Climate Change and Implications for Forest Restoration: Creating a Resilient Landscape

Malcolm North, USFS PSW Research & UC Davis, mnorth@ucdavis.edu

Climate Change: The Future is Here

Top 20 Largest California Wildfires

	FIRE NAME *(CAUSE)*	DATE	COUNTY	*ACRES*	STRUCTURES	DEATHS
1	**MENDOCINO COMPLEX** *(Under Investigation)*	July 2018	Colusa County, Lake County, Mendocino County & Glenn County	**459,123**	280	1
2	**THOMAS** *(Powerlines)*	December 2017	Ventura & Santa Barbara	**281,893**	1,063	2
3	**CEDAR** *(Human Related)*	October 2003	San Diego	**273,246**	2,820	15
4	**RUSH** *(Lightning)*	August 2012	Lassen	**271,911 CA / 43,666 NV**	0	0
5	**RIM** *(Human Related)*	August 2013	Tuolumne	**257,314**	112	0
6	**ZACA** *(Human Related)*	July 2007	Santa Barbara	**240,207**	1	0
7	**CARR** *(Human Related)*	July 2018	Shasta County, Trinity County	**229,651**	1,614	8
8	**MATILIJA** *(Undetermined)*	September 1932	Ventura	**220,000**	0	0
9	**WITCH** *(Powerlines)*	October 2007	San Diego	**197,990**	1,650	2
10	**KLAMATH THEATER COMPLEX** *(Lightning)*	June 2008	Siskiyou	**192,038**	0	2
11	**MARBLE CONE** *(Lightning)*	July 1977	Monterey	**177,866**	0	0
12	**LAGUNA (POWERLINES)**	September 1970	San Diego	**175,425**	382	5
13	**BASIN COMPLEX** *(Lightning)*	June 2008	Monterey	**162,818**	58	0
14	**DAY FIRE** *(Human Related)*	September 2006	Ventura	**162,702**	11	0
15	**STATION** *(Human Related)*	August 2009	Los Angeles	**160,557**	209	2
16	**CAMP FIRE** *(Powerlines)*	November 2018	Butte	**153,336**	18,804	85
17	**ROUGH** *(Lightning)*	July 2015	Fresno	**151,623**	4	0
18	**McNALLY** *(Human Related)*	July 2002	Tulare	**150,696**	17	0
19	**STANISLAUS COMPLEX** *(Lightning)*	August 1987	Tuolumne	**145,980**	28	1
20	**BIG BAR COMPLEX** *(Lightning)*	August 1999	Trinity	**140,948**	0	0

*There is no doubt that there were fires with significant acreage burned in years prior to 1932, but those records are less reliable, and this list is meant to give an overview of the large fires in more recent times.
**This list does not include fire jurisdiction. These are the Top 20 regardless of whether they were state, federal, or local responsibility.

8/08/2019

- 16 of the 20 largest CA wildfires occurred in the last 20 years
- Typically high severity is >30% of fire footprint (vs. 3-8% historically)
- Size of high-severity patches is well beyond conifer seed dispersal
- Annual acres needing reforestation has quadrupled over last 20 years

King Fire: >55% high severity



Climate Change: The Future is Here

Overly dense forests are not only a fire problem, they also create water stress: there are too many ‘straws in the ground’



- 2012-2016: Most severe drought in last 1000 years
- In California’s Sierra Nevada >150,000,000 dead trees
- Mortality correlated with climatic water deficit and stand basal area (Young et al. 2017)
- Beetle mortality is particularly accelerating the **loss of large, old-growth (>400 yrs) trees**

Given these conditions, how do we create resilient forest landscapes in the Sierra Nevada?




Outline:

1. What is landscape resilience and how do we create it?
2. Constraints: spotted owls, limitations on mechanical treatment and on fire use
3. Changing treatment pace and scale
4. Pyrosilviculture proposal

1. What is landscape resilience and how do we create it?

Forest structure and composition are influenced by largely immutable top down and bottom up factors, that drive disturbance and affect development processes.

Managing for resilience is 'reverse engineering' by accentuating differences in forest conditions with topography (bottom-up) to influence disturbance and developmental processes



So to reverse engineer forest conditions, they should be aligned with key drivers. What were they?

- The drivers of forest variability were productivity (soil moisture availability) and fire regime[2]
- **Overstory** conditions such as ***tall trees***, canopy cover, and size and number of large snags is driven by **soil moisture availability.**
- Understory conditions such as small (ladder) tree density, shrubs, and logs is determined by fire frequency and intensity.
- Historically, forests were heterogenous, which is integral to their resilience[1]

Variable forest conditions in Yosemite's Illilouette Valley

[1]Koontz, M.J., M.P. North, C.M. Werner, S.E. Rick and A.M. Latimer. 2020. Local forest structure variability increases resilience to wildfire in dry western U.S. coniferous forests. Ecology Letters. doi: 10.1111/ele.13447.

[2]Lydersen, J. and M. North. 2012. Topographic variation in active-fire forest structure under current climate conditions. Ecosystems 15: 1134-1146.

Schematic of local density, composition, and structure in congruence with how topography influences water availability and fire intensity





So 2009…and 2020

Is there information on how to do this?

Yes*. Top down climate drivers creates large-scale variability in forest conditions. Using reference sites as guides, we now have quantified target forest conditions for >20 climate classes across the Sierra.



Map of layers used to classify climate – annual actual evapotranspiration (AET), climatic water deficit (Deficit), and January minimum temperature (T_{min}) – across the study area using the Flints' Basin Model.

Climate conditions can be readily calculated from publicly available data such as the Flints' Basin Model



Map of climate classes with catchments containing at least one restored patch indicated.

* Jeronimo, S.M.A., V.R. Kane, D.JU. 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.

Within each climate class, how should forests conditions vary with topography? New paper* provides detailed stand structure metrics.

	Ridge		Mid-slope		Valley	
Individual Trees						
# Trees (ha^{-1})	30.2	(5.5)	31.5	(5.4)	29.7	(7.1)
% of total trees	19.1^{a}	(7.3)	14.0^{b}	(2.8)	11.4^{c}	(3.0)
QMD	58.0	(4.1)	58.0	(5.5)	57.6	(9.4)
BA (m^{-2}·ha^{-1})	8.0	(1.9)	8.3	(1.8)	7.7	(2.3)
% of total BA	20.9^{a}	(7.9)	14.8^{b}	(3.5)	10.9^{c}	(3.8)
Small Clumps (2–4 trees)						
# Trees (ha^{-1})	46.0^{a}	(9.2)	52.3^{b}	(11.3)	39.8^{c}	(14.4)
% of total trees	28.3^{a}	(8.6)	23.3^{b}	(5.9)	15.5^{c}	(6.6)
QMD	54.1	(7.4)	55.0	(4.5)	57.1	(7.1)
BA (m^{-2}·ha^{-1})	10.6	(3.0)	12.5	(3.1)	9.9	(3.4)
% of total BA	27.0^{a}	(10.6)	22.3^{b}	(6.4)	14.6^{c}	(6.6)
# Clumps (ha^{-1})	18.1^{a,b}	(3.6)	19.3^{a}	(4.5)	15.1^{b}	(5.6)
w/in-clump tree density*	679.7	(101.0)	684.6	(58.1)	774.4	(273.9)
Medium Clumps (5–9 trees)						
# Trees (ha^{-1})	36.9^{a}	(21.0)	45.9^{b}	(11.6)	39.8^{a}	(10.1)
% of total trees	20.1^{a}	(5.5)	20.1^{a}	(5.0)	15.6^{b}	(5.5)
QMD	57.0	(8.9)	55.4	(7.0)	60.1	(10.2)
BA (m^{-2}·ha^{-1})	9.3	(5.0)	11.2	(4.1)	11.4	(4.3)
% of total BA	20.9	(5.9)	19.6	(6.7)	15.8	(5.9)
# Clumps (ha^{-1})	5.8	(2.9)	7.2	(1.7)	6.0	(1.7)
w/in-clump tree density*	659.8	(135.8)	686.0	(106.5)	608.1	(99.5)
Large Clumps (≥ 10 trees)						
# Trees (ha^{-1})	62.8^{a}	(39.3)	101.1^{b}	(39.7)	155.7^{c}	(49.5)
% of total trees	32.6^{a}	(13.1)	42.6^{b}	(9.6)	57.6^{c}	(12.8)
QMD	52.0	(10.2)	57.2	(6.5)	60.0	(8.2)
BA (m^{-2}·ha^{-1})	14.9^{a}	(10.6)	25.2^{b}	(8.4)	44.6^{c}	(19.8)
% of total BA	31.2^{a}	(15.8)	43.4^{a}	(9.3)	58.6^{b}	(13.2)
# Clumps (ha^{-1})	3.8^{a}	(2.0)	5.2^{a,b}	(1.6)	6.4^{b}	(2.0)
w/in-clump tree density*	693.7	(157.8)	624.3	(105.9)	609.7	(106)
Plot-level						
# Trees (ha^{-1})	175.9^{a}	(60.2)	230.8^{b}	(45.3)	264.9^{c}	(41.0)
QMD	55.6	(4.9)	56.5	(3.8)	59.3	(7.7)
BA (m^{-2}·ha^{-1})	42.9^{a}	(15.9)	57.2^{b}	(9.4)	73.7^{b}	(19.3)
# Clumps (ha^{-1})	27.6^{a}	(6.4)	31.7^{b}	(5.1)	27.5^{a}	(7.1)
w/in-clump tree density*	675.7	(89.7)	676.7	(54.5)	699.7	(179.6)
Mean # trees/clump	5.1^{a}	(1.2)	6.3^{a}	(1.2)	9.3^{b}	(3.9)
Max. # trees/clump	24.1^{a}	(10.6)	37.1^{b}	(11.2)	73.3^{c}	(41.8)

Example Stem Maps



Plot Buffer
Openings
Tree Crowns
Tree Species:
Shade tolerant
Shade intolerant

% Plot Area



Openings
Interstitial space
Individual trees
Small clumps
Medium clumps
Large clumps

Frequency distribution of forest openings ≥ 80 m^{2}



*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.

GTR 220 Coda: How do you know when you've created resilience?

Hypothesis: In forests that historically had frequent-fire regimes, after treatments ask: "Is **competition** still driving vegetation composition & structure or **disturbance**?"

Why:

Ecologists have noted that in grazed and frequent fire communities around the world, a 'healthy' system is most resilient when its well below its carrying capacity & largely lacks competition

Example:

"this region does not now carry over 35% of the timber capacity it is capable of carrying, and that deficiency is wholly due to forest fires" Leiberg (1904)

This idea of keeping frequent-fire forests well below carrying capacity has already been shown to secure stable carbon stocks[1] and recently suggested for drought resilience[2]

Note: If this lack of competition metric is valid, it has important silvicultural impacts:

We manipulate and model forests (i.e., FVS) based on density-dependent [competition] mortality

Density would be much lower & tree spatial patterns (clumpy/gappy vs. regular spacing) will differ between disturbance and competition driven ecosystems

1) Keith, H., B.G. Makcey, and D.B. Lindenmayer. 2009. Re-evaluation of forest biomass carbon stocks and lessons from the world's most carbon-dense forests. PNAS 106: 11635–11640

2) Goulden, M.L. and R.C. Bales. 2019. California forest die-off linked to multi-year deep soil drying in 2012-2015 drought. Nature Geoscience 12: 632-637.

2A) Constraints: Spotted Owls

Owl's Impact on NF Land in the Sierra Nevada

Since the CASPO was published in 1992:

- ✓ Retain at least 40-50% canopy cover
- ✓ In a more recent paper, Tempel et al. (2014) "**>70% canopy cover** is associated with higher occupancy and reproduction"



How do you accommodate 70% canopy cover in fire and drought prone forests? How did the owl persist when the forest had an active fire regime and most canopy cover (before 1850) was 25-40%?

LiDAR Analysis of Spotted Owl Habitat

Forest Ecology and Management 405 (2017) 166-178

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Forest Ecology and Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/foreco

Cover of tall trees best predicts California spotted owl habitat

Malcolm P. North[a,k,*], Jonathan T. Kane[b], Van R. Kane[b], Gregory P. Asner[c], William Berigan[d], Derek J. Churchill[b], Scott Conway[e], R.J. Gutiérrez[d,f], Sean Jeronimo[b], John Keane[a], Alexander Koltunov[e,j], Tina Mark[g], Monika Moskal[b], Thomas Munton[h], Zachary Peery[d], Carlos Ramirez[e], Rahel Sollmann[i], Angela M. White[a], Sheila Whitmore[d]



18 co-authors including prominent spotted owl biologists

- ➢ Largest owl habitat analysis (by >10X)
- ➢ Dataset >65 Terrabytes, **100% of landscape sampled**
- ➢ >2 weeks to run analysis on multi-processor computers

Study area	Nest sites	Acres
SEKI*	131	66,518
Eldorado NF	58	100,223
Sierra NF	63	101,511
Tahoe NF	64	770,795
Total	**316**	**1,039,047**

*SEKI

- Only owl demographic area with increasing population is old growth, much of it with a restored fire regime
- Used for contrast with NF conditions and as possible 'ideal' habitat

Contrasting Spotted Owl Habitat



NF: Traditional interpretation of ideal habitat:

Profile showing large, tall trees

Top down canopy transect with high (75%) canopy cover



Typical SEKI Habitat

Canopy transect with 40% cover



LiDAR also found owl habitat without high cover

Profile shows tall (>157 ft) trees

Sierra Nevada forests can be managed to provide owl habitat while reducing fuels and increasing tree drought resilience

- **Key habitat feature is not total canopy cover, but the cover in tall (>157 ft) trees.**

- Owls actually avoid areas with understory (6-50’ strata) cover suggesting that **reducing ladder fuels and stem density should not adversely impact owls.**

“Work with the hand you’re dealt, but plan for the future”

- BUT… many current owl PACs are not in sustainable locations (i.e., often using steep, remote slopes that were inaccessible to logging where there are remnant older forests) prone to fire and drought.
- Building landscape resilience should consider planning to transition owl habitat **to landscape locations best able to support tall trees.**
- This means identifying and fostering large tree development in wet, fire refugia areas.

Location and height of tall trees is driven by scale-nested factors that drive water availability*…easy to identify in GIS



*Fricker, G.A., N.W. Synes, J.M. Serra-Diaz, M.P. North, F.W. Davis, and J. Franklin. 2019. More than climate? Predictors of tree canopy height vary with scale in complex terrain, Sierra Nevada, CA (USA). Forest Ecology and Management 434: 142-153.

2B) Mechanical Constraints: If We Got 'Serious', Could We Thin Our Way To Resilience?

Reduction in FS acres Available for Mechanical Treatment



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


Sierra National Forest
Merced River
Hwy 140
Lake Crowley
Lake Thomas Edison
Bass Lake
Huntington Lake
Florence Lake
Hwy 41
Shaver Lake
Courtright Reservoir
Wishon Reservior
San Joaquin River
FS managed lands
Restricted
Available
Hwy 168
Pine Flat Reservior
Kings River
N
0
4
8 Miles


Sierra National Forest
Merced River
Hwy 140
Hwy 41
Bass Lake
Huntington Lake
Lake Thomas Edison
Florence Lake
Lake Crowley
Shaver Lake
Courtright Reservoir
Wishon Reservior
San Joaquin River
Hwy 168
Pine Flat Reservior
Kings River
FS managed lands
Restricted
Available
N
0
4
8 Miles

Sierra National Forest



Sierra National Forest





Analysis by “Subwatersheds ≈ Firesheds”

National Forest:	Level of Constraint			
	HUs with >25% FS ownership	High (85-100%)	Moderate (65-84%)	Light (<65%)
Modoc	96	51.0%	32.3%	16.7%
Lassen	98	22.4%	39.8%	37.8%
Plumas	87	20.7%	44.8%	34.5%
Tahoe	54	24.1%	48.1%	27.8%
LTBMU	16	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%
Eldorado	50	26.0%	50.0%	24.0%
Stanislaus	53	49.7%	30.2%	20.1%
Sierra	77	66.2%	15.6%	18.2%
Sequoia	70	72.9%	22.8%	4.3%
Inyo	109	91.7%	3.7%	4.6%
	710	**46.2%**	33.7%	**20.1**%
	Total	Average		

- **20%** of subwatersheds you could thin your way to resilience
- **46%** of subwatersheds need prescribed fire or managed wildfire for effective landscape treatment

2C: Fire Use Constraints

Fire suppression and human settlement have produced roadblocks

1) Small and intermediate size trees can 'ladder' surface or ground burns into catastrophic crown fires.

2) Surface fuel accumulations produce hot, long-duration temperatures that can kill large, old trees.

3) Smoke production



4) Liability

5) Revenue (or lack thereof)

Whatever type of fire is restored, it will not replicate the historical fire regime

3) Changing treatment pace and scale: Need to increase pace and scale, otherwise treatments are blown out by severe wildfire and drought









Example: Dinkey CFLRP treated 9310 ha over 9 years

Over that same period, drought killed roughly 400,000 ha of trees and wildfire burned about 10,000,000 ac

How do we change current pace and scale on National Forests?

Historical Rate of Fire	487,486 acres/year
Rates of Treatment* (1998-2008)	36,854
• Mechanical treatment	28,598
• Prescribed fire	8,256

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

→ **Current treatment is 7.6% of historical rate**

→ **Annual Deficit = 450,000 acres/year (NF lands in Sierra Nevada)**

→ **At current pace, due to maintenance, 2/3's of the forest will never be treated**

→ **Sierra Nevada forests are very productive…maintenance will kill you unless we find an economic, scalable means of making treatments extensive and economical.**

Where does the logic of this lead?

Some Deductions:

Deficit is so large, there's no point in arguing over thinning vs. burning priorities: silviculture and fire need to come out of their silos and explicitly work together to increase pace and scale: Pyrosilviculture

Scale up and concentrate efforts: Firesheds (≈30-60,000 ac or HUC 12s) need to be >35-50% fuels reduced to moderate fire intensity. Higher % to be drought/beetle resistant.

Use the extensive but blunt effects of fire to link landscape treatments, thin density, and for phenotypic selection (i.e., individuals with thicker bark and earlier branch abscission).

Use precision but limited scale of silviculture to affect fuel abundance and continuity, generate revenue to support fire, and facilitate widespread fire use.

Increase mechanical by using it to not only aid suppression, but also to strategically place anchors to facilitate fire use

- There are many Sierra Nevada fire/water sheds untreated because mechanically available acreage is too small to effect fire with thinning alone…however mechanical treatment could establish 'anchors' for expanding fire use.
- In eastern Australia, with about 20% of landscape in strategic 'anchors', they reached a tipping point for widespread fire use

Green is areas available for mechanical thinning

Central subwatershed above is left untreated because only 10% of area is available to mechanical treatment

Zoning Landscapes for Different Fire Objectives: Forest Plan Revision



3 Early Adopter NFs in southern Sierra used the mechanical constraints and other analyses to delineate 4 zones in the NF with different levels of fire use. The wildfire 'Restoration' and 'Maintenance' now require justification for putting out a fire in those zones.



- To scale up Rx/managed fire, will need to **keep it burning** using Yosemite's push/pull approach: 'Push' fire into low fuel areas (ex. granite outcrops) during bad weather/dispersion and 'pull' it across landscape during good conditions (ARC will need to allow much longer burn windows).
- Wildfire is by far the largest forest 'treatment' (100-500,000 ac/yr). Move focus beyond just salvaging & planting high severity➔ leverage 'restoration work' of low/moderate severity areas, by continuing fuels and density reduction.


Questions?
Malcolm North, USFS PSW Research Station & Dept of Plant Sciences, UC Davis mnorth@ucdavis.edu
Lab website: http://northlab.faculty.ucdavis.edu/