Wildland/Urban Interface and Communities at Risk

Joint Fire Modeling Project for Power County, Idaho Bureau of Land Management, Upper Snake River District GIS And Idaho State University GIS Training and Research Center

12-19-2003

Chad Gentry, <u>gentchad@isu.edu</u>, Workstation: Borah Jeff Frank, <u>franjeff@isu.edu</u>, Workstation: Beaverhead

<u>Abstract:</u> Wildland/Urban Interface (WUI) fires and Communities at Risk (CAR) projects are high priorities to federal land management agencies. It is important that the federal government help educate homeowners, firefighters, local officials, and land managers regarding the risk of wildland fire. The Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Upper Snake River District (USRD) Geographic Information Systems (GIS) team and the GIS Training and Research Center (GISTReC) at Idaho State University (ISU), have created a model to predict potential wildfire risk areas for Power County, Idaho. During this project models were created of specific individual risks associated with wildfires: topography, vegetation moisture, fuel load, and the number of structures at risk. These models were evaluated together to create a final fire risk model for Power County, Idaho. This report describes each of the WUI fire risk components and what effect each has on the final fire risk model. This final model is an accurate depiction of the spatial distribution of wildfire risk in Power County, and can be used by regional fire managers to manage wildfire risk.

Keywords: Fire, Wildfire, GIS, Power County, Idaho, BLM

Contents:	Page
Abstract	1
Keywords	1
Table of Contents	2
Introduction	2
Methods	3
Required Data Sets	3
Data Processing	3
Primary Models	4
Creating NDVI models	4
Creating Fuel load model	5
Fuel load model Validation	6
Creating Slope model	7
Creating Aspect Model	7
Creating wildfire risk model components	7
Fuel load/ Vegetation Moisture	8
Fuel load/ Rate of Spread	8
Fuel load/ Intensity	9
Slope/ Rate of Spread	9
Slope/ Suppression Difficulties	10
Aspect/ Sun Position	10
Structures at Risk	11
Final WUI fire risk model	11
Results	11
Discussion	23
Assessment of errors and bias	25
References cited	26
Acknowledgments	26
Appendix A - Cartographic Model	27
Appendix B - Weighting for Component Models	28
Appendix C - Data Dictionary	30

Introduction:

The Wildland/ Urban Interface (WUI) is more than a geographic area. It is anywhere homes and other anthropogenic structures exist among flammable vegetative fuels (Owens and Durland, 2002). Because wildland fire is an essential component of healthy ecosystems, people need to live compatibly with wildland fire (Owens and Durland, 2002). As people move into the Wildland/ Urban Interface zones, planners and agencies responsible for fire management and protection are in need of tools to help them assess fire risk and make decisions regarding funding, development, and deployment of suppression resources. One very valuable tool used by fire managers is Geographic Information Systems (GIS). GIS allows for spatial analysis of large geographic areas and is easily integrated with satellite imagery.

Using these tools, we created 7 models that account for different types of fire risk. The first model created was Fuel Load/ Vegetation Moisture. This model takes into account how different levels of vegetation moisture affect fire risk. The second component model was Fuel Load/ Rate of Spread. This model takes into account how different fuel load classes spread and affect fire risk. The third component model Fuel Load/ Intensity describes how different fuel load classes release heat energy during a fire. The fourth component model, Slope/ Rate of Spread, takes into account how the angle of slope affects the rate of spread of a fire. The fifth component model, Slope/ Suppression Difficulty, takes into account how varying slope affects the effectiveness of suppression efforts of firefighters and their equipment. The sixth component model, Aspect/ Sun Position, takes into account different fire risks associated with aspect. Finally the Structures at Risk component model takes into account structure density. Each of these component models are weighted and summed to produce the Final Fire Risk Model. The Power County, Idaho WUI fire risk assessment is a continuation of WUI projects that have been completed and validated for the City of Pocatello, Idaho (Mattson et al, 2002) the city of Lava Hot Springs, Idaho (Jansson et al, 2002), Clark County, Idaho (Gentry et al, 2003), and Bannock County, Idaho (Gentry et al, 2003).

Methods:

Required data sets:

- Digital Elevation Model (DEM) of Power County
- Landsat 7 ETM+ imagery for Power County and environs Path 039, Row 030 and Path 039, Row 031.
- Digital Orthophoto Quarter-Quads (DOQQs) for Power County
- Digital Raster Graphics (DRGs) for Power County
- Transportation dataset for Power County
- Census data for Power County from the year 2002

Data processing:

We projected all datasets as Idaho Transverse Mercator (GCS North American 1927) using Arc Toolbox \rightarrow Data Management Tools \rightarrow Project.

The DEM for Power County was downloaded from <u>http://srtm.usgs.gov/data/obtainingdata.html</u> as a single seamless ArcInfo grid with 30m pixels. The Power County DEM was then clipped to the footprint of Power County using ArcInfo Workstation 8.2.

Landsat 7 ETM+ (Path 039, Row 030 and Row 031), bands 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 were retrieved from the GIS TReC's archives in Fast-L7A format and converted into ArcInfo grids. These ArcInfo grids were also clipped to Power County using ArcInfo Workstation 8.2.

The GIS TReC had all of the DOQQs and DRGs covering Power County. These datasets were used for visual purposes only, and no processing was necessary as they were already projected into IDTM.

The transportation dataset was also retrieved from the spatial library of the GIS TReC (<u>http://giscenter.isu.edu/data/data.htm</u>), and needed only to be clipped to the extent of Power County.

A polygon shapefile containing census data for Power County was downloaded from http://arcdata.esri.com/data/tiger2000/tiger_download.cfm and used to define structure density. This dataset was converted to an ArcInfo grid using ArcMap's Spatial Analyst extension.

Primary Models:

- NDVI model
- Fuel Load model
- Slope model
- Aspect model

Creating NDVI models

We estimated vegetation cover with satellite imagery using the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) for Landsat 7 ETM+, dated 07-28-2002. The NDVI, which is an estimation of photosynthetically active vegetation, was calculated from atmospherically corrected reflectance from the visible red (band 3) and near infrared (band 4) bands of Landsat 7 ETM +. The resulting NDVI has an interval of -1 to +1, where -1 is no vegetation and +1 is pure photosynthetically active vegetation. Equation 1 shows the argument used to calculate the NDVI grid in ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Raster Calculator.

$$NDVI = \frac{Band 4 - Band 3}{Band 4 + Band 3}$$

Equation 1: Equation for calculating NDVI.

Once the NDVI grid was completed we made several raster calculations of the NDVI grid in ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Raster Calculator to delineate wet vegetation, dry vegetation, and no vegetation. After each raster grid was made, we compared it to DOQQs. A visual assessment determined that values >0.6 reliably indicated areas of photosynthetically active wet vegetation, values between 0.6 and 0.15 indicated photosynthetically active dry vegetation, and values <0.15 indicated no photosynthetically active vegetation.

Creating the Fuel Load Model

Supervised classification of Landsat 7 ETM+ imagery was used for estimating fuel load in Power County. To estimate fuel load, we used 419 sample points. Forty-one of the sample points were collected in the summer of 2003 by Ben McMahan and Chad Gentry. The remaining 378 points used were collected by Ben McMahan and Joel Sauder in the summer of 2002. Each of the sample points was classified, by McMahan, Sauder, and Gentry, into one of 7 fuel load classes: 0 = 0 tons/acre (No vegetation), 0.74 tons/acre (Grassland), 1 ton/acre (Grassland with some Sagebrush), 2 tons/acre (Low Sagebrush), 4 tons/acre (Typical Sagebrush), and = >6 tons/acre (Forest).

To begin creating the fuel load model we imported bands 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 (Fast-L7A format) from two Landsat 7 ETM+ scenes (Path 39 Row 30 and Path 39 and Row 31) into ERDAS Software. The digital number values of each of the bands were converted into radiance and from radiance into reflectance using ERDAS \rightarrow Model Builder. Once the bands were in reflectance we exported the files into grid format for use in ArcGIS 8.3. All identical bands, from each of the scenes, were merged using Arc \rightarrow Grid \rightarrow Merge. The merged grids were then exported to Idrisi 32 Software in float file format.

To develope our training sites we used 378 of the sample points. These training sites were converted to raster using ArcView $3.3 \rightarrow$ Spatial Analysis \rightarrow Convert to grid (we used ArcView

3.3, because it allowed us to select the spatial extent of an existing grid and also let us determine pixel size). This grid was then exported to Idrisi in float file format.

Once all our data was in Idrisi we created a signature file using our training site grid and Landsat 7 ETM+ bands 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 using Idrisi $32 \rightarrow$ Image Processing \rightarrow Signature Development \rightarrow MAKESIG. The signature file was used to make the fuel load model using Idrisi $32 \rightarrow$ Hard Classifiers \rightarrow Maxlikely. We checked this model using techniques described in the next section "Fuel load Model Validation". Our results showed that this fuel load model classified the higher fuel load classes well, but discriminated against the lower fuel load classes. To try and improve the model accuracy a second model was created using Landsat 7 ETM+ bands 4, 5, 7, the NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegataion Index), and a Principal Component Analysis consisting of all Landsat 7 ETM+ bands, PVI, NDVI, TSAVI, Tassled Cap Greeness, and Tassled Cap Brightness to create the signature file. This signature file was used to create the second fuel load model. This model classified the lower fuel load classes well, but discriminated against higher fuel load classes. These two fuel load models were then exported to ArcGIS 8.3 and the fuel load categories with low accuracy for each model were reclassified as No Data using ArcMap \rightarrow Grid \rightarrow Merge.

Fuel Load Model Validation

Each component was validated using a number of methodologies. The first was a standard error matrix where each predicted (modeled) class was compared against the measured (field) class at all sample point locations. The second validation method was a modified error matrix where similar classes were clumped together into sub-classes. These classes were based on Anderson (1982) United States Forest Service (USFS) fuel load classes. We also employed a third validation procedure using fuzzy set theory outlined in Congalton and Green (1999) whereby a threshold of acceptable error is established. In the case of our models, the fuzzy set threshold was +/-1 tolerance class. This procedure determined whether the predicted (modeled) class was within one class of the field-observed value. The results of these tests are reported in the text as standard/expanded, clumped, and fuzzy-set-theory accuracies, respectively.

We also completed a Kappa Statistic, using Keith T. Weber's "Chance" program, for our model. This program allowed use to calculate the observed proportion of agreement (Po), the chance expected proportion of agreement (Pc), the Kappa statistic (Kappa), 95% confidence intervals (LO-95 and HI-95), standard error (SE), and a test of significance (Z). The Kappa statistic describes how much better --or worse-- a classification performed relative to chance alone.

Creating the Slope Model

Using the Power County DEM, we made a slope grid that calculated the surface steepness using ArcMap → Spatial Analyst → Surface Analysis → Slope. Output measurement: degree Z-factor: 1 Output cellsize: 30m

Creating the Aspect Model

Aspect shows what direction the surface faces. We made the aspect model from the Power County, Idaho DEM in ArcMap → Spatial Analyst → Surface Analysis → Aspect. Output measurement: degree Output cell size: 30m

Wildfire risk components:

- Fuel Load/ Vegetation Moisture
- Fuel Load/ Rate of Spread
- Fuel Load/ Intensity
- Slope/ Rate of Spread
- Slope/ Suppression Difficulty
- Aspect/ Sun Angle
- Structures at Risk

Creating the wildfire risk components

Each component model was treated separately to learn how each affected fire risk. To be able to merge the models together easily, we reclassified each model using equal scales from 0 to 1000, where 1000 is highest risk. We used weightings based on Mattsson *et al.* (2002) and Jansson *et al* (2002) to complete our analysis. After completing these analyses, we examined the impact each fire model component had on the overall fire risk in Power County, Idaho.

Fuel load/ Vegetation Moisture

We reclassified the Fuel Load grid and NDVI grid using ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Reclassify. Table B-1 in Appendix B shows the reclassification table. To create the Fuel Load/ Vegetation Moisture component model we multiplied the fuel model with the NDVI model using ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Raster Calculator. These values were then weighted based on Jansson *et al.* (2002) using ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Reclassify, shown in figure 1. The weightings used are shown in table B-2 in Appendix B.



Figure 1. Weightings for Fuel Load/Vegetation Moisture (Jansson et al, 2002).

Fuel load/ Rate of Spread

We reclassified the Fuel load model, following Mattsson *et al.* (2002) (table B-3 in Appendix B), using ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Reclassify (fig. 2).



Figure 2. Weightings for Fuel Load/ Rate of Spread (Mattsson et al, 2002).

Fuel load/ Intensity

We reclassified the Fuel load model using values following Mattsson *et al.* (2002) (table B-4 in Appendix B) using ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Reclassify (fig. 3).



Figure 3. This chart describes all weightings for Fuel Load/ Intensity (Mattsson et al, 2002).

Slope/ Rate of Spread

To make the Slope/Rate of Spread model, we reclassified the Slope model based on weightings from Mattsson *et.al.* (2002). These weightings are shown in table B-5 in Appendix B. We used ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Reclassify (fig. 4).



Figure 4. Weightings describe how spread rate increase with angle of slope. The weight proportion is essentially exponential with slope angle (Mattsson et al., 2002).

Slope/ Suppression Difficulties

To create the Slope/Suppression Difficulties model, we used the original slope and applied weightings for Slope/ Suppression Difficulties following Mattsson *et al.* (2002) (table B-6 in Appendix B). ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Reclassify, shown in (fig. 5).



Figure 5. Weightings for slope/suppression difficulties describe how suppression difficulties are affected by the angle of slope (Mattsson et al, 2002).

Aspect/ Sun position

To create the Aspect/ Sun Position we reclassified the aspect grid, following Mattsson *et al* (2002) (table B-7 in Appendix B). We used ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Reclassify (fig. 6).



Figure 6. Weightings for Aspect/Sun position describe how the sun desiccates the ground at different aspects (Mattsson et al, 2002).

Structures at Risk

We used census data for Power County, found on the ESRI website

(http://arcdata.esri.com/data/tiger2000/tiger_download.cfm) in tabular form. These tables were then joined with a corresponding shapefile of census tracts, obtained from the same web site. The resulting dataset contained data on population as well as structures in each census tract. Using ArcMap's field calculator we divided the number of structures in each polygon by the area of that polygon to calculate structure density. Next, we converted the structure density polygons into a grid and applied a linear regression to fit the values between 0 and 1000 to generate the final structures at risk grid.

<u>WUI fire risk model</u>

After developing the different fire model components, we weighted and summed each component into the final fire risk model. Weightings were based on a regional fire manager, Fred Judd (pers. comm.). Beginning with the highest, we distributed each component as follows:

- Structures at Risk 22%
- Fuel load/ Rate of Spread 17%
- Fuel load/ Intensity 17%
- Fuel load/ Vegetation Moisture 11%
- Slope/ Rate of Spread 17%
- Slope/ Suppression Difficulties 11%
- Aspect/ Sun position 5%

These component models were weighted appropriately in a multi-criterion evaluation. This calculation was done in ArcMap \rightarrow Spatial Analyst \rightarrow Raster Calculator.

Results:

We compared the WUI fire risk models for Clark County, Bannock County and Power County, Idaho (Gentry *et al* 2003). Figure 8 shows portions of each county classified as low, medium, and high risk relative to individual areas. Comparison between total acres classified as low, medium, and high fire risk is shown in table 1. Figure 9 describes the Fuel load distribution for each county. Table 2 show total acres of BLM Land classified as low, medium, and high fire risk.



Figure 8. Percent of Clark County, Bannock County, and Power County, considered low, medium, and high fire risk.

Total Acres Classified as low, medium, and high fire risk				
	Clark County	Bannock County	Power County	
Low	395,360	413,146	233,958	
Medium	666,464	277,805	638,886	
High	67,776	21,370	26,996	
Total	1,129,600	712,321	899,840	

Table 1. Total acres classified as low, medium, and high fire risk for Clark, Bannock, and Power County.

Table 2. BLM land area classified as low, medium, and high fire risk.

BLM Land Classified as low, medium, and high fire risk			
	Km ²	Acres	Percent
Low	107	26,330	12%
Medium	741	183,133	81%
High	63	15,468	7%
Total	910	224,931	



Figure 9. Comparison of fuel load distribution for Clark County (A), Bannock County (B), and Power County (C).

The NDVI grid used to generate the fuel load model is shown in figure 10. Our reclassified NDVI grid estimating the location of wet vegetation, dry vegetation and no vegetation is shown in Figure 11. Figure 12 illustrates the Fuel Load model derived from field training sites and Landsat 7 ETM+ satellite imagery. Table 2 shows the error matrix validation for the fuel load model. Table 3 shows the kappa statistics for the fuel load model.



Figure 10. The NDVI has an interval of -1 to +1, where -1 is no vegetation and +1 is pure vegetation.



Figure 11. The results of the reclassification of NDVI into no vegetation (100), dry vegetation (200) and wet vegetation (75).



Figure 12. The fuel load model and the distribution of different fuel load classes for Power County, ID.

	Field Measurement of Fuel Load (Tons/Acre)							
		0.74	1	2	4	>6	Total	Acc %
	0.74	33	11	5	6	1	56	58.93%
Modeled	1	15	23	21	10	2	71	32.39%
Fuel Load	2	17	25	42	27	5	116	36.21%
(Tons/Acre)	4	7	12	37	59	8	123	47.97%
	>6	0	4	2	1	5	12	41.67%
	Total	72	75	107	103	21	378	
	Acc %	45.83%	30.67%	39.25%	57.28%	23.81%	Standard/ Expanded	42.86%
							USFS/ Anderson	66.67%
							Fuzzy Set Theory	81.22%

Table 3. Error matrix for the fuel load model.

Table 4. Kappa Statistics for the fuel load model.

PC	PO	КАРРА	LO-95% CI	HI-95% CI	SE	Z
0.242784	0.428571	0.245356	0.178126	0.312585	0.029124	8.424444

The three component models derived from the fuel load model are shown in figures 13, 14, and 15. Figure 13 is the vegetation moisture model, irrigated and riparian areas contain the lowest risk values, while the grasses and shrubs in the Snake River Plain portion of Power County contain the highest values. The high risk areas are due to the low moisture content associated with sagebrush steppe that dominates the area. The effect of fuel load on fire's spread rate is reported in figure 14. Mountainous areas, with larger fuel loads, contain the highest values. The high risk areas are due to the high concentration of Power County contain the highest values. The high concentration of 4 tons/acre fuels. Finally, figure 15 is the intensity model. Conifers in the highlands, especially in the southern part of the county, comprise the highest risks for the most intense fires.



Figure 13. The Fuel Load/Vegetation Moisture model. This model expresses how vegetation moisture and the combination of different fuel load classes affect fire risk. This model was given an overall weighting of 11% of the final model.



Figure 14. The Fuel Load/ Rate of Spread model. This model expresses the fire risk associated with the spread rate of different fuel load classes. This model was given an overall weighting of 17% of the final model.



Figure 15. The Fuel Load/ Intensity model. This model expresses the fire risk associated with the amount of heat energy (intensity) each fuel load class gives off. This model was given an overall weighting of 17% of the final model.

The next three figures (16-18) are the component models generated using the Power County DEM. Figure 16 assesses the risk of fires spreading quickly due to steep slopes. Here, the highlands in the southern portions of the county received the highest values and the bottom land, with shallow slopes, in Arbon Valley, Rockland valleys and northern part of the county received the lowest values. Next is the suppression difficulty model (figure 17), where steeper slopes pose increasingly greater problems to fire fighters attempting to access fires in order to suppress them. Once again, the steeper terrain in the south is weighted the highest risk. Figure 18 is the Aspect/ Sun Position component model, south and southwest aspects contain the highest fire risk, due the intense sunlight and prevailing wind exposure. North and East facing slopes, which are sheltered from intense sunlight and prevailing wind through much of the day, contain the lowest fire risk.



Figure 16. The Slope/Rate of spread model. This model expresses how different angles of slope affect the spread rate of fire. Steeper slops are given the highest fire risk. This model was given an overall weighting of 17% of the final model.



Figure 17. The Slope/Suppression Difficulty model. This model expresses how different slope angles suppression efforts of firefighters. This model was given an overall weighting of 11% of the final model.



Figure 18. The Aspect/Sun Position model. This model expresses how different aspects affect fire risk. Southern aspects have the highest fire risk. This model was given an overall weighting of 5% of the final model.

The Structures at Risk component model is shown in figure 19. Here the population centers of American Falls and Rockland contain the highest structure density and the highest fire risk.



Figure 19. The Structures at Risk model. This model expresses areas that are high risk due to high structure density and is given an overall weighting of 22% of the final model.

The Final Fire Risk Model is shown in Figure 20 and the fire risk model with BLM lands superimposed is in Figure 21. Figure 22 shows fire history from 1939 – 2002, superimposed.



Figure 20. The Final Fire Risk Model for Power County, Idaho. Fire risk is shown on a graduated symbology.



Figure 21. BLM lands within Power County.



Figure 22. Fire history for Power County, 1939-2002

Discussion:

Clark, Bannock, and Power Counties are considered high desert sagebrush steppe ecosystems. Clark County has the largest area, with 1,765 square miles (1,129,600 acres). Power County is the second largest with 1,406 square miles (899,840 acres), followed by Bannock County with 1,113 square miles (712,321). Clark County has the highest total acres, classified as high fire risk, with 67,776 acres, followed by Power County with 26,996 acres and Bannock with 21,370 acres. The high fire risk classification for all three counties is concentrated in the mountainous areas. This is due to the influence of the topography component models Aspect/ Sun Position, Slope/ Suppression Difficulty, and Slope/ Rate of Spread. Clark County and Power County had the highest medium risk classification. This is due to the strong influence of the fuel load model. The southern portion of Clark County and the northern portion of Power County are located within the Snake River Plain which consists of primarily 1, 2, and 4 tons/acre fuels.

NDVI values vary with absorption of red light by plant chlorophyll and the reflection of infrared radiation by water-filled leaf cells. It is correlated with Intercepted Photo-synthetically Active Radiation (IPAR) (Land Management Monitoring, 2003). In most cases (but not all) IPAR and hence NDVI is correlated with photosynthesis. Because photosynthesis occurs in the green parts of plant material the NDVI is normally used to estimate green vegetation. The NDVI is a nonlinear function which varies between -1 and +1 but is undefined when RED and NIR are zero (Land Management Monitoring, 2003). Early in this project we determined thresholds for no-vegetation, dry-vegetation, and moist vegetation using NDVI. We chose the value 0.15 as a threshold between no vegetation and general vegetation based on where and how well the NDVI values matched a DOQQ. We chose the second threshold (separating dry vegetation from moisture vegetation) using similar methods. The NDVI value of 0.6 was the threshold limit between dry vegetation and moist vegetation.

The overall accuracy of the 2003 fuel load model was quantified using all three methodologies described above (standard/expanded, clumped, and fuzzy set). These results emphasize the difficulties associated with using multispectral remote sensing imagery to delineate vegetation types with extremely similar spectral signatures.

The Structures at Risk component was weighted most heavily (22%). This is due to the nature of this project; we were most interested in quantifying risk for the Wildland/ Urban Interface. This model allowed us to emphasize the interface areas. Areas of high structure density received the

highest fire risk values and areas of low or no structure got the lowest fire risk values. The Structures at Risk component shows that of all three counties, Bannock, by far, has the largest population with 75,323, while Power County has a population of 7,468 and Clark County has 971 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts 2003). Though each county has a relatively large area (Clark-1,765 sq. miles; Power- 1,406 sq. miles; Bannock- 1,113 sq. miles), the structure density component model for Bannock County shows the highest risk to structure (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts 2003).

The Fuel Load/ Rate of Spread takes into account how fast a fire will spread depending on different fuel load classes. The lower fuel load classes were considered to be the primary carrier of fire (e.g. grasses), and have the fastest spread rate. Fuel Load class 4 tons/acre received the highest fire risk value, because of its high load of fine, low-standing fuels. Fuel Load class >6 tons/acre received the lowest fire risk value since these fuels are of a larger size and higher moisture content, so they will not ignite as quickly.

The Slope/ Rate of Spread component model takes into account how different angles of slope affect the rate of spread of a fire. When fire moves across flat land it moves more slowly than fire moving up a mountainside (Amdahl, 2001). The steeper angles in this model have the highest fire risk values, because fire increases exponentially with slope. Correspondingly, shallower angles have lower fire risk values.

The Fuel Load/ Vegetation component accounts for moist vegetation and different fuel load classes that may be abundant but not readily flammable. Areas with dry vegetation and high fuel load (>6 tons/acre) had the highest fire risk value. Areas that had wet vegetation and lower fuel load had the lowest fire risk values.

The Fuel Load/ Intensity component takes into account how intense a fire of different fuel load classes affects fire risk. Intensity is considered the amount of energy a fire produces. The more energy the fire produces, the more difficult it is for the firefighters to suppress it. Intense fires create their own wind system, drying out fuel ahead of the fire. This intensity depends on fuel load and other factors such as wind and ground conditions at the time of the fire. Thus, if firefighters do not suppress the fire, it will keep spreading. The fuel load class >6 tons/acre had the highest fire risk value, due to the high intensity fires associated with these larger fuels.

The Slope/Suppression Difficulties component describes how difficult it is for firefighters to suppress fire based on slope/terrain steepness. If firefighters cannot reach the fire, it will keep burning even though it may be a low risk area according to other criteria. Slopes that are > 20 degrees affect wheeled vehicle support and slopes > 30 degrees affect tracked vehicle support. Without the aid of motorized equipment support suppression efforts are slowed, allowing the fire to spread. Slopes with the greatest degree of inclination had the highest fire risk values and shallow slopes received the lowest fire risk values.

The Aspect/ Sun position component models the direction each slope faces and the extent to which the sun desiccates the ground/vegetation. The sun will desiccate the ground/vegetation more on southern aspects and least on northern aspects. Southern aspects received the highest fire risk values and northern aspects received the lowest.

Assessments of error and bias:

All estimations in this report are made based upon our knowledge of the criteria and the expert knowledge of Keith T. Weber, Felicia Burkhardt, and Fred Judd. We have discussed our analyses and results with these people and believe our results to be valid.

The goal for our model is to be a tool to assist fire managers and decision-makers. As we treated each analysis separately, we believe the results have accuracy adequate to fit this purpose. We further believe our model gives a good overview of the fire risk in our study area and that it is easy to understand. Because the model is easy to understand, it should be applied to other users, which was a primary objective with this study.

Not all conditions affecting wildfire could be accurately modeled in this study. Factors not taken into account, such as wind direction and wind speed, are difficult to model without building many assumptions into the model (e.g., yearly weather patterns). Since the scope of this study is broad, we felt that removing these factors from the final model helped its overall effectiveness as a management tool. This also allowed us to place more emphasis on the factors us and Fred Judd (pers.comm.) felt were more important.

The date (July 28, 2002) during which the Landsat 7 ETM+ data was gathered plays a significant role in the outcome of the Fuel Load-based components of the final model.

References cited:

- Amdahl, G. 2001. *Disaster Response: GIS for Public Safety* United States of America: ESRI PRESS.
- Anderson Hal E. 1982. Aids to Determining Fuel Models for Estimating Fire Behavior. National Wildfire Coordinating Group.
- Congalton R.G and Green K. 1999. Assessing the Accuracy of Remotely Sensed Data: Principles and Practices. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton.
- Gentry C., Narsavage D., Weber K.T., and Burkhardt F. 2003. Wildland/Urban Interface and Communities at Risk: Power County, Idaho
- Jansson, C., Pettersson, O., Weber K.T., and Burkhardt F. 2002. Wildland/Urban Interface and Communities at Risk: Lava Hot Springs, Idaho

Land Management Monitoring. 2003. http://www.ea.gov.au/land/monitoring/ndvi.html

- Mattsson, D., Thoren, F., Weber K.T., and Burkhardt F. 2002. Wildland/Urban Interface and Communities at Risk: Pocatello, Idaho
- Owens J. and Durland P. 2002. Wild Fire Primer/ A Guide for Educators. United States Government Printing Office.

Acknowledgements:

On October 5, 2003 and November 13, 2003, we had meetings with fire managers to discuss our progress. We also looked at implementing a component model that would reflect fire season duration. Kevin Conran provided burn indices for weather stations scattered throughout southern Idaho. This data may be used in the future to create a fire season duration component model. We also decided to generate a map that would visually reflect fire history within the final fire risk model for Power County.

These people were attending:

Chad Gentry: ISU, GIS Training and Research Center Kevin Conran: United States Department of Agriculture Fred Judd: Bureau of Land Management William West: Dynamic Intermountain West Office



Appendix B – Weightings

These tables show the weightings we used to weight our fire risk model components.

Table B-1: Reclassification system of the	
Fuel Load and NDVI grids. Compare with figure l	!.

Fuel Load	NDVI
0 = 0 tons/acre	100 = No Vegetation
1 = 0.74 tons/acre	200 = Dry Vegetation
2 = 1 tons/acre	75 = Moist Vegetation
3 = 2 tons/acre	
4 = 4 tons/acre	
6 = >6 tons/acre	

Table B-2: Weighting data for Fuel Load/Vegetation Moisture component model (Jansson et al. 2002).Compare with figure 1.FuelVegetation =ClassWeights

Fuel	Vegetation =	Class	Weights
Load *			
1	75	75	150
1	100	100	50
2	75	150	200
1	200	200	300
3	75	225	250
4	75	300	400
2	200	400	650
6	75	450	600
3	200	600	700
4	200	800	850
6	200	1200	1000

Table B-3: Weighting data for Fuel Load/Rate of Spread. Compare with figure 2.

Classes (Tons/acres)	Weights
< 0.74	0
0.74	800
1	850
2	950
4	1000
>6	600

Table B-4: Weighting data for Fuel Load/

Intensity.	Compare with figur	e 3.

Classes (Tons/acres)	Weights
< 0.74	0
0.74	74
1	100
2	200
4	400
>6	1000

 Table B-5: Weighting data for Slope/ Rate
 of Spread. Compare with figure 4.

Angle/degree	
Intervals	Weights
0—10	41
10—20	137
20—30	256
30—40	489
40—50	1000

Table B-6: Weighting data for Slope/

Angle/degree Intervals	Weights
010	100
1020	200
2030	850
3040	1000
4050	1000

Table B-7: Weighting data for Aspect/Sun Position. Compare with figure 6.

Degree		
Interval	Aspect	Weight
337.522.5	Ν	100
22.567.5	NE	150
67.5112.5	Е	300
112.5157.5	SE	800
157.5202.5	S	1000
202.5247.5	SW	1000
247.5292.5	W	700
292.5337.5	NW	200

Table B-8: Weighting data for Response Time.Compare with figure 7.

Time (Seconds)	Weights
30	292
60	319
90	367
120	403
150	444
180	500
210	597
240	694
270	819
300	1000

Data	File name	Full path to dataset	Description	Format
County bound	power_idtm.shp	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Boundary of Power county	polygon coverage
Roads	Power_streets.shp	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Roads and streets in Power County	line shapefile
Bands used for NDVI	B3mrger30r31	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Landsat Band 3 for Power County	Grid - 28.5m pixels
	b4mrger30r31	\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets	Landsat Band 4 for Power County	Grid - 28.5m pixels
	pow_ban_ndvi	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Landsat NDVI model for all of Power and Power County	Grid - 28.5m pixels
Fuel Load	fuelload_id	\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets	Fuel Load model for Power County. Classes are .74 tons/acre, 1 tons/acre, 2 tons/acre, 4 tons/acre, and =>6 tons/acre	Grid - 28.5m pixels
DEM	powban_dem	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Digital Elevation Model of Power County	Grid - 30m pixels
Component models	pow_aspec_id	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Risk associated with aspect angle i.e. North, East,	Grid - 30m pixels
	pow_slpspr_id	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Risk associated with how fire spreads with angel of slope.	Grid - 30m pixels
	pow_slpsup_id	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Risk associated with how Suppression efforts are affected by angle of slope.	Grid - 30m pixels
	pow_spread_id	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Risk associated with how quick different fuel load classes spread during a fire.	Grid - 26m pixels
	pow_intsty_id	\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets	Risk associated with how intense (release heat energy) different fuel load classes burn.	Grid - 26m pixels
	pow _vgmst_id	\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets	Risk associated with vegetation moisture.	Grid - 26m pixels
	pow_densty_id	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Risk associated with structure density.	Grid - 30m pixels
Final Model	pow_final	<u>\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\all_datasets</u>	Final risk model - 30m pixels - ArcInfo Grid	Grid - 30m pixels
Reports	Power_WUI_Final_Report	\\Alpine\Data\urbint\Power\reports	Report covering methods, results, & conclusions of WUI modeling	Word Document

Appendix C – Data dictionary