BEC-Tree Species Description: BWBSdk

Sixty-five percent of the forested area within the BWBSdk consists of forests over 120 years in age. Younger stands, mostly of fire origin comprise 34% of the forested area. Just 1% of the forests are represented by immature stands resulting from timber harvesting. Mature stands are dominated by white spruce (43%) and lodgepole pine (27%), with lesser amounts of subalpine fir and black spruce. Wetter, poorer sites are typically black spruce - dominated. Deciduous species (cottonwood, aspen, and birch) make up 9% of the tree species composition of BWBSdk stands. Younger natural stands are dominantly lodgepole pine or deciduous forests.

Age class distribution as a % of total forest area [Source: VRIMS 2008]

Stand age class	7-9 natural forest	7-9 harvested forest	4-6 natural forest	4-6 harvested forest	1-3 natural forest	1-3 harvested forest
% of total forest area	65	0	23	0	11	1

Tree species distribution in natural old/mature (age class 7-9) and natural immature (age class 4-6) as a % of the total natural old/mature and natural immature forest cover respectively [Source: VRIMS 2008]

Species	Sw	Pl	Bl	Sb	Deciduous
% of total natural old/mature (age class 7-9) forest cover	43	27	14	7	9
% of total natural immature (age class 4-6) forest cover	18	42	4	5	32

Immature managed stands are dominantly lodgepole pine (40 to 50%[1]) with significant spruce (27 to 36%[1]) and deciduous (18 to 20%[1]) composition.

% species composition of post-harvested stands [Source: RESULTS 1988-2004]

Species	Pl	Sw	Bl	Deciduous
% of harvested area	50	27	4	18

From a landscape perspective, the impacts of regeneration management strategies on species composition and diversity in the BWBSdk have so far been very limited, since only 1% of the area has been harvested. Given the current dominance in younger stands, both natural and harvested, by lodgepole pine, however, future regeneration strategies should include a significant white spruce component as well as some subalpine fir.

---

[1] Range of values reflects differences between VRIMS and RESULTS data sources.

Author: A. Banner (March 2011)

Note: the above write-up does not account for TFL forest cover/regeneration information. This is not expected to impact significantly on the tree species and age class percentages described above.