

Ecological site F111XC014IN

Wet Floodplain

Accessed: 09/06/2026

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): 111X–Indiana and Ohio Till Plain

111C – Indiana and Ohio Till Plain, Northwestern Part. This MLRA is in the glaciated part of north-central Indiana and is dominated by glacial till plains broken in places by lake plains, outwash plains, and flood plains. Areas that parallel most of the major rivers and streams have deposits of sand. Although it is an important agricultural region, MLRA 111C hosts a large proportion of Indiana's biodiversity.

Classification relationships

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA)(USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2006) USFS Ecological Regions (USDA, 2007): Sections - Central Till Plains, Beech Maple (222H), South Central Great Lakes (222J), Central Till Plains and Grand Prairies (251D) Subsections - Kalamazoo-Elkhart Moraines and Plains (222Jh), Steuben Interlobate Moraines (222Ji), Bluffton Till Plains (222Ha), Entrenched Valleys (222Hf), Miami-Scioto Plain-Tipton Till Plain (222Hb), Kankakee Sands (251Dg) and Eastern Grand Prairie (251Dd). NatureServe Systems anticipated (NatureServe, 2011): Agriculture-Pasture/Hay, Agriculture-Cultivated Crops and Irrigated Agriculture, Harvested Forest-Grass Regeneration, Harvested Forest-Herbaceous Regeneration, Introduced Upland Vegetation – Treed, North-Central Interior Dry-Mesic Oak Forest & Woodland, North-Central Interior Floodplain, North-Central Interior Wet Flatwoods, Ruderal Forest, Ruderal Upland-Old Field, South-Central Interior Large Floodplain. LANDFIRE Biophysical Settings anticipated (USGS, 2010): Central Interior and Appalachian Swamp Systems, North-Central Interior Dry-Mesic Oak Forest and Woodland, North-Central Interior Beech-Maple Forest, Central Interior and Appalachian Floodplain Systems, North Central Wet Flatwoods, North-Central Interior Maple-Basswood Forest, Laurentian-Acadian Floodplain Systems.

Ecological site concept

This site is a riparian site formed on alluvial parent materials that are somewhat poorly drained or wetter. It is located along the floodplain of lotic systems in loamy alluvial deposits often overlaying coarser materials. Active hydrologic and geomorphic process, along with windthrow of established trees, drive the long interval disturbance regime of this site. There are 3 distinct states; 1. floodplain forest, 2. invaded state, and 3. agriculture state. Currently, just under half of this site is in agriculture production with the remaining being naturally regenerated vegetation.

Associated sites

F111XC015IN	Dry Floodplain Located on terraces on floodplain and better drained.
-------------	--

Similar sites

F111XC015IN	Dry Floodplain Located on terraces on floodplain and better drained.
-------------	--

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Populus deltoides</i> (2) <i>Platanus occidentalis</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Asimina triloba</i>
Herbaceous	Not specified

Physiographic features

This site is located in the 111C - Indiana and Ohio Till Plain, Northwestern Part MLRA. It is classified as a wetland/riparian site. This site was formed in loamy alluvium in the floodplains of streams and rivers. This creates a long, linear expression of the site on the landscape.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Flood plain
Runoff class	Negligible to low
Flooding duration	Brief (2 to 7 days) to very long (more than 30 days)
Flooding frequency	Frequent to very frequent
Elevation	160 – 360 m
Slope	0 %
Water table depth	20 – 60 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The climate is humid continental in nature typified by large season temperature differences, with warm to hot, humid summers and cold winters. Precipitation is relatively well distributed year-round.

Climate stations used

- (1) CHALMERS 5 W [USC00121417], Chalmers, IN
- (2) GOSHEN 3SW [USC00123418], Goshen, IN
- (3) WARSAW [USC00129240], Warsaw, IN
- (4) WINAMAC 2SSE [USC00129670], Winamac, IN
- (5) RENSSELAER [USC00127298], Rensselaer, IN
- (6) PLYMOUTH [USC00126989], Plymouth, IN

Influencing water features

This site is characterized by its location in a floodplain and there is most affected by the flooding, scouring, and channel movement of the adjacent lotic system.

Soil features

In a representative profile for the Wet Floodplain ecological site, the soils of this site are grayish brown, very deep loams. The loamy alluvial surface material often overlays a much coarser material further down the profile. The components Shoals and Waterford are common soils found on this site.

Table 3. Representative soil features

Surface texture	(1) Loam
Family particle size	(1) Sandy
Drainage class	Very poorly drained to somewhat poorly drained
Permeability class	Moderate to moderately rapid
Soil depth	80 – 110 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0 – 10 %
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 10 %

Ecological dynamics

The historic plant community of the Wet Floodplain ecological site is a floodplain forest. The dominant species in the canopy are cottonwood and sycamore, with silver maple, swamp white oak, and walnut being common as well. This site is the result of hydrologic and geomorphic process at the macro scale and windthrow on a more local scale. The disturbance regime is one of frequent low intensity flooding events that do not greatly effect the dominant species often. This is punctuated by high intensity events (ie. 100+ year floods, tornados, or ice storms) that remove the dominate species. Succession starts with a shrub dominated community that is a mix of pioneering species such as willows and herbaceous species. Since settlement, just under 50% of this site is in agriculture production. The balance being largely a mix of the reference state and the invaded state.

State and transition model

Additional community tables

Table 4. Community 1.1 plant community composition

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

Table 5. Community 1.2 plant community composition

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

Table 6. Community 2.1 plant community composition

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

Table 7. Community 3.1 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 3.2 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

Site concept developed through expert opinion, review of the literature, and field work. Field work has included reconnaissance, qualitative data collection, and soil pedon description.

Other references

Betz, R. (1973). The prairies of Indiana. Proceedings of the Fifth Midwest Prairie Conference (pp. 34-31). Ames: Iowa State University.

Homoya, M. A., Abrell, D. B., Aldrich, J. R., & Post, T. W. (1985). The Natural Regions of Indiana. Indiana Academy of Science , 94, 245-269.

Kartesz, J. T. (2011). Density Gradient Map Samples Produced From BONAP's Floristic Synthesis. Retrieved 12 12, 2011, from Biota of North America Program: <http://bonap.org/diversity/diversity/diversity.html>

NatureServe. (2011). An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. NatureServe, Arlington, VA, USA [Online: [www. natureserve. org/explorer](http://www.natureserve.org/explorer)] .

Soil Survey Staff. (2011). Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database. Retrieved 10 04, 2011, from Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture: <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov>

Transeau, E. (1935). The prairie peninsula. Ecology vol. 16 (3) , 423-437.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). Population Distribution and Change: 2000 to 2010. Retrieved 10 06, 2011, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-01.pdf>

USDA. (2007). Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections for the Conterminous United States. Washington, DC: USDA - Forest Service.

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

USGS. (2010). LANDFIRE Biophysical Settings. Retrieved from <http://www.landfire.gov>

Contributors

Tyler Staggs

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	09/06/2026

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:
