Team 9

# Rooting for Upper Little Bear Mountain Club

..`



# Dixie Fire Structure

# Caldor Fire Structure

F



Maps Sourced From *fire.ca.gov(CALFire)* 

# Fuel **Reduced**. . . But Will Fire **Produce**?

# **Upper Little Bear Mountain Club History**

- Little bear lake project in 1890 was for irrigation
- $1913 \rightarrow Water Commission Act$
- 1920 Became Arrowhead
- Switched to a recreational area (Mostly Fishing)

# **Upper Little Bear Mountain Club Size**

- "Approximately 40 acres of undeveloped forest"
- Around 40 cabins
- 5,200 Feet in Elevation
- Diverse Species

- David Haas, RPF of San Bernardino Unit

## Upper Little Bear Mountain Club Location



## **Fire Behavior**

- We can directly influence fuel
- Fuel ladders carry surface fire up into crowns



"When you look out the window, you see houses with vegetation..a fire is unstoppable..."





- John Nicoles, Registered Forester since 1974

## **Fuel Reduction**

Infographics Sourced From Cal Office of Emergency Services

- Disconnect vertical and horizontal fuels
- Remove vegetation or fuel
- Thinning trees, removing underbrush, limbing trees





## First Thought: Beautiful



## Second Thought: Uh Oh...



## Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)

- Between unoccupied land & human development
- Areas experiencing wildfires

North of Upper Little Bear Mountain Club





## **ULBMC Fuel Reduction Project**

- Created through CAL Fire
- For communities falling within WUI
- 2019: project on 40 acres of undeveloped forest
- Maintenance re-entry since October 2021

#### **Treatment Specifications**

- □ Thin Trees
- Prune Trees
- □ Remove Vegetation
- Remove Snags
- Bark Beetles
- □ Remove 85% of Brush
- □ Spaced brush to 2.5x fuel height



#### Data Collected

Trees 254 Snags 6 Acres 2.5 Basal Area 128 Average Brush Height 3 Brush Cover **30%** Pruned to 8'48% Yes Canopies Touching 85% Yes Vegetation Removed 54% Yes Spacing 56% No Canopy Cover 64%







# So how did we get this data?







# **DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES**

Angle Gauge



#### Densitometer



#### Increment Borer



#### Clinometer



#### Plot Analysis





# Were Objectives Met?

# **Untreated Vs. Treated**







Qualitatively, it appears that the project has met objectives of reducing fuel.

# **Comparison of Data to Project Objectives**

Canopies Touching 85% Pruned to 8'48% Yes Vegetation Removed 54% Yes Snags 2.4 per acre Bark Beetle trees in 3 plots Brush Cover 30% Spacing 56% No

Thin Trees NO Prune Trees NO Remove Vegetation YES Remove Snags 1-2 Per Acre (NO) Bark Beetles 3 Plots \*\* Remove 85% of Brush NO (70% removed) Spaced brush to 2.5x fuel height NO

\*\*David Haas (SB Unit Forester) stated that the bark beetle data is most likely incorrect due to student error. In his vast experience walking through the area, he has never seen a bark beetle infested tree.

Quantitatively, comparisons show that the project **DID NOT** meet the objectives Must consider regrowth since that time (October 2021)

# Tending the Timberland: Future Tree-atments



# **Congressional Role**

H.R .188 Proven Forest Management Act of 2022

- Educate on the lack of forest management
- Allowing more reasonable time to complete/begin projects



# One/two more rounds of pruning

- 85% of canopy touching adjacent
- Trees prune to 8ft or half their height is 50%



"That's a lasting treatment."

"The mortality rate was less..because he had thinned the forest."

- John Nicoles, Registered Forester since 1974

# **Remove drip line vegetation**



54% removed separated

1. Prescribed grazing

2. Prescribed fires

45%



"Manipulate vegetation..reduce competition to protect trees..."

"Fatality rate was low under area beneath the trees"

(Untreated = 100% Mortality) (Treated = 60%)

- David Haas, RPF of San Bernardino Unit

John Nicoles, Registered Forester since 1974 -

# Thank you for this opportunity.



