Check for updates

Accepted Article

DR. SUSAN J. PRICHARD (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-6001-1487)

DR. PAUL FRANCIS HESSBURG (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-0330-7230)

DR. R. KEALA HAGMANN (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-1952-7449)

DR. NICHOLAS ADAM POVAK (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-1220-7095)

DR. MATTHEW D. HURTEAU (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-8457-8974)

DR. LEDA NIKOLA KOBZIAR (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-5882-8498)

DR. SEAN AARON PARKS (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-2982-5255)

DR. JENS T STEVENS (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-2234-1960)

DR. DAVID W. HUFFMAN (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-6547-7107)

Article type : Invited Feature Article

Journal: Ecological Applications

Manuscript type: Invited Feature Articles

Running Head: Invited Feature: Climate change and western wildfires

Title: Adapting western North American forests to climate change and wildfires: ten common questions

Authors: Prichard, Susan, J.[1,19], Paul F. Hessburg[1,2], R. Keala Hagmann[1,3], Nicholas A. Povak[4], Solomon Z. Dobrowski[5], Matthew D. Hurteau[6], Van R. Kane[1], Robert E. Keane[7], Leda N. Kobziar[8],

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/EAP.2433

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Crystal A. Kolden[9], Malcolm North[10], Sean A. Parks[11], Hugh D. Safford[12], Jens T. Stevens[13], Larissa L. Yocom[14], Derek J. Churchill[15], Robert W. Gray[16], David W. Huffman[17], Frank K. Lake[18], and Pratima Khatri-Chhetri[1]

[1] University of Washington School of Environmental and Forest Sciences, Seattle, Washington, USA
[2] U.S. Forest Service PNW Research Station, Wenatchee, Washington, USA
[3] Applegate Forestry LLC, Corvallis, Oregon, USA
[4] U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Institute of Forest Genetics, 2480 Carson Road, Placerville, California, USA
[5] University of Montana College of Forestry and Conservation, Missoula, Montana, USA
[6] University of New Mexico Biology Department, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA
[7] U.S. Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station, Missoula Fire Sciences Laboratory, Missoula, Montana, USA
[8] University of Idaho, Natural Resources and Society, Moscow, Idaho, USA
[9] University of California Merced, School of Engineering, Merced, California, USA
[10] U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station, Mammoth Lakes, California, USA
[11] U.S. Forest Service Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, Missoula, Montana, USA
[12] U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, California, USA
[13] U.S. Geological Survey Fort Collins Science Center, New Mexico Landscapes Field Station, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA
[14] Utah State University College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, Department of Wildland Resources, Logan, Utah, USA
[15] Washington State Department of Natural Resources Forest Health Program, Olympia, Washington, USA
[16] R.W. Gray Consulting, Chilliwack, British Columbia, Canada
[17] Northern Arizona University Ecological Restoration Institute, Flagstaff, Arizona, USA
[18] U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station, Arcata, California, USA

[19]*Corresponding author: E-mail: sprich@uw.eu*

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Accepted Article

Manuscript received 18 November 2020; revised 9 March 2021; accepted 22 March 2021; final version received 4 July 2021.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Abstract:
We review science-based adaptation strategies for western North American (wNA) forests that include restoring active fire regimes and fostering resilient structure and composition of forested landscapes. As part of the review, we address common questions associated with climate adaptation and realignment treatments that run counter to a broad consensus in the literature. These include: (1) Are the effects of fire exclusion overstated? If so, are treatments unwarranted and even counterproductive? (2) Is forest thinning alone sufficient to mitigate wildfire hazard? (3) Can forest thinning and prescribed burning solve the problem? (4) Should active forest management, including forest thinning, be concentrated in the wildland urban interface (WUI)? (5) Can wildfires on their own do the work of fuel treatments? (6) Is the primary objective of fuel reduction treatments to assist in future firefighting response and containment? (7) Do fuel treatments work under extreme fire weather? (8) Is the scale of the problem too great – can we ever catch up? (9) Will planting more trees mitigate climate change in wNA forests? and (10) Is post-fire management needed or even ecologically justified? Based on our review of the scientific evidence, a range of proactive management actions are justified and necessary to keep pace with changing climatic and wildfire regimes and declining forest successional heterogeneity after severe wildfires. Science-based adaptation options include the use of managed wildfire, prescribed burning, and coupled mechanical thinning and prescribed burning as is consistent with land management allocations and forest conditions. Although some current models of fire management in wNA are averse to short-term risks and uncertainties, the long-term environmental, social, and cultural consequences of wildfire management primarily grounded in fire suppression are well documented, highlighting an urgency to invest in intentional forest management and restoration of active fire regimes.

Keywords: Climate change, adaptive management, carbon, cultural burning, fuel treatments, forest management, mechanical thinning, managed wildfire, wildland fire, prescribed fire, restoration, ecological resilience

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

INTRODUCTION

Forested landscapes across much of western North America (wNA) are significantly departed from historical structure, species composition, and wildland fire regime characteristics (Hagmann et al. this issue), and as such, their resilience and resistance to rapidly changing wildfire and climatic regimes are compromised (Stephens et al. 2020). Through a variety of causes, including curtailment of Indigenous burning practices, livestock grazing, and modern fire suppression, fire frequency in the 20th-century decreased in many wNA forests (Marlon et al. 2012, Hessburg et al. 2019). The absence of fire and past forest management have led to profound changes in ecosystem structure, composition, and processes over the last two centuries (Hessburg et al. 2005, Parks et al. 2015b, Haugo et al. 2019). As the climate warms, forested landscapes face increasing vulnerability to rapid and extensive ecosystem changes from severe, large-scale disturbances such as persistent droughts, insect outbreaks, disease epidemics, and high-severity fires (Allen et al. 2010, Bentz et al. 2010, Crockett and Westerling 2017).

Historically, wildland fires, including human and lightning ignitions, varied in size, intensity, duration and seasonality (Perry et al. 2011, Hessburg et al. 2016). Patterns of burning and re-burning created mosaics of severity, species distributions, and resource conditions within shifting patchworks of forest and nonforest vegetation and fuels, thereby limiting the extent of stand-replacing fire events (Hagmann et al. this issue, Prichard et al. 2017, Nigro and Molinari 2019). In the context of fire exclusion and climate change, many fire-prone forests now exhibit high surface, ladder, and canopy fuel contagion with lasting implications for ecosystem changes, carbon storage, hydrologic regimes, native biodiversity, and terrestrial and aquatic habitats (Ager et al. 2007, Coop et al. 2020).

In recent decades, increased area burned by western wildfires has been associated with uncharacteristically large patches of high-severity, stand-replacing fire (Parks and Abatzoglou 2020, Hagmann et al. this issue). In some regions, such as the Sierra Nevada Range in California and eastern Cascades of Washington state, area burned by high-severity fire is 4-10 times that of historical fire regimes (Mallek et al. 2013, Reilly et al. 2017). Because high-severity fire events can be catalysts for vegetation change, particularly when coupled with warmer and drier climatic conditions, trends in large wildfires and burn severity have implications for rapid ecosystem shifts and declines in valued resources (Kemp et al. 2019, Stevens-Rumann and Morgan 2019, Coop et al. 2020).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

There is growing awareness of the vulnerability of many wNA forests and human communities to changing wildfire and climatic regimes (North et al. 2015b, Hessburg et al. 2016). Under the United States National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy (https://www.forestsandrangelands.gov/strategy), multi-entity, cross-jurisdictional partnerships have formed to increase the pace and scale of forest adaptation and restorative treatments to promote broad-based landscape resilience to fire, fire-adapted communities, and safe and effective wildfire responses. Similarly, recent large wildfires (>1.2 million ha in both 2017 and 2018) in western Canada are prompting re-examination of forest fire management practices and the need to restore more fire-resilient landscapes (Parisien et al. 2020, Tymstra et al. 2020). Northern Mexico and Baja peninsula forests have experienced a much shorter period of fire exclusion, but a growing fire deficit mirrors trends in the United States and Canada (Rivera-Huerta et al. 2016, Yocom Kent et al. 2017).

Over the past two decades, there has been confusion in some of the scientific literature and popular media surrounding changes in the nature and extent of forest and fire regime changes (Hagmann et al. this issue), and the need for and efficacy of adaptation or restorative treatments. Since some treatments can involve the commercial sale of timber, they can be viewed through the lens of conflict over the role of timber production on federal, tribal and private forestlands. The legacy of mistrust from these conflicts affects how different groups perceive the science and its application in support of proactive efforts to increase the resilience of forested landscapes (Schultz and Jedd 2012, Dubay et al. 2013). Perceived uncertainty in the science of fuel treatments and adaptive forest management has the potential to hinder collaborative decision-making, weaken public support for adaptive forest management, and slow implementation of needed forest management, particularly where courts rule that the science is yet unsettled. For example, in a recent opinion on a proposed forest restoration project, US State Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Judge Graber wrote, "The project's proposed methodology of variable density thinning is both highly controversial and highly uncertain." (*BARK et al. v. U.S. Forest Service*. No. 3:18-cv-01645-MO). Given current warming trends, changing wildfire regimes, and climate projections for the balance of this century, the current slow pace and small scale of adaptive management portend that many forest landscapes will experience uncharacteristic, high-severity wildfires and/or insect outbreaks before treatments can occur (North et al. 2015b, McWethy et al. 2019). High-severity disturbance events often have long-

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

lasting impacts, including losses to ecosystem services and valued resources, shifts to new ecosystem types, and reduced options for future adaptation (Stevens-Rumann and Morgan 2019).

Under climate change, land development, and the spread of invasive species, adaptive forest management is not intended to return systems to historical reference conditions (Allen et al. 2011, Falk et al. 2019). Nonetheless, adaptive strategies prompt managers to define a set of historical and future reference conditions that can be used to discern the direction and magnitude of changes from the current conditions and continuing trends to develop metrics of success (e.g., see Keane et al. 2009, Safford and Stevens 2017). An evidenced-based approach built on data and the scientific method is the most promising approach to promote resilience in forests subject to future wildfires and climate change (Stephens et al. 2016, 2020). Given the historical role of Indigenous land stewardship on many wNA landscapes, combining western science and Indigenous knowledge systems is foundational to intentionally restoring and adapting western forest ecosystems (Kimmerer and Lake 2001, Lake et al. 2017, Roos et al. 2021).

Here, we provide a synthesis of science-based active management strategies that include restoring active fire regimes and fostering resilient forest structure and composition. Through a thorough review of the scientific literature, we evaluate the relative effectiveness of forest management strategies. We then address ten common questions about fuel treatments and forest adaptation to changing climatic and wildfire regimes: (1) *Are the effects of fire exclusion overstated? If so, are treatments unwarranted and even counterproductive?* (2) *Is forest thinning alone sufficient to mitigate wildfire hazard?* (3) *Can forest thinning and prescribed burning solve the problem?* (4) *Should active forest management, including forest thinning, be concentrated in the wildland urban interface (WUI)?* (5) *Can wildfires on their own do the work of fuel treatments?* (6) *Is the primary objective of fuel reduction treatments to assist in future firefighting response and containment?* (7) *Do fuel treatments work under extreme fire weather?* (8) *Is the scale of the problem too great – can we ever catch up?* (9) *Will planting more trees mitigate climate change in wNA forests?* and (10) *Is post-fire management needed or even ecologically justified?*

Fuel treatments and active forest management

Biophysical context and socio-cultural considerations

Much of the literature on adaptive forest management and fuel treatments in wNA pertains to

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

seasonally dry pine and mixed-conifer forests, including ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), Jeffrey pine (*P. jeffreyi*), interior Douglas-fir, and mixed-conifer forests of Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), grand or white fir (*Abies grandis, A. concolor*), and western larch (*Larix occidentalis*) and is concentrated on the western United States. However, as reviewed by Hagmann et al. (this issue), the effects of fire exclusion are broad reaching and include departures in oak woodlands, mixed broadleaf-conifer forests, and cold forests as well. As we address the topics of forest and fuel management, it is important to provide the context, observation scale, and scope of inference of existing studies to understand where and when active management may be warranted.

Seasonally dry pine and mixed-conifer forests were historically dominated by fire- and drought-tolerant conifers with thick bark; fire-tolerant leaf, branch, and crown morphology; and other adaptations to surviving low- to moderate-intensity surface fires (Agee 1996, Margolis and Malevich 2016, Stevens et al. 2020). Repeated fires removed fuels and created highly varying patterns of individual trees, small tree clumps, and variable sized openings (Jeronimo et al. 2019, Kane et al. 2019). These fuel characteristics collectively contributed to resistance to active crown fires (Ritter et al. 2020) but allowed for individual tree and tree-group torching. Past management and fire exclusion caused tree infilling in many of these forests (Naficy et al. 2016, Hessburg et al. 2019), resulting in substantially denser forests with continuous layered canopies, homogeneous structure, higher density of fire-intolerant species, and high surface fuel loads and fuel ladders connecting surface to crown fuels (Savage et al. 2013, Battaglia et al. 2018, van Mantgem et al. 2018).

Many western oak woodlands and mixed hardwood-pine forests were historically adapted to frequent fire and actively maintained by Indigenous burning practices (Lake et al. 2018). In the absence of frequent fire, oak woodlands and hardwood-conifer forests have been invaded by conifers and other vegetation (Engber et al. 2011, Hoffman et al. 2019). Due to the often extensive fuel ladders and surface fuel loads of contemporary mixed oak-conifer woodlands, reintroducing low-severity fire in forests now dominated by conifers will not likely restore oak woodlands to enable an active fire regime (Barnhart et al. 1996). In some locations, invasion of non-native grasses combined with frequent human ignitions can lead to a decline in oak woodlands and mixed hardwood-pine forests, favoring grassland expansion, and precluding restoration of oak woodlands (Lilley and Vellend 2009).

Moist mixed-conifer and broadleaf deciduous forests (e.g., quaking aspen, black cottonwood, and

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

balsam poplar, *Populus tremuloides*, *P. trichocarpa, and P. balsamifera*) exist throughout wNA, and where they reside in drier climatic settings, they occupy moist sites and valley-bottom locations. These are environments where dense forests with multi-layered canopies are more typical. Historically, moderate- and high-severity fires were common in these topographic settings (Perry et al. 2011, Hessburg et al. 2019). However, where moist mixed forests were interspersed between dry pine and mixed-conifer forest along topographic and edaphic gradients, low- and moderate-severity fires also commonly occurred (Hagmann et al. 2014, Johnston et al. 2016, Merschel et al. 2018, Ng et al. 2020). Historically, frequent fire favored fire-tolerant tree species and open canopy conditions that were well below carrying capacity of many mixed-conifer forest sites (Hagmann et al. this issue). Indigenous burning also intentionally created patches of meadows, prairies and seasonally dry wetlands in some moist conifer forests (Underwood et al. 2003, Storm and Shebitz 2006). With climate shifting to warmer and drier conditions, managers may reduce the vulnerability of these patches by employing variable density thinning and prescribed fire that favor the likelihood of low- to moderate fire effects rather than high severity by creating tree clumps, gaps, and openings within currently continuous forest canopies (Churchill et al. 2013, Knapp et al. 2017). Where reducing the risk of large patches of high-severity fire is the goal, many of the same strategies used in dry mixed-conifer forests are appropriate to moist mixed-conifer forests (LeFevre et al. 2020). However, small patches of dense and older forest can be embedded within the clumped and gapped tree patterns, and large patches are especially appropriate on north aspects and in valley-bottoms (Perry et al. 2011, Hessburg et al. 2015).

Montane cold forests are dominated by thin-barked species such as Engelmann spruce (*Picea engelmanii*), subalpine fir (*A. lasiocarpa*) and lodgepole pine (*P. contorta*), and can include white and black spruce (*P. glauca,* and *P. mariana*) further north in the Canadian boreal and subboreal zones (Rowe and Scotter 1973, Agee 1996, Morgan et al. 2008). Departures in these forests are primarily manifested in a loss of burned and recovering patchworks, loss of seral stage and patch size complexity, and high crown fire potential over broad areas (Hessburg et al. 2019, Fig. 1) rather than within-patch changes in tree density and composition. Historical resilience in these forests was largely driven by landscape heterogeneity in the form of patchworks of nonforest vegetation (shrublands, wet and dry meadows) and varied successional and surface fuel conditions, which reduced contagion of dense and layered forests (Stockdale et al. 2019). Indigenous fire stewardship in some cold forests

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

varied post-fire effects to stagger availability of desired resources. The condition of the valued resources (e.g., foods, forage for big game, medicines, basketry materials), fuel loading, and fuel continuity determined the frequency, seasonality, and locations of intentionally burning, where lightning ignitions were too few, or fire effects were insufficient to the maintenance of resources (Lake and Christianson 2019).

Fuel treatments and how they contribute to forest adaptation

Stephens et al. (2010) recommend four strategies for adapting western forest landscapes to changing climatic and wildfire regimes. They define *resistance* work as that which mitigates expected wildfire effects and protects valued resources, while *realignment* work modifies existing conditions to restore key ecosystem patterns and the processes they drive. Creating *resilient* conditions improves the natural capacity of an ecosystem to respond favorably when unplanned or unanticipated disturbances occur. Finally, they present *response* work as any active facilitation to achieve culturally and ecologically desirable results that are otherwise difficult to achieve. Each of these strategies can play a role in wNA forest management.

As wNA forest ecosystems respond to warmer and drier summers and longer fire seasons, some areas that once supported forests will shift to nonforest (Parks et al. 2019, Coop et al. 2020), and historical fire regimes that resulted from feedbacks between past climate and vegetation may no longer be supported (McWethy et al. 2019). With rapid change and ecological surprises, novel ecosystems and disturbance regimes will emerge, and there is a high level of uncertainty in future ecological outcomes. The combined strategies reviewed in Stephens et al. (2010) can be used to prioritize where adaptive forest management may be the most advisable and effective (Box 1). Furthermore, facilitating ecosystem shifts in portions of the landscape can benefit resilience at landscape and regional scales. For example, certain vegetation types (e.g. shrub and grasslands) may be more adapted to future climate conditions and can contribute to landscape heterogeneity. They also may alter fire behavior patterns towards a reduction in crown fire initiation and spread.

There are two main types of management actions to modify forest fuels (termed fuel treatments), and they include (1) reducing surface and canopy fuels via prescribed burning, thinning or other mechanical treatments followed by removal or on-site burning of woody debris, or (2) rearranging fuels including thinning or mechanical treatments without slash reduction. Each type of treatment

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

directs how and where potential energy is stored and released at the scale of forest patches to landscapes – and thresholds to burning.

Fuel reduction

Common *fuel reduction treatments* include a combination of (1) forest thinning to reduce canopy bulk density and ladder fuels, and (2) prescribed burning or biomass removal to reduce surface fuels, including logging slash from the thinning event and prior fuel accumulations (Reinhardt et al. 2008, Kalies and Yocom Kent 2016). Prescribed burning of logging slash generally includes piling and burning concentrated logging slash and broadcast burning dispersed slash. Forest management projects aimed at fuel reduction in dry or moist mixed-conifer forests and pine, Douglas-fir, or oak woodlands are designed to foster the development of forest structure, composition, and configurations that are more resilient to drought and disturbances. These treatments also commonly reduce surface fuel loads to promote lower flame lengths, surface fire intensity and spread, and a reduction in crown fire potential (Agee and Skinner 2005). Forest thinning in these forest types is aimed at retaining large, more fire-resilient tree species, and restoring open canopy structure. For example, the individuals, clumps, and openings (ICO) method is a system of selecting trees and tree groups to impart spatial heterogeneity to the forest by varying the distribution of forest and non-forest cover to achieve a low edge to interior ratio with the goals of refostering drought tolerance and reducing the probability of crown fire (Larson and Churchill 2012, Churchill et al. 2017). Recent evidence suggests that low-intensity fire alone may not increase resilience because it is not sufficiently lethal to shade-tolerant species that established during an extended period of fire exclusion (e.g., Douglas-fir, grand fir, white fir, incense-cedar (*Calocedrus decurrens*)(Cocking et al. 2014, Huffman et al. 2018, Eisenberg et al. 2019). Methods such as ICO are intended to emulate the structural patterns maintained by frequent fires and can be employed where single entry fires may not achieve restoration goals.

Due to altered stand conditions, restoring an active fire regime and reducing climate vulnerability often requires either a managed wildfire that significantly thins forests, consumes fuels, and favors fire-resistant, larger trees (Holden et al. 2010, Kane et al. 2015), or coupled mechanical thinning and prescribed or cultural burning treatment followed by regular maintenance burning (Stephens et al. 2012). Unplanned wildfires that consume surface fuels can also be considered fuel reduction treatments under moderate fire weather conditions (North et al. 2012, Prichard et al. 2017). Mechanical

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

treatments that involve thinning and off-site biomass transport can also be effective fuel reduction surrogates where infrastructure and economics allow (North et al. 2015a). In all cases, fuel reduction treatments can be effective at mitigating subsequent wildfire behavior and effects for a period of time after treatment until surface and canopy fuels accumulate through vegetation growth and deposition (Keane et al. 2015).

The key to effective fuel reduction is that it creates gaps in surface and canopy fuel structures and reduces the potential for contagious crown fire initiation and spread (Reinhardt et al. 2008, Martinson and Omi 2013, Fig. 2a). Depending upon the scale of a wildfire event and the underlying climate and weather conditions, past fuel reduction treatments can mitigate fire spread and intensity at very fine to coarse spatial scales (Fulé et al. 2012, Prichard et al. 2017). For example, in a fire-maintained pine forest or savanna, frequent understory burning can maintain low loads of pine needle duff and litter, fine wood and grass to support low-intensity surface fires. In these forest types, the threshold for high-severity fire is only crossed during extreme fire weather and fire behavior, often involving plume-driven fire spread from adjacent forests (Agee and Skinner 2005, Lydersen et al. 2014).

Fuel rearrangement

Without associated reduction of surface fuels, mechanical thinning and mastication treatments are examples of *fuel rearrangement* treatments (Fig. 2b). Commercial or pre-commercial forest thinning reduces the continuity of tree crowns, their bulk density, and their propensity for spreading crown fire. Consequently, thinning without prescribed burning is considered both a *reduction* of canopy and ladder fuels and a *rearrangement* of fuels from the canopy to the forest floor (Pollet and Omi 2002). Where canopy thinning results in augmented surface fuels, fire behavior and severity can be amplified rather than diminished (Safford et al. 2009, Prichard et al. 2010). Furthermore, many fire-excluded forests have elevated surface fuels associated with more than a century of fire exclusion (Knapp et al. 2013, Keane et al. 2015). Effective treatment therefore necessitates prescribed burning that is intense enough to reduce surface and ladder fuels such that the likelihood of a subsequent intense fire is reduced (Stephens et al. 2012). Wildfires that result in substantial tree mortality may offer a short-term fuel reduction, but over longer time periods (15-25 years), downed wood accumulations from snag and branch fall can elevate surface fuels and create conditions for high-intensity reburn events (Stevens-Rumann et al. 2012, Dunn and Bailey 2016, Johnson et al. 2020). As such, moderate to high-

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

severity wildfires are generally considered a type of longer-term fuel rearrangement (Lydersen et al. 2019a).

Development of landscape mosaics

Intentional management of landscapes involves the broad-scale planning and spatial design of treatments, including determining where they are most effective on the landscape and assessing how individual treatments will interact with fire over space and time (Ager et al. 2010, Falk et al. 2019). Many historical landscapes, influenced by lightning and Indigenous ignitions, supported a hierarchical patchwork of forest and nonforest vegetation at coarse spatial scales in addition to meso- and fine-grained heterogeneity of forest age classes and vulnerability to fire (Hagmann et al. this issue, Hessburg et al. 2019). Managed landscape mosaics can be designed to restore more characteristic patchworks of open and closed canopy vegetation of different patch sizes, tree ages, and forest densities, and of fuel contagion to facilitate restoring fire as a dynamic and beneficial ecological process (Hessburg et al. 2015).

Fuel treatments that modify within-stand structure to remove small trees and reduce surface fuels while retaining large, more fire-resistant trees and variable stand structure (Stephens et al. 2021) are most appropriate in dry pine, dry to moist mixed-conifer forests and oak woodlands, particularly where there is evidence that older fire-resistant species have been or are being replaced by younger fire-sensitive species (e.g. Yocom-Kent et al. 2015). This mirrors the fine- to meso-scale (i.e. 1-10,000 ha) heterogeneity in forest structure which characterized these frequent-fire forest types historically (Hagmann et al. this issue, Hessburg et al. 2019). In cold forests characterized by greater landscape-scale heterogeneity, fuel treatments including managing unplanned wildfires may be more appropriate at larger scales, particularly where landscape-scale heterogeneity has been lost (Hagmann et al. this issue, Hessburg et al. 2019).

Within this context, reserves and other no-treatment areas can be designated where fuels are left to accumulate over time (Fig. 2c). Competing resource management objectives and consideration of values at risk often inevitably lead to management areas where fuel reduction treatments are not allowed and wildfires are actively suppressed. Examples include late-successional reserves, riparian reserves, and other locations where wildland fires and fuel reduction treatments are restricted to facilitate habitat development. Over time, surface and canopy fuel accumulations and wildfire

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

dynamics will threaten the objectives of these reserved areas (Van de Water and North 2011, Reilly et al. 2018). Stationary reserves will be difficult to maintain in areas where wildfires are the disturbance engine that drives the ecosystem.

TEN COMMON QUESTIONS ABOUT ADAPTIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Although the need to increase the pace and scale of fuel treatments is broadly discussed in scientific and policy arenas (North et al. 2012, Franklin and Johnson 2012, Kolden 2019), there is still confusion and disagreement about the appropriateness of forest and fuel treatments. For example, recent publications have questioned whether large, high-severity fires are outside of the historical range of variability for seasonally dry forests, and whether the risk of high-severity fire warrants large-scale treatment of fire-prone forests (Bradley et al. 2016, DellaSala et al. 2017). Others have questioned whether intentional management, including forest thinning, is effective or justified outside of the wildland urban interface (Moritz et al. 2014, Schoennagel et al. 2017). Furthermore, debates around the management of fire-adapted forests are occurring within the context of long running conflicts over timber production on public lands, especially federal lands, leading to questions about science-based benefits of management treatments where they align with economic incentives (Daniels and Walker 1995). Currently, management strategies employing active fire suppression and limited use of fuel reduction treatments are common for most public land management agencies.

Among the many challenges to active management on public lands (e.g., funding, adequate and qualified personnel, smoke impacts, and weather and fuel conditions that fall within burn prescription parameters), uncertainty in the scientific literature about forest management and fuel treatments is commonly cited in planning process-public comment periods (Spies et al. 2018, Miller et al. 2020). In the following sections, we examine ten common questions about forest management and fuel treatments. We summarize them in Table 1 and provide key citations that examine these questions. For each topic, we evaluate the strength of evidence in the existing scientific literature concerning each topic. Our goal is to help managers, policy makers, informed public stakeholders, and others working in this arena to establish a robust scientific framework that will lead to more effective discussions and decision-making processes, and better outcomes on the ground. Additional citations for each question are listed in Appendix S1.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

1."Are the effects of fire exclusion overstated? If so, are treatments unwarranted and even counterproductive?"

Concerns about forest thinning and other forms of active management are sometimes based on the assumption that contemporary conditions and fire regimes in dry pine and mixed-conifer forests are not substantially departed from those maintained by uninterrupted fire regimes (Hagmann et al. this issue). This perspective does not accurately reflect the breadth and depth of scientific evidence documenting the influence of over a century of fire exclusion. Support for the suggestion that ecological departures associated with fire exclusion are overestimated has repeatedly failed independent validation by multiple research groups (Hagmann et al. this issue). In addition, these arguments fail to consider widespread Indigenous fire uses that affected landscape scale vegetation conditions linked to valued cultural resources and services, food security, and vulnerability to wildfires (Lake et al. 2018, Power et al. 2018). As is explored in the following sections, a number of forest management and treatment strategies are shown to be highly effective. Site conditions and history are always important considerations. Moreover, there is no one-treatment-fits-all approach to forest adaptation.

Evidence from a broad range of disciplines documents widespread, multi-regional 20th-century fire exclusion in interior forested landscapes of wNA (see a detailed reference list and discussion in Hagmann et al. this issue). Collectively, these studies reveal extensive changes in tree density, species and age composition, forest structure, and continuity of canopy and surface fuels. Forests that were once characterized by shifting patchworks of forest and nonforest vegetation (i.e., grasslands, woodlands, and shrublands) in the early 20th-century gradually became more continuously covered in forest and densely stocked with fuels (Fig. 4).

However, for over two decades, a small fraction of the scientific literature has cast doubt on the inferences made from fire-scar based reconstructions and broader landscape-level assessments to suggest that estimates of low- to moderate-severity fire regimes from these studies are overstated. Hagmann et al. (this issue) examine this counter-evidence in detail and identify critical flaws in reasoning and methodologies in original papers and subsequent re-application of these methods in numerous geographic areas. Subsequent research shows that studies relying on Williams and Baker (2011) methods for estimating historical tree densities and fire regimes overestimate tree densities and

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

fire severity (see also Levine et al. 2017). Moreover, established tree-ring fire-scar methods more accurately reconstruct known fire occurrence and extent. Other studies, also based on the methods of Williams and Baker (2011), conflate reconstructed low-severity, high-frequency fire regimes with landscape homogeneity. These interpretations disregard critical ecosystem functions that were historically associated with uneven-aged forests embedded in multi-level fine-, meso- and broad-scale landscapes. By extension, claims that low-severity fire regimes are overestimated then imply that large, high-severity fires were a regular occurrence prior to the era of European colonization. Such interpretations may lead to the conclusion that recent increases in high-severity fire are still within the historical range of variability, and that there is no need of restorative or adaptive treatments (Hanson and Odion 2014, Odion et al. 2014, Baker and Hanson 2017).

Indeed, research from across wNA has shown that high-severity fire was a component of historical fire regimes, and that fires of all severities are currently in deficit (Parks et al. 2015b, Reilly et al. 2017, Haugo et al. 2019, but see Mallek et al. 2013). Reanalysis of the methods of Baker and others shows that their methods inherently overestimate fire severity and the frequency and area affected by high-severity fire (Hagmann et al. this issue, Fulé et al. 2014). In addition, high-severity patches in recent fires are less heterogeneous and more extensive than the historical range of variability for forests characterized by low- and moderate-severity fire regimes (Stevens et al. 2017, Hagmann et al. this issue). Finally, research across wNA reveals key climate-vegetation-wildfire linkages, where fire frequency, extent, and severity all increase with increasing climatic warming, suggesting that observed trends in fire patterns are commensurate with predicted relationships with ongoing climate change (McKenzie and Littell 2017, Parks and Abatzoglou 2020).

Another perspective on this debate contends that whether historical records can be agreed upon is of ancillary importance. Adaptive forest management and fuel reduction treatments are primarily aimed at increasing forest resilience and/or resistance to climate change, fire and other disturbances, which has positive societal and ecological impacts that do not require justification based on historical conditions, particularly given the no-analog present and future that climate change presents (Freeman et al. 2017). For example, the most concerning contemporary high-severity fire events are associated with large patches of complete stand replacement (Miller and Quayle 2015, Lydersen et al. 2016). In some cases, high-severity fire events convert forests to shrubland and grassland assemblages as

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

alternative stable states in uncharacteristically large patches (Falk et al. 2019, Kemp et al. 2019, Stevens-Rumann and Morgan 2019). As such, a critical forest management concern is that high-severity wildfires are accelerating rates of vegetation change, forest conversion, and vulnerability of native habitats in response to a warming climate.

2. "Is forest thinning alone sufficient to mitigate wildfire hazard?"

While "thin the forest to reduce wildfire threat" is commonly cited in the popular media, the capacity for thinning alone to mitigate wildfire hazard and severity is not well supported in the scientific literature. Thinning treatments require strategic selection of trees to target fuel ladders and fire-susceptible trees, along with a subsequent fuel reduction treatment (Jain et al. 2020). When thinning is conducted without accompanied surface fuel reduction, short and long-term goals may not be realized.

Thinning from below reduces ladder fuels and canopy bulk density concurrently, which can reduce the potential for both passive and active crown fire behavior (Agee and Skinner 2005). For instance, Harrod et al. (2009) found that thinning treatments that reduced tree density and canopy bulk density, and increased canopy base height significantly reduced stand susceptibility to crown fire compared to untreated controls. Furthermore, large-diameter trees and snags that provide essential wildlife habitat and other ecosystem values can be retained and fuels can be deliberately removed around these structures using this approach (Lehmkuhl et al. 2015). Where wood from treatments can be marketed, revenues from thinning help to sustain broader management goals on public lands. For example, some landscape restoration collaboratives seek to reinvest profits from commercially viable thinning to off-set costs associated with more labor-intensive manual thinning and prescribed or cultural burning needs (Shultz and Jedd 2012).

Some studies show that thinning alone can mitigate wildfire severity (e.g., Pollet and Omi 2002, Prichard and Kennedy 2014, Prichard et al. 2020), but across a wide range of sites, thin and prescribed burn treatments are most effective at reducing fire severity (see reviews by Fulé et al. 2012, Martinson and Omi 2013, Kalies and Yocom Kent 2016). On most sites, thinning alone achieves a reduction of canopy fuels but contributes to higher surface fuel loads. If burned in a wildfire, these fuels can contribute to high-intensity surface fires and elevated levels of associated tree mortality (e.g., Stephens et al. 2009, Prichard and Kennedy 2012). When trees are felled and limbed,

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

fine fuels from tree tops and branches (termed activity fuels) are re-distributed over the treatment area, thereby increasing surface fuel loads (Martinson and Omi 2013). Mechanical fuel reduction treatments of these activity fuels are possible, but in many locations, biomass removal and utilization (e.g., for bioenergy) after thinning treatments can be cost-prohibitive due to long hauling distances and the economic and technological challenges of building new biomass facilities (Hartsough et al. 2008). Mastication equipment is sometimes used to shred understory trees and shrubs into smaller woody fragments, which are then redistributed and left on site (Kane et al. 2009). However, following mastication, surface fuels are temporarily elevated, and masticated stands that burn in wildland fires can cause deep soil heating from smoldering combustion and elevated fire intensities (Kreye et al. 2014).

Other unintended consequences of thinning without concomitant reduction in surface fuels can occur. For instance, decreasing canopy bulk density can change site climatic conditions (Agee and Skinner 2005). Wildfire ignition potential is largely driven by fuel moisture, which can decrease on drier sites when canopy bulk density is reduced through commercial thinning (e.g., Reinhardt et al. 2006). Reduced canopy bulk density can lead to increased surface wind speed and fuel heating, which allows for increased rates of fire spread in thinned forests (Pimont et al. 2009, Parsons et al. 2018). Other studies show no effect of thinning on surface fuel moisture (Estes et al. 2012, Bigelow and North 2012), suggesting that thinning effects on surface winds and fuel moisture are complex, site specific, and likely vary across ecoregions and seasons.

In summary, although the efficacy of thinning alone as a fuel reduction treatment is questionable and site dependent, there exists widespread agreement that *combined* effects of thinning plus prescribed burning consistently reduces the potential for severe wildfire across a broad range of forest types and conditions (Fig. 3, Fulé et al. 2012, Kalies and Yocom Kent 2016, Stephens et al. 2021). Given this broad consensus in the scientific literature, some authors suggest that forest thinning should be considered in the context of wildfire hazard abatement, ecological restoration and adaptation, and revitalization of cultural burning (Lehmkuhl et al. 2007, Hessburg et al. 2015, Huffman et al. 2020). Where restoring resilient forest composition and structure and reducing future wildfire hazard are goals of management (Koontz et al. 2020), combined thinning and burning approaches will provide ecological and wildfire-risk reduction benefits (Knapp et al. 2017).

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

3. "Can forest thinning and prescribed burning solve the problem?"

Fire has been a tool that has been actively used for millennia. Indigenous burning practices maintained prairies, oak and pine savannas, riparian areas, mixed-conifer, hardwood, and dry forests, and high mountain huckleberry and beargrass assemblages for food, medicine, basketry and other resources (Trauernicht et al. 2015, Roos et al. 2021). Following prolonged fire exclusion, many seasonally dry forest landscapes that were once frequently burned now are densely stocked with multi-layered canopies that often require thinning prior to restoring fire (North et al. 2012, Ryan et al. 2013). Prescribed burning on its own and in combination with mechanical thinning are essential fuel reduction treatments with demonstrated effectiveness in reducing fire severity, crown and bole scorch, and tree mortality compared to untreated forests (Safford et al. 2012, Kalies and Yocom Kent 2016). Thinning and burning in partnership with local Indigenous knowledge and practice can support culturally-valued practices, traditions, livelihoods, and food and medicine security (Sowerwine et al. 2019).

Although the use of prescribed burning, often in combination with mechanical thinning, has been shown to be highly effective at mitigating wildfire severity and increasing forest resilience to drought, insects and disease (Hood et al. 2015), these treatments alone cannot address forest management challenges across wNA. Fuel reduction treatments are not appropriate for all conditions or forest types (DellaSala et al. 2004, Reinhardt et al. 2008, Naficy et al. 2016). In some mesic forests, for instance, mechanical treatments may increase the risk of fire by increasing sunlight exposure to the forest floor, drying surface fuels, promoting understory growth, and increasing wind speeds that leave residual trees vulnerable to wind throw (Zald and Dunn 2018, Hanan et al. 2020). Furthermore, prescribed surface fire is difficult to implement in many current mesic forests since fire readily spreads into tree crowns via abundant fuel ladders and can result in crown fires. In other forest types such as subalpine, subboreal, and boreal forests, low crown base heights, thin bark, and heavy duff and litter loads make trees vulnerable to fire at any intensity (Agee 1996, Stevens et al 2020). Fire regimes in these forests, along with lodgepole pine, are dominated by moderate- and high-severity fires, and applications of forest thinning and prescribed underburning are generally inappropriate. However, landscape burning and maintenance of high elevation forests and meadows is part of cultural burning, and high-intensity crown fire is used operationally on national forests and parks within the US and Canada for landscape

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

restoration objectives (Table 2).

Even where socially and ecologically appropriate, thinning and low-intensity prescribed burning generally require repeated treatments to meet fuel reduction objectives. For example, without prior thinning, low-intensity prescribed fire, on its own, may not consume enough fuel or cause enough tree mortality to change forest structure and reduce crown fire hazard (e.g., Lydersen et al. 2019b). In contrast, prescribed burns in heavy slash may result in high tree mortality. The first harvest entry into fire-excluded stands often leaves high surface fuel loads and dense understories that require one or more prescribed burning treatments to reduce surface and ladder fuels (Goodwin et al. 2018, Korb et al. 2020). Thus, it often takes multiple treatments and/or fire entries, as well as ongoing maintenance, to realize resilience and adaptation goals (Agee and Skinner 2005, Stevens et al. 2014, Goodwin et al. 2020). Given the extent and variability of forest ecosystems that have experienced prolonged fire exclusion, active forest management can be only one tool to increase adaptation to climate and future fires.

Although thinning and prescribed burning have been shown to be highly effective, the current scale and pace of these treatments do not match the scale of the management challenge (Barnett et al. 2016b, Kolden 2019). Mechanical treatments are constrained by land management allocations and their enabling legislation (e.g., wilderness and roadless areas), operational constraints (e.g., steep slopes, distance to roads, costs), and administrative boundaries (e.g., riparian areas, areas managed for species of concern). In the central Sierra Nevada for example, these constraints - combined with large areas of non-productive timberland that are unsuitable for commercial treatment due to steep slopes or distance from roads - left only 28% of the landscape available for mechanical thinning and prescribed burning treatments (North et al. 2015a). In the remaining area, prescribed burning alone and/or use of managed wildfires may be suitable replacement treatments (Boisramé et al. 2017, Barros et al. 2018). However, prescribed fire-only treatments are frequently limited by cost, liability, air quality regulations, equipment availability, personnel capacity and training, and the need for ongoing maintenance treatments (Quinn-Davidson and Varner 2012, Schultz et al. 2019).

In light of these constraints, some researchers and managers have called for the expanded use of landscape-scale prescribed burns and managed wildfires in addition to fuel reduction treatments as a promising approach to expand the pace and scale of adaptive management (see below). Increasingly

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

collaborative restoration partnerships with Indigenous cultures can increase opportunities for re-instating tribal stewardship practices (Lake et al. 2018, Long and Lake 2018). Under appropriate weather and safety conditions, and where infrastructure is not at risk, managed wildfire may serve as a useful and cost-effective tool for reintroducing wildfire to fire-excluded forests and achieve broad-scale management goals.

4. "*Should active forest management, including forest thinning, be concentrated in the wildland urban interface (WUI)?*"

A question often asked by land managers is where to locate fuel treatments to maximize their advantage while minimizing adverse impacts. The 2000 National Fire Plan (USDA and USDI 2001) and the 2002 Healthy Forests Initiative identified the need to reduce wildfire risk to people, communities, and natural resources. The 2003 Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA, US Congress 2003) then specified that >50% of fuel reduction funding be spent on projects within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), and it reduced environmental review within 2.41 km (1.5 miles) of at-risk communities. The significant increase in homes lost and suppression dollars spent in the WUI in subsequent years (Mell et al. 2010) has catalyzed extensive research on the WUI environment and population expansion into wildlands (Radeloff et al. 2018). Subsequent studies demonstrating fuel treatment effectiveness in the WUI (Safford et al. 2009, Kennedy and Johnson 2014) and spatial methods for optimizing WUI fuel treatments (Bar Massada et al. 2011, Syphard et al. 2012) could be taken to suggest that most fuel reduction should be implemented in the WUI to protect homes and lives.

However, prioritizing the WUI-only for fuel reduction treatments is often too narrow in scope to address broader landscape-scale objectives. For example, Schoennagel et al. (2009) found that more than two-thirds of the area within a 2.5 km radius of at-risk communities was privately owned and unavailable for federally-funded fuel treatments. This finding partly elucidates why most hazard reduction fuel treatments are implemented outside of HFRA-designation. Fuel treatments on federal lands near communities may also be significantly more difficult, expensive, and risky to implement, while air quality regulations and associated risks create disincentives to treating near homes. Alternatively, agencies may be able to meet both annual prescribed burning accomplishment targets and ecological objectives in areas more distant from the WUI with fewer risks, less money, and fewer personnel (Kolden and Brown 2010, Schultz et al. 2019). Further, there is increasing evidence that treating fuels across larger spatial extents in

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

strategically planned wildland locations, rather than immediately adjacent to WUI, can indirectly reduce risk to communities (Smith et al. 2016, Bowman et al. 2020). Benefits of this strategy include increased initial attack and short-term suppression effectiveness, reduced crown fire potential and ember production, reduced smoke impacts to communities, and increased forest resilience (Ager et al. 2010, Stevens et al. 2016).

Fuel reduction treatments can support cultural, ecological, ecosystem service, and management objectives beyond the WUI. For example, treatments that restore the ecological resilience of old-growth forests and patches with large and old trees are critical to long term maintenance of wildlife habitats (Hessburg et al. 2020) of seasonally dry forests and terrestrial carbon stocks, and slowing the feedback cycle between fire and climate change (Hurteau and North 2009). Treatments in watersheds that are distant from the WUI and protect municipal and agricultural water supplies are critical to minimizing high-severity fire impacts that can jeopardize clean water delivery (Bladon 2018, Hallema et al. 2018). For example, post-fire erosion and debris flows may cause more detrimental and longer-term impacts to watersheds than the wildfires themselves (Jones et al. 2018, Kolden and Henson 2019).

Finally, treated areas outside the WUI can serve as defensible positions for fire suppression personnel that can be used to establish control lines or allow for more flexible suppression strategies, freeing up resources to protect WUI infrastructure or forests in another area (Thompson et al. 2017), or can support rapid and organized evacuation when they are implemented along evacuation routes (Kolden and Henson 2019). Across complex landscapes, it is more effective in the long-term to prioritize fuel treatments that maximize benefits across large areas and over long time frames, rather than constrain them to the WUI.

5. "Can wildfires - on their own - do the work of fuel treatments?"

The use of managed wildfires and co-managing incidents (e.g., suppressing in some areas, and allowing other areas to burn) is increasingly promoted in the scientific literature (Stephens et al. 2016, Moreira et al. 2020). Managed wildfires are particularly appropriate in backcountry areas where lack of road access, steep topography, firefighter safety concerns, or management designations limit opportunities for active management (Hessburg et al. 2016, Huffman et al. 2020). However, in many cases the effects of fire exclusion on increased tree density, layering, surface fuels, and fuel ladders are extensive (Meyer

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

2015). Under these conditions, opportunities for cultural burning, prescribed burning, and managed wildfires are limited to days with low to moderate fire weather, and these windows of opportunity are shrinking under climate change (Westerling et al. 2016).

For the past several decades, land managers have generally followed one of two strategies to respond to wildfires in wNA forests. First, most agencies in the US and Canada have followed a policy of aggressive fire suppression, and this approach is increasingly used in Mexico (Stephens and Fulé 2005). Under this policy, a small fraction of fires that escape suppression (less than 3 percent) are responsible for over 90% of area burned, based on a 1992 to 2015 reference period (Abatzoglou et al. 2018). Second, some land managers - including those managing national parks and wilderness areas - have designated large, remote areas where most wildfires are allowed to burn under moderate fire weather and fuel conditions (Huffman et al. 2020). These are termed managed wildfires, with the goal of restoring more characteristic fire regimes and landscape patterns in the context of incident-specific objectives (Table 2).

In contrast, unplanned fires that escape suppression in fire-excluded landscapes during extreme fire weather do not generally restore forest resilience. Landscapes that are consistently managed with active fire suppression typically have a greater area burned at higher severity than those managed to restore more resilient fire regimes (Stevens et al. 2017, Rodman et al. 2020). In fire-excluded forest landscapes, forest surface and canopy fuels tend to be highly elevated, and despite active fire suppression, forests may eventually burn under extreme fire weather, which is becoming more frequent as the climate warms. For example, Povak et al. (2020) found fire severity during the 2013 Rim Fire was higher in the Stanislaus National Forest, much of which had not burned for >80 years, compared to Yosemite National Park where past burn mosaics existed. High-severity burn patches in fires that escaped suppression are larger and less complex than in fires managed with less aggressive suppression tactics (Stevens et al. 2017), and seed sources for forest regeneration are more often distant, yielding sparse or non-existent tree regeneration (Shive et al. 2018, Korb et al. 2019, Stevens-Rumann and Morgan 2019). In dry pine and moist mixed-conifer forests, subsequent shrub establishment can lead to a cycle of repeated high-severity fires that perpetuates shrub dominance and a potentially long-term shift in alternative stable states (Collins et al. 2009, Cocking et al. 2014, Coppoletta et al. 2016, Coop et al. 2020).

Where managers allow managed wildfires to burn under prescription, burned areas are typically smaller and have greater proportions of low- and moderate-severity burn patches within the fire

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

perimeter, and high-severity patches are typically smaller (Parks et al. 2014, Stevens et al. 2017). Within low- and moderate-severity burn patches, fuels are reduced, and forest structures resembling more typical historical conditions emerge (Holden et al. 2007, Huffman et al. 2018, Stoddard et al. 2020). In some forests, this includes characteristic patterns of small tree clumps and interspersed openings (Fig. 4**,** Kane et al. 2014, 2019, Jeronimo et al. 2019). In fire-excluded forests, a first entry with managed wildfire may not meet fuels reduction and management objectives unless allowed to burn at a severity that modifies stand structure (Huffman et al. 2017). Fire resilient landscapes are generally created by burning and reburning, in which prior fires modify the spread, intensity and severity of subsequent fires (Prichard et al. 2017, Walker et al. 2018, Yocom et al. 2019, Koontz et al. 2020).

Promising strategies are emerging to delineate landscapes into operational units where decisions about applying managed fire can be considered before ignitions even occur (Thompson et al. 2016, Dunn et al. 2017). Managed wildfires are an important management tool and they are increasingly recognized as a vital component of adaptive management. However, relying solely on managed wildfires to achieve management objectives is not possible due to a number of factors that include current restrictions on the use of managed wildfire in the WUI or near other infrastructure, limited burn windows with moderate fire weather, and the potential negative consequences of allowing fire spread into nearby fire-excluded areas with elevated fuel loads.

6. *"Is the primary objective of fuel reduction treatments to assist in future firefighting response and containment?"*

In a review of fuel treatment options for interior western United States forests, Reinhardt et al. (2008) recommend that the central objective of fuel reduction treatments should not be to halt fire spread or reduce ignitions. Rather, fuel reduction treatments could be implemented to modify fire behavior and mitigate fire effects (Safford et al. 2012), thereby reinforcing the initial resilience of the treated stand by further reducing fuels, introducing greater heterogeneity, and allowing firefighters to fight fires, as needed, using direct techniques (Stevens et al. 2014, Kalies and Yocom Kent 2016). Under adaptive management, fuel treatments are not designed to prevent or stop fires but to moderate fire behavior when fire inevitably returns (Calkin et al. 2014). However, there is a frequent misconception that fuel treatments should facilitate suppression and limit the size of wildfires (Table 1, Cochrane et al. 2012, Schoennagel et al.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

2017).

The reasoning behind treating fuels to facilitate fire suppression activities is circular. If fuel treatments make suppression more successful, then wildland fuels continue to accumulate, creating even more hazardous conditions for the entire landscape. Inevitably, this makes subsequent suppression more difficult, and more areas will be burned in fewer, unmanageable events with greater ecological consequences (Collins et al. 2010, Calkin et al. 2015). This phenomenon has been described as "the wildland fire paradox" (Arno and Brown 1991). Rather than creating conditions where wildfire is easier to suppress, fuel treatments designed within a restoration or climate adaptation strategy are engineered to allow subsequent wildfires to burn without the need of full suppression tactics and to increase opportunities for prescribed or cultural burning.

Typical fuel reduction activities near communities illustrate the long-term consequences of using treatments with the expressed objective of suppressing future wildfires. Near communities, fuel reduction treatments are often explicitly implemented to create conditions that enhance fire suppression efficacy in both the surrounding wildland and WUI (Moghaddas and Craggs 2007). Treatment locations are selected based on criteria that involve community protection (Fleeger 2008), suppression concerns (Finney 2001), and fuel hazards (Schmidt et al. 2008), at stand and landscape scales (Chung et al. 2013). Suppression strategies are designed to use treated areas for burnout operations, anchor points for fire lines, and safe zones for firefighters. Some of the challenges associated with this approach are that burnout operations often burn at high severity (Backer et al. 2004), and most fire line and safe zone construction involves the cutting of live and dead trees and mineral soil exposure, all of which result in conditions that can facilitate the spread of invasive species where they are present or nearby, degrade archaeological-heritage sites, and actually reduce ecological resilience (Davies et al. 2010). Further, if insufficient area is treated on a landscape, the unexpected behavior of large wildfires will overwhelm the ability of small fuel treatments to facilitate effective suppression (Agee et al. 2000, Finney et al. 2001). If fuel treatments are designed such that the next wildfire can be allowed to burn with limited or no suppression, then three economic and ecological objectives might be achieved: reduced suppression costs and actions; management of future wildfires as effective fuel treatment maintenance; and favorable ecological outcomes in areas treated before wildfire.

There is little doubt that fuel reduction treatments can be effective at reducing fire severity and

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

achieving culturally and ecologically beneficial effects, if designed and implemented correctly (Stephens et al. 2009, Fulé et al. 2012). However, fuel treatments intended only for crown fire hazard mitigation rarely constitute effective restoration (Stephens et al. 2020). As the pace and scale of fuel treatments increase, emphasis on resilient forest structure and composition, long-term reduction of surface and canopy fuels, and adaptation to climate change are critical components of treatment objectives rather than creating conditions that are more conducive to fire suppression (Hessburg et al. 2019).

7. "Do fuel treatments work under extreme fire weather?"

Although extreme fire behavior including strong winds and column-driven fire spread can overwhelm individual treatments, there is strong scientific evidence that even under extreme weather conditions, fuel treatments are effective at moderating fire severity across a range of forest types and wildfire events. For example, Walker et al. (2018) studied the 2011 Las Conchas fire in New Mexico that burned under extreme weather and found that sites that were previously prescribed burned exhibited higher conifer survival (i.e. lower severity fire) compared to sites that were not treated prior to the wildfire. Similarly, Yocom Kent et al. (2015) found that moderate- and high-severity effects in the Rodeo-Chediski Fire, which burned under extreme fire weather, were reduced from 76% in untreated areas to 57% in prescribed fire, and 38% in thin and burn treatments. Likewise, Povak et al. (2020) presented evidence that some treated areas experienced lower severity fire even under the most extreme fire growth period of the 2013 Rim Fire. Past wildfires also acted as short-term barriers to fire spread and mitigated fire severity in mixed-conifer forests of the interior western United States (Parks et al. 2015a, Stevens-Rumann et al. 2016). Lastly, two studies in seasonally dry mixed-conifer forests of north-central Washington State found that thinning followed by prescribed burning was an effective treatment for mitigating wildfire effects under extreme weather conditions (Prichard and Kennedy 2014, Prichard et al. 2020). Results of these observational studies are also supported by numerous modelling studies indicating that fuel treatments reduce fire intensity and effects in dry conifer forests under dry fuels and high wind speeds (Stephens and Moghaddas 2005, Ager et al. 2007, Vaillant et al. 2009, Johnson et al. 2011).

In forests characterized by moderate- and high-severity fire regimes, a limited number of studies suggest that fuel reduction treatments are ineffective at reducing fire behavior and effects, particularly under extreme weather conditions (e.g., Graham 2003, Martinson et al. 2003, Schoennagel et al.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

2004). The rationale is that fires burning within moist and cold forest patches are generally controlled by climate (i.e., a warmer and drier than average year) and not controlled by fuel within patches (Turner and Romme 1994, Bessie and Johnson 1995). However, at larger spatial scales, there is strong evidence that patchwork burn mosaics resulting from reburns reduce landscape contagion, and consequently, spread and severity of wildfires, even under extreme fire weather (Stine et al. 2014, Parks et al. 2015b, Hessburg et al. 2016, Spies et al. 2018).

Dependent on the forest type and environmental setting, some fuel treatments are more effective at reducing adverse fire effects than others, and this can also contribute to confusion as to whether or not treatments are effective under extreme fire weather. Several studies highlight that the most effective fuel treatments include coupled thinning and burning (Kalies and Yocom Kent 2016), and emphasize the importance of retaining large, fire-resistant trees in dry mixed conifer forests (Agee and Skinner 2005, DellaSala et al. 2004, Stephens et al. 2009). Furthermore, other studies showed that fire severity decreased as wildfires progress further into areas with more treated area (Kennedy and Johnson 2014, Arkle et al. 2012), strongly suggesting that small fuel treatments or those with large perimeter-to-edge ratios are less effective than larger treatments under extreme fire weather conditions (Kennedy et al. 2019).

Finally, fuel treatments generally are designed to mitigate wildfire intensity and effects but they are not necessarily intended to impede fire spread or reduce fire size (Reinhardt et al. 2008). Consequently, when fires burn large areas under extreme fire weather some may conclude that burned-over fuel treatments were ineffective (e.g., Schoennagel et al. 2017). However, the occurrence of large fires does not necessarily suggest that existing fuel treatments were unsuccessful. Large fires have always been a part of fire-prone forests, and within large fire events fuel treatments can allow fires to continue burning but mitigate fire severity and enhance the heterogeneity of fire effects.

8. "Is the scale of the problem too great – can we ever catch up?"

Recent meta-analyses of fuel treatment effectiveness demonstrate that at landscape and regional scales, fuel treatments account for only a small fraction (~1%) of the area burned by wildfires (e.g., Barnett et al. 2016a, Kolden 2019). Therefore, there is some concern that treatments are ineffective because under current prescription levels, wildfires may not actually encounter treated areas during the duration of their potential effectiveness (Odion and Hanson 2006, Rhodes and Baker 2008). While this is factually accurate at the current pace and scale of treatment in wNA, the question is not whether every

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

wildfire can be impacted by fuels treatments, but whether treatments can be strategically used to multiply their benefits and promote greater opportunities for applying wildland fire across landscapes. The scientific evidence that fuel reduction treatments can mitigate fire behavior and effects strongly supports a conclusion that expanding treated areas – including the use of forest thinning, prescribed burning, cultural burning, and managed wildfires – will lead to greater landscape resilience to future wildfires.

Ongoing warming and drying are linked to increasing large fire occurrence, contributing to large increases in area burned (Abatzoglou and Williams 2016) and area burned as high severity (Parks and Abatzoglou 2020) in wNA in recent decades. Given projected increases in warming due to climate change, burn probability is increasing in many wNA forests (Littell et al. 2018, Hurteau et al. 2019) along with increasing likelihood that future wildfires will impact a larger proportion of landscapes. In this light, the current pace and scale of fuels treatments is insufficient to address the scale of fire exclusion. Furthermore, treated areas require ongoing maintenance to retain efficacy (Krofcheck et al. 2017, Vaillant and Reinhardt 2017), making it difficult to expand treated areas across a landscape without significant additional financial and personnel investments (North et al. 2015a). Thus, the scope, scale, and urgency of adapting wNA forests to climate change and future wildfires is immense.

Given the complexity of forest ecosystems, the economic and personnel investment required, and the policy and management constraints, there is no single management tool that is adequate to increase the resilience of wNA landscapes to future wildfires. Coupled thinning and burning treatments will be especially helpful in dry pine, oak woodlands, and dry mixed conifer forests, while restoration of more characteristic forest successional and nonforest patchworks using managed moderate and high severity wildfires will be key in cold forests. Forest managers in western Australia have reduced the frequency of large and severe wildfires, but only after building extensive landscape networks of strategic treatments (i.e., spatially linked naturally occurring and treated areas of reduced fuels prior to the outbreak of wildfires) and by conducting frequent prescribed burning under moderate fire weather and including Indigenous fire use over large areas (Boer et al. 2009, Sneeuwjagt et al. 2013). Similar approaches are being used in US national forest, wilderness, and park areas to allow for more area of managed wildfires (Table 2). Given limitations on where mechanical thinning, prescribed and cultural burning, and managed wildfire are practical or allowed, combining

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

these tools over broad areas can markedly expand treatment extent and reduce impact of large wildfires.

Fire hazard, burn probability, and fire ecology vary widely across wNA forest landscapes. Prior knowledge of cultural burning practices, ignition and weather patterns, vegetation and fuel distributions, and topography all provide critical information for prioritizing fuel treatments in areas with the highest risk of burning (Ager et al. 2010, 2016). Near population centers, humans are often responsible for the majority of wildfire ignitions, and they provide ignition sources in highly predictable areas and seasons of the year, when natural ignitions are rare (Balch et al. 2017, Keeley and Syphard 2018). Ignition pattern and frequency interact with fuels, weather, and topography to influence fire occurrence, leading to heterogeneous burn probabilities across a landscape (Ager et al. 2012, Povak et al. 2018). Using prior knowledge of human and lighting-caused fire starts coupled with knowledge of the probability of fire spread and likely severity, managers can identify the areas of any landscape where uncharacteristic or impactful fires will likely occur (Parisien and Moritz 2009, Parisien et al. 2012), and decrease the proportion of the landscape that requires treatment.

There are a number of available tools and approaches to identify areas that would benefit from strategically placed fuel treatments. In general, fuel treatments are not implemented at random, and for good reason (Finney et al. 2007). A comparison of random versus strategically placed treatments showed that a significant reduction in area could be achieved with strategic placement (Ager et al. 2013, 2016), where that opportunity exists. Quantifying the probability of high-severity wildfire across a given landscape and focusing thinning treatments on high-probability areas can decrease the required treatment area by >50% (Krofcheck et al. 2019). However, the success of these strategies depends on maintaining the treatments and reintroducing fire to a larger portion of the landscape (Agee and Skinner 2005, Barros et al. 2018). Where reserved areas are abundant or widely distributed, opportunities for spatially optimizing fuel treatments are limited, and considerably more treated area may be required outside of reserves (Finney et al. 2007).

In summary, justifying inaction based on the scale of the problem is too large is highly circular. Evidence supports increasing the pace of treatments to significantly reduce the area impacted by uncharacteristic wildfire, even under a changing climate (Liang et al. 2018). For example, managers can expand areas where prescribed burn prescriptions are applied to reduce fuels and increase forest

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

heterogeneity (Safford et al. 2012, Striplin et al. 2020). The efficacy of these was historically demonstrated by Indigenous burning practices that amplified natural lightning ignitions in many seasonally dry forests, thereby modifying active fire regimes and fire effects, and diversifying the seasonality and frequency of fires (Crawford et al. 2015, Trauernicht et al. 2015, Taylor et al. 2016). Managed wildfires can also increase forest and fuel heterogeneity, constraining subsequent fire size and severity (Collins et al. 2009, Parks et al. 2015b, Barros et al. 2018). When used in conjunction with mechanical treatments and prescribed or cultural burning, managed wildfire presents an opportunity to increase the effectiveness of treatments across large landscapes (North et al. 2012).

9. "Will planting more trees in wNA forests help to mitigate climate change?"

Tree plantations have long been a debated aspect of forest management, and more recently, climate change mitigation (Alig 1997, Chmura et al. 2011). Planting after harvest to increase forest productivity were the central justifications for past clearcut logging, even as a growing body of science demonstrated that plantations (1) did not provide the needed ecological structures or functional diversity of old-growth forests, (2) were not necessarily more productive than mature forests (Franklin et al. 2002), and (3) without surface fuel treatment, could be conducive to high-severity wildfires (Thompson et al. 2007). Similarly, planting seedlings after post-fire salvage logging is sometimes used to expedite tree regeneration following high-severity fire. Without strategic management, post-fire plantations may be overstocked, dominated by a single species (North et al. 2019), lack tree clumping and canopy gaps, and pose significant wildfire hazard (Kobziar et al. 2009), particularly without post-harvest slash reduction (Donato et al. 2009).

A recent proposal to combat climate change includes planting a trillion trees globally, including substantial reforestation in the western United States (Bastin et al. 2019). The study suggested that these additional trees would sequester sufficient atmospheric carbon to curb climate change. Baseline assumptions and findings from this study have been contested by scientists (Veldman et al. 2019, Holl and Brancalion 2020) as the study failed to account for forest interactions with climate, drought, and wildfire dynamics. In addition to future disturbance resilience, numerous other barriers currently impede large-scale reforestation efforts (Fargione et al. 2021).

Across wNA, most of the forest carbon is captured in moist temperate forests with high precipitation levels and net primary productivity, including the coastal ranges along the Pacific Coast,

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

western Cascade and western Sierra Nevada Mountain Ranges (Hudiburg et al. 2009). These forests possess complex, heterogeneous structures that are shaped by infrequent wildfires. Some, including those in southwestern Oregon and northern California, were also influenced by a long legacy of Indigenous burning (Anderson 2013, Merschel et al. 2014). Because most of the standing biomass in high productivity wNA forests occurs in live trees, when these forests burn, relatively low levels of carbon are initially emitted, with most of the biomass retained either in standing trees and snags or to newly downed heavy fuels that slowly release carbon to the atmosphere through decomposition, unless they subsequently burn in a reburn fire event (Stenzel et al. 2019, Lutz et al. 2020). By contrast, even-aged stands, both naturally occurring (e.g., lodgepole pine forests) and in young plantations, are relatively homogeneous in structure, and with elevated surface fuels, can facilitate high-intensity, severe fire (Bowman et al. 2019). Climate change-induced reduction of fire return intervals may ultimately convert some of these live carbon pools from sinks to sources (Turner et al. 2019, Foster et al. 2020).

In fire-adapted dry mixed conifer forests, dense tree plantations are highly susceptible to future wildfires and drought. However, a promising approach to retaining and sequestering carbon in dry, fire-prone forests is to retain existing trees and restore characteristic low-severity fire to maintain low-severity fire to maintain resilient forest structure and composition (Hurteau and North 2009). It is still debatable whether prescribed burning and removal of small diameter trees and ladder fuels will actually increase or decrease aboveground carbon stores (Campbell et al. 2012, Restaino and Peterson 2013) and is likely site dependent, but there is broad scientific agreement that these management actions are key to increasing forest ecological resilience, which ultimately stabilizes forest carbon stocks (Hurteau et al. 2019, Krofcheck et al. 2019, Westlind and Kerns 2021). Managed landscape mosaics will be particularly critical to maintaining legacy old-growth forests and minimizing sink-to-source conversions due to fire and other disturbances (Barbero et al. 2015, Liang et al. 2017). Finally, governmental cap-and-trade and carbon taxation programs must accurately account for the complex role fire plays in carbon cycle feedbacks and carbon maintenance, rather than simply characterizing fire as a net carbon loss (Hurteau et al. 2008, North et al. 2009).

Across wNA forests, tree planting can serve as an important tool to nudge the trajectory of post-fire landscapes towards more climate adapted tree species or genotypes, particularly in areas where

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

seed source is limited (North et al. 2019). However, traditional high density plantations will often predispose forests to high-severity fire where pre-commercial thinning and associated fuel treatments are not implemented, which is increasingly the case (McCarley et al. 2017). Alternatives to traditional plantations are emerging that are designed to promote resilience to future fire and drought from the beginning of the planting process. These include: planting drought-conditioned seedlings reared from lower-elevation seed stock, planting discontinuous "founder stands" or "nucleation islands" of trees into portions of stand-replacing patches far from tree refugia, and planning for the reintroduction of fire into younger planted stands as they develop (Peterson et al. 2007, Landis et al. 2011).

10. "Is post-fire management needed or even ecologically justified?"

Many contemporary wildfires exhibit a range of post-fire effects (Thode et al. 2011); variable sized patches of stand-replacing or partial stand replacing fire are embedded within a matrix of live forest (Stevens et al. 2017). Among large fires, these patches of stand-replacing fire may themselves contain isolated and variably sized patches of live trees often referred to as fire refugia (Meddens et al. 2018, Krawchuk et al. 2020). Thus, the post-fire landscape can be viewed as a complex patchwork of interconnected surviving forest, the product of low and moderate severity fires, high-severity patches, and isolated refugia (Coop et al. 2019). However, these post-fire landscapes are not necessarily on resilient trajectories. Fire refugia are often in uncharacteristic locations, and active forest and fuels management are often required after the fire to promote future forest resilience to disturbance and climate change and to protect valued cultural resources.

Patches of low- and moderate-severity fire generally have short-term resistance to future fire due to the reduction of surface fuels from the first burn (Prichard et al. 2017). Compared to low-severity fire, moderate-severity fire events can create a residual stand structure that more closely approximates historical conditions (Collins et al. 2011, Huffman et al. 2017). However, moderate-severity fires that burn through previously dense forest also leave considerable standing and down wood, which can lead to elevated fuel loads and high-severity fire in subsequent reburns (Collins et al. 2018). Thus, post-fire fuel reduction of the trees that encroached during the period of fire exclusion can be warranted to improve the fire resilience of residual forests, including fire refugia.

Smaller refugial patches within larger burned patches are increasingly recognized as having significant cultural and ecological value by preserving biological and cultural legacies that can contribute to forest

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

succession via seed dispersal (Johnstone et al. 2016, Meddens et al. 2018). Small refugia in particular make disproportionate contributions to reforestation potential within larger patches of stand-replacing fire (Shive et al. 2018, Coop et al. 2019). However, isolated tree refugia can have a significant standing and down fuel component around their edges due to adjacent high-severity burn effects (Lydersen et al. 2019a). Given their outsized importance as biological legacies, surface fuel reduction to "harden" the edges of refugia may be critical to their future resilience and prioritize refugia retention during wildland firefighting operations (Meddens et al. 2018).

Large patches of stand-replacing fire are an increasing focus of research (Coop et al. 2020). Independent of subsequent fire dynamics, regeneration is challenged by seed dispersal limitations (Stevens-Rumann and Morgan 2019). Fuel conditions in large patches of stand-replacing fire are usually dominated by coarse wood, regenerating shrubs, and hardwoods, increasing the risk of subsequent high-severity, and occurrence of long-duration re-burns (Coppoletta et al. 2016, Prichard et al. 2017). Collectively, these conditions pose a substantial management challenge if the objective is to restore at least a portion of large burn patches to conifer forest, as this is unlikely over decades to centuries without management intervention (Coop et al. 2020).

Fuels management and regeneration dynamics in stand-replacing patches are closely related. In high-severity patches, management to reduce coarse wood accumulations and flammable shrubs may promote post-fire tree regeneration and mitigate future fire severity (Peterson et al. 2015, Lydersen et al. 2019b). In planted forests, coarse wood presents a different challenge, as downed logs facilitate seedling survival through shading and moisture retention (Castro et al. 2011) but pose a risk to seedlings if they burn (Peterson et al. 2015). Understanding the range and variability of historical reburning would provide essential guidance of restoration targets to improve the post-fire resilience of regenerating landscapes.

Strategic tree planting can be used to encourage the re-establishment of some post-fire landscapes and for climate change adaptation, particularly where conditions are not favorable to natural regeneration (see previous question). Post-fire mechanical thinning (e.g., salvage logging) is often driven by economic and safety considerations but may have some ecological benefits in terms of reduced future surface fuel loads and fire hazard 10-20 years post-fire (Peterson et al. 2015). Future research in this area is warranted to investigate the impacts of variable density harvests and how

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

potential ecological tradeoffs vary over time (e.g. Ritchie et al. 2013).

CONCLUSIONS

During this time of rapid environmental change, the impacts of climatic changes on forests and their associated fire regimes cannot be overstated. In addition to the increased incidence of large wildfires, tree mortality associated with persistent drought and die-off events, chronic forest insect outbreaks, and increasingly common tree regeneration failures are all critical management considerations (Stephens et al. 2016, Coop et al. 2020). In a majority of cases, forest management and fuel reduction treatments will not return landscapes to any historical condition or fire regime, nor is that a particularly useful premise on which to base adaptive forest management (Allen et al. 2011, Hanberry et al. 2015, Falk et al. 2019). Instead, intentional management focused on adapting current forest conditions to a rapidly evolving future climate future climate is needed. Adaptations can foster resilience to longer, warmer, drier, and windier fire seasons, increasing incidence of episodic, multi-year to decadal droughts, and increasing dominance of severe wildfire and insect disturbances. Given the rapid increase in human-caused large wildfires, mitigating unplanned human ignitions is another critical wildland fire management issue (Balch et al. 2017), that by itself can reshape wildfire and forest landscape futures.

Although the management situation for wNA forests is daunting, our review of the scientific literature offers clear guidance. In seasonally dry wNA forests that were historically dominated by fire-resistant species, restoring open, fire-tolerant canopy structure and composition, favoring larger tree sizes, and reducing surface fuels can effectively mitigate subsequent wildfire and stabilize carbon stocks (Fig. 1). In many instances, these adaptation actions, with ongoing maintenance, will also enable future wildfire events to continually reinforce resilient structure, composition, and fuels.

Ecological departures associated with fire exclusion are not confined to seasonally dry pine and mixed-conifer forests. Across a wide range of wNA forests, landscape-level treatment prescriptions that promote resilient patchworks with heterogeneous nonforest and forest successional conditions can reduce the extent of high-severity wildfires and make landscapes less susceptible to extensive insect and disease outbreaks. Restoration of fire resilient mosaics in moist mixed-conifer forests, mixed conifer-hardwood forests, fire-prone deciduous forests (e.g., aspen), and cold forests is also needed.

Despite calls to restore fire as a cultural and ecological process (e.g., The U.S. National Wildland

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Fire Cohesive Strategy), the dominant approach to wildfire management continues to be aggressive suppression. Response to unplanned fire starts is highly successful in the US and Canada and is becoming increasingly common in Mexico. However, a small fraction of fires that escape suppression (2-3%) generally burn under extreme fire weather conditions, lead to explosive fire growth, and account for >90% of annual area burned (Abatzoglou et al. 2018). The strategy to actively suppress fire is a highly consequential active management prescription, with surface and canopy *fuel accumulation* as a consequence. Continued forest infilling and fuel accumulation predisposes forests to high-severity fire when fire inevitably returns (North et al. 2015b).

Not surprisingly, recommendations to increase wNA forest resilience to climate change and wildfires are in close alignment with Indigenous knowledge, cultural resource values, and desired land management strategies (Kimmerer and Lake 2001, Lake et al. 2018, Roos et al. 2021). Over millennia, Indigenous burning practices influenced fire regimes, which contributed to the resilient composition and structure of many historical wNA forest and nonforest ecosystems. Although European colonization severely curtailed and displaced Indigenous land management (Lake et al. 2017, Lake and Christianson 2019), Indigenous knowledge for the maintenance of fire-dependent ecosystems and services endures (Huffman 2013). Given the urgent need for adaptive forest management in the 21st-century, an intentional merging of Indigenous and western knowledge is needed to guide future forest conditions and restore active fire regimes to wNA forests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This synthesis project was funded by the US Forest Service Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest Research Stations (PFH, NAP), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (SJP, KH, PKP); Ecological Restoration Institute (DH, KH); Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DC, KH); the Wilderness Society (KH); Nature Conservancy - Oregon (KH); and Conservation Northwest (KH). We thank Mike Battaglia, Ellis Margolis and James Rosen for their constructive reviews and the US Fish and Wildlife Service for assistance with publication. This paper was written and prepared by US Government employees on official time, and therefore it is in the public domain and not subject to copyright.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

LITERATURE CITED

Abatzoglou, T. T., J. K. Balch, B. A. Bradley, and C. A. Kolden. 2018. Human-related ignitions concurrent with high winds promote large wildfires across the USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 27:377-386.

Abatzoglou, J. T., and A. P. Williams. 2016. Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113:11770–11775.

Agee, J. K. 1996. Fire Ecology of Pacific Northwest Forests. Island Press.

Agee, J. K., B. Bahro, M. A. Finney, P. N. Omi, D. Sapsis, C. Skinner, J. van Wagtendonk, and C. P. Weatherspoon. 2000. The use of shaded fuelbreaks in landscape fire management. Forest Ecology and Management 127:55–66.

Agee, J., and C. N. Skinner. 2005. Basic principles of forest fuel reduction treatments. Forest Ecology and Management 211:83–96.

Ager, A. A., M. A. Day, K. C. Short, and C. R. Evers. 2016. Assessing the impacts of federal forest planning on wildfire risk mitigation in the Pacific Northwest, USA. Landscape and Urban Planning 147:1–17.

Ager, A., A. J. McMahan, J. J. Barrett, and C. W. McHugh. 2007. A simulation study of thinning and fuel treatments on a wildland–urban interface in eastern Oregon, USA. Landscape and Urban Planning 80:292–300.

Ager, A. A., N. M. Vaillant, and M. A. Finney. 2010. A comparison of landscape fuel treatment strategies to mitigate wildland fire risk in the urban interface and preserve old forest structure. Forest Ecology and Management 259:1556–1570.

Ager, A. A., N. M. Vaillant, M. A. Finney, and H. K. Preisler. 2012. Analyzing wildfire exposure and source–sink relationships on a fire prone forest landscape. Forest Ecology and Management 267:271–283.

Ager, A. A., N. M. Vaillant, and A. McMahan. 2013. Restoration of fire in managed forests: a model to prioritize landscapes and analyze tradeoffs. Ecosphere 4:19.

Alig, R. 1997. Assessing effects of mitigation strategies for global climate change with an intertemporal model of the U.S. forest and agriculture sectors. Environmental and Resource Economics 9:259–274.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Allen, C. D., A. K. Macalady, H. Chenchouni, D. Bachelet, N. McDowell, M. Vennetier, T. Kitzberger, A. Rigling, D. D. Breshears, E. H. Hogg, P. Gonzalez, R. Fensham, Z. Zhang, J. Castro, N. Demidova, J.-H. Lim, G. Allard, S. W. Running, A. Semerci, and N. Cobb. 2010. A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging climate change risks for forests. Forest Ecology and Management 259:660–684.

Allen, C. R., J. J. Fontaine, K. L. Pope, and A. S. Garmestani. 2011. Adaptive management for a turbulent future. Journal of Environmental Management 92:1339–1345.

Anderson, M. K. 2013. Trending the Wild: Native American knowledge and the management of California's natural resources. University of California Press.

Arkle, R. S., D. S. Pilliod, and J. L. Welty. 2012. Pattern and process of prescribed fires influence effectiveness at reducing wildfire severity in dry coniferous forests. Forest Ecology and Management 276:174–184.

Arno, S. F., and J. K. Brown. 1991. Overcoming the paradox in managing wildland fire. National Emergency Training Center. Emmitsburg, Maryland, USA.

Backer, D. M., S. E. Jensen, and G. R. McPherson. 2004. Impacts of fire-suppression activities on natural communities. Conservation Biology 18:937–946.

Baker, W. L., and C. T. Hanson. 2017. Improving the use of early timber inventories in reconstructing historical dry forests and fire in the western United States. Ecosphere 8:e01935.

Balch, J. K., B. A. Bradley, J. T. Abatzoglou, R. C. Nagy, E. J. Fusco, and A. L. Mahood. 2017. Human-started wildfires expand the fire niche across the United States. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114:2946–2951.

Bar Massada, A., V. C. Radeloff, and S. I. Stewart. 2011. Allocating fuel breaks to optimally protect structures in the wildland–urban interface. International Journal of Wildland Fire 20:59.

Barbero, R., J. T. Abatzoglou, N. K. Larkin, C. A. Kolden, and B. Stocks. 2015. Climate change presents increased potential for very large fires in the contiguous United States. International Journal of Wildland Fire 24:892-899.

Barnett, K., C. Miller, and T. J. Venn. 2016a. Using risk analysis to reveal opportunities for the management of unplanned ignitions in wilderness. Journal of Forestry 114:610–618.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Barnett, K., S. A. Parks, C. Miller, and H. T. Naughton. 2016b. Beyond fuel treatment effectiveness: characterizing interactions between fire and treatments in the US. Forests. 7: 237.

Barnhart, S. J., J. R. McBride, and P. Warner. 1996. Invasion of northern oak woodlands by *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Mirb.) Franco in the Sonoma Mountains of California. Madroño 43:28–45.

Barros, A. M., A. A. Ager, M. A. Day, M. A. Krawchuk, and T. A. Spies. 2018. Wildfires managed for restoration enhance ecological resilience. Ecosphere 9:e02161.

Bastin, J. -F., Y. Finegold, C. Garcia, D. Mollicone, M. Rezende, D. Routh, C. M. Zohner, and T. W. Crowther. 2019. The global tree restoration potential. Science 365:76–79.

Battaglia, M. A., B. Gannon, P. M. Brown, P. J. Fornwalt, A. S. Cheng, and L. S. Huckaby. 2018. Changes in forest structure since 1860 in ponderosa pine dominated forests in the Colorado and Wyoming Front Range, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 422:147–160.

Battaglia, M. A., and W. D. Shepperd. 2007. Ponderosa pine, mixed conifer, and spruce-fir forests [Chapter 2]. Fire ecology and management of the major ecosystems in southern Utah. RMRS-GTR-202. US Forest Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Belote, R. T., A. J. Larson, and M. S. Dietz. 2015. Tree survival scales to community-level effects following mixed-severity fire in a mixed conifer forest. Forest Ecology and Management 353:221-231.

Bentz, B. J., J. Régnière, C. J. Fettig, E. M. Hansen, J. L. Hayes, J. A. Hicke, R. G. Kelsey, J. F. Negrón, and S. J. Seybold. 2010. Climate change and bark beetles of the western United States and Canada: direct and indirect effects. BioScience 60:602–613.

Bessie, W. C., and E. A. Johnson. 1995. The relative importance of fuels and weather on fire behavior in subalpine forests. Ecology 76:747-762.

Bigelow, S. W., and M. P. North. 2012. Microclimate effects of fuels-reduction and group-selection silviculture: Implications for fire behavior in Sierran mixed-conifer forests. Forest Ecology and Management 264:51–59.

Bladon, K. D. 2018. Rethinking wildfires and forest watersheds. Science 359:1001-1002.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Boer, M. M., R. J. Sadler, R. S. Wittkuhn, L. McCaw, and P. F. Grierson. 2009. Long-term impacts of prescribed burning on regional extent and incidence of wildfires—evidence from 50 years of active fire management in SW Australian forests. Forest Ecology and Management 259:132–142.

Boisramé, G., S. Thompson, B. Collins, and S. Stephens. 2017. Managed wildfire effects on forest resilience and water in the Sierra Nevada. Ecosystems 20:717–732.

Bowman, D. M, A. Moreira-Muñoz, C. A. Kolden, R. O. Chávez, A. A. Muñoz, F. Salinas, Á. González-Reyes, R. Rocco, F. de la Barrera, G. J. Williamson, N. Borchers, L. A. Cifuentes, J. T. Abatzoglou, and F. H. Johnston. 2019. Human–environmental drivers and impacts of the globally extreme 2017 Chilean fires. Ambio 48:350–362.

Bowman, D. M. J. S., C. A. Kolden, J. T. Abatzoglou, F. H. Johnston, G. R. van der Werf, and M. Flannigan. 2020. Vegetation fires in the Anthropocene. Nature Reviews Earth & Environment 1: 505-515.

Bradley, C. M., C. T. Hanson, and D. A. DellaSala. 2016. Does increased forest protection correspond to higher fire severity in frequent-fire forests of the western United States? Ecosphere 7:e01492.

Brown, P. M., C. Gentry, and Q. Yao. 2019. Historical and current fire regimes in ponderosa pine forests at Zion National Park, Utah: restoration of pattern and process after a century of fire exclusion. Forest Ecology and Management 445:1–12.

Brown, R. T., J. K. Agee, and J. F. Franklin. 2004. Forest restoration and fire: principles in the context of place. Conservation Biology 18:903–912.

Calkin, D. E., J. D. Cohen, M. A. Finney, and M. P. Thompson. 2014. How risk management can prevent future wildfire disasters in the wildland-urban interface. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 111:746–751.

Calkin, D. E., M. P. Thompson, and M. A. Finney. 2015. Negative consequences of positive feedbacks in US wildfire management. Forest Ecosystems 2:9.

Campbell, J. L., M. E. Harmon, and S. R. Mitchell. 2012. Can fuel-reduction treatments really increase forest carbon storage in the western US by reducing future fire emissions? Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 10:83–90.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Castro, J., C. D. Allen, M. Molina-Morales, S. Maranon-Jimenez, A. Sanchez-Miranda, and R. Zamora. 2011. Salvage logging versus the use of burnt wood as a nurse object to promote post-fire tree seedling establishment. Restoration Ecology 19:537-544.

Chmura, D. J., P. D. Anderson, G. T. Howe, C. A. Harrington, J.E. Halofsky, D.L. Peterson, D.C. Shaw, and J. St. Clair. 2011. Forest responses to climate change in the northwestern United States: ecophysiological foundations for adaptive management. Forest Ecology and Management 261:1121–1142.

Chung, W., G. Jones, K. Krueger, J. Bramel, and M. Contreras. 2013. Optimising fuel treatments over time and space. International Journal of Wildland Fire 22:1118.

Churchill, D. J., G. C. Carnwath, A. J. Larson, and S. A. Jeronimo. 2017. Historical forest structure, composition, and spatial pattern in dry conifer forests of the western Blue Mountains, Oregon. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-956. USDA Forest Service, Portland, Oregon, USA.

Churchill, D. J., A. J. Larson, M. C. Dahlgreen, J. F. Franklin, P. F. Hessburg, and J. A. Lutz. 2013. Restoring forest resilience: from reference spatial patterns to silvicultural prescriptions and monitoring. Forest Ecology and Management 291:442–457.

Cochrane, M. A., C. J. Moran, M C. Wimberly, A D. Baer, M. A. Finney, K. L. Beckendorf, J. Eidenshink, and Z. Zhu. 2012. Estimation of wildfire size and risk changes due to fuels treatments. International Journal of Wildland Fire 21:357-367.

Cocking, M. I., J. M. Varner, and E. E. Knapp. 2014. Long-term effects of fire severity on oak-conifer dynamics in the southern Cascades. Ecological Applications 24:94-107.

Collins, B. M., R. G. Everett, and S. L. Stephens. 2011. Impacts of fire exclusion and recent managed fire on forest structure in old growth Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forests. Ecosphere 2:1-14.

Collins, B. M., J. M. Lydersen, R. G. Everett, and S. L. Stephens. 2018. How does forest recovery following moderate-severity fire influence effects of subsequent wildfire in mixed-conifer forests? Fire Ecology 14:3.

Collins, B. M., J. D. Miller, A. E. Thode, M. Kelly, J. W. van Wagtendonk, and S.L. Stephens. 2009. Interactions among wildland fires in a long-established Sierra Nevada natural fire area. Ecosystems 12:114–128.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Collins, B. M., S. L. Stephens, J. J. Moghaddas, and J. Battles. 2010. Challenges and approaches in planning fuel treatments across fire-excluded forested landscapes. Journal of Forestry 108:24–31.

Coop, J. D., T. J. DeLory, W. M. Downing, S. L. Haire, M. A. Krawchuk, C. Miller, M.-A. Parisien, and R. B. Walker. 2019. Contributions of fire refugia to resilient ponderosa pine and dry mixed-conifer forest landscapes. Ecosphere 10:e02809.

Coop, J. D., S. A. Parks, C. S. Stevens-Rumann, S. D. Crausbay, P. E. Higuera, M. D. Hurteau, A. Tepley, E. Whitman, T. Assal, B. M. Collins, K. T. Davis, S. Dobrowski, D. A. Falk, P. J. Fornwalt, P. Z. Fulé, B. J. Harvey, V. R. Kane, C. E. Littlefield, E. Q. Margolis, M. North, M.-A. Parisien, S. Prichard, and K. C. Rodman. 2020. Wildfire-driven forest conversion in western North American landscapes. BioScience 70:659–673.

Coppoletta, M., K. E. Merriam, and B. M. Collins. 2016. Post-fire vegetation and fuel development influences fire severity patterns in reburns. Ecological Applications 26:686–699.

Crawford, J. N., S. A. Mensing, F. K. Lake, and S. R. H. Zimmerman. 2015. Late Holocene fire and vegetation reconstruction from the western Klamath Mountains, California, USA: a multi-disciplinary approach for examining potential human land-use impacts. The Holocene 25:1341-1357.

Crockett, J. L., and A. L. Westerling. 2017. Greater temperature and precipitation extremes intensify western U.S. droughts, wildfire severity, and Sierra Nevada tree mortality. Journal of Climate 31:341–354.

Daniels, S. E., and G. B. Walker. 1995. Managing local environmental conflict amidst national controversy. International Journal of Conflict Management 6:290-311.

Davies, G. M., A. A. Smith, A. J. MacDonald, J. D. Bakker, and C. J. Legg. 2010. Fire intensity, fire severity and ecosystem response in heathlands: factors affecting the regeneration of *Calluna vulgaris*. Journal of Applied Ecology 47:356–365.

Davis, E. J., E. M. White, L. K. Cerveny, D. Seesholtz, M. L. Nuss, and D. R. Ulrich. 2017. Comparison of USDA Forest Service and stakeholder motivations and experiences in collaborative federal forest governance in the western United States. Environmental Management 60:908-921.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

DellaSala, D. A., R. L. Hutto, C. T. Hanson, M. L. Bond, T. Ingalsbee, D. Odion, and W. L. Baker. 2017. Accommodating mixed-severity fire to restore and maintain ecosystem integrity with a focus on the Sierra Nevada of California, USA. Fire Ecology 13:148–171.

DellaSala, D. A., J. E. Williams, C. D. Williams, and J. F. Franklin. 2004. Beyond smoke and mirrors: a synthesis of fire policy and science. Conservation Biology 18:976–986.

Dennison, P. E., S. C. Brewer, J. D. Arnold, and M. A. Moritz. 2014. Large wildfire trends in the western United States, 1984–2011. Geophysical Research Letters 41:2928–2933.

Donato, D. C., J. B. Fontaine, J. L. Campbell, W. D. Robinson, J. B. Kauffman, and B. E. Law. 2009. Conifer regeneration in stand-replacement portions of a large mixed-severity wildfire in the Klamath–Siskiyou Mountains. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 39:823–838.

Dubay, T., D. Egan, E. E. Hjerpe, W. Selig, D. Brewer, D. Coelho, Z. Wurtzebach, C. Schultz, and A. E. M. Waltz. 2013. Breaking barriers, building bridges: collaborative forest landscape restoration handbook. Northern Arizona University.

Dunn, C. J., and J. D. Bailey. 2016. Tree mortality and structural change following mixed-severity fire in *Pseudotsuga* forests of Oregon's western Cascades, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 365:107-118.

Dunn, C. J., M. P. Thompson, and D. E. Calkin. 2017. A framework for developing safe and effective large-fire response in a new fire management paradigm. Forest Ecology and Management 404:184–196.

Eisenberg, C., C. L. Anderson, A. Collingwood, R. Sissons, C. J. Dunn, G. W. Meigs, D. E. Hibbs, S. Murphy, S. D. Kuiper, J. SpearChief-Morris, L. Little Bear, B. Johnston, and C. B. Edson. 2019. Out of the ashes: ecological resilience to extreme wildfire, prescribed burns, and indigenous burning in ecosystems. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution 7:436.

Engber, E. A., J. M. Varner, L. A. Arguello, and N. G. Sugihara. 2011. The effects of conifer encroachment and overstory structure on fuels and fire in an oak woodland landscape. Fire Ecology 7:32–50.

Estes, B. L., E. E. Knapp, C. N. Skinner, and F. C. C. Uzoh. 2012. Seasonal variation in surface fuel moisture between unthinned and thinned mixed conifer forest, northern California, USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 21:428-435.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Falk, D. A., A. C. Watts, and A. E. Thode. 2019. Scaling ecological resilience. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution 7:275.

Fargione, J., D. L. Haase, O. T. Burney, O. A. Kildisheva, G. Edge, S. C. Cook-Patton, T. Chapman, A. Rempel, M. D. Hurteau, K. T. Davis, S. Dobrowski, S. Enebak, R. De La Torre, A. A. R. Bhuta, F. Cubbage, B. Kittler, D. Zhang, and R. W. Guldin. 2021. Challenges to the reforestation pipeline in the United States. Frontiers in Forests and Global Change 4.

Finney, M. A. 2001. Design of regular landscape fuel treatment patterns for modifying fire growth and behavior. Forest Science 47:219–228.

Finney, M. A. 2007. A computational method for optimizing fuel treatment locations. International Journal of Wildland Fire 16:702-711.

Fleeger, W. E. 2008. Collaborating for success: community wildfire protection planning in the Arizona White Mountains. Journal of Forestry 106:78–82.

Foster, D. L., J. J. Battles, B. M. Collins, R. A. York, and S. L. Stephens. 2020. Potential wildfire and carbon stability in frequent-fire forests in the Sierra Nevada: trade-offs from a long-term study. Ecosphere e03198.

Franklin, J. F., and K. N. Johnson. 2012. A restoration framework for federal forests in the Pacific Northwest. Journal of Forestry 110:429–439.

Franklin, J. F., T. A. Spies, R. V. Pelt, A. B. Carey, D. A. Thornburgh, D. R. Berg, D. B. Lindenmayer, M. E. Harmon, W. S. Keeton, D. C. Shaw, K. Bible, and J. Chen. 2002. Disturbances and structural development of natural forest ecosystems with silvicultural implications, using Douglas-fir forests as an example. Forest Ecology and Management 155:399–423.

Freeman, J., L. Kobziar, E. W. Rose, and W. Cropper. 2017. A critique of the historical-fire-regime concept in conservation. Conservation Biology 31:976–985.

Fulé, P. Z., J. E. Crouse, J. P. Roccaforte, and E. L. Kalies. 2012. Do thinning and/or burning treatments in western USA ponderosa or Jeffrey pine-dominated forests help restore natural fire behavior? Forest Ecology and Management 269:68–81.

Fulé, P. Z., and D. C. Laughlin. 2007. Wildland fire effects on forest structure over an altitudinal gradient, Grand Canyon National Park, USA. Journal of Applied Ecology 44:136–146.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Fulé, P. Z., T. W. Swetnam, P. M. Brown, D. A. Falk, D. L. Peterson, C. D. Allen, G. H. Aplet, M. A. Battaglia, D. Binkley, C. Farris, R. E. Keane, E. Q. Margolis, H. Grissino-Mayer, C. Miller, C. H. Sieg, C. Skinner, S. L. Stephens, and A. Taylor. 2014. Unsupported inferences of high-severity fire in historical dry forests of the western United States: response to Williams and Baker. Global Ecology and Biogeography 23:825–830.

Fulé, P. Z., A. E. Waltz, W. W. Covington, and T. A. Heinlein. 2001. Measuring forest restoration effectiveness in reducing hazardous fuels. Journal of Forestry 11:24-29.

Goodwin, M. J., M. P. North, H. S. J. Zald, and M. D. Hurteau. 2018. The 15-year post-treatment response of a mixed-conifer understory plant community to thinning and burning treatments. Forest Ecology and Management 429:617–624.

Goodwin, M. J., M. P. North, H. S. J. Zald, and M. D. Hurteau. 2020. Changing climate reallocates the carbon debt of frequent-fire forests. Global Change Biology 26:6180-6189.

Graham, R. T. 2003. Hayman Fire Case Study. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-114. USDA Forest Service, Ogden, Utah, USA.

Hagmann, R. K., J. F. Franklin, and K. N. Johnson. 2014. Historical conditions in mixed-conifer forests on the eastern slopes of the northern Oregon Cascade Range, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 330:158–170.

Hagmann, R. K., P. F. Hessburg, S. J. Prichard, N. A. Povak, P. M. Brown, P. Z. Fulé, R. E. Keane, E. E. Knapp, J. M. Lydersen, K. L. Metlen, M. J. Reilly, A. J. Sánchez-Meador, S. L. Stephens, J. T. Stevens, A. H. Taylor, L. L. Yocom, M. A. Battaglia, D. J. Churchill, L. D. Daniels, D. A. Falk, P. Henson, J. D. Johnston, M. A. Krawchuck, C. R. Levine, G. W. Meigs, A. G. Merschel, M. P. North, H. D. Safford, T. W. Swetnam, and A. E. M. Waltz. 2021. Evidence for Widespread changes in western North American forest structure, composition, and wildfire regimes. Ecological Applications.

Hallema, D. W., G. Sun, P. V. Caldwell, S. P. Norman, E. C. Cohen, Y. Liu, K. D. Bladon, and S. G. McNulty. 2018. Burned forests impact water supplies. Nature Communications 9:1307.

Hanan, E. J., Ren, J., Tague, C. L., Kolden, C. A., Abatzoglou, J. T., Bart, R. R., Kennedy, M. C., Liu, M. and Adam, J., 2020. How climate change and fire exclusion drive wildfire regimes at actionable scales. Environmental Research Letters 16:024051.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Hanberry, B. B., R. F. Noss, H. D. Safford, S. K. Allison, and D. C. Dey. 2015. Restoration is preparation for the future. Journal of Forestry 113:425–429.

Hanson, C. T., D. C. Odion, D. A. DellaSala, and W. L. Baker. 2009. Overestimation of fire risk in the northern spotted owl recovery plan. Conservation Biology 23:1314–1319.

Hanson, C. T., and D. C. Odion. 2014. Is fire severity increasing in the Sierra Nevada, California, USA? International Journal of Wildland Fire 23:1–8.

Harrod, R. J., D. W. Peterson, N. A. Povak, and E. K. Dodson. 2009. Thinning and prescribed fire effects on overstory tree and snag structure in dry coniferous forests of the interior Pacific Northwest. Forest Ecology and Management 258:712–721.

Hartsough, B. R., S. Abrams, R. J. Barbour, E. S. Drews, J. D. McIver, J. J. Moghaddas, D. W. Schwilk, and S. L. Stephens. 2008. The economics of alternative fuel reduction treatments in western United States dry forests: Financial and policy implications from the National Fire and Fire Surrogate Study. Forest Policy and Economics 10:344–354.

Haugo, R. D., B. S. Kellogg, C. A. Cansler, C. A. Kolden, K. B. Kemp, J. C. Robertson, K. L. Metlen, N. M. Vaillant, and C. M. Restaino. 2019. The missing fire: quantifying human exclusion of wildfire in Pacific Northwest forests, USA. Ecosphere 10:e02702.

Hessburg, P. F., J. K. Agee, and J. F. Franklin. 2005. Dry forests and wildland fires of the inland Northwest USA: Contrasting the landscape ecology of the pre-settlement and modern eras. Forest Ecology and Management 211:117–139.

Hessburg, P. F., S. Charnley, K. L. Wendel, E. M. White, P. H. Singleton, D. W. Peterson, J. E. Halofsky, A. N. Gray, T. A. Spies, R. L. Flitcroft, and R. White. 2020. The 1994 eastside screens large-tree harvest limit: review of science relevant to forest planning 25 years later. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-990. US Forest Service, Portland, Oregon, USA.

Hessburg, P. F ., D. J. Churchill, A. J. Larson, R. D. Haugo, C. Miller, T. A. Spies, M. P. North, N. A. Povak, R. T. Belote, P. H. Singleton, W. L. Gaines, R. E. Keane, G. H. Aplet, S. Stephens, P. Morgan, P. A. Bisson, B. E. Rieman, R. B. Salter, and G. H. Reeves. 2015. Restoring fire-prone Inland Pacific landscapes: seven core principles. Landscape Ecology 30:1805–1835.

Hessburg, P. F., C. L. Miller, N. A. Povak, A. H. Taylor, P. E. Higuera, S. J. Prichard, M. P. North, B. M. Collins, M. D. Hurteau, A. J. Larson, C. D. Allen, S. L. Stephens, H. R. Huerta, C. S. Rumann,

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

L. D. Daniels, Z. Gedalof, R. W. Gray, V. R. Kane, D. J. Churchill, R. K. Hagmann, T. A. Spies, S. A. Parks, C. A. Cansler, R. T. Belote, T. Veblen, M. A. Battaglia, C. Hoffman, C. N. Skinner, and H. D. Safford. 2019. Climate, environment, and disturbance history govern resilience of western North American forests. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution 7:239.

Hessburg, P. F., S. J. Prichard, R. K. Hagmann, N. A. Povak, and F. K. Lake. 2021. Wildfire and climate change adaptation of western North American forests: A case for intentional management. Ecological Applications.

Hessburg, P. F., T. A. Spies, D. A. Perry, C. N. Skinner, A. H. Taylor, P. M. Brown, S. L. Stephens, A. J. Larson, D. J. Churchill, N. A. Povak, P. H. Singleton, B. McComb, W. J. Zielinski, B. M. Collins, R. B. Salter, J. J. Keane, J. F. Franklin, and G. Riegel. 2016. Tamm Review: Management of mixed-severity fire regime forests in Oregon, Washington, and Northern California. Forest Ecology and Management 366:221–250.

Hoffman, K. R., S. B. Wickham, W. S. McInnes, and B. M. Starzomski. 2019. Fire exclusion destroys habitats for at-risk species in a British Columbia protected area. Fire 2:48.

Holden, Z. A., P. Morgan, and A.T. Hudak. 2010. Burn severity of areas reburned by wildfires in the Gila National Forest, New Mexico, USA. Fire Ecology. 6:77-85.

Holden, Z. A., P. Morgan, M. G. Rollins, and K. Kavanagh. 2007. Effects of multiple wildland fires on ponderosa pine stand structure in two southwestern wilderness areas, USA. Fire Ecology 3:18–33.

Holl, K. D. 2020. Primer of Ecological Restoration. Island Press.

Holl, K. D., and P. H. S. Brancalion. 2020. Tree planting is not a simple solution. Science 368:580–581.

Holsinger, L., S. A. Parks, and C. Miller. 2016. Weather, fuels, and topography impede wildland fire spread in western US landscapes. Forest Ecology and Management 380:59-69.

Hood, S., A. Sala, E. K. Heyerdahl, and M. Boutin. 2015. Low-severity fire increases tree defense against bark beetle attacks. Ecology 96:1846-1855.

Hudiburg, T., B. Law, D.P. Turner, J. Campbell, D. Donato, and M. Duane. 2009. Carbon dynamics of Oregon and Northern California forests and potential land-based carbon storage. Ecological Applications 19:163–180.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Huffman, M. 2013. The many elements of traditional fire knowledge: synthesis, classification, and aids to cross-cultural problem solving in fire-dependent systems around the world. Ecology and Society 18.

Huffman, D. W., J. E. Crouse, A. J. Sánchez Meador, J. D. Springer, and M. T. Stoddard. 2018. Restoration benefits of re-entry with resource objective wildfire on a ponderosa pine landscape in northern Arizona, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 408:16–24.

Huffman, D. W., J. P. Roccaforte, J. D. Springer, and J. E. Crouse. 2020. Restoration applications of resource objective wildfires in western US forests: a status of knowledge review. Fire Ecology 16:18.

Huffman, D. W., A. J. Sánchez Meador, M. T. Stoddard, J.E. Crouse, and J.P. Roccaforte. 2017. Efficacy of resource objective wildfires for restoration of ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*) forests in northern Arizona. Forest Ecology and Management 389:395–403.

Hunter, M. E., J. M. Iniguez, and C. A. Farris. 2014. Historical and current fire management practices in two wilderness areas in the southwestern United States: the Saguaro Wilderness Area and the Gila-Aldo Leopold Wilderness Complex. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-325. USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Hurteau, M. D., B. A. Hungate, and G. W. Koch. 2009. Accounting for risk in valuing forest carbon offsets. Carbon Balance and Management 4:1.

Hurteau, M. D., G. W. Koch, and B. A. Hungate. 2008. Carbon protection and fire risk reduction: toward a full accounting of forest carbon offsets. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 6:493–498.

Hurteau, M. D., S. Liang, A. L. Westerling, and C. Wiedinmyer. 2019. Vegetation-fire feedback reduces projected area burned under climate change. Scientific Reports 9:2838.

Hurteau, M., and M. North. 2009. Fuel treatment effects on tree-based forest carbon storage and emissions under modeled wildfire scenarios. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 7:409-414.

Jain, T. B., J. S. Fried, and S. M. Loreno. 2020. Simulating the effectiveness of improvement cuts and commercial thinning to enhance fire resistance in west coast dry mixed conifer forests. Forest Science 66:157-177.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Jeronimo, S. M. A., V. R. Kane, D. J. Churchill, J. A. Lutz, M. P. North, G. P. Asner, and J. F. Franklin. 2019. Forest structure and pattern vary by climate and landform across active-fire landscapes in the montane Sierra Nevada. Forest Ecology and Management 437:70–86.

Johnson, M. C., M. C. Kennedy, S. C. Harrison, D. Churchill, J. Pass, and P. W. Fischer. 2020. Effects of post-fire management on dead woody fuel dynamics and stand structure in a severely burned mixed-conifer forest, in northeastern Washington State, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 470:118190.

Johnson, M. C., M. C. Kennedy, and D. L. Peterson. 2011. Simulating fuel treatment effects in dry forests of the western United States: testing the principles of a fire-safe forest. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 41:1018–1030.

Johnston, J. D., J. D. Bailey, and C. J. Dunn. 2016. Influence of fire disturbance and biophysical heterogeneity on pre-settlement ponderosa pine and mixed conifer forests. Ecosphere 7:e01581.

Johnstone, J. F., C. D. Allen, J. F. Franklin, L. E. Frelich, B. J. Harvey, P. E. Higuera, M. C. Mack, R. K. Meentemeyer, M. R. Metz, G. L. Perry, T. Schoennagel, and M. G. Turner. 2016. Changing disturbance regimes, ecological memory, and forest resilience. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 14:369–378.

Jones, G. M., J. J. Keane, R. J. Gutiérrez, and M. Z. Peery. 2018. Declining old-forest species as a legacy of large trees lost. Diversity and Distributions 24:341–351.

Kalies, E. L., and L. Yocom Kent. 2016. Tamm Review: Are fuel treatments effective at achieving ecological and social objectives? A systematic review. Forest Ecology and Management 375:84–95.

Kane, V. R., B. N. Bartl-Geller, M. P. North, J. T. Kane, J. M. Lydersen, S. M. Jeronimo, B. M. Collins, and L. M. Moskal. 2019. First-entry wildfires can create opening and tree clump patterns characteristic of resilient forests. Forest Ecology and Management 454:117659.

Kane, V. R., C. A. Cansler, N. A. Povak, J. T. Kane, R. J. McGaughey, J. A. Lutz, D. J. Churchill, and M. P. North. 2015. Mixed severity fire effects within the Rim fire: relative importance of local climate, fire weather, topography, and forest structure. Forest Ecology and Management 358:62-79.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Kane, V. R., M. P. North, J. A. Lutz, D. J. Churchill, S. L. Roberts, D. F. Smith, R. J. McGaughey, J. T. Kane, and M. L. Brooks. 2014. Assessing fire effects on forest spatial structure using a fusion of Landsat and airborne LiDAR data in Yosemite National Park. Remote Sensing of Environment 151:89–101.

Kane, J. M., J. M. Varner, and E. E. Knapp. 2009. Novel fuelbed characteristics associated with mechanical mastication treatments in northern California and south-western Oregon, USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 18:686-697.

Keane, R. E., S. Arno, and L. J. Dickinson. 2006. Wilderness management: the complexity of managing fire-dependent ecosystems in wilderness: relict ponderosa pine in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Ecological Restoration 24:71-78.

Keane, R. E., P. F. Hessburg, P. B. Landres, and F. J. Swanson. 2009. The use of historical range and variability (HRV) in landscape management. Forest Ecology and Management 258:1025-1037.

Keane, R. E., D. McKenzie, D. A. Falk, E. A. H. Smithwick, C. Miller, and L.-K. B. Kellogg. 2015. Representing climate, disturbance, and vegetation interactions in landscape models. Ecological Modelling 309–310:33–47.

Keane, R. E., and R. A. Parsons. 2010. Management guide to ecosystem restoration treatments: Whitebark pine forests of the northern Rocky Mountains, U.S.A. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-232. USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Keeley, J. E., and A. D. Syphard. 2018. Historical patterns of wildfire ignition sources in California ecosystems. International Journal of Wildland Fire 27:781-799.

Kemp, K. B., P. E. Higuera, P. Morgan, and J. T. Abatzoglou. 2019. Climate will increasingly determine post-fire tree regeneration success in low-elevation forests, Northern Rockies, USA. Ecosphere 10.

Kennedy, M. C., and M. C. Johnson. 2014. Fuel treatment prescriptions alter spatial patterns of fire severity around the wildland--urban interface during the Wallow Fire, Arizona, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 318:122–132.

Kennedy, M. C., M. C. Johnson, K. Fallon, and D. Mayer. 2019. How big is enough? Vegetation structure impacts effective fuel treatment width and forest resiliency. Ecosphere 10:e02573.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Kimmerer, R. W., and Lake, F. K. 2001. The role of indigenous burning in land management. Journal of Forestry 11:36-41.

Knapp, E. E., J. M. Lydersen, M. P. North, and B. M. Collins. 2017. Efficacy of variable density thinning and prescribed fire for restoring forest heterogeneity to mixed-conifer forest in the central Sierra Nevada, CA. Forest Ecology and Management 406:228–241.

Knapp, E. E., C. N. Skinner, M. P. North, and B. L. Estes. 2013. Long-term overstory and understory change following logging and fire exclusion in a Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forest. Forest Ecology and Management 310:903–914.

Kobziar, L. N., J. R. McBride, and S. L. Stephens. 2009. The efficacy of fire and fuels reduction treatments in a Sierra Nevada pine plantation. International Journal of Wildland Fire 18:791-801.

Kolden, C. A. 2019. We're not doing enough prescribed fire in the western United States to mitigate wildfire risk. Fire 2:30.

Kolden, C. A., and T. J. Brown. 2010. Beyond wildfire: perspectives of climate, managed fire and policy in the USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 19:364–373.

Kolden, C. A., and C. Henson. 2019. A socio-ecological approach to mitigating wildfire vulnerability in the wildland urban interface: a case study from the 2017 Thomas Fire. Fire 2:9.

Koontz, M. J., M. P. North, C. M. Werner, S. E. Fick, and A. M. Latimer. 2020. Local forest structure variability increases resilience to wildfire in dry western U.S. coniferous forests. Ecology Letters 23:483–494.

Korb, J. E., P. J. Fornwalt, and C. S. Stevens-Rumann. 2019. What drives ponderosa pine regeneration following wildfire in the western United States? Forest Ecology and Management 454:117663.

Korb, J. E., M. T. Stoddard, and D. W. Huffman. 2020. Effectiveness of restoration treatments for reducing fuels and increasing understory diversity in shrubby mixed-conifer forests of the southern Rocky Mountains, USA. Forests 11:508.

Krawchuk, M. A., G. W. Meigs, J. M. Cartwright, J. D. Coop, R. Davis, A. Holz, C. Kolden, and A. J. Meddens. 2020. Disturbance refugia within mosaics of forest fire, drought, and insect outbreaks. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 18:235–244.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Kreye, J. K., N. W. Brewer, P. Morgan, J. M. Varner, A. M. S. Smith, C. M. Hoffman, and R. D. Ottmar. 2014. Fire behavior in masticated fuels: a review. Forest Ecology and Management 314:193–207.

Krofcheck, D. J., M. D. Hurteau, R. M. Scheller, and E. L. Loudermilk. 2017. Restoring surface fire stabilizes forest carbon under extreme fire weather in the Sierra Nevada. Ecosphere 8:e01663.

Krofcheck, D. J., C. C. Remy, A. R. Keyser, and M. D. Hurteau. 2019. Optimizing forest management stabilizes carbon under projected climate and wildfires. Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences 124:3075–3087.

Lake, F. K., and A. C. Christianson. 2019. Indigenous fire stewardship. In: Manzello, S.L. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Wildfires and Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) Fires. Springer Nature.

Lake, F. K., J. Parrotta, C. P. Giardina, I. Davidson-Hunt, and Y. Uprety. 2018. Chapter 12: Integration of traditional and western knowledge in forest landscape restoration. In: Mansourian, S., Parrotta, J. (eds.) Forest Landscape Restoration: integrated approaches to support effective implementation. Routledge.

Lake, F. K., V. Wright, P. Morgan, M. McFadzen, D. McWethy, and C. S. Stevens-Rumann. 2017. Returning fire to the land: celebrating traditional knowledge and fire. Journal of Forestry 115:343-353.

Landis, T. D., L. E. Riley, D. L. Haase, and J. R. Pinto. 2011. The target plant concept-a history and brief overview. National Proceedings: Forest and Conservation Nursery Associations-2010 Proceedings. RMRS-P-65. USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Larson, A. J., R. T. Belote, C. A. Cansler, S. A. Parks, and M. S. Dietz. 2013a. Latent resilience in ponderosa pine forest: effects of resumed frequent fire. Ecological Applications 23:1243–1249.

Larson, A. J., R. T. Belote, M. A. Williamson, and G. H. Aplet. 2013b. Making monitoring count: project design for active adaptive management. Journal of Forestry 5:348-356.

Larson, A. J., and D. Churchill. 2012. Tree spatial patterns in fire-frequent forests of western North America, including mechanisms of pattern formation and implications for designing fuel reduction and restoration treatments. Forest Ecology and Management 267:74–92.

LeFevre, M. E., D. J. Churchill, A. J. Larson, S. M. A. Jeronimo, J. Bass, J. F. Franklin, and V. R. Kane. 2020. Evaluating restoration treatment effectiveness through a comparison of residual

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

composition, structure, and spatial pattern with historical reference sites. Forest Science 66:578-588.

Lehmkuhl, J. F., M. Kennedy, E. D. Ford, P. H. Singleton, W. L. Gaines, and R. L. Lind. 2007. Seeing the forest for the fuel: integrating ecological values and fuels management. Forest Ecology and Management 246:73–80.

Lehmkuhl, J., W. Gaines, D. Peterson, J. Bailey, and A. Youngblood. 2015. Silviculture and monitoring guidelines for integrating restoration of dry mixed-conifer forest and spotted owl habitat management in the eastern Cascade Range. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-915. USDA Forest Service, Portland, Oregon.

Liang, S., M. D. Hurteau, and A. L. Westerling. 2017. Potential decline in carbon carrying capacity under projected climate-wildfire interactions in the Sierra Nevada. Scientific Reports 7:2420.

Liang, S., M. D. Hurteau, and A. L. Westerling. 2018. Large-scale restoration increases carbon stability under projected climate and wildfire regimes. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 16:207–212.

Lilley, P. L., and M. Vellend. 2009. Negative native-exotic diversity relationship in oak savannas explained by human influence and climate. Oikos 118:1373–1382.

Littell, J. S., D. McKenzie, H. Y. Wan, and S. A. Cushman. 2018. Climate change and future wildfire in the western United States: an ecological approach to nonstationarity. Earth's Future 6:1097–1111.

Long, J. W., and F. K. Lake. 2018. Escaping social-ecological traps through tribal stewardship on national forest lands in the Pacific Northwest, United States of America. Ecology and Society 23:10.

Lutz, J. A., S. Struckman, T. J. Furniss, C. A. Cansler, S. J. Germain, L. L. Yokum, D. J. McAvoy, C. A. Kolden, A. M. S. Smith, M. E. Swanson, and A. J. Larson. 2020. The importance of large-diameter trees to fuel evolution following reintroduced fire in a mixed-conifer forest in Yosemite National Park, California, USA. Ecological Processes 9:41.

Lydersen, J. M., B. M. Collins, M. L. Brooks, J. R. Matchett, K. L. Shive, N. A. Povak, V. R. Kane, and D. F. Smith. 2017. Evidence of fuels management and fire weather influencing fire severity in an extreme fire event. Ecological Applications 27: 2013-2030.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Lydersen, J. M., B. M. Collins, M. Coppoletta, M. R. Jaffe, H. Northrop, and S. L. Stephens. 2019a. Fuel dynamics and reburn severity following high-severity fire in a Sierra Nevada, USA, mixed-conifer forest. Fire Ecology 15:43.

Lydersen, J. M., B. M. Collins, and C. T. Hunsaker. 2019b. Implementation constraints limit benefits of restoration treatments in mixed-conifer forests. International Journal of Wildland Fire 28:495-511.

Lydersen, J. M., B. M. Collins, J. D. Miller, D. L. Fry, and S. L. Stephens. 2016. Relating fire-caused change in forest structure to remotely sensed estimates of fire severity. Fire Ecology 12:99–116.

Lydersen, J., M. North, and B. M. Collins. 2014. Severity of an uncharacteristically large wildfire, the Rim Fire, in forests with relatively restored frequent fire regimes. Forest Ecology and Management 328:326–334.

Lyons, J. E., M. C. Runge, H. P. Laskowski, and W. L. Kendall. 2008. Monitoring in the context of structured decision-making and adaptive management. Journal of Wildlife Management 72:1683-1692.

Mallek, C., H. Safford, J. Viers, and J. Miller. 2013. Modern departures in fire severity and area vary by forest type, Sierra Nevada and southern Cascades, California, USA. Ecosphere 4:1–28.

Marks-Block, T., F. K. Lake, and L. M. Curran. 2019. Effects of understory fire management treatments on California hazelnut, an ecocultural resource of the Karuk and Yurok Indians in the Pacific Northwest. Forest Ecology and Management 450:117517.

Margolis, E. Q., and Malevich, S. B. 2016. Historical dominance of low-severity fire in dry and wet mixed-conifer forest habitats of the endangered terrestrial Jemez Mountains salamander (*Plethodon neomexicanus*). Forest Ecology and Management 375:12-26.

Marlon, J. R., P. J. Bartlein, D. G. Gavin, C. J. Long, R. S. Anderson, C. E. Briles, K. J. Brown, D. Colombaroli, D. J. Hallett, M. J. Power, E. A. Scharf, and M. K. Walsh. 2012. Long-term perspective on wildfires in the western USA. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 109:535–543.

Martinson, E. J., and P. N. Omi. 2013. Fuel treatments and fire severity: a meta-analysis. Res. Pap. RMRS-RP-103www. USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Martinson, E., P. N. Omi, and W. Shepperd. 2003. Part 3: Effects of fuel treatments on fire severity. In Graham, RT (Ed.), Hayman Fire Case Study. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-114. USDA Forest Service, Ogden, Utah, USA.

McCarley, T. R., Kolden, C. A., Vaillant, N. M., Hudak, A. T., Smith, A. M. and Kreitler, J., 2017. Landscape-scale quantification of fire-induced change in canopy cover following mountain pine beetle outbreak and timber harvest. Forest Ecology and Management, 391:164-175.

McKenzie, D., and J. S. Littell. 2017. Climate change and the eco-hydrology of fire: Will area burned increase in a warming western USA? Ecological Applications 27:26–36.

McWethy, D. B., T. Schoennagel, P. E. Higuera, M. Krawchuk, B. J. Harvey, E. C. Metcalf, C. Schultz, C. Miller, A. L. Metcalf, B. Buma, A. Virapongse, J. C. Kulig, R. C. Stedman, Z. Ratajczak, C. R. Nelson, and C. Kolden. 2019. Rethinking resilience to wildfire. Nature Sustainability 2:797–804.

Meddens, A. J. H., C. A. Kolden, J. A. Lutz, A. M. S. Smith, C. A. Cansler, J. T. Abatzoglou, G. W. Meigs, W. M. Downing, and M. A. Krawchuk. 2018. Fire refugia: what are they, and why do they matter for global change? BioScience 68:944-954.

Mell, W. E., S. L. Manzello, A. Maranghides, D. Butry, and R. G. Rehm. 2010. The wildland - urban interface fire problem - current approaches and research needs. International Journal of Wildland Fire 19:238-251.

Merschel, A. G., E. K. Heyerdahl, T. A. Spies, and R. A. Loehman. 2018. Influence of landscape structure, topography, and forest type on spatial variation in historical fire regimes, Central Oregon, USA. Landscape Ecology 33:1195–1209.

Merschel, A. G., T. A. Spies, and E. K. Heyerdahl. 2014. Mixed-conifer forests of central Oregon: effects of logging and fire exclusion vary with environment. Ecological Applications 24:1670–1688.

Meyer, M. D. 2015. Forest fire severity patterns of resource objective wildfires in the southern Sierra Nevada. Journal of Forestry 113:49–56.

Miller, J. D., and B. Quayle. 2015. Calibration and validation of immediate post-fire satellite-derived data to three severity metrics. Fire Ecology 11:12–30.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Miller, J. D., and H. Safford. 2012. Trends in wildfire severity: 1984 to 2010 in the Sierra Nevada, Modoc Plateau, and Southern Cascades, California, USA. Fire Ecology 8:41–57.

Miller, J. D., H. D. Safford, M. Crimmins, and A. E. Thode. 2009. Quantitative evidence for increasing forest fire severity in the Sierra Nevada and southern Cascade Mountains, California and Nevada, USA. Ecosystems 12:16–32.

Miller, R. K., C. B. Field, and K. J. Mach. 2020. Barriers and enablers for prescribed burns for wildfire management in California. Nature Sustainability 3:101–109.

Moghaddas, J. J., and L. Craggs. 2007. A fuel treatment reduces fire severity and increases suppression efficiency in a mixed conifer forest. International Journal of Wildland Fire 16:673.

Moreira, F., D. Ascoli, H. Safford, M. Adams, J. M. Moreno, J. C. Pereira, F. Catry, J. Armesto, W. J. Bond, M. Gonzalez, T. Curt, N. Koutsias, L. McCaw, O. Price, J. Pausas, E. Rigolot, S. Stephens, C. Tavsanoglu, R. Vallejo, B. V. Wilgen, G. Xanthopoulos, and P. Fernandes. 2020. Wildfire management in Mediterranean-type regions: paradigm change needed. Environmental Research Letters 15:1.

Morgan, P., E. K. Heyerdahl, and C. E. Gibson. 2008. Multi-season climate synchronized forest fires throughout the 20th century, northern Rockies, USA. Ecology 89:717-728.

Morgan, P., A. T. Hudak, A. Wells, S. A. Parks, L. S. Baggett, B. C. Bright, and P. Green. 2017. Multidecadal trends in area burned with high severity in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area 1880–2012. International Journal of Wildland Fire 26:930-943.

Moritz, M. A., E. Batlloria, R. A. Bradstock, J. Stringer, R. Sitzlar, P. F. Hessburg, J. Leonard, S. McCaffrey, D. C. Odion, T. Schoennagel, and A. D. Syphard. 2014. Learning to coexist with wildfire. Nature 515:58-66.

Mueller, S. E., A. E. Thode, E. Q. Margolis, L. L. Yocom, J. D. Young, and J. M. Iniguez. 2020. Climate relationships with increasing wildfire in the southwestern US from 1984 to 2015. Forest Ecology and Management 460:117861.

Naficy, C. E., E. G. Keeling, P. Landres, P. F. Hessburg, T. T. Veblen, and A. Sala. 2016. Wilderness in the 21st century: a framework for testing assumptions about ecological intervention in wilderness using a case study of fire ecology in the Rocky Mountains. Journal of Forestry 114:384–395.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Ng, J., M. P. North, A. J. Arditti, M. R. Cooper, and J. A. Lutz. 2020. Topographic variation in tree group and gap structure in Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forests with active fire regimes. Forest Ecology and Management 472:118220.

Nigro, K., and N. Molinari. 2019. Status and trends of fire activity in southern California yellow pine and mixed conifer forests. Forest Ecology and Management 441:20–31.

North, M., A. Brough, J. Long, B. Collins, P. Bowden, D. Yasuda, J. Miller, and N. Sugihara. 2015a. Constraints on mechanized treatment significantly limit mechanical fuels reduction extent in the Sierra Nevada. Journal of Forestry 113:40–48.

North, M., B. M. Collins, and S. Stephens. 2012. Using fire to increase the scale, benefits, and future maintenance of fuels treatments. Journal of Forestry 110:392–401.

North, M. P., J. T. Kane, V. R. Kane, G. P. Asner, W. Berigan, D. J. Churchill, S. Conway, R. J. Gutiérrez, S. Jeronimo, J. Keane, A. Koltunov, T. Mark, M. Moskal, T. Munton, Z. Peery, C. Ramirez, R. Sollmann, A. White, and S. Whitmore. 2017. Cover of tall trees best predicts California spotted owl habitat. Forest Ecology and Management 405:166–178.

North, M. P., S. L. Stephens, B. M. Collins, J. K. Agee, G. Aplet, J. F. Franklin, and P. Z. Fulé. 2015b. Reform forest fire management. Science 349:1280–1281.

North, M. P., J. T. Stevens, D. F. Greene, M. Coppoletta, E. E. Knapp, A. M. Latimer, C. M. Restaino, R. E. Tompkins, K. R. Welch, R. A. York, D. J. N. Young, J. N. Axelson, T. N. Buckley, B. L. Estes, R. N. Hager, J. W. Long, M. D. Meyer, S. M. Ostoja, H. D. Safford, K. L. Shive, C. L. Tubbesing, H. Vice, D. Walsh, C. M. Werner, and P. Wyrsch. 2019. Tamm Review: Reforestation for resilience in dry western U.S. forests. Forest Ecology and Management 432:209–224.

North, M., P. Stine, K. O'Hara, W. Zielinski, and S. Stephens. 2009. An ecosystem management strategy for Sierran mixed-conifer forests. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-220, USDA Forest Service, Albany, California, USA.

Odion, D. C., and C. T. Hanson. 2006. Fire severity in conifer forests of the Sierra Nevada, California. Ecosystems 9:1177–1189.

Odion, D. C., C. T. Hanson, A. Arsenault, W. L. Baker, D. A. DellaSala, R. L. Hutto, W. Klenner, M. A. Moritz, R. L. Sherriff, T. T. Veblen, and M. A. Williams. 2014. Examining historical and

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

current mixed-severity fire regimes in ponderosa pine and mixed-conifer forests of western North America. PLOS ONE 9:e87852.

Parisien, M.-A., Q. E. Barber, K. G. Hirsch, C. A. Stockdale, S. Erni, X. Wang, D. Arseneault, and S. A. Parks. 2020. Fire deficit increases wildfire risk for many communities in the Canadian boreal forest. Nature Communications 11:2121.

Parisien, M.-A., and M. A. Moritz. 2009. Environmental controls on the distribution of wildfire at multiple spatial scales. Ecological Monographs 79:127–154.

Parisien, M.-A., S. Snetsinger, J. A. Greenberg, C. R. Nelson, T. Schoennagel, S. Z. Dobrowski, and M. A. Moritz. 2012. Spatial variability in wildfire probability across the western United States. International Journal of Wildland Fire 21:313-327.

Park, J., G. Walker, W. Hunt, D. Bourdin, and J. Weir. 2019. Banff, Kootenay and Yoho National Parks Fire Management Plan. Parks Canada, Alberta, Canada.

Parks, S. A. 2014. Mapping day-of-burning with coarse-resolution satellite fire-detection data. International Journal of Wildland Fire 23:215-223.

Parks, S. A., and J.T. Abatzoglou. 2020. Warmer and drier fire seasons contribute to increases in area burned at high severity in western US forests from 1985-2017. Geophysical Research Letters: e2020GL089858.

Parks, S. A., S. Z. Dobrowski, J. D. Shaw, and C. Miller. 2019. Living on the edge: trailing edge forests at risk of fire-facilitated conversion to nonforest. Ecosphere 10:e02651.

Parks, S. A., L. M. Holsinger, C. Miller, and C. R. Nelson. 2015a. Wildland fire as a self-regulating mechanism: the role of previous burns and weather in limiting fire progression. Ecological Applications 25:1478–1492.

Parks, S. A., C. Miller, L. M. Holsinger, L. S. Baggett, and B. J. Bird. 2016. Wildland fire limits subsequent fire occurrence. International Journal of Wildland Fire 25:182–190.

Parks, S. A., C. Miller, C. R. Nelson, and Z. A. Holden. 2014. Previous fires moderate burn severity of subsequent wildland fires in two large western US wilderness areas. Ecosystems 17:29–42. Wildland fire deficit and surplus in the western United States, 1984-2012. Ecosphere 6:275.

Parks, S. A., C. Miller, M.-A. Parisien, L. M. Holsinger, S. Z. Dobrowski, and J. Abatzoglou. 2015b. Wildland fire deficit and surplus in the western United States, 1984-2012. Ecosphere. 6: 275.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Parks, S., S. Dobrowski, and M. Panunto. 2018. What drives low-severity fire in the southwestern USA? Forests 9:165.

Parsons, R. A., F. Pimont, L. Wells, G. Cohn, W. M. Jolly, F. de Coligny, E. Rigolot, J.-L. Dupuy, W. Mell, and R. R. Linn. 2018. Modeling thinning effects on fire behavior with STANDFIRE. Annals of Forest Science 75:7.

Perry, D. A., P. F. Hessburg, C. N. Skinner, T. A. Spies, S. L. Stephens, A. H. Taylor, J. F. Franklin, B. McComb, and G. Riegel. 2011. The ecology of mixed severity fire regimes in Washington, Oregon, and Northern California. Forest Ecology and Management 262:703–717.

Peterson, D. W., Hessburg, P. F., Salter, R. B., James, K. M., Dahlgreen, M. C. and Barnes, J. A. 2007. Reintroducing fire in regenerated dry forests following stand-replacing wildfire. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-203, USDA Forest Service, Albany, California, USA.

Peterson, D. W., E. K. Dodson, and R. J. Harrod. 2015. Post-fire logging reduces surface woody fuels up to four decades following wildfire. Forest Ecology and Management 338:84–91.

Pimont, F., J.-L. Dupuy, R. R. Linn, and S. Dupont. 2009. Validation of FIRETEC wind-flows over a canopy and a fuel-break. International Journal of Wildland Fire 18:775-790.

Pollet, J., and P. N. Omi. 2002. Effect of thinning and prescribed burning on crown fire severity in ponderosa pine forests. International Journal of Wildland Fire 11:1–10.

Povak, N. A., P. F. Hessburg, and R. B. Salter. 2018. Evidence for scale-dependent topographic controls on wildfire spread. Ecosphere 9:e02443.

Povak, N. A., V. R. Kane, B. M. Collins, J. M. Lydersen, and J. T. Kane. 2020. Multi-scaled drivers of severity patterns vary across land ownerships for the 2013 Rim Fire, California. Landscape Ecology 35:293–318.

Power, M. J., Codding, B. F., Taylor, A. H., Swetnam, T. W., Magargal, K. E., Bird, D. W. and O'Connell, J. F. 2018. Human fire legacies on ecological landscapes. Frontiers in Earth Science 6:151.

Prichard, S. J., and M. C. Kennedy. 2012. Fuel treatment effects on tree mortality following wildfire in dry mixed conifer forests, Washington State, USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 21:1004-1013.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Prichard, S. J., and M. C. Kennedy. 2014. Fuel treatments and landform modify landscape patterns of burn severity in an extreme fire event. Ecological Applications. 24:571-590.

Prichard, S. J., D. L. Peterson, and K. Jacobson. 2010. Fuel treatments reduce the severity of wildfire effects in dry mixed conifer forest, Washington, USA. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 40:1615–1626.

Prichard, S. J., N. A. Povak, M. C. Kennedy, and D. W. Peterson. 2020. Fuel treatment effectiveness in the context of landform, vegetation, and large, wind-driven wildfires. Ecological Applications 30:e02104.

Prichard, S. J., C. S. Stevens-Rumann, and P. F. Hessburg. 2017. Tamm Review: Shifting global fire regimes: Lessons from reburns and research needs. Forest Ecology and Management 396:217–233.

Quinn-Davidson, L. N., and J. M. Varner. 2012. Impediments to prescribed fire across agency, landscape and manager: an example from northern California. International Journal of Wildland Fire 21:210–218.

Radeloff, V. C., D. P. Helmers, H. A. Kramer, M. H. Mockrin, P. M. Alexandre, A. Bar-Massada, V. Butsic, T. J. Hawbaker, S. Martinuzzi, A. D. Syphard, and S. I. Stewart. 2018. Rapid growth of the US wildland-urban interface raises wildfire risk. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 115:3314–3319.

Reilly, M. J., C. J. Dunn, G. W. Meigs, T. A. Spies, R. E. Kennedy, J. D. Bailey, and K. Briggs. 2017. Contemporary patterns of fire extent and severity in forests of the Pacific Northwest, USA (1985–2010). Ecosphere 8:e01695.

Reilly, M. J., M. Elia, T. A. Spies, M. J. Gregory, G. Sanesi, and R. Lafortezza. 2018. Cumulative effects of wildfires on forest dynamics in the eastern Cascade Mountains, USA. Ecological Applications 28:291–308.

Reinhardt, E. D., R. E. Keane, D. E. Calkin, and J. D. Cohen. 2008. Objectives and considerations for wildland fuel treatment in forested ecosystems of the interior western United States. Forest Ecology and Management 256:1997–2006.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Reinhardt, E., J. Scott, K. Gray, and R. Keane. 2006. Estimating canopy fuel characteristics in five conifer stands in the western United States using tree and stand measurements. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 36:2803–2814.

Restaino, J. C., and D. L. Peterson. 2013. Wildfire and fuel treatment effects on forest carbon dynamics in the western United States. Forest Ecology and Management 303:46–60.

Reynolds, R. T., A. J. S. Meador, J. A. Youtz, T. Nicolet, M. S. Matonis, P. L. Jackson, D G. DeLorenzo, and A. D. Graves. 2013. Restoring composition and structure in Southwestern frequent-fire forests: A science-based framework for improving ecosystem resiliency. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-310. USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Rhodes, J. J., and W. L. Baker. 2008. Fire probability, fuel treatment effectiveness and ecological tradeoffs in western U.S. public forests. The Open Forest Science Journal 1:1–7.

Ritchie, M. W., E. E. Knapp, and C. N. Skinner. 2013. Snag longevity and surface fuel accumulation following post-fire logging in a ponderosa pine dominated forest. Forest Ecology and Management 287:113-122.

Ritter, S. M., C. M. Hoffman, M. A. Battaglia, C. S. Stevens-Rumann, and W. E. Mell. 2020. Fine-scale fire patterns mediate forest structure in frequent-fire ecosystems. Ecosphere 11:e03177.

Rivera-Huerta, H., H. D. Safford, and J. D. Miller. 2016. Patterns and trends in burned area and fire severity from 1984 to 2010 in the Sierra de San Pedro Mártir, Baja California, Mexico. Fire Ecology 12:52–72.

Rodman, K. C., T. T. Veblen, T. B. Chapman, M. T. Rother, A. P. Wion, and M. D. Redmond. 2020. Limitations to recovery following wildfire in dry forests of southern Colorado and northern New Mexico, USA. Ecological Applications 30:e02001.

Rollins, M. G., P. Morgan, and T. Swetnam. 2002. Landscape-scale controls over 20th century fire occurrence in two large Rocky Mountain (USA) wilderness areas. Landscape Ecology 17:539-557.

Roos, C. L., T. W. Swetnam, T. J. Fergson, M. J. Liebmann, R. A. Loehman, J. R. Welch, E. Q. Margolis, C. H. Guiterman, W. C. Hockaday, M. J. Aiuvalasit, J. Battillo, J. Farella, and C. A. Kiahtipes. 2021. Native American fire management at an ancient wildland–urban interface in the Southwest United States. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118:e2018733118.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Rowe, J. S., and G. W. Scotter. 1973. Fire in the boreal forest. Quaternary Research 3:444-464.

Ryan, K. C., E. E. Knapp, and M. J. Varner. 2013. Prescribed fire in North American forests and woodlands: history, current practice, and challenges. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 11:15-24.

Safford, H. D., G. D. Hayward, N. E. Heller, and J. Wiens. 2012a. Historical ecology, climate change, and resource management: can the past still inform the future? In: Wiens, J.A., G.D. Hayward, H.D. Safford, and Giffen, C.M. (eds.) Historical Environmental Variation in Conservation and Natural Resource Management. John Wiley & Sons.

Safford, H. D., D. A. Schmidt, and C. H. Carlson. 2009. Effects of fuel treatments on fire severity in an area of wildland–urban interface, Angora Fire, Lake Tahoe Basin, California. Forest Ecology and Management 258:773–787.

Safford, H. D., J. T. Stevens, K. Merriam, M. D. Meyer, and A. M. Latimer. 2012b. Fuel treatment effectiveness in California yellow pine and mixed conifer forests. Forest Ecology and Management 274:17–28.

Savage, M., J. N. Mast, and J. J. Feddema. 2013. Double whammy: high-severity fire and drought in ponderosa pine forests of the Southwest. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 43:570–583.

Schmidt, D. A., A. H. Taylor, and C. N. Skinner. 2008. The influence of fuels treatment and landscape arrangement on simulated fire behavior, Southern Cascade Range, California. Forest Ecology and Management 255:3170–3184.

Schoennagel, T., J. K. Balch, H. Brenkert-Smith, P. E. Dennison, B. J. Harvey, M. A. Krawchuk, N. Mietkiewicz, P. Morgan, M. A. Moritz, R. Rasker, and others. 2017. Adapt to more wildfire in western North American forests as climate changes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114:4582–4590.

Schoennagel, T., C. R. Nelson, D. M. Theobald, G. C. Carnwath, and T. B. Chapman. 2009. Implementation of National Fire Plan treatments near the wildland-urban interface in the western United States. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106:10706–10711.

Schoennagel, T., T. T. Veblen, and W. H. Romme. 2004. The interaction of fire, fuels, and climate across rocky mountain forests. Bioscience 54:661–676.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Schultz, C. A., and T. Jedd. 2012. The collaborative forest landscape restoration program: a history and overview of the first projects. Journal of Forestry 110:381-391.

Schultz, C. A., S. M. McCaffrey, and H. R. Huber-Stearns. 2019. Policy barriers and opportunities for prescribed fire application in the western United States. International Journal of Wildland Fire 28:874.

Scholl, A. E., and A. H. Taylor. 2010. Fire regimes, forest change, and self-organization in an old-growth mixed-conifer forest, Yosemite National Park, USA. Ecological Applications 20:362-380.

Shive, K. L., H. K. Preisler, K. R. Welch, H. D. Safford, R. J. Butz, K. L. O'Hara, and S. L. Stephens. 2018. From the stand scale to the landscape scale: predicting the spatial patterns of forest regeneration after disturbance. Ecological Applications 28:1626–1639.

Smith, A. M. S., C. A. Kolden, T. B. Paveglio, M. A. Cochrane, D. M. Bowman, M. A. Moritz, A. D. Kliskey, L. Alessa, A. T. Hudak, C. M. Hoffman, J. A. Lutz, L. P. Queen, S. J. Goetz, P. E. Higuera, L. Boschetti, M. Flannigan, K. M. Yedinak, A. C. Watts, E. K. Strand, J. W. van Wagtendonk, J. W. Anderson, B. J. Stocks, and J. T. Abatzoglou. 2016. The science of firescapes: achieving fire-resilient communities. BioScience 66:130–146.

Sneeuwjagt, R. J., T. S. Kline, and S. L. Stephens. 2013. Opportunities for improved fire use and management in California: lessons from Western Australia. Fire Ecology 9:14–25.

Sowerwine, J., D. Sarna-Wojcicki, M. Mucioki, L. Hillman, F. K. Lake and E. Friedman, 2019. Enhancing Indigenous food sovereignty: A five-year collaborative tribal-university research and extension project in California and Oregon. Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development. 9:167-190.

Spies, T. A., P. A. Stine, R. A. Gravenmier, J. W. Long, and M. J. Reilly. 2018. Volume 1—Synthesis of science to inform land management within the Northwest Forest Plan Area. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-966. USDA Forest Service, Portland, Oregon, USA.

Stan, A. B., P. Z. Fulé, K. B. Ireland and J. S. Sanderlin. 2014. Modern fire regime resembles historical fire regime in a ponderosa pine forest on Native American lands. International Journal of Wildland Fire 23:686-697.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Stenzel, J. E., K. J. Bartowitz, M. D. Hartman, J. A. Lutz, C. A. Kolden, A. M. S. Smith, B. E. Law, M. E. Swanson, A. J. Larson, W. J. Parton, and T. W. Hudiburg. 2019. Fixing a snag in carbon emissions estimates from wildfires. Global Change Biology 25:3985–3994.

Stephens, S. L., M. A. Battaglia, D. J. Churchill, B. M. Collins, M. Coppoletta, C. M. Hoffman, J. M. Lydersen, M. P. North, R. A. Parsons, S. M. Ritter, and J. T. Stevens. 2021. Forest restoration and fuels reduction: convergent or divergent? Bioscience 71:85-101.

Stephens, S. L., B. M. Collins, E. Biber, and P. Z. Fulé. 2016. U.S. federal fire and forest policy: emphasizing resilience in dry forests. Ecosphere 7.

Stephens, S. L., and P. Z. Fulé. 2005. Western pine forests with continuing frequent fire regimes: Possible reference sites for management. Journal of Forestry 103:357–362.

Stephens, S. L., J. D. McIver, R. E. J. Boerner, C. J. Fettig, J. B. Fontaine, B. R. Hartsough, P. L. Kennedy, and D. W. Schwilk. 2012. The effects of forest fuel-reduction treatments in the United States. BioScience 62:549–560.

Stephens, S. L., C. I. Millar, C. I., and B. M. Collins. 2010. Operational approaches to managing forests of the future in Mediterranean regions within a context of changing climates. Environmental Research Letters 5:024003.

Stephens, S. L., and J. J. Moghaddas. 2005. Experimental fuel treatment impacts on forest structure, potential fire behavior, and predicted tree mortality in a California mixed conifer forest. Forest Ecology and Management 215:21–36.

Stephens, S. L., J. J. Moghaddas, C. Edminster, C. E. Fiedler, S. Haase, M. Harrington, J. E. Keeley, E. E. Knapp, J. D. McIver, K. Metlen, and others. 2009. Fire treatment effects on vegetation structure, fuels, and potential fire severity in western US forests. Ecological Applications 19:305–320.

Stephens, S. L., A. L. Westerling, M. D. Hurteau, Z. M. Peery, C. A. Schultz, and S. Thompson. 2020b. Fire and climate change: conserving seasonally dry forests is still possible. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 18:354-360.

Stevens, J. T., B. M. Collins, J. W. Long, M. P. North, S. J. Prichard, L. W. Tarnay, and A. M. White. 2016. Evaluating potential trade-offs among fuel treatment strategies in mixed-conifer forests of the Sierra Nevada. Ecosphere 7:e01445.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Stevens, J. T., B. M. Collins, J. D. Miller, M. P. North, and S. L. Stephens. 2017. Changing spatial patterns of stand-replacing fire in California conifer forests. Forest Ecology and Management 406:28–36.

Stevens, J. T., M. M. Kling, D. W. Schwilk, J. M. Varner, and J. M. Kane. 2020. Biogeography of fire regimes in western U.S. conifer forests: A trait-based approach. Global Ecology and Biogeography 29:944–955.

Stevens, J. T., H. D. Safford, and A. M. Latimer. 2014. Wildfire-contingent effects of fuel treatments can promote ecological resilience in seasonally dry conifer forests. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 44:843-854.

Stevens-Rumann, C. S., and P. Morgan. 2019. Tree regeneration following wildfires in the western US: a review. Fire Ecology 15:15.

Stevens-Rumann, C. S., S. J. Prichard, E. K. Strand, and P. Morgan. 2016. Prior wildfires influence burn severity of subsequent large fires. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 46:1375–1385.

Stevens-Rumann, C. S., C. H. Sieg, and M. E. Hunter. 2012. Ten years after wildfires: How does varying tree mortality impact fire hazard and forest resiliency? Forest Ecology and Management 267:199–208.

Stine, P., P. Hessburg, T. Spies, M. Kramer, C. J. Fettig, A. Hansen, J. Lehmkuhl, K. O'Hara, K. Polivka, P. Singleton, S. Charnley, A. Merschel, and Rachel. White. 2014. The ecology and management of moist mixed-conifer forests in eastern Oregon and Washington: a synthesis of the relevant biophysical science and implications for future land management. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-897. USDA Forest Service, Portland, Oregon, USA.

Stoddard, M. T., P. Z. Fulé, D. W. Huffman, A. J. S. Meador, and J. P. Roccaforte. 2020. Ecosystem management applications of resource objective wildfires in forests of the Grand Canyon National Park, USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 29:190–200.

Storm, L., and D. Shebitz. 2006. Evaluating the purpose, extent, and ecological restoration applications of indigenous burning practices in southwestern Washington. Ecological Restoration 24:256–268.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Striplin, R., S. A. McAfee, H. D. Safford, and M. J. Papa. 2020. Retrospective analysis of burn windows for fire and fuels management: an example from the Lake Tahoe Basin, California, USA. Fire Ecology 16:13.

Stockdale, C. A., MacDonald, S. E. and Higgs, E. 2019. Forest closure and encroachment at the grassland interface: a century-scale analysis using oblique repeat photography. Ecosphere, 10:e02774.

Syphard, A. D., J. E. Keeley, A. B. Massada, T. J. Brennan, and V. C. Radeloff. 2012. Housing arrangement and location determine the likelihood of housing loss due to wildfire. PLOS ONE 7:e33954.

Taylor, A. H., V. Trouet, C. N. Skinner and S. Stephens. 2016. Socio-ecological transitions trigger fire regime shifts and modulate fire-climate interactions in the Sierra Nevada, CA, 1600-2015 CE. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 13:13684-13689.

Teske, C. 2012. Characterizing fire-on-fire interactions in three large wilderness areas. Fire Ecology 8:82-106.

Thode, A. E., J. W. van Wagtendonk, J. D. Miller, and J. F. Quinn. 2011. Quantifying the fire regime distributions for severity in Yosemite National Park, California, USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 20:223–239.

Thompson, J. R., T. A. Spies, and L. M. Ganio. 2007. Reburn severity in managed and unmanaged vegetation in a large wildfire. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 104:10743–10748.

Thompson, M. P., P. Bowden, A. Brough, J. H. Scott, J. Gilbertson-Day, A. Taylor, J. Anderson, and J. R. Haas. 2016. Application of wildfire risk assessment results to wildfire response planning in the southern Sierra Nevada, California, USA. Forests 7:64.

Thompson, D. K., M.-A. Parisien, J. Morin, K. Millard, C. P. S. Larsen, and B. N. Simpson. 2017. Fuel accumulation in a high-frequency boreal wildfire regime: from wetland to upland. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 47:957–964.

Trauernicht, C., B. W. Brook, B. P. Murphy, G. J. Williamson, and D. M. J. S. Bowman. 2015. Local and global pyrogeographic evidence that indigenous fire management creates pyrodiversity. Ecology and Evolution 5:1908-1918.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Turner, M. G., K. H. Braziunas, W. D. Hansen, and B. J. Harvey. 2019. Short-interval severe fire erodes the resilience of subalpine lodgepole pine forests. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116:11319–11328.

Turner, M. G., and W. H. Romme. 1994. Landscape dynamics in crown fire ecosystems. Landscape Ecology 9:59-77.

Tymstra, C., B. J. Stocks, X. Cai, and M. D. Flannigan. 2020. Wildfire management in Canada: Review, challenges and opportunities. Progress in Disaster Science 5:100045.

Underwood, S. L. Arguello, and N. Siefkin. 2003. Restoring ethnographic landscapes and natural elements in Redwood National Park. Ecological Restoration 21:278-283.

United States Congress 2020. H.R. 5859 – Trillion Trees Act.

United States Department of Agriculture 2001. National Fire Plan Research and Development 2001 Business Summary. North Central Research Station. Saint Paul, Minnesota, USA.

Vaillant, N. M., J. A. Fites-Kaufman, and S. L. Stephens. 2009. Effectiveness of prescribed fire as a fuel treatment in Californian coniferous forests. International Journal of Wildland Fire 18:165–175.

Vaillant, N. M., and E. D. Reinhardt. 2017. An evaluation of the forest service hazardous fuels treatment program—Are we treating enough to promote resiliency or reduce hazard? Journal of Forestry 115:300–308.

Van de Water, K., and M. North. 2011. Stand structure, fuel loads, and fire behavior in riparian and upland forests, Sierra Nevada Mountains, USA: a comparison of current and reconstructed conditions. Forest Ecology and Management 262:215–228.

van Mantgem, P. J., D. A. Falk, E. C. Williams, A. J. Das, and N. L. Stephenson. 2018. Pre-fire drought and competition mediate post-fire conifer mortality in western U.S. National Parks. Ecological Applications 28:1730-1739.

van Wagtendonk, J. W., K. A. van Wagtendonk, and A. E. Thode. 2012. Factors associated with the severity of intersecting fires in Yosemite National Park, California, USA. Fire Ecology 7:11–31.

Veblen, T. T., T. Kitzberger, and J. Donnegan. 2000. Climatic and human influences on fire regimes in ponderosa pine forests in the Colorado Front Range. Ecological Applications 10:1178–1195.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Veldman, J. W., J. C. Aleman, S. T. Alvarado, et al. 2019. Comment on "The global tree restoration potential." Science 366:eaay7976.

Walker, R. B., J. D. Coop, S. A. Parks, and L. Trader. 2018. Fire regimes approaching historic norms reduce wildfire-facilitated conversion from forest to nonforest. Ecosphere 9:e02182.

Westerling, A. L. 2016. Increasing western US forest wildfire activity: sensitivity to changes in the timing of spring. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B 371:20150178.

Westlind, D. J., and B. K. Kerns. 2021. Repeated fall prescribed fire in previously thinned *Pinus ponderosa* increases growth and resistance to other disturbances. Forest Ecology and Management 480:118645.

White, C. A. 1985. Wildland fires in Banff National Park 1880-1980. National Parks Branch Occasional Paper 3, Parks Canada, Alberta, Canada.

Whitman, E., M.-A. Parisien, D. K. Thompson, and M. D. Flannigan. 2019. Short-interval wildfire and drought overwhelm boreal forest resilience. Scientific Reports 9:18796.

Williams, M. A., and W. L. Baker. 2011. Testing the accuracy of new methods for reconstructing historical structure of forest landscapes using GLO survey data. Ecological Monographs 81:63–88.

Yocom Kent, L. L., P. Z. Fulé, P. M. Brown, J. Cerano-Paredes, E. Cornejo-Oviedo, C. C. Montaño, S. A. Drury, D. A. Falk, J. Meunier, H. M. Poulos, C. N. Skinner, S. L. Stephens, and J. Villanueva-Díaz. 2017. Climate drives fire synchrony but local factors control fire regime change in northern Mexico. Ecosphere 8:e01709.

Yocom Kent, L. L., K. L. Shive, B. A. Strom, C. H. Sieg, M. E. Hunter, C. S. Stevens-Rumann, and P. Z. Fulé. 2015. Interactions of fuel treatments, wildfire severity, and carbon dynamics in dry conifer forests. Forest Ecology and Management 349:66–72.

Yocom, L. L., J. Jenness, P. Z. Fulé, and A. E. Thode. 2019. Previous fires and roads limit wildfire growth in Arizona and New Mexico, U.S.A. Forest Ecology and Management 449:117440.

Zald, H. S,. and C. J. Dunn. 2018. Severe fire weather and intensive forest management increase fire severity in a multi-ownership landscape. Ecological Applications 28:1068-1080.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Box 1. Defining restorative and adaptive management.

Ecosystem restoration is actively assisting the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or transformed (Holl 2020). Adaptive management is a learning-by-doing method of responding to ecosystem changes, informed by effectiveness monitoring (Lyons et al. 2008, Larson et al. 2013b). Recent reviews examine in detail research on adaptive and restorative forest fuel treatments, including mechanical thinning, prescribed and Indigenous cultural burning, and management of unplanned ignitions, and their relative effectiveness at mitigating future wildfire spread and severity (Fulé et al. 2012, Stephens et al. 2012, Martinson and Omi 2013, Ryan et al 2013, Kalies and Yocom Kent 2016). Across seasonally-dry forests, a promising finding is that treatments involving prescribed or cultural burning or effectively managed wildfires generally mitigate the spread and severity of subsequent wildfires for a period of time after treatment (5-20 years, depending on site productivity, vegetation and climate), and are often more effective than mechanical treatments without follow-up prescribed burning (Prichard et al. 2017). Use of these management techniques can therefore improve forest resilience and resistance to change under a warmer, drier climate.

Treatments designed to restore or adapt fire-excluded forests to a changing climate must foster ecosystem resilience and conserve native biodiversity. For example, restoration treatments are often designed to enhance plant vigor, favor fire-adapted species, and create open forest structures, all with the objective of increasing resilience and resistance to climatic warming and severe wildfires (Lehmkuhl et al. 2007, Reinhardt et al. 2008, North et al. 2012). An added benefit of most restorative treatments is that wildland fuel hazard is also reduced (Fulé et al. 2001, Brown et al. 2004). Fire-less fuel reduction treatments rarely mimic the broad role of fire (Reinhardt et al. 2008), which performs many cultural and ecological functions, e.g., nutrient cycling, facilitating tree regeneration by exposing mineral soils, promoting valued cultural and aesthetic resources (Marks-Block et al. 2019). As a result, any area treated using mechanical fuel treatments alone rarely restores fire-adapted ecosystems.

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Table 1. Ten common questions about active forest management.

Question	Summary of evidence	Key citations
1) *Are the effects of fire exclusion overstated? If so, are treatments unwarranted and even counterproductive*?	Broad-scale evidence of fire exclusion is strong across disciplines and western forest ecosystems. Although high severity fire was a component of many historical fire regimes, the frequency and extent of high severity fire over the past few decades is outside the range of historical range of variability.	Hessburg et al. (1999) Reynolds et al. (2013) Stine et al. (2014) Safford and Stevens (2017) Stephens et al. (2020) Hagmann et al. (this issue)
2) *Is forest thinning alone sufficient to mitigate wildfire hazard?*	Thinning alone can sometimes mitigate fire severity, but through residual logging slash, desiccation of understory fuels and increased surface wind flow without accompany surface fuel reduction, thinning can contribute to high-intensity surface fires and abundant mortality.	Stephens et al. (2009) Fulé et al. (2012) Martinson & Omi (2013) Kalies & Yocom Kent (2016)
3) *Can forest thinning and prescribed burning solve the problem?*	Although thinning and prescribed burning have been shown to be highly effective, not all forest are appropriate for this treatment (e.g., thin-barked species common in cold mixed-conifer forests). This type of fuel treatment is also not appropriate for wilderness and other roadless areas.	DellaSala et al. (2004) Battaglia & Shepperd (2007) Reinhardt et al. (2008)
4) *Should active forest management, including forest*	The majority of designated WUI is in private ownership and hence these lands are sometimes more difficult to treat than public lands.	Kolden & Brown (2010) Bladon (2018)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

thinning, be concentrated in the wildland urban interface (WUI)?	Treating dry and moist mixed-conifer forests beyond WUI buffers can modify fire behavior and change the intensity of wildfires arriving at communities.	Hallema et al. (2018) Kolden & Henson (2019) Schultz et al. (2019)
5) *Can wildfires on their own do the work of fuel treatments*?	Unplanned fires that escape suppression often burn under extreme fire weather and can have severe wildfire effects. In contrast, prescribed burns and managed wildfires generally burn under more moderate weather conditions and contribute to variable fire effects and surface fuel reduction that can mitigate future wildfire severity.	Miller & Safford (2012) Parks et al. (2015a, 2016) Prichard et al. (2017) Stevens et al. (2017) Kane et al. (2019) Huffman et al. (2020) Rodman et al. (2020)
6) *Is the primary objective of fuel reduction treatments to assist in future firefighting response and containment?*	Although fuel reduction treatments can assist in suppression operations, primarily using fuel treatments to suppress future wildfires actually contributes to wildland fire deficit. Adaptive treatments in fire-adapted landscapes aim to restore the patch to landscape role of fire as an ecological process, reduce fire effects and need for aggressive suppression when the fire next occurs.	Reinhardt et al. (2008) Safford et al. (2012) Stephens et al. (2020)
7) *Do fuel treatments work under extreme fire weather?*	Fire behavior associated with persistent drought, high winds and column-driven spread are associated with higher burn severity in western NA forests. However, strong scientific evidence across dry and moist mixed conifer forests demonstrates effectiveness at mitigating	Arkle et al. (2012) Yocom-Kent et al. (2015) Povak et al. (2020) Prichard et al. (2020)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

	burn severity, often even under extreme fire weather conditions.	
8) *Is the scale of the problem too great – can we ever catch up?*	The current pace and scale of treatments is decidedly inadequate to restore fire-resilient and climate adapted landscapes. However, evidence strongly supports that expanded use of fuel reduction treatments can be effective.	Collins et al. (2009) North et al. (2012) Parks et al. (2015a, 2016) Ager et al. (2016) Barros et al. (2018) Liang et al. (2018)
9) *Will planting more trees mitigate climate change in wNA forests?*	Temperate rainforests and other wet forests have the capacity to store and sequester high amounts of forest carbon. However, planting to increase tree density and continuity in fire-prone forests is unsustainable due to high fire danger, anticipated climatic water deficits and drought stress.	Thompson et al. (2007) Veldman et al. (2019) Holl & Brancalion (2020)
10) *Is post-fire management needed or even ecologically justified*?	Active forest and fuels management may be required beyond the initial fire response in order to promote future forest resilience to disturbance and climate change. Due to fire exclusion, uncharacteristically dense patches of dead trees may contribute to high-severity reburns as they fall and create heavy surface fuel accumulations.	Peterson et al. (2015) Lydersen et al. (2019a) North et al. (2019)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Table 2: Examples of wildfire management of unplanned ignitions and the influence of past wildfires in national parks and wilderness areas.

Area	Management objective	Study findings	Biophysical setting	Reference
North Rim Grand Canyon National Park, AZ	Restoring fire – created strategic fuel reductions to allow for natural fire to return	Fires have thinning effect on small diameter trees along with fine fuel and coarse wood consumption.	Dry ponderosa pine forest and shrublands; cold dry mixed conifer forests.	Fulé & Laughlin (2007) Stoddard et al. (2020)
Saguaro Wilderness, AZ	Sky islands – 30 years of repeated wildland fires	Repeat fires have reduced small density trees but medium trees are still denser than historical stand structures probably supported.	Dry ponderosa pine forest and shrublands	Holden et al. (2007) Hunter et al. (2014)
Hualapai tribal lands, AZ	Compared fire scars with modern use of low-intensity prescribed burning	Prescribed fires since the 1960s approximate the frequent surface fires of historical record but could incorporate greater variability in temporal schedules of burning.	Dry ponderosa pine forests	Stan et al. (2014)
Gila/Aldo Leopold	Restore fire as natural process.	Low severity fires beget low severity fires, and high severity	Dry ponderosa pine forest and shrublands;	Rollins et al. (2002) Holden et al. (2007)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Wilderness, NM	Surface loads and continuity drive high fire frequency on productive sites.	fires tend to reburn at high severity in flammable shrub fields. Previous fires reduce size of subsequent fires for a short period of time.	dry mixed conifer forest; some cold forest	Holden et al. (2010) Hunter et al. (2014) Parks et al. (2014) Holsinger et al. (2016) Parks et al. (2015a) Parks et al. (2016) Parks et al. (2018)
Zion National Park, UT	Science-based fire management plan including managed wildfires, prescribed burning and hazardous fuel reduction.	Repeat prescribed fires reduce probability of crown fire and increased grass and forb cover, but not tree density or shrub cover.	Dry ponderosa pine forest and shrublands	Brown et al. (2019)
Yosemite National Park (YNP), CA	Restore fire as natural process – began with fires within the park interior and gradually worked outward to allow for more fires throughout park.	High severity burns favor flammable shrub fields, which perpetuate high severity reburns. Low severity burns perpetuate low severity burns.		Boisramé et al. (2017) Collins et al. (2009) Coppoletta et al. (2016) Scholl & Taylor (2010) Thode et al. (2011) van Wagtendonk et al. (2012)
Sequoia & Kings	Restore fire as natural	In red fir forests, repeated low-		Meyer et al. (2015)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

Canyon National Parks , Giant Sequoia National Monuments, CA	process	to moderate-severity fire can restore structural heterogeneity		
Frank Church – River of No Return Wilderness, ID	Restore fire as natural process	Burn severity is lower within recent fire areas and increases with time since fire. Previous fires reduce size of subsequent fires.	Dry mixed conifer forests and cold forests	Teske et al. (2012) Parks et al. (2014, 2015a, 2016, 2018) Holsinger et al. (2016)
Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, MT	Restore fire as natural process	Previous fires reduce size of subsequent fires.	Cold mixed conifer forests, Rocky Mountains	Belote et al. (2015) Holsinger et al. (2016) Keane et al. (2006) Larson et al. (2013a) Parks et al. (2015a, 2016, 2018) Teske et al. (2012)
Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Complex, ID and MT	Restore fire as natural process; moisture content of large fuels and tree crowns drive fire frequency (higher	Previous fires reduce size of subsequent fires.	Cold mixed conifer and subalpine forests	Rollins et al. (2002) Parks et al. (2015a) Barnett et al. (2016a) Holsinger et al. (2016)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

	on drier sites)			Morgan et al. (2017) Parks et al. (2016, 2018) Teske et al. (2012)
Banff, Kootenay and Yoho National Parks (NP), BC & Alberta, Canada	Guard fires to allow for more natural ignitions to burn within park; restoration of aspen and grasslands (Bison habitat)	Multiple prescribed burns to reduce dense lodgepole pine (LPP) and allow aspen to regenerate.	Cold mixed conifer and subboreal forests, Rocky Mountains	White (1985) Park et al. (2019)
Wood Buffalo National Park, Alberta and NW Territories, Canada	Restore and maintain fire as natural process	Fire severity is influenced by pre-fire stand structure and composition, topoedaphic context, and fire weather at time of burning. Burned areas less likely to burn again for 33 years, though this decreases in drought years.	Vegetation is representative of the western Canadian boreal forest.	Parks et al. (2018) Thompson et al. (2017) Whitman et al. (2019)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

FIGURES

Figure 1: *Dry mixed-conifer forests (above).* Theorized responses of seasonally dry mixed-conifer forest biomass to wildfire and three fire management scenarios under 21st century climate change. a) Partial wildfire suppression with only a small fraction of forested landscape treated each year (~1%). In this scenario, escaped high-severity wildfires are the dominant change agent with a high probability of forest conversion to nonforest as represented in the ball and cup figure by a shallow forest basin of attraction and a deep and broad nonforest basin of attraction. b) A large percentage of the forested landscape (>50%) is treated either by frequent low and moderate severity fires or fuel reduction treatments with ongoing maintenance. Large wildfires are infrequent, and fire severity within the event perimeter is mostly low and moderate severity as represented in the ball and cup figure by a deep and wide forest basin of attraction and a moderately deep and wide nonforest basin of attraction. c) Aggressive wildfire suppression with no active fuel reduction treatments; similar to scenario A but with even a higher likelihood of forest to nonforest conversion.

Cold forests (below). Wildfire management scenarios represent two levels of wildland fire management under 21st century climate change. d) Cold forest area treated with moderately frequent fires of moderate and high severity. Because large fire events are relatively rare, forest regeneration is supported by patchworks of remnant forest, represented by a deep and wide forest basin of attraction. e) Aggressive fire suppression with no active fuel treatments. In this scenario, escaped wildfires are the major change agent through large, mostly high severity fires. Forest regeneration is limited by large, high severity fire events, and conversion to nonforest is common; represented by a shallow and narrow forest basin of attraction and a deep and broad nonforest basin of attraction.

Figure 2: Representative photos of a) fuel reduction treatment –maintenance surface fire in a previously thinned and burned forest; b) fuel rearrangement - forest residues following mechanical thinning; and c) fuel accumulation – fire excluded forest with infilling around old western larch and ponderosa pine. *Photo credits: Roger Ottmar, Susan Prichard, and Paul Hessburg.*

Figure 3. Active forest restoration treatment, Sinlahekin Wildlife Refuge, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Top left: Multi-layered, dense dry mixed conifer forest after 100 years of fire exclusion. Top right: Residual forest after a variable density thinning treatment. Bottom right: Treated

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

condition after pile and broadcast burning. Bottom left: Treated forest one year later, after all thinning and burning work was completed. *Photo credit: John Marshall.*

Figure 4: Conceptual diagram of low and moderate severity fire effects on post-fire residual structure. Top: Frequent fire reduces surface and ladder fuels. Middle: Gradual accumulation of live and dead fuels between fires. Bottom: Conditions after prolonged fire exclusion. Forest are denser and more layered, and high-severity fire is likely. *Drawing credit: Robert Van Pelt*

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article



eap_2433_f1.tif

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

eap_2433_f3.tif

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Accepted Article

eap_2433_f4.pptx



This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.