Predicting post-fire hillslope erosion in forest lands of the western United States
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Abstract. Many forests and their associated water resources are at increasing risk from large and severe wildfires due to high fuel accumulations and climate change. Extensive fuel treatments are being proposed, but it is not clear where such treatments should be focussed. The goals of this project were to: (1) predict potential post-fire erosion rates for forests and shrublands in the western United States to help prioritise fuel treatments; and (2) assess model sensitivity and accuracy. Post-fire ground cover was predicted using historical fire weather data and the First Order Fire Effects Model. Parameter files from the Disturbed Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP) were combined with GeoWEPP to predict post-fire erosion at the hillslope scale. Predicted median annual erosion rates were 0.1–2 Mg ha\textsuperscript{-1} year\textsuperscript{-1} for most of the intermountain west, 10–40 Mg ha\textsuperscript{-1} year\textsuperscript{-1} for wetter areas along the Pacific Coast and up to 100 Mg ha\textsuperscript{-1} year\textsuperscript{-1} for north-western California. Sensitivity analyses showed the predicted erosion rates were predominantly controlled by the amount of precipitation rather than surface cover. The limited validation dataset showed a reasonable correlation between predicted and measured erosion rates ($R^2 = 0.61$), although predictions were much less than measured values. Our results demonstrate the feasibility of predicting post-fire erosion rates on a large scale. The validation and sensitivity analysis indicated that the predictions are most useful for prioritising fuel reduction treatments on a local rather than interregional scale, and they also helped identify model improvements and research needs.
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Introduction

Many forests in the western USA are more susceptible to large, high-severity wildfires because of increased fuel accumulations from fire suppression (Agee 1993; Keane et al. 2002) and climate change (Flannigan et al. 2000; Westerling et al. 2006). Areas burned at high severity are of particular concern because of their high potential for flash floods and surface erosion (Forrest and Harding 1994; Neary et al. 2005). Post-fire increases in runoff and erosion can severely degrade water quality and reduce reservoir capacities (Tiedemann et al. 1979; Moody and Martin 2001; Neary et al. 2005).

To combat this risk, the USDA Forest Service and other land-management agencies have initiated fuel reduction programs, but the areas needing treatment far exceed the available funding (GAO 1999; Sampson et al. 2000; GAO 2007). Hence, there is a need to assess and compare the relative priority for fuel reduction treatments on a spatially explicit basis. Previous large-scale erosion mapping projects have utilised conceptual empirical models such as the Universal Soil Loss Equation or the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) (MacDonald et al. 2000; Miller et al. 2003; Brough et al. 2004), or locally derived categorical equations (e.g. Fox et al. 2006). However, it is questionable whether these largely empirical models should be extrapolated to conditions for which they have not been calibrated (Larsen and MacDonald 2007).

The primary objective of this project was to develop and apply a spatially explicit procedure for predicting first year post-fire surface erosion rates across a large geographic area. The study area consisted of the forests and shrublands in the continental western United States, and our modelling goal was to use existing data and procedures that could be consistently applied across the entire region. A series of additional objectives were identified during model development and application, and these included: (1) evaluating the sensitivity of predictions to key input parameters; (2) validating predicted values against measured values; (3) identifying key limitations to the consistency and accuracy of the predicted values; and (4) identifying specific modelling and research needs.
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The following sections successively present our modelling approach, the development and compilation of the input data, modelling results, a sensitivity analysis and a discussion of key issues and possible improvements. The effect of uncertainties in the input parameters on model predictions can be evaluated through the exposed mineral soil equation and the results of the sensitivity analysis, but the absolute quantification of input and prediction errors is hampered by the lack of field data for the diverse landscapes found in the forested lands of the western US. Nevertheless, the approach and results presented here are already providing guidance to resource managers through several different risk-assessment projects. We hope the results and ideas presented in this paper will further stimulate efforts to better predict post-fire effects in fire-prone areas.

Modelling approach

Soil erosion due to water depends primarily on the amount of surface cover, slope length, slope steepness and the amount and intensity of rainfall (Renard et al. 1997; Pietraszek 2006). Soil texture and topographic convergence are other important parameters (Renard et al. 1997; Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005). For convenience and simplicity, the term ‘erosion’ in the present paper is used to refer to both the predicted soil loss at the hillslope scale (≈1–15 ha) and measured sediment yields at scales of 0.01–4 ha.

The focus of this paper is on surface erosion from rainsplash, sheetwash and rilling, as these are the most common and widespread causes of post-fire erosion (Moody and Martin 2001; Pietraszek 2006). In certain geographic areas, such as the rapidly rising mountains of southern California, debris flows and dry ravel can be important (Krammes 1960; Gabet 2003; Wohlgermuth 2003), and empirical prediction models have been developed for debris flows in some areas (Cannon 2001). At larger scales, channel erosion can be the dominant sediment source (e.g. Moody and Martin 2001), but the data and models needed to predict post-fire channel erosion are still in the developmental stage (Montgomery and Dietrich 1989; Istanbulluoglu et al. 2002; Moody and Kinner 2006).

Given the present state-of-the-art and geographic variability in erosion processes, the most widely used models for predicting post-fire erosion are based either on RUSLE (Renard et al. 1997) or the Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP) (Flanagan and Nearing 1995; Lafflen et al. 1997). Key inputs for both models are climate, soils, ground cover and topography. RUSLE is a conceptual empirical model that is widely used in agricultural areas; its applicability to forested areas is uncertain because of its focus on overland flow and the datasets used for calibration and validation were primarily from agricultural and rangeland plots (Renard et al. 1997).

WEPP is a process-based model that predicts runoff and sediment yields from planar hillslopes and small watersheds up to 2.5 km², and these predictions are based on up to 100 years of stochastically generated climatic data (Flanagan and Nearing 1995). The surface hydrology component of WEPP uses climate, soils, topography and vegetation input files to predict infiltration, runoff volume and peak discharge for each simulated storm. Climate, soils and vegetation inputs are also used to predict vegetative growth, litter accumulation and litter decomposition. WEPP uses these inputs and predictions to calculate both rill and interrill erosion as well as sediment deposition (Flanagan and Nearing 1995). The physically based nature of WEPP means that several hundred parameters must be specified to run the model.

Online interfaces, such as Disturbed WEPP (Elliot 2004) and the Erosion Risk Management Tool, ERMIT (Robichaud et al. 2007a), have been developed to facilitate the use of WEPP in forested areas. The Disturbed WEPP interface (http://forest.moscowfsl.wsu.edu/fswepp/, accessed 14 August 2011) was designed to simulate different forest conditions and management scenarios, including sites burned at high and low severity (Elliot 2004). To run Disturbed WEPP, the user needs only to specify a few key input parameters, including soil texture class, vegetation type, a climate station from the WEPP database and a hillslope profile. The interface then generates all of the additional parameters needed to run the WEPP model (Elliot 2004), and Disturbed WEPP has been used to model post-fire erosion in forested areas (Soto and Diaz-Fierros 1998; Larsen and MacDonald 2007; Spigel and Robichaud 2007).

The relative accuracy of RUSLE and WEPP for predicting post-fire erosion was evaluated by comparing measured and predicted values for 83 hillslopes of 0.01–0.5 ha from nine different fires in the Colorado Front Range (Larsen and MacDonald 2007). The predicted values using Disturbed WEPP (R² = 0.25) were more accurate than RUSLE (R² = 0.16), but neither model was able to accurately predict erosion rates from individual hillslopes. The high spatial variability between plots meant the model predictions were much more accurate for the mean erosion rate from groups of hillslopes burned at similar severity in a given fire, and Disturbed WEPP was again more accurate than RUSLE (R² = 0.66 vs. 0.54 respectively) (Larsen and MacDonald 2007). Spigel and Robichaud (2007) also found similar results by comparing the mean erosion rates rather than from individual plots after the 2000 Bitterroot Valley fires in Montana. These results imply that average erosion rates are easier to model rather than trying to account for all the small-scale variations after wildfires within surface conditions, soil characteristics and other factors in each plot. Given these results and the greater potential accuracy of physically based models for predicting results outside the areas or conditions for which they were calibrated, the present study used the WEPP model to predict post-fire erosion rates.

The need to predict post-fire erosion rates across large areas necessitated the use of the Geo-spatial interface for the Water Erosion Prediction Project (GeoWEPP) (Renschler 2003). GeoWEPP facilitates the use of WEPP across large areas by converting GIS data into WEPP inputs, running WEPP and then compiling the results into a spatial map (Renschler 2003). Like WEPP, GeoWEPP only predicts runoff and erosion from watersheds smaller than 2.5 km² because it does not route sediment through perennial stream channels. The present project used the March 2004 version of GeoWEPP and the April 2005 version of WEPP.

The primary inputs for GeoWEPP are climate data, plant-management files (‘land use or land cover files’ in GeoWEPP), a soils map, and a Digital Elevation Model (DEM) (Fig. 1). The various plant-management and soil input files developed for burned areas and used in the Disturbed WEPP interface were
used to create the different sets of input parameters needed by the underlying WEPP model. To maximise the comparability and consistency of the results, the same sets of input files were applied across the study area. These sets of input files allowed us to spatially vary the soil type, rock content and vegetative cover as described below.

Using this procedure, we were able to predict potential erosion in the first year after burning for most areas covered by forests and dense shrublands in the western USA (Fig. 2), or a total area of 650,000 km². The resulting maps are available through http://environmental-rs-modeling.com/erosion_maps.html (accessed 18 August 2011), and these predictions are already being used to identify the relative risk to municipal water supplies and aquatic resources in parts of Colorado, Washington, Oregon and California. Some of the modelling issues identified in this project have led to revisions in the underlying WEPP model, and the approach developed here is being considered for similar projects in other areas.

Development and compilation of input data

Subdividing the study area

The continental western USA was divided into 27 zones following the delineation being used by the LANDFIRE project (Fig. 2) (The National Map LANDFIRE 2005; Rollins 2009). This multiagency project is generating maps and data on vegetation, wildland fire regimes and fuel assessments across the entire USA and it provided the seamless soils and topographic data layers used in the present project (The National Map LANDFIRE 2005; The Nature Conservancy et al. 2005; Rollins 2009). The spatial input data layers were converted to Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates as GeoWEPP requires a coordinate system with positive values. The results were projected back to the original LANDFIRE Albers projection for viewing purposes.

Climate data

Climate input files were generated by CLIGEN (Nicks et al. 1995), which is the stochastic weather generation program within WEPP (Flanagan and Nearing 1995). The climate database in WEPP has more than 2000 weather stations in the USA, including 739 stations in the study area. The data for each station include the monthly means and statistical distributions of maximum and minimum temperatures, number of wet days, and the frequency distributions of precipitation amounts and intensities. CLIGEN uses these data to generate climate input files with up to 100 years of daily temperature and precipitation data (Nicks et al. 1995; Yu 2002; Robichaud et al. 2007a).

GeoWEPP automatically identifies the climate station in the WEPP database nearest each watershed outlet. Mean annual post-fire erosion rates were calculated for the first 5 years of the 100 years of simulated daily weather data in order to reduce computational time while still averaging some of the interannual climatic variability. The validity of this truncation was tested as part of the sensitivity analysis.

Cover percentage and plant—management input files

An important step in the modelling process was to predict the amount of surface cover after a wildfire, as field studies have shown the amount of surface cover (or conversely the amount of bare mineral soil) is a dominant control on post-fire erosion.
rates under a given climatic regime (Dissmeyer and Foster 1981; Robichaud and Brown 1999; Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005; Larsen et al. 2009). The amount of exposed mineral soil after burning (EM) is a key parameter in the plant–management input files, and this was predicted using an empirical equation from FOFEM (First Order Fire Effects Model) (Reinhardt et al. 1997; Reinhardt 2003) (Fig. 1). Surface cover was then calculated as 100 minus EM percentage.

FOFEM predicts EM percentage after burning from National Fire Danger Rating Thousand-Hour (NFDR-TH) fuel moisture values and fuel types. The FOEFM database includes typical fuel loading values for different vegetation types, but it cannot provide fuel moisture values because these vary over time and space. We therefore had to calculate and map NFDR-TH fuel moisture values for an assumed probability of severe fire weather (i.e. the conditions under which an area would likely burn).

NFDR-TH fuels are defined as dead plant material with a diameter of 7.6–20 cm; the name signifies that it takes 1000 h for these fuels to gain or lose 63% of their initial moisture content (Fosberg et al. 1981). Daily NFDR-TH fuel moisture values can be calculated from weather data for the previous 7 days and the initial 1000-h fuel moisture content (Ottmar and Sandberg 1985). The required weather data are daily minimum and maximum temperatures, daily minimum and maximum relative humidities, and the duration of any precipitation events. These data are collected by stationary and mobile RAWS (Remote Automated Weather Stations) (National Fire and Aviation Management 2005). Daily maps of the NFDR-TH fuel moisture values are generated by the US National Interagency Fire Center. These maps are produced by identifying the 12 fire weather stations nearest to each 1-km grid cell, and then weighting each of the 12 stations by an inverse distance squared algorithm (L. Bradshaw, USDA Forest Service, pers. comm., 2005).

Cumulative frequency distributions of archived weather data were used to calculate NFDR-TH fuel moisture values for 987 fire weather stations located within the study area that had at least 8 years of data from one location. The assumed NFDR-TH fuel conditions at the time of burning were at 98–100% ERC (Energy Released Component) (K. Ryan, USDA Forest Service, pers. comm., 2005), where ERC is the energy released per unit area of flaming front. The ERC values depend on the NFDR-TH fuel moisture values and fuel type as defined below and in Burgan et al. (1998).

Twenty different fuel types were defined to represent the major plant communities in the USA (e.g. short-needle pine with normal dead fuel loads, hardwoods, or California mixed chaparral) (Burgan et al. 1998). Ten of these fuel types were needed to represent the forest and shrubland communities in the study area, and digital maps of these fuel types are available at a 1-km² resolution (Burgan et al. 1998) (Table 1). The NFDR-TH fuel moistures at 98–100% ERC were calculated for each of these 10 fuel types for each fire weather station using the FireFamily Plus software package (USDA Forest Service 2002) (Fig. 1). NFDR-TH fuel moisture maps were generated for each fuel type with the same inverse distance squared interpolation algorithm used to map daily fuel moistures. The GIS layer of fuel types (Burgan et al. 1998) was used to determine which fuel type was appropriate for each 1-km² cell in the study area, and the
appropriate NFDR-TH fuel moisture for that fuel type was clipped from the 10 NFDR-TH fuel moisture maps. The clipped fuel moisture maps were then merged into a single map of predicted NFDR-TH fuel moisture values at 98–100% ERC.

Some areas that were barren according to the GIS map of fuel types (Burgan et al. 1998) had woody vegetation according to the Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA) as derived from AVHRR (Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer) satellite data (Zhu and Evans 1994) (Table 1). The vegetation in these areas was assumed to be represented by fuel type G (short-needle pine with heavy dead fuel loads), as this fuel type adequately predicts ERC for many forests in the USA (Hall et al. 2003). The spatially explicit NFDR-TH fuel moisture values were used to predict EM percentage using Eqn 1 (Brown et al. 1985):  

\[ EM = 94.3 - 4.96 \times NFDR-TH \]  

(1)

The predicted EM values were used to assign a surface cover percentage to each 30-m grid cell in the study area.

As the modelling goal was to predict post-fire erosion in the first year after burning, a series of WEPP plant–management input files without growth and decomposition were developed to maintain constant surface cover over the 5 years of simulated weather (normally WEPP would simulate vegetation recovery over time). Plant–management files were developed for each 2.5% increment of surface cover, and for each file, the initial cover variables were specified to obtain the desired cover percentage. The presumed lack of regrowth in the first year after burning is justified as most areas burn in the summer or fall (autumn), shortly before the wet or summer monsoon season, and in at least some areas, sediment production per unit rainfall erosivity is unchanged for the first 2 years after burning (Shakesby et al. 1996; Larsen et al. 2009).

### Soils data

Soil data layers from the LANDFIRE project (Rollins 2009) were used to develop the soil input layers used in this project (Table 1). The LANDFIRE soil layers were derived from STATSGO (STATs Soil GeOgraphic) data (USDA 1991), and included: maximum soil depth; rock fragments percentage (>2.0 mm); sand percentage; silt percentage; and clay percentage. The sand, silt and clay layers were used to classify each soil pixel into one of the four soil texture classes in Disturbed WEPP (sandy loam, loam, silt loam and clay loam). Disturbed WEPP estimates other input parameters (e.g. effective hydraulic conductivity, soil albedo and rill erodibility) from the soil texture class, and only four classes are used because there are not enough data from forested areas to justify a more detailed classification (Elliot et al. 2000).

The soil parameters in Disturbed WEPP also vary according to whether a site burned at high or low severity. Burn severity was classified from the map of EM values; grid cells with more than 35% bare soil were assumed to have burned at high severity, and grid cells with ≤35% bare soil were assumed to have burned at low severity (Robichaud 2000). The combination of four soil texture classes and two burn severities yielded a total of eight soil classes.

Erosion rates in WEPP are affected by the percentage of rock fragments (>2 mm) until the proportion exceeds 50% (Elliot et al. 2000). According to the STATSGO data, the soils in the study area had from 0 to 85% rock fragments. We therefore divided the soils into 27 rock-fragment classes using 2% increments; soils with more than 50% rock fragments were included in the 50% class. The combination of four soil texture classes, two burn severity classes, and 27 rock fragment classes necessitated the generation of 216 soil input files.

### Topographic data, watershed delineation, and processing

The LANDFIRE project provided a seamless 30-m DEM of the study area derived from the National Map (USGS 2002) (Table 1). GeoWEPP uses a topographic analysis software, TOPAZ: Topographic Parameterisation (Garbrecht and Martz 1999), to delineate watersheds and create the slope files needed to run WEPP. Required input parameters for TOPAZ include the critical source area (CSA) and minimum source channel length (MSCL). To be consistent with our modelling philosophy and available data, we used the default values in GeoWEPP of 5 ha for CSA and 100 m for MSCL, and these values resulted in a mean hillslope size of ~6 ha.

To more efficiently model the study area, GeoWEPP was modified to run batch files (C. Renschler, State University of New York at Buffalo, pers. comm., 2005). These batch files were created in ESRI’s ArcInfo GIS (ESRI Inc., Redlands, CA) software by first delineating watersheds based on the DEM data, and then clipping the surface cover and soil layers to match this initial delineation. The predominant soil and surface cover values for each hillslope determined which soil and plant–management files were used in GeoWEPP. This processing created some gaps in the output layer, and these were primarily caused by the failure of TOPAZ to delineate watersheds in flat regions. There also were some gaps near UTM boundaries due to an inadequate buffer when reprojecting the data. Taken together, these data gaps comprised from 10 to 30% of each LANDFIRE zone.

To the extent possible, these gaps were filled by dividing the unmodelled watersheds into smaller units and rerunning GeoWEPP. The finer-scale delineation isolated the flattest areas, which allowed the remaining watersheds to be
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Sensitivity analysis

The sensitivity analysis evaluated the changes in predicted erosion as a result of variations in climate, surface cover, slope steepness, slope length, soil rock content, soil texture and length of the simulated climate. The baseline scenario for these analyses assumed a 60 m-long hillslope with a 30% slope, a loam soil with 25% rock fragments, and 50% surface cover. The relative effects of climate and surface cover were evaluated by systematically varying the surface cover from 20 to 100% for six climate stations with widely varying mean annual precipitation (MAP). The other sensitivity analyses were run for both a dry and a wet climate. The dry climate was represented by the Cheesman station in the Colorado Front Range, where the predicted 5-year MAP is 406 mm. The wet climate was represented by Strawberry Valley on the west slope of the Sierra Nevada in California, where the predicted 5-year MAP is 2235 mm. Each sensitivity analysis used a 5-year simulated climate except for assessing the effect of the length of the simulated climate on predicted erosion rates. The combined effect of changing the CSA and MSCL parameters was evaluated by rerunning GeoWEPP for an 800-ha watershed in the Sierra Nevada of California with exceptionally high predicted erosion rates.

Validation

Validation of the predicted erosion rates was severely limited by the paucity of directly comparable field measurements. At the time of this study, the two most extensive and readily available datasets were: (1) hillslope-scale measurements from the Colorado Front Range, and (2) small-watershed sediment yields from four western states. The hillslope-scale erosion data from the Colorado Front Range were collected from 50 different hillslopes immediately after four wildfires that occurred in late spring or early summer and two prescribed fires (Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005; Pietraszek 2006). The mean contributing area for each hillslope was ~0.1 ha, and sediment production was measured with sediment fences similar to those of Robichaud and Brown (2002). The measured sediment production from each hillslope was averaged over the first 2 years after burning for two reasons. First, vegetative recovery in Colorado is slow given the coarse-textured soils and cool, dry climate, so post-fire erosion rates are nearly identical for the first and second summers after burning when normalised by rainfall erosivity (Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005; Larsen et al. 2009). Second, over 90% of the post-fire erosion is generated by summer convective storms, and in the Colorado Front Range, summer precipitation in the year of burning is typically below average (Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005; Pietraszek 2006). Erosion is usually higher in the second summer after burning than the first summer (Pietraszek 2006). As it is not known if precipitation is generally below normal in the first year after burning in other areas, the bias in the field data due to the below-normal precipitation relative to the predicted values was reduced by averaging the measured erosion in the first 2 years after burning. Erosion rates were also averaged for the hillslopes within each fire that burned at high and moderate severity, as the measured hillslopes had relatively consistent soils, slopes and ground cover, they were in close proximity, and the hillslope areas were typically much smaller than the modelled hillslopes. The measured mean annual erosion rates for each fire were compared with the mean predicted erosion for the two or three hillslopes that encompassed the field data from each fire.

The second dataset consisted of erosion data from six high-severity-burned 1–13-ha watersheds in California, Colorado, Montana and Washington (Robichaud et al. 2008). The sediment captured in large weirs at each watershed outlet was periodically cleaned out, weighed and summed to yield annual amounts. The outlet coordinates and characteristics of each watershed were used to identify the nearest comparable modelled hillslope. As with the first dataset, the mean erosion rate for the first 2 years of data from each watershed was compared with the mean predicted value for the corresponding hillslopes.

Results

Predicted exposed soil and erosion rates

The predicted amount of EM ranged from 0 to 81% (Fig. 3). The intermountain west and southern Rocky Mountains generally had the highest amounts of EM and the lowest amounts of surface cover after burning (Table 2a). In these areas, the mean predicted EM after burning was ~55–65%, and this decreased to 45–50% for the northern Rocky Mountains, eastern Oregon and eastern Washington. Wetter areas along the northern Pacific Coast had the lowest predicted EM and highest surface cover values (Fig. 3; Table 2a). The lower EM values in Fig. 3 can be attributed to the higher NFDR-TH fuel moisture values in areas with more precipitation. The predicted post-fire surface cover values within each LANDFIRE zone were relatively consistent, as the coefficient of variation (CV) for the 1-km² pixels ranged only from 13 to 21% (Table 2a). More variability could be expected with a finer-scale map of fuel types.

Predicted first-year erosion rates spanned a broad range within and among the 12 LANDFIRE zones modelled in this project (Table 2b; Fig. 4). Predicted erosion rates were typically less than 5 Mg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (5 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹) for the Rocky Mountains and interior west where mean annual precipitation is often low and much of the precipitation falls as snow. The lowest predicted mean erosion rate was 0.9 Mg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for zone 23, which is split between Colorado and Utah (Table 2b; Fig. 4).

Mean predicted erosion rates were at least an order of magnitude higher along the Pacific Coast, with values ranging from 52 Mg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ in western Washington to 155 Mg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for north-western California (LANDFIRE zones 1 and 3 respectively) (Table 2b; Fig. 4). The mean predicted erosion rate for eastern Oregon (zone 7) was 28 Mg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹, which effectively split the difference between the low values in the California with exceptionally high predicted erosion rates.
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Fig. 3. Predicted percentage of exposed mineral soil after burning.

Fig. 4. Predicted post-fire erosion rates for the first year after burning for the 12 LANDFIRE zones where the modelling was completed. The grey colour in the background indicates forests and shrublands according to the Forest Inventory Analysis (Zhu and Evans 1994).
intermountain west and the much higher values along the Pacific Coast. The forests and shrublands in the Sierra Nevada of California (LANDFIRE zone 6) also had a relatively high predicted mean erosion rate of 47 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\), and this zone also had the highest hillslope-scale erosion rate of 2100 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) (Table 2b).

The distribution of predicted erosion rates within each LANDFIRE zone was highly skewed as maximum values were 8 to 160 times the mean (Table 2b). LANDFIRE zones with lower mean annual erosion rates (under 6 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\)) were all from drier interior zones where the mean was typically 3–9 times the median (Table 2b). The remaining wetter zones on or near the coast (1, 2, 3, 6 and 7) all had mean annual erosion rates over 28 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) and the mean was 1–15 times the median.

Some sharp spatial changes in the predicted post-fire erosion rates that are not due to topography can be attributed to a sudden change in the climate stations selected by GeoWEPP (Fig. 4). These discontinuities were most pronounced in mountainous areas, as these areas have fewer climate stations and there can be large changes in the amount and type of precipitation between adjacent stations.

Sensitivity analysis

Climate and surface cover

The first sensitivity analysis evaluated the effect of climate and surface cover percentage on predicted erosion rates. There was a very steep, non-linear decline in predicted erosion rates for the three wetter climates as surface cover percentage increased from 20 to 65%, and a much smaller decline as surface cover increased from 65 to 100% (Fig. 5). For the three drier climates, the relative decline in predicted erosion rates with increasing cover was similar to the three wetter climates, though the absolute range was smaller (Fig. 5). For each station, the sudden decline at 65% surface cover was due to the shift from high to low burn severity and the resulting changes in soil properties and other input parameters. The non-linear decline in predicted erosion with increasing ground cover is consistent with field studies (e.g. Walsh and Voight 1977; Larsen et al. 2009).

A quantitative analysis of the climate stations with varying MAP indicates climate has a greater effect on the predicted erosion rates than surface cover percentage (Fig. 5). It is important, however, to note that the predicted erosion rates depend on the precipitation intensity and duration of individually modelled storms, not annual precipitation amounts. At 20% surface cover (corresponding to the maximum predicted EM of 80% in Table 2a), the predicted erosion rate for Cheesman is just

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landfire Zones</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>CV (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 6 7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 1 5 1 6 1 9 2 1 2 3 2 8</td>
<td>69 49 41 53 6</td>
<td>9 5 10 9 6 9</td>
<td>30 25 28 28 20</td>
<td>8 20 23</td>
<td>16 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landfire Zones</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>CV (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 6 7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 1 5 1 6 1 9 2 1 2 3 2 8</td>
<td>88 47 28</td>
<td>151 15</td>
<td>134 84</td>
<td>0 2100</td>
<td>151 1500</td>
<td>200 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5. Predicted erosion rates v. surface cover percentage for six climate stations with mean annual precipitation values ranging from 330 to 2896 mm year\(^{-1}\).
under 4 Mg ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ as compared with nearly 200 Mg ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ for the wettest climate. Effective rainfall intensities for these two stations were similar; which indicates that a seven-fold increase in MAP resulted in a 50-fold increase in erosion (Fig. 5). The type of precipitation also affects predicted erosion rates, as the Santa Ana climate in southern California yielded slightly higher erosion rates than the Cheesman climate, even though the MAP for Santa Ana is 19% less than for Cheesman (Fig. 5). The lower erosion rates for the Cheesman climate can be attributed to the fact that at least one-third of the annual precipitation at Cheesman falls as snow (Libohova 2004), and snowmelt causes very little post-fire erosion (Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005; Pietraszek 2006). These results confirm the relatively dominant effect of precipitation on the predicted erosion rates, even when two of the stations in Fig. 5 include substantial amounts of snow.

**Slope steepness and slope length**

An increase in slope percentage caused a nearly linear increase in predicted post-fire erosion rates for slopes from nearly zero to 30–40% for both the dry (Cheesman) and the wet (Strawberry) climates (Fig. 6). The increase in predicted erosion was progressively smaller as slopes increased beyond 40%. The overall pattern was similar for both climates, but for the wet climate the absolute erosion rates were ~35 times greater than for the dry climate (Fig. 6).

An increase in slope length had a very different effect on the predicted erosion rates for the dry climate than the wet climate (Fig. 7). For the dry climate, the predicted unit area erosion rates increased sharply as slope length increased up to ~100 m, increased more slowly as slope length increased to ~260 m, and then declined slightly as slope length increased from 260 to 600 m (Fig. 7a). Plots of the predicted runoff against slope length showed the decline in erosion is due to a decrease in unit area runoff and sediment transport capacity with increasing slope length.

Under the wet climate, the predicted erosion rate initially increased nearly linearly with slope length up to ~150 m, and then increased more slowly as the slope length increased from ~150 to 600 m (Fig. 7b). The continued increase in erosion in the wet climate can be attributed to the continuing increase in runoff and sediment transport capacity as the contributing area increased with slope length.

**Rock fragment percentage and soil texture**

Both the percentage of rock fragments in the soil profile and soil texture class affected the predicted erosion rates (Fig. 8). For the dry climate, the predicted soil loss always increased with soil
rock content, and this increase was most rapid as the rock content increased from 0 to 10% and from 40 to 50% (Fig. 8a). The overall pattern was similar for all four soil textures, although the increase in erosion with increasing soil rock content was much smaller for the clay loam than the other three soil types because the clay loam has a low infiltration rate and low rill erodibility.

For the wet climate, the predicted erosion rate increased rapidly as rock content increased from zero to either 5 or 10% (Fig. 8b). Increasing the rock content to 50% reduced the predicted erosion rates by ~50% for the silt loam and clay loam, but had almost no effect on the predicted erosion rates for the two coarser-textured soils. The rapid initial increase in erosion with increasing rock content is attributed to a decrease in infiltration due to a decrease in pore volume. Beyond 5 or 10% rock content, the lower hydraulic conductivity for the finer-textured soils causes WEPP to predict lower soil moisture contents at the end of each day during wet periods, and the resulting increase in soil moisture storage capacity reduces surface runoff and erosion. The effect of increasing the amount of rock fragments on the soil surface was not evaluated, but an increase in rock cover should have a similar effect on erosion rates to an increase in ground cover, as this will reduce rain-splash, sheetwash and rill erosion (Bunte and Poesen 1994).

In the dry climate, the predicted erosion rates were very similar for the silt loam, loam and sandy loam soils, but the predicted erosion rates for the clay loam soil were almost 50% lower (Fig. 8a). The lower erosion rates for the clay loam can be attributed to its higher cohesion (Singer and Munns 2002). For the wet climate, the predicted soil loss was two to four times higher for the silt loam than the other three soil types (Fig. 8b), and this can be attributed to the relative ease with which silt particles can be detached and transported when there is more rainfall and overland flow (Singer and Munns 2002).

Length of the simulated climate

Increasing the length of the stochastically generated climate caused a similar pattern in the predicted erosion rates for both the dry and wet climates (Fig. 9). At first, there were considerable fluctuations in the mean annual erosion rates as the length of the simulation period increased from 1 to 20 years, and the predicted mean erosion rate peaked at ~30–35 years. Mean erosion rates then declined, and after ~45–50 years the length of the simulation had little or no effect on the predicted soil loss (Fig. 9). For both climates, there was a local maximum in the predicted erosion rates at approximately 5 years, and this local maximum was 78% of the long-term mean for the dry climate and 93% of the long-term mean for the wet climate (Fig. 9). The larger difference between the 5-year and long-term mean erosion in the dry climate is due to the greater skew in the
distribution of annual erosion rates, as the biggest storms in dry climates generate proportionally more erosion than in wetter climates (Haan et al. 1994).

These results demonstrate that the mean annual erosion predicted using a 5-year simulated climate is a reasonable compromise between computational time and accuracy. In practice, the mean erosion from a 5-year climate record is more likely to occur than the mean value calculated from a longer climate record because the very wet years have such a low probability of occurrence. Some studies also suggest that the year of burning will have below-normal precipitation and hence potentially lower erosion rates than the second season after burning (Shakesby et al. 1996; Larsen et al. 2009).

Critical source area and minimum source channel length

The effect of decreasing the critical source area (CSA) and minimum source channel length (MSCL) was evaluated for an 800-ha watershed in the Sierra Nevada of California with a relatively high mean erosion rate of $677 \text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{year}^{-1}$. Decreasing the default CSA from 5 to 1 ha and the default MSCL from 100 to 60 m reduced the predicted mean erosion rate by 53% to $319 \text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{year}^{-1}$ (Fig. 10). This decrease is partly due to a reduction in hillslope size and hence hillslope length. The lower CSA and MSCL values also increased stream channel density, and the proportion of the watershed designated as channels increased from 5.7% to nearly 16% (Fig. 10). These results are consistent with a study showing that increasing the CSA from 5 to 50 ha increased both hillslope length and predicted erosion rates (Conroy 2005).

Model validation

The comparison of measured and predicted erosion rates yielded a strong positive correlation ($R^2 = 0.61$, $P = 0.003$), but the predicted values were generally much lower than the measured values (Fig. 11). The range of the predicted values also was quite limited, as the highest predicted value for the validation sites was only $4 \text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{year}^{-1}$. Although this value is larger than the median predicted value for eight of the twelve LANDFIRE...
zones modelled in this project, it is much less than the median predicted values for the four wetter zones (Table 2, Fig. 4) where there are almost no post-fire hillslope-scale erosion data that can be directly compared with our predicted values (Moody and Martin 2009).

Discussion

Concerns and potential improvements

The underlying modelling philosophy was to use existing models and a consistent approach to demonstrate the feasibility of predicting post-fire erosion at a large scale and to maximise the comparability of the results. Several important concerns were identified when assessing the results, and these included: (1) higher than expected erosion rates in wetter areas, particularly for areas burned at low severity (i.e. less than 35% bare soil); (2) uncertainties in predicting the conditions under which a given area will burn and the associated reliability of predicted exposed mineral soil after burning; (3) spatial discontinuities in the predicted erosion rates, particularly in mountainous areas; (4) difficulties in validating the predicted erosion rates; and (5) incorporating the frequency of burning to estimate long-term post-fire erosion risks rather than short-term post-fire erosion rates.

High erosion rates in wet areas

The predicted hillslope-scale erosion rates appear to be excessively high in the wetter areas along the Pacific Coast, particularly LANDFIRE zones 1, 2 and 3. In LANDFIRE zone 3 in north-western California, for example, the mean predicted post-fire surface cover was 49%, and the predicted median erosion rate was 115 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\). These values are high relative to the mean maximum hillslope plot values of 12 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) measured in the northernmost portion of zone 5 (Sampson 1944) and <1 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) for the Oakland fire just south of zone 3 (Booker et al. 1993, 1995, cited in Moody and Martin 2009). These predicted values also are much higher than suggested by qualitative field observations, such as the limited amount of rilling and sediment deposition after the 2002 Biscuit fire in south-western Oregon and north-western California (Bormann et al. 2005).

The high predicted erosion rates in wet areas relative to field data and qualitative observations, plus the results of our sensitivity analysis, have triggered additional evaluations of, and improvements to, the WEPP model. More specifically, WEPP was overpredicting surface runoff in wet areas, in part because percolation below 200 mm and lateral flow were being routed as a single output at the end of each daily simulation. If the top 200 mm of soil became saturated, the infiltration rate dropped to zero during the storm rather than to the saturated hydraulic conductivity, and the resultant infiltration-excess overland flow helped generate the very high predicted erosion rates. The Disturbed WEPP Fortran code has been since modified to resolve this problem, reducing the high predicted erosion rates in wet areas. Other changes are being made to the plant–management files in both the online versions of WEPP and the Windows interface for WEPP.

To evaluate the effect of these changes, the models were rerun for the 800-ha watershed (Fig. 10) using the March 2008 version of GeoWEPP, the October 2008 version of WEPP, and new plant–management and soil input files designed to reduce the frequency of saturation. These changes reduced the predicted mean erosion rate from 677 to 190 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\), or 72% (Fig. 12); similar reductions can be expected in other high-rainfall areas.

There are at least two other ways to reduce the high predicted erosion rates in wet areas. First, the CSA and MSCL could be reduced, and this would reduce the predicted hillslope erosion rates (Fig. 10) (Renard et al. 1997; Cochrane and Flanagan 2005). Both of these parameters should be lower in wet areas owing to the greater amounts of runoff and higher drainage densities. Field studies have shown that the contributing area needed to generate surface runoff can drop dramatically after a high-severity wildfire (Libohova 2004; Moody and Kinne 2006). The problem is that there are no simple, physically based methods for determining the appropriate CSA and MSCL values in response to the variations in climate, soils, vegetation and burn severity across the entire study area (Moody and Kinne 2006). This is a key research need that could greatly improve the relative and absolute accuracy of the predicted erosion rates.

A second possibility for reducing high erosion rates in wet areas is to improve parameter accuracy in the plant–management files. The modified plant–management files used in this project yielded erosion rates that were consistent with measured values from the Hayman wildfire in Colorado. Under the Cheesman climate, there was no difference in the predicted erosion rates between simulations using the plant–management files modified to maintain 100% cover and the standard plant–management file in Disturbed WEPP for a 20-year-old forest. Subsequent analyses have shown that in a wet climate, the predicted erosion rate for a fixed cover of 100% was several times higher than the predicted erosion from the standard plant–management file for a 20-year-old forest. More detailed sensitivity studies are needed to determine the relative importance of the different parameters in the plant–management files, and these results should stimulate field studies to better determine key parameter values for WEPP under different conditions. In the meantime, the erosion values predicted here are believed to be more valid on a relative rather than an absolute scale and more valid within climatic regions, which is consistent with other erosion models (e.g. Wischmeier 1976; Renard et al. 1997).

Predicting the conditions for burning and exposed mineral soil

A key assumption was that areas would burn at the 98–100th percentile of ERC. This assumption is important because the assumed ERC level affects the NFDR-TH fuel moisture values, which then control the predicted EM after burning (Eqn 1). The midpoint of the assumed ERC range is the 99th percentile, and on average, these weather conditions should occur for slightly less than 2 days in a 6-month fire season. In reality, wildfires can occur under less extreme conditions because they also depend on an ignition source, fuel loadings and topography, as well as weather and fuel moistures (Sugihara et al. 2006).

The effect of assuming a more extreme ERC class of 99–100% on the predicted EM values was evaluated for 14 fire
weather stations using FireFamilyPlus version 3.0.5. The mean increase in predicted EM was only 2%, and this would increase the predicted erosion rate by 5–10% (Fig. 5). This increase in erosion would yield a better validation in drier areas (Fig. 11), but further increase the predicted erosion rates in wet areas (Fig. 5).

A critical research need is to develop a better procedure for predicting EM values after burning. Field data show the highest predicted EM of 81% is substantially less than the values of 90% or more that have been measured after high-severity fires in the Colorado Front Range (e.g. Libohova 2004; Larsen et al. 2009) and other parts of the Rocky Mountains (e.g. Robichaud et al. 2008). An increase in the bare soil percentage from 80 to 95% would increase the predicted erosion rate by nearly 50% for the Cheesman climate, which again would improve the validation results (Fig. 11).

Efforts to validate the predicted EM values were hampered by differences in the resolution of the predicted values (1 km²) relative to the measured values (<5 ha). The extreme patchiness of EM, particularly after low- and moderate-severity fires (Robichaud et al. 2007b), makes it difficult to validate the predicted EM values and accurately predict post-fire erosion. An improved procedure for predicting EM after wildfires could lead to higher EM values and more accurate erosion predictions in dry areas, and possibly lower EM values and lower predicted erosion rates in wet areas.

Spatial discontinuities in the predicted erosion rates
The sharp spatial changes in predicted erosion rates due to shifts in the climate stations selected by GeoWEPP have been addressed by the incorporation of PRISM and Rock:Clime into GeoWEPP (Minkowski and Renschler 2008). PRISM (Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model) uses a DEM, point sources of climatic data and other spatial datasets to generate grids of climate data at a resolution of 4 km² or finer (Daly et al. 1997). Rock:Clime (Elliot et al. 1999; Scheele et al. 2001) uses elevation to adjust precipitation and temperature values in mountainous areas, which would help determine whether precipitation falls as rain or snow. A change from rain to snow will greatly reduce post-fire erosion rates (e.g. Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005), and this could help reduce the predicted erosion rates in some of the higher-elevation areas in California, Oregon and Washington. PRISM and Rock:Clime also could be used to improve the accuracy of the NFDR-TH values, but this would have a much smaller effect on the predicted erosion rates.

Difficulties in validating the predicted erosion rates
Model validation is a critical step in the development and use of any model (Oreskes et al. 1994; Beven 2001), but the inherent problems in validating hillslope-scale predictions of post-fire erosion rates should not be underestimated. These include the extent to which the simulated climate matches the weather conditions at each site during the measurement period, the differences in spatial scale between the predicted and measured erosion rates, the resolution of the underlying GIS layers, the matching of field measurements to a specific modelled hillslope, and the logistical difficulties in measuring post-fire erosion.

The measured erosion rates after a fire are highly dependent on the weather experienced in the first 1–3 years after burning.

---

Fig. 12. Predicted erosion rates for a watershed in the Sierra Nevada of California: (a) as originally modelled in this study; and (b) using the March 2008 version of GeoWEPP, the October 2008 version of WEPP, and updated soil and plant-management files.
(Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald 2005; Moody and Martin 2009). The erosion rates predicted in the current study are the annual means for a 5-year stochastic climate record, and these values can differ from field measurements simply because the weather during the field measurement period is unlikely to match the stochastically simulated values. Differences in weather can account for many of the random differences between predicted and observed erosion rates, but there are at least two possible sources of systematic bias. First, the predicted erosion rates were based on the nearest climate station in the WEPP database, but these stations are typically in towns at lower elevations than the field sites. Hence, these stations are likely to underestimate the amount of precipitation and the predicted post-fire erosion rates. The second potential bias is the tendency for precipitation to be below normal in the year of burning (Shakesby et al. 1996; Pietraszek 2006). This second bias would reduce the measured erosion rates relative to the values predicted using mean climate data or a stochastic weather sequence, and an adjustment for this bias would help reduce the gap between the measured and predicted erosion rates shown in Fig. 11.

Differences in spatial scale between the predicted and measured values were a potential concern for validating the hillslope plots in the Colorado Front Range. However, field data from convergent hillslopes and small watersheds in the Hayman and Bobcat fires in Colorado show that erosion rates are relatively constant for plots ranging in size from a few hundred square metres up to 4 ha (Larsen and MacDonald 2007). This observation is consistent with the precept that most post-fire sediment is derived from rill and channel erosion (e.g. Moody and Martin 2001; Pietraszek 2006), as there is often a tremendous headward extension of the channel network after a high-severity fire (Libohova 2004; Moody and Kinner 2006). These results indicate erosion rates after high-severity fires may not follow the standard assumption of decreasing sediment yields with increasing area as evidenced by most sediment delivery ratios (Walling 1983) and predicted by WEPP for drier areas (Fig. 7a). Additional work is needed to determine the relationships between spatial scale and post-fire erosion rates for different climatic regimes and fire severities, and incorporate this knowledge into post-fire erosion models.

The USDA Forest Service watersheds and the modelled hillslopes were similar in size, but it was difficult to precisely match the measured watersheds to one or more modelled hillslopes. The predicted erosion rates were relatively consistent among neighbouring hillslopes adjacent to the field sites, so the effect of any errors in spatially matching the modelled and measured values should have little effect on the validation results shown in Fig. 11.

DEM resolution can affect the predicted values and validation results because this can affect both slope length and slope steepness, and these parameters directly affect predicted erosion rates (Figs 6, 7). A 30-m DEM, as used in this project, underpredicted hillslope steepness by 34% relative to a mean measured value of 23.8%, and a finer resolution 10-m DEM underpredicted slope steepness by 21% (Yao 2009). For the Cheesman climate, an underestimate of slope steepness by 34% could result in a 30% underprediction of erosion. However, a higher-resolution DEM will generally decrease slope length (Cochrane and Flanagan 2005; Zhang et al. 2009), and this would counteract the associated underestimate of slope steepness.

The final and largest difficulty for validating the results is the lack of field data, particularly in wetter areas. This problem will not be easily resolved, as wildfires are inherently less common in wetter environments. The paucity of post-fire hillslope-scale erosion rate data in wet areas is immediately apparent in any compilation of post-fire erosion data (e.g. Fig. 1 in Moody and Martin 2009). At the hillslope scale, rill erosion is the largest sediment source in severely burned areas (Moody and Martin 2001; Pietraszek 2006); therefore, our validation only used measurements that included erosion due to rilling. Thus, we used weir and sediment fence data, but excluded point measurements from erosion pins and small-scale measurements from Gerlach troughs because these measurements typically do not cover a large enough scale to capture rill erosion. We also were not able to use the extensive post-fire erosion data from southern California as the modelling for this zone was not completed (Fig. 2).

The logistical issues of measuring post-fire erosion rates also must be recognised. The gap between a fire and the first storm(s) is often only a few days or weeks, and it is difficult to obtain the necessary funding and personnel to establish study sites immediately after a fire (Lentile et al. 2007). The spatial variability in post-fire erosion rates means that replicated sites are needed to obtain an accurate mean value, but replication at scales larger than a hillslope is costly and difficult owing to problems of accurately measuring sediment yields at larger scales (Bunte and MacDonald 1999; Edwards and Glysson 1999). These limitations mean that large-scale, spatially explicit modelling efforts will be difficult to validate, and that the results will necessarily be more valid on a relative than an absolute scale.

**Frequency of burning**

The erosion rates predicted under this project are for the first year after burning using a 5-year simulated climate, but there is no consideration of the frequency of burning. Hence, the predicted erosion rates are largely a function of the amount of precipitation and EM, even though the frequency of burning can vary by an order of magnitude or more between climatic regions and vegetation types. If the objective is to predict longer-term risk to aquatic resources – such as domestic water supplies, habitat for an endangered fish species or reservoir sedimentation – the frequency of burning also must be considered, as this will greatly lower the predicted erosion rates in wet areas.

To predict long-term post-fire erosion rates ($R_p$, Mg ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$), one must sum the probability of each different fire severity ($P_{fs}$) over the period of interest times the associated cumulative post-fire erosion for each fire severity ($E_{fs}$, Mg ha$^{-1}$) divided by the period interval ($T$, years) (Eqn 2):

$$R_p = \frac{\sum (P_{fs} \cdot E_{fs})}{T}$$

(2)

To calculate $R_p$, the frequency and severity of burning need to be determined, which is problematic owing to changes in forest structure and density, increased frequency of anthropogenic
ignition sources and climate change (Elliott and Parker 2001; Schmidt et al. 2002; Guyette and Dey 2004; Westerling et al. 2006). Then the cumulative erosion for each fire severity has to be predicted.

Since the initial modelling was completed, the LANDFIRE project has developed a spatially explicit fire frequency map for the entire US (Rollins 2009). As a first step, the erosion rates shown in Fig. 1 could be multiplied by these fire frequencies to estimate the long-term mean erosion rate from burning without having to estimate $P_f$ and $E_R$ for all locations. The problem with this approach is that fire severity varies with fire frequency.

An alternative would use the relative probabilities of low-, mixed- and high-severity fires developed by the LANDFIRE project (Rollins 2009). Multiplying these relative probabilities times fire frequency would yield a recurrence interval for each fire severity. The modelling process followed in the present project could then be completed for each fire severity using different assumed ERC values. Entering these probabilities and erosion rates into Eqn 2 would yield a mean long-term predicted erosion rate. The frequency of burning can also better guide the allocation of resources for forest thinning among geographic regions and forest types. Additionally, post-fire erosion could be predicted by simply selecting the appropriate predicted erosion rates using a map of fire severity.

**Model applications**

An important benefit of the work reported here is the suite of logic and procedures developed for predicting post-fire erosion over large geographic areas. The high cost of fuel treatments and fire suppression is forcing government agencies in the US and elsewhere to develop procedures for allocating funds in the most cost-effective manner. Portions of this work have already been used to assess the risk to domestic water supplies in the Colorado Front Range (D. Martin, US Geological Survey, pers. comm., 2009) and reservoir sedimentation in Lake Hemet, CA. The erosion predictions developed in this project also are being incorporated into pilot efforts to quantify watershed risk in the Pacific Northwest (D. Calkin, USDA Forest Service, pers. comm., 2010). Finally, the predicted EM values were incorporated into large-scale efforts to predict post-fire debris flows (S. Cannon, US Geological Survey, pers. comm., 2006).

The results from this study already have led to improvements in the underlying WEPP model and identified key information needs. Similar modeling efforts in other areas can help confirm the results presented here and identify other research needs. Over time, the absolute predictions should become more accurate as additional information becomes available and the underlying models are improved.

**Conclusions**

This project developed and applied procedures to predict first-year post-fire erosion rates for forests and dense shrublands in the continental western USA to help prioritise fuel reduction treatments. The modelling process first predicted exposed mineral soil from historical fire weather data, a spatially explicit map of fuel moistures at 98–100% ERC for the different fuel types in the study area, and an empirical equation from the First Order Fire Effects Model. The maximum predicted EM value of 81% is less than the values of 90–95% observed after some high-severity wildfires. Validation of the predicted EM values was hampered by the coarse spatial scale of the predicted values relative to field measurements, and the high spatial variability of observed values. Percentage EM was combined with a 5-year simulated climate, local soil information and a DEM to model over 650 000 km$^2$.

Mean predicted erosion rates ranged from less than 5 Mg ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ in the Rocky Mountains and intermountain west to 50–155 Mg ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ for north-western California, western Oregon and western Washington. The limited field data indicate a reasonable correlation between the predicted and observed values for the Rocky Mountain region ($R^2 = 0.61$), but the predicted values in drier climates were generally too low in absolute terms. In wetter climates, the limited qualitative and quantitative data indicate that the predicted erosion rates are too high.

The predicted erosion rates were more sensitive to mean annual precipitation than bare soil percentage, and this helps explain why the predicted erosion rates in wetter areas were much higher than expected. These and other results have led to a series of improvements in the underlying WEPP model and changes to the plant–management files used in Disturbed WEPP.

The present study was successful in demonstrating that post-fire erosion predictions can be done relatively rapidly over large spatial scales, and in identifying key limitations and research needs. Like most erosion models, the results are most useful in relative terms and on a local scale rather than predicting absolute values across different climatic zones. The procedures developed here can serve as a model for other areas, and the results already are being used to determine which areas should have the highest priority for fuel treatments, and to quantify risks to water resources at the watershed scale. Additional studies and field data are needed to: better understand and predict the amount of exposed mineral soil after burning; improve predictions of post-fire erosion, particularly in wetter areas; and account for the frequency of burning to estimate longer-term post-fire erosion rates.
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