Fire risk report for Sophora tomentosa

Full Species Name Sophora tomentosa L.Family: FabaceaeCommon names: yellow necklacepod silverbushSynonyms:	0 I Lowest risk This species is likely a risk score of 0.16. This species was rank algorithm using the d predicted score of > . risk.	ed by our macl ata presented	hine learning on the next page. A
Known occurrences (as of 2020)	Summary of Fire ecology		
Veer first desure stades returnlined	Native habitat fire pr	oneness Fire	e-prone
	Fire promoting plant native range	in its No	
	Fire promoting plant introduced range*	in its No	
Year first documented as naturalized in Hawai'i: 2011 This species has been ranked by the Hawai'i Weed Risk Assessment program as Low Risk with a score of -3.	Regenerates after fir	e Yes	
	Promoted by fire	no	data
View photos on Starr Environmental	Reported flammable	* No	Data
View on Wikipedia View occurrences on iNaturalist	Relative is flammable	e* No	
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	"[described as being from a fire prone habitat]" https://bsapubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.3732/aj b.0800083 Fisher, J. B. (2008). Anatomy of axis contraction in seedlings from a fire prone habitat. American Journal of Botany, 95(11), 1337-1348.
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	No	

within the species introduced range)		
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	"[occured after 3 months- 1 year post fire; table 2]" https://www.scielo.br/pdf/abb/v18n4/23211.pdf Menezes, L. F. T. D., & Araujo, D. S. D. D. (2004). The structure and diversity of three areas of shrubby restinga vegetation were analyzed 3, 12 and 84 months after fire in the Marambaia Restinga, Rio de Janeiro State, Brazil. Acta Botanica Brasilica, 18(4), 771-780.
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?)	No	 "[S. japonica listed as modereratly flammable, 8 on a scale from 7 to 9]" #this is however a lab test and doesn't really represent ecological fuel conditions https://search.proquest.com/docview/214560108?fromope nview=true&pq-origsite=gscholar Wang, X., Niu, S., & Kan, Z. (2009). Properties and flammability of major tree species in the Beijing area. Frontiers of Forestry in China, 4(3), 304-308.
		"[Sophora microphillay listed as low/mod flammability]" #this is the only lab burn test that I actually trust https://www.publish.csiro.au/wf/pdf/WF15047 Wyse, S. V., Perry, G. L., O'Connell, D. M., Holland, P. S., Wright, M. J., Hosted, C. L., & Curran, T. J. (2016). A quantitative assessment of shoot flammability for 60 tree and shrub species supports rankings based on expert opinion. International Journal of Wildland Fire, 25(4), 466- 477.

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.

