

Ecological site RX141X230

Acidic Peat Wetland Complex

Last updated: 10/03/2024
Accessed: 09/24/2026

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): 141X–Tug Hill Plateau

MLRA 141 is entirely in New York and makes up about 1,173 square kilometers (3,037 square kilometers). It consists of a relatively small but unique upland that lies just off the eastern end of Lake Ontario and west of the Black River Valley and Adirondack Mountain region. It is essentially a north- and east-facing glaciated cuesta scarp and is underlain by thick Wisconsin till and small areas of outwash. Most of the plateau is woodland, so forestry and recreation are the primary uses, but small isolated dairy operations and hobby farms are located around the perimeter. The area is bordered on the east by the Black River Valley, on the north by the St. Lawrence Lowland, on the west by the Ontario Lowland, and on the south by the Upper Mohawk Valley. The northern and eastern boundaries of MLRA 141 are distinct where they contact the physiographically dissimilar southwestern part of MLRA 142 (St. Lawrence-Champlain Plain). The western and southern boundaries are also distinct where they contact the physiographically dissimilar MLRA 101 (Ontario-Erie Plain and Finger Lakes Region)

Ecological site concept

This site occurs in flat, low-lying areas characterized by very poorly-drained acidic peat soils and acid bog vegetation. Soil pH is generally below 4.5 throughout (usually below 4.0). Typical soils are medihemists. The vegetation of this site is dominated by sphagnum moss and heath shrubs, along with other common bog species such as pitcher plant, cotton grass, sundews, etc. in lower quantities. This site may sometimes support stunted black spruce and larch trees, not more than a few feet tall. This site is resistant to major disturbances except for small scale hydrologic alterations that may create small patches of drained or ponded peatland (such as near a culvert). This ecological resistance can be attributed to the ability of these bogs to respond to large fluctuations in water, as the peat acts like a sponge, expanding and contracting with the water supply. There is also a general resistance to fire, insects, disease, construction, land management, etc. due to the wet nature and particular species on the site. Further study is needed to identify alternative states for this site.

Associated sites

RX141X110	Floodplain Riparian Complex Floodplain Riparian complex may be located adjacent to or surrounding Acidic Peat Wetland Complex.
RX141X210	Marsh Wetland Complex Marsh Wetland Complex may be located adjacent to or surrounding Acidic Peat Wetland Complex.
RX141X220	Semi-acidic Peat Wetland Complex Semi-acidic Peat Wetland Complex may be located adjacent to, surrounding, or transition into Acidic Peat Wetland Complex.

Similar sites

RX141X220	Semi-acidic Peat Wetland Complex The Semi-acidic Peat Wetland Complex ecological site is similar in soil properties, vegetation composition, and physiography to Acidic Peat Wetland Complex ecological sites. PH levels are < 4.5 in Acidic Peat Wetland Complex while PH levels in Semi-acidic Peat Wetland Complex are between 4.5-6.
------------------	--

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Picea mariana</i> (2) <i>Larix laricina</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Chamaedaphne calyculata</i> (2) <i>Kalmia angustifolia</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Carex trisperma</i> (2) <i>Vaccinium corymbosum</i>

Legacy ID

F141XY230NY

Physiographic features

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Depression
Ponding frequency	Occasional to frequent
Elevation	80 – 610 m
Water table depth	0 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

Throughout the year precipitation is evenly distributed around most of this area with slightly less rainfall occurring around the lower margins of the plateau. Rainfall occurs as high-intensity, convective thunderstorms during the summer. Lake-effect snowfall is heavy from late autumn to early spring with the summit of the plateau having the lowest temperatures and the shortest freeze-free periods.

Climate stations Watertown and Old Forge are adjacent to the MLRA and were used to tabulate additional representative climate data.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	90-120 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	130-160 days

Precipitation total (characteristic range)	1,190-1,350 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	90-130 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	120-160 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	1,120-1,450 mm
Frost-free period (average)	110 days
Freeze-free period (average)	140 days
Precipitation total (average)	1,270 mm

- (1) BOONVILLE 4 SSW [USC00300785], Boonville, NY
- (2) CAMDEN [USC00301110], Camden, NY
- (3) WATERTOWN [USC00309000], Watertown, NY
- (4) OLD FORGE [USC00306184], Eagle Bay, NY

Influencing water features

Soil features

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Organic material
Surface texture	(1) Peaty loam
Drainage class	Very poorly drained
Permeability class	Very slow to moderately slow
Soil depth	180 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified

Available water capacity (35.6-50.8cm)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0cm)	Not specified
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0cm)	Not specified
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0cm)	Not specified

Ecological dynamics

[Caveat: The vegetation information contained in this section and is only provisional, based on concepts, and future projects support validation through field work. *] The vegetation groupings described in this section are based on the terrestrial ecological system classification and vegetation associations developed by NatureServe (Comer 2003) and localized associations provided by the New York Natural Heritage Program (Edinger et al. 2014).

The vegetation of this site is dominated by sphagnum moss and heath shrubs, along with other common bog species such as pitcher plant, cotton grass, sundews, etc. in lower quantities. This site may sometimes support stunted black spruce and larch trees, not more than a few feet tall.

This ecological site is resistant to major disturbances except for small scale hydrologic alterations that may create small patches of drained or ponded peatland (such as near a culvert). This ecological resistance can be attributed to the ability of these bogs to respond to large fluctuations in water, as the peat acts like a sponge, expanding and contracting with the water supply. There is also a general resistance to fire, insects, disease, construction, land management, etc. due to the wet nature and particular species on the site. Further study is needed to identify alternative states for this site.

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 1.3 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 1.4 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 1.5 plant community composition

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

Table 10. Community 2.1 plant community composition

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

Table 11. Community 2.2 plant community composition

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

Table 12. Community 2.3 plant community composition

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

Table 13. Community 3.1 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

Future work is needed, as described in a future project plan, to validate the information presented in this provisional ecological site description. Future work includes field sampling, data collection and analysis by qualified vegetation ecologists and soil scientists. As warranted, annual reviews of the project plan can be conducted by the Ecological Site Technical Team. A final field review, peer review, quality control, and quality assurance reviews of the ESD are necessary to approve a final document.

Other references

Comer, P., D. Faber-Langendoen, R. Evans, S. Grawler, C. Josse, G. Kittel, S. Menard, M. Pyne, M. Reid, K. Schultz, K. Snow, and J. Teague. 2003. Ecological Systems of the United States: A Working Classification of U.S. Terrestrial Systems. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia

Edinger, G. J., D. J. Evans, S. Gebauer, T. G. Howard, D. M. Hunt, and A. M. Olivero (editors). 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.

Gawler, S. and A. Cutko. 2010. Natural Landscapes of Maine: A Guide to Natural Communities and Ecosystems. Maine Natural Areas Program, Maine Department of Conservation, Augusta, Maine.

NatureServe. 2021. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. <https://explorer.natureserve.org/>. (accessed 10 July. 2021).

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. Agricultural Handbook 296

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Official Soil Series Descriptions. Available online. (accessed 11 Aug. 2021).

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Soil Climate Research Station Data. Available online. (accessed 23 June. 2021).

Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for [MLRA 141, Maine]. Available online. (accessed 14 Oct. 2021).

USNVC [United States National Vegetation Classification]. 2017. United States National Vegetation Classification Database V2.01. Federal Geographic Data Committee, Vegetation Subcommittee, Washington DC. Available The U.S. National Vegetation Classification (usnvc.org) (accessed 2 July. 2021).

Contributors

Christopher Mann

Approval

Greg Schmidt, 10/03/2024

Acknowledgments

Nels Barrett and Nick Butler provided considerable review of this ecological site concept.

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	09/24/2026
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:
