

Ecological site PX138X00Y110

Sandy Over Loamy Lowland Flats

Last updated: 6/09/2025

Accessed: 09/30/2026

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): 138X–North-Central Florida Ridge

The MLRA notes section provides a brief description of the entire MLRA. This description is intended to provide some context about the MLRA within which this ecological site is associated. A more complete description of the MLRA can be found in Ag Handbook 296 (USDA-NRCS, 2022). This MLRA is on a limestone upland that is mantled with sandy marine deposits and has an irregular, gently rolling topography. Because of the underlying karst topography, there are a moderate number of limestone sinkholes, some filled with water. Production of cash crops, hay, and pasture is the primary land use. This area comprises about 2,196 square miles (5,688 square kilometers) and is entirely within Florida. This area is underlain by sediments of the Quaternary Period (present to 2.58 million years ago) that overlie the Neogene (2.53 to 23.03 million years ago) and Paleogene (23.03 to 66 million years ago) formations of the Hawthorn Group (Green et al., 2006). The rocks are progressively older to the south. The Quaternary sediments are largely undifferentiated marine deposits consisting of fine to coarse sands that are poorly to moderately sorted with variable mixtures of clay and organic material. The formations of the Hawthorn Group are, from youngest to oldest, the Statesville Formation, Coosawhatchie Formation, Suwannee Limestone, and Ocala Limestone. The Statesville Formation consists of thinly interbedded, and commonly cross-bedded, dolostone and clay alternating with beds of sand. Phosphate grains are common to abundant. The Coosawhatchie Formation is made up of poorly to moderately sorted sandy clay or clayey sand with phosphate grains, limestone, and dolostone. The Suwannee Limestone is a cream colored to tan, crystalline, vuggy and muddy, fossiliferous, variably dolomitic carbonate. It has chert nodules in some areas. The Ocala Limestone was deposited in the Eocene (33.9 to 56 million years ago) and is the oldest rock formation exposed in Florida. It is a white to cream-colored, fossiliferous limestone and has chert nodules in some areas. This area borders MLRA 133A to the north, which has only slight differences in use and management due to the underlying karst topography. Its boundaries with MLRA 152A to the west and MLRA 153A to the east are distinguishable by an abrupt scarp on a lower, younger marine terrace. Its boundary with MLRA 154 is a gradual transition to slightly younger marine sediments to the south. Elevation of the MLRA ranges from 26 to 197 feet (8 to 60 meters). Local relief is generally 10 to 20 feet (3 to 6 meters) but can be as much as 35 feet (10 meters). The dominant soil orders are Ultisols, Entisols, and Alfisols. The soils in the area dominantly have a thermic temperature regime, a udic moisture regime, and siliceous mineralogy. This area supports open pine and oak vegetation. Major wildlife species include white-tailed deer, raccoon, skunk, opossum, rabbit, gray squirrel, fox squirrel, turkey, bobwhite quail, and mourning dove. The abundant rainfall and the Floridan aquifer are the principal sources of water in the area. The many lakes and ponds are used for recreation. Most of the river water is suitable for almost all uses. Shallow and deep wells in the Floridan aquifer provide water for public supply, domestic use, industry, mining, livestock, and irrigation. This aquifer is one of the most productive sources of ground water in the United States. Its water is hard but of good quality. Wells yield large quantities of the calciumbicarbonate type of water. The Floridan aquifer is a thick sequence of Tertiary limestone and dolomite. The Eocene Avon Park Formation and Ocala Limestone are the thickest and most productive units in the aquifer system. A significant portion of this MLRA along riparian areas remains wooded with some larger holdings used exclusively for forestry. Pulpwood and lumber are the principal forest products. Hay and pasture are of great extent throughout this MLRA. The cropland in the area is used mainly for corn, peanuts, tobacco, soybeans, vegetables, and melons. The major resource concerns are maintenance of organic matter and productivity of the soils, management of soil moisture, and management of animal waste. Conservation practices on cropland generally include crop rotations, cover crops, nutrient management, pest management, and irrigation water management. (USDA, NRCS, 2022)

Classification relationships

Most of this area is in the East Gulf Coastal Plain section of the Coastal Plain province of the Atlantic Plain. The southern one-quarter is in the Floridian section of the same province and division. (McNab et al., 2007; USDA, NRCS, 2022) MLRA 138 is relatively small and comprises the eastern half of EPA level IV ecoregion 65o, Tallahassee Hills and Valdosta Limesink, which is part of level III ecoregion 65, Southeastern Plains. (U.S. EPA, 2013) The reference community of this site corresponds approximately with the Mesic and Wet Flatwood communities (FNAI, 2010). The improved pasture community of the managed grassland state corresponds well with Forage Suitability Group G138XA241FL. (USDA, NRCS, 2013)

Ecological site concept

This site is on poorly drained soils in lowland flats where the dominant hydrology is a fluctuating water table. The land is flat with slopes mostly from 0 to 2 percent. Soils are mostly sandy over loamy, and have an argillic horizon between 20 and 40 inches. Some soils may have a mollic or umbric horizon. This site often supports Mesic and Wet Flatwoods, Coniferous Plantations, Improved Pasture, and Rural communities.

Associated sites

PX138X00Y100	Sandy Lowland Flats These soils are in a similar landscape position but have different physical properties and productivity.
PX138X00Y120	Loamy and Clayey Lowland Flats These soils are in a similar landscape position but have different physical properties and productivity.

Similar sites

PX138X00Y100	Sandy Lowland Flats These sites support similar native vegetation communities, but production is somewhat different, especially regarding grazing forage production.
--------------	--

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Pinus palustris</i> (2) <i>Pinus elliottii</i>
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	Not specified

Legacy ID

F138XY110AL

Physiographic features

This site occurs in landscape positions that are not along major rivers and stream, or if it does occur near major rivers and streams it is not influenced by regular flooding events, even in the absence of water control structures. This site occurs on mesic or hydric lowlands. Dominant hydrology on this site is typically a fluctuating water table. Slope is typically 0 to 2 percent.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Marine terrace > Flatwoods (2) Marine terrace > Flat
Runoff class	Very low

Flooding frequency	None
Ponding duration	Not specified
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	10 – 60 m
Slope	0 %
Water table depth	20 – 50 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Table 3. Representative physiographic features (actual ranges)

Runoff class	Very low
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding duration	Brief (2 to 7 days)
Ponding frequency	None to frequent
Elevation	10 – 60 m
Slope	0 %
Water table depth	0 – 50 cm

Climatic features

The maximum precipitation occurs in summer, and the minimum occurs in winter and late autumn. Rainfall occurs during high-intensity, convective thunderstorms in summer. The average annual temperature is 68 to 69 degrees F (20 to 21 degrees C).

An additional hazard of concern during late summer through early fall are tropical cyclones. While most impacts from hurricanes and tropical storms are confined along the coastal zone, heavy rainfall, severe flooding, and high winds can occur well into Florida when such systems pass through the area. To the extreme, the region is susceptible to the effects of a strong Bermuda High during the summer, which can cause devastating drought conditions for weeks and even months in some years.

(USDA, NRCS, 2022)

Table 4 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	220-230 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	250-260 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	1,320-1,370 mm
Frost-free period (actual range)	210-230 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	240-270 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	1,320-1,370 mm
Frost-free period (average)	220 days
Freeze-free period (average)	260 days
Precipitation total (average)	1,350 mm

- (1) JASPER [USC00084394], Jasper, FL
- (2) LIVE OAK [USC00085099], Live Oak, FL
- (3) MAYO [USC00085539], Live Oak, FL
- (4) LAKE CITY 2 E [USC00084731], Lake City, FL
- (5) HIGH SPRINGS [USC00083956], High Springs, FL
- (6) BELL 4NW [USC00080598], Old Town, FL

Influencing water features

The Suwannee River, which originates in the Okefenokee Swamp to the northeast and is spring-fed, flows through this MLRA. The Alapaha and Withlacoochee Rivers join the Suwannee River in the area. Another Suwannee River tributary, the Santa Fe River, crosses the southern part of the area. (USDA, NRCS, 2022)

Wetland description

Dominant hydrology on this site is a fluctuating water table. This site is poorly drained. It represents locations where the soils may or may not meet hydric field criteria, and the variation between the two may be exceptionally subtle. In situations where the soil is hydric, this site represents locations that are seasonally saturated and/or ponded, are not typically flooded, and are not exposed to tidal influences, so any wetlands that occur on this site are palustrine in nature.

Soil features

Please note that the soils listed in this section of the description may not be all inclusive. There may be additional soils that fit the site's concepts. Additionally, the soils that provisionally form the concepts of this site may occur elsewhere, either within or outside of the MLRA and may or may not have the same geomorphic characteristics or support similar vegetation. Some soil map units and soil series included in this "provisional" ecological site were used as a "best fit" for a particular soil – landform catena during a specific era of soil mapping, regardless of the origin of parent material or the location of MLRA boundaries. Therefore, the listed soils may not be typical for MLRA 138 or a specific location, and the associated soil map units may warrant further investigation in a joint ecological site inventory – soil survey project. When utilizing this provisional description, the user is encouraged to verify that the area of interest meets the appropriate ecological site concepts by reviewing the soils, landform, vegetation, and physical location. If the site concepts do not match the attributes of the area of interest, please review the Similar or Associated Sites listed in the General Information section of this

description to determine if another site may be a better fit for your area of interest.

This site is comprised of soils in the Goldhead, Mascotte, and Pelham series. These soils are poorly drained, sandy over loamy, and they have an argillic horizon between 20 and 40 inches. Some soils may have a mollic or umbric horizon.

Table 5. Representative soil features

Parent material	(1) Marine deposits
Surface texture	(1) Fine sand (2) Sand
Drainage class	Poorly drained
Permeability class	Moderately rapid
Soil depth	200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	5.33 – 10.16 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-25.4cm)	3.5 – 5.5
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	Not specified
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	Not specified

Table 6. Representative soil features (actual values)

Drainage class	Poorly drained
Permeability class	Moderately rapid

Soil depth	200 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	0 %
Surface fragment cover >3"	0 %
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	5.33 – 10.16 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-25.4cm)	3.5 – 5.5
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0 %

Ecological dynamics

The information presented in this ecological site description (ESD) and state-and-transition model (STM) were developed using archaeological and historical information, published and unpublished scientific reports, professional experience, consultation with technical experts, and NRCS inventories and studies. The information presented represents a complex set of plant community dynamics and environmental variables. Not all scenarios or plants are represented and included. Key indicator plants, animals, and ecological processes are described to help guide land management decisions and actions.

Unlike those of sandhill or scrub, plants of mesic flatwoods must be able to withstand the stress of soil saturation or inundation during the wet part of the year, as well as dry conditions at other times. Mesic flatwoods require frequent fire; all of its constituent plant species recover rapidly from fire and several species require fire to reproduce. Longleaf pines have thick bark to protect them from fire and their seeds need the mineral soil and open sunlight that fire provides to germinate; they form a grass stage for several years after germination that is resistant to fire. Wiregrass requires fire to flower, along with a number of other characteristic herbs, including, but not limited to, whitetop aster (*Oclemena reticulata*), many-flowered grass-pink, crowpoison (*Stenanthium densum*), and grassleaf goldenaster (*Pityopsis oligantha*). Red-cockaded woodpeckers, which nest in cavities in mature living pines, will abandon a nesting site if the midstory becomes too tall and dense, i.e. if fire is excluded for too long. The flatwoods salamander prefers a grassy border around its breeding ponds which is maintained against encroaching shrubs by frequent fire. Direct evidence for the natural fire return interval and season in mesic flatwoods comes from a study of fire scars on cross sections of old longleaf pine stumps in mesic flatwoods near the Gulf coast west of Apalachicola. Scars from 61 fires were recorded over a 189 year period (1679 to 1868). The average fire return interval was 3.2 years, and most fires occurred at two year intervals (42%) with three year intervals having the next highest number (22%). Seventy-two percent of all fires occurred within one to three year intervals and 23% occurred within four to six year intervals. The maximum interval recorded was ten years. Over 95% of all fires recorded before European settlement in the area (1830) occurred in the growing season. (FNAI, 2010)

The variations of vegetation structure and composition of wet flatwoods in Florida likely reflect variations in soil characteristics, hydrology and fire. The general historic fire frequency in pinelands across the southeastern U.S. coastal plain is estimated to be every 1-3 years. This interval is frequent enough to maintain grassy wet flatwoods and inhibit invasion by shrubs and is consistent with management of longleaf pine systems. Wet flatwoods that are naturally shrubbier and dominated by slash pine or pond pine may have had longer fire return intervals, or perhaps a few periods of longer intervals, on the order of 5-7 years, or up to 5-10 years, in order to allow the pines to establish and shrubs to proliferate. (FNAI, 2010)

Following this narrative, a "provisional" state and transition model is provided that includes the "perceived" reference state and several

alternative (or altered) vegetation states that have been observed and/or projected for this ecological site. This model is based on limited inventories, literature, expert knowledge, and interpretations. Plant communities may differ from one location to the next depending on the severity of local land use activities and rates of deposition. Depending on objectives, the reference plant community may not necessarily be the management goal.

The environmental and biological characteristics of this site are complex and dynamic. As such, the following diagram suggests pathways that the vegetation on this site might take, given that the modal concepts of climate and soils are met within an area of interest. Specific locations with unique soils and disturbance histories may have alternate pathways that are not represented in the model. This information is intended to show the possibilities within a given set of circumstances and represents the initial steps toward developing a defensible description and model. The model and associated information are subject to change as knowledge increases and new information is garnered. This is an iterative process. Most importantly, local and/or state professional guidance should always be sought before pursuing a treatment scenario.

State and transition model

Additional community tables

Table 7. Community 1.1 plant community composition

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

Table 8. Community 1.2 plant community composition

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

Table 9. Community 1.3 plant community composition

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

Table 10. Community 1.4 plant community composition

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

Table 11. Community 1.5 plant community composition

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

Table 12. Community 1.6 plant community composition

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

Table 13. Community 2.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
Grass/Grasslike					
1	Graminoids			1009-15692	
	Bermudagrass	CYDA	<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>	12329-15692	–
	limpograss	HEAL5	<i>Hemarthria altissima</i>	9863-14571	–
	pearl millet	PEGL2	<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i>	7398-13450	–
	eastern gamagrass	TRDA3	<i>Tripsacum dactyloides</i>	4483-7566	–
	bahiagrass	PANO2	<i>Paspalum notatum</i>	3699-6725	–
	big bluestem	ANGE	<i>Andropogon gerardii</i>	1009-2018	–
Forb					
2	Legumes			2466-3363	
	shyleaf	AEAM	<i>Aeschynomene americana</i>	2466-3363	–
	hairy indigo	INHI	<i>Indigofera hirsuta</i>	2466-3363	–

Table 14. Community 2.2 plant community composition

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

Inventory data references

Data collection and analysis of field data will be performed during the Verification Stage of ESD development. Production data for pasture communities taken from the USDA, NRCS Florida Field Office Technical Guide, forage suitability groups (USDA, NRCS, 2013).

Other references

Carr, S. C., Robertson, K. M., & Peet, R. K. 2010. A vegetation classification of fire-dependent pinelands of Florida. *Castanea*, 75(2), 153-189.

Casey, W. P., & Ewel, K. C. 2006. Patterns of succession in forested depressional wetlands in north Florida, USA. *Wetlands*, 26(1), 147-160.

Dey, D. C., Brissette, J. C., Schweitzer, C. J., & Guldin, J. M. 2012. Silviculture of forests in the Eastern United States. Cumulative watershed effects of fuel management in the Eastern United States Gen Tech Rep SRS-161. Asheville, NC: US Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station, 7-40.

Florida Chapter Soil and Water Conservation Society. 1989. 26 Ecological Communities of Florida

Greenberg, C. H., & Simons, R. W. 1999. Age, composition, and stand structure of old-growth oak sites in the Florida high pine landscape: implications for ecosystem management and restoration. *Natural Areas Journal*. 19 (1): 30-40.

Grelen, H. E. 1962. Plant succession on cleared sandhills in northwest Florida. *American Midland Naturalist*, 36-44.

Haag, K. H., Lee, T. M., & Water, T. B. 2010. Hydrology and ecology of freshwater wetlands in central Florida: a primer. Reston, VA, USA: US Geological Survey.

Inventory, F. N. A. 2010. Guide to the natural communities of Florida: 2010 edition. Florida Natural Areas Inventory, Tallahassee, FL.

Kellison, R. C., & Young, M. J. 1997. The bottomland hardwood forest of the southern United States. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 90(2-3), 101-115.

Landers, J. L., & Boyer, W. D. 1999. An old-growth definition for upland longleaf and south Florida slash pine forests, woodlands, and savannas (Vol. 29). US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.

LaPierre, G. D. J., Irizarry, N. M., & Andreu, M. G. 2022. Florida Soil Series and Natural Community Associations: FOR384/FR455, 5/2022. *EDIS*, 2022(3).

Light, H. M. 1993. Hydrology, vegetation, and soils of four North Florida river flood plains with an evaluation of state and federal wetland determinations (Vol. 93, No. 4033). US Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey.

Martin, T. A., & Jokela, E. J. 2004. Stand development and production dynamics of loblolly pine under a range of cultural treatments in north-central Florida USA. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 192(1), 39-58.

Martin, T. A., Adams, D. C., Cohen, M. J., Crandall, R. M., Gonzalez-Benecke, C. A., Smith, J. A., & Vogel, J. G. 2017. Managing Florida's plantation forests in a changing climate. *Florida's Climate: Changes, Variations, & Impacts*.

McNab, W.H.; Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J.A.; Keys, Jr., J.E.; Nowacki, G.J.; Carpenter, C.A., comps. 2007. Description of ecological subregions: sections of the conterminous United States [CD-ROM]. Gen. Tech. Report WO-76B. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 80 p

Monk, C. D. 1968. Successional and environmental relationships of the forest vegetation of north central Florida. *American Midland Naturalist*, 441-457.

NatureServe. 2018. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, VA. U.S.A. Data current as of 28 August 2018.

Schoeneberger, P.J., and Wysocki, D.A. 2017. Geomorphic Description System, Version 5.0. Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Soil Survey Center, Lincoln, NE.

Scott, T. M. 2001. Text to accompany the geologic map of Florida. Florida Geologic Survey, Tallahassee, Florida.

Tamang, B., Hedman, C., Haines, F., Stone, D., & Andreu, M. 2023. Upland forest community composition and structure by ecoregion in 73 Florida state parks—Insights for ongoing management. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 545, 121237.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013. Forage Suitability Groups, MLRA 138XA. Retrieved from <https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/#/state/FL/documents/section=2&folder=52895>.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013a. Forage Suitability Group G138XA111, Sandy Soils on Ridges and Dunes of Xeric Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA111FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013b. Forage Suitability Group G138XA113, Sandy Soils on Strongly Sloping to Steep Side Slopes of Xeric Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA113FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013c. Forage Suitability Group G138XA114, Sandy Xeric Soils on Stream Terraces or Flood Plains. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA114FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013d. Forage Suitability Group G138XA121, Sandy Soils on Rises, Knolls, and Ridges of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA121FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013e. Forage Suitability Group G138XA123, Sandy Soils on Strongly Sloping to Steep Side Slopes of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA123FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013f. Forage Suitability Group G138XA124, Very Deep, Sandy Soils on Terraces and Floodplains. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA124FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013g. Forage Suitability Group G138XA131, Sandy Soils on Rises and Knolls of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA131FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013h. Forage Suitability Group G138XA134, Sandy or Sandy Over Loamy Soils on Stream Terraces or Flood Plains. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA134FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013i. Forage Suitability Group G138XA141, Sandy Soils, on Flats on Mesic and Hydric Lowlands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA141FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013j. Forage Suitability Group G138XA145, Sandy Soils on Stream Terraces, Flood Plains, or in Depressions. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA145FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013j'. Forage Suitability Group G138XA211, Sandy Over Loamy Soils on Knolls and Ridges of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA211FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013k. Forage Suitability Group G138XA221, Sandy Over Loamy Soils on Rises, Knolls, and Ridges of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA221FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013l. Forage Suitability Group G138XA231, Sandy Over Loamy Soils on Flats and Rises of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA231FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013m. Forage Suitability Group G138XA241, Sandy Over Loamy Soils on Flats of Hydric or Mesic Lowlands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA241FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013n. Forage Suitability Group G138XA245, Sandy Over Loamy Soils on Stream Terraces, Flood Plains or in Depressions. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA245FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013o. Forage Suitability Group G138XA311, Loamy and Clayey Soils on Knolls and Ridges of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA311FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013p. Forage Suitability Group G138XA312, Loamy and

Clayey Soils on Ridges and Side Slopes of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA312FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013p'. Forage Suitability Group G138XA321, Loamy and Clayey Soils on Rises and Knolls of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA321FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013p". Forage Suitability Group G138XA322, Loamy and Clayey Sols on Rises, Knolls, and Ridges of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA322FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013q. Forage Suitability Group G138XA331, Loamy and Clayey Soils on Flats and Rises of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA331FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013r. Forage Suitability Group G138XA334, Loamy and Clayey Soils on Stream Terraces and Flood Plains. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA334FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013s. Forage Suitability Group G138XA341, Loamy and Clayey Soils on Flats of Hydric or Mesic Lowlands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA341FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013t. Forage Suitability Group G138XA345, Loamy and Clayey Soils on Stream Terraces, Flood Plains or in Depressions. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA345FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013u. Forage Suitability Group G138XA521, Shallow or Moderately Deep, Sandy or Loamy Soils on Rises and Ridges of Mesic Uplands. Retrieved from https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/FL/FSG_MLRA_138XA521FL.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2017. Geomorphic Description System, Version 5.0. Schoeneberger, P.J., and D.A. Wysocki (eds). USDA-NRCS, National Soil Survey Center, Lincoln, NE.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2022. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. Agriculture Handbook 296.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2013. Level III and IV ecoregions of the continental United States: Corvallis, Oregon, U.S. EPA, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, map scale 1:3,000,000, <https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/level-iii-and-iv-ecoregions-continental-united-states>.

Contributors

Duvall, Matthew
Ferrara, Jack
Figueroa, Martin

Approval

Charles Stemmans, 6/09/2025

Acknowledgments

Sincere appreciation goes to the MLRA 138X ecological sites technical team, especially NRCS Florida State Soil Scientist, Isabelle Giuliani, and NRCS Florida State Forester, Conrad Wysocki, for their persistent collaboration in the development of these Provisional ESDs.

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	09/30/2026
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:
