

**Are Wildfire Mitigation and Restoration of Historic Forest Structure
Compatible? A Spatial Modeling Assessment**

Abstract:

In response to catastrophic wildfires, wide-reaching forest management policies have been enacted in recent years, most notably the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003. A key premise underlying these policies is that fire suppression has resulted in denser forests than were present historically in some western forest types. Thus, while reducing the threat of wildfire is typically the primary goal, fuel treatments are also viewed as restoring historic forest structure in forest types that are outside of their historic range of variation.

This study evaluates how spatial distributions of potential fire behavior and historic fire regime determine where these goals are appropriate in the context of land ownership patterns for the ponderosa pine-dominated montane forest zone of Boulder County, Colorado. Two spatial models were overlain: a model of potential fireline intensity and a model of historic fire frequency. The overlay was then aggregated by land ownership. Contrary to current assumptions, results of this study indicate that the goals of wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure are both appropriate in only a small part of the study area, primarily at low elevations. Furthermore, little of this land is located on Forest Service land where most of the current thinning projects are taking place and therefore we question the validity of thinning to reduce the threat of wildfire and to restore historic forest structure. A “one-size fits all” thinning and fuels reduction plan for the objectives of fire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure should not be applied in lieu of site-specific data collection on past and present landscape conditions.

Key Words: *wildfire, wildland urban interface, Colorado, ecological restoration, GIS, ponderosa pine*

Introduction

Widespread and severe wildfires in recent years in the western United States have resulted in large financial and environmental costs, and have prompted local fire mitigation plans as well as the federal Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) of 2003 (National Interagency Fire Center 2002; HFRA 2003; Front Range Fuels Treatment Partnership 2004). Many proposals for forest management, including the HFRA, are based on the premise that the root cause of such recent catastrophic fires is the long-standing policy of fire exclusion. It is widely believed that fire exclusion has resulted in fuels buildup: an increase in dense stands, ladder fuels, understory vegetation, and dead and down wood in western forests. For example, the HFRA web page (2003) states that “an estimated 190 million acres [79.89 million hectares] of Federal forests and rangelands in the United States, an area almost twice the size of California, continue to face an elevated risk of catastrophic fire due to unnatural, densely packed forest conditions”. The term “unnatural” is loosely used to describe vegetation that is outside of its historical range of variation (HRV), defined as the “ecological conditions and spatial/temporal variation in these conditions that are relatively unaffected by people, within a period of time and geographical area appropriate to an expressed goal” (Landres, Morgan, and Swanson 1999). In this context, a forest stand is outside the HRV if its density and age structure are substantially different from what would be expected in the pre-fire suppression era (ca. before 1920, varies by region). It is important to note that long term climate patterns prevalent during the reference period heavily influence density and age structure of vegetation at a regional scale (Baker 2003; Veblen 2003). Therefore,

when we evaluate whether stands are “unnatural”, we must acknowledge possible changes in climatic patterns in addition to anthropogenic factors such as fire suppression.

According to the HFRA, areas where the current fire regime and forest conditions represent large departures from historic conditions should be given priority for vegetation treatments such as mechanical thinning (HFRA 2003). Consequently, federal land management agencies are considering fuel conditions in the context of their potential departure from historic conditions (e.g. Schmidt et al. 2002). Thus, although goals of fuels treatment are typically manifold (e.g. considering threatened and endangered species, wildlife habitat, recreational impacts, water resources, etc.), there are two broad goals driving most fuels treatment plans: reduction of potential intensity of wildfire (i.e., wildfire mitigation) and restoration of historic forest structure. It is often unclear, however, whether fuels treatment is appropriate for both these objectives because many forests were historically dense (Shinneman and Baker 1997, Veblen 2003; Odion 2004).

The current study addresses the following questions: (1) *In what areas of the montane zone (1830-2740 m) of Boulder County, Colorado, are the goals of wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure both appropriate?* (2) *What percentage of this land is on private versus public lands?* To address these questions, two models were developed: (1) a model of potential wildfire behavior was used to determine where wildfire mitigation would be appropriate and (2) a model of historic patterns in fire occurrence based on reconstructed fire frequency was used to determine

where restoration of historic forest structure through mechanical thinning would be appropriate. The results were then aggregated by land ownership.

The results of this study have important management implications but should be interpreted with the model limitations in mind. In particular, the methodology has three key limitations: the potential wildfire behavior was measured at a coarse spatial resolution, differences in modern and historic fuel quantities were not directly measured, and specific treatments were not evaluated. Despite these limitations, we argue that the results provide a strategic guide to planning and prioritization of vegetation treatments for the dual purposes of fire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure. Although the results are specific to the study area, the methodology developed for this study could be used in other forest types and geographical regions.

Background

The assumption that wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure can be achieved simultaneously comes largely from research in dry ponderosa pine ecosystems in the West. For example, in the Southwestern U.S. numerous studies support a model of suppression of formerly frequent low-severity fires resulting in fuel accumulations that now permit crown fires (Covington and Moore 1994; Fule, Covington, and Moore 1997; Moore, Covington, and Fule 1999). Many ponderosa pine forests in the Southwest were historically (i.e. prior to the 19th century) characterized by frequent low-intensity surface fires at intervals of 2-20 years (Swetnam and Baisan 1996). In the Southwest, fire suppression and fuels reduction through grazing were

followed by increases in stand densities and enhanced conditions for severe crown fires (Covington and Moore 1994). Studies of ponderosa pine dominated ecosystems of the Southwest have also established that current stand densities, age distributions, fuel quantities and configurations are now outside the HRV in many areas (Covington and Moore 1994; Fule, Covington, and Moore 1997; Moore, Covington, and Fule 1999). In short, the forest conditions seen today in much of the ponderosa pine dominated ecosystems of the Southwest are denser than they were in the pre-fire suppression era and pose a greater risk of catastrophic wildfire. Therefore if properly conducted, forest thinning has the potential to both reduce the hazard of catastrophic wildfire and restore vegetation structure to within the HRV. These results, however, do not necessarily hold in other ponderosa pine-dominated ecosystems or other forest types with longer fire return intervals (Shinneman and Baker 1997; Veblen 2003).

In the U.S. West, the ponderosa pine cover type occurs extensively from the Pacific Northwest to the Southwest under varying conditions of climate, geology and soils (Peet 2000). Variations in these environmental factors influence site productivity and hence patterns of fuel accumulation at broad biogeographic scales. Even within a single biogeographic region and at local scales, the spatial heterogeneity associated with topography and edaphic factors influences stand structures and hence fuel conditions and fire regime within the ponderosa pine cover type (Peet 2000).

In contrast to the fire regime of ponderosa pine in much of the Southwest where open stands were maintained by frequent surface fires, ponderosa pine ecosystems in the

Colorado Front Range were characterized by a mixed-severity fire regime in which severe crown fires occurred as well as surface fires (Veblen and Lorenz 1986; Mast, Veblen, and Linhart 1998; Brown, Kaufmann, and Shepperd 1999; Kaufmann, Regan, and Brown 2000; Veblen, Kitzberger, and Donnegan 2000; Ehle and Baker 2003; Sherriff 2004). Large, severe fires caused widespread mortality of canopy trees and often resulted in dense post-fire stands of ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir (Veblen and Lorenz 1986; Mast, Veblen, and Linhart 1998; Brown, Kaufmann, and Shepperd 1999; Kaufmann, Regan, and Brown 2000; Veblen, Kitzberger, and Donnegan 2000; Ehle and Baker 2003; Sherriff 2004). Reconstructions of past forest structures in combination with tree-ring based fire history records indicate a high degree of spatial heterogeneity in past forest conditions within the ponderosa pine cover type in the Colorado Front Range (Kaufmann, Regan, and Brown 2000; Ehle and Baker 2003; Sherriff 2004). Such reconstructions can inform management decisions about the appropriateness of thinning as a tool for achieving the dual goals of wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure.

Since severe crown fires and patches of dense stands were common in the pre-settlement era within the ponderosa pine cover type in the Colorado Front Range, not all of the modern extent of this cover type is outside of its HRV. Consequently, although thinning of such stands would be appropriate for the goal of wildfire mitigation, it would not recreate a stand structure typical of pre-fire suppression conditions. Thus, a major research and management challenge is to understand where dense stands are an inherent feature of the historic fire regime and where they are an artifact created by fire suppression or other land-use practices (i.e. are outside the HRV).

Study Area

The study area is the montane zone of Boulder County, Colorado, an area between 1830-2740 m in elevation that is bounded by the forest-grassland ecotone to the east and the subalpine zone to the west. Several local projects in Boulder County seek to restore historic forest structure and mitigate wildfire hazard. Two examples are: The Winiger Ridge Project (Winiger Ridge Project 1999) and the Sugarloaf Fuel Reduction Project (Sugarloaf Reduction Project 2004). Both projects emphasize coordination between land management agencies and landowners to reduce the potential for wildfire (a primary goal for the Sugarloaf Fuel Reduction Project, secondary for the Winiger Ridge Project) and promote forest health through vegetation treatments to return forests to historic conditions (a primary goal for the Winiger Ridge Project, secondary for the Sugarloaf Fuel Reduction Project). The montane zone of Boulder County is a challenging area for the implementation of wildfire mitigation and restoration projects because of the spatial heterogeneity of historic fire regimes, the intermingling of private and public lands, and rapid exurban growth. Approximately 42% of the study area is Forest Service land, 2% is BLM land, 8% is managed by the Boulder County and City Open Space and Mountain Parks (henceforth called “Open Space”), 28% is privately owned, and the remainder is managed by various other entities (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Land ownership in the montane zone of Boulder County, Colorado.

The historic fire regime in Boulder County varies along environmental gradients and includes both surface and high-severity fires; the former are non-lethal to large trees whereas the latter kill all or many of the large trees in a stand. The lower elevations of the montane zone (1830-2350 m) are composed of a mixture of grasses, shrubs, ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*) and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*). This zone is characterized by relatively frequent, low-intensity surface fires at intervals of 10 to 40 years at a scale of ~100 hectares (Veblen, Kitzberger, and Donnegan 2000; Sherriff 2004; Sherriff and Veblen submitted a, b). Repeat photography and stand age-structure studies in the lower montane zone along the plains grassland-forest ecotone (below 1950m) show that in the aggregate, stands have become denser during the 20th-century, encroached on grasslands and coalesced with other forest patches (Mast, Veblen, and Hodgson 1997; Mast, Veblen, and Linhart 1998). At a stand scale, however, long intervals occurred between fires at some sites leading to individual stands that were historically dense. Therefore, not all individual stands in the lower montane zone are outside of the HRV even though in the aggregate it is this lower elevation area where tree densities have increased most obviously since fire exclusion (Sherriff and Veblen submitted b).

Whereas the historic fire regime of the lower montane zone is relatively well understood, the historic fire regime of the mid- to upper- elevations of the montane zone (2100-2740 m) is more complex. Forests at these elevations are dominated primarily by ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir, but other species can also be important such as aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*) and limber pine (*Pinus flexilis*). In stands of ~100 ha, historic fire intervals (i.e. prior to 20th-century fire suppression) at

these elevations were 30 to 100+ years, longer than the lower montane zone, and included high-severity fires that killed most or all trees in a stand (Veblen and Lorenz 1986; Veblen, Kitzberger, and Donnegan 2000; Sherriff and Veblen submitted b). For individual sites, however, fire intervals were highly variable, and fire severities varied widely across this landscape resulting in a complex vegetation mosaic.

The vegetation structure and fire regimes throughout the montane zone have been influenced by climatic variation as well as by land-use practices. For example, during the second half of the 19th century fire occurrence increased. Though this increase coincided with increased anthropogenic ignitions associated with Euro-American settlement, it appears to have been driven primarily by climatic conditions more conducive to fire spread (Veblen, Kitzberger, and Donnegan 2000). Today, the legacy of these widespread 19th century fires are even-aged stands of approximately 100 to 140 years old (Veblen and Lorenz 1986; Sherriff 2004). The second half of the 19th century was also a time of widespread grazing, logging and road construction, which triggered tree establishment reflected in tree ages in the modern landscape (Veblen and Lorenz 1986; Sherriff 2004). During the 20th-century, grazing and extractive resource use declined while low-density residential development became the dominant land use pattern (Riebsame, Gosnell, and Theobald 1996). Since approximately 1920, when adequate resources and equipment were made available to fight fires in the national forest system, fire exclusion dramatically reduced the occurrence and extent of fires in the montane zone.

Methods

The principal goal of this study is to explicitly model where thinning may be appropriate for achieving both restoration of historic forest structure and wildfire mitigation across the heterogeneous landscape of the montane zone of Boulder County. To do this, models of potential wildfire behavior (which show where wildfire mitigation is appropriate) and historic fire frequency (which show where restoration of historic forest structure is appropriate) were constructed and overlain as described in the following sections.

Model of Potential Wildfire Behavior

It is assumed that areas of potentially high fire hazard are appropriate for thinning treatments, whereas thinning is unnecessary in areas of low potential fire hazard. To analyze this spatially, a static model of potential wildfire behavior was developed using the FlamMap software package, which maps spatial variations in potential fire behavior. FlamMap implements several fire behavior models including a surface fire model (Rothermel 1972), a model of crown fire initiation (Van Wagner 1977), a model of crown fire spread (Rothermel 1991) and a model of dead fuel moisture (Nelson 2000). Using these fire behavior models FlamMap generates raster grids of potential fire behavior such as rate of spread, flame length, fireline intensity (energy released per unit length along the flaming front of a fire) and crown fire activity (Finney, technical documentation). It is important to note that FlamMap models potential fire behavior pixel-by-pixel assuming an ignition source is always available; it does not model fire spread.

This study focuses on a single descriptor of wildfire behavior: Byram's fireline intensity (Byram 1959) due to surface and crown fuels. Fireline intensity is a measure of energy released per unit length along the flaming front of a fire. Fireline intensity was selected over other measures of fire behavior in part because it incorporates rate of spread and heat per unit area.

$$I_b = H_A R / 60 \quad (1)$$

Where:

I_b = Byram's fireline intensity (kW/m)

H_A = heat per unit area (kJ/m²)

R = rate of spread (m/min)

Fireline intensity has meaningful fire suppression interpretations so it can be logically classified into low, high, or extreme potential fireline intensity. One threshold is the fireline intensity of 346 kW/m, above which fires should not be attacked by hand and control efforts at the head of the fire may not always be effective (Albini. F.A. unpublished notes; Pyne, Andrews, and Laven 1996). In this study, 346 kW/m is the boundary between low and high potential fireline intensity. A second meaningful threshold is 1730 kW/m, above which extreme wildfire behavior such as spotting, crowning and torching is common. In this study, 1730 kW/m is the boundary between high and extreme potential fireline intensity. It is logical that these areas be prioritized

for thinning treatments aimed at reducing fire hazard. However, it is certainly possible that mechanical thinning could achieve wildfire mitigation even in areas below this threshold, even though this land is less hazardous than other places in the study area. Fireline intensity is a function of several key variables including topography, fuels, and weather (Bessie and Johnson 1995; Pyne, Andrews, and Laven 1996), the derivation of which are described in the following sections.

Topography

Three characteristics of topography -- aspect, slope and elevation -- were generated with available 30m digital elevation models (DEMs). FlamMap uses this topographic information in several ways. First, aspect and slope together are used to calculate angle of incident solar radiation, which influences fuel moisture conditions (Finney, technical documentation). Secondly, slope is used in determining rate of spread, as it influences whether flames are tipped toward or away from fuels (Pyne, Andrews, and Laven 1996). Third, elevation is used to refine temperature and humidity to produce more accurate fuel moisture calculations.

Weather

Weather is another important input to FlamMap and directly influences fireline intensity (Pyne, Andrews, and Laven 1996). We assumed moderate wind conditions: upslope winds of 24 kph (15 mph), which are typical of the study area. We also assumed that fuel moisture was fixed at the level specified by the fuel model, and not further “conditioned” by wind, heat, or relative humidity. Though an assumption of constant

conditions over space would be inadequate for modeling historic fires, it is sufficient for measuring potential fire behavior under hypothetical weather conditions.

We do not simulate extreme weather conditions because under such conditions it becomes difficult to prioritize areas based on potential wildfire behavior; effectively *all* areas are characterized by extreme fireline intensity (>1730 kW/m). Furthermore, fuel treatments are likely to be ineffective in many places under extreme weather conditions. Climate and weather – not fuels -- are the primary driving forces behind the size and severity of fires in areas prone to infrequent but severe wildfires (Romme and Despain 1989; Bessie and Johnson 1995, Rollins, Morgan and Swetnam 2002, Schoennagel, Veblen and Romme 2004, Turner and Romme 1994). In such areas, which are extensive in the upper montane zone of Boulder County, mechanical thinning is unlikely to be effective under extreme conditions (Schoennagel, Veblen and Romme 2004).

Fuels

Another essential input to FlamMap is fuels, which are difficult to measure due to their high spatial heterogeneity (Roberts and Dennison 2003). Fuels are often characterized with 13 standard fuel models derived by the National Forest Fire Laboratory (NFFL) (Albini 1976). Each fuel model comprises approximately 30 fuelbed properties, such as live and dead fuel weight per unit area and fuel bed depth, which determine how fire will propagate through a fuels complex (Anderson 1982). This study uses fuels data hand drawn on aerial photography (taken in the 1990s) and verified in the field for classification accuracy by the Colorado State Forest Service (Boulder County

Land Use Fuels Data 2002). According to this fuels data set, a total of 76% of the study area is characterized by NFFL fuel models 2 and 9 (Table 1), which are characteristic of open ponderosa pine and closed canopy mixed conifer respectively (Anderson 1982). In the study area mixed canopy refers to stands dominated mainly by ponderosa pine and/or Douglas-fir with smaller components of lodgepole pine and limber pine also present. Though fuels are often associated with vegetation type, as they are here, it is important to note that other factors such as stand history, vegetation structure and abiotic factors also play an important role in determining fuel type and amount (Keane *et al.* 1998).

Table 1: National Forest Fire Laboratory (NFFL) standard fuel models (Anderson 1982) and associated FlamMap variables. Crown Base Height (CBH) is the distance between the ground and the bottom of the crown. Crown Bulk Density (CBD) is the weight per volume of the crown biomass.

Canopy Cover

Another input to FlamMap, canopy cover, influences potential fire behavior by modifying the shading of surface fuels and influencing wind speed. Canopy cover was estimated with Landsat imagery, dated 5 October 1999. An unsupervised classification was performed with the ISODATA algorithm (10 classes, minimum 1 pixel/class, max class standard deviation of 1, minimum class difference of 5, maximum number of merge pairs of 2). The classes were then aggregated to approximate the 4 canopy cover classes required by FlamMap: (1) 1-20%, (2) 21-50%, (3) 50-80% and (4) 81-100%. For validation, a simple random sample of 87 points was generated. These points were then hand-classified with 1 meter black and white digital orthophotos taken in April 1999. Quantitative goodness of fit was evaluated using variations on the Kappa statistic, which

show sources of classification successes and error (Pontius 2000). The overall classification accuracy was 79%, and of this 26% was correct due to chance and 50% was correct due to the model's ability to predict location. Of the 21% of pixels that were misclassified, only 1/3 were incorrect by more than one category separated from the true class.

Crown Fuels

Crown fuel characteristics include crown base height (CBH), stand height, and crown bulk density (CBD). These variables (1) determine whether a fire remains on the surface, torches individual trees (a passive crown fire) or spreads through tree crowns (an active crown fire) and (2) influence fireline intensity (Finney, technical documentation). The most important crown fuel variable is CBH, defined as the distance between the ground and the bottom of the live crown fuels. CBH cannot be detected directly with remotely sensed imagery so, short of prohibitively extensive fieldwork, it must be inferred through expert knowledge. This study associates a CBH value with each fuel model using values developed for wildfire modeling in Boulder County (M. McClean, Redzone Software, November 2003, personal communication; Table 1).

Two other crown fuel characteristics, stand height and crown bulk density, were also estimated. In this study, stand height was assumed to be a constant of 15m, which is a realistic average value, though locally it can be inaccurate. This value is often used for wildfire modeling in Boulder County (M. McClean, Redzone Software, November 2003, personal conversation). A second variable, CBD, is the weight per unit volume of crown

fuels. In this study, CBD was estimated by associating fuel type to vegetation type/canopy cover and then to CBD according to approximations by Keane *et al.* 1998 for Rocky Mountain conifer cover types (Table 1).

Model Uncertainty and Limitations

The model of potential wildfire behavior has a number of limitations related to FlamMap and its sensitivity to variations in the input data. First, FlamMap itself has not been validated in the study area, though the fire behavior models within FlamMap have been validated more generally in a laboratory setting (Finney, technical documentation), and its sister program Farsite has been validated on conifer-dominated ecosystems of the Rocky Mountain Region (Finney and Ryan 1995). Secondly, though we know that the input layers are imperfect, we do not know to what degree this could influence FlamMap output. To explore this uncertainty, a sensitivity analysis for the study area was conducted by altering the input layers and aspatial parameters one by one to see the effect on FlamMap output. The following changes were evaluated: (1) original topography → flat topography, (2) original canopy cover → closed canopy or open canopy assigned to entire study area (3) upslope wind → westerly wind, (4) 24 kph wind → 48 kph wind, and (5) original fuels → fuel models 2 or 10 assigned to the entire study area, (6) original CBH → half of original CBH, (7) original CBD → add .1 kg/m³ to original CBD, (8) stand height 15m → stand height 30m. The purpose of the sensitivity analysis was twofold: to determine which factors contribute the most to potential fireline intensity in the study area and to evaluate whether errors in the input data could potentially have a major influence on the model results. The impact of these parameters can only be

compared qualitatively since they are varied by different amounts in the sensitivity analysis.

Model of Historic Fire Regime

To determine where restoration of historic forest structure is an appropriate goal, one must know where stand structure could be theoretically outside the HRV as a consequence of fire suppression. A spatially-explicit reconstruction of fire regimes based on a statistical model of fire frequency classes was developed for the montane zone of Boulder County (Sherriff 2004; Sherriff and Veblen submitted a). We do not attempt to directly locate areas that have experienced fuel accumulation (i.e. denser stands) since fire suppression began. Instead, we use a spatial model to locate areas that historically experienced relatively frequent low-severity fires but now do not, largely due to fire suppression. In the aggregate, it is expected that such areas will have experienced fuel accumulation and could be effectively treated with mechanical thinning. At the stand scale, however, many of these stands may be within the HRV. Therefore, while we present spatially explicit results, we interpret the results only in terms of broad zones.

Historic fire frequencies at 54 sample sites ranging in size from 30-200 ha were reconstructed using tree population age data and other tree-ring evidence collected in the field (Sherriff 2004). The sample sites were subjectively located across the entire elevational range of the ponderosa pine-dominated montane zone of Boulder County, predominately on Forest Service and Open Space land, and exclusively in areas that showed no significant signs of logging. Thus, the sites are representative of a larger

landscape with minimal human disturbance that in many places across the study area has been lost. At these sites, a total of 779 fire-scarred trees were sampled and crossdated to determine the date of fire scars, number of fires, and number of trees with fire scars (Sherriff and Veblen submitted b). Tree age (> 3200 tree establishment dates) and forest structure data supplemented the fire-scar records (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a). This information was used to place each sample site into one of three fire frequency categories for the era prior to European settlement (1700-1860): high fire frequency (criteria: 6+ fire years or mean fire interval (MFI) < 30 years, 50%+ trees have multiple fire scars, 3+ trees have at least 3 scars), moderate fire frequency (criteria: 4 or fewer fire years or MFI 30-40 years), and low fire frequency (criteria: 3 or fewer fire years, MFI > 40 years or fewer than 4 fire dates, 2 or fewer trees with >2 scars) (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a). The historic fire frequency categories represent an index of different fire regimes based on multiple criteria.

Although fireline intensity cannot be directly measured in studies of historic fire regimes, dendrochronological evidence of past fire effects was used to relate classes of historic fire frequency to fire severity (Sherriff 2004, Sherriff and Veblen submitted b). Areas with shorter fire intervals (higher fire frequency) have all-aged tree age frequency distributions indicating tree establishment was not associated primarily with fire events. In such areas, the dating of dead trees did not show that any mortality was temporally linked to fire-scar dates. Furthermore, at or near many of the sample sites classified into the high fire frequency class, historical photographs showed that these were open stands in the late 19th century that were unlikely to support crown fires (Veblen and Lorenz

1991). In contrast, for the moderate and low fire frequency classes, dendrochronological evidence indicated that the fire regime included some, if not mostly, high-severity fires (Sherriff 2004, Sherriff and Veblen submitted b). This evidence included: (1) high percentages of trees that established soon after fire-scar dates typically resulting in single or double post-fire cohorts; (2) truncated tree recruitment several decades following fire dates resulting in the typical bell-shaped age frequency distribution for shade-intolerant trees following a coarse-scale disturbance event; and (3) presence of dead trees that died at the time of a dated fire. Areas of these high-severity fires, as inferred from patch size, were variable and ranged from a few ha to much > 200 ha (the maximum sample area). Again, historical photographs show that in the landscape zone classified as moderate or low fire frequency there were extensive areas of dense, closed canopy stands in the 19th century (Veblen and Lorenz 1991).

A logistic regression was calibrated with data from 40 of the sample sites. The remaining 14 sample sites were reserved and combined with 50 randomly located qualitative evaluation sites for the validation process (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a). The logistic regression was used to predict the three historic fire frequency classes across the study area, largely in areas where no fire history data exist. The model used the following independent variables to predict historic fire frequency: elevation (significant for high and moderate fire frequency), arcsine of aspect (significant for low fire frequency), distance to ravine (significant for moderate and low fire frequency) and slope (significant for low fire frequency). This statistical model is an improvement over current approaches, which are either based on research in limited portions of the range of

montane cover types (e.g. Kaufmann *et al.* 2001; Kaufmann *et al.* 2003) or use simplistic assumptions linking vegetation type to fire frequency (e.g. Colorado State Forest Service 2002).

In the original model (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a) the three fire frequency classes were allowed to overlap, while in this study a cell can belong to only one class. To eliminate overlap, sites were assigned to the higher fire frequency category in cases of conflict. For example, if a site was originally classified as low fire frequency and moderate fire frequency, it would be re-classified as moderate fire frequency for the purposes of this study. This step prevents over-prediction of low fire frequency areas, but also causes the classification accuracy to differ somewhat from the original model (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a).

Model Uncertainty and Limitations

The model of historic fire frequency types, though validated, also has inherent uncertainty (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a). This model is based on tree-ring methods that have a number of limitations associated with fires that do not leave scars, data loss due to trees that burn or decompose, bias due to targeted sampling, and the difficulty of precisely dating cohort ages (Goldblum and Veblen 1992; Veblen, Kitzberger, and Donnegan 2000; Baker and Ehle 2001). From a statistical standpoint, the model also suffers from a low sample size, which may result in type II errors (failure to reject a false hypothesis) in t-tests of the independent variables. Given the extensive fieldwork required to increase the sample size, this obstacle is difficult to overcome. In fact, the

number of field sample sites, fire-scar samples and tree cores collected in the development of this model (Sherriff 2004; Sherriff and Veblen submitted a) is large in comparison with other published fire history studies (see Baker and Ehle 2001).

Model Overlay

By overlaying the results of the potential wildfire behavior and historic fire frequency class models, the appropriate goals can be determined (Table 2). If the current potential fire hazard is low (fireline intensity of <376 kW/m) it is assumed that wildfires can be fought by hand and effectively contained and therefore these are not appropriate areas for wildfire mitigation. If potential fireline intensity is high or extreme (≥ 376 kW/m), wildfire mitigation is appropriate because these fires cannot be fought by hand.

Within areas of this specified hazard, stands whose historic fire regime is characterized by high fire frequency (and low severity) may have a forest structure outside the HRV due to fuels buildup following 20th-century fire exclusion. In this case, mechanical thinning may be appropriate for both the goals of wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure. Conversely, stands whose historic fire regime consisted of high-severity fires at relatively long intervals (> 40 to 100 years), are dense today not due to suppression of surface fires but because they are post-fire cohorts. In these stands, mechanical thinning may be appropriate for mitigating wildfire hazard but short of clearcuts to simulate high-severity fires, it would not be appropriate for restoration of historic forest structure because the current stand density is likely within the range of what we would expect historically at a stand scale.

If potential fireline intensity is high or extreme and historic fire frequency is moderate, the result is ambiguous. Though low and high fire frequency areas have a clear association with high and low stand densities respectively, the relative importance of high-severity fires versus non-lethal surface fires is less clear in areas of moderate fire frequency. Consequently, areas of moderate fire frequency may or may not be able to be restored with mechanical thinning because tree densities were probably more spatially variable under that fire regime (Table 2). To address this uncertainty, the results of the model overlays are presented under the following scenarios: (1) that thinning areas of moderate historic fire frequency can potentially restore historic forest structure and (2) that thinning such areas cannot restore historic forest structure. The overlay results were then spatially aggregated by land owner (Figure 1).

Table 2: Appropriate management goals in the montane zone of Boulder County, CO, based on potential wildfire behavior and historic fire frequency

Results

Potential Wildfire Behavior

The prediction of wildfire behavior based on the FlamMap model indicates that under the assumed weather conditions, 45% of the study area is characterized by low potential fireline intensity (<376 kW/m), 25% by high fireline intensity (376-1730 kW/m) and 30% by extreme fireline intensity (>1730 kW/m) (Figure 2). As expected, the high and extreme hazard areas are located on steep, south-facing slopes. High and extreme potential fireline intensity land is located at all elevations, but concentrated at

middle and lower elevations. This is probably because terrain in this area is steeper and moisture levels are generally lower at these elevations. It is important to note that under extreme weather conditions (i.e. extreme low humidity, high winds), fireline intensity also would be high in the upper elevations of the montane zone (i.e. in areas of the lodgepole pine cover type). Under weather conditions assumed in the present study, the most prevalent fuel models, including primarily open canopy ponderosa pine and closed canopy mixed conifer types, all appear to be spatially coincident with land of high and extreme potential fireline intensity.

Figure 2: Potential fireline intensity in the montane zone of Boulder County under 24 kph upslope winds, classified from FlamMap output.

The sensitivity analysis revealed that the percentage of the landscape classified as high or extreme fireline intensity is sensitive to changes in many of the parameters. For one, it was found that potential wildfire behavior is sensitive to changes in topography (Table 3). If the terrain is “flattened”, the area characterized by potential high or extreme fireline intensity decreases by 22%. A flat slope reduces the spread of fire by tilting the source of the fire away from the fuel source so that fuels upslope are not pre-heated (Pyne, Andrews, and Laven 1996). Secondly, potential fireline intensity is sensitive to changes in canopy cover (Table 3). Compared with the original conditions, a closed canopy would result in a 10% reduction in the area of high or extreme fireline intensity. In contrast, an open canopy has the opposite effect, increasing the area exposed to high or extreme fireline intensity by 36%. Though it may appear counter-intuitive, all else equal open canopies lead to reduced fuel moisture and increased midflame windspeed, which increase potential fireline intensity. Third, wind has a pronounced effect on fire behavior

(Table 3). West winds, for example, counteract the effects of slope in this study area and reduce the amount of land classified as high or extreme potential fireline intensity by 11% compared to upslope winds. Wind speed is perhaps the most important factor in determining wildfire behavior; during a wind event with gusts of 48 kph (30 mph) 30% more of the study area would be subject to high or extreme fireline intensity compared to 24 kph (15 mph) winds. Fourth, the fuel composition clearly has a large influence on potential fireline intensity (Table 3). For example, if the study area was exclusively composed of fuel model 2 and 10, a greater percentage of the study area would be classified as high or extreme fireline intensity (37% and 30% respectively). Finally, crown fuels had a modest influence on the percentage of the landscape classified as high or extreme fireline intensity (Table 3). Reducing the crown base height to half of the original assumed height increased the percentage of the study area classified as high or extreme by 13%. Increasing CBD by .1 kg/m³ and doubling the stand height to 30m had less of an effect, increasing the percentage classified as high or extreme by 3% and 1% respectively. It is important to note that these results do not reflect any increases in fireline intensity within cells that already qualified as high or extreme. The sensitivity analysis revealed that potential fireline intensity is sensitive to shifts in all the parameters and that local errors in the source data could potentially affect the local output of FlamMap. Therefore, managers should interpret the results with caution. When the results are aggregated, however, we believe that the source data is sufficiently accurate for this application.

Table 3: Results of sensitivity analysis for FlamMap parameters. The sensitivity analysis helps determine which factors contribute the most to surface wildfire

behavior in the study area and to evaluate whether errors in the input data could potentially have a major influence in the model results.

Historic Fire Frequency

The model of historic fire frequency was calibrated with logistic regression to predict the probability of a given cell belonging to each fire frequency class. The regression coefficients indicate that high fire frequency was generally confined to elevations below 2100m. Elevation may be a proxy for other factors such as proximity to grasslands, given that the lowest elevations are adjacent to the plains-grassland ecotone, where the highest fire frequency sites occur (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a). In contrast, the other two fire types occur across a broad range of elevation in relation to other environmental conditions. Low-frequency fires generally occur on steep, north-facing slopes farther from ravines. At mid- to high elevation in the study area, moderate-frequency fires often occur near ravines, which may act as a firebreak. The model classified 22% of the study area as high frequency, 25% as moderate frequency and 53% as low frequency (Figure 3). Overall, areas of historically lower fire frequency are associated with abundant post-fire tree establishment pre-dating fire exclusion, and areas of formerly frequent low-severity fires are associated with abundant tree establishment during the fire exclusion period (Sherriff 2004, Sherriff and Veblen submitted b).

Figure 3: Reconstruction of historic fire frequency classes for the montane zone of Boulder County. High fire frequency (6 or more spreading fires between 1700-1915) areas occur at the lowest elevations (below c. 2064 m). Moderate fire frequency areas occur at mid and high elevations close to ravines. Low fire frequency areas occur at mid and high elevations on steep and north-facing slopes.

The model was validated on a random sample of 14 of the original 54 fire history sites plus 50 additional qualitative evaluation sites for a total of 64 validation points (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a). The qualitative evaluation sites were randomly located within the montane zone in Forest Service and Open Space land. Unlike the selection of field sites, random sampling was possible for qualitative evaluation sites because of their smaller size (100x300 m for evaluation sites versus 30-200 ha for field sites). The evaluation site was moved to an adjacent site if evidence of logging was present. For each qualitative validation point, the fire frequency category was determined by the number of fire scarred trees, number of scars per tree, and general age structure (Sherriff and Veblen submitted a).

The validation procedure using all 64 validation points showed that the predictions of high fire frequency were 90% accurate, predictions of moderate fire frequency were 71% accurate, and predictions of low fire frequency were 78% accurate, for an overall accuracy of 77% for the model as a whole. Under the first scenario, that thinning areas of moderate historic fire frequency can restore historic forest structure, the high and moderate fire frequency categories are combined, yielding an accuracy of 80% for the high-moderate fire frequency category and 80% for the model as a whole. Under the second scenario, that thinning areas of moderate historic fire frequency cannot restore historic forest structure, the moderate and low fire frequency categories are combined, yielding an accuracy of 93% for the low-moderate category and 91% for the model as a whole. This shows that moderate and high fire frequency historic fire regimes are easily confused and the overall accuracy of the model increases when they are combined. Note

that the accuracy of the model of historic fire frequency is the maximum accuracy for the model as a whole before other uncertainties are taken into account.

Overlay of Predicted Fire Behavior and Historic Fire Frequency

By overlaying the results of the model of potential fireline intensity and of reconstructed historic fire types, it was possible to infer where mechanical thinning is likely to be appropriate for both wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure (Table 2). Under the first scenario (i.e. that thinning areas of moderate historic fire frequency can restore historic forest structure), the overlay analysis shows that both goals would both be appropriate on a maximum of ca. 27% of the total land area, in particular at low elevations, near ravines and on south-facing slopes (Figure 4). On an additional ca. 27% of land area, the goal of wildfire mitigation would be appropriate, but not restoration of historic forest structure. Areas suitable only for wildfire mitigation are characterized by high or extreme potential fireline intensity and a historic fire regime of infrequent fires. Such areas are located primarily at mid to high elevations on steep north-facing slopes. The remainder of the land is classified as low hazard. In these areas the predicted fires have a low enough fireline intensity ($<346 \text{ kW/m}$) that they could be fought with hand tools. Under the assumed weather conditions they are located at mid and upper elevations within the study area.

Figure 4: Areas where only mitigation or both goals (wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure) would be appropriate, assuming that the historic fire regime of moderate frequency areas can be restored. The remainder of land is classified as low hazard under the assumed weather conditions (i.e. 24 kph upslope winds).

Under the second scenario (i.e. that thinning areas of moderate historic fire frequency cannot restore historic forest structure) the model shows that both goals would be appropriate on a maximum of ca. 15% of the total land area, exclusively at the lowest elevations on south facing slopes. Only wildfire mitigation would be appropriate in ca. 39% of the study area (Figure 5). The area defined as low hazard is the same as before.

Figure 5: Areas where only mitigation or both goals (wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure) would be appropriate, assuming that the historic fire regime of moderate frequency areas cannot be restored. The remainder of land is classified as low hazard, meaning potential fireline intensity is < 376 kW/m under the assumed weather conditions (i.e. 24 kph upslope winds).

Aggregation of map overlay by land ownership

The results of the model overlays were then aggregated by land ownership (Figure 6). Under the first scenario, Open Space had the greatest percentage of land where both goals would be appropriate (ca. 41%) and the lowest percentage where only the goal of wildfire mitigation would be appropriate (ca. 18%). Private land followed a similar pattern. In contrast, BLM and Forest Service land had a higher percentage of land where only the goal of wildfire mitigation would be appropriate (ca. 34% and 37%, respectively) than where both goals would be appropriate (ca. 28% and 18%, respectively).

Figure 6: Percentage of land within ownership classes in the montane zone of Boulder County, Colorado where only mitigation or both goals (wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure) would be appropriate, assuming that the historic fire regime of moderate frequency areas can be restored. The remainder of

land is classified as low hazard, meaning potential fireline intensity is below 376 kW/m under the assumed weather conditions (i.e. 24 kph upslope winds).

A similar pattern of results holds under the second scenario. The amount of land where both goals would be appropriate decreases in each land use category, with a commensurate increase in the amount of land where only wildfire mitigation is appropriate (Figure 7). This time, both goals would be appropriate on only ca. 6% of Forest Service land, compared with ca. 31% of Open Space and ca. 16% of private land.

Figure 7: Percentage of land within ownership classes in the montane zone of Boulder County, Colorado where only mitigation or both goals (wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure) would be appropriate, assuming that the historic fire regime of moderate frequency areas cannot be restored. The remainder of land is classified as low hazard, meaning potential fireline intensity is below 376 kW/m under the assumed weather conditions (i.e. 24 kph upslope winds).

Discussion

Key Findings

The results of two models -- a model of potential wildfire behavior and a model of historic fire frequency -- were overlain and classified into areas where mechanical thinning would be appropriate for both wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure, be appropriate only wildfire mitigation, or as areas of low fire hazard not to be managed. An evaluation of this classification has led to several key findings.

Under the scenario that thinning areas of moderate historic fire frequency can restore historic forest structure, this study shows that both goals are appropriate in ca. 27% of the study area, primarily on private land and Open Space and only a small amount on Forest

Service land. This is a key result because the Forest Service receives the most money for mechanical thinning compared to other federal and non-federal agencies, and yet has relatively little land in absolute and relative terms where both goals would be appropriate. The areas where both goals would be appropriate are located at low elevations, near ravines and on south-facing slopes. On an additional ca. 27% of land area, the goal of only wildfire mitigation would be appropriate. The remainder of land is classified as having low wildfire hazard under the assumed weather conditions (i.e. 24 kph wind). Under the scenario that thinning areas of moderate historic fire frequency cannot restore historic forest structure, the amount of land where both goals are appropriate drops to ca. 15%, while the amount of land where only mitigation is appropriate increases to ca. 39%. In both cases, the amount of land where both goals are appropriate is relatively small and at lower elevation than areas historically characterized by large high severity fires. Open Space has the greatest percentage land where both goals are appropriate, while Forest Service land has the lowest.

Model Uncertainty and Limitations

At the start of this article, we presented three key limitations of the methodology. The findings of this study must be evaluated in relation to these limitations to be used in a management context. We stress that results should be interpreted at an aggregate scale. Maps should be read as descriptors of general spatial trends and not as locators of stand targets for management prescriptions. Here are the limitations once again, and how they relate to the model results:

1. Potential wildfire behavior was measured at a spatially coarse resolution: As the sensitivity analysis for FlamMap inputs demonstrated, the modeled potential wildfire behavior can be affected by errors in the source data. We believe that the spatial resolution of our source data (including fuel type, canopy fuels, etc.) is too coarse to give us accurate results at the scale of small stands (e.g. a few ha), but yields acceptable results at the landscape and regional scales. Short of starting fires, however, we cannot validate this model further.

2. Differences in modern and historic fuel quantities were not directly measured: The model should not be used to target individual stands for treatments, but should be seen as a general guide in the planning process. This study shows general locations of where environmental factors lead to the prediction that current vegetation conditions are likely to be outside of the HRV. However, site specific data and observations would be required to determine the degree to which individual stands have actually experienced fuel accumulation outside of the HRV.

3. Specific treatments were not evaluated: The actual on-the-ground thinning specification may vary widely and may incorporate management goals not considered in the current study (e.g. effects on threatened and endangered species). Thus, it is impossible to know the actual effectiveness of the thinning treatment in advance. Several factors can influence the effect of thinning treatments on potential wildfire behavior, including to what degree the canopy cover is opened up and the crown bulk density (CBD) reduced, whether ladder fuels are removed to raise crown base height (CBH),

whether the thinning treatment is maintained or if trees are allowed to regenerate, and if prescribed fire is used to reduce post-treatment surface fuels. The actual outcomes of thinning treatments also depend on factors related to firefighting, which are also beyond the scope of this study. This study assesses where mechanical thinning could *potentially* accomplish the goals of wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure. Whether these goals could *actually* be accomplished depends on the specific thinning treatments and whether they are maintained. Thus, in the context of the limitations noted above, the results of the present study are most appropriate for strategic planning in the arena of fuels management and restoration of historic forest structure using thinning as the primary management tool.

Management Implications

This study helps to evaluate the assumption that forest thinning can both reduce wildfire hazard and restore forest structure to conditions believed to have prevailed prior to the effects of 20th-century fire suppression. A premise of national policies such as HFRA is that high stand densities are symptomatic of unhealthy forests and that they have resulted from the suppression of formerly frequent surface fires (HFRA 2003). Critics of the national policy have questioned the applicability of this and other premises to the wide range of forest ecosystem types in the western U.S. (Veblen 2003; Schoennagel, Veblen, and Romme 2004). This study indicates that extensive site-specific research in different forest types is required to determine whether wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure are both feasible in particular environments and under what scenario of possible vegetation treatments. The current

study was based on an unusually large dataset on fire history and tree ages that permitted a spatially explicit reconstructions of historic fire regimes and forest conditions across a complex landscape (Sherriff 2004; Sherriff and Veblen et al. submitted a). We stress that data on fire history and past stand structures necessary for guiding and prioritizing vegetation treatment plans in a spatially heterogeneous landscape generally surpass the current availability of information for the application of the Fire Regime Condition Classification protocols on federal lands (Schmidt et al. 2002; Shlisky and Hann 2004).

In the montane zone of Boulder County, both potential wildfire behavior and historic fire frequencies are heterogeneous across the landscape. Fire mitigation and restoration models derived from other ponderosa pine ecosystems (e.g. Covington and Moore 1994; Kaufmann, *et al.* 2001; Kaufmann *et al.* 2003) should not be extrapolated to the montane zone of Boulder County in lieu of conducting intensive, site-specific data collection in the potential management area. Analogously, the specific results reported here should not be uncritically applied to other areas of ponderosa pine ecosystems. Rather, the approach and methodology of the current study can inform management discussion and guide data collection procedures in other ecosystems. An important theme in the current study is that there is often a discrepancy between the historic structure and the desired forest structure for fuels reduction, a fact that is sometimes not sufficiently stressed in discussions of mechanical thinning. Our analysis provides transparent, quantitative estimates of where fire mitigation and restoration goals may coincide or diverge, and thus provides a pragmatic basis for considering the goals of thinning across a complex landscape. Indeed, in our study area, mechanical thinning is

only appropriate for both goals in ca. 15-27% of the study area. Furthermore, although Forest Service land accounts for 42% of Boulder County most of the land on which both goals are appropriate is not on Forest Service property. This implies that to attain the dual goals of wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure, federal funding needs to be directed towards non-federal lands.

Although forest managers and policymakers often recognize that wildfire mitigation and restoration of historic forest structure often cannot be achieved simultaneously, the conflicts between these goals are sometimes not clearly articulated for areas of historically mixed-severity fire regimes. In places where restoration of historic forest structure is the primary goal and the historic fire regime included high-severity fires, forest managers must actively communicate the political, financial, and managerial difficulties of maintaining forests within a potentially hazardous state. In places where wildfire mitigation is the primary goal, managers should clearly articulate that the natural structure of the forest is not the desired structure to protect communities. The approach developed in the current study can aid managers in the articulation of these options in a spatially explicit manner.

In short, this study provides guidance for mechanical thinning in the montane zone of Boulder County and also raises issues important to implementation of national fire policy elsewhere. It indicates that the complexity of wildfire, ecosystems, and land ownership precludes simple generalizations to guide policy. A “one-size fits all” thinning and fuels reduction plan for the objectives of fire mitigation and restoration of

historic forest structure should not be applied in lieu of site-specific data collection on past and present landscape conditions. Spatial models of potential wildfire behavior and historic fire regimes, such as those in this study, can aid decision making in such complex environments.

Acknowledgements

Research was funded by the National Science Foundation (awards DEB-0314305 and BCS-0221493), the USGS Division of Biological Resources, and the EPA STAR program (Grant U915889-01-1).

References

- Albini, F. A. 1976. Estimating wildfire behavior and effects. USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station General Technical Report INT_30. Ogden, UT. 74 pp.
- Anderson, H. E. 1982. Aids to Determining Fuel Models For Estimating Fire Behavior. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report INT-122. Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Ogden, UT. 22 p.
- Baker, W. L. and D. Ehle. 2001. Uncertainty in surface-fire history: the case of ponderosa pine forests in the western United States. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research-Revue Canadienne De Recherche Forestiere*. 31(7): 1205-1226.
- Baker, W. L. 2003. Fires and Climatic Change in forested landscape in the U.S. Rocky Mountains. Pages 120-157 in Veblen TT, Baker WL, Montenegro G, Swetnam TW, eds. *Fire and Climatic Change in Temperate Ecosystems of the Western Americas*. New York: Springer.
- Bessie, W. C. and E. A. Johnson. 1995. The relative importance of fuels and weather on fire behavior in subalpine forests. *Ecology*. 76(3): 747-762.
- Boulder County Land Use Fuels Data. 2002. http://www.co.boulder.co.us/gis/downloads/dl_data_dict/dl_dd_fueltype.htm (last accessed 13 December 2004).

- Brown, P. M., M. R. Kaufmann and W. D. Shepperd. 1999. Long-term, landscape patterns of past fire events in a montane ponderosa pine forest of central Colorado. *Landscape Ecology*. 4(6):513-532.
- Byram, G. M. 1959. Combustion of forest fuels. In: Forest Fire: Control and Use. Ed. Davis, K.P. McGraw-Hill, New York, pp. 113-126.
- Colorado State Forest Service. 2002. Colorado Wildland Urban Interface Hazard Assessment. <http://www.colostate.edu/depts/CSFS/> (last accessed 13 December 2004).
- Covington, W. W. and M. Moore. 1994. Southwestern ponderosa forest structure. *Journal of Forestry* 92:39-47.
- Ehle, D. S., and W. L. Baker. 2003. Disturbance and stand dynamics in ponderosa pine forests in Rocky Mountain National Park, USA. *Ecological Monographs* 73 (4): 543-566.
- Finney, M. A. FARSITE Technical Documentation. <http://farsite.org/> (last accessed 13 December 2004)
- Finney, M. A. and K. C. Ryan. 1995. Use of the FARSITE fire growth model for fire protection in the U.S. National Parks. International Emergency Management and Engineering Conference. Nice, France, The International Emergency Management and Engineering Society, pp 183-189.
- Front Range Fuels Treatment Partnership. 2004. <http://www.rockymountainwildlandfire.info/frftp.htm> (last accessed 13 December 2004).
- Fule, P. Z., W. W. Covington and M. M. Moore. 1997. Determining reference conditions for ecosystem management of southwestern ponderosa pine forests. *Ecological Applications* 7(3):895-908.
- Goldblum, D. and T. T. Veblen. 1992. Fire history of a ponderosa pine/Douglas-fir forest in the Colorado Front Range. *Physical Geography* 13(2):133-148.
- Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) H.R. 1904. 2003. An initiative for wildfire prevention and stronger communities. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/healthyforests> (last accessed 13 December 2004).
- Kaufmann M.R., P. J. Fornwalt, L. S. Huckaby, J. M. Stoker. 2001. Cheesman Lake -- A Historical Ponderosa Pine Landscape Guiding Restoration in the South Platte Watershed of the Colorado Front Range. USDA Forest Service Proceedings. RMRS-P-22: 9-18.
- Kaufmann, M. R., C. M. Regan and P. M. Brown. 2000. Heterogeneity in ponderosa pine/Douglas-fir forests: age and size structure in unlogged and logged landscapes of central Colorado. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 30: 698-711.

Kaufmann, M. R., L. S. Huckaby, P. J. Fornwalt, J. M. Stoker, and W. H. Romme. 2003. Using tree recruitment patterns and fire history to guide restoration of an unlogged ponderosa pine/Douglas-fir landscape in the southern Rocky Mountains after a century of fire suppression. *Forestry* 76(2): 231-241.

Keane, R. E., J. L. Garner, K. M. Schmidt, D. G. Long, J. P. Menakis, and M. A. Finney. 1998. Development of input data layers for the FARSITE fire growth model for the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Complex, USA. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-3. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, 66 pp.

Landres, P.B., P. Morgan, F.J. Swanson. 1999. Overview of the use of the natural variability concepts in managing ecological systems. *Ecological Applications* 9:1179-1188.

Mast, J. N., P. Z. Fule, M. M. Moore, W. W. Covington and A. M. Waltz. 1999. Restoration of presettlement age structure of an Arizona ponderosa pine forest. *Ecological Applications* 9(1): 228-239.

Mast, J. N., T. T. Veblen, and M. E. Hodgson. 1997. Tree invasion within a pine/grassland ecotone: An approach with historic aerial photography and GIS modeling. *Forest Ecology and Management* 93(3): 181-194.

Mast, J. N., T. T. Veblen, and Y. B. Linhart. 1998. Disturbance and climatic influences on age structure of ponderosa pine at the pine/grassland ecotone, Colorado Front Range. *Journal of Biogeography* 25: 743-755.

Moore, M. M., W. W. Covington, and P. Fule. 1999. Reference conditions and ecological restoration: A southwestern ponderosa pine perspective. *Ecological Applications* 9: 1266-1277.

National Interagency Fire Center 2002. <http://www.nifc.gov/> (last accessed 13 December 2004)

Nelson, R. M. 2000. Prediction of diurnal change in 10-hour fuel moisture content. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 30:1071-1087.

Odion, D. C., E. J. Frost, J. R. Strittholt, H. Jiant, D. A. Dellasala, and M. A. Moritz (2004). Patterns of Fire Severity and Forest Conditions in the Western Klamath Mountains, California. *Conservation Biology* 18(4): 927-936.

Peet, R. K. 2000. Forests of the Rocky Mountains. Pages 75-122 in M.G. Barbour and W.D. Billings, editors, *Norther American Terrestrial Vegetation*. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, New York, New York.

Platt, Veblen, and Sherriff in preparation. Evaluating criteria for wildfire mitigation under alternative scenarios of weather and historic fire regime.

Pontius, R. G. 2000. Quantification error versus location error in comparison of categorical maps. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 67(5): 540-540.

Pyne, S. J., P. L. Andrews, R. D. Laven. 1996. Introduction to Wildland Fire. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Riebsame, W. E., H. Gosnell, and D. M. Theobald. 1996. Land use and landscape change in the Colorado Mountains .1. Theory, scale, and pattern. *Mountain Research and Development* 16:395-405.

Roberts, D. A. and P. E. Dennison, 2003. Hyperspectral technologies for wildfire fuel mapping, Proc. 4th International Workshop on Remote Sensing and GIS Applications to Forest Fire Management, Jun 5-7, 2003, Ghent, Belgium, 11pp.

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

Romme, W.H. and D.G. Despain. 1989. Historical perspective on the Yellowstone Fires of 1988. *Bioscience* 39(10): 696-699.

Rothermel, R. C., 1972, A mathematical model for predicting fire spread in wildland fuels, General Technical Report INT-115, USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Rothermel, R. C. 1991. Predicting behavior and size of crown fires in the Northern Rocky Mountains. USDA Forest Service, Research Paper INT-438, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden Utah. 46 pages.

Schmidt, K. M., J. P. Menakis, C. C. Hardy, W. J. Hann, Bunnell, D. L. 2002. Development of coarse-scale spatial data for wildland fire and fuel management. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-87. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, 41 p + CD.

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.

Sherriff, R.L. 2004. The historic range of variability of ponderosa pine in the northern Colorado Front Range: past fire types and fire effects. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

- Sherriff, R.L., and T.T. Veblen. Submitted a. A spatially-explicit reconstruction of historical fire occurrence in the ponderosa pine zone of the Colorado Front Range. *Ecosystems*.
- Sherriff, R.L., and T.T. Veblen. Submitted b. Ecological effects of changes in fire regimes in ponderosa pine ecosystems in the Colorado Front Range. *Ecological Applications*.
- Shlisky, A.Y. and W.J. Hann. 2004. Regime change. *Wildfire*, March/April: 25-30.
- Shinneman, D.J. and W.L. Baker. 1997. Nonequilibrium dynamics between catastrophic disturbances and old-growth forests in ponderosa pine landscapes of the Black Hills. *Conservation Biology* 11:1276-1288.
- Sugarloaf Fuel Reduction Project. 2004. Environmental Assessment for the Sugarloaf Fuel Reduction Project. Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forests. Boulder Ranger District. Boulder, County, CO.
- Swetnam, T. W. and C. H. Baisan. 1996. Historical fire regime patterns in the southwestern United States since AD 1700. ed. Allen, C.D. Proceedings of the 2nd annual La Mesa fire symposium. U.S.D.A. Forest Service General Technical Report RM-GTR-286.
- Turner, M.G. and W.H. Romme. 1994. Landscape dynamics in crown fire ecosystems. *Landscape Ecology* 9:59-77.
- Winiger Ridge Project. 1999. Environmental Assessment for Vegetation Management on National Forest System Lands in the Winiger Ridge Ecosystem Management Pilot Area. USDA Forest Service. Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forests. Boulder Ranger District. Boulder, County, CO.
- Van Wagner, C. E. 1977. Conditions for the start and spread of crown fire. *Can. J. For. Res.* 7, 23-34.
- Veblen, T. T. 2003. An Introduction to Key Issues in Fire Regime Research for Fuels Management and Ecological Restoration. In: Proceeding of the Conference on Fire, Fuel Treatments and Ecological Restoration: Proper place, Appropriate Time, April 16-18, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- 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(4): 1178-1195.
- Veblen, T. T. and D. C. Lorenz. 1986. Anthropogenic Disturbance and Recovery Patterns in Montane Forests, Colorado Front Range. *Physical Geography* (7)1:1-24.

Veblen, T. T. and D. C. Lorenz.1991. The Colorado Front Range: A century of ecological change. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Table 1: National Forest Fire Laboratory (NFFL) standard fuel models (Anderson 1982) and associated FlamMap variables. Crown Base Height (CBH) is the distance between the ground and the bottom of the crown. Crown Bulk Density (CBD) is the weight per volume of the crown biomass.

Fuel Model	Associated Vegetation Types (Anderson 1982)	Percent of study area	Crown Base Height (CBH) (m)	Crown Bulk Density (CBD) (kg/m ³)
1	Short grass	12%	0	0
2	Open ponderosa pine	30%	2	0.9
5	Brush	1%	0.3	0.9
6	Dormant brush, hardwood slash	<1%	0.3	0.14
8	Closed canopy, little ground litter, lodgepole pine	8%	2	0.22
9	Closed canopy mixed conifer	46%	1	0.2
10	Similar to 9 w/heavy ground fuels	4%	0.3	0.2

Table 2: Management goals that are appropriate in the montane zone of Boulder County, CO, based on potential wildfire behavior and historic fire frequency.

		Historic Fire Frequency		
		Low	Medium	High
Potential fireline intensity	Extreme/high	Mitigation Only	Ambiguous	Both goals
	Low	Management not necessary	Management not necessary	Management not necessary

Table 3: Results of sensitivity analysis for FlamMap parameters. The sensitivity analysis helps determine which factors contribute the most to surface wildfire behavior in the study area and to evaluate whether errors in the input data could potentially have a major influence in the model results.

Reference State	New State	Change in percentage of landscape classified as high or extreme potential fireline intensity
Original topography	Flat topography	- 22%
Original canopy cover	Closed canopy	- 10%
Original canopy cover	Open canopy	+ 36%
Upslope wind	Westerly wind	- 11%
24 kph wind	48 kph wind	+ 30%
Original fuels	All open ponderosa pine (Fuel Model 2)	+ 37%
Original fuels	All closed canopy mixed conifer (Fuel Model 10)	+ 30%
Original CBH	Half of original height	+ 13%
Original CBD	Add .1 kg/m ³ to original	+ 3%
Stand height 15m	Stand height 30m	+ 1%

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7

