

# Patterns in plant flammability at a fire-prone wildland-urban interface in eastern Australia



**Thomas Hawthorne**

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science  
(Research), under the supervision of Dr Brad Murray, Dr Megan Murray, Dr Leigh Martin,  
and Dr Tim Curran

November 2020

University of Technology Sydney  
Faculty of Science, School of Life Sciences

## **Certificate of Original Authorship**

I, Thomas Hawthorne declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Master of Science (Research), in the School of Environment at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

**Signature:** Production Note:  
Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 06/11/20

## Acknowledgements

First of all, I'd like to thank my supervisors Brad Murray, Megan Murray, and Leigh Martin of University of Technology Sydney and Timothy Curran of Lincoln University. It has been an honour to work with leading researchers in fire ecology. Brad I feel incredibly lucky to have had such a passionate, supportive supervisor. Your tireless enthusiasm for research is infectious. Thank you to Leigh for giving me my start as a teaching associate. It has been rewarding to get students excited about environmental sciences. Thank you to Tim for flying over from New Zealand to help get our flammability work under way and for the many constructive comments on my thesis chapters.

At UTS, I'd like to thank Sue Fenech for making sure us terrestrial ecologists were never forgotten. To Greg Dalsanto at the UTS workshop, who took on the task of building our beloved plant BBQ. My thesis would not have been possible without Barbera Que, many thanks Greg. Thank you to Erin Rogers, for your help with field work, lab work and for teaching me many new plants. Thanks should also go to Lisa Danzey, Claudia Pilon-Summers and Cooper Torrens for volunteering to help me safely light things on fire.

I would like to thank my small but special lab group. I'm extremely grateful to Dan Krix, the mastermind behind the R work in this project, we're so lucky to have someone of your expertise. A big thank you to Molly for the adorable mini goat content and of course for helping with the BBQ data collection, most of this data would not have been collected without you. Pip I'd like to thank you for checking in with me to make sure I'd written my target amount of words for the day and for continued words of encouragement.

I cannot begin to express my thanks to Kieran Young, who has been there through my highest and lowest moments inside and outside of UTS. Completing this thesis would not have

been possible without your unwavering support. You've helped with field work as well as lab work and always knew how to kick me into gear when deadlines were approaching. I am also grateful to Kirsty Milner for many things but mostly for showing me how to do anything at UTS, from applying for conference funds to simply knowing who to ask for what, you were always there when I needed assistance no matter how busy you were.

Last but certainly not least, I'd like to thank my family for all their love and emotional support. Special thank you to my parents, for their financial support throughout the past two years. Visiting home on the Central Coast, always felt like a summer holiday no matter what time of the year I visited.

A final thank you to anyone I've forgotten, including those who asked how I was going or showed interest in my research.

## **Statement of thesis format**

This thesis is submitted as a thesis by compilation. Chapter 1 provides a general introduction to wildfires and the wildland-urban interface, the gaps in the field and my research questions. The following three data chapters (Chapters 2, 3 and 4) have been prepared as standalone chapters with an additional introductory paragraph to link chapters. Chapter 5 provides a synthesis of my research and highlights the contribution this thesis makes to our understanding of plant flammability in wildland-urban interface systems and provides future directions for the field.

## Table of Contents

Certificate of Original Authorship.....	i
Acknowledgements .....	ii
Statement of thesis format.....	iv
List of figures .....	vii
List of tables.....	xii
Abstract .....	xiii
Chapter 1   Introduction .....	1
1.1 The Global Wildfire Problem .....	1
1.2 Wildfires in Australia.....	2
1.3 Plant Flammability .....	3
1.4 The Wildland-Urban Interface .....	5
1.5 Study Region.....	6
1.6 Research objectives and thesis outline.....	7
Chapter 2   Floristic patterns among the dominant plant species of the wildland-urban interface in the mid-to-lower Blue Mountains of eastern Australia.....	9
2.1 Introduction .....	9
2.2 Methods .....	11
2.2.1 Study region and sites.....	11
2.2.2 Vegetation surveys .....	14
2.2.3 Data analyses.....	15
2.3 Results .....	17
2.3.1 Floristic comparisons among plant communities .....	17
2.3.2 Comparisons of species richness among WUI areas.....	25
2.3.3 Comparison of growth forms WUI areas .....	28
2.3.4 Comparison of phylogenetic diversity among WUI areas.....	29
2.4 Discussion .....	30
Chapter 3   Comparative flammability of native and exotic plants at the wildland-urban interface in the Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area.....	35
3.1 Introduction .....	35
3.2 Methods .....	37
3.2.1 Study region, species and sampling.....	37
3.2.2 Fuel moisture content .....	38
3.2.3 Flammability measurements .....	39
3.2.4 Data analyses.....	42
3.3 Results .....	44

3.4 Discussion .....	52
Chapter 4   Shoot traits do not adequately explain differences in shoot level flammability between natives and exotics of dominant WUI plants .....	60
4.1 Introduction .....	60
4.2 Methods .....	63
4.2.1 Shoot flammability.....	63
4.2.2 Degree of ramification.....	63
4.2.3 Bulk density .....	64
4.2.4 Shoot water content.....	64
4.2.5 Data analyses.....	65
4.3 Results .....	67
4.4 Discussion .....	72
Chapter 5   General Discussion .....	76
5.1 Were the aims of this thesis met? .....	76
5.1.1 Plant composition at the WUI.....	76
5.1.2 Comparisons of shoot flammability between urban and wildland areas at the WUI.....	77
5.1.3 Shoot traits drive interspecific shoot flammability.....	77
5.2 Future research directions.....	78
5.3 Conclusion .....	81
Appendix.....	83
Supporting information for Chapter 2.....	83
References .....	87

## List of figures

**Fig. 2.1** The proximity of the Blue Mountains to other major cities of the central coast and hinterland of NSW. The area in the small box encapsulates the study region and is expanded below in Fig. 2.2.

**Fig. 2.2** Suburbs of the study region across an elevational gradient from Lapstone (160 m a.s.l.) to Faulconbridge (446 m a.s.l.).

**Fig. 2.3** RDA biplot showing site scores with the four WUI areas dry sclerophyll woodland (DS), wet sclerophyll gully (GU), household gardens (HG) and public parks and recreational grounds (PR). Shaded areas of the same colour as the points show the convex hull of the site scores.

**Fig. 2.4 Part 1** The distributions of dominant plant species among dry sclerophyll woodland (DS), wet sclerophyll gully (GU), household gardens (HG), and public parks and recreational (PR) sites and the proportion of sites occupied by each species (i.e. occupancy) within each area. The names of non-native species are shaded in grey.

**Fig. 2.4 Part 2** The distributions of dominant plant species among dry sclerophyll woodland (DS), wet sclerophyll gully (GU), household gardens (HG), and public parks and recreational (PR) sites and the proportion of sites occupied by each species (i.e. occupancy) within each community. The names of non-native species are shaded in grey.

**Fig. 2.5 Part 1** Mean local abundances of dominant plant species among dry sclerophyll woodland (DS), wet sclerophyll gully (GU), household gardens (HG), and public parks and recreational (PR) sites. Local abundance was measured as class 1 (25–50% cover), class 2 (51–75% cover), class 3 (76–100% cover). The names of non-native species are shaded in grey.



**Fig. 2.5 Part 2** Mean local abundances of dominant plant species among dry sclerophyll woodland (DS), wet sclerophyll gully (GU), household gardens (HG), and parks and recreational (PR) sites. Local abundance was measured as class 1 (25–50% cover), class 2 (51–75% cover), class 3 (76–100% cover). The names of non-native species are shaded in grey.

**Fig. 2.6** Boxplots of total species richness (plots a-d), native species richness (e-h) and exotic species richness (i-l) for all strata (a, e, i), the understorey (b, f, j), the midstorey (c, g, k) and the overstorey (d, h, l) in the four WUI areas (DS = dry sclerophyll woodland, GU = wet sclerophyll gully, HG = household gardens, PR = public parks and recreational grounds). Red letters below boxplots indicate which areas are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ).

**Fig. 2.7** Mosaic plot of the  $\chi^2$  contingency table with growth form forming rows, and WUI areas forming columns. Column width indicates the proportion of all study sites in each area. The height of the 'tiles' indicates the proportion of species in each growth form in each area. Tiles are coloured by values of Pearson residuals (key at top right), with values  $< -3$  or  $> 3$  strongly contributing to the significance of the test. Broken lines link tiles for clarity.

**Fig. 2.8** (a) Boxplots of phylogenetic diversity by plant community, with letters below boxplots indicating which communities are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ) and (b) coefficients from the plant community x species richness interaction term. Coloured points and lines in (b) match the colours of the plant communities in (a).

**Fig. 3.1** A general diagram of the shoot flammability device used in this research. (a) Gas cylinder, (b) gas flow tap, (c) grill, (d) butane blowtorch, (e) water bath (for extinguishing samples), (f) Wind protection hood, (g) lockable wheels, (h) BBQ barrel, (i) low flammability mat, (j) portable stand.

**Fig. 3.2** Alternate view of the shoot flammability device. (a) Blowtorch, (b) shoot sample (*Acacia podalyriifolia*), (c) BBQ grill, (d) BBQ burners.

**Fig 3.3a** Joy plot contains probability densities for time to flame scores (x-axis) across 45 WUI species (y-axis) grouped by WUI status (Urban, Wildland). Within groups species are arranged in ascending order (bottom = most flammable, top = least flammable) in terms of median ignition score. UN = urban native plants; UE = urban exotic plants; WN = wildland native plants; WE = wildland exotic plants.

**Fig. 3.3b** Joy plot for probability densities for values of burn time (x-axis) across WUI species (y-axis) grouped by WUI status (Urban, Wildland). Within groups species are arranged in ascending order (bottom = most flammable, top = least flammable) of median BT values. UN = urban native plants; UE = urban exotic plants; WN = wildland native plants; WE = wildland exotic plants. UN = urban native plants; UE = urban exotic plants; WN = wildland native plants; WE = wildland exotic plants.

**Fig. 3.3c** Joy plot contains probability densities for combustion temperatures (x-axis) across WUI species (y-axis) grouped by WUI status (Urban, Wildland). Within groups species are in ascending order (bottom = most flammable, top = least flammable) of median CT values. UN = urban native plants; UE = urban exotic plants; WN = wildland native plants; WE = wildland exotic plants.

**Fig. 3.3d** Joy plots contain probability densities for biomass consumed (x-axis) across 45 WUI species (y-axis), grouped by WUI status (Urban, Wildland). Within groups species are arranged in ascending order (bottom = most flammable, top = least flammable) of median BC values. Green = urban-exotic species; blue = urban-native species; orange = wildland-exotic species; purple = wildland-native species.

**Fig. 3.4** Boxplots for **(a)** mean time to flame (ignition) score, **(b)** mean burn time (BT), **(c)** mean combustion temperature (CT), **(d)** mean biomass consumed (BC) across all species. Box = interquartile range; line across box = mean; whiskers = range of values; points on the figures = species values; urban species = blue, wildland species = red; P = statistical significance.

**Fig. 3.5** Boxplots for **(a)** mean time to flame (ignition) score, **(b)** mean burn time (BT), **(c)** mean combustion temperature (CT), **(d)** mean biomass consumed (BC) across all species. Box = interquartile range; line across box = mean; whiskers = range of values; Points on the figures = species values; exotic species = blue, native species = red; P = statistical significance.

**Fig. 3.6** Boxplots for **(a)** mean time to flame (ignition) score, **(b)** mean burn time (BT), **(c)** mean combustion temperature (CT), **(d)** mean biomass consumed (BC) across all species. Box = interquartile range; line across box = mean; whiskers = range of values; Points on the figures = species values; Plant groups are as follows, UN = urban native species (blue); UE = urban exotic species (green); WN = wildland native species (purple); WE = wildland exotic species (orange); P = statistical significance. Note: WE category has one value, due to their only being one species (*L. camara*) in this category.

**Fig. 4.2** TTF score (y-axis) as function of shoot water content (x-axis) from RC2. Data points are species' mean values. P = statistical significance. Dot-dash line represents line of best fit.

**Fig. 4.3** (a) BT (y-axis) in relation to shoot RC1 (x-axis), which represents shoot dry weight. (b) BT (y-axis) in relation to shoot RC2 (x-axis), which represents shoot water content. (c) Mean BT (y-axis) for each plant group (x-axis). Each point on plots represents plant group's mean values, whiskers represent range in values across group. Triangles = urban species; diamonds = wildland species. Blue = urban native species; green = urban-exotic species; purple =

wildland native species. P = statistical significance. Letters indicate direction of statistical significance.

**Fig 4.4** (a) Relationship between CT (y-axis) and shoot RC1 (x-axis), which represents shoot dry biomass (DB). Data points represent species mean values. Dot-dash line represents line of best fit. (b) CT (y-axis) as a function of plant group (x-axis). Data points represent plant group's mean values, whiskers represent range in values across group. Triangles = urban species; diamonds = wildland species. Blue = urban native species; green = urban-exotic species; purple = wildland native species. P = statistical significance. Letters indicate direction of statistical significance.

**Fig. 4.5** (a) BC (x-axis) as a function of shoot RC1 (y-axis), which represents shoot water content. (b) BC (x-axis) as a function of shoot RC1 (y-axis), which represents shoot dry mass. Data points in (a) and (b) represent species mean values. Dot-dash line represents line of best fit. (c) BC (x-axis) as a function of plant group (y-axis). Each point on plots represents plant group's mean values, whiskers represent range in values across group. Triangles = urban species; diamonds = wildland species. Blue = urban native species; green = urban-exotic species; purple = wildland native species. P = statistical significance. Letters indicate direction of statistical significance.

## List of tables

**Table 2.1** Tests of differences in total species richness, native and exotic species richness among the four WUI areas, for all plant strata combined and separately for the understorey (US), midstorey (MS) and overstorey (OS). Significant P values in bold.

**Table 3.1** Species, family, status (native = N, exotic = E), WUI (wildland = W, urban = U), and WUI status (WN, WE, UN, UE) for the 45 study species. \* = species that were widespread in WUIs but were replacements of other study species.

### *Supplementary*

**Appendix 2.1** Native (N) and exotic (E) plant species recorded across the study sites with taxonomic family and growth form.

## **Abstract**

Wildfires can have detrimental impacts on biodiversity, human lives and infrastructure, particularly at the wildland-urban interface (WUI). The WUI consists of low-level urban development nested within a broader area of predominantly natural wildland vegetation, and as such, the WUI is the frontline of human-wildfire interactions. With many WUIs expanding and wildfires becoming more frequent it is critical that we understand wildfire risks and hazards at the WUI for effective future wildfire management. In this context, I investigate patterns in flammability of locally-abundant plant species from urban and wildland areas in a fire-prone WUI in the mid-lower Blue Mountains of eastern Australia.

I show that floristic composition of dominant plant species varies significantly among dry sclerophyll woodland and wet sclerophyll gully forest (wildland) and home gardens and parks and recreational (urban) areas of the WUI. Notably, urban areas have higher exotic species richness and canopy cover which is driven by the prevalence of exotics in household gardens. Given the significant floristic differences between urban and wildland areas, I then compare patterns in shoot flammability across 45 woody plant species between these WUI areas. I show that wildland plants are more flammable than urban plants via their longer burn times (higher sustainability) and larger amounts of consumed shoot biomass (higher consumability). In terms of native and exotic plants in wildland and urban areas, not only are wildland native plants more flammable than urban exotic plants, but urban native plants also have longer burn times, consume more biomass and in addition reach higher combustion temperatures (higher combustibility) than urban exotic plants. Across all species, I show that in general high-flammability plants contain lower shoot water content and have heavier shoot dry biomass than low-flammability plants. Shoot bulk density and degree of

ramification do not explain cross-species variation in flammability, and furthermore, none of the shoot traits measured were significant in explaining differences in shoot flammability among wildland-native, urban-native and urban-exotic species.

This thesis takes a novel approach to understanding fire risk at the WUI through the lens of shoot flammability. My findings enhance our knowledge of how plants burn and provide insights for selecting low flammability plants that may mitigate wildfire impacts on human lives and infrastructure. Furthermore, my work underscores the importance in understanding the influence of plant traits on flammability in fire-prone landscapes.