

BEC-Tree Species Description: MSdc2

The MSdc2 represents a landscape of primarily fire regenerated stands. Prior to the recent catastrophic mountain pine beetle outbreak, the MSdc2 landscape was dominated by near mature and mature (age class 5-7) mixed species stands of pine, subalpine fir, Douglas-fir and spruce. Older stands tended to be dominated by fire resistant Douglas-fir on drier sites and spruce and subalpine fir on wet, fire resistant sites. Hardwood trees are uncommon. It is important to note that as a result of the mountain pine beetle epidemic, much of the mature lodgepole pine and the larger diameter immature pine trees in the MSdc2 have been or will be killed. Depending on stand age, beetle-killed stands often have a live sub-canopy layer of immature spruce and subalpine fir.

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	52	<1	40	<1	7	1

Very little harvesting has occurred in the MSdc2 (only about 1% of the forested land base). Clearcut harvesting and artificial regeneration is the dominant silvicultural system used.

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	PI	S	Fd	Bl	Pa	At
% of total natural old/mature (age class 7-9) forest cover	46	10	22	16	7	0
% of total natural immature (age class 4-6) forest cover	80	2	5	6	1	5

Currently available RESULTS data for the MSdc2 exists for 4 years and indicates that lodgepole pine and spruce are the dominant species being regenerated in harvested stands and that Douglas-fir and subalpine fir are also common. Subalpine fir regeneration is largely natural advance regeneration that was present at time of harvesting.

% species composition of post-harvested stands [Source: RESULTS 1995, 1998, 2002, & 2003]

	PI	S	Fd	Bl
% of harvested area	33	32	16	16

Author: R. Coupé (January 2012)