# MODELING MANUAL

# Modeling the Carbon Implications of Ecologically-Based Forest Management

Camp Navajo – Modeling Manual SERDP Project RC-2118



Matthew D. Hurteau **The Pennsylvania State University** 

Bruce A. Hungate George W. Koch Northern Arizona University

Malcolm P. North US Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station

> Distribution Statement A This document has been cleared for public release



This report was prepared under contract to the Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP). The publication of this report does not indicate endorsement by the Department of Defense, nor should the contents be construed as reflecting the official policy or position of the Department of Defense. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the Department of Defense.

#### List of Acronyms

DBH – Diameter at Breast Height (1.37 m)

CN – Camp Navajo

NECB - Net Ecosystem Carbon Balance

NEE – Net Ecosystem Exchange

NEP – Net Ecosystem Production

NPP – Net Primary Productivity

R<sub>h</sub> – Heterotrophic Respiration

RCW – Red-cockaded Woodpecker

TEC – Total Ecosystem Carbon

#### Acknowledgements

Project Team:

Katherine Martin – Postdoctoral Scholar, Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, The Pennsylvania State University

Shuang Liang - Graduate Student, IGDP in Ecology, The Pennsylvania State University Danelle Laflower – Graduate Student, IGDP in Ecology, The Pennsylvania State University Celine Colbert – Undergraduate Research Technician, Department of Ecosystem Science and

Management, The Pennsylvania State University

Brian Wegman - Undergraduate Research Technician, Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, The Pennsylvania State University

Funding for this research was provided by the US Department of Defense's Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP).

# **Table of Contents**

Background1
LANDIS-II Model
Files Used in FB LANDIS-II Simulations4
File Descriptions
Species File5
Century Succession File5
Leaf Biomass Harvest File6
Dynamic Fire System File
Getting Started10
Model Outputs
Model Output Considerations
Additional Resources
Literature Cited
Appendix 1 – Parameter ValuesI
References for LANDIS ParametersIV

# Background

The forest carbon cycle can be generically described as a series of carbon pools that interact with each other and the atmosphere through a series of fluxes (Figure 1). Carbon is removed from the atmosphere through photosynthesis by trees and understory vegetation, and some of this carbon is released back to the atmosphere through respiration. Once sequestered, carbon in plant material eventually transitions to the snag, woody debris, or surface fuel pool for trees, and the surface fuel pool in the case of understory vegetation. During decomposition, some of the carbon from the dead plant material is incorporated into the organic horizon and mineral soil. In the absence of disturbance, the expectation is that the carbon stock grows to a theoretical maximum where Net Ecosystem Productivity (NEP, the annual change in the total ecosystem carbon stock) approaches zero (Hudiburg et al., 2009).



When fire enters into the equation, fluxes back to the atmosphere increase as a function of fire severity (Meigs et al., 2009; Wiedinmyer and Hurteau, 2010). Furthermore, increasing fire severity increases tree mortality (Agee and Skinner, 2005). When fire severity and tree mortality are high, NEP and carbon storage can decline precipitously (Dore et al., 2008; Meigs et al., 2009) and carbon stocks decline over longer time horizons as compared to forests experiencing lower fire severity (Hurteau and North, 2009; Hurteau, 2013). In fire-prone systems, the carbon carrying capacity - quantity of carbon that can be maintained under naturally prevailing conditions (Keith et al., 2009) - likely represents an appropriate target for carbon life-cycle management (Figure 2).



Figure 2: In dry, fire-prone forest types, the C stock varies as a function of the frequency of disturbance. An active fire regime results in a relatively stable C stock because frequent fires maintain fuel loads at levels that result in low-intensity fire. When we exclude fire from these systems, the C stock exceeds the C carrying capacity because of increased tree density and fuel buildup. When wildfire occurs in the fire-excluded forest, the C stock is reduced below the carrying capacity because of high fire severity. The C stock recovery following wildfire depends on the successional path of the forest recovery (from Hurteau, 2013).

Because forest carbon sequestration is a major part of the global carbon cycle (Canadell and Raupach, 2008), management actions that affect forest carbon dynamics are being increasingly scrutinized. In particular, the role of fire management, including its impacts on forest carbon and the resultant emissions is garnering substantial attention (Hurteau, 2013; Hurteau et al., 2013). Thus, quantifying the expected effects of management actions on forest carbon stocks prior to management implementation is increasingly important.

The objectives of this document are to present the modeling approach used to simulate forest carbon dynamics at Camp Navajo, AZ as part of SERDP funded project RC-2118.

# LANDIS-II Model

This research used the LANDIS-II model, a landscape-scale forest succession and disturbance model that simulates forest succession using age cohorts of species (Scheller et al. 2007). The study area is gridded and each grid cell populated with age cohorts of species from forest inventory data. Species regeneration, growth, and mortality are functions of a species' life history characteristics and the environment within a given grid cell. The LANDIS-II base model has a number of extensions to expand its capabilities. As part of this research, we parameterized the Century Succession, Dynamic Fuels and Fire System, Leaf Biomass Fuels, and Leaf Biomass Harvest extensions. Executable files for the base model and extensions can be downloaded from <a href="http://www.landis-ii.org/">http://www.landis-ii.org/</a>.

#### **Data Sources**

Forest data: Camp Navajo inventory data

Soils data: NRCS SSURGO

Climate data: NCDC station data (station ID GHCND: USW00003103)

#### **Files Used in FB LANDIS-II Simulations**

#### All simulations:

Initial Communities: CNIC21J.txt/ CNIC126.img

Ecoregions: CNER1.txt/ CNER1.img

Species: CNSPP1.txt

Century Succession: CNSUCC10Feb1.txt

Climate: CNClimate1.txt

Age only disturbances: CNBioRedux.txt

Leaf biomass output: CNLeafBio.txt

#### Forest Management:

#### Leaf biomass harvest

Maps: Management areas: CNMgmt2.img; Stands: CNStands2.img

Leaf biomass harvest:

CNThinRxFire12Feb.txt - Used in thin and burn

CNThinOnly12Feb.txt – Used in thin only

#### Dynamic Fire & Fuels

Dynamic Leaf biomass fuels:

CNLeafFuels.txt – Used in thin and burn

CNLeafFuelsThinOnly.txt – Used in thin only

Dynamic Fire System: CNDyWF11F3.txt

Fire regions: CNFR1.img

Slope: CNSlope1.img

Azimuth: CNUpAsp1.img

Fire weather: CNIFW.csv

Scenario files: CNThinOnlyWF.TXT/ CNThinBurnWF.TXT

# **File Descriptions**

This section uses the thin and burn with wildfire scenario (CNThinBurnWF.txt) simulated for this project to demonstrate how the different input files are used to set up simulations. The purpose of the thin and burn scenario is to reduce fire risk across the installation. It excludes areas with steep slopes and potential Mexican spotted owl nesting habitat.

The model uses the scenario file to call the species file, the ecoregions text and img files, and the extension files. For the CNThinBurnWF.txt scenario file, the model calls the Century Succession extension using CNCSUCC10FEB1.txt, the Leaf Biomass Harvest extension using CNThinRxFire12Feb.txt, the Dynamic Leaf Biomass Fuels extension using CNLeafFuels.txt, the Dynamic Fire System extension using CNDyWF11F3.txt, and the Output Leaf Biomass extension using CNLeafBio.txt.

#### **Species File**

The species file (CNSPP1.txt) includes parameter values for the life history parameters for the species simulated at Camp Navajo. The full list of species already parameterized includes:

- PIPO Pinus ponderosa
- QUGA Quercus gambelii

#### **Century Succession File**

The four letter species codes are used to reference physiological parameters for each species in the Century Succession file (CNCSUCC10FEB1.txt). The Century Succession extension is used to model fluxes and pools of carbon and nitrogen. It can also be used to simulate projected changes in climate using simulated climate. The Century Succession extension requires a range of physiological parameter values for each species (e.g. growing degree days, drought tolerance, leaf longevity, etc). We parameterized the species using values from the peerreviewed literature (see Appendix 1). The Century Succession file also includes soil parameter values, which were obtained from NRCS SSURGO data. The Century Succession extension calls the initial communities text file, map files, and the climate file. The climate file is used to create monthly climate distributions for each ecoregion (subdivision within the installation) using climate data. The model draws from these distributions to obtain weather data for each calculation. The climate data file (CNClimate1.txt) was developed using 104 years of meteorological data (1909-2012) from the Pulliam Airport Flagstaff, AZ weather station (station ID GHCND: USW00003103). The Century Succession extension also calls the age-only disturbances file (CNBioRedux.txt). This file allows the biomass of age-cohorts to be distributed to the proper dead biomass pools once they are killed by disturbance.

#### Leaf Biomass Harvest File

The Leaf Biomass Harvest extension is used to simulate structural manipulations. The harvest extension requires that the simulation landscape be divided into management areas or stands and the map file of stands (CNMgmt2.img) is called by the harvest extension file. In this study we simulated one silvicultural prescription, thin-from-below, with and without prescribed burning. To be able to simulate both prescribed burning and wildfire, we used the Leaf Biomass Harvest extension to simulate prescribed burning.

The harvest input file is structured such that each harvest type is specified individually. It is important to remember that LANDIS-II is simulating age-cohorts of species and not individual trees. As a result, harvesting simulations specify the minimum age at which the harvest will occur and the minimum time between harvests. For each harvest type, the user specifies the percentage of age cohorts to be removed for each species. As an example, to initiate a thin-from-below treatment, we prescribe the following in the harvest file:

>> CN Fuel Reduction Thinning treatment LandisData "Leaf Biomass Harvest" Timestep 1 >>----->>Management Areas: map that define the management areas \_\_\_\_\_ ManagementAreas "C:\My Documents\CN LANDIS\CNMgmt2.img" >> Areas are defined by areas at CN >>Stands: the map that defines the stands, each stand can only be in one mgmt area Stands "C:\My Documents\CN LANDIS\CNStands2.img" >>Prescriptions Prescription ThRxBurn << Target younger cohorts (thin from below) StandRanking MaxCohortAge MinimumAge 30 MinimumTimeSinceLastHarvest 100 SiteSelection Complete CohortsRemoved SpeciesList >> Species >>-----PIPO Selection 1-10 (90%) 11-30 (80%) 31-50 (66%) 51-70 (60%) 71-90 (40%) 91-100 (5%) 1-5 (90%) 6-10(50%) 11-20 (25%) OUGA >>-----

This prescription tells the model to harvest 90% of PIPO cohorts age 1-10, 80% of PIPO cohorts age 11-30, and so on. This prescription is implemented periodically throughout the simulation period as a function of stand conditions. We have also used this extension to simulate prescribed burning. In the prescribed fire prescribed fire prescription, we prescribed the following in the harvest file:

```
>>
                                                  _____
Prescription RxFire << mimic Rx Fire
StandRanking FireHazard
>> Fuel Type Index
                       Rank
>>-----
           _____
                       _____
70
                       100
80
                       100
90
                       100
91
                       100
>>MinimumAge 30
MinimumTiméSinceLastHarvest 10
SiteSelection Complete
CohortsRemoved SpeciesList
>>Species
                Selection
>>-----
                1-10 (90%) 11-30 (33%) 31-50 (10%) 51-80 (2%)
1-5 (90%) 6-10(50%) 11-20 (25%) 21-50 (2%)
PIPO
QUGA
```

In this prescription we remove the majority of the youngest cohorts and a small percentage of older cohorts to simulate fire-induced mortality. The Leaf Biomass Harvest file also controls the area treated and the frequency.

<pre>&gt;&gt; Harvest Implementat &gt;&gt;changed end time for HarvestImplementations</pre>	ion Table ThRxBurn for bot	th 4 and 5 from 12 (ka	aties original) to	100
>> Mgmt Area	Prescription	Harvest Area	Begin Time	End Time
4 5 4 5 6 6	ThRxBurn ThRxBurn RxFire RxFire ThRxBurn RxFire	12% 12% 100% 100% 10% 100%	1 1 10 10 12 22	100 100 100 100 100 100
»»				
>> Output files PrescriptionMaps ThinRx BiomassMaps ThinMAP/b	Map/prescripts-	{timestep}.img timestep}.img		
EventLog Thin/lo SummaryLog Thin/su	og.csv ummarylog.csv			

This portion of the file indicates the time-step in which treatments begin and how much of the land area is treated each year. The ThRxBurn prescription tells the model that beginning in the first year management areas 4 and 5 will be thinned at a rate of 12% per year. The RxFire prescription simulates the prescribed fire treatment every ten years beginning in year ten. The harvest file also prescribes the output files. In this case, we tell the model to provide maps of where harvest was implemented and how much biomass was removed for each time-step. We also output harvest logs in .csv format.

#### **Dynamic Fire System File**

The Dynamic Fire System is used to simulate wildfire. In the thin and burn simulation that included wildfire, we used this extension to simulate wildfire with a probability of occurrence equivalent to 0.02 (1 in 50 chance of occurrence).

The fire extension requires a fire regions map (CNFR1.img), a fire weather file (CNIFW.csv), and a fuel input file (CNLeafFuels.txt). The fuels file classifies fuels as a function of species, age, and other characteristics. Specific information regarding the parameter values in the fuels file can be found in the LANDIS-II Dynamic Leaf Biomass Fuel System Extension v2.0 User Guide. Given the role of topography in determining fire behavior, we also include a file that provides slope (CNSlope1.img) and aspect (CNUpAsp1.img) for the wildfire simulations.

The fire input file specifies fire parameters for each ecoregion, including a distribution for fire size. In the thin and burn simulations, we prescribed the following fire size characteristics:



This file provides the model with a distribution from which to draw the number of ignitions in a time-step (NumFires). The NumFires value is used as the average number of ignitions for a Poisson distribution for a given fire region. The average number of fires is 75. The model draws the number of ignitions from the distribution and then randomly selects cells from the fire region and determines if a fire occurs based on the ignition and fuel type. Fire size is determined using a lognormal distribution with Mu being the mean of the associated normal distribution and Sigma being the scale parameter of the lognormal distribution. The Max parameter defines the maximum fire size. The spring foliar moisture content provides the low (SpFMCL) and high (SpFMCH) foliar moisture values and the spring high proportion parameter (SpHProp) specifies the proportion of fires that occur during the high foliar moisture content period. The same parameters are provided for summer and fall. The open fuel type index (OpFuelIndex) is used to calculate fire spread rates when no trees are present in a grid cell. The season table is used to specify the season in which fires occur.

SeasonTable >> Name	LeafStatus	Proportion Fire	Percent Curing	DayLengthProportion
Spring Summer Fall	LeafOff LeafOn LeafOff	0.05 0.87 0.08	0 51 100	1.0 1.0 1.0
InitialWeatherD DynamicWeatherT	Database "c:∖My Table	Documents\CN LANDIS\CNIF	₩.csv"	

In the season table, the user specifies leaf off or leaf on for deciduous species, the proportion of fires that happen within each season, the degree that grasses in the understory have cured, and the proportion of each 24-hour day that fires can spread. The fuel type table specifies the ignition probability for each fuel type and parameter values specific to calculating fire behavior for each fuel type.

FuelTypeTabl	e t Table									
>> Index	BaseFuel	SurfType	IgnProb	a	b	C	q	BUI	maxBE	CBH
>>										
20	Open	01b	0.02	250	0.0350	1.7	1.0	1	1.00	0
30	Conifer	C4	0.02	110	0.0293	1.5	0.80	120	1.184	0
40	Conifer	C4	0.02	110	0.0293	1.5	0.80	120	1.184	1
50	Conifer	C4	0.02	110	0.0293	1.5	0.80	120	1.184	1
60	Deciduous	D1	0.001	30	0.0232	1.6	0.90	32	1.179	0
70	Conifer	C7	0.001	30	0.0200	2.0	0.85	25	1.000	5
80	Conifer	C7	0.001	30	0.0200	2.0	0.85	25	1.000	5
90	Conifer	C4	0.02	30	0.0200	1.5	0.85	25	1.000	3
91	Conifer	C4	0.02	30	0.0200	1.5	0.85	25	1.000	5
10	Conifer	M1	0.02	0	0	0	0.8	50	1.250	0

The fire damage table is used to determine fire effects on tree age-cohorts. Fire tolerance is prescribed based on the percentage of a species maximum longevity. The fire severity – fire tolerance parameter determines mortality by fire and is the minimum difference between the severity of a fire event and the fire tolerance for an individual species.

```
SeverityCalibrationFactor 0.0
FireDamageTable
                   Fire Severity- Fire Tolerance
>>Cohort Age
>>% longevity
>>-----
                   ____
                        ------
2.5%
                   -2
12.5%
                   -1
20%
                    0
85%
                    1
                    2
100%
MapNames wf/sev/{timestep}-sev.img
LogFile wf/burnlog.csv
SummaryLogFile wf/summary-log.csv
```

The fire input file is also used to specify the simulation outputs related to fire. In this case, we have specified a fire log summary and fire severity maps for each time-step.

# **Getting Started**

You will need to download and install the following:

- LANDIS-II 6.0
- Century Succession
- Dynamic Fuels and Fire System
- Leaf Biomass Fuels
- Leaf Biomass Harvest
- Leaf Biomass Output
- Cohort Statistics Output

Once you have installed the model and extensions, you will need to create a directory for your input files. In your My Documents folder, create a new folder called "CN LANDIS". Copy and paste the provided files into this folder.

The next step is to ensure that all of your input files are referenced properly in the text files. You will need to edit the file path to match your working directory in the following files:

Scenario File: CNThinWF.txt or CNThinBurnWF.txt

Century File: CNCSUCC10Feb1.txt

Fire File: CNDyWF11F3.txt

Harvest File: CNThinRxFire12Feb.txt or CNThinOnly12Feb.txt

Example scenario file. Note that there are seven different file paths that require updating.



To open the model, you will need to open the ms dos prompt by typing "cmd" in the search box on the start menu.



Next you will need to map to the folder you just created. To do this you will need to use the change directory command (cd).



Once you have typed the new directory command, your prompt should indicate that you are working from the CN LANDIS folder.



To initiate a model run, you need to type landis-ii followed by the name of the scenario file.



The model will initiate after hitting enter. The command window will show progress through each time-step as the model runs. If the model stops running, the command window will display any file reference issues.

#### **Model Outputs**

The model run produces a number of output files. In your working folder (CN LANDIS) you will find the following outputs:

Folders:

- bioMAP biomass by species for each simulation time-step
- conmap percent conifer maps for each time-step
- deadfirmap percent dead fir maps for each time-step
- DFFS-output time of last fire maps for each time-step
- Sev maps of fire severity for each time-step
- FuelMap fuel maps for each time-step
- NEEMap maps of net ecosystem exchange for each time-step
- NPPMap maps of net primary productivity for each time-step
- SoilCMap maps of soil carbon for each time-step

Files:

- Century-prob-establish-log.csv probability of establishment for each species in each ecoregion for each time-step
- Century-succession-log.csv annual outputs of carbon and nitrogen pools and fluxes by ecoregion
- Century-succession-montly-log.csv monthly outputs of precipitation, temperature, respiration, net ecosystem exchange, and nitrogen deposition for each ecoregion.
- Landis-log.txt simulation log
- Spp-biomass-log.csv biomass of each species by ecoregion for each time-step

#### **Model Output Considerations**

There are a few things that you need to consider when examining model outputs. We have parameterized the model such that each grid cell is 150 x 150 m (2.25 hectares). We have divided the Camp Navajo landscape into six ecoregions based on soil type and climate. The land area by ecoregion is displayed in Table 2. To calculate average carbon pools and fluxes across the installation, you will need to use a weighted average and weight each ecoregion value by the area occupied by that ecoregion.

Ecoregion	Grid Cells (number)	Total Land Area (ha)
Eco1	197	443.25
Eco2	1578	3550.5
Eco3	137	308.25
Eco4	400	900
Eco5	2611	5874.75
Eco6	237	533.25

Table 2: Number of grid cells and land area by ecoregion.

As an example, if we have the following model output for Net Ecosystem Exchange of Carbon (NEEC) for one time-step:

Ecoregion	Grid Cells (number)	NEEC	% of Total	NEEC Contribution
Eco1	197	-111.11	0.03817	-4.24
Eco2	1578	-94.91	0.30581	-29.02
Eco3	137	-129.83	0.02655	-3.44
Eco4	400	-206.14	0.07751	-15.97
Eco5	2611	-63.32	0.50600	-32.04
Eco6	237	-269.97	0.04593	-12.39
Total Grid Cells	5160		Total NEEC	<u>-97.13</u>

Flux results are in g m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> and pools are in g m<sup>-2</sup>. NEE flux is from an atmospheric perspective and when a value is negative it means carbon is being removed from the atmosphere and sequestered by the forest. In this case, forests at Camp Navajo sequestered on average 97.13 gC m<sup>-2</sup> in this particular simulation year. Multiplying the g m<sup>-2</sup> value by 0.01 converts to megagrams (10<sup>6</sup> gC) per hectare (10<sup>4</sup> m<sup>2</sup>), in this case giving a value of 0.9713 MgC ha<sup>-1</sup>. The NEE value accounts for carbon sequestered by the ecosystem through photosynthesis, carbon lost through respiration, and carbon emitted from burning. The Century-succession-log.csv output file provides pool and flux values for a number of ecosystem attributes. The most useful outputs for the purposes of evaluating the effects of different management actions on carbon pools and fluxes are presented in Table 3. The Century-succession-monthly-log.csv output file allows you to evaluate the monthly fluxes of carbon. The net primary productivity (NPPC) value provides a monthly carbon uptake value by ecoregion. The respiration (Resp) value provides a monthly value of carbon respired by the ecosystem by ecoregion. Table 3: Century Succession outputs useful for evaluating the effects of forest management on carbon pools and fluxes.

Output	Name	Units	Conversion
NEEC	Net Ecosystem Exchange	gC m <sup>-2</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup>	multiply by -1 to get C sequestered; multiply by 0.01 to get Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>
SOMTC	Soil Organic Matter Total C	gC m <sup>-2</sup>	multiply by 0.01 to get Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>
AGB	Aboveground Biomass	gBiomass m <sup>-2</sup>	multiply by 0.5 to get carbon; multiply by 0.01 to get Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>
FireCEfflux	Fire emission of Carbon	gC m <sup>-2</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup>	multiply by 0.01 to get Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>

# **Additional Resources**

Scheller, RM, M Lucash (Eds). Forecasting forested landscapes: an introduction to LANDIS-II with exercises 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

#### www.landis-ii.org

There are manuals for the core model and each extension on the LANDIS-II website.

### **Literature Cited**

Agee, J.K., Skinner, C.N., 2005. Basic principles of forest fuel reduction treatments. Forest Ecology and Management 211, 83-96.

Canadell, J.G., Raupach, M.R., 2008. Managing forests for climate change mitigation. Science 320, 1456.

Dore, S., Kolb, T.E., Montes-Helu, M., Sullivan, B.W., Winslow, W.D., Hart, S.C., Kaye, J.P., Koch, G.W., Hungate, B.A., 2008. Long-term impact of a stand-replacing fire on ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange of a ponderosa pine forest. Global Change Biology 14, 1-20.

Hudiburg, T., Law, B., Turner, D.P., Campbell, J., Donato, D., Duane, M., 2009. Carbon dynamics of Oregon and Northern California forests and potential land-based carbon storage. Ecological Applications 19, 163-180.

Hurteau, M., North, M., 2009. Fuel treatment effects on tree-based forest carbon storage and emissions under modeled wildfire scenarios. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 7, 409-414.

Hurteau, M.D., 2013. Effects of wildland fire management on forest carbon stores. In: D.G. Brown, D.T.R., N.H.F. French, B.C. Reed (Ed.), Land Use and the Carbon Cycle: Advances in Integrated Science, Management, and Policy. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 359-380.

Hurteau, M.D., Hungate, B.A., Koch, G.W., North, M.P., Smith, G.R., 2013. Aligning ecology and markets in the forest carbon cycle. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 11, 37-42.

Keith, H., Mackey, B.G., Lindenmayer, D.B., 2009. Re-evaluation of forest biomass carbon stocks and lessons from the world's most carbon-dense forests. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106, 11635-11640.

Martin, K.L., Hurteau, M.D., Hungate, B.A., Koch, G.W., North, M.P. In press. Carbon tradeoffs of restoration and provision of endangered species habitat in a fire-maintained forest. Ecosystems, doi: 10.1007/s10021-014-9813-1

Meigs, G.W., Donato, D.C., Campbell, J.L., Martin, J.G., Law, B.E., 2009. Forest fire impacts on carbon uptake, storage, and emission: the role of burn severity in the Eastern Cascades, Oregon. Ecosystems 12, 1246-1267.

Scheller, R.M., Domingo, J.B., Sturtevant, B.R., Williams, J.S., Rudy, A., Gustafson, E.J., Mladenoff, D.J. 2007. Design, development, and application of LANDIS-II, a spatial landscape simulation model with flexible temporal and spatial resolution. Ecological Modelling 201:409-419.

Wiedinmyer, C., Hurteau, M.D., 2010. Prescribed fire as a means of reducing forest carbon emissions in the western U.S. Environmental Science and Technology 44, 1926-1932.

# **Appendix 1 – Parameter Values**

Appendix 1 contains parameter values used for LANDIS-II simulations and a list of references used to determine parameter values.

Species	Longevity (years)	Sexual Maturity (years)	Shade Tolerance (1-5)	Fire Tolerance (1-5)	Effective Seed Dispersal Distance (m)	Maximum Seed Dispersal Distance (m)
Pinus ponderosa	400	7	2	4	35	120
Quercus aambelii	90	3	3	3	30	1000

Table A1: Species-specific parameter values used for the species file.

Species	Vegetative reproduction probability (0-1)	Minimum age of sprouting	Maximum age of sprouting	Post-fire Regeneration	
Pinus ponderosa	0	0	3	None	
Quercus gambelii	0.75	1	80	resprout	

Table A2: Species-specific parameter values for the Century Succession extension of LANDIS-II.

Species	Functional Type	N Fixation	Growin Degree Days Min	g Growi Degre Days Max	ng Mini e Jan T	mum emp	Max Drought	Leaf Longevity	Epicormic Sprouting
Pinus ponderosa	1	Ν	155	4000	-5		0.92	4.5	N
Quercus gambelii	2	Ν	800	4000	-5		0.90	1.0	Y
Species	Leaf Lignin	Fine Root Lignin	Wood Lignin	Coarse Root Lignin	Leaf C:N	Fine Root C:N	Wood C:N	Coarse Root C:N	Litter C:N
Pinus ponderosa	0.28	0.2	0.25	0.25	48	48	250	170	100
Quercus gambelii	0.175	0.23	0.23	0.23	30	48	500	333	46

Functional Group Name	Index	PPDF1 T- Mean	PPDF2 T-Max	PPDF3 T- Shape	PPDF4- T- Shape	FCFRAC Leaf	BTOLAI	KLAI	MAXLAI
Pine	1	23.0	38.0	0.05	6.0	0.2	0.004	5000.0	10.0
Hardwood	2	23.0	35.0	0.05	7.0	0.3	0.004	5000.0	20.0
Functional Group Name	Index	PPRPTS2	PPRPTS	3 Wood Decay Rate	Month Wood Mortal	ly ity	Mortality Age Shape	Lea Mo	f Drop nth
Pine	1	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.002		10	10	
Hardwood	2	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.002		10	10	

Table A3: Functional group parameters for the Century Succession extension of LANDIS-II.

Table A4: Ecoregion parameters for the Century Succession extension of LANDIS-II.

InitialEcoregionParameters									
Name	SOM1	SOM1	SOM1	SOM1	SOM2	SOM2	SOM3	SOM3	Minrl
	С	Ν	С	Ν	С	Ν	С	Ν	Ν
	surf	surf	soil	soil					
Eco1	412	4.5	90	7.5	2100	42	810	20	2.4
Eco2	412	4.5	90	7.5	2100	42	810	20	2.4
Eco3	412	4.5	90	7.5	2100	42	810	20	2.4
Eco4	412	4.5	90	7.5	2100	42	810	20	2.4
Eco5	412	4.5	90	7.5	2100	42	810	20	2.4
Eco6	412	4.5	90	7.5	2100	42	810	20	2.4

	Soil	0/	9/	Field	\A/il+	StormE	BacoE	Drain	۸tm	Atm N	Latitudo
	3011	/0	/0	Field	vviit	Storm	Daser	Drain	Aun	AUTIN	Latitude
	Depth	Clay	Sand	Сар	Point	Frac	Frac		N dep	intercept	
Eco1	100	0.13	0.55	0.24	0.09	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.035	0.004	35.2
Eco2	100	0.30	0.34	0.33	0.14	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.035	0.004	35.2
Eco3	100	0.30	0.34	0.33	0.14	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.035	0.004	35.2
Eco4	100	0.13	0.55	0.24	0.09	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.035	0.004	35.2
Eco5	100	0.30	0.34	0.33	0.14	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.035	0.004	35.2
Eco6	100	0.30	0.34	0.33	0.14	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.035	0.004	35.2

Ecoregion	Decay Surf	Decay SOM1	Decay SOM2	Decay SOM3	Denitrifi
Parameters cont					
Eco1	0.15	1.0	0.018	0.00035	0.1
Eco2	0.15	1.0	0.018	0.00035	0.1
Eco3	0.15	1.0	0.018	0.00035	0.1
Eco4	0.15	1.0	0.018	0.00035	0.1
Eco5	0.15	1.0	0.018	0.00035	0.1
Eco6	0.15	1.0	0.018	0.00035	0.1

Table A5: Species productivity parameters for the Century Succession extension of LANDIS-II.

MonthlyMaxNPP (g m<sup>-2</sup> month<sup>-1</sup>)

	Eco1	Eco2	Eco3	Eco4	Eco5	Eco6
PIPO	150	150	150	150	150	150
QUGA	75	75	75	75	75	75

Maximum Biomass (g m<sup>-2</sup>)

	Eco1	Eco2	Eco3	Eco4	Eco5	Eco6	
PIPO	16000	16000	16000	16000	16000	16000	
QUGA	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000	

#### **References for LANDIS Parameters**

Burns, R.M., B.H. Honkala (Eds.). 1990a. Silvics of North America Volume 1: Conifers. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington DC.

Burns, R.M., B.H. Honkala (Eds.). 1990b. Silvics of North America Volume 2: Hardwoods. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington DC.

Dore, S., M. Montes-Helu, B.W. Sullivan, W.D. Winslow, S.C. Hart, J.P. Kaye, G.W. Koch, B.A. Hungate. Long-term impact of a stand-replacing fire on ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange of a ponderosa pine forest. Global Change Biology 14:1801-1820.

Dore, S., T.E. Kolb, M. Montes-Helu, S.E. Eckert, B.W. Sullivan, B.A. Hungate, J.P. Kaye, S.C. Hart, G.W. Koch, A. Finkral. 2010. Carbon and water fluxes from ponderosa pine forests disturbed by wildfire and thinning. Ecological Applications 20:663-683.

Dore, S., M. Montes-Helu, S.C. Hart, B.A. Hungate, G.W. Koch, J.B. Moon, A.J. Finkral, T.E. Kolb. 2012. Recovery of ponderosa pine ecosystem carbon and water fluxes from thinning and stand-replacing fire. Global Change Biology 18:3171-3185.

Fulé, P.Z., W.W. Covington, M.M. Moore. 1997. Determining reference conditions for ecosystem management of southwestern ponderosa pine forests. Ecological Applications 7:895-908.

Grady, K.C., and S.C. Hart. 2006. Influences of thinning, prescribed burning, and wildfire on soil processes and properties in southwestern ponderosa pine forests: a retrospective study. Forest Ecology and Management234:123-135.

Hooker, T.D., J.E. Compton. 2003. Forest ecosystem carbon and nitrogen accumulation during the first century after agricultural abandonment. Ecological Applications 13:299-313.

Kolb, T.E., and J.E. Stone. 2000. Differences in leaf gas exchange and water relations among species and tree sizes in an Arizona pine-oak forest. Tree Physiology 20:1-12.

Loudermilk, E.L., R.M. Scheller, P.J. Weisberg, J. Yang, T.E. Dilts, S.L. Karam, C. Skinner. 2013. Carbon dynamics in the future forest: the importance of long-term successional legacy and climate-fire interactions. Global Change Biology 19:3502-3515.

Metherell, A.K., L.A. Harding, C.V. Cole, W.J. Parton. 1993. CENTURY soil organic matter model environment technical documentation Agroecosystem Version 4.0. USDA-ARS, Fort Collins, CO.

Parton, W.J., J.M.O. Scurlock, D.S. Ojima, T.G. Gilmanov, R.J. Scholes, D.S. Schimel, T. Kirchner, J.C. Menaut, T. Seastedt, E.G. Moya, A. Kamnalrut, J.I. Kinyamario. 1993. Observations and

modeling of biomass and soil organic matter dynamics for the grassland biome worldwide. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 7:785-809.

Pastor, J., W.M. Post. 1986. Influence of climate, soil-moisture, and succession on forest carbon and nitrogen cycles. Biogeochemistry 2:3-27.

Prather, J.W., R.F. Noss, T.D. Sisk. 2008. Real versus perceived conflicts between restoration of ponderosa pine forests and conservation of the Mexican spotted owl. Forest Policy and Economics 10:140-150.

Scheller, R.M., J.B. Domingo, B.R. Sturtevant, J.S. Williams, A. Rudy, E.J. Gustafson, D.J. Mladenoff. 2007. Design, development, and application of LANDIS-II, a spatial landscape simulation model with flexible temporal and spatial resolution. Ecological Modelling 201:409-419.

Scheller, R.M., D. Hua, P.V. Bolstad, R.A. Birdsey, D.J. Mladenoff. 2011a. The effects of forest harvest intensity in combination with wind disturbance on carbon dynamics in Lake States mesic forests. Ecological Modelling 222:144-153.

Scheller, R.M., S. Van Tuyl, K.L. Clark, J. Hom, I. La Puma. 2011b. Carbon sequestration in the New Jersey pine barrens under different scenarios of fire management. Ecosystems 14:987-1004.

Schimel, D.S., B.H. Braswell, E.A. Holland, R. McKeown, D.S. Ojima, T.H. Painter, W.J. Parton, A.R. Townsend. 1994. Climatic, edaphic, and biotic controls over storage and turnover of carbon in soils. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 8:279-293.

Smith, P., J.U. Smith, D.S. Powlson, W.B. McGill, J.R.M. Arah, O.G. Chertov, K. Coleman, U. Franko, S. Frolking, D.S. Jenkinson, L.S. Jensen, R.H. Kelly, H. Klein-Gunnewiek, A.S. Komarov, C. Li, J.A.E. Molina, T. Mueller, W.J. Parton, J.H.M. Thornley, A.P. Whitmore. 1997. A comparison of the performance of nine soil organic matter models using datasets from seven long-term experiments. Geoderma 81:153-225.

Sturtevant, B.R., R.M. Scheller, B.R. Mirand, D. Shinneman, A. Syphard. 2009. Simulating dynamic and mixed-severity fire regimes: a process-based fire extension for LANDIS-II. Ecological Modelling 220:3308-3393.

Syphard, A.D., R.M. Scheller, B.C. Ward, W.D. Spencer, J.R. Strittholt. 2011. Simulating landscape-scale effects of fuels treatments in the Sierra Nevada, California, USA. International Journal of Wildland Fire 20:364-383.

USDA, Forest, Service, 2013. Fire Effects Information System. In: Service, U.F. (Ed.). USDA Forest Service, Washington DC.

USDA, NRCS, 2013. The PLANTS Database. USDA NRCS, Greensboro, NC.

Van Wagner, C.E., 1987. Development and structure of the Canadian forest fire weather index system. Forestry Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

Van Wagner, C.E., B.J. Stocks, B.D. Lawson, M.E. Alexander, T.J. Lynham, R.S. McAlpine. 1992. Development and structure of the Canadian forest fire behavior prediction system. Fire Danger Group, Forestry Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.