## Fire risk report for Clitoria ternatea

Full Species Name Clitoria ternatea L.Family: FabaceaeCommon names: butterfly pea blue peaSynonyms:	risk score of <b>0.22</b> This species was a algorithm using the	ranked by our ne data prese	1 Highest risk risk in Hawai'i with a fire machine learning nted on the next page. A sts the plant is a high fire	
Known occurrences (as of 2020)	Summary of Fire ecology			
Year first documented as naturalized	Native habitat fi	e proneness	No Data	
	Fire promoting p native range	lant in its	No	
	Fire promoting p introduced range		No	
in Hawai'i: 1937 This species has been ranked by the Hawai'i Weed Risk Assessment program as High Risk with a score of 11.	Regenerates afte	er fire	Yes	
	Promoted by fire	2	No Data	
	Reported flamm	able*	No Data	
View photos on Starr Environmental				
View on Wikipedia	Relative is flammable* Yes			
View occurrences on iNaturalist				
View at Plants of Hawaii	*These values were used by the model to predict fire risk			
View photos on Flickr				

Detailed summary of Fire Ecology

Native habitat fire proneness (In any part of the plant's native range is its habitat described as fire prone due to natural or human caused fires?)	No Data	
Fire promoting plant in its native range (Does the species act as a major fuel source, increase fire severity, frequency, or modify fuel bed characteristics within its native range?)	No	
Fire promoting plant in its introduced range (Same as Fire Promoting Native but within the species introduced range)	No	
Regenerates after fire (Does the plant regrow after fire by any means? This includes resprouters, reseeders, and recruiters which dispersed into the area within approximately one year post fire)	Yes	"Downes (1966) reported clitoria had fiar recovery in the dry season from frost and fire" http://tropicalgrasslands.info/public/journals/4/Historic/Tro pical%20Grasslands%20Journal%20archive/PDFs/Vol_19_19 85/Vol_19_04_85_pp156_163.pdf Hall, T. J. (1985). Adaptation and agronomy of Clitoria ternatea L. in northern Australia. Tropical Grasslands, 19(14), 156-163.
Promoted by fire (Does the plant increase in abundance after a fire?)	No Data	
Reported flammable (Is the species described as being flammable, being a major wildfire fuel, or high fire risk?)	No Data	

Relative is flammable (Does a plant in the same genus meet the Reported Flammable criteria?)	Yes	"Because it was found in Henley Park plots which were burned every one to two years in the winter, it is fire- tolerant. [8] It resprouts quickly after fire, which can be supported by the fact that it resprouted within a month after fire in Pavon's study. [18] It attained its peak in two- year rough plots at one study in Henley Park and another near Bainbridge GA, which are plots that had undergone two growing seasons since the last burn.[8][19] This is supported by Greenberg's study, which shows the peak percent cover to be 16 months after fire around 80% [7] As well, one study found C. mariana to establish at sites after a burn that was rare or absent before the fire.[20] In Kush's
		supported by Greenberg's study, which shows the peak percent cover to be 16 months after fire around 80% [7] As well, one study found C. mariana to establish at sites after a
		study, this species along with milk-pea became the dominant species proceeding plots that were burned in the winter.[21]" http://coastalplainplants.org/wiki/index.php/Clitoria_maria na

Text in quotes are direct quotes from the source

Text in square brackets was added by the assessor to clarify something or to summarize from a figure. Text preceded by a "#" is comment from the assessor

The data presented were assembled from literature and database searches for each species using as much data as could be collected regarding the plant's fire ecology under natural conditions. Searches aimed to be exhaustive and consist of as much data as could be located in 2020. Our machine learning algorithm was trained on 49 species of plants which had their fire risk ranked by 49 managers in Hawai'i in November 2020. The model used a conditional random forest regression algorithm to predict scores for each species using the manager score as the response variable and the fire ecology traits of each plant as the predictor variables to generate a fire risk score. This trained model was then used to predict the fire risk for all species which were not ranked by managers. The model was calibrated such that it is 90% accurate at predicting high fire risk plants and 79% accurate at predicting low fire risk plants. This research and the resulting fire risk model has been published in the journal <u>Biological Invasions</u> by <u>Kevin</u> <u>Faccenda</u> and <u>Curt Daehler</u> (both at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa).

Note that the analysis doesn't account for a plant species' spatial distribution, population density, or distinct climate and ecosystem conditions (which can also influence fire risk). The fire risk of these species are mostly under "worst case" environmental conditions where the climate is dry enough to maintain fire, but wet enough to allow for plant growth and fuel accumulation. The fire risk ranking should not be taken as a stand-alone risk metric in prioritizing weed control

efforts. Rather, this information may also be useful for determining if a newly discovered species poses a potential fire threat in wildland areas.

More general information on the weed risks and ecology of non-native plants in Hawai'i is available from the Hawai'i Invasive Species Committee's <u>Weed Risk Assessment database</u>.

View more fact sheets at <a href="https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/weed-fire-risk-assessments">https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/weed-fire-risk-assessments</a>

Fact sheet prepared by Kevin Faccenda (<u>faccenda@hawaii.edu</u>) in November 2021. Data were prepared by Kevin Faccenda in 2020.

This research was funded by the Department of the Interior Pacific Islands Climate Adaptation Science Center. The project described in this publication was supported by Grant or Cooperative Agreement No.G20AC00073 to Curt Daehler from the United States Geological Survey. The views

and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Geological Survey. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement by the Pacific Islands Climate Adaptation Science Center or the National Climate Adaptation Science Center or the US Geological Survey.

