

Ecological site F144AY028MA Wet Outwash

Accessed: 05/04/2024

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): 144A–New England and Eastern New York Upland, Southern Part

MLRA 144A: New England and Eastern New York Upland, Southern Part. The eastern half of the eastern part of this MLRA is in the Seaboard Lowland Section of the New England Province of the Appalachian Highlands. The western half of the eastern part and the southeastern half of the western part are in the New England Upland Section of the same province and division. The northwestern half of the western part is in the Hudson Valley Section of the Valley and Ridge Province of the Appalachian Highlands. This MLRA is a very scenic area of rolling to hilly uplands that are broken by many gently sloping to level valleys that terminate in coastal lowlands. Elevation ranges from sea level to 1,000 feet (0 to 305 meters) in much of the area, but it is 2,000 feet (610 meters) on some hills. Relief is mostly about 6 to 65 feet (2 to 20 meters) in the valleys and about 80 to 330 feet (25 to 100 meters) in the uplands. This area has been glaciated and consists almost entirely of till plains and drumlins dissected by narrow valleys with a thin mantle of till. The southernmost boundary of the area marks the farthest southward extent of glaciation on the eastern seaboard. The river valleys and coastal plains are filled with glacial lake sediments, marine sediments, and glacial outwash. The bedrock in the eastern half of the area consists primarily of igneous and metamorphic rocks of early Paleozoic age. Granite is the most common igneous rock, and gneiss, schist, and slate are the most common metamorphic rocks. In the parts of the MLRA in northeastern Pennsylvania and in eastern and southeastern New York, Devonian- to Pennsylvanian-age sandstone, shale, and limestone bedrock is dominant. Carbonate rocks, primarily dolomite and limestone, are the dominant kinds of bedrock in the part of this MLRA in northwestern Connecticut.

Ecological site concept

Red Maple – Black Gum / Highbush blueberry. This site consists of very deep, poorly drained sandy to loamy soils formed in outwash and stratified drift. They are nearly level to gently sloping soils in low-lying positions on terraces and plains. Representative soils include Walpole, Wareham, Raypol, Mashpee, Massasoit.

Representative plant communities are typically dominated by red maple and/or blackgum with a dense shrub layer and Atlantic white cedar may also grow in admixtures or dominance, e.g., “red maple / highbush blueberry” (CT); “Red maple-hardwood swamp” (NY); “Red maple-blackgum swamp” (NY, MA, NH); “red maple – deciduous shrub swamp” (RI); “red maple - black ash” (VT), “Atlantic white cedar swamp” (RI, NH); with more open sites supporting “shrub swamps” (CT, RI, MA); “wet meadows” (MA).

Table 1. Dominant plant species

| | |
|------------|---------------------------------|
| Tree | (1) <i>Acer rubrum</i> |
| Shrub | (1) <i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i> |
| Herbaceous | Not specified |

Physiographic features

Climatic features

Influencing water features

Soil features

Ecological dynamics

Representative plant communities are typically dominated by red maple and/or blackgum with a dense shrub layer and Atlantic white cedar may also grow in admixtures or dominance, e.g., “red maple / highbush blueberry” (CT); “Red maple-hardwood swamp” (NY); “Red maple-blackgum swamp” (NY, MA, NH); “red maple – deciduous shrub swamp” (RI); “red maple - black ash” (VT), “Atlantic white cedar swamp” (RI, NH); with more open sites supporting “shrub swamps” (CT, RI, MA); “wet meadows” (MA).

State and transition model

144AY028 – Wet Outwash




Figure 1. STM_144AY028_Wet_Outwash

| Transition | Drivers/practices |
|------------------------------|--|
| T1-2 | Forest mgmt |
| T1-3, T1-4, T2-3, T3-4, T4-3 | Disturbance/cutting/clearing, Brush removal |
| R2-1, R3-1, R4-1, | Restoration & Mgmt, Forest Stand Improvement, Upland Wildlife Mgmt |
| R3-1, R3-2 | Brush removal, Herb weed control, Plant establishment |
| R4-1 CP4.1-4.2 | Abandonment, succession |
| CP4.2-4.1 | Restoration & Mgmt., Early Successional Habitat Development |

Figure 2. STM_144AY028_Wet_Outwash

Other references

REFERENCES

Edinger, G.J., Evans, D.J., Gebauer, S., Howard, T.G., Hunt, D.M., and A.M. Olivero, A.M. (eds.). 2014. Ecological Communities of New York State, Second Edition: A revised and expanded edition of Carol Reschke's Ecological Communities of New York State. New York Natural Heritage Program, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY.

Enser, R., Gregg, D., Sparks, C., August, P., Jordan, P., Coit, J., Raithe, C., Tefft, B., Payton, B., Brown, C. and LaBash, C., 2011. Rhode Island ecological communities classification. Rhode Island Natural History Survey, Kingston, RI.

Enser, R. and Lundgren, J.A., 2006. Natural communities of Rhode Island. Rhode Island Natural History Survey, Kingston (RI).

Gawler, S.C. and Cutko, A., 2010. Natural landscapes of Maine: a guide to natural communities and ecosystems. Maine Natural Areas Program, Department of Conservation.

Metzler, K.J. and Barrett, J.P., 2006. The Vegetation of Connecticut, a Preliminary Classification. Department of Environmental Protection, State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut.

Sperduto, D.D., & Nichols, W.F. 2011. Natural Communities of New Hampshire, Second Ed. NH Natural Heritage Bureau, Concord, NH. Publ. UNH Cooperative Extension.

Swain, P.C. and Kearsley, J.B., 2001. Classification of the natural communities of Massachusetts. Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program, Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife.

Thompson, E.H. and Sorenson, E.R., 2000. Wetland, woodland, wildland. Vermont Department of Fish and Wildlife and The Nature Conservancy. Publ. University Press of New England.

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 | |
| 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:**
