this region reveals that today these sites are much denser with woody cover and less covered with grass-like vegetation. Early accounts consistently describe this region as a vast expanse of hills covered with "cedar" from San Antonio to Austin. Accounts also describe an abundance of clean, flowing water and abundant wildlife. These accounts seem to describe heavy wooded areas in mosaic patterns occurring along the highs and lows of the landscape.

The plant communities of this site are dynamic and vary in relation to grazing, fire, and rainfall. Studies of the pre-European vegetation of the general area suggested 47 percent of the area was wooded (Wills, 2006). Historical records do reflect area observations but are not specific on the Loamy bottomland site except in anecdotal references from early travelers. The loamy bottomland was utilized for camping and travel routes. From the Teran expedition in 1691, “great quantities of buffaloes” were noted in the area. By 1840 the Bonnell expedition reflected that “buffalo rarely range so far to the south” (Inglis, 1964). Another example is an early settler, Arnold Gugger, who wrote in his journal about the mid to late 1800s in the Helotes, Texas area, “in those days buffaloes were in droves by the hundreds…..and antelopes were three to four hundred in a bunch….and deer and turkeys at any amount” (Massey, 2009). Many research studies document the interaction of bison grazing and fire (Fuhlendorf and et al., 2008). Bison would come into an area, graze it down, leave and then not come back for many months or even years. Many times this grazing scheme by buffalo was high impact and followed fire patterns and available natural water. This usually long deferment period allowed the taller grasses and forbs to recover from the high impact bison grazing. This relationship created a diverse landscape both in structure and composition.

Historical fire frequencies for the region are suggested to be 13 to 25 years (Frost, 1998). When fires did occur, they were set either by Native Americans or by lighting. Woody plant control would vary in accordance with the intensity and severity of the fire encountered, which resulted in a mosaic of vegetation types within the same site.

Ashe juniper (Juniperus ashei) will increase regardless of grazing. Juniper will establish with grazing and without unless goats are utilized. Goats and sheep will eat young juniper and when properly used, are an effective tool to maintain juniper (Taylor, 1997; Anderson, et al., 2013). The main role of excessive grazing relative to juniper is the removal of the fine fuel needed to carry an effective burn.

Ashe juniper, because of its dense low growing foliage, has the ability to retard grass and forb growth. Grass and forb growth can become nonexistent under dense juniper canopies. Many times there is a resurgence of the better grasses such as little bluestem when Ashe juniper is controlled and followed by proper grazing management. Seeds and dormant rootstocks of many plant species are contained in the leaf mulch and duff under the junipers.

Currently, cattle, goats, white-tailed deer, sheep, and exotic animals are the primary large herbivores. At settlement, large numbers of deer occurred, but as human populations increased (with unregulated harvest) their numbers declined substantially. Eventually, laws and restrictions on deer harvest were put in place which assisted in the recovery of the species. Females were not harvested for several decades following the implementation of hunting laws, which allowed population booms. In addition, suppression of fire favored woody plants which provided additional browse and cover for the deer. Because of their impacts on livestock production, large predators such as red wolves (Canis rufus), mountain lions (Felis concolor), black bears (Ursus americanus), and eventually coyotes (Canis latrins) were reduced in numbers or eliminated (Schmidly, 2002).

The screwworm fly (Cochilomyia hominivorax) was essentially eradicated by the mid-1960s, and while this was immensely helpful to the livestock industry, this removed a significant control on deer populations (Teer, Thomas, and Walker 1965; Bushland, 1985).

Currently, due to the increased land ownership for recreational purposes and a corresponding reduction in livestock production, predator populations are on the increase. This includes feral hogs (Sus scrofa).
Progressive management of the deer herd, because of their economic importance through lease hunting, has the objective of improving individual deer quality and improving habitat. Managed harvest based on numbers, sex ratios, condition, and monitoring of habitat quality has been effective on individual properties. However, across the Edwards Plateau, excess numbers still exist which may lead to habitat degradation and significant die-offs during stress periods such as extended droughts.

The Edwards Plateau is home to a variety of exotic ungulates, mostly introduced for hunting (Schmidly, 2002). These animals are important sources of income to some landowners, but as with the white-tailed deer, their populations must be managed to prevent degradation of the habitat for themselves as well as for the diversity of native wildlife in the area. Many other species of medium- and small-sized mammals, birds, and insects can have significant influences on the plant communities in terms of pollination, herbivory, seed dispersal, and creation of local disturbance patches, all of which contribute to the plant species diversity.

The plants and topography aided in increasing the infiltration of rainfall into the moderately slowly permeable soil. Any loss of soil organic matter and plant cover has a negative effect on infiltration. More rainfall is directed to overland flow, which causes increased soil erosion and flooding. Soils are also more prone to drought stress since organic matter acts like a sponge aiding in moisture retention for plant growth. Mulch buildup under the Ashe juniper canopy, following brush management and incorporation into the soil, can have a positive effect on increasing infiltration.
This site contains a large diversity of plants and this document does not attempt to cover them all. The intent of this document is to describe ecological processes on representative plants.

European settlement occurred in the mid to late 1800s (Raunick, 2007). This time period also coincided with a stoppage of fire. It was during this time that large-scale fencing was initiated to help the introduction of livestock. Predators were also reduced to protect livestock. In many cases sheep and goats heavily utilized the site. Low successional, unpalatable grasses, forbs, and shrubs have taken the place of the more desirable plant species. Non-preferred browse, such as juniper, fared well at the expense of the palatable browse.

This site was a favored grazing site for the many species that inhabited the site. This site would be one of the first to be overgrazed once early settlers began controlling grazing. It was also their main source of water.

Continued abusive grazing caused little bluestem, big bluestem, Indiangrass, switchgrass, and eastern gamagrass to decline or completely disappear from the site. Sideoats grama, Texas wintergrass, silver bluestem, pinhole bluestem, purpletop, southwestern bristle, and buffalograss would have increased once the tall grasses were removed from the ecosystem. Elimination of the tall and mid grasses from the site lead to decreased production, decreased organic matter, increased erosion, and decreased water holding capacity. Overharvest of the site removed the fuel supply so that fire became almost nonexistent on the site. Woody species, such as mesquite and Ashe juniper increased accordingly.
The species composition of the site changed from a warm season tall grass-hardwood site to a cool season mid grass-hardwood site and if retrogression continued, the site would become a woodland with a shrub and vine understory with very limited cool season grass and forb production. Sunlight becomes one of the most limiting factors for warm-season grass growth once the canopy cover exceeds 30 percent.

During the post-settlement years, land managers become knowledgeable of the soil quality of this site. Areas were cleared of woody and grass species and some of the sites were tilled and planted to crops. Eventually, permanent grasses were planted on some of the cropland.

It should be noted that the management of the Loamy Bottomland is linked and related to the adjacent upland sites. The management of these adjacent uplands is critical to any improvement efforts done on the Loamy Bottomland site.
Plant Communities and Transitional Pathways (diagram)

A State and Transition Model for the Loamy Bottomland Ecological Site (R081CY561TX) is depicted in this report. Descriptions of each state, transition, plant community, and pathway follow the model. Experts base this model on available experimental research, field observations, professional consensus, and interpretations. It is likely to change as knowledge increases. The major plants in the riparian zone are also included although, at some future time, the riparian zone deserves individual description.

Plant communities will differ across the MLRA because of the naturally occurring variability in weather, soils, and aspect. The Reference Plant Community is not necessarily the management goal; other vegetative states may be desired plant communities as long as the Range Health assessments are in the moderate and above category. The biological processes on this site are complex. Therefore, representative values are presented in a land management context. The species lists are representative and are not botanical descriptions of all species occurring, or potentially occurring, on this site. They are not intended to cover every situation or the full range of conditions, species, and responses for the site.

Both percent species composition by weight and percent canopy cover are described as are other metrics. Most observers find it easier to visualize or estimate percent canopy for woody species (trees and shrubs). Canopy cover can drive the transitions between communities and states because of the influence of shade and interception of rainfall. Species composition by dry weight is used for describing the herbaceous community and the community as a whole. Woody species are included in species composition for the site. Calculating the similarity index requires the use of species composition by dry weight.

The following diagram suggests some pathways that the vegetation on this site might take. There may be other states not shown in the diagram. This information is intended to show what might happen in a given set of circumstances. It does not mean that this would happen the same way in every instance. Local professional guidance should always be sought before pursuing a treatment scenario.

State and transition model

Additional community tables

Table 6. Community 1.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
Grass/Grasslike					
1	**Tallgrass**			1821-2914	
	eastern gamagrass	TRDA3	*Tripsacum dactyloides*	897-1345	–
	switchgrass	PAVI2	*Panicum virgatum*	785-1233	–
	Indiangrass	SONU2	*Sorghastrum nutans*	560-1121	–
	big bluestem	ANGE	*Andropogon gerardii*	560-1121	–
	little bluestem	SCSC	*Schizachyrium scoparium*	532-1065	–
2	**Midgrasses**			252-532	
	sideoats grama	BOCU	*Bouteloua curtipendula*	168-532	–
	southwestern bristlegrass	SESC2	*Setaria scheelei*	112-224	–
	purpletop tridens	TRFL2	*Tridens flavus*	28-112	–
	Arizona cottontop	DICA8	*Digitaria californica*	56-112	–
	plains lovegrass	ERIN	*Eragrostis intermedia*	56-112	–
	vine mesquite	PAOB	*Panicum obtusum*	56-112	–
	large-spike bristlegrass	SEMA5	*Setaria macrostachya*	56-112	–
3	**Midgrasses**			252-532	
	cane bluestem	BOBA3	*Bothriochloa barbinodis*	84-168	–
	silver beardgrass	BOLA2	*Bothriochloa laguroides*	22-112	–
	crowngrass	PASPA2	*Paspalum*	56-112	–
	white tridens	TRAL2	*Tridens albescens*	28-56	–
4	**Shortgrasses**			6-56	
	buffalograss	BODA2	*Bouteloua dactyloides*	6-56	–
	fall witchgrass	DICO6	*Digitaria cognata*	6-22	–

5	**Cool Season Grasses**			252-532	
	cedar sedge	CAPL3	*Carex planostachys*	56-168	–
	Canada wildrye	ELCA4	*Elymus canadensis*	56-168	–
	Virginia wildrye	ELVI3	*Elymus virginicus*	56-168	–
	threeflower melicgrass	MENI	*Melica nitens*	56-168	–
	Texas wintergrass	NALE3	*Nassella leucotricha*	56-168	–
	Indian woodoats	CHLA5	*Chasmanthium latifolium*	56-112	–
	Scribner's rosette grass	DIOLS	*Dichanthelium oligosanthes var. scribnerianum*	56-112	–
	Texas bluegrass	POAR	*Poa arachnifera*	28-84	–
Forb					
6	**Forbs**			56-280	
	Cuman ragweed	AMPS	*Ambrosia psilostachya*	56-112	–
	prairie clover	DALEA	*Dalea*	56-112	–
	beeblossom	GAURA	*Gaura*	28-112	–
	Maximilian sunflower	HEMA2	*Helianthus maximiliani*	56-112	–
	dotted blazing star	LIPU	*Liatris punctata*	28-112	–
	wax mallow	MAAR14	*Malvaviscus arboreus*	28-112	–
	Engelmann's daisy	ENPE4	*Engelmannia peristenia*	28-112	–
	awnless bushsunflower	SICA7	*Simsia calva*	28-112	–
	eastern milkpea	GARE2	*Galactia regularis*	28-84	–
	Nuttall's sensitive-briar	MINU6	*Mimosa nuttallii*	28-84	–
	yellow puff	NELU2	*Neptunia lutea*	28-84	–
	slimflower scurfpea	PSTE5	*Psoralidium tenuiflorum*	28-84	–
	snoutbean	RHYNC2	*Rhynchosia*	28-84	–
	zarzabacoa comun	DEIN3	*Desmodium incanum*	28-84	–
	aster	ASTER	*Aster*	28-84	–
	amberique-bean	STHE9	*Strophostyles helvola*	28-84	–
	coastal indigo	INMI	*Indigofera miniata*	28-56	–
	Gregg's tube tongue	JUPI5	*Justicia pilosella*	28-56	–
7	**Annual Forbs**			0-1	
	prairie broomweed	AMDR	*Amphiachyris dracunculoides*	0-1	–
Shrub/Vine					
8	**Shrubs and Vines**			56-280	
	roughleaf dogwood	CODR	*Cornus drummondii*	28-196	–
	Bush oak	QUBU	*Quercus ×bushii*	56-112	–
	mustang grape	VIMU2	*Vitis mustangensis*	56-112	–
	greenbrier	SMILA2	*Smilax*	56-112	–
	Eve's necklacepod	STAF4	*Styphnolobium affine*	28-84	–
	Mexican buckeye	UNSP	*Ungnadia speciosa*	28-84	–
	rusty blackhaw	VIRU	*Viburnum rufidulum*	28-84	–
	dwarf palmetto	SAMI8	*Sabal minor*	0-84	–
	eastern redbud	CECA4	*Cercis canadensis*	28-84	–
	hawthorn	CRATA	*Crataegus*	28-84	–
	stretchberry	FOPU2	*Forestiera pubescens*	28-84	–
	possumhaw	ILDE	*Ilex decidua*	28-84	–
	western white honeysuckle	LOAL	*Lonicera albiflora*	28-84	–

	plum	PRUNU	*Prunus*	28-84	–
	common hoptree	PTTR	*Ptelea trifoliata*	28-84	–
	Ohio buckeye	AEGL	*Aesculus glabra*	0-84	–
	Lindheimer's silktassel	GAOVL	*Garrya ovata ssp. lindheimeri*	0-56	–
	sycamoreleaf snowbell	STPL3	*Styrax platanifolius*	0-56	–
	American beautyberry	CAAM2	*Callicarpa americana*	0-28	–
Tree					
9	**Trees**			252-532	
	black walnut	JUNI	*Juglans nigra*	112-224	–
	pecan	CAIL2	*Carya illinoinensis*	112-224	–
	Texas live oak	QUFU	*Quercus fusiformis*	112-224	–
	bald cypress	TADI2	*Taxodium distichum*	0-168	–
	little walnut	JUMI	*Juglans microcarpa*	56-168	–
	Texas mulberry	MOMI	*Morus microphylla*	56-112	–
	American sycamore	PLOC	*Platanus occidentalis*	56-112	–
	cottonwood	POPUL	*Populus*	56-112	–
	hackberry	CELTI	*Celtis*	56-112	–
	elm	ULMUS	*Ulmus*	56-112	–
	bur oak	QUMA2	*Quercus macrocarpa*	56-112	–
	chinquapin oak	QUMU	*Quercus muehlenbergii*	28-112	–
	western soapberry	SASAD	*Sapindus saponaria var. drummondii*	56-112	–
	gum bully	SILA20	*Sideroxylon lanuginosum*	56-112	–
	Carolina buckthorn	FRCA13	*Frangula caroliniana*	28-84	–
	black cherry	PRSE2	*Prunus serotina*	28-84	–

Table 7. Community 1.2 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 3.1 plant community composition

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

Table 10. Community 3.2 plant community composition

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

Table 11. Community 4.1 plant community composition

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

Animal community

This site is used for the production of domestic livestock and to provide habitat for native wildlife and certain species of exotic wildlife. Cow-calf operations are the primary livestock enterprise although stocker cattle are also grazed. Sheep and goats were formerly raised in large numbers and are still present in reduced numbers. Sustainable stocking rates have declined drastically over the past 100 years because of the deterioration of the reference plant community. An assessment of vegetation is needed to determine initial safe starting stocking rates. Implementing a monitoring protocol will be needed to fine-tune the carrying capacity over time. Calculations used to determine an initial starting stocking rate should be based on forage production and grazeable acreage. Grazing can be useful to refresh decadent accumulated plant material and recycle their nutrients. Grazing can also improve plant diversity and sculpt the structure of the vegetation. However, grazing animals must be managed to prevent overuse of the areas adjacent to streams. Unmanaged grazing is very detrimental to streambanks. Not only can unmanaged grazing remove protective plant cover but streambanks can be physically damaged starting a chain reaction leading to the loss of the streambank and unnecessary steep cut-banks (some may be natural). Prescribed grazing, offsite mineral and feeding areas, offsite water, and retraining of grazing behavior all contribute to healthy streambanks. Fencing is also an option to manage animal access unless maintenance is a limiting issue. A large diversity of wildlife is native to this site. In the historic plant community, large migrating herds of bison, resident herds of pronghorn, and large numbers of prairie chickens (Tympanuchus spp.) and wild turkeys (Meleagris gallopavo var. intermedia) were the more dominant species. With the demise of these species and the changes in the plant community, the kinds of wildlife have changed. With the eradication of the screwworm fly, the increase in woody vegetation, and insufficient natural predation, white-tailed deer numbers have increased drastically and are often in excess of carrying capacity. Where deer numbers are excessive, overbrowsing and overuse of preferred forbs causes deterioration of the plant community. Progressive management of deer populations and exotics through hunting can keep populations in balance and provide an economically important ranching enterprise. Achieving a balance between woodland and more open plant communities on this site is an important key to deer management. Competition among deer, sheep, and goats is an important consideration in livestock and wildlife management and can cause damage to preferred vegetation. Smaller mammals include many kinds of rodents, jackrabbit, cottontail rabbit, raccoon, skunks, opossum, and armadillo. Mammalian predators include coyote, red fox, gray fox, bobcat, and mountain lion. Many species of snakes and lizards are native to the site. Many species of birds are found on this site including game birds, songbirds, and birds of prey. Major game birds that are economically important are Rio Grande turkey, bobwhite quail, and mourning dove. Turkey prefers plant communities with substantial amounts of shrubs and trees interspersed with grassland. Quail prefer plant communities with a combination of low shrubs, bunch grass, bare ground, and low successional forbs. The different species of songbirds vary in their habitat preferences. In general, a habitat that provides a large variety of grasses, forbs, shrubs, vines, and trees and a complex of grassland, savannah, shrubland, and woodland will support a good variety and abundance of songbirds. Birds of prey are important to keep the numbers of rodents, rabbits, and snakes in balance. The different plant communities of the site will sustain different species of raptors. Turkeys, in particular, utilize this site for much of their life cycle. The dense grasses are utilized for nesting, the creeks for water, and the trees for roosting. For roosting, turkeys prefer large trees with a relatively open understory from which to spot approaching predators. Various kinds of exotic wildlife utilize the site including axis, sika, fallow and red deer, aoudad sheep, and blackbuck antelope. Some exotic species, such as axis deer, can switch their diets between plant groups which renders them more competitive to the native white-tailed deer. Their numbers should be managed in the same manner as livestock and white-tailed deer to prevent damage to the plant community. Feral hogs are present and can cause damage when their numbers are not managed. This rating system provides general guidance as to animal forage preference for plant species. It also indicates possible competition and diet overlap between kinds of herbivores. Grazing preference changes from time to time, especially between seasons, and between animal kinds and classes. An animal’s preference or avoidance of certain plants is learned over time through grazing experience and maternal learning (http://extension.usu.edu/behave). Preference does not necessarily reflect the ecological status of the plant within the plant community. For wildlife, plant preferences for food are rated in the following tables. Refer to detailed habitat guides for a more complete description of a species habitat needs. Legend Rating Preference Description P Preferred Percentage of plant in animal diet is greater than it occurs on the land D Desirable Percentage of plant in animal diet similar to the percentage composition on the land U Undesirable Percentage of plant in animal diet is less than it occurs on the land N Not Consumed Plant would not be eaten under normal conditions. It is only consumed when other forages are not available T Toxic Rare occurrence in diet and, if consumed in any tangible amounts results in death or severe illness in animal X Used Degree of utilization unknown

Hydrological functions

The water cycle on this site functions according to the management of not only the existing plant community but to an extent of the surrounding plant communities. The water cycle is most functional when the site is dominated by tall bunchgrass and native trees as the site functions much the same as a sponge. Rapid rainfall infiltration, high soil organic matter, good soil structure, and good porosity are present with a good cover of bunchgrass. Quality of surface runoff will be high and erosion and sedimentation rates will be low. With high rates of infiltration and periods of heavy rainfall, some water will move below the root zone of grasses and into the fractures in the limestone. As this water moves downward it contributes to the recharge of some aquifers. A majority of the recharge on this site comes through fractures and cavities in the streambed. When unmanaged grazing causes loss or reduction of bunchgrass and ground cover, the water cycle becomes impaired. Infiltration is decreased and runoff is increased because of poor ground cover, rainfall splash, soil capping, low organic matter, and poor structure. With a combination of a sparse ground cover and intensive rainfall, this site can contribute to an increased frequency and severity of flooding within a watershed. Soil erosion is accelerated, quality of surface runoff is poor and sedimentation increased. As the site becomes dominated by woody species, especially oaks and juniper, the water cycle is further altered. Interception of rainfall by tree canopies is increased which reduces the amount of rainfall reaching the surface (Thurow and Hester, 1997). Stem flow is increased, however, because of the funneling effect of the canopy, especially on the oaks. This increases soil moisture at the base of the tree. Increased transpiration, especially when evergreen species such as live oak and juniper dominate, provides less chance for deep percolation into aquifers. As woody species increase, grass cover declines, which causes some of the same results as heavy grazing. Various brush management components can help restore the natural hydrology of the site. Also critical to the overall health of the Loamy Bottomland is the existence of healthy streamside or riparian vegetation. These small but very important vegetative communities exist in the transition zone between the upland portion of the site and the creeks or streams. Many important functions come from a healthy riparian plant community. These communities protect the streambanks during flooding much the same as shingles protect a roof. They also trap sediments, deadfall, and nutrients fostering the building of soils and nutrients. Another function is that of a sponge, absorbing water and slowly releasing it over time leading to a more sustained flow. These small areas also provide diverse grazing for livestock. If a mature woodland canopy develops, a buildup of leaf litter occurs which increases the organic matter of the soil, builds structure, improves infiltration, and retards erosion. Some, but not all values of a properly functioning water cycle are restored on this site when a woodland plant community persists.

Recreational uses

This site has the appeal of the wide open spaces. The abundant tall and midgrasses and scattered oaks produce beautiful fall color variations. The area is also used for hunting, birding, and other eco-tourism related enterprises.

Wood products

Honey mesquite and oaks can be used for firewood and the specialty wood industry.

Inventory data references

Information provided here has been derived from limited NRCS clipping data, and from field observations of range trained personnel.

Other references

References:

Anderson, J.R., C.A. Taylor, Jr., C.J. Owens, J.R. Jackson, D.K. Steele, and R. Brantley. 2013. Using experience and supplementation to increase juniper consumption by three different breeds of sheep. Rangeland Ecol. Management. 66:204-208. March.
Archer S. 1994. Woody plant encroachment into southwestern grasslands and savannas: rates, patterns and proximate causes. in: Ecological implications of livestock herbivory in the West, pp.13-68. Edited by M. Vavra, W. Laycock, R. Pieper, Society for Range Management Publication. , Denver, Colorado.
Bestelmeyer, B.T., J.R. Brown, K.M. Havsted, R. Alexander, G. Chavez, and J.E. Hedrick. 2003. Development and use of state-and-transition models for rangelands. Journal of Range Management. 56(2): 114-126.
Bushland, R.C. 1985. Eradication program in the southwestern United States. Symposium on eradication of the screwworm from the United States and Mexico. Misc. Pub. Entomol. Soc. Am., 62:12-15.
Foster, J.H. 1917. The spread of timbered areas in central Texas. Journal of Forestry 15:442-445.
Frost, C. C. 1998. Presettlement fire frequency regimes of the Unites States: a First Approximation. Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference Proceedings. No. 20. Tall Timbers Research Station. Tallahassee, FL.
Fuhlendorf, S. D., and Engle D.M., Kerby J., and Hamilton R. 2008. Pyric Herbivory: rewilding Landscapes through the Recoupling of Fire and Grazing. Conservation Biology. Volume 23, No. 3, 588-598.
Hamilton W. and D. Ueckert. 2005. Rangeland Woody Plant Control--Past, Present, and Future. Chapter 1 in: Brush Management-Past, Present, and Future. Texas A & M University Press. Pp.3-16.
Hanselka, W., R. Lyons, and M. Moseley. 2009. Grazing Land Stewardship – A Manual for Texas Landowners. Texas AgriLife Communications, http://agrilifebookstore.org.
Hart, C., R.T. Garland, A.C. Barr, B.B. Carpenter, and J.C. Reagor. 2003. Toxic Plants of Texas. Texas Cooperative Extension Bulletin B-6103 11-03.
Inglis, J. M. 1964. A History of Vegetation on the Rio Grande Plains. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Bulletin No. 45. Austin, Texas.
Massey, C.L. 2009. The founding of a town – The Gugger and Benke families. Helotes Echo, July 1, 2009.
Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1994. The Use and Management of Browse in the Edwards Plateau of Texas. Temple, Texas.
Plant symbols, common names, and scientific names according to USDA/NRCS Texas Plant List (Unpublished)
Pyne, S.J. 1982. Fire in America. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
Roemer, Ferdinand Von. 1983. Roemer's Texas. Eakins Press.
Schmidly, D.J. 2002. Texas natural history: a century of change. Texas Tech University Press, Lubbock.
Scifres, C.J. and W.T. Hamilton. 1993. Prescribed Burning for Brush Management: The South Texas Example. Texas A & M University Press, 245 pp.
Smeins, F., S. Fuhlendorf, and C. Taylor, Jr. 1997. Environmental and Land Use Changes: A Long Term Perspective. Chapter 1 in: Juniper Symposium 1997. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station. Pp 1-21.
Taylor, C.A. (Ed.). 1997. Texas Agriculture Experiment Station Technical Report 97-1 (Proceedings of the 1997 Juniper Symposium), Sonora Texas, pp. 9-22.
Teer, J.G., J.W. Thomas, and E.A. Walker. 1965. Ecology and Management of White-tailed Deer in the Llano Basin of Texas. Wildlife Monographs 10: 1-62.
Thurow, T.O. and J.W. Hester. 1997. 1997 Juniper Symposium. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, The Texas A&M University System. Tech. Rep. 97-1. January 9-10, 1997. San Angelo, Texas
USDA-NRCS (Formerly Soil Conservation Service) Range Site Description (1972)
Vines, R.A. 1984. Trees of Central Texas. University of Texas Press. Austin, Texas.
Weninger, D. 1984. The Explorer's Texas. Eakin Press; Waco, Texas.
Wilcox. B.P. and T.L. Thurow. 2006. Emerging Issues in Rangeland Ecohydrology: Vegetation Change and the Water Cycle. Rangeland Ecol. Management. 59:220-224, March.
Wilcox, B.P., Y. Huang, and J.W. Walker. 2008. Long-term trends in stream flow from semiarid rangeland: uncovering drivers of change. Global Change Biology 14: 1676-1689, doi:10.1111/j.1365.2486.2008.01578.
Wilcox, B.P., W.A. Dugas, M.K. Owens, D.N Ueckert, and C.R. Hart. 2005. Shrub Control and Water Yield on Texas Rangelands: Current State of Knowledge. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report 05-1.
Wills, Frederick. 2006. Historic Vegetation of Camp Bullis and Camp Stanley, Southeastern Edwards, Plateau. Texas. Texas Journal of science. 58(3):219-230.

Wright, H.A. and A.W. Bailey. 1982. Fire Ecology: United States and Southern Canada. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Wu. B.X., E.J. Redeker, and T.L. Thurow. 2001. Vegetation and Water Yield Dynamics in an Edwards Plateau Watershed. Journal of Range Management. 54:98-105. March 2001.
http://extension.usu.edu/behave/

Contributors

Carl Englerth
Joe Franklin
Mark Moseley
Travis Waiser, MLRA Leader, NRCS, Kerrville, TX

Approval

Bryan Christensen, 9/19/2023

Acknowledgments

Site Development and Testing Plan: Future work, as described in a Project Plan, to validate the information in this Provisional Ecological Site Description is needed. This will include field activities to collect low, medium and high intensity sampling, soil correlations, and analysis of that data. Annual field reviews should be done by soil scientists and vegetation specialists. A final field review, peer review, quality control, and quality assurance reviews of the ESD will be needed to produce the final document. Annual reviews of the Project Plan are to be conducted by the Ecological Site Technical Team. Reviewers and Technical Contributors: Joe Franklin, Zone Range Management Specialist, NRCS, San Angelo Zone Office, Texas Ryan McClintock, Biologist, NRCS, San Angelo Zone Office, Texas Jessica Jobes, Project Leader, Kerrville Soil Survey Office, NRCS, Kerrville, Texas Travis Waiser, Soil Scientist, NRCS, Kerrville Soil Survey Office, Texas Bryan Hummel, Natural Resources Technician, Joint Base San Antonio - Camp Bullis, Texas Ann Graham, Editor, NRCS, Temple, Texas QC/QA completed by: Bryan Christensen, SRESS, NRCS, Temple, TX Erin Hourihan, ESDQS, NRCS, Temple, TX

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)	Charles Anderson
Contact for lead author	325.944.0147
Date	06/27/2005
Approved by	
Approval date	
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production

Indicators

1. **Number and extent of rills:** None.

2. **Presence of water flow patterns:** Most water flow patterns are expected to pass through the site. Some deposition will occur from out of bank flooding.

3. **Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes:** None except for a few near the stream or drainageway.

4. **Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground):** 0-5%, small non connected areas. Some bare areas right after flooding.

5. **Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies:** None

6. **Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas:** None to slight. Wind erosion hazard of soil is slight.

7. **Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel):** Minimal movement of fine litter< 1 foot. Large woody debris will accumulate at the base of trees as will other plant debris.

8. **Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values):** Erosion stability values estimated at 5-6. Water erosion hazard of soil is slight.

9. **Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness):** Oakalla soil is dark grayish brown silty clay loam and brown clay loam to 50 inches. The surface layer is subangular blocky. Many fine roots and worm casts. SOM: High Refer to specific description for component sampled.

10. **Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff:** High canopy, basal cover and density make raindrop impact negligible. Flexible grasses lean over during flooding. The grassed capture sediment, When rainfall exceeds sites ability to hold water the runoff is free of erosive action.

11. **Presence and thickness of compaction layer (usually none; describe soil profile features which may be mistaken for compaction on this site):** None.

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: Warm season tallgrass (D)

Sub-dominant: warm-season midgrass (S) cool season grasses shortgrass (S) trees (S)

Other: forb (M) shrub/vine (M) warm season short grasses.

Additional:

---

13. **Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence): Minimal. Grasses will almost always show some mortality and decadence, especially under drought conditions. There is some deadfall of limbs from mature trees.**

---

14. **Average percent litter cover (%) and depth (in): Litter is dominantly herbaceous.**

---

15. **Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annual-production): 3000 # in years with below average moisture, 4700# in "average" and 6500# in above average moisture years. Site may receive extra moisture from upslope sites and be highly productive in wet years.**

---

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: mesquite, pricklypear, juniper, broom snakeweed, algerita, acacia and condalia, introduced bluestems and annual brooweed.**

---

17. **Perennial plant reproductive capability: Good. All species should be capable of reproducing except during peroids of of prolonged drought, heavy natural herbivory or intense fire. Recovery from these disturbances will take 2-5 years.**
