

*enter
for Jan*

Bibkey ID 98471

PROGRESS REPORT

on the research project entitled

LONG TERM POST-FIRE
VEGETATION MONITORING
OF THE RECENT
STANLEY RIDGE BURN
IN ISLE ROYALE NATIONAL PARK

by

Robert A. Janke

Michigan Technological University

February, 1996

INTRODUCTION

This report describes the progress made on a research project dealing with the monitoring of vegetation within a recently burned area in Isle Royale National Park. The primary objective is to determine what vegetation invades the area following a fire and how this vegetation changes with time after the fire. Such information should increase our understanding of the role of fire in the natural ecosystems involved.

The fire was lightning-caused and occurred during the summer of 1988 on Stanley Ridge on the northeast end of Isle Royale. Before it was extinguished by natural causes, the area burned spread over approximately 75 acres. It was the largest fire on Isle Royale since 1948. Part of this was on the ridge top which had been occupied by a forest of jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*). The remainder was on the rocky open south slope of the ridge.

The initial vegetation sampling of this burn occurred during the summer of 1991. The area was again sampled during the summers of 1992, 1993, 1994 and 1995. This report will discuss the results of the 1995 sampling and will compare these with the results of sampling in 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994.

Sampling during the summer of 1995 was performed by myself with the assistance of two National Park Service employees, Pat Valencia and Katrina Coffman and a volunteer, Abe Davis.

METHODS

Following the ridge top, 10 plot reference points separated by random distances had been established with the assistance of National Park Service personnel during the summer of 1990 in the jack pine forested portion of the burn. These had been marked by permanent metal reference stakes. During the summer of 1991 we established 10 more plot reference points within the open rocky meadow on the south-east facing slope of the ridge. Each of these points were established at a random distance down-slope of the ridge (in a direction of 160 °) from one of the original 10 reference points and marked with a permanent metal stake. Thus 10 vegetation plots were established in each of 2 distinctly different ecosystems.

Stems of tree and tall shrub species greater than 1 meter in height (saplings) were counted in circular plots of 6 meters radius centered about each reference point. All stems were checked for moose browsing. Low ground cover plants and seedlings (stems less than 1 meter in height) of tree and tall shrub species were sampled in 2x2 meter square plots oriented so that one side of the square aligned with the line connecting one of the upper plot reference points with the corresponding lower one and so that the reference point was at the center of this side. For ground cover plants, % cover was estimated for each species. For seedlings, both % cover estimates and stem counts were made. To facilitate this sampling, a 1x1 meter wooden quadrat frame was used and laid down on the ground 4 times to cover the 2x2 meter quadrat.

RESULTS

On the forested ridge top, the seedling densities of quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*), white birch (*Betula papyrifera*) and sugar plum (*Amelachier spp.*) still, by far, exceed that of all other tree/tall shrub species (Table 1). All four of these species had increased in densities up to 1993 but have generally decreased since. The density of all species combined has behaved similarly.

On the open south slope, the density of sugar plum seedlings still far exceeds that of all other species although it has declined since 1993. As on the ridge top, the density of all species combined, after increasing during the first five years after the burn, has declined since. Our

monitoring of vegetation in the Card Point and McGinty's Cove burns has indicated that, for both burns, the seedlings densities of all species combined has followed a similar time trend (Janke, 1991). This decline after the fifth year is undoubtedly partly due to seedlings becoming saplings (stems greater than 1 meter in height) but probably mostly due to increasing competition from other plant species.

Of the stems sampled in the 6 meter radius circular plots, none were in the tree stage of development (diameter at breast height >5 cm) (Table 2). Our first year of sampling this burn indicated that no stems in the tree stage survived the fire and this year's data indicates that there has been insufficient time since the fire for newly established woody plants to reach this stage of development. All stems sampled in these plots, then, were in the sapling stage of development.

On the ridge top the density of jack pine saplings has increased phenomenally from 0 in 1992 to 7276.9 stems per hectare in 1995 (Table 2). To a much lesser extent, aspen and birch saplings have also steadily increased. On the south slope jack pine has steadily increased, while aspen declined during the last year. The density of all species combined has continued to increase for both the ridge top and the south slope.

For the ridge tip and south slope combined, the % of saplings browsed by moose was calculated for each species (Table 3). The values for aspen and birch have declined somewhat since 1994. This may be due to the large increase in the density of these species during this time. For jack pine, none of the saplings sampled were browsed during the entire time of the study. Because of this and because of the large increase in the jack pine density, the percentage of saplings browsed for all species combined has decreased considerably.

From our sampling results for 1991 and 1992, it appeared that quaking aspen would become the dominant tree species on the ridge top. By 1993, however, jack pine saplings exceeded those of aspen and by 1995 they were 50 times more abundant. This is not surprising since prior to the fire the ridge top was almost a pure stand of jack pine. On Isle Royale, it is common for jack pine to grow in dry rocky environments such as this. While jack pine sapling density greatly exceeds that of aspen, its seedling density is still less than that of aspen. Hence, compared to jack pine, aspen is experiencing a low rate of survival in the sapling stage. Generally aspen requires better soil conditions for survival than does jack pine. Also it is highly subject to browsing by moose.

In determining the effects of fire on any Isle Royale ecosystem, one of the most important things to investigate is the effect of a fire on the food supply of moose. We have estimated this by totaling the densities of all sapling species considered to be palatable to moose (quaking aspen, white birch, sugar plun, pin cherry, and willow). The results of this are given below in stems/hectare for both the ridge top and the south slope for each year sampled:

	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
forested ridge top	8.8	247.6	601.1	760.2	1007.9
open south slope	26.5	44.2	353.7	486.2	406.7

In one of our previous studies dealing with 100 year old jack pine stands, the density of palatable saplings averaged 289 stems/hectare (Janke, 1983). By 1993 (5 years after the burn) the density of these species on the ridge top greatly exceeded that of the 100 year old stands and up to 1995 it was still increasing. Fire, then, appears to decrease the woody food supply for moose in jack pine stands immediately after the fire occurs but, after a few years, the supply increases considerably above its value prior to the fire. Future years of sampling will reveal how long the food supply will remain above its pre-fire value. The density of palatable species has steadily increased for the south slope up to 1994, but declined in 1995. It has remained consistently less than that of the ridge top.

Among the low ground cover plants on the ridge top, the blueberry species (*Vaccinium angustifolium*) is still by far the most dominant (Table 4). Its % cover, however, has decreased since 1992. The % cover in 100 year old stands had been found to be only 4.7%. Another effect of fire, on jack pine stands, then, is an increase in the blueberry crop. For all ground cover species combined, the % cover had increased to a value of 46.5% by 1993 and then has declined since. For 100 year old stands, the % cover averages only 22.1%.

The total number of ground cover species on the ridge top for various years of sampling are as follows:

1991 - 42
1992 - 50
1993 - 50
1994 - 49
1995 - 51

After increasing up to 1992, the number remained relatively constant. The number of species for 100 year old jack pine stands averages only 39. Fire on the ridge top has thus resulted in a greater amount of ground cover vegetation and a greater diversity of ground cover species.

For the south slope, the % cover of all ground cover species combined had also increased up until 1993 and then declined since (Table 5). The value for 1995 on the south slope is less than half of that found on the ridge top in 1995. The blueberry species *Vaccinium angustifolium* is not a dominant species here as it is on the ridge top. The total number of ground cover species for the various sampling years for the south slope are as follows:

1991 - 37
1992 - 41
1993 - 46
1994 - 46
1995 - 46

The number of species has increased up to 1993 but has not changed since.

SUMMARY

Saplings of tree and tall shrub species have generally continued to increase, while seedlings have continued to decrease. The increase in jack pine saplings has been phenomenal between 1993 and 1995. The aspen population has only moderately increased and, although originally it was the dominant species after the burn, it is now greatly exceeded by jack pine. The sapling density of species palatable to moose has continued to increase. The total % cover of all low ground cover species, after having increased up to 1993, has declined since. The % cover of *Vaccinium angustifolium* still greatly exceeds that of all other ground cover species on the forested ridge top but is only a minor element on the open south slope. Some significant effects that fire has had on the ridge top are (1) an increase in the density of woody plants palatable to moose, (2) an increase in the % cover of the dominant ground cover species, *Vaccinium angustifolium*, (3) an increase in the total ground cover vegetation, and (4) an increase in the diversity of ground cover species.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Janke, R.A. 1983. The flora and vegetation ecology of Isle Royale National Park. A final report for a research project submitted to the U.S. National Park Service.
- Janke, R.A. 1991. Post-fire vegetation monitoring after recent burns on Isle Royale National Park. An annual report for a research project submitted to the U.S. National Park Service.

TABLE 1. Seedling densities (stems/hectare) of tree and tall shrub species for 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994 and 1995.

FORESTED RIDGE TOP

<u>species</u>	<u>density</u>				
	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
quaking aspen	26,500	51,750	47,250	37,250	30,250
jack pine	23,000	25,000	30,250	27,000	21,000
white birch	9,750	20,750	24,000	22,500	18,000
sugar plum (serviceberry)	18,250	18,250	27,000	18,250	19,250
white spruce	500	1,000	750	750	750
pin cherry	750	750	1,750	4,750	3,750
staghorn sumac	250	500	750	1,000	500
red elderberry	250	250	0	750	250
choke-cherry	500	0	0	0	0
balsam fir	0	0	500	250	250
mountain ash	0	0	0	0	750
total all species	79,750	118,250	132,250	106,250	94,750

OPEN SOUTH SLOPE

<u>species</u>	<u>density</u>				
	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
sugar plum (serviceberry)	22,000	27,250	32,750	29,500	26,750
choke-cherry	1,750	9,750	12,500	8,500	6,750
staghorn sumac	500	1,500	2,250	5,500	7,750
jack pine	1,000	0	250	250	250
pin cherry	1,000	0	0	0	0
total all species	26,250	38,500	47,750	43,750	41,500

TABLE 2. Sapling densities (stems/hectare) of tree and tall shrub species for 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994 and 1995.

FORESTED RIDGE TOP

<u>species</u>	<u>density</u>				
	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
quaking aspen	8.8	141.5	353.6	371.3	468.6
white birch	0.0	61.9	141.5	318.2	512.6
sugar plum (serviceberry)	0.0	26.5	61.8	53.0	17.7
pin cherry	0.0	17.7	8.8	17.7	8.8
jack pine	0.0	0.0	433.8	3783.5	7276.9
willow	0.0	0.0	35.4	0.0	17.7
mountain alder	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
total all species	8.8	247.6	1034.9	4543.7	8302.4

OPEN SOUTH SLOPE

<u>species</u>	<u>density</u>				
	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
sugar plum (serviceberry)	0.0	35.4	168.0	70.7	203.3
jack pine	0.0	26.5	114.9	327.1	663.1
willow	8.8	8.8	53.1	97.2	44.2
quaking aspen	17.7	0.0	123.8	150.3	141.5
choke-cherry	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	0.0
pin cherry	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>168.0</u>	<u>17.7</u>
total all species	26.5	70.7	468.6	813.3	1069.8

TABLE 3. Percent of stems browsed for saplings of tree and tall shrub species. The symbol * indicates that insufficient stems were sampled to yield an accurate value.

	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
quaking aspen	56	74	93	77
white birch	*	63	94	79
jack pine	*	0	0	0
sugar plum	*	*	*	<u>68</u>
all species combined	<u>42</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>12</u>

TABLE 4. Percent cover of vascular ground cover species for forested ridge top. "P" indicates cover less than 0.1%.

Species	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
<i>Vaccinium angustifolium</i>	14.3	14.5	10.9	10.1	11.1
<i>Epilobium angustifolium</i>	1.7	3.6	3.4	1.7	0.6
<i>Betula papyrifera</i>	1.6	2.7	3.4	2.7	3.6
<i>Amelanchier</i> spp.	2.1	2.5	3.4	2.5	2.7
<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	1.9	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.9
<i>Deschampsia flexuosa</i>	0.1	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.4
<i>Maianthemum canadense</i>	0.5	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.9
<i>Pinus banksiana</i>	1.0	1.8	2.8	3.9	4.0
<i>Potentilla tridentata</i>	1.3	1.3	3.1	2.6	1.7
<i>Potentilla arguta</i>	P	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.1
<i>Carex aenea</i>	2.9	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.1
<i>Hieracium florentinum</i>	0.1	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.5
<i>Diervilla lonicera</i>	1.0	0.9	1.4	1.1	1.5
<i>Rubus strigosus</i>	0.5	0.9	1.9	1.8	2.1
<i>Vaccinium myrtilloides</i>	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.8	1.1
<i>Solidago nemoralis</i>	P	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.4
<i>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</i>	0.4	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.6
<i>Lonicera dioica</i>	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Danthonia spicata</i>	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.3
<i>Linnaea borealis</i>	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5
<i>Carex houghtoniana</i>	0.2	0.4	0.2	P	P
<i>Symphoricarpos alba</i>	0.1	0.2	0.1	P	0.1
<i>Argrostis hyemalis</i>	0.3	0.2	0.9	0.3	0.1
<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.4
<i>Aster macrophyllus</i>	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.6
<i>Oryzopsis pungens</i>	P	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3
<i>Fragaria virginiana</i>	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
<i>Arabis divaricarpa</i>	P	0.1	0.2	0.1	P
<i>Prunus pensylvanica</i>	P	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.7
<i>Anaphalis margaritacea</i>	P	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2
<i>Erigeron canadensis</i>	0.0	0.1	P	0.0	0.1
<i>Poa glauca</i>	0.0	P	0.1	0.1	P
<i>Geranium bicknellii</i>	P	P	P	0.0	0.0
<i>Corydalis sempervirens</i>	0.1	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Polygonum douglasii</i>	P	P	P	0.0	0.0
<i>Convolvulus spithameus</i>	P	P	P	P	P
<i>Picea glauca</i>	0.0	P	P	0.0	0.1
<i>Rubus parviflorus</i>	P	P	P	P	0.0
<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i>	P	P	P	0.1	0.1
<i>Sambucus pubens</i>	0.1	P	P	P	P
<i>Agropyron trachycaulon</i>	0.3	P	0.0	0.2	0.0
<i>Prunus virginiana</i>	P	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Polygonum cilinode</i>	P	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Antennaria plataginifolia</i>	0.0	P	P	P	P
<i>Silene antirrhina</i>	P	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Dracocephalum parviflorum</i>	0.0	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Viburnum edula</i>	0.0	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	0.0	P	P	P	P
<i>Rhus typhina</i>	0.1	P	P	P	P

continued

TABLE 4. (continued)

Species	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
<i>Viola conspersa</i>	P	P	P	0.0	P
<i>Ribes glandulosum</i>	P	0.0	P	0.0	P
<i>Oryzopsis asperifolia</i>	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1
<i>Melampyron lineare</i>	0.0	0.0	P	0.0	P
<i>Abies balsamea</i>	0.0	0.0	P	0.0	P
<i>Actea rubra</i>	0.0	0.0	P	P	0.0
<i>Aralia hispida</i>	0.0	0.0	P	P	0.0
<i>Shepherdia canadensis</i>	0.0	0.0	P	0.0	P
<i>Lonicera involucrata</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
<i>Festuca rubra</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	0.0
<i>Carex umbellata</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
<i>Clintonia borealis</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	P
<i>Aquilegia canadensis</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	P
<i>Geocaulon lividum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	0.1
<i>Poa compressa</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	P
<i>Solidago graminifolia</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	0.0
<i>Sorbus decora</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	P
<i>Solidago hispida</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	P
total of all species	<u>33.0</u>	<u>44.1</u>	<u>46.5</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>42.1</u>

TABLE 5. Percent cover of vascular ground cover species for open south slope.
"P" indicates cover less than 0.1%.

Species	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
<i>Amelanchier</i> spp.	1.9	2.5	2.1	1.9	3.0
<i>Polygonum douglassii</i>	0.3	1.2	0.4	0.1	P
<i>Convolvulus spithameus</i>	1.6	1.2	1.9	1.6	1.4
<i>Geranium bicknellii</i>	0.1	1.0	1.4	0.1	P
<i>Saxifraga virginiana</i>	0.2	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.1
<i>Solidago nemoralis</i>	0.4	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.4
<i>Danthonia spicata</i>	1.3	0.8	0.8	0.4	1.0
<i>Argrostis hyemalis</i>	0.4	0.8	1.4	1.6	0.4
<i>Symphoricarpos albus</i>	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.6
<i>Potentilla arguta</i>	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0	0.6
<i>Prunus virginiana</i>	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.4	P
<i>Fragaria virginiana</i>	0.5	0.5	1.6	1.6	0.9
<i>Argopyron trachycaulum</i>	0.3	0.5	1.6	2.2	1.6
<i>Deschampsia flexuosa</i>	0.1	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.9
<i>Hieracium florentinum</i>	0.1	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.2
<i>Antennaria plantaginifolia</i>	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.1
<i>Diervilla lonicera</i>	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2
<i>Arabis divaricarpa</i>	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.5
<i>Vaccinium angustifolium</i>	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
<i>Carex houghtoniana</i>	0.0	0.3	0.4	P	P
<i>Woodsia ilvensis</i>	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
<i>Satureja vulgaris</i>	P	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.1
<i>Artemisia canadensis</i>	0.1	0.2	0.6	1.1	0.4
<i>Rhus typhina</i>	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.2	1.4
<i>Sorbus decora</i>	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Aquilegia canadensis</i>	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1
<i>Arctostaphylos uva-ursi</i>	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
<i>Rubus strigosus</i>	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1
<i>Viola conspersa</i>	P	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1
<i>Prunus pennsylvanica</i>	0.1	0.1	P	0.0	0.0
<i>Mianthemum canadense</i>	P	P	0.0	P	P
<i>Pinus banksiana</i>	P	P	0.1	0.1	0.2
<i>Carex aenea</i>	P	P	0.0	0.0	P
<i>Lilium philadelphicum</i>	0.0	P	P	P	P
<i>Dracocephalum parviflorum</i>	P	P	P	0.0	0.0
<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i>	P	P	0.1	P	P
<i>Oryzopsis pungens</i>	P	P	0.1	0.1	0.1
<i>Corydalis sempervirens</i>	0.1	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Polygonum cilinode</i>	P	P	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Erigeron canadensis</i>	0.0	P	0.4	0.0	P
<i>Taraxacum officinalis</i>	0.0	P	0.1	0.1	0.0
<i>Carex umbellata</i>	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.6
<i>Ranunculus rhomboideus</i>	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	P
<i>Poa compressa</i>	P	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.2
<i>Poa glauca</i>	0.0	0.0	P	P	P
<i>Epilobium angustifolium</i>	0.0	0.0	P	P	P
<i>Silene antirrhina</i>	0.0	0.0	P	P	P
<i>Melampyrum lineare</i>	0.0	0.0	P	P	P
<i>Collinsia parviflora</i>	0.0	0.0	P	0.0	0.0

continued

TABLE 5. (continued)

Species	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>
<i>Lonicera canadensis</i>	0.0	0.0	P	0.0	0.0
<i>Anaphalis margaritacea</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	0.0
<i>Vaccinium myrtilloides</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	0.0
<i>Oryzopsis asperifolia</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	0.0
Unk grass D	0.0	0.0	0.0	P	0.0
<i>Rosa acicularis</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
<i>Potentilla tridentata</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	P
<i>Lactuca</i> spp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	P
<i>Festuca brachyphylla</i>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>P</u>
total of all species	11.0	16.8	23.1	20.1	16.7