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Abstract—The use of fire to maintain and restore oak (Quercus spp.) ecosystems is becoming an increasingly accepted silvicultural tool; however, specific management recommendations have been slow to develop as past studies have shown mixed results. By examining fire temperature in response to landscape position and season of burn, we attempted to offer increased insight into the use of prescribed fire to effectively regenerate oak. Prescribed burns were performed in 2004 in two oak forests that encompassed 96 and 170 ha. One forest was burned late-March and the other was burned early-November. Eight areas that represented the four aspects and two slope positions (upper and lower) were marked out within each forest and replicated. Fire temperature was measured using temperature-sensitive paint applied to aluminum tags (pyrometer) at three different heights above the forest floor. Six pyrometers were placed in each area, providing a total of 192 sets of temperature/height data. Pre-burn fuel conditions were characterized around each temperature gauge. Temperature readings as indicated by temperature-sensitive paint were recorded immediately after each burn. Fall burns were significantly hotter than spring burns at all aspects and slope positions. This same trend was recorded at the different height readings, indicating longer flame lengths during the fall burn. This paper discusses how fire reacts to landscape position and season of burn, and how these factors may be used to more successfully implement prescribed fire for oak management objectives.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past fifty years many stands once dominated by oak have been slowly replaced by more mesophytic species, especially red maple (Acer rubrum) (Heiligmann and Norland 1985, Lorimer 1993). These declining oak-dominated, second-growth forests of today are believed to have originated after years of widespread, high intensity fires swept through old-growth logging slash. However, the historical disturbance regime also consisted of more frequent, low intensity fire (Brose and others 2001), ignited naturally by lighting, but mainly by indigenous peoples and early settlers (Kimmerer and Lake 2001). It seems inevitable that without replicating this historical fire regime, oaks will continue to decline because of the increasing difficulty in regenerating the genus (Clark 1993).

In recent years the use of prescribed fire as a means to maintain or restore oak forests has gained attention as studies have indicated the potential effectiveness of this management tool (Arthur and others 1998, Brose and others 1999). The ubiquitous nature of oak regeneration failure throughout its eastern range requires that an equally universal management technique must be developed and implemented if forest managers are to maintain and restore oak forests. Although it seems clear that fire can increase oak regeneration success, the analysis of more specific data about fire will increase its effectiveness as a management tool. For instance, if higher fire intensity, of which temperature is large part, is more effective in promoting oak regeneration, then detailed knowledge about fire temperature variability across a multitude of landscape positions would be very useful. The objective of this study was to examine how fire temperature is affected by landscape position, aspect, and season of burn. These results are the first phase of a continuing study that will evaluate the differential sprouting response of oak and red maple following fire.
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SITE DESCRIPTION
The two study sites are located 24 km apart in the unglaciated hill country of southern Ohio. The regional topography is characterized by deeply dissected terrain of the Allegheny Plateau, which creates a gradient of moisture regimes and subsequent microclimates across the landscape. Forest composition and structure consist primarily of mixed-oak, sawtimber size stands. Both sites are located within Ohio state forests with similar geologic, topographic, and climatic characteristics, and accordingly, very similar vegetation.

The spring burn site is a 96 ha tract located in Richland Furnace State Forest (39°10’N, 82°36’W), in Jackson County, Ohio. Soils consist mainly of deep, well drained to moderately well drained silt loams of the Rigley-Rarden-Clymer association, formed in colluvium and residuum from sandstone and shale. The climate of Jackson County is characterized by mean annual precipitation of 105.36 cm and a mean annual temperature of 11°C. Average daily maximum and minimum temperatures in January are 4.3°C and -5.7°C respectively, and average daily maximum and minimum temperatures in July are 30°C and 15.5°C respectively (United States Department of Agriculture 1985).

The fall burn site is a 170 ha tract located in Tar Hollow State Forest (39°22’N, 82°45’W), in Ross County, Ohio. Soils in this area are deep to very deep, moderately well drained to well drained soils of Cruze-Shelota-Brownville association, derived from shale, siltstone, and sandstone. The climate of Ross County is characterized by mean annual precipitation of 98.50 cm with a fairly even annual distribution. The mean annual temperature is 11.6°C, with January average daily maximum and minimum temperatures being 3.7°C and -7.7°C respectively, and July average daily maximum and minimum temperatures being 30°C and 16.8°C respectively (United States Department of Agriculture 2003).

SAMPLE DESIGN
This study was the first phase of a continuing study that will evaluate the differential sprouting response of oak and red maple following fire. Because the overall objective was to evaluate the response of individual sample trees to fire, the experimental design consisted accordingly of individual observations surrounding those sample trees.

Prior to the burns at each site, two areas were identified that represent northeast (NE) (360°-90°), southeast (SE) (90°-180°), southwest (SW) (180°-270°), and northwest (NW) (270°-360°) aspects. In addition, two areas were chosen at each aspect that represent slope position: upper and lower. These landscape positions were defined with the upper slope being the upper 33 percent of the slope and lower slope being the lower 33 percent of the slope. The two sample areas in each aspect and slope position were placed in different locations within each site for replication. This provided for the following sample design:

(2 areas) X (4 aspects) X (2 slope positions) X (2 sites) = 32 areas

Fire temperature measurement was achieved by placing six pyrometers throughout each area. With six temperature gauges at 32 areas, the following sample size was achieved:

N = (6 pyrometers) X (32 areas) = 192

Each pyrometer then became the center of a circular 0.005 hectare plot for purposes of characterizing fuel. This characterization was performed by placing fuel into fuel-type categories defined as: (1) coarse woody debris being small to large logs, (2) fine woody debris being twig, branch and bark material, (3) woody vegetation, and (4) herbaceous vegetation. The percent coverage of each of these fuel types on each plot was determined by ocular estimation and recorded. The litter depth was defined as the depth to mineral soil, and was measured at the base of each pyrometer.

The temperature gauges consisted of three aluminum tags painted with temperature-sensitive paint (Tempilaq®), and attached to a metal pin that was then inserted into the ground (Blankenship and Arthur...
The three aluminum tags were attached to each pin at 0 cm, 20 cm, and 40 cm above the ground. On each tag, 10 temperature-sensitive paints were applied, each with a different melting point from 79°C to 538°C, as a means to record the fire temperature at different heights. The aluminum tags were then covered with aluminum foil to protect the paint from moisture, ash, and charring damage. Soon after the burns were completed, the aluminum tags were collected, and the temperature indicated by the melted paint was recorded.

**Fire Implementation**

The Ohio Division of Forestry conducted both the spring and fall burns with the dual intention of reducing fuel, in accordance with the national fire plan, and to promote oak regeneration. Both burn areas were fully enclosed by either roads or bulldozed fire lines. Ignition consisted of first backfiring a buffer or blackline of approximately 30 m around the perimeter of the burn area. The interior of the burn compartment was then lit using both manual and aerial internal ignitions.

The spring burn in Richland Furnace State Forest was conducted at approximately 10:00 a.m. on March 26, 2004. Weather conditions were partly cloudy with a relative humidity and air temperature of 46 percent and 21°C respectively, and southwesterly winds of 14.5 km per hour. The fall burn at Tar Hollow State Forest was implemented at approximately 10:00 a.m. on November 10, 2004. Weather conditions were partly cloudy with a relative humidity and air temperature of 35 percent and 16°C respectively, and southwesterly winds of 7.9 km per hour. Fuel moisture levels were not measured prior to the fires; however both sites had recently received light precipitation.

**RESULTS**

The prescribed fires burned both sites almost completely, leaving only small patches of each area unburned. However, due to these unburned areas several samples were discarded, reducing the spring burn sample size from 96 to 92, and the fall burn sample size from 96 to 90.

Fuel characterization yielded fairly homogeneous pre-burn fuel levels between the spring and fall sites (table 1). Litter depths across sites did not differ significantly, with a spring site depth of 4.5202 cm and a fall site depth of 4.5159 cm. Similarly, little difference was measured in the fuel-type categories across the two sites with coarse, woody and herbaceous fuels not differing significantly; however, a significant difference was found between mean fine woody debris percentages, with a spring site mean of 9.7917 percent cover and a fall site mean of 12.604 percent cover.

The pyrometers indicated a significantly higher temperature in the fall burn than in the spring (table 2). The average total temperature, which consisted of all samples combined, was 117°C for the spring burn and 167°C for fall burn. This difference between burns was similar when temperatures were examined at
the three temperature height locations. Mean ground level temperatures for spring versus fall burns were 176°C and 233°C, mean temperatures at 20 cm were 107°C and 166°C, and mean temperatures at 40 cm were 68°C and 101°C respectively. The significantly higher temperatures recorded at 40 cm during the fall burn indicate that fall burn flame heights were greater. These higher flame heights were also confirmed by observing higher scorch heights on surrounding trees. Fire temperature and height were found to have a negative relationship at both the spring and fall burn sites, with ground level temperatures being the highest and the 40 cm temperatures being the lowest.

The fall burn also resulted in higher temperatures when measurements were further evaluated by aspect, height, and burn season (table 3). For each temperature location: total average temperature, average temperatures at 0 cm, average temperature at 20 cm, and average temperature at 40 cm, the NE and NW aspects were slightly higher for the fall burn than for the spring burn; however SE and SW aspects were all significantly higher for the fall burn. In addition to burning hotter, the fall burn had a more variable temperature range than the spring burn, with average total spring temperatures ranging from 89°C to 141°C, a difference of only 52°C, while average total fall temperatures ranged from 96°C to 207°C, a difference of 111°C. For both burns the SE aspects achieved the highest temperatures for all temperature locations, except for the 20 cm location during the fall burn where the SW aspect temperatures were highest. SW aspects showed the second highest temperatures across both sites, NW aspects were the third highest, and NE aspects indicated the lowest temperatures.

Fire temperatures were higher on upper slope positions for both spring and fall burns (table 4). Spring burn values across all temperature height locations were higher on upper slope positions than lower slope positions, with the average total temperature ranging from 103°C on lower slopes to 132°C on upper slopes, a difference of 29°C; however only the difference at the 0 cm temperature location was found to be significant. Fall burn values across all temperature locations were significantly higher on upper slopes than lower slopes, with the average total temperature ranging from 103°C on lower slopes to 190°C on upper slopes, a difference of 96°C. Temperature differences between season of burn were higher across both slope positions and all temperature locations for the fall burn. Upper slope positions for the fall burn were significantly higher than upper slope positions for the spring burn across all temperature locations. Lower slope position temperatures were higher for the fall burn, with the exception of the 20 cm temperature location, but these differences were not significant.

Mean temperature values grouped according to slope position and aspect show significantly higher fall burn temperatures (table 5). The mean temperatures also duplicate the positive relationship between slope elevation and temperature, as in table 4. Upper slopes with SE and SW aspects achieved the highest

---

**Table 2—Mean fire temperatures by burning season of two forest sites in southern Ohio used in this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature/location</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average total temperature</td>
<td>117 a</td>
<td>167 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 0 cm</td>
<td>176 a</td>
<td>233 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 20 cm</td>
<td>107 a</td>
<td>166 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 40 cm</td>
<td>68 a</td>
<td>101 b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = sample size.
Means followed by the same small case letter are not significantly different across sites (Duncan’s MRT, p = 0.05).
temperatures for both spring and fall burns, while lower slopes with NW and NE aspects experienced lowest temperatures.

**MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

Fire intensity has been shown to be one of the key factors in encouraging competitive oak regeneration (Arthur and others 1998, Brose and others 1999), with oak regeneration success often displaying a positive relationship with fire intensity. Because landscape position, season of burn and fuel characteristics can determine fire intensity, more knowledge about these interactions could help to fine-tune the use of prescribed fire as a management tool.

Other studies have suggested that spring burns are most effective in achieving medium to high intensity burns (Brose and others 1999), due to the occurrence of more days with favorable weather conditions such as high temperature, low humidity, and sunshine. Our findings at Richland Furnace and Tar Hollow, however, showed that higher fire intensity was reached during the fall burn. With weather conditions, fuel quantities, and site characteristics being similar between the spring and fall burns studied here, the more intense fall burn can perhaps be explained by the superior quality of leaf litter in the fall burn. Leaves had freshly fallen prior to the November fire, whereas by spring much of the fall litter would be expected to degrade somewhat. However, contrary to expectations, the results showed nearly identical litter depths at the two sites, suggesting that leaf litter quality rather than leaf litter quantity influenced fire temperature.

---

**Table 3—Mean fire temperatures by burning season and aspect of two forest sites in southern Ohio used in this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature/location</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Burn season (site)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>°C</td>
<td></td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total temperature</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>bA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>abA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>abA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 0 cm</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 20 cm</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 40 cm</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>aA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = sample size.
Means followed by the same small case letter are not significantly different across aspects; means followed by the same uppercase letter are not significantly different between burn seasons (Duncan’s MRT, p = 0.05).
Fall burns may also be preferable to spring burns for oak regeneration due to differences in post-burn nutrient utilization by trees. The historical forest conditions in which oak remained dominant are thought to have been nitrogen limiting, and through chronic atmospheric deposition, species with higher nitrogen requirements can now outcompete oak (Boerner and Brinkman 2003). These competitors are likely to receive a surge of recycled nutrients after a spring burn to facilitate vigorous sprouting. However, after a fall burn, many of these nutrients would be lost to leaching and runoff while the trees are dormant. Boerner and Brinkman also state that when mean fire temperatures exceed 200°C, direct volatilization of nitrogen becomes significant, which would also help to favor oak because of its adaptation to poorer site conditions. This volatilization would have been greater during the fall burn where temperatures frequently reached or exceeded 200°C, while during the spring burn 200°C was rarely reached.

Our results also clearly show that fire intensity is directly related to slope position and aspect. Measurements on the upper slopes of both spring and fall sites displayed higher temperatures than on lower slopes. Measurements on SE and SW aspects showed significantly higher temperatures than on NW and NE slopes across both sites. This relationship between aspect and fire temperature has important management implications if achieving moderate to high intensity fire is the goal. Because oak regeneration success, or oak competition failure, has been shown to increase with fire intensity (Arthur and others 1998, Brose and others 1999), then it may only be practical to maintain or restore oak on the SE and SW aspects where fire intensity will be high enough to have the desired effect. On NW and NE aspects where fire intensity is likely to be low, repeated burns or alternative silvicultural treatments may be necessary to promote oak. Historically, oak may have been able to dominate these productive, mesic sites due to a more frequent and intense fire regime which, due to safety precautions, today’s forest managers are unable to duplicate with prescribed fire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature/location</th>
<th>Slope position</th>
<th>Burn season (site)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average total temperature</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>132 aA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>199 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>103 aA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>103 bA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 0 cm</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>198 aA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>198 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>156 bA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>156 bA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 20 cm</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>119 aA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>119 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>96 aA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>96 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 40 cm</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79 aA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58 aA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58 bA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = sample size.
Means followed by the same small case letter are not significantly different across slope positions; means followed by the same uppercase letter are not significantly different between burn seasons (Duncan’s MRT, \( p = 0.05 \)).
Table 5—Mean fire temperatures grouped according to slope position and aspect by burning season for two forest sites in southern Ohio used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature/location</th>
<th>Slope position</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Burn season (site)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Spring °C</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fall °C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average total temperature</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>135 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>175 aB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>223 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115 aAB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>229 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>146 aAB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>219 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87 aA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>196 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>128 aA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>172 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91 aA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105 aC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 0 cm</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>184 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>219 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>228 aA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>297 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>186 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>290 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>187 aA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>290 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>121 aA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>191 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>264 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>163 aA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>218 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>142 aA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>177 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 20 cm</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>130 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>166 aB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>217 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>228 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>144 aAB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>226 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84 aA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>92 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>184 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>142 aA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>183 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79 aA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average temperature at 40 cm</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132 aB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>155 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79 aB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>107 aAB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>141 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56 aA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54 aA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>138 bB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79 aA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>114 aB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33 aA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50 aA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = sample size.
Means followed by the same small case letter are not significantly different across aspects within slope positions; means followed by the same uppercase letter are not significantly different between burn seasons (Duncan’s MRT, p = 0.05).
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