Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-56-AC1, 2019

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Fine scale assessment of cross boundary wildfire events in the Western US" *by* Palaiologos Palaiologou et al.

Palaiologos Palaiologou et al.

palaiologou.p@aegean.gr

Received and published: 11 June 2019

The manuscript entitled "Fine scale assessment of cross boundary wildfire events in the Western US" aims to analyze cross-boundary wildfire exchange among major land tenures on public and private lands in western US by using fire simulation modeling. The authors also evaluated how ignition types and land tenure characteristics affect wildfire transmission and exposure patterns, and estimated wildfire exposure in terms of incoming or self-burning fires at the community level. Overall, the work is interesting and the subject addressed in this manuscript is worthy of investigation. The manuscript provides an interesting methodology to inform wildfire risk assessment and to prioritize fuel management in areas at high-risk. The manuscript is well written and clear. Methods and results are adequately described and presented, and the discus-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

sion and conclusions are justified by the data presented. A few points should be better addressed or improved by the authors and can improve the quality of the manuscript.

I recommend a minor revision before publication.

Reply: Many thanks for the comments. We have revised the manuscript carefully to address all your comments/suggestions. Please check the file named "NHESS_ALL_LANDS_Revised_track_changes.pdf" to see the edits with track changes, and the "NHESS_ALL_LANDS_Revised_no_track.docx" to see the clean version of the manuscript.

Specific Comments

Pag. 2 – L3-4 (and others): Please order the references following chronological and alphabetical order

Reply: Corrected throughout the manuscript. References have been listed alphabetically at the end of the manuscript under the first author's name. In-text citations were ordered chronologically and for the cases of same year, alphabetically.

Pag. 2 – L26: I suggest replacing "to predict future levels" with "to analyze" Reply: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

Pag. 3 – L22: Please define the meaning of "fire regimes 1 and 3"

Reply: We rephrased the sentence as "Approximately 115 million ha are fire adapted with low and mixed severity fires, as defined by fire regimes 1 ($\leq$35-year fire return interval) and 3 (>35 - 200 year fire return interval)..."

Pag. 4 – L9-11: Even if the FSim modeling approach proposed in this work was covered in previous works, I recommend to provide more information (e.g.: resolution of input and output data; settings of the simulated spot fires; etc.)

Reply: We edited the whole section to provide more information on FSim fire behavior modelling, including details on the evaluation process, resolution, and crown/spotting.

Pag. 6 – L5: Please replace “define” with “defines”

Reply: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

Pag. 11 – L27: Please add space between “2012)” and “Human”

Reply: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

Pag. 12 – L13: Do the author mean “extent”?

Reply: Corrected to “extent”.

Pag. 14 – L12: Do the authors mean “fuel model”?

Reply: Corrected to “fuel model”.

Figure 2b: In the upper graph, please modify the y-axis adopting the same scale (0-300) used in Figure 2a.

Reply: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

Figure 3: Please specify the acronyms of the land tenures in the Figure legend. In addition, make uniform the size of the graphs (for example, OR graph is larger than WA graph size), so that the graph size will not be different depending on the State

Reply: Acronyms were added, and graph size has been standardized across all states.

Figure 4: Please replace “By” with “by”

Reply: Rephrased as: “(a) Average percentage of incoming fire across the western US; (b) by state, calculated for its entire area and for all land tenures; (c) by land tenure, across all the 11 western US states.”

Figure 5: The color used for National Forests (grey) is too light and does not help readers: please use a darker grey.

Reply: Corrected.

Figure 6: In the x-axis, please use thousand ha, rather than ha

Reply: Corrected.

Figure 7: Again, the grey is too light. Moreover, please replace “to show” with “show”

Reply: Corrected.

Figure 8: Please specify the acronyms of the land tenures in the Figure legend.

Reply: Acronyms were added as suggested by the reviewer.

Figure 9c: Considering that the percentage area covered by slash/burn seems very limited, the authors could remove it from both Figure and legend.

Reply: We removed the fuel model class “slash/burn” as suggested by the reviewer.

Table 1: Please explicit the full name of each land tenure, before or after the acronym

Reply: We added the full names of each land tenure before each acronym.

Table B1: This supplementary table is not mentioned in the text.

Reply: It was mentioned on Page 3, Line 23, in the part where we explain the extent of fire adapted lands, mentioning that the differences among States and land tenures can be found in Table B1.

Table B2: Please consider to replace “0” with “N/A.”, as you did in Table B1

Reply: Zeros were replaced with “n/a” as suggested by the reviewer.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2019-56/nhess-2019-56-AC1-supplement.zip

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-56, 2019.


Self-burning fire
Outgoing fire
Fireshed
A
B
Fire receiver
Burned area = Incoming fire + Self-burning fire
Incoming fire: land tenure 1 (red)
Outgoing fire: land tenure 2 (cyan)
Reciprocal fire exchange between land tenures 1 & 2
Self-burning fire
Incoming fire: land tenure 2 (blue)
Outgoing fire:land tenure 1 (pink)

Fig. 1.



Fig. 2.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper


Washington
Montana
Idaho
Oregon
Wyoming
Utah
Colorado
California
Nevada
Arizona
New Mexico
N
CC FEDNPS TR WUI ST PR BLM FS
State (ST)
Tribal (TR)
Forest Service (FS)
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
National Park Service (NPS)
Other Federal Agencies (FED)
Private (PR)
City / County(CC)
Community(WUI)
0 125 250 500
km

Fig. 3.



Fig. 4.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fig. 5.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fig. 6.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fig. 7.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fig. 8.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fig. 9.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fig. 10.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fig. 11.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper


AZ
Prescott
Flagstaff
Prescott Valley
Show Low
Green Valley
Pinetop Country Club
Pinetop Lakeside
Pine
Heber Overgaard
Phoenix
0 50 100 150 200
CA
Valley Center
Ramona
Fallbrook
Anza
Beaumont
Temecula
Los Angeles
Lake Arrowhead
Yucaipa
Hemet
0 50 100 150 200 250 300 350
CO
Aspen Park
Evergreen
Colorado Springs
Durango
Estes Park
Florissant
Woodland Park
Genesee
Loveland
Boulder
0 20 40 60
ID
Boise City
Mountain Home
Pocatello
Salmon
Robie Creek
Emmett
McCall
Eagle
Nampa
Cascade
0 30 60 90
MT
Hamilton
Big Sky
Stevensville
Missoula
Victor
Darby
Florence
Conner
Bozeman
Billings
0 10 20 30 40
NM
Ruidoso
Cloudcroft
Twin Forks
Santa Fe
Lovington
Silver City NM
Ruidoso Downs
Angel Fire
High Rolls
Mora
0 20 40 60 80 100 120
NV
Spring Creek
Elko
Winnemucca
Enterprise
Mesquite
Henderson
Dayton
Reno
Carlin
Osino
0 20 40 60 80 100 120 140
OR
Merlin
Bend
Terrebonne
Prineville
Redmond
Redwood
New Hope
Grants Pass
Jacksonville
Odell
0 5 10 15 20
UT
St George
Eagle Mountain
Hurricane
Saratoga Springs
Ivins
Herriman
Washington
Cedar City
Grantsville
West Jordan
0 30 60 90 120
Structures exposed (n/yr)
WA
Leavenworth
Cashmere
Cle Elum
Winthrop
Chelan
Twisp
Wenatchee
Goldendale
Entiat
Sunnyslope
0 20 40 60 80 100
Structures exposed (n/yr)
WY
Gillette
Casper
Buffalo
Lander
Sheridan
Evanston
Douglas
Laramie
Jackson
Dubois
0 5 10 15 20
Structures exposed (n/yr)
Incoming fire
Self-burning fire

Fig. 12.