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):

R3PICOif

Central Rocky Mountains Lodgepole Pine - Infrequent Fire

General Information

Contributors (additiona	al contributors may	/ be liste	d under "Mode	l Evolution and Comm	ents")			
Modelers				<u>Reviewers</u>				
Barry C. Johnston	bcjohnston@fs.fed.us			William L. Baker	bakerwl@1	bakerwl@uwyo.edu		
William L. Baker	bakerwl@uwyo	o.edu						
Vegetation Type	General Model Sources			Rapid Assessment Model Zones				
Forested	✓ Literature			Ca	lifornia	Pacific Northwest		
Dominant Species*	✓ Local Data✓ Expert Estimate			Gr	eat Basin	South Central		
PICO					eat Lakes	Southeast		
VACCI	LANDFIRE Mapping Zones			ortheast	S. Appalachians			
	1.4	24	28		orthern Plains	✓ Southwest		
	14	24	20	N	Cent.Rockies			
	15	25						
	23	27						

Geographic Range

South-central Wyoming, south in the Front Ranges and interior ranges to Highway 50, west to the White River Plateau and northern Gunnison Basin. Also occurs in the Northern Rockies, north of the Red Desert.

Biophysical Site Description

Subalpine cold climate, relatively moist but water usually not available in liquid form, usually excessively well-drained, residual or glacial, coarse fraction 20-30% in soil, shallow soil (effectively 1-2 in) to broken rock or bedrock. Precipitation 400-900 mm/yr, soil pH usually slightly basic.

Vegetation Description

Lodgepole pine, usually persistent and not being replaced by other trees, although sometimes aspen may be seral to it. Sometimes with sparse understories. Tree cover averages 70-90% at later stages.

Disturbance Description

Fire rotation for surface fires is 7,587 yr and 346 yr for crown fires (Buechling and Baker 2004).

Adjacency or Identification Concerns

Persistent lodgepole pine stands in the Montane and lower Subalpine Zones, that are on less well-drained soils, are usually seral to Douglas-fir (or spruce-fir) or disclimaxes in Douglas-fir (or Spruce-fir) potential groups.

Scale Description

Sources of Scale Data Literature 🖌 Local Data 🖌 Expert Estimate

Isodiametric stands, mostly large (100s of acres), sometimes very large (1000s of acres). Patches of this PNVG usually correspond to patches of habitat (well-drained to excessively well-drained soils) in the subalpine zone.

Issues/Problems

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

Model Evolution and Comments

Quality control revealed one rule violation which was deleted with minor affects on results (5% change in classes C and D).

Peer review agreed with modeled parameters.

Basic model developed by local expert team on Grand Mesa-Uncompany Gunnison National Forest, October 2003. Four-stage model.

Succession Classes

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

Indicator Species* and	Structure Da	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)			
Canopy Position VASC VAMYO CAGE2 PICO Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data	Upper layer				
Indicator Species* and Canopy Position PICO VASC CAGE2 VAMYO Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree	Cover Height Tree Size Cla	Min 60 % no data Iss no data	Max 95% no data dominant lifeform.		
	Canopy Position VASC VAMYO CAGE2 PICO Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data Indicator Species* and Canopy Position PICO VASC CAGE2 VAMYO Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub	Canopy Position Output of the second of	Canopy Position Min VASC Min VAMYO Cover 0% VAMYO Height no data CAGE2 Tree Size Class no data PICO Upper Layer Lifeform Upper layer lifeform differs from Height no data Upper Layer Lifeform Height no data Upper layer lifeform differs from Herbaceous Shrub Upper layer lifeform differs from Tree Fuel Model no data PICO Min Min Cover 60 % Height PICO Min Cover VASC Cover 60 % VASC Height no data VAMYO Tree Size Class no data VAMYO Upper layer lifeform differs from Height and cover of dominant life Shrub Shrub Upper layer lifeform differs from		

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

Class C	30 %	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)				
		PICO		Min	Max		
Mid2 Open			Cover	30 %	70%		
Description		VAMYO	Height	no data	no data		
Understory 1		VASC	Tree Size	Class no data			
	S): Variety of	CAGE2					
lodgepole size classes, some mature trees, often somewhat		Upper Layer Lifeform	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform.				
		Herbaceous	Height ar	nd cover of dominant life	form are:		
patchy. If aspen is present,□lodgepole usually dominates it.□							
lougepole us	sually dominates it.	Tree					
		Fuel Model no data					
Class D	35%	Indicator Species* and	Structure	Data (for upper layer li	feform)		
	33 /6	Canopy Position	onuotaro	Min	Max		
Late1 Open		PICO	Cover	50 %	80 %		
Description		VASC VAMYO	Height	no data	no data		
•	e lodgepole pine,	CAGE2	Tree Size	Class no data			
1	atchy, variety of						
01	ze classes, open	Upper Layer Lifeform	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform.				
denser trees.	canopies overall but patches of Height and cover of dominant lifeform and doment trace						
		Tree					
		Fuel Model no data					
Class E	0%	Indicator Species* and Canopy Position	Structure	Data (for upper layer li	feform)		
Late1 Closed	ł	<u>Carlopy rosition</u>		Min	Max		
Description	u		Cover	0%	%		
<u></u>			Height	no data	no data		
			Tree Size	Class no data			
		Upper Layer Lifeform	rm Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:				
		☐Herbaceous ☐Shrub					
		Fuel Model no data					
		Disturba					
Non-Fire Dis	turbances Modeled	Disturba <u>Fire Regime Group:</u>	5				
✓ Insects/Di	isease	Disturba <u>Fire Regime Group:</u> I: 0-35 year frequer	5 ncy, low and r	nixed severity			
✓Insects/Di	isease eather/Stress	Disturba Fire Regime Group: I: 0-35 year frequer II: 0-35 year freque III: 35-200 year freq	5 ncy, low and r ncy, replacen quency, low a	nent severity nd mixed severity			
✓Insects/Di □Wind/We □Native Gr	isease eather/Stress razing	Disturba Fire Regime Group: I: 0-35 year frequer II: 0-35 year freque III: 35-200 year freq IV: 35-200 year freq	5 ncy, low and r ncy, replacen quency, low a quency, repla	nent severity nd mixed severity cement severity			
✓Insects/Di □Wind/We □Native Gr □Competiti	isease eather/Stress razing	Disturba Fire Regime Group: I: 0-35 year frequer II: 0-35 year freque III: 35-200 year freq	5 ncy, low and r ncy, replacen quency, low a quency, repla	nent severity nd mixed severity cement severity			
✓Insects/Di □Wind/We □Native Gr	isease eather/Stress razing	Disturba Fire Regime Group: I: 0-35 year frequer II: 0-35 year freque III: 35-200 year freq IV: 35-200 year freq	5 ncy, low and r ncy, replacen quency, low a quency, repla	nent severity nd mixed severity cement 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 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	300	250	500	0.00333	82	
✓ Literature	Mixed						
 Local Data	Surface	1400	1000	8000	0.00071	18	
 Expert Estimate 	All Fires	247			0.00406		

References

Buechling, Arne; and William L. Baker. 2004. A fire history of tree rings in a high-elevation forest of Rocky Mountain National Park. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 34:1259-1273.

Howe, E., and W. L. Baker. 2003. Landscape heterogeneity and disturbance interactions in a subalpine watershed in northern Colorado, USA. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 93:797-813.

Johnston, Barry C.; Laurie Huckaby; Terry J. Hughes; and Joseph Pecor. 2001. Ecological types of the Upper Gunnison Basin: Vegetation-Soil-Landform-Geology-Climate-Water land classes for natural resource management. Technical Report R2-RR-2001-01, 858 pp. Lakewood, CO: USDA Forest Serv ice, Rocky Mountain Region.

Kaufmann, Merrill R. 1985. Annual transpiration in subalpine forests: large differences among four tree species. Forest Ecology and Management 13:235-246.

Kipfmueller, K. F., and W. L. Baker. 2000. A fire history of a subalpine forest in south-eastern Wyoming, USA. Journal of Biogeography 27:71-85.

Kulakowski, D., and T. T. Veblen. 2002. Influences of fire history and topography on the pattern of a severe wind blowdown in a Colorado subalpine forest. Journal of Ecology 90:806-819.

Lotan, James E.; James K. Brown; and Leon F. Neuenschwanger. 1985. Role of fire in lodgepole pine forests. Pp. 133-152 in Baumgartner, David M.; Richard G. Krebill, James T. Arno; and Gordon F. Weetman, Compilers and Editors. Lodgepole pine: The species and its management. Pullman, WA: Washington State University, Cooperative Extension.

Romme, William H. 1982. Fire and landscape diversity in subalpine forests of Yellowstone National Park. Ecological Monographs 52(2):199-221.

Smith, Jane K.; and William C. Fischer. 1997. Fire ecology of the forest habitat types of northern Idaho. General Technical Report INT-GTR-363, 142 pp. Odgen, UT: Intermountain Research Station.

Sibold, J. S. 2001. The forest fire regime of an upper montane and subalpine forest, Wild Basin, Rocky Mountain National Park. Master's Thesis. University of Colorado, Boulder.

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