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#MGRA	Idaho Fescue Grasslands	5					
General Information							
Contributors (additiona	al contributors may be listed under "Model Evoluti	ion and Comments")					
Modelers	Reviewers						
Katie Phillips	cgphillips@fs.fed.us						
Jimmy Kagen	jimmy.kagan@oregonstate. edu						
Vegetation Type	General Model Sources	Rapid Assessment Model Zones					
Grassland	✓ Literature	California	 Pacific Northwest 				
Dominant Species*	Local Data	Great Basin	South Central				
FEID	✓ Expert Estimate	Great Lakes	Southeast				
LUPIN	LANDFIRE Mapping Zones	Northeast	S. Appalachians				
KOCR	1 8	N-Cent.Rockies					
PSSP6	2 9						
	7						

Geographic Range

Eastern Columbia Basin, Palouse, Okanogan foothills, Blue Matins, Zumwalt Prairie, Yumatilla Plateau, Hells Canyon

Biophysical Site Description

PNVG generally occurs on gentle (< 30%) northerly aspects above 2000 feet, gentle southerly aspects in the montane zone, and steep (>30%) southerly aspects in the upper montane zone (FRCC model MGRA1). It is typically dominated by one or more perennial bunchgrasses (e.g. Festuca idahoensis) but may contain a strong forb component on more mesic sites. Its distribution is largely the product of low precipitation caused by the rain shadow of the Cascades Mountains, though timing of precipitation and soils are also important drivers (Daubenmire 1970, Driscoll 1964). Climatically this vegetation zone is arid to semi-arid with warm to hot dry summers and relatively cold winters (Franklin and Dyrness 1988).

Vegetation Description

It is typically dominated by one or more perennial bunchgrasses including Pseudoroegneria spicata, Agropyron inerme (currently Pseudoroegneria spicata ssp. Inermis), Festuca idahoensis, Calamagrostis rubescens, Koeleria crestata. This PNVG also includes a strong forb component including Balsamorhiza sagittata, Hieracium cynoglossoides, Lupinus sericeus and Lupinus latifolius.

Disturbance Description

Grasslands retain little evidence of historic fire regimes. Native Americans likely played a role in fire occurrence near populated areas, but the evidence is inconclusive as to their impact at a larger spatial scale and it is likely that fuel conditions and weather were more important drivers of historic fire regimes (Whitlock and Knox 2002). Grasslands in this area dominated by Idaho fescue may have enough fuel to burn annually, but probably did not because of low flammability early in the season and lack of fire starts

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

across grasslands late in the season (Agee 1994). Response to fire varies, with Idaho fescue susceptible to mortality if fuel load allows smouldering of the root crown to occur. Following fire, this PNVG typically exhibits an increase in forb cover (Agee 1994).

The rangelands of the planning area and many of the major perennial grasses (e.g. bluebunch wheatgrass and Idaho fescue) did not evolve with substantial ungulate grazing (Daubenmire 1970).

Adjacency or Identification Concerns

Many of the soils are suitable for agriculture and approximately 56 percent of the dry grass zone has been converted to agriculture or urban use (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997).

Fire suppression may lead to a shrub dominated type in some areas, particularly in mesic ecotones.

Scale Description

Sources of Scale Data Literature Local Data Expert Estimate

This type fingers up into the montane forests on steep southerly slopes and shallow soils. These patches are often too small to map and may be overlooked. Burn size is variable with topography and distribution of rock and riparian areas influencing fire spread.

Issues/Problems

This PNVG lacks fire history data.

Model Evolution and Comments

Succession Classes

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

Class A 10%	Indicator Species* and	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)			
	Canopy Position		Min	Max	
Early1 PostRep	PSSP6	Cover	5%	20 %	
<u>Description</u>	POSA	Height	no data	no data	
This early seral community follows	EPILO	Tree Size Clas		no data	
a topkill event in which cover of	FEID	The Size Class no data			
bunch grasses and perennial forbs has been reduced. Forb composition is relatively higher in this stage than at later stages with increased occurrence of Colinsia, Lupinus, Epilobium, Balsamorhiza, Geum and Potentilla. Poa and Vulpia may also increase.	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data	Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:			

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

Class B 70 %		Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)				
Late1 Closed		FEID	Min Ma				
		LUPIN	Cover	40 %	80 %		
<u>Description</u>		PSSP6	Height	no data	no data		
Very little bare ground, litter bare ground cover is high. Plants are vigorous and well established. Fires are rarely lethal, and the community responds quickly to fire. Cover values are high, ranging from 30 to 80 percent.		KOCR	Tree Siz	e Class no data			
		Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data		i dominant lifeform. feform are:			
Class C 2	0%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	<u>d</u> <u>Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)</u>				
Lata 2 Classed		SYAL		Min	Max		
Late2 Closed Description		ROSA	Cover	20 %	60 %		
	l resulting from long	CRDO2	Height	no data	no data		
	e. Shrub component	FEID	Tree Size	e Class no data			
has largely encroached from adjacent deciduous shrublands. These sites are more mesic than the similar Class B.		Upper Layer Lifeform	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifefo Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:				
adjacent decidu These sites are i	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	Herbaceous Shrub Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data					
adjacent decidu These sites are i similar Class B.	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	□ Shrub □ Tree	Height a	and cover of dominant life e Data (for upper layer I	eform are: ifeform)		
adjacent decidu These sites are r similar Class B.	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	Shrub Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data <u>Indicator Species* and</u>	Height a	and cover of dominant life e Data (for upper laver l Min	eform are: <u>ifeform)</u> Max		
adjacent decidu These sites are r similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	Shrub Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data <u>Indicator Species* and</u>	Height a	and cover of dominant life e Data (for upper layer I Min %	eform are: <u>ifeform)</u> <u>Max</u> %		
adjacent decidu These sites are i similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	Shrub Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data <u>Indicator Species* and</u>	Height a <u>Structure</u> <u>Cover</u> <u>Height</u>	and cover of dominant life 2 Data (for upper layer l <i>Min</i> % no data	eform are: <u>ifeform)</u> Max		
adjacent decidu These sites are r similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	Shrub Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data <u>Indicator Species* and</u>	Height a	and cover of dominant life 2 Data (for upper layer l <i>Min</i> % no data	eform are: <u>ifeform)</u> <u>Max</u> %		
adjacent decidu These sites are i similar Class B.	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	Shrub Tree <u>Fuel Model</u> no data <u>Indicator Species* and</u>	Height a <u>Structure</u> <u>Cover</u> <u>Height</u> <u>Tree Size</u> Upper la	and cover of dominant life 2 Data (for upper layer l <i>Min</i> % no data	eform are: <u>ifeform)</u> <u>Max</u> No data dominant lifeform.		
adjacent decidu These sites are r similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	☐ Shrub ☐ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and Canopy Position Upper Layer Lifeform ☐ Herbaceous ☐ Shrub	Height a <u>Structure</u> <u>Cover</u> <u>Height</u> <u>Tree Size</u> Upper la	and cover of dominant life Data (for upper layer l <i>Min</i> % no data <i>Class</i> no data ayer lifeform differs from	eform are: <u>ifeform)</u> <u>Max</u> No data dominant lifeform.		
adjacent decidu These sites are n similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed Description	ous shrublands. more mesic than the 0%	☐ Shrub ☐ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and Canopy Position Upper Layer Lifeform ☐ Herbaceous ☐ Shrub ☐ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and	Height a	and cover of dominant life Data (for upper layer l <i>Min</i> % no data <i>Class</i> no data ayer lifeform differs from	ifeform) <u>Max</u> <u>%</u> no data dominant lifeform. eform are:		
adjacent decidu These sites are r similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed Description	ous shrublands. more mesic than the	□ Shrub □ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and Canopy Position Upper Layer Lifeform □ Herbaceous □ Shrub □ Tree Fuel Model no data	Height a	e Data (for upper laver I Min % no data e Class no data ayer lifeform differs from and cover of dominant life	ifeform) <u>Max</u> <u>%</u> no data dominant lifeform. eform are:		
adjacent decidu These sites are r similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed Description Class E 0 Late2 Closed	ous shrublands. more mesic than the 0%	☐ Shrub ☐ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and Canopy Position Upper Layer Lifeform ☐ Herbaceous ☐ Shrub ☐ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and	Height a	and cover of dominant life Data (for upper layer l <i>Min</i> % no data <i>Class</i> no data ayer lifeform differs from and cover of dominant life Data (for upper layer l	eform are: ifeform) Max % no data dominant lifeform. eform are: ifeform)		
adjacent decidu These sites are n similar Class B. Class D Late1 Closed Description	ous shrublands. more mesic than the 0%	☐ Shrub ☐ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and Canopy Position Upper Layer Lifeform ☐ Herbaceous ☐ Shrub ☐ Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and	Height a <u>Structure</u> <u>Cover</u> <u>Height</u> <u>Tree Size</u> Upper la Height a <u>Structure</u>	Data (for upper layer I Min % no data Class no data ayer lifeform differs from and cover of dominant life e Data (for upper layer I Min	eform are: ifeform) Max % no data dominant lifeform. eform are: ifeform) Max		

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

	Upper Layer Life Herbaceou Shrub Tree Fuel Model no	IS			differs from d dominant lifef	ominant lifeform. orm are:
Disturbances						
Non-Fire Disturbances Modeled ☐ Insects/Disease ☐ Wind/Weather/Stress ☐ Native Grazing ✔ Competition ☐ Other: ☐ Other:	Fire Regime Group:2I: 0-35 year frequency, low and mixed severityII: 0-35 year frequency, replacement severityIII: 35-200 year frequency, low and mixed severityIV: 35-200 year frequency, replacement severityV: 200+ year frequency, replacement severity					
<u>Historical Fire Size (acres)</u> Avg: Min: Max:	<i>Fire Intervals (FI):</i> 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	40			0.025	76
✓ Literature	Mixed	125			0.008	24
 Local Data	Surface					
Expert Estimate	All Fires	30			0.03301	
References						

Agee, J.K. 1994. Fire and weather disturbances in terrestrial ecosystems of the Eastern Cascades. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-320. Portland OR: USDA, Forest Service 52 pp.

Daubenmire, R. 1970. Steppe vegetation of Washington. Wash. Agric. Exp. Stn. Tech. Bull. 62, 131 p., illus.

Driscoll, R.S. 1964. A relict area in the central Oregon juniper zone. Ecology, Vol 45, No. 2, pp. 345-353.

Franklin, J.F. and C.T.Dyrness. 1988. Natual Vegetation of Oregon and Washington. Oregon State University Press, pp 452.

Quigley, T.M. and Arbelbide S.J. tech. Eds. 1997. An assessment of ecosystem components in the interior Columbia Basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins: vol. 2. Gen. Tech. Rpt. GTR-PNW-405. Portland OR: USDA, Forest Service pp. 1055.

Whitlock, Cathy and M.A. Knox 2002. Prehistoric burning in the Pacific Northwest : human versus climatic influences. Fire, native peoples, and the natural landscape. Washington, D. C. : Island Press: p. 195-231.

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