

Ecological site F105XY009WI

Sandy Upland

Last updated: 2/23/2024
Accessed: 08/28/2026

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): 105X–Upper Mississippi River Bedrock Controlled Uplands and Valleys

The Northern Mississippi Valley Loess Hills area corresponds closely to the Western Coulees and Ridges and Southwest Savanna Ecological Landscapes. Some of the following brief overview is borrowed from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Ecological Landscape publication (2015). Fifty-two percent of the Upper Mississippi River Bedrock Controlled Uplands and Valleys MLRA is in Wisconsin; Iowa, Minnesota, and Illinois contain the rest. This region is the only area in Wisconsin that has not been covered by glaciers within the past 2.4 million years. The Wisconsin portion of this MLRA is approximately 7.4 million acres (11,600 square miles). The landscape is characterized by dissected topography with deeply-incised, steep-walled valleys between bedrock controlled ridges. Though it's called the "Driftless Region", some glacial drift is found in the major river valleys of this region in the form of outwash, deposited by proglacial streams of glacial meltwater. Wisconsin's most recent glaciations also impacted the sediment of the area through the deposition of loess. After the glacier receded and before vegetation established, the bare surfaces of the glaciated areas were highly susceptible to wind erosion. As a result, a veneer of loess (wind-blown silt) was deposited over the entire region. The thickest deposits—nearly five meters—are on ridges near the Mississippi River and gradually thin moving eastward. The loess caps in Dane and Green counties are generally 0.5-1.5 meters deep. Much of the loess has eroded downslope and collected in floodplains. Bedrock is shallow throughout this MLRA and is a major influence on topography and hydrology. Most of the MLRA has bedrock within two meters, except in the deep river valleys that are filled with outwash and alluvium materials. Sandstone is the dominant bedrock type in MLRA 105, but the southernmost portion is dominated by dolomite. Military Ridge is an escarpment that straddles the boundary between sandstone and dolomite bedrock. The sandstone north of the ridge is weaker than the erosion-resistant dolomite south of the ridge. The sandstone is deeply cut and dissected into steep slopes and valleys. The dolomite-controlled ridges tend to be less dissected and broader with more gentle, south sloping topography. Geomorphic and fluvial processes formed these landscapes by way of sheet wash, soil creep, and flowage. These processes eroded the hillslopes, cut into bedrock, and transported the debris to streams, forming floodplains and terraces. Underfit streams are common in MLRA 105, especially in the southern portion. These streams currently occupy large river valleys—especially those of the Black, Chippewa, Mississippi, and Wisconsin Rivers—that were carved by proglacial meltwater streams carrying much larger quantities of water than what's present today. As the climate dried, waterflow decreased and the valleys filled with alluvial sediment. Narrow meanders were formed by the shrinking streams and are often dissimilar to the meanders of the larger valleys they occupy. Fluvial landforms – including terraces, oxbow lakes, sandbars, eroding bluffs, and large floodplain complexes – are found within these large valleys and are subject to varying flooding frequencies, intensities, and durations. Karst topography formed in this region from dissolution of carbonate bedrock by surface and groundwater. Dolomite and limestone are more easily affected by dissolution, but karst topography also formed in sandstone. Erosion by water (stream meanders, rain/runoff, and groundwater), wind, and frost weaken joints and bedding planes that can cause collapse. In addition, sandstone materials collapse into cavities in underlying dolomite or limestone. Historically, MLRA 105 was dominated by oak forests and oak openings making up more than 50% of the area. Prairies were significant and covered 32% of the area south of Military Ridge. Maple-basswood forests covered 19% of the area north of Military Ridge. Dominant tree species were white oak (*Quercus alba*), bur oak (*Quercus macrocarpa*), black oak (*Quercus velutina*), and sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*).

Classification relationships

Relationship to Established Framework and Classification Systems: Habitat Types of S. Wisconsin (Kotar, 1996): *Pinus/Vaccinium-Rubus hispidus* [PVRh], *Pinus strobus/Vaccinium-Cornus racemose* [PVCr], *Pinus/Vaccinium-Hamamelis* [PVHa], and *Pinus strobus/Vaccinium-Gaylussacia* [PVGr]. Biophysical Settings (Landfire, 2014): This ES is largely mapped as Laurentian-Acadian Northern Pine Forest, Laurentian Pine Barrens, North-Central Interior Oak Savanna, North-Central Interior Dry-Mesic Oak Forest and Woodland, North-Central Interior Maple-Basswood Forest, North-Central Interior Sand and Gravel Tallgrass Prairie, Paleozoic Plateau Bluff and Talus Herbaceous, Eastern Cool Temperate Pasture and Hayland, Eastern Cool Temperate Row Crop, and Developed-Low Intensity WDNR Natural Communities (WDNR, 2015): This ES is most closely described as the Southern Dry Forest by the Wisconsin DNR. Hierarchical Framework Relationships: Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): Upper Mississippi River Bedrock Controlled Uplands and Valleys (105)

Ecological site concept

The Sandy Uplands ecological site occupies approximately 45,000 acres in MLRA 105, or about 0.7% of total land area. It is found in upland positions on diverse landforms throughout the MLRA. It is most common to landscapes dominated by sandy valley trains and sandstone hills. 91% of the acreage of this site is north of the Wisconsin River. This site is characterized by very deep, moderately well to somewhat excessively drained soils comprised of sandy materials. Most sites in the east-central portion of this MLRA (mainly Monroe, Jackson, and Lacrosse counties) formed in siliceous sandy alluvium deposits weathered and reworked from silica-cemented sandstone. Other sites formed in sandy outwash deposits and sandy eolian (wind-blown) deposits.

Associated sites

F105XY002WI	Wet Sandy Floodplain These sites form in deep, sandy alluvium and outwash deposits in floodplains, especially those along the Chippewa, Black, and Wisconsin rivers. They support vegetation tolerant of seasonal flooding. They are sometimes saturated enough for hydric conditions to occur. They may be found in floodplains adjacent to Sandy Uplands.
F105XY004WI	Wet Sandy Lowland These sites form in depressions and drainageway in deep, sandy outwash deposits. They are very poorly or poorly drained and are saturated long enough for hydric conditions to occur. They may be found on similar landforms as Sandy Uplands in lower landscape positions.
F105XY006WI	Moist Sandy Lowland These sites form in sandy outwash deposits along major waterways. They are somewhat poorly drained. They may be found on similar landforms as Sandy Uplands in lower landscape positions.
R105XY018WI	Dry Mollic or Umbric Upland These sites form in sandy materials deposited by wind, water, or weathered from sandstone bedrock. They have deep, dark surfaces. They are moderately well to excessively drained. They may be adjacent to Sandy Uplands in higher landscape positions.
F105XY019WI	Dry Upland These sites form in sandy materials deposited by wind, water, gravity, or weathered from sandstone bedrock. They are well drained to excessively drained. They may be adjacent to Sandy Uplands in higher landscape positions.

Similar sites

F105XY013WI	Loamy-Silty Upland These sites form in loamy to silty materials, often silty loess and residuum. They are moderately well to well drained. They are found in similar landscape positions as Sandy Uplands but have finer textures and a higher nutrient status.
--------------------	---

F105XY019WI	Dry Upland These sites form in sandy materials deposited by wind, water, gravity, or weathered from sandstone bedrock. They are well drained to excessively drained. They are drier than to Sandy Uplands.
--------------------	---

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Pinus strobus</i> (2) <i>Acer rubrum</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Prunus serotina</i> (2) <i>Amelanchier</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i> (2) <i>Maianthemum canadense</i>

Physiographic features

These sites form on outwash plains, stream terraces, dunes, pediments, lake plains, and valley trains in the summit or backslope positions. Slope shape is linear or convex. Slopes range from 0 to 50 percent.

These sites are not subject to inundation by water. The seasonally high water table is generally found between 24 to 60 inches (61 and 153 cm) below the soil surface but may be deeper in dry conditions. Runoff potential is negligible to low.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Hillslope profile	(1) Summit (2) Backslope
Slope shape across	(1) Convex
Slope shape up-down	(1) Linear
Landforms	(1) Outwash plain (2) Stream terrace (3) Dune (4) Pediment (5) Valley train (6) Lake plain
Runoff class	Negligible to low
Flooding frequency	None

Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	220 – 310 m
Slope	0 – 50 %
Water table depth	60 – 150 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The climate of the Upper Mississippi River Bedrock Controlled Uplands and Valleys MLRA is typical of southern Wisconsin, with warmer winters, warmer summers, and higher precipitation rates than MLRA in northern Wisconsin. The MLRA stretches over about 2.9 degrees of latitude, or nearly 200 miles, from its northern tip in Barron county to its southern Wisconsin extent on the border of Illinois. This results in considerable variation in climate throughout the MLRA. The growing season ranges from 117 to 181 growing degree days, with longer growing seasons in the southern portion.

The average annual precipitation for this ecological site is 35 inches. The average annual snowfall is 44 inches. The annual average maximum and minimum temperatures are 57°F and 35°F, respectively.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	120-120 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	130-150 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	840-890 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	110-120 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	130-150 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	810-910 mm
Frost-free period (average)	120 days
Freeze-free period (average)	140 days
Precipitation total (average)	860 mm

- (1) MONDOVI [USC00475563], Mondovi, WI

- (2) EAU CLAIRE RGNL AP [USW00014991], Eau Claire, WI
- (3) SPARTA [USC00477997], Sparta, WI
- (4) SAUK CITY WWTP [USC00477576], Sauk City, WI
- (5) BLAIR [USC00470882], Blair, WI

Influencing water features

Water is received through precipitation and runoff from adjacent uplands. Water is lost from the site primarily through runoff, evapotranspiration, and groundwater recharge.

Permeability of the soils is very slow to rapid. The hydrologic group for this site is A.

Wetland description

Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification: None

Cowardin Wetland Classification: None

Soil features

This site is represented by the Aldo, Mindoro, Moundville, Tint, and Tintson soil series, and by a variant of the Plainfield soil series. Quartzipsamments, Udipsamments, and Dystrudepts each account for about 27% of the acreage of this site. The remaining 19% is made up of Udorthents, Hapludalfs, and Haplorthods.

This soil formed in sandy materials deposited by wind or water. Many of the sites are composed of sand with a high silica content (siliceous sand) derived from sandstone bedrock. They generally lack bedrock contact within two meters of the soil surface. Subsurface fragments smaller than 3 inches in diameter (gravel) may occupy up to 8% volume in some soils. These soils are moderately well to somewhat excessively drained. They do not meet hydric soil requirements.

Soils are very strongly acid to slightly acid. They lack secondary carbonates.

Figure 7. Mindoro Soil Series sample taken on 07/10/2020

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Outwash (2) Alluvium (3) Drift (4) Eolian sands
Surface texture	(1) Loamy sand (2) Sand
Drainage class	Moderately well drained to somewhat excessively drained
Permeability class	Slow to rapid
Soil depth	200 – 250 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified

Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-150.1cm)	3.07 – 9.45 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-100.1cm)	4.6 – 6.2
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0-100.1cm)	0 – 10 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0-100.1cm)	Not specified

Ecological dynamics

Perhaps the most important ecological characteristic of this Ecological Site, in terms of its influence on forest community dynamics, is its lack of capacity to support the high to moderate soil moisture and nutrient requiring species such as sugar maple, basswood and white ash, the shade-tolerant species, that typically dominate the more productive sites throughout Wisconsin.

In pre-European settlement time wild fire was the main controlling factor of forest community dynamics. Following a severe, stand-replacing fire, any of the species present on the landscape could become established, depending on seed source availability and specific conditions of post-fire seedbed. The newly established young stands of any species were easily eliminated by recurring fires, but differences in fire-resisting properties among the species began to play a role in any species' survival success. White pine is best adapted for long-term success on this Ecological Site. Although vulnerable to damage or elimination by fire in early life it eventually develops thick fire-resistant bark which helps to extend its longevity, in some cases for up to four centuries or more. These survival properties assure the species' relatively continuous seed source in the region as a whole. White pine is also moderately shade-tolerant in early life which means that it can become established in some pioneer communities, such as aspen – white birch stands, or in poorly stocked oak and red maple dominated communities. Red pine had in the past been a common associate of white pine stands. It shares some of the fire-resisting properties of white pine, but it lacks shade-tolerance and does not become established in the understory. For this reason, it has not maintained its presence in current stands and its seed source has been greatly reduced throughout its natural range following the onset of fire suppression. Several species of oak are common members of forest communities on this ecological site. Northern pin oak (*Q. ellipsoidalis*) and, to a lesser degree, black oak (*Q. velutina*), are intolerant of shade and do not reproduce from seed under existing canopies. However, following fire or clear cutting they respond by sprouting from stumps. In the absence of disturbance, they are replaced—through succession—by more shade-tolerant white pine, red maple (*Acer rubrum*), or white oak (*Quercus alba*) and Red oak (*Quercus rubra*).

Red maple has not been identified by Finley (1976) as an important component of pre-settlement pine or oak forests, but it is a prominent member in current stands. Absence of fire since the original logging era is probably the main reason. Red maple is extremely sensitive to fire damage, but is a prolific and early seed producer. Stems of 2-4 inches in diameter can produce large amounts of seed (USDA For. Serv. 1990). It is sufficiently shade-tolerant to become established in the understories of most communities on sandy soils. On this Ecological Site it behaves similarly to white pine, but because of its much smaller size at maturity, it does not compete with white pine in the upper canopy.

Some portions of this ES may support grassland or oak savanna and restoration/establishment efforts have had some success.

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 2.1 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 2.2 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 2.3 plant community composition

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

Table 10. Community 2.4 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 4.1 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

Plot and other supporting inventory data for site identification and community phases is located on a NRCS North Central Region shared and one drive folder. University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point described soils, took photographs, and inventoried vegetation data at community phases within the reference state. The data sources include WI ESD Plot Data Collection Form - Tier 2, Relieve Method, NASIS pedon description, NRCS SOI 036, photographs, and Kotar Habitat Types.

Other references

Cleland, D.T.; Avers, P.E.; McNab, W.H.; Jensen, M.E.; Bailey, R.G., King, T.; Russell, W.E. 1997. National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units. Published in, Boyce, M. S.; Haney, A., ed. 1997. Ecosystem Management Applications for Sustainable Forest and Wildlife Resources. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. pp. 181-200.

Curtis, J.T. 1959. Vegetation of Wisconsin: an ordination of plant communities. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. 657 pp.

Finley, R. 1976. Original vegetation of Wisconsin. Map compiled from U.S. General Land Office notes. U.S. Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota.

NatureServe. 2018. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, VA. U.S.A. Data current as of 28 August 2018.

Kotar, J., J. A. Kovach, and T. L. Burger. 2002. A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Northern Wisconsin. Second edition. University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Madison.

Kotar, J., J. A. Kovach, and T. L. Burger. 1996. A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Southern Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Madison.

Kotar, J., and T. L. Burger. 2017. Wetland Forest Habitat Type Classification System for Northern Wisconsin: A Guide for Land Managers and landowners. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, PUB-FR-627 2017, Madison.

Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2001. The original U.S. public land survey records: their use and limitations in reconstructing pre-European settlement vegetation. *Journal of Forestry* 99:5–10.

Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2005. Severe wind and fire regimes in northern forests: historical variability at the regional scale. *Ecology* 86(2):431–445.

Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2005. Severe wind and fire regimes in northern forests: historical variability at the regional scale. *Ecology* 86(2):431–445.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land Resource and Major Land Resource

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2015. The ecological landscapes of Wisconsin: An assessment of ecological resources and a guide to planning sustainable management. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, PUB-SS-1131 2015, Madison.

Contributors

Jacob Prater, Associate Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point
Bryant Scharenbroch, Assistant Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point
John Kotar, Ecological Specialist Independent Contractor

Approval

Suzanne Mayne-Kinney, 2/23/2024

Acknowledgments

NRCS contracted UWSP to write ecological sites in MLRA 105. Completed in 2021.

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	08/28/2026
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:
-