

On behalf of the TNC LANDFIRE Team and the entire LANDFIRE Program, Kori and I thank you for the opportunity to present this webinar describing the status and plans for the LANDFIRE Program.



Review agenda



LANDFIRE is a partnership between the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Department of Interior, and TNC. On the left is a significant part of the LF Production team at EROS, and the right is the TNC team.



LANDFIRE program products

- are created for every acre in CONUS, AK, HI and the Island Territories comprehensive
- match thematically and geometrically compatible
- are produced using similar data sets and processes across time and space consistent (there are changes due to feedback and product improvement desires
- are produced and delivered as rapidly as possible current

These criteria have tangible impacts on what the products are, when we can deliver them, and how well they represent ground conditions.

The LANDFIRE product suite consists of nearly 2 dozen 30-meter spatial data sets (veg, fuels, etc.) and 800+ quantitative state-and-transition models in 5 (1 original + 4 temporal updates) completed delivered versions, and 1 partial delivery (Remap)

| each column, links are provided to download ful | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| And a first firmer | extent mosaics or da | itabases. Please note | that mosaics a | are not available until th | e full extent is complete. D | ata availability is shown on LF's | Data Distribution Site (D) | 25), which offers data dow | mioads at selected extended |
| Product manie | LCD D2 | helene | 005 | UF 1.0.5 | 171.1.0 | UF 1.2.0 | UF 1.3.0 | UF 1.4.0 | 172.0.0 |
| Public Events Geodatabase 1999 YEAR | Eventa | Reference | * | 30105101 | USTAKTHE | USIAKIHI | USTAKTHE | USTAKTH | |
| Forest Vegetation Simulator Ready Database | PVSRD8 | Reference | - | - | - | - | US LAS LAS | - | |
| Disturbance | DistYear | Disturbance | ж | | 100 1 66 | MB I AS | MR L MK T MI | ME I AN I HE | |
| Vegetation Disturbance | VDistYear | Disturbance | x | - | 22142183 | 20180100 | 12112111 | 02140140 | |
| Vegetation Transition Magnitude | VTHYear | Disturbance | × | - | | V3144 | USTAKTED | USTAKTHI | |
| Forest Vegetation Transitions Database | PVTD8 | Disturbance | | | | | USIANIHI | n/c | |
| Non-forest Vegetation Transitions Database | NEVTOB | Disturbance | | | | | SE LEE LEE | n/c | |
| Forest Vecetation Simulator Disturbance Database | PUSDOR | Disturbance | - | - | 22125125 | 20100100 | US LACING | 921 85 1 81 n/s | |
| Biophysical Settings | 8PS | Vegetation | × | VS LAK LHD | MS LAK LHS | US LAK LHE LIA | VS Lac L HI | US LAK LHD | |
| Environmental Site Potential | ESP | Vegetation | ж | UE I AK I HI" | n/s | VE LAK LEE | n/c | n/c | |
| Existing Vegetation Cover | EVC | Vegetation | ж | VE I M I M | US I AK I HI | RIWIEID | ME LINE LINE | US I MY I HI | |
| Existing Vegetation Height | EVH | Vegetation | ж | 2018/181 | LE LAK LES | 221 AK 1 22 1 34 | 20120180 | 92 T 65 T 81 | |
| National Vacatation Classification | EVI MAC | Vegetation | x | 22122101 | 32185185 | 10100100100 | 22120100 | 92185181 | |
| Biophysical Settings Hodels and Descriptions | BpG | Vegetation | | DPS Models | n/c | n/c | n/c | n/s | |
| 13 Anderson Fire Behavior Fuel Models | FBFM13 | Fuel | × | US LAK LEI | US FAX FBI | MINIMIZE IN | US F AK F AL | US I AK I HI | |
| 40 Scott and Burgan Fire Behavior Fuel Hodels | FBFM40 | Fuel | | STATING 1 MG | ME LAK LAS | 10 AK HE 1A | MS 1 85 1 85 | MB 1 66 1 60 | |
| Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System | OFFORS | Fuel | ж | | | <u>#</u> | <u>#</u> | × | |
| Forest Canopy Buck Density Except Canopy Back Melabit | 080 | Fuel . | * | 55 1 65 1 61 | 12 1 65 1 81 10 1 47 1 47 | 101100100100 | 55 1 85 1 81 | US 1 65 1 51 | |
| Forest Cancov Cover | CC. | Fuel | * | USIAKIHI | US LAK LHC | US LAK HE IA | USTAKTHO | US LAK LHD | |
| Forest Canopy Height | CH | Fuel | ж | STAKE HE | ME FAX FEE | 1014618018 | ME FASTED | ME LAK LED | |
| Fuel Characteristic Classification System Fuelbeds | FCCS | Fuel | x | SS 1 85 1 80 | 25126185 | | | M2 1 85 1 85 | |
| Fuel Loading Models | FLM | Fuel | ж | STELL AND A STATE | US I AK | - | - | - | |
| Puel Vegetation Cover | PVC | Fuel Real | | | | | | | |
| Eval Vacatation Tune | DVT. | Tuel . | | | | | | | |
| Fuel Rulesets Database | | Fuel | | | | SEL ALL HE | S25 1 85 1 80 | US 1 65 1 85 | |
| Fire Regime Groups | FRG | Fire Regime | | 55 85 81 | n/c | SE LES LES | n/c | n/s | |
| Mean Fire Return Interval | MFRI | Fire Regime | ж | MET ANT HI | n/c | 20120100 | n/c | n/c | |
| Percent Mixed seventy Fire | PNS | Fire Regime | x | USIACING | n/s | US AK I HI | n/s | n/s | |
| Percent Replacement-severity fire | PRS | Fire Regime | | 500 T AK T HS | n/s | 221 245 1 22 | n/s | n/s | |
| Succession Classes | SClass | Fire Regime | ж | US LAK LEI | US I AK I HI | US I AK I HI | n/c | n/c | |
| Vegetation Condition Class** | VCC | Fire Regime | x | VE LAS LED | MS 1 AK 1 HS | | MS L BK T BS | MB 1 66 1 60 | |
| Aspect *** | ASP | Topographic | * | n/s | n/s | US LAK I HE I JA | n/s | n/s | US AK INCI A |
| Eevation *** | DEM | Topographic | ж | n/c | 1/1 | ME I AN I HE I IA | n/c | n/c | ME AK HI IA |
| | SLP. | Topportuble | | ala | ala | 100 1 44/1 47 1 14 | ala | ale | THE R AND I WAR I WAR |

I don't expect you to read this, but to appreciate the depth and breadth of program products



Remap is NOT an update...it is a re-creation of the majority of the product suite from scratch...new plots, new imagery, new processes, etc.

NW, SW, and South Central U.S. GeoArea Vegetation and Fuels (EVT, EVC, EVH, FBFM, Canopy Fuels, BpS) have been delivered.

Fire Regime data will be created and delivered when veg and fuels are complete for CONUS.



LANDFIRE Program has the same design criteria/constraints: comprehensive, compatible, consistent and current.

The basic product suite is the same, but there are changes to mapping processes and thematic content intended to improve product usability.

Should still be considered a large landscape, regional, national data set as delivered out-of-the-box.

LF Remap – What's New? Mapping footprints based on Omernik Level III ecoregions instead of NLCD Map Zones. New compositing/tiling/masking methods that provide an improved and more consistent image base. New, improved plot "Auto-Keys" for assigning vegetation type to field plots. Landsat 8 imagery and Landsat Analysis Ready Data Sets (image stacks). Included external review of the Existing Vegetation

Type legend and draft products.

LANDFIRE

The Nature Conservancy

• Independently mapped NVC Group.



| Original Fire Regime Group | New Group Designation | All Fire Fire Return Interval | % Replacement Fire | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| | I-A | 0 - 5 years | Less than 66.7% | |
| I | I-B | 6 - 15 years | | |
| | I-C | 16 - 35 years | | |
| | II-A | 0 - 5 years | 66.7% or greater | |
| II | II-B | 6 - 15 years | | |
| | II-C | 16 - 35 years | | |
| ш | III-A | 36 - 100 years | Less than 80% | |
| III | III-B | 101- 200 years | Less than 66.7% | |
| TV. | IV-A | 36 - 100 years | 80% or greater | |
| IV | IV-B | 101- 200 years | 66.7% or greater | |
| V | V-A | 201 to 500 years | Any severity | |
| | V-B | 501+ years | | |

Based on user comments from previous versions the FRG schema was often problematic....insufficient FRI resolution

Wendel Hann LF did an analysis of FRG, and then developed a new, backwardly compatible FRG definitions that we hope is more useful.



Vegetation Height (EVH)---and exploring FBFM



- We expect to complete Remap in CONUS, followed by AK, HI and Insular areas
- Then we will begin an update cycle, final plan impacted by budget
- Updating alternatives being explored
 - Annual, next year rapid updates based on submitted disturbances/landscape changes
 - Bi-annual updates based on submitted disturbances + remotely sensed landscape change
- · Communications and support---listening as much as talking
- Now I will turn over the presentation duties to Kori Blankenship, Fire Ecologist on our team and a NW native





Fewer Seamlines

- As mentioned previously by Jim the way we process the imagery now (e.g. using tiling, larger processing unit) leads to fewer seamlines.
- Here you can see a seamline created at the mapzone border where shrub cover abruptly changes in the 2014 cover product.
- In Remap, the seamline is not evident due to improvements in how LANDIFRE mapping teams process the imagery.



Improved Mapping of Invasives

- Mappers made an effort to improve the mapping of invasive species such as cheatgrass.
- Here you see a comparison of Remap (left) and 2014 EVT (middle) to the Near Real Time Annual Herbaceous Cover product (on the right; Boyte and Wylie). You can see the Remap product aligns more closely with the Near Real Time product.



Improved EVT Mapping in Disturbed Areas

- In previous LF versions natural EVTs were mapped regardless of disturbance history.
- We've changed that in Remap to more accurately reflect the vegetation on the ground post-disturbance.
- In this example, starting on the right you can see an area mapped as shrub by NLCD. In 2014, shown in the middle, we mapped the area as CA Montane Woodland and Chaparral.
- Based on LF disturbance data we know that this area was recently burned and so in the Remap product, shown on the left, we have assigned it to the EVT class Recently Burned – Shrub Cover, more accurately reflecting the vegetation currently on the ground.



Improved EVT

• In previous LF versions Greasewood Flat was mapped in higher slope positions where other shrub types are more appropriate. In Remap, mappers restricted it to lower slopes.



Finer Level Distinctions in Aggregate Types

- In previous LANDFIRE versions riparian and wetland types were aggregated into coarse types.
- Here you can see how we have split out some previously aggregated types: for example what we mapped in 2014 as N.A. Warm Desert Riparian Forest and Woodland is now mapped as Riparian Woodland, Lower Montane Riparian Woodland and Riparian Mesquite Bosque Woodland types.
- A similar change was made to aggregate Barren types. In the Remap legend you'll find areas previously mapped as Barren mapped into finer classes such as Bedrock and Scree or Playa.



Improved Shrub Cover

- NLCD produces a continuous shrub cover product based on very high resolution imagery that LF has incorporated into its process for Remap.
- Here you can see an area mapped in 2014 as herb is mapped as shrub in Remap
- In arid areas, like the one shown here, we are doing a better job of identifying low shrub cover using new methods.

Note: "NLCD 2016 Shrub Component products characterize the percentage of each 30meter pixel in the Western United States covered by shrub, herbaceous, bare ground, litter, sagebrush, big sagebrush and annual herbaceous, along with estimating shrub height and sagebrush height."

| Contir | nuous I | Heigh | t & Covei | - |
|--|------------------------------|------------------|---|------------------------|
| Developed - Mick Interview | Shareb Marinki a 1.8 materia | Herb Cover = 16% | Herb Cover = 82% | The Cover = 28% |
| Consider a state of the state o | diconigit - to many | Herb Cover = 17% | NASS-Close Grown Crop | Tree Cover = 29% |
| Developed - Low Intensity | Shrub Height = 1.7 meters | Herb Cover = 18% | NASS-Row Crop | Tree Cover = 30% |
| Developed - Medium Intensity | Shrub Height = 1.8 meters | Herb Cover = 19% | NASS-Wheat | Tree Cover = 31% |
| Developed Roads | Shrub Height = 1.9 meters | Herb Cover = 20% | Open Water | Tree Cover = 32% |
| Developert United Deviduous Except | Smalle | Herb Cover = 21% | Quarries-Strip Mines-Gravel Pits-Well and Wind Pads | Tree Cover = 33% |
| Developed opains beloades Parest | 3.04.00 | Herb Cover = 22% | Shrub Cover = 10% | Tree Cover = 34% |
| Developed-Upland Evergreen Forest | Sparse Vegetation Canopy | Herb Cover = 23% | Shrub Cover = 11% | Tree Cover = 35% |
| Developed Upland Herbaceous | Tree Height = 1 meter | Herb Cover = 24% | Shrub Cover = 12% | Tree Cover = 36% |
| Developed-Upland Mixed Forest | Tree Height = 10 meters | Herb Cover = 25% | Shrub Cover = 13% | Tree Cover = 37% |
| Developed Unland Shoubland | Tree Height = 11 meters | Herb Cover = 26% | Shrub Cover = 14% | The Cover = 38% |
| | internet in the second | Herb Cover = 27% | Shrub Cover = 15% | Tee Cover = 39% |
| Herb Height = 0.1 meter | Tree Height = 12 meters | Herb Cover = 25% | Divid Cover = 16% | The Cover - work |
| Herb Height = 0.2 meter | Tree Height = 13 meters | Harb Cover = 20% | Shade Cover = 17% | Two Cores a 42% |
| Herb Height = 0.3 meter | Tree Height = 14 meters | Harb Cover = 31% | Shoch Cover = 19% | Tana Cover a 43% |
| Math Maight # 0.4 mater | The Height = 15 meters | Harb Cover = 325 | Shub Cover = 20% | Two Cover = 44% |
| | | Harb Cover = 33% | Shub Cover = 21% | Tree Cover = 45% |
| Herb Height = 0.5 meter | Tree Height = 16 meters | Herb Cover = 34% | Shrub Cover = 22% | The Cover = 46% |
| Herb Height = 0.6 meter | Tree Height = 17 meters | Herb Cover = 35% | Shrub Cover = 23% | Tree Cover = 47% |
| Herb Height = 0.7 meter | Tree Height = 18 meters | Herb Cover = 36% | Shrub Cover = 24% | Tree Cover = 48% |
| Mark Mainhi a 0.8 sector | Tere Mainhi e 10 maters | Herb Cover = 37% | Shrub Cover = 25% | Tree Cover = 49% |
| The bird regit - 5.0 meta | internet in the second | Herb Cover = 38% | Shrub Cover = 26% | Tree Cover = 50% |
| NASS-Close Grown Crop | Tree Height = 2 meters | Herb Cover = 39% | Shrub Cover = 27% | Tree Cover = 51% |
| NASS-Row Crop | Tree Height = 20 meters | Herb Cover = 40% | Shrub Cover = 28% | Tree Cover = 52% |
| NASS-Wheat | Tree Height = 21 meters | Herb Cover = 41% | Shrub Cover = 29% | Tree Cover = \$3% |
| Once Wester | Two Malakia 22 malana | Herb Cover = 42% | Shrub Cover = 30% | Tree Cover = 54% |
| Open Water | Thee Height * 22 meters | Herb Cover = 43% | Shrub Cover = 31% | Tree Cover = 55% |
| Quarries-Strip Mines-Gravel Pits-Well and Wind Pads | Tree Height = 23 meters | Herb Cover = 44% | Shrub Cover = 32% | Tree Cover = 56% |
| Shrub Height = 0.1 meter | Tree Height = 24 meters | Herb Cover = 45% | Shrub Cover = 33% | Tree Cover = 57% |
| Shrub Height = 0.2 meter | The Height # 25 meters | Herb Cover = 46% | Shrub Cover = 34% | Tree Cover = 58% |
| Physical Manipelli and C. Strandard | Two Maintain 28 maters | Herb Cover = 47% | Shrub Cover = 35% | Tree Cover = 59% |
| sinup neight = 0.3 meter | The reight # 26 meters | Herb Cover = 48% | Shrub Cover = 38% | Tree Cover = 60% |
| Shrub Height = 0.4 meter | Tree Height = 27 meters | Herb Cover = 49% | ahrub Cover = 37% | Tree Cover = 61% |
| Shrub Height = 0.5 meter | Tree Height = 28 meters | Herb Cover = 50% | shrub Cover = 38% | The Lover = 52% |
| Shrub Height = 0.6 meter | Time Height = 29 meters | Herb Cover = 51% | Shudi Cover = 39% | The Cover = 63% |
| Paral House of Taxata | The Helder Dension | Harb Cover = 51% | Shub Cover = 415 | The Cover = 65% |
| arrue rregnt = 0.7 meter | nee renges - 3 millions | Herb Cover = 54% | Shrub Cover = 42% | Tree Cover = 66% |
| Shrub Height = 0.8 meter | Tree Height = 4 meters | Herb Cover = 55% | Shrub Cover = 43% | Tree Cover = 67% |
| Shrub Height = 0.9 meter | Tree Height = 5 meters | Herb Cover = 56% | Shrub Cover = 44% | Tree Cover = 65% |
| Shrub Height = 1 meter | Tree Height = 6 meters | Herb Cover = 57% | Shrub Cover = 45% | Tree Cover = 69% |
| Shub Habbi = 11 meters | Two Height = 7 maters | Herb Cover = 58% | Shrub Cover = 46% | Tree Cover = 70% |
| and require 1.1 months | - Se require a reserve | Herb Cover = 59% | Shrub Cover = 47% | Tree Cover = 71% |
| Shrub Height = 1.2 meters | The Height = 5 meters | Herb Cover = 60% | Shrub Cover = 48% | Tree Cover = 72% |
| Shrub Height = 1.3 meters | Troe Height = 9 meters | Herb Cover = 61% | Shrub Cover = 49% | The Cover = 73% |
| | | | | The Nature Conservancy |

- LANDFIRE EVH (left) and EVC (right) are now delivered in continuous classes. Previously the data were binned into broader classes; e.g. 10% classes for EVC.
- Graphic shows partial legends, too many classes to display.



- 2014 EVH data on the left is dominated by two shades of green representing forest.
- Remap EVH data on the right show many shades of green representing more fine scaled variation in height.
- Similar patterns are shown in the brown tones that represent shrubs.





- We made a special effort to get review of major western rangeland types.
- 4 BpS were part of a what we call a "macro review" effort where we looked at the logical consistency between models for widespread systems.
- For example, LANDFIRE mapped the Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland BpS (show here in brown) on nearly 52 million acres. We created 12 unique BpS models to represent the system throughout its range.
- We felt it was important to review all the models for this type as a set.
- The review focused on several key questions:
 - Does the set of models encompass the full range of variability we see across the range of the type?
 - Do the models accurately reflect ecological differences?
 - Is the relationship between models logically consistent? For example, does the fire regime change as expected as models change north to south and east to west?



- Many improvements were made to the BpS models.
- I'll illustrate the types of changes users can expect using one example Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland in the great basin



- The big sage brush shrubland BpS for the Great Basin was reviewed by a group of Nature Conservancy scientists. They indicated that the original model encompasses a lot of variability and would be more useful for managers if it were divided into two types.
- Based on this feedback we split the model into two variants:
 - 1) Upland Soils type receives enough moisture (>10 inches annual) to support pinyon and juniper trees.
 - 2) Semi-Desert soils found in areas with 8-10 inches of annual precipitation, generally too dry to support trees
 - The two types have different indicator species, different fire frequencies, different management strategies.
- The models were refined to reflect these differences.

| The Nature 🍪 | | LANI Biophysical Set | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|--|
| Home EpS Search About Review Re | nources Program | Contacts | | |
| Vegetation Types Forest and Woodland Shrubland Herbacouts Science Revents | (330) (139) (104) (82) | Getarch | | Documents selected for download: No documents selected for download |
| Woody Woland Woody Woland Head Uptand and Wetland Herbacesous Wetland Map Zones 7 16 | (62) (56) (25) (63) (44) | Hawai'i Subalpine Mesic Shrubland Molel Number 1920 Vegetation Type Shubland | 113 m Map Zane(s) 79 | alls favel in 2me Download All Search Results Documents |
| 25 6 15 1 28 9 | (44) (43) (42) (40) (39) (30) | Hawai'i Wet-Mesic Coastal Strand Model Number 18270 Vegetation Type: Shubland | Map Zone(s): 79 | |
| 23 10 15 4 13 | (37) (35) (35) (35) (34) | Hawai'i Dry Coastal Strand Model Number 18360 Vegetation Type: Shubland | Map Zona(s), 79 | |
| 17 29 21 27 | (34) (32) (31) (31) | Hawai'i Dry Cliff Model Number 18250 | Map Zone(s) 79 | |

- LANDFIRE has developed a new, searchable, user interface for downloading model information.
- The reviewed and updated BpS model dataset for CONUS and HI are complete, but not publicly available yet.
- AK models are still being finalized.



- The Rio Grande Water Fund is an effort in New Mexico to protect municipal water supplies through improved managment of the watershed.
- The Nature Conservancy and partners developed the "Rio Grande Comprehensive Plan for Wildfire and Water Source Protection."
- The Plan uses the best available data to describe the current wildfire threat to water sources and forested watersheds and prioritizes where treatments will help reduce wildfire

impacts such as post-fire erosion.

• LANDFIRE spatial data were key this effort providing ready to go data for the entire state.



- A focal areas analysis was used to identify areas where water supply were at risk.
- Data about forest conditions, water supplies and users, potential for wood use, and social and economic importance to the state were the bases for identifying focal areas
- LANDFIRE fuels data were used in the wildfire risk portion of the analysis to model fire behavior.
- Here you see areas in need of restoration treatment to protect water supplies shown in red and areas with a lower need for treatment in

green.

 The focal areas map can be used to ensure that the water funds are allocated to the areas where the risk to water supplies is greatest and where restoration actions have the highest probability of success.

Take-home Messages

LANDFIRE products

- are comprehensive, compatible, consistent and current. (4 C's)
- are designed for use at regional and national scales.
- can be modified for local use.

LF Remap incorporated new processes and data sets to improve usability of the products, and represents conditions in 2016.

User can help improve LANDFIRE products by providing plots and data + feedback.

The Nature Conservancy



LANDFIRE welcomes feedback. Contact the helpdesk and/or provide feedback via the LANDFIRE website.



