

Ecological site F130AY006PA

Quartzitic Footslopes And Terraces

Last updated: 9/27/2024
Accessed: 09/15/2026

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): 130A–Northern Blue Ridge

Major Land Resource Area 130A is in the Northern Section of the Blue Ridge Province of the Appalachian Highlands. The region is characterized by rugged mountains with steep slopes, sharp crests, and narrow valleys. The mountain range forms a narrow band that runs north to south between the Piedmont Upland Section to the east, the Ridge and Valley section to the west, and the Southern Section of the Blue Ridge to the south. Stream dissection is deep and intricate. Major streams and their tributaries flow through gorges and gaps. Elevation ranges from about 820 feet (250 meters) in the lower valleys and on footslopes along the Potomac River just east of Harpers Ferry, where West Virginia joins Maryland and Virginia, to more than 4,200 feet (1,280 meters) along the Appalachian Trail in Bedford County, Virginia. Apple Orchard Mountain, the highest peak, is at an elevation of 4,225 feet (1,288 meters) (USDA 2006). The backbone of the northern Blue Ridge is an anticline composed of rocks that can be divided into geological groupings based on age. In general, the oldest rocks are the furthest east, and become younger towards the west (Fichter and Baedke, 2000; Barnes and Sevon, 2002). The first group are plutonic rocks that formed when liquid molten rock, called magma, solidified deep within the earth's crust over a billion years ago. Collectively referred to as the Grenville rocks, they make up much of the eastern half of the mountains and are composed of granites, gneisses, and granulites. The second group, characterized by the Catoclin greenstone formation, is slightly younger, and is made up of metabasalts and metarhyolites, types of igneous rocks that have been metamorphosed by heat and pressure. The third group was formed during the Cambrian period about 500 million years ago and are represented by the Harpers, Antiedam, Weverton, and Loudoun formations which comprise the Chilhowee group. These rocks are primarily quartzites, phyllites, and meta-sandstones, and form the western flank of the Blue Ridge. Preliminary ecological site differentiation is based on these three main age groups and geologies. The variable characteristics of the underlying rocks give rise to different soil physical and chemical properties and exert control on the landscape, slope shape, aspect, and elevation, all of which affect vegetation.

Classification relationships

This ecological site is found in Major Land Resource Area 130A – the Northern Blue Ridge. MLRA 130A is located within Land Resource Region N – East and Central Farming and Forest Region (USDA 2006), and in United States Forest Service ecoregion M221D – Central Appalachian Broadleaf Forest-Coniferous Forest-Meadow Province, Blue Ridge Mountain Province (Bailey, 1995). In addition, MLRA 130A falls within area #66 of EPA Ecoregion Level III – the Blue Ridge (US EPA 2013). The Quartzitic Footslopes and Terraces ecological site occurs primarily within 66b of EPA Ecoregion IV – Northern Sedimentary and Metasedimentary Ridges (Woods et. al., 1996). Central Appalachian Dry Oak-Pine Forest System - CES202.591 *Quercus prinus* - (*Quercus coccinea*, *Quercus rubra*) / *Kalmia latifolia* / *Vaccinium pallidum* Forest Association (CEGL006299) Northeastern Interior Dry-Mesic Oak Forest System - CES202.592 *Quercus prinus* - *Quercus rubra* / *Hamamelis virginiana* Forest Association (CEGL006057) (NatureServe 2017)

Ecological site concept

The Quartzitic Footslopes and Terraces ecological sites are located in the Northern Blue Ridge region of the Appalachian Highlands, primarily on the western side where underlying geologies are mostly composed of quartzite, metaquartzite, phyllite, sandstone, and shale. This ecological site is found on lower mountain slopes, footslopes, toeslopes, coves, benches, drainageways, mountain valleys, stream terraces, and fans. Soils are deep, well drained and very strongly to moderately acidic. Low to mid slope areas generally have more moisture than ecological sites further upslope, however, these landscapes are dry due to the sandy soil textures and stoniness. This ecological site is drier, more acidic, and less fertile than the Mixed Metamorphic-Metabasalt Footslopes and Terraces ecological site which is on similar landscapes, but underlain by different geology: metabasalts, granitic rocks, granodiorite, gneiss, schists, and some phyllite. Not much is known about this site, and future field work may result in it being combined with another coarse textured terrace or floodplain ecological site or combined with an upland site. Current field data from the Heritage Programs of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia suggest that this ecological site is very similar to the Quartzitic Uplands, however, much more ruderal forest exists on these lower slope areas than in the upper slopes and ridgetops, suggesting a more extensive history of logging, past farming and settlement. The

reference state is a combination of several vegetation communities within the Central Appalachian Dry Oak-Pine Forest, and the Northeastern Interior Dry-Mesic Oak Forest as defined by NatureServe (NatureServe 2009). These forests are mostly closed-canopy but can include patches of more open woodlands and grasslands. The coarse, acidic, well drained soils, will host a variable mixture of dry-site oak and pine species. Heath shrubs are common in the understory.

Associated sites

F130AY004PA	Quartzitic Upland The Quartzitic Upland occurs on adjacent upper slopes.
F130AY007PA	Fine To Loamy Mixed Metamorphic Floodplain The Fine to Loamy Mixed Metamorphic Floodplain occurs along adjacent drainageways and streams.

Similar sites

F147XY007PA	Loamy To Coarse Terrace The Loamy to Coarse Terrace provisional ecological site of the Ridge and Valley major land resource area has similar soil textures, depth, and drainage. Future field work and analysis may result in these ecological sites being combined.
F130AY004PA	Quartzitic Upland The Quartzitic Upland provisional ecological site of the Northern Blue Ridge is similar but is generally drier with many more areas of shallow soils. More fieldwork is needed to see if these ecological sites should be combined.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Quercus prinus</i> (2) <i>Quercus coccinea</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Kalmia latifolia</i> (2) <i>Vaccinium pallidum</i>
Herbaceous	Not specified

Physiographic features

The Quartzitic Foothills and Terraces provisional ecological site occurs on geologies of quartzite, metaquartzite, phyllite, sandstone, and shale. Typical landscapes are mountain and hillslopes, foothills, toeslopes, benches, coves, drainageways, and fans. Elevation is generally around 1380 feet (420m) but can range from 235 to 2000 feet (72 to 610m). Slopes range from nearly level to 60 percent. Depth to bedrock is greater than 70 inches (178cm). This ecological site is not subject to flooding nor ponding.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Cove (2) Terrace (3) Fan
-----------	------------------------------------

Runoff class	Medium to very high
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	70 – 610 m
Slope	0 – 60 %
Water table depth	150 – 180 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The Northern Blue Ridge, Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) 130A, appears to have three somewhat distinct sections based on PRISM data for average annual precipitation and minimum average annual temperature (PRISM 2013). The northernmost section that runs from Adams County, Pennsylvania south through Washington County, Maryland has an average annual average precipitation of 38 inches (97cm) in the lower elevations up to 50 inches (127 cm) in the higher elevations - about 2000 feet (610m). The average annual minimum temperature is 40 to 44°F (4.4 to 6.7°C). From Washington County, Maryland south to the northern tip of Rappahannock County, Virginia, the average annual precipitation is less variable, ranging from approximately 38 to 42 inches (97 to 107cm). The average annual minimum temperature remains about the same as to the north, 40 to 44°F (4.4 to 6.7°C). The lower third of MLRA 130A starting from northern Rappahannock County down through Bedford County, Virginia receives more moisture and is colder, with average annual precipitation that ranges from 40 (107cm) to greater than 50 inches (127cm) at elevations higher than 2000 feet (610m) which is a significant part of this section of the MLRA. Average minimum temperatures range from 34°F (1.1°C) at elevation greater than 3000 feet (914m) to 38°F (3.3°C) at the lowest elevations, less than 1000 feet (305m).

These three climate regions seem to correspond to differences in elevation and relief. Most of the Blue Ridge ranging from Adams County, Pennsylvania through Maryland to Rappahannock County, Virginia rises no higher than 2000 feet (610m). Much of the Blue Ridge south of and including Rappahannock County rises above 2000 feet up to 4000 feet (610 to 1219m).

The higher elevations interact with moist air that flows inland from the Atlantic Ocean. Along the east coast of the United States, winter storms moving across the continent encounter the warm Gulf Stream waters and begin to track northeastward paralleling the coast. As the moisture-laden air from the storms crosses Virginia, the eastern slopes and foothills of the Blue Ridge receive much of this precipitation (Hayden and Michaels 2017). In addition, the high relief of the mountains intercepts much of any moisture moving inland from the east coast. The Shenandoah Valley which lies just to the west of the Blue Ridge is one of the driest parts of the state of Virginia. Where the Blue Ridge elevation is greater than 2000 feet (610m), the east-facing slopes appear to receive over 50 inches (127cm) of annual rainfall on average while the Valley to the west of the mountains receives less than 38 inches (97 cm), and the mountains' western footslopes receive 2 to 4 inches (5 to 10cm) less of precipitation than the eastern ones (PRISM). This rain shadow effect is not as pronounced where the ridges are below 1640 ft (500m) of elevation.

Currently, the Shallow to Moderately Deep Mixed Metamorphic Granitic provisional ecological site is mapped throughout the MLRA. Field work is needed to determine if the precipitation and annual average temperature differences are significant enough to cause major shifts in ecological sites from north to south or from east to west necessitating the further subdivision of broadly mapped PES into more refined climatic groupings.

Data for mean annual precipitation, frost-free and freeze-free periods and monthly precipitation for this ecological site are shown below. The original data used in developing the tables was obtained from the USDA-NRCS National Water & Climate Center (2015) climate information database for 4 weather stations throughout MLRA 130A in proximity to this ecological site. All climate station monthly averages for maximum and minimum temperature and precipitation were then added together and averaged to make this table.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	130-160 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	170-190 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	1,090-1,270 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	120-160 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	160-190 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	1,070-1,350 mm
Frost-free period (average)	140 days
Freeze-free period (average)	180 days
Precipitation total (average)	1,190 mm

- (1) CATOCTIN MTN PARK [USC00181530], Sabillasville, MD
- (2) BIG MEADOWS [USC00440720], Syria, VA
- (3) MT WEATHER [USC00445851], Paris, VA
- (4) LURAY 5 E [USC00445096], Luray, VA

Influencing water features

This ecological site is not influenced by wetland or riparian water features.

Soil features

The representative soil series associated with this site are Sherando, Lostcove, Keener, Covegap, and Bagtown. These soils have weathered from geologies of metaquartzite, quartzite, metasedimentary rock, phyllite, sandstone, shale, and small areas of limestone. The soils are mostly derived from material that has moved from upper slopes to lower slope positions, called colluvium. Some of these soils have formed from alluvial sediments that were originally deposited along former floodplains which are now considered upland as the current floodplain has incised downward over geologic time.

Depth to bedrock is over 70 inches (178cm). The soils are moderately well to excessively well-drained with average water table depth ranging from 70 to 79 inches (178 to 201 cm). Soil permeability is moderately slow to rapid, and soil is very strongly to moderately acid with pH ranging from 4.8 to 5.8. Surface textures are fine sandy loam, loam, and sandy loam. Subsurface texture tends to be loamy. Soils data was obtained from the Natural Resources and Conservation Service (NRCS) National Soils Information System database (USDA 2015).

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Colluvium – quartzite (2) Alluvium – metaquartzite
-----------------	---

Surface texture	(1) Cobbly fine sandy loam (2) Extremely stony sandy loam (3) Very flaggy loam
Family particle size	(1) Loamy
Drainage class	Moderately well drained to somewhat excessively drained
Permeability class	Moderately slow to rapid
Soil depth	180 – 200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0 – 50 %
Surface fragment cover >3"	0 – 50 %
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	6.6 – 17.02 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	4.8 – 5.8
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 30 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 50 %

Ecological dynamics

The vegetation groupings described in this section are based on the terrestrial ecological system classification and vegetation associations developed by NatureServe (Comer 2003) and the Natural Heritage Programs of Pennsylvania (Zimmerman et al. 2012), Virginia (Fleming et al. 2013), West Virginia (WVDNR 2014), and Maryland (Harrison 2004). Terrestrial ecological systems are specifically defined as a group of plant community types (associations) that tend to co-occur within landscapes with similar ecological processes, substrates, and/or environmental gradients. They are intended to provide a classification unit that is readily mappable, often from remote imagery, and readily identifiable by conservation and resource managers in the field. A given system will typically manifest itself in a landscape at intermediate geographic scales of tens to thousands of hectares and will persist for 50 or more years. A vegetation association is a plant community that is much more specific to a given soil, geology, landform, climate, hydrology, and disturbance history. It is the basic unit for vegetation classification. Each association will be named by the dominant species that occupy the different strata (tree, sapling, shrub, and herb). Within the NatureServe database, individual vegetation associations are assigned an identification number called a Community Element Global Code (CEGL). Most of the Information contained in this section was adapted from several sources, including the Nature Conservancy's Northeast Terrestrial and Aquatic Habitat map (Anderson et al., 2013), NatureServe's

Ecological Systems of the United States (Comer 2003; NatureServe 2009), and Landfire's Biophysical Settings and Existing Vegetation Type layers (Landfire 2010; Landfire 2013). The USDA Plants database was used to verify species' scientific and common names (USDA, NRCS. 2017).

Not much is known about this site, and future field work may result with it being combined with another coarse textured terrace or floodplain or upland ecological description. The characteristic forest system is the Central Appalachian Dry Oak Forest (NatureServe 2009; Anderson et. al. 2013) composed of a variable mixture of dry-site oak and pine species, including *Quercus prinus* (Chestnut oak), *Pinus virginiana* (Virginia pine), and *Pinus strobus* (Eastern white pine). Heath shrubs such as *Vaccinium pallidum* (Blue Ridge blueberry), *Gaylussacia baccata* (Black huckleberry), and *Kalmia latifolia* (Mountain laurel) are common in the understory.

The Northeastern Interior Dry-Mesic Oak Forest System also occupies this ecological site, but not to the extent as the Dry Oak Forest (NatureServe 2009; Anderson et. al 2013). This is an oak-dominated, mostly closed canopy forest that occurs as a matrix (dominant) type through much of the Appalachians. It occurs at low to mid elevations on gently rolling to steep topography on planar, slightly concave, and slightly convex slopes. Oak species characteristic of dry to mesic conditions and hickories are dominant in mature stands. These include *Quercus rubra*, *Quercus alba*, *Quercus velutina*, and *Quercus coccinea* (red, white, black, and scarlet oaks) and *Carya* spp. (hickories). *Castanea dentata* (American chestnut) was a prominent tree before chestnut blight eradicated it as a canopy constituent.

The ecological site includes small areas of high gradient floodplains that are part of the Central Appalachian Floodplain Forest System, but are much more diverse and will be included in the Fine to Loamy Mixed Metamorphic Floodplain ecological site description.

Disturbance agents in these forests include fire, wind throw, and ice damage. Gypsy moths can wreak havoc in the oak over story periodically. Oak forests historically have been maintained by periodic fire. Fire suppression since the early 20th century in the eastern United States is believed to be leading to the overall replacement of oaks with fire-sensitive, non-oak species like maples, beeches, birches, tulip poplars, and black cherry (Brose et. al., 2008). Oak forest regeneration is also hindered by heavy deer browsing (Latham et. al. 2005). Deer will selectively consume many native species including oak seedlings and acorns over less palatable species like hay-scented fern and several non-native species including Japanese barberry, Eurasian species of honeysuckle, and garlic mustard.

Parts of this ecological site have been subjected to human activity including logging, settlement, or other disturbance, therefore some of the forests are mid successional, in which pines (typically Virginia or white) may be codominant or dominant. These ruderal (growing where the natural vegetation has been disturbed by humans) forests and woodlands comprise about 18% of the area and are generally characterized by unnatural combinations of species (primarily natives, though they often contain slight or substantial numbers and amounts of species alien to the region as well). Currently, little data has been documented about this post settlement successional state in this ecological site. There may be agricultural lands in the form of pasture and hayland present, but acreage is only about 2% due to the infertility, stoniness, and dryness of the soils and landscapes. Therefore, no agricultural alternative state is described.

The information presented is representative of very complex vegetation communities. Key indicator plants and ecological processes are described to help inform land management decisions. Plant communities will differ across the major land resource region because of the naturally occurring variability in weather, soils, and aspect. The reference plant community is not necessarily the management goal. 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.

State and transition model

Figure 7. State and Transition Model

Figure 8. Legend

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 3.1 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

Site Development and Testing Plan Future work is needed, as described in a future project plan, to validate the information presented in this provisional ecological site description. Future work includes field sampling, data collection and analysis by qualified vegetation ecologists and soil scientists. As warranted, annual reviews of the project plan can be conducted by the Ecological Site Technical Team. A final field review, peer review, quality control, and quality assurance reviews of the ESD are necessary to approve a final document.

Other references

References

Anderson, M.G. M. Clark, C.E. Ferree, A. Jospe, A. Olivero Sheldon and K.J. Weaver. 2013. Northeast Habitat Guides: A companion to the terrestrial and aquatic habitat maps. The Nature Conservancy, Eastern Conservation Science, Eastern Regional Office. Boston, MA. <http://nature.ly/HabitatGuide>.

Bailey, Robert G. 1995. Description of the ecoregions of the United States 2d ed. Rev. and expanded (1st ed. 1980). Misc. Publ. No. 1391 (rev.), Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service. 108p. with separate map at 1:7,500,000.

Barnes, John H. and W.D. Sevon, The Geological Story of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Geological Survey Fourth Series, Harrisburg, 2002.

Brose, P. H., K.W. Gottschalk, S. B. Horsley, P.D. Knopp, J. N. Kochenderfer, B. J. McGuinness, G.W. Miller, T.E. Ristau, S. H. Stoleson, and S.L. Stout. 2008. Prescribing regeneration treatments for mixed-oak forests in the Mid-Atlantic region. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-33. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 100 p.)

Comer, P., D. Faber-Langendoen, R. Evans, S. Gawler, C. Josse, G. Kittel, S. Menard, M. Pyne, M. Reid, K. Schulz, K., Snow, and J. Teague. 2003. Ecological Systems of the United States: A Working Classification of U.S. Terrestrial Systems. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia.

Duiker, S. W. and J.C. Myers, 2005. Better Soils with the NoTill System, A Publication to Help Farmers Understand the Effect of No-Till Systems of the Soil. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Dyer, James, M. 2010. Land-use legacies in a central Appalachian forest differential response of trees and herbs to historic agricultural practices. *Applied Vegetation Science* 13:195-206.

ESRI, arcgisonline.com/maps/World_Topo_Map, accessed April 3, 2017.

Fichter, Lynn S. and Steve J. Baedke, Structural Cross Section Through the Blue Ridge Province in Central Virginia, last modified September 13, 2000, <http://csmres.jmu.edu/geollab/vageol/vahist/blurdgdiv.html>.

Fleming, G.P., K.D. Patterson, K. Taverna, and P.P. Coulling. 2013. The natural communities of Virginia: classification of ecological community groups. Second approximation. Version 2.6. Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, Division of Natural Heritage, Richmond, VA.

Harrison, J.W. 2004. Classification of vegetation communities of Maryland: First iteration. NatureServe and Maryland Natural Heritage Program, Wildlife and Heritage Service, Maryland Department of Natural Resources. Annapolis, MD.

Hayden, Bruce P. and Patrick J. Michaels, "Virginia's Climate." Accessed April 5, 2017, <http://climate.virginia.edu/description.htm>.

LANDFIRE: LANDFIRE Biophysical Settings. (2010, January 01 - last update). U.S. Department of Interior, Geological Survey. [Online]. Available: <http://landfire.cr.usgs.gov/viewer/> [2015, June 5].

LANDFIRE: LANDFIRE Existing Vegetation Type Layer. (2013, June – last update). U.S. Department of Interior, Geological Survey. [Online]. Available: <https://landfire.cr.usgs.gov/viewer/>[2015, June 5].

Latham, R. E., J. Beyea, M. Benner, C. A. Dunn, M. A. Fajvan, R. R. Freed, M. Grund, S. B. Horsley, A. F. Rhoads and B. P. Shissler. 2005. Managing White-tailed Deer in Forest Habitat From an Ecosystem Perspective: Pennsylvania Case Study. Report by the Deer Management Forum for Audubon Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania Habitat Alliance, Harrisburg. xix + 340 pp.

NatureServe. 2009. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, VA, U.S.A. Data current as of 06 February 2009.

NatureServe 2017. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available <http://explorer.natureserve.org>. (Accessed: June 2017).

PRISM Climate Group, Oregon State University, <http://prism.oregonstate.edu>, created February 26, 2013.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2015. National Soils Information System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Water and Climate Center, <http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov>, Accessed February 2015.

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, 669p.

USDA, NRCS. 2017. The PLANTS Database (<http://plants.usda.gov>, 20 July 2017). National Plant Data Team, Greensboro, NC 27401-4901 USA.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2013, Level III ecoregions of the continental United States: Corvallis, Oregon, U.S. EPA National health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, map scale 1:7,500,000, http://www.epa.gov/wed/pages/ecoregions/level_iii_iv.htm.

Woods, A.J., J.O. Omernik, D.D. Brown, C.W. Kiilsgaard. 1996. Level IV Ecoregions of EPA Region 3. US Environmental Protection Agency National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, Corvallis, Oregon. Map scale 1:250,000.

WVDNR [West Virginia Division of Natural Resources]. 2014. Plots2-WV database of community ecology plots. West Virginia Natural Heritage Program, WVDNR, Elkins, WV.

Zimmerman, E., T. Davis, G. Podniesinski, M. Furedi, J. McPherson, S. Seymour, B. Eichelberger, N. Dewar, J. Wagner, and J. Fike (editors). 2012. Terrestrial and Palustrine Plant Communities of Pennsylvania, 2nd Edition. Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program, Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Contributors

Regional Soil Survey Staff

Approval

Greg Schmidt, 9/27/2024

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	09/15/2026
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:
