

Ecological site F122XY011KY

Somewhat Poorly Drained Fragipan Terraces And Uplands

Last updated: 5/14/2025
Accessed: 09/24/2026

General information

Provisional. A provisional ecological site description has undergone quality control and quality assurance review. It contains a working state and transition model and enough information to identify the ecological site.

MLRA notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 122X–Highland Rim and Pennyroyal

MLRA 122 is in Tennessee (47 percent), Kentucky (43 percent), Indiana (7 percent), and Alabama (3 percent). It makes up about 21,530 square miles (55,790 square kilometers). **SOILS:** Many of the soils in this MLRA are Udalfs. The moderately deep to very deep, well drained, clayey soils formed in limestone residuum. They are dominantly in rolling to steep areas of the “Outer Basin” (Mimosa, Braxton, Gladdice, and Hampshire series) and the undulating to hilly areas of the “Inner Basin” (Talbot and Bradyville series). The most agriculturally productive soils are the very deep, well drained, clayey or loamy soils that formed in alluvium and/or loess over alluvium or limestone residuum in nearly level to undulating areas (Armour, Cumberland, Harpeth, Lomond, and Maury series). The less extensive soils generally are moderately well drained to somewhat poorly drained and formed in loamy or clayey alluvium and/or residuum (Byler, Capshaw, Colbert, and Tupelo series). This MLRA has a significant acreage of Mollisols. Shallow or moderately deep, well drained, clayey Udolls (Ashwood and Barfield series) formed in limestone residuum dominantly in rolling to steep areas. Very shallow, well drained, clayey Rendolls (Gladeville series) formed in limestone residuum dominantly in undulating to rolling areas of the “Inner Basin.” Very deep, well drained or moderately well drained Udolls (Arrington, Egam, Lynnvill, and Staser series) and somewhat poorly drained or poorly drained Aquolls (Agee, Godwin, and Lanton series) formed in loamy or clayey alluvium derived from limestone on flood plains. Most of the remaining soils on flood plains are moderately well drained or well drained Udepts (Lindell and Ocana series). Udults are of small extent in this area. Most are very deep, well drained, and loamy and formed in gravelly colluvium or colluvium and the underlying residuum on steep hillsides (Dellrose soils). Rock outcrops are common on uplands. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** This area supports mixed oak forest vegetation. White oak, black oak, northern red oak, and some scarlet oak are the dominant tree species. Shagbark hickory, bitternut hickory, pignut hickory, and mockernut hickory also occur. Oak, blackgum, flowering dogwood, sassafras, Virginia pine, pitch pine, and shortleaf pine grow mostly on ridgetops. (Excerpt from United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296.)

Classification relationships

Scientific Name: South-Central Interior Large Floodplain Unique Identifier: CES202.705

Ecological site concept

Individual sites deserve a detailed understanding before conservation and restoration practices are implemented. The provisional ecological site (PES) communities described in this document reflect plant communities that can be found but does not encompass the entire complexity or diversity possible. Additional ecological field assessments are needed to develop a full ecological site description (ESD) which can be utilized for conservation planning and restoration purposes. Only two tree species can be selected for entry into the database as dominants; however, multiple tree species may be dominant on these sites and it will vary depending on aspect, soil depth, seed sources, management, and disturbance history. State 1. (Reference): Phase 1.1: Plant species dominants: Oaks (*Quercus* spp.) – sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) / spicebush (*Lindera benzoin*) – paw paw (*Asimina triloba*) / Canadian woodnettle (*Laportea canadensis*) –jewelweed (*Impatiens capensis*) State 2, Phase 2.1: Managed Pasture. Plant species dominants: *Schedonorus arundinaceus* (tall fescue) Pasture plant species are dependent on seeding, weed control, concurrent land uses, on-going levels of disturbance, and landowner goals. Individual site and soil characteristics, along with management activities, will influence production levels. State 3: – Transitional (Abandoned) Field Phases 3.1.: maples (*Acer* spp.) – tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) / common ninebark (*Physocarpus opulifolius*) - (berries (*Rubus* spp.) / fescue (*Schedonorus arundinaceus*) Phase 4.1. Plant species dominant: henbit deadnettle (*Lamium amplexicaule*) – mouse-eared chickweed (*Cerastium* L.) Abandonment of cropland would result in many weed species taking over the site. Initially, annual weeds would be predominate followed by grasses, shrubs and finally, pioneers trees State: 5. Cropland Phase 5.1: Plant species dominants: *Zea* spp. – *Glycine* spp. Plants on these sites will be dependent upon seeding and management. Most common crops are corn and soybeans. Due to the drainage issues on these soil, many have been tilled or

ditched extensively to facilitate crop production. Transitioning states 2-5 to a reference community would require extensive, long-term restoration efforts.

Associated sites

F122XY010KY	Moderately Well Drained Fragipan Terraces Moderately Well Drained Fragipan Terraces
--------------------	---

Similar sites

F122XY012KY	Somewhat Poorly Drained Terrace Lakebeds Somewhat Poorly Drained Terrace Lakebeds
--------------------	---

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Quercus</i> (2) <i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Asimina triloba</i> (2) <i>Lindera benzoin</i>
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Laportea canadensis</i> (2) <i>Impatiens capensis</i>

Physiographic features

These soils are predominately on terraces.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Terrace (2) Flat (3) Depression
Runoff class	Very low to very high
Flooding duration	Extremely brief (0.1 to 4 hours) to brief (2 to 7 days)
Flooding frequency	None to very rare
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	110 – 370 m

Slope	0 %
Water table depth	20 – 60 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

Climate

The average annual precipitation in this area is 43 to 63 inches (1,090 to 1,600 millimeters), increasing to the south. The maximum precipitation occurs in winter and early in spring, and the minimum occurs in fall. Most of the rainfall occurs as high-intensity, convective thunderstorms. Snowfall may occur in winter. The average annual temperature is 52 to 60 degrees F (11 to 16 degrees C), increasing to the south. The freeze-free period averages 210 days and ranges from 185 to 235 days. The longer freeze-free periods occur in the more southerly parts of the area.

(Excerpt from United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296.)

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	160-170 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	190-200 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	1,270-1,450 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	150-170 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	180-200 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	1,190-1,500 mm
Frost-free period (average)	160 days
Freeze-free period (average)	190 days
Precipitation total (average)	1,350 mm

- (1) CLARKSVILLE WWTP [USC00401790], Clarksville, TN
- (2) GREENSBURG [USC00153430], Greensburg, KY
- (3) COOKEVILLE [USC00402009], Cookeville, TN
- (4) SALEM [USC00127755], Salem, IN
- (5) WAYNESBORO [USC00409502], Waynesboro, TN

Influencing water features

These sites have a fragipan. Some mapunits in this group are occasionally or rarely flooded.

Soil features

Soils in this groups are somewhat poorly drained with a fragipan.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Alluvium – limestone
Surface texture	(1) Silt loam
Family particle size	(1) Loamy
Drainage class	Somewhat poorly drained
Permeability class	Very slow to slow
Soil depth	40 – 60 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	10.16 – 17.78 cm
Calcium carbonate equivalent (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Electrical conductivity (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Sodium adsorption ratio (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	4.5 – 5.5

Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	Not specified
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	Not specified

Ecological dynamics

11-Somewhat Poorly Drained Fragipan Terraces Major Land Resource Area (MLRA) 122

Communities described in this provisional document reflect plant communities that are likely to be found on these soils and have not been extensively field verified. This PES describes hypotheses based on available data of many different scales and sources and has not been developed utilizing site-specific ecological field monitoring. Additional field studies are needed to develop a comprehensive and science-based native plant restoration plan for these soils. Soil series and/or mapunits may be removed or added pending field inspections.

Forest Vegetation as listed in Official Series Descriptions (OSD):

Lawrence: Native forest is water tolerant species such as bottomland oaks, gum, elm, birch, willow, maple, and sycamore as the dominant species.

Taft: The native vegetation is hardwood forest of maple, elm, water oak, post oak, gum, beech, sycamore, and cottonwood.

Only two tree species can be selected for entry into the database as dominants; however, multiple tree species may be dominant on these sites and it will vary depending on aspect, soil depth, seed sources, management, and disturbance history.

State 1. (Reference):

Phase 1.1: Plant species dominants:

Oaks (*Quercus* spp.) – sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) / spicebush (*Lindera benzoin*) – paw paw (*Asimina triloba*) / Canadian woodnettle (*Laportea canadensis*) –jewelweed (*Impatiens capensis*)

Trees found on these sites recorded in the NASIS database exhibit great variation. Top three trees combinations vary from black oak –willow oak – red maple; tulip poplar – white oak – black oak; and sweetgum – tulip poplar –American beech. Field work specific to these mapunits will be required to better define the reference state community.

Plants commonly found in MLRA 122 which prefer higher levels of available water (FACW per USDA Plants Website) would include:

Apois americana (groundnut)
Arisaema dracontium (green dragon)
Arundinaria gigantea (giant cane)
Arisaema triphyllum (Jack in the pulpit)
Bidens aristosa (bearded beggar ticks)
Bidens frondosa (devils' beggartick)
Boehmeria cylindrica (smallspike false nettle)
Carex spp. (sedges)
Chaerophyllum tainturieri (hairy chervil)
Cinna arundinacea (sweet woodreed)
Cornus amomum (silky dogwood)
Pilea pumila (Canadian clearweed)
Lobelia siphilitica (great blue lobelia)
Ranunculus abortivus (littleleaf buttercup)
Mertensia virginica (Virginia bluebells)

State: 2. Pasture

State 2, Phase 2.1: Managed Pasture. Plant species dominants: *Schedonorus arundinaceus* (tall fescue)

Pasture plant species are dependent on seeding, weed control, concurrent land uses, on-going levels of disturbance, and landowner goals. Individual site and soil characteristics, along with management activities, will influence production levels.

Many species of grass, both warm and cool season, are available and suitable for these sites. Common forage species include tall fescue, orchard grass, Kentucky bluegrass, Johnson grass, timothy, and various species of clover.

Management of pasture sites should follow conservation planning standards and protocols which include watershed protection, soil health, and adequate forage species.

Transitioning this state to a reference condition would require long-term timber stand improvement practices to control non-native vegetation and manage for desired hardwood species. Sites may have been ditched or tiled and require hydrologic restoration.

State 3: – Transitional (Abandoned) Field

Phases 3.1.: maples (*Acer* spp.) – tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) / common ninebark (*Physocarpus opulifolius*) - (berries (*Rubus* spp.) / fescue (*Schedonorus arundinaceus*)

Tree species regeneration on these sites will depend on the severity and duration of disturbance, soil characteristics, micro-topography, adjacent plant communities and seed sources, post-disturbance management inputs, presence or absence of continued site disturbances (such as grazing), and aspect. Pioneer tree species may include silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), American sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), white ash (*Fraxinus americana*), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), American elm (*Ulmus americana*), sugarberry (*Celtis laevigata*), and boxelder (*Acer negundo*).

Transitioning this state to a reference condition would require long-term timber stand improvement practices. Sites may have been ditched or tiled and require hydrologic restoration.

State 4: - Abandoned Cropland

Phase 4.1. Plant species dominant:

henbit deadnettle (*Lamium amplexicaule*) – mouse-eared chickweed (*Cerastium* L.)

Abandonment of cropland would result in many weed species taking over the site. Initially, annual weeds would be predominate followed by grasses, shrubs and finally, pioneers trees.

It would require years of management, plantings, and weed control to establish successional communities that could transition to a reference community. Sites may have been ditched or tiled and require hydrologic restoration.

State: 5. Cropland

Phase 5.1: Plant species dominants: *Zea* spp. – *Glycine* spp.

Plants on these sites will be dependent upon seeding and management. Most common crops are corn and soybeans. Due to the drainage issues on these soil, many have been tiled or ditched extensively to facilitate crop production.

Transitioning this state to a reference condition will require extensive, long-term restoration efforts including timber stand improvement practices to control non-native vegetation and manage for desired species. Sites may have been ditched or tiled and require hydrologic restoration.

State and transition model

Figure 7. Group 11

Additional community tables

Inventory data references

Site Development and Testing Plan 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

Abrams, M.D. 1992. Fire and the development of oak forests. *BioScience*, 42: 346–353.

Abrams, M.D. and G.J. Nowacki. 2008. Native Americans as active and passive promoters of mast and fruit trees in the eastern USA. *The Holocene* 18.7. pp. 1123-1137.

Alexander, H.D. and M.A. Arthur, D.L. Loftis, and S.R. Green. 2008. Survival and growth of upland oak and co-occurring competitor seedlings following single and repeated prescribed fires. *Forest Ecology and Management* 256: 1021–1030.

Anderson, Michelle D. 2003. *Juniperus virginiana*. In: Fire Effects Information System, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, and Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Anderson, R.C. & Brown, L.E. 1983. Comparative effects of fire on trees in a Midwestern savannah and an adjacent forest. *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club*, 110: 87–90.

Baskin, J.M., C.C. Baskin, and E.W. Chester. 1994. The Big Barrens of Kentucky and Tennessee: Further observations and considerations. *Castanea* 59:226-254.

Black, B.A., Abrams, M.D. 2001. Influence of Native Americans and surveyor biases on metes and bounds witness tree distribution. *Ecology*. 82:2574-2586.

Braun, E.L. 1950. *Deciduous forests of Eastern North America*. Blakinston Co., Pennsylvania. Reprinted in 2001 by Blackburn Press, Caldwell, New Jersey.

Carmean, W.H. 1970. Site quality for eastern hardwoods. The silviculture of oaks and associated species. USDA Forest Service Research paper, Northeast. Forest Exp. Sta., Upper Darby, PA, NE-144: 36-56.

Carmean, W.H. 1971. Soil-site relationships of the upland oaks. Oak Symp. Proc. USDA Forest Service Research Paper. Northeast. Forest Exp. Sta., Upper Darby, PA. p. 23-29.

Carmean, Willard H.; Hahn, Jerold T.; Jacobs, Rodney D. 1989. Site index curves for forest species in the eastern United States. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-128. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.

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.

Curtis, J. T., 1959. *Ecological Systems of the United States: A Working Classification of U.S. Terrestrial Systems*. NatureServe, Virginia. .

Denevan, W.M. 1992. The pristine myth: the landscape of the Americas in 1492. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 82 (3), 369–385.

DeSelm, H. R. 1994. Tennessee barrens. *Castanea* 59(3):214-225.

Faber-Langendoen, D., editor. 2001. *Plant communities of the Midwest: Classification in an ecological context*. Association for Biodiversity Information, Arlington, VA. 61 pp. + appendix (705 pp.).

Fenneman, N.M. 1917. Physiographic subdivisions of the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. Vol. 3(1). pp. 17 -22.

Gleason, H.A. and A. Cronquist. *Manual of Vascular Plants of Northeastern United States and Adjacent Canada*. 2nd edition. The New York Botanical Garden, Bronx.

Griffith, G. E., J. M. Omernik, and S. H. Azevedo. 1998. Ecoregions of Tennessee. (Two-sided color poster with map, descriptive text, summary tables, and photographs). U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA. Scale 1:940,000.

Kartesz, J.T., The Biota of North America Program (BONAP). 2011. North American Plant Atlas (<http://www.bonap.org/MapSwitchboard.html>). Chapel Hill, N.C. [maps generated from Kartesz, J.T. 2010. Floristic Synthesis of North America, Version 1.0. Biota of North America Program (BONAP). (in press)].

Keever, C. 1978. A study of the mixed mesophytic, western mesophytic, and oak chestnut regions of the eastern deciduous forest including a review of the vegetation and sites recommended as potential natural landmarks. Millersville State College, Pennsylvania.

Kuchler, A.W. 1964. Potential natural vegetation of the conterminous United States. Spec. Publ. 36 New York, NY: American Geographical society.

Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States. United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Handbook 296. Dec. 1981. 87-88.

Landfire [Landfire National Vegetation Dynamics Database]. 2007a. Landfire National Vegetation Dynamics Models. Landfire Project, USDA Forest Service, U.S. Department of Interior. (January - last update)

Lawless, P. J., Baskin, J. M. and C. C. Baskin. 2006. Xeric Limestone Prairies of Eastern United States: Review and Synthesis. *The Botanical Review* 73(4): 303–325. The New York Botanical Garden.

Lunt, I.D. & Spooner, P.G. 2005. Using historical ecology to understand patterns of biodiversity in fragmented agricultural landscapes. *Journal of Biogeography*, 32:1859–1873.

McNab, W.H. and P.E. Avers. 1994. Ecological subregions of the United States. U.S. Forest Service. Prepared in cooperation with Regional Compilers and the ECOMAP Team of the Forest Service.

Miller, J.H., Chambliss, E.B. and Loewenstein, N.J. 2010. A field guide for the Identification of Invasive Plants in Southern Forests. US Forest Service Southern Research Station, General Technical Report SRS-119.

Parker, G.R. 1989. Old-growth forests of the Central Hardwood Region. *Nat. Areas J.* 9(1): 5-11.

Quarterman, E. and R.L. Powell. 1978. Potential ecological/geological natural landmarks on the Interior Low Plateaus. pp. 7-73. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. Quarterman,

Stritch, L.R. 1990. Landscape-scale restoration of barrens-woodland within the oak-hickory forest mosaic. *Restoration & Management Notes* 8: 73-77.

Somers, P., L. R. Smith, P. B. Hamel, and E. L. Bridges. 1986. Preliminary analyses of plant communities and seasonal changes in cedar glades of middle Tennessee. *ASB Bulletin* 33:178-192.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service.
Soil surveys of Tennessee counties in MLRA 123.

U.S. Department of Agriculture-Forest Service, Agriculture Handbook 654, Silvics of North America.

Zollner, D., M.H. MacRoberts, B.R. MacRoberts, & D. Ladd. 2005. Endemic vascular plants of the Interior Highlands, U.S.A. *Sida* 21:1781-1791.

Websites:

Cleland, D. T., J. A. Freeouf, J. E. Keys, Jr., G. J. Nowacki, C. A. Carpenter, and W. H. McNab. 2007. Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections of the Conterminous United States.
GTR-WO-76C-1. http://fsgeodata.fs.fed.us/other_resources/ecosubregions.html

Ecosystem classification of the United States; Ecological Subregions of the United States.1994. Compiled by W. Henry McNab, Peter E. Avers, et al. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA], Washington, DC., USA: <http://www.fs.fed.us/land/pubs/ecoregions>

Environmental Mapping and Assessment Program (EMAP). 2004. Washington, DC., USA: <http://www.epa.gov/docs/emap/>

Geospatial Data Gateways: <https://gdg.sc.egov.usda.gov/>

Landfire: <http://www.landfire.gov>

NatureServe. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia.
<http://www.natureserve.org/explorer>

Nashville Basin Limestone Glade and Woodland, Ecological System Comprehensive Report
http://explorer.natureserve.org/servlet/NatureServe?searchSystemUid=ELEMENT_GLOBAL.2.723170

Official Soil Series Descriptions, USDA-NRCS: <https://soilseries.sc.egov.usda.gov/osdname.asp>

Silvics of North America, US Forest Service. http://www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo/pubs/silvics_manual/table_of_contents.htm

USDA Plants: <http://plants.usda.gov/java/>

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Center for Biological Informatics (CBI) 2004. U.S. Department of the Interior: <http://biology.usgs.gov/cbi>

Vascular Plant Image Library: <http://botany.csd.tamu.edu/FLORA/imaxxara.htm>

Vegetation Mapping Program, National Vegetation Classification Standard. 2004.

Vegetation Classification Standard, Vegetation Subcommittee, U.S. Geological Survey [USGS; U.S. Department of the Interior], Reston, Virginia, USA. <http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/projects/FGDC-standards-projects/vegetation>

Vegbank: www.vegbank.org

Web Soil Survey, USDA-NRCS: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>

Woodland Wildflowers of Illinois: http://www.illinoiswildflowers.info/woodland/woodland_index.htm

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1994. Ecosystem classification of the United States; Ecological Subregions of the United States. Compiled by W. Henry McNab, Peter E. Avers, et al., Washington, DC. <http://www.fs.fed.us/land/pubs/ecoregions>

U.S. Department of the Interior. 2004. Vegetation Mapping Program, National Vegetation Classification Standard. <http://biology.usgs.gov/npsveg>

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Center for Biological Informatics (CBI) 2004. U.S. Department of the Interior. <http://biology.usgs.gov/cbi>

Approval

Matthew Duvall, 5/14/2025

Rangeland health reference sheet

Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health is a qualitative assessment protocol used to determine ecosystem condition based on benchmark characteristics described in the Reference Sheet. A suite of 17 (or more) indicators are typically considered in an assessment. The ecological site(s) representative of an assessment location must be known prior to applying the protocol and must be verified based on soils and climate. Current plant community cannot be used to identify the ecological site.

Author(s)/participant(s)	
Contact for lead author	
Date	09/24/2026
Approved by	
Approval date	
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production

Indicators

1. Number and extent of rills:

2. Presence of water flow patterns:

3. Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes:

4. Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground):

5. Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies:

6. Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas:

7. Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel):

8. Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values):

9. Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness):

10. Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff:

11. Presence and thickness of compaction layer (usually none; describe soil profile features which may be mistaken for compaction on this site):

12. Functional/Structural Groups (list in order of descending dominance by above-ground annual-production or live foliar cover using symbols: >>, >, = to indicate much greater than, greater than, and equal to):

Dominant:

Sub-dominant:

Other:

Additional:

13. Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence):

14. Average percent litter cover (%) and depth (in):

15. Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annual-production):

16. Potential invasive (including noxious) species (native and non-native). List species which BOTH characterize degraded states and have the potential to become a dominant or co-dominant species on the ecological site if their future establishment and growth is not actively controlled by management interventions. Species that become dominant for only one to several years (e.g., short-term response to drought or wildfire) are not invasive plants. Note that unlike other indicators, we are describing what is NOT expected in the reference state for the ecological site:

17. Perennial plant reproductive capability:
