



GLOBAL MODELS CAN PRODUCE RELIABLE SMOKE EMISSION ESTIMATES FROM EUCALYPTUS FOREST FIRES

Characterising smoke emissions from the 2013 Eucalyptus forest fire in Southern Australia

M. N. Ndalila¹, G. J. Williamson¹ and D. M. J. S. Bowman¹

¹ School of Natural Sciences, University of Tasmania



Introduction

Episodic wildfires in Australian temperate forests have produced significant smoke emissions but have received less attention than the North American conifer forests and the Australian tropical savanna fires.

We use the Forcett-Dunalley fire as a case study to understand smoke emissions dynamics from temperate *Eucalyptus* ecosystems and compare a basic emissions model with a global model GFED.

Methods

- Map spatial patterns of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) emission using basic model (FS) that incorporates fine scale fuel attributes.
- Investigate the reliability of GFED by comparing with the basic model.
- Conduct a sensitivity analysis to determine the



Fig. 1: Spatial distribution of the two emissions types (in tonnes) from the fire using the basic model.

- The spatial distribution based on GFED was poor compared to basic model (Figs. 1, 2).
- Fire severity contributed to an emissions variability of 34-38%.

Discussion

We highlight GFED's reliability within the limits of emissions uncertainties in *Eucalyptus* ecosystems because of comparable:

- Burnt area estimates with FS inventory.
- Total CO₂ emissions with FS inventory.

Figures







effect of variability in fire severity on emissions estimation.

Results

- From the basic (FS) inventory, total CO_2 emission was 1.125 ± 0.232 Tg (or 56 t ha⁻¹) while $PM_{2.5}$ emission was 0.022 ± 0.006 Tg (or 1.1 t ha⁻¹).
- Both inventories produced comparable estimates for CO_2 (difference of 27%), but $PM_{2.5}$ estimates were a factor of three (or difference of 70%) lower for GFED.
- Temporal evolution of both CO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions (Fig. 3).

To further improve emissions estimation, we recommend the following:

- More detailed field assessments of coarse wood fuels (CWD) and fuel consumption.
- An upward revision of emissions factors for $PM_{2.5}$ within GFED.

Fig. 3: Daily variability of the two emission types from the Forcett-Dunalley fire between the fine scale (FS) and GFED inventories.

For more information, please email: mercy.ndalila@utas.edu.au



Business Cooperative Research Centres Program





© 2020 Bushfire and Natural Hazards CRC bnhcrc.com.au