WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF
Natural Resources
Peter Goldmark - Commissioner of Public Lands

This document is part of a collection of Ecological Integrity Assessments addressing 67 of Washington's 99 Ecological Systems. These documents were prepared by the Washington Natural Heritage Program with funding provided by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Ecological Integrity Assessment:
Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow

Ecological Summary

The Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow ecological system is a high-elevation (montane to alpine) wetland mostly found west of or near the Cascade crest and in the Olympics. Sites have mineral soils and are dominated by herbaceous species, typically graminoids on wet sites with very low-velocity surface and subsurface water flows. It is a small patch system which occurs among montane and subalpine forests from California's Transverse and Peninsular ranges north to the Alaskan coastal forests at varying elevations depending on latitude. Sites are open wet depressions, basins and flats that are usually seasonally wet, often drying by late summer. Many sites occur in a tension zone between perennial wetlands and uplands, where water tables fluctuate in response to long-term climatic cycles. Seasonal surface water depths rarely exceed a few centimeters if present. Soils show typical hydric soil characteristics, including high organic content (often with histic epipedons) and/or low chroma and redoximorphic features. Site often are associated with groundwater discharge or seasonally high water tables. The system is often tightly associated with snowmelt and typically not subjected to high disturbance events such as flooding.

The Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow ecological system occurs as a mosaic of several plant associations with various dominant herbaceous species that may include *Camassia quamash*, *Carex bolanderi*, *Carex utriculata*, *Carex exsiccata*, *Dodecatheon jeffreyi*, *Glyceria striata* (= *Glyceria elata*), *Carex nigricans*, *Calamagrostis canadensis*, *Juncus nevadensis*, *Caltha leptosepala* ssp. *howellii*, *Veratrum californicum*, and *Scirpus* and/or *Schoenoplectus* spp. Trees occur peripherally or on elevated microsites and include *Picea engelmannii*, *Abies lasiocarpa*, *Abies amabilis*, *Tsuga mertensiana*, and *Chamaecyparis nootkatensis*. Common shrubs may include *Salix* spp., *Vaccinium uliginosum*, and *Betula nana*.

Sites with soils over 40 cm of organic matter would be classified as North Pacific Bog and Fen ecological system. Geography distinguish this from the similar Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow, which occurs to the east of the coastal and Cascade mountain ranges, and the Boreal Wet Meadow, which occurs further north and east in boreal regions where the climatic regime is generally colder than that of the Rockies or Pacific Northwest regions. Floristics of these three systems is somewhat similar, but there are differences related to biogeographic affinities of the species composing the vegetation.

Stressors

The stressors described below are those primarily associated with the loss of extent and degradation of the ecological integrity of existing occurrences. The stressors are the cause of the system shifting away from its natural range of variability. In other words, type, intensity, and duration of these stressors is what moves a system's ecological integrity rank away from the expected, natural condition (e.g. A rank) toward degraded integrity ranks (i.e. B, C, or D).

Historic and contemporary land use practices have impacted hydrologic, geomorphic, and biotic structure and function of wetlands in western Washington. Higher elevation wetlands are less altered than lowland wetlands even though they have undergone modification as well. Reservoirs, water diversions, ditches, roads, and human land uses in the contributing watershed can induce lower water tables and contribute excess nutrients and sediment. Increased nutrients can alter species composition by allowing aggressive, invasive species to displace native. Human land uses in adjacent and upland areas can fragment the landscape and thereby reduce connectivity between wet meadow patches and between wetland and upland areas. The intensity and types of land use within and near wet meadows can have a significant affect on plant community composition. Direct alteration of hydrology (i.e., channeling, draining, damming) or indirect alteration (i.e., roading or removing vegetation on adjacent slopes) results in changes in amount and pattern of herbaceous wetland habitat. Livestock management can impact wet meadows by compacting soil, pugging (creation of pedestals by hooves) on the soil surface, altering nutrient concentrations and cycles, changing surface and subsurface water movement and infiltration, and shifting species composition. In general, excessive livestock or native ungulate use leads to a shift in plant species composition. Non-native plants or animals, which can have wide-ranging impacts, also tend to increase with these stressors. Although most wetlands some receive regulatory protection at the national, state, and county level, many wetlands have been and continued to be filled, drained, and grazed in the Washington. Montane wetlands are less altered than lowland wetlands even though they have undergone modification as well. Non-native species can displace native species, alter hydrology, alter structure, and affect food web dynamics by changing the quantity, type, and accessibility to food for fauna. Wetland dominated by non-native, invasive species typically support fewer native animals. Wet meadows are susceptible to invasion by many non-native species, especially pasture grasses such as *Poa pratensis* and *Phleum pratense* as well as exotics species common to other wetland types such as *Cirsium arvense* and *Taraxacum officinale*. *Phalaris arundinacea* is also common exotics in wet meadows. Native increasers such as *Juncus arcticus*, *Iris missouriensis*, *Argentea anserina*, and *Dasiphora floribunda* often increase with overgrazing and or changes in the water table.

Conceptual Ecological Model

The general relationships among the key ecological attributes associated with this system are presented in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Conceptual Ecological Model for Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow

Ecological Integrity Assessments

The assessment of ecological integrity can be done at three levels of intensity depending on the purpose and design of the data collection effort. The three-level approach is intended to provide increasing accuracy of ecological integrity assessment, recognizing that not all conservation and management decisions need equal levels of accuracy. The three-level approach also allows users to choose their assessment based in part on the level of classification that is available or targeted. If classification is limited to the level of forests vs. wetlands vs. grasslands, the use of remote sensing metrics may be sufficient. If very specific, fine-scale forest, wetland, and grassland types are the classification target then one has the flexibility to decide to use any of the three

levels, depending on the need of the assessment. In other words, there is no presumption that a fine-level of classification requires a fine-level of ecological integrity assessment.

Because the purpose is the same for all three levels of assessment (to measure the status of ecological integrity of a site) it is important that the Level 1 assessment use the same kinds of metrics and major attributes as used at Levels 2 and 3. Level 1 assessments rely almost entirely on Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and remote sensing data to obtain information about landscape integrity and the distribution and abundance of ecological types in the landscape or watershed. Level 2 assessments use relatively rapid field-based metrics that are a combination of qualitative and narrative-based rating with quantitative or semi-quantitative ratings. Field observations are required for many metrics, and observations will typically require professional expertise and judgment. Level 3 assessments require more rigorous, intensive field-based methods and metrics that provide higher-resolution information on the integrity of occurrences. They often use quantitative, plot-based protocols coupled with a sampling design to provide data for detailed metrics.

Although the three levels can be integrated into a monitoring framework, each level is developed as a stand-alone method for assessing ecological integrity. **When conducting an ecological integrity assessment, one need only complete a single level that is appropriate to the study at hand.** Typically only one level may be needed, desirable, or cost effective. But for this reason it is very important that each level provide a comparable approach to assessing integrity, else the ratings and ranks will not achieve comparable information if multiple levels are used.

Level 1 EIA

A generalized Level 1 EIA is provided in Rocchio and Crawford (2009). Please refer to that document for the list of metrics applicable to this ecological system.

Ecological Integrity Assessments (Level 2 and 3)

The following tables display the metrics chosen to measure most of the key ecological attributes in the conceptual ecological model above. The EIA is used to assess the ecological condition of an assessment area, which may be the same as the element occurrence or a subset of that occurrence based on abrupt changes in condition or on artificial boundaries such as management areas. **Unless otherwise noted, metric ratings apply to both Level 2 and Level 3 EIAs. The difference between the two is that a Level 3 EIA will use more intensive and precise methods to determine metric ratings.** To calculate ranks, each metric is ranked in the field according the ranking categories listed below. Then, the rank and point total for each metric is entered into the EIA Scorecard and multiplied by the weight factor associated with each metric resulting in a metric 'score'. Metric scores within a key ecological attribute are then summed to arrive at a score (or rank). These are then tallied in the same way to arrive at an overall ecological integrity score.

Table 1. Temperate Pacific Subalpine-Montane Wet Meadow Level 2 EIA.

Metric	Justification	Rank			
		A (5 pts.)	B (4 pts.)	C (3 pts.)	D (1 pts.)
Rank Factor: LANDSCAPE CONTEXT					
Key Ecological Attribute: *Buffer Effects*					
Buffer Length	The buffer can be important to biotic and abiotic aspects of the wetland as it provides connectivity and provides a 'filter' from exogenous threats.	Buffer is > 75 – 100% of occurrence perimeter.	Buffer is > 50 – 74% of occurrence perimeter.	Buffer is 25 – 49% of occurrence perimeter	Buffer is < 25% of occurrence perimeter.
Buffer Width		Average buffer width of occurrence is > 200 m, adjusted for slope.	Average buffer width is 100 – 199 m, after adjusting for slope.	Average buffer width is 50 – 99 m, after adjusting for slope.	Average buffer width is < 49 m, after adjusting for slope.
Buffer Condition		Abundant (>95%) cover native vegetation, little or no (<5%) cover of non-native plants, intact soils, AND little or no trash or refuse.	Substantial (75–95%) cover of native vegetation, low (5–25%) cover of non-native plants, intact or moderately disrupted soils; minor intensity of human visitation or recreation.	Moderate (25–50%) cover of non-native plants, moderate or extensive soil disruption; moderate intensity of human visitation or recreation.	Dominant (>50%) cover of non-native plants, barren ground, highly compacted or otherwise disrupted soils, moderate or greater intensity of human visitation or recreation, no buffer at all.
Key Ecological Attribute: *Landscape Structure*					
Connectivity	Intact areas have a continuous corridor of natural or semi-natural areas	Intact: Embedded in 90-100% natural habitat; connectivity is expected to be high.	Variegated: Embedded in 60-90% natural or semi-habitat; habitat connectivity is generally high, but lower for species sensitive to habitat modification;	Fragmented: Embedded in 20-60% natural or semi-natural habitat; connectivity is generally low, but varies with mobility of species and arrangement on landscape.	Relictual: Embedded in < 20% natural or semi-natural habitat; connectivity is essentially absent

Landscape Condition Model Index	The intensity and types of land uses in the surrounding landscape can affect ecological integrity.	Landscape Condition Model Index >0.8		Landscape Condition Model Index 0.75 – 0.65	Landscape Condition Model Index < 0.65
Rank Factor: CONDITION					
Key Ecological Attribute: *Vegetation Composition*					
Relative Cover Native Plant Species	Native species dominate this system; non-natives increase with human impacts.	Cover of native plants 95-100%.	Cover of native plants 80-95%.	Cover of native plants 50 to 79%.	Cover of native plants <50%.
Absolute Cover of Invasive Species	Invasive species can inflict a wide range of ecological impacts. Early detection is critical: *Poa pratensis, Phleum pratense, Phalaris arundinacea*	None present.	Invasive species present, but sporadic (<3% cover).	Invasive species prevalent (3–10% absolute cover).	Invasive species abundant (>10% absolute cover).
Relative Cover of Native Increasers	Some stressors such as grazing can shift or homogenize native composition toward species tolerant of stressors: *Juncus arcticus, Iris missouriensis, Argentea anserina, Dasiphora floribunda*.	Absent or incidental	<10% cover	10-20% cover	>20% cover
Species Composition Note: Once developed, the Floristic Quality Assessment index could be used here instead.	The overall composition of native species can shift when exposed to stressors.	Species diversity/abundance at or near reference standard conditions. Native species sensitive to anthropogenic degradation are present, functional groups indicative of anthropogenic disturbance (ruderal or "weedy" species) are absent to minor, and full range of diagnostic / indicator species are present.		Species diversity/abundance close to reference standard condition. Some native species reflective of past anthropogenic degradation present. Some indicator/ diagnostic species may be absent.	Species diversity/abundance is different from reference standard condition in, but still largely composed of native species characteristic of the type. This may include ruderal ("weedy") species. Many indicator/diagnostic species may be absent.
Key Ecological Attribute: *Vegetation Structure*					
Organic Matter Accumulation	Accumulation of coarse and fine debris is integral to a variety of ecological processes	The site is characterized by a moderate amount of fine organic matter. There is some matter of various sizes, but new materials seem much more prevalent than old materials. Litter layers, duff layers, and leaf piles in pools or topographic lows are thin.		The site is characterized by occasional small amounts of coarse organic debris, such as leaf litter or thatch, with only traces of fine debris, and with little evidence of organic matter recruitment, or somewhat excessive littler.	The site contains essentially no significant amounts of coarse plant debris, and only scant amounts of fine debris. OR too much debris

Key Ecological Attribute: *Hydrology*					
Water Source	Anthropogenic sources of water can have detrimental effects on the hydrological regime	Source is natural or naturally lacks water in the growing season. No indication of direct artificial water sources	Source is mostly natural, but site directly receives occasional or small amounts of inflow from anthropogenic sources	Source is primarily urban runoff, direct irrigation, pumped water, artificially impounded water, or other artificial hydrology	Water flow has been substantially diminished by human activity
Water Table Depth	Estimates water table depth using hydric soil indicators from a single site visit.	Seasonal high water table and/or soils saturated for long durations; Hydric Soils present; Water table is within .5 m of soil surface. Surface soil horizons are gleyed or have a chroma value of 2 or less in mottled soils, or 1 less in unmottled soils; Depth to mottles is within 40 cm	Seasonal high water table and/or soils saturated for long durations; Hydric Soils present; Water table is within 0.5 m of soil surface. Surface soil horizons are gleyed or have a chroma value of 2 or less in mottled soils, or 1 less in unmottled soils; Depth to mottles is within 40 cm	No redoximorphic features present < 40 cm. Soil chromo > 2 Hydric Soils NOT present Indicators of remnant hydric conditions may be present e.g., distinct boundaries between mottles and matrix	No redoximorphic features present <40 cm. Soil chromo > 2 Hydric Soils NOT present Indicators of remnant hydric conditions may be present e.g., Distinct boundaries between mottles and matrix
Hydroperiod	Alteration in hydrology or sediment loads or some onsite stressors can degrade channel stability	Site is characterized by stable, saturated hydrology, or by naturally damped cycles of saturation and partial drying.	Site experiences minor altered inflows or drawdown/drying, as compared to more natural wetlands (e.g., ditching).	Site is somewhat altered by greater increased inflow from runoff, or experiences moderate drawdown or drying, as compared to more natural wetlands (e.g., ditching).	Site is greatly altered by greater increased inflow from runoff, or experiences large drawdown or drying, as compared to more natural wetlands (e.g., ditching).
Key Ecological Attribute: *Physicochemical*					
Soil Surface Condition	Soil disturbance can result in erosion thereby negatively affecting many ecological processes	Bare soil areas are limited to naturally caused disturbances such as flood deposition or game trails	Some bare soil due to human causes but the extent and impact is minimal. The depth of disturbance is limited to only a few inches and does not show evidence of ponding or channeling water.	Bare soil areas due to human causes are common. There may be pugging due to livestock resulting in several inches of soil disturbance. ORVs or other machinery may have left some shallow ruts.	Bare soil areas substantially & contribute to altered hydrology or other long-lasting impacts. Deep ruts from ORVs or machinery may be present, or livestock pugging and/or trails are widespread. Water will be channeled or ponded.
Water Quality	Excess nutrients, sediments, or other pollutant have an adverse affect on natural water quality	No evidence of degraded water quality. Water is clear; no strong green tint or sheen.	Some negative water quality indicators are present, but limited to small and localized areas. Water may have a minimal greenish tint or cloudiness, or sheen.	Negative indicators or wetland species that respond to high nutrient levels are common. Water may have a moderate greenish tint, sheen or other turbidity with common algae.	Widespread evidence of negative indicators. Algae mats may be extensive. Water may have a strong greenish tint, sheen or turbidity. Bottom difficult to see during due to surface algal mats and other vegetation blocking light to the bottom.
Rank Factor: SIZE					
Key Ecological Attribute: *Size*					

Relative Size	Indicates the proportion lost due to stressors.	Site is at or minimally reduced from natural extent (>95% remains)	Occurrence is only modestly reduced from its original natural extent (80-95% remains)	Occurrence is substantially reduced from its original natural extent (50-80% remains)	Occurrence is severely reduced from its original natural extent (<50% remains)
Absolute Size	Absolute size may be important for buffering impacts originating in the surrounding landscape	Very large (> 75 ac/30 ha)	Large (20-75 ac/8-30 ha)	Moderate (1-20 ac/0.5-8 ha)	Small (< 1 ac/0.5 ha)

Level 3 EIA
Level 3 metrics would include more quantitative measures of the metrics listed above. In addition, further consideration might be given to:

- Soil Bulk density can reduce the soil's water holding capacity, infiltration rate, water movement through the soil, and limit plant growth by physically restricting root growth.
- Soil organic carbon is strong metric of soil quality due to its sensitivity to environmental disturbance.
- Nutrient Enrichment (C:P) and (C:N) ratios

Triggers or Management Assessment Points
Ecological triggers or conditions under which management activities need to be reassessed are shown in the table below. Since the Ecological Integrity rankings are based on hypothesized thresholds, they are used to indicate where triggers might occur. Specific details about how these triggers translate for each metric can be found by referencing the values or descriptions for the appropriate rank provided in the Table above.

Table 2. Triggers for Level 2 & 3 EIA

Key Ecological Attribute or Metric	Trigger	Action
Any metric (except Connectivity)	▪ C rank ▪ Shift from A to B rank ▪ negative trend within the B rating (Level 3)	Level 2 triggers: conduct Level 3 assessment; make appropriate short-term management changes to ensure no further degradation Level 3 triggers: make appropriate management adjustments to ensure no additional degradation occurs. Continue monitoring using Level 3.
Any Key Ecological Attribute	▪ any metric has a C rank ▪ > ½ of all metrics are ranked B ▪ negative trend within the B rating (Level 3)	Level 2 triggers: conduct Level 3 assessment; make appropriate short-term management changes to ensure no further degradation Level 3 triggers: make appropriate management adjustments to ensure no additional degradation occurs. Continue monitoring using Level 3.

Protocol for Integrating Metric Ranks
If desired, the user may wish to integrate the ratings of the individual metrics and produce an overall score for the three rank factor categories: (1) Landscape Context; (2) Condition; and (3) Size. These rank factor rankings can then be combined into an Overall Ecological Integrity Rank. This enables one to report scores or ranks from the various hierarchical scales of the assessment depending on which best meets the user's

objectives. Please see Table 5 in Rocchio and Crawford (2009) for specifics about the protocol for integrating or 'rolling-up' metric ratings.

Supporting documents for the EIAs can be found at:
http://www1.dnr.wa.gov/nhp/refdesk/communities/eia.html

Documentation about Ecological Systems can be found at:
http://www1.dnr.wa.gov/nhp/refdesk/communities/ecol_systems.html

References

MacKenzie, W.H. and J.R. Moran. 2004. Wetlands of British Columbia. A Guide to Identification. Research Branch, B.C. Ministry of Forestry, Victoria, British Columbia.

NatureServe Explorer. 2007. Descriptions of Ecological Systems for the State of Washington. Data current as of October 06, 2007. NatureServe, Arlington, VA. [http://www.natureserve.org/explorer/index.htm]

Rocchio, F.J. and R.C. Crawford. 2009).Monitoring Desired Ecological Conditions on Washington State Wildlife Areas Using an Ecological Integrity Assessment Framework. Washington Natural Heritage Program, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA.

Rocchio, J. 2005. Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow Ecological System. Report Prepared for NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Colorado Natural Heritage Program, Colorado State University. Fort Collins, CO. Online: http://www.cnhp.colostate.edu/download/documents/2005/ecological_integrity

Authorship: Rex Crawford & Joe Rocchio, Washington Natural Heritage Program
February 22, 2011