
Measurements of Smoke from Chipped and Unchipped Plots

Gary L. Achtemeier, *USDA Forest Service, Athens, GA 30602*; **Jeff Glitzenstein**, *Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, FL 32312*; and **Luke P. Naeher**, *Department of Environmental Health Science, College of Public Health, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602*.

ABSTRACT: *Smoke data were collected from two instrumented plots located on the Francis Marion National Forest in South Carolina during prescribed burns on Feb. 12, 2003. One of the plots had been subjected to mechanical chipping. Particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) data analyzed by gravimetric methods were collected at nine locations on the downwind sides of each plot. In addition, samplers were hung atop ~9-m poles at four interior positions within each plot. Perimeter 12-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations in the burn-only plot were significantly higher than those at the chip-burn plot. Similarly, interior 8-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations in the burn-only plot were moderately higher than those at the chip-burn plot. When possible cross-contamination was detected at a check site midway between the two plots, we used PB-Piedmont, a smoke model for predicting ground-level smoke movement at night. The modeled smoke, verified by smoke observed at the check site, indicated winds blowing 75 degrees off from winds observed at the Charleston Airport, approximately 50 km southwest of the experimental site. *South. J. Appl. For.* 30(4):165–171.*

Key Words: Smoke modeling, particulate matter, prescribed fire, carbon monoxide, particulate matter.

Southern land managers use prescribed fire to treat 2–3 million ha of forest and agricultural lands in the southern states each year (Wade et al. 2000), more than any other comparable area in the United States. In addition, the South is experiencing rapid population growth. Large urban centers such as Atlanta and Charlotte have encroached on historically forested areas. Many people are retiring to communities located adjacent to forested areas. These demographics have created an enormous wildland/urban interface problem for Southern land managers.

Although dwelling-destroying wildfires are a threat along the wildland/urban interface, the greatest threat is from smoke, either as a nuisance (Achtemeier 2001) or as pollution (Achtemeier et al. 1998). The outcome is that many land managers have curtailed the use of fire or have abandoned fire altogether because of the threat of litigation (Mobley 1989) and have switched to more expensive mechanical methods to reduce competing midstory tree and

shrub species. Furthermore, the US Environmental Protection Agency has implemented more stringent regulations regarding emissions of particulate matter (EPA 2003). Wood smoke is a major source of particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) (aerodynamic diameter of equal to or less than 2.5 microns.)

The Francis Marion National Forest (FMNF) near Charleston, South Carolina, was devastated in September 1989, when approximately 100 million board feet of timber were felled by Hurricane Hugo (Sheffield and Thompson 1992). The outcome was a forest floor littered with logs. It was estimated that it would take 10–20 years for these 1,000-hour fuels to decay into soil. Thousand-hour fuels, once ignited, can smolder for days. Thus, burn plans that must take into consideration wind direction to avoid sensitive targets can be placed into jeopardy by smoke from these fuels. Wind shifts days after a prescribed burn has been completed can transport residual smoke over sensitive targets.

Because of the fallen log problem, prescribed burning was halted over large areas of the FMNF. One consequence was the development since Hugo of dense loblolly pine and hardwood midstories in formerly open pine woodlands and savannas. Mechanical chipping is now being used on these sites to remove the undesirable midstory and restore the desired ecological and burning conditions. An additional important goal is to reduce heavy fuels that pose fire and smoke hazards, including the aforementioned 1,000-hour fuels.

Although mechanical chipping may reduce wildfire threats, there remains the question regarding smoke production when future prescribed fires are passed over chipped sites. Chipped materials may form moist wooden mats that

NOTE: Gary L. Achtemeier can be reached at (706) 559-4239; Fax: (706) 559-437; gachtemeier@fs.fed.us. We thank University of Georgia technicians Jeffrey Yanosky, Robert Robinson, Cameron Carlton, Krista Merry, and Dean Hardy for their help with data collection and analysis. Joe O'Brien and Ken Forbus of the USDA Forest Service assisted with instrumentation, collection of weather data, and the prescribed fires. Donna Streng is acknowledged for help in the field and with the prescribed fires. Dale Wade contributed to planning and implementing the study. Thanks also go to Francis Marion National Forest (FMNF) Fire Management Officer Eddie Stroman and the FMNF Burn Crew. Finally, thanks also go to John Brubaker, who suggested the pole technique for mounting the PM_{2.5} sensors. This research was supported by the Joint Fire Sciences Project under Grant SRS 01-DG-11330136-361. Manuscript received June 30, 2005, accepted July 12, 2006. Copyright © 2006 by the Society of American Foresters.

could smoke profusely during the smoldering phase of prescribed burns, perhaps producing more smoke than does untreated land when subjected to fire.

Materials and Methods

This study tested whether a plot subjected to mechanical chipping produced more PM_{2.5} particulate mass during prescribed fire than a plot subjected to prescribed fire only. Because of the expense of smoke monitoring equipment, this experiment was limited to a single pair of plots. However, the two plots had the same size (1 ha) with dimensions (100 × 100 m) and were similar with respect to pretreatment fuels and environment. From companion studies, it was known that the number and type of smoke measuring instruments were sufficient to gain accurate measurements of total smoke production (Naeher et al. 2006) and robust data on fuels and fire behavior (Glitzenstein et al. 2006).

Our hypothesis was that smoke production from a prescribed burn, measured by PM_{2.5}, would be lower in the chip-burn plot than in the burn-only plot. To test our hypothesis, we used a simple one-tailed Student's *t*-test to compare the time-integrated PM_{2.5} levels measured along on the perimeter (ground level) and interior (elevated to 9 m) from the chip-burn plot versus the burn-only plot. In addition, we compared real-time perimeter PM_{2.5} in the chip-burn plot versus the burn-only plot.

Study Site

The study was located in compartment 53 of the FMNF, in the outer South Atlantic Coastal Plain, approximately 50 km northwest of Charleston, South Carolina (Figure 1). The site is located in the northwestern part of the FMNF within the wildland-urban interface zone surrounding the town of Moncks Corner, approximately 7 km distant. Establishment dates of midstory stems removed during the chip operation suggest that the last prescribed fire occurred shortly before the hurricane, probably during the period 1985–88. Typical of such sites, vegetation was loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.) flatwoods with dense post-Hugo regeneration dominating the mid-canopy and understory strata. In addition to loblolly pine, tree and shrub species included *Acer rubrum* L., *Clethra alnifolia* L., *Ilex glabra* (L.) Gray, *Liquidambar*

styraciflua L., *Quercus nigra* L., *Quercus phellos* L., and *Vaccinium* spp. A few open, grass patches (*Schizachyrium scoparium* (Michx.) Nash) dominated wetter microsites. Soils in the stand are Wahee series (Long et al. 1980) currently classified as fine, mixed, semiactive, thermic, Aeric, and Endoaquult (USDA Soil Survey Staff 2004). These soils are characterized by sandy loam surface soils and shallow clay subsoils (Long et al. 1980). During wet periods, precipitation percolates through the surface sand and “perches” on top of the clay subsoil. Perched water tables can persist during most of the dormant season during typical winters on flat, poorly drained outer Coastal Plain sites (Long et al. 1980). An important consequence of this hydrologic pattern for smoke and fire propagation is that lower litter layers and heavy fuels in contact with the soil maintain persistently high moisture levels during much of the prescribed burn season. Traditionally, most prescribed burns in the southeastern USA are carried out in winter through early spring, i.e., January through early March (Robbins and Myers 1992).

Experimental Design

The study site was located near enough to the coast so that land breeze circulations might extend inland far enough to affect early morning winds over the experimental sites. We therefore determined that the smoke experiment would be conducted when steady winds were from the northwest. To minimize the possibility of cross-contamination, the experimental plots were oriented along a northeast-southwest axis (Figure 2) and were separated by 300 m.

For the arrangement of instruments shown in Figure 2 to be successful, steady northwest winds were required for a minimum of 24 hours (preferably 36 hours): the day of the burn, through the night after the burn, and into the morning of the following day. These conditions were predicted for the 36 hours beginning Feb. 12, 2003. A cold front had




Figure 1. Location of the experimental burn site (black dot) in the Francis Marion National Forest (dark gray) in South Carolina.




Figure 2. Distribution of ground and tower samplers and the weather station for the Francis Marion National Forest smoke measuring experiment. The distance (300 m) between the burn-only and chipped-burn plots is not to scale. PM, particulate matter.

passed through on Feb. 10, producing enough rain that 1 day was required to dry fuels sufficiently for a satisfactory burn. However, a dry secondary cold front passed through on Feb. 12, and northwesterly winds persisted through the next morning. Thus, Feb. 12–13, 2003, was a suitable window of opportunity for the smoke experiment.

Instrumentation for Smoke Data

Particulate data analyzed by gravimetric methods were collected by SKC pumps (SKC Inc., Eighty Four, PA) drawing air at a rate of 4.0 L/minute through a BGI KTL cyclone (BGI Incorporated, Waltham, MA) and SKC Air Check 2000 pumps drawing air at a rate of 1.5 L/minute through a BGI Triplex cyclone (Naehrer et al. 2006). Both cyclone types used 37-mm Teflo filters to which the particles adhered. A line of SKC Air Check 2000 pumps was positioned along the downwind side and part way up the adjacent sides of each plot (Figure 2). Pumps were separated by approximately 20 m, and the cyclones were hung approximately 1.5 m off the ground. In addition to the ground-level samplers, SKC pumps were hung atop 9-m poles at four positions within the interior of each smoke monitoring plot. Pumps were set to run throughout the night (6:00 pm to 6:00 am) to catch smoke produced during the active burning and smoldering phases. Before and after sampling, the flow rate of the pumps was calibrated using a Delta Cal calibrator. At the end of the sampling period, PM_{2.5} samples were collected, put in boxes, sealed, and refrigerated. They were later brought back from FMNF to a partially climate-controlled room for analysis in the Department of Environmental Health Science, University of Georgia (Naehrer et al. 2006).

Real time aerosol PM_{2.5} data were collected by TSI Dust Trak monitors (TSI Incorporated, Shoreview, MN) that used laser photometry to record airborne dust concentrations. Dräger PAC III (Dräger (AG), Lübeck, Germany) and Langan instruments were used for real time CO data collection (Naehrer et al. 2006). A Langan CO monitor (Langan Products, Inc., San Francisco, CA) and a TSI Dust Trak were positioned along the downwind sides in both plots (Figure 2). PAC IIIs were placed at the downwind corners of the plots.

A SKC Air Check pump was colocated with a weather station in the open space midway (i.e., 150 m) between the two plots. The purpose for the control sampler was to monitor for cross-contamination between the two plots. The weather station was a Campbell Scientific CR23X Station. Wind and air sensor heights were approximately 3.5 m aboveground. Sensor data were taken and stored every 10 seconds. The sensor for air temperature (°C) and relative humidity (RH) was a Vaisala, Inc., HMP45C with temperature accuracy ±0.2 C at 20 degrees and RH accuracy 2% from 0–90% RH and 3% from 90–100% RH. Wind speed (m s⁻¹) and direction measurements were taken via a RM Young, Inc., wind monitor. Wind speed accuracy is ±2 percent; wind speed threshold is 0.9 m s⁻¹. Wind direction accuracy is approximately ±5%.

Results

Smoke Observations

Low relative humidities and strong winds during the day of Feb. 12, 2003, delayed ignition on the two experimental plots

until after sunset (5:57 pm). The burn-only plot was ignited at 6:15 pm, and the chipped-burn plot was ignited at 7:30 pm. Given the potential hazard of lighting strips in the dark in dense vegetation, the firing technique for the burn-only plot was to ignite a backfire on the downwind side, allow it to burn out a broad “blackline” about 20 m wide, and then to ignite the upwind side of the plot. The fire front moved rapidly across the plot, covering the approximately 80-meter distance to the blackline in less than 10 minutes, i.e., an estimated rate of spread of approximately 7.8 m minutes⁻¹. Flame lengths appeared to be mostly less than 1.0 m, but with occasional flare-ups up to 5.0 m as pyrogenic shrubs, e.g., *Myrica cerifera*, were combusted. In contrast, the fire moved slowly through the chipped-burn plot, necessitating numerous strip headfires to ultimately burn the majority of the plot area. Flame lengths were also much lower, averaging approximately 25 cm according to field observations.

PM_{2.5} total mass measurements for the two plots are shown in Figures 3 and 4. Smoke particulate concentrations in the burn-only plot exceeded those at the chipped-burn plot at each of the four pole-mounted and at 8 of the 9 ground locations.

A more detailed temporal picture of PM_{2.5} emissions at ground level in the burn-only plot was provided by the TSI Dust Trak located at position 1-5 on the downwind side of the plot (Figure 3). The instrument was turned on at 3:00 pm and turned off near midnight on Feb. 12, 2003 (Figure 5). A sharp peak in concentrations occurred when smoke from the broad backfire affected the instruments. PM_{2.5} concentrations briefly exceeded 100 mg m⁻³ (milligrams per cubic meter) during this period. Concentrations remained high during the active flaming stage of the burn, then fell to less than 2 mg m⁻³ after 6:30 pm and then to near background levels by 7:30 pm. Concentrations increased to 5–10 mg m⁻³ after 7:30 pm.

The record for the chipped-burn plot (Figure 5, blue line) began with a sharp peak in smoke concentrations to 9 mg m⁻³ at 7:30 pm then dropped off to near background levels




Figure 3. Plan view of the burn-only plot showing magnitudes and distributions of PM_{2.5} particulate matter (µg/m³) for the pole-mounted and ground-level samplers.




Figure 4. Plan view of the chipped-burn plot showing magnitudes and distributions of $PM_{2.5}$ particulate matter ($\mu g/m^3$) for the pole-mounted and ground-level samplers.

until after 8:30 pm when smoke concentrations peaked between $2\text{--}3\text{ mg m}^{-3}$.

Perimeter 12-hour $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations in the burn-only plot (average, $519.9\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$, standard deviation, $238.8\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$) were significantly higher (1-tail t-test, $P = 0.01$) than those at the chipped-burn plot (average, $198.1\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$; standard deviation, $71.6\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$). Similarly, interior pole-mounted 8-hour $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations in the burn-only plot (average, $773.4\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$; standard deviation, $321.8\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$) were moderately higher (1-tail t-test, $P = 0.06$) than those at the chipped-burn plot (average, $460.3\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$; standard deviation, $147.3\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$).

Analysis for Cross-Contamination

An important issue concerns possible contamination between smoke monitoring plots. The plots were oriented along a southwest/northeast axis on the basis of the expectation that steady winds from the northwest would avoid cross-contamination. A TSI Dust Trak $PM_{2.5}$ sampler and a Langan CO monitor were collocated with the weather station at a check site located half way between the burn-only and the chipped-burn plots (Figure 2) to monitor for cross contamination. The total $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentration measured at the check site was $178.5\text{ }\mu g\text{ m}^{-3}$. Figure 5 shows the trace for the Dust Trak (green line). Contamination began at 9:00 pm, approximately 1.5 hours after ignition and probably during the smoldering phase at the chipped-burn plot. The concentrations are small in comparison with postburn smoldering $PM_{2.5}$ measurements at the burn-only site but are typical of $PM_{2.5}$ measurements at the chipped-burn site.

Hourly wind reports at the Charleston, South Carolina, airport, approximately 50 km southwest of the experiment site, showed that the wind directions ranged from 270 degrees (wind blowing from the west) to 310 degrees (wind blowing from the west-northwest) through the period from 5:00 am on Feb. 12 to 7:00 am on Feb. 13. Given the arrangement of the plots along a northeast-southwest axis, these wind directions did not support smoke from the chipped-burn plot passing over either the check site or the

burn-only plot. A critical wind direction of 232 degrees (wind blowing from the southwest) would be required for smoke from the extreme northwest corner of chipped-burn plot to just pass over the check site.

Wind directions more representative of below canopy air movement over the experiment site were collected from the weather station at the check site. During the period from 6:00 to 6:30 pm, as wind speeds were decreasing (Figure 6), winds blew from the west ($273\text{--}279$ degrees). After 6:30 pm, wind speeds fell below the recording threshold for the instrument. However, the wind direction vane was still responding to the winds until 7:30 pm. Wind directions ranged from 258 degrees (winds blowing from the west-southwest) to 298 degrees (winds blowing from the west-northwest) with the west-southwest winds appearing later in the hour. After 7:30 pm, wind directions became unreliable; there were longer periods with wind speeds below the response of the vane. Wind directions from 7:30 to 7:50 pm ranged from 277 degrees to 306 degrees (winds blowing from the west to west-northwest). Analysis of wind directions stopped after 7:50 pm. Thus reliable wind direction data ceased only 20 minutes after ignition at the burn-only plot and more than an hour before cross contamination was detected at the control site.

Discussion

From Figures 3 and 4, smoke particulate concentrations in the burn-only plot exceeded those at the chipped-burn plot at the 4 pole-mounted locations and at 8 of the 9 ground-mounted locations. The difference was especially pronounced for the ground-level sensors. In addition to possible treatment and fuel differences, this large difference may be explained by wind speed changes on the night of the burn. The burn-only plot was lit during a period of steady west-northwest winds lasting from 6:00–7:00 pm. These winds blew smoke directly across the ground-level sensors. By the time the chipped-burn plot was ignited, around 7:30 pm, these winds had dissipated. Since light winds prevailed, it is likely that a thermal plume developed quickly and lofted smoke above the ground sensors. Thus, the pole sensors detected most of the smoke particles from the chipped-burn plot. Consistent with this possibility, the ratio of perimeter to pole-mounted concentrations for the chipped-burn plot (excluding position 6-6 as an outlier) was only 0.47, compared with a ratio of 0.91 for the burn-only plot.

We suggest that development of a thermal plume above each burn is supported by the time series measurements from the TSI Dust Trak (Figure 5). Stronger winds (Figure 6) during the active flaming phase at the burn-only plot blew smoke along the ground from 6:00 to 6:30 pm and over the Dust Trak resulting in high measured smoke concentrations. After 6:30 pm, the light winds made it possible for residual flames plus heat from the ground to develop a thermal plume with sufficient organization to loft smoke above the smoke collectors located on the burn-only plot boundaries. After 7:30 pm, the ground had cooled sufficiently so that a thermal plume was no longer supported. This, in combination with an intensifying nocturnal inversion, trapped smoke near the ground with the resulting




Figure 5. Concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ (mg/m^3) from a TSI Dust Trak at burn-only position 1-5 (Figure 3) (red), chipped-burn position 6-5 (Figure 4) (blue), and check site (green) with vertical scale from 0 to $15\ mg/m^3$.

second increase in $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations measured by the Dust Trak after 7:30 pm.

The time series for $PM_{2.5}$ as measured by the TSI Dust Trak at Position 5 within the chipped-burn plot is shown by the blue line in Figure 5. $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations observed by this instrument were uniformly lower than those observed by the Dust-Trak at the burn-only plot over the same time period (red line).




Figure 6. The 15-minute average wind speed from 6:00 pm to 11:00 pm on Feb. 12, 2003, as measured from the weather station located at the control site.

The chipped-burn trace indicated an initial spike in concentrations when the back fire line was lit near the instrument. However, the magnitude of the spike was much smaller than that observed for the burn-only plot. The concentration minimum at chipped-burn plot that followed the initial spike was also much less pronounced than that for the burn-only plot. Thus, the fine-scale temporal record of $PM_{2.5}$ emissions provided by the chipped-burn plot Dust-Trak supported the inference from the mass samplers that a thermal plume developed relatively rapidly in this fire and lofted most of the smoke above the ground samplers. As there was no abrupt ending of the active flaming phase, the thermal plume in the chipped-burn plot appears to have gradually weakened within an increasingly strong nocturnal inversion. Thus, the $PM_{2.5}$ record became more continuous after 9:00 pm.

Regarding cross contamination, Achtemeier (2005) developed PB-Piedmont, a numerical wind model specifically designed to simulate smoke movement in very light winds near the ground at night. The model uses gradients of the pressure field calculated from 7–10 National Weather Service ground stations surrounding a burn site to mathematically simulate air movement under light wind situations. This approach avoids reliance on inaccurate wind reports from ground weather stations at night. Although designed to be used in terrain typical of that of the Piedmont of the South, we determined that the model could be used to investigate the source of the cross

contamination because land cover was relatively uniform (detailed land use data were unnecessary), road cuts that would channel the wind were located east and south of the site (downwind from the burns), and the weather patterns remained well-organized through the night.

PB-Piedmont was initialized with USGS 30-m Digital Elevation Model (DEM) elevation data and hourly weather data from National Weather Service surface weather reporting stations for the period from 5:00 pm on Feb. 12 to 6:00 am on Feb. 13. The model burn was started at 7:30 pm. Figure 7a shows both plots (red squares rotated 45 degrees) and the

check site (green circle) geo-referenced to elevation. Colored bands represent 1 m; the elevation range is 7 m over this roughly 500-m square grid. PB-Piedmont assumes that a burn site can be represented by a square. This square (white) is colocated with the chipped-burn plot. As locations of smoldering fuels within chipped-burn plot were unknown, a 25-point matrix was overlaid on the white square in the model. PB-Piedmont simulated smoke movement from each point within the matrix.

The timing of smoke arrival at the check site in the PB-Piedmont simulation can be compared with the TSI Dust Trak




Figure 7. PB-Piedmont smoke model simulation of the ground-level smoke plume from the chipped-burn plot on Feb. 12, 2003, for 8:00 pm (b) and 10:00 pm (c) and on Feb. 13 for 1:00 am (d), 4:00 am (e), and 6:00 am (f). a, Initial graphic.

PM_{2.5} concentrations (Figure 5, green line). The smoke plume at 8:00 pm (Figure 7b), 1 hour before smoke was detected by the Dust Trak, was blowing at the critical wind direction of 232 degrees (blowing from the southwest). By 10:00 pm, the time of the peak in PM_{2.5} concentrations measured by the check site Dust Trak, the winds had shifted to blow from 229 degrees, thus enveloping the check site with smoke (Figure 7c) and affecting the eastern edge of Plot 1. The smoke plume remained over the check site and the burn-only plot (Figure 7, d and e) through the night until 6:00 am Feb. 13, when the wind direction was blowing from the critical direction again. The Dust Trak stopped reporting smoke at 6:00 am. Smoke again returned to the check site after 7:00 am.

Management Implications

Because of the expense of installing and operating smoke monitoring equipment and in analysis of the data, the study of the impact of chipping on smoke production was done for only one pair of experimental plots (burn-only versus chipped-burn). Our results are not statistically significant, and generalizations beyond the conditions present during the experiment should be regarded with circumspection. Given the above caveats, this study has several implications for land management.

1. The active burn phase smoke production in the chipped-burn plot was about 60 percent of that in the burn-only plot as observed from the pole-mounted sensors. Given the overall reduction in smoke from the chipped-burn plot, mechanical chipping may be a useful method for reducing midstory fuels buildup along smoke-sensitive wildland/urban interfaces in Southern forests.
2. If these results are extrapolated to an operational scale burn, it is clear that fairly high levels of smoke would still be produced in both active burn and smoldering phases. This much smoke could still necessitate follow-up expenses in terms of traffic control and interventions with local residents with medical conditions.
3. Although smoke production in the chipped-burn plot was greatly reduced in comparison with that of the burn-only plot (60% for the active burn phase and 38% for the smoldering phase), chipped areas may produce more smoke under certain conditions. This study was done 1 year after chipping was done. The chipped areas were relatively free of overlying fine fuels and woody debris. Thus, after several years and before the chipped fuels have fully decayed into soil, there remains the possibility that chipped fuels could ignite and smolder in a manner analogous to the ignition of organic soils. Land managers should not use chipped areas as fire breaks or “fire stoppers” when planning prescribed burns.
4. An important and somewhat unexpected result to emerge from this study was an appreciation of how difficult it is to predict where smoke will be transported at night even for well-defined synoptic weather conditions and flat terrain. Despite a forecast of strong winds out of the northwest, actual wind directions and

smoke movements on the night of the smoke burn were quite different from those expected.

5. PB-Piedmont simulated smoke moving from the chipped-burn plot across the check site and over the burn-only plot for several hours during the night. This represented a wind direction change from predicted northwesterly to southwesterly—approximately 75 degrees. The wind shift, accurately simulated by PB-Piedmont, occurred near the ground under the canopy, whereas winds at standard reporting stations remained relatively constant from the west to west-northwest. The study therefore points out the need for and usefulness of wind/smoke models such as PB-Piedmont as aids to assist land managers in preburn planning for and post-burn monitoring of smoke at night.

Literature Cited

- ACHTEMEIER, G.L. 2005. Planned Burn: Piedmont. A local operational numerical meteorological model for tracking smoke on the ground at night: Model development and sensitivity tests. *Int. J. Wildl. Fire* 14:85–98.
- ACHTEMEIER, G.L. 2001. Simulating nocturnal smoke movement. *Fire Manage. Today* 61:28–33.
- ACHTEMEIER, G.L., W. JACKSON, B. HAWKINS, D. WADE, AND C. MCMAHON. 1998. The smoke dilemma: A head-on collision! P. 415–421 in *Trans. 63rd North American wildlife and natural resources conf.*, Mar. 20–24, 1998, Orlando, FL. Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, DC.
- BROWN, J.K. 1974. *Handbook for inventorying downed woody material*. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-16, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Ogden, UT. 24 pp.
- BROWN, J.K., R.D. OBERHEU, AND C.M. JOHNSTON. 1982. *Handbook for inventorying surface fuels and biomass in the interior west*. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-129, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Ogden, UT. 22 p.
- GLITZENSTEIN, J.S., D.R. STRENG, G.L. ACHTEMEIER, L.P. NAEHER, AND D.D. WADE. 2006. Fuels and fire behavior in chipped and unchipped plots: Implications for land management near the wildland/urban interface. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, in press.
- LONG, B.M., G.W. HURT, G.V. LONG, T.R. LOVE, AND L.E. ANDREWS. 1980. *Soil survey of Berkeley County, SC*. USDA Soil Conservation Service and USDA Forest Service. USDA Soil Conservation Service, Washington, DC. 94 pp.
- MOBLEY, H.E. 1989. *Summary of smoke-related accidents in the South from prescribed fire (1979–1988)*. American Pulpwood Association Technical Release. 90-R-11. American Pulpwood Association, Rockville, MD.
- NAEHER, L.P., G.L. ACHTEMEIER, J.S. GLITZENSTEIN, D. MACINTOSH, AND D.R. STRENG. 2006. Real-time and time-integrated PM_{2.5} and CO from prescribed burns in chipped and non-chipped plots: Firefighter and community exposure and health implications. *J. Expos. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* 16:351–361.
- ROBBINS, L.E., AND R.M. MYERS. 1992. *Seasonal effects of prescribed burning in Florida: A review*. Tall Timbers Research Inc. Misc. Publication No. 8. 96 p.
- SHEFFIELD, R.M., AND M.T. THOMPSON. 1992. *Hurricane Hugo effects on South Carolina's forest resources*. USDA Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, NC. Research Paper SE-284.
- US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY. 2003. *National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)*. US Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC.
- USDA SOIL SURVEY STAFF. 2004. Natural Resources Conservation Service. Soil Series Classification Database. soils.usda.gov/soils/technical/classification/scfile/index.html; last accessed Feb. 10, 2004.
- WADE, D.D., B.L. BROCK, P.H. BROSE, J.B. GRACE, G.A. HOCH, AND W.A. PATTERSON III. 2000. Fire in eastern ecosystems. P. 53–96 in *Wildland fire in ecosystems: Effects of fire on flora*, Brown, J.K., and Smith, J.K. (eds.). USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-42, Rocky Mountain Research Station.