# **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 and 2005. For more information, please visit www.landfire.gov. Please direct questions to helpdesk@landfire.gov.

#### Potential Natural Vegetation Group (PNVG) **R0PIPObh** Ponderosa Pine-Black Hills-High Elevation General Information Contributors (additional contributors may be listed under "Model Evolution and Comments") **Modelers** Reviewers Deanna Reyher dreyher@fs.fed.us Dennis Knight khknight@uwyo.edu Cathy Stewart cstewart@fs.fed.us Bill Baker bakerwl@uwyo.edu **General Model Sources** Rapid AssessmentModel Zones **Vegetation Type ✓** Literature Forested Pacific Northwest California Local Data Great Basin South Central **✓** Expert Estimate **Dominant Species\*** Great Lakes Southeast Northeast S. Appalachians **PIPO LANDFIRE Mapping Zones** Northern Plains Southwest **PIGL** 10 21 ✓ N-Cent.Rockies 19 22 20 29

# Geographic Range

Black Hills of South Dakota and Wyoming.

#### **Biophysical Site Description**

This group is most common at the higher elevations in the Central Granitic Core and Upper Limestone Plateau of the Black Hills. It occurs on gentle to steep slopes. Several mountain grasslands (many that are not associated with water) are intermingled throughout this area and influence burn patterns.

### **Vegetation Description**

Ponderosa pine, white spruce, paper birch and aspen are dominant overstory species. Other woody species found in various areas of this type includes various woody species such as bearberry, hazelnut, ninebark, grouseberry, snowberry, rose, and ironwood. Spruce and paper birch generally occur on northern aspects and higher elevations of this area. Numerous forb species dominate the herbaceous layer and include species such as twinflower, violets, and orchids.

#### **Disturbance Description**

Fire Regime Group III or I. Stand replacing disturbances are primarily associated with climatic fluctuations and include fire and insect (in late-development classes only, mountain pine beetle creates larger patch sizes; Ips beetles creates smaller patches). Snowbreak and windthrow events may occur, but are not modeled here.

Surface and stand replacing fire events occurred in this PNVG. Stand replacing fires were likely most common in higher elevation and northern slopes that were primarily dominated by spruce, with surface fires and occurring most often in the moist ponderosa pine. There is some debate about whether mixed severity fire would have occurred in this type based on tree-ring and historical evidence. It is included in this model at a 200-year return interval, but see peer-review feedback under "Comments".

### **Adjacency or Identification Concerns**

This type occurs at elevations above Ponderosa Pine Black Hills Low Elevation. This type differs from Ponderosa Pine Black Hills Low Elevation because it has less frequent surface fires, more frequent replacement fires, and less closed canopy forest.

### **Scale Description**

Sources of Scale Data ☐ Literature ✓ Local Data ✓ Expert Estimate

Scale varies widely. Includes gap phase dynamics (single to few tree mortality events) to watershed scale events (mixed severity fire or insect events in ponderosa pine to stand replacing fire in spruce).

## Issues/Problems

There is considerable debate over the role of mixed severity and surface fires in the historical range of variability in this and other ponderosa pine forests in the northern and central Rockies (Baker and Ehle 2001, 2003; Barrett 2004; Veblen et al. 2000).

#### **Model Evolution and Comments**

Workshop code was PPIN9.

Additional authors and in-workshop review from: Cody Wienk, Carolyn Sieg, Peter Brown, Blaine Cook, Breck Hudson.

Peer review was incorporated on 4/18/2005. The peer review process raised questions about the role of mixed severity fire versus surface fire in this PNVG and the overall fire frequency. The PNVG was originally modeled with a 25 year MFI; 62% of fires were surface (45 year MFI), 25% were mixed (100 year MFI), and 12% (200 year MFI) were replacement severity. Based on peer review, the overall fire frequency was reduced to 35 years, the amount of mixed severity fire was cut in half to a 200 year return interval (although some comments indicated eliminating mixed severity fire completely), the amount of replacement fire was reduced to a 300 year return interval, and the amount of surface fire was decreased slightly to a 50 year return interval. The resulting relative proportion of replacement, mixed, and surface fire is a compromise among review comments, and changed the Fire Regime Group from I to III. These changes resulted in only slight adjustments to the amount of the landscape in the vegetation classes: middevelopment 1 open (class C) was reduced by 5% (from 25% to 20%); mid-development 2 open was reduced by 5% (from 30% to 25%), and the amount of late-development closed was increased by 10% (from 25% to 35%).

#### Succession Classes\*\* Succession classes are the equivalent of "Vegetation Fuel Classes" as defined in the Interagency FRCC Guidebook (www.frcc.gov). **Dominant Species\* and** Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform) Class A 10% **Canopy Position** Min Max POTR5 Early1 PostRep Cover 0% 100 % BEPA **Description** Height no data no data **ARUV** Aspen and birch shrublands with Tree Size Class no data **AMAL** dense herbaceous cover of a variety Upper Layer Lifeform of forbs. Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Herbaceous Height and cover of dominant lifeform are: Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data

Class B 10 %	Dominant Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)		
Early2 Closed	POTR5	Min Max		
Description Description	BEPA	Cover	50 %	100 %
Closed-canopy deciduous forest		Height	no data	no data
dominated by quaking aspen and		Tree Size Class	no data	
paper birch. Birch tends to dominate on north aspects and moist slopes, while aspen will dominate on the remaining sites.	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant life Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:			
Class C 20 %	Dominant Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)		
	POTR5	Min		Max
Mid1 Open	BEPA	Cover	50 %	100 %
Description Confirm basin invading and	PIPO	Height	no data	no data
Conifers begin invading and constitute about 20% of the	PIGL	Tree Size Class	no data	
overstory.	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 25%	Dominant Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)		
Mid2 Open	PIPO		Min	Max
Description	PIGL	Cover	50 %	100 %
Conifers continue to expand, and	POTR5	Height	no data	no data
constitute about 50% of the	BEPA	Tree Size Class no data		
overstory.	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 E 35%	Dominant Species* and Canopy Position	Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)		
Late1 Closed	PIPO	Min		Max
Description	PIGL	Cover	50 %	100 %
Dominated by dense stands of	11011	Height	no data	no data
white spruce on north-facing slopes at higher elevations, and pine-dominated stands on lower elevation level areas and south-facing slopes at higher elevations. Pockets of deciduous trees and	Upper Layer Lifeform  Herbaceous Shrub Tree	Tree Size Class   no data  Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:		
shrubs occur throughout.	Fuel Model no data			

#### Disturbances **Disturbances Modeled** Fire Regime Group: I: 0-35 year frequency, low and mixed severity **✓** Fire II: 0-35 year frequency, replacement severity ✓ Insects/Disease III: 35-200 year frequency, low and mixed severity Wind/Weather/Stress IV: 35-200 year frequency, replacement severity Native Grazing V: 200+ year frequency, replacement severity Competition Fire Intervals (FI) Other: Fire interval is expressed in years for each fire severity class and for all types of Other fire combined (All Fires). Average FI is central tendency modeled. Minimum and **Historical Fire Size (acres)** 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. Avg: no data Percent of all fires is the percent of all fires in that severity class. All values are Min: no data estimates and not precise. Max: no data Probability Percent of All Fires Avg FI Min FI Max FI Sources of Fire Regime Data Replacement 300 0.00333 12 Literature Mixed 200 0.00518 ✓ Local Data Surface 50 0.02 71 **✓** Expert Estimate All Fires 35 0.02833

#### References

Baker, William L., Ehle, Donna S. 2001. Uncertainty in surface-fire history: The case of ponderosa pine forests in the western United States. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 31: 1205-1226.

Baker, William L.; Ehle, Donna S. 2003. Uncertainty in fire history and restoration of ponderosa pine forests in the western United States. In: Omi, Philip N.; Joyce, Linda A., tech. eds. Fire, fuel treatments, and ecological restoration: conference proceedings; 2002 April 16-18; Fort Collins, CO. Proceedings RMRS-P-29. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station: 319-333.

Barrett, S. W. 2004. Altered fire intervals and fire cycles in the Northern Rockies. Fire Management Today 64(3): 25-29.

Barrett, S. W. 2004. Fire Regimes in the Northern Rockies. Fire Management Today 64(2): 32-38.

Brown, Peter. Unpublished fire history data from Rifle Pit Gulch.

Brown and Sieg. 1996. Fire history in interior ponderosa pine communities of the Black Hills, South Dakota, USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire. 6:97-105.

Brown, P.M., M.G. Ryan, and T.G. Andrews. 2000. Historical surface fire frequency in ponderosa pine stands in Research Natural Areas, Central Rocky Mountains and Black Hills, USA. Natural Areas Journal 20:133-139.

Graves, H.S. 1899. The Black Hills Forest Reserve. In: the 19th Annual Report of the Survey, 1897-1898. Part V. Forest Reserves. Wasington, D.C. U.S. G.S. 67-164.

Hoffman,G.R. And R.R. Alexander. 1987. Forest vegetation of the Black Hills National Forest of South Dakota and Wyoming: A Habitat type classification. RM Research Paper 276, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Fort Collins, CO.

Marriott, H.J., D. Faber-Langendoen. 2000. Black Hills community inventory. Vol. 2. Plant community descriptions. TNC and Association for Biodiversity information. Minneapolis, MN.

Parrish, J.B., D.J. Herman, D.J. Reyher. 1996. A century of change in Black Hills forest and riparian ecosystems. U.S. Forest Service and South Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station B722, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD.

Progulske, D.R. 1974. Yellow ore, yellow hair, yellow pine: A photographic study of a century of forest ecology. Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 616, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD.

Sheppard, W.D., and M.A. Bettaglia. 2002. Ecology, silviculture and management of Black Hills Ponderosa Pine. RMRS GTR-97, Rocky Mtn. Research Station, Fort Collins, CO.

Shinneman, D. J., and W. L. Baker. 1997. Nonequilibrium dynamics between catastrophic disturbances and old-growth forests in ponderosa pine landscapes of the Black Hills. Conservation Biology 11:1276-1288.

Uresk, D.W., and K.E. Severson. 1989. Understory-overstory relationships in ponderosa pine forests, Black Hills, SD. Journal of Range Management 42: 203-208.

Veblen, Thomas T.; Kitzberger, Thomas; Donnegan, Joseph. 2000. Climatic and human influences on fire regimes in ponderosa pine forests in the Colorado Front Range. Ecological Applications. 10(4): 1178-1195.

Wienk, C. L., C. H. Sieg and G. R. McPherson. 2004. Evaluating the role of cutting treatments, fire and soil seed banks in an experimental framework in ponderosa pine forest of the Black Hills, South Dakota. Forest Ecology and Management 192: 375-393.