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):

R#DFWV

Douglas-fir Willamatte Valley Foothills

	General Info	ormation			
Contributors (addition	al contributors may be listed under "Model	Evolution and Commen	nts")		
Modelers		Reviewers			
Jane Kertis	jkertis@fs.fed.us	Pete Weisberg	pweisberg@cabnr.unr.ed u		
Tom DeMeo	tdemeo@fs.fed.us	Louisa Evers	Louisa_Eve ov	Evers@or.blm.g	
Vegetation Type	General Model Sources	Rapid Assessment Model Zones			
Forested	Literature	Cali	fornia	✓ Pacific Northwest	
Dominant Species*	✓Local Data	Grea	ıt Basin	South Central	
PSME	✓ Expert Estimate	Grea	it Lakes	Southeast	
TSHE	LANDFIRE Mapping Zones	Nort	heast hern Plains	S. Appalachians	
ADUK	1 8 2 9		ent.Rockies		

Geographic Range

This forested type occurs in the foothills around the rim of the Willamette Valley, Oregon. It more abundant at the south end of the valley.

Biophysical Site Description

The type occurs in the lower hills of both the Coast range and Cascades. Precipitation averages 50-55 in per year. Elevation 1000-1800 ft.

Vegetation Description

Douglas-fir with western hemlock and grand fir, particularly in later seral stages. Willamette Valley grasses may be present in the post-replacement and open classes. Dry sites may contain Incense cedar.

Disturbance Description

Fire Regime III overall. Mix of IIIA and I. Burns more frequently than Douglas-fir-Hemlock. Since the type spans between the frequent fires of the Willamette Valley grasslands and forested hills, the range of fire return is wide.

Adjacency or Identification Concerns

Affected by fires in adjacent oak woodland. Burns more frequently than Douglas-fir-Hemlock PNVG.

Scale Description

Sources of Scale Data Literature 🖌 Local Data 🖉 Expert Estimate

Relatively small abundance. Probably too finely distributed for the rapid assessment.

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

Issues/Problems

Louisa Evers suggested that wind-damage is significant and should be modeled.

Both reviewers thought that the fire freq was too high. One thesis showed an MFRI of 28 years (cross-dated) in the southern Willamette Valley foothills, while another showed 50-60 in the Coburg Hills (not cross-dated). The cross-dated fire history informed this model, and may reflect the detection of lower severity fires than those that non-cross-dated results may show.

Model Evolution and Comments

Can also be thought of as the driest Douglas-fir-Hemlock type. Native American burning may have increased the frequency of fire in certain locations, especially at lower elevations where the grasslands fire regime impinges.

Class A	15%	Indicator Species* and	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)			
Early1 PostRep <u>Description</u> Grasses, forbs, and seedling to pole- sized Douglas-fir.		Canopy Position PSME	Min		Max	
			Cover		0%	90 %
			Height		no data	no data
			Tree Size Class no data			
		Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant life Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:			
		Evel Mardel 1				
		Fuel Model no data				
Class B	15%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	Structure I	Data (for upper laye	er lifeform)
Class B Mid1 Close	15% ed	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position PSME	Structure I	Data (for upper laye Min	e <mark>r lifeform)</mark> Max
<i>Class B</i> Mid1 Close Description	15% ed	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position PSME TSHE	Structure I	Data (for upper laye Min 40 %	r lifeform) Max 100 %
Class B Mid1 Close <u>Description</u>	15% ed	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position PSME TSHE	Structure I Cover Height	Data (for upper laye Min 40 % no data	er lifeform) Max 100 % no data
Class B Mid1 Close <u>Description</u> >40% pole fir with sort	15% ed - - to small-sized Douglas- ne grand fir and western	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position PSME TSHE ABGR	Structure I Cover Height Tree Size C	Data (Class	for upper laye Min 40 % no data no data	e <mark>r lifeform)</mark> Max 100 % no data
Class B Mid1 Close <u>Description</u> >40% pole fir with sor hemlock. I growth rate diameters t	15% ed 	Fuer Model no data Indicator Species* and Canopy Position PSME TSHE ABGR Upper Laver Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree	Structure I Cover Height Tree Size C Upper lay Height and	Data (Class ver life nd cove	for upper laye Min 40 % no data no data form differs fro er of dominant	r lifeform) Max 100 % no data m dominant lifeform lifeform are:

Class C 10%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)				
Mid1 Open	PSME TSHE ABGR	Min		Max		
Description		Cover	0%	40 %		
<40% Douglas-fir pole-sized to		Height	no data	no data		
small-sized with open understory		Tree Size	e Class no data			
(including grand fir and western hemlock). In certain conditions, growth rates may produce larger diameters than noted.	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:				
Class D 30%	Indicator Species* and	nd Structure Data (for upper laver lifeform)				
	Canopy Position DSME		Min	Max		
Late1 Open	PSME TSHE	Cover	0%	40 %		
Description		Height	no data	no data		
<40% medium and large Douglas-	ADUK	Tree Size	e Class no data			
	□Shrub □Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data					
Class E 30 %	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	d <u>Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)</u>				
Late1 Closed	PSME	0	Min	Max		
Description	TSHE	Cover	40%	90%		
>40% medium and large, even-	ABGR	Height	no data	no data		
aged Douglas-fir with some grand		1166 2126	e Class no data			
fir and western hemlock in overstory, little understory.	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 Disturbances Modeled	Fire Regime Group:	1				
 Insects/Disease Wind/Weather/Stress Native Grazing Competition Other: Other: 	I: 0-35 year frequer II: 0-35 year freque III: 35-200 year freq IV: 35-200 year freq V: 200+ year freque	ency, low and mixed severity uency, replacement severity equency, low and mixed severity requency, replacement severity quency, replacement severity				

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

<u>Historical Fire Size (acres)</u> Avg: Min: Max:	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 Fl	Max FI	Probability	Percent of All Fires	
Sources of Fire Regime Data	Replacement	150	100	400	0.00667	18	
✓ Literature	Mixed	90	40	150	0.01111	29	
✓ Local Data	Surface	50	20	80	0.02	53	
Expert Estimate	All Fires	26			0.03778		

References

Kertis, J. 2004. Valley fringe fire history study. Unpub. Data on file, USDA Forest Service. Siuslaw National Forest, Corvallis, OR

Eira Intervola (El)

Robbins, D. 2005. Temporal and Spatial Variability of Historic Fire Frequency in the Southern Willamette Valley Foothills of Oregon. M.S. Thesis, Oregon State University.

Weisberg, P.J. 1998. Fire History, Fire Regimes and Develoment of Forest Structure in the Central Western Oregon Cascades. PhD dissertation. Oregon State University. 256 pp

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