Rapid Assessment Reference Condition Model

The Rapid Assessment is a component of the LANDFIRE project. Reference condition models for the Rapid Assessment were created through a series of expert workshops and a peer-review process in 2004-2005. For more information, please visit www.landfire.gov. Please direct questions to helpdesk@landfire.gov.

Potential Natural Vegetation Group (PNVG):

R1MTME

Wet Mountain Meadow/Lodgepole Pine-Subalpine

General Information							
Contributors (additional contributors may be listed under "Model Evolution and Comments")							
Modelers		Reviewers					
Kelly Pohl	kpohl@tnc.org						
Paul Reeberg	paul_reeberg@nps.gov						
Ayn Shlisky	ashlisky@tnc.org						
Vegetation Type	General Model Sources	Rapid Assessment Model Zones					
Grassland	✓ Literature	✓ California					
Dominant Species*	Local Data	Great Basin South Central					
CAREX	✓ Expert Estimate	Great Lakes Southeast					
DECA18	LANDFIRE Mapping Zones	Northeast S. Appalachians					
MUFI2		Northern Plains Southwest					
	3 6	N-Cent.Rockies					
PICO	4	—					
	5						

Geographic Range

California Sierra Nevada, Southern Cascades

Biophysical Site Description

Wet meadows typically occur at upper elevations scattered throughout the geographic range, generally above 3900 ft (1200 m) in the north and 5900 ft (1800 m) in the south. The soils are less acidic and nutrient-rich compared to bogs and fens, and are likely to remain wet late into the summer and in some places permanently. Meadows can occur near seeps streams and lakes, on steep slopes or in larger gaps within forested areas. Climate, interacting with fire, has played a role in maintaining meadows.

Vegetation Description

Occurs in openings interspersed among the various timber types. Generally there is less than 20 percent shrub canopy, and trees may occur widely scattered, especially around the perimeters. Two meadow typeswet and dry-are recognized in this classification, although commonly both types may occur in the same opening. Willows (Salix spp.) and alders (Alnus spp.) may form rather dense thickets about these wetter sites. Perennial grasses and forbs dominate dry meadows, and most will have some sedges. Dominant species include: primarily monocotyledonous species including hydrophytic sedges, which may include: abrupt-beaked sedge (C. abrupta), golden-fruited sedge (Carex aurea), and Nebraska sedge (C. nebraskensis), Agrostis thuberiana, Deschampsia caespitosa, and Muhlenbergia filiformis. Or if on steep slopes or in larger gaps: satin lupine (Lupinus obtusilobus), mule ears (Wyethia mollis), Artemisia douglasiana, and Alnus tenuifolia.

Disturbance Description

Tree invasion of meadows began during the late 1800s and peaked during the early 1900s following a decline in fire frequency. Establishment occurred during cool and/or normal to wet springs, but was delayed along stock trails where grazing effects were most severe (Norman and Taylor 2003). Tree invasion or

mortality is often primarily a result of interannual climatic patterns in addition to fire. The disturbance regime is very spatially complex in this vegetation type.

Adjacency or Identification Concerns

Scale Description

Sources of Scale Data V Literature Local Data V Expert Estimate

Issues/Problems

Model Evolution and Comments

Original model description did not match model attributes or outputs. Reeberg suggested editing model to reflect description better. Shlisky did this, but could not replicate reference state percentages with the original fire return interval means. With the original 250/120/2 replacement/mixed/surface intervals it was impossible to get 80% in an early seral state (A), as originally estimated in the DB by Reeburg. Shlisky assumed most of the surface fires implied by Reeberg were in open lodgepole stands, and may have been frequent, but would not result in a 2 year FRI for surface fires over the entire PNVG (i.e., open lodgepole stands make up a small portion of the PNVG, and the majority of the PNVG is estimated to be in state A, where it is assumed most fires would be stand replacement, not surface fires.

Succession Classes

Succession classes are the equivalent of "Vegetation Fuel Classes" as defined in the Interagency FRCC Guidebook (www.frcc.gov).

Class A 50 %		Indicator Species* and	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)				
Early 1 Deat	Dam	Canopy Position	Min			Max	
Early1 PostRep <u>Description</u> Grasses and forbs; shrubs emerging (snow bush, bush chinquapin); tree		HW	Cover		0%	100 %	
			Height		no data	no data	
			Tree Size	e Class			
cover <10%	2	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data	Height and cover of dominant lifeforn				
Class B	30%	Indicator Species* and	Structur	e Data (1	for upper layer	lifeform)	
		Canopy Position	Structur	e Data (i	f <mark>or upper layer</mark> Min	lifeform) Max	
Mid1 Closed		Canopy Position PICO	Structur	e Data (i		a	
Mid1 Closed Description	d	Canopy Position			Min	Max	
Mid1 Closed Description Sapling and	d pole sized lodgepole	Canopy Position PICO	Cover		Min 40 %	Max 100 %	
Mid1 Closed <u>Description</u> Sapling and pines at >40	d	Canopy Position PICO	Cover Height Tree Size	e <i>Class</i> ayer lifel	Min 40 % no data no data	Max 100 % no data dominant lifeform.	

Class C	10%	Indicator Species* and	d <u>Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)</u>				
		<u>Canopy Position</u> PICO	Min			Max	
Mid1 Open <u>Description</u> Sapling-pole sized lodgepole pines at <40% cover with little		HW	Cover		10%	39 %	
		П₩	Height		no data	no data	
			Tree Size	e Class	no data	J	
	occurring on rockier,	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data	Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:				
Class D 5% Indicator Species* and Structure Data (for u					for upper laver	lifeform)	
	0 /0	<u>Canopy Position</u> PICO			Min	Max	
Late1 Open			Cover		10%	39 %	
Description		HW	Height		no data	no data	
-	l stands of mature to dgepole pines at <40%		Tree Size	e Class	no data		
understory. V lower elevati	atches and little White fir emerging at ions; limber pine higher elevations.	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data		n dominant lifeform. feform are:			
Class E	5%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	nd Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)				
Late1 Closed	1	PICO			Min	Max	
Description	1	HW	Cover		40 %	100 %	
Mature and large lodgepole pines with lower strata of fir; occurring		11 **	Height		no data	no data	
			Tree Size	e Class	no data		
lower in elev	•	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:				
		Fuel Model no data					
		Disturba	nces				
Non-Fire Dist	turbances Modeled	Fire Regime Group:	1				
✓ Insects/Di ✓ Wind/Wes ✓ Native Gr □ Competiti □ Other:	ather/Stress azing	e I: 0-35 year frequency, low and mixed severity II: 0-35 year frequency, replacement severity III: 35-200 year frequency, low and mixed severity					

<u>Historical Fire Size (acres)</u> Avg: Min: Max:	Fire intervals (FI): Fire interval is expressed in years for each fire severity class and for all types of fire combined (All Fires). Average FI is the central tendency modeled. Minimum and maximum show the relative range of fire intervals, if known. Probability is the inverse of fire interval in years and is used in reference condition modeling. Percent of all fires is the percent of all fires in that severity class. All values are estimates and not precise.						
		Avg Fl	Min FI	Max FI	Probability	Percent of All Fires	
Sources of Fire Regime Data	Replacement	100			0.01	21	
Literature	Mixed	200			0.005	10	
Local Data	Surface	30			0.03333	69	
Expert Estimate	All Fires	21			0.04833		

References

Brown, James K.; Smith, Jane Kapler, eds. 2000. Wildland fire in ecosystems: effects of fire on flora. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42-vol. 2. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 257 p.

Chang, Chi-Ru. 1996. Ecosystem responses to fire and variations in fire regimes. In: Status of the Sierra Nevada. Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project: Final report to Congress. Volume II: Assessments and scientific basis for management options. Wildland Resources Center Report No. 37. Davis, CA: University of California, Centers for Water and Wildland Resources: 1079-1099.

Holland, R.F., 1986. Preliminary descriptions of the terrestrial natural communities of California. State of California, The Resources Agency, Nongame Heritage Program, Dept. Fish & Game, Sacramento, Calif. 156 pp.

Norman, S.P. and A.H. Taylor. 1998. Variable fire history across a forest-meadow landscape. Association of American Geographers, Boston, Massachusetts.

Norman, S. P. and A. H. Taylor. 2003. Tropical and north Pacific teleconnections influence fire regimes in pine-dominated forests of northeastern California, USA. Journal of Biogeography 30(7): 1081-1092.

Parker, A. 1986. Persistence of lodgepole pine forests in the central Sierra Nevada. Ecology 67(6): 1560-1567.

Pinder, J.E., G.C. Kroh, J.D. White, and A.M.B. May. 1997. The relationships between vegetation type and topography in Lassen Volcanic National Park. Plant Ecology 131:17-29.

Peterson, David L., Arbaugh, Michael J., Robinson, Lindsay J., and Derderian, Berg R. 1990. Growth trends of whitebark pine and lodgepole pine in a subalpine Sierra Nevada forest, California, U.S.A. Arctic and Alpine Research 22 (3): 233-243.

Rendel, Philip W., Parsons, David J., Gordon, Donald T. 1988. Montane and subalpine vegetation of the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Ranges. In Barbour, Michael G., and Major, Jack, eds. Terrestrial Vegetation of California. California Native Plant Society Special Publication #9.

Schmidt, Kirsten M, Menakis, James P., Hardy, Colin C., Hann, Wendel J., Bunnell, David L. 2002. Development of coarse-scale spatial data for wildland fire and fuel management. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-

^{*}Dominant and Indicator Species are from the NRCS PLANTS database. To check a species code, please visit http://plants.usda.gov.

GTR-87. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 41 p. + CD.

Sheppard, Paul R., Lassoie, James P. 1998. Fire regime of the lodgepole pine forest of Mt. San Jacinto, California. Madroño 45 (1): 47-56. U.S.

Taylor, A.H. 1990. Tree invasion in meadows of Lassen Volcanic National Park, California. Professional Geographer 4:457-470.