

# THE CANADIAN SYSTEM OF FOREST FIRE DANGER RATING

*B. J. Stocks<sup>1</sup>, B.D. Lawson<sup>2</sup>, M.E. Alexander<sup>3</sup>, C.E. Van Wagner<sup>4</sup>, R.S. McAlpine<sup>3</sup>,  
T. J. Lynham<sup>1</sup> and D.E. Dubé<sup>5</sup>*

## *Abstract*

Forest fire danger rating research in Canada was initiated by the federal government in 1925. Five different fire danger rating systems have been developed since that time, each with increasing universal applicability across Canada. The approach has been to build on previous danger rating systems in an evolutionary fashion and to use field experiments and empirical analysis extensively. The current system, the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System (CFFDRS), has been under development by the Canadian Forestry Service (CFS) since 1968. The first major subsystem of the CFFDRS, the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index (FWI) System, provides numerical ratings of relative fire potential based solely on weather observations, and has been in use throughout Canada since 1970. The second major subsystem, the Canadian Forest Fire Behavior Prediction (FBP) System, which accounts for variability in fire behaviour amongst fuel types (predicting rate of spread, fuel consumption and frontal fire intensity), was issued in interim form in 1984 with final production scheduled for 1990. A third major CFFDRS subsystem, the Canadian Forest Fire Occurrence Prediction (FOP) System, is presently being formulated. This paper briefly outlines the history and philosophy of fire danger rating research in Canada, discussing in detail the structure of the current CFFDRS and its application and use by fire management agencies throughout Canada.

## **Introduction**

Forest fire danger is defined as 'a general term used to express an assessment of both fixed and variable factors of the fire environment that determine the ease of ignition, rate of spread, difficulty of control and fire impact' (Merrill & Alexander 1987). The process of systematically evaluating and integrating the individual and combined factors influencing fire danger is referred to as fire

---

<sup>1</sup>Great Lakes Forestry Centre, Canadian Forestry Service, PO Box 490, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada P6A 5M7

<sup>2</sup>Pacific Forestry Centre, Canadian Forestry Service, 506 West Burnside Road, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8Z 1M5

<sup>3</sup>Northern Forestry Centre, Canadian Forestry Service, 5320-122 Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6H 3S5

<sup>4</sup>Petawawa National Forestry Institute, Canadian Forestry Service, Chalk River, Ontario, Canada KOJ 1J0


<sup>5</sup>Forest Science Directorate, Canadian Forestry Service, 351 St Joseph Blvd., Hull, Quebec, Canada K1A 1G5

danger rating. Fire danger systems produce qualitative and/or numerical indexes of fire potential that are used as guides in a variety of fire management activities (Fig. 1). A national system for rating fire danger has been under development by the Canadian Forestry Service (CFS) for a number of years, and while developments are expected to continue, the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System (CFFDRS) as it currently exists, is presented in this paper.

### Historical Perspective

Research on forest fire danger rating was initiated in Canada by J.G. Wright in 1925 when he developed a practical research program to investigate the relationship between weather, fuel moisture and fire behaviour. Over the next several decades Wright, his primary colleague H.W. Beall, and other successors, developed four different fire danger rating systems which were gradually accepted and widely applied across Canada. A more detailed account of this period is given elsewhere (Van Wagner 1987a).

During this period, fire research field stations were established for varying lengths of time across the country from Newfoundland to British Columbia. The primary goal was to investigate the fundamental relationships between the weather elements and fuel moisture, and between fuel moisture and fire behaviour in important forest fuel types, through the use of field test fires. In reviewing early fire danger research in Canada, two concepts are worth emphasising. First, the development process was one of evolution in which certain features, even though modified, were retained from system to system. Second, there was a trend toward simplification, both in required weather measurements and in the method of calculation.




**Figure 1.** Conceptual framework illustrating the integral role of the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System in fire management actions.

### Current System Structure and Development

The CFFDRS has been under development by the CFS since 1968, when the Service adopted a modular approach to a new national system of fire danger rating. When complete, the CFFDRS will consist of four modules or subsystems: the now familiar Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index (FWI)

System, the recently introduced Canadian Forest Fire Behavior Prediction (FBP) System, a proposed Canadian Forest Fire Occurrence Prediction (FOP) System, and the incomplete Accessory Fuel Moisture System (Fig. 2). The CFFDRS is being documented in a series of reports, in English and French, issued by CFS headquarters. A CFFDRS 'Users' Guide' has been produced recently that houses all national publications and associated material documenting the technical aspects of the system, including a bibliography (Can. For. Serv. 1987). Also, provision has been made for the inclusion of pertinent regional items related to the System's operational use. The CFFDRS is not complete at this stage and, in future years, new component and interpretive publications will be incorporated within the Users' Guide as they are developed, and outdated publications will be revised as necessary.



**Figure 2.** Simplified structure diagram for the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System (CFFDRS).

### *Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index System*

By the late 1960s fire management agencies in Canada had become more sophisticated and were making increasing demands on regional fire danger rating systems developed in the mid-1950s. In response to these demands, CFS fire researchers began work on a national system for rating fire danger. The result was the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index (FWI) System, issued provisionally in 1969, the first subsystem of the CFFDRS. Subsequent editions appeared in 1970, 1976, 1978 and 1984. The FWI System is more complex than its predecessors, retaining the best features of earlier systems but incorporating new components where necessary. The solid link with past systems remained intact.

The FWI System consists of six components that individually and collectively account for the effects of fuel moisture and wind on fire behaviour. The three fuel moisture codes, the Fine Fuel Moisture

Code (FFMC), the Duff Moisture Code (DMC) and the Drought Code (DC), are numerical ratings of the fuel moisture content of fine surface litter, loosely compacted duff of moderate depth, and deep compact organic matter. The three fire behaviour indices, the Initial Spread Index (ISI), the Buildup Index (BUI) and the Fire Weather Index (FWI) component itself, are intended to represent rate of fire spread, fuel available for combustion, and frontal fire intensity. System components depend solely on daily measurements of dry-bulb temperature, relative humidity, a 10 m open wind speed and 24 h accumulated precipitation recorded at noon local standard time. A CFFDRS weather manual has been published (Turner & Lawson 1978). Codes and indexes may be calculated from tables (Can. For. Serv. 1984) or from a computer program (Van Wagner & Pickett 1985).

The three moisture codes are in fact bookkeeping systems that add moisture after rain and subtract some for each day's drying (i.e., today's moisture code is dependent on yesterday's value and present weather). The three fuel moisture codes are expressed on scales related to actual fuel moisture (Van Wagner 1987a). Because the three codes react at different rates, timelags and rain amounts required for saturation of the representative fuel layer, any one of them may be high or low in contrast to the others. For example, two or three good days drying following a heavy rain would produce a high FFMC while the DMC remains low. Conversely, a light rain after a long dry spell will result in a low FFMC while the DMC remains high. Finally, the DC may rise or fall slowly while the FFMC and DMC fluctuate many times.

The three fuel moisture codes plus wind are linked in pairs to form two intermediate indices and one final index of fire behaviour. The ISI, which combines the effects of wind and the fine fuel moisture content represented by the FFMC, represents a numerical rating of fire spread rate without the influence of variable fuel quantity. Because the ISI is dependent solely on weather, actual rate of spread (ROS) can be expected to vary from one fuel type to another over the range of the ISI because of differences in fuel-complex characteristics and wind exposure. The BUI, which combines the DMC and DC, represents a numerical rating of the total fuel available for combustion. The BUI was constructed so that when the DMC is near zero the DC would not affect daily fire danger (except for smouldering potential) no matter what the level of DC (i.e. when the DMC is near zero, so is the BUI, no matter what the DC value). The FWI, which combines the ISI and BUI represents a relative measure of the potential intensity of a single spreading fire in a standard fuel complex (i.e. a mature pine stand) on level terrain (Alexander & De Groot 1988). Jack pine and lodgepole pine forest types form a more or less continuous band across Canada (Rowe 1972) so that the concept of a standardised fuel type is reasonably valid.

The FWI is a good indicator of several aspects of fire activity and is best used as a measure of general fire danger for administrative purposes. However, it is impossible to communicate a complete picture of daily fire potential in a single number. The subsidiary components of the FWI System need to be examined as well for proper interpretation of the effects of past and present fire weather on fuel flammability. Each component of the FWI System conveys direct information about certain aspects of wildland fire potential. For example, we know that fires are not likely to spread in surface litter with a FFMC less than 74, the duff layer does not contribute to frontal fire intensity until the DMC reaches 20, and ground or sub-surface fire activity tends to persist at DC values greater than 400.

The FWI scale is uniform across Canada, but the range of fire weather varies greatly, with the result that each major jurisdiction in the country has developed its own qualitative fire danger classification scheme. Classes (e.g. extreme) are derived from regional cumulative frequency distributions of FWI System components, with class limits derived systematically.

Subsequent to the introduction of the FWI System, the analysis of many years of fire weather and fire report information from across Canada showed strong correlations between fire activity (i.e. fire occurrence and area burned) and increasing severity of fire weather as reflected by the components of the FWI System. As a result, components of the FWI System are well suited to administrative presuppression planning. Studies undertaken in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia analysing many years of fire weather and fire report information, showed strong correlations between various measures of fire business and an increasing severity of fire weather as reflected by the component codes and indexes of the FWI System. For example, there is a strong relationship between man-caused fire occurrence and the FFMC, and a high correlation between area burned and the ISI (Stocks 1974; Kiil *et al.* 1977). The FWI component itself is a good indicator of a variety of aspects of fire activity and is best used as a measure of general fire danger.

FWI System components and their values have different interpretations in different fuel types, because the System was developed to represent fire behaviour in a generalised, standard fuel type. Fire behaviour variation with fuel type is addressed by the second major subsystem of the CFFDRS, the Canadian Forest Fire Behavior Prediction System.

### *Canadian Forest Fire Behavior Prediction System*

While the first subsystem of the CFFDRS was being developed in the late 1960s, CFS fire researchers were already working on a second subsystem, now known as the Canadian Forest Fire Behaviour Prediction (FBP) System. The FBP System was conceived as a series of quantitative fire behaviour models for major Canadian fuel types. The FBP System was released in 1984, in interim form (Alexander *et al.* 1984; Lawson *et al.* 1985) to:

- avoid any further delay in transmittal of the existing information on quantitative prediction of fire spread and growth; and
- allow field testing and evaluation by fire management agencies prior to formal publication of the complete version of the FBP System in 1990.

Philosophically, the FBP System reflects the long-established CFS approach to fire behaviour research. Field documentation of readily measured variables on experimental fires (Stocks 1987; Alexander *et al.* 1991), followed by analysis of the data using simple mathematical models and correlation techniques, are the basis of the CFS approach. Well-documented operational prescribed fires and wildfires have been used as well, the latter being particularly useful to quantify the extreme end of the fire behaviour scale where experimental fires are difficult to schedule and manage. Laboratory-based fire research in moisture physics and heat transfer theory provides the models and framework by which field data are analysed and explained. While the FBP System is empirically based in part, it nevertheless remains a defensible 'holding action' until an accepted physically based model for predicting fire behaviour is developed. Such a model remains a continuing research challenge.

When complete, the FBP System will consist of four primary components (rate of spread, fuel consumption, frontal fire intensity and type of fire) and three secondary components (fire spread distance, elliptical fire area and perimeter length). In the ROS component, ISI is the primary input variable, along with fuel type and topographic slope. The output is forward, linear, head fire rate of spread on level terrain under equilibrium conditions. Predicted spread rates are therefore intended to apply to fires that have grown to the point where they are in equilibrium with their environment.

Crowning and spotting, and their effect on overall spread rate, are automatically taken into account. The form of the ROS equations was selected by trial and judgment, with special emphasis on the fit at low ISI values and on the principle that, in the absence of firm data, rate of spread tends to level off at high ISI values. Crowning thresholds were identified for appropriate fuel types, based on informal experience.

Fuel types in the FBP System are described in qualitative rather than quantitative terms. Stand structure and composition, surface and ladder fuels, forest floor cover and the organic layer are described with emphasis on properties important to fire behaviour. Terminology is used which allows semi-quantitative comparison of characteristics among fuel types to assist a user in selecting the most appropriate fuel type. The user is required to fit the fuel complex to one of the fourteen fuel types provided; no provision is made for adjusting ROS for a fuel type which has characteristics between the discrete fuel types provided. Fuel types will be illustrated with representative colour photographs and a composite wall poster (e.g. De Groot 1987). The number of fuel types currently recognised in the FBP System reflects the amount of empirical fire behaviour data available in Canada (the current FBP System data base contains more than 400 fire observations). Eventually other important fuel types will be added as further experimental burning projects are completed. Fire managers must rely upon the fuel type descriptions to equate FBP System fuel types to existing forest inventory/site classification schemes, including the production of FBP System fuel type maps.

Fuel consumption/BUI relationships for the FBP System fuel types are currently under development based primarily on data gathered from experimental and operational prescribed fires. Predicted frontal fire intensity will be calculated from the computed spread rate and fuel consumption for each FBP System fuel type. The type of fire will also be specified (e.g. surface, crown) based on more objective criteria for determining crown fire spread. In addition, fire suppression interpretations associated with frontal fire intensities will be offered. A standard computer program for the FBP System is also under development.

The 1984 interim edition of the FBP System included procedures for projecting fire growth from a single ignition point (McAlpine 1986). Fire area and perimeter calculations are derived from a simple elliptical fire growth model that utilises the predicted ROS, elapsed time since ignition, 10 m open wind speed and fuel type group. The fire size and shape computations are described in detail elsewhere (Alexander 1985). A method of adjusting the predicted forward spread distance for acceleration from a point ignition is also being investigated.

The general response to the 1984 interim edition of the FBP System has been positive. Excellent results with the system have been reported. Verifiable after-the-fact predictions have shown quite acceptable agreement between observed versus predicted values given the resolution of the inputs (Stocks 1988).

#### *Canadian Forest Fire Occurrence Prediction System*

The development of a Canadian Forest Fire Occurrence Prediction (FOP) System, as shown in Fig. 2, is currently under consideration. The FOP subsystem in the CFFDRS is envisioned as a national framework consisting of both lightning and man-caused fire components. Several approaches to predicting area-specific numbers of lightning and man-caused fires, that rely in one way or another on the FWI System components, are presently being used on an operational and/or experimental basis in several Canadian provinces (e.g. Kourtz 1984; Martell *et al.* 1987).

### *Accessory Fuel Moisture System in the CFFDRS*

The primary role of the Accessory Fuel Moisture System in the CFFDRS (Fig. 2) is to supplement or support special applications and requirements of the three major systems. The Accessory Fuel Moisture System is currently incomplete and will remain so for some time, given the variety of fuel situations and fire danger rating requirements in Canada. This subsystem is intended to include:

- . fuel-specific moisture codes not represented by the standard fuel moisture codes in the FWI System, such as cured grass, exposed ground lichen, deciduous leaf litter and roundwood slash (e.g. Van Wagner 1987b); and
- . corrections/adjustments for landform characteristics, latitude, season (e.g., live surface vegetation and spring foliar moisture content effects), time of day, etc. An example of the latter is the hourly version of the FPMC (Van Wagner 1977).

### **Fire Management Applications**

Daily calculations of CFFDRS components are made from data recorded at more than 1000 weather stations throughout Canada. The level of CFFDRS application in fire management varies with the user agency (Fig. 1). The agency mandate, scope of the problem, size and operating budget of the organisation and land area to be managed, all contribute to the sophistication of CFFDRS application. Some of these uses are:

- . fire behaviour training;
- . prevention planning (e.g. informing the public of impending fire danger, regulating access and risk associated with public and industrial forest use);
- . preparedness planning (level of readiness and pre-positioning of suppression resources);
- . detection planning (e.g. lookout manning and aircraft routing);
- . initial attack dispatching;
- . suppression tactics and strategies on active wildfires;
- . prescribed fire planning and execution.

Relevant examples illustrating these fire management applications of the CFFDRS can be found in British Columbia Ministry of Forests and Lands (1983, 1987), Gorley (1985), Gray & Janz (1985), Martell *et al.* (1984), Hirsch (1988) and Muraro (1975). Prescribed fire applications of quantitative fire behaviour prediction in the context of the CFFDRS are limited, since ignition patterns influence the resulting fire behaviour and impact. However, other components of the CFFDRS dealing with fuel moisture relations are directly applicable to the safe and effective use of prescribed fire. Quantitative fire behaviour predictions in fuel types adjacent to treatment areas are an important part of prescribed fire planning with regard to prevention and control of escaped fires.

Conceptually, the CFFDRS deals with the prediction of fire behaviour from point-source weather measurements (i.e. a single fire weather network station). The System deals primarily with variation in weather from day to day, but will accommodate diurnal variation as well. The System does not



account for spatial variation in weather elements between points of measurement; such interpolation must be handled by models and guidelines external to the CFFDRS. In operational practice, fire weather and fire danger forecasting procedures have been devised to integrate point-source measurement of CFFDRS components over time and space. Spatial variation in fuels and terrain is a fire management information problem not easily handled by a fire danger rating system unless linked to a geographic information system (GIS) which stores, updates and displays land base information in ways directly usable by the fire manager. Computer-based information systems for fire management are under development in many regions of Canada. Fire management decision support systems exploit technological advances in computerised information handling, remote automatic collection and transmission of fire weather data, automatic lightning detection and recording networks (e.g. Kourtz 1984). These support systems depend on the CFFDRS to integrate the various information elements, providing the user with real-time fire occurrence and behaviour prediction.

New approaches to the development and implementation of decision-aids, such as artificial intelligence (AI) and expert systems, will become more prominent in the field of fire management information systems (e.g. Kourtz 1987), but it is certain that outputs from the CFFDRS will become part of any new knowledge-based system. Close interaction among workers in both these research and development fields is required for the most effective progress.

## **Future Developments**

The responsibility for continued development of the CFFDRS rests with the CFS Fire Danger Group, which presently consists of one or more representatives from each of the four CFS establishments maintaining a fire research program. This group maintains liaison with regional, national and international fire organisations, committees and agencies, and reports annually to the Canadian Committee on Forest Fire Management (the national body responsible for advising the federal government on fire research needs), to ensure that research, development and application of the CFFDRS continues in a timely and relevant manner. The recent expansion of the CFFDRS provides Canadian fire managers with site-specific fire behaviour information for a number of important fuel types. Continued monitoring and documentation of wildfires by user agencies will verify existing relationships and provide key information for new model development. Further additions and improvements to the system will require continued research and testing, but feedback from the field contributes to the development of the system. Effective use of quantitative fire behaviour prediction and probabilistic fire occurrence prediction requires improvements in fire weather forecasting, fire weather data collection and information-handling capability. The CFFDRS will continue to evolve in future years to reflect the needs of fire management agencies and the result will be demonstrable progress in improving the effectiveness of fire management in Canada. Completion of the goals presently envisioned for the CFFDRS will mark the end of a major phase in the system's development; however, the system will never be finished, as this type of decision-aid system requires continuous revision and updating. Fire management agencies will expand their application and training programs based upon advances in the CFFDRS.



## References

- Alexander, M.E. (1985). Estimating the length-to-breadth ratio of elliptical forest fire patterns. Proceedings 8th Conference Fire and Forest Meteorology, Soc. Amer. For. Publ. 85-04, Bethesda, Maryland, 287-304.
- Alexander, M.E. & De Groot, W.J. (1988). Fire behavior in jack pine stands as related to the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index (FWI) System. Can. For. Serv., North. For. Cent. Poster (with text).
- Alexander, M.E., Lawson, B.D., Stocks, B.J. & Van Wagner, C.E. (1984). User guide to the Canadian Forest Fire Behavior Prediction System: rate of spread relationships. Interim ed. Can. For. Serv., Fire Danger Group, unnumbered publ.
- Alexander, M.E., Stocks, B.J. & Lawson, B.D. (1991). Fire behavior in black spruce-lichen woodland: the Porter Lake Project. For. Can. Inf. Rep. NOR-X-310.
- British Columbia Ministry of Forests and Lands (1983). Fire weather indices, decision aids for forest operations in British Columbia. B.C. Minist. For. Lands Prot. Branch Handb. 12.
- British Columbia Ministry of Forests and Lands (1987). S-390 (B.C.) Fire behavior prediction student workbook. B.C. Minist. For. Lands Prot. Branch, unnumbered publ.
- Canadian Forestry Service (1984). Tables for the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index System. 4th ed. Can. For. Serv. For. Tech. Rep. 25.
- Canadian Forestry Service (1987). Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System - users' guide. Can. For. Serv., Fire Danger Group, unnumbered publ.
- De Groot, W.J. (1987). Examples of Canadian Forest Fire Behavior Prediction System fuel types in Saskatchewan. Can. For. Serv., Sask. Dist. Off. Poster (with text).
- Gray, H.W. & Janz, B. (1985). Initial-attack initiatives in Alberta: a response to the 1980s. Proceedings Intermountain Fire Council, 1983 Fire Management Workshop, Can. For. Serv. Inf. Rep. NOR-X-271, 25-35.
- Gorley, A. (1985). The application of strategic fire management planning. Proceedings Northwest Forest Fire Council Annual Meeting, 18-19 Nov 1985, Victoria, British Columbia. 5 pp + appendices.
- Hirsch, K.G. (1988). An overview of the 1987 Wallace Lake Fire, Manitoba. *Fire Manage. Notes* 49(2), 26-7.
- Kiil, A.D., Miyagawa, R.S. & Quintilio, D. (1977). Calibration and performance of the Canadian Fire Weather Index in Alberta. Can. For. Serv. Inf. Rep. NOR-X-173.
- Kourtz, P. (1984). Decision-making for centralized forest fire management. *For. Chron.* 60, 320-7.
- Kourtz, P. (1987). Expert system dispatch of forest fire control resources. *AI Appl. Nat. Resour. Manage.* 1(1), 1-8.

- Lawson, B.D., Stocks, B.J., Alexander, M.E. & Van Wagner, C.E. (1985). A system for predicting fire behavior in Canadian forests. *Proceedings 8th Conference Fire and Forest Meteorology, Soc. Amer. For. Publ. 85-04*, Bethesda, Maryland, 6-16.
- McAlpine, R.S. (1986). Forest fire growth calculator. *Can. For. Serv., North. For. Cent. For. Manage. Note No. 35*.
- Martell, D.L., Drysdale, R.J., Doan, G.E. & Boychuk, D. (1984). An evaluation of forest fire initial attack resources. *Interfaces* 14(5), 20-32.
- Marettl, D.L., Otukol, S. & Stocks, B.J. (1987). A logistic model for predicting daily people-caused forest fire occurrence in Ontario. *Can. J. For. Res.* 17, 394-401.
- Merrill, D.F. & Alexander, M.E. (Eds) (1987). Glossary of forest fire management terms. 4th ed. *Natl. Res. Counc. Can., Can. Comm. For. Fire Manage., Publ. NRCC No. 26515*.
- Muraro, S.J. (1975). Prescribed Fire Predictor. *Can. For. Serv., Pac. For. Res. Cent. Slide-rule (with text)*.
- Rowe, J.S. (1972). Forest regions of Canada. *Can. For. Serv. Publ. 1300*.
- Stocks, B.J. (1974). Wildfires and the Fire Weather Index System in Ontario. *Can. For. Serv. Inf. Rep. 0-X-213*.
- Stocks, B.J. (1987). Fire behavior in immature jack pine. *Can. J. For. Res.* 17, 80-6.
- Stocks, B.J. (1988). Forest fire close to home: Terrace Bay #7/86. *Proceedings Symposium and Workshop Protecting People and Homes from Wildfire in the Interior West, USDA For. Serv., Intermt. Res. Stn., Ogden, UT, Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-251, 189-93*.
- Turner, J.A. & Lawson, B.D. (1978). Weather in the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System: a user guide to national standards and practices. *Can. For. Serv. Inf. Rep. BC-X-177*.
- Van Wagner, C.E. (1977). A method of computing fine fuel moisture content throughout the diurnal cycle. *Can. For. Serv. Inf. Rep. PS-X-69*.
- Van Wagner, C.E. (1987a). Development and structure of the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index System. *Can. For. Serv. For. Tech. Rep. 35*.
- Van Wagner, C.E. (1987b). A moisture content model for medium-sized logging slash. *Postprint Vol. 9th Conference Fire and Forest Meteorology, Am. Meteor. Soc., Boston, Massachusetts, 34-40*.
- Van Wagner, C.E. & Pickett, T.L. (1985). Equations and FORTRAN program for the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index System. *Can. For. Serv. For. Tech. Rep. 33*.

# CONFERENCE ON BUSHFIRE MODELLING AND FIRE DANGER RATING SYSTEMS

---

---

P R O C E E D I N G S


---

---



11-12 July 1988 Canberra

Edited by  
N.P. Cheney & A.M. Gill



**CONFERENCE  
ON  
BUSHFIRE  
MODELLING  
AND  
FIRE DANGER  
RATING SYSTEMS  
P R O C E E D I N G S**

**11-12 July 1988 CSIRO Canberra**

**Edited by  
N.P. Cheney & A.M. Gill**

**Sponsored by**

**Standing Committee of the Australian Forestry Council  
and CSIRO**



**CSIRO Division of Forestry  
Banks Street, Yarralumla, ACT 2600 Australia**