

## Università degli Studi Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria

Archivio Istituzionale dei prodotti della ricerca

Postfire management impacts on soil hydrology

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

Postfire management impacts on soil hydrology / Zema, D. A.. - In: CURRENT OPINION IN ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & HEALTH. - ISSN 2468-5844. - 21:100252(2021). [10.1016/j.coesh.2021.100252]

Availability: This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12318/123352 since: 2024-11-25T14:54:36Z

Published DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2021.100252 The final published version is available online at:https://www.sciencedirect.

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website

Publisher copyright

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria (https://iris.unirc.it/) When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1	This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:
2	
3	Zema, D. A. (2021). Postfire management impacts on soil hydrology. Current Opinion in
4	Environmental Science & Health, 21, 100252.,
5	
6	which has been published in final doi
7	
8	1016/j.coesh.2021.100252
9	
10	
11	(https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468584421000246)
12	
13	The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the
14	publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website

### Post-fire management impacts on soil hydrology

- 17 Demetrio Antonio Zema
- 18

19 "Mediterranea" University of Reggio Calabria, Department "AGRARIA", Località Feo di Vito, I20 89122 Reggio Calabria (Italy), dzema@unirc.it

21

### 22 Abstract

23

24 Research about soil hydrology after wildfire has widely investigated the impacts of many post-fire 25 management strategies on ecosystems with different characteristics. However, despite this ample 26 literature, clear guidelines about the effectiveness and feasibility of the different restoration 27 techniques in environmental contexts showing variable responses still lack. Furthermore, post-fire 28 hydrological modelling is based on mere adaptations of existing models, which often fail to 29 simulate with accuracy the changes in soil hydrology after fire. After a short review about the 30 effects of wildfire on hydrological processes, this study aims to propose an updated overview of the 31 existing post-fire management techniques at both hillslope (afforestation and seeding, mulching, 32 salvage logging, erosion barriers, soil preparation and other novel techniques) and channel (check 33 dams) scales. Moreover, the results of the most recent studies analysing the feasibility of common 34 hydrological models in predicting runoff and soil erosion are analyzed. Most studies have 35 demonstrated the effectiveness of post-fire management techniques, but some uncertainty remains 36 regarding the opportunity of natural recovering or implementation of soil and vegetation restoration. 37 The optimal solution in fire-affected areas may be a combination of actions (at hillslope and 38 channel scales), whose effectiveness should be evaluated on the watershed scale. The existing 39 hydrological models should be specifically adapted to burned conditions with reliable simulation of 40 soil changes due to fire. Modelling experiences with focus on the effects of post-fire management 41 actions are needed.

42

43 Keywords: infiltration; water repellency; runoff; mulching; soil loss; hydrological models.

- 44 45
- 46 **1. Background**
- 47

48 Wildfire is a natural and anthropogenic agent with a long history of influence on terrestrial and 49 aquatic ecosystems [1]. The wildfire effects, which mainly depends on fire severity, extend in 50 several components, such as soil, vegetation, air, and surface and deep water [2], determining strong 51 changes in the ecosystems affected by fire. Wildfire can have positive impacts on soils, increasing 52 fertility and weathering, particularly in fire-affected areas where mild morphological conditions and 53 rapid vegetation cover limit post-fire erosion [3]. The magnitude of these changes varies according 54 to the pre-fire environmental conditions of the burnt areas, wildfire characteristics, and post-fire 55 weather dynamics and human actions [4,5]. The vegetation burning coupled to the alterations in the 56 physico-chemical properties of soils modify the soil hydrology with possible increases in surface 57 runoff as well as soil erosion and degradation rates. Overland flow and eroded sediments generated 58 on hillslopes easily reach the catchment channels, producing severe hydrological effects compared 59 to unburned areas [6]. These negative impacts may lead to loss of biomass productivity and decline 60 on short- to medium-term soil biodiversity [7] beside geomorphologic changes in the rivers and 61 landscape. Moreover, the wildfire effects may extend in the space and in time. As a matter of fact, 62 increases in flood risk and pollution of downstream water bodies can be recorded outside of the burned area, and the pre-fire conditions of the burned ecosystem may be restored after a period 63 64 varying from few months to several years. Fire-induced changes on soil hydrology also affects 65 forest ecosystem services, including water resource availability, quality of water bodies, erosion and 66 flood control, and biodiversity maintenance [8].

This study carries out an updated overview of the most common post-fire management techniques as well as hydrological models reported in a selection of papers published between 2017 and 2021 and selected using relevant keywords from Scopus and Web of Science databases. This overview aims at: (i) understanding the effectiveness of each technique on post-fire hydrology of burned and restored soils across different environmental contexts; (ii) analysing whether the available hydrological models are effective in simulating post-fire hydrology. Finally, scientific literature gaps and future research directions are discussed.

74

75

#### 76 2. Wildfire effects on soil hydrology

77

The occurrence of wildfire produces an increased hydrological response in recently burnt areas, especially during the "window-of-disturbance" [9]. In this period, the soil vulnerability to runoff and erosion effects increases compared the unburned forest areas [4,10]. After the window of disturbance ends, the background pre-fire hydrological conditions tend to be restored throughout periods lasting from few months to several years, that is, after the vegetation cover is re-established and the magnitude of soil erosion is reduced [8,11]. The extent of the fire-induced changes in soil

84 hydrology strictly mainly depends on wildfire intensity (i.e., the energy release rate) and severity 85 (i.e., the magnitude of changes in the burned ecosystem) [12]. However, other environmental 86 factors play important role on changes in fire-affected ecosystems, such as type and physico-87 chemical properties of soils, topography, fire history, fuel quantity, vegetation species, weather 88 patterns, etc. [13][14]. The wildfire characteristics drive the effects of regenerating vegetation cover 89 on hydrological properties of soil as well as the changes in the properties of the affected soils 90 [15,16]. Fire reduces (in the case of low-severity fire) or completely removes (for fires with high 91 severity) the canopy and ground cover of vegetation and litter. Therefore, interception and evapo-92 transpiration decreases, and net precipitation increases, leading more water available for runoff 93 [8,11]; moreover, a soil left bare due to vegetation burning becomes more susceptible to raindrop 94 impact and particle detachment. Wildfire also modifies the physico-chemical properties of the soil 95 surface in many ways that influence the hydrological response to precipitation events based on the 96 heat released [17,18] (Figure 1). Wildfire impacts on soil properties can be direct or indirect. Direct 97 impacts, which are related to burning duration and fire temperatures, are usually short and restricted 98 to the upper layer of the soil (few centimetres from the surface). The indirect impacts of wildfire 99 depend on several factors, such as the ash release, vegetation cover, morphology as well as post-fire 100 weather patterns and management [13,19-21]. More specifically, ash is a key driver of the hydraulic response of the burned soils (depending on its depth and type). Ash can either increase the 101 102 soil water retention and reduce the soil water repellency or might seal the soil surface, reducing 103 water infiltration and increasing surface runoff and flooding [15,18,22]. Ash impact on hydrological 104 characteristics of burned soil depends on its colour; in more detail, black ash, generated by lower 105 fire temperatures, acts as a mulch with a wettable cover for soil, retaining rainwater and improving 106 infiltration, while gray to white ashes of higher severity fires, clog soil pores and generates surface 107 sealing, increasing overland flow and erosion processes [23]. As result of wildfire impacts, in burnt 108 areas, sealing, surface crust formation, pore clogging, and bulk density increase [1]; moreover, soil 109 organic matter and macro-nutrients are lost and its structure can be modified by fire. The depletion 110 of soil organic matter has a substantial effect on soil properties such as the structure as well as chemical and biological properties [19]. In turn, these effects on soil physico-chemical 111 112 characteristics can influence the hydraulic properties, such as water repellency, water retention, hydraulic conductivity and sorptivity. wildfire particularly impacts on aggregate stability and water 113 114 repellency of soils, and also these effects on soils depend on temperature and duration [24]. Soil 115 aggregate stability is not altered or slightly increases at temperatures up to 220 °C, while it is strongly reduced between 380 and 460 °C [25]. Soil structure is irreversibly disrupted over 460 °C 116 117 [24], while, in contrast, clayey soils can show increased aggregate stability at high temperatures

[26]. Soil water repellency does not noticeably change at temperatures under 200 °C, increases
between 250 and 300 °C, and completely disappears over 300-400 °C [13] [25] (Figure 1).

120 The changes in soil properties due to wildfire determine noticeable impacts on post-fire hydrology, 121 such as reduction in water infiltration or shifts in runoff generation mechanisms [1,15,18]. However, the changes in soil hydrology are differentiated between low- and high-severity fire. For 122 123 low severity fires soil heating is negligible and the impact on soil cover is minimal: therefore, 124 overland flow and soil erosion are reduced compared to high severity wildfires; conversely, in areas 125 affected by high-severity fires, large amounts of fuel are burnt and soil can reach very high 126 temperature (up to 600-800 °C): the impacts on soil hydrology can be extremely negative, such as 127 strong water repellency and very low infiltration capacity [13] (Figure 1). Overall, soil burn severity is considered as a key descriptor of the magnitude of the changes in the soil for its implications on 128 129 both the hydrological response and vegetation recovery [27].

130





134 or can decrease after fires with high severity.

- 135 \*\* Changes in soil water repellency and aggregate stability depend on fire severity (soil water repellency: no changes 136 under 200 °C, increases between 250 and 300 °C, and disappearance over 300-400 °C; soil aggregate stability: no 137 changes or slightly increases under 220 °C, decreases between 380 and 460 °C, and aggregate destruction over 460 °C, 138 except for clayey soils, which can show increased aggregate stability at high temperatures);
- \*\*\* green, brown and blue-coloured boxes refer to the three environmental domains affected by wildfire (vegetation,
  soil and water, respectively).
- 141
- 142 Figure 1 Scheme of wildfire effects on soil and vegetation with implications on soil hydrology.
- 143

# 144 **3. Monitoring of post-fire management strategies on soil hydrology**

145

The need to mitigate the fire impacts on soil's hydrological response has increased the use of postfire treatments, whose effects have been largely experimented mainly in the United States, Australia and Europe [28,29]. The objectives of post-fire management are flood control, reduction in soil loss and sediment yield, restoration of the ecological functions, and management of the residual fuels to mitigate the future wildfire risks [14,30] (Figure 2).

151



152



154 post-fire management (adapted from [31]).

156 Post-fire treatments can be adopted as emergency or restoration strategies to reduce soil degradation 157 and control floods in fire-affected areas. These treatments can be practised both on hillslopes and 158 river channels. Hillslope treatments (e.g. afforestation, seeding, mulching, salvage logging, erosion 159 barriers - the latter including log erosion barriers or contour felled log debris - or soil preparation) 160 are targeted to quick restore vegetation and soil cover, remove residual fuel to burn, protect soil 161 from raindrop impact, reduce overland flow, trap sediments, and increase water infiltration [13]. 162 Channel treatments (such as the construction of rock or concrete check dams) aim at delaying the 163 flood propagation, reducing the sediment transport in watercourses, and retaining eroded sediments 164 [32].

165

### 166 *3.1. Afforestation and seeding*

167

Afforestation is targeted to increase the vegetation cover and improve the soil hydrological properties in areas affected by wildfires. However, the artificial vegetation cover is often less dense and stable compared to natural reforestation. After being seeded, the new plants need time to properly establish in new field conditions, being soil cover by new plants delayed for some years. Although being generally successful, in some cases post-fire afforestation may lead to increased runoff and erosion, because some tree species (such as pines) increase soil water repellency; furthermore, the use of highly flammable trees increases the risk of future frequent wildfires [15].

175

### 176 *3.2. Mulching*

177

178 In agricultural lands, rangelands, fire-affected areas and anthropic sites, mulching is widely used to 179 limit the negative impacts of surface runoff and soil erosion [29,33]. Mulching is targeted to 180 increase infiltration rates, ground cover and soil quality, if used properly and at the correct time 181 [11]. This treatment consists of dispersing on the soil surface organic and inorganic materials as an 182 alternative surface cover, such as agricultural straw, plant leaves, plastic film, logging slash, 183 shredded barks, wood strands, chips and shreds, as well as gravel and loose soil [34,35]. Among the 184 different mulch materials, vegetal residues are considered the most effective to reduce the soil 185 hydrological response also in agricultural soils [33]. In general, organic residues, such as straw and 186 wood residues, are preferred to other mulch materials, due to its wide availability, high soil 187 covering capacity, low cost and easy-of-handling [4]. Agricultural straw can be applied from the air 188 (heli-mulching), thus allowing the treatment of extensive burned areas in a relatively short time

[36]. The selection of the mulch material depends on the local availability and effectiveness, but also on the area to be treated. Large burnt areas with difficult access are more expensive to be treated, forcing the adoption of lower application rates [34,35].

192 Hydrological response of soil is effectively reduced by mulching, thanks to three effects: (i) 193 increase in interception of raindrops and thus reduction in rain splash detachment; ii) reduction in 194 surface sealing and crusting, thereby increasing infiltration; and (iii) increase in surface roughness 195 and slowdown of velocity of overland flow that results in lower soil detachment by sheet and 196 concentrated flows [35,37]. These effects of mulching help stabilizing soil, reducing sediment 197 movement, preventing the loss of soil productivity and preventing the risk of flooding [38]. 198 Generally speaking, soil mulching after wildfire is more effective against erosion than its impact on 199 runoff discharge [29].

200 Several factors influence the effectiveness of mulching on soil hydrology (e.g., resistance to 201 physical degradation, strand length, thickness of the application), but the application rate and 202 ground cover are considered as the most important factors [34,35]. Application rates range from 1 to 11 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> with straw and forest residue mulches for post-fire unlogged environments until 20-203 204 fold values for skidder-compacted soils [35]. More specifically, with regard to the ground cover, a 205 mulch cover rate of 80% using straw and forest residues have been reported to decrease runoff and 206 erosion by 50% and 80-90%, respectively [35,37]. Short-term studies showed that wheat straw 207 mulch treatment reduced the erosion rates by 50-99% in the first two post-fire years at 70% or more ground cover [20]. Concerning to the mulch application rate, straw mulch at rates of 0.6 to 1 Mg ha<sup>-</sup> 208 <sup>1</sup> reduces soil losses by 45-70%, while under forest residue mulch at rates of 1 to 2.6 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> soil 209 erosion decreases by 65-90% during the first post-fire year [4]. As a general rule, it is widely 210 assumed that mulching at rates of 2-3 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> above 60% ground cover can significantly reduce 211 post-fire stream flow and soil loss [20,35]. 212

213 The presence of a mulch cover on soil is able to increase soil moisture, by slowing runoff and 214 increasing infiltration, and reduce topsoil temperature fluctuations and evaporative loss, by 215 impeding solar radiation reaching the soil surface. Such impacts on soil moisture and temperature 216 support the ability of some plant species to germinate and establish [10,33,39,40]. In addition, 217 mmulching enhances and fastens tree regeneration without influencing plant diversity 218 [41]. Therefore, mulch application has the potential to change many aspects of the post-fire 219 environment and therefore mulching has become one of the most direct and effective soil restoring 220 techniques after wildfire [29,39].

However, mulching can also have negative effects as post-fire treatment. In some cases, compared to untreated soils, straw may reduce the soil hydraulic conductivity under unsaturated conditions, 223 particularly in the drier season: this suggests caution in mulch use in the case of heavy storm 224 occurrence in summer [42]. Straw mulch can be displaced by wind, which can leave some slopes 225 bare and too much thick layer of straw in other areas, the latter preventing the emergence of 226 vegetation due to the sunlight absence [20]. Moreover, agricultural straw may contain seeds, 227 chemicals and parasites, which can be the sources of non-native vegetation and plant diseases. A 228 possible solution may be the use of mulches from forest materials (e.g. wood strands, chips or 229 shreds), which are less likely to carry non-native seeds chemical residues, and show greater resistance to wind displacement. The forest materials provide similar protection from erosion at 230 231 equal ground cover rates and show a longer effectiveness, although requiring higher application 232 rates compared to agricultural straw [38]).

Moreover, the research experiences that are proven the effectiveness of mulching as post-fire management treatment have been carried out mainly at the plot scale; therefore, the extent at which the application rates can be effective and the quantification of hydrological benefits on larger scales are still unknown [34]. This means that further research is needed to quantify these key issues for a consolidated use of mulching, especially in the areas where soil erosion by water represents a severe threat, as the areas affected by wildfires [33].

- 239
- 240 *3.3. Salvage logging*
- 241

Salvage logging as post-fire management technique is based on the removal of dead and damaged trees, often carried out using machinery that drags the wood over the burned soil. This treatment is generally executed in the first two years after wildfire, in order to recovery the economic value of the wood and to reduce the danger of another wildfire [20]. Salvage logging can sometimes be prolonged, when the recovered wood must be used for other purposes, such as wildfire wood or log home [2].

248 Generally speaking, salvage logging heavily impacts on soil properties, particularly in the short-249 term after torrential rainfalls, determining soil degradation [43]. The hydrological effects of salvage 250 logging can be contrasting. This technique may be beneficial, if the water repellent layer is broken 251 up - and thus the infiltration is increased - as well as the addition of logging slash is able to increase 252 the surface cover, with consequent decreased erosion rates. Conversely, salvage logging can have 253 heavy hydrological impacts, since the machinery and logging equipment exert a high pressure on 254 soil, with consequent compaction and rut formation from logging traffic [11,20]. Skid trails formed 255 by machine wheels create preferential flow paths, where surface runoff may concentrate and its 256 sediment transport capacity increases [44]. Post-wildfire salvage logging is able to increase flooding

and soil erosion over an area by two orders of magnitude compared to the undisturbed soil [20]. Moreover, the disturbance of salvage logging can affect soil properties and vegetation regeneration for decades [15]. A possible countermeasure may be mitigating the increased erosion rates with post-fire treatments (e.g., distributing available treetops and branches on skid trails and landings), to protect the logged areas from surface erosion [20]. The impacts of salvage logging on vegetation are also uncertain, as shown by the very low vegetative re-growth rates recorded immediately after a wildfire compared to the long-term regeneration [44].

264

### 265 *3.4. Erosion barriers*

266

267 Erosion barriers have been used for decades to stabilize hillslopes and mitigate post-wildfire runoff 268 and erosion. These barriers are made of inert or vegetal materials, the latter having the advantage of 269 being biodegradable. The erosion barriers are classified into contour-felled logs, straw wattles, 270 contour trenches, straw bales, fascines, vegetal strips and buffers [16]. The use of erosion barriers 271 prevents sediment delivery to downstream water bodies by slowing down runoff, causing localized 272 ponding, and trapping sediments [15]. Some erosion barriers have been shown to have a sediment 273 trapping rate of 40% or more, and resulted to be very cheap compared to other hillslope 274 stabilization techniques [16]. Contour-felled logs were found to be even very effective to reduce 275 runoff and sediment yield on burned forest subject to machinery salvage logging, provided that the 276 barrier distance is higher than 20 m [40]. Literature reports also some cases in which erosion 277 barriers have not been successful in reducing post-fire soil erosion, presumably due to the excessive 278 burn severity of the wildfire or defective construction (e.g., [45]). The decrease in post-fire erosion 279 rate over time is also attributed to the soil improvement and vegetation recovery [45]. It has been 280 demonstrated the beneficial effects of log erosion barriers and contour-felled log debris on promote 281 soil multifunctionality and plant diversity to recover community-level properties and forest 282 functions also in the short term after wildfire [46]. In this sense, log erosion barriers are slightly 283 more effective in improving soil quality and vegetation regeneration compared to contour-felled log 284 debris, and these beneficial effects help retaining sediments and limiting nutrient loss, which is 285 essential to recover vegetation after a wildfire [28].

However, this technique is mainly effective for low-intensity rainfalls, since the barriers easily get overtopped after high-intensity rains; furthermore, they lose their effectiveness due to the progressive sediment accumulation and material degradation, if not maintained or regularly cleaned [15,40]. Research still has to quantify the direct impacts of the different types of erosion barriers, since this technique has been generally adopted in combination with other post-fire management strategies (grass and vegetative barriers or contour-felled logs) [16].

### *293 3.5. Soil preparation*

294

295 Soil preparation (e.g., by tillage, conditioning and terracing) is considered as a viable practice to 296 reduce the hydrological response of soil, particularly in croplands (e.g., [47-49]). However, when 297 used for post-fire management, these techniques may be less beneficial for improving soil quality 298 and hydrology (e.g., [37]) and furthermore expensive, when very large forest areas must be treated. 299 As a matter of fact, soil tillage is theoretically able to break up fire-induced soil water repellency or 300 sealing and increase infiltration [20,38]); at the same time, tillage can decrease organic matter 301 content and worsen structure degradation of soil, leading to a decreased infiltration (at least in the 302 short-time) and resulting ineffective to reduce runoff and erosion [50]. Soil tillage may synergistic 303 with other post-fire techniques, since this can increase the capacity of limiting runoff and erosion in 304 same cases by 20% [37]; in this direction, future research must watch at the integration of the most 305 effective post-fire management techniques with soil pre-treatments that are able to increase the 306 hydrological restoration capacity of burned areas.

307

#### 308 *3.6. Other techniques*

309

310 The success of natural fibre webs for supporting vegetation growth and soil stabilization in 311 degraded hillslopes, highway and railway embankments and construction sites has recently 312 suggested the use as mats and rolls made of coconut fibres as post-fire restoration techniques. 313 Coconut fibre webs have been found to delay the time to runoff generation, enhance soil infiltration 314 capacity, decrease splash erosion and reduce the velocity of overland flow [15]. The application of 315 moss crust, which is a very fast soil colonizer after wildfires, may also be beneficial in the first 316 periods after wildfire. Although the runoff response of the soil increases, sediment and organic 317 matter losses can be reduced by over 60% and 30%, respectively, especially during the rainiest 318 season [51]. Moreover, mosses are important for restoring soil functionality after high-severity fires 319 (particularly in terms of fertility and microbial activity), thus improving post-fire vegetation 320 recovery [52].

321

323

The use of check dams is presumably the most common measure to control soil erosion in channels, particularly under the semi-arid conditions [32,53]. This technique has been proposed and applied

<sup>322</sup> *3.7. Check dams* 

326 since long time to trap sediment and stabilize channels also in burned catchment of different size 327 and conditions. Check dams are built of rock, wood, straw bales, rock gabions or a combination of 328 these materials in ephemeral channels draining low-order catchments [54]. In general, the sediment 329 storage capacity of check dams directly depends on its height and channel slope [55,56]. As post-330 fire management strategy, the use of straw bale check dams is largely diffused in USA, due to their 331 quick and easy installation in burned catchments. However, the effectiveness of this channel 332 treatment is questionable for three main reasons. First, the treatment is unsuccessful in primary 333 watersheds or small catchments, since fine sediments and ashes wash permeate the structures and 334 are released into higher-order channels. Second, the straw bale check dams are prone to an easy 335 failure, because of piping and stream dragging. Third, once the check dams are filled with 336 sediments, their storage capacity is depleted, and this occurs just after two years post-fire. Overall, 337 the installation of light check dams such as straw bales is viable only in areas with low rainfall 338 intensities and soil with low erodibility [54]. However, research about the effectiveness of check 339 dams in burned catchments has not been sufficient to explore the large variability of climatic, 340 geomorphological and vegetation conditions, in order to deeply assess the contribution of channel 341 structures as catchment level. It is likely that check dams are able to reduce the catchment 342 connectivity, but their effectiveness in reducing the runoff and erosion rates is less pronounced 343 compared to hillslope treatments, once the water and sediment flows are already mobilised across 344 the torrent system.

345

### 346 4. Modelling post-fire management impacts

347

348 In areas affected by high-severity fires, accurate hydrological predictions using computer-based 349 models help land managers in the adoption of the most suitable actions to mitigate post-fire land 350 degradation and rehabilitation planning [57,58].

351 An ample and eminent literature exists about modelling experiences in burned forests [59]. To 352 summarise, simple empirical and semi-empirical models (such as the Universal Soil Loss Equation, USLE, the Morgan-Morgan-Finney model, MMF and the revised versions [31,57,60], and 353 354 physically-based models (such as the Water Erosion Prediction Project, WEPP, the Pan-European 355 Soil Erosion Risk Assessment, PESERA, the Soil and Water Assessment Tool model, SWAT) have 356 been widely tested with results generally showing sufficient reliability and accuracy [58,61]. These 357 modelling experiences have relied on adaptations of existing hydrological models to fire-induced 358 changes [31,62]. A recent review of Lopes et al. [63] reports that 73% of the related case studies 359 involved model adaptation to burned conditions. The existing models do not usually account for the

360 impacts of wildfires on vegetation cover and soil properties [64]. In general, fire-adapted 361 algorithms, methods to parameterize post-fire vegetation and soil properties, empirical "fire factor" 362 or adjustments of input parameters - such as ground cover, surface roughness or soil hydraulic 363 properties - have been proposed for the existing models (e.g., [31,58,60,63]). According to the latter 364 authors, only 21% of the reported studies attempted to accommodate new processes and 27% of the 365 papers have tested the accuracy of the models in simulating the effects of mitigation measures. 366 Referring only to the most recent experiences, only Nunes et al. [64], using SWAT to simulate postfire afforestation, Pastor et al. [65], working with the long-term soil erosion "LandSoil" model 367 368 under post-fire mulching, combined with riparian vegetation maintenance/restoration and reduced 369 tillage, as well as Vieira et al. [31], comparing MMF, RUSLE and PESERA models for mulched 370 areas, and Zema et al. [57], using an adapted version of MMF in post-fire pine stands treated with 371 mulching, have evaluated the accuracy of these hydrological models to simulate soil hydrology 372 under post-fire management measures. Vieira et al. [31] concluded that the RUSLE model seems to 373 be ideal for prioritization of areas prone to wildfire risks, mainly due to its simplicity and reduced 374 data requirements, while the more complex MMF and PESERA models are more suitable for 375 testing different land management scenarios. Zema et al. [58] have adopted a novel approach to 376 post-fire hydrological modelling, proposing an Artificial Neural Network to predict with very 377 satisfactory results surface runoff and soil erosion after wildfire under Mediterranean climate 378 conditions.

379 Overall, it can be concluded that the available literature about post-fire hydrological modelling is 380 not homogeneously distributed worldwide, in accordance with Lopes et al. [63]. Erosion modelling 381 is well developed in the U.S.A., where post-fire prediction models are commonly applied, but in 382 other regions, where the hydrological processes may be site-specific, research is still far from being 383 exhaustive [60]. For instance, Mediterranean burnt areas have intrinsic conditions (e.g., very 384 shallow soils, strong soil water repellency, peculiar hydrologic regime). In these environments, the 385 available hydrological models, developed in other climatic contexts and not in fire-affected areas, 386 may find limited applicability and therefore require targeted modifications [31]. As previously outlined, the hydrology of burned areas is extremely complex, due to the large number of 387 388 influencing factors, and the post-fire management techniques are numerous and different in nature. 389 Therefore, the simulation of the hydrological response of burnt and treated soils is a challenging 390 task, which requires further research [61]. The statement by Lopes et al. [63] can be shared, given the 391 evidences that such studies should alternatively adapt the existing models to the hydrology of 392 burned and treated soils or develop new prediction tools under variable post-fire conditions and 393 management [63]. The exploitation of powerful analytical techniques, such as the remote sensing, to

derive ground cover and soil properties (e.g., water content and burn severity maps) from soil 394 395 survey maps may enhance the prediction accuracy and the easiness of use of these tools.

- 396
- 397

#### 5. Future perspectives and conclusions

398

399 The intense research and discussions about the hydrological effects of post-fire management is still 400 open, and even some uncertainty remains whether some areas should recover naturally or it is more 401 convenient to implement soil and vegetation restoring measures [14,30]. On this context, the 402 discussion above has demonstrated the general effectiveness of hillslope and channel measures after 403 wildfire on both soil and vegetation components.

404 However, despite the large availability of effective post-fire management techniques, it is clear that 405 the optimal solution in fire-affected areas remains a combination of these actions. In other words, 406 the post-fire management techniques should be synergistically integrated in a holistic approach that 407 has to consider the integrated hydrological response of the watershed system [66]. Moreover, 408 because of the wide-ranging temporal and spatial effects of each management technique, upscaling 409 the research from the hillslope or channel scale to the watershed scale is warmly recommended, in 410 order to better understand the effects of each technique at large spatial scales [11]; their effects after 411 years or decades must not be neglected rather than limiting the analysis to the short-time impacts.

412 Despite the large body of studies that have evaluated the effectiveness of the post-fire management 413 techniques in a wide range of climatic, geomorphological and ecological conditions, more 414 experiences are needed to identify the most effective strategy, which should to be tailored to site 415 and wildfire characteristics [15]. In this sense, comparative studies of more than one technique 416 against the negative hydrological impacts of post-fire management are welcome. These studies 417 would give as support the scientific evidence about the effectiveness of each action in a territory of 418 specific characteristics. However, there is also a need to develop methods of feasibility assessment 419 using suitable indicators about the sensitivity of each environmental context to wildfire and the 420 benefits of the different techniques. This assessment can help prioritising the management actions in 421 restoration projects, due to the fact that the cost of mitigation measures may be prohibitive over 422 very large fire-affected areas [67].

423 Regarding the prediction of the hydrological effects of post-fire management using computer 424 models, future research paths should go towards a large applicability of post-fire models, which 425 currently is not homogeneously distributed worldwide. The existing models should be adapted as 426 much as possible to burned conditions with attention to the impacts of soil changes in runoff and 427 erosion generation mechanisms. Many studies have limited their evaluations to existing models

428 under burned and unburned conditions; research should go ahead, focusing the effects of post-fire 429 management actions, since these types of modelling experiences are generally scarce and confined 430 to very few environments and techniques. Finally, future modelling studies should include 431 uncertainty analysis, in order to give modellers the level of reliability and accuracy of their 432 hydrological predictions [63]. 433 434 References 435 436 1. Niemeyer RJ, Bladon KD, Woodsmith RD: Long-term hydrologic recovery after wildfire 437 and post-fire forest management in the interior Pacific Northwest. Hydrol Process 2020, 438 **34**:1182–1197. 439 2. Lucas-Borja MEE, Plaza-Álvarez PAA, Gonzalez-Romero J, Sagra J, Alfaro-Sánchez R, 440 Zema DAA, Moya D, de las Heras J: Short-term effects of prescribed burning in Mediterranean pine plantations on surface runoff, soil erosion and water quality of 441 442 runoff. Sci Total Environ 2019, 674:615-622. 443 3. Santín C, Doerr SH: Fire effects on soils: The human dimension. Philos Trans R Soc B 444 Biol Sci 2016, 371:28–34. 445 4. Keizer JJ, Silva FC, Vieira DCS, González-Pelayo O, Campos I, Vieira AMD, Valente S, 446 Prats SA: The effectiveness of two contrasting mulch application rates to reduce postfire erosion in a Portuguese eucalypt plantation. Catena 2018, 169:21-30. 447 448 5. Hueso-González P, Martínez-Murillo JF, Ruiz-Sinoga JD: Prescribed fire impacts on soil 449 properties, overland flow and sediment transport in a Mediterranean forest: A 5 year 450 study. Sci Total Environ 2018, 636:1480-1489. 451 Martínez-Murillo JF, López-Vicente M: Effect of Salvage Logging and Check Dams on 6. 452 Simulated Hydrological Connectivity in a Burned Area. L Degrad Dev 2018, 29:701-453 712. 454 7. Lopes ARR, Prats SASA, Silva FCC, Keizer JJJ: Effects of ploughing and mulching on soil and organic matter losses after a wildfire in Central Portugal. Geogr Res Lett 2020, 455 **46**:303–318. 456 Vieira DCS, Malvar MC, Martins MAS, Serpa D, Keizer JJ: Key factors controlling the 457 8. 458 post-fire hydrological and erosive response at micro-plot scale in a recently burned 459 Mediterranean forest. Geomorphology 2018, 319:161–173. 9. 460 Prosser IP, Williams L: The effect of wildfire on runoff and erosion in native Eucalyptus 461 forest. Hydrol Process 1998, 12:251–265.

- 462 10. Wilson C, Kampf SK, Wagenbrenner JW, MacDonald LH: Rainfall thresholds for post-fire
  463 runoff and sediment delivery from plot to watershed scales. *For Ecol Manage* 2018,
  464 430:346–356.
- 465 11. Zituni R, Wittenberg L, Malkinson D: The effects of post-fire forest management on soil
  466 erosion rates 3 and 4 years after a wildfire, demonstrated on the 2010 Mount Carmel
  467 fire. Int J Wildl Fire 2019, 28:377–385.
- 468 12. Zavala LM, De Celis R, Jordán A: How wildfires affect soil properties. A brief review.
  469 *Cuad Investig Geográfica* 2014, 40:311.
- 470 13. Pereira P, Francos M, Brevik EC, Ubeda X, Bogunovic I: Post-fire soil management. *Curr*471 *Opin Environ Sci Heal* 2018, 5:26–32.
- 472 14. Francos M, Pereira P, Alcañiz M, Úbeda X: Post-wildfire management effects on short473 term evolution of soil properties (Catalonia, Spain, SW-Europe). Sci Total Environ 2018,
  474 633:285–292.
- 475 15. Wittenberg L, van der Wal H, Keesstra S, Tessler N: Post-fire management treatment
  476 effects on soil properties and burned area restoration in a wildland-urban interface,
  477 Haifa Fire case study. *Sci Total Environ* 2020, 716:135190.
- 478 16. Albert-Belda E, Bermejo-Fernández A, Cerdà A, Taguas E V.: The use of Easy-Barriers to
  479 control soil and water losses in fire-affected land in Quesada, Andalusia, Spain. Sci
  480 Total Environ 2019, 690:480–491.
- 481 17. Certini G: Effects of fire on properties of forest soils: A review. *Oecologia* 2005, 143:1–
  482 10.
- Inbar A, Lado M, Sternberg M, Tenau H, Ben-Hur M: Forest fire effects on soil chemical
  and physicochemical properties, infiltration, runoff, and erosion in a semiarid
  Mediterranean region. *Geoderma* 2014, 221–222:131–138.
- Keesstra S, Wittenberg L, Maroulis J, Sambalino F, Malkinson D, Cerdà A, Pereira P: The
  influence of fire history, plant species and post-fire management on soil water
  repellency in a Mediterranean catchment: The Mount Carmel range, Israel. *Catena*2017, 149:857–866.
- 490 20. Robichaud PR, Lewis SA, Brown RE, Bone ED, Brooks ES: Evaluating post-wildfire
  491 logging-slash cover treatment to reduce hillslope erosion after salvage logging using
  402 ground measurements and numerate sensing. *Hudwel Process* 2020, 24:4421, 4445
- 492 **ground measurements and remote sensing**. *Hydrol Process* 2020, **34**:4431–4445.
- 493 21. Salis M, Del Giudice L, Robichaud PR, Ager AA, Canu A, Duce P, Pellizzaro G, Ventura A,
  494 Alcasena-Urdiroz F, Spano D, et al.: Coupling wildfire spread and erosion models to
- 495 quantify post-fire erosion before and after fuel treatments. Int J Wildl Fire 2019, 28:687–

496 703.

- 497 22. Plaza-Álvarez PA, Lucas-Borja ME, Sagra J, Zema DA, González-Romero J, Moya D, De
  498 las Heras J: Changes in soil hydraulic conductivity after prescribed fires in
- 499 Mediterranean pine forests. *J Environ Manage* 2019, **232**:1021–1027.
- 500 23. Thomaz EL: Ash Physical Characteristics Affects Differently Soil Hydrology and
   501 Erosion Subprocesses. L Degrad Dev 2018, 29:690–700.
- 502 24. Shakesby RA, Doerr SH: Wildfire as a hydrological and geomorphological agent. *Earth-*503 Science Rev 2006, 74:269–307.
- Varela ME, Benito E, Keizer JJ: Effects of wildfire and laboratory heating on soil
   aggregate stability of pine forests in Galicia: The role of lithology, soil organic matter
   content and water repellency. *Catena* 2010, 83:127–134.
- 507 26. Shakesby RA: Post-wildfire soil erosion in the Mediterranean: Review and future
  508 research directions. *Earth-Science Rev* 2011, 105:71–100.
- 509 27. Fernández-Alonso JM, Fernández C, Arellano S, Vega JA: *Modeling Soil Burn Severity*510 *Prediction for Planning Measures to Mitigate Post Wildfire Soil Erosion in NW Spain.*511 Elsevier Inc.; 2019.
- 512 28. Gómez-Sánchez E, Lucas-Borja ME, Plaza-Álvarez PA, González-Romero J, Sagra J, Moya
  513 D, De Las Heras J: Effects of post-fire hillslope stabilisation techniques on chemical,
- 514physico-chemical and microbiological soil properties in mediterranean forest515ecosystems. J Environ Manage 2019, 246:229–238.
- 516 29. Lucas-Borja ME, González-Romero J, Plaza-Álvarez PA, Sagra J, Gómez ME, Moya D,
  517 Cerdà A, de las Heras J: The impact of straw mulching and salvage logging on post-fire
  518 runoff and soil erosion generation under Mediterranean climate conditions. *Sci Total*519 *Environ* 2019, 654:441–451.
- Muñoz-Rojas M, Pereira P, Brevik EC, Cerdà A, Jordán A: Soil Mapping and Processes
   Models for Sustainable Land Management Applied to Modern Challenges. In Soil
- 522 *Mapping and Process Modeling for Sustainable Land Use Management*. Elsevier Inc.;
  523 2017:151–190.
- 524 31. Vieira DCS, Serpa D, Nunes JPC, Prats SA, Neves R, Keizer JJ: Predicting the
- effectiveness of different mulching techniques in reducing post-fire runoff and erosion
  at plot scale with the RUSLE, MMF and PESERA models. *Environ Res* 2018, 165:365–
  378.
- 528 32. González-Romero J, Lucas-Borja ME, Plaza-Álvarez PA, Sagra J, Moya D, De Las Heras J:
   529 Temporal effects of post-fire check dam construction on soil functionality in SE Spain.

*Sci Total Environ* 2018, **642**:117–124.

- 531 33. Prosdocimi M, Tarolli P, Cerdà A: Mulching practices for reducing soil water erosion: A
  532 review. *Earth-Science Rev* 2016, 161:191–203.
- 533 34. Prats SA, González-Pelayo Ó, Silva FC, Bokhorst KJ, Baartman JEM, Keizer JJ: Post-fire
  534 soil erosion mitigation at the scale of swales using forest logging residues at a reduced
  535 application rate. *Earth Surf Process Landforms* 2019, 44:2837–2848.
- 536 35. Prats SA, Malvar MC, Coelho COA, Wagenbrenner JW: Hydrologic and erosion responses
  537 to compaction and added surface cover in post-fire logged areas: Isolating splash,
  538 interrill and rill erosion. *J Hydrol* 2019, 575:408–419.
- 539 36. Fernández C, Vega JA, Fontúrbel T: Reducing post-fire soil erosion from the air:
  540 Performance of heli-mulching in a mountainous area on the coast of NW Spain. *Catena*541 2016, 147:489–495.
- 542 37. Lopes AR, Prats SA, Silva FC, Keizer JJ: Effects of ploughing and mulching on soil and
  543 organic matter losses after a wildfire in Central Portugal. *Cuad Investig Geográfica*544 2020, 46:303–318.
- S45 38. Robichaud PR, Lewis SA, Wagenbrenner JW, Brown RE, Pierson FB: Quantifying longterm post-fire sediment delivery and erosion mitigation effectiveness. *Earth Surf Process Landforms* 2020, 45:771–782.
- Jonas JL, Berryman E, Wolk B, Morgan P, Robichaud PR: Post-fire wood mulch for
  reducing erosion potential increases tree seedlings with few impacts on understory
  plants and soil nitrogen. *For Ecol Manage* 2019, 453:117567.
- Jourgholami M, Ahmadi M, Tavankar F, Picchio R: Effectiveness of three post-harvest
  rehabilitation treatments for runoff and sediment reduction on skid trails in the
  hyrcanian forests. Croat J For Eng 2020, 41:309–324.
- 41. Bontrager JD, Morgan P, Hudak AT, Robichaud PR: Long-term vegetation response
  following post-fire straw mulching. *Fire Ecol* 2019, 15.
- 556 42. Lucas-Borja ME, Zema DA, Carrà BG, Cerdà A, Plaza-Alvarez PA, Sagra Cózar J,
- Gonzalez-Romero J, Moya D, De Las Heras J: Short-term changes in infiltration between
   straw mulched and non-mulched soils after wildfire in Mediterranean forest\*
   ecosystems. 2018, doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.07.018.
- 560 43. Francos M, Úbeda X, Pereira P: Impact of torrential rainfall and salvage logging on post561 wildfire soil properties in NE Iberian Peninsula. *Catena* 2019, 177:210–218.
- 562 44. Wagenbrenner JW, MacDonald LH, Coats RN, Robichaud PR, Brown RE: Effects of post-
- 563 fire salvage logging and a skid trail treatment on ground cover, soils, and sediment

564		production in the interior western United States. For Ecol Manage 2015, 335:176–193.
565	45.	Fernández C, Fontúrbel T, Vega JA: Effects of pre-fire site preparation and post-fire
566		erosion barriers on soil erosion after a wildfire in NW Spain. Catena 2019, 172:691–698.

567 46. Lucas-Borja ME, Delgado-Baquerizo M, Muñoz-Rojas M, Plaza-Álvarez PA,

```
568 Gómez-Sanchez ME, González-Romero J, Peña-Molina E, Moya D, de las Heras J: Changes
```

569 in ecosystem properties after post-fire management strategies in wildfire-affected

570		Mediterranean forests. J Appl Ecol 2021, doi:10.1111/1365-2664.13819.
571	47.	de Almeida WS, Panachuki E, de Oliveira PTS, da Silva Menezes R, Sobrinho TA, de
572		Carvalho DF: Effect of soil tillage and vegetal cover on soil water infiltration. Soil Tillage
573		<i>Res</i> 2018, <b>175</b> :130–138.
574	48.	Nunes JP, Bernard-Jannin L, Rodríguez Blanco ML, Santos JM, Coelho C de OA, Keizer JJ:
575		Hydrological and Erosion Processes in Terraced Fields: Observations from a Humid
576		Mediterranean Region in Northern Portugal. L Degrad Dev 2018, 29:596–606.
577	49.	Meena RS, Lal R, Yadav GS: Long-term impacts of topsoil depth and amendments on
578		soil physical and hydrological properties of an Alfisol in central Ohio, USA. Geoderma
579		2020, <b>363</b> :114164.
580	50.	Bombino G, Denisi P, Gómez JA, Zema DA: Mulching as best management practice to
581		reduce surface runoff and erosion in steep clayey olive groves. Int Soil Water Conserv
582		Res 2020, doi:10.1016/j.iswcr.2020.10.002.
583	51.	Silva FC, Vieira DCS, van der Spek E, Keizer JJ: Effect of moss crusts on mitigation of
584		post-fire soil erosion. <i>Ecol Eng</i> 2019, <b>128</b> :9–17.
585	52.	García-Carmona M, Arcenegui V, García-Orenes F, Mataix-Solera J: The role of mosses in
586		soil stability, fertility and microbiology six years after a post-fire salvage logging

- 587 **management**. *J Environ Manage* 2020, **262**:110287.
- 53. Bombino G, Zema DA, Denisi P, Lucas-Borja ME, Labate A, Zimbone SM: Assessment of
  riparian vegetation characteristics in Mediterranean headwaters regulated by check
  dams using multivariate statistical techniques. Sci Total Environ 2019,
- 591 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.12.045.
- 592 54. Robichaud PR, Storrar KA, Wagenbrenner JW: Effectiveness of straw bale check dams at
  593 reducing post-fire sediment yields from steep ephemeral channels. *Sci Total Environ*594 2019, 676:721–731.
- 595 55. Lucas-Borja ME, Zema DA, Hinojosa Guzman MD, Yang Y, Hernández AC, Xiangzhou X,
  596 Carrà BG, Nichols M, Cerdá A: Exploring the influence of vegetation cover, sediment
  597 storage capacity and channel dimensions on stone check dam conditions and
- 598 effectiveness in a large regulated river in México. *Ecol Eng* 2018,

599 doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.07.025.

- 56. Zema DA, Bombino G, Denisi P, Lucas-Borja ME, Zimbone SM: Evaluating the effects of
  check dams on channel geometry, bed sediment size and riparian vegetation in
  Mediterranean mountain torrents. *Sci Total Environ* 2018, 642:347–340.
- 57. Zema DA, Nunes JP, Lucas-Borja ME: Improvement of seasonal runoff and soil loss
  predictions by the MMF (Morgan-Morgan-Finney) model after wildfire and soil
  treatment in Mediterranean forest ecosystems. *Catena* 2020, 188.
- 58. Zema DA, Lucas-Borja ME, Fotia L, Rosaci D, Sarnè GML, Zimbone SM: Predicting the
  hydrological response of a forest after wildfire and soil treatments using an Artificial
  Neural Network. *Comput Electron Agric* 2020, 170.
- 59. Lucas-Borja ME, Bombino G, Carrà BG, D'Agostino D, Denisi P, Labate A, Plaza-Alvarez
   610 PA, Zema DA: Modeling the Soil Response to Rainstorms after Wildfire and Prescribed
- 611 **Fire in Mediterranean Forests**. *Climate* 2020, **8**:150.
- 612 60. Hosseini M, Nunes JP, Pelayo OG, Keizer JJ, Ritsema C, Geissen V: Developing
- generalized parameters for post-fire erosion risk assessment using the revised Morgan Morgan-Finney model: A test for north-central Portuguese pine stands. *Catena* 2018,
   165:358–368.
- 616 61. Schmeer SR, Kampf SK, MacDonald LH, Hewitt J, Wilson C: Empirical models of annual
  617 post-fire erosion on mulched and unmulched hillslopes. *Catena* 2018, 163:276–287.
- 618 62. Fernández C, Vega JA: Evaluation of the rusle and disturbed wepp erosion models for
- 619 predicting soil loss in the first year after wildfire in NW Spain. *Environ Res* 2018,
- 620 **165**:279–285.

- 63. Lopes AR, Girona-García A, Corticeiro S, Martins R, Keizer JJ, Vieira DCS: What is wrong
  with post-fire soil erosion modelling? A meta-analysis on current approaches, research
  gaps, and future directions. *Earth Surf Process Landforms* 2020, doi:10.1002/esp.5020.
- 624 64. Nunes JP, Naranjo Quintanilla P, Santos JM, Serpa D, Carvalho-Santos C, Rocha J, Keizer
- 625 JJ, Keesstra SD: Afforestation, Subsequent Forest Fires and Provision of Hydrological
- 626 Services: A Model-Based Analysis for a Mediterranean Mountainous Catchment. *L*
- 627 *Degrad Dev* 2018, **29**:776–788.
- 628 65. Pastor AV, Nunes JP, Ciampalini R, Koopmans M, Baartman J, Huard F, Calheiros T, Le-
- Bissonnais Y, Keizer JJ, Raclot D: Projecting future impacts of global change including
  fires on soil erosion to anticipate better land management in the forests of NW
  Portugal. Water (Switzerland) 2019, 11:1–19.
- 632 66. Prats SA, Abrantes JRC de B, Coelho C de OA, Keizer JJ, de Lima JLMP: Comparing
  633 topsoil charcoal, ash, and stone cover effects on the postfire hydrologic and erosive
  634 response under laboratory conditions. *L Degrad Dev* 2018, 29:2102–2111.
- 635 67. Alexandra J, Finlayson CM: Floods after bushfires: rapid responses for reducing impacts
  636 of sediment, ash, and nutrient slugs. *Aust J Water Resour* 2020, 24:9–11.