Fire risk report for *Euphorbia ingens*

Full Species Name Euphorbia ingens E.Mey. ex Boiss.Family: EuphorbiaceaeCommon names: candelabra tree naboomSynonyms:	risk score of 0.25 This species was algorithm using t	ranked by ou he data prese	1 Highest risk risk in Hawai'i with a fire r machine learning ented 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 in Hawai'i: 2012 This species has been ranked by the Hawai'i Weed Risk Assessment program as High Risk with a score of 7.	Native habitat fi	re proneness	Fire-prone
	Fire promoting p native range	plant in its	No
	Fire promoting printroduced rang		No
	Regenerates after	er fire	Yes
	Promoted by fire	2	no data
View photos on Starr Environmental	Reported flamm	able*	Low
View on Wikipedia	Relative is flammable* No		No
View occurrences on iNaturalist			
View at Plants of Hawaii View photos on Flickr	*These values were used by the model to predict fire risk		

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?)	Fire- prone	"The savanna ecosystem in which E. ingens occurs covers approximately 35% of South Africa (Scholes, 1997; Scholes and Archer,1997). Savanna ecosystems are maintained by interactions among fire, herbivory and precipitation" #article does not mention how E. ingens interacts with fire https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sajb.2017.03.022 Van der Linde, J. A., Wingfield, M. J., Crous, C. J., Six, D. L., & Roux, J. (2017). Landscape degradation may contribute to large-scale die-offs of Euphorbia ingens in South Africa. South African Journal of Botany, 111, 144-152.
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	Yes	"[table 1 lists several sites with recent fires]" #does not explicitly claim regeneration, but they must survive if they were recorded on the survey and not killed. https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/31158/ VanDerLinde_Factors_2011.pdf?sequence=3 der Linde, V., & Alwyn, J. (2011). Factors associated with the decline of Euphorbia ingens in the Limpopo Province of South Africa (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).

within approximately one year post fire)		"Species such as Grewia and Euphorbiaceae are considered to be fire-sensitive and typically restricted to termite mounds instead of dominating the open savanna [6] However, Euphorbia candelabrum has been found to be quite widespread throughout the savanna and short-grass areas of the Queen Elizabeth National Park in Uganda. [7] This is an unusual habitat for tall succulents, as they have been proven to typically be poor invaders of frequently burned stands of land. " #E. candelbrum is a very closely related relative https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euphorbia_candelabrum
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?)	Low	#succulent, intrinsically low flammability.
Relative is flammable (Does a plant in the same genus meet the Reported Flammable criteria?)	No	#most euphorbias have a somewhat high water content. Although this genus is huge, there are likely some flammable members, but the highly succulent members are very likely not fire promoting.

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 https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/weed-fire-risk-assessments

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.

