

DATA ATTRIBUTES, DEFINITIONS, AND VALUES FOR NATURAL COMMUNITY POINTS

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
Site	Name of managed area or potential natural site.
SurveyDate	Date of data collection
Surveyor	Name of scientist who collected the data for this particular point.
FNAI_NC	<p>Type of current natural community observed at the point, using the FNAI classification system plus altered community/land cover types.</p> <p>For all possible values, download the Guide to the Natural Communities of Florida – 2010 Edition here: https://www.fnai.org/species-communities/natcom-guide</p>
IncludedNC	Natural community types that are included within the polygon described by this point. An inclusion may or may not have a data point of its own. This is one of the few fields that applies to the whole polygon, not just the plot.
HistoricNC	Historic natural community type, i.e. the type of natural community that occurred at this point prior to disturbance or alteration, if discernable by the surveyor.
NC_Rank	<p>Rank compared to historic condition based on factors that reflect the present quality, condition, and landscape context of the natural community. Quality reflects species components; condition describes community structure; landscape context is the quality and condition of the surrounding communities irrespective of property ownership. Ranks reflect the degree to which people have directly or adversely impacted community composition, structure, and/or function, including alteration of natural disturbance processes.</p> <p>Rank may be applied to pine plantation or restoration natural community, but should never be “Excellent” for these types.</p> <p>Natural community rank values:</p> <p>Excellent – Natural community is in excellent quality and condition. It is dominated by components and structure characteristic of that natural community type. This natural community has minimal restoration needs and management is at a maintenance condition. No or minimal exotic species are present. Landscape context allows for active management for rare elements and ecological processes.</p> <p>Good – Natural community is in good quality and condition. Most dominant components of the community are present, but some characteristic species are noticeably missing and/or there is a minor presence of weedy or early successional species. Community structure is such that aggressive fire management may be needed to achieve maintenance condition. May have light levels of invasive exotic species. Landscape context allows for active management of rare species and ecological processes.</p> <p>Fair – Natural community is in fair quality and condition. Many dominant components of the community are missing or there is a heavy presence of weedy or early successional species. The community is in need of restoration to restore community structure (e.g., aggressive fire management or more intensive restoration or may have been converted in the past and is now in some stage of restoration). May have</p>

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
	<p>moderate levels of invasive exotic species OR heavy invasive exotic species infestations but is undergoing active treatment. Landscape context may hinder management of rare species and ecological processes.</p> <p>Poor – Natural community is generally degraded but still retains some components and/or structure characteristic of the natural community. This natural community requires extensive restoration. Landscape context may prevent management of rare species and ecological processes.</p>
comments	<p>Free text</p> <p>Comments provides additional, optional information about the plot or polygon. For example, as per a request from the manager at Etoniah State Forest, some natural communities were categorized into “types” depending on ecological quality. This information is listed in the comments field.</p>
veg_notes	<p>Information on dominant species. Full scientific names of species starting with the canopy and moving down through the strata (canopy, subcanopy, tall shrub, short shrub, and herb). Names are separated by commas and the strata are separated by forward slashes.</p>
canopydom	<p>Describes the dominant canopy species. May include any species in the canopy layer (tallest layer of tree species, if present).</p>
subcandom	<p>Describes the dominant subcanopy species. May include any species in the subcanopy layer (if present).</p>
tshrubdom	<p>Describes the dominant tall shrub species. May include any species in the tall shrub layer (multi-stem woody plants and saw palmetto that are taller than 6 feet plus tree saplings that have not entered the sub-canopy).</p>
sshubdom	<p>Describes the dominant short shrub species. May include any species in the short shrub layer (woody plants, single- or multi-stemmed, less than 6 feet tall, including woody seedlings, tree saplings, saw palmetto, and woody ground-vining plants).</p>
herbdom	<p>Describes the dominant herb species (non-woody, soft-tissued plants regardless of height, including non-woody vines, legumes, and graminoids).</p>
epiphytdom	<p>Describes the dominant epiphyte species (ferns, bromeliads, and orchids that typically occur as epiphytes as well as other species that may inhabit tree trunks just above the water line in swamps).</p>
vinedom	<p>Describes the dominant woody vine species (climbing, sprawling, or twining woody vines).</p>
LLP_BA	<p>Numeric</p> <p>Basal area of longleaf pines taken using a 10-factor prism.</p>
OthPine_BA	<p>Numeric</p> <p>Basal area of non-longleaf pine species using a 10-factor prism.</p>
NonPine_BA	<p>Numeric</p> <p>Basal area of all non-pine tree species taken using a 10-factor prism.</p>
canopy_age	<p>Canopy age determined by visual estimate.</p>

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
	<p>Canopy age classes:</p> <p>Old growth: average dbh of canopy trees is very large and/or old growth tree morphology is prevalent in the canopy (e.g. "flat top" morphology in pines or cypress). If tree ages are known, they should average 100+ years old.</p> <p>Older mature: average dbh of canopy trees is medium to large, and some old-age tree morphology (as described in "old growth" above) may be present in the canopy, but is not the norm for most canopy trees. If tree ages are known, they should average 50+ years old.</p> <p>Mature: average dbh of canopy trees is medium size, and may have reached the typical height for a mature forest, but no trees exhibit old age morphology, and there are no trees of very large dbh present. If tree ages are known, they should be more than 30 years old.</p> <p>Younger mature: average dbh for canopy trees is small, and trees may not have reached full height. The majority of canopy trees have reached reproductive status. If tree ages are known, average canopy tree age should be 5-30 years.</p> <p>Pre-reproductive: average canopy tree is small in stature and little or no reproduction is evident, because the trees are too young.</p> <p>None: no canopy present</p>
<p>cnpy_rank Canopy condition rank</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment of canopy condition compared to DFC within the plot based on the expert opinion of field observer. Canopy is defined to include all trees >4" DBH (tree diameter at 4.5ft above ground). If the field surveyor does not have the experience to form an expert opinion on current conditions compared to DFC, this field should be left blank.</p> <p>Canopy condition rank definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor – Canopy cover and diversity bear little resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with very little or no expected canopy development, trees may be common or dominant. Or conversely, a mature canopy may be lacking where it is expected to be present. Weedy (e.g., hardwood encroachment in pine communities or off-site pines) or non-native species may dominate the canopy layer. • Fair – Canopy cover and diversity has some resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with very little or no expected canopy development, trees may be common, but not dominant. Or conversely, canopy trees may be sparse, young, or single-aged where they are expected to be common and multi-aged. Weedy or non-native species may be present in the canopy layer but are not dominant. • Good – Canopy cover and diversity is similar to the historic natural community. In communities with very little or no expected canopy development, trees are occasional to rare. Or conversely, the canopy is well-developed and of desirable density where trees are expected to be common. Canopies in pine communities are multi-aged. Weedy or non-native species may be occasional in the canopy layer but are not common. • Excellent – Canopy cover and diversity is very similar to the historic natural community. The canopy is in desired condition. Non-native species are not present, and weedy species are very sparse.

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
midst_rank Subcan condition rank	<p>Qualitative assessment of midstory (subcanopy) condition compared to DFC within the plot based on the expert opinion of field observer. Midstory is defined to include stems 1-4" DBH. Includes woody shrub species, hardwood/pine saplings, and woody vines. Do NOT include saw palmetto (<i>Serenoa repens</i>) or scrub palmetto (<i>Sabal etonia</i>) regardless of height. If the field surveyor does not have the experience to form an expert opinion on current conditions compared to DFC, this field should be left blank. Subcanopy condition rank definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor – Subcanopy cover and diversity bear little resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with very little or no expected hardwood subcanopy, hardwoods may be highly developed. Or conversely, subcanopy trees may be lacking where they are expected to be present. Weedy or non-native species may dominate the subcanopy layer. • Fair – Subcanopy cover and diversity has some resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with very little or no expected hardwood subcanopy, hardwoods may be common, but not dominant. Or conversely, subcanopy trees may be sparse where they are expected to be common. Weedy or non-native species may be present in the subcanopy layer but are not dominant. • Good – Subcanopy cover and diversity is similar to the historic natural community. In communities with very little or no expected hardwood subcanopy, hardwoods are occasional to rare. Or conversely, the subcanopy is well-developed where hardwoods are expected to be common. Weedy or non-native species may be occasional in the subcanopy layer but are not common. • Excellent – Subcanopy cover and diversity is very similar to the historic natural community. The subcanopy is in desired condition. Non-native species are not present, and weedy species are very sparse.
tshrub_cov	<p>Tall shrubs include multi-stem woody plants and saw palmetto that are taller than 6 feet plus tree saplings that have not entered the sub-canopy.</p> <p>Tall shrub cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%
sshruh_cov	<p>All woody plants, single- or multi-stemmed, less than 6 feet tall, including woody seedlings, tree saplings, saw palmetto, and woody ground-vining plants.</p> <p>Short shrub cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
<p>palmetto</p>	<p>Palmetto cover is a subset of shrubs that includes saw palmetto (<i>Serenoa repens</i>) and scrub palmetto (<i>Sabal etoniah</i>) and is intended to convey information about inflammability of the shrub layer. It does not include needle palm (<i>Rhapidophyllum hystrix</i>), blue palm (<i>Sabal minor</i>), or cabbage palm (<i>Sabal palmetto</i>), unless they occur in fire-maintained communities and function as saw palmetto does to carry fire.</p> <p>Palmetto cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%
<p>dwarfshrub</p>	<p>Dwarf shrub cover is a subset of SSHRUB_COV and includes shrubs that are genetically of short stature and rarely if ever exceed 1 meter/3 feet in height, e.g. runner oak (<i>Quercus pumila</i>), dwarf live oak (<i>Q. minima</i>), Darrow's blueberry (<i>Vaccinium darrowii</i>), dwarf shiny blueberry (<i>V. myrsinites</i>), gopher apple (<i>Licania michauxii</i>), and dwarf huckleberry (<i>Gaylussacia mosieri</i>).</p> <p>Dwarf shrub cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%
<p>shrub_rank Shrub condition rank</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment of overall shrub condition compared to DFC based on the expert opinion of field surveyor. If the field surveyor does not have the experience to form an expert opinion on current conditions compared to DFC, this field should be left blank.</p> <p>Shrub condition rank definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor – Tall and short shrub cover and diversity bear little resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with an expected short, open shrub structure, shrubs may be highly overgrown, tall, dense or have negatively altered the herbaceous community. Or conversely, shrubs may be lacking where they are expected to be present. Weedy or non-native species may dominate the shrub layers. • Fair – Tall and short shrub cover and diversity has some resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with an expected short, open shrub structure, shrubs may be somewhat overgrown and/or have somewhat negatively altered the herbaceous community. Or conversely, shrubs may be sparse where they are expected to be common. Weedy or non-native species may be present in the shrub layers but are not dominant. • Good – Tall and short shrub cover and diversity is similar to the historic natural community. In communities with an expected short, open shrub structure, shrubs are generally in desired condition. Weedy or non-native species may be occasional in the shrub layers but are not common.

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – Tall and short shrub cover and diversity is very similar to the historic natural community. In communities with an expected short, open shrub structure, shrubs are in desired condition. Non-native species are not present, and weedy species are very sparse.
herb_cover	<p>Herb cover includes non-woody, soft-tissued plants regardless of height, including non-woody vines, legumes, and graminoids (grasses, sedges, rushes).</p> <p>Herb cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%
wirygramin	<p>Wiry graminoid cover includes all grasses, sedges, and rushes that have wiry, involute leaves that function as wiregrass (<i>Aristida stricta</i>) in a fire. This is typically an indicator of native groundcover vegetation for pyrogenic natural communities (sandhills, mesic flatwoods, wet flatwoods, wet prairies).</p> <p>Wiry graminoid cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%
herb_rank Herb condition rank	<p>Qualitative assessment of herbaceous groundcover condition compared to DFC based on the expert opinion of field surveyor. If the field surveyor does not have the experience to form an expert opinion on current conditions compared to DFC, this field should be left blank.</p> <p>Herb condition rank definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor – Herbaceous vegetation bears little resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with a high expected diversity or cover, herbs are missing, highly depauperate, or composed of mainly weedy or non-native species. • Fair - Herbaceous vegetation has some resemblance to the historic natural community. In communities with a high expected diversity or cover, herbs are present but lacking in diversity or cover. Weedy or non-native species may be common, but do not dominate the herb layer. • Good - Herbaceous vegetation is similar to the historic natural community. In communities with a high expected diversity or cover, herbs are common to abundant but may be slightly lacking in diversity or cover. Weedy or non-native species may be occasional, but not common. • Excellent - Herbaceous vegetation is very similar to the historic natural community in both diversity and cover. Non-native species are not present, and weedy species are very sparse.

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
epiphyte_abund	<p>Epiphyte abundance refers to ferns, bromeliads, and orchids that typically occur as epiphytes as well as other species that may inhabit tree trunks just above the water line in swamps.</p> <p>Epiphyte abundance values:</p> <p>Absent – Epiphytes are not present in the plot.</p> <p>Infrequent – One or two trees or branches in the plot have a few epiphytes.</p> <p>Occasional – Several trees or branches support epiphytes.</p> <p>Common – Approximately half the trees or tree branches in the plot carry epiphytes, or a few trees or branches are dense with them.</p> <p>Abundant – More than half of the trees or branches have epiphytes, or several trees or branches are especially dense with them.</p>
vine_abund	<p>Vine abundance refers to climbing, sprawling, or twining woody vines.</p> <p>Vine abundance values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absent – Vines are not present in the plot. • Infrequent – One or two vines occur in the plot. • Occasional – Several trees or branches support vines. • Common – Approximately half the trees or tree branches in the plot support vines. • Abundant – More than half of the trees or branches support vines.
litter_cov	<p>Litter cover includes litter exposed between plants as well as litter under shrubs, grass clumps, or other vegetation.</p> <p>Litter cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None – Litter cover is not present in the plot • Low – Less than 50% litter cover • Med – 50-100% litter cover • High – 90-100% litter cover with litter depth over 1 inch
bare_soil	<p>Bare soil coverage includes bare soil surface exposed between plants as well as the litter-free ground surface under vegetation (i.e. not “sky to ground” coverage).</p> <p>Bare soil cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%
inundated	<p>Natural community polygon has water on the ground surface.</p> <p>Inundated values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – Greater than 50% of the plot surface area is under water. • No – Less than 50% of the plot surface area is under water.

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
lastfireyr	<p>Last fire year is an estimate of the time since last fire, using field indicators such as charring and fuel load, unless better data are available from land managers. Non-pyrogenic communities are considered “>20 years” unless there is better information available.</p> <p>Last fire year values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <3 yrs • 3 yrs - 20 yrs • >20 yrs • unknown
exoticscov	<p>Exotics cover includes any non-native species present in the plot, even if it is not invasive in that particular plot.</p> <p>Exotics cover values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • <1% • 1-5% • 6-25% • 26-50% • 51-75% • 76-100%
poly_sever	<p>Polygon disturbance severity describes the overall impact of all combined disturbances noted in the natural community polygon.</p> <p>Polygon disturbance severity values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none • light • moderate • heavy • severe
polydist_1	<p>Polygon disturbance 1 describes the primary disturbance in the natural community polygon. If there is more than one type of disturbance, the most prevalent form of disturbance is entered here and lesser disturbances are entered in POLYDIST_2 and POLYDIST_3.</p> <p>Polygon disturbance values are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agriculture • cattle grazing • cattle trampling • clearing • ditching • exotics • firebreaks • foodplots • forestry site prep • hog digging • natural • ORV trail

ATTRIBUTE	VALUE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recent logging • roads • shrub encroachment • trash/dumping • utility corridor • woody encroachment • roads • exotics • trash piles or dumping • hog digging • firebreaks • food plots • forestry site prep • recent logging • woody encroachment • natural disturbance
polydist_2	<p>Polygon disturbance 2 describes secondary disturbance in the polygon. If there are more than two types of disturbance, the third-most prevalent form of disturbance is entered in POLYDIST_3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Polygon disturbance values are the same as those for POLYDIST_1.
polydist_3	<p>Polygon disturbance 3 describes tertiary disturbance in the polygon.</p> <p>Polygon disturbance values are the same as those for POLYDIST_1.</p>
disturbcom	<p>Disturbance comments are optional and are entered by the surveyor if further explanation is needed in addition to entering data in POLYDIST_1, POLYDIST_2, and POLYDIST_3.</p>
ref_site	<p>Indicates the site is one of FNAIs natural community reference sites.</p> <p>Reference site values are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No