



Greenhouse gas
emissions depend on
fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (ACP). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in ACP if available.

Greenhouse gas emissions from laboratory-scale fires in wildland fuels depend on fire spread mode and phase of combustion

N. C. Surawski¹, A. L. Sullivan¹, C. P. Meyer², S. H. Roxburgh¹, and P. J. Polglase¹

¹CSIRO Land and Water Flagship and Agriculture Flagship, Clunies Ross St, Acton, ACT 2601, Australia

²CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Flagship, Station St, Aspendale, VIC 3195, Australia

Received: 4 August 2014 – Accepted: 27 August 2014 – Published: 8 September 2014

Correspondence to: N. C. Surawski (nicholas.surawski@csiro.au)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	



Abstract

Experimental fires were conducted in a combustion wind tunnel facility to explore the role of fire spread mode on the resulting emissions profile from combustion of fine (< 6 mm) Eucalyptus litter fuels. Fires were burnt spreading with the wind (heading fire), perpendicular to the wind (flanking fire) and against the wind (backing fire). Greenhouse gas compounds (i.e. CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O) and CO were quantified using off-axis integrated-cavity-output spectroscopy (off-axis ICOS). A dilution system was employed with the off-axis ICOS technique to prevent spectral broadening of the CO emissions peak and to enable simultaneous quantification of N₂O and CO. The forward rate of spread was 20 times faster and the Byram fireline intensity was 20 times higher for heading fires compared to flanking and backing fires. Emissions factors calculated using a carbon mass balance technique (along with statistical testing) showed that most of the carbon was emitted as CO₂, with heading fires emitting 17% more CO₂ than flanking and 9.5% more CO₂ than backing fires, and about twice as much CO. Heading fires had less than half as much carbon remaining in combustion residues. Statistically significant differences in CH₄ and N₂O emissions factors were not found with respect to fire spread mode. Emissions factors calculated per unit of dry fuel consumed showed that combustion phase (i.e. flaming or smouldering) had a statistically significant impact, with CO and N₂O emissions increasing during smouldering combustion and CO₂ emissions factors decreasing. Findings on the equivalence of different emissions factor reporting methods are discussed along with the impact of our results for emissions accounting. The primary implication of this study is that prescribed fire practices might be modified to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions from forested landscapes by the preferential application of flanking and backing fires over heading fires. Future research could involve wind tunnel testing with more realistic fuel architectures and could also quantify particulate emissions with different fire spread modes.

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



1 Introduction

Wildfires emit a variety of pollutants to the atmosphere which have impacts on global warming, biogeochemical cycles, ambient air quality and human health (Mack et al., 2011; Monks et al., 2009; Weinhold, 2011). Globally, wildfires contribute approximately 23% of total anthropogenic greenhouse gas equivalent emissions (Houghton et al., 2009; van der Werf et al., 2010) although there can be significant year-to-year variability. Furthermore, increases in wildfire occurrence have been observed in many parts of the world during the last decade, including the Western United States (Running, 2006), the Mediterranean region (Portugal, Spain and Greece) (Vicente et al., 2011) and Australia (Cai et al., 2009).

The main greenhouse gas species of interest emitted by wildfire include CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O. Wildfires also emit particulate matter (PM) to the atmosphere that has an impact on climate due to its ability to absorb and scatter light (Reid et al., 2005). In addition, the effect of wildfire PM on the aerosol indirect effect (i.e. cloud formation) remains poorly quantified at present (Bowman et al., 2009).

Despite considerable progress since the pioneering works on emissions from biomass burning by Crutzen et al. (1979), and Seiler and Crutzen (1980), only recently has the chemical composition of biomass burning smoke been quantified in detail. Yokelson et al. (2013) deployed a Fourier Transform Infra-Red Spectrometer (FTIR) and a range of different mass spectrometry systems to quantify 204 trace gas species, with a further 153 species being quantified but not able to be identified from the resulting mass spectra. Most of these compounds were non-methane hydrocarbons which play a role in ozone and secondary organic aerosol formation (Akagi et al., 2011). Based on this work there now appears to be detailed knowledge on the chemical composition of smoke from biomass burning from fuels located in the south-east and south-west of the United States. However, measurements of N₂O emissions from biomass burning are not commonly reported.

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The various sections of wildfire perimeters propagate with three different orientations in response to the prevailing wind direction. Fire perimeters can propagate with the wind (i.e. a heading fire) against the wind (i.e. a backing fire) and perpendicular to the wind (i.e. a flanking fire) (Sullivan et al., 2012). The individual fire spread modes (i.e. heading, flanking and backing) within a larger overall fire exhibit different fire behaviour (such as different rates of spread, flame heights, combustion factors and fire-line intensities) which could lead to differences in emissions with respect to fire spread mode. Laboratory experiments testing the role of fire spread mode on fire behaviour and emissions have been conducted once before with Keene et al. (2006) referring to flanking fires as mixed combustion fires. Keene et al. reported differences in modified combustion efficiency (MCE) with different fire spread modes and report higher emissions factors for acetic acid (CH_3COOH) for heading and flanking fires compared to backing fires.

The only greenhouse gas compound measured in the study of Keene et al. was CO_2 ; however, detailed particulate emissions measurements were made. In this study, we re-examine the burning methodology of Keene et al. in a controlled laboratory study with an explicit experimental design combined with statistical testing of results. As such, examining the hypothesis that greenhouse gas emissions could depend on fire spread mode is the major focus of this article. The validity of this hypothesis has the implication that if emissions were dependent on fire spread mode, opportunities could open up to dramatically improve the precision with which greenhouse gas estimates of wildfire events are made and, perhaps more importantly, to strategically manage prescribed burning operations in forested landscapes to minimise greenhouse gas emissions by changing the applied fire spread mode of such fires.

In this study, the impact of fire spread mode on greenhouse gas (CO_2 , CH_4 , N_2O) emissions (plus CO) profiles from the combustion of dry eucalypt forest litter was tested in a combustion wind tunnel facility. Dry eucalypt forest fuel was selected for this study as it is the dominant flora of south-eastern Australia with this region being representative of fire activity in Australian temperate forests. Emissions estimates derived from

this study build upon previous research efforts undertaken globally in temperate forest, where it is noted that emissions estimates from this ecological biome are rare in Australia (van Leeuwen and van der Werf, 2011).

In addition to testing the role of fire spread mode (i.e. heading, flanking and backing) on greenhouse gas emissions, the role of combustion phase (i.e. flaming or smouldering) and the temporal progression of emissions factors during a complete fire are explicitly tested with appropriate statistical methods. We also report findings on different methods for reporting emission factors and demonstrate the impact of our results with reference to greenhouse gas emissions accounting from prescribed burning in Australia. Overall, the results from this study provide a new body of information on biomass burning emission estimates from a region that has been poorly characterised in the past.

2 Methodology

2.1 Combustion wind tunnel details

Experiments were conducted in the CSIRO Pyrotron (see Fig. 1) which is a 25.6 m long combustion wind tunnel facility designed to investigate the behaviour and emissions of laboratory-scale fires (Sullivan et al., 2013). Wind for experiments is generated upstream from the working section by a 1.372 m diameter centrifugal fan (model 54LSW) from Fans and Blowers Australia Pty Ltd. Positioned downstream of the fan in the settling section are four perforated screens and a flow straightener for removing as much turbulence from the air stream as possible (turbulence intensity < 0.6 %) (Sullivan et al., 2013). The working section, where fuel is placed for experimental burns and where combustion takes place, is 1.5 m wide and 4.8 m long. Gas phase emissions samples were obtained from the exit section of the wind tunnel, downstream of the working section. Two 12.7 mm diameter stainless steel tubes positioned at a height of

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



840 mm above the floor of the combustion wind tunnel were used to sample gas and particle phase samples separately.

2.2 Fuel collection and preparation

Forest litter fuel was collected from Kowen Forest in the north-east of the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), Australia during late summer (see Fig. 2), in a stand dominated by *Eucalyptus macrorhyncha* (F. Muell.) and *E. rossii* (R. T. Bak. & H. G. Sm.). The fine fuel (< 6 mm diameter) litter layer was collected because it is the primary fuel layer combusted during forest fires in south-eastern Australia (Sullivan et al., 2012) and was comprised of leaf, bark and twig components. An attempt was made during the fuel collection not to include coarse fuel elements (such as large pieces of bark, twigs, logs and branches) greater than 6 mm in diameter. After fuel collection, it was sieved to remove coarse fuel fractions that were not removed in the field. Fuel sieving also removed fragmented material from the soil fermentation layer which can affect the ability of a fire to propagate and its combustion phase.

A dry fine fuel load of 1.1 kg m^{-2} (or 11 t ha^{-1}) was used which is typical of dry sclerophyll forest and is equivalent to that experienced during a major Australian wildfire (the 2009 Kilmore East fire) in dry sclerophyll forest (with a low understorey) in Victoria (Cruz et al., 2012). The moisture content of the fuel was measured prior to weighing to ensure that the correct dry fuel weight was achieved. Fuel moisture measurements before fuel drying were performed with a Wiltronics fine fuel moisture meter (Chatto and Tolhurst, 1997) which uses the electrical resistance of a plant sample to measure its water content.

After weighing out the fuel with ambient moisture content it was dried in an oven at 50°C for 24 h to reduce the fuel moisture content to a level typical of that for fine fuels during major Australian wildfires (< 5 % oven-dry weight) (Cruz et al., 2012; McArthur, 1967; Sullivan and Matthews, 2013). Prior to each experimental burn, three to five sub-samples were collected in tins from the fuel bed to measure the fuel moisture

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



content. The tins were oven-dried at 105 °C for 24 h (Matthews, 2010) with fuel moisture contents between 4.6–6.8 % being achieved (see Table 1).

Fuel was spread in the working section of the wind tunnel to make the fuel bed as homogeneous as possible in terms of depth and the structural arrangement of leaf, bark and twig components. Mean fuel depths were between 24.2 and 33.6 mm for the experimental fires. Three unburnt fuel samples were sorted and weighed throughout the course of the experiment to establish the relative proportions of leaf (23.2 %), bark (28.6 %) and twig (48.2 %) components. The size of the fuel bed was 6 m² (4 m × 1.5 m) for heading fires and 2.25 m² (1.5 m × 1.5 m) for flanking and backing fires.

Fires were ignited using a 1.5 m channel filled with ethanol (60 mL volume), which was placed in a different position (relative to the air flow) for each fire spread mode and lit with a gas lighter. Each fire spread mode was replicated six times (with the level of replication being based on Mulvaney (2012) and Mulvaney et al., 2014) to enable the experimental uncertainty to be reduced to a satisfactory level. This level of replication resulted in a total of 18 fires. A wind speed of 1.5 m s⁻¹ was used in all fire experiments.

2.3 Emissions measurements

Gas phase measurements were performed using off-axis ICOS, a laser-based absorption technique used in commercially available instruments from Los Gatos Research (<http://www.lgrinc.com/>). One instrument measured CO₂/CH₄ (Greenhouse Gas Analyser GGA-24r-EP) and the other measured N₂O/CO (N₂O/CO Analyser 907-0015) with both instruments operating in slow flow mode. The method works by directing a laser beam into an optical cavity equipped with high reflectivity dielectric coated mirrors (with mirror losses around 100 ppm capable of being achieved) (Baer et al., 2002). The absorption signal is determined by the temporal decay (or “ringdown”) of the light transmitted through the cavity due to absorption (based on the Beer–Lambert law) which is modelled as an exponential decay process (O’Keefe and Deacon, 1988).

Due to the highly reflective nature of the mirrors, optical path lengths of several kilometres can be achieved, making the technique highly suited for the detection of trace

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



gas species (Baer et al., 2002). Off-axis ICOS is a relatively new method in cavity ring down spectroscopy that is simpler to operate as the optical alignment of the laser beam with respect to the optical cavity does not need to be mode-matched (Baer et al., 2002). Both instruments collected data with a 1 Hz sampling frequency. Particle phase emissions measurements were also made during experiments, but we reserve the presentation of those results for a future publication.

For gas measurements, the sample flow was diluted with zero air to enable simultaneous quantification of N_2O and CO. During calibrations (Fig. 3) there was spectral broadening of the CO absorbance peak with smouldering combustion (CO concentrations in excess of 10 ppm) which prevented the N_2O absorbance peak from being quantified accurately. To keep the CO concentration below 10 ppm and prevent the spectral broadening, a dilution ratio between 5.7 and 6.0 for flanking and backing fires and between 5.9 and 10.7 for heading fires were used. Heading fires required the initial dilution ratio to be increased during the experiment which is why these dilution ratios are greater than those for flanking and backing fires.

Calibration of the N_2O/CO instrument (before and after experiments) against bottled CO gas gave coefficients of determination of 0.9993 and 0.9996 based on a linear fit between the measured CO concentration and the concentration provided by the calibration system, with slopes of these linear fits being 0.94 and 1.07. Overall, the calibrations performed before and after experiments confirmed the linear response and accuracy of the off-axis ICOS technique.

2.4 Data analysis

2.4.1 Calculation of emissions factors

Emissions ratios are widely used in biomass burning research to rectify the problems associated with plume sampling in environments subject to variable levels of dilution (Le Canut et al., 1996) and as such are used as an input to enable the calculation of emission factors. An emissions ratio (ER) is calculated via the following equation

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



and PC represents particulate carbon. NMHC have not been quantified in the current study; however, to complete the calculation of emissions factors in the above equation, an NMHC emissions factor of 0.0091 has been used based on the fire emissions work of Hurst et al. (1994a) in Australian savanna's. Note that there are no published estimates of PC emissions factors in Australian temperate forest so this term has been removed from the calculation of emissions factors. Removing PC emissions factors from the calculation of emission factors would have a very marginal impact on the final results with an upwards bias of < 1–2 % being likely (Yokelson et al., 1999).

To calculate carbon-based emission factors for compounds other than CO₂ the following equation was used:

$$EF_X = \frac{\Delta X}{CO_2} n EF_{CO_2}, \quad (3)$$

where n is the number of carbon atoms in the compound of interest.

By definition, the sum of all carbon-based emission factors equals the fraction of fuel carbon that is emitted to the atmosphere. This expression is given by:

$$\sum_X EF_X = \frac{\sum C_{emit}}{C_{fuel}}. \quad (4)$$

To estimate emissions factors for N₂O, the excess mixing ratio for N₂O is substituted into the numerator of Eq. (3) and is then divided by the molar nitrogen-to-carbon ratio of the fuel. Performing this calculation makes nitrogen-based emission factors independent of the nitrogen content of the fuel (Hurst et al., 1994b). Nitrogen-to-carbon ratios (0.73 %) were measured from un-burnt fuel samples, consisting of leaf, bark and twig components, using Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrometry.

Whilst reporting emissions factors on a per unit element basis is common in inventory reporting, in atmospheric chemistry it is common to report emissions factors per unit of dry fuel consumed. The carbon mass balance method used to present emissions

factors this way is discussed by Yokelson et al. (1999) and Paton-Walsh et al. (2014) and for carbon containing species is given by the following equation:

$$EF_i = F_C \cdot 1000 \cdot \frac{MM_i}{12} \cdot \frac{C_i}{C_T}, \quad (5)$$

where EF_i is the mass of compound i emitted per kg of dry fuel consumed, F_C is the fuel carbon content (measured before burning: 51.6%), 1000 is a units conversion factor (1000 g kg^{-1}), MM_i is the molecular mass of species i , 12 is the atomic mass of carbon, C_i/C_T is the number of moles of species i emitted divided by the total number of moles of carbon emitted.

When using CO_2 as a reference gas, C_i/C_T is given by:

$$\frac{C_i}{C_T} = \frac{\frac{\Delta C_i}{\Delta \text{CO}_2}}{\sum_j \text{NC}_j \frac{\Delta C_j}{\Delta \text{CO}_2}}, \quad (6)$$

where ΔC_i and ΔC_j are the excess mixing ratios for species i and j and NC_j is the number of carbon atoms in species j .

To calculate N_2O emissions factors per unit of dry fuel consumed, the following equation (based on Andreae and Merlet, 2001) was used:

$$EF_{\text{N}_2\text{O}} = EF_{\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{CO}_2} \cdot \frac{MM_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}}{MM_{\text{CO}_2}} \cdot EF_{\text{CO}_2}. \quad (7)$$

This equation uses a molar emissions ratio for $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{CO}_2$, the CO_2 emissions factor and the respective molecular masses to calculate an emissions factor.

2.4.2 Other calculations

Time series data of excess mixing ratios was calculated by subtracting the diluted ambient readings for emissions before the test from the plume diluted concentrations, as

the emissions from the fire only (and not ambient air) were of interest. Concentrations were then multiplied by the dilution ratio to enable undiluted plume concentrations to be calculated.

Emissions factors reported on a per unit dry fuel consumed basis were estimated (using Eq. (5) for carbon containing species and Eq. (7) for N_2O) separately for the flaming and smouldering combustion phases of each fire. Furthermore, plotting the results of Eqs. (5) and (7) vs. time enabled time series of emissions factors ($g\ kg^{-1}$) to be calculated.

2.4.3 Statistical analysis of data

Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was performed to test for the statistical significance of fire spread mode (a categorical factor) and fine fuel moisture content (a numerical covariate) on the emissions factors measured. The one-way MANCOVA analysis involved testing hypotheses related to a single categorical variable and a single numerical covariate. The statistical models fitted to the data were of the following form:

$$Y_{ijk} = \underbrace{\mu}_{\text{Grand mean}} + \underbrace{\alpha_{ij}}_{\text{Treatment effect}} + \underbrace{\beta_{ij}}_{\text{Covariate effect}} + \underbrace{\epsilon_{ijk}}_{\text{Residual}} \quad (8)$$

where Y_{ijk} is the response (i.e. the emissions factor) for the i th emissions species for the j th fire spread mode and for the k th replicate.

The null hypothesis (H_0) being tested for the categorical variable (fire spread mode) was:

$$H_0 : \mu_{iH} = \mu_{iF} = \mu_{iB} \quad \text{for } \forall i, \quad (9)$$

where H, F and B denote the levels of the fire spread mode factor (i.e. heading, flanking and backing fires).

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	



This hypothesis states that different fire spread modes (i.e. heading, backing and flanking) do not lead to significant differences in emissions for all species investigated (i.e. CO₂, CO, CH₄, N₂O and residue carbon).

The alternative hypothesis (H_1) being tested was that at least one of the μ_{ij} comparisons in Eq. (9) were concluded to differ.

The null hypothesis being tested for the covariate (fine fuel moisture content) was:

$$H_0 : \beta_{iH} = \beta_{iF} = \beta_{iB} \quad \text{for } \forall i, \quad (10)$$

while the alternative hypothesis tested that at least one of the β_{ij} slope comparisons in Eq. (10) were concluded to differ.

In addition, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed to test whether fire spread mode and combustion phase (i.e. flaming or smouldering combustion) had a statistically significant impact on emissions factors reported on a per unit dry fuel consumed basis. The statistical models fitted and hypotheses tested had the same structure as Eq. (8), except instead of having a single factor and a covariate, two categorical factors (i.e. fire spread mode and combustion phase) were fitted in this two-way MANOVA. All statistical tests were conducted using R v 3.03 and a significance level of 5 % was used to determine statistical significance.

3 Results

Table 1 reports summary statistics from the fire experiments which shows that flanking and backing fires are quite similar in terms of their Byram fireline intensity (Byram, 1959), rate of spread and duration of smouldering combustion. Heading fires burnt about 20 times faster (for rate of forward spread) and with approximately 20 times higher fireline intensity than flanking or backing fires. Furthermore, the duration of flaming combustion was about 75 % less with heading fires and smouldering combustion was more than twice as long. Table 2 reports emissions factors for all four emissions species per unit dry fuel consumed.

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Time series data for the excess mixing ratios of CO₂, CO, CH₄, and N₂O are shown in Fig. 5. The two most striking aspects are the relative magnitudes of the emissions peaks, and also differences in the combustion duration for different fire spread modes. Heading fires produced very pronounced peaks during flaming combustion for all emissions species considered, whereas flanking and backing fires exhibit less temporal variability in their emissions with less pronounced peaks. The temporal variability in emissions is very similar for flanking and backing fires.

Emissions factors for carbon- and nitrogen-based species using the carbon mass balance approach show that between 63–74 % of fuel carbon is emitted to the atmosphere as CO₂, and about 5.7–13 % is emitted as CO (Fig. 6), 0.36–0.53 % as CH₄ and 0.35–0.57 % of fuel nitrogen as N₂O (Fig. 6). For heading fires, the CO₂ emissions factor was about 17 % greater than flanking fires and 9.5 % higher than backing fires and CO emission factors were about twice as high for heading fires than for the other two fire spread modes. The fraction of unburnt and partially burnt fuel (residue) ranges from 12 % of fuel carbon for heading fires up to 30 % of fuel carbon for flanking fires. During some experiments, it was difficult to get flanking fires to propagate with a continuous flame front which offers an explanation for the greater production of combustion residue (due to patchiness) during these fires.

Statistical testing of the results with MANCOVA indicated that fine fuel moisture content (i.e. the covariate) did not have an impact on emissions factors ($p = 0.60$); however, fire spread mode was a statistically significant factor ($p < 0.0001$). Fire spread mode had a statistically significant effect on CO₂ ($p < 0.0001$), CO ($p < 0.0001$) and carbon residue emissions ($p < 0.0001$) but did not have a statistically significant effect on CH₄ ($p = 0.269$) or N₂O emissions ($p = 0.261$). Testing with pairwise comparisons showed that CO₂ emissions factors for all paired combinations of fire spread mode (i.e. heading vs. backing, heading vs. flanking and flanking vs. backing) were statistically different ($p < 0.0001$ for all comparisons). For CO emissions, heading vs. backing and heading vs. flanking emissions factors were statistically different ($p < 0.0001$ for

all comparisons); however, flanking emissions factors were not statistically different to backing emissions factors ($p = 0.962$).

As shown previously (see Fig. 6), emissions factors for different chemical species varied significantly with respect to fire spread mode. In addition, the different phases of combustion (e.g. flaming, smouldering, and glowing) during a fire have different fire behaviour and, therefore, potentially different emissions profiles (Lee et al., 2010). To test this hypothesis, emissions factors (per unit of dry fuel consumed) were calculated separately for flaming and smouldering phases for the 18 experimental fires (see Fig. 7). The results confirm that both CO and CH₄ emissions ratios were substantially increased during smouldering combustion. CO emissions factors ranged from 72–102 g kg⁻¹ during flaming combustion and ranged from 189–221 g kg⁻¹ during smouldering combustion. CH₄ emissions factors ranged from 2.4–3.8 g kg⁻¹ during flaming combustion and 5.0–10.5 g kg⁻¹ during smouldering combustion. With more carbon being emitted as either CO or CH₄ during smouldering combustion, this led to decreases in the CO₂ emissions factor, with CO₂ emissions factors ranging from 1705–1750 g kg⁻¹ during flaming combustion and from 1515–1550 g kg⁻¹ during smouldering combustion. Alternatively, N₂O emissions factors did not increase during smouldering combustion for heading fires but did increase for both backing and flanking fires.

The MANOVA analysis confirms that combustion phase ($p < 0.0001$) had a statistically significant impact on emissions factors (reported per unit of dry fuel consumed) and so did fire spread mode, but only for the heading fire vs. flanking fire comparison ($p = 0.04$). CO₂ emissions factors were lower during smouldering combustion ($p < 0.0001$) whilst CO emissions factors were increased ($p < 0.0001$). CH₄ emissions factors did not exhibit statistically significant differences with respect to combustion phase ($p = 0.12$) but N₂O emissions factors did ($p = 0.04$). Furthermore, N₂O emissions factors exhibited a relationship with fire spread mode ($p = 6.5 \times 10^{-3}$) with heading fires producing less N₂O than flanking or backing fires.

Time resolved emissions factors (on a per dry fuel consumed basis) were calculated and are shown in Fig. 8. This graph shows that the CO₂ emissions factor peaks early

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



bon deposited in ash were measured, meaning that these sources of error have been eliminated from the analysis.

A further source of error which has received limited discussion in the literature relates to the equivalence of the methods described in Eqs. (2) or (5). In particular, the calculation of total emissions from a fire should not depend on which metric is used to calculate emissions factors. The method described in Eq. (2) is commonly used in inventory reporting and is a well-established methodology. In contrast, applying Eq. (5) to estimate total emissions would involve multiplying the area burnt, fuel load, combustion factor and emissions factor and would not report the same result as Eq. (2). The reason for this discrepancy is that the method described in Eq. (5) does not explicitly consider the fraction of total fuel carbon emitted to the atmosphere. Instead, this method implicitly assumes that all fuel carbon is emitted to the atmosphere.

Making the assumption that all fuel carbon is emitted to the atmosphere might be acceptable in the headfire of a high intensity wildfire; however, in the current work a significant fraction of fuel carbon (12–30%) is contained in the post-fire residue and furthermore displays a trend with respect to fire spread mode. As a result, in burning conditions representative of prescribed burning it is not acceptable to assume that all fuel carbon is emitted to the atmosphere and instead this fraction should be estimated, as recommended by Andreae and Merlet (2001) and as done in the current work. Multiplication of Eq. (5) by $\sum C_{\text{emit}}/C_{\text{fuel}}$ would enable the per unit dry fuel consumed method of reporting emissions factors to report the same total emissions as the per unit element method. Performing this correction leads to the correct trend in CO₂ emission factors with respect to fire spread mode, with heading fires (1407 g kg⁻¹) emitting more CO₂ than flanking (1200 g kg⁻¹) or backing fires (1284 g kg⁻¹).

4.2 Comparison with field derived measurements

This emissions study was performed in a combustion wind tunnel facility with the relationship of the results obtained with those acquired in the field constituting a very important validation exercise. Recently Volkova et al. (2014) explored the relationship

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



of fuel reduction burning on the carbon and greenhouse gas emissions from subsequent wildfire in temperate forest in Victoria, Australia. Measurements of CH_4 and N_2O emission factors over a very wide MCE range (0.7–1) were made during fuel reduction burning. The laboratory-derived CH_4 and N_2O emissions factors are in very good agreement with those measured by Volkova et al. who measured CH_4 emission factors between 0.5–1.5 % and N_2O emission factors between 0.4–1 % over the MCE range relevant to the laboratory measurements (0.82–0.93).

Another valuable source of data for comparison is the dataset of Paton-Walsh et al. (2014) who recently measured trace gas emissions factors with an FTIR system during prescribed fires in temperate forests in New South Wales, Australia. CO_2 emissions factors are slightly smaller for heading fires (~ 1.5 %) and are larger for flanking (~ 5 %) and backing fires (~ 6 %) compared to Paton-Walsh et al. Keeping in mind that emissions sampling from an active fire front will involve contributions from different fire spread modes (especially heading and flanking) makes the overall CO_2 emissions profile from our measurements consistent with those reported by Paton-Walsh et al.

Our CO emissions measurements are significantly higher for heading fires (~ 45 %) due to significant smouldering after the progression of the flame front (see Fig. 8), but are lower for flanking (17 %) and backing fires (~ 19 %). CH_4 emission factors are higher for heading (20 %) and flanking (23 %) fires but are slightly lower for backing (~ 6 %) fires. Increases in the CH_4 and CO emissions factors are consistent with sampling at a lower MCE in the combustion wind tunnel compared to the results of Paton-Walsh et al. Our MCE range was 0.82–0.93, whereas the recommended emissions factors reported by Paton-Walsh et al. are based on an MCE average of 0.90. In contrast the N_2O emissions factors are lower for heading (~ 41 %), flanking (22 %) and backing (~ 57 %) compared to Paton-Walsh et al.

The only other published estimates of greenhouse gas emissions from temperate forest fires in Australia are those of Hurst et al. (1996) who measured CO_2 , CO and CH_4 emission factors for two wildfires in the Sydney region in February 1991, another wildfire in January 1994 and also a prescribed fire in March 1994. Averaged over four

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



ence to prescribed burning in Victoria. The Royal Commission into the 2009 bushfires in Victoria recommended that 5 % of Victoria's public land (approximately 390 000 ha) should be burnt by prescribed fires each year to reduce the risk of bushfires (Teague et al., 2010). Using state-based and country specific data from Australia's National Inventory System (Commonwealth of Australia, 2014) it is estimated that 5630 Giga-grams (Gg) of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂-e) emissions would be emitted from the burning of 390 000 ha. Using the emission and combustion factors derived from our experimental study (as an estimate of prescribed burning emission and combustion factors) and keeping all other inputs fixed yields estimates of: 5640 Gg of CO₂-e emissions if all the area is burnt by heading fire, 4200 Gg CO₂-e if burnt by flanking fire and 4990 Gg CO₂-e if burnt as a backing fire.

This calculation suggests that the preferential application of flanking fires over heading fires during prescribed burning operations would save approximately 1280 Gg of CO₂ emissions with 420 Gg being saved with backing fires. In addition, the application of flanking fires would leave an extra 265 Gg of carbon as a post-fire combustion residue (compared to heading fires) and backing fires would leave an extra 250 Gg; preventing further carbon emissions to the atmosphere. A further benefit to the application of non-heading fires during prescribed burning would be a reduction in CO emissions, which are implicated in respiratory health effects, with flanking fires emitting 330 Gg less CO (compared to heading fires) and backing fires emitting 290 Gg less.

In addition, the results have implications for carbon accounting methods considering that the Australia's National Inventory System does not currently discriminate between types of fire other than whether they are prescribed or wildfires. Given that, compared with heading fires, CO₂-e emissions are about 26 % lower for flanking fires and 11 % lower for backing fires, there is potentially scope for more accurate greenhouse inventory reporting by taking into account the mode of fire spread.

5 Conclusions

This study has explored the hypothesis (which was formulated and tested statistically) that fire spread mode and phase of combustion could lead to differences in emission factors of greenhouse gases from laboratory-scale fires conducted in a wind tunnel facility. We found that both fire spread mode and combustion phase had statistically significant impacts on emissions of greenhouse gases. Furthermore, the temporal progression of emission factors were markedly different for the three different fire spread modes.

In particular, we found that flanking and backing fires emitted less CO₂ and CO than heading fires and had more carbon remaining in combustion residues on a per unit carbon basis. These results have direct relevance to the management of forested landscapes that are affected by fire. Given the lower magnitude of greenhouse emissions species from flanking and backing fires this (potentially) opens up an opportunity to reduce carbon emissions from fire by the strategic use of these fire spread modes over heading fires. Future research activities could involve investigating greenhouse gas emissions for different fire spread modes but with more strata in the fuel bed which would better represent the way in which forest fuels burn in the field. In addition, the measurement of particulate emissions factors continues to be a significant avenue for future research.

Author contribution. All authors were involved in the experimental design. NCS, ALS and SHR performed the experiments with guidance from PJP. NCS performed the data analysis with input from ALS and CPM. NCS prepared the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Nigel England and Matthew Plucinski for their assistance during the experimental fires. This work was undertaken in the former Greenhouse Gas Abatement and Carbon Storage in Land Use Systems Theme of the Sustainable Agriculture Flagship. The authors wish to thank Michael Battaglia and Sandra Eady for their support of this project and their guidance.

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



References

- Akagi, S. K., Yokelson, R. J., Wiedinmyer, C., Alvarado, M. J., Reid, J. S., Karl, T., Crounse, J. D., and Wennberg, P. O.: Emission factors for open and domestic biomass burning for use in atmospheric models, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 4039–4072, doi:10.5194/acp-11-4039-2011, 2011. 23127, 23152
- 5 Andreae, M. O. and Merlet, P.: Emission of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 15, 955–966, doi:10.1029/2000gb001382, 2001. 23135, 23141, 23152
- Baer, D. S., Paul, J. B., Gupta, J. B., and O’Keefe, A.: Sensitive absorption measurements in the near-infrared region using off-axis integrated-cavity-output spectroscopy, *Appl. Phys B-Lasers O.*, 75, 261–265, doi:10.1007/s00340-002-0971-z, 2002. 23131, 23132
- 10 Bowman, D. M. J. S., Balch, J. K., Artaxo, P., Bond, W. J., Carlson, J. M., Cochrane, M. A., D’Antonio, C. M., DeFries, R. S., Doyle, J. C., Harrison, S. P., Johnston, F. H., Keeley, J. E., Krawchuk, M. A., Kull, C. A., Marston, J. B., Moritz, M. A., Prentice, I. C., Roos, C. I., Scott, A. C., Swetnam, T. W., van der Werf, G. R., and Pyne, S. J.: Fire in the earth system, *Science*, 324, 481–484, doi:10.1126/science.1163886, 2009. 23127
- Byram, G. M.: Forest fire behaviour, in: *Forest Fire Control and Use*, edited by: Davis, K., McGraw-Hill, New York, chap. 4, pp. 90–123, 1959. 23137
- 15 Cai, W., Cowan, T., and Raupach, M.: Positive Indian Ocean Dipole events precondition south-east Australia bushfires, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L19710, doi:10.1029/2009gl039902, 2009. 23127
- Chatto, K. and Tolhurst, K.: The Development and Testing of the Wiltronics T-H Fine Fuel Moisture Meter, Research Report No. 46, Fire Management Branch, Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Melbourne, Vic., 1997. 23130
- 25 Commonwealth of Australia: Australian National Greenhouse Accounts, National Inventory Report 2012, Volume 2, Canberra, 2014. 23144
- Crutzen, P. J., Heidt, L. E., Krasnec, J. P., Pollock, W. H., and Seiler, W.: Biomass burning as a source of atmospheric gases CO, H₂, N₂O, NO, CH₃CL and COS, *Nature*, 282, 253–256, doi:10.1038/282253a0, 1979. 23127
- 30 Cruz, M., Sullivan, A., Gould, J., Sims, N., Bannister, A., Hollis, J., and Hurley, R.: Anatomy of a catastrophic wildfire: the Black Saturday Kilmore East fire in Victoria, Australia, *Forest Ecol. Manag.*, 284, 269–285, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2012.02.035, 2012. 23130

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Department of Agriculture: Australian Coastal Outline and Landmass with State Boundaries, available at: http://data.daff.gov.au/anrdl/metadata_files/pa_nsaasr9nnd_02211a04.xml (last access: 4 September 2014), 2014. 23154

Houghton, R. A., Hall, F., and Goetz, S. J.: Importance of biomass in the global carbon cycle, *J. Geophys. Res.-Biogeo.*, 114, G00E03, doi:10.1029/2009jg000935, 2009. 23127

Hurst, D. F., Griffith, D. W. T., Carras, J. N., Williams, D. J., and Fraser, P. J.: Measurements of trace gases emitted by Australian savanna fires during the 1990 dry season, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 18, 33–56, doi:10.1007/bf00694373, 1994a. 23134

Hurst, D. F., Griffith, D. W. T., and Cook, G. D.: Trace gas emissions from biomass burning in tropical Australian savannas, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 99, 16441–16456, doi:10.1029/94jd00670, 1994b. 23134

Hurst, D. F., Griffith, D. W. T., and Cook, G. D.: Trace-gas emissions from biomass burning in Australia, in: *Biomass Burning and Global Change*, edited by: Levine, J., The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, vol. 2, 787–792, 1996. 23140, 23142, 23143

Keene, W. C., Lobert, R. M., Crutzen, P. J., Maben, J. R., Scharffe, D. H., Landmann, T., Hely, C., and Brain, C.: Emissions of major gaseous and particulate species during experimental burns of southern African biomass, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 111, D04301, doi:10.1029/2005jd006319, 2006. 23128

Le Canut, P., Andreae, M. O., Harris, G. W., Wienhold, F. G., and Zenker, T.: Airborne studies of emissions from savanna fires in southern Africa. 1. Aerosol emissions measured with a laser optical particle counter, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 101, 23615–23630, doi:10.1029/95jd02610, 1996. 23132

Lee, T., Sullivan, A. P., Mack, L., Jimenez, J. L., Kreidenweis, S. M., Onasch, T. B., Worsnop, D. R., Malm, W., Wold, C. E., Hao, W. M., and Collett, Jeffrey L., J.: Chemical smoke marker emissions during flaming and smoldering phases of laboratory open burning of wildland fuels, *Aerosol Sci. Tech.*, 44, I–V, doi:10.1080/02786826.2010.499884, 2010. 23139

Levine, J. and Cofer III, W.: Boreal forest fire emissions and the chemistry of the atmosphere, in: *Fire, Climate Change, and Carbon Cycling in the Boreal Forest*, edited by: Kasischke, E. S. and Stocks, B. J., Springer-Verlag, New York, 31–48, 2000. 23133

Lobert, J. M., Scharffe, D. H., Hao, W. M., and Crutzen, P. J.: Importance of biomass burning in the atmospheric budgets of nitrogen-containing gases, *Nature*, 346, 552–554, doi:10.1038/346552a0, 1990. 23143

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Mack, M. C., Bret-Harte, M. S., Hollingsworth, T. N., Jandt, R. R., Schuur, E. A. G., Shaver, G. R., and Verbyla, D. L.: Carbon loss from an unprecedented Arctic tundra wildfire, *Nature*, 475, 489–492, doi:10.1038/nature10283, 2011. 23127
- Matthews, S.: Effect of drying temperature on fuel moisture content measurements, *Int. J. Wildland Fire*, 19, 800–802, doi:10.1071/WF08188, 2010. 23131
- McArthur, A.: *Fire Behaviour in Eucalypt Forests*, Forest and Timber Bureau Leaflet No. 107, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, 1967. 23130
- Monks, P. S., Granier, C., Fuzzi, S., Stohl, A., Williams, M. L., Akimoto, H., Amann, M., Baklanov, A., Baltensperger, U., Bey, I., Blake, N., Blake, R. S., Carslaw, K., Cooper, O. R., Dentener, F., Fowler, D., Fragkou, E., Frost, G. J., Generoso, S., Ginoux, P., Grewe, V., Guenther, A., Hansson, H. C., Henne, S., Hjorth, J., Hofzumahaus, A., Huntrieser, H., Isaksen, I. S. A., Jenkin, M. E., Kaiser, J., Kanakidou, M., Klimont, Z., Kulmala, M., Laj, P., Lawrence, M. G., Lee, J. D., Liousse, C., Maione, M., McFiggans, G., Metzger, A., Mieville, A., Moussiopoulos, N., Orlando, J. J., O'Dowd, C. D., Palmer, P. I., Parrish, D. D., Petzold, A., Platt, U., Poeschl, U., Prevot, A. S. H., Reeves, C. E., Reimann, S., Rudich, Y., Sellegri, K., Steinbrecher, R., Simpson, D., ten Brink, H., Theloke, J., van der Werf, G. R., Vautard, R., Vestreng, V., Vlachokostas, C., and von Glasow, R.: Atmospheric composition change – global and regional air quality, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43, 5268–5350, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.08.021, 2009. 23127
- Mulvaney, J.: *The Inherent Variability of Fires in Naturally Heterogeneous Fuel Beds under Controlled Conditions*, Honours thesis, Fenner School of Environment and Society, Australian National University, Canberra, 2012. 23131
- Mulvaney, J. J., Sullivan, A. L., Cary, G. J., and Bishop, G. R.: Repeatability of free-burning fire experiments using heterogeneous natural forest fuel beds in a combustion wind tunnel, *Int. J. Wildland Fire*, submitted, 2014.
- O'Keefe, A. and Deacon, D. A. G.: Cavity ring-down optical spectrometer for absorption-measurements using pulsed laser sources, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 59, 2544–2551, doi:10.1063/1.1139895, 1988. 23131
- Paton-Walsh, C., Smith, T. E. L., Young, E. L., Griffith, D. W. T., and Guérette, É.-A.: New emission factors for Australian vegetation fires measured using open-path Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy – Part 1: methods and Australian temperate forest fires, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 14, 4327–4381, doi:10.5194/acpd-14-4327-2014, 2014. 23135, 23140, 23142, 23152

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Radke, L., Hegg, D., Lyons, J., Brock, C., and Hobbs, P.: Airborne measurements on smokes from biomass burning, in: *Aerosols and Climate*, edited by: Hobbs, P. and Patrick McCormick, M., A. Deepak Publishing, Hampton, Virginia, 411–422, 1988. 23133
- Reid, J. S., Koppmann, R., Eck, T. F., and Eleuterio, D. P.: A review of biomass burning emissions part II: intensive physical properties of biomass burning particles, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 799–825, doi:10.5194/acp-5-799-2005, 2005. 23127
- Running, S. W.: Is global warming causing more, larger wildfires?, *Science*, 313, 927–928, doi:10.1126/science.1130370, 2006. 23127
- Seiler, W. and Crutzen, P. J.: Estimates of gross and net fluxes of carbon between the biosphere and the atmosphere from biomass burning, *Climatic Change*, 2, 207–247, doi:10.1007/bf00137988, 1980. 23127
- Sullivan, A. L. and Matthews, S.: Determining landscape fine fuel moisture content of the Kilmore East “Black Saturday” wildfire using spatially-extended point-based models, *Environ. Modell. Softw.*, 40, 98–108, doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.08.008, 2013. 23130
- Sullivan, A. L., McCaw, W., Cruz, M., Matthews, S., and Ellis, P.: Fuel, fire weather and fire behaviour in Australian ecosystems, in: *Flammable Australia: Fire Regimes, Biodiversity and Ecosystems in a Changing World*, edited by: Bradstock, R., Gill, A., and Williams, R., CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Victoria, 51–77, 2012. 23128, 23130
- Sullivan, A. L., Knight, I. K., Hurley, R. J., and Webber, C.: A contractionless, low-turbulence wind tunnel for the study of free-burning fires, *Exp. Thermal Fluid Sci.*, 44, 264–274, doi:10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2012.06.018, 2013. 23129
- Teague, B., McLeod, R., and Pascoe, S.: 2009 Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission, Final Report Summary, State of Victoria, Melbourne, Vic., 2010. 23144
- Urbanski, S. P.: Combustion efficiency and emission factors for wildfire-season fires in mixed conifer forests of the northern Rocky Mountains, US, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 7241–7262, doi:10.5194/acp-13-7241-2013, 2013. 23143
- van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., Collatz, G. J., Mu, M., Kasibhatla, P. S., Morton, D. C., DeFries, R. S., Jin, Y., and van Leeuwen, T. T.: Global fire emissions and the contribution of deforestation, savanna, forest, agricultural, and peat fires (1997–2009), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 11707–11735, doi:10.5194/acp-10-11707-2010, 2010. 23127
- van Leeuwen, T. T. and van der Werf, G. R.: Spatial and temporal variability in the ratio of trace gases emitted from biomass burning, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3611–3629, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3611-2011, 2011. 23129

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



van Leeuwen, T. T., Peters, W., Krol, M. C., and van der Werf, G. R.: Dynamic biomass burning emission factors and their impact on atmospheric CO mixing ratios, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 118, 6797–6815, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50478, 2013. 23143

5 Vicente, A., Alves, C., Monteiro, C., Nunes, T., Mirante, F., Evtugina, M., Cerqueira, M., and Pio, C.: Measurement of trace gases and organic compounds in the smoke plume from a wildfire in Penedono (central Portugal), *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 5172–5182, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.06.021, 2011. 23127

10 Volkova, L., Meyer, C. P. M., Murphy, S., Fairman, T., Reisen, F., and Weston, C.: Fuel reduction burning mitigates wildfire effects on forest carbon and greenhouse gas emission, *Int. J. Wildland Fire*, doi:10.1071/WF14009, in press, 2014.

Weinhold, B.: Fields and forests in flames: vegetation smoke and human health, *Environ. Health Persp.*, 119, A386–A393, doi:10.1289/ehp.119-a386, 2011. 23127

15 Yokelson, R. J., Goode, J. G., Ward, D. E., Susott, R. A., Babbitt, R. E., Wade, D. D., Bertschi, I., Griffith, D. W. T., and Hao, W. M.: Emissions of formaldehyde, acetic acid, methanol, and other trace gases from biomass fires in North Carolina measured by airborne Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 104, 30109–30125, doi:10.1029/1999jd900817, 1999. 23134, 23135, 23140

20 Yokelson, R. J., Burling, I. R., Gilman, J. B., Warneke, C., Stockwell, C. E., de Gouw, J., Akagi, S. K., Urbanski, S. P., Veres, P., Roberts, J. M., Kuster, W. C., Reardon, J., Griffith, D. W. T., Johnson, T. J., Hosseini, S., Miller, J. W., Cocker III, D. R., Jung, H., and Weise, D. R.: Coupling field and laboratory measurements to estimate the emission factors of identified and unidentified trace gases for prescribed fires, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 89–116, doi:10.5194/acp-13-89-2013, 2013. 23127

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Table 1. Summary data from the fire experiments. Values are reported as the mean with the range reported as: (minimum value–maximum value).

Fire duration (s)	Flaming combustion duration (s)	Smouldering combustion duration (s)	Rate of spread (m h^{-1})	Combustion factor (–)	Residue carbon content (%)	Byram fireline intensity (kW m^{-1})
715 (580–840)	256 (224–290)	459 (356–582)	123 (103–150)	81.8 (77.7–84.4)	33.3 (29.4–66.2)	553 (462–693)
1085 (900–1530)	907 (763–1099)	178 (93–431)	6.6 (4.9–8.2)	71.6 (61.3–81.7)	54.0 (39.2–67.7)	26 (17–32)
1413 (1160–2230)	1196 (867–1988)	218 (72–533)	6.1 (4.2–7.5)	82.2 (77.3–86.4)	72.8 (34.8–78.9)	27 (20–32)

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Table 2. Emissions factors (\pm one standard deviation) for emissions species reported on a per unit of dry fuel burnt basis.

Data source	CO ₂ (g kg ⁻¹)	CO (g kg ⁻¹)	CH ₄ (g kg ⁻¹)	N ₂ O (g kg ⁻¹)
Heading fires (this study)	1594 \pm 46	172 \pm 30	4.2 \pm 0.5	0.089 \pm 0.043
Flanking fires (this study)	1709 \pm 18	98 \pm 11	4.3 \pm 2.7	0.117 \pm 0.071
Backing fires (this study)	1716 \pm 14	95 \pm 9	3.3 \pm 1.3	0.064 \pm 0.031
Andreae and Merlet (2001)	1569 \pm 131	107 \pm 37	4.7 \pm 1.9	0.26 \pm 0.07
Akagi et al. (2011)	1637 \pm 71	89 \pm 32	3.9 \pm 2.4	0.16 \pm 0.21
Paton-Walsh et al. (2014)	1620 \pm 30	118 \pm 16	3.5 \pm 1.1	0.15 \pm 0.09

Note that the emissions factors calculated in this study were based on measured carbon contents of 51.6 % and a molar nitrogen-to-carbon ratio of 0.73 %. Comparisons are also made with emission factors reported by Andreae and Merlet (2001) in global extra-tropical forest and Akagi et al. (2011) in global temperate forests. Emissions factors are also compared with those measured in Australian temperate forest by Paton-Walsh et al. (2014).

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)

[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)





Figure 1. A schematic (not to scale) of the experimental configuration used in the CSIRO Pyrotron for experimental fires.

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	






Figure 2. Location of the dry sclerophyll eucalypt forest for collection of litter ($35^{\circ}19'30.07''$ S, $149^{\circ}15'25.64''$ E). Shapefile of Australia sourced from Department of Agriculture (2014).

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.




Figure 4. Linear fits of excess mixing ratios (not corrected for the overall dilution ratio) using either CO_2 , CO or CH_4 as a reference gas. **(A)** CO plotted against CO_2 ($R^2 = 0.872$, $\text{CO} = -3.99 + 0.097\text{CO}_2$). **(B)** CH_4 plotted against CO_2 ($R^2 = 0.871$, $\text{CH}_4 = -0.14 + 0.0044\text{CO}_2$). **(C)** N_2O plotted against CO_2 ($R^2 = 0.811$, $\text{N}_2\text{O} = 0.0012 + 3.79 \times 10^{-5}\text{CO}_2$). **(D)** CH_4 plotted against CO ($R^2 = 0.942$, $\text{CH}_4 = -0.066 + 0.044\text{CO}$). **(E)** N_2O plotted against CO ($R^2 = 0.788$, $\text{N}_2\text{O} = 0.0035 + 3.61 \times 10^{-4}\text{CO}$). **(F)** N_2O plotted against CH_4 ($R^2 = 0.822$, $\text{N}_2\text{O} = 0.0030 + 0.0081\text{CH}_4$).

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)

[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.




Figure 5. Time series of excess mixing ratios for different emissions species and three different fire spread modes (A) CO₂. (B) CO. (C) CH₄. (D) N₂O. Note that each line of a particular colour represents one experimental replicate.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.




Figure 7. Carbon and nitrogen based emissions factors (per unit of dry matter burnt) for different combustion phases within the experimental burns. **(A)** CO₂ and CO emission factors for flaming and smouldering combustion. **(B)** CH₄ and N₂O emission factors for flaming and smouldering combustion.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)

[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


Greenhouse gas emissions depend on fire spread mode

N. C. Surawski et al.




Figure 8. Time resolved emissions factors for the trace gas emissions species measured during the experimental burns. **(A)** Time resolved CO₂ and CO emissions factors. **(B)** Time resolved CH₄ and N₂O emissions factors. Coloured vertical and dotted bars represent the median end time for predominantly flaming combustion for each fire spread mode.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

