

Ecological site R110XY014IL

Moist Sand Prairie

Last updated: 4/22/2020
Accessed: 08/27/2026

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): 110X–Northern Illinois and Indiana Heavy Till Plain

The Northern Illinois and Indiana Heavy Till Plain (MLRA 110) encompasses the Northeastern Morainal, Grand Prairie, and Southern Lake Michigan Coastal landscapes (Schwegman et al. 1973, WDNR 2015). It spans three states – Illinois (79 percent), Indiana (10 percent), and Wisconsin (11 percent) – comprising about 7,535 square miles (Figure 1). The elevation is about 650 feet above sea level (ASL) and increases gradually from Lake Michigan south. Local relief varies from 10 to 25 feet. Silurian age fractured dolomite and limestone bedrock underlie the region. Glacial drift covers the surface area of the MLRA, and till, outwash, lacustrine deposits, loess or other silty material, and organic deposits are common (USDA-NRCS 2006). The vegetation in the MLRA has undergone drastic changes over time. At the end of the last glacial episode – the Wisconsin glacialiation – the evolution of vegetation began with the development of tundra habitats, followed by a phase of spruce and fir forests, and eventually spruce-pine forests. Not until approximately 9,000 years ago did the climate undergo a warming trend which prompted the development of deciduous forests dominated by oak and hickory. As the climate continued to warm and dry, prairies began to develop approximately 8,300 years ago. Another shift in climate that resulted in an increase in moisture prompted the emergence of savanna-like habitats from 8,000 to 5,000 years before present (Taft et al. 2009). Forests maintained footholds on steep valley sides, morainal ridges, and wet floodplains. Fire, droughts, and grazing by native mammals helped to maintain the prairies and savannas until the arrival of European settlers, and the forests were maintained by droughts, wind, lightning, and occasional fire (Taft et al. 2009; NatureServe 2018).

Classification relationships

USFS Subregions: Southwestern Great Lakes Morainal (222K) and Central Till Plains and Grand Prairies (251D) Sections; Kenosha-Lake Michigan Plain and Moraines (222Kg), Valparaiso Moraine (Kj), and Eastern Grand Prairie (251Dd) Subsections (Cleland et al. 2007) U.S. EPA Level IV Ecoregion: Kettle Moraines (53b), Illinois/Indiana Prairies (54a), and Valparaiso-Wheaton Morainal Complex (54f) (USEPA 2013) National Vegetation Classification – Ecological Systems: North-Central Interior Sand and Gravel Tallgrass Prairie (CES202.695); Great Lakes Wet-Mesic Lakeplain Prairie (CES202.027) (NatureServe 2018) National Vegetation Classification – Plant Associations: *Andropogon gerardii* – *Calamagrostis canadensis* Sand Wet Meadow (CEGL005177); *Andropogon gerardii* – *Calamagrostis canadensis* – *Pycnanthemum virginianum* – *Oligoneuron ohioense* Wet Meadow (CEGL005095) (Nature Serve 2018) Biophysical Settings: North-Central Interior Sand and Gravel Tallgrass Prairie (BpS 4214120) (LANDFIRE 2009) Illinois Natural Areas Inventory: Wet-mesic sand prairie (White and Madany 1978)

Ecological site concept

Moist Sand Prairies are located within the green areas on the map. They occur on uplands. The soils are Mollisols and Entisols that are somewhat poorly drained and very deep, formed in eolian deposits and outwash. The historic pre-European settlement vegetation on this ecological site was dominated by herbaceous vegetation. Big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii* Vitman) and cinnamon fern (*Osmunda cinnamomea* L.) are the dominant and characteristic species on the site, respectively. Other grasses present may include bluejoint (*Calamagrostis canadensis* L.), Indiangrass (*Sorghastrum nutans* (L.) Nash), and prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata* Bosc ex Link) (White and Madany 1978; NatureServe 2018). Species typical of an undisturbed plant community associated with this ecological site may include royal fern (*Osmunda regalis* L.), handsome holly (*Rhexia virginica* L.), bog white violet (*Viola lanceolata* L.), and slender yelloweyed grass (*Xyris torta* Sm.) (Taft et al. 1997). Fire is the primary disturbance factor that maintains this ecological site, while periodic drought and large mammal grazing are secondary factors (LANDFIRE 2009; Taft et al. 2009; NatureServe 2018).

Associated sites

R110XY013IL	Dry Sand Prairie Eolian deposits and outwash that are not shallow to a high-water table including Ade, Dickinson, Hononegah, Kankakee, Onarga, and Sparta soils
R110XY015IL	Wet Sand Prairie Outwash that is shallow to a high-water table including Fieldon, Gilford, Granby, Granby variant, Hooppole, and Mussey soils

Similar sites

R110XY007IL	Moist Glacial Drift Upland Prairie Moist Glacial Drift Upland Prairies have a similar vegetation type, but the parent material is loess or other silty or loamy material, loamy outwash, or glacial till
--------------------	--

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Andropogon gerardii</i> (2) <i>Osmunda cinnamomea</i>

Physiographic features

Moist Sand Prairies occur on uplands. They are situated on elevations ranging from approximately 400 to 1361 feet ASL. The site does not experience flooding but rather generates runoff to adjacent, downslope ecological sites.

Figure 1. Representative block diagram of Moist Sand Prairie and associated ecological sites.




Figure 2.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Slope shape across	(1) Convex
Slope shape up-down	(1) Convex
Landforms	(1) Upland
Runoff class	Negligible to medium
Elevation	120 – 420 m
Slope	0 %
Water table depth	40 – 50 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The Northern Illinois and Indiana Heavy Till Plain falls into the hot-summer humid continental climate (Dfa) and warm-summer humid continental climate (Dfb) Köppen-Geiger climate classifications (Peel et al. 2007). The two main factors that drive the climate of the MLRA are latitude and weather systems. Latitude, and the subsequent reflection of solar input, determines air temperatures and seasonal variations. Solar energy varies across the seasons, with summer receiving three to four times as much energy as opposed to winter. Weather systems (air masses and cyclonic storms) are responsible for daily fluctuations of weather conditions. High-pressure systems are responsible for settled weather patterns where sun and clear skies dominate. In fall, winter, and spring, the polar jet stream is

responsible for the creation and movement of low-pressure systems. The clouds, winds, and precipitation associated with a low-pressure system regularly follow high-pressure systems every few days (Angel n.d.).

The soil temperature regime of MLRA 110 is classified as mesic, where the mean annual soil temperature is between 46 and 59°F (USDA-NRCS 2006). Temperature and precipitation occur along a north-south gradient, where temperature and precipitation increase the further south one travels. The average freeze-free period of this ecological site is about 181 days, while the frost-free period is about 146 days (Table 2). The majority of the precipitation occurs as rainfall in the form of convective thunderstorms during the growing season. Average annual precipitation is 39 inches, which includes rainfall plus the water equivalent from snowfall (Table 3). The average annual low and high temperatures are 41.4 and 60.5°F, respectively.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	140-150 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	170-190 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	990-1,020 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	140-160 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	170-200 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	970-1,020 mm
Frost-free period (average)	150 days
Freeze-free period (average)	180 days
Precipitation total (average)	990 mm

- (1) PIPER CITY [USC00116819], Piper City, IL
- (2) KANKAKEE WASTEWATER [USC00114603], Kankakee, IL
- (3) MORRIS 1 NW [USC00115825], Morris, IL
- (4) CHICAGO MIDWAY AP [USW00014819], Chicago, IL

Influencing water features

Moist Sand Prairies are not influenced by wetland or riparian water features. Precipitation is the main source of water for this ecological site. Infiltration is moderate (Hydrologic Group B), and surface runoff is negligible to medium. Surface runoff contributes some water to downslope ecological sites.




Figure 9. Hydrologic cycling in Moist Sand Prairie ecological site.

Soil features

Soils of Moist Sand Prairies are in the Mollisols and Entisols orders, further classified as Aquic Argiudolls and Aquic Hapludolls with moderate infiltration and negligible to medium runoff potential. The soil series associated with this site includes Bonfield, Hoopeston, Ridgeville, Watseka, and Wesley. The parent material is eolian deposits and outwash, and the soils are somewhat poorly drained and very deep with a seasonal water table. Soil pH classes are very strongly acid to moderately alkaline. No rooting restrictions are noted for the soils of this ecological site

Figure 10. Profile sketches of soil series associated with Moist Sand Prairie.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Eolian deposits (2) Outwash
Family particle size	(1) Coarse-loamy (2) Loamy-skeletal (3) Sandy
Drainage class	Somewhat poorly drained
Permeability class	Very slow to rapid
Depth to restrictive layer	200 cm

Soil depth	200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (Depth not specified)	5.08 – 17.78 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (Depth not specified)	0 – 40 %
Electrical conductivity (Depth not specified)	Not specified
Sodium adsorption ratio (Depth not specified)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (Depth not specified)	4.5 – 8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 10 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 40 %

Ecological dynamics

The information in this Ecological Site Description, including the state-and-transition model (STM), was developed based on historical data, current field data, professional experience, and a review of the scientific literature. As a result, all possible scenarios or plant species may not be included. Key indicator plant species, disturbances, and ecological processes are described to inform land management decisions.

The MLRA lies within the tallgrass prairie ecosystem of the Midwest, but a variety of environmental and edaphic factors resulted in landscape that historically supported prairies, savannas, forests, and various wetlands. Moist Sand Prairies form an aspect of this vegetative continuum. This ecological site occurs on uplands on somewhat poorly drained coarse soils. Species characteristic of this ecological site consist of herbaceous vegetation.

Fire is a critical disturbance factor that maintains Moist Sand Prairies. Fire intensity typically consisted of periodic, low-intensity surface fires occurring every 1 to 5 years (LANDFIRE 2009). Ignition sources included summertime lightning strikes from convective storms and bimodal, human ignitions during the spring and fall seasons. Native Americans regularly set fires to improve sight lines for hunting, driving large game, improving grazing and browsing habitat, agricultural clearing, and enhancing vital ethnobotanical plants (Barrett 1980).

Drought and grazing by native ungulates have also played a role in shaping this ecological site. The periodic episodes of reduced soil moisture in conjunction with the well to excessively drained soils have favored the proliferation of plant species tolerant of such conditions. Drought can also slow the growth of plants and result in dieback of certain species. Large mammals, specifically prairie elk (*Cervus elaphus*), bison (*Bos bison*), and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), likely occurred in low densities resulting in limited impacts to plant composition and dominance (LANDFIRE 2009). When coupled with fire, periods of drought and herbivory can greatly delay the establishment of woody vegetation (Pyne et al. 1996).

Today, Moist Sand Prairies are limited in their extent, having been type-converted to agricultural production land or other human-modified landscapes. Remnants that do exist show evidence of indirect anthropogenic influences from fire suppression and non-native species invasion. A return to the historic plant community may not be possible following extensive land modification, but long-term conservation agriculture or prairie reconstruction efforts can help to restore some biotic diversity and ecological function. The state-and-transition model that follows provides a detailed description of each state, community phase, pathway, and transition. This model is based on available experimental research, field observations, literature reviews, professional consensus, and interpretations.

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 2.1 plant community composition

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

Table 7. Community 2.2 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 3.1 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 4.1 plant community composition

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

Table 10. Community 4.2 plant community composition

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

Table 11. Community 4.3 plant community composition

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

Table 12. Community 5.1 plant community composition

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

Table 13. Community 5.2 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

No field plots were available for this site. A review of the scientific literature and professional experience were used to approximate the plant communities for this provisional ecological site. Information for the state-and-transition model was obtained from the same sources. All community phases are considered provisional based on these plots and the sources identified in this ecological site description.

Other references

- Anderson, M.D. 2003. *Juniperus virginiana*. In: Fire Effects Information System [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Available at: <https://www.crs-feis/org/feis/>. (Accessed 16 March 2018).
- Angel, J. No date. Climate of Illinois Narrative. Illinois State Water Survey, Prairie Research Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Available at <https://www.isws.illinois.edu/statecli/General/Illinois-climate-narrative.htm>. Accessed 8 November 2018.
- Barrett, S.W. 1980. Indians and fire. *Western Wildlands* Spring: 17-20.
- Brudvig, L.A., C.M. Mabry, J.R. Miller, and T.A. Walker. 2007. Evaluation of central North American prairie management based on species diversity, life form, and individual species metrics. *Conservation Biology* 21:864-874.
- Cleland, D.T., J.A. Freeouf, J.E. Keys, G.J. Nowacki, C. Carpenter, and W.H. McNab. 2007. Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections of the Coterminous United States. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report WO-76. Washington, DC. 92 pps.
- Fierer, N., J. Ladau, J.C. Clemente, J.W. Leff, S.M. Owens, K.S. Pollard, R. Knight, J.A. Gilbert, and R.L. McCulley. 2013. Reconstructing the microbial diversity and function of pre-agricultural tallgrass prairie soils in the United States. *Science* 342: 621-624.
- Howard, J.L. 1996. *Bromus inermis*. In: Fire Effects Information System [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Available at: <https://www.crs-feis/org/feis/>. (Accessed 16 March 2018).
- Kardol, P. and D.A. Wardle. 2010. How understanding aboveground-belowground linkages can assist restoration ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 25: 670-679.
- LANDFIRE. 2009. Biophysical Setting 4214120 North-Central Interior Sand and Gravel Tallgrass Prairie. In: LANDFIRE National Vegetation Dynamics Models. USDA Forest Service and US Department of Interior. Washington, DC.
- Leake, J., D. Johnson, D. Donnelly, G. Muckle, L. Boddy, and D. Read. 2004. Networks of power and influence: the role of mycorrhizal mycelium in controlling plant communities and agroecosystem functioning. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 82: 1016-1045.
- Martin, L.M. and B.J. Wilsey. 2006. Assessing grassland restoration success: relative roles of seed additions and native ungulate activities. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 43: 1098-1110.
- Martin, L.M. and B.J. Wilsey. 2012. Assembly history alters alpha and beta diversity, exotic-native proportions and functioning of restored prairie plant communities. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 49: 1436-1445.
- NatureServe. 2018. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1 NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available at <http://explorer.natureserve.org>. (Accessed 13 January 2020).
- Peel, M.C., B.L. Finlayson, and T.A. McMahon. 2007. Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 11: 1633-1644.
- Schwegman, J.E., G.B. Fell, M. Hutchinson, G. Paulson, W.M. Shepherd, and J. White. 1973. Comprehensive Plan for the Illinois Nature Preserves System, Part 2 The Natural Divisions of Illinois. Illinois Nature Preserves Commission, Rockford, IL. 32 pps.
- Skinner, R.H. 2008. High biomass removal limits carbon sequestration potential of mature temperate pastures. *Journal for Environmental Quality* 37: 1319-1326.
- Smith, D.D. 1998. Iowa prairie: original extent and loss, preservation, and recovery attempts. *The Journal of the Iowa Academy of Sciences* 105: 94-108.
- Smith, D.D., D. Williams, G. Houseal, and K. Henderson. 2010. The Tallgrass Prairie Center Guide to Prairie Restoration in the Upper Midwest. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, IA. 338 pps.
- Society for Ecological Restoration [SER]. Science & Policy Working Group. 2002. The SER Primer on Ecological Restoration. Available at: <http://www.ser.org/>. (Accessed 28 February 2017).
- Taft, J.B., G.S. Wilhelm, D.M. Ladd, and L.A. Masters. 1997. Floristic Quality Assessment for vegetation in Illinois, a method for assessing vegetation integrity. *Erigenia* 15: 3-95.
- Taft, J.B., R.C. Anderson, L.R. Iverson, and W.C. Handel. 2009. Chapter 4: Vegetation ecology and change in terrestrial ecosystems. In: C.A. Taylor, J.B. Taft, and C.E. Warwick (eds.). *Canaries in the Catbird Seat: The Past, Present, and Future of Biological Resources in a Changing Environment*. Illinois Natural Heritage Survey Special Publication 30, Prairie Research Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 306 pps.
- Teague, W.R., S.L. Dowhower, S.A. Baker, N. Haile, P.B. DeLaune, and D.M. Conover. 2011. Grazing management impacts on

vegetation, soil biota and soil chemical, physical and hydrological properties in tall grass prairie. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 141: 310-322.

Tomer, M.D., D.W. Meek, and L.A. Kramer. 2005. Agricultural practices influence flow regimes of headwater streams in western Iowa. Journal of Environmental Quality 34:1547-1558.

United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. 682 pps.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. 2013. Level III and Level IV Ecoregions of the Continental United States. Corvallis, OR, U.S. EPA, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, map scale 1:3,000,000. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/ecoresearch/level-iii-and-iv-ecoregions-continental-united-states>. (Accessed 1 March 2017).

White, J. and M.H. Madany. 1978. Classification of natural communities in Illinois. In: J. White. Illinois Natural Areas Inventory Technical Report. Illinois Natural Areas Inventory, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign. 426 pps.

Williams, D.A., L.L. Jackson, and D.D. Smith. 2007. Effects of frequent mowing on survival and persistence of forbs seeded into a species-poor grassland. Restoration Ecology 15: 24-33.

Wilsey, B.J. 2008. Productivity and subordinate species response to dominant grass species and seed source during restoration. Restoration Ecology 18: 628-637.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources [WDNR]. 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, WI. 293 pps.

Contributors

Lisa Kluesner
Kristine Ryan
Sarah Smith
Tiffany Justus

Approval

Chris Tecklenburg, 4/22/2020

Acknowledgments

This project could not have been completed without the dedication and commitment from a variety of staff members. Team members supported the project by serving on the technical team, assisting with the development of state and community phases of the state-and-transition model, providing peer review and technical editing, and conducting quality control and quality assurance reviews. List of primary contributors and reviewers. Organization Name Title Location Natural Resources Conservation Service Ron Collman State Soil Scientist Champaign, IL Tonie Endres Senior Regional Soil Scientist Indianapolis, IN Tiffany Justus Soil Scientist Aurora, IL Lisa Kluesner Ecological Site Specialist Waverly, IA Rick Neilson State Soil Scientist Indianapolis, IN Jason Nemecek State Soil Scientist Madison, WI Kevin Norwood Soil Survey Regional Director Indianapolis, IN Kristine Ryan MLRA Soil Survey Leader Aurora, IL Stanley Sipp Resource Inventory Specialist Champaign, IL Sarah Smith Soil Scientist Aurora, IL Chris Tecklenberg Acting Regional Ecological Site Specialist Hutchinson, KS

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	08/27/2026
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:
