## **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)

R2MGWAws Great Basin Grassland

## General Information

**Contributors** (additional contributors may be listed under "Model Evolution and Comments")

<u>Modelers</u> <u>Reviewers</u>

Cheri Howell chowell02@fs.fed.us Louis Provencher lprovencher@tnc.org

(edit)

Vegetation Type	<b>General Model Sources</b>	Rapid AssessmentModel Zones		
Grassland	✓ Literature	California	Pacific Northwest	
Dominant Species*	✓ Local Data ✓ Expert Estimate	✓ Great Basin ☐ Great Lakes	☐ South Central ☐ Southeast	
LECI4	LANDFIRE Mapping Zones	☐ Northeast ☐ Northern Plains	☐ S. Appalachians ☐ Southwest	
DIST3 CADO POSE	12 17 13 18	□ N-Cent.Rockies	Southwest	

## **Geographic Range**

Northern and Central Great Basin.

### **Biophysical Site Description**

Elevation: 5000-7000 feet

Landform: moist to dry floodplain, saline bottom

Soils: Deep, somewhat poorly drained, mollic, loamy (most silt loams to some clay loams), may be saline,

very little rock or gravel present

Slopes:0 to 4%

Precipitation: 6 to 14 inches

### **Vegetation Description**

80-100% graminoids with dominant species being Basin wildrye (Leymus cinereus), Sandberg's or Nevada bluegrass (Poa secunda), Western wheatgrass (Pascopyron smithii), cordgrass (Spartina spp.), alkali saltgrass (Distichlis stricta), Douglas sedge (Carex douglasii), Shorthair sedge (Carex exserta), Mat muhly (Muhlenbergia richardsonis), dropseed (Sporobolis spp.), Baltic rush (Juncus balticus).

About 5% forbs (High cover of forbs indicates altered conditions).

Shrubs found at 5 to 10%. Common shrubs are Basin big sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata tridentata), at the higher elevations (Artemisia tridentata vaseyana), rubber rabbitbrush (Ericameria nauseosa), rabbitbrush (Chrysothamnus spp.) At high cover, shrubs indicate an altered state.

## **Disturbance Description**

Fire most often occurred in these sites, when adjacent shrublands burned. Fires were typically mixed (average FRI of 37 years) and stand replacement (average FRI of 75 years). Most species respond favorably

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

to fire. Rabbitbrush tends to increase with spring and summer fires.

These sites were prone to flooding during high precipitation, resulting in erosion of topsoil and some short term loss of vegetative cover. In cases of +500 yr flooding event, the site could downcut, thus lowering the water table, and favored woody species in an altered state.

Infrequent native grazing has occurred, which may have resulted in heavy defoliation, but was confined to small acreage and generally temporary in nature. Drought cycles likely resulted in a reduction in vegetative cover, production and acreage of these sites. Drought negatively affected woody species. Native American's likely used these sites for camping and some vegetation collection, while hunting and gathering in adjacent wetlands. Human's likely caused heavy impacts to soils and vegetation in small campsites, but overall impact was light and transitory in nature.

## Adjacency or Identification Concerns

Found adjacent to wet meadows, wetlands, sagebrush uplands and salt desert shrublands. Sites adjacent to sagebrush uplands tended to burn more frequently than sites adjacent to wet or salt desert shrub. This system is similar to the Mountain Mesic to Dry Meadow (R2MGCOws), but with longer FRI for replacement fire and less native grazing.

## **Scale Description**

Sources of Scale Data	✓ Literature	✓ Local Data	<b>✓</b> Expert Estimate

These sites are generally small and often moist. Fire in these systems is usually introduced from adjacent shrublands or native burning to improve herbaceous understory.

#### Issues/Problems

Many of these sites were impacted by introduced grazing animals post-European settlement and have been converted to shrub dominated systems with soil compaction problems that tend toward an increase in taprooted forb species. Class D is found more frequently now, due to altered disturbance regimes with livestock grazing, changes in fire frequency, altered water flow and climate change.

## **Model Evolution and Comments**

This PNVG was submitted to 4 experts for review, but none return reviews.

Succession Classes** Succession classes are the equivalent of "Vegetation Fuel Classes" as defined in the Interagency FRCC Guidebook (www.frcc.gov).					
Class A	5%	Dominant Species* and Canopy Position	Structure I	Data (for upper layer	· <u>lifeform)</u>
Early1 Open		LECI4		Min	Max
Description		POSE	Cover	0 %	25 %
	ad an duarraht apuly	CADO2	Height	no data	no data
	od or drought early nity. Bare ground is 10	DIST3	Tree Size C	Class no data	
cover is 0-25 is 10-40%. R cover is 60-9 minimal or n Replacement maintains the whereas mix 37 yrs), while change the st flood events	wegetative canopy %. Relative forb cover lealitive graminoid 0%. Shrub cover is on-existent. If the (FRI of 75 yrs) e vegetation in A, ed severity fire (FRI of e occurring, does not accessional age. Rare (average return 00-yr) moves the	Upper Layer Lifeform Herbaceous Shrub Tree Fuel Model no data		yer lifeform differs fro nd cover of dominant	

vegetation to a more shrubby condition, D, after downcutting. Succession is from A to B.

### Class B 73 %

Mid1 Open

## Description

Mostly stable and resilient system. Bare ground is less than 10%. Total canopy cover is 25-80%. Relative cover of grasses is >85%. Relative cover of forbs is 0-5%. Relative cover of shrubs is 0-10%. Replacement fire (FRI 75 years) causes a transition to A, whereas mixed severity (FRI of 37 yrs), while active, does not affect the successional age of B. Weather and flooding affects this system in three different ways: 1) Recurring drought with a 100-yr return interval will thin vegetation and keep this state open; 2) The site will be scoured, but not downcut, by 100-yr flood events causing a transition to A; and 3) Rare 1000yr flooding event will cause a downcut and alteration of the site towards a more permanent woody condition (D). Succession is from B to C.

# Dominant Species\* and Canopy Position

LECI4 POSE DIST3 CADO2

## Upper Layer Lifeform

☐Herbaceous ☐Shrub ☐Tree

Fuel Model no data

#### Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)

		Min	Max
Cover		0 %	10 %
Height no		no data	no data
Tree Size	e Class	no data	

Upper layer lifeform	differs from	dominant	lifeform
Height and cover of	dominant lif	eform are:	

## Class C 20%

# Late1 Open Description

This system differs from mid-open by an increase in the shrub cover component. Bare ground is <10%. Total canopy cover is 50-80%. Relative cover of grasses is 25-50%. Relative cover of forbs is 0-5% Relative cover of shrubs (most frequently rubber rabbitbrush and Basin big sagebrush) is 10-75%. The dynamics of C are similar to those of B, except that drought causes a transition to B (not A) through the thinning of shrubs.

## Dominant Species\* and Canopy Position

LECI4 DIST3 ERNA1 ARTRT

## Upper Layer Lifeform

Herbaceous
Shrub
Tree

Fuel Model no data

#### Structure Data (for upper layer lifeform)

		IVIII I	iviax	
Cover		10 %	75 %	
Height	no data		no data	
Tree Size Class		no data		

Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:

State C, unlike B, experiences infrequent native grazing (browsing) that will reduce woody vegetation and cause a transition to B. Succession remains in C.

Class D 2%	Dominant Species* and Canopy Position	Structure D	ata (for upper layer	lifeform)	
Mid1 Closed	LECI4		Min	Max	
Description	DIST3	Cover	75 %	100 %	
	ERNA1	Height	no data	no data	
This system differs from mid-open by a significant increase in the shrub cover component. Bare ground is <20%. Total canopy cover can exceed 100% due to shrub dominance. Relative cover of grasses is <25%. Relative cover of forbs is 0-5% Relative cover of shrubs (most frequently rubber	ARTRT  Upper Layer Lifeform  Herbaceous Shrub Tree  Fuel Model no data	Tree Size Class no data  Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifeform. Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:			
rabbitbrush and Basin big sagebrush) is >75%. Replacement fire (FRI of 75 yrs) and 100-yr flood event are the only disturbances causing a transition to A. Mixed severity fire (average FRI of 37 yrs) opens the stand, but maintain in a woody state (transition to C).					
Class E 0%	Dominant Species* and	Structure D	ata (for upper layer	lifeform)	
I 1 Cl 1	Canopy Position		Min	Max	
Late1 Closed		Cover	0%	%	
<u>Description</u>		Height	no data	no data	
		Tree Size Cl	ass no data		
	Upper Layer Lifeform  Herbaceous Shrub Tree	Upper layer lifeform differs from dominant lifefor Height and cover of dominant lifeform are:			
	Fuel Model no data  Disturban				

#### **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 V: 200+ year frequency, replacement severity ✓ Native Grazing Competition Other: Fire Intervals (FI) 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 Min FI Avg FI Max FI Probability Percent of All Fires Sources of Fire Regime Data Replacement 75 40 110 0.01333 33 **✓** Literature 37 Mixed 20 54 0.02703 67 ✓ Local Data Surface **✓** Expert Estimate All Fires 25 0.04037

## References

Heyerdahl, E. K., D. Berry, and J. K. Agee. 1994. Fire history database of the western United States. Final report. Interagency agreement: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency DW12934530; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service PNW-93-0300; University of Washington 61-2239. Seattle, WA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Pacific Northwest Research Station; University of Washington, College of Forest Resources. 28 p. [+ Appendices]. Unpublished report on file with: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory, Missoula, MT.

Howell, C., R. Hudson, B. Glover, and K. Amy. 2004. Resource Implementation Protocol for Rapid Assessment Matrices. USDA Forest Service, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest.

Kellogg, E. A. 1985. A biosystematic study of the Poa secunda complex. Journal of the Arnold Arboretum. 66: 201-242.

Martin, R. E., and J.D. Dell. 1978. Planning for prescribed burning in the Inland Northwest. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-76. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station. 67 p.

McKell, C. M. 1956. Some characteristics contributing to the establishment of rabbitbrush, Chrysothamnus spp. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State College. 130 p. Dissertation.

Plummer, A. P., A. C. Hull, Jr. G. Stewart, and J. H. Robertson. 1955. Seeding rangelands in Utah, Nevada, southern Idaho and western Wyoming. Agric. Handb. 71. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 73 p.

Range, P., P. Veisze, C. Beyer, and G. Zschaechner. 1982. Great Basin rate-of-spread study: Fire behavior/fire effects. Reno, Nevada: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Nevada State Office, Branch of Protection. 56 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1991b. Range Ecological Sites, Major Land Resource Area 28B. Central Nevada.

Young, R. P. 1983. Fire as a vegetation management tool in rangelands of the Intermountain Region. In: Monsen, S. B., and N. Shaw, compilers. Managing Intermountain rangelands--improvement of range and wildlife habitats: Proceedings; 1981 September 15-17; Twin Falls, ID; 1982 June 22-24; Elko, NV. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-157. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station: 18-31.

Zouhar, Kristin L. 2000. Achnatherum nelsonii. In: Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Producer). Available: http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/ [2005, June 11].

Zschaechner, G. A. 1985. Studying rangeland fire effects: a case study in Nevada. In: Sanders, K. and J. Durham, eds. Rangeland fire effects: Proceedings of the symposium; 1984 November 27-29; Boise, ID. Boise, ID: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Idaho State Office: 66-84.