

Ecological site F022AE025CA

Loamy Moist Outwash

Accessed: 09/19/2026

General information

Approved. An approved ecological site description has undergone quality control and quality assurance review. It contains a working state and transition model, enough information to identify the ecological site, and full documentation for all ecosystem states contained in the state and transition model.

MLRA notes

Major Land Resource Area (MLRA): 022A—Sierra Nevada and Tehachapi Mountains

Major Land Resource Area 22A, Sierra Nevada Mountains, is located predominantly in California and a small section of western Nevada. The area lies completely within the Sierra Nevada Section of the Cascade-Sierra Mountains Province. The Sierra Nevada range has a gentle western slope, and a very abrupt eastern slope. The Sierra Nevada consists of hilly to steep mountains and occasional flatter mountain valleys. Elevation ranges between 1,500 and 9,000 ft throughout most of the range, but peaks often exceed 12,000 ft. The highest point in the continental US occurs in this MLRA (Mount Whitney, 14,494 ft). Most of the Sierra Nevada is dominated by granitic rock of the Mesozoic age, known as the Sierra Nevada Batholith. The northern half is flanked on the west by a metamorphic belt, which consists of highly metamorphosed sedimentary and volcanic rocks. Additionally, glacial activity of the Pleistocene has played a major role in shaping Sierra Nevada features, including cirques, aretes, and glacial deposits and moraines. Average annual precipitation ranges from 20 to 80 inches in most of the area, with increases along elevational and south-north gradients. The soil temperature regime ranges from mesic, frigid, and cryic. LRU "E" Northern Sierran Upper Montane: This LRU occurs at the mid elevations of the Sierra Nevada, from the Sonora Pass area to the higher mountains in the vicinity of Quincy. Elevations are typically between 5,500 feet to 8,500 feet, with the lower elevations typically on southern aspects, and the higher elevations on northern aspects. The frost-free season is 60 to 125 days, MAAT ranges from 40 to 50 F, and MAP ranges from 35 to 85 inches. The soil temperature regime is mostly frigid, with some cryic soil temperatures at the upper elevations and northern aspects. Soil moisture regimes are mostly xeric, but may be udic where snow persists through spring.

Ecological site concept

This site occurs on valley bottoms on gently sloping glacial outwash, alluvial fans and old lake terraces with deep to very deep soils formed in colluvium and alluvium from mixed sources. Soils have loamy textures and relatively high soil moisture holding capacity and nutrients. Elevations range from 6220 to 6710 feet and slopes typically between 0 and 9 percent. Jeffrey pine (*Pinus jeffreyi*) dominates a productive mixed-conifer forest, with white fir (*Abies concolor*), sugar pine (*Pinus lambertiana*), and incense cedar (*Calocedrus decurrens*) important secondary canopy species. Thimbleberry (*Rubus parviflorus*) and creeping snowberry (*Symphoricarpos mollis*) are the dominant shrub species. Thimbleberry prefers moist, fertile soils and is indicative of the additional soil moisture in the loamy soils of this ecological site. This additional moisture allows for greater understory diversity than similar topographic positions with sandy soils, and more than 40 species of forbs occur on this site.

Associated sites

F022AC006CA	Moderately Deep Cryic Sandy Till Occurs on adjacent south-facing cryic mountain slopes with moderately deep loamy-skeletal soils. The vegetation is an open lodgepole pine (<i>Pinus contorta</i> var. <i>murrayana</i>) forest with red fir (<i>Abies magnifica</i>) and western white pine (<i>Pinus monticola</i>).
F022AE007CA	Frigid, Sandy, Moraines And Hill Slopes Occurs on adjacent moraines and hillslopes with sandy, moderately deep to very deep soils. The vegetation is white fir (<i>Abies concolor</i>) - Jeffrey pine (<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>) forest.

F022AE013CA	Frigid, Loamy, Volcanic Mountain Slopes Occurs on adjacent mountain slopes with moderately deep to deep soils derived from andesite. The vegetation is a white fir (<i>Abies concolor</i>) - mixed conifer forest. Jeffrey pine (<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>), sugar pine (<i>Pinus lambertiana</i>) and incense cedar (<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>) are all important species.
R022AX107CA	Frigid C Channel System This riparian complex occurs along C-B type channels with gravelly to cobbly channel substrates and 2 - 3 percent slopes. The vegetation is characterized by willow (<i>Salix</i> spp.) - aspen (<i>Populus tremuloides</i>) - cottonwood (<i>Populus balsamifera</i>) communities.

Similar sites

F022AF002CA	Frigid, Sandy, Or Loamy Outwash Occurs in the "AF" lru where precipitation is lower. Jeffrey pine (<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>) dominates the forest canopy and greenleaf manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos patula</i>) and prostrate ceanothus (<i>Ceanothus prostratus</i>) are dominant understory species.
F022AF006CA	Loamy Frigid Metamorphic Slopes Occurs in the "AF" lru, where precipitation is lower. Forest canopy composition is less diverse, and is strongly dominated by Jeffrey pine (<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>).
F022AE008CA	Frigid Loamy Moraine Slopes Occurs on similar landforms where cooler and moister topographic positions allow red fir (<i>Abies magnifica</i>) to co-dominate with white fir (<i>Abies concolor</i>). Jeffrey pine (<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>) is a minor species if present.
F022AE013CA	Frigid, Loamy, Volcanic Mountain Slopes Occurs on mountain slopes. Forest canopy composition is similar, but the understory is less diverse. Greenleaf manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos patula</i>) and bush chinquapin (<i>Chrysolepis sempervirens</i>) are the dominant understory species.
F022AE007CA	Frigid, Sandy, Moraines And Hill Slopes Occurs on similar landforms and topographic positions with sandy soils. The forest canopy composition is similar, but the understory is less diverse due to lower soil moisture holding capacity of sandy soils.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	(1) <i>Pinus jeffreyi</i> (2) <i>Abies concolor</i>
Shrub	(1) <i>Rubus parviflorus</i> (2) <i>Symphoricarpos mollis</i>
Herbaceous	Not specified

Physiographic features

This ecological site is on gently sloping alluvial fans, lake terraces and moraines. Slopes may range from 0 to 15 percent, but are typically below 9 percent. It is found on all aspects and elevations range from 6220 to 6710 feet. Runoff class is low to medium. This ecological site occurs primarily on the western shores of the Lake Tahoe basin, but is occasionally found on moist loamy soils on the east shore.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Moraine (2) Alluvial fan (3) Lake terrace
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Elevation	1,900 – 2,050 m
Slope	0 – 20 %

Climatic features

The average annual precipitation ranges from 23 to 43 inches, mostly in the form of snow in the winter months (November through April). The average annual air temperature ranges from 39 to 46 degrees Fahrenheit. The frost-free (>32F) season is 30 to 90 days, and the freeze-free (>28F) season is 80 to 140 days.

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (average)	110 days
Freeze-free period (average)	60 days
Precipitation total (average)	840 mm

Influencing water features

This ecological site is not influenced by wetland or riparian water features.

Soil features

The soils associated with this ecological site are deep to very deep, and formed in colluvium over till derived from mixed parent materials, or are derived from andesite over lacustrine deposits. They are moderately to well drained with very slow to moderately rapid permeability. The soil moisture regime is typic xeric and the soil temperature regime is frigid. Surface rock fragments smaller than 3 inches in diameter average 1 percent cover, and larger fragments also average 1 percent. Surface textures are stony sandy loam and gravelly coarse sandy loam. A thin layer of partially decomposed litter (Oi) overlies the mineral subsurface horizons. Subsurface textures are gravelly, extremely cobbly, and very gravelly coarse sandy loam, stony sandy loam, loam, sandy clay loam, and clay loam. Subsurface rock fragments smaller than 3 inches in diameter range from 0 to 35 percent by volume, and larger fragments range from 0 to 50 percent (for a depth of 0 to 66 inches). The soils correlated to this site include Kingsbeach (fine-loamy, isotic, frigid Ultic Palexeralfs), and Tallac (loamy-skeletal, mixed, superactive, frigid Humic Dystrocherepts). Kingsbeach soils are very deep and derived from andesite

over lacustrine deposits. Tallac (Moderately well drained phase) soils are deep to very deep to a duripan, and formed from mixed parent material weathered from glacial deposits.

This ecological site has been correlated with the following mapunits and soil components in the Tahoe Basin soil survey area (CA693):

Musym ; MUname ; Compname ; Local_phase ; Comp_pct

7161 ; Kingsbeach stony sandy loam, 2 to 15 percent slopes ; Kingsbeach ; ; 80

7524 ; Tallac gravelly coarse sandy loam, moderately well drained, 0 to 5 percent slopes ; Tallac ; moderately well drained ; 80; Tallac ; moderately well drained ; 10

7525 ; Tallac gravelly coarse sandy loam, moderately well drained, 5 to 9 percent slopes ; Tallac ; moderately well drained ; 80; ; Tallac ; moderately well drained ; 10

7526 ; Tallac gravelly coarse sandy loam, moderately well drained, 2 to 9 percent slopes, rubbly ; Tallac ; moderately well drained ; 10

7141 ; Inville gravelly coarse sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, stony ; Kingsbeach ; ; 2

7521 ; Tallac gravelly coarse sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes, very stony ; Tallac ; moderately well drained ; 9

Table 4. Representative soil features

Surface texture	(1) Stony sandy loam (2) Gravelly coarse sandy loam
Family particle size	(1) Loamy
Drainage class	Moderately well drained to well drained
Permeability class	Very slow to moderately rapid
Soil depth	100 cm
Surface fragment cover <=3"	Not specified
Surface fragment cover >3"	Not specified
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	6.1 – 18.54 cm
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	5.1 – 6.5
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 40 %
Subsurface fragment volume >3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 50 %

Ecological dynamics

Abiotic Factors

This site occurs on valley bottoms on gently sloping glacial outwash, alluvial fans and old lake terraces with deep to very deep soils formed in colluvium and alluvium from mixed sources. Soils have loamy textures and relatively high soil moisture holding capacity and nutrients. Elevations range from 6220 to 6710 feet and slopes range from 0 to 15 percent. Jeffrey pine dominates a productive mixed-conifer forest, with white fir, sugar pine, and incense cedar important secondary canopy species. Thimbleberry and creeping snowberry are the dominant shrub species. Thimbleberry prefers moist habitats with nutrient-rich soils (Gucker 2012), and is indicative of additional soil moisture in the loamy soils of this ecological site. This additional moisture allows for greater understory diversity than similar topographic positions with sandy soils, and more than 40 species of forbs occur on this site.

Ecological factors

Fire and fire suppression, logging, drought and pathogens are the primary disturbance factors affecting the dynamics of this ecological site. Pre-European settlement, the most successional advanced community phase was most likely dominated by large old growth Jeffrey pine, with old growth white fir, sugar pine, and incense cedar sharing the canopy. The canopy was relatively open, allowing for a high diversity of shrubs and forbs in the understory (e.g. Beardsley et al. 1999, Murphy and Knopp 2000, Barbour et al. 2002, Taylor 2004, Stephens and Fry 2005, Binkley et al. 2007). Historically, this community phase developed with a mixed fire severity regime, with patchy, frequent, low to medium intensity surface fires, and occasional larger high severity fires, all of which occurred primarily in the fall when fuel moisture was lowest and trees were dormant (Beaty and Taylor 2008). Fire scar analysis indicates the median historic fire return interval for low and moderate severity fires in mixed conifer forests in the Lake Tahoe area was 3 to 9 years, and that larger fires occurred every 12 to 34 years (Beaty and Taylor 2008). This mixed severity fire regime created a forest with a mosaic of age-classes, and provided frequent recruitment opportunities for Jeffrey pine and sugar pine, which require open sites for seedling establishment. Frequent fires kept the understory largely clear of shade-tolerant but fire-intolerant white fir, red fir, and incense cedar, but longer intervals between fires allowed these species to reach sizes where they are less susceptible to fire-induced mortality.

The old-growth phase is currently rare due to either fire suppression or clear-cutting. This ecological site was almost entirely clear-cut during the 1870s to 1890s during the period known as the Comstock Era (Elliot-Fisk et al. 1996, Murphy and Knopp 2000, Barbour et al. 2002, Taylor 2004, Beaty and Taylor 2008). Young forests that have subsequently developed have higher density and basal area, and are comprised of younger and smaller trees with a more even age-class distribution, with most canopy trees 80 to 120 years old (Taylor 2004, Stephens and Fry 2005, Beaty and Taylor 2008). A long-term policy of fire suppression has impacted both these second-growth forests, and the few remaining contemporary stands of old-growth forest (Barbour et al. 2002, Stephens and Fry 2005, Beaty and Taylor 2008). White and red fir and incense cedar have increased in the understory, leading to densely stocked forests with increasing canopy closure, and a build-up of coarse woody debris. The lack of canopy openings limits recruitment opportunities for Jeffrey pine and sugar pine, which decline in importance in these infilled forests. Increasing canopy cover, and lack of bare ground and nutrient cycling also reduces the abundance and richness of the understory in forests with a long duration of fire suppression (e.g. Huisinga et al. 2005, Laughlin et al. 2005, Binkley et al. 2007). Understory trees provide ladder fuels, and the accumulation of highly flammable downed wood increases the likelihood of large high severity canopy fire, and reduces the likelihood that the natural fire regime, which includes frequent low to moderate severity, small to medium-sized fires, can occur. However, management practices such as thinning with prescribed fire can mimic natural processes and help restore these forests back to a more natural condition.

Contemporary forests, with more crowded conditions, and a higher frequency of drought (e.g. Jones et al. 2004) are more susceptible to pathogen induced mortality (Barbour et al. 2002). Bark beetles (*Dendroctonus* spp.) are significant disease agents for Jeffrey pine and sugar pine. Fire damage increases the likelihood of bark beetle infestation and mortality (Bradley and Tueller 2001, Maloney et al. 2008, Fettig et al. 2010). Drought also increases the likelihood of mortality. Barbour et al. (2002) found that most of the mortality of old-growth Jeffrey pine in the Lake Tahoe Basin was due to severe drought from 1988-1992, and all dead trees were infected by bark beetle. Nitrogen deposition and ozone pollution have been shown to contribute to Jeffrey pine susceptibility to pathogens and mortality in Southern California (e.g. Peterson et al. 1987), but equivalent studies have not been done in the northern Sierra. White pine blister rust (*Cronartium ribicola*) is a serious threat to sugar pine (*Pinus lambertiana*) (Murphy and Knopp 2000). White pine blister rust kills old, young, and seedling trees. It can severely inhibit regeneration in infested areas by greatly reducing the sugar pine population. In this ecological site where sugar pine is already present at low abundances, white pine blister rust could eliminate sugar pine altogether. These pathogens may also have played a role in diminishing the importance of pines relative to fir species in contemporary forests (Beardsley et al. 1999).

The reference state consists of the pre-settlement, most successional advanced community phase (numbered 1.1), and the community phases that result from natural and human disturbances. Community phase 1.1 is deemed the phase representative of the most successional advanced pre-European plant/animal community including periodic natural surface fires that influenced its composition and production. Because this phase is determined from reconstruction and/or historic literature, some speculation is necessarily involved in describing it.

All tabular data listed for a specific community phase within this ecological site description represent a summary of one or more field data collection plots taken in modal communities within the community phase. Although such data are valuable in understanding the phase (kinds and amounts of ground and surface materials, canopy characteristics, community phase overstory and understory species, production and composition, and growth), they do not represent the absolute range of characteristics or an exhaustive listing of all species that may occur in that phase over the geographic range of the ecological site.

State and transition model

Additional community tables

Table 5. Community 1.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 6. Community 1.2 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 7. Community 1.3 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
Tree					
1	Trees			56-112	
	white fir	ABCO	<i>Abies concolor</i>	50-106	8-30
	incense cedar	CADE27	<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	1-11	2-11
	Jeffrey pine	PIJE	<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>	3-8	6-31
	quaking aspen	POTR5	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	0-6	0-20
	sugar pine	PILA	<i>Pinus lambertiana</i>	0-6	0-3
Shrub/Vine					
2	Shrubs			56-112	
	thimbleberry	RUPA	<i>Rubus parviflorus</i>	0-56	0-20
	creeping snowberry	SYMO	<i>Symphoricarpos mollis</i>	28-56	5-15
	whitethorn ceanothus	CECO	<i>Ceanothus cordulatus</i>	0-22	0-7
	Saskatoon serviceberry	AMAL2	<i>Amelanchier alnifolia</i>	9-22	0-3
	antelope bitterbrush	PUTR2	<i>Purshia tridentata</i>	10-22	0-2
	bitter cherry	PREM	<i>Prunus emarginata</i>	0-17	0-1
	mountain big sagebrush	ARTRV	<i>Artemisia tridentata ssp. vaseyana</i>	0-13	0-3
	Utah serviceberry	AMUT	<i>Amelanchier utahensis</i>	0-11	0-7
	greenleaf manzanita	ARPA6	<i>Arctostaphylos patula</i>	0-2	0-1
	gooseberry currant	RIMO2	<i>Ribes montigenum</i>	0-2	0-1
	Sierra currant	RINE	<i>Ribes nevadense</i>	0-2	0-1
	roundleaf snowberry	SYRO	<i>Symphoricarpos rotundifolius</i>	0-2	0-1
	Scouler's willow	SASC	<i>Salix scouleriana</i>	0-2	0-1
Forb					
3	Forbs			22-50	
	silvery lupine	LUAR3	<i>Lupinus argenteus</i>	0-28	0-5
	rose thistle	CIAN	<i>Cirsium andersonii</i>	0-22	0-2
	woolly mule-ears	WYMO	<i>Wyethia mollis</i>	0-11	0-5
	arrowleaf balsamroot	BASA3	<i>Balsamorhiza sagittata</i>	0-6	0-1
	wavyleaf Indian paintbrush	CAAP4	<i>Castilleja applegatei</i>	0-1	0-1
	dusky onion	ALCA2	<i>Allium campanulatum</i>	0-1	0-1
	spreading dogbane	APAN2	<i>Apocynum androsaemifolium</i>	0-1	0-1
	Holboell's rockcress	ARHO2	<i>Arabis holboellii</i>	0-1	0-1
	cryptantha	CRYPT	<i>Cryptantha</i>	0-1	0-1
	sanddune wallflower	ERCAP	<i>Erysimum capitatum var. perenne</i>	0-1	0-1
	milk kelloggia	KEGA	<i>Kelloggia galioides</i>	0-1	0-1

	pea	LATHY	<i>Lathyrus</i>	0-1	0-1
	Brown's peony	PABR	<i>Paeonia brownii</i>	0-1	0-1
	goosefoot violet	VIPU4	<i>Viola purpurea</i>	0-1	0-1
Grass/Grasslike					
4	Grasses and Grasslike			1-3	
	sedge	CAREX	<i>Carex</i>	1-7	1-3
	western needlegrass	ACOC3	<i>Achnatherum occidentale</i>	0-4	0-2
	squirreltail	ELEL5	<i>Elymus elymoides</i>	0-1	0-1

Table 8. Community 1.3 forest overstory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height M	Canopy Cover (%)	Diameter Cm	Basal Area (square M/hectare)
Tree							
Jeffrey pine	PIJE	<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>	Native	–	5-30	40.6-68.6	–
white fir	ABCO	<i>Abies concolor</i>	Native	–	7-28	48.3-68.6	–
quaking aspen	POTR5	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	Native	–	0-20	–	–
incense cedar	CADE27	<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	Native	–	2-10	–	–
sugar pine	PILA	<i>Pinus lambertiana</i>	Native	–	0-3	–	–

Table 9. Community 1.3 forest understory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height (m)	Canopy Cover (%)
Grass/grass-like (Graminoids)					
sedge	CAREX	<i>Carex</i>	Native	–	1-3
western needlegrass	ACOC3	<i>Achnatherum occidentale</i>	Native	–	0-2
squirreltail	ELEL5	<i>Elymus elymoides</i>	Native	–	0-1
Forb/Herb					
silvery lupine	LUAR3	<i>Lupinus argenteus</i>	Native	–	0-5
woolly mule-ears	WYMO	<i>Wyethia mollis</i>	Native	–	0-5
rose thistle	CIAN	<i>Cirsium andersonii</i>	Native	–	0-2
spreading dogbane	APAN2	<i>Apocynum androsaemifolium</i>	Native	–	0-1
sanddune wallflower	ERCAP	<i>Erysimum capitatum var. perenne</i>	Native	–	0-1
Brown's peony	PABR	<i>Paeonia brownii</i>	Native	–	0-1
pea	LATHY	<i>Lathyrus</i>	Native	–	0-1
goosefoot violet	VIPU4	<i>Viola purpurea</i>	Native	–	0-1
arrowleaf balsamroot	BASA3	<i>Balsamorhiza sagittata</i>	Native	–	0-1
Holboell's rockcress	ARHO2	<i>Arabis holboellii</i>	Native	–	0-1
milk kelloggia	KEGA	<i>Kelloggia galioides</i>	Native	–	0-1
wavyleaf Indian paintbrush	CAAP4	<i>Castilleja applegatei</i>	Native	–	0-1
cryptantha	CRYPT	<i>Cryptantha</i>	Native	–	0-1
dusky onion	ALCA2	<i>Allium campanulatum</i>	Native	–	0-1
Shrub/Subshrub					
thimbleberry	RUPA	<i>Rubus parviflorus</i>	Native	–	1-20
creeping snowberry	SYMO	<i>Symphoricarpos mollis</i>	Native	–	5-15
Utah serviceberry	AMUT	<i>Amelanchier utahensis</i>	Native	–	0-7
whitethorn ceanothus	CECO	<i>Ceanothus cordulatus</i>	Native	–	0-7
mountain big sagebrush	ARTRV	<i>Artemisia tridentata ssp. vaseyana</i>	Native	–	0-3
Saskatoon serviceberry	AMAL2	<i>Amelanchier alnifolia</i>	Native	–	0-3
antelope bitterbrush	PUTR2	<i>Purshia tridentata</i>	Native	–	0.5-2

bitter cherry	PREM	<i>Prunus emarginata</i>	Native	–	0-1
Scouler's willow	SASC	<i>Salix scouleriana</i>	Native	–	0-1
gooseberry currant	RIMO2	<i>Ribes montigenum</i>	Native	–	0-1
greenleaf manzanita	ARPA6	<i>Arctostaphylos patula</i>	Native	–	0-1
roundleaf snowberry	SYRO	<i>Symphoricarpos rotundifolius</i>	Native	–	0-1
Sierra currant	RINE	<i>Ribes nevadense</i>	Native	–	0-1
Tree					
white fir	ABCO	<i>Abies concolor</i>	Native	–	0.5-2
sugar pine	PILA	<i>Pinus lambertiana</i>	Native	–	0-2
quaking aspen	POTR5	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	Native	–	0-2
incense cedar	CADE27	<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	Native	–	0.5-1
Jeffrey pine	PIJE	<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>	Native	–	0.5-1

Table 10. Community 1.4 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 11. Community 1.4 forest overstory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height M	Canopy Cover (%)	Diameter Cm	Basal Area (square M/hectare)
Tree							
white fir	ABCO	<i>Abies concolor</i>	Native	–	17-55	25.4-76.2	–
quaking aspen	POTR5	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	Native	–	0-20	–	–
California red fir	ABMA	<i>Abies magnifica</i>	Native	–	0-10	–	–
incense cedar	CADE27	<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	Native	–	0-10	–	–
Jeffrey pine	PIJE	<i>Pinus jeffreyi</i>	Native	–	3-8	–	–

Table 12. Community 1.4 forest understory composition

Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Nativity	Height (m)	Canopy Cover (%)
Grass/grass-like (Graminoids)					
needlegrass	ACHNA	<i>Achnatherum</i>	Native	–	0-3
big quakinggrass	BRMA	<i>Briza maxima</i>	Native	–	0-1
Forb/Herb					
longspur lupine	LUAR6	<i>Lupinus arbustus</i>	Native	–	0-2
waxy checkerbloom	SIGL2	<i>Sidalcea glaucescens</i>	Native	–	0-1
white hawkweed	HIAL2	<i>Hieracium albiflorum</i>	Native	–	0-1
Gray's licorice-root	LIGR	<i>Ligusticum grayi</i>	Native	–	0-0.5
Virginia strawberry	FRVI	<i>Fragaria virginiana</i>	Native	–	0-0.5
milk kelloggia	KEGA	<i>Kelloggia galioides</i>	Native	–	0-0.5
common yarrow	ACMI2	<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	Native	–	0-0.5
Fern/fern ally					
western brackenfern	PTAQ	<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>	Native	–	0-4
Shrub/Subshrub					
creeping snowberry	SYMO	<i>Symphoricarpos mollis</i>	Native	–	0-6
thimbleberry	RUPA	<i>Rubus parviflorus</i>	Native	–	0.5-2
Utah serviceberry	AMUT	<i>Amelanchier utahensis</i>	Native	–	0-2
Scouler's willow	SASC	<i>Salix scouleriana</i>	Native	–	0-1
Sierra currant	RINE	<i>Ribes nevadense</i>	Native	–	0-1
Tree					

white fir	ABCO	Abies concolor	Native	–	3-5
California red fir	ABMA	Abies magnifica	Native	–	0-3
quaking aspen	POTR5	Populus tremuloides	Native	–	0-2

Table 13. Community 1.5 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Animal community

This forest provides food and shelter for a variety of animals including squirrels, bears, birds and deer. Tree seeds are eaten by birds, and the roots and young stems are eaten by small mammals. The standing dead and downed trees provide habitats for nesting birds and shelter for cavity dwellers (Gucker 2007). Thimbleberry is an important food source for deer and elk, black bear, small mammals and birds (Gucker 2012).

Hydrological functions

The hydrology of this site is characterized by heavy snowmelt in the spring, with very little precipitation in the summer months.

Recreational uses

This ecological site is can be a scenic forest. If slopes are appropriate, it provides suitable camping and picnicking areas. Trails for walking, biking and cross-country skiing are found along the shore of Lake Tahoe, and upland throughout this site.

Wood products

Jeffrey pine is used for high-grade lumber, and is used for molding, cabinets, doors, and windows (Gucker 2007). White fir is used extensively for solid construction framing and plywood, pulpwood, poles and pilings. It requires large amounts of preservatives because the heartwood decays rapidly. It is poorly suited for firewood because of its low specific gravity and heat production (Zouhar 2001). Sugar pine lumber is valued because it is easy to mill and can be used for molding, window and doorframes, doors and other specialty items (Habeck 1992). The wood from incense cedar is valued because is resistant to rot. It is used as mud sills, window sashes, sheathing under stucco or brick veneer construction, greenhouse benches, fencing, poles, and trellises. It is also widely used for exterior and interior siding. Much of the top quality incense cedar is used in the manufacture of pencils (Tollefson 2008).

Other products

Jeffrey pine and sugar pine cones are used for arts and crafts. Jeffrey pine pitch was distilled for turpentine early in the century; however the terpenes were found to contain high amounts of the explosive chemical heptane (Gucker 2007).

Other information

Thimbleberry produces delicious fruits that were widely consumed by many indigenous peoples, and stems and leaves were used for medicinal purposes and in basketry (Gucker 2012).

Table 14. Representative site productivity

Common Name	Symbol	Site Index Low	Site Index High	CMAI Low	CMAI High	Age Of CMAI	Site Index Curve Code	Site Index Curve Basis	Citation
white fir	ABCO	30	55	51	109	70	030	50TA	Schumacher, Francis X. 1926.Yield, stand, and volume tables for white fir in the California pine region. University of California Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 407.
sugar pine	PILA	90	110	70	89	70	605	300TA	Dunning, Duncan. 1942. A site classification for the mixed-conifer selection forest of the Sierra Nevada. USDA, Forest Service. California Forest and Range Experiment Station Research Note 28.
Jeffrey pine	PIJE	60	92	46	88	50	600	100TA	Meyer, Walter H. 1961. Yield of even-aged stands of ponderosa pine. USDA Technical Bulletin 630. (1938 version revised in 1961).
incense cedar	CADE27	25	25	0	0	0	300	50BH	Dolph, K. L. 1983. Site index curves for young-growth incense-cedar of the Westside Sierra Nevada. USDA, Forest Service. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station. Research Note PSW 363.

Inventory data references

Community Phase 1.1: JhC74001 - Type location tcb03012 tcc03010 Community Phase 1.4: tcc03063 tcc03064 tkc03066

Type locality

Location 1: Placer County, CA	
Township/Range/Section	T16N R17E S12
UTM zone	N
UTM northing	48123
UTM easting	55116
General legal description	Approximately 0.5 miles west of highway 267 in Kings Beach, CA.

Other references

Anderson, M. D. 2001. *Salix scouleriana*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Anderson, M. D. 2008. *Carex rossii*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Azuma, D. L., J. Donnegan, and D. Gedney. 2004. Southwest Oregon Biscuit Fire: an analysis of forest resources and fire severity. PNW-RP-560, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Barbour, M., E. Kelly, P. Maloney, D. Rizzo, E. Royce, and J. Fites-Kaufmann. 2002. Present and past old-growth forests of the Lake Tahoe Basin, Sierra Nevada, US. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 13:461-472.

Beardsley, D., C. Bolsinger, and R. Warbington. 1999. Old-growth forest in the Sierra Nevada: By type in 1945 and 1993 and ownership in 1999. PNW-RP-516, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Beaty, R. M. and A. H. Taylor. 2008. Fire history and the structure and dynamics of a mixed conifer forest landscape in the northern Sierra Nevada, Lake Tahoe Basin, California, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 255:707-719.

Binkley, D., T. Sisk, C. Chambers, J. Springer, and W. Block. 2007. The role of old-growth forests in frequent-fire landscapes. *Ecology and Society* 12:18-35.

Bradley, T. and P. Tueller. 2001. Effects of fire on bark beetle presence on Jeffrey pine in the Lake Tahoe Basin. *Forest Ecology and Management* 142:205-214.

Dhaemers. 2006. Vegetation recovery following spring prescribed fire in pinyon-juniper woodlands of central Nevada: Effects of elevation and tree cover. M.Sc. University of Nevada, Reno.

Elliot-Fisk, D. L., R. Harris, R. A. Rowntree, T. C. Cahill, R. Kattelman, P. Rucks, O. K. Davis, R. Lacey, D. A. Sharkey, L. Duan, D. Leisz, S. L. Stephens, C. R. Goldman, S. Lindstrom, D. S. Ziegler, G. E. Gruell, and D. Machida. 1996. Lake Tahoe Case Study. Pages 217-276 *Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project*. University of California, Centers for Water and Wildland Resources, Davis, CA.

Fettig, C. J., S. R. McKelvey, D. R. Cluck, S. L. Smith, and W. J. Orosina. 2010. Effects of prescribed fire and season of burn on direct and indirect levels of tree mortality in Ponderosa and Jeffrey Pine forests in California, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 260:207-218.

Fryer, J. L. 1997. *Amelanchier alnifolia*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky

Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Gucker, C. 2012. *Rubus parviflorus*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Habeck, R. J. 1992. *Pinus lambertiana*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Hauser, A. S. 2007. *Arctostaphylos patula*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Huisinga, K. D., D. C. Laughlin, P. Z. Fule, J. D. Springer, and C. M. McGlone. 2005. Effects of an intense prescribed fire on understory vegetation in a mixed conifer forest. *Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society* 132:590-601.

Jones, M. E., T. D. Paine, M. E. Fenn, and M. A. Poth. 2004. Influence of ozone and nitrogen deposition on bark beetle activity under drought conditions. *Forest Ecology and Management* 200:67-76.

Laughlin, D. C., J. D. Bakker, and P. Z. Fule. 2005. Understorey plant community structure in lower montane and subalpine forests, Grand Canyon National Park, USA. *Journal of Biogeography* 32:2083-2102.

Lindh, B. C. and P. S. Muir. 2004. Understory vegetation in young Douglas-fir forests: does thinning help restore old-growth composition? *Forest Ecology and Management* 192:285-296.

Maloney, P. E., T. F. Smith, C. E. Jensen, J. Innes, D. M. Rizzo, and M. P. North. 2008. Initial tree mortality and insect and pathogen response to fire and thinning restoration treatments in an old-growth mixed-conifer forest of the Sierra Nevada, California. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 38:3011-3020.

Murphy, D. D. and C. M. Knopp. 2000. Lake Tahoe Basin Watershed Assessment. PSW-GTR-175, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station.

Nagal, T. A. and A. H. Taylor. 2005. Fire and persistence of montane chaparral in mixed conifer forest landscapes in the northern Sierra Nevada, Lake Tahoe Basin, California, USA. *Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society* 132:442-457.

Parker, V. T. and M. P. Yoder-Williams. 1989. Reduction of survival and growth of young *Pinus jeffreyi* by an herbaceous perennial, *Wyethia mollis*. *American Midland Naturalist* 121:105-111.

Peterson, D. L., M. J. Arbaugh, V. A. Wakefield, and P. R. Miller. 1987. Evidence of growth reduction in Ozone-injured Jeffrey pine (*Pinus jeffreyi* Grev. and Balf.) in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. *JAPCA* 37:906-912.

Rau, B. M., J. C. Chambers, R. R. Blank, and D. W. Johnson. 2008. Prescribed fire, soil, and plants: burn effects and interactions in the central Great Basin. *Rangeland Ecology and Management* 61:169-181.

Reeves, S. L. 2006. *Ceanothus cordulatus*. Fire Effects Information System. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Riegel, G. M., T. J. Svejcar, and M. D. Busse. 2002. Does the presence of *Wyethia mollis* affect growth of *Pinus jeffreyi* seedlings? *Western North American Naturalist* 62:141-150.

Schoennagel, T., D. M. Waller, M. G. Turner, and W. H. Romme. 2004. The effect of fire interval on post-fire understorey communities in Yellowstone National Park. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 15:797-806.

Simonin, K. A. 2001. *Elymus elymoides*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Smith, S. 1994. Ecological guide to eastside pine associations. R5-ECOL-TP-004, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.

Snyder, S. A. 1991. *Symphoricarpos mollis*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Stephens, S. L. and D. L. Fry. 2005. Spatial distribution of regeneration patches in an old-growth *Pinus jeffreyi*-mixed conifer forest in northwestern Mexico. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 16:693-702.

Taylor, E. H. 2004. Identifying forest reference conditions on early cut-over lands, Lake Tahoe Basin, USA. *Ecological Applications* 14:1903-1920.

Tollefson, J. E. 2008. *Calocedrus decurrens*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Wayman, R. B. and M. North. 2007. Initial response of a mixed-conifer understory plant community to burning and thinning restoration treatments. *Forest Ecology and Management* 239:32-44.

Wright, H. A. 1985. Effects of fire on grasses and forbs in sagebrush-grass communities. Pages 12-21 in *Rangeland Fire Effects; A symposium*. USDI-Bureau of Land Management, Boise, ID.

Zhang, J., M. W. Ritchie, and W. W. Oliver. 2008. Vegetation responses to stand structure and prescribed fire in an interior ponderosa pine ecosystem. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 38:909-918.

Zouhar, K. 2001. *Abies concolor*. Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory.

Contributors

Alice Miller

Marchel Munnecke

Rangeland health reference sheet

Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health is a qualitative assessment protocol used to determine ecosystem condition based on benchmark characteristics described in the Reference Sheet. A suite of 17 (or more) indicators are typically considered in an assessment. The ecological site(s) representative of an assessment location must be known prior to applying the protocol and must be verified based on soils and climate. Current plant community cannot be used to identify the ecological site.

Author(s)/participant(s)	
Contact for lead author	
Date	
Approved by	
Approval date	
Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production

Indicators

1. Number and extent of rills:

2. Presence of water flow patterns:

3. Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes:

4. Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground):

5. Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies:

6. Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas:

7. Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel):

8. Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values):

9. Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness):

10. Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff:

11. Presence and thickness of compaction layer (usually none; describe soil profile features which may be mistaken for compaction on this site):

12. Functional/Structural Groups (list in order of descending dominance by above-ground annual-production or live foliar cover using symbols: >>, >, = to indicate much greater than, greater than, and equal to):

Dominant:

Sub-dominant:

Other:

Additional:

13. Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence):

14. Average percent litter cover (%) and depth (in):

15. Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annual-production):

16. Potential invasive (including noxious) species (native and non-native). List species which BOTH characterize degraded states and have the potential to become a dominant or co-dominant species on the ecological site if their future establishment and growth is not actively controlled by management interventions. Species that become dominant for only one to several years (e.g., short-term response to drought or wildfire) are not invasive plants. Note that unlike other indicators, we are describing what is NOT expected in the reference state for the ecological site:

17. Perennial plant reproductive capability:
