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):

R5PRSG

Southern Short/Mixed Grass Prairie

General Information								
Contributors (additional contributors may be listed under "Model Evolution and Comments")								
Modelers	<u>Reviewers</u>							
Gary P Bell	gbell@tnc.org			Delbert M. Bassett dmbassett@tamu.edu				
				Doug Zollner	tnc.org			
Vegetation Type	Genera	I Model	Sources	Rap	oid Assessme	nt Model Zones		
Grassland	∠ Li	terature			California	Pacific Northwest		
Dominant Species*		ocal Data			Great Basin	South Central		
BOGR2	▼E:	xpert Esti	imate		Great Lakes	Southeast		
BUDA	LANDFIRE Mapping Zones			Northeast Northern Plains	S. Appalachians			
BOCU	27	31	26		N-Cent.Rockies	Southwest		
ARPU9	34	32	38		v-Cent.ROCKIES			
	33	35	29					

Geographic Range

Shortgrass Prairie occurs in the High Plains from Southern Wyoming and Nebraska through Eastern Colorado and Western Kansas to Eastern New Mexico and West Texas. This PNVG grades into Mixed Grass Prairie in the Central Plains.

Biophysical Site Description

This PNVG occurs on the High Plains portion of the Great Plains in the eastern foothills of the Rocky Mountain front and associated N-S trending mountain ranges south to the Guadalupes in eastern New Mexico and West Texas where the type transitions into Desert Grasslands.

Vegetation Description

The vegetation is dominated by a matrix system of blue grama (Bouteloua gracilis) throughout most of range, with a variety of graminoid codominants and associates, especially buffalo grass (Buchloe dactyloides), sideoats grama (B. curtipendula) and three-awn (Aristida purpurea and others). Mid-height grasses may be present to a greater or lesser extent, especially on the north slope of hills, breaks, and draws. In the eastern part of the range this system forms deep sods. Further west where the system grades into desert grasslands blue grama tends to become a bunchgrass, with lighter fuel loads and more bare ground.

Disturbance Description

This fire regime is group II, with frequent stand-replacement fires (approx. every eight years). There is no historical documentation on the actual extent or condition of native grasslands or the frequency of fire before 1850. However, the presumed return cycle is 3-5 years. Some authors suggest that Native Americans may have started fires routinely in grassland and oak woodland (e.g. Stewart 1951, Sauer 1944). Traubaud and LePart (1980) indicated that species diversity peaks two years after a fire in grassland. Because fire has an adverse effect on the dominant exotic grasses, a decline in their percent composition provides competitive release for forbs, both native and exotic (Hervey 1949). The initial burn on a

previously unburned plot results in a more pronounced change in species composition than subsequent burns, relative to an unburned control plot, but without subsequent burning, a burned area slowly reverts back to the unburned condition; low in species diversity and dominated by alien annual grasses.

Adjacency or Identification Concerns

This PNVG may be similar to the PNVGs R4PRMGs from the Northern Plains model zone and R5PRSG from the South Central model zone.

Scale Description

Sources of Scale Data ♥ Literature □ Local Data ♥ Expert Estimate

Landscape is greater than 100,000 acres.

Issues/Problems

Recovery in this system is more a function of climate that years post burn. If it rains shortly after a fire then recovery will be within a year. The longer it remains dry after a fire, the longer the recovery time.

Model Evolution and Comments

Chris Pague (TNC-COFO), Steve Kettler (KS); Tom Bragg, Suzanne Hickey. Site description and issues/problems sections were expanded after review.

Succession Classes

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

Class A10 %Early1 All StructuresDescriptionPostfire. Char and ash w/ resprouting grasses especially post- rains in August-October. Low likelihood of subsequent replacement fire in the absence of dry fuel build-up.	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position BOGR2 Upper BUCHL Upper BOCU Upper SCHIZ4 Upper Laver Lifeform ✓ Herbaceous Shrub Tree	Structure Data (for upper layer Min Cover 0 % Height no data Tree Size Class no data Upper layer lifeform differs from Height and cover of dominant lift	Max 100 % no data dominant lifeform.		
	Fuel Model 1	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)			
Class B 55%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position				
Class B 55% Mid1 Closed	Canopy Position BOGR2 Upper	Min	Мах		
	Canopy Position		Max 75 % no data dominant lifeform.		

Class C 20%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (fo	or upper layer life	<u>eform)</u>	
Latal Classed	BOGR2 Upper		Min	Max	
Late1 Closed Description	BUCHL Upper	Cover	75 %	100 %	
	BOCU Upper	Height n	no data	no data	
Late development closed canopy. Lower diversity and lower	SHIZ4 Upper	Tree Size Class	e Class no data		
productivity greater than 3 years post-fire. Fuel build-up in absence of grazing or fire may make the system more susceptible to stand- replacement fire. Mesquite (Prosopis glandulosa) and other woody species may encroach in th absence of fire. With fire suppression, another class would be added to the model.	Shrub Tree Fuel Model 1		orm differs from de r of dominant lifef	m dominant lifeform. lifeform are:	

Class D	15%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	* and <u>Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)</u>			
Latal Opan				Min	Max	
Late1 Open			Cover	0%	25 %	
<u>Description</u>			Height	no data	no data	
Sparse vegetation on large-scale			Tree Size Cla	ass no data		
1 0	own complexes.					
U	diversity. Towns may	Upper Layer Lifeform			n dominant lifeform.	
-	breaks to limit extent	✓ Herbaceous	Height and	cover of dominant I	iteform are:	
-	-scale fires. Rare	Shrub				
	ts might make the	Tree				
•	able to recolonization	Fuel Model 1				
	therwise these town	1				
complexes a	re rather persistent.					

Class E	0%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)				
Lata 1 All Structures			Min		Min	Max	
Late1 All Structures Description	Cover		%		%		
	Height		no data		no data		
	Tree Size Class		no data				
		Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:				
		Disturba	nces				

Non-Fire Disturbances Modeled ✓Insects/Disease Wind/Weather/Stress ✓Native Grazing Competition ✓Other: Prairie Dog Town 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						
Historical Fire Size (acres) Avg: 100000 Min: 1000 Max: 1000000	<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 Fl	Max FI	Probability	Percent of All Fires	
Sources of Fire Regime Data	Replacement	8	1	10	0.125	100	
✓ Literature	Mixed						
Local Data	Surface						
Expert Estimate							
References							

Brockway, D.G., R.G. Gatewood, and R.B. Paris. 2002. Restoring fire as an ecological process in shortgrass prairie ecosystems: initial effects of prescribed burning during the dormant and growing seasons. Journal of Environmental Management 65: 135-152.

Dick-Peddie, W.A. 1993. New Mexico vegetation: past, present and future. University of New Mexico Press. 244 pp.

Jurney, D., R. Evans, J. Ippolito and V. Bergstrom. 2004. The role of wildland fire in portions of southeastern North America. Pp. 95-116 IN: R.T. Engstrom, K.E.M. Galley and W.J. de Groot (eds). Proceedings of the 22nd Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference: Fore in Montane, Boreal, and Temperate Ecosystems. Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, FL.

Loucks, O.L., M.L. Plumb-Mentjes, and D. Rogers. 1985. Gap processes and large-scale disturbances in sand prairies. Pp 71-83 in S.T.A. Pickett and P.J. White, eds., The Ecology of Natural Disturbance and Patch Dynamics. Academic Press, New York. 472 pp.

Lusby, G.C. Hydrologic and biotic effects of grazing vs. non-grazing near Grand Junction, Colorado. J. Range Manage. 23:256-260.

Sauer, C.O. 1944. A geographic sketch of early man in America. Geogr. Rev. 34:529-573. Stewart, O.C. 1951. Burning and the natural vegetation of the United States. Geogr. Rev. 41:317-320.

Vogl, R.J. 1974. Effects of fire on grasslands, Pp. 139-194, In: T.T. Kozlowski and C.E. Ahlgren [eds.], Fire and ecosystems, Academic Press, New York.

Wright, H.A. and A.W. Bailey. 1982. Chapter 5, Grasslands, Pp. 80-137 In: Fire Ecology - United States and Canada. John Wiley, New York.