USDA icon **Natural Resources Conservation Service**

Ecological site F116CY002MO
Igneous Upland Woodland

Accessed: 09/01/2026

General information

Approved. An approved ecological site description has undergone quality control and quality assurance review. It contains a working state and transition model, enough information to identify the ecological site, and full documentation for all ecosystem states contained in the state and transition model.

MLRA notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 116C–St. Francois Knobs and Basins

The St Francois Knobs and Basins is the structural center of the Ozark Dome. Elevation ranges from about 450 feet along the rivers in the southern part of the area, to 1,772 feet on the summit of Taum Sauk Mountain, the highest point in Missouri. Prominent features of this major land resource area (MLRA) are the Precambrian igneous knobs and hills that rise conspicuously to various elevations, interspersed with smooth-floored basins and valleys overlying dolomite and sandstone. Ecological sites defined for this MLRA are associated with the igneous parent materials, either in knob or basin positions. Areas influenced primarily by dolomite and/or sandstone are included in ecological sites within MLRA 116A (Ozark Highlands).

Classification relationships

Atlas of Missouri Ecoregions (Nigh and Schroeder 2002): This ecological site occurs primarily within the following Land Type Association - OZ10a St. Francois Igneous Glade/Oak Forest Knobs Terrestrial Natural Community Type (Nelson, 2010): The reference state for this ecological site is most similar to Dry-Mesic Igneous Woodland National Vegetation Classification System Vegetation Association (NatureServe, 2010): The reference tate for this ecological site is most similar to CEGL005030) Quercus velutina - Quercus alba/Vaccinium (angustifolium, pallidum)/Carex pensylvanica Forest

Ecological site concept

Igneous Upland Woodlands occur in the central and southern part of the MLRA. Soils are over 40 inches to igneous bedrock, and are low in bases. These sites are often adjacent to Dry Igneous Upland Woodland ecological sites, and in places, are mapped in complex with them. Dry Igneous sites have root-restricting bedrock in the upper part of the soil profile, as do the nearby Shallow Igneous Knob Glade sites. Vegetation of the reference state is woodland with a moderately developed canopy dominated by white oak and northern red oak.

Associated sites

F116CY003MO	**Dry Igneous Upland Woodland** Dry Igneous Upland Woodlands are often downslope from Igneous Upland Woodlands, but are intermingled in other areas and mapped as a complex.
F116CY005MO	**Dry Igneous Protected Backslope Woodland** Igneous Protected Backslope Woodlands are typically downslope from Igneous Upland Woodlands, and are steeper.
F116CY010MO	**Igneous Exposed Backslope Woodland** Igneous Exposed Backslope Woodlands are typically downslope from Igneous Upland Woodlands, and are steeper.

R116CY006MO	**Shallow Igneous Knob Glade** Shallow Igneous Knob Glades have shallow soils with significant amounts of bedrock outcrop.

Similar sites

F116CY005MO	**Dry Igneous Protected Backslope Woodland** Igneous Protected Backslope Woodlands are downslope, on steeper slopes and have generally shallower soil depths than Igneous Upland Woodlands. The protected aspects make the site more mesic and closer in species composition to Igneous Upland Woodlands.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) *Quercus alba* (2) *Quercus rubra*
Shrub	(1) *Vaccinium pallidum*
Herbaceous	(1) *Danthonia spicata* (2) *Schizachyrium scoparium*

Physiographic features

This site is on upland summit crests, shoulders and backslopes with slopes of 3 to 15 percent. The site generates runoff to adjacent, downslope ecological sites. This site does not flood.

The following figure (adapted from Simmons et al., 2006) shows the typical landscape position of this ecological site, and landscape relationships among the major ecological sites in the igneous uplands. This ecological site occurs in unit “1” on the diagram, as well as in the upper areas of unit “4”. Sites on summit crests and shoulders (labeled “1”) have more loess influence in the soil than do sites lower on the slopes, which are generally upslope from steeper, backslope ecological sites.

Figure 1. Major ecological sites of the igneous uplands.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Ridge (2) Interfluve (3) Hill
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	180 − 540 m
Slope	0 − 20 %

Water table depth	60 – 150 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The St. Francois Knobs and Basins have a continental type of climate marked by strong seasonality. In winter, dry-cold air masses, unchallenged by any topographic barriers, periodically swing south from the northern plains and Canada. If they invade reasonably humid air, snowfall and rainfall result. In summer, moist, warm air masses, equally unchallenged by topographic barriers, swing north from the Gulf of Mexico and can produce abundant amounts of rain, either by fronts or by convectional processes. In some summers, high pressure stagnates over the region, creating extended droughty periods. Spring and fall are transitional seasons when abrupt changes in temperature and precipitation may occur due to successive, fast-moving fronts separating contrasting air masses.

The St. Francois Knobs and Basins experience few regional differences in climates. The average annual precipitation in this area is 42 to 46 inches. The average annual temperature is about 54 to 56 degrees F. The lower temperatures occur at the higher elevations. Mean July maximum temperatures have a range of only one or two degrees across the area.

Mean annual precipitation varies somewhat along a west to east gradient. The rainfall is fairly evenly distributed throughout the year. Snow falls nearly every winter, but the snow cover lasts for only a few days.

During years when precipitation is normal, moisture is stored in the soil profile during the winter and early spring, when evaporation and transpiration are low. During the summer months the loss of water by evaporation and transpiration is high, and if rainfall fails to occur at frequent intervals, drought will result. Drought directly affects plant and animal life by limiting water supplies, especially at times of high temperatures and high evaporation rates.

Superimposed upon the basic MLRA climatic patterns are local topographic influences that create topoclimatic, or microclimatic variations. For example, air drainage at night may produce temperatures several degrees lower in the basin and floodplain ecological sites downslope from this ecological site. At critical times during the year, this phenomenon may produce later spring or earlier fall freezes in basins and valleys. Nearby Glade ecological sites may have higher daytime temperatures due to bare rock and higher reflectivity of these un-vegetated surfaces. Slope orientation is an important topographic influence on climate. Summits and south-and-west-facing slopes are regularly warmer and drier than adjacent north- and-east-facing slopes. Finally, the climate within closed-canopy woodland communities is measurably different from the climate of open-canopy woodlands within this ecological site.

References:
University of Missouri Climate Center. Accessed May, 2012. http://climate.missouri.edu/climate.php

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	140-150 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	160-170 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	1,140-1,190 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	140-150 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	160-170 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	1,140-1,190 mm

Frost-free period (average)	140 days
Freeze-free period (average)	170 days
Precipitation total (average)	1,170 mm

- (1) FARMINGTON [USC00232809], Farmington, MO
- (2) FREDERICKTOWN [USC00233038], Fredericktown, MO
- (3) ARCADIA [USC00230224], Arcadia, MO

Influencing water features

The site generates runoff to adjacent, downslope ecological sites. The water features of this upland ecological site include evapotranspiration, surface runoff, and drainage. Each water balance component fluctuates to varying extents from year-to-year. Evapotranspiration remains the most constant. Precipitation and drainage are highly variable between years. Seasonal variability differs for each water component. Precipitation generally occurs as single day events. Evapotranspiration is lowest in the winter and peaks in the summer. Water stored as ice and snow decreases drainage and surface runoff rates throughout the winter and increases these fluxes in the spring. The surface runoff pulse is greatly influenced by extreme events. Conversion to high intensity land uses tends to increase runoff, but also decreases evapotranspiration. Depending on the situation, this might increase groundwater discharge, and decrease baseflow in receiving streams.

Soil features

These soils have acidic subsoils that are low in bases. The soils were formed under woodland vegetation, and have thin, light-colored surface horizons. Parent material is slope alluvium and residuum weathered from acid igneous rock such as diorite. Sites on summit crests generally have loess in the upper part. They have silt loam surface layers that range to gravelly and very gravelly and cobbly, particularly on lower slope positions, with loamy subsoils that have moderate amounts of volcanic gravel and cobbles. These soils are not affected by seasonal wetness. Soil series associated with this site include Hassler, Mudlick, and Trackler.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Slope alluvium – diorite (2) Residuum – diorite
Surface texture	(1) Cobbly silt loam
Family particle size	(1) Loamy
Drainage class	Moderately well drained to well drained
Permeability class	Moderately slow to moderate
Soil depth	100 – 180 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	10 %

Surface fragment cover >3"	10 – 30 %
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	15.24 – 17.78 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Electrical conductivity (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Sodium adsorption ratio (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	3.5 – 10
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	10 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	10 – 30 %

Ecological dynamics

Information contained in this section was developed using historical data, professional experience, field reviews, and scientific studies. The information is representative of very complex vegetation communities. Not all scenarios or plants are included or discussed. Key indicator plants, animals and ecological processes are described to help guide land management decisions. 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. 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.

The historic reference community for Igneous Upland Woodland has a moderately developed canopy (50 to 70 feet tall and 60 to 80 percent closure) that is dominated by white oak (Quercus alba), black oak (Quercus velutina), and northern red oak (Quercus rubra) and occasional shortleaf pine (Pinus echinata) with a sun loving woodland ground flora. Increased canopy heights and higher stocking densities of white oak are associated with the deeper soil depth ranges of the correlated soil components (Nelson, 2010).

Igneous Upland Woodlands likely had an estimated fire frequency of 3 to 5 years. These periodic fires kept woodlands open, removed the litter, and stimulated the growth and flowering of the grasses and forbs. (Ladd, 1991; Frost, 1996) During fire free intervals, woody species, especially black hickory (Carya texana), winged elm (Ulmus alata) and eastern redcedar (Juniperus virginiana) would have increased and the herbaceous understory diminished. The return of fire would have opened the woodlands up again and stimulated the abundant ground flora.

Igneous Upland Woodlands were also subjected to occasional disturbances from wind and ice, as well as grazing by native large

herbivores. Wind and ice would have periodically opened the canopy up by knocking over trees or breaking substantial branches off canopy trees. Grazing by native herbivores would have effectively kept understory conditions more open, creating conditions more favorable to oak reproduction and sun-loving ground flora species.

In the long term absence of fire, woody species will encroach into these woodlands (Nigh and Schroeder, 2002). Once established, these woody plants can quickly fill the woodland system. Most of these ecological sites today are more dense and shady with a greatly diminished ground flora. Removal of the younger understory and the application of prescribed fire have proven to be effective management tools (MDC, 2006).

These sites have undergone periodic timber harvests and infrequent domestic livestock grazing. Most existing occurrences have a younger (50 to 80 years) canopy whose composition has been altered by timber harvesting practices. An increase in hickories (Carya sp.) over historic conditions is common. The absence of periodic fire has allowed more shade-tolerant tree species, such as red maple (Acer rubrum), winged elm, coralberry (Symphoriocarpus orbiculatus) and hickories to increase in abundance increasing canopy cover and stand densities (Nelson, 2010). Some less sloping sites have been cleared and converted to non-native cool season grassland.

Igneous Upland Woodlands are moderately productive timber sites. Unmanaged timber harvests in this region typically results in removal of the most productive trees, or high-grading of the stand. This can result in poorer quality residual timber and a shift in species composition away from more valuable oak species. Carefully planned single tree selection or the creation of small group openings can help regenerate more desirable oak species and increase vigor on the residual trees.

Clear-cutting does occur and results in dense, even-aged stands of primarily oak. This may be most beneficial for existing stands whose composition has been highly altered by past management practices. Thinning and prescribed fire can play a beneficial role in the management of this ecological site.

Some soil properties may vary with ecological dynamics and management regimes, particularly in the upper part of the soil profile. Unrestricted grazing in woodland communities generally results in an increase in bulk density of the surface horizon and a decrease in infiltration rates. Long-term fire exclusion allows for a buildup of leaf litter increasing surface organic material over time. Conversion to grassland may result in soil loss from the clearing process and from erosion before the grassland is well established. Long-term, proper grassland management results in higher soil pH levels and higher levels of calcium and magnesium from pasture liming. These effects may extend a foot or more into the soil profile (Conant and others, 2001; Schellberg, and others, 1999).

A state and transition model for the Igneous Upland Woodland Ecological Site (F116CY002MO) follows this narrative. 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 following diagram suggests some pathways that the vegetation on this site might take. There may be other states not shown on 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

Figure 8. State and Transition Diagram

Additional community tables

Table 5. Community 1.1 plant community composition

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

Table 6. Community 1.1 forest overstory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height M	Canopy Cover (%)	Diameter Cm	Basal Area (square M/hectare)
Tree							
white oak	QUAL	*Quercus alba*	Native	11-18.3	20-40	12.7-48.3	–
black oak	QUVE	*Quercus velutina*	Native	12.8-21.3	10-30	–	–
northern red oak	QURU	*Quercus rubra*	Native	12.8-21.3	10-30	12.7-48.3	–
black hickory	CATE9	*Carya texana*	Native	9.1-15.2	10-20	–	–
white ash	FRAM2	*Fraxinus americana*	Native	11-18.3	5-20	–	–
post oak	QUST	*Quercus stellata*	Native	9.1-15.2	10-20	12.7-53.3	–
shagbark hickory	CAOV2	*Carya ovata*	Native	9.1-15.2	5-20	12.7-27.9	–
shortleaf pine	PIEC2	*Pinus echinata*	Native	12.8-21.3	5-10	–	–

Table 7. Community 1.1 forest understory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height (m)	Canopy Cover (%)
Grass/grass-like (Graminoids)					
poverty oatgrass	DASP2	*Danthonia spicata*	Native	0-0.3	10-20
little bluestem	SCSC	*Schizachyrium scoparium*	Native	0-0.9	10-20
rock muhly	MUSO	*Muhlenbergia sobolifera*	Native	0-0.6	5-10
whitetinge sedge	CAAL25	*Carex albicans*	Native	0-0.6	5-10
Forb/Herb					
elmleaf goldenrod	SOUL2	*Solidago ulmifolia*	Native	0-0.6	5-10
Virginia threeseed mercury	ACVI	*Acalypha virginica*	Native	0.2-0.3	5-10
licorice bedstraw	GACI2	*Galium circaezans*	Native	0-0.1	5-10
downy ragged goldenrod	SOPE	*Solidago petiolaris*	Native	0-0.6	5-10
perplexed ticktrefoil	DEPE80	*Desmodium perplexum*	Native	0.1-0.3	5-10
manyray aster	SYAN2	*Symphyotrichum anomalum*	Native	0.2-0.9	5-10
trailing lespedeza	LEPR	*Lespedeza procumbens*	Native	0-0.1	5-10
St. Andrew's cross	HYHY	*Hypericum hypericoides*	Native	0.2-0.9	5-10
hairy sunflower	HEHI2	*Helianthus hirsutus*	Native	0-0.6	5-10
nakedflower ticktrefoil	DENU4	*Desmodium nudiflorum*	Native	0.2-0.6	5-10
violet lespedeza	LEVI6	*Lespedeza violacea*	Native	0-0.3	5-10
Shrub/Subshrub					
lowbush blueberry	VAAN	*Vaccinium angustifolium*	Native	0.1-0.9	5-20
Carolina buckthorn	FRCA13	*Frangula caroliniana*	Native	0.3-1.8	5-20
fragrant sumac	RHAR4	*Rhus aromatica*	Native	0.2-1.5	5-20
Tree					
red maple	ACRU	*Acer rubrum*	Native	1.5-3	5-10
common serviceberry	AMAR3	*Amelanchier arborea*	Native	1.5-3	5-10
flowering dogwood	COFL2	*Cornus florida*	Native	1.5-3	5-10
sassafras	SAAL5	*Sassafras albidum*	Native	1.5-3	5-10

Table 8. Community 1.2 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 1.2 forest overstory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height M	Canopy Cover (%)	Diameter Cm	Basal Area (square M/hectare)
Tree							
white oak	QUAL	*Quercus alba*	Native	11-18.3	20-40	12.7-48.3	–
northern red oak	QURU	*Quercus rubra*	Native	12.8-21.3	15-30	12.7-48.3	–
black oak	QUVE	*Quercus velutina*	Native	12.8-21.3	10-30	–	–
black hickory	CATE9	*Carya texana*	Native	9.1-15.2	15-25	–	–
white ash	FRAM2	*Fraxinus americana*	Native	11-18.3	10-20	–	–
shagbark hickory	CAOV2	*Carya ovata*	Native	9.1-15.2	10-20	12.7-27.9	–
post oak	QUST	*Quercus stellata*	Native	9.1-15.2	10-20	12.7-53.3	–
shortleaf pine	PIEC2	*Pinus echinata*	Native	12.8-21.3	5-10	–	–

Table 10. Community 1.2 forest understory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height (m)	Canopy Cover (%)
Grass/grass-like (Graminoids)					

little bluestem	SCSC	*Schizachyrium scoparium*	Native	0-0.9	5-15
poverty oatgrass	DASP2	*Danthonia spicata*	Native	0-0.6	5-15
rock muhly	MUSO	*Muhlenbergia sobolifera*	Native	0-0.6	0-5
whitetinge sedge	CAAL25	*Carex albicans*	Native	0-0.6	0-5
Forb/Herb					
Virginia threeseed mercury	ACVI	*Acalypha virginica*	Native	0.2-0.3	0-10
downy ragged goldenrod	SOPE	*Solidago petiolaris*	Native	0-0.6	5-10
elmleaf goldenrod	SOUL2	*Solidago ulmifolia*	Native	0-0.6	5-10
manyray aster	SYAN2	*Symphyotrichum anomalum*	Native	0.2-0.9	5-10
trailing lespedeza	LEPR	*Lespedeza procumbens*	Native	0-0.1	5-10
nakedflower ticktrefoil	DENU4	*Desmodium nudiflorum*	Native	0.2-0.6	5-10
perplexed ticktrefoil	DEPE80	*Desmodium perplexum*	Native	0.1-0.3	5-10
licorice bedstraw	GACI2	*Galium circaezans*	Native	0-0.1	5-10
hairy sunflower	HEHI2	*Helianthus hirsutus*	Native	0-0.6	0-10
St. Andrew's cross	HYHY	*Hypericum hypericoides*	Native	0.2-0.9	5-10
violet lespedeza	LEVI6	*Lespedeza violacea*	Native	0-0.3	5-10
Shrub/Subshrub					
Carolina buckthorn	FRCA13	*Frangula caroliniana*	Native	0.3-1.8	10-20
fragrant sumac	RHAR4	*Rhus aromatica*	Native	0.3-1.5	10-20
lowbush blueberry	VAAN	*Vaccinium angustifolium*	Native	0.2-0.9	5-20
Tree					
red maple	ACRU	*Acer rubrum*	Native	1.5-3	10-15
common serviceberry	AMAR3	*Amelanchier arborea*	Native	1.5-3	5-10
sassafras	SAAL5	*Sassafras albidum*	Native	1.5-3	5-10
flowering dogwood	COFL2	*Cornus florida*	Native	1.5-3	5-10
white ash	FRAM2	*Fraxinus americana*	Native	1.5-3	0-5
northern red oak	QURU	*Quercus rubra*	Native	1.5-3	0-5
black oak	QUVE	*Quercus velutina*	Native	1.5-3	0-5
bitternut hickory	CACO15	*Carya cordiformis*	Native	1.5-3	0-5

Table 11. Community 2.1 plant community composition

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

Table 12. Community 2.2 plant community composition

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

Table 13. Community 3.1 plant community composition

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

Table 14. Community 4.1 plant community composition

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

Table 15. Community 5.1 plant community composition

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

Table 16. Community 5.2 plant community composition

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

Animal community

Wildlife (MDC, 2006): Wildlife habitat: Oaks on this site provide abundant hard mast; scattered shrubs provide soft mast; native legumes provide high-quality wildlife food. Sedges and native cool-season grasses provide green browse; native warm-season grasses provide cover and nesting habitat; and a diversity of forbs provides a diversity and abundance of insects. Post-burn areas can provide temporary bare-ground and herbaceous cover habitat is important for turkey poults and quail chicks. Birds species associated with this site are Indigo Bunting, Red-headed Woodpecker, Eastern Bluebird, Northern Bobwhite, Summer Tanager, Eastern Wood-Pewee, Whip-poor-will, Chuck-will's widow, Red-eyed Vireo, Rose-breasted Grosbeak, Yellow-billed Cuckoo, and Broad-winged Hawk. Reptile and amphibian species include ornate box turtle, northern fence lizard, five-lined skink, broad-headed skink, six-lined racerunner, flat-headed snake, rough earth snake, and timber rattlesnake. Domestic livestock: Currently, domestic cattle grazing is absent or very limited on wooded sites due to lack of water, access issues, and high amounts of acorns on the ground in the fall that are detrimental to cattle. On sites that have been cleared of trees and converted to cool-season grasses cattle grazing occurs. Heavily grazed pasture states can reduce water quality through exposed mineral soil and lack of adequate ground/overstory cover that increases soil erosion and soil compaction.

Hydrological functions

The water features of this upland ecological site include evapotranspiration, surface runoff, and drainage. Each water balance component fluctuates to varying extents from year-to-year. Evapotranspiration remains the most constant. Precipitation and drainage are highly variable between years. Seasonal variability differs for each water component. Precipitation generally occurs as single day events. Evapotranspiration is lowest in the winter and peaks in the summer. Water stored as ice and snow decreases drainage and surface runoff rates throughout the winter and increases these fluxes in the spring. The surface runoff pulse is greatly influenced by extreme events. Conversion to cropland or other high intensities land uses tends to increase runoff, but also decreases evapotranspiration. Depending on the situation, this might increase groundwater discharge, and decrease baseflow in receiving streams.

Recreational uses

Hunting, bird watching, horseback riding, camping, and hiking are recreational uses of this ecological site. Reference and well managed sites provide good hunting for turkey, white-tailed deer, and squirrel. Recreational uses are reduced in the heavily grazed grassland state and high-graded woodland state.

Wood products

This ecological site is moderately productive. Timber harvesting can occur but care must be taken to maintain the integrity and character of the site. Potential products include lumber, oak staves, pallet materials, and in some cases oak veneer (only on well managed or old growth sites). Management: Field measured site index values range from 47 to 56 for northern red oak, 48 to 63 for black oak, and 59 for shortleaf pine (NRCS, 2014). Higher site index values are usually associated with protected and lower slopes and lesser site index values associated with exposed and upland slopes. Forest management opportunities are generally good. These groups respond well to even-aged management. Restrict clear cuttings to less than 30 acres or group selection cuttings of 2 to 5 acres. Uneven-aged management using single tree selection and crop tree release are other options that can be used if clear cutting is not desired or warranted or if sites occur on exposed slopes. Using prescribed fire as a management tool could have a negative impact timber quality, may not be fitting, or should be used with caution on a particular site if timber management is the primary objective. Favor white oak and northern red oak on higher productivity sites and black oak, scarlet oak and shortleaf pine (Ozark region) on lower productivity sites (NRCS, 2002). Limitations: No major equipment restrictions or limitations exist; coarse fragments are possible in subsurface profile; restricted soil depth. Moderate seedling mortality during low rainfall periods due to possible limited rooting depth and low to moderate available water capacity. Disturbing the surface excessively during site preparation activities increases soil losses, which may also leave coarse fragments on the surface. Erosion is a hazard when slopes exceed 15 percent. On steep slopes, traction problems increase. Track type equipment or yarding with cables may be necessary (NRCS, 2002).

Other products

Additional opportunities exist in the reference and well managed woodland states for agroforestry undertakings like wild crafting activities, such as seasonal harvesting spring and summer florals and native blueberries.

Other information

Historically, black bears were common across the area. Their reduced numbers were directly correlated with the westward expansion of the European settlers and uncontrolled hunting. Like other mobile animals in the area, bears would have used multiple ecological sites. Other predators like the mountain lion and wolf have disappeared from these sites in a similar manner. Today sightings of black bears and mountain lions are increasing throughout the area due a natural migration of these species from other states and regions.

Table 17. Representative site productivity

Common Name	Symbol	Site Index Low	Site Index High	CMAI Low	CMAI High	Age Of CMAI	Site Index Curve Code	Site Index Curve Basis	Citation
shortleaf pine	*PIEC2*	59	59	86	86	50	–	–	
black oak	*QUVE*	48	63	32	46	50	–	–	
northern red oak	*QURU*	47	56	32	43	50	–	–	

Inventory data references

The data contained in this document is derived from analysis of inventories, ecological interpretation from field evaluations, and various reference papers and books. Nelson, Paul W. 2010. The Terrestrial Natural Communities of Missouri. Missouri Department of Conservation, Jefferson City, Missouri. Yatskievych, George A. 1999/2006/2013. Flora of Missouri. Missouri Dept. of Conservation in cooperation with Missouri Botanical Garden Press, Volumes 1-3. Sampling methods (nested plots/transects/releve) Reference Inventory Plots: BUMOCA01 Buford Mountain CA; Mudlick BUMOCA02 Buford Mountain CA; Mudlick TASASP03 Taum Sauk SP; Trackler HUMOCA04 Hughes Mountain CA; Trackler Level 2 and reconnaissance inventory: 2003: Nigh/Meinert-Initial reconnaissance/site mapping. Three weeks of recon on numerous 116C sites. 2007: Reconnaissance plots on Stegall Mountain and Taum Sauk Mountain. 2012: Central States Forest Soils Workshop field sites (6) in 116C. 2013: Reconnaissance on numerous igneous mountains working on reference plots. Taum Sauk, Hughes, Peck Ranch, Russel Mountain, Johnson Shut-Ins, Mill Mountain NA, Buford

Type locality

Location 1: Iron County, MO	
Township/Range/Section	T35N R3E S34
UTM zone	N
UTM northing	4174745
UTM easting	703570
Latitude	37° 41′ 50″
Longitude	-90° 41′ 27″
General legal description	Igneous Upland Woodland at Buford Mountain Conservation Area.
Location 2: Iron County, MO	
Township/Range/Section	T35N R3E S34
UTM zone	N
UTM northing	4174753
UTM easting	703461

Latitude	37° 41′50″
Longitude	-90° 41′31″
General legal description	Igneous Upland Woodland at Buford Mountain Conservation Area.
Location 3: Washington County, MO	
Township/Range/Section	T36N R3E S28
UTM zone	N
UTM northing	4186644
UTM easting	701364
Latitude	37° 48′17″
Longitude	-90° 42′45″
General legal description	Igneous Upland Woodland at Hughes Mountain Conservation Area.

Other references

Batek, M.J., A.J. Rebertus, W.A. Schroeder, T.L. Haithcoat, E. Compas, and R.P. Guyette. 1999. Reconstruction of early nineteenth-century vegetation and fire regimes in the Missouri Ozarks. Journal of Biogeography 26:397-412.

Conant, R. T., K. Paustian, and E. T. Elliott. 2001. Grassland management and conversion into grassland: effects on soil carbon. Ecological Applications, 11(2). pp. 343–355

Frost, C., 1996. Pre-settlement Fire Frequency Regimes of the United States: A First Approximation. Pages 70-81, Proceedings of the 20nd Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference: Fire in Ecosystem Management: Shifting the Paradigm from Suppression to Prescription. Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, FL.

Guyette, R.P. and B.E. Cutter. 1991. Tree-ring analysis of fire history of a post oak savanna in the Missouri Ozarks. Natural Areas Journal 11: 93-99.

Harlan, J.D., T.A. Nigh and W.A. Schroeder. 2001. The Missouri original General Land Office survey notes project. University of Missouri, Columbia.

Ladd, D. 1991. Reexamination of the role of fire in Missouri oak woodlands. Pp. 67-80 in G.V. Brown, James K.; Smith, Jane Kapler, eds. 2000. Wildland fire in ecosystems: effects of fire on flora. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42-vol. 2. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 257 p.

Missouri Natural Heritage Inventory Database. 2013. Woodland element occurrence records. Missouri Department of Conservation. Jefferson City, Missouri.

Missouri Department of Conservation, 2006. Missouri Forest and Woodland Community Profiles. Jefferson City, Missouri.

National Vegetation Classification System Vegetation Association. 2010. http://www.natureserve.org/prodServices/ecomapping.jsp

Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2002. Woodland Suitability Groups. Missouri FOTG, Section II, Soil Interpretations and Reports. 30 pgs.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. Site Index Reports. Accessed May 2014. https://esi.sc.egov.usda.gov/ESI_Forestland/pgFSWelcome.aspx

Nelson, P. W. 2010. The Terrestrial Natural Communities of Missouri. Missouri Department of Conservation, Jefferson City, Missouri. 550 p.

Nigh, T. A., and W. A. Schroeder. 2002. Atlas of Missouri Ecoregions. Missouri Department of Conservation, Jefferson City, Missouri. 212 p.

Schellberg, J., B. Möseler, W. Kühbauch and A. Rademacher. 1999. Long-term effects of fertilizer on soil nutrient concentration, yield, forage quality and floristic composition of a hay meadow in the Eifel Mountains, Germany. Grass and Forage Science, 54: 195–207.

Schoolcraft, H.R. 1821. Journal of a tour into the interior of Missouri and Arkansas from Potosi, or Mine a Burton, in Missouri territory, in a southwest direction, toward the Rocky Mountains: performed in the years 1818 and 1819. Richard Phillips and Company, London.

Simmons, M., J. D. Childress, K. Godsey, and R. Taylor. 2006. Soil Survey of Reynolds County, Missouri. U.S. Dept. of Agric. Natural Resources Conservation Service.

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 pgs.

University of Missouri Climate Center - http://climate.missouri.edu/climate.php
Yatskievych, George A. 1999/2006/2013. Flora of Missouri. Missouri Dept. of Conservation in cooperation with Missouri Botanical Garden Press, Volumes 1-3.

Contributors

Douglas Wallace
Fred Young

Acknowledgments

Missouri Department of Conservation and Missouri Department of Natural Resources personnel provided significant and helpful field and technical support in the development of this ecological site.

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	09/01/2026

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:**
