

Projecting future fire regimes in semiarid systems of inland northwestern U.S.: interactions among climate change, vegetation productivity, and fuel dynamics

^{1,2}Jianning Ren, ²Erin J. Hanan, ³John T. Abatzoglou, ³Crystal A. Kolden, ⁴Christina (Naomi) L. Tague, ⁵Maureen C. Kennedy, ¹Mingliang Liu, ¹Jennifer C. Adam

¹ Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Washington State University, 99163, Pullman, USA

² Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences, University of Nevada, Reno, 89501, Reno, USA

³ Management of Complex Systems, University of California, Merced, 95344, Merced, USA

⁴ Bren School of Environmental Science & Management, University of California, Santa Barbara, 93106, Santa Barbara, USA

⁵ School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, Division of Sciences and Mathematics, University of Washington, Tacoma, 98402, Tacoma, USA

Correspondence to:

Jennifer Adam (jcadam@wsu.edu)

Key Points:

- Fire activity in a semiarid ecosystem is projected to increase in the 2040s (i.e., 2031 – 2060) and decrease in the 2070s (i.e., 2061 – 2090).
- While climate change (without CO₂ fertilization) decreases fire activity by reducing fuel load, CO₂ fertilization counteracts this effect to some extent.

- 22 • For a given vegetation type, there are temporally stable thresholds—specifically, the ratio of
23 changes in fuel loading to changes in fuel aridity—that determine whether a location is fuel
24 or flammability limited.

25

Abstract

Fire regimes are influenced by both exogenous drivers (e.g., increases in atmospheric CO₂ and climate change) and endogenous drivers (e.g., vegetation and soil/litter moisture), which constrain fuel loads and fuel aridity. Herein, we identified how exogenous and endogenous drivers can interact to affect fuels and fire regimes in a semiarid watershed in the inland northwestern U.S. throughout the 21st century. We used a coupled ecohydrologic and fire regime model to examine how climate change and CO₂ scenarios influence fire regimes over space and time. In this semiarid watershed we found that, in the mid-21st century (2040s), the CO₂ fertilization effect on vegetation productivity outstripped the effects of climate change-induced fuel decreases, resulting in greater fuel loading and, thus, a net increase in fire size and burn probability; however, by the late-21st century (2070s), climatic warming dominated over CO₂ fertilization, thus reducing fuel loading and fire activity. We also found that, under future climate change scenarios, fire regimes will shift progressively from being flammability to fuel-limited, and we identified a metric to quantify this shift: the ratio of the change in fuel loading to the change in its aridity. The threshold value for which this metric indicates a flammability versus fuel-limited regime differed between grasses and woody species but remained stationary over time. Our results suggest that identifying these thresholds in other systems requires narrowing uncertainty in exogenous drivers, such as future precipitation patterns and CO₂ effects on vegetation.

Plain Language Summary

Many studies have projected increases in wildfire under future climate change. However, in addition to changes in fuel aridity, this also depends on how the fuel loading change in response to warmer temperatures and increasing atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. We used a

coupled ecohydrological and fire model to simulate how wildfire changes in a semiarid watershed of the northwestern U.S. throughout the 21st century. We found that wildfire is projected to increase in the mid-21st century due to increases in fuel loading and fuel aridity. However, wildfire is projected to decrease in the late-21st century due to drought-induced decreases in fuel loading, even when fuels are drier. We demonstrated that future wildfire regimes are dynamic, and we cannot simply extrapolate fire activity from the baseline and 2040s scenarios to the 2070s. Furthermore, we found there was a clear threshold in the ratio of the change in fuel loading to the change in its aridity at which fire regimes shift from being flammability to fuel-limited. Predicting future wildfires will require reducing key uncertainties in future precipitation patterns and our understanding of how CO₂ fertilization affects plant growth.

Key words: fire regimes, climate change, fuel aridity, fuel loading, vegetation, fire regime modeling, fire prediction, semiarid watersheds.

1 Introduction

While frequent low-intensity fires are an important component of many forest ecosystems, e.g., contributing to the regulation of energy, water, and carbon cycling (Flitcroft et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2013), large, stand-replacing wildfires are becoming more common in locations that historically burned at low intensity (Abatzoglou & Williams, 2016; Westerling, 2016; Williams et al., 2019). These fire regime shifts can transform ecosystem dynamics and structure, increase air and water pollution, cause flood and landslide hazards, and threaten human property and lives (Abatzoglou et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2016). Climate change is a major factor pushing fire regimes in flammability-limited forested systems outside their historical range of variability (Abatzoglou & Williams, 2016). Thus, mitigating future fire hazard requires understanding how climate change and wildfire interact at the scales where management actions

are implemented. However, this is challenging at fine scales because climate-wildfire interactions can vary with local environmental conditions, including topography and vegetation cover (Hanan et al., 2021; Littell et al., 2018; Pausas & Paula, 2012).

While climate change is playing an essential role in facilitating large fires in the western U.S. (Abatzoglou & Williams, 2016), the effects of climate change are location-dependent. For example, climate change (i.e., warming) can increase the frequency, duration, and intensity of drought, which can in turn increase fuel aridity and fire hazard (Abatzoglou & Kolden, 2013). This is especially true in mesic landscapes where wildfire regimes are flammability-limited. In more arid locations, on the other hand, climate change may ultimately decrease wildfire hazard by reducing net primary productivity (NPP) and, therefore, fuel loads (Hanan et al., 2021; Littell et al., 2016, 2018). Thus, the effects of climate change on future fire regimes depends in large part on how vegetation (and fuels) respond.

Understanding how climate change influences vegetation, fuel aridity, and fuel loading is further complicated by the role of rising atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, which can modify plant (and therefore fuel) responses to drought (Becklin et al., 2017; Warren et al., 2011). For example, increasing CO₂ concentrations can increase plant productivity by increasing photosynthetic and water-use efficiency, thereby partially offsetting the suppressive effects of drought (Becklin et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2009; Sullivan et al., 2020). Because rising CO₂ concentrations and warming influence vegetation, fuel loading, and fuel moisture in opposite ways, it is important to disentangle which drivers dominate in different locations.

Many recent studies have focused on understanding how climate, ecosystem structure, and fuel conditions interact to drive wildfire regimes at different scales (Abatzoglou & Kolden, 2013; Halofsky et al., 2020; Hicke et al., 2012; McCarley et al., 2017; Williams et al., 2019).

However, many of these observational studies are limited in their ability to isolate specific drivers or project into the future (Hicke et al., 2012; McCarley et al., 2017). Alternatively, empirical models have been used to predict future fire regimes (e.g., Abatzoglou et al., 2019; Bradstock, 2010; Littell et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2013; McKenzie et al., 2004). However, empirical models do not consider dynamic vegetation and changes in fuel loading that occur under climate change (Pausas & Paula, 2012). Process-based models are a key tool for complimenting field-based and empirical modeling studies; they can bridge spatial and temporal scales while also accounting for feedbacks among climate change, rising CO₂, vegetation productivity, and fire. They also enable researchers to manipulate drivers to isolate their individual and combined effects (Hanan et al., 2021).

In this study, we addressed the overarching question: **What role does vegetation play in influencing the effects of climate change on fire regimes in a semiarid watershed?** We applied the coupled ecohydrological, fire regime modeling platform RHESSys-WMFire (Bart et al., 2020; Kennedy et al., 2017; Tague & Band, 2004) in a semiarid watershed in the U.S. Inland Northwest. We used a range of possible future scenarios to assess how climate change and increasing atmospheric CO₂ interact to influence vegetation and, thus, the roles of fuel loading and fuel aridity in determining future fire regimes. Specifically, we addressed the following questions:

(1) What are the relative and opposing roles of two key *exogenous* drivers in driving fire regimes: climate change (warming and changes in precipitation) and increasing CO₂ (*Figure 1*)?

(2) What are the relative and opposing roles of two key *endogenous* drivers in driving fire regimes: fuel load and fuel aridity (*Figure 1*)?

118 Climate change and increasing CO₂ can either compete or compound one another to influence
119 fuel aridity, fuel loading, and resultant fire regimes. The extent to which a particular ecosystem is
120 affected by either mechanism depends on whether or not fire is limited by fuel (biomass
121 available for burning) or flammability (environmental conditions that enable the fuel to burn,
122 which are partially controlled by climate, Abatzoglou et al., 2019; Littell et al., 2018; Werf et al.,
123 2008). We hypothesize that climate change can affect fuel loading and fuel aridity through
124 changes in vegetation productivity, evapotranspiration (ET), and litter decomposition. At finer
125 scales, historical aridity gradients across the watershed (PET/P) also play an important role in
126 determining the spatial distribution of how fire regimes respond to climate change (Hanan et al.,
127 2021). Thus, it is essential to account for these biophysical and biogeochemical processes in
128 projections of future fire regimes in order to improve our understanding of how fire regimes are
129 changing in semiarid landscapes and support policy and other decision-making processes at
130 management-relevant scales.




Figure 1. Exogenous (external) and endogenous (internal) drivers of fire regimes. Question 1 (Q1) focuses on the role of exogenous drivers while Question 2 (Q2) focuses on endogenous drivers.

2 Methods

2.1 Study area

Trail Creek is a 167-km² sub-catchment of the Big Wood River Basin located in Blaine County, Idaho, between the Salmon-Challis National Forest and Sawtooth National Forest (43.44N, 114.19W; Figure 2). The mean annual precipitation in the area is around 980 mm, of which 60% is snow (Frenzel, 1989). Trail Creek is characterized by cold, wet winters and warm, dry summers. Elevations range from 1760 to 3478 m, and there is a vegetation and aridity gradient following changes in elevation. To describe the spatial variation of atmospheric aridity (which is different from fuel aridity), we use the ratio of multi-year average annual potential evapotranspiration (PET) to multi-year average annual precipitation (P) as an index. We define areas with $PET/P > 2$ as water-limited, $PET/P < 0.8$ as energy-limited, and PET/P between 0.8 and 2 as balanced (McVicar et al., 2012). As Figure 2 depicts, lower to middle elevation slopes are

water-limited and covered by sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata ssp.*), mixed riparian species, and grasslands; middle to higher elevation areas are water-energy balanced and are covered by Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta varlatifolia*), subalpine fir (*Abies lasiocarpa*), and mixed shrub and herbaceous vegetation (Buhidar, 2001). Soils in Trail Creek are mainly coarse, permeable alluvium (Smith, 1960). No wildfires have occurred in the last 40 years. The soils, vegetation and topography, however, are comparable to several sub-catchments on the western side of the Big Wood River Basin, which were burned in the 2013 Beaver Creek Fire (total 45,036 ha burnt area, Skinner, 2013).

Table 1. Fire regime groups and corresponding characteristics (Rollins, 2009).

Fire Regime Group	Characteristics
Fire Regime Group I	<= 35-year fire return interval, low and mixed severity
Fire Regime Group II	<= 35-year fire return interval, replacement severity
Fire Regime Group III	35 to 200-year fire return interval, low and mixed severity
Fire Regime Group IV	> 200-year fire return interval, any severity




Figure 2. Study site – Trail Creek. (a) fire regime from LANDFIRE data (Rollins, 2009; Table 1); the gridded areas show different long-term aridity indices; (b) land cover overlapped with topography (elevations range from 1760 to 3478 m).

The aridity index generally correlates with the fire regime classifications from LANDFIRE, which are based on vegetation cover, ecological and vegetation simulation, and successional modeling (Fig. 2; Rollins, 2009). In the lower part of the basin, the mean LANDFIRE fire return interval (FRI) is short (i.e., 35 years) and fires are generally low or mixed severity. This is a fuel-limited fire regime (the fuels are dry enough to burn in most years, but there is rarely enough fuel to carry fire). The upper part of the basin, on the other hand, has a long mean FRI (i.e., 200 years) and typically burns at high severity. This is a flammability-limited fire regime (there is enough fuel present, but fuels are generally too moist to burn; LANDFIRE, Rollins 2009, Figure 2, Table 1). The central part of the basin is a transitional zone,

with some fuel-limited patches located in relative mesic areas, and some flammability-limited patches located in more water-limited areas. Within the northern part of the basin there is also a small water-limited area due to slightly lower precipitation.

2.2 Model description

We used the coupled ecohydrologic-fire regime modeling platform RHESSys-WMFire (Kennedy et al., 2017; Bart et al., 2020) to model fire and vegetation responses under a range of climate and CO₂ scenarios. The Regional Hydro-ecologic Simulation System (RHESSys, Tague & Band, 2004) is a mechanistic model designed to simulate the effects of climate and land use change on ecosystem carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) cycling and hydrology. RHESSys fully couples hydrology (streamflow, ET, soil moisture), C (photosynthesis, respiration, net primary productivity=NPP, mortality) and N fluxes (mineralization, nitrification, denitrification, plant uptake, and leaching) at a hierarchy of scales (e.g., patch, zone, sub-basin, basin). Photosynthesis is calculated based on the Farquhar model, which is a function of nitrogen, radiation, stomatal conductance, atmospheric pressure, atmospheric CO₂ concentration, and daily average temperature (Farquhar & von Caemmerer, 1982). Higher atmospheric CO₂ concentrations can increase photosynthesis rates (i.e., CO₂ fertilization). Stomatal conductance is based on the Jarvis model of stratum conductance (Jarvis, 1976), which accounts for the effects of light, atmospheric CO₂ concentration, leaf water potential, and vapor pressure deficit (Running & Coughlan, 1988; Tague & Band, 2004). Recent empirical studies have shown that higher CO₂ concentration can increase plant water use efficiency but with large uncertainties (Becklin et al., 2017; Duursma et al., 2014). Therefore, we did not include the effect of CO₂ augmentation on stomatal conductance and only considered the CO₂ fertilization effect on photosynthesis. Litter decomposition models are based on the method developed by Thornton, (1998), which is related

to the C:N ratio and potential decay rate. The potential decay rate is limited by soil moisture, temperature, and nitrogen, and a higher temperature may cause a higher decay rate. RHESSys has been widely tested and applied in many mountainous watersheds (Garcia & Tague, 2015; Hanan et al., 2017, 2018, 2021; Lin et al., 2019; Ren et al., 2021; Son & Tague, 2019). A more detailed description of the RHESSys model can be found in Tague & Band, (2004).

RHESSys-WMFire couples RHESSys with a model for fire spread (WMFire, Kennedy et al., 2017) and a model for fire effects (Bart et al., 2020), which capture fuel and climate controls on fire spread and severity. RHESSys-WMFire computes key processes at a daily time-step and partitions the landscape into patches (the smallest spatial unit, typically 30-120 m). The model therefore accounts for spatial differences in energy and precipitation conditions on soil moisture, evapotranspiration, vegetation growth, and fire dynamics. Notably the model accounts for the lateral downslope redistribution of water. WMFire is a stochastic model that requires several replicate simulations (200 in the current study) to attain a representative result (Kennedy, 2019). Additional details on the model framework and parameter calibration are provided in supplementary material text S1 and S2.

2.3 Input data

2.3.1 Selection of GCM models (storylines) and CO₂ data

Because RHESSys-WMFire is computationally intensive, we selected four General Circulation Models (GCM) based on changes in climate variables that are most related to fire activity between the historical (1971 – 2000) and future (2040 – 2069) periods. For selecting GCM models, we used three variables: 1) a measure of annual water deficit (DEF), calculated as potential evapotranspiration (PET) minus actual evapotranspiration (AET), 2) a measure of annual plant available moisture (i.e., AET), and 3) 100-hour dead fuel moisture (FM100) in

summer, defined as a biomass volume that takes 100 hours to lose or gain 2/3 of the difference between the dead fuel itself and the surrounding atmosphere. Note that for the purpose of GCM selection, PET and AET was estimated at monthly time scales (Abatzoglou & Rupp, 2017). The first variable (DEF) is a proxy of changes in vegetation moisture stress that enable flammability and is most important in modulating burned area in flammability-limited forests. The second variable (AET) is a proxy for potential changes in plant productivity and fuel accumulation and is therefore more important for modulating fire occurrence in fuel-limited environments. The differences in standard deviation (SD) of PET and AET between the future and the historical climate is also important because climate variability can exacerbate or temper fire return intervals. FM100 is calculated based on the National Fire Danger Rating System using climate data from GCMs (Cohen & Deeming, 2006).

We started with 20 GCMs from the Coupled Model Inter-comparison Project 5 (CMIP5; Taylor et al., 2012) that have been statistically downscaled across the contiguous U.S. using the Multivariate Adaptive Constructed Analogs (MACA, Abatzoglou & Brown, 2012) with 1/24 degree resolution (~4-km) covering the time period from 1950 to 2100. Then, we used six metrics based on the assessment criteria described above to select future climate scenarios: the change in mean AET and DEF (i.e., 2040 – 2069 mean vs. 1971 – 2000 mean); the standard deviation of monthly AET and DEF; and the number of days per year where FM100 in the future (i.e. 2040-2069) is less than the 3rd percentile value for the historical period (i.e. 1971 – 2000), and the 10th percentile. Based on the ranking shown in Figure S1, we selected four models to cover the range of all 20 GCMs, as well as a model representing the mean behavior (IPSL-CM5A-LR, **MultiMean**): one with a large increase in aridity that may promote drought (CSIRO-Mk3-6-0, **ProDrought**), one that promotes increased productivity but limits fire (GFDL-

ESM2G, **ProVeg**), and one with a significant fluctuation of fire-related metrics (INMCM4, **ProFire**). For forcing RHESSys-WMFire, we select representative concentration pathway (RCP) 8.5 due to its close agreement with historical total cumulative CO₂ emissions during the historical time period (Meinshausen et al., 2011; Schwalm et al., 2020).

Table 2. Lists of four selected GCM model based on fire-related characteristics.

GCM #	Storyline Name	Model Name	Characteristics
1	ProDrought	CSIRO-Mk3-6-0	A large increase in summer aridity that may promote drought
2	ProVeg	GFDL-ESM2G	Promotes increased productivity and limits fire
3	ProFire	INMCM4	A significant increase in fire-related metrics (FM100)
4	MultiMean	IPSL-CM5A-LR	Close to the multi-model mean

To evaluate the effect of rising CO₂ concentrations, we used observed and projected CO₂ concentrations from 1900 to 2099 produced by Meinshausen et al., (2011) based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC AR4). For the “with CO₂ fertilization effect”, we use transient CO₂ concentration from AR4; and for the “without CO₂ fertilization effect”, we use constant CO₂ concentration, i.e. 353 ppm-the concentration in year 1990

2.3.2 Model calibration and initialization

For soil parameter calibration, we used daily, high-resolution (1/24 degree or ~ 4 km) gridded meteorological data from GridMET (*Table 3 A*), including minimum and maximum temperatures, precipitation, relative humidity, shortwave radiation, and wind speed covering the

time period from 1895 to 2017. We used raw gridMET data from 1980 to 2017 (Abatzoglou, 2013) to reconstruct the historical record from 1895 to 1979 (Hanan et al., 2021) based on Parameter-elevation Relationships on Independent Slopes Model data (PRISM, Daly et al., 1994) and the European Center for Medium-Range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) reanalysis data (Simmons & Gibson, 2000).

After model calibration, we initialized vegetation and soil C and N pools using a target-driven spin-up approach (Hanan et al., 2018). During the vegetation initialization period, we used the same observed climate data from model calibration, but with the anthropogenic climate change signal removed (*Table 3 B*) per Hanan et al., (2021). We ran the model for 300 years with this modified climate data and with the fire model “on” to initialize the landscape vegetation. From this we obtained the pre-industrial and pre-suppression condition as a starting point for running different climate change scenarios. The vegetation initialization was conducted once for all scenarios, i.e. they have same initial state of vegetation, litter, and soil C & N storage.

Table 3. Climate forcing data, atmospheric CO₂ concentration, and their usage for this study.

Label	Forcing data name	Data period	Data source	Manipulations	Purpose
A	Observed climate data	1895 - 2017	gridMET, ECMWF and PRISM	gridMET reconstructed with PRISM	Calibration
B	Observed climate data with anthropogenic signal removed	1895 - 2017	gridMET, ECMWF and PRISM	Use ensemble of 20 MACA downscaled GCMs to remove the historical climate signal from observed data	Vegetation initialization (looped the data over 300 years)

C	Baseline climate	1950 - 2005	CMIP5	MACA downscaled	Future fire scenarios spin-up and fire assessment
D	RCP8.5 climate data	2006 - 2099	CMIP5	MACA downscaled	
E	Transient CO ₂ concentrations	1900-2099	IPCC AR4	NA	

2.3.3 Other biophysical and land cover data

We aggregated a 10-m resolution digital elevation model (DEM) from the US Geologic Survey National Elevation Database to 100-m resolution (USGS, NED 2016) to generate the topographic properties and watershed structure of Trail Creek, which include elevation, slope, aspect, patches, sub-basins, and basin boundaries. In total, we delineated 72 sub-basins and 16,705 patches. We use the National Land Cover Database (NLCD 2016, Dewitz, 2019) to classify five vegetation types. Of these, 49.6% were evergreen, 24.9% were shrub, 22.0% were grass, 0.3% were deciduous, and 3.1% were not vegetated. Soil type was assigned using a spatial continuous probability soil map (POLARIS) created by Chaney et al. (2016).

2.4 Modeling scenarios and climate forcing

We conducted model simulations using RHESSys-WMFire over three major timeframes for each GCM, both with and without CO₂ fertilization: baseline, 2040s, and 2070s. The 2040s and 2070s timeframes were simulated with the RCP8.5 (Meinshausen et al., 2011). For each timeframe there was a 55-year spin-up and a 30-year assessment time period (*Figure 3*) for a total 85-year simulation with the fire model turned on. Each spin-up period was initialized with the same initial conditions generated in the vegetation initialization described above.

For the baseline scenario, we first ran the model for 55 years using historical GCM forcing inputs from each of the 4 chosen GCMs (1950-2005; *Table 3*). We then repeated the climate data over the years 1950-1964 and 1991-2005 to generate the 30-year baseline assessment period. Climate change effects were assessed against the patterns seen in the baseline time period.

For the future scenarios, we simulated a 55-year spin-up period using each of the 4 GCMs and starting with the same vegetation initialization described above. We then repeated the last 15 years of the climate data and combined it with the next 15 years to produce the assessment period. For example, for the 2040s simulation we spun the model up for 55 years using climate data from 1991-2045, then simulated an additional 30-year assessment period using climate data from 2031-2060. For the 2070s simulation we spun the model up for 55 years using climate data from 2021-2075, then simulated an additional 30-year assessment period using climate data from 2061-2090. All simulations were repeated with and without CO₂ fertilization for each of the 4 GCMs.




Figure 3. Future fire simulation scenarios using the ProDrought GCM as an example. b, e, and h show the assessment of the 2040s (2031 to 2060); c, f, and i show the assessment of 2070s (2061 – 2090); a, d, and g are for baseline scenarios. There are three simulation periods: the vegetation initialization period (not shown), the scenario spin-up period, and the assessment period. For the scenario spin-up period, there were two different climate inputs: baseline and RCP8.5; and two different CO₂ fertilization scenarios (with and without). We used the historical output from individual GCMs as a baseline for calculating future climate change effects. For the scenario spin-up period, the baseline scenario used historical data from 1951 to 2005. For the assessment period (30 years), the baseline scenario used data that concatenated the first 15 years of the historical record (1950 -1964) to its last 15 years records (1991 -2005). We considered the future climate and CO₂ fertilization scenarios in isolation and together to build different landscape fuel conditions for the subsequent assessment periods. For the CO₂ fertilization effect, we used transient CO₂ concentrations from IPCC as the model input; for the no CO₂ fertilization scenarios, we used a constant CO₂ concentration (i.e., 353 ppm). For the assessment period (30 years), we use the spun-up fuel conditions as initial conditions and ran the fire model to assess the relative contribution of different factors in driving fire regimes.

Table 4. Summary of model simulation scenarios. “Climate change” refers to the climate change effect with no CO₂ fertilization (using constant CO₂ concentration - 353 ppm as the model input). “Climate change and increasing CO₂” refers to their combined effects (using both RCP8.5 climate data and transient CO₂ concentrations as inputs. Meinshausen et al., 2011).

ID	Scenarios	Representing period	Forcing data	
			Climate data	CO ₂ data
1	Baseline	Baseline (30 years)	Historical (Table 3 C)	353 ppm
2	Climate change (2040s)	2040s (2031-2060)	RCP8.5 (Table 3 D)	353 ppm
3	Climate change and increasing CO ₂ (2040s)	2040s (2031-2060)	RCP 8.5 (Table 3 D)	transient CO ₂ (Table 3 E)
4	Climate change (2070s)	2070s (2061-2090)	RCP8.5 (Table 3 D)	353 ppm
5	Climate change and increasing CO ₂ (2070s)	2070s (2061-2090)	RCP 8.5 (Table 3 D)	transient CO ₂ (Table 3 E)

For evaluating the changes in fire regimes, we only analyzed outputs for the 30-year assessment period. We calculated 4 main fire characteristics for each of the 200 independent Monte Carlo replicates for each scenario: mean number of patches burned per fire, 95th percentile fire size in 30 years’ assessment period, annual area burned (mean number of patches burned each year), and number of fire starts (fires that surpass 30 burned patches in 30 years’ assessment period). We then compared distributions of these variables among the model scenarios.

We also considered patch-level summaries of burn probability (P_{burn}), fuel aridity, and fuel loading. For each patch, the burn probability (P_{burn}) was calculated as:

$$p_{burn} = \frac{\text{number of times burned across all simulations}}{\text{number of simulation years} * \text{number of simulations}} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

Fuel aridity is calculated by WMFire as relative deficit and was calculated monthly as:

$$\text{Fuel aridity} = 1 - ET/PET \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

We calculated patch-level mean burn probability, fuel loading, and fuel aridity to understand the relationships among these variables in the different model scenarios.

3 Results

In the following descriptions we use “overall effect” to represent both the climate change and CO₂ fertilization effects on fire activity, while “climate change effect” represents the climate change effects without CO₂ fertilization.

3.1 Effects of climate change and CO₂ fertilization on fire starts and size

During the 2040s assessment period, the **climate change effect** decreased fire size and activity relative to baseline (*Figure 4*). In contrast, the **overall effect** increased or only slightly decreased fire activity and fire size (*Figure 4 a*). These patterns correspond to climate change and CO₂ effects on fuel and vegetation. Climate change alone decreased overall fine fuel loading through increases to soil respiration (*Figure S5*), whereas CO₂ fertilization increased fire activity by enhancing vegetation productivity and thus fuel loading (*Figure S6*).

Fire responses differed among GCM storylines. When considering the climate change effect, the ProDrought storyline exhibited the greatest decreases in fire activity and the ProVeg storyline the smallest decrease (*Figure 4*). This occurred because the ProDrought storyline had the largest decrease in fuel loading, which outstripped the effects of increasing fuel aridity (*Figure S2 and Figure S3*). When considering the overall effect (climate change and CO₂), the ProVeg storyline predicted the largest increase in fire size and AAB with no noticeable increase in the number of fire starts (fire that burned more than 30 patches). This occurred because the storyline promoted productivity and, therefore, increases in fuel loading (*Figure S2 and Figure S4*). The MultiMean storyline also predicted an increase in fire size for the overall effect but the

increase was smaller in magnitude than ProVeg. ProFire and MultiMean predicted the most significant increases in the number of fire starts for the overall effect, but differed in their fire size responses (*Figure 4c*).




Figure 4. Box plot of projected fire characteristics in 2040s under each climate change and increasing atmospheric CO₂ storyline for the assessment period: (a) mean fire size, (b) 95th percentile fire size, (c) number of fire starts (fires that burned more than 30 patches), and (d) annual area burned. Red lines represent the median value for the baseline scenario. Box plots show medians, 25th and 75th percentiles and 95% confidence intervals. “Climate change (2040s)” refers to the climate change effect without CO₂ fertilization, and “climate change and increasing CO₂ (2040s)” refers to the overall effect. All four fire characteristics were calculated first within each independent simulation replicate (there were 200 simulation replicates for each scenario). Then their distribution across 200 simulations is shown for each scenario.

Fire activity had a non-monotonic response to exogenous drivers over the 21st century (i.e., in the 2070s; *Figure 5*). When only considering climate change (for all four GCM storylines), there was a dramatic decrease in all fire metrics in the 2070s compared to the historical scenario, consistent with the simulated decrease for the 2040s. The effect of CO₂ fertilization, however, differed between the two timeframes. The overall effect of climate change and CO₂ fertilization was predicted to increase fire activity in the 2040s, but either did not change or decreased predicted fire in the 2070s (*Figure 5*). Warming increased aridity and reduced vegetation productivity (*Figure 8 b&d*), which reduced fuel accumulation. It also increased decomposition rates, which further reduced fuel loading (*Figure S6 and Figure S9*). Faster decomposition of litter and reduced vegetation productivity are the dominate driver than fire-caused fuel combustion in reducing fuel loading. CO₂ fertilization however, increased fuel loading by enhancing vegetation productivity (*Figure S8*), which counteracted warming-induced decreases in fuel loading in 2040s. However, by the 2070s, climate change-driven decreases in fuel loading outstripped any compensatory effects of CO₂ fertilization (*Figure S2 Figure S6*). This led to an overall decrease in fire activity from the 2040s to the 2070s (e.g., *Figure 5a*).




Figure 5. Same as Figure 4, but for the period of 2070s

3.2 Effects of exogenous and endogenous drivers on burn probability (P_{burn})

Fuel conditions varied among vegetation cover types (Figure 6). For example, region A (grass-dominated) was very fuel-limited (fuel load $< 0.3 \text{ kg/m}^2$, Figure S10 and Figure 6 b) and had a broader range of fuel aridity conditions; region B (shrub-dominated) was fuel-limited (fuel load $< 0.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$, Figure S10 and Figure 6 b) and very arid (fuel aridity > 0.6); and region C (evergreen forest) was fuel abundant (fuel load $> 0.4 \text{ kg/m}^2$) and relatively humid ($0.5 < \text{fuel aridity} < 0.85$, Figure S10 and Figure 6 b).

In the 2040s, climate change reduced P_{burn} (**Equation 1**) across the watershed by reducing fuel loading. However, increasing CO₂ tempered that effect, and in many locations even changed its direction (except for in region B, which is shrub-dominated). The counteracting effects of climate change and CO₂ fertilization depended on location and vegetation cover type. Region B (shrub-dominated) had the largest decreases in P_{burn} due to climate change (except under the ProVeg storyline). This occurred because warming reduced shrub productivity (*Figure 2 & Figure 8 d*) and enhanced litter decomposition, which synergistically reduced fuel loading (*Figure S2*).




Figure 6. Relationships among fuel load (i.e., litter carbon), fuel aridity, and percent changes in burn probability (relative to the baseline scenario) under various climate change and atmospheric CO₂ fertilization scenarios in the 2040s. Panels (a), (b), (c), (d) show the distribution of burn probability against fuel load and fuel aridity with the baseline scenario as the reference. Other panels show bivariate effects of fuel load and fuel aridity on percentage changes in burn probability (climate change scenario minus baseline scenario). Data are binned with 0.05 window length for both fuel load and fuel aridity. The value is the median of percent changes within each bin. Panels (e), (f), (g), and (h) show the climate change effect and (i), (j), (k), and (l) show combined climate change and CO₂ fertilization effects (i.e., the overall effect). Region A has low fuel load with a broader range of aridity, representing grasses, region B is dry with low fuel loading, where shrubs dominate, and region C is relatively humid with high fuel loading, where forests dominate. For more information about vegetation distribution of each scenario see Figure S10.

In the 2070s, changes in P_{burn} were more consistent across storylines and fuel conditions. With climate change, the fuel conditions in Region B (shrub-dominated) and C (evergreen forest) converged with Region A (grass-dominated), where the watershed as a whole became intensely fuel-limited (caused by climate change effect on vegetation growth and litter decomposition). The CO₂ fertilization effect tempered the magnitude of decreasing fuel loads in the 2070s but was not sufficient for changing the direction of P_{burn} , with a few exceptions (e.g., in region A and C under the MultiMean climate change storyline, *Figure 7 i*). However, in Region B, where shrubs were distributed broadly across the whole basin (*Figure 2*), the dominant mechanism differed among climate change storylines.

In all cases, the CO₂ fertilization effect had an upper limit (i.e., around 610 ppm, which was the concentration at the beginning of assessment period for the 2070s) at which it can no longer compete with climate change; as the climate continues to warm and the fuel load continues to decrease, which shifts the system from flammability limited to fuel limited, the mitigating effects of CO₂ fertilization appear to diminish.




Figure 7. Relationships among fuel load (i.e., litter carbon), fuel aridity, and percentage changes in burn probability (relative to baseline) under various climate change and atmospheric CO₂ fertilization effect scenarios in the 2070s. Panels (a), (b), (c), (d) show the distribution of burn probability against fuel load and fuel aridity for baseline scenario as the reference (the same baseline as 2040s). Other panels show bivariate effects of fuel load and fuel aridity on percentage changes in burn probability (climate change scenario minus baseline scenario). For more information about the vegetation distribution of each bin see Figure S11.

To better understand why the ProDrought and ProVeg storylines exhibit different P_{burn} responses, we analyzed spatial distributions of P_{burn} , fuel aridity, fuel load, and net primary productivity (NPP) for the baseline and the 2040s scenarios (Figure 8 and Figure 9). Recall that

ProDrought was the only storyline with a mix of increases and decreases in P_{burn} for the overall effect, whereas ProVeg exhibited strong increases across the watershed (*Figure 6*). For the climate change scenario, both GCM storylines decreased fuel loading, but had opposite effects on fuel aridity (i.e., fuel aridity increased under ProDrought, *Figure 8 b*; and decreased under ProVeg, *Figure 9 b*). Therefore, under ProVeg, decreases in both fuel loading and aridity compounded to decrease P_{burn} (*Figure 9 a*). Under ProDrought on the other hand, decreases in fuel load and increases in fuel aridity counteracted one another; however, the effects of decreasing fuel loads outstripped increasing fuel aridity to decrease P_{burn} (*Figure 8 a*). While both storylines exhibit decreases in P_{burn} across the watershed, this occurred for different reasons. The ProDrought and ProVeg storylines demonstrate the competing and/or compounding effects of exogenous (climate change vs CO_2 fertilization) and endogenous (fuel load vs fuel aridity) drivers.

3.3 Mechanisms driving fire regime changes in the dry future storyline (e.g., ProDrought)

Under the **climate change only scenario and ProDrought** storyline, fuel loading and fuel aridity had counteracting effects on fire regimes and those effects varied among locations. What are the mechanisms that result in fuel load and fuel aridity competing with each other in **the ProDrought** storyline? *Fuel Load*: warming increased NPP and fuel loading in the relatively humid, forested areas and decreased NPP and fuel loading in water-limited areas (*Figure 8 d*). However, at the same time, warming decreased fuel loading by increasing decomposition rates in both dry and humid areas (*Figure S5*). Overall decreases in fuel load suggest that decomposition dominates over the increase of NPP in forested area. While some studies corroborate this finding in semiarid systems (Matthews et al., 2012), future decomposition rates are a key source of uncertainty in C cycling models (Luo et al., 2015; Tang & Riley, 2020). Given our current

understanding and representation of decomposition under climate change, the net effect, therefore, is a decrease in fuel loading across the basin. *Fuel aridity*: warming increases fuel aridity across the whole basin because it increases PET but not AET since the watershed is largely water-limited (Bradstock, 2010; Littell et al., 2016). *Net Effect*: the decrease in P_{burn} shows that the decrease of fuel load dominates over the increase in fuel aridity.

What are the mechanisms that result in climate change and CO₂ fertilization competing with each other in the **ProDrought storyline** for the **Overall Effect**? *Climate Change*: this decreases P_{burn} for the reasons described above. CO₂ fertilization, on the other hand, increased NPP and fuel loading, especially in arid areas (*Figure 8 h*) because the vegetation became more energy- and water- efficient under greater ambient CO₂ concentrations (Becklin et al., 2017). By reviewing evidences from different approaches (field observation and vegetation models), Lewis et al., (2009) also found rising CO₂ concentration is the most likely driver of increased NPP. *Net Effect*: fuel loading decreased overall, suggesting that the climate change effect dominates over the CO₂ fertilization effect (*Figure 8 g*). CO₂ fertilization also further increased fuel aridity by increasing LAI in water-limited areas (*Figure 8 f*). This occurred because greater LAI can intensify the difference between PET and AET for water-limited ecosystems (Tague et al., 2009; Warren et al., 2011). With the overall effect, P_{burn} increased in the relatively humid areas and decreased in the arid area (*Figure 8 i*). This suggests that, in the relatively humid areas that are historically flammability-limited, increases in fuel aridity can increase fire activity even with reduced fuel loading. However, in arid areas, fire activity is more sensitive to changes in fuel load than fuel aridity (*Figure 8 i*).




Figure 8. The individual and combination effect of climate change and CO₂ fertilization on burn probability, mean annual fuel aridity, mean annual fuel load (i.e., litter carbon), and mean annual NPP over the 30 years' assessment period in the 2040s under the ProDrought climate change storyline (effects are calculated as the difference between future scenario and baseline). Red colors represent increases; blue colors represent decreases. Panels (a), (e), and (i) are changes in burn probability; panels (b), (f), and (j) are changes in fuel aridity; panels (c), (j), and (k) are changes in fuel load; and panels (d), (h), and (i) are changes in NPP.

3.4 Mechanisms driving fire regime changes in the wet future storylines (e.g., ProVeg)

What are the mechanisms that result in climate change and CO₂ fertilization competing with each other **in the ProVeg storyline for the Overall Effect?** *Climate Change:* both fuel

loading and fuel aridity decreased (*Figure 9 b & c*). Fuel loading decreased in response to warming while more precipitation decreased aridity (*Figure S12*). *CO₂ Fertilization*: as with all storylines, CO₂ fertilization increased fuel loading. However, it had a mixed effect on fuel aridity, with slight increases occurring in more the arid areas and slight decreases occurring in the more humid areas (*Figure 9 f*). *Net Effect*: We observed a net increase in fuel loading, suggesting that CO₂ fertilization can dominate over climate change-induced drought under wetter future scenarios (*Figure 9 k*). For fuel aridity, CO₂ fertilization only outstripped the climate change effect in very arid areas (at the bottom part of the basin, CO₂ fertilization changed the fuel aridity from a decrease to an increase, *Figure 9 j*). P_{burn} increased across the entire basin (even with less arid fuel), indicating that increasing fuel load was the main driver of P_{burn} for the overall effect, under the ProVeg storyline (*Figure 9 i*).




Figure 9. The individual and combined effects of climate change and CO₂ fertilization on burn probability, mean annual fuel aridity, mean annual fuel load (i.e., litter carbon), and mean annual NPP over 30 years' assessment period in the 2040s under the ProVeg climate change storyline. The red colors indicate increases; blue colors indicate decreases. Panel (a), (e), and (i) are changes in burn probability; panels (b), (f), and (j) are changes in fuel aridity; panels (c), (g), and (k) are changes in fuel load; and panels (d), (h), and (l) are changes in NPP.

4 Discussion

Vegetation productivity and litter decomposition are critical processes that integrate exogenous and endogenous drivers (e.g., climate and fuels) to shape wildfire activity. For example, we found that in the mid-21st century (2040s), CO₂ fertilization increased NPP to a greater extent than it was reduced by climate change-induced drought, resulting in a net increase

in fuel loading and resultant fire activity. However, by the late-21st century (2070s), climatic warming (and associated drought) outstripped the effects of CO₂ fertilization, leading to a decrease in fire activity. The timing and magnitude of these trade-offs were modified by local aridity gradients and vegetation composition. This local-scale variability, combined with the non-monotonic responses we observed, suggest that we cannot linearly or empirically extrapolate fire activity from the baseline and 2040s scenarios to the 2070s (Balshi et al., 2009; Westerling et al., 2011). Projecting future fire regimes requires accounting for complex feedbacks among climate, hydrology, vegetation productivity and biogeochemical processes.

Climate change and increasing CO₂ are the main drivers of future fire regimes, through their direct impact on biophysical processes and indirect effects on vegetation dynamics and biogeochemical processes. Below, we summarize the main drivers of fire regimes, how they interact to influence future fire regimes, and how these interactions vary with precipitation patterns and local aridity gradients (*Figure 10*).

4.1 The role of exogenous drivers in influencing future fire regimes

4.1.1 The role of climate change and CO₂ fertilization in influencing future fire regimes

Exogenous drivers affect fire regimes through their effects on vegetation productivity, litter decomposition, and endogenous fire drivers (i.e., fuel loading and fuel aridity; Kennedy et al., 2021). Climate warming and CO₂ fertilization are two key exogenous drivers that can either compete with or compound one another to influence fire regimes. For example, given sufficient moisture, climate warming can increase vegetation growth and fuel loading by increasing photosynthetic activity (Kurz et al., 2008). However, warming can also accelerate litter decomposition, which can counteract such increases (Bradstock, 2010; Keane et al., 1999; Kurz

et al., 2008). We found that in Trail Creek, this model system predicts that litter decomposition dominated over increases in vegetation productivity (*Figure 8 c* and *Figure 9 c*).

Aridity and CO₂ fertilization can also compete to influence fuel and fire dynamics. In water-limited locations for example, climate change can actually decrease fuel loading and fire activity by promoting drought (Hanan et al. 2021). CO₂ fertilization can enhance vegetation productivity and resultant fire activity by enabling higher rates of photosynthesis when stomata are partially closed to reduce transpiration (Becklin et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2009). Consequently, drought effects on plant productivity can be tempered by CO₂ fertilization, and the final fuel loading is determined by two competing mechanisms: climate change and CO₂ fertilization. We found that the ProVeg and ProDrought storylines led to different fuel loadings, which suggests precipitation patterns (and aridity) play a strong role in the relative balance between these mechanisms (*Figure 8 k* and *Figure 9 k*).

Climate warming and CO₂ fertilization can also compound one another to influence fuel aridity. For example, in water-limited ecosystems, climate warming can increase the water budget deficit (i.e., PET – ET, Bradstock, 2010; Littell et al., 2016), while CO₂ fertilization can increase leaf area index and PET thus making plants more water stressed (Warren, et al. 2011; Tague, et al. 2009). However, this compounding effect is location-dependent and can be modified by precipitation patterns, which will be discussed in the next section (*Figure 8 j* and *Figure 9 j*).

Our modeling results suggest that plant responses to CO₂ fertilization are an important factor in predicting future fire regimes in fuel-limited watersheds such as Trail Creek. Physiological responses to rising CO₂ can vary among species and over time and there is still a great deal of uncertainty in projecting physiological responses to increasing atmospheric CO₂

575 because empirical studies have produced mixed results (Becklin et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2009;
576 Norby et al., 2016; Warren et al., 2011). RHESSys accounts for the direct effect of increasing
577 water use efficiency on assimilation and the resulting potential increases in growth and biomass
578 (including LAI). However, other responses such as changes in stomatal functioning under
579 elevated CO₂ (Swann et al., 2016) or changes in allocation or leaf physiology (Warren et al.,
580 2011) were not included, and may dampen or alter projected CO₂ fertilization changes. Our no-
581 CO₂ vs. CO₂ fertilization scenarios account for the two extreme possibilities, when reality may
582 be somewhere in the middle.

583 Litter stores are a major control on fire spread. Thus, modeling fire spread requires high
584 skill in representing litterfall and decomposition. Decomposition in particular is complex and is
585 affected by temperature, moisture, nitrogen, pH, and microbial dynamics (Lin & Webster, 2014).
586 Although RHESSys accounts for many of these drivers, it necessarily includes some
587 simplifications that may ignore important mechanisms in semiarid, fire-prone systems. For
588 example, spatial partitioning of moisture and nitrogen in litter stores can accelerate or decelerate
589 decomposition during drying and rewetting cycles (Birch, 1959). Hanan et al., (2021, submitted)
590 also found that the sensitivity of modeled decomposition rate to parameter and model structure
591 uncertainties increases with climate warming but decreases with increasing precipitation. This
592 may be problematic when projecting the future fuel load under climate change. Especially, these
593 uncertainties can compound each other when the projection period is longer, thus causing more
594 uncertainties when extends the projections from 2040s to 2070s.




Figure 10. Conceptual diagram illustrating how exogenous drivers, vegetation, litter decomposition and endogenous drivers interact to influence wildfire burn probability. “+” indicates an increase (e.g., increases in productivity cause increases in fuel loading; “-” indicates a decrease (e.g., increases in litter decomposition lead to decreases in fuel loading). “Mesic” and “arid” indicates that the specified affect is location dependent and occurs in mesic or arid locations. Relative deficit is calculated as $(1 - ET)/PET$.

4.1.2 The role of precipitation in influencing future fire regimes

Precipitation was also an important factor in predicting future fire regimes in our relatively fuel-limited watershed. At an annual timescale, increases in precipitation can decrease fire activity by increasing fuel moisture and decreasing the length of the fire season. However, over longer timescales, increased precipitation can increase fuel loading and resultant fire activity. Other studies have also found that precipitation is important in driving fuel load and fire (Bradstock, 2010; Littell et al., 2016; Pausas & Paula, 2012; Williams et al., 2019). Recent research has also shown that, in a drier future, there may be less fire due to decreases in fuel loading; whereas in a wetter future, there may be more fire activity due to increases in productivity, *Figure 10*). Williams et al., (2019) also argue that interannual variability (i.e., the sequencing of dry and wet extremes) is as important as changes in average precipitation. A

worst-case scenario for a fuel-limited system would be a high precipitation year followed by a low precipitation year, in which the wet year increases fuel abundance and the dry year provides the arid conditions needed to cause large fires (Kennedy, 2019; Williams et al., 2019). This is the sequence that currently drives large fire growth in the arid southwestern US, and will likely expand in extent under climate change (Abatzoglou & Kolden, 2011).

Despite its importance, particularly in semi-arid systems, there is considerable uncertainty in prediction of future precipitation patterns among GCMs (Pendergrass et al., 2017; Polade et al., 2017). Our study shows that ProVeg increases fire activity in 2040s to the greatest extent compared to other GCMs. During fire season, ProVeg had a 6% increase in precipitation, while other storylines had decreases (*Figure S12*). We found that higher precipitation increased productivity and fuel loads, thereby increasing fire activity (*Figure 10*; Kennedy et al., 2021), and that, for Trail Creek, precipitation is as critical in driving future fire regimes as warming (e.g., *Figure 8 d* vs. *Figure 9 d*).

4.2 The role of endogenous drivers in influencing future fire regimes

Fuel loading and fuel aridity can also counteract one another driving future fire regimes, and their interactions are also modified by vegetation type. For example, we found that increases in fuel aridity could increase fire activity but these increases were tempered by decreases in fuel loading. This is consistent with conceptual frameworks that describe gradual transitions from forests and shrub lands to grasslands due to fire-climate feedbacks (e.g., Bowman et al., 2020). Plant functional types (grass, shrub and forest) are generally distributed along gradients in aridity and productivity leading to differences in their fire regimes, and the sensitivity of fire regimes to climate change (Bradstock, 2010; Littell et al., 2016; Williams et al., 2019). For example, woodland fires in dry climates are limited by fuel loads, and forest fires in wet climates are

limited by fuel moisture (Bradstock, 2010). To explore the role of vegetation type in affecting
 fuel conditions for driving future fire activity, we calculate changes in P_{burn} in response to
 changes in fuel loading ($\Delta \text{fuel loading}$) and changes in fuel aridity ($\Delta \text{fuel aridity}$) for each
 vegetation type (*Figure 11*). For all vegetation types, when fuel load and aridity both increased,
 they compounded to increase P_{burn} . However, as fuel load decreased, and fuel aridity increased,
 the dominant driver varied among vegetation type. We investigated this difference by drawing a
 line in each panel that separated negative and positive changes in P_{burn} . For conifer and shrub
 patches, the line had a negative slope ($\Delta \text{fuel loading} : \Delta \text{fuel aridity}$ is 1:1), which represents a
 threshold separating the negative and positive changes in P_{burn} . A sloped line indicates that both
 fuel load and fuel aridity drive P_{burn} therefore conifer stands in Trail Creek (region C in *Figure 6*)
 can be classified as co-limited by fuel and flammability. While many previous studies using
 empirical models suggest that forest fire activity will increase under future warming due to
 increases in fuel aridity (Bradstock 2010), our process-based model results agrees with
 conceptual frameworks and suggest that in semiarid forests, fire activity may ultimately decrease
 due to decreasing fuel loads (even without wildfire-driven self-limitation) despite increases in
 fuel aridity. These results are corroborated by studies in other dry forests that similarly found fire
 activity is likely to decrease in the future due to drought (Halofsky et al., 2020; Littell et al.,
 2018). In *grass-dominated locations*, the line that separates P_{burn} increases or decreases is
 vertical, which indicates that this area is fuel-limited and fuel load is the main driver of P_{burn} (i.e.
 P_{burn} is insensitive to changes in fuel aridity, vertical line in *Figure 11 c* and *f*). Each vegetation
 type shows its own pattern of fire responses to climate change; fire in dry woodland ecosystem is
 limited by fuel loading, while fire in wet forest is limited by fuel aridity and fire weather
 (Bradstock, 2010).

The lines separating the negative and positive changes in P_{burn} have the same pattern in the 2070s as for the 2040s, indicating that they represent a consistent characteristic of this watershed over time (assuming no vegetation type-conversion). In the 2070s, we see the cluster of patches moves towards lower fuel loading (to the left), and higher fuel aridity (upwards). Therefore, even though we observed a non-monotonic trend in fire response to climate change from the 2040s to 2070s (*Figure 4* and *Figure 5*), here we found that the $\Delta \text{fuel loading} : \Delta \text{fuel aridity threshold}$, above which increases in fuel aridity dominate over decreases in fuel loading (and vice versa), is stationary, and this stationary threshold varies among vegetation types (pines and shrubs show a similar pattern while grasses stand out as highly fuel-limited). In evergreen forest ecosystems, for patches above the threshold line, P_{burn} increases with higher fuel aridity meaning that increases in fuel aridity dominated over the decreases in fuel loading (*Figure 11 a*). In grass ecosystems, fuel loading was the only factor that separated increases or decreases in P_{burn} (*Figure 11 c*). Because the distribution of plant functional types is shifting in many locations due to climate change (Batllori et al., 2020), identifying the stationary threshold for new vegetation types may be useful for predicting future fire regimes.




Figure 11. The changes in burn probability in response to changes of fuel load and fuel aridity (in percentage) relative to the baseline. (a), (b), and (c) illustrate how burn probability changes in response to changes in fuel load and fuel aridity for 2040s. (d), (e), and (f) show responses for 2070s. Changes are binned by every 5 percent change, and changes in burn probability are the median of these bins (note that the data for these bins are drawn from all four GCM storylines). We removed bins that had less than 100 observations. The panels are as follows: a&d: pine; b&e: shrub; and c&f: grass. All these changes are between future climate change and CO₂ fertilization scenarios and the baseline scenario. The red line is the threshold $\Delta \text{fuel loading} : \Delta \text{fuel aridity}$ that separates negative and positive changes in burn probability.

4.3 The role of aridity gradient in influencing future fire regimes

Interactions between exogenous and endogenous drivers can vary along aridity gradients (Figure 10). Although top-down climate warming can be the dominant driver of wildfire at large scales, local aridity (P/PET, Figure 2) also responds to bottom-up drivers such as topography and vegetation composition (Hanan et al., 2021; Littell et al., 2018). As a result, climate warming can

have different effects on fuel loading in arid vs. mesic locations (e.g., *Figure 8 d*). In arid locations, warming can increase drought stress and reduce productivity and resultant fuel loading, while in more mesic locations warming can increase productivity by increase photosynthetic activity. Similarly, the effects of CO₂ fertilization also differ between arid and mesic locations (e.g., *Figure 9 f*). In water-limited locations, CO₂ fertilization can increase fuel aridity by increasing leaf area index and therefore water deficit (as explained in previous section 4.1). In mesic locations, CO₂ fertilization is more likely to decrease fuel aridity by increasing ET, thereby decreasing water deficit (Warren et al. 2011; Duursma et al. 2014; Becklin et al. 2017). To further complicate matters, aridity gradients are not stationary under climate change. With warming, some historically mesic areas are likely to become increasingly arid (Abatzoglou & Kolden, 2011; Goss et al., 2020; McKenzie & Littell, 2017). Thus, interactions between exogenous and endogenous drivers can vary over space and time. It is worth noting, however, that as the frequency and mean size of very large fires increases, single fires regularly burn across these gradients, further challenging the ability to model fire-climate-vegetation feedbacks that are already difficult to disentangle.

5 Conclusions

We found that climate change and CO₂ fertilization effects can counteract one another to alter fuel loads. Climatic warming reduced fuel loading by decreasing vegetation productivity and increasing fuel decomposition rates, while CO₂ fertilization increased fuel loading by enhancing vegetation productivity. On the other hand, both climatic warming and CO₂ fertilization increased fuel aridity. In the 2040s, CO₂ fertilization outstripped climatic warming to increase fire activity; however, in the 2070s, climatic warming became so intense that the mitigating effects of CO₂ fertilization could no longer keep up and therefore, fire activity

713 decreased. This non-monotonic response in fire size and burn probability occurred because
714 decreases in fuel loading dominated over the increases in fuel aridity. However, the decreases in
715 fuel loading will outstrip changes in fire weather and causes a 100% reduction in wildfire under
716 the climate change in the far future (2070s) seems like a radical result. Some important feedback
717 or threshold may be missing when modeling the effect of climate change on decomposition. But
718 our simulation study does provide interesting possibilities in how climate and vegetation interact
719 with wildfire, particularly in the context of increasing atmospheric CO₂ concentration.

720 Vegetation type is an important factor modifying how future fire regimes respond to
721 tradeoffs between fuel loading and aridity. For example, $\Delta \text{fuel loading} : \Delta \text{fuel aridity}$ thresholds
722 that determine whether fire regimes are influenced more by fuel loading or fuel aridity vary
723 between grasses (in which fuel load is limiting) and conifer and shrub stands (where fuel load
724 and fuel aridity can both be limiting depending on underlying aridity gradients). For all
725 vegetation types, this threshold does not change between the 2040s and the 2070s, suggesting
726 that thresholds are a stationary characteristic of a given vegetation type. This stationary threshold
727 can be used as a tool to predict future fire regimes.

728 Given the catastrophic consequences of wildfire to human infrastructure, identifying
729 appropriate management actions to reduce vulnerability is a high priority. However, fire regimes
730 are changing (Littell et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2013; Liu & Wimberly, 2016), and therefore,
731 allocation of limited resources to reduce fire risks and societal vulnerability will need to take
732 these changes into account. Our modeling approach demonstrates that fire regimes will likely
733 change differentially across watersheds, but there is still substantial uncertainty in the models. As
734 scientists work to reduce key uncertainties—including future precipitation patterns, future

decomposition rates, and species-specific responses to CO₂ fertilization—future projections will continue to be refined, providing better support to wildfire management decisions.

Acknowledgments

This project is supported by National Science Foundation of United States under award numbers DMS-1520873 and DEB-1916658. William Burke and Tung Nguyen provided helpful support for setting up the RHESSys model. We thank Jan Boll, Nicholas Engdahl, Rebecca Gustine, and Ames Fowler for providing valuable suggestions on the manuscript.

Code and data availability

The coupled RHESSys-WMFire model code is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5594757> (Ren et al., 2021a). The data used in this study are available at: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/AX45N> (Ren et al., 2021b).

References

- Abatzoglou, J. T., Kolden, C. A., DiMento, J. F. C., Doughman, P., & Nespor, S. (2014). Climate-change effects, adaptation, and mitigation. In *Climate Change: what IT Means for Us, Our Children, and Our Grandchildren*. (pp. 53–104). MIT Press.
- Abatzoglou, John T. (2013). Development of gridded surface meteorological data for ecological applications and modelling. *International Journal of Climatology*, 33(1), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3413>
- Abatzoglou, John T., & Brown, T. J. (2012). A comparison of statistical downscaling methods suited for wildfire applications. *International Journal of Climatology*, 32(5), 772–780. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2312>
- Abatzoglou, John T., & Kolden, C. A. (2011). Climate Change in Western US Deserts: Potential for Increased Wildfire and Invasive Annual Grasses. *Rangeland Ecology & Management*, 64(5), 471–478. <https://doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-09-00151.1>
- Abatzoglou, John T., & Kolden, C. A. (2013). Relationships between climate and macroscale area burned in the western United States. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*, 22(7), 1003. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WF13019>
- Abatzoglou, John T., & Rupp, D. E. (2017). Evaluating climate model simulations of drought for the northwestern United States. *International Journal of Climatology*, n/a-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5046>
- Abatzoglou, John T., & Williams, A. P. (2016). Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(42), 11770–11775. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1607171113>

768 Abatzoglou, John T., Williams, A. P., & Barbero, R. (2019). Global Emergence of
 769 Anthropogenic Climate Change in Fire Weather Indices. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 770 46(1), 326–336. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080959>
 771 Balshi, M. S., McGuire, A. D., Duffy, P., Flannigan, M., Kicklighter, D. W., & Melillo, J. (2009).
 772 Vulnerability of carbon storage in North American boreal forests to wildfires during the
 773 21st century. *Global Change Biology*, 15(6), 1491–1510. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01877.x)
 774 2486.2009.01877.x
 775 Bart, R. R., Kennedy, M. C., Tague, C. L., & McKenzie, D. (2020). Integrating fire effects on
 776 vegetation carbon cycling within an ecohydrologic model. *Ecological Modelling*, 416,
 777 108880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2019.108880>
 778 Batllori, E., Lloret, F., Aakala, T., Anderegg, W. R. L., Aynekulu, E., Bendixsen, D. P., et al.
 779 (2020). Forest and woodland replacement patterns following drought-related mortality.
 780 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
 781 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2002314117>
 782 Becklin, K. M., Walker, S. M., Way, D. A., & Ward, J. K. (2017). CO2 studies remain key to
 783 understanding a future world. *New Phytologist*, 214(1), 34–40.
 784 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14336>
 785 Birch, H. F. (1959). Further observations on humus decomposition and nitrification. *Plant and*
 786 *Soil*, 11(3), 262–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01435157>
 787 Bowman, D., Kolden, C., Abatzoglou, J., Johnston, F., Werf, G., & Flannigan, M. (2020).
 788 Vegetation fires in the Anthropocene. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 1, 1–16.
 789 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0085-3>

- Bradstock, R. A. (2010). A biogeographic model of fire regimes in Australia: current and future implications. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 19(2), 145–158.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00512.x>
- Buhidar, B. B. (2001). The Big Wood River Watershed Management Plan. *Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Twin Falls Regional Office, Twin Falls, ID.*
- Chaney, N. W., Wood, E. F., McBratney, A. B., Hempel, J. W., Nauman, T. W., Brungard, C. W., & Odgers, N. P. (2016). POLARIS: A 30-meter probabilistic soil series map of the contiguous United States. *Geoderma*, 274, 54–67.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.03.025>
- Cohen, J. D., & Deeming, J. (2006). *National Fire Danger Rating System (NFDRS)*. American Cancer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471743984.vse8649>
- Daly, C., Neilson, R. P., & Phillips, D. L. (1994). A Statistical-Topographic Model for Mapping Climatological Precipitation over Mountainous Terrain. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 33(2), 140–158. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450\(1994\)033<0140:ASTMFM>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1994)033<0140:ASTMFM>2.0.CO;2)
- Dewitz, J. (2019). National Land Cover Database (NLCD) 2016 Products. U.S. Geological Survey data release. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5066/P96HHBIE>
- Duursma, R. A., Barton, C. V. M., Lin, Y.-S., Medlyn, B. E., Eamus, D., Tissue, D. T., et al. (2014). The peaked response of transpiration rate to vapour pressure deficit in field conditions can be explained by the temperature optimum of photosynthesis. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 189–190, 2–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2013.12.007>
- Farquhar, G. D., & von Caemmerer, S. (1982). Modelling of Photosynthetic Response to Environmental Conditions. In O. L. Lange, P. S. Nobel, C. B. Osmond, & H. Ziegler

812 (Eds.), *Physiological Plant Ecology II: Water Relations and Carbon Assimilation* (pp.
 813 549–587). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-68150-9_17
 814 Flitcroft, R. L., Falke, J. A., Reeves, G. H., Hessburg, P. F., McNyset, K. M., & Benda, L. E.
 815 (2016). Wildfire may increase habitat quality for spring Chinook salmon in the
 816 Wenatchee River subbasin, WA, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 359, 126–140.
 817 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.09.049>
 818 Frenzel, S. A. (1989). *Water resources of the upper Big Wood River basin, Idaho*. US Geological
 819 Survey.
 820 Garcia, E. S., & Tague, C. L. (2015). Subsurface storage capacity influences climate–
 821 evapotranspiration interactions in three western United States catchments. *Hydrology and*
 822 *Earth System Sciences*, 119(12), 4845–4858. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-4845-2015>
 823 Goss, M., Swain, D. L., Abatzoglou, J. T., Sarhadi, A., Kolden, C., Williams, A. P., &
 824 Diffenbaugh, N. S. (2020). Climate change is increasing the risk of extreme autumn
 825 wildfire conditions across California. *Environmental Research Letters*.
 826 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab83a7>
 827 Halofsky, J. E., Peterson, D. L., & Harvey, B. J. (2020). Changing wildfire, changing forests: the
 828 effects of climate change on fire regimes and vegetation in the Pacific Northwest, USA.
 829 *Fire Ecology*, 16(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42408-019-0062-8>
 830 Hanan, E. J., Tague, C. (Naomi), & Schimel, J. P. (2017). Nitrogen cycling and export in
 831 California chaparral: the role of climate in shaping ecosystem responses to fire.
 832 *Ecological Monographs*, 87(1), 76–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecm.1234>
 833 Hanan, E. J., Tague, C., Choate, J., Liu, M., Kolden, C., & Adam, J. (2018). Accounting for
 834 disturbance history in models: using remote sensing to constrain carbon and nitrogen pool

835 spin-up. *Ecological Applications: A Publication of the Ecological Society of America*,
 836 28(5), 1197–1214. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.1718>
 837 Hanan, E. J., Ren, J., Tague, C. L., Kolden, C. A., Abatzoglou, J. T., Bart, R. R., et al. (2021).
 838 How climate change and fire exclusion drive wildfire regimes at actionable scales.
 839 *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(2), 024051. [https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abd78e)
 840 9326/abd78e
 841 Hicke, J. A., Johnson, M. C., Hayes, J. L., & Preisler, H. K. (2012). Effects of bark beetle-caused
 842 tree mortality on wildfire. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 271, 81–90.
 843 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.02.005>
 844 Jarvis, P. G. (1976). The Interpretation of the Variations in Leaf Water Potential and Stomatal
 845 Conductance Found in Canopies in the Field. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
 846 *Society B: Biological Sciences*, 273(927), 593–610.
 847 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1976.0035>
 848 Keane, R. E., Morgan, P., & White, J. D. (1999). Temporal patterns of ecosystem processes on
 849 simulated landscapes in Glacier National Park, Montana, USA. *Landscape Ecology*,
 850 14(3), 311–329. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008011916649>
 851 Kennedy, M. C. (2019). Experimental design principles to choose the number of Monte Carlo
 852 replicates for stochastic ecological models. *Ecological Modelling*, 394, 11–17.
 853 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2018.12.022>
 854 Kennedy, M. C., McKenzie, D., Tague, C., & Dugger, A. L. (2017). Balancing uncertainty and
 855 complexity to incorporate fire spread in an eco-hydrological model. *International Journal*
 856 *of Wildland Fire*, 26(8), 706–718. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WF16169>

857 Kennedy, M. C., Bart, R. R., Tague, C. L., & Choate, J. S. (2021). Does hot and dry equal more
 858 wildfire? Contrasting short- and long-term climate effects on fire in the Sierra Nevada,
 859 CA. *Ecosphere*, 12(7), e03657. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.3657>
 860 Kurz, W. A., Stinson, G., & Rampley, G. (2008). Could increased boreal forest ecosystem
 861 productivity offset carbon losses from increased disturbances? *Philosophical*
 862 *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363(1501), 2259–2268.
 863 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2007.2198>
 864 Lewis, S. L., Lloyd, J., Sitch, S., Mitchard, E. T. A., & Laurance, W. F. (2009). Changing
 865 Ecology of Tropical Forests: Evidence and Drivers. *Annual Review of Ecology,*
 866 *Evolution, and Systematics*, 40(1), 529–549.
 867 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173345>
 868 Lin, L., & Webster, J. R. (2014). Detritus decomposition and nutrient dynamics in a forested
 869 headwater stream. *Ecological Modelling*, 293, 58–68.
 870 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.12.013>
 871 Lin, L., Band, L. E., Vose, J. M., Hwang, T., Miniati, C. F., & Bolstad, P. V. (2019). Ecosystem
 872 processes at the watershed scale: Influence of flowpath patterns of canopy ecophysiology
 873 on emergent catchment water and carbon cycling. *Ecohydrology*, 0(0), e2093.
 874 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.2093>
 875 Littell, J. S., Peterson, D. L., Riley, K. L., Liu, Y., & Luce, C. H. (2016). A review of the
 876 relationships between drought and forest fire in the United States. *Global Change*
 877 *Biology*, 22(7), 2353–2369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13275>

878 Littell, J. S., McKenzie, D., Wan, H. Y., & Cushman, S. A. (2018). Climate Change and Future
879 Wildfire in the Western United States: An Ecological Approach to Nonstationarity.
880 *Earth's Future*, 6(8), 1097–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EF000878>

881 Liu, Y., L. Goodrick, S., & A. Stanturf, J. (2013). Future U.S. wildfire potential trends projected
882 using a dynamically downscaled climate change scenario. *Forest Ecology and*
883 *Management*, 294, 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.06.049>

884 Liu, Z., & Wimberly, M. C. (2016). Direct and indirect effects of climate change on projected
885 future fire regimes in the western United States. *Science of The Total Environment*, 542,
886 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.10.093>

887 McCarley, T. R., Kolden, C. A., Vaillant, N. M., Hudak, A. T., Smith, A. M. S., & Kreidler, J.
888 (2017). Landscape-scale quantification of fire-induced change in canopy cover following
889 mountain pine beetle outbreak and timber harvest. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 391,
890 164–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.02.015>

891 McKenzie, D., & Littell, J. S. (2017). Climate change and the eco-hydrology of fire: Will area
892 burned increase in a warming western USA? *Ecological Applications*, 27(1), 26–36.
893 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.1420>

894 McKENZIE, D., Gedalof, Z., Peterson, D. L., & Mote, P. (2004). Climatic Change, Wildfire, and
895 Conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18(4), 890–902. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00492.x)
896 [1739.2004.00492.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00492.x)

897 McVicar, T. R., Roderick, M. L., Donohue, R. J., Li, L. T., Van Niel, T. G., Thomas, A., et al.
898 (2012). Global review and synthesis of trends in observed terrestrial near-surface wind
899 speeds: Implications for evaporation. *Journal of Hydrology*, 416–417, 182–205.
900 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.10.024>

901 Meinshausen, M., Smith, S. J., Calvin, K., Daniel, J. S., Kainuma, M. L. T., Lamarque, J.-F., et
 902 al. (2011). The RCP greenhouse gas concentrations and their extensions from 1765 to
 903 2300. *Climatic Change*, 109(1), 213. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0156-z>
 904 Mu, Q., Zhao, M., & Running, S. W. (2011). Improvements to a MODIS global terrestrial
 905 evapotranspiration algorithm. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 115(8), 1781–1800.
 906 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.02.019>
 907 Norby, R. J., De Kauwe, M. G., Domingues, T. F., Duursma, R. A., Ellsworth, D. S., Goll, D. S.,
 908 et al. (2016). Model–data synthesis for the next generation of forest free-air CO₂
 909 enrichment (FACE) experiments. *New Phytologist*, 209(1), 17–28.
 910 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13593>
 911 Ottmar, R. D., Burns, M. F., Hall, J. N., & Hanson, A. D. (1993). *CONSUME: users guide*. (No.
 912 PNW-GTR-304). Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific
 913 Northwest Research Station. <https://doi.org/10.2737/PNW-GTR-304>
 914 Pausas, J. G., & Paula, S. (2012). Fuel shapes the fire-climate relationship: evidence from
 915 Mediterranean ecosystems: Fuel shapes the fire-climate relationship. *Global Ecology and*
 916 *Biogeography*, 21(11), 1074–1082. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2012.00769.x>
 917 Pendergrass, A. G., Knutti, R., Lehner, F., Deser, C., & Sanderson, B. M. (2017). Precipitation
 918 variability increases in a warmer climate. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1).
 919 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17966-y>
 920 Polade, S. D., Gershunov, A., Cayan, D. R., Dettinger, M. D., & Pierce, D. W. (2017).
 921 Precipitation in a warming world: Assessing projected hydro-climate changes in
 922 California and other Mediterranean climate regions. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 10783.
 923 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-11285-y>

924 Ren, J., Adam, J. C., Hicke, J. A., Hanan, E. J., Tague, C. L., Liu, M., et al. (2021). How does
 925 water yield respond to mountain pine beetle infestation in a semiarid forest? *Hydrology
 926 and Earth System Sciences*, 25(9), 4681–4699. [https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-4681-](https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-4681-2021)
 927 2021

928 Ren, J., Hanan, E., Abatzoglou, J., Kolden, C., Tague, C., Kennedy, M., Liu, M., Adam, J. (2021
 929 a). Code for Projecting future fire regimes in semiarid systems of inland northwestern
 930 U.S.: interactions among climate change, vegetation productivity, and fuel dynamics
 931 [code]. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5594757>

932 Ren, J., Hanan, E., Abatzoglou, J., Kolden, C., Tague, C., Kennedy, M., Liu, M., Adam, J. (2021
 933 b). Data for Projecting future fire regimes in semiarid systems of inland northwestern
 934 U.S.: interactions among climate change, vegetation productivity, and fuel dynamics
 935 [data set]. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/AX45N>

936 Rollins, M. G. (2009). LANDFIRE: a nationally consistent vegetation, wildland fire, and fuel
 937 assessment. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*, 18(3), 235–249.

938 Rollins, Matthew G. (2009). LANDFIRE: a nationally consistent vegetation, wildland fire, and
 939 fuel assessment. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*, 18(3), 235–249.
 940 <https://doi.org/10.1071/WF08088>

941 Running, S. W., & Coughlan, J. C. (1988). A general model of forest ecosystem processes for
 942 regional applications I. Hydrologic balance, canopy gas exchange and primary production
 943 processes. *Ecological Modelling*, 42(2), 125–154. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3800(88)90112-3)
 944 3800(88)90112-3

945 Schwalm, C. R., Glendon, S., & Duffy, P. B. (2020). RCP8.5 tracks cumulative CO2 emissions.
 946 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(33), 19656–19657.
 947 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2007117117>
 948 Simmons, A., & Gibson, J. (2000). The ERA-40 Project Plan.
 949 Skinner, K. D. (2013). *Post-fire debris-flow hazard assessment of the area burned by the 2013*
 950 *Beaver Creek Fire near Hailey, central Idaho* (USGS Numbered Series No. 2013–1273).
 951 Reston, VA: U.S. Geological Survey. Retrieved from
 952 <http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/ofr20131273>
 953 Smith, A. M. S., Kolden, C. A., Paveglio, T. B., Cochrane, M. A., Bowman, D. M., Moritz, M.
 954 A., et al. (2016). The Science of Firescapes: Achieving Fire-Resilient Communities.
 955 *BioScience*, 66(2), 130–146. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biv182>
 956 Smith, R. O. (1960). *Geohydrologic evaluation of streamflow records in the Big Wood River*
 957 *basin, Idaho* (USGS Numbered Series No. 1479). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Print.
 958 Off., Retrieved from <http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/wsp1479>
 959 Son, K., & Tague, C. (2019). Hydrologic responses to climate warming for a snow-dominated
 960 watershed and a transient snow watershed in the California Sierra. *Ecohydrology*, 12(1),
 961 e2053. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.2053>
 962 Sullivan, M. J. P., Lewis, S. L., Affum-Baffoe, K., Castilho, C., Costa, F., Sanchez, A. C., et al.
 963 (2020). Long-term thermal sensitivity of Earth’s tropical forests. *Science*, 368(6493),
 964 869–874. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaw7578>
 965 Swann, A. L. S., Hoffman, F. M., Koven, C. D., & Randerson, J. T. (2016). Plant responses to
 966 increasing CO2 reduce estimates of climate impacts on drought severity. *Proceedings of*

967 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(36), 10019–10024.
 968 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1604581113>

969 Tague, C., Seaby, L., & Hope, A. (2009). Modeling the eco-hydrologic response of a
 970 Mediterranean type ecosystem to the combined impacts of projected climate change and
 971 altered fire frequencies. *Climatic Change*, 93(1–2), 137–155.
 972 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-008-9497-7>

973 Tague, C. L., & Band, L. E. (2004). RHESSys: Regional Hydro-Ecologic Simulation System—
 974 An Object-Oriented Approach to Spatially Distributed Modeling of Carbon, Water, and
 975 Nutrient Cycling. *Earth Interactions*, 8(19), 1–42. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1087-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1087-3562(2004)8<1:RRHSSO>2.0.CO;2)
 976 [3562\(2004\)8<1:RRHSSO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1087-3562(2004)8<1:RRHSSO>2.0.CO;2)

977 Tang, J., & Riley, W. J. (2020). Linear two-pool models are insufficient to infer soil organic
 978 matter decomposition temperature sensitivity from incubations. *Biogeochemistry*, 149(3),
 979 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-020-00678-3>

980 Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., & Meehl, G. A. (2012). An Overview of CMIP5 and the
 981 Experiment Design. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(4), 485–498.
 982 <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1>

983 Thornton, P. E. (1998). Regional ecosystem simulation: Combining surface- and satellite-based
 984 observations to study linkages between terrestrial energy and mass budgets, 295.

985 USGS NED. (2016). The National Map. Retrieved from [https://www.usgs.gov/core-science-](https://www.usgs.gov/core-science-systems/ngp/3dep)
 986 [systems/ngp/3dep](https://www.usgs.gov/core-science-systems/ngp/3dep)

987 Warren, J. M., Norby, R. J., & Wullschleger, S. D. (2011). Elevated CO₂ enhances leaf
 988 senescence during extreme drought in a temperate forest. *Tree Physiology*, 31(2), 117–
 989 130. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpr002>

990 Werf, G. R. van der, Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., Gobron, N., & Dolman, A. J. (2008). Climate
 991 controls on the variability of fires in the tropics and subtropics. *Global Biogeochemical*
 992 *Cycles*, 22(3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB003122>
 993 Westerling, Anthony L., Turner, M. G., Smithwick, E. A. H., Romme, W. H., & Ryan, M. G.
 994 (2011). Continued warming could transform Greater Yellowstone fire regimes by mid-
 995 21st century. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(32), 13165–13170.
 996 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1110199108>
 997 Westerling, Anthony LeRoy. (2016). Increasing western US forest wildfire activity: sensitivity to
 998 changes in the timing of spring. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
 999 *Biological Sciences*, 371(1696), 20150178. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0178>
 1000 Williams, A. P., Abatzoglou, J. T., Gershunov, A., Guzman-Morales, J., Bishop, D. A., Balch, J.
 1001 K., & Lettenmaier, D. P. (2019). Observed Impacts of Anthropogenic Climate Change on
 1002 Wildfire in California. *Earth's Future*, 7(8), 892–910.
 1003 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001210>
 1004
 1005