

Ecological site F144BY502ME

Loamy Till Toeslope

Last updated: 9/27/2024
Accessed: 09/01/2026

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): 144B—New England and Eastern New York Upland, Northern Part

This major land resource area (MLRA) is in Maine (56 percent), New Hampshire (22 percent), Vermont (14 percent), Massachusetts (6 percent), Connecticut (1 percent), and New York (1 percent). It makes up about 22,728 square miles (58,864 square kilometers). The MLRA consists of a relatively young landscape shaped by the Laurentide Ice Sheet, which covered the region from 35,000 to 10,000 years ago. Rolling hills of dense basal till converge on ridges of shallow bedrock that were scoured by glacial ice. River valleys that were flooded by melting glacial water or seawater house large expanses of glacial outwash and stratified drift in inland areas and, to a lesser extent, glaciomarine and glaciolacustrine sediment deposits in coastal areas. Organic bogs, ablation till, and alluvial flood plains make up the remaining portions of the MLRA. The soils in this region are dominantly Entisols, Spodosols, and Inceptisols. They commonly have a fragipan. The dominant suborders are Ochrepts, Orthods, Aquepts, Fluvents, and Sapristis. The soils in the region dominantly have a frigid soil temperature regime with some cryic areas at higher elevation, a udic soil moisture regime, and mixed mineralogy. Most of the land is forested, and 98 percent is privately owned. Significant amounts of forest products are produced including lumber, pulpwood, Christmas trees, and maple syrup. Principal agricultural crops include forage and grains for dairy cattle, potatoes, apples, and blueberries. Wildlife habitat and recreation are important land uses. Stoniness, steep slopes, and poor drainage limit the use of many of the soils.

Classification relationships

NRCS: Land Resource Region: R—Northeastern Forage and Forest Region MLRA: 144B—New England and Eastern New York Upland, Northern Part MLRA resources Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 144B—New England and Eastern New York Upland, Northern Part

Ecological site concept

This site occurs on gentle foot and toe slopes (0-15%) at the base of watersheds where water and nutrients accumulate near slope breaks. Soils are underlain by a densely compacted till layer within 27 inches of the soil surface, which perches water and nutrients in the plant rooting zone. Occasionally groundwater seeps out at the surface, leaving rivulets as useful site indicators. The resulting plant community is highly-productive and most commonly dominated by northern hardwoods, though red spruce and balsam fir are often abundant, particularly in flatter areas. Abundant yellow birch is a good indicator of this site. Relationship to Other Classification Systems This site includes the following state natural heritage program types: • Semi-rich Mesic Sugar Maple Forest (Sperduto and Nichols 2004) • Sugar Maple – Beech – Yellow birch Forest (Sperduto and Nichols 2004) • Hardwood Seepage Forest (Gawler and Cutko 2010) • Spruce-Northern Hardwoods Forest (Gawler and Cutko 2010) • Sugar maple-beech-yellow birch forest (Thompson and Sorenson 2000) • Semi-rich Mesic Sugar Maple Forest (Thompson and Sorenson 2000)

Associated sites

F144BY301ME	Loamy Till Swamp The Loamy Till Swamp site occurs lower in the watershed than the Loamy Till Toeslope site. The two sites occur together along a soil drainage gradient from somewhat poorly to poorly- and very poorly-drained.
-------------	---

F144BY501ME	Loamy Slope (Northern Hardwoods) The somewhat poorly- and poorly-drained Loamy Till Toeslope site often occurs downslope of the moderately well- and well-drained Loamy Slope site
F144BY504ME	Enriched Loamy Cove The Enriched Loamy Cove site is richer than the Loamy Till Toeslope and occurs in areas where the most amount of nutrients accumulate, such as small drainageways

Similar sites

F144BY507ME	Semi-rich Till Toeslope The Semi-rich Till Toeslope site has similar soil texture and wetness, but is distinguished by higher soil nutrients derived from calcareous parent material (such as limestone), as evidenced by high soil pH and rich site indicator species (particularly basswood).
F144BY501ME	Loamy Slope (Northern Hardwoods) The Loamy Slopes site is predominantly well and moderately well-drained soils (sometimes with somewhat poorly-drained inclusions) that produce mostly northern hardwoods, whereas the Loamy Till Toeslopes site consists of somewhat poorly- to poorly drained soils and can produce more mixedwood stands.
F144BY402ME	Clay Hills While these two sites produce similar forests, Clay Hills occur on better-drained, finer-textured soils, usually of glaciomarine or glaciolacustrine origin, while the Loamy Till Toeslope site occurs on till soils that are typically coarser in texture and poorly- to somewhat-poorly drained. The Loamy Till Toeslope site is thought to be more productive than the Clay Hills site (not confirmed).
F144BY504ME	Enriched Loamy Cove The Enriched Loamy Cove site occurs along drainageways, produces hardwood forests (typically with white ash, yellow birch, sugar maple, and/or beech), has a thick dark soil surface horizon, and has rich site indicators. By contrast, the Loamy Till Toeslope occurs at the base of slopes and produces semirich hardwood or mixedwood stands.
F144BY503ME	Loamy Flat The Loamy Flat site and Loamy Till Toeslopes site share many of the same soils, but Loamy Flats occur on flatter areas grading into wetlands and produce spruce-fir forests, whereas the Loamy Till Toeslope occurs at the base of slopes and produces semi-rich mixedwood forests.

Figure 1.

Table 2. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Pinus strobus</i> (2) <i>Betula papyrifera</i>
------	---

Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	Not specified

Physiographic features

This site is found at the base of long slopes, typically on toeslopes of hills as they transition to till plains. Slopes are mostly 0-15%, sometimes up to 25%. A seasonally-high water table can be found between 6 and 20 inches below the soil surface from November to May. This site has sufficient water and nutrients in the soil to be highly productive. It occurs from sea level to 2660 feet in elevation.

Table 3. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Depression
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	0 – 810 m
Slope	0 %
Water table depth	20 – 30 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The climate is humid and temperate and is characterized by warm summers and cold winters. Precipitation generally is evenly distributed throughout the year. Near the coast, it is slightly lower in summer. In inland areas, it is slightly higher in spring and fall. Rainfall occurs during high-intensity, convective thunderstorms in summer. In winter, most of the precipitation occurs as moderate-intensity storms (northeasters) that produce large amounts of rain or snow. Heavy snowfalls commonly occur late in winter. Temperatures and the length of the freeze-free period increase from north to south and closer to the coast.

This major land resource area (MLRA) covers four states and may have substantial climate variability among locations: Maine (56 percent), New Hampshire (22 percent), Vermont (14 percent), Massachusetts (6 percent), Connecticut (1 percent), and New York (1 percent).

Table 4 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	120-140 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	140-170 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	1,070-1,220 mm

Frost-free period (actual range)	100-150 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	130-180 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	1,020-1,370 mm
Frost-free period (average)	130 days
Freeze-free period (average)	160 days
Precipitation total (average)	1,170 mm

- (1) BELFAST [USC00170480], Belfast, ME
- (2) ACADIA NP [USC00170100], Bar Harbor, ME
- (3) CORINNA [USC00171628], Corinna, ME
- (4) DOVER-FOXCROFT WWTP [USC00171975], Dover Foxcroft, ME
- (5) FARMINGTON [USC00172765], Farmington, ME
- (6) GARDINER [USC00173046], Gardiner, ME
- (7) JONESBORO [USC00174183], Addison, ME
- (8) LEWISTON [USC00174566], Auburn, ME
- (9) MADISON [USC00174927], Anson, ME
- (10) NEWCASTLE [USC00175675], Newcastle, ME
- (11) ORONO [USC00176430], Old Town, ME
- (12) WATERTOWN TRTMT PLT [USC00179151], Waterville, ME
- (13) WEST ROCKPORT 1 NNW [USC00179593], Rockport, ME
- (14) AUGUSTA STATE AP [USW00014605], Augusta, ME
- (15) BANGOR INTL AP [USW00014606], Bangor, ME
- (16) PORTLAND INTL JETPORT [USW00014764], Portland, ME

Influencing water features

This site is not typically influenced by streams or wetlands.

Soil features

The soils of this site are typically an association of poorly- and somewhat poorly-drained lodgment till. They are characterized by a densely-compacted layer within 10 to 27 inches (sometimes up to 50 inches) of the soil surface. Textures range from silt loam to fine sandy loam to silt loam on the surface, with muck at the surface in wet depressions.

The soil surface is typically pit-and-mound formed by tree roots excavating small depressions in the soil when trees tip over, depositing a mound of soil next to the pit. Often the pits are poorly-drained with gleyed grey colors near the soil surface, while the mounds are somewhat poorly-drained with redoximorphic features above the dense layer. Soil pH is typically 4.5 to 6.0, and 3.2 to 6.5 at the extremes.

Table 5. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Till – phyllite (2) Granite (3) Schist (4) Shale (5) Slate
Surface texture	(1) Silt loam (2) Fine sandy loam
Drainage class	Poorly drained to somewhat poorly drained
Permeability class	Very slow
Soil depth	0 – 50 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-10.2cm)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (9.1-18.5cm)	Not specified
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (0-38.1cm)	Not specified
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (0-5.1cm)	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 et al., 2003) and localized associations provided by the New York Natural Heritage Program (Edinger et al., 2014), Maine Natural Areas Program (Gawler and Cutko, 2010), New Hampshire Natural Heritage Program (Sperduto and Nichols, 2011), and Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife (Swain, 2020).

This site is dominated by northern hardwoods and can be co-dominant with conifers, particularly red spruce. Yellow birch is a good site indicator, and red and sugar maples are often dominant.

Treethrow and logging are the most common disturbances on this site. The site is resilient following these disturbances and succeeds through an herbaceous and shrubby phase prior to tree establishment and eventual return to the reference community. The young forest stands include several species not typically dominant in the reference community, including grey and white birch, aspen, balsam fir, etc. After about 80-100 years these species die out and the reference community species retain dominance.

This site may be cultivated for crop or pasture but require soil amendments due to acidity and lack of soil nutrients. When cropland or pastureland management ceases, the site either returns to northern hardwoods or may transition to a white pine forest. Once white pine is established, it tends to form a single age stand with low diversity and little understory.

Relationship to Other Classification Systems

- This site includes the following state natural heritage program types:
- Semi-rich Mesic Sugar Maple Forest (Sperduto and Nichols 2004)
 - Sugar Maple – Beech – Yellow birch Forest (Sperduto and Nichols 2004)
 - Hardwood Seepage Forest (Gawler and Cutko 2010)
 - Spruce-Northern Hardwoods Forest (Gawler and Cutko 2010)
 - Sugar maple-beech-yellow birch forest (Thompson and Sorenson 2000)
 - Semi-rich Mesic Sugar Maple Forest (Thompson and Sorenson 2000)

State and transition model

Additional community tables

Table 6. Community 1.1 plant community composition

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

Table 7. Community 1.2 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 1.3 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 1.4 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 3.1 plant community composition

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

Table 12. Community 4.1 plant community composition

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

Table 13. Community 4.2 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).

Sperduto, D.D. and William F. Nichols. 2011. Natural Communities of New Hampshire. 2nd Ed. NH Natural Heritage Bureau, Concord, NH. Pub. UNH Cooperative Extension, Durham, NH.

Swain, P. C. 2020. Classification of the Natural Communities of Massachusetts. Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, Westborough, MA

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

Nels Barrett, 9/27/2024

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	06/29/2020
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:
