

# Spiraling wildfire fighting costs are largely beyond the Forest Service's control

July 25 2018, by Cassandra Moseley

---



Fighting wildfires with air tankers, like this one dropping fire retardant on the Willow Fire in California on September 2, 2015, is expensive and not always effective. Credit: USFS, CC BY

Just six months after the devastating Thomas Fire – the [largest blaze in](#)

[California's history](#) – was fully contained, the 2018 fire season is well under way. As of mid-July, large wildfires had already burned [over 1 million acres in a dozen states](#). Through October, the National Interagency Fire Center [predicts](#) above-average wildfire activity in many regions, including the Northwest, Interior West and California.


Rising [fire](#) suppression [costs](#) over the past three decades have nearly destroyed the U.S. Forest Service's budget. Overall funding for the agency, which does most federal firefighting, [has been flat for decades](#), while fire suppression costs have grown dramatically.

Earlier this year Congress passed a "[fire funding fix](#)" that changes the way in which the federal government will pay for large fires during expensive fire seasons. This is vital for helping to restore the Forest Service budget. But the funding fix doesn't affect the factors that drive costs, such as climate trends and more people living in fire prone landscapes.

## **More burn days, more fuel**

Why are costs increasing so dramatically? Many factors have come together to create a perfect storm. [Climate change](#), past [forest](#) and fire management practices, housing development, increased focus on community protection and the professionalization of [wildfire](#) management are all driving up costs.

Fire seasons are growing longer in the United States and [worldwide](#). According to the Forest Service, [climate change](#) has expanded the wildfire season by an average of [78 days per year](#) since 1970. Agencies need to keep seasonal employees on their payrolls longer and have contractors standing by earlier and available to work later in the year. All of this adds to costs, even in low fire years.



The cost of managing wildfires began to rise in the late 1990s and increased significantly after fiscal year 2000. Credit: CRS


In many parts of the wildfire-prone West, decades of fire suppression combined with historic logging patterns have created small, dense forest stands that are more vulnerable to large wildfires. In fact, many areas have fire deficits – significantly less fire than we would expect given current climatic and forest conditions. Fire suppression in these areas only delays the inevitable. When fires do get away from firefighters, they are more severe because of the accumulation of small trees and brush.

## Protecting both communities and forests

In recent decades, development has pushed into areas with fire-prone ecosystems – the wildland-urban interface. In response, the Forest Service has shifted its priorities from protecting timber resources to

trying to prevent fire from reaching houses and other physical infrastructure.

Fires near communities are fraught with political pressure and complex interactions with state and local fire and [public safety](#) agencies. They create enormous pressure on the Forest Service to do whatever is possible to suppress fires, which can drive up costs. There is considerable pressure to use air tankers and helicopters, although these resources are expensive and only effective in a limited number of circumstances.



Blue areas on this map experienced fire deficits (less area burned than expected) between 1994 and 2012. Red areas had fire surpluses (more area burned than expected), while yellow areas were roughly normal. Credit: [Parks et al., 2015.](#)


<https://doi.org/10.1890/ES15-00294.1>, [CC BY](#)

As it started to prioritize protecting communities in the late 1980s, the Forest Service also ended its policy of fully suppressing all wildfires. Now fires are managed using a multiplicity of objectives and tactics, ranging from full suppression to allowing fires to grow larger so long as they stay within desired ranges.

This shift requires more and better-trained personnel and more interagency coordination. It also means letting some fires grow bigger, which requires personnel to monitor the blazes even when they stay within acceptable limits. Moving away from full suppression and increasing prescribed fire is controversial, but many scientists believe it will produce [long-term ecological, public safety and financial benefits](#).

## **Professionalizing wildfire response**

As fire seasons lengthened and staffing for the national forest system declined, the Forest Service was less and less able to use national forest as a militia whose regular jobs could be set aside for brief periods for firefighting. Instead, it started to hire staff dedicated exclusively to wildfire management and use private-sector contractors for fire suppression.




Suburban and exurban development has pushed into many fire-prone wild areas.  
Credit: [USFS](#), [CC BY-ND](#)

There is little research on the costs of this transition, but hiring more dedicated professional fire staffers and a large contractor pool is probably more expensive than the Forest Service's earlier model. However, as the agency's workforce shrank by 20,000 between 1980 and the early 2010s and fire seasons expanded, it had little choice but to transform its fire organization.

## **Few opportunities for cost control**

Many of these cost drivers are out of the Forest Service's hands. The agency may be able to have some impact on fire behavior in certain settings, with techniques such as hazardous fuels reduction and prescribed fire, but these strategies will further increase costs in the short and medium term.

Another option is rethinking the resources for wildfire response. While there are almost certainly savings to be had, capturing these savings will require changes in how society views wildfire, and political courage on the part of the Forest Service to not use expensive resources on high-profile wildfires when they may not be effective.



In six of the past 10 years, wildfire activities have consumes at least half of the U.S. Forest Service’s annual budget. Credit: [CRS](#)

Even if these approaches work, they will likely only slow the rate of increase in costs. Climate change, the fire deficit on many western lands



and development in the [wildland-urban interface](#) ensure that continued cost increases are baked into the system for decades to come.

Wildfire fighting costs now consume [more than half of the agency's budget](#), reducing funds for [national forest](#) management, research and development, and support for state and private forestry. Even if it doesn't lower costs, the fire funding fix is vital because it will help create space in the Forest Service budget to fund the very activities that are needed to address the growing problem of wildfire.

This article was originally published on [The Conversation](#). Read the [original article](#).

Provided by The Conversation

Citation: Spiraling wildfire fighting costs are largely beyond the Forest Service's control (2018, July 25) retrieved 23 June 2024 from <https://phys.org/news/2018-07-spiraling-wildfire-largely-forest.html>

This document is subject to copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study or research, no part may be reproduced without the written permission. The content is provided for information purposes only.