

## **Ecological site R098XA002MI Inland Salt Marshes**

Last updated: 1/12/2024  
Accessed: 05/18/2024

---

### **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): 098X–Southern Michigan and Northern Indiana Drift Plains

This area is in the Eastern Lake Section of the Central Lowland Province of the Interior Plains. It is a broad glaciated plain that is deeply mantled by till in the north and outwash to the south. Much of the area is nearly level to gently rolling. Elevation ranges from 183 to 391 m (600 to 1285 ft). Local topographic relief averages 9 m and ranges up to 74 m (30 to 245 ft). Highest relief occurs adjacent to river valleys eroded through moraines. Topography is more subdued south of the Atlantic/Gulf drainage divide near the Michigan/Indiana state line, elevations ranging from 185 to 280 m (605 to 920 ft). Local topographic relief in the south averages 4 m and ranges up to 49 m (10 to 160 ft).

The surface of this area is covered by 30 to 150 m (100 to 500 ft) of glacial drift in most areas. At the northern edge of the area, the drift is more than 100 meters (300 ft) thick. From the Grand River basin northward, most of the drift consists of till from the Saginaw Lobe of the Wisconsin Ice Sheet. From the Kalamazoo River basin southward, there are significant deposits of unconsolidated sand and gravel outwash formed between major lobes of the receding Wisconsin Ice Sheet. The outwash deposits are reworked as sand dunes in the Kankakee River basin.

The bedrock beneath the glacial deposits in this area is deformed in the shape of a basin. The center of this basin is in the north-central part of the area. Pennsylvanian-age sandstone are in the center of the basin, and Mississippian-age sandstone and shale beds form the outer rings of the basin. In a few areas the drift deposits are less than 2 m (6 ft) thick, where glacial outwash channels have eroded to limestone bedrock in Grand Rapids, and where sandstone bedrock cuestas peak in elevation in near Hillsdale, Michigan. A sandstone cliff < 15 m high (<50 ft) occurs along a short stretch of the Grand River in Grand Ledge, Michigan.

Most of the rivers in this area are short because of their proximity to the Great Lakes east and west of the area. The largest watersheds, the St. Joseph River, Grand River, and Kalamazoo River drain into Lake Michigan. The southern extent of the MLRA is drained by the Kankakee River of the Mississippi River watershed.

### **Classification relationships**

Among the USFS ecoregional framework (Cleland et al., 2007), most of MLRA 98 is represented by the Humid Temperate Domain (200), Hot Continental Division (220), Midwest Broadleaf Forest Province (222), South Central Great Lakes Section (222J), subsections 222Jc, 222Jg, 222Jh, and 222Jf. Similar sites within the portion of MLRA 98 that overlap the Prairie Division (250) and Prairie Parkland Province (251) are treated as separate ecological sites. MLRA 98 recently was adjusted to exclude portions of Warm Continental Division (210), Laurentian Mixed Forest Province (212) to the north, and subsections 222Ja and 222Jb to the northwest.

Among the EPA ecoregional framework (Omernik and Griffith, 2014), most of MLRA 98 falls within Eastern Temperate Forests (Level I: 8), Mixed Wood Plains (Level II: 8.1), Southern Michigan/Northern Indiana Drift Plains (Level III: 56), and Level IV: 56b, 56g, and 56h. Similar sites within the portion of MLRA 98 that overlap the Central

USA Plains (Level II: 8.2) and Central Corn Belt Plains (Level III: 54) are treated as separate ecological sites. MLRA 98 recently was adjusted to exclude portions of Northern Forests (Level I: 5), Mixed Wood Shield (Level II: 5.2), Northern Lakes and Forests (Level III: 50) to the north, and level IV: 56d and 56f to the northwest.

## Ecological site concept

The central concept of the Inland Salt Marshes is a range of organic (or mineral) soils with high electrical conductivity, indicating a high amount of dissolved salts, particularly sodium chloride.

## Associated sites

F098XA006MI	<b>Mucky Depressions</b>
-------------	--------------------------

## Similar sites

F098XA006MI	<b>Mucky Depressions</b>
-------------	--------------------------

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Schoenoplectus americanus</i> (2) <i>Eleocharis parvula</i>

## Physiographic features

Extant occurrences are in floodplains, presumably below the elevation of Paleozoic salt deposits.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features


Landforms	(1) Valley floor
Runoff class	Low
Elevation	162–280 m
Water table depth	0 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

## Climatic features


This ecological site experiences a humid continental climate with mild summers and cold winters. Precipitation is moderately well distributed through the year with higher amounts during the growing season than the winter. Temperature extremes are moderated by the Great Lakes compared to other inland continental locations, though not as much as MLRAs directly bordering the Great Lakes. Mean annual extreme minimum temperatures range from -26.6 to -20.8°C (-16 to -5°F), which falls within hardiness zones 5a to 6a. Annual snowfall is enhanced by the Great Lakes, mainly on the western half of the MLRA.

Table 3. Representative climatic features


Frost-free period (average)	140 days
Freeze-free period (average)	167 days
Precipitation total (average)	889 mm



**Figure 1. Monthly precipitation range**



**Figure 2. Monthly average minimum and maximum temperature**



**Figure 3. Annual precipitation pattern**

## Climate stations used

- (1) IONIA 2SSW [USC00204078], Ionia, MI
- (2) ALMA [USC00200146], Alma, MI
- (3) SAINT JOHNS [USC00207280], Saint Johns, MI

## Influencing water features

Site remains saturated from groundwater flow.

## Soil features

Soils are very poorly drained mucks or mineral soils. Extant occurrences are included in mollic floodplain mapunits (Ceresco and Sloan) and a Houghton muck map unit. A provisional classification of these sites is Fluvaquentic Endoaquepts and Typic Sulfisaprists. If the sulfur content proves to be too low to make Sulfisaprists, classification it is likely to be the catch-all Typic Haplosaprists. The only soil taxonomic grouping available to recognize the higher salinity is Halic Haplosaprists. However, documented electrical conductivity readings failed reach the necessary 30 dS/m to be identified as a Halic subgroup, despite a unique response in floristic composition to the otherwise

elevated salinity. Recent field data across one saltmarsh shows pHs ranging from 5.4 to 7, and electrical conductivity ranging from 2.05 to 13.55 dS/m. Vegetation composition turnover from *Typha angustifolia* to saltmarsh specialist *Schoenoplectus americanus* occurred at 3 dS/m. The relatively low *Typha* cover present in this higher salinity zone was 1.8 m tall compared to 3 m outside this zone. An area of exclusively the very short *Eleocharis parvula* had readings greater than 10 dS/m. The site was probably overlooked by Clinton County surveys due to its extremely limited occurrences (3 sites < 5 ha total) restricted to the Maple River floodplain.

**Table 4. Representative soil features**


Parent material	(1) Organic material
Surface texture	(1) Muck
Drainage class	Very poorly drained
Permeability class	Moderately slow to moderately rapid
Soil depth	201 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0%
Surface fragment cover >3"	0%
Available water capacity (0-100.1cm)	35–54.99 cm
Electrical conductivity (0-50cm)	2–15 mmhos/cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-50cm)	5.5–8
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0-150.1cm)	0%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0-150.1cm)	0%

## Ecological dynamics


Site remains saturated year round with saline groundwater, though the salinity may vary spatially and seasonally. Relatively few species of halophytes (salt tolerant plants) dominate the vegetation. Site remains relatively clear of woody species due a lack of salt tolerant native trees and shrubs. The reference community is dominated by obligate halophytic (salt tolerant) sedges like *Schoenoplectus americanus* and *Eleocharis parvula*.

## State and transition model


### Ecosystem states




State 1 submodel, plant communities




State 2 submodel, plant communities



State 3 submodel, plant communities



State 4 submodel, plant communities



State 1  
Reference State

The Reference State consists of a spontaneous wild condition wherein non-native species are of low abundance and all native species retain viable populations. Structure and function of communities vary according to natural processes and disturbance regimes, with human influences limited to drivers that have the similar outcomes as natural processes. Communities range from marshes to shrub swamps. Dominant natural processes and disturbance regimes include fire, wind, and beaver activities.

## Dominant plant species

- chairmaker's bulrush (*Schoenoplectus americanus*), grass
- dwarf spikerush (*Eleocharis parvula*), grass

## Community 1.1

**Marsh: *Schoenoplectus maritimus* - *Atriplex patula* - *Eleocharis parvula* Saline Marsh Association**

## Community 1.2

**Aquatic: *Nuphar advena* - *Nymphaea odorata* Aquatic Vegetation**

## Community 1.3

**Inundated Shrub Swamp: *Cephalanthus occidentalis* / *Carex* spp. Northern Shrub Swamp**

This phase represents the shrubby phase with shallow standing water. This shrubby often occurs on the nutrient rich edges of a wetland where the muck is more decomposed, and the substrate becomes submerged (no hummocks to stand on).

**Forest overstory.** Less than 5 percent tree cover associated with this phase, related to transitions from adjacent vegetation phases or is shaded from adjacent upland vegetation. Trees rooted within this zone most likely are willows (*Salix* spp.) that can tolerate longer hydroperiods.

## Pathway 1.1A

**Community 1.1 to 1.2**

Inundation

## Pathway 1.1B

**Community 1.1 to 1.3**

Temporary exposure and reduced salinity; shrub establishment

## Conservation practices

Tree/Shrub Site Preparation
Tree/Shrub Establishment

## Pathway 1.2A

**Community 1.2 to 1.1**

Lower water table, seasonal exposure; emergent vegetation established

## Pathway 1.2B

**Community 1.2 to 1.3**

Temporary exposure and lower salinity; shrub establishment

## Pathway 1.3A

**Community 1.3 to 1.1**

Disturbance (fire, deep inundation) or higher salinities leading to shrub mortality

## Conservation practices

Brush Management
------------------

## **Pathway 1.3B**

### **Community 1.3 to 1.2**

Disturbance (fire, deep inundation) or higher salinities leading to shrub mortality

## **State 2**

### **Cultural State**

The cultural state is actively managed. The structure and composition of cultural vegetation is not self-sustaining without human inputs.

## **Community 2.1**

### **Sustainable Crop, Pasture, or Plantation**

The community phase is an undifferentiated placeholder representing any of a number of possible crops or other intensive land uses in which best available management practices are employed to ensure that a minimum amount of soil erosion and water pollution occurs.

## **Community 2.2**

### **Unsustainable Cultural Phase**

The community phase is an undifferentiated placeholder representing any of a number of possible crops or other intensive land uses in which poor management practices are employed, resulting in an unacceptable amount of soil erosion and water pollution.

## **Community 2.3**

### **Conservation Feature**

The community phase represents non-crop vegetation that is managed in association with cropland or other intensive land uses to reduce environmental impacts of the land use. The managed vegetation can be a grassed waterway, conservation reserve, a small patch pollinator garden, or other land taken out of crop production. The small size and adjacency to an intensive land uses limits the degree to which native biological community and associated ecosystem services can be restored, but in a landscape context it may provide buffers or connectivity with nearby wild ecosystems.

## **Pathway 2.1A**

### **Community 2.1 to 2.2**

Revert to unsustainable cultural practices

## **Pathway 2.1B**

### **Community 2.1 to 2.3**

Establish conservation feature

### **Conservation practices**

Conservation Cover
--------------------

Grassed Waterway
------------------

## **Pathway 2.2A**

### **Community 2.2 to 2.1**

Implement sustainable cultural practices

### Conservation practices

Conservation Crop Rotation
Cover Crop
Nutrient Management
Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

### Pathway 2.2B

#### Community 2.2 to 2.3

Establish conservation feature

### Conservation practices

Conservation Cover
Grassed Waterway

### Pathway 2.3A

#### Community 2.3 to 2.1

Implement sustainable cultural practices

### Conservation practices

Conservation Crop Rotation
Cover Crop
Nutrient Management
Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

### Pathway 2.3B

#### Community 2.3 to 2.2

Revert to unsustainable cultural practices

## State 3

### Seminatural Drained State

The Seminatural Drained State is modified from reference conditions by draining the site, often followed by temporary cultivation of the site. The vegetation is spontaneously self-generated or self-sustaining in response to both human and natural drivers. However, species composition may no longer indicate wetland definitions, and may consist of a mix of native and introduced species. The degree of isolation from intact habitat and the degree of disturbance will dictate the species composition as vegetation recovers.

### Community 3.1

#### Ruderal Drained Meadow & Shrub

This phase represents an undifferentiated open community with few trees, with a variable native and non-native species composition.

### Dominant plant species

- multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*), shrub
- reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), grass
- eastern woodland sedge (*Carex blanda*), grass



- rice cutgrass (*Leersia oryzoides*), grass

## Community 3.2

### Semi-Natural Drained Swamp Forest

This phase represents an undifferentiated forested community, with a variable native and non-native species composition.

#### Dominant plant species

- American elm (*Ulmus americana*), tree
- red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tree
- American basswood (*Tilia americana*), tree
- Virginia creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*), shrub
- multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*), shrub
- northern spicebush (*Lindera benzoin*), shrub
- eastern bottlebrush grass (*Elymus hystrix*), grass
- Canadian clearweed (*Pilea pumila*), other herbaceous
- great ragweed (*Ambrosia trifida*), other herbaceous
- jumpseed (*Polygonum virginianum*), other herbaceous

**Table 5. Ground cover**

Tree foliar cover	55-95%
Shrub/vine/liana foliar cover	10-55%
Grass/grasslike foliar cover	2-25%
Forb foliar cover	10-80%
Non-vascular plants	0-2%
Biological crusts	0%
Litter	25-50%
Surface fragments >0.25" and <=3"	0%
Surface fragments >3"	0%
Bedrock	0%
Water	0%
Bare ground	0%

**Table 6. Canopy structure (% cover)**

Height Above Ground (M)	Tree	Shrub/Vine	Grass/ Grasslike	Forb
<0.15	0-3%	1-25%	0-15%	5-75%
>0.15 <= 0.3	0-3%	1-25%	0-15%	5-75%
>0.3 <= 0.6	0-3%	10-50%	0-15%	10-90%
>0.6 <= 1.4	0-5%	5-30%	0-3%	1-40%
>1.4 <= 4	20-75%	5-35%	—	0-20%
>4 <= 12	55-95%	0-5%	—	—
>12 <= 24	20-80%	0-1%	—	—
>24 <= 37	—	—	—	—
>37	—	—	—	—

## Pathway 3.1A

## Community 3.1 to 3.2

Succession

### Pathway 3.2A

#### Community 3.2 to 3.1

Blowdown or clearcut

#### Conservation practices

Early Successional Habitat Development/Management
Forest Stand Improvement

## State 4

### Seminatural State

The Seminatural State is modified from reference conditions mainly in species composition due to some type of disturbance, but retains a wetland hydrology. The state might have been drained and under cultivation for a time, but subsequently, hydrology is at least partially restored. The vegetation is spontaneously self-generated or self-sustaining in response to both human and natural drivers. However, species composition consists of a mix of native and introduced species. The degree of isolation from intact habitat and the degree of disturbance will dictate the species composition as vegetation recovers.

## Community 4.1

### Ruderal Wet Meadow & Shrub Swamp: *Phalaris arundinacea* Eastern Ruderal Marsh

#### Transition T1A

##### State 1 to 2

Drained, cleared vegetation, then cultivated domesticated species

#### Transition T1B

##### State 1 to 3

Drained, cleared vegetation, then invasive species introduced

#### Transition T1C

##### State 1 to 4

Cleared vegetation, then invasive species introduced

## Restoration pathway R2

### State 2 to 1

Restored hydrology, removed domesticated species, and restored native species

#### Conservation practices

Brush Management
Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management
Wetland Restoration
Herbaceous Weed Control

**Transition T2A**  
**State 2 to 3**

Abandoned, then succession

**Transition T2B**  
**State 2 to 4**

Restored hydrology, controlled invasive species, then restored native species

**Conservation practices**

Wetland Restoration
---------------------

**Restoration pathway R3**  
**State 3 to 1**

Restored hydrology, controlled invasive species, then restored native species

**Conservation practices**

Brush Management
Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management
Wetland Restoration
Herbaceous Weed Control

**Transition T3A**  
**State 3 to 2**

Cleared vegetation, then cultivated domesticated species

**Transition T3B**  
**State 3 to 4**

Restored hydrology

**Conservation practices**

Wetland Restoration
---------------------

**Restoration pathway R4**  
**State 4 to 1**

Controlled invasive species, then restored native species

**Conservation practices**

Brush Management
Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management
Herbaceous Weed Control

**Transition T4A**

State 4 to 2

Drained, cleared vegetation, then cultivated domesticated species

Transition T4B  
State 4 to 3

Drained

Additional community tables

Table 7. Community 3.2 forest overstory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height (M)	Canopy Cover (%)	Diameter (Cm)	Basal Area (Square M/Hectare)
Tree							
American elm	ULAM	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	Native	5–15	5–50	–	–
common hackberry	CEOC	<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	Native	5–15	1.5–40	–	–
red maple	ACRU	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	Native	10–25	0–30	–	–
pin oak	QUPA2	<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Native	10–25	3–30	–	–
silver maple	ACSA2	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	Native	10–25	1–25	–	–
boxelder	ACNE2	<i>Acer negundo</i>	Native	5–15	1.5–15	–	–
American basswood	TIAM	<i>Tilia americana</i>	Native	10–25	0–15	–	–
American basswood	TIAM	<i>Tilia americana</i>	Native	5–15	0–10	–	–
swamp white oak	QUBI	<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Native	10–25	0–10	–	–
swamp white oak	QUBI	<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Native	5–15	1.5–10	–	–
red maple	ACRU	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	Native	5–15	0–10	–	–
American elm	ULAM	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	Native	10–25	0–10	–	–
eastern cottonwood	PODE3	<i>Populus deltoides</i>	Native	10–25	0–5	–	–
white mulberry	MOAL	<i>Morus alba</i>	Introduced	5–15	0–5	–	–
black cherry	PRSE2	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Native	10–25	0–4	–	–
tuliptree	LITU	<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	Native	10–25	0–3	–	–
sassafras	SAAL5	<i>Sassafras albidum</i>	Native	10–25	0–3	–	–
black cherry	PRSE2	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Native	5–15	0–2	–	–
silver maple	ACSA2	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	Native	5–15	0–2	–	–
bigtooth aspen	POGR4	<i>Populus grandidentata</i>	Native	10–25	0–1.5	–	–
black oak	QUVE	<i>Quercus velutina</i>	Native	10–25	0–1.5	–	–
Vine/Liana							
riverbank grape	VIRI	<i>Vitis riparia</i>	Native	2–15	0.1–2	–	–
summer grape	VIAE	<i>Vitis aestivalis</i>	Native	5–20	0–1.5	–	–
Virginia creeper	PAQU2	<i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i>	Native	2–15	0–0.2	–	–

Table 8. Community 3.2 forest understory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height (M)	Canopy Cover (%)
-------------	--------	-----------------	----------	------------	------------------

<b>Grass/grass-like (Graminoids)</b>					
eastern bottlebrush grass	ELHY	<i>Elymus hystrix</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0.2–10
rosy sedge	CARO22	<i>Carex rosea</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–5
awlfruit sedge	CAST5	<i>Carex stipata</i>	Native	0.5–1	0–1
sweet woodreed	CIAR2	<i>Cinna arundinacea</i>	Native	1–1.5	0–1
broadleaf rosette grass	DILA8	<i>Dichanthelium latifolium</i>	Native	0.5–1	0–0.4
whitegrass	LEVI2	<i>Leersia virginica</i>	Native	0.5–1	0–0.4
<b>Forb/Herb</b>					
Canadian clearweed	PIPU2	<i>Pilea pumila</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	25–65
great ragweed	AMTR	<i>Ambrosia trifida</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–35
American pokeweed	PHAM4	<i>Phytolacca americana</i>	Native	1–2	2–20
threelobe beggarticks	BITR	<i>Bidens tripartita</i>	Native	0.5–1	0–15
white snakeroot	AGAL5	<i>Ageratina altissima</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–5
stinging nettle	URDI	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0.4–5
white avens	GECA7	<i>Geum canadense</i>	Native	0.5–1	0.5–5
lesser burdock	ARM12	<i>Arctium minus</i>	Introduced	0.1–0.5	0.1–5
devil's beggartick	BIFR	<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	Native	0.5–1	0–4
clustered blacksnakeroot	SAOD	<i>Sanicula odorata</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–4
Canadian woodnettle	LACA3	<i>Laportea canadensis</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–4
American hogpeanut	AMBR2	<i>Amphicarpaea bracteata</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–2
stickywilly	GAAP2	<i>Galium aparine</i>	Native	0.1–0.3	0–1
American bellflower	CAAM18	<i>Campanulastrum americanum</i>	Native	1–2	0–1
beggarslice	HAVI2	<i>Hackelia virginiana</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.5
bristly buttercup	RAHI	<i>Ranunculus hispidus</i>	Native	0.4–1	0–0.5
garlic mustard	ALPE4	<i>Alliaria petiolata</i>	Introduced	0.1–0.5	0–0.5
Asiatic dayflower	COCO3	<i>Commelina communis</i>	Introduced	0.1–0.5	0–0.4
Canadian honewort	CRCA9	<i>Cryptotaenia canadensis</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.4
common yellow oxalis	OXST	<i>Oxalis stricta</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.2
feathery false lily of the valley	MARA7	<i>Maianthemum racemosum</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.1
mayapple	POPE	<i>Podophyllum peltatum</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.1
common cinquefoil	POSI2	<i>Potentilla simplex</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.1
calico aster	SYLA4	<i>Symphotrichum lateriflorum</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.1
Canadian white violet	VICA4	<i>Viola canadensis</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.1
<b>Fern/fern ally</b>					
spinulose woodfern	DRCA11	<i>Dryopteris carthusiana</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.3
western brackenfern	PTAQ	<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>	Native	1–2	0–0.1
<b>Shrub/Subshrub</b>					
multiflora rose	ROMU	<i>Rosa multiflora</i>	Introduced	0.5–2	0.5–20
northern spicebush	LIBE3	<i>Lindera benzoin</i>	Native	0.5–2	1–15
Morrow's honeysuckle	LOMO2	<i>Lonicera morrowii</i>	Introduced	0.5–2	0–5
black raspberry	RUOC	<i>Rubus occidentalis</i>	Native	0.5–2	0–4
Amur honeysuckle	LOMA6	<i>Lonicera maackii</i>	Introduced	0.5–2	0–2
autumn olive	ELUM	<i>Elaeagnus umbellata</i>	Introduced	0.5–2	0–0.4
eastern prickly gooseberry	RICY	<i>Ribes cynosbati</i>	Native	0.5–2	0–0.1

Allegheny blackberry	RUAL	<i>Rubus allegheniensis</i>	Native	0.5–2	0–0.1
European cranberrybush	VIOP	<i>Viburnum opulus</i>	Native	0–0.3	0–0.1
multiflora rose	ROMU	<i>Rosa multiflora</i>	Introduced	0–0.3	0–0.1
<b>Tree</b>					
green ash	FRPE	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Native	1–5	0–3
green ash	FRPE	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–2
sassafras	SAAL5	<i>Sassafras albidum</i>	Native	1–5	0–2
common hackberry	CEOC	<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	Native	1–5	0.1–1.5
black cherry	PRSE2	<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–1
swamp white oak	QUBI	<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Native	1–5	0–1
swamp white oak	QUBI	<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–1
bitternut hickory	CACO15	<i>Carya cordiformis</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0–0.1
hawthorn	CRATA	<i>Crataegus</i>	Native	1–5	0–0.1
<b>Vine/Liana</b>					
Virginia creeper	PAQU2	<i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	3–25
eastern poison ivy	TORA2	<i>Toxicodendron radicans</i>	Native	0.1–0.5	0.2–1.5
eastern poison ivy	TORA2	<i>Toxicodendron radicans</i>	Native	1–5	0–1

## 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

Albert, D. A. et al., 1995. Vegetation circa 1800 of Michigan. Michigan's native landscape as interpreted from the General Land Office Surveys 1816-1856 (digital map), Lansing: Michigan Natural Features Inventory.

Barnes, B. V. and Wagner, W. H., 2004. Michigan trees: a guide to the trees of the Great Lakes region. Ann Arbor (Michigan): University of Michigan Press.

Burger, T. L. and Kotar, J., 2003. A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Michigan. Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Forest Ecology and Management, University of Wisconsin.

Cleland, D. T. et al., 1994. Field guide: Ecological classification and inventory system of the Huron-Manistee National Forests, s.l.: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.

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. 1–92.

Jacquart, E., Homoya, M. and Casebere, L., 2002. Natural Communities of Indiana (Working Draft), Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Nature Preserves.

Kost, M. A. et al., 2010. Natural Communities of Michigan: Classification and Description, Lansing, MI: Michigan Natural Features Inventory.

Moran, R. C., 1981. Prairie fens in northeastern Illinois: floristic composition and disturbance. Ohio Biol Surv Biol

Notes, 15, 164-168.

Omernik, J.M. and G.E. Griffith. 2014. Ecoregions of the Conterminous United States: Evolution of a Hierarchical Spatial Framework. *Environmental Management* 54:1249–1266.

Swink, F. and Wilhelm, G., 1994. *Plants of the Chicago Region*. Indianapolis(Indiana): Indiana Academy of Science.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, 2008. LANDFIRE: LANDFIRE 1.1.0 Vegetation Dynamics Models. Accessed August 28, 2012 <http://landfire.cr.usgs.gov/viewer/>.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, 2011. LANDFIRE: LANDFIRE 1.1.0 Existing Vegetation Type layer. <http://landfire.cr.usgs.gov/viewer/>

## Contributors

Greg Schmidt

## Approval

Nels Barrett, 1/12/2024

## Acknowledgments

Matt Bromley and Andy Henriksen reviewed the narratives. Matt Bromley reviewed associated soil map units.

## 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	05/18/2024
Approved by	Nels Barrett
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:**

---