USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Ecological site F144AY029NY
Semi-Rich Wet Outwash

Last updated: 10/04/2024
Accessed: 05/11/2025

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): 144A–New England and Eastern New York Upland, Southern Part

MLRA 144A: New England and Eastern New York Upland, Southern Part. The eastern half of the eastern part of this MLRA is in the Seaboard Lowland Section of the New England Province of the Appalachian Highlands. The western half of the eastern part and the southeastern half of the western part are in the New England Upland Section of the same province and division. The northwestern half of the western part is in the Hudson Valley Section of the Valley and Ridge Province of the Appalachian Highlands. This MLRA is a very scenic area of rolling to hilly uplands that are broken by many gently sloping to level valleys that terminate in coastal lowlands. Elevation ranges from sea level to 1,000 feet (0 to 305 meters) in much of the area, but it is 2,000 feet (610 meters) on some hills. Relief is mostly about 6 to 65 feet (2 to 20 meters) in the valleys and about 80 to 330 feet (25 to 100 meters) in the uplands.
This area has been glaciated and consists almost entirely of till hills, drumlins, and bedrock-controlled uplands with a mantle of till. It is dissected by narrow glacio-fluvial valleys. The southernmost boundary of the area marks the farthest southward extent of Wisconsinian glaciation on the eastern seaboard. The river valleys and coastal plains are filled with glacial lake sediments, marine sediments, and glacial outwash. The bedrock in the eastern half of the area consists primarily of igneous and metamorphic rocks of early Paleozoic age. Granite is the most common igneous rock, and gneiss, schist, and slate are the most common metamorphic rocks. In the parts of the MLRA in eastern and southeastern New York, Devonian- to Pennsylvanian-age sandstone, shale, and limestone are dominant. Carbonate rocks, primarily dolomite and limestone, are the dominant kinds of bedrock in the part of this MLRA in northwestern Connecticut.

Classification relationships

USDA-NRCS (USDA 2006):
Land Resource Region (LRR): N—East and Central Farming and Forest Region
Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 144A— New England and Eastern New York Upland, Southern Part.

USDA-FS (Cleland et al. 2007)
Province: 221 - Eastern Broadleaf Province
Section: 221A - Lower New England
Subsection: 221Aa – Boston Basin
221Ac – Narragansett-Bristol Lowland and Islands
221Ad – Southern New England Coastal Lowland
221Ae – Hudson Highlands
221Ag - Southeast New England Coastal Hills and Plains
221Ah - Worcester-Monadnock Plateau
221Ai – Gulf of Maine Coastal Plain
221Ak - Gulf of Maine Coastal Lowland
Section: 221B – Hudson Valley
Subsection: 221Ba – Hudson Limestone Valley

221Bb - Miami – Taconic Foothills
221Bc – Hudson Glacial Lake Plains

Ecological site concept

This site consists of very deep, poorly drained soils formed in glaciofluvial materials on outwash terraces and outwash plains. Representative soils are Fredon. Circumneutral seepage swamps of the northeastern United States have moderate to closed canopies and a rich herb layer influenced by calcium-rich groundwater seepage. These can occur along streams or at headwaters in areas of calcareous bedrock. The modal reference plant community is an enriched red maple- black ash forest.

Associated sites

F144AY025MA	**Semi-Rich Moist Outwash**
F144AY030NY	**Semi-Rich Very Wet Outwash**

Similar sites

F144AY040NY	**Semi-Rich Very Wet Till Depressions**
F144AY041MA	**Very Wet Till Depressions**

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) *Fraxinus nigra* (2) *Acer rubrum*
Shrub	(1) *Rhamnus alnifolia*
Herbaceous	Not specified

Physiographic features

This site occurs in relatively flat outwash plains and can be occasionally flooded.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Outwash plain > Depression (2) Drainageway (3) Terrace (4) Outwash plain (5) Valley train
Runoff class	Low to very high
Flooding frequency	None to occasional
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	3–1,200 ft
Slope	0–3%
Water table depth	6–14 in
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

The Koppen-Geiger climate classification of the area in which this MLRA occurs varies between Dfb (Warm-summer humid continental) in the North, and Dfa (Hot-summer humid continental) in the southern portion of the MLRA. Precipitation is usually uniformly distributed throughout the year. Near the coast, however, it is slightly lower in summer. Precipitation is slightly higher in spring and fall in inland areas. Rainfall occurs as high-intensity, convective thunderstorms during the summer. During the winter, most of the precipitation occurs as moderate-

intensity storms (northeasters) that produce large amounts of rain or snow. The freeze-free period increases in length to the south.

Table 3. Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	116-140 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	147-186 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	46-51 in
Frost-free period (actual range)	114-144 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	146-188 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	42-53 in
Frost-free period (average)	131 days
Freeze-free period (average)	164 days
Precipitation total (average)	48 in



Figure 1. Monthly precipitation range



Figure 2. Monthly minimum temperature range



Figure 3. Monthly maximum temperature range



Figure 4. Monthly average minimum and maximum temperature



Figure 5. Annual precipitation pattern



Figure 6. Annual average temperature pattern

Climate stations used

- (1) RUTLAND [USC00436995], Rutland, VT
- (2) GLOVERSVILLE [USC00303319], Gloversville, NY
- (3) BURLINGTON [USC00060973], Avon, CT
- (4) BELVIDERE BRG [USC00280734], Bangor, NJ
- (5) NEW BEDFORD MUNI AP [USW00094726], New Bedford, MA
- (6) DURHAM 2 SSW [USW00054795], Durham, NH
- (7) WIGWAM RSVR [USC00069568], Morris, CT

Influencing water features

Poorly drained
Water is removed so slowly that the soil is wet at shallow depths periodically during the growing season or remains wet for long periods. Internal free water occurrence is shallow or very shallow and common or persistent. Free water is commonly at or near the surface long enough during the growing season that most mesophytic crops cannot be grown, unless the soil is artificially drained. The soil, however, is not continuously wet directly below plow depth. Free water at shallow depth is common. The water table is commonly the result of low or very low saturated hydraulic conductivity, nearly continuous rainfall, or a combination of these.

Wetland description

National Wetland Classification (Cowardin et al., 1979):

Palustrine, class variable, leaf morphology variable, water regime variable, chemistry modifier variable.

Soil features

This site consists of moderate to very deep, somewhat poorly to poorly drained soils formed in glaciofluvial deposits. The representative soils in the site is Fredon; saturated hydraulic conductivity for this soil is moderately high or high in the solum and high or very high in the substratum.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Glaciofluvial deposits–limestone and dolomite (2) Schist
Surface texture	(1) Loam (2) Silt loam
Family particle size	(1) Coarse-loamy over sandy or sandy-skeletal
Drainage class	Poorly drained to somewhat poorly drained
Permeability class	Slow to moderately slow
Depth to restrictive layer	23–72 in
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0%
Surface fragment cover >3"	0–1%
Available water capacity (Depth not specified)	4–5 in
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (Depth not specified)	5.1–8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	10–50%
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0–3%

Ecological dynamics

[Caveat: The vegetation information contained in this section and is only provisional, based on concepts, not yet validated with 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). Terrestrial ecological SYSTEMS are specifically defined as a group of plant community-types called ASSOCIATIONS that tend to [co-]occur within landscapes with similar ecological processes, substrates, and/or environmental gradients. Any given system will typically manifest itself in a landscape at intermediate geographic scales of tens-to-thousands of hectares and will persist for 50 or more years. A vegetation association is a plant community that is much more specific to a given soil, geology, landform, climate, hydrology, and disturbance history. It is the basic unit for vegetation classification and recognized by the US National Vegetation Classification (US FDGC 2008). Each association will be named by the diagnostic and often dominant species that occupy the different height strata (tree, sapling, shrub, and herb). Within the NatureServe Explorer database (NatureServe, 2015), ecological systems are numbered by a Community Ecological System Code (CES) and individual vegetation associations are assigned an identification number called a Community Element Global Code (CEGL).

Additional and more localized vegetation information is provided by the State Natural Heritage Programs of Connecticut (Metzler and Barrett 2001), Massachusetts (Swain and Kearsley 2001), New Hampshire (Sperduto and

Nichols, 2011), New York (Edinger et al., 2014), and Rhode Island (Enser and Lungren, 2006).

The Semi Rich Wet Outwash ecological site is characteristic of the North-Central Interior and Appalachian Rich Swamp system (CES202.605). The modal reference plant community is an enriched red maple- black ash forest. Natural disturbances include climate extremes such as, excessive droughts, or storm activity ranging from windthrows to downbursts to ice-storms. Alteration of the natural hydrological regime (diversions, culverts, impoundments) can be a threat. Invasive plants, include purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), reedgrass (*Phragmites australis* ssp. australis), and buckthorn (*Frangula alnus*).

[*Caveat] The information presented is representative of very complex vegetation communities. Key indicator plants and ecological processes are described to help inform land management decisions. Plant communities will differ across the MLRA because of the naturally occurring variability in weather, soils, and geography. The reference plant community is not necessarily the management goal. The drafts of species lists are merely representative and are not botanical descriptions of all species occurring, or potentially occurring, on this site. They are not intended to cover every situation or the full range of conditions, species, and responses for the site.

State and transition model



Transition	*Drivers/practices*
T1A	Forest mgmt., Disturbance
T1B, T2A	Disturbance/cutting/clearing, Brush removal
R2A, R2B	Restoration & Mgmt, Forest Stand Improvement, Early Successional Habitat Development, Upland Wildlife Mgmt, Invasive spp. Control, Plant establishment
T3A	Abandonment, Plant establishment, Forest mgmt.
P2.1A	Disturbance, Invasive species establishment
P2.2A	Invasive spp. Control, Forest mgmt..
P1.3A, P1.2A	Abandonment, succession
P3.1A, P3.2A, P3.3A, P3.1B, P3.2B, P3.3B	Changing agricultural phases
P1.1A, P1.1B, P1.2B	Disturbance, Early Successional Habitat Development

State 1
Reference State (Minimally-managed)

The reference plant community includes: • *Acer rubrum* - *Fraxinus nigra* - (*Larix laricina*) / *Rhamnus alnifolia* Swamp Forest Translated Name: Red Maple - Black Ash - (Tamarack) / Alderleaf Buckthorn Swamp Forest Common Name: Red Maple - Black Ash Rich Seepage Swamp Forest (CEGL006009) Others plant communities can include: • *Acer rubrum* - *Fraxinus nigra* - (*Tsuga canadensis*) / *Tiarella cordifolia* Swamp Forest Translated Name: Red Maple - Black Ash - (Eastern Hemlock) / Heartleaf Foamflower Swamp Forest Common Name: Northern Hardwood - Hemlock Seepage Swamp Forest (CEGL006052)

Community 1.1
Red Maple - Black Ash - (Tamarack) / Alderleaf Buckthorn Swamp Forest (CEGL006009)

Acer rubrum - *Fraxinus nigra* - (*Larix laricina*) / *Rhamnus alnifolia* Swamp Forest Translated Name: Red Maple - Black Ash - (Tamarack) / Alderleaf Buckthorn Swamp Forest Common Name: Red Maple - Black Ash Rich Seepage Swamp Forest (CEGL006009) The canopy is dominated by red maple (*Acer rubrum*) and black ash (*Fraxinus nigra*) with the American larch (*Larix laricina*) occasionally prominent. Other canopy trees includeyellos birch (*Betula alleghaniensis*), eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*), white pine (*Pinus strobus*), American hornbeam (*Carpinus caroliniana* ssp. virginiana), and red spruce (*Picea rubens*), the latter especially in the north or at higher elevations. Shrub cover varies with canopy cover and can be quite dense; typical species include poisin ivy (*Toxicodendron vernix*), alder-leaved buckthorn (*Rhamnus alnifolia*), red-osier dogwood (*Cornus sericea*), willows (Salix spp)., common winterberry (Ilex verticillate), highbush blueberry (*Vaccinium corymbosum*), and occasionally shrubby cinquefoil (*Dasiphora fruticosa* ssp. floribunda) and bog birch (*Betula pumila*). The diverse herb layer is characterized by eastern swamp saxifrage (*Saxifraga pensylvanica*), yellow marsh marigold (*Caltha palustris*), bulbous bittercress (*Cardamine bulbosa*), water avens(*Geum rivale*),cinnamon fern (*Osmunda cinnamomea*), bristly-stalked sedge (*Carex leptalea*), interior sedge (*Carex interior*), tussock sedge (*Carex stricta*), lakeside sedge (*Carex lacustris*), yellow-green sedge (*Carex flava*), rough leaved goldenrod (*Solidago patula*), blueflag iris (*Iris versicolor*), hispid crowfoot (*Ranunculus hispidus* var. caricetorum), pink bittercress (*Cardamine douglassii*), marsh fern (*Thelypteris palustris*), crested wood-fern (*Dryopteris cristata*), golden groundsel (*Packera aurea*)(= Senecio aureus), and skunk cabbage (*Symplocarpus foetidus*); plus yellow lady's slipper (*Cypripedium parviflorum* [= Cypripedium calceolus[). (Source: NatureServe 2018 [accessed 2019], USNVC 2017 [accessed 2019]). Cross-referenced plant community concepts (typically by political state): CT: Red maple – black ash / hispid crowfoot Swamp Forest (Metzler and Barret, 2006) MA: Red Maple - Black Ash - Tamarack Calcareous Seepage Swamp (Swain and Kearsley, 2001) NY: Red maple-tamarack peat swamp (Edinger et al., 2014)

Dominant plant species

- red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tree
- black ash (*Fraxinus nigra*), tree
- alderleaf buckthorn (*Rhamnus alnifolia*), shrub
- shrubby cinquefoil (*Dasiphora fruticosa ssp. floribunda*), shrub
- cinnamon fern (*Osmunda cinnamomea*), other herbaceous
- eastern swamp saxifrage (*Saxifraga pensylvanica*), other herbaceous

Community 1.2
Ruderal Forest/Woodland

Community 1.3
Abandoned Field/Meadow

Pathway P1.1A
Community 1.1 to 1.2

Disturbance, early successional habitat development

Pathway P1.1B

Community 1.1 to 1.3

Disturbance, early successional habitat development

Pathway P1.2A
Community 1.2 to 1.1

Abandonment, succession

Pathway P1.2B
Community 1.2 to 1.3

Disturbance, early successional habitat development

Pathway P1.3A
Community 1.3 to 1.2

Abandonment, succession

State 2
Semi-natural State

The Semi-natural State would expect plant communities where ecological processes are primarily operating with some land conditioning in the past or present, e.g., managed forests, or plant communities that are an artifact of land management e.g., predominately invasive plants.

Community 2.1
Managed trees/shrubs/herbs(?)

Community 2.2
Invasive Plants

Pathway P2.1A
Community 2.1 to 2.2

Disturbance, invasive species management

Pathway P2.2A
Community 2.2 to 2.1

Invasive species control, forest management

State 3
Cultural State

The Cultural State would expect the ecological site to be very strongly conditioned by land management conversion, by transformation to Cultivated/Pasture/Plantation.

Community 3.1
Cultivated

Community 3.2
Pasture

Community 3.3
Plantation

Pathway P3.1A
Community 3.1 to 3.2

Changing agricultural phases

Pathway P3.1B
Community 3.1 to 3.3

Changing agricultural phases

Pathway P3.2A
Community 3.2 to 3.1

Changing agricultural phases

Pathway P3.2B
Community 3.2 to 3.3

Changing agricultural phases

Pathway P3.3A
Community 3.3 to 3.1

Changing agricultural phases

Pathway P3.3B
Community 3.3 to 3.2

Changing agricultural phases

Transition T1A
State 1 to 2

Forest management, disturbance

Transition T1B
State 1 to 3

Disturbance/cutting/clearing, brush removal

Restoration pathway R2A
State 2 to 1

Restoration and management, forest stand improvement, early successional habitat development, upland wildlife management, invasive species control, plant establishment

Transition T2A
State 2 to 3

Disturbance/cutting/clearing, brush removal

Restoration pathway R3A
State 3 to 1

Restoration and management, forest stand improvement, early successional habitat development, upland wildlife management, invasive species control, plant establishment

Transition T3A
State 3 to 2

Abandonment, plant establishment, forest management

Additional community tables

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

REFERENCES

Cleland, D.T., J.A. Freeouf, J.E. Keys, G.J. Nowacki, C.A. Carpenter, and W.H.McNab. 2007. Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections for the conterminous United States. [Map. presentation scale 1:3,500,000, colored; A.M. Sloan, cartographer] Gen. Tech. Report WO-76D. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC. (https://www.fs.fed.us/research/publications/misc/73326-wo-gtr-76d-cleland2007.pdf)

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

Cowardin, L.M. et. al. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater habitats of the United States. FWS/OBS-79/31, U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.

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

Enser, R.W. and Lundgren, J.A. 2006. Natural Communities of Rhode Island. A joint project of the Rhode Island Dept. of Environmental Management Natural Heritage Program and The Nature Conservancy of Rhode Island. Web published by R.I. Natural History Survey, Kingston, RI. www.rinhs.org.

FGDC [Federal Geographic Data Committee]. 2008. National Vegetation Classification Standard, Version 2. Federal Geographic Data Committee, Vegetation Subcommittee, Washington DC..

Gawler, S.C. and Cutko, A., 2010. Natural landscapes of Maine: a guide to natural communities and ecosystems. Maine Natural Areas Program, Department of Conservation.

Metzler, K.J. and Barrett, J.P., 2006. The Vegetation of Connecticut, a Preliminary Classification. Department of Environmental Protection, State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut. Rpt of Investigations No. 12.

NatureServe 2015. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available http://explorer.natureserve.org. (Accessed: December 2015).

PRISM Climate Group, Oregon State University. Available http://prism.oregonstate.edu, (created February 26, 2013).

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. (https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051845.pdf).

Sperduto, D.D., & Nichols, W.F. 2011. Natural Communities of New Hampshire, Second Ed. NH Natural Heritage Bureau, Concord, NH. Publ. UNH Cooperative Extension.

Swain, P.C. and Kearsley, J.B., 2001. Classification of the natural communities of Massachusetts. Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program, Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife.

Thompson, E.H. and Sorenson, E.R., 2000. Wetland, woodland, wildland. Vermont Department of Fish and Wildlife and The Nature Conservancy. Publ. University Press of New England.

USNVC [United States National Vegetation Classification]. 2017 (Date accessed). United States National Vegetation Classification Database V2.01. Federal Geographic Data Committee, Vegetation Subcomittee, Washington DC.

Contributors

Nels Barrett, Ph.D. (vegetation)

Approval

Greg Schmidt, 10/04/2024

Acknowledgments

Michael Margo and tech team provided earlier drafts. Josh Hibit made compliance updates w/ 2021 Checklist V.2

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	05/11/2025
Approved by	Greg Schmidt
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:**