

CEDAR FLAT GROVE

CEDAR FLAT GROVE OVERVIEW

Relative Overall Vulnerability

LOW
0.6

This grove is ranked **LOW** for Relative Overall Vulnerability due to:

Wildfire Vulnerability

LOW - 0.0

Regen Vulnerability

LOW - 0.6

See the [Grove Health & Resilience](#) section below for more information.

Relative Management Priority

LOW
0.5

This grove is ranked **LOW** for Relative Management Priority due to:


Overall Vulnerability

LOW - 0.6

Treatment Feasibility

MODERATE - 4.2

See the [Management Considerations](#) section below for more information.



Grove Map - click map for more detailed spatial information

Grove Information

Grove Size (Acres)	15
Location	Kaweah River Watershed, Tulare County
Management Unit(s)	Sequoia - Kings Canyon National Park
Land Steward(s)	NPS SEKI

About Cedar Flat Grove

Cedar Flat Grove is a 15-acre grove in the Kaweah River Watershed region situated between 4,934 - 6,037 feet elevation at 36.36242°N. It is managed by Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Park and is located within a wilderness area. The grove occurs in the Cedar Creek drainage, within the South Fork of the Kaweah River watershed.

HEALTH & RESILIENCE

LOW
0.6

Relative Overall Vulnerability

Cedar Flat Grove is ranked **Low** for Relative Overall Vulnerability because it is at a **Low** risk of being negatively impacted by the effects of severe wildfire and at **Low** risk for inadequate natural regeneration.

Additionally, Cedar Flat Grove is at **Low** risk for negative impacts from drought stress, **Low** levels of tree mortality have been detected in the grove, and the presence and activity of beetles in the grove is **Unknown**. 100% of Cedar Flat Grove has burned in large fires since 1984. See below for more detailed information.


Components of Relative Overall Vulnerability

Relative Overall Vulnerability is based on **Wildfire Vulnerability** and **Regeneration Vulnerability** using an area-weighted calculation. See [Grove Assessment Analysis Methods](#) for more details.

The pie charts below provide the percentage of the grove with high, medium, and low vulnerabilities. Click on the charts to view interactive maps of these vulnerabilities within the grove.


Wildfire Vulnerability

LOW - 0.0



Regeneration Vulnerability

LOW - 0.6




Additional Grove Health & Resilience Information

Below is additional information about Cedar Flat Grove's Health & Resilience. These data, their inputs, and any available notes and updates may be found in the [Grove Resilience Datasheet](#).

Relative Drought Stress

LOW



Relative Drought Stress in Cedar Flat Grove is Low based on an area-weighted average. Click on the chart for an interactive map.

Beetle Activity

UNKNOWN

Beetle Activity in Cedar Flat Grove has not been determined. Please see the [Grove Resilience Datasheet](#) for details.

Tree Mortality

LOW

Tree Mortality in Cedar Flat Grove is Low according to the most current available USFS dead canopy data.


Please see the [Grove Resilience Datasheet](#) for details.

Wildfire History

The table below provides information about large wildfires in this grove recorded since 1984. See [this map of wildfires and locations of high severity fire](#).

Wildfires	CASTLE - 2020
% of grove burned	100%
% of grove unburned	0%
Fire Return Interval Department	High

The chart below provides the percentages of the grove burned at different levels of severity for each wildfire since 1984.



MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

LOW
0.5

Cedar Flat Grove is ranked **Low** for Relative Management Priority because it has **Low** Relative Overall Vulnerability and **Moderate** feasibility for implementing management actions toward restoration goals.

Relative Management Priority

Additionally, the grove is 4.9 miles from a community and is 1.8 miles from recreational infrastructure. See below for more detailed information.

Components of Relative Management Priority

Relative Management Priority is determined by combining the **Relative Overall Vulnerability** and **Treatment Feasibility** ranks. See [Grove Assessment Analysis Methods](#) for more details.

Relative Overall Vulnerability

LOW - 0.6

See the [Health & Resilience](#) section above for the component metrics for the Relative Overall Vulnerability rank.

Treatment Feasibility

MODERATE - 4.2

Special Land Designation	John Krebs Wilderness Area
Grove Manager Opinion	Unknown
Remote	No

Additional Management Considerations

Below is additional information relevant to Cedar Flat Grove's Management Considerations. These data, their inputs, and any available notes and updates may be found in the [Grove Resilience Datasheet](#).

Treatment History

The table below lists treatment projects in and 90 meters around this grove implemented **since 2022**. See this [map of grove treatments](#).

Treatment Type	% of Grove	Acres
Mechanical Treatments	0%	0
Prescribed Fire	0%	0
Pile Treatments	0%	0
Pile Burns	0%	0
Replanting	0%	0

Management Recommendations

The table below provides an estimate of the percentage and acreage of the grove that are recommended for evaluation for treatment based on the Vulnerability Models. See this [map of Grove Vulnerability Models](#).

Treatment Need	% of Grove	Acres
Fuels Reduction/Restoration	0%	0
Reforestation	6.2%	0.93

CEDAR FLAT GROVE REFERENCES

Willard, D. 1994. Giant Sequoia Groves of the Sierra Nevada: A Reference Guide.

Giant Sequoia Health & Resilience Assessment [Glossary](#) 

[How to Use the Giant Sequoia Health & Resilience Assessment](#) 

[Giant Sequoia Health & Resilience Assessment Analysis Methods](#) 

Find more giant sequoia science by searching the [GSLC Scientific Publications Library](#) .

Explore more groves or learn about the Giant Sequoia Lands Coalition.

DISCLAIMER

The information presented in the Giant Sequoia Grove Health & Resilience Assessment is intended to supplement on-the-ground knowledge of giant sequoia groves for use in conjunction with current on-the-ground knowledge of grove condition and management activities when planning fuel treatment and reforestation projects. It should not be considered the only source of information about the condition of groves.