




Photo by Bradford S. Slaughter



**Overview:** Wet-mesic prairie is a native wetland grassland that occurs on occasionally saturated, rarely inundated soils on outwash plains and outwash channels and in depressions on ground moraines, end moraines, and ice-contact features. Soils range from loam to loamy sands and sandy clays, typically with neutral pH and high organic content. Dominant or subdominant species include big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*), Indian grass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), bluejoint grass (*Calamagrostis canadensis*), and sedges (*Carex* spp.). Fluctuating water levels and fire are important natural disturbances.


#### Global and State Rank: G2G3/S2

**Range:** Wet-mesic prairie is broadly distributed throughout the central Midwestern United States and adjacent Canadian provinces, occurring in Saskatchewan, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Manitoba, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ontario, and possibly Kentucky (NatureServe 2009). Species composition and dominance patterns vary throughout this range. In Michigan, wet-mesic prairie occurs south of the climatic tension zone in the southern Lower Peninsula, where it was likely prevalent historically in subsection VI.2 (Kalamazoo Interlobate), and infrequent in subsections VI.1 (Washtenaw), VI.3 (Allegan), and VI.4 (Ionia). Currently, high quality occurrences of wet-mesic prairie have been documented

from subsections VI.1 and VI.2 (MNFI 2010). A related natural community, wet-mesic sand prairie, has a broader distribution, occurring in both the southern and northern Lower Peninsula (Albert et al. 2008, Kost and Slaughter 2008). Wet-mesic prairie on the glacial lakeplain is classified as lakeplain wet-mesic prairie (Albert and Kost 1998a, Kost et al. 2007).

**Rank Justification:** Analysis of General Land Office (GLO) survey notes in Michigan reveals that graminoid-dominated wetlands, broadly classified as “inland wet prairie,” covered approximately 220,000 acres (89,000 ha) circa 1800. Nearly all of this acreage occurred in southern Lower Michigan (Comer et al. 1995). Wet and wet-mesic prairie on glacial lakeplain covered an additional 160,000 ac (65,000 ha), and is described by Albert and Kost (1998a, 1998b) and Kost et al. (2007). Acreage mapped as “inland wet prairie” was comprised of several natural communities, including wet-mesic prairie, wet prairie, southern wet meadow, and prairie fen. The extent of wet-mesic prairie circa 1800 is difficult to determine because GLO notes do not contain sufficient detail to assign specific natural community types to acreage mapped broadly as “wet prairie.” In addition, wet-mesic prairie sometimes occurs as ecotonal zones between fire-dependent uplands (e.g., oak barrens) and peat-accumulating wetlands (e.g., southern wet meadow, prairie fen). Because of their small size, these ecotonal zones of wet-mesic prairie were not recorded by the GLO surveyors, thus further





Ecoregional map of Michigan (Albert 1995) depicting historical distribution of wet-mesic prairie (Albert et al. 2008)



complicating attempts to estimate circa 1800 acreage. The majority of inland wet prairie acreage in southern Lower Michigan occurred in Jackson County (49,000 ac or 20,000 ha), representing over 10% of the county's land surface. Inland wet prairie was also common in Washtenaw (37,000 ac or 15,000 ha), Livingston (34,000 ac or 14,000 ha), Oakland (21,000 ac or 8,500 ha), Shiawassee (14,000 ac or 5,700 ha), Cass (11,000 ac or 4,500 ha), Lenawee (8,000 ac or 3,000 ha), Ingham (8,000 ac or 3,000 ha), Calhoun (8,000 ac or 3,000 ha), Hillsdale (7,000 ac or 3,000 ha), and Genesee (6,000 ac or 2,000 ha) counties (Comer et al. 1995). The majority of this acreage was likely comprised of southern wet meadow and prairie fen, both graminoid-dominated, peat-accumulating wetlands.

Since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, wet-mesic prairie has been significantly impacted by drainage and conversion for agriculture. Drainage networks lowered regional water tables and allowed extensive agricultural development, reducing wet-mesic prairie to small, isolated patches, often at the margins of unfarmed wetlands (MNFI 2010; see also Urban 2005 for a discussion of wet prairie settlement in Illinois). Currently, 10 occurrences of wet-mesic prairie have been documented statewide, totaling approximately 100 ac (40 ha) (MNFI 2010). Only three of these occurrences are estimated to be of good (B-rank) viability, totaling under 17 ac (7 ha). Five of the 10 wet-mesic prairie occurrences were last surveyed in or prior to 1990. Many extant occurrences of wet-mesic prairie show signs of past agricultural use (e.g., grazing, plowing), and are currently threatened by shrub and tree encroachment due to fire suppression, disturbed hydrology, invasive species, and development. Though it is difficult to assess the historical distribution and acreage of the community, it is clear that wet-mesic prairie has undergone a severe reduction in both total acreage and number of occurrences across its range.

**Physiographic Context:** The Michigan range of wet-mesic prairie is in southern Lower Michigan, south of the climatic tension zone. This region has a warm, temperate, rainy to cool, snow-forest climate with hot summers and no dry season. The daily maximum temperature in July ranges from 29° to 32° C (85° to 90° F), the daily minimum temperature in January ranges from -9° to -4° C (15° to 25° F), and the annual average temperature ranges from 8.2° to 9.4° C (47° to 49° F) (Albert et al. 1986, Barnes 1991). The mean number of freeze-free days is between 146 and 163, and the

average number of days per year with snow cover of 2.5 cm (1 in) or more is between 10 and 60. The mean annual total precipitation for this region is 820 mm (32 in).

Wet-mesic prairie occurs on a variety of landforms, including poorly drained glacial clay and sand lakeplain (where it is classified as lakeplain wet-mesic prairie; see Albert and Kost 1998a, 1998b, Kost et al. 2007), poorly drained outwash channels and outwash plains, and depressions on ground moraine, end moraine, and ice-contact features. Historically, the largest areas of wet-mesic prairie may have occurred in association with extensive southern wet meadows, prairie fens, and forested wetlands in ice-contact terrain in the Jackson Interlobate (Sub-subsection VI.1.3) and Cassopolis Ice-Contact Ridges (Sub-subsection VI.2.2) (Albert 1995, Comer et al. 1995). Elsewhere in southern Lower Michigan, wet-mesic prairie was likely more limited in extent, occurring along stream headwaters, floodplains of larger streams and rivers, and lakeshores (NatureServe 2009).

Wet-mesic prairie occurs on mineral soils, ranging from loams and sandy loams to loamy sands and sandy clays (Sytsma and Phippen 1981, Chapman 1984, Kost et al. 2007). The top layer of the soil is often rich in organic matter derived from partially decomposed grass roots (Curtis 1959). Soils are typically circumneutral, with an average pH of 6.9 (range 5.5 to 7.7) documented for several Michigan wet and wet-mesic prairies (Chapman 1984). Wet-mesic prairie can develop where impermeable subsurface soil layers perch the water table, or where heavy precipitation events, snow melt, and over-the-bank flooding along streams cause brief periods of inundation (Curtis 1959). Despite these periods of inundation, the water table drops well below the ground surface over much of the growing season, permitting decomposition of organic matter (Curtis 1959). Thus, peat rarely accumulates in wet-mesic prairie. Wet-mesic prairie also develops on mineral soils influenced by groundwater seepage. Although wet-mesic prairie occurs on a variety of soil textures and landforms, a relatively high water table is characteristic of all sites.

Wet-mesic prairie is associated with a variety of natural community types. Adjacent uplands typically support fire-dependent systems, including oak barrens, oak openings, dry southern forest, and dry-mesic southern



forest. In southwestern Lower Michigan, where upland prairies were common, wet-mesic prairie occasionally graded into adjacent upland prairie types such as mesic prairie, mesic sand prairie, and dry-mesic prairie. A variety of open or forested wetland communities occur in adjacent lowlands, including southern wet meadow, prairie fen, wet prairie, southern shrub-carr, rich tamarack swamp, and southern hardwood swamp. Historically, wet-mesic prairie on glacial lakeplain was associated with extensive tracts of emergent marsh, lakeplain wet prairie, lakeplain oak openings, and wet-mesic flatwoods (Comer et al. 1995, Albert and Kost 1998a, 1998b, Kost et al. 2007). The concentration of wet-mesic prairie in a savanna landscape, instead of a prairie landscape, may account for differences in soils and plant species composition between wet-mesic prairies in southern Michigan, where savanna was historically dominant, and those in the “prairie states” to the west (see Vegetation section below).



Photo by Michael A. Kost

Indian grass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), one of the characteristic grasses of wet-mesic prairie, often forms dense stands on the sandy margins of prairie fens.

**Natural Processes:** The two primary natural disturbances integral to the development, structure, and stability of wet-mesic prairie are hydrologic fluctuation and fire. Wet-mesic prairie occurs in several hydrologic settings, including surface water depressions, surface water slopes, and groundwater slopes (Novitzki 1979, Brinson 1993). Surface water depressions occur above the water table, and receive most of their water from overland flow and precipitation. Water loss is through evapotranspiration. Surface water depressions occur on broad, flat landscapes, such as large outwash plains and glacial lakeplains, where impermeable subsurface clay

layers occur above the water table and cause seasonal inundation and ponding. Species composition in surface water depressions is regulated by spring and summer saturation or inundation followed by soil desiccation in late summer and fall, when the water table drops well below the soil surface. Surface water slope wetlands are similar to surface water depression wetlands, but occur on a slope that allows outflow of precipitation and runoff, usually adjacent to lakes, streams, and other water bodies. Seasonal water level fluctuations in these water bodies cause periods of inundation in adjacent wetlands (Novitzki 1979, Brinson 1993). Groundwater slope wetlands are associated with hydrologic breaks, such as where outwash channels bisect moraines (Novitzki 1979, Brinson 1993, Amon et al. 2002). In these areas, groundwater seepages rich in calcium and magnesium carbonates develop as a result of movement of groundwater through base-rich glacial deposits. Wetlands supported by steady groundwater seepage typically experience fairly stable hydrologic conditions during the year. In all three settings (surface water depressions, surface water slopes, and groundwater slopes), wet-mesic prairies are characterized by less frequent periods of soil saturation and inundation than wet prairies, which impacts vegetative composition and dominance patterns (see Vegetation section below) (Slaughter and Kost 2009).

As in other prairie and savanna communities, fire played a critical role in maintaining open conditions in wet-mesic prairie. The frequency and intensity of fire depended on a variety of factors including the type and volume of fuel, topography, presence of natural firebreaks, and density of Native Americans (Chapman 1984). In general, the probability of wide-ranging fire increases in level topography such as large outwash plains (Chapman 1984). Wet-mesic prairie associated with upland prairie on gently rolling outwash plains may have burned more frequently and/or more severely than small, isolated patches of wet-mesic prairie protected from fire by water bodies or topographic breaks. The frequency and intensity of fire was likely also affected by flooding and hydrologic dynamics. In the absence of fire, lowland grassland may succeed rapidly to savanna or forest due to favorable moisture conditions for the colonization and establishment of shrubs and trees (Curtis 1959, Faber-Langendoen and Maycock 1994).

While occasional lightning strikes resulted in fires that spread across the landscape, Native Americans were



the main sources of ignition. There are many early accounts of Native Americans intentionally setting fires to accomplish specific objectives (see Day 1953, Curtis 1959, Thompson and Smith 1970, Chapman 1984, Denevan 1992, Kay 1995). Native Americans intentionally set fires in the fall to clear briars and brush and make the land more easily passable. Frequent fires kept the land open, increasing both short- and long-range visibility, which facilitated large game hunting and provided a measure of safety from surprise attacks by neighboring tribes. Fire was used to increase productivity of berry crops and agricultural fields. As a habitat management tool, fires were used to maintain high quality forage for deer, elk, woodland caribou, bison and other game species. It was also used as a hunting tool to drive and encircle game. During warfare, fire was strategically employed to drive away advancing enemies, create cover for escape, and for waging attacks.

In addition to maintaining open conditions, fire plays a critical role in maintaining species diversity. A recensus of 54 prairie remnants in Wisconsin found a decline of 8% to 60% of the original plant species recorded at the sites in the span of 32 to 52 years, even though the sites appeared relatively undisturbed (Leach and Givnish 1996). The decline in diversity appeared to be the result of taller vegetation outcompeting species with small stature, those with small seeds (e.g., orchids), and those that rely on nitrogen-fixing symbioses, such as members of the legume family (Fabaceae). Because fire maintains open conditions and burns off accumulated leaf litter, species that require open microsites for seedling establishment and growth are able to acquire enough space and light to coexist with taller, denser vegetation. In the absence of frequent fires, small species are outcompeted by taller and denser vegetation, and seedlings with low nutrient reserves (i.e., species with small seeds) have difficulty growing through thick litter. The decline in species diversity is especially pronounced in mesic and wet community types where biomass accumulates rapidly. Because fire volatilizes much of the nitrogen stored in combustible vegetation, frequent burning also favors species that form nitrogen-fixing symbioses (e.g., legumes and rhizobium bacteria) by providing a competitive edge not found in unburned sites (Leach and Givnish 1996).

Fire also helps maintain species diversity by facilitating expression of the soil seed bank and promoting

seed germination and establishment. By consuming accumulated and standing leaf litter, fire increases light availability to the soil surface and increases diurnal temperature fluctuations, both of which trigger seed germination. Through burning accumulated litter and dead, standing vegetation, fire increases the availability of many important plant nutrients (e.g., N, P, K, Ca and Mg), which are thought to contribute to higher plant biomass, increased flowering and seed production, and greater palatability to herbivores following a burn (Vogl 1964, Daubenmire 1968, Viro 1974, Vogl 1974, Smith and Kadlec 1985, Abrams et al. 1986, Collins and Gibson 1990, Reich et al. 1990, Schmalzer and Hinkle 1992, Timmins 1992, Laubhan 1995, Warners 1997).

Animals also contribute to the development and persistence of wet-mesic prairie. Ants, particularly *Formica* spp., play an important role in mixing and aerating prairie soils (Curtis 1959, Trager 1998). Because of their abundance and frequent habit of abandoning old mounds and building new ones, ants overturn large portions of prairies in a relatively short time (Curtis 1959). Other important species contributing to the mixture and aeration of prairie soil include moles, voles, mice, skunks, ground hogs, ground squirrels, and badgers (Curtis 1959, Gibson 1989). Beaver, too, may have played an important role in maintaining wet-mesic prairies (Albert and Kost 1998a, 1998b). On the glacial lakeplain, lakeplain wet-mesic prairie occurred in a complex mosaic of other natural communities, including emergent marsh, lakeplain wet prairie, mesic sand prairie, lakeplain oak openings, wet-mesic flatwoods, and southern hardwood swamp. The interaction of fire, hydrology, and beaver activity resulted in dynamic flux among these community types on the poorly drained lakeplain landscape. Beaver also likely played an important role in maintaining inland wet-mesic prairie, in association with fire and hydrologic fluctuation. Following beaver flooding, graminoid and herb-dominated communities develop and sometimes persist for several decades (Terwilliger and Pastor 1999). The presence of numerous plant species typical of wet forests in lowland prairies, combined with their relatively rapid succession to shrubs and trees in the absence of frequent fires, suggests at least some occurrences of lowland prairie may result from flooding and/or catastrophic fire in wooded systems (Curtis 1959).



The role of grazing ungulates in lowland prairie, including wet-mesic prairie, is unclear (MNDNR 2005, Nelson 2005). Historically, large herbivores such as elk (wapiti) and, locally, bison, significantly influenced plant species diversity in Michigan prairie and oak savanna ecosystems. The diet of bison consists of 90 to 95% grasses and sedges (Steuter 1997). Wet and wet-mesic prairie may have been preferentially grazed during dry periods, when moisture conditions in lowlands were more favorable for forage growth (MNDNR 2005). As grazing ungulates selectively forage on grasses and sedges, they reduce the dominance of graminoids and provide a competitive advantage to forb species. The activities of bison, which include wallowing and trampling, promote plant species diversity by creating microsites for seed germination and seedling establishment and reducing the dominance of robust perennials (Steuter 1997). Bison were present in significant numbers for a relatively short time in Michigan and other states east of the Mississippi River, during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, and were quickly eliminated from the region by settlers in the early 1800s (Cochrane and Iltis 2000). In Michigan, bison appear to have been restricted to the extreme southern counties (Hornaday 1889; see accounts in Greenberg 2002).

**Vegetation Description:** Wet-mesic prairie is a grassland community generally dominated by a single layer of dominant grasses 1-2 m in height (NatureServe 2009). Dominant species include big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*), Indian grass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), bluejoint grass (*Calamagrostis canadensis*), and sedges (including *Carex bebbii* and *C. stricta*) (Kost et al. 2007, Chapman and Brewer 2008). Other characteristic herbaceous species in Michigan include little bluestem (*Andropogon scoparius*), Indian hemp (*Apocynum cannabinum*), eastern lined aster (*Aster lanceolatus*), New England aster (*Aster novae-angliae*), fringed brome (*Bromus ciliatus*), joe-pye-weed (*Eupatorium maculatum*), boneset (*E. perfoliatum*), grass-leaved goldenrod (*Euthamia graminifolia*), wild strawberry (*Fragaria virginiana*), bottle gentian (*Gentiana andrewsii*), lesser fringed gentian (*Gentianopsis procera*), tall sunflower (*Helianthus giganteus*), marsh pea (*Lathyrus palustris*), Michigan lily (*Lilium michiganense*), common water horehound (*Lycopus americanus*), whorled loosestrife (*Lysimachia quadriflora*), wild bergamot (*Monarda fistulosa*), leafy satin grass (*Muhlenbergia mexicana*), grass-of-Parnassus (*Parnassia glauca*), common

mountain mint (*Pycnanthemum virginianum*), tall goldenrod (*Solidago altissima*), late goldenrod (*S. gigantea*), old-field goldenrod (*S. nemoralis*), Riddell's goldenrod (*S. riddellii*), rough goldenrod (*S. rugosa*), purple meadow-rue (*Thalictrum dasycarpum*), marsh fern (*Thelypteris palustris*), and golden alexanders (*Zizia aurea*) (Kost et al. 2007). Reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) and lawn prunella (*Prunella vulgaris*) are common non-native species.

Shrubs that occasionally occur within wet-mesic prairie include shrubby cinquefoil (*Potentilla fruticosa*), which is an occasional dominant, silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*), gray dogwood (*C. foemina*), red-osier dogwood (*C. stolonifera*), ninebark (*Physocarpus opulifolius*), Bebb's willow (*Salix bebbiana*), pussy willow (*S. discolor*), sandbar willow (*S. exigua*), prairie willow (*S. humilis*), and meadowsweet (*Spiraea alba*). Scattered tree species may include red maple (*Acer rubrum*), tamarack (*Larix laricina*), black cherry (*Prunus serotina*), and quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*). Woody species increase in the absence of fire (NatureServe 2009).



Big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*) and cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*) dominate a small wet-mesic prairie in Barry County.

Because grassland on mineral soils characterized by wet-mesic hydrology occurs in a variety of landscape settings and in association with a variety of upland and wetland natural communities, species composition can vary significantly among sites. Many characteristic species of lowland prairie are of Alleghenian and/or Ozarkian origin, resulting in floristic dissimilarities to upland prairies, which have a higher concentration of species of Great Plains, Arco-Tertiary, and



Cordilleran affinity (Curtis 1959, Cochrane and Iltis 2000). Michigan is situated at the eastern edge of the “Prairie Peninsula” (see Transeau 1935) and is strongly influenced by floristic elements originating in wet meadows in the eastern United States, as opposed to species originating in the prairies of the western United States (Curtis 1959). Thus, many lowland prairies in Michigan bear stronger resemblance to wet meadows than to lowland grasslands in Wisconsin and other states more extensively colonized by species of western affinity following glacial retreat (Cochrane and Iltis 2000, Chapman and Brewer 2008).

**Noteworthy Animal Species:** Ants can turn over large portions of prairies in a relatively short time through mound construction and abandonment, creating microsites for germination of small-seeded species (Curtis 1959, Trager 1998). Moles, voles, mice, skunks, ground hogs, ground squirrels, and badgers mix and aerate prairie soil. Beaver can cause flooding that substantially alters wetland community structure, converting lowland shrub and forest systems to pond, emergent marsh, wet meadow, wet prairie, wet-mesic prairie, and wet-mesic sand prairie, depending on landscape position, soils, and depth and duration of flooding (Terwilliger and Pastor 1999). Large ungulates may have affected regeneration and competitive interactions among plant species through grazing, browsing, and trampling activities.

**Rare Species:** Wet-mesic prairie provides potential habitat for 11 rare plant species and 20 rare animal species. The drastic decline in number of sites and total acreage of wet-mesic prairie has likely contributed to the rarity of several plant species listed in the table below.

**Rare Plants Associated with Wet-mesic Prairie** (E, Endangered; T, Threatened; SC, species of special concern; X, presumed extirpated from Michigan).

Scientific Name	Common Name	State Status
<i>Dodecatheon meadia</i>	shooting star	E
<i>Eryngium yuccifolium</i>	rattlesnake-master	T
<i>Mimulus alatus</i>	winged monkey flower	X
<i>Platanthera ciliaris</i>	orange- or yellow-fringed orchid	E
<i>Polemonium reptans</i>	Jacob’s ladder	T
<i>Polygala incarnata</i>	pink milkwort	X
<i>Pycnanthemum muticum</i>	broad-leaved mountain mint	T
<i>Rudbeckia subtomentosa</i>	sweet coneflower	X
<i>Scleria triglomerata</i>	tall nut-rush	SC
<i>Silphium integrifolium</i>	rosinweed	T
<i>Sisyrinchium fuscatum</i>	Farwell’s blue-eyed-grass	X
<i>Sporobolus heterolepis</i>	prairie dropseed	SC



Photo by Bradford S. Slaughter

Rattlesnake-master (*Eryngium yuccifolium*) is a state-threatened forb associated with wet-mesic prairie and other prairie communities. The distinctive, glaucous basal leaves, with their thread-like marginal teeth, are unmistakable.

**Rare Animals Associated with Wet-mesic Prairie** (E, Endangered; T, Threatened; SC, species of special concern; LE, Federally Endangered).

Scientific Name	Common Name	State Status
<i>Anmodramus savannarum</i>	grasshopper sparrow	SC
<i>Asio flammeus</i>	short-eared owl	E
<i>Botaurus lentiginosus</i>	American bittern	SC
<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	northern harrier	SC
<i>Clemmys guttata</i>	spotted turtle	T
<i>Clonophis kirtlandii</i>	Kirtland’s snake	E
<i>Dorydiella kansana</i>	leafhopper	SC
<i>Emydoidea blandingii</i>	Blanding’s turtle	SC
<i>Meropleon ambifusca</i>	Newman’s brocade	SC
<i>Neoconocephalus lyristes</i>	bog conehead	SC
<i>Neoconocephalus retusus</i>	conehead grasshopper	SC
<i>Neonympha m. mitchellii</i>	Mitchell’s satyr	E; LE
<i>Orphulella pelidna</i>	green desert grasshopper	SC
<i>Pantherophis spiloides</i>	gray ratsnake	SC
<i>Papaipema cerina</i>	golden borer	SC
<i>Papaipema speciosissima</i>	regal fern borer	SC
<i>Sistrurus c. catenatus</i>	eastern massasauga	SC
<i>Spartiniphaga inops</i>	spartina moth	SC
<i>Spiza americana</i>	dickcissel	SC
<i>Tyto alba</i>	barn owl	E

**Conservation and Biodiversity Management:** Wet-mesic prairie is imperiled in Michigan, and efforts should be taken to identify, protect, and manage intact remnants. Primary threats to wet-mesic prairie include fire suppression, hydrologic alteration, and invasive



species. For specific management strategies and recommendations, see Packard and Mutel (1997) and O'Connor (2006).

Managing wet-mesic prairie requires frequent burning. Burn intervals longer than one to three years will result in tree and tall shrub encroachment. Prescribed burning is required to protect and enhance plant species diversity and prevent encroachment of trees and tall shrubs, which, in the absence of fire, outcompete light-dependent grasses and forbs. Long-term fire suppression is associated with local extinctions of plant species in otherwise intact prairie remnants (Leach and Givnish 1996). In addition to prescribed fire, brush cutting accompanied by stump application of herbicide is an important component of prairie restoration. While fires frequently kill woody seedlings, long-established trees and tall shrubs such as black cherry (*Prunus serotina*) and dogwoods (*Cornus* spp.) typically resprout and can reach former levels of dominance within two to three years. Herbicide application to cut stumps will prevent resprouting.



Photo by MNFI staff

Prescribed fire is a critical component of wet-mesic prairie management and restoration. Burns implemented every one to three years restrict encroachment of woody species and create conditions suitable for the maintenance of plant species diversity.

To reduce the impacts of management on fire intolerant species, prescribed burns should be conducted on a rotating schedule in which adjacent management units are burned in alternate years. Insect species that are restricted to prairie habitats have already experienced severe losses in the amount of available habitat due to forest succession brought on by years of fire

suppression. By burning adjacent management units in alternate years, insect species from unburned units may be able to recolonize burned areas (Panzer et al. 1995). Avian species diversity is also thought to be enhanced by managing large areas as a mosaic of burned and unburned patches (Herkert et al. 1993). Because fire is a landscape-scale natural process, burn plans for small wet-mesic prairie remnants should include, wherever possible, adjacent fire-dependent upland (e.g., oak barrens, dry-mesic southern forest) and lowland (e.g., prairie fen, southern wet meadow) systems.

Prairie ants (*Formica* spp.) are an extremely important component of grassland communities and research indicates that they respond with population increases to restoration activities, especially prescribed fire (Trager 1998). Prescribed burning shifts dominance of ant species from carpenter and woodland ants (*Camponotus* spp. and *Aphaenogaster* spp.) to prairie ants because it reduces woody vegetation and detritus used by the arboreal and litter- and twig-nesting species in favor of species restricted to grassland habitats (Trager 1998). Restorations involving prairie plantings near old fields or remnant prairies are typically colonized by several species of prairie ants within a few years (Trager 1990, Lane and BassiriRad 2005).

Protection of groundwater and surface water hydrology is critical to maintaining the integrity of wet-mesic prairie. Agricultural development, including the installation of ditches and drain tiles and conversion of much of the land surface to row crops, has resulted in significant landscape-scale hydrologic alteration, including increased flooding and extended periods of water table drawdown (Chapman and Brewer 2008). Hydrologic disturbances, including altered water chemistry and water level fluctuations, have been shown to favor annuals and invasive perennials at the expense of native perennial species in wet meadows (Galatowitsch et al. 2000). Reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), an aggressive invader of graminoid-dominated wetlands (including wet-mesic prairie), increases in importance following floods of high intensity or long duration (Kercher and Zedler 2004a). This species and cat-tails (*Typha* spp.) are highly flood tolerant and can be expected to increase in disturbed landscapes at the expense of flood intolerant species, which include several characteristic wet-mesic prairie species (e.g., fringed brome [*Bromus ciliatus*], bluejoint grass [*Calamagrostis canadensis*], joe-pye-



weed [*Eupatorium maculatum*], Riddell's goldenrod [*Solidago riddellii*], and cordgrass [*Spartina pectinata*] (Galatowitsch et al. 2000, Kercher and Zedler 2004b). Nutrient enrichment and sedimentation are additional disturbance factors that favor expansion of reed canary grass (Kercher and Zedler 2004a). The interaction of flooding, sedimentation, and nutrient enrichment can lead to significant mortality of native species and rapid growth and spread of reed canary grass (Kercher and Zedler 2004b, Kercher et al. 2007).

Invasive plant species are a significant threat to wet-mesic prairie. In addition to reed canary grass, species of particular concern include narrow-leaved cat-tail (*Typha angustifolia*), hybrid cat-tail (*T. xglauca*), common reed (*Phragmites australis*), Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*), reedtop (*Agrostis gigantea*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), glossy buckthorn (*Rhamnus frangula*), common buckthorn (*R. cathartica*), multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*), and autumn olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*). Fragmentation and isolation of wet-mesic prairie occurrences by residential, commercial, and industrial development threatens this natural community type by restricting dispersal of native species and increasing the spread of commonly planted non-native herbs, shrubs, and trees. Monitoring and removal of invasive species should focus on those species that threaten to alter community composition, structure, and function. Management activities should avoid soil and hydrologic disturbances that favor the spread of invasive plant species.



Photo by Michael R. Penskar

Wet-mesic prairie often occurs as narrow ecotonal bands at the margins of prairie fen, where the community is subject to encroachment by invasive plant species, including autumn olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*, background).

**Research Needs:** A systematic survey for wet-mesic prairie in Michigan, including the collection of plot data, is necessary to assess the statewide and ecoregional conservation status of this natural community type, and to assess variation in the community type across its range. Quantitative data on vegetative composition and structure will allow more precise classification of lowland grasslands, including wet-mesic prairie, wet-mesic sand prairie, and wet prairie.

Continued research on the interaction of anthropogenic and natural disturbances and invasion by native and non-native invasive species will promote the development of improved management and restoration techniques. Additional studies of the natural disturbances that shape and maintain wet-mesic prairie will lead to a better understanding of this community type in relation to other prairie and open wetland types. In particular, detailed studies of hydrologic dynamics could be conducted to elucidate differences between wet-mesic prairie and wet prairie.

**Similar Communities:** Wet-mesic prairie occupies the position on the moisture gradient between *wet prairie*, which occurs on wetter soils and has higher importance of wetland species and lower importance of prairie grasses and forbs, and *mesic prairie*, which occurs on moderately-well drained upland soils and has low importance of wetland species (Kost 2004, Slaughter and Kost 2010). *Lakeplain wet-mesic prairie* is a variant of wet-mesic prairie occurring on postglacial lakeplain, primarily in southeastern Lower Michigan (Albert and Kost 1998a). *Lakeplain wet prairie* is the lakeplain variant of wet prairie (Albert and Kost 1998b). *Wet-mesic sand prairie* occurs on deep, seasonally saturated sands associated with flat to gently rolling sandy outwash plains and lakeplain, concentrated in western Lower Michigan (Kost and Slaughter 2008). *Southern wet meadow* is a sedge-dominated wetland on peat soils with low importance of prairie grasses and forbs (Kost 2001). *Prairie fen* is a graminoid- and low shrub-dominated wetland on peat soils associated with inputs of carbonate-rich groundwater (Spieles et al. 1999).

#### Other Classifications:

**Michigan Natural Features Inventory Land Cover Mapping Code:** 6251 (Inland Wet-Mesic Prairie)

**MNFI circa 1800 Vegetation:** Wet Prairie



**Michigan Resource Information Systems (MIRIS)** (MDNR 1978): 625 (Wet Prairie)

**Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR):** G – Grass

**MDNR IFMAP** (MDNR 2001): Emergent Wetland

**NatureServe U.S. National Vegetation Classification and International Classification of Ecological Communities** (Faber-Langendoen 2001, NatureServe 2009):

CODE; ALLIANCE; ASSOCIATION;  
COMMON NAME

V.A.5.N.a; *Andropogon gerardii* – *Calamagrostis canadensis*, *Panicum virgatum*)  
Herbaceous Alliance; *Andropogon gerardii* – *Panicum virgatum* – *Helianthus grosseserratus*  
Herbaceous Vegetation; Central Wet-Mesic Tallgrass Prairie

**Other states and Canadian provinces** (natural community types with significant overlap with Michigan wet-mesic prairie indicated in *italics*):

- MN: Northern wet prairie; *Southern wet prairie*; Prairie wet meadow/carr (MNDNR 2005)
- WI: *Wet-mesic prairie* (Epstein et al. 2002)
- IL: *Wet-mesic prairie*; Wet-mesic sand prairie (White and Madany 1978)
- IN: Wet prairie; Wet-mesic sand prairie (Jacquart et al. 2002)
- ON: Tallgrass meadow marsh ecosite; Fresh-moist tallgrass prairie ecosite (Lee et al. 1998)
- OH: Slough grass – bluejoint prairie; Big bluestem prairie (Anderson 1982)

**Related Abstracts:** bur oak plains, dry sand prairie, dry-mesic prairie, lakeplain oak openings, lakeplain wet prairie, lakeplain wet-mesic prairie, mesic prairie, mesic sand prairie, oak barrens, oak openings, prairie fen, southern wet meadow, wet prairie, wet-mesic sand prairie, short-eared owl, American bittern, northern harrier, spotted turtle, Blanding's turtle, Mitchell's satyr, regal fern borer, eastern massasauga, shooting star, wing-stemmed monkey-flower, Jacob's ladder, orange or yellow fringed orchid, pink milkwort.

## References:

- Abrams, M.D., A.K. Knapp, and L.C. Hulbert. 1986. A ten year record of aboveground biomass in a Kansas tallgrass prairie: Effects of fire and topographic position. *American Journal of Botany* 73: 1509-1515.
- Albert, D.A. 1995. Regional landscape ecosystems of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin: A working map and classification. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-178. St. Paul, MN: USDA, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station, St. Paul, MN. <http://nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/242> (Version 03JUN1998). 250 pp.
- Albert, D.A., S.R. Denton, and B.V. Barnes. 1986. Regional landscape ecosystems of Michigan. School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. 32 pp.
- Albert, D.A., and M.A. Kost. 1998a. Natural community abstract for lakeplain wet-mesic prairie. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 4 pp.
- Albert, D.A., and M.A. Kost. 1998b. Natural community abstract for lakeplain wet prairie. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 4 pp.
- Albert, D.A., J.G. Cohen, M.A. Kost, B.S. Slaughter, and H.D. Enander. 2008. Distribution Maps of Michigan's Natural Communities. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Report No. 2008-01, Lansing, MI. 174 pp.
- Amon, J.P., C.A. Thompson, Q.J. Carpenter, and J. Miner. 2002. Temperate zone fens of the glaciated Midwestern USA. *Wetlands* 22: 301-317.
- Anderson, D.M. 1982. Plant communities of Ohio: A preliminary classification and description. Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Columbus, OH.
- Barnes, B.V. 1991. Deciduous forests of North America. Pp. 229-344 in E. Röhrig and B. Ulrich, eds., *Ecosystems of the World 7: Temperate Deciduous Forests*. Elsevier Publishing, New York.
- Brinson, M.M. 1993. A hydrogeomorphic classification for wetlands. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station. Wetlands Research Program Technical Report WRP-DE-4. 79 pp. + appendices.
- Chapman, K.A. 1984. An ecological investigation of native grassland in southern Lower Michigan. M.S. Thesis, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. 235 pp.
- Chapman, K.A., and R. Brewer. 2008. Prairie and savanna in southern Lower Michigan: History, classification, ecology. *Michigan Botanist* 47: 1-48.



- Cochrane, T.S., and H.H. Iltis. 2000. Atlas of the Wisconsin prairie and savanna flora. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Technical Bulletin No. 191, Madison, Wisconsin. 226 pp.
- Collins, S.L., and D.J. Gibson. 1990. Effects of fire on community structure in tallgrass and mixed grass prairie. Pp. 81-98 in S.L. Collins and L.L. Wallace, eds., *Fire in North American Tallgrass Prairies*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.
- Comer, P.J., D.A. Albert, H.A. Wells, B.L. Hart, J.B. Raab, D.L. Price, D.M. Kashian, R.A. Corner, and D.W. Schuen. 1995. Michigan's presettlement vegetation, as interpreted from the General Land Office Surveys 1816-1856. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. Digital map.
- Curtis, J.T. 1959. The Vegetation of Wisconsin: An Ordination of Plant Communities. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI. 657 pp.
- Daubenmire, R. 1968. Ecology of fire in grasslands. *Advances in Ecological Research* 5: 209-266.
- Day, G.M. 1953. The Indian as an ecological factor in the northeastern forest. *Ecology* 34: 329-346.
- Denevan, W.M. 1992. The pristine myth: The landscape of the Americas in 1492. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 83: 369-385.
- Epstein, E., E. Judziewicz, and E. Spencer. 2002. Wisconsin Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) recognized natural communities – working document. September 2002 revision. Wisconsin Natural Heritage Inventory, Madison, WI.
- Faber-Langendoen, D., ed. 2001. Plant communities of the Midwest: Classification in an ecological context. NatureServe, Arlington, VA.
- Faber-Langendoen, D., and P.F. Maycock. 1994. A vegetation analysis of tallgrass prairie in southern Ontario. Pp. 17-32 in R.G. Wicket, P.D. Lewis, A. Woodliffe, and P. Pratt, eds., *Proceedings of the Thirteenth North American Prairie Conference, 1992*, Windsor, Ontario. Department of Parks and Recreation, Windsor, Ontario.
- Galatowitsch, S.M., D.C. Whited, R. Lehtinen, J. Husveth, and K. Schik. 2000. The vegetation of wet meadows in relation to their land-use. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 60: 121-144.
- Gibson, D.J. 1989. Effects of animal disturbance on tallgrass prairie vegetation. *American Midland Naturalist* 121: 144-154.
- Greenberg, J. 2002. A Natural History of the Chicago Region. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 592 pp.
- Herkert, J.R., R.E. Szafoni, V.M. Kleen, and J.E. Schwegman. 1993. Habitat establishment, enhancement and management for forest and grassland birds in Illinois. Division of Natural Heritage, Illinois Department of Conservation, Natural Heritage Technical Publication #1, Springfield, Illinois. 20 pp.
- Hornaday, W.T. 1889. The extermination of the American bison, with a sketch of its discovery and life history. Annual Report 1887, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Jacquot, E., M. Homoya, and L. Casebere. 2002. Natural communities of Indiana: 7/1/02 Working draft. Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Nature Preserves, Indianapolis, IN. 19 pp.
- Kay, C.E. 1995. Aboriginal overkill and Native burning: Implications for modern ecosystem management. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry* 10: 121-126.
- Kercher, S.M., and J.B. Zedler. 2004a. Multiple disturbances accelerate invasion of reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.) in a mesocosm study. *Oecologia* 138: 455-464.
- Kercher, S.M., and J.B. Zedler. 2004b. Flood tolerance in wetland angiosperms: A comparison of invasive and noninvasive species. *Aquatic Botany* 80: 89-102.
- Kercher, S.M., A. Herr-Turoff, and J.B. Zedler. 2007. Understanding invasion as a process: The case of *Phalaris arundinacea* in wet prairies. *Biological Invasions* 9: 657-665.
- Kost, M.A. 2001. Natural community abstract for southern wet meadow. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 5 pp.
- Kost, M.A. 2004. Natural community abstract for mesic prairie. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 10 pp.
- Kost, M.A., D.A. Albert, J.G. Cohen, B.S. Slaughter, R.K. Schillo, C.R. Weber, and K.A. Chapman. 2007. Natural Communities of Michigan: Classification and Description. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Report No. 2007-21, Lansing, MI. 314 pp.
- Kost, M.A., and B.S. Slaughter. 2008. Natural community abstract for wet-mesic sand prairie. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 8 pp.
- Lane, D.R., and H. BassiriRad. 2005. Diminishing effects of ant mounds on soil heterogeneity across a chronosequence of prairie restoration sites. *Pedobiologia* 49: 359-366.



- Laubhan, M.K. 1995. Effects of prescribed fire on moist-soil vegetation and macronutrients. *Wetlands* 15: 159-166.
- Leach, M.K., and T.J. Givnish. 1996. Ecological determinants of species loss in remnant prairies. *Science* 273: 1555-1558.
- Lee, H.T., W.D. Bakowsky, J. Riley, J. Bowles, M. Puddister, P. Uhlig, and S. McMurray. 1998. Ecological land classification for southern Ontario: First approximation and its application. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Southcentral Science Section, Science Development and Transfer Branch. SCSS Field Guide FG-02.
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), Resource Inventory Program (MRIP). 1978. Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) Landcover 1978. Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, MI. Digital dataset.
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). 2001. IFMAP/GAP Lower Peninsula Land Cover (produced as part of the IFMAP natural resources decision support system). Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, MI. Digital dataset and report.
- Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI). 2010. Biotics Database. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI.
- Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR). 2005. Field guide to the native plant communities of Minnesota: The Prairie Parkland and Tallgrass Aspen Parklands Provinces. Ecological Land Classification Program, Minnesota County Biological Survey, and Natural Heritage and Nongame Research Program. MNDNR, St. Paul, MN.
- NatureServe. 2009. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer>. (Accessed: January 12, 2010).
- Nelson, P.W. 2005. The Terrestrial Natural Communities of Missouri. Missouri Natural Areas Committee, Jefferson City, Missouri.
- Novitzki, R.P. 1979. Hydrologic characteristics of Wisconsin's wetlands and their influence on floods, stream flow, and sediment. Pp. 377-388 in P.E. Greeson, J.R. Clark, and J.E. Clark, eds., *Wetland Functions and Values: The State of Our Understanding*. American Water Resources Association, Minneapolis, MN.
- O'Connor, R.P. 2006. A land managers guide to prairies and savannas in Michigan: History, classification, and management. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Report No. 2006-18, Lansing, MI. 58 pp.
- Packard, S., and C.F. Mutel, eds. 1997. *The Tallgrass Restoration Handbook for Prairies, Savannas, and Woodlands*. Island Press, Washington, D.C. 463 pp.
- Panzer, R.D., D. Stillwaugh, R. Gnaedinger, and G. Derkowitz. 1995. Prevalence of remnant dependence among prairie- and savanna-inhabiting insects of the Chicago region. *Natural Areas Journal* 15: 101-116.
- Reich, P.B., M.D. Abrams, D.S. Ellsworth, E.L. Kruger, and T.J. Tabone. 1990. Fire affects ecophysiology and community dynamics of Central Wisconsin oak forest regeneration. *Ecology* 71: 2179-2190.
- Schmalzer, P.A., and C.R. Hinkle. 1992. Soil dynamics following fire in *Juncus* and *Spartina* marshes. *Wetlands* 12: 8-21.
- Slaughter, B.S., and M.A. Kost. 2010. Natural community abstract for wet prairie. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 11 pp.
- Smith, L.M., and J.A. Kadlec. 1985. Fire and herbivory in a Great Salt Lake marsh. *Ecology* 66: 259-265.
- Spieles, J.B., P.J. Comer, D.A. Albert, and M.A. Kost. 1999. Natural community abstract for prairie fen. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 4 pp.
- Steuter, A.A. 1997. Bison. Pp. 339-347 in S. Packard and C.F. Mutel, eds., *The Tallgrass Restoration Handbook for Prairies, Savannas, and Woodlands*. Island Press, Washington, D.C. 463 pp.
- Sytsma, K.J., and R.W. Pippen. 1981. The Hampton Creek wetland complex in southwestern Michigan: II. Community classification. *Michigan Botanist* 20: 147-156.
- Terwilliger, J., and J. Pastor. 1999. Small mammals, ectomycorrhizae, and conifer succession in beaver meadows. *Oikos* 85: 83-94.
- Thompson, D.Q., and R.H. Smith. 1970. The forest primeval in the Northeast – a great myth? *Proceedings of the Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference* 10: 255-265.
- Timmins, S.M. 1992. Wetland vegetation recovery after fire: Eweburn Bog, Te Anau, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Botany* 30: 383-399.
- Trager, J.C. 1990. Restored prairies colonized by native prairie ants (Missouri, Illinois). *Restoration and Management Notes* 8: 104-105.



- Trager, J.C. 1998. An introduction to ants (Formicidae) of the tallgrass prairie. *Missouri Prairie Journal* 18: 4-8.
- Transeau, E.N. 1935. The prairie peninsula. *Ecology* 16:423-437.
- Urban, M.A. 2005. An uninhabited waste: Transforming the Grand Prairie in nineteenth century Illinois, USA. *Journal of Historical Geography* 31: 647-665.
- Viro, P.J. 1974. Effects of forest fire on soil. Pp. 7-45 in T.T. Kozlowski and C.E. Ahlgren, eds., *Fire and Ecosystems*. Academic Press, New York, New York.
- Vogl, R.J. 1964. The effects of fire on a muskeg in northern Wisconsin. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 28: 317-329.
- Vogl, R.J. 1974. Effects of fire on grasslands. Pp. 139-194 in T.T. Kozlowski and C.E. Ahlgren, eds., *Fire and Ecosystems*. Academic Press, New York, New York.
- Warners, D.P. 1997. Plant diversity in sedge meadows: Effects of groundwater and fire. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. 231 pp.
- White, J. and M.H. Madany. 1978. Classification of natural communities in Illinois. Pp. 310-405 in J. White, ed. *Illinois natural areas inventory technical report*. Illinois Natural Areas Inventory, Urbana, IL. 426 pp.

**Abstract Citation:**

- Slaughter, B.S., and M.A.Kost. 2010. Natural community abstract for wet-mesic prairie. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI. 13 pp.

Updated June 2010.

Copyright 2010 Michigan State University Board of Trustees.

Michigan State University Extension is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity organization.

Funding for this abstract was provided by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 through the Wetland Grant Program.

