# The role of defensible space for residential structure protection during wildfires

*Alexandra D. Syphard*[A,D], *Teresa J. Brennan*[B] *and Jon E. Keeley*[B,C]

[A]Conservation Biology Institute, 10423 Sierra Vista Avenue, La Mesa, CA 91941, USA.
[B]US Geological Survey Western Ecological Research Center, Three Rivers, CA 93271, USA.
[C]Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of California, 612 Charles E. Young
  Drive, South Los Angeles, CA 90095-7246, USA.
[D]Corresponding author. Email: asyphard@consbio.org

**Abstract.** With the potential for worsening fire conditions, discussion is escalating over how to best reduce effects on urban communities. A widely supported strategy is the creation of defensible space immediately surrounding homes and other structures. Although state and local governments publish specific guidelines and requirements, there is little empirical evidence to suggest how much vegetation modification is needed to provide significant benefits. We analysed the role of defensible space by mapping and measuring a suite of variables on modern pre-fire aerial photography for 1000 destroyed and 1000 surviving structures for all fires where homes burned from 2001 to 2010 in San Diego County, CA, USA. Structures were more likely to survive a fire with defensible space immediately adjacent to them. The most effective treatment distance varied between 5 and 20 m (16–58 ft) from the structure, but distances larger than 30 m (100 ft) did not provide additional protection, even for structures located on steep slopes. The most effective actions were reducing woody cover up to 40% immediately adjacent to structures and ensuring that vegetation does not overhang or touch the structure. Multiple-regression models showed landscape-scale factors, including low housing density and distances to major roads, were more important in explaining structure destruction. The best long-term solution will involve a suite of prevention measures that include defensible space as well as building design approach, community education and proactive land use planning that limits exposure to fire.

## Introduction

Across the globe and over recent decades, homes have been destroyed in wildfires at an unprecedented rate. In the last decade, large wildfires across Australia, southern Europe, Russia, the US and Canada have resulted in tens of thousands of properties destroyed, in addition to lost lives and enormous social, economic and ecological effects (Filmon 2004; Boschetti *et al.* 2008; Keeley *et al.* 2009; Blanchi *et al.* 2010; Vasquez 2011). The potential for climate change to worsen fire conditions (Hessl 2011), and the projection of continued housing growth in fire-prone wildlands (Gude *et al.* 2008) suggest that many more communities will face the threat of catastrophic wildfire in the future.

Concern over increasing fire threat has escalated discussion over how to best prepare for wildfires and reduce their effects. Although ideas such as greater focus on fire hazard in land use planning, using fire-resistant building materials and reducing human-caused ignitions (e.g. Cary *et al.* 2009; Quarles *et al.* 2010; Syphard *et al.* 2012) are gaining traction, the traditional strategy of fuels management continues to receive the most attention. Fuels management in the form of prescribed fires or mechanical treatments has historically occurred in remote, wildland locations (Schoennagel *et al.* 2009), but recent studies

suggest that treatments located closer to homes and communities may provide greater protection (Witter and Taylor 2005; Stockmann *et al.* 2010; Gibbons *et al.* 2012). In fact, one of the most commonly recommended strategies in terms of fuels and fire protection is to create defensible space immediately around structures (Cohen 2000; Winter *et al.* 2009). Defensible space is an area around a structure where vegetation has been modified, or 'cleared,' to increase the chance of the structure surviving a wildfire. The idea is to mitigate home loss by minimising direct contact with fire, reducing radiative heating, lowering the probability of ignitions from embers and providing a safer place for fire fighters to defend a structure against fire (Gill and Stephens 2009; Cheney *et al.* 2001). Many jurisdictions provide specific guidelines and practices for creating defensible space, including minimum distances that are required among trees and shrubs as well as minimum total distances from the structure. These distances may be enforced through local ordinances or state-wide laws. In California, for example, a state law in 2005 increased the required total distance from 9 m (30 ft) to 30 m (100 ft).

Despite these specific guidelines on how to create defensible space, there is little scientific evidence to support the amount and location of vegetation modification that is actually effective

at providing significant benefits. Most spacing guidelines and laws are based on 'expert opinion' or recommendations from older publications that lack scientific reference or rationale (e.g. Maire 1979; Smith and Adams 1991; Gilmer 1994). However, one study has provided scientific support for, and forms the basis of, most guidelines, policy and laws requiring a minimum of 30 m (100 ft) of defensible space (Cohen 1999, 2000). The modelling and experimental research in that study showed that flames from forest fires located 10–40 m (33–131 ft) away would not scorch or ignite a wooden home; and case studies showed 90% of homes with non-flammable roofs and vegetation clearance of 10–20 m (33–66 ft) could survive wildfires (Cohen 2000). However, the models and experimental research in that study focussed on crown fires in spruce or jack pine forests, and the primary material of home construction was wood. Therefore, it is unknown how well this guideline applies to regions dominated by other forest types, grasslands, or nonforested woody shrublands and in regions where wooden houses are not the norm.

Some older case studies showed that most homes with non-flammable roofs and 10–18 m (33–ft) of defensible space survived the 1961 Bel Air fire in California (Howard *et al.* 1973); most homes with non-flammable roofs and more than 10 m (33 ft) of defensible space also survived the 1990 Painted Cave fire (Foote and Gilless 1996). Also, several fire-behaviour modelling studies have been conducted in chaparral shrublands. One study showed that reducing vegetative cover to 50% at 9–30 m (30–ft) from structures effectively reduced fireline intensity and flame lengths, and that removal of 80% cover would result in unintended consequences such as exotic grass invasion, loss of habitat and increase in highly flammable flashy fuels (A. Fege and D. Pumphrey, unpubl. data). Another showed that separation distances adequate to protect firefighters varied according to fuel model and that wind speeds greater than 23 km h$^{-1}$ negated the effect of slope, and wind speed above 48 km h$^{-1}$ negated any protective effect of defensible space (F. Bilz, E. McCormick and R. Unkovich, unpubl. data, 2009). Results obtained through modelling equations of thermal radiation also found safety distances to vary as a function of fuel type, type of fire, home construction material and protective garments worn by firefighters (Zárate *et al.* 2008).

Although there is no empirical evidence to support the need for more than 30 m (100 ft) of defensible space, there has been a concerted effort in some areas to increase this distance, particularly on steep slopes. In California, a senate bill was introduced in 2008 (SB 1618) to encourage property owners to clear 91 m (300 ft) through the reduction of environmental regulations and permitting needed at that distance. Although this bill was defeated in committee, many local ordinances do require homeowners to clear 91 m (300 ft) or more, and there are reports that some people are unable to get fire insurance without 91 m (300 ft) of defensible space (F. Sproul, pers. comm.). In contrast, homeowner acceptance of and compliance with defensible space policies can be challenging (Winter *et al.* 2009; Absher and Vaske 2011), and in many cases homeowners do not create any defensible space.

It is critically important to develop empirical research that quantifies the amount, location and distance of defensible space that provides significant fire protection benefits so that guidelines and policies are developed with scientific support.

Data that are directly applicable to southern California are especially important, as this region experiences the highest annual rate of wildfire-destroyed homes in the US. Not having sufficient defensible space is obviously undesirable because of the hazard to homeowners. However, there are clear trade-offs involved when vegetation reduction is excessive, as it results in the loss of native habitats, potential for increased erosion and invasive species establishment, and it potentially even increases fire risk because of the high flammability of weedy grasslands (Spittler 1995; Keeley *et al.* 2005; Syphard *et al.* 2006).

It is also important to understand the role of defensible space in residential structure protection relative to other factors that explain why some homes are destroyed in fires and some are not. Recent research shows that landscape-scale factors, such as housing arrangement and location, as well as biophysical variables characterising properties and neighbourhoods such as slope and fuel type, were important in explaining which homes burned in two southern California study areas (Syphard *et al.* 2012; 2013). Understanding the relative importance of different variables at different scales may help to identify which combinations of factors are most critical to consider for fire safety.

Our objective was to provide an empirical analysis of the role of defensible space in protecting structures during wildfires in southern California shrublands. Using recent pre-fire aerial photography, we mapped and measured a suite of variables describing defensible space for burned and unburned structures within the perimeters of major fires from 2001 to 2010 in San Diego County to ask the following questions:

1. How much defensible space is needed to provide significant protection to homes during wildfires, and is it beneficial to have more than the legally required 30 m (100 ft)?
2. Does the amount of defensible space needed for protection depend on slope inclination?
3. What is the role of defensible space relative to other factors that influence structure loss, such as terrain, fuel type and housing density?

## Methods

### Study area

The properties and structures analysed were located in San Diego County, California, USA (Fig. 1) – a topographically diverse region with a Mediterranean climate characterised by cool, wet winters and long summer droughts. Fire typically is a direct threat to structures adjacent to wildland areas. Native shrublands in southern California are extremely flammable during the late summer and fall (autumn) and when ignited, burn in high-intensity, stand-replacing crown fires. Although 500 homes on average have been lost annually since the mid-1900s (Calfire 2000), that rate has doubled since 2000. Most of these homes have burned during extreme fire weather conditions that accompany the autumn Santa Ana winds. The wildland–urban interface here includes more than 5 million homes, covering more than 28 000 km$^2$ (Hammer *et al.* 2007).

### Property data

The data for properties to analyse came from a complete spatial database of existing residential structures and their

**Fig. 1.** Location of destroyed and unburned structures within the South Coast ecoregion of San Diego County, California, USA.

corresponding property boundaries developed for San Diego County (Syphard *et al.* 2012). This dataset included 687 869 structures, of which 4315 were completely destroyed by one of 40 major fires that occurred from 2001 to 2010. Our goal was to compare homes that were exposed to wildfire and survived with those that were exposed and destroyed. To determine exposure to fire, we only considered structures located both within a GIS layer of fire perimeters and within areas mapped as having burned at a minimum of low severity through thematic Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity produced by the USA Geological Survey and USDA Forest Service. From these data, we used a random sample algorithm in GIS software to select 1000 destroyed and 1000 unburned homes that were not adjacent to each other, to minimise any potential for spatial autocorrelation. Our final property dataset included structures that burned across eight different fires. More than 97% of these structures burned in Santa Ana wind-driven fire events (Fig. 1).

*Calculating defensible space and additional explanatory variables*

To estimate defensible space, we developed and explored a suite of variables relative to the distance and amount of defensible space surrounding structures, as well as the proximity of woody vegetation to the structure (Table 1). We measured these variables based on interpretation of Google Earth aerial imagery. We based our measurements on the most recent imagery before the date of the fire. In almost all cases, imagery was available for less than 1 year before the fire.

Our definition of defensible space followed the guidelines published by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Calfire 2006). 'Clearance' included all areas that were not covered by woody vegetation, including paved areas

or grass. Although Google Earth prevents the identification of understorey vegetation, woody trees and shrubs were easily distinguished from grass, and our objective was to measure horizontal distances as required by Calfire rather than assess the relative flammability of different vegetation types. Trees or shrubs were allowed to be within the defensible space zone as long as they were separated by the minimum horizontal required distance, which was 3 m (10 ft) from the edge of one tree canopy to the edge of the next (Fig. 2). Although greater distances between trees or shrubs are recommended on steeper slopes, we followed the same guidelines for all properties. For all structures, we started the distance measurements by drawing lines from the centre of the four orthogonal sides of the structure that ended when they intersected anything that no longer met the requirements in the guidelines. A fair number of structures are not four sided; thus, the start of the centre point was placed at a location that approximated the farthest extent of the structure along each of four orthogonal sides.

We developed two sets of measurements of the distance of defensible space based on what is feasible for homeowners within their properties *v.* the total effective distance of defensible space. We made these two measurements because homeowners are only required to create defensible space within their own property, and this would reflect the effect of individual homeowner compliance. Therefore, even if cleared vegetation extended beyond the property line, the first set of distance measurements ended at the property boundary. The second set of measurements ignored the property boundaries and accounted for the total potential effect of treatment. For all measurements, we recorded the cover types (e.g. structure >3 m (10 ft) long, property boundary, or vegetation type) at which the distance measurements stopped (Table 1). Because property

**Table 1.   Defensible space variables measured for every structure**

Urban veg, landscaping vegetation that was not in compliance with regulations within urban matrix; wildland veg, wildland vegetation that was not in compliance with regulations; orchard, shrub to tree-sized vegetation in rows; urban to wildland, landscaping vegetation that leads into wildland vegetation; structure, any building longer than 3 m (10 ft)

| Variable | Definition |
|---|---|
| Distance defensible space within property | Measure of clearance from side of structure to property boundary calculated for four orthogonal directions from structure and averaged |
| Total distance defensible space | Measure of clearance from side of structure to end of clearance calculated for four orthogonal directions from structure and averaged |
| Cover type at end of defensible space | Type of cover encountered at end of measurement (urban veg, wildland veg, orchard, urban to wildland, structure) |
| Percentage clearance | Percentage of clearance calculated across the entire property |
| Neighbours' vegetation | Binary indicator of whether neighbours' uncleared vegetation was located within 30 m (100 ft) of the main structure |
| Vegetation touching structure | Number of sides on which woody vegetation touches main structure (1–4) Structure with more than 4 sides were viewed as a box and given a number between 1 and 4 |
| Vegetation overhanging roof | Was vegetation overhanging the roof? (yes or no) |



**Fig. 2.**   Illustration of defensible space measurements. See Table 1 for full definition of terms.

owners usually can only clear vegetation on their own land, it is possible that the effectiveness of defensible space partly depends upon the actions of neighbouring homeowners. Therefore, we also recorded whether or not any neighbours' un-cleared vegetation was located within 30 m (100 ft) of the structure.

To assess the total amount of woody vegetation that can safely remain on a property and still receive significant benefits of defensible space, we calculated the total percentage of cleared land, woody vegetation and structure area across every property. This was accomplished by overlaying a grid on each property and determining the proportion of squares falling into each class. Preliminary results showed these three measurements to be highly correlated, so we only retained percentage clearance for further analysis. To evaluate the relative effect of woody

vegetation directly adjacent to structures, we also calculated the number of sides of the structure with vegetation touching and recorded whether any trees were overhanging structures' roofs.

In addition to defensible space measurements, we evaluated other factors known to influence the likelihood of housing loss to fire in the region (Syphard *et al.* 2012, 2013). Using the same data as in Syphard *et al.* (2012, 2013), we extracted spatial information from continuous grids of explanatory variables for the locations of all structures in our analysis. Variables included interpolated housing density based on a 1-km search radius; percentage slope derived from a 30-m digital elevation model (DEM); Euclidean distance to nearest major and minor road and fuel type, which was based on a simple classification of US Forest Service data (Syphard *et al.* 2012), including urban, grass, shrubland and forest & woodland.

## Analysis

We performed several analyses to determine whether relative differences in home protection are provided by different distances and amounts of defensible space, particularly beyond the legally required 30 m (100 ft), and to identify the effective treatment distance for homes on low and steep slopes.

### Categorical analysis

For the first analysis, we divided our data into several groups to identify potential differences among specific categories of defensible space distance around structures located on shallow and steep slopes. We first sorted the full dataset of 2000 structures by slope and then split the data in the middle to create groups of homes with shallow slope and steep slope. We divided the data in half to keep the number of structures even within both groups and to avoid specifying an arbitrary number to define what constitutes shallow or steep slope. The two equal-sized subsets of data ranged from 0 to 9%, with a mean of 8% for shallow slope, and from 9 to 40%, with a mean of 27% for steep slope. Within these data subsets, we next created groups reflecting different mean distances of defensible space around structures. We also performed separate analyses based on whether defensible space measurements were calculated within the property boundary or whether measurements accounted for the total distance of defensible space.

Within all groups, we calculated the proportion of homes that were destroyed by wildfire. We performed Pearson's Chi-square tests of independence to determine whether or not the proportion of destroyed structures within groups was significantly different (Agresti 2007). We based one test on four equal-interval groups within the legally required distance of 30 m (100 ft): 0–7 m (0–25 ft), 8–15 m (26–50 ft), 16–23 m (51–75 ft) and 24–30 m (76–100 ft). A second test was based on three groups (24–30 m (75–100 ft), 31–90 m (101–300 ft) and >90 m (>300 ft) or >60 m (>200 ft)) to evaluate whether groups with mean defensible space distances >30 m (>100 ft) were significantly different from groups with <30 m (<100 ft). When defensible space distances were only measured to the property boundary, few structures had mean defensible space >90 m (>300 ft). Therefore, we used a cut-off of 60 m (200 ft) to increase the sample size in the Chi-square analysis. In addition to the Chi-square analysis, we calculated the relative risk among every successive pair of categories (Sheskin 2004). The relative risk was calculated as the ratio of proportions of burned homes within two groups of homes that had different defensible space distances.

### Effective treatment analysis

In addition to comparing the relative effect of defensible space among different groups of mean distances, as described above, we also considered that the protective effect of defensible space for structures exposed to wildfire is conceptually similar to the effect of medication in producing a therapeutic response in people who are sick. In addition to pharmacological applications, treatment–response relationships have been used for radiation, herbicide, drought tolerance and ecotoxicological studies (e.g. Streibig *et al.* 1993; Cedergreen *et al.* 2005; Knezevic *et al.* 2007; Kursar *et al.* 2009). The effect produced by a drug or treatment typically varies according to the concentration or amount, often up to a point at which further increase provides no additional response. The effective treatment (ET50), therefore, is a specific concentration or exposure that produces a therapeutic response or desired effect. Here we considered the treatment to be the distance or amount of defensible space.

Using the software package DRC in R (Knezevic *et al.* 2007; Ritz and Streibig 2013), we evaluated the treatment–response relationship of defensible space in survival of structures during wildfire. To calculate the effective treatment, we fit a log-logistic model with logistic regression because we had a binary dependent variable (burned or unburned). We specified a 2-parameter model where the lower limit was fixed at 0 and the upper limit was fixed at 1. We again performed separate analyses for data subsets reflecting shallow and steep slope, as well as from measurements of defensible space taken within, or regardless of, property boundaries. We also performed analyses to find the effective treatment of percentage clearance of trees and shrubs within the property.

### Multiple regression analysis

To evaluate the role of defensible space relative to other variables, we developed multiple generalised linear regression models (GLMs) (Venables and Ripley 1994). We again had a binary dependent variable (burned versus unburned), so we specified a logit link and binomial response. Although the proportion of 0s and 1s in the response may be important to consider for true prediction (King and Zeng 2001; Syphard *et al.* 2008), our objective here was solely to evaluate variable importance. We developed multiple regression models for all possible combinations of the predictor variables and used the corrected Akaike's Information Criterion (AICc) to rank models and select the best ones for each region using package MuMIn in R (R Development Core Team 2012; Burnham and Anderson 2002). We recorded all top-ranked models that had an AICc value within 2 of that of the model with lowest AICc to identify all models with empirical support. To assess variable importance, we calculated the sum of Akaike weights for all models that contained each variable. On a scale of 0–1, this metric represents the weight of evidence that models containing the variable in question are the best model (Burnham and Anderson 2002). The distance of defensible space measured within property boundaries was highly correlated with the distance of defensible space measured beyond property boundaries ($r = 0.82$), so we developed two separate analyses – one using variables measured only within the property boundary and the other using variables that accounted for defensible space outside of the property boundary as well as the potential effect of neighbours having uncleared vegetation within 30 m (100 ft) of the structure. A test to avoid multicollinearity showed all other variables within each multiple regression analysis to be uncorrelated ($r < 0.5$).

### Surrounding matrix

To assess whether the proportion of destroyed structures varied according to their surrounding matrix, we summarised the most common cover type at the end of defensible space measurements (descriptions in Table 1) for all structures. These summaries

(a)    Low slope properties



(b)    High slope properties

**Fig. 3.**    Proportion of destroyed homes grouped by distances of defensible space based upon total distance of clearance within property boundary, for structures on (a) shallow slopes (mean 8%) and (b) steep slopes (mean 27%).

(a)    Low slope properties



(b)    High slope properties

**Fig. 4.**    Proportion of destroyed homes grouped by distances of defensible space based upon total distance of clearance regardless of property boundary, for structures on (a) shallow slopes (mean 8%) and (b) steep slopes (mean 27%).

were based on the majority surrounding cover type from the four orthogonal sides of the structure. We also noted cases in which there was a tie (e.g. two sides were urban vegetation and two sides were structures).

## Results

### Categorical analysis

When the distance of defensible space was measured both 'only within property boundaries' (Fig. 3) and 'regardless of property boundaries' (Fig. 4), the Chi-square test showed a significant difference ($P < 0.001$) in the proportion of destroyed structures among the four equal-interval groups of distance ranging from 0 to 30 m (0–100 ft). This relationship was consistent on both shallow-slope and steep-slope properties, although the relative risk analysis showed considerable variation among classes (Table 2) There was a steadily decreasing proportion of destroyed structures at greater distances of defensible space up to 30 m (100 ft) on the steep-slope structures with defensible space measured regardless of property boundaries (Fig. 4b). Otherwise, the biggest difference in proportion of destroyed structures occurred between 0 and 7 m (0–25 ft) and 8–15 m (26–50 ft) (Figs 3a–b, 4a).

When the distance of defensible space was measured in intervals from 24 m (75 ft) and beyond, the Chi-square test

showed no significant difference among groups ($P = 0.96$ for shallow-slope properties and $P = 0.74$ for steep-slope properties) (Figs 3, 4), although again, the relative risk analysis showed considerable variation (Table 2).There was a slight increase in the proportion of homes destroyed at longer distance intervals when the defensible space was measured only to the property boundaries (Fig. 3a–b). This slight increase is less apparent when distances were measured regardless of boundaries (Fig. 4a–b).

The relative risk calculations showed that the ratio of proportions was generally more variable among successive pairs when the distances were measured within property boundaries (Table 2). For these calculations, the risk of a structure being destroyed was significantly lower when the defensible space distance was 8–15 m (25–50 ft) compared to 0–7 m (0–25 ft) on both shallow- and steep-slope properties. On the steep-slope properties, there was an additional reduction of risk when comparing 24–30 m (75–100 ft) to 16–23 m (50–75 ft). However, the risk of a home being destroyed was slightly significantly higher when there was 31–90 m (101–225 ft) compared to 16–23 m (50–75 ft). For distances that were measured regardless of property boundary (total clearance), the only significant differences in risk of burning were a reduction in risk for 8–15 m (25–50 ft) compared to 0–7 m (0–25 ft).

**Table 2. Number of burned and unburned structures within defensible space distance categories (m), their relative risk and significance**

A relative risk of 1 indicates no difference; <1 means the chance of a structure burning is less than the other group; >1 means the chance is higher than the other group. The relative risk is calculated for pairs that include the existing row and the row above. Confidence intervals are in parentheses

| | Distance within property | | | | Total distance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Burned | Unburned | Relative risk | $P$ | Burned | Unburned | Relative risk | $P$ |
| Shallow slope | | | | | | | | |
| 0–7 | 200 | 186 | | | 162 | 114 | | |
| 8–15 | 109 | 198 | 0.69 (0.12) | <0.001 | 108 | 132 | 0.77 | 0.002 |
| 16–23 | 51 | 89 | 1.03 (0.30) | 0.850 | 78 | 90 | 1.03 | 0.770 |
| 24–30 | 36 | 40 | 1.30 (0.39) | 0.110 | 50 | 70 | 0.90 | 0.430 |
| 31–90 | 28 | 47 | 0.79 (0.24) | 0.220 | 79 | 99 | 1.06 | 0.640 |
| 60 or 90+ | 10 | 6 | 1.67 (0.63) | 0.040 | 8 | 9 | 1.01 | 0.830 |
| Steep slope | | | | | | | | |
| 0–7 | 245 | 128 | | | 224 | 128 | | |
| 8–15 | 174 | 148 | 0.82 (0.10) | 0.001 | 158 | 139 | 0.84 | 0.008 |
| 16–23 | 85 | 68 | 1.03 (0.16) | 0.750 | 73 | 83 | 0.87 | 0.210 |
| 24–30 | 29 | 56 | 0.61 (0.17) | 0.004 | 26 | 50 | 0.73 | 0.080 |
| 31– | 29 | 28 | 1.49 (0.48) | 0.050 | 39 | 68 | 1.06 | 0.760 |
| 60 or 90+ | 5 | 5 | 0.98 (0.47) | 0.950 | 4 | 8 | 0.91 | 0.830 |

**Table 3. Effective treatment results reflecting the distance (in metres, with feet in parentheses) and percentage clearance within properties that provided significant improvement in structure survival during wildfires**

The property mean is the average distance of defensible space or percentage clearance that was calculated on the properties before the wildfires and provides a means to compare the effective treatment result to the actual amount on the properties

| | All parcels effective treatment ($n = 2000$) | Parcel mean | Shallow slope (mean 8%) effective treatment ($n = 1000$) | Parcel mean | Steep slope (mean 27%) effective treatment ($n = 1000$) | Parcel mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defensible space within parcel | 10 (33) | 13 (44) | 4 (13) | 14 (45) | 25 (82) | 11 (35) |
| Total distance defensible space | 10 (32) | 19 (63) | 5 (16) | 20 (67) | 20 (65) | 18 (58) |
| Mean percentage clearance on property | 36 | 48 | 31 | 51 | 37 | 35 |

## Effective treatment analysis

Analysis of the treatment–response relationships among defensible space and structures that survived wildfire showed that, when all structures are considered together, the mean actual defensible space that existed around structures before the fires was longer than the calculated effective treatment (Table 3). Regardless of whether the defensible space was measured within or beyond property boundaries, the estimated effective treatment of defensible space was nearly the same at 10 m (32–33 ft).

The effective treatment distance was much shorter for structures on shallow slopes (4–5 m (13–16 ft)) than for structures on steep slopes (20–25 m (65–82 ft)), but in all cases was <30 m (<100 ft). Although longer distances of defensible space were calculated as effective on steeper slopes, these structures actually had shorter mean distances of defensible space around their properties than structures on low slopes (Table 3).

The calculated effective treatment of the mean percentage clearance on properties was 36% for all properties, 31% for structures on shallow slopes and 37% for structures on steep slopes (Table 3). In total, the properties all had higher actual percentage clearance on their property than was calculated to be effective. However, this mainly reflects the shallow-slope properties, as those structures on steep slopes had less clearance than the effective treatment.

## Multiple regression analysis

When defensible space was measured only to the property boundaries, it was not included in the best model, according to the all-subsets multiple regression analysis (Table 4). However, it was included in the best model when factoring in the distance of defensible space measured beyond property boundaries (Table 5). In both multiple regression analyses, low housing density and shorter distances to major roads were ranked as the most important variables according to their Akaike weights. Slope and surrounding fuel type were also in both of the best models as well as other measures of defensible space, including the percentage clearance on property and whether vegetation was overhanging the structure's roof. The number of sides in which vegetation was touching the structure was included in the best model when defensible space was only measured to the property boundary. The total explained deviance for the multiple regression models was low (12–13%) for both analyses.

**Table 4.  Results of multiple regression models of destroyed homes using all possible variable combinations and corrected Akaike's Information Criterion (AICc)**

Includes variables measured within property boundary only. Top-ranked models include all those ($n = 12$) with AICc within 2 of the model with the lowest AICc. Relative variable importance is the sum of 'Akaike weights' over all models including the explanatory variable

| Variable in order of importance | Relative variable importance | Model-averaged coefficient | Number inclusions in top-ranked models |
|---|---|---|---|
| Housing density | 1 | −0.003 | 12 |
| Distance to major road | 1 | −0.0005 | 12 |
| Percentage clearance | 1 | −0.02 | 12 |
| Slope | 1 | 0.03 | 12 |
| Vegetation overhang roof | 1 | 0.5 | 12 |
| Fuel type | 0.67 | Factor | 9 |
| Vegetation touch structure | 0.49 | 0.07 | 6 |
| Distance defensible space within property | 0.45 | −0.0002 | 5 |
| South-westness | 0.36 | −0.0007 | 3 |
| Distance to minor road | 0.28 | −0.0002 | 1 |
| $D^2$ of top-ranked model | | | 0.123 |

**Table 5.  Results of multiple regression models of destroyed homes using all possible variable combinations and corrected Akaike's Information Criterion (AICc)**

Includes variables measured beyond property boundary. Top-ranked models include all those ($n = 6$) with AICc within 2 of the model with the lowest AICc. Relative variable importance is the sum of 'Akaike weights' over all models including the explanatory variable

| Variable in order of importance | Relative variable importance | Model-averaged coefficient | Number inclusions in top-ranked models |
|---|---|---|---|
| Housing density | 1 | −0.003 | 6 |
| Distance to major road | 1 | −0.0005 | 6 |
| Total distance defensible space | 1 | −0.004 | 6 |
| Percentage clearance | 1 | −0.01 | 6 |
| Vegetation overhang roof | 0.99 | 0.4 | 6 |
| Slope | 0.99 | 0.03 | 6 |
| Fuel type | 0.86 | Factor | 4 |
| South-westness | 0.42 | −0.0009 | 2 |
| Distance to minor road | 0.36 | −0.0009 | 2 |
| Neighbours' vegetation | 0.27 | 0.08 | 1 |
| Vegetation touch structure | 0.27 | 0.18 | 1 |
| $D^2$ of top-ranked model | | | 0.125 |

*Surrounding matrix*

The cover type that most frequently surrounded the structures at the end of the defensible space measurements was urban vegetation, followed by urban vegetation leading into wildland vegetation, and wildland vegetation (Fig. 5). Many structures were equally surrounded by different cover types. There were no significant differences in the proportion of structures destroyed depending on the surrounding cover type. However, a disproportionately large proportion of structures burned (28 *v.* 9% unburned) when they were surrounded by urban vegetation that extended straight into wildland vegetation.

## Discussion

For homes that burned in southern Californian urban areas adjacent to non-forested ecosystems, most burned in high-intensity Santa Ana wind-driven wildfires and defensible space increased the likelihood of structure survival during wildfire.

The most effective treatment distance varied between 5 and 20 m (16–58 ft), depending on slope and how the defensible space was measured, but distances longer than 30 m (100 ft) provided no significant additional benefit. Structures on steeper slopes benefited from more defensible space than structures on shallow slopes, but the effective treatment was still less than 30 m (100 ft). The steepest overall decline in destroyed structures occurred when mean defensible space increased from 0–7 m (0–25 ft) to 8–15 m (26–50 ft). That, along with the multiple regression results showing the significance of vegetation touching or overhanging the structure, suggests it is most critical to modify vegetation immediately adjacent to the house, and to move outward from there. Similarly, vegetation overhanging the structure was also strongly correlated with structure loss in Australia (Leonard *et al.* 2009).

In terms of fuel modification, the multiple regression models also showed that the percentage of clearance was just as, or more important than, the linear distance of defensible space.

**Fig. 5.** Proportion of destroyed and unburned structures based on the primary surrounding cover type at the end of defensible space measurements. There were no significant differences in the proportion of burned and unburned structures within cover types ($P = 0.14$). Cover types are defined in Table 1.

However, as with defensible space, percentage clearance did not need to be draconian to be effective. Even on steep slopes, the effective percentage clearance needed on the property was <40%, with no significant advantage beyond that. Although these steep-slope structures benefited more from clearance, they tended to have less clearance than the effective amount, which may be why slope was such an important variable in the multiple regression models. Shallow-slope structures, in contrast, had more clearance on average than was calculated to be effective, suggesting these property owners do not need to modify their behaviours as much relative to people living on steep slopes.

Although the term 'clearance' is often used interchangeably with defensible space, this term is incorrect when misinterpreted to mean clearing all vegetation, and our results underline this difference. The idea behind defensible space is to reduce the continuity of fuels through maintenance of certain distances among trees and shrubs. Although we could not identify the vertical profile of fuels through Google Earth imagery, the fact that at least 60% of the horizontal woody vegetative cover can remain on the property with significant protective effects demonstrates the importance of distinguishing defensible space from complete vegetation removal. Thus, we suggest the term 'clearance' be replaced with 'fuel treatment' as a better way of communicating fire hazard reduction needs to home owners.

The percentage cover of woody shrubs and trees was not evenly distributed across properties, and we did not collect data describing how the cover was distributed. Considering the importance of defensible space and vegetation modification immediately adjacent to the structure, it should follow that actions to reduce cover should also be focussed in close proximity to the structure. The hazard of vegetation near the structure has apparently been recognised for some time (Foote *et al.* 1991; Ramsey and McArthur 1994), but it is not stressed enough, and rarely falls within the scope of defensible space guidelines or ordinances.

In addition to the importance of vegetation overhanging or touching the structure, it is important to understand that ornamental vegetation may be just as, if not more, dangerous than native vegetation in southern California. Although the results showed no significant differences in the cover types in the surrounding matrix, there was a disproportionately large number of structures destroyed (28% burned *v.* 9% unburned) when ornamental vegetation on the property led directly into the wildland. Ornamental vegetation may produce highly flammable litter (Ganteaume *et al.* 2013) or may be particularly dangerous after a drought when it is dry, or has not been maintained, and species of conifer, juniper, cypress, eucalypt, *Acacia* and palm have been present in the properties of many structures that have been destroyed (Franklin 1996). Nevertheless, ornamental vegetation is allowed to be included as defensible space in many codes and ordinances (Haines *et al.* 2008).

One reason that longer defensible space distances did not significantly increase structure protection may be that most homes are not destroyed by the direct ignition of the fire front but rather due to ember-ignited spot fires, sometimes from fire brands carried as far as several km away. Although embers decay with distance, the difference between 30 and 90 m (100 and 300 ft) may be small relative to the distance embers travel under the severe wind conditions that were present at the time of the fires. The ignitability of whatever the embers land on, particularly adjacent to the house, is therefore most critical for propagating the fire within the property or igniting the home (Cohen 1999; Maranghides and Mell 2009).

Aside from roofing or home construction materials and vegetation immediately adjacent to structures (Quarles *et al.* 2010; Keeley *et al.* 2013), the flammability of the vegetation in the property may also play a role. Large, cleared swaths of land are likely occupied at least in part by exotic annual grasses that are highly ignitable for much of the year. Conversion of woody shrubs with higher moisture content into low-fuel-volume grasslands could potentially increase fire risk in some situations by increasing the ignitability of the fuel; and if the vegetation between a structure and a fire is not readily combustible, it could protect the structure by absorbing heat flux and filtering fire brands (Wilson and Ferguson 1986).

The slight increase in proportion of structures destroyed with longer distances of defensible space within parcel boundaries was surprising. However, that increase was not significant in the Chi-square analysis, although there were some significant differences in the pairwise relative risk analysis. Nevertheless, the largest significant effect of defensible space was between the categories of 0–7 m (0–25 ft) to 8–15 m (26–50 ft), and it may be that differences in categories beyond these distances are not highly meaningful or reflect an artefact of the definition of distance categories. These relationships at longer distances are likely also weak compared to the effect of other variables operating at a landscape scale. Although the categorical analysis allowed us to answer questions relative to legal requirements and specific distances, the effective treatment analysis was important for identifying thresholds in the continuous variable.

The multiple regression models showed that landscape factors such as low housing density and longer distances to major roads were more important than distance of defensible space for explaining structure destruction, and the importance of

these variables is consistent with previous studies (Syphard *et al.* 2012, 2013), despite the smaller spatial extent studied here. Whereas this study used an unburned control group exposed to the same fires as the destroyed structures, previous studies accounted for structures across entire landscapes. The likelihood of a fire destroying a home is actually a result of two major components: the first is the likelihood that there will be a fire, and the second is the likelihood that a structure will burn in that fire. In this study, we only focussed on structure loss given the presence of a fire, and the total explained variation for the multiple regression models was quite low at ~12%. However, when the entire landscape was accounted for in the total likelihood of structure destruction, the explained variation of housing density alone was >30% (Syphard *et al.* 2012). One reason for the relationship between low housing density and structure destruction is that structures are embedded within a matrix of wildland fuel that leads to greater overall exposure, which is consistent with Australian research that showed a linear decrease of structure loss with increased distance to forest (Chen and McAneney 2004). That research, however, only focussed on distance to wildland boundaries and did not quantify variability in defensible space or ornamental vegetation immediately surrounding structures. Thus, fire safety is important to consider at multiple scales and for multiple variables, which will ultimately require the cooperation of multiple stakeholders.

## Conclusions

Structure loss to wildfire is clearly a complicated function of many biophysical, human and spatial factors (Keeley *et al.* 2009; Syphard *et al.* 2012). For such a large sample size, we were unable to account for home construction materials, but this is also well understood to be a major factor, with older homes and wooden roofs being most vulnerable (Franklin 1996; Cohen 1999, 2000). In terms of actionable measures to reduce fire risk, this study shows a clear role for defensible space up to 30 m (100 ft). Although the effective distances were on average much shorter than 30 m (100 ft), we recognise that additional distance may be necessary to provide sufficient protection to firefighters, which we did not address in this study (Cheney *et al.* 2001). In contrast, the data in this study do not support defensible space beyond 30 m (100 ft), even for structures on steep slopes. In addition to the fact that longer distances did not contribute significant additional benefit, excessive vegetation clearance presents a clear detriment to natural habitat and ecological resources. Results here suggest the best actions a homeowner can take are to reduce percentage cover up to 40% immediately adjacent to the structure and to ensure that vegetation does not overhang or touch the structure.

In addition to defensible space, this study also underlines the potential importance of land use planning to develop communities that are fire safe in the long term, in particular through their reduction to exposure to wildfire in the first place. Localised subdivision decisions emphasising infill-type development patterns may significantly reduce fire risk in the future, in addition to minimising habitat loss and fragmentation (Syphard *et al.* 2013). This study was conducted in southern California, which has some of the worst fire weather in the world and many properties surrounded by large, flammable exotic trees.

Therefore, recommendations here should apply to other non-forested ecosystems as well as many forested regions.

## References

Absher JD, Vaske JJ (2011) The role of trust in residents' fire wise actions. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **20**, 318–325. doi:10.1071/WF09049

Agresti A (2007) 'An Introduction to Categorical Data Analysis', 2nd edn. (Wiley: New York)

Blanchi R, Lucas C, Leonard J, Finkele K (2010) Meteorological conditions and wildfire-related house loss in Australia. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **19**, 914–926. doi:10.1071/WF08175

Boschetti L, Roy D, Barbosa P, Justice C (2008) A MODIS assessment of the summer 2007 extent burned in Greece. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* **29**, 2433–2436. doi:10.1080/01431160701874561

Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) 'Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: a Practical Information-Theoretic Approach', 2nd edn. (Springer-Verlag: New York)

Calfire (2000) 'Wildland Fire Hazard Assessment Final Report on FEMA.' (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection: Sacramento, CA)

Calfire (2006) 'General Guidelines for Creating Defensible Space.' (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection: Sacramento, CA)

Cary GJ, Flannigan MD, Keane RE, Bradstock RA, Davies ID, Lenihan JM, Li C, Logan KA, Parsons RA (2009) Relative importance of fuel management, ignition management and weather for area burned: evidence from five landscape–fire–succession models. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **18**, 147–156. doi:10.1071/WF07085

Cedergreen N, Ritz C, Streibig JC (2005) Improved empirical models for describing hormesis *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* **24**, 3166–3177. doi:10.1897/05-014R.1

Chen K, McAneney J (2004) Quantifying bushfire penetration into urban areas in Australia. *Geophysical Research Letters* **31**, L12212. doi:10.1029/2004GL020244

Cheney P, Gould J, McCaw L (2001) The dead-man zone – a neglected area of firefighter safety. *Australian Forestry* **64**, 45–50. doi:10.1080/00049158.2001.10676160

Cohen JD (1999) Reducing the wildland fire threat to homes: where and how much? In 'Proceedings of the Symposium on Fire Economics, Planning, and Policy: Bottom Lines', 5–9 April 1999, San Diego, CA. (Eds A Gonzales-Caban, PN Omi) USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, General Technical Report PSW-GTR-173, pp. 189–195. (Albany, CA)

Cohen JD (2000) Home ignitability in the wildland–urban interface. *Journal of Forestry* **98**, 15–21.

Filmon G (2004) Firestorm 2003, provincial review. Report to the Provincial Government of British Columbia (Vancouver, BC) Available at http://bcwildfire.ca/History/ReportsandReviews/2003/FirestormReport.pdf [Verified 9 August 2014]

Foote EID, Gilless JK (1996) Structural survival. In 'California's I-Zone.' (Ed R Slaughter) pp. 112–121. (CFESTES: Sacramento, CA)

Foote EID, Martin RE, Gilless JK (1991) The defensible space factor study: a survey instrument for post-fire structure loss analysis. In 'Proceedings of the 11th Conference on Fire and Forest Meteorology', 16 April 1991, Bethesda, MD. (Eds PL Andrews, DF Potts) pp. 66–73. (Society of American Foresters: Bethesda, MD)

Franklin SE (1996) California's catastrophic intermix fires causes, culprits and cures. *American Fire Journal* **48**, 20–23.

Ganteaume A, Jappiot M, Corrine L (2013) Assessing the flammability of surface fuels beneath ornamental vegetation in wildland–urban interfaces in Provence (south-eastern France). *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **22**, 333–342. doi:10.1071/WF12006

Gibbons P, van Bommel L, Gill MA, Cary GJ, Driscoll DA, Bradstock RA, Knight E, Moritz MA, Stephens SL, Lindenmayer DB (2012) Land management practices associated with house loss in wildfires. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e29212. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0029212

Gill AM, Stephens SL (2009) Scientific and social challenges for the management of fire-prone wildland–urban interfaces. *Environmental Research Letters* **4**, 034014. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/4/3/034014

Gilmer M (1994) 'California Wildfire Landscaping.' (Taylor Publishing Company: Dallas, TX)

Gude PH, Rasker R, van den Noort J (2008) Potential for future development on fire-prone lands. *Journal of Forestry* **106**, 198–205.

Haines TK, Renner CR, Reams MA (2008) A review of state and local regulation for wildfire mitigation. In 'The Economics of Forest Disturbances: Wildfires, Storms, and Invasive Species'. (Eds TP Holmes, JP Prestemon, KL Abt) pp. 273–293. (US Forest Service: Washington, DC) Available at http://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/32690 [Verified 9 August 2014]

Hammer RB, Radeloff VC, Fried JS, Stewart SI (2007) Wildland–urban interface housing growth during the 1990s in California, Oregon, and Washington. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **16**, 255–265. doi:10.1071/WF05077

Hessl AE (2011) Pathways for climate change effects on fire: models, data, and uncertainties *Progress in Physical Geography* **35**, 393–407. doi:10.1177/0309133311407654

Howard RA, North DW, Offensend FL, Smart CN (1973) 'Decision Analysis of Fire Protection Strategy for the Santa Monica Mountains: an Initial Assessment.' (Stanford Research Institute: Menlo Park, CA)

Keeley JE, Baer-Keeley M, Fotheringham CJ (2005) Alien plant dynamics following fire in Mediterranean-climate California shrublands. *Ecological Applications* **15**, 2109–2125. doi:10.1890/04-1222

Keeley JE, Safford HD, Fotheringham CJ, Franklin J, Moritz MA (2009) The 2007 southern California wildfires: lessons in complexity. *Journal of Forestry* **107**, 287–296.

Keeley JE, Syphard AD, Fotheringham CJ (2013) The 2003 and 2007 wildfires in southern California. In 'Natural Disasters and Adaptation to Climate Change'. (Eds S Boulter, J Palutikof, DJ Karoly, D Guitart) pp. 42–52. (Cambridge University Press: Oxford, UK)

King G, Zeng L (2001) Logistic regression in rare events data. *Political Analysis* **9**, 137–163. doi:10.1093/OXFORDJOURNALS.PAN.A004868

Knezevic SZ, Streibig JC, Ritz C (2007) Utilizing R software package for dose-response studies: the concept and data analysis. *Weed Technology* **21**, 840–848. doi:10.1614/WT-06-161.1

Kursar TA, Engelbrecht BMJ, Burke A, Tyree MT, El Omari B, Giraldo JP (2009) Tolerance to low leaf water status of tropical tree seedlings is related to drought performance and distribution. *Functional Ecology* **23**, 93–102. doi:10.1111/J.1365-2435.2008.01483.X

Leonard J, Blanchi R, Lipkin F, Newnham G, Siggins A, Opie K, Culvenor D, Cechet B, Corby N, Thomas C, Habili N, Jakab M, Coghlan R, Lorenzin G, Campbell D, Barwick M (2009) Building and land-use planning research after the 7th February Victorian bushfires: preliminary findings. CSIRO and Bushfire CRC. (Melbourne)

Maire RG (1979) 'Landscape for Fire Protection.' (University of California Agriculture Extension Service: Los Angeles, CA)

Maranghides A, Mell WE (2009) A case study of a community affected by the Witch and Guejito fires. NIST Technical Note 1635. (Washington, DC)

Quarles SL, Valachovic Y, Nakamura GM, Nader GA, DeLasaux J (2010) Home survival in wildfire-prone areas: building materials and design considerations. University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources, ANR Publication 8393. (Richmond, CA) Available at http://anrcatalog.ucdavis.edu/pdf/8393.pdf [Verified 9 August 2014]

R Development Core Team (2012) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) Available at http://www.R-project.org/ [Verified 23 August 2013]

Ramsey GC, McArthur NA (1994) Planning in fire-prone areas: building survival. In 'Bushfire! Looking to the Future: Papers from the Nature Conservation Council of NSW Seminar', June 1994. (Eds C Brown, L Tohver) pp. 142–150. (Envirobook: Sydney)

Ritz C, Streibig JC (2013) Package 'drc' analysis of dose-response curves. Available at http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/drc/index.html [Verified 9 August 2014]

Schoennagel T, Nelson CR, Theobald DM, Carnwath GC, Chapman TB (2009) Implementation of National Fire Plan treatments near the wildland–urban interface in the western United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **106**, 10 706–10 711. doi:10.1073/PNAS.0900991106

Sheskin DJ (2004) 'Handbook of Parametric and Nonparametric Statistical Procedures', 3rd edn. (Chapman & Hall and CRC: Boca Raton, FL).

Smith E, Adams G (1991) 'Incline Village/Crystal Bay Defensible Space Handbook.' (University of Nevada: Reno, NV)

Spittler TE (1995) Fire and the debris flow potential of winter storms. In 'Brushfires in California Wildlands: Ecology and Resource Management.' (Eds JE Keeley, T Scott) pp. 113–120. (International Association of Wildland Fire: Fairfield, WA)

Stockmann K, Burchfield J, Calkin D, Venn T (2010) Guiding preventative wildland fire mitigation policy and decisions with an economic modeling system. *Forest Policy and Economics* **12**, 147–154. doi:10.1016/J.FORPOL.2009.09.009

Streibig JC, Rudemo M, Jensen JE (1993) Dose-response curves and statistical models. In 'Herbicide Bioassays.' (Eds JC Streibig, P Kudsk) pp. 29–55. (CRC: Boca Raton, FL)

Syphard AD, Franklin J, Keeley JE (2006) Simulating the effects of frequent fire on southern California coastal shrublands. *Ecological Applications* **16**, 1744–1756. doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2006)016[1744: STEOFF]2.0.CO;2

Syphard AD, Radeloff VC, Keuler NS, Taylor RS, Hawbaker TJ, Stewart SI, Clayton MK (2008) Predicting spatial patterns of fire on a southern California landscape. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **17**, 602–613. doi:10.1071/WF07087

Syphard AD, Keeley JE, Massada AB, Brennan TJ, Radeloff VC (2012) Housing arrangement and location determine the likelihood of housing loss due to wildfire. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e33954. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0033954

Syphard AD, Bar Massada A, Butsic V, Keeley JE (2013) Land use planning and wildfire: development policies influence future probability of housing loss. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e71708. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0071708

Vasquez T (2011) The Russian inferno of 2010. *Weatherwise* **64**, 20–25. doi:10.1080/00431672.2011.551592

Venables WM, Ripley BD (1994) 'Modern Applied Statistics with S-Plus.' (Springer-Verlag: New York)

Wilson AAG, Ferguson IS (1986) Predicting the probability of house survival during bushfires. *Journal of Environmental Management* **3**, 259–270.

Winter G, McCaffrey S, Vogt CA (2009) The role of community policies in defensible space compliance. *Forest Policy and Economics* **11**, 570–578. doi:10.1016/J.FORPOL.2009.07.004

Witter M, Taylor RS (2005) Preserving the future: a case study in fire management and conservation from the Santa Monica Mountains. In 'Fire, Chaparral, and Survival in Southern California'. (Ed. RW Halsey) pp. 109–115. (Sunbelt Publications: San Diego, CA)

Zárate L, Arnaldos J, Casal J (2008) Establishing safety distances for wildland fires. *Fire Safety Journal* **43**, 565–575. doi:10.1016/J.FIRESAF.2008.01.001