USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Ecological site F094AB017MI
Wet Loamy Depression

Last updated: 9/10/2024
Accessed: 05/21/2025

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.

Figure 1. Mapped extent

Areas shown in blue indicate the maximum mapped extent of this ecological site. Other ecological sites likely occur within the highlighted areas. It is also possible for this ecological site to occur outside of highlighted areas if detailed soil survey has not been completed or recently updated.

MLRA notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 094A–Northern Michigan Sandy Highlands

This area is dominated by outwash plains and moraines. The terrain can be steep on the moraines and flat in the areas of outwash. Elevation ranges from 177 to 520 m (580 to

1705 ft). Local topographic relief averages 14 m and ranges up to 188 m (45 to 615 ft). This area is covered entirely by drift. Bedrock consisting of Devonian limestone and dolomite with interbedded shale, chert, and anhydrite stringers is at various depths below the surface because of the curvature of the Michigan basin. However, bedrock exposures completely absent, as the depth of glacial drift ranges from 60 to 300 m (200-1000 ft). The Au Sable, Manistee, Au Gres, and Pine Rivers are the major streams draining this MLRA, in both the Lake Michigan and Lake Huron watersheds. The Muskegon River has its headwaters in this area.

About 70 percent of this area is forested, and about 15 percent is cropland or hayland. About one-third of the area is in small, privately owned holdings, and another one-third consists of national and State forests. The forests are used mainly for timber production and recreation. Dairy and beef operations are very important enterprises in the area. Forage and feed grains for dairy cattle and other livestock are the principal crops. Wheat, oats, corn, potatoes, and hay also are grown in the area. The Huron and Manistee National Forests, Hartwick Pines State Park, Camp Grayling (Department of Defense), Pigeon River Country State Forest are among the most notable conservation lands in the area. Reaches of the Au Sable and Pine Rivers are National Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Summary of existing land use:
Upland Forest (58%)
Hardwood (41%)
Conifer (15%)
Swamps and Marshes (14%)
Developed (11%)
Agricultural (10%)
Grassland (5%)

Classification relationships

According to the USFS (Bailey) system of ecoregions, the site is located mostly within 212Hg (Kirtland's Warbler High Sand Plains) and 212Hh (Gladwin Silty Lake Plain) subsections. According to the EPA (Omernik) system of ecoregions, the site is located in 50ae (Mio Plateau), 50ah (Tawas Lake Plain) and eastern 50ad (Vanderbilt Moraines) level IV ecoregions. This site is outside the environmental range of the Kotar system. This site corresponds to the Mineral Wetland, ecological land type phase, 74, in the USFS Ecological Land Type system.

Ecological site concept

The central concept of Wet Loamy Depression is Site occurs on lowlands with seasonal water tables less than 25 cm deep (poorly drained to very poorly drained). Site occurs on loamy drift (till or lake plains) with soil textures loamy to clayey (upper 50 cm <70% sand). Site is outside the heavy snowfall belt, mostly east of Houghton Lake where fire was frequent. Vegetation trending towards swamp forest with a calciphilic species composition.

Associated sites

F094AB016MI	**Loamy Depression**

Similar sites

F094AA004MI	**Snowy Wet Loamy Depression**

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) *Thuja occidentalis* (2) *Populus balsamifera*
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) *Symplocarpus foetidus*

Physiographic features

Site occurs mostly on glacial till, but minor areas of fine lake plain deposits have similar properties. Landforms are gently sloping lower slope positions and depressions.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Moraine (2) Till plain
Runoff class	Negligible to low
Elevation	177–479 m
Water table depth	0–25 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

Mean annual temperatures are 5.7 to 7.6 °C (42 to 46 °F). The warmest six months average 14.3 to 16.1 °C (58 to 61 °F). Mean July temperatures range from 19.1 to 20.8 °C (66 to 69 °F). Mean January temperatures range from -8.2 to -6.0 °C (17 to 21 °F). The maximum monthly average daily highs are 25.9 to 27.7 °C (79 to 82 °F). The minimum monthly average daily lows are -13.2 to -10.7 °C (8 to 13 °F).Temperatures generally decrease with elevation and latitude. Mean annual precipitation ranges from 700 to 870 mm (28 to 34 in). Precipitation decreases from west to east. Average 0 °C (32 °F) frost-free season ranges from 73 to 144 days. Average -2 °C (28 °F) freeze-free season is 106 to 172 days. Mean annual snowfall ranges from 1.1 to 2.9 m (40 to 120 in). Snowfall decreases from northwest to southeast. Mean annual extreme minimum temperatures range from -33.3 to -23.1 °C (-28 to -10 °F), or hardiness zones 4a to 6a.

Table 3. Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	76-110 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	119-143 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	737-787 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	52-113 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	114-150 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	711-838 mm
Frost-free period (average)	92 days
Freeze-free period (average)	133 days
Precipitation total (average)	762 mm

Climate stations used

- (1) EAST TAWAS [USC00202423], Tawas City, MI
- (2) MIO HYDRO PLT [USC00205531], Mio, MI
- (3) VANDERBILT 11ENE [USC00208417], Vanderbilt, MI
- (4) GRAYLING [USC00203391], Grayling, MI
- (5) HOUGHTON LK ROSCOMMON AP [USW00094814], Houghton Lake, MI
- (6) HALE LOUD DAM [USC00203529], Glennie, MI
- (7) WEST BRANCH 3SE [USC00208800], West Branch, MI

Influencing water features

Site has seasonal high water table within 0-25 cm of the surface. Some sites may have a perched water table or ponding due to the impermeability of finer textures.

Soil features

Soils are very poorly drained to poorly drained loams or clays. They are commonly classified Mollic Epiaquepts, Typic Epiaquolls, and Aeric Epiaquents, and commonly mapped as Springport, Wakeley, and Sims series or components. The top 50 cm has a typical pH of 7 and is 45% sand and 3.2% organic matter. At depth, pH ranges up to 7.8, and texture averages 40% sand and 30% clay. Depth to impeded hydraulic conductivity or root restrictive layers averages 85 cm. Depth to carbonates averages 70 cm.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Till
Surface texture	(1) Loam

Drainage class	Poorly drained to very poorly drained
Permeability class	Slow to moderately rapid
Soil depth	201 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0–5%
Surface fragment cover >3"	0–1%
Available water capacity (0-100.1cm)	13–22 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-50cm)	5.5–7
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0-150.1cm)	0–35%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0-150.1cm)	0–15%

Ecological dynamics

Wet Loamy Depression tends to share the same ecological dynamics as Natureserve/Landfire system, Laurentian-Acadian Alkaline Conifer-Laurentian-Acadian Wet Meadow-Shrub Swamp. Stand replacing fires occurred every 500-2000 years, while light surface fires were very rare. Overstory was dominated by flood tolerant species like poplar (Populus spp.) and willow (Salix spp.) after disturbance, and whitecedar (*Thuja occidentalis*) in stable areas with groundwater flow. Understory is composed of rich wetland species such as skunk cabbage (*Symplocarpus foetidus*).

State and transition model

Ecosystem states



State 1 submodel, plant communities



Communities 2 and 5 (additional pathways)



State 2 submodel, plant communities



State 3 submodel, plant communities



State 4 submodel, plant communities



State 1
Reference State

Community 1.1
Swamp Forest

Community 1.2
Wet Meadow

Community 1.3
Shrub-Thicket

Community 1.4
Emergent Marsh

Community 1.5
Inundated Shrub Swamp

Pathway 1.1A
Community 1.1 to 1.2

Temporary prolonged inundation.

Pathway 1.1B
Community 1.1 to 1.3

Clearcut/Blowdown.

Conservation practices

Early Successional Habitat Development/Management
Forest Stand Improvement

Pathway 1.2A
Community 1.2 to 1.1

Succession.

Conservation practices

Tree/Shrub Site Preparation
Tree/Shrub Establishment

Pathway 1.2B
Community 1.2 to 1.3

Succession.

Conservation practices

Tree/Shrub Site Preparation
Tree/Shrub Establishment

Pathway 1.2D

Community 1.2 to 1.4

Permanent inundation.

Pathway 1.2E
Community 1.2 to 1.5

Shrub establishment; permanent inundation.

Conservation practices

Tree/Shrub Establishment

Pathway 1.3A
Community 1.3 to 1.1

Succession.

Conservation practices

Tree/Shrub Site Preparation
Tree/Shrub Establishment

Pathway 1.3B
Community 1.3 to 1.2

Temporary prolonged inundation.

Pathway 1.3C
Community 1.3 to 1.4

Permanent inundation.

Pathway 1.3C
Community 1.3 to 1.5

Permanent inundation.

Pathway 1.4A
Community 1.4 to 1.2

Drop water table.

Pathway 1.4C

Community 1.4 to 1.5

Temporary drop water table; shrub establishment.

Pathway 1.5A
Community 1.5 to 1.2

Drop water table; shrub mortality.

Conservation practices

Brush Management

Pathway 1.5C
Community 1.5 to 1.4

Temporary drought; shrub mortality.

State 2
Cultural State

Community 2.1
Sustainable Crop, Pasture, or Plantation

Community 2.2
Unsustainable Cultural Phase

Community 2.3
Conservation Feature

Can be a grassed waterway, conservation reserve, a small patch pollinator garden, or other land taken out of its primary cultural production to mitigate or reduce impacts of adjacent land use, and is not by itself a permanent restoration of a complete native biological community and associated ecosystem services.

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

Community 3.1
Ruderal Drained Meadow & Shrub

Community 3.2
Exotic Ruderal Drained Forest

Pathway 3.1A
Community 3.1 to 3.2

Succession

Pathway 3.2A
Community 3.2 to 3.1

Blowdown/clearcut.

Conservation practices

Early Successional Habitat Development/Management
Forest Stand Improvement

State 4
Seminatural State

Community 4.1
Ruderal Wet Meadow & Shrub Swamp

Community 4.2
Exotic Ruderal Swamp Forest

Pathway 4.1A
Community 4.1 to 4.2

Succession.

Pathway 4.2A

Community 4.2 to 4.1

Blowdown/clearcut.

Conservation practices

Early Successional Habitat Development/Management
Forest Stand Improvement

Transition T1A
State 1 to 2

Drain; clear vegetation; cultivate domesticated species.

Transition T1B
State 1 to 3

Drain; clear vegetation, invasive species introduced.

Transition T1C
State 1 to 4

Clear vegetation, invasive species introduced.

Restoration pathway R2
State 2 to 1

Restore hydrology; remove domesticated species; restore 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

Abandon, succession.

Transition T2B
State 2 to 4

Restore hydrology; abandon; succession.

Conservation practices

Wetland Restoration

Restoration pathway R3
State 3 to 1

Restore hydrology; control invasive species; restore 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

Clear vegetation; cultivate domesticated species.

Transition T3B
State 3 to 4

Restore hydrology.

Conservation practices

Wetland Restoration

Restoration pathway R4
State 4 to 1

Control invasive species; restore 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

Drain; clear vegetation; cultivate domesticated species.

Transition T4B
State 4 to 3

Drain.

Additional community tables

Other references

A PROVISIONAL ECOLOGICAL SITE is a conceptual grouping of soil map unit components within a major land resource area (MLRA) based on the similarities in response to management. A provisional ecological site is a first approximation based on a cursory literature review, personal experience, and limited field reconnaissance. As more adequate literature review, expert opinion, and intensive plot data are collected, the site concept is subject to shifting, broadening, narrowing, subdivision, or re-aggregation in definition. Likewise, the community dynamics will be more elaborate in content, and may also change in structure, upon reaching approved status.

Future work, as described in a project plan, to validate the information in this provisional ecological site description is needed. This will include field activities to collect low and medium intensity sampling, soil correlations, and analysis of that data. Annual field reviews should be done by soil scientists and vegetation specialists. A final field review, peer review, quality control, and quality assurance reviews of the ESD will be needed to produce the final document. Annual reviews of the project plan are to be conducted by the Ecological Site Technical Team.

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.

Baker, M.E. and Barnes, B.V., 1998. Landscape ecosystem diversity of river floodplains in northwestern Lower Michigan, USA. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 28(9), pp.1405-1418.

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.

Eichenlaub, V.L., 1979. Weather and climate of the Great Lakes region. University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana. 335 pages.

GHCN, 2016. Global Historical Climatology Network Monthly Versions 2 and 3 (temperature and precipitation data). NOAA. https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/ghcnm/

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

Landfire, 2017. Landfire Biophysical Settings Review Site. Accessed May, 2017 http://www.landfirereview.org/descriptions.html.

National Ocean Service, 2017. Tides and Currents (historic water level data for US coastal waters). https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/stations.html?type=Water+Levels

NDBC, 2017. National Data Buoy Center (wave height and period data for US coastal waters). NOAA. http://www.ndbc.noaa.gov/

PRISM Climate Group. 2013. Gridded 30 Year Normals, 1981-2010. Oregon State University, http://prism.oregonstate.edu

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

USFS, Witness Tree data for northern Lower Michigan.

Contributors

Gregory J. Schmidt

Approval

Greg Schmidt, 9/10/2024

Acknowledgments

The following individuals made substantive comments regarding the development of the Provisional Ecological Sites: Randy Swaty, The Nature Conservancy; Trevor Hobbs, USFS; Richard A. Corner, USFS; Andy Henriksen, NRCS; Dan Zay, NRCS.

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	05/21/2025
Approved by	Greg Schmidt
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:**
