

## Comparison of fuel accumulation models fitted to a range of fuel parameters at Dee Vee and McCorkhill sites

**Table 1**

Comparison of two regression models {Model 1  $F_p = ss (1 - \exp(-k \cdot \text{age}))$ } {Model 2  $F_p = (a \cdot \text{age}) / (b + \text{age})$ } where:  $ss$ ,  $k$ ,  $a$ , and  $b$  are estimated regression parameters (std er= standard error) for Dee Vee (a) and McCorkhill (b) site.

Fuel parameter ( $F_p$ )	$F_p = ss (1 - \exp(-k \cdot \text{age}))$				$F_p = (a \cdot \text{age}) / (b + \text{age})$			
	$ss$	std er	$k$	std er	$a$	std er	$b$	std er
<b>(a) Dee Vee site</b>								
Surface fuel load (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	13.16	1.252	0.017	0.004	16.11	2.092	53.58	18.79
Surface fuel depth (mm)	24.08	1.354	0.025	0.004	27.86	1.892	30.69	7.43
Surface fuel hazard score	3.31	0.123	0.035	0.005	3.76	0.185	20.38	4.42
Surface fuel percent cover score	3.69	0.106	0.042	0.005	4.10	0.180	15.62	3.51
Total near surface fuel load (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	16.04	1.232	0.022	0.004	19.14	2.166	39.03	13.82
Near surface fuel height (cm)	20.02	2.539	0.035	0.017	22.22	3.917	18.55	15.35
Near-surface fuel bulk density (kg m <sup>-3</sup> )	9.089	0.649	0.042	0.014	9.97	0.827	13.49	6.28
Near surface fuel hazard score	2.85	0.227	0.018	0.003	3.52	0.427	54.53	18.38
Near surface fuel percent cover score	2.01	0.158	0.024	0.005	2.36	0.289	35.20	14.53
Elevated fuel height (cm)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elevated fuel hazard score	2.18	0.144	0.038	0.010	2.42	0.208	16.95	7.19
Elevated fuel percent cover score	1.96	0.094	0.103	0.047	2.05	0.141	3.89	3.64
Intermediate bark hazard score	2.97	0.250	0.021	0.004	3.44	0.353	36.85	12.48
Intermediate canopy percent cover score	1.59	0.049	0.182	0.117	1.64	0.072	2.15	2.11
Overstorey bark hazard score	3.15	0.284	0.019	0.005	3.63	0.389	39.58	13.51
Overstorey percent cover score	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Combustibility score	33.68	1.702	0.021	0.003	40.16	2.847	42.33	9.28

continued over page...