

Ecological site F092XY008WI

Sandy Sandstone Uplands

Last updated: 4/09/2020

Accessed: 06/03/2026

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): 092X—Superior Lake Plain

The Wisconsin portion of the Superior Lake Plain (MLRA 92) corresponds very closely to the Superior Coastal Plain Ecological Landscape published by Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR 2015). The following brief overview of this MLRA is borrowed from that publication. The Superior Coastal Plain is bordered on the north by Lake Superior and on the south by the Northwest Sands, Northwest Lowlands, and North Central Forest Ecological Landscapes. The total land area is approximately 1.2 million acres, which mostly consists of privately-owned forestland. The climate is strongly influenced by Lake Superior, resulting in cooler summers, warmer winters, and greater precipitation compared to more inland locations. The most extensive landform in this ecological landscape is a nearly level plain of lacustrine clays that slopes gently northward toward Lake Superior. The coastal plain is cut by deeply incised stream drainages and interrupted by the comparatively rugged Bayfield Peninsula. During the Late Wisconsin glacial period, this area was covered with the advancing and retreating lobes of Superior and Chippewa. The landscape was rippled with moraines, but they were subdued by deposition of lacustrine materials. As the glaciers receded, glacial lakes riddled the landscape—most notably, Glacial Lake Duluth. The glacier receded eastward, exposing the western Lake Superior Basin. The ice covered the eastern basin, blocking the outlet of the lake, and continued to recede and contribute meltwaters that filled the glacial lake. The deep, red clays were deposited during this period of glacial lakes. The meltwaters from the glacier also contained sands which were deposited along the edge of the glacial lakes as beach deposits. Deep, narrow valleys have since been carved by rivers and streams flowing north into Lake Superior. Historically, the Superior Coastal Plain was almost entirely forested. Various mixtures of eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*), white spruce (*Picea glauca*), balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*), white birch (*Betula papyrifera*), balsam poplar (*Populus balsamifera*), quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), and northern white-cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*) occurred on the fine-textured glacio-lacustrine deposits bordering much of the Lake Superior coast. Sandy soils, sometimes interlayered with clays, occur in some places. Such areas supported forests dominated by eastern white pine and red pine (*Pinus resinosa*). Eastern white pine was strongly dominant in some areas, according to mid-19th century notes left by surveyors of the federal General Land Office (Finley, R. 1976). Dry-mesic to wet-mesic northern hardwoods or hemlock-hardwood forests were prevalent on the glacial tills of the Bayfield Peninsula. Large peatlands occurred along the Lake Superior shoreline, associated with drowned river mouths.

Classification relationships

Habitat Types of N. Wisconsin (Kotar, 2002): This ES keys out to two habitat types: *Pinus strobus* - *Acer rubrum* / *Vaccinium angustifolium* - *Apocynum androsaemifolium* [PARVAa-Po]; and *Acer saccharum* – *Tsuga canadensis* / *Maianthemum canadense*. [ATM] Biophysical Setting (Landfire, 2009): This ES is mapped as Laurentian-Acadian Northern Hardwoods Forest-Hemlock; and Laurentian – Acadian Sub-boreal Mesic Balsam Fir-Spruce Forest – Coastal. This ES is more similar to the Northern Hardwoods Hemlock Forest. WDNR Natural Communities (WDNR, 2015): This ES is most similar to the Northern Dry Forest, though some sites may be more similar to the Northern Dry-Mesic Forest. USFS Subregions: Superior-Ashland Clay Plain Subsection (212Ya); May contain small areas of Ewen Dissected Lake Plain Subsection (212Jo), Winegar Moraines Subsection (212Jc), Gogebic-Penokee Iron Range Subsection (212Jb), and NorthShore Highlands Subsection (212Lb)* Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): Superior Lake Plain (92)

Ecological site concept

The Sandy Sandstone Uplands has a small extent in MLRA 92 and occurs along the shore of Lake Superior and on the Apostle Islands. These sites occur on shallow to moderately deep sandy soils overlying sandstone outcrops. The soils associated with this ES are excessively drained and parent materials include sandy-skeletal beach deposits and sandstone residuum. The soils differ in their depth to bedrock, but are all underlain by sandstone within 100 cm. Water is received through precipitation, but quickly drains. Soils do not remain saturated for any time during the year. These soils are strongly acidic. Historically this Ecological Site was occupied by forest communities dominated by various mixtures of pine and oak species. The mixtures were largely dependent on frequency and severity of disturbances, particularly fire and subsequent seed-bed conditions and availability of seed sources. White pine was the most constant

species in forest communities due to its ecological characteristics of great longevity, resistance of old trees to fire damage and moderate tolerance to shade by seedlings and saplings. Red oak was often present as an associate species. Virtually all stands on this Ecological Site were harvested during the late 19th and early 20th centuries and post-logging fires were almost universal. Today's forests are dominated by any mixture of white pine, red pine, aspen, red oak and red maple. White birch, balsam fir and white spruce are common associates. This ES is distinguished by its truncated soil and excessive drainage. Other sandy sites have a deeper solum, may be underlain by finer material, and often have more saturation during the year. Loamy Sandstone Uplands has a finer soil texture. Sandy Sandstone Uplands are uniquely along lake shore bluffs or close to Lake Superior as a result they have a unique climate yielding some variability in their vegetation namely whether Sugar maple is strongly expressed or only an uncommon associate.

Associated sites

F092XY006WI	<p>Wet Sandy Lowlands</p> <p>Wet Sandy Depressions are poorly or very poorly drained sandy soils that have formed in outwash and lake plains. The sites are seasonally ponded depressions that remain saturated for sustained periods, allowing for hydric conditions to occur. Primarily associated with Kinross soil series. HGM criteria: recharge; Depressional. These sites are located lower in the drainage sequence than Sandy Sandstone Uplands, and remain saturated much longer during the year.</p>
F092XY010WI	<p>Moist Sandy Lowlands</p> <p>Moist Sandy Lowlands have a sandy mantle overlying finer glaciofluvial materials. The finer materials can cause episaturation in spring and fall, allowing the site to remain moist for some of the growing season, but does not remain saturated, nor does it have hydric conditions. These sites are located lower in the drainage sequence than Sandy Sandstone Uplands, and remain saturated longer during the year.</p>

Similar sites

F092XY013WI	<p>Sandy Uplands</p> <p>While vegetatively similar, Sandy Uplands also contains the PARVAa-Po habitat type, the Sandy Sandstone Uplands have a restricted rooting depth and are less likely to support large trees. Sandy Uplands sites are formed primarily in sandy deposits, and some are underlain by finer glaciofluvial material. Sites are moderately well to excessively drained, but sites with underlying finer materials may have extended saturation in spring and fall. Sites range from strongly acid to neutral and may contain carbonates. These sites can be located in the drainage sequence with Sandy Sandstone Uplands. These sites have a deeper solum, and often have an additional parent material beneath the sandy materials on top.</p>
F092XY009WI	<p>Loamy Sandstone Uplands</p> <p>These sites are shallow loamy soils that overly sandstone bluffs along the shore of Lake Superior. They are moderately well drained soils, but have a seasonally high water table. The soils range from strongly acid to neutral. These sites are nearby on similar landscape to Sandy Sandstone Uplands, but differ in having a finer texture.</p>

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Pinus strobus</i> (2) <i>Quercus rubra</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Corylus cornuta</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Eurybia macrophylla</i>

Physiographic features

This site occurs on knolls, ridges, hillslopes, interfluves, and terraces located on bedrock-controlled hills. Landform shape ranges from linear to convex. Elevation of the landforms range from 185 to 400 meters above sea level. Slopes range from 0 to 15 percent. This site occurs on all slope aspects.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Hills > Knoll (2) Hills > Ridge (3) Hills > Hillslope (4) Hills > Interfluve
Runoff class	Negligible to very high
Elevation	190 – 400 m
Slope	0 – 20 %
Ponding depth	100 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

Sandy Sandstone Uplands are located along the shore of Lake Superior on the Bayfield Peninsula, and the Apostle Islands. The annual average precipitation is 29-33 inches, with an average snowfall range of 72-132 inches (PRISM, 19881-2010). The annual average maximum and minimum temperatures are 51oF and 31oF, respectively (PRISM, 19881-2010). Being mostly located directly on the lake, the Sandy Sandstone Uplands sites tend to have a lower maximum temperature and a higher minimum temperature than some of the PESDs located inland of the Lake Superior. The length of the freeze-free period ranges from 162 to 194, with an average of 179 days (Table 2). The length of the frost-free period ranges from 138 to 166, with an average of 152 days (Table 2). These ranges occur because this PESD has sites located all around the Bayfield Peninsula that are subject to different wind and precipitation patterns. A few sites even occur further inland from the lake, and others are located on the small Apostle Islands, with various aspects.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	100-110 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	130-140 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	790-840 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	90-110 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	120-140 days

Precipitation total (actual range)	790-840 mm
Frost-free period (average)	100 days
Freeze-free period (average)	130 days
Precipitation total (average)	810 mm

- (1) ASHLAND EXP FARM [USC00470349], Ashland, WI
- (2) BAYFIELD 6 N [USC00470603], Bayfield, WI
- (3) MADELINE ISLAND [USC00474953], La Pointe, WI

Influencing water features

Water is received primarily through precipitation. Water is discharged from the site primarily through runoff, subsurface outflow, or evapotranspiration.

Permeability of the soil is rapid. Runoff potential is negligible to very high. The hydrologic group of this site is either A or B.

The soils of this site do not exhibit any significant saturation at any depth for any significant period. Water that percolates into the soil is generally lost through plant uptake and evapotranspiration, or through subsurface outflow. The sandstone bedrock restricts ground water recharge.

Soil features

The soils of this site are represented by the Brownstone, Deerton, and Redrim soil series. These soils are classified as Haplorthods.

This ecological site is characterized by shallow to moderately deep, excessively drained and well drained soils formed in sandy to sandy-skeletal beach deposits or residuum weathered from sandstone, all underlain by sandstone within 100 cm.

The average gravel content within the soil can be as much as 35 percent, while the average content of cobbles and stones can be as much as 35 percent. Surface stones average about 2 percent. Soil reaction (pH) in the upper 100 cm is very strongly acid. Carbonates are absent.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Residuum – sandstone (2) Beach sand
Surface texture	(1) Very cobbly sand
Drainage class	Well drained to excessively drained
Permeability class	Rapid
Soil depth	30 – 100 cm

Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-152.4cm)	6.68 – 7.72 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	4.6 – 10
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0-101.6cm)	10 – 40 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0-101.6cm)	0 – 40 %

Ecological dynamics

Perhaps the most important ecological characteristic of this Ecological Site, in terms of influence on forest community dynamics, is its limited capacity to support the high to moderate soil moisture and nutrient requiring species such as sugar maple, basswood and white ash, the shade-tolerant species, commonly known as the northern hardwoods, that typically dominate the more productive sites throughout northern Wisconsin. Although these species do occur sporadically on this Ecological Site, their regeneration capacity and growth rates are sub-optimal, thus precluding their canopy dominance.

In pre-European settlement time wild fire was the main controlling factor of forest community dynamics. Following a severe, stand-replacing fire, any of the naturally occurring species could become established, depending on the seed source and specific conditions of post-fire seedbed. The newly established young stands of any species were easily eliminated by recurring fires, but differences in fire-resisting properties among the species began to play a role in any species' survival success. White pine is best adapted for long-term success on this Ecological Site. Although vulnerable to damage or elimination by fire in early life it eventually develops thick fire-resistant bark which helps to extend its longevity, in some cases for up to four centuries or more. These survival properties assure the species' relatively continuous seed source in the region as a whole. White pine is also moderately shade-tolerant in early life which means that it can become established in some pioneer communities, such as aspen – white birch stands, or in poorly stocked oak and red maple dominated communities. Red pine had in the past been a common associate of white pine stands. It shares some of the fire-resisting properties of white pine, but it lacks shade-tolerance and does not become established in the understory. For this reason it has not maintained its presence in current stands and its seed source has been greatly reduced throughout its natural range following the onset of fire suppression.

Red maple (*Acer rubrum*) has not been identified by Finley (1976) as a component of pre-settlement pine forests, but it is a prominent member in current stands. Absence of fire since the original logging era is probably the main reason. Red maple is extremely sensitive to fire, but is a prolific and early seed producer. Stems of 2-4 inches in diameter can produce large amounts of seed (USDA For. Serv. 1990). It is sufficiently shade-tolerant to become established in the understories of most communities on sandy soils. On this Ecological Site it behaves similarly to white pine, but because of its natural much smaller stature at maturity it does not compete with white pine in the upper canopy.

State and transition model

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 2.2 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 2.3 plant community composition

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

Table 10. Community 2.4 plant community composition

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

Table 11. Community 2.5 plant community composition

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

Table 12. Community 3.1 plant community composition

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

Table 13. Community 4.1 plant community composition

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

Other references

Cleland, D.T.; Avers, P.E.; McNab, W.H.; Jensen, M.E.; Bailey, R.G., King, T.; Russell, W.E. 1997. National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units. Published in, Boyce, M. S.; Haney, A., ed. 1997. Ecosystem Management Applications for Sustainable Forest and Wildlife Resources. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. pp. 181-200.

County Soil Surveys from Douglas, Bayfield, and Ashland Counties.

Curtis, J.T. 1959. Vegetation of Wisconsin: an ordination of plant communities. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. 657 pp.

Davis, R.B. 2016. Bogs and Fens, A Guide to the Peatland Plants of Northeastern United States and Adjacent Canada. University Press of New England, Hanover and London. 296 pp.

Finley, R. 1976. Original vegetation of Wisconsin. Map compiled from U.S. General Land Office notes. U.S. Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Hvizdak, David. Personal knowledge and field experience.

Jahnke, J. and Gienccke, A. 2002. MLRA 92 Clay Till Field Investigations. Summary of field day investigations by Region 10 Soil Data Quality Specialists.

NatureServe. 2018. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, VA. U.S.A. Data current as of 28 August 2018.

Kotar, J. 1986. Soil – Habitat Type relationships in Michigan and Wisconsin. J. For. and Water Cons. 41(5): 348-350.

Kotar, J., J.A. Kovach and G. Brand. 1999. Analysis of the 1996 Wisconsin Forest Statistics by Habitat Type. U.S.D.A. For. Serv. N.C. Res. Stn. Gen. Tech. Rept. NC-207.

Kotar, J., J. A. Kovach, and T. L. Burger. 2002. A Guide to Forest Communities and Habitat Types of Northern Wisconsin. Second edition. University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Madison.

Kotar, J., and T. L. Burger. 2017. Wetland Forest Habitat Type Classification System for Northern Wisconsin: A Guide for Land Managers and landowners. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, PUB-FR-627 2017, Madison.

Martin, L. 1965. The physical geography of Wisconsin. Third edition. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

McNab, W.H. and P.W. Avers. 1994. Ecological Subregions of the United States: Section Descriptions. USDA For. Serv. Pun. WO-WSA-

5, Washington, D.C.

Radeloff, V.C., D.J. Mladenoff, H.S. He and M.S. Boyce. 1999. Forest landscape change in Northwestern Wisconsin Pine Barrens from pre-European settlement to the present. *Can. J. For. Res.* 29: 1649-1659.

Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2001. The original U.S. public land survey records: their use and limitations in reconstructing pre-European settlement vegetation. *Journal of Forestry* 99:5–10.

Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2005. Severe wind and fire regimes in northern forests: historical variability at the regional scale. *Ecology* 86(2):431–445.

Soil Survey Staff. Input based on personal experience. Tim Miland, Scott Eversoll, Ryan Bevernitz, and Jason Nemecek.

Stearns, F. W. 1949. Ninety years change in a northern hardwood forest in Wisconsin. *Ecology*, 30: 350-58.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1989. Proceedings – Land Classification Based on Vegetation: Applications for Management. Gen. Tech. Report INT-527.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1990. *Silvics of North America, Vol. 1, Hardwoods*. Agricultural Handbook 654, Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1990. *Silvics of North America, Vol. 2, Conifers*. Agricultural Handbook 654, Washington, D.C.

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

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2008. Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification System: An Overview and Modification to Better Meet the Needs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Technical Note No. 190-8-76. Washington D.C.

Wilde, S.A. 1933. The relation of soil and forest vegetation of the Lake States Region. *Ecology* 14: 94-105.

Wilde, S.A. 1976. *Woodlands of Wisconsin*. University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension, Pub. G2780, 150 pp.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2015. *The ecological landscapes of Wisconsin: An assessment of ecological resources and a guide to planning sustainable management*. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, PUB-SS-1131 2015, Madison.

Contributors

Jacob Prater, Associate Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point

John Kotar, Ecological Specialist, independent contract

Bryant Scharenbroch, Assistant Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point

Approval

Chris Tecklenburg, 4/09/2020

Acknowledgments

Contact for Lead Authors: Jacob Prater (jprater@uwsp.edu) Associate Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point, John Kotar (jkotar@wsic.edu) Ecological Specialist, independent contract, and Bryant Scharenbroch Assistant Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point

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	06/03/2026
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:**
