An integrated study investigating masticated itels: Developing sampling methods Describing fire behavior, and Evaluating fire effects

Bob Keane, Helen Smith

US Forest Service,

Rocky Mountain Research Station, Missoula Fire Sciences Laboratory Missoula MT

Masticated Fuels

Mechanically altered fuelbeds:

•A less risky, cost-effective method of reducing fire hazard

•Mechanically disintegrate canopy and surface fuels

•Wide variety of methods, techniques, machinery, and outcomes

Disintegrate: to break or decompose into constituent elements, parts, or small particles

Masticated fuels What makes them unique?

Canopy fuels are altered and deposited with manipulated surface fuels

Create different fuelbed properties: Size class Shape

Mineral content
 Bulk densities
 Live dead ratio
 Surface area volume ratio
 Spatial distribution
 Fuel components

Masticated fuels What are the implications? **Ecological impacts** Weed invasions > Nitrogen, nutrient cycling Native species response Water relations

Management impacts

Sampling techniques
Post-treatment fire behavior

This study

Integrated study exploring masticated fuels

iMAST

- **Objectives:**
- Develop sampling methods.
- Describe fire behavior
- Build new fuel models
- Evaluate treatment effects

Develop sampling methods Three methods are being explored

Cover-depth-bulk density

 Measure percent cover and fuelbed depth
then multiply by bulk density

Planar intercept sampling (Brown transects)
Count intercepts along a sampling plane

Photoload
Visually match fuelbeds to a photo of known loading

Describe fire behavior Record fire behavior characteristics

Use cameras, sensors, and field measurements



Build fuel models

Develop a series of fuel models for masticated fuels

Augment existing fuel model classifications



Evaluate treatment effects

Monitor treatments blocks for trends

Major Response Variables
Tree populations
Fuel loadings
Plant species cover
Weed populations



Methods Experimental design

Four Blocks

Control (C)
Masticate only (M)
Burn only (B)
Masticate & Burn (F)

Design

> 10 plots per unit> Replicate if possible



Measurements: Pre-treatment After each treatment 5 years 10 years

Methods Plot sampling design

Sampling methods

- **Trees (macroplot)**
 - DBH, height, species
 Allometric (FUELCALC)

Logs (transects) Dia, length, rot

- Fine woody, shrub, herbs (microplot)
 - Collection by class
 - ► Transect
 - PHOTOLOAD
- Duff, litter (nanoplot)
 - Collection
 - Depth

Plants

- Cover, height on microplots
- Weed population surveys



Methods Synthetic masticated fuelbeds

Created a set of fuelbeds with graduated fuel loadings

Measure:
Consumption
Soil heating
Plant response



Methods Study areas All ponderosa pine sites Treated with Fedco flailer



Sample sites Libby Kootenai NF 20 acres

Brockover Mesa
 San Juan NF

Banco BonitoValles Caldera NP

Results Before and after photo-pairs

Banco Bonito Site



Pre-treatment

Post-mastication



Results **Banco Bonito Site Before and after photo-pairs Post-mastication**

Pre-treatment

Results Before and after photo-pairs

Banco Bonito Site

Post-mastication



Results Banco Bonito – Tree populations



Results *Brockover Mesa – Tree populations*



Results- Banco Bonito – Fuel loadings



Results- Brockover Mesa – Fuel loadings



Discussion What have we learned so far?

Masticated fuelbeds are unique and diverse

- No "one-size-fits-all"
- Tailor sampling, fuel model to fit area and treatment

Cover-depth-bulk density method best

Transects performed well
Photoloads need masticated photoset

Summary Study is only half finished Still waiting for all sites to be burned 10 year measurements need to be taken





Thanks

Results Banco Bonito – Fuel Joach Strethod (Fine Fuel Only)



Brockover Mesa Fuels



Results Tenderfoot Canopy fuel Variability Summary

