

1968

Mature Pine Forests in Duluth Harbor Area

Donald W. Davidson
Wisconsin State University, Superior

John B. Bernard
Ithaca College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas>



Part of the [Botany Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davidson, D. W., & Bernard, J. B. (1968). Mature Pine Forests in Duluth Harbor Area. *Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science, Vol. 35 No.2*, 118-121.

Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas/vol35/iss2/17>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science by an authorized editor of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Mature Pine Forests in Duluth Harbor Area

DONALD W. DAVIDSON* and JOHN M. BERNARD**

ABSTRACT: Quantitative and qualitative studies have been made on mature pine forests of selected areas on Minnesota Point and Wisconsin Point in the Duluth-Superior Harbor area. The forests were sampled by the point quarters method. The leading dominant in the Minnesota forest was *Pinus resinosa*, while the leading dominant in the Wisconsin forest was *Pinus strobus*. Trees up to 173 years of age were found on Minnesota Point, while the maximum age of the trees sampled on Wisconsin Point was 142 years. A total of 87 species of vascular plants were identified in the two areas.

This study was initiated during the summer of 1966 to investigate features of the vegetation of the Duluth-Superior Harbor area, and particularly on Minnesota Point and Wisconsin Point.

The pine forest on Minnesota Point represents the last basically undisturbed remnant of the natural vegetation which was formerly present on the Point. Wisconsin Point, while disturbed, has been less so than the Minnesota Point forests.

The well-protected Duluth-Superior Harbor is formed by the two points of land, and the St. Louis River flowing into the harbor had been "drowned" by the post-glacial tilting toward the south of Lake Superior (Schwartz and Thiel, 1954). Minnesota and Wisconsin Points combine to form the longest sand bar in the world in fresh water, stretching more than 9 miles.

About 3,200 years ago, the lake level (Lake Superior) dropped to 596 feet. In response to this lower level, two inner harbor points (Rices and Connors), were abandoned and a new profile of equilibrium was established in the sand of the south shore six miles to the east. From this point a spit built across the head of the lake parallel to the storm wave crestline at a rate of 15 to 20 feet per year and reached the Minnesota shore a few hundred years ago (Loy, 1963a). Natural accretion from the south shore is more than 22,000 cubic yards per year (Loy, 1963a). This is the only available evidence as to how long the two points have been exposed for plant colonization.

Pinus resinosa and *Pinus strobus* trees still living and standing on the points are for the most part scattered, and in many cases isolated, except for two main bodies of trees.

References to pine forest vegetation in the harbor area are found in the writings of Alfred Merritt (Van Brunt, 1921, p. 2), discussing red pine on Connors Point, and Laurence Oliphant (Van Brunt, 1921) of pine trees in general. Charles F. Johnson in his diary of 1886 dis-

cussed the "scrub pine" on the sand dunes of Minnesota Point. In Woodbridge and Pardee (1910), reference is made to the fact (p. 218, vol. 1) that "Minnesota Point was covered from its base with a heavy growth of pine through which ran a narrow road for a mile or two, . . ."

Conjecture on Origins

Just when the *Pinus resinosa* and *Pinus strobus* forests became established can only be conjectured—but there are no visible remains of decaying trees (logs) on the two points. However, there are a number of standing dead trees, some of which have been aged. Both forests, small in area which could be sampled systematically by modern techniques, have been much disturbed. On Minnesota Point a road cuts through a side of the forest for most of its length, and there are at the present a number of rubble remains of dwellings. Recently fires have further disrupted the forest ecosystem. On Wisconsin Point there is also a road through much of the forest, leaving a tract with trees of greater maximum diameter than that of the Minnesota Point forest. There also has been some selective cutting of pine on Wisconsin Point.

The beach strand communities of the Great Lakes (of which these two points are examples) have received considerable attention from plant ecologists, Curtis (1959), but the most complete account was made by Cowles (1899) for the sand dunes of Lake Michigan. Beals & Cottam (1960) reported on pine forests of the sand bars of the Apostle Islands on Lake Superior. Curtis (1959) illustrated the evergreen, heathlike mat of *Hudsonia*, *Juniperus* and *Arctostaphylos* on the dunes of Wisconsin Point, but did not give attention to the mature pine forests. The studies of Lakela, unpublished and her paper of 1939, and Johnson (1963) represent the work in Minnesota on Lake Superior beaches. Many of Lakela's extensive collections of Minnesota Point plants are recorded in her monumental work on the Flora of Northeastern Minnesota (1965).

Nomenclature follows Fernald (1950). Dr. John W. Moore, Department of Botany, University of Minnesota, made some determinations and verified or corrected all others.

Field and Laboratory Methods

Trees and saplings were sampled by the point-centered quarters method (Cottam and Curtis, 1956). On Minne-

* DONALD W. DAVIDSON, B.A., University of Minnesota, Duluth; Ph.D., Rutgers. The State University; Currently, Associate Professor, Department of Biology, Wisconsin State University, Superior.

** John M. Bernard, B.S., University of Minnesota, Duluth; M.S., Ph.D., Rutgers. The State University; Currently, Associate Professor, Department of Biology, Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York.

sota Point, only trees were sampled (15 points), as the sapling layer was too sparse to warrant sampling. On Wisconsin Point, both trees and saplings were sampled (13 points). In the laboratory, data on basal area and density were converted to values of relative dominance and relative density. A table was then computed showing the values of relative density and relative dominance for each species. From the values of relative density and relative dominance, an importance value (total for each stand, 200) was then computed. Soil samples were collected from two points in each stand at a depth of four inches. The samples from the two points were then pooled for analysis from each stand. Analysis for pH, total P, Ca, Mg, K and organic matter were made by the University of Wisconsin Extension Soil Laboratory, courtesy of Mr. Conrad C. Olsen and Mr. Raymond E. Polzin. A complete floristic survey for each of the two stands was made. Increment borings were made on each stand as a means of attempting to determine the age of the forests.

Results

Importance values for the 4 species of trees on Minnesota Point and the 5 species on Wisconsin Point are shown in Table 1. The leading dominant on Minnesota Point was *Pinus resinosa* (107.8) with *P. strobus* number 2 (86.5). The other species found on Minnesota Point are shown in Table 1. The leading dominant on Wisconsin Point was *P. strobus* (112.7). *Betula papyrifera* was number 2 dominant (41.4) and number 3 domi-

TABLE 1. Importance Value of Trees and Saplings

SPECIES	Minnesota Point (Trees only)	Wisconsin Point Trees	Wisconsin Point Saplings
<i>Pinus resinosa</i>	107.8	33.9	16.5
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	86.5	112.7	87.8
<i>Betula papyrifera</i>	2.0	41.4	13.4
<i>Betula cordifolia</i>	3.7
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	10.2	47.9
<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	1.9	29.5
<i>Prunus pensylvanica</i>	4.8

TABLE 2. Soil Analysis

	pH	Organic Matter	P	K	Ca	Mg
Minnesota Point	5.1	2.0%	9 ppm	20 ppm	150 ppm	50 ppm
Wisconsin Point	5.0	1.5%	9 ppm	20 ppm	100 ppm	40 ppm

TABLE 3. Increment Borings

SPECIES	Minnesota Point		Wisconsin Point	
	DBH	Growth Rings	DBH	Growth Rings
<i>Pinus resinosa</i>	16.6	95	19.9	135
<i>Pinus resinosa</i>	19.6	173	20.9	131
<i>Pinus resinosa</i>	19.3	148
<i>Pinus resinosa</i>	20.1	169
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	21.4	91	19.7	142
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	22.4	122
<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	3.9	68

nant was *P. resinosa* (33.9). In the sapling layer of Wisconsin Point the principal species were *P. strobus* (87.7), *Acer rubrum* (47.8), and *Thuja occidentalis* (29.5). Although no sampling was done on the saplings of Minnesota Point, there is some reproduction of *P. strobus* in the interior of the forest and more abundant reproduction of *P. resinosa* on the lakeshore side of the forest.

Results of the soil analyses are shown in Table 2 and results of the increment corings are shown in Table 3.

Concerning the floristics of the two pine areas, there were 39 species common to both areas, as shown in Table 4. There were 21 species found only in the forest on Minnesota Point, and 27 species found only in the forest on Wisconsin Point (Tables 5 and 6). In all, 87 different species were identified in the two forested areas.

Discussion of Differences

Although similar in gross appearance when passing through them, the natural pine forests of Minnesota Point and Wisconsin Point are somewhat different in composition. The leading dominant in the Minnesota pine forest (*P. resinosa*, 107.7), is only one-third as important in the Wisconsin pine forest (33.9). There has been some selective cutting of pine in the Wisconsin pine forest, and this would affect the result somewhat. The leading dominant in the Wisconsin pine forest (*P. strobus*, 112.7) is represented in the Minnesota pine forest at 86.5. The importance of *Betula papyrifera* is vastly different in the two forests, being much more important in the Wisconsin forest (41 versus 5.7 on Minnesota Point). Two species, *Acer rubrum* and *Thuja occidentalis*, were found in the Wisconsin forest, but not in the Minnesota forest. This can probably be explained by the fact that on Wisconsin Point, the sampling touched several low areas.

Reproduction was inadequate for sampling purposes in the Minnesota forest, so no quantitative data are available. However, in the interior of the Minnesota forest the pine reproduction is *P. strobus*, while on the lakeshore side the dominant reproduction is *P. resinosa*. On Wisconsin Point, it can be said that in general all canopy species are represented in the sapling layer, and in addition *Prunus pensylvanica* is present. *P. strobus* was more important in the sapling layer in the interior of the Wisconsin forest, just as in the Minnesota forest.

To determine the ages of trees, cores were taken from the largest individuals of each species which could be located. The ages of the larger trees of *Pinus resinosa* (up to 169 and 173 years) indicate that this species has been on Minnesota Point for at least 200 years and probably longer. The maximum age of the trees sampled on Wisconsin Point was 142 years (*Pinus strobus*).

Beals and Cottam (1960) in their studies on the Apostle Islands, found pine forests typically located on sand bars on the shores of some islands. Three such stands were studied, with *P. resinosa* as the dominant and *P. strobus* as the second dominant. *Pinus banksiana* and *Betula papyrifera* also were present in small numbers. No naturally-occurring *P. banksiana* was found in either the Minnesota or Wisconsin Point forests.

The pH of the soils on both Minnesota and Wisconsin

Points ranges from strong to moderately acid (Buckman and Brady, 1960). With the exception of calcium and organic matter, the chemical analysis of the two soils differs little.

The total of 87 species in the two areas is not large. Nearly half (39) of the species were found in both areas. The areas cannot be said to be rich floristically, and would not be presumed to be so with the poor nutrient status of stabilized sand dunes. As Olson (1958) points out, "Even after plants have overcome the instability of the dune sand, this infertile medium for plant growth must be sufficiently poor to exclude all but a few typical sand plants—." In the present study there were more than a few typical sand plants present, but the environmental conditions no doubt restrict the floristic diversity.

Acknowledgment

Financial assistance for this study was granted to the principal author, D. W. Davidson, by the Wisconsin State University Board of Regents.

References

- BEALS, E. W. and GRANT COTTAM. 1960. The Forest Vegetation of the Apostle Islands, Wisconsin. Ecology 41(4): 743-751.
- BRUNCKEN, E. 1910. Studies in plant distribution. 9. The shore of Lake Michigan. Bull. Wis. Nat. Hist. Soc., 8:145-157.
- BUCKMAN, H. O. and N. C. BRADY. The Nature and Properties of Soils. MacMillan Co., New York. 1-567 pp.

TABLE 4. Plants Found in Both Minnesota Point and Wisconsin Point Sample Areas

<i>Acer rubrum</i> L.	<i>Galium triflorum</i> Michx.	<i>Poa interior</i> Rydb.
<i>Achillea millefolium</i> L.	<i>Juniperus communis</i> L. var. <i>depressa</i> Pursh	<i>Poa palustris</i> L.
<i>Amelanchier intermedia</i> Spach	<i>Linaria vulgaris</i> Hill	<i>Prenanthes alba</i> L.
<i>Aralia nudicaulis</i> L.	<i>Linnaea borealis</i> L. var. <i>americana</i> (Forbes) Rehder	<i>Prunus pensylvanica</i> L. f.
<i>Betula cordifolia</i> Regal	<i>Lonicera dioica</i> L. var. <i>glaucescens</i> (Rydb.) Butters	<i>Prunus virginiana</i> L.
<i>Betula papyrifera</i> Marsh.	<i>Maianthemum canadense</i> Desf.	<i>Pyrola asarifolia</i> Michx.
<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i> (Michx.) Beauv.	<i>Maianthemum canadense</i> Desf. var. <i>canadense</i>	<i>Ribes glandulosum</i> Grauer
<i>Clintonia borealis</i> (Ait.) Raf.	<i>Melampyrum lineare</i> Desr.	<i>Rosa blanda</i> Ait.
<i>Cornus canadensis</i> L.	<i>Pinus resinosa</i> Ait.	<i>Rubus idaeus</i> L. var. <i>strigosus</i> (Michx.) Maxim.
<i>Cornus stolonifera</i> Michx.	<i>Pinus strobus</i> L.	<i>Sambucus pubens</i> Michx.
<i>Diervilla lonicera</i> Mill.		<i>Taraxacum officinale</i> Weber
<i>Dryopteris spinulosa</i> (O. F. Mueller) Watt.		<i>Sorbus decora</i> (Sarg.) Schneid.
<i>Epilobium angustifolium</i> L.		<i>Trientalis borealis</i> Raf.
<i>Fragaria virginiana</i> Duchesne		<i>Vaccinium angustifolium</i> Ait.
		<i>Vaccinium myrtilloides</i> Michx.
(Total Species, 39)		

TABLE 5. Plants Found Only in Minnesota Point Sample Areas

<i>Agropyron repens</i> (L.) Beauv.	<i>Poa pratensis</i> L.	<i>Solidago gigantea</i> Ait. var. <i>leiophylla</i> Fern.
<i>Amelanchier humilis</i> Wieg.	<i>Potentilla tridentata</i> Ait.	<i>Syringa vulgaris</i> L.
<i>Amelanchier interior</i> Nielsen	<i>Rosa arkansana</i> Porter var. <i>suffulta</i> (Greene) Cockerell	<i>Trientalis borealis</i> Raf.
<i>Amelanchier sanguinea</i> (Pursh) DC.	<i>Schizachne purpurescens</i> (Torr.) Swallen	<i>Urtica gracilis</i> Ait.
<i>Arabis divaricarpa</i> A. Nelson	<i>Silene cserie</i> Baumg.	<i>Viola adunca</i> Sm.
<i>Aralia hispida</i> Vent.	<i>Smilacina stellata</i> (L.) Desf.	<i>Viola incognita</i> Brainerd
<i>Artemisia caudata</i> Michx.		<i>Viola conspersa</i> Reichenb.
<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i> L.		
(Total Species, 21)		

TABLE 6. Plants Found Only in Wisconsin Point Sample Areas

<i>Abies balsamea</i> (L.) Mill.	<i>Corylus americana</i> Walt.	<i>Lycopodium obscurum</i> L. var. <i>dendroideum</i> (Michx.) D. C. Eaton
<i>Acer spicatum</i> Lam.	<i>Corylus cornuta</i> Marsh.	<i>Oryzopsis asperifolia</i> Michx.
<i>Actaea rubra</i> (Ait.) Willd.	<i>Fragaria virginiana</i> Duchesne var. <i>illinoensis</i> (Prince) A. Gray	<i>Ribes triste</i> Pall.
<i>Amelanchier laevis</i> Wieg.	<i>Iris versicolor</i> L.	<i>Rosa acicularis</i> Lindl.
<i>Aster ciliolatus</i> Lindl. forma <i>comatus</i> Fern.	<i>Ledum groenlandicum</i> Oeder	<i>Solidago hispida</i> Muhl.
<i>Bromus ciliatus</i> L.	<i>Lonicera canadensis</i> Marsh.	<i>Solidago nemoralis</i> Ait.
<i>Carex brunnescens</i> (Pers.) Poir.	<i>Lonicera tatarica</i> L.	<i>Thalictrum confine</i> Fern.
<i>Carex deweyana</i> Schwein.	<i>Lycopodium annotinum</i> L.	<i>Thuja occidentalis</i> L.
<i>Coptis groenlandica</i> (Oeder) Fern.	<i>Lycopodium lucidulum</i> Michx.	<i>Viola renifolia</i> A. Gray
(Total Species, 27)		

- COTTAM, G. and J. T. CURTIS. 1956. The use of distance measures in phytosociological sampling. *Ecology*. 37: 451-460.
- COWLES, H. C. 1899. The ecological relations of the vegetation on the sand dunes of Lake Michigan. *Bot. Gaz.* 27:95-117, 167-202, 281-308, 361-391.
- CURTIS, JOHN T. 1959. *The Vegetation of Wisconsin*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. 1-657 pp.
- FERNALD, M. L. 1950. *Grays Manual of Botany*. 8th Ed. American Book Co.
- GATES, F. C. 1912. The vegetation of the beach area in northeastern Illinois and southeastern Wisconsin. *Bull. Ill. Lab. Nat. Hist.*, 9:255-272.
- JOHNSON, CHARLES F. 1886. *Diary*. In: *Duluth News-Tribune*, January 11, 1942.
- JOHNSON, EUGENE. 1963. A taxonomic study of the flora of Minnesota Point. M. A. Thesis. Univ. of Minnesota. 1-36 pp. Duluth.
- LAKELA, OLGA. 1939. A floristic study of a developing plant community of Minnesota Point, Minnesota. *Ecology* 20(4): 544-552.
- LAKELA, OLGA. 1965. *A Flora of Northeastern Minnesota*. University of Minnesota Press. 1-541 pp. Minneapolis.
- LOY, W. G. 1963a. The evolution of bay-head bars in western Lake Superior. Publication No. 10, Great Lakes Research Division, The University of Michigan. pp. 150-157.
- OEHMCKE, A. A. 1937. Ecology of the lake shore ravines and beaches of the Wisconsin coast of Lake Michigan. B. A. Thesis. University of Wisconsin. Madison.
- OLSON, JERRY S. 1958. Rates of Succession and Soil Changes on Southern Lake Michigan Sand Dunes. *Botanical Gazette*. 119(3): 125-170.
- SCHWARTZ, GEORGE M. and GEORGE M. and GEORGE A. THIEL. 1954. *Minnesota's Rocks and Waters*. Univ. of Minnesota Press. 1-360 pp.
- SHINNERS, L. H. 1940. Vegetation of the Milwaukee Region. B. A. Thesis. University of Wisconsin. Madison.
- VAN BRUNT, WALTER. 1921. *Duluth and St. Louis County. Their Story and People*. The American Historical Society, Chicago and New York.
- WOODBIDGE, DWIGHT E., and JOHN S. PARDEE. Editors. 1910. Vol. 1. *History of Duluth and St. Louis County*. C. F. Cooper and Company.

Learned Societies Around the World

United States of America

There is a considerable number of scientific societies. Nearly every branch has its own national organization. Nearly every scientific society publishes various periodicals.

National Academy of Science. Founded 1863 by President Lincoln. A private institution. Functions as a link between science and government. Has more than 550 members of whom approximately 60 are foreigners. Has 13 divisions: mathematics, astronomy, physiology and biochemistry, physics, technology, chemistry, geology, botany, zoology and anatomy, pathology and bacteriology, anthropology, psychology, and geophysics. Members are elected upon recommendation of Academy's Council or of the divisions. The number of new members is limited to 30 Americans and 4 foreigners per year. President is elected for 4 years.

Funds are derived from sale of publications, contracts with government departments, and donations from industry, foundations, and private individuals. Academy does not maintain research institutes of own but advises on award of scholarships and endeavours to encourage research work and to coordinate scientific investigations of general interest on a national as well as international level.

National Research Council. Founded in 1916 by National Academy of Science to function as its executive body. The most important societies in the fields of the natural sciences (including medicine) and technology are members.

American Council of Learned Societies. Founded 1919. Central organization for most of distinguished national societies in field of humanities. Promotes public interest in all branches of arts and humanities and advancement of teaching and training. Member national societies number 29.

Social Science Research Council. Founded 1924. Has 7 distinguished national societies as members, all of which work in field of social sciences. Council administers fellowships and grants for research.