Ecological site F093BY010MI
Loamy Uplands

Last updated: 9/27/2023
Accessed: 08/23/2026

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): 093B–Superior Stony and Rocky Loamy Plains and Hills

The Wisconsin portion of this MLRA is a mixture of high-relief moraines and flat till plains with interspersed glacial meltwater deposits. It is bordered on the north by glaciolacustrine deposits of Glacial Lake Duluth and on the south by extensive pitted and unpitted outwash plains. The approximate land area is just under 600,000 acres (935 sq miles). The Penokee-Gogebic Iron Range runs through the middle of the Wisconsin portion of this MLRA and into Michigian. The range is a hilly, bedrock-controlled moraine. The bedrock outcropping is composed of igneous and metamorphic materials and was created by inland folding and faulting of the ancient Superior continent when it collided with the Marshfield continent about 1.8 billion years ago (Dott & Attig, 2004). Volcanic and intrusive bedrock occurs in some places. This bedrock is overlain by a thin layer of glacial till deposited by the Chippewa Lobe. To the north of the range is a former spillway for Glacial Lake Ontonagon. The flowing meltwater cut deep channels into the morainal systems. Glaciofluvial landforms here include old beaches and dunes. South of the range, along the southern edge of this MLRA, are rolling collapsed end moraines, pushed to their extent by the Chippewa and Ontonagon Lobes. The landscape is dotted with abundant kettle lakes and swamps, especially in the eastern portion. Ice-walled lake plains and eskers are also found along these collapsed moraines. The climate is influenced by Lake Superior in areas near the lake, resulting in cooler summers, warmer winters, and greater precipitation – especially snowfall – compared to more inland locations. Historically, mixtures of eastern hemlock (Tsuga canadensis), sugar maple (Acer saccharum), yellow birch (Betula alleghaniensis), eastern white pine (Pinus strobus), and red pine (Pinus resinosa) covered the area. In wetter pockets (such as the swamps that dot the moraines to the south) white cedar (Thuja occidentalis), black spruce (Picea mariana), and tamarack (Larix laricina) were common (Finley, R., 1976).

Classification relationships

Relationship to Established Frameworks and Classification Systems: Habitat Types of N. Wisconsin (Kotar, 2002): Two sites key out to Acer saccharum – Tsuga canadensis/ Maianthemum canadense (ATM), one site keys to Acer saccharum – Tsuga canadensis/ Dryopteris spinulosa (ATD), and one site keys to Acer saccharum / Ozmmorhiza claytonia – Caulophyllum thalictroides (AOCa). Biophysical Setting (Landfire, 2014): This ES is mapped as Boreal White Spruce-Fir-Hardwood Forest - Inland, Laurentian-Acadian Northern Hardwoods Forest – Hemlock, and Laurentian-Acadian Northern Hardwoods Forest; though, it is likely best represented by the latter. WDNR Natural Communities (WDNR (2015): This ES is most similar to the Northern Mesic Forest. Hierarchical Framework Relationships: Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): Superior Stoney and Rocky Loamy Plains and Hills, Eastern Part (93B) USFS Subregions: Winegar Moraines (212Jc) Small sections occur in the Gogebic-Penokee Iron Range (212Jb) subregion Wisconsin DNR Ecological Landscapes: North Central Forest

Ecological site concept

Loamy Uplands is an uncommon site in MLRA 93B, located on hills, moraines, eskers, kames, lake and outwash plains, and stream terraces. These sites are characterized by moderately deep to very deep, moderately well to well drained soils formed in loamy glaciofluvial, till and eolian deposits, and residuum. Precipitation and runoff from adjacent uplands are the primary sources of water. Soils range from extremely acid to moderately acid. Loamy Uplands lacks any significant layer of accumulated clay (an argillic horizon) or a dense, reversibly-cemented, root-restrictive layer (a fragipan), distinguishing it from Alfic Loamy Uplands and Fragic Loamy Uplands, respectively. The lack of these layer results in a lower available water capacity, but most sites do not have root growth restriction. Some sites do have lithic contact that does restrict root growth. Loamy textures differ Loamy Uplands from other upland sites. Loamy materials have a higher pH and available water capacity than sandy materials, which may promote more vegetative growth.

Associated sites

F093BY004MI	**Wet Lowlands** Wet Lowlands occur on depressions and drainageways and form in loamy till or loamy alluvium underlain by dense sandy till or sandy and gravelly outwash. These sites are poorly drained and occur lower on the drainage sequence than Loamy Uplands.
F093BY005MI	**Moist Lowlands** Moist Lowlands occur on footslope positions across the landscape. They are not subject to flooding nor ponding. Soils form in till, lacustrine deposits, or outwash deposits and may be loamy to sandy. These sites are somewhat poorly drained and occur slightly lower on the drainage sequence than Loamy Uplands.

Similar sites

F093BY009MI	**Alfic Loamy Uplands** Alfic Loamy Uplands occur on upland sites in loamy glaciofluvial deposits. Unlike Loamy Uplands, these soils have a layer of significant clay accumulation. They are moderately well to well drained.
F093BY008MI	**Fragic Loamy Uplands** Fragic Loamy Uplands occur on uplands sites in deep loamy till often overlain by loess. In these soils, a fragipan is either present or developing. The root restrictive Fragic layer is often impermeable and the water table is often perched above it (episaturation).
F093BY007MI	**Sandy Uplands** Sandy Uplands occur on upland sites in deep sandy outwash deposits, sometimes with a thin loamy mantle of alluvium or loess. Like Loamy Uplands, argillic horizons are neither present nor forming in these soils. While their landscape position and drainage classes are comparable, the soils of Sandy Uplands have much coarser textures and can hold less water. These differences are reflected in the vegetative communities: Loamy Uplands support mesic (ie. slightly wetter) species with higher nutrient requirements than Sandy Uplands.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) *Acer saccharum* (2) *Tilia americana*
Shrub	(1) *Acer saccharum*
Herbaceous	(1) *Maianthemum racemosum* (2) *Athyrium filix-femina*

Physiographic features

These sites are found primarily on moraines, but may also be found on eskers, lake plains, outwash plains, stream terraces, and kames in backslope, shoulder, and summit positions. Slope ranges from 0 to 75 percent.

These sites are subject to neither ponding nor flooding. There generally do not have water table contact within 80 inches though some sites may have a seasonally high water table as high as 18 inches. Surface runoff is low to very high and greatly depends on slope and landscape position.

Figure 1. Distribution of Loamy Uplands in the Superior Stoney and Rocky Loamy Plains and Hills, Eastern Part (93B).

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Moraine (2) Esker (3) Lake plain (4) Outwash plain (5) Stream terrace (6) Kame
Runoff class	Low to very high
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	200 – 250 m
Slope	0 – 80 %
Water table depth	50 – 200 cm
Aspect	W, NW, N, NE, E, SE, S, SW

Climatic features

The continental climate of the Superior Stoney and Rocky Loamy Plains and Hills, Eastern Part MLRA is characterized by long, cold winters and short, warm summers where precipitation exceeds evapotranspiration. Neither average annual precipitation nor average annual minimum and maximum temperatures vary greatly within this MLRA, though the climate of the northern tip is somewhat affected by Lake Superior and receives higher annual precipitation in the form of lake effect snow.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	90-120 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	120-150 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	740-860 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	80-120 days

Freeze-free period (actual range)	120-160 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	710-910 mm
Frost-free period (average)	100 days
Freeze-free period (average)	140 days
Precipitation total (average)	810 mm

- (1) MELLEN 4 NE [USC00475286], Mellen, WI
- (2) HURLEY [USC00473800], Ironwood, WI
- (3) WATTON [USC00208706], Watton, MI
- (4) HANCOCK HOUGHTON CO AP [USW00014858], Calumet, MI
- (5) MARQUETTE [USW00014838], Marquette, MI

Influencing water features

Water is received through precipitation and runoff from adjacent uplands. Water is lost from the site primarily through runoff, evapotranspiration, and groundwater recharge.
Permeability of the soils is impermeable or moderately slow. The hydrologic soil group of these sites is B, C, D, or B/D.

Hydrologic Group: B, C, D, B/D
Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Classification: None
Cowardin Wetland Classification: None

Soil features

These sites are represented by the Dishno, Chabeneau, Metonga, Amasa, and Peshekee series. Dishno and Chabeneau are classified as Oxyaquic Haplorthods, while Metonga, Amasa, and Peshekee are classified as Entic, Typic, and Lithic Haplorthods, respectively.
These soils lack significant clay accumulation. They form in loamy till, sometimes with a loamy or silty eolian mantle and sometimes underlain by sandy and gravelly glaciofluvial deposits or by igneous or metamorphic bedrock. These soils may be shallow to very deep, with depth to bedrock ranging from 19 inches to over 80 inches. They are moderately well to well drained and do not meet hydric soil requirements.

Surface textures are fine sandy loam to silt loam. Subsurface textures range from coarse sand to silt loam. Carbonates are absent in these soils.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Glaciofluvial deposits (2) Till (3) Eolian deposits (4) Residuum
Surface texture	(1) Fine sandy loam (2) Silt loam

Drainage class	Moderately well drained to well drained
Depth to restrictive layer	50 – 200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	0 – 50 %
Available water capacity (Depth not specified)	7.57 – 16.28 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (Depth not specified)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (Depth not specified)	3.8 – 5.9
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	10 – 40 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 30 %

Ecological dynamics

Historically, mature forests on this ecological site were dominated by shade tolerant sugar maple and hemlock, often with an admixture of yellow birch (Wilde, 1933, Finley, 1976). This association was self-maintained with new cohorts of advanced regeneration gaining canopy status through gaps formed by small-scale disturbances and natural mortality in the dominant canopy. Scattered large individuals of less shade tolerant white pine were also common components of mesic hardwood forests. These presumably became established following relatively rare disturbances that included fire (Schulte and Mladenoff, 2005).

Current stands on this Ecological Site represent the entire array of potential successional stages from pure aspen, or aspen-white birch, stands to sugar maple dominated mixed northern hardwoods stands. Succession to sugar maple dominance is evident everywhere where seed sources are present and disturbance remains infrequent.

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 3.1 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.

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

Dott, R. H., & Attig, J. W. 2004. Roadside geology of Wisconsin. pp. 40. Mountain Press Pub.

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.

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

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.
Schulte, L.A., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2001. The original U.S. public land sur¬vey 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.

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.

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 Sates, 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.

Approval

Suzanne Mayne-Kinney, 9/27/2023

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 Authors: Jacob Prater (jprater@uwsp.edu) Associate Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point, Joel Gebhard (jgebhard@uwsp.edu) Associate Research Specialist at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point, Bryant Scharenbroch Assistant Professor at University of Wisconsin Stevens Point, and John Kotar (jkotar@wsic.edu) Ecological Specialist, independent contractor
Contact for lead author	
Date	09/27/2023
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:**