cultural and technological revolutions that enabled humans to grow rapidly and dominate the biosphere, however, humans likely existed in a low-energy, or "Malthusian", steady-state, with population size regulated by energy or other resources (Galor and Moav 2001).

Global human population dynamics are tightly linked to the demographic transition (Lee 2011), which remains an unsolved life-history problem (Burger *et al.* 2011). Some researchers argue that a quantity–quality trade-off drives declining fertility to offset increasing per-child costs (Becker and Lewis 1973), but whatever the explanation, recognizing that the vital rates of modern humans are responsive to environmental inputs and not just functions of time is crucial for predicting future population growth. Also, the relationship between energy use and demographic rates may not be fixed (Myrskyla *et al.* 2009), so understanding how cultural, economic, political, and historical forces could alter the relationship is important because it determines the location of the equilibrium. Rapid changes in the availability of energy, such as the loss of key flows of fossil fuels or the development of alternative energy sources, could potentially alter population growth rates, but the time scale of the response to such changes will be unknown as long as the demographic transition remains unexplained.

There is growing concern that either too many or too few people could jeopardize the stability and prosperity of humanity, but it is unknown when and at what size the human population will stop growing. Yet sustainability requires a stable population, because energy and other resource demands increase with population size. Understanding human population dynamics is thus crucial for planning a sustainable future. With their wealth of experience in population ecology, ecologists can and should play a larger role in expanding our understanding of human population dynamics, but to date have mostly ignored such dynamics in their research. Current research emphasizes uncertainty in extrapolations rather than underlying mechanisms, and this must change. If ecologists began to include mechanistic models of the global population into studies on ecosystem services, climate change, and environmental management, we might develop a better sense of what lies ahead.

John P DeLong[1*†], Oskar Burger[2], and Marcus J Hamilton[3]
[1]Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, New Haven, CT
[*](jpdelong@unl.edu); [†]current address: School of Biological Sciences, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE;
[2]Laboratory for Evolutionary Biodemography, Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, Germany; [3]Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM

See WebPanel 1 for acknowledgements.

Becker GS and Lewis HG. 1973. On the interaction between the quantity and quality of children. *J Polit Econ* **81**: S279–88.

Brown J, Burnside W, Davidson A, *et al.* 2011. Energetic limits to economic growth. *BioScience* **61**: 19–26.

Burger O, DeLong JP, and Hamilton MJ. 2011. Industrial energy use and the human life history. *Sci Rep* **1**: 56.

Cohen JE. 2003. Human population: the next half century. *Science* **302**: 1172–75.

DeLong JP and Hanson DT. 2009. Metabolic rate links density to demography in *Tetrahymena pyriformis*. *ISME J* **3**: 1396–1401.

DeLong JP, Burger O, and Hamilton MJ. 2010. Current demographics suggest future energy supplies will be inadequate to slow human population growth. *PLoS ONE* **5**: e13206.

Galor O and Moav O. 2001. Evolution and growth. *Eur Econ Rev* **45**: 718–29.

Lee R. 2011. The outlook for population growth. *Science* **333**: 569–73.

Lutz W, Sanderson W, and Scherbov S. 2001. The end of world population growth. *Nature* **412**: 543–45.

Myrskyla M, Kohler H-P, and Billari FC. 2009. Advances in development reverse fertility declines. *Nature* **460**: 741–43.

Nel WP and van Zyl G. 2010. Defining limits: energy constrained economic growth. *Appl Energ* **87**: 168–77.

UN (United Nations). 2011. World population prospects, the 2010 revision. UN Population Fund. http://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/index.htm. Viewed 5 Feb 2012.

doi:10.1890/13.WB.004

Forest fire management, climate change, and the risk of catastrophic carbon losses

Peer-reviewed letter

Approaches to management of fire-prone forests are undergoing rapid change, driven by recognition that technological attempts to subdue fire at large scales (fire suppression) are ecologically and economically unsustainable. However, our current framework for intervention excludes the full scope of the fire management problem within the broader context of fire–vegetation–climate interactions. Climate change may already be causing unprecedented fire activity, and even if current fires are within the historical range of variability, models predict that current fire management problems will be compounded by more frequent extreme fire-conducive weather conditions (eg Fried *et al.* 2004). Concern about climate change has also made the mitigation of greenhouse-gas (GHG) emissions and increased carbon (C) storage a priority for forest managers.

A widely accepted fire management strategy is prescribed burning – purposefully setting fires under mild weather conditions to reduce fuel loads and the risk of subsequent high-severity wildfires. However, the potential for prescribed burning in some biomes to mitigate GHG emissions is contested. In northern Australia's eucalypt savannas, non-carbon-dioxide GHG emissions (eg methane, nitrous oxides) are being reduced as part of a voluntary C offset program, by setting fires early in the dry season when mild conditions prevail, thereby reducing fuel consumption and fire severity (Russell-Smith *et al.* 2009). By contrast, in southern Australia's less fire-prone eucalypt forests, this approach reportedly has little potential to reduce emissions (Bradstock *et al.* 2012), because the emissions from prescribed burning are likely to exceed the emissions avoided by reducing wildfire extent



Figure 1. *Contrasting responses of forest biomass to wildfire and possible alternative fire management scenarios. (a) Representation of a forest adapted to frequent, low-severity fire, with historical fire suppression increasing the density of small trees and risk of stand-replacing fire. Such forests generally have limited regenerative capacity after stand-replacing fires, because seeds do not survive the fires and recruitment must come from offsite. Thinning and prescribed burning can decrease the risk of stand replacement, potentially preventing long-term shifts to low-biomass states after regeneration failure (eg ponderosa pine [*Pinus ponderosa*], see image). (b) Representation of a forest adapted to infrequent, stand-replacing fire. Although seeds survive high-intensity fires (eg stored in canopy-borne serotinous cones), climate-driven reductions in intervals between stand-replacing fires can kill off immature regrowth, leading to subsequent regeneration failure. Under climate-change scenarios, the most appropriate management option for minimizing the risk of regeneration failure may be total fire suppression (eg mountain ash [*Eucalyptus regnans*], southeastern Australia, see image). (c) Representation of a forest experiencing infrequent, high-severity fires; the trees are highly resistant to fire because of their ability to resprout. Such forests are relatively resilient to changes in intervals between high-intensity fires because regeneration from seeds is unnecessary. Management to prevent fire-driven state shifts is not required (eg most eucalypt forests [*Eucalyptus* spp], southern Australia, see image).*

and intensity in treated landscapes. Indeed, in these systems, 3–4 areal units of prescribed fire are needed to avoid a single areal unit of wildfire (Boer *et al.* 2009; Price and Bradstock 2011). In the western US, prescribed burning for reducing GHG emissions from ponderosa pine forests is controversial. Fire suppression over the past century has caused a shift from surface- to crown-fire regimes, leading to an increase in tree density and fuel loads in these forests. Hurteau and Brooks (2011) posited that mechanical thinning, followed by the restoration of frequent, low-severity fires through prescribed burning, can increase the stability of live tree biomass by reducing the risk of stand-replacing wildfires. Although there is widespread acceptance that prescribed burning can reduce wildfire risk in these forests, Campbell *et al.* (2012) argued that the emissions from prescribed burning exceed the emissions avoided by reducing wildfire extent and intensity, thus rendering this approach ineffective in reducing GHG emissions. Clearly, a better understanding of the complex C trade-offs between prescribed fire and wildfire will be required before this important debate can be resolved.

A paradoxical feature of the debate about prescribed burning as a GHG mitigation tool is the limited consideration given to irreversible climate- and fire-driven conversion of high-biomass forests to low-biomass, non-forest states (Figure 1). Such "biome switching" is predicted by alternative stable state theory and accords with the fire ecology of some forest systems. Lindenmayer *et al.* (2011), for example, proposed the "landscape trap" concept, whereby strong feedbacks after logging of high-biomass eucalypt forests grossly inflate fire risk, making recovery to the pre-fire state unlikely. Alternative stable state theory can be similarly applied to climate-change impacts on many fire-prone forests. For instance, some fire-suppressed forests of the western US are vulnerable to conversion to non-forest states because of increasingly severe fire weather and prolonged drying. Indeed, modeling by Westerling *et al.* (2011) suggests that climate-driven increases in fire frequency over the next century could transform much of Wyoming's Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem from conifer forests to more open vegetation types.

For vulnerable forests, the real value of mechanical thinning and subsequent prescribed burning, as proposed by Hurteau and Brooks (2011), may be to resist biome switching, assuming that the "expenditure" of C associated with these interventions is substantially less than the avoided C losses associated with a biome switch (Figure 1a). In southern Australia's tallest eucalypt forests (Figure 1b), which are vulnerable to stand-replacing fires, broad-scale prescribed burning is impractical given the dominance of obligate seeders. In this case, extensive thinning may increase fire risk, and fire suppression may be the best management option. In contrast, in fire-resistant eucalypt forest types, dominated by resprouting tree species, there is a low likelihood that climate change could alter fire regimes sufficiently to cause biome switching (Figure 1c). At the wildland–urban interface, the most cost-effective fire management strategy for reducing the threat to human life and property may be to focus on heavy localized thinning of forests through mechanical harvesting, prescribed burning, or grazing, regardless of forest regeneration strategies (eg Figure 1; Cochrane *et al.* 2012; Gibbons *et al.* 2012).

Crucial steps in better understanding the relative risks of both orthodox and unconventional fire management interventions require predicting the vulnerability of ecosystems to state transitions due to fire–climate interactions. Where the risk is high, discriminating various alternative management approaches demands assessment of the magnitude of C losses and the costs and benefits in terms of other ecosystem services, biodiversity values, and public safety. No single objective should define fire management, and an evidence-based understanding of the inherent tradeoffs between different fire management regimes is imperative.

David MJS Bowman[1], Brett P Murphy[2,3*], Matthias M Boer[4], Ross A Bradstock[5], Geoffrey J Cary[6], Mark A Cochrane[2], Roderick J Fensham[7,8], Meg A Krawchuk[9], Owen F Price[5], and Richard J Williams[10]

*[1]School of Plant Science, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia; [2]Geographic Information Science Center of Excellence, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD; [3]School of Botany, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia *(brett.murphy@unimelb.edu.au); [4]Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, University of Western Sydney, Richmond, Australia; [5]Centre for Environmental Risk Management of Bushfire, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia; [6]Fenner School of Environment and Society, the Australian National University, Acton, Australia; [7]Queensland Herbarium, Department of Environment and Resource Management, Toowong, Australia; [8]School of Biological Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Australia; [9]Department of Geography, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada; [10]CSIRO Tropical Ecosystems Research Centre, Winnellie, Australia*

Concepts in this letter originated from a working group funded by the Australian Centre for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis, a facility of the Australian Government-funded Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network (www.tern.gov.au), a research infrastructure facility established under the National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy and Education Infrastructure Fund–Super Science Initiative, through the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education, and a NASA Interdisciplinary Sciences Grant (NNX11AB89G).

Boer MM, Sadler RJ, Wittkuhn RS, *et al.* 2009. Long-term impacts of prescribed burning on regional extent and incidence of wildfires – evidence from 50 years of active fire management in SW Australian forests. *For Ecol Manag* **259**: 132–42.

Bradstock RA, Boer MM, Cary GJ, *et al.* 2012. Modelling the potential for prescribed burning to mitigate carbon emissions from wildfires in fire-prone forests of Australia. *Int J Wildland Fire*; doi:10.1071/WF11023.

Campbell JL, Harmon ME, and Mitchell SR. 2012. Can fuel-reduction treatments really increase forest carbon storage in the western US by reducing future fire emissions? *Front Ecol Environ* **10**: 83–90.

Cochrane MA, Moran CJ, Wimberly MC, *et al.* 2012. Estimation of wildfire size and risk changes due to fuels treatments. *Int J Wildland Fire* **21**: 357–67.

Fried JS, Torn MS, and Mills E. 2004. The impact of climate change on wildfire severity: a regional forecast for northern California. *Climatic Change* **64**: 169–91.

Gibbons P, van Bommel L, Gill AM, *et al.* 2012. Land management practices associated with house loss in wildfires. *PLoS ONE* **7**: e29212.

Hurteau MD and Brooks ML. 2011. Short- and long-term effects of fire on carbon in US dry temperate forest systems. *BioScience* **61**: 139–46.

Lindenmayer DB, Hobbs RJ, Likens GE, *et al.* 2011. Newly discovered landscape traps produce regime shifts in wet forests. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **108**: 15887–91.

Price OF and Bradstock RA. 2011. Quantifying the influence of fuel age and weather on the annual extent of unplanned fires in the Sydney region of Australia. *Int J Wildland Fire* **20**: 142–51.

Russell-Smith J, Murphy BP, Meyer CP, *et al.* 2009. Improving estimates of savanna burning emissions for greenhouse accounting in northern Australia: limitations, challenges, applications. *Int J Wildland Fire* **18**: 1–18.

Westerling AL, Turner MG, Smithwick EAH, *et al.* 2011. Continued warming could transform Greater Yellowstone fire regimes by mid-21st century. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **108**: 13165–70.

doi:10.1890/13.WB.005