Hydrologic response to forest treatment practices for wildfire mitigation in a Sierra Nevada watershed

AGU Fall National Meeting, December 2021

Kate Boden, Jake Kurzweil, Daniel Philippus, Jackie Randell, Anneliese Sytsma, Alicia Kinoshita, Terri Hogue

FUNDING BY THE EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING COMMITTEE (EMC), STATE OF CALIFORNIA BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION



ROARD OF FO

"The age of the Megafire"

- "Megafire" is a fire that burns more than 100,000 acres
- Before 1950 no megafires were documented but in 2020 alone the United States experienced 11
- Since 2003 California has experienced 17 of its 20 largest fires on record

Caldor Fire, South Lake Tahoe ~222,000 acres

Forest treatments- methods to reduce fuel loads





Are forest treatments a triple win?

- 1. Forest treatments mitigate wildfire impacts
- 2. Forest treatments increase biodiversity
- 3. Forest treatments increase runoff



Wildfires are known to increase runoff

Mechanism- altering the forest structure leads to an altering of water partitioning across the landscape

Annual Water Budget Approach

Storage = Inputs - outputs

$$\Delta S = P - (R + ET)$$

$$P = Precipitation$$

$$R = Runoff$$

$$ET = Evapotranspiration$$

<u>Idea</u>: If we can show a change ET due to a change in forest structure we can use a water budget approach to predict the increase in runoff depth



5

Research Question

How do forest treatments impact runoff? At what spatial scale?

Specifically, do forest treatments impact water yield?

Water yield- total amount of water collected in a watershed in a given year





Sagehen Watershed- Eastern Sierra's, CA

Area: 30 km²

Average Precipitation: 800 mm

Snowfall: 80% of precipitation

Peak flow: May

Min flow: September





Water Resources Research, Volume: 50, Issue: 3, Pages: 2657-2678, First published: 27 February 2014, DOI: (10.1002/2013WR014420)



Variable precipitation over Sagehen during period of study





MINES.EDU

Sagehen Basin Water Budget

High variability in Precip and low variability in ET





Sagehen Basin Water Budget

High variability in Precip and low variability in ET





Changes in runoff is explained by precipitation

Simple Linear Regression



Highly variable runoff depth between 2001-2020





Sub-basin	Area (km^2)	Treatment Aspen Restoration
2	3.02	Plantation Thin Secret Meadow S Variable Thin
4	2.95	Sagehen Watershed
5	19.96	
6	13.79	
7	1.71	
8	4.48	SAGEHEN A GRAN SIGEHEN HILLS
9	4.87	
10	2.36	0 0.5 1 2 Kilometers
15	24.22	Sources: Esr), HERE, Garmin, Intermap, interma



Changes in runoff at sub-basin scale is explained by precipitation alone



Significant change in ET not observed at sub-basin scale



















15 MINES.EDU

Relative Change in Forest Density 2014-2018 100m x 100m LiDAR Pixels





Relative Change in Forest Density 2014-2018 100m x 100m LiDAR Pixels





Median forest density change in sub-basins is minimal but there is significant variation



MINES.EDU

Change in forest density "hot spots" can be linked with change in ET

Low : -0.84	Seeming	Indere Anner	·	
			Hotspots	1
Chrometer va	0 0.7	75 1.5 3 Kilometers	Area of change (km ²)	~0.5
asin	SGH 15	SGH 2	Median Forest Density	-25%
im ²)	34.22	3.02	Median ET Change	-25%
Median Forest Density Change	-0%	-5%		
Median ET Change	< 1 %	< 1 %	19	

Strong correlation when sub-dividing sub-basin 2 into 7 sub-sub basins





Concluding Thoughts

No measurable increase in water yield due to forest treatments. Potential reasons for this...

1. Forest treatments were just too small

• < 15% median change in ET in all sub-basin

2. Precipitation variability dominates ET variability

• simple bivariate regressions are sufficient in explaining changes in runoff depth

However, zooming in to hot spots reveals that forest density change, measured with LiDAR can be correlated to ET.

An extrapolation of this may be able to be used in conjunction with a water budget approach to predict increase in runoff due to > 15% change in ET.



Thanks!



