

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	Ignition	
Copyright Year	2018	
Copyright Holder	Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature	
Author	Family Name	Urban
	Particle	
	Given Name	James L.
	Suffix	
	Division	Department of Mechanical Engineering
	Organization	University of California Berkeley
	Address	Berkeley, CA, USA
	Email	jlurban@berkeley.edu
Corresponding Author	Family Name	Fernandez-Pello
	Particle	
	Given Name	A. Carlos
	Suffix	
	Division	Department of Mechanical Engineering
	Organization	University of California Berkeley
	Address	Berkeley, CA, USA
	Email	ferpello@me.berkeley.edu

1 Ignition

2 James L. Urban and A. Carlos Fernandez-Pello
 3 Department of Mechanical Engineering,
 4 University of California Berkeley, Berkeley,
 5 CA, USA

6 Definition

7 Ignition is defined here as the process leading
 8 to the onset of a sustained combustion reaction
 9 between a combustible material and an oxidizer,
 10 typically air, which results in the release of heat.
 11 The combustible material may be in the gaseous,
 12 liquid, or solid phase. Ignition can also refer to
 13 the original cause of the fire or the point when a
 14 specific fuel element is ignited such as a structure.
 15 The combustion reaction may be either a homo-
 16 geneous gas phase reaction (flaming ignition) or
 17 a heterogeneous surface reaction (smolder igni-
 18 tion). For either combustion reaction to occur,
 19 the temperature of the fuel and air must first be
 20 elevated above a certain value, often termed the
 21 "ignition temperature," so that the heat released
 22 by the combustion reaction is larger than the heat
 23 losses from the reaction. However, this "ignition
 24 temperature" is not a property of the fuel material
 25 alone as it also depends on the circumstances
 26 in which the fuel is being ignited. Thus, the
 27 onset of ignition would occur by increasing the
 28 combustible material temperature with an external
 29 heat source (spark, pilot flame, hot surface,

radiant source) and by ensuring that the temper- 30
 ature of the reactants remains high so that their 31
 combustion reaction overcomes the heat losses to 32
 the surrounding. 33

Introduction 34

The ignition of a solid fuel is obviously a critical 35
 process in the initial development of a fire. It 36
 must be recognized however that without the 37
 subsequent spread of the flames throughout the 38
 fuel, ignition may be inconsequential. Because 39
 of its importance in the onset of fire, ignition 40
 of solid combustibles has been studied intensi- 41
 vely. There are excellent reviews published on 42
 solid fuel ignition. Particularly notable is the 43
 compendium of works on the subject of fuel 44
 ignition (Babrauskas 2003). There are also 45
 reviews that address specific subjects of the ignition 46
 process of continuous solid fuels (Cote 2003; 47
 Fernandez-Pello 1994, 2011; Atreya 1998; Quin- 48
 tierie 2006; Torero 2016; Kanury 1988; Drysdale 49
 2011). However, despite the obvious importance 50
 of wildland fires, very few studies have been con- 51
 ducted specifically on the ignition of wildland fu- 52
 els (McAllister and Weise 2017; Fernandez-Pello 53
 2011, 2017; Mindykowski et al. 2011; Consalvi 54
 et al. 2011). While ignition and flame spread are 55
 different, flame spread is essentially the ignition 56
 of successive fuel elements with a flame as the 57
 source of heating and ignition. Thus, ignition 58
 also has relevance in the propagation of a fire. 59
 One hallmark ignition source of the WUI fires 60

61 are firebrands (also known as embers): pieces of
62 burning debris which can be lifted by the wind
63 to a yet unreacted fuel. This is possible because
64 the burning process reduces the weight of the
65 firebrand enabling lofting. The topic of ignition
66 by firebrands/embers is discussed some in this
67 chapter. The initial threat of a ~~wildland-urban~~
68 ~~interface~~ (WUI) fire is firebrands, flame contact
69 from burning vegetation in wildland areas or
70 landscaping adjacent the structure, and radiation
71 from the flame. After an initial structure ignition,
72 the burning of the structure can produce more
73 firebrands (Suzuki et al. 2012), allowing for the
74 fire to spread further in the community through
75 firebrand spotting.

76 Both WUI and wildland fuels include accumu-
77 lations of finer natural fuels, but structure fuels
78 are also relevant for WUI fire. Structures are
79 primarily nonporous solid combustible materi-
80 als, their ignition characteristics are well studied,
81 and there are multiple sources of information
82 about the problem in the literature (Cote 2003;
83 Fernandez-Pello 1994, 2011; Atreya 1998; Quin-
84 ttiere 2006; Torero 2016; Kanury 1988; Drys-
85 dale 2011). There are of course commonalities
86 between wildland and WUI fires in terms of
87 how they are ignited. However, many structure
88 fuels have different characteristics (i.e., chemical,
89 thermal, and morphological) which are vastly dif-
90 ferent than wildland fuels which are also present
91 due to their proximity to wildland areas.

92 In general, the vast majority of wildland fires
93 are caused by humans – either deliberately or
94 accidentally (Balch et al. 2017); this encom-
95 passes the US Forest Service-designated cate-
96 gories: equipment use, smoking, campfire, rail-
97 road, arson, debris burning, children, fireworks,
98 power lines, structure, and miscellaneous fires
99 (Balch et al. 2017). Alternatively, the only nat-
100 ural ignition causes are spontaneous ignition,
101 lightning strikes, or heating from volcanic activ-
102 ity. While the idea of a solid fuel igniting may
103 seem conceptually simple, characterizing ignition
104 based on the controlling physical mechanisms
105 can be quite difficult as there are numerous pro-
106 cesses involved.

107 On the most basic level, the most stringent
108 requirement is that heat must be added to the fuel

109 so that a combustion reaction of the fuel and air,
110 either heterogeneous surface reaction/smolder or
111 a homogeneous gas phase reaction/flame, is initi-
112 ated. Once initiated the combustion reaction
113 must produce more heat than is lost to the sur-
114 rounding environment, so that the reaction is
115 sustained. However, describing the ignition of a
116 solid fuel is particularly complicated because it
117 also encompasses complexities of the condensed
118 phase thermochemistry. Thus, there are the addi-
119 tional physiochemical processes describing how
120 the solid fuel is thermally decomposed so that it
121 can react with air in the fuel surface or turned
122 into a gaseous fuel which in turn can burn with
123 air (T'ien et al. 2001). This chapter presents an
124 overview of the physical processes that play a role
125 on the ignition of wildland fuels, what types of
126 fuels are ignited, and the description of several
127 fundamental ignition sources.

Common Fuels First Ignited 128

replace cause with : "first fuel ignited"

Wildland Fuels 129

130 In the ignition of natural wildland fuels, the
131 easiest and most common type of fuel to be
132 ignited is fine fuels such as grass, leaves, needles,
133 chaff, mulch, and compost. This is because the
134 large void fraction of these fuels allows the top
135 layer burn with good availability of oxygen while
136 thermally insulating the bottom of the burning
137 layer. The NFPA reports that overall "light veg-
138 etation, including grass" is the ~~cause~~ of 66%
139 of all outdoor fires and 83% of grass fires in
140 the USA (Ahrens 2013). These finer fuels are
141 often referred to as "1-h fuel" because the fuel
142 reaches the moisture level of the surrounding
143 environment in the timescale of an hour. Thus,
144 on a hot day, these 1-h fuels could dry very
145 quickly becoming easily ignitable. Because of
146 this, these fuels can become dry over the course
147 of an abnormally dry and hot day. Then with the
148 added effect of them being thermally thin makes
149 them easier to heat and ignite.

150 For forest fires, however, the major fuel first
151 ignited is "heavy vegetation, including trees,"
152 corresponding to 44% of these fires (Balch et al.
153 2017). The difference of this is attributed to two

154 factors: firstly lightning is a more frequent cause
 155 of forest fires due to their height of large trees
 156 relative to smaller vegetation. Secondly the forest
 157 canopy limits the amount of sunlight reaching the
 158 finer fuels that are present on the forest floor,
 159 limiting their ability to dry as much as if they
 160 were exposed to direct sunlight.

161 **Structure Fuels**

162 In WUI fires, man-made structures can be found
 163 on the interface with wildland areas. The struc-
 164 tures can be ignited from traditional flame spread
 165 (flame contact) or flame radiation but also by fire-
 166 brand spotting. Firebrand spotting is the process
 167 by which burning materials are moved signifi-
 168 cant distances by the wind and/or fire-induced
 169 gas dynamics. Recent studies estimate firebrand
 170 spotting to be the largest cause of structure loss
 171 in WUI fires as compared to direct flame contact
 172 or radiation from flames (Maranghides and Mell
 173 2013; Mell et al. 2010). A recent review article
 174 (Caton et al. 2016) provides an overview of
 175 several components of structures that have been
 176 identified as vulnerabilities from firebrand spot-
 177 ting, flame contact, and flame radiation. Specifi-
 178 cally mentioned are roofing, gutters, eaves, vents,
 179 siding, windows, glazing, decks, porches, pa-
 180 tios, fences, mulches, and debris (Caton et al.
 181 2016). These vulnerable components themselves
 182 can serve as the fuel itself, they can serve as a
 183 place for fuels to collect such as leaf or pine
 184 litter from nearby trees collecting on roofs, pa-
 185 tios/decks, and gutters), and they can also provide
 186 a path for embers to enter the interior of the home
 187 (vents, open windows).

AU3

188 The potential materials to be ignited first in
 189 structures are consequently much more diverse
 190 as they encompass natural fuels such as pine and
 191 leaf litter accumulated on the house, synthetic
 192 fuels such as roofing material and siding material,
 193 and minimally processed biomass-derived fuels
 194 such as decking. These fuels also span the range
 195 from very fine fuels (pine and leaf litter) to
 196 larger wood components (decking). Large wood
 197 components have low porosity (small void frac-
 198 tion) and typically require more heat to ignite.
 199 Consequently, these larger materials require more
 200 significant flame interactions and/or accumula-

tion of embers to overcome the demand imposed 201
 by the larger energy requirements compared to 202
 the finer fuels. 203

Ignition Process

204

The differences in common fuels first ignited in 205
 wildland and WUI fires also cause differences 206
 in ignition pathways. The finer, natural fuels can 207
 be ignited more easily, by a single firebrand 208
 (Manzello et al. 2006, 2008) or a relatively small 209
 amount of flame contact or radiation, and the 210
 larger fuels such as wood components (e.g., deck- 211
 ing) require significantly more energy deposi- 212
 tion to ignite which comes in the form of accu- 213
 mulations of many firebrands which combined 214
 can ignite these much larger pieces. The ember 215
 accumulations occur due to surface roughness 216
 and local flow structures near fuels (Suzuki and 217
 Manzello 2017). Smaller natural fuels can act 218
 as tinder and kindling to ignite the larger fuels. 219
 The ignition of the larger fuels can also be made 220
 easier by reducing heat losses; examples of this 221
 are ignition of gaps in decking and crevices which 222
 provide opportunities for reradiation. 223

Ignition of Wildland Fuels

224

Wildland fuels have a morphology that is very 225
 different from that of a continuous solid. Typi- 226
 cally, surface fuels consist of fine, solid pieces 227
 of biomass, arranged to form a heterogeneous 228
 porous material. The morphology of the fuel 229
 could vary from powder and very thin pieces 230
 (duff, grass, etc.) to relatively larger pieces of 231
 woody material (needles, twigs, branches, etc.). 232
 The canopy fuels are also composed of thin 233
 pieces (leaves, needles, etc.) to large woody mate- 234
 rials (branches, trunks, etc.). Also, the fuel could 235
 be dry, moist, or live. Consequently, the ignition 236
 and burning characteristics of these fuels are 237
 much more complex than that of a continuous 238
 solid fuel such as a slab of wood or plastic. 239
 Furthermore, in addition to flaming ignition of 240
 the fuel, the porous character surface fuels also 241
 allow the onset of smolder ignition, thus intro- 242
 ducing a wide range of potential ignition modes, 243
 from smolder to spontaneous and piloted ignition 244

245 (Drysdale 2011). Finally, the morphology of the
 246 fuel allows for a wide range of ignition sources,
 247 from an open flame or hot surface to embers and
 248 hot metal particles.

249 When surface wildland fires are first ignited,
 250 the fuel bed is typically composed of layers of
 251 fine fuels such as pine needle litter, leaf litter,
 252 or dry grass (Ahrens 2013). These fuel beds
 253 typically have large void fractions, ϕ , (fraction
 254 of fuel bed volume occupied by air), and since
 255 biomass and air have low thermal conductivity,
 256 these porous fuels are characterized by low ther-
 257 mal conductivities. Consequently, wildland fuel
 258 beds would have a large Biot numbers, ($Bi > 0.1$),
 259 and they would be considered to be thermally
 260 thick following the definition that the heated layer
 261 would be smaller than the fuel thickness. The
 262 Biot number is the ratio of internal conductive
 263 thermal resistance to external convective thermal
 264 resistance at the surface, given by the equation
 265 $Bi = hL/k$ where h is the convection coefficient,
 266 L is the characteristic thermal length scale, and
 267 k is the thermal conductivity of the solid. How-
 268 ever, when heated by an external source, only a
 269 relatively thin outer layer of the fuel would be
 270 heated up, and the fuel would behave as a thin
 271 fuel in some aspects of the problem. The fuels in
 272 this layer would reach their pyrolysis temperature
 273 much faster than if they were nonporous, while
 274 the rest of the fuel underneath the layer would
 275 heat up more slowly. Thus, although the wildland
 276 fuel bed would be theoretically thermally thick,
 277 in practice it would behave as thermally thin
 278 ($Bi < 0.1$), in the sense that only a thin surface
 279 layer of the fuel bed would heat up. How fast
 280 it would heat up would depend on the heating
 281 source and the morphology characteristics of the
 282 fuel bed. In addition of the complexity that the
 283 fuel bed morphology brings, wildland fuels con-
 284 tain moisture, so the heating and evaporation of
 285 the moisture complicate the ignition process fur-
 286 ther. The moisture is primarily water, especially
 287 in the case of dead biomass fuels, although recent
 288 studies have shown that the drying behavior can
 289 be more complex with live fuels (McCallister and
 290 Weise 2017).

Ignition of Structure Materials

292 The ignition of a structure is more difficult than
 293 the ignition of a wildland fuel: structure fuels are
 294 much denser, with higher thermal conductivities,
 295 and consequently required more energy and time
 296 to be ignited. While studies have shown that duff,
 297 litter, mulch, and other fine fuels can be ignited by
 298 single firebrands, larger solid structures require
 299 accumulations of many firebrands to ignite the
 300 structure. An alternative ignition pathway would
 301 be to ignite accumulated fine natural fuels on
 302 or near the structure which act as tinder and
 303 kindling, igniting first then igniting the larger fuel
 304 (Manzello et al. 2010, 2017; Cohen and Stratton
 305 2008). The ignition of the larger fuels can also be
 306 made possible by reducing heat losses; examples
 307 of this are ignition of gaps in decks (Manzello
 308 and Suzuki 2014), and crevices (Manzello et al.
 309 2009) by firebrands by creating opportunities
 310 for reradiation. Structure fuels are also typically
 311 thermally thick like wildland fuels, but do not
 312 have the same porous nature. This means that
 313 while similar equations can be used to describe
 314 the ignition process, the requirements for ignition
 315 are higher: the fuels require more heating, over a
 316 longer time to ignite compared to a wildland fuel.

Formulation of the Ignition Problem

318 A rigorous analysis of the ignition of a fuel
 319 requires the solution of the full conservation
 320 equations for the solid and gas phases. As men-
 321 tioned above this is quite complex, although some
 322 simplifying assumptions can be made to make the
 323 problem formulation and solution more manage-
 324 able. Furthermore, the heterogeneous characteris-
 325 tics of the fuel bed can be simplified by assuming
 326 that it behaves as a homogeneous porous mater-
 327 ial. Considering the fuel as 1-D and homoge-
 328 neous, the energy equation can be expressed as

$$\rho_f (1 - \phi) c_f \frac{dT}{dt} = k_{eff} \frac{d^2T}{dx^2} + \dot{w}_{p,ex}''' \Delta h_{p,ex} - \dot{w}_{p,en}''' \Delta h_{p,en} - \dot{w}_{dry}''' \Delta h_{vap} \quad (1)$$

329 The term on the left-hand side of Eq. 1 is the
 330 energy storage term, the first term on the right-
 331 hand side accounts for thermal diffusion, and the
 332 remaining terms are the rates of the oxidative and
 333 thermal pyrolysis reactions and the evaporation
 334 reaction. Here ϕ , c_f , and ρ_f are the porosity,
 335 specific heat capacity, and density of the fuel;
 336 $k_{eff} = k_f + \gamma(\phi)\sigma T^3$ is the effective conductivity
 337 of the fuel accounting for the true conductivity of
 338 the fuel and the effective pore-radiation thermal
 339 conductivity if the porosity is large enough that
 340 pore/gap radiation is important. In the case of
 341 a nonporous fuel, ϕ would have a value of 0,
 342 whereas for wildland fuels such as accumulated
 343 fine fuels, the porosity would be non-zero. The
 344 generalized boundary conditions for Eq. 1 are
 345 given by Eqs. 2 and 3 for the interaction of the
 346 fuel boundary with the ignition source and the
 347 ambient surroundings and the fact that the fuels
 348 are thermally thick and heat transfer far from the
 349 heated boundary is minimal, respectively.

$$-\rho_f k_{eff} \frac{dT}{dx} \Big|_{surf} = h_{conv} (T_{surf} - T_{\infty}) + \epsilon \sigma (T_{surf}^4 - T_{rad}^4) \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dT}{dx} \Big|_{x \rightarrow \infty} \rightarrow 0 \quad (3)$$

350 In the solid fuel, the material must be heated
 351 to the point at which pyrolysis reactions will
 352 occur producing enough pyrolyzate to support
 353 combustion. The pyrolysis of biomass can be
 354 complicated with several intermediate pyrolysis
 355 steps (Lautenberger and Fernandez-Pello 2008).
 356 In general, there are two main pyrolysis
 357 pathways: endothermic pyrolysis reactions and
 358 exothermic oxidative pyrolysis reactions. For
 359 flaming ignition, it is typically assumed that the
 360 pyrolysis reactions act as a net heat sink, but
 361 for smoldering ignition the oxidative surface
 362 reactions must be strong enough so that they
 363 produce enough heat to offset any heat losses.
 364 Thus, the oxidative pyrolysis term, $\dot{\omega}_{p,ex}''' \Delta h_{p,ex}$,
 365 would typically play a larger role in smoldering
 366 ignition than for flaming ignition and would
 367 need to produce enough heat for the smolder

to propagate. The fuel moisture can play an
 important role in the fuel bed ignition, deterring
 it because of the energy required to vaporize the
 water.

In its simplest form, the fuel pyrolysis reaction
 can be described by a single, first-order in fuel,
 Arrhenius-type reaction. The rate of pyrolysis is
 then given by the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{m}''_{pyr} &= \int_0^{\delta_{pyr}} \sum_{i=0} \alpha_i \dot{\omega}_i''' dx \\ &= \int_0^{\delta_{pyr}} \sum_{i=0} \alpha_i \rho_f (1 - \phi) A_i \\ &\quad \exp\left(-\frac{E_{a,i}}{RT}\right) X_{O_2}^{n_{O_2}} dx \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where δ_{pyr} is the region of the solid fuel that
 is undergoing pyrolysis and α_i is the amount of
 pyrolyzate fuel produced per amount of solid fuel
 pyrolyzed. The endothermic vaporization term
 would have similar formulation. It should be
 noted here that the value of the porosity will have
 strong implications on the reaction kinetics and
 thus parameters such as A_i and $E_{a,i}$ could change
 if the porosity were changed.

An important result of Eq. 4 is that since wood
 has a relatively large activation energy, the rate
 of pyrolysis is strongly dependent on the fuel
 temperature. Consequently, the rate of pyrolysis
 is small until a certain temperature, T_p , is reached,
 referred to as the pyrolysis temperature. The
 strong temperature dependence of the pyrolysis
 makes the rate of gasification influenced by the
 heat input from the external source or exothermic
 pyrolysis reaction. So, if the fuel is heated to
 the pyrolysis temperature, and in the presence of
 sufficient oxygen, a strong ignition source (pilot),
 and appropriate ambient conditions, ignition will
 occur. Thus, this temperature can be viewed as an
 "ignition" temperature, T_{ign} . While this approach
 is sufficient for practical purposes, changes in the
 other parameters (i.e., oxygen supply, external
 heating, characteristics of the ignition source, and
 ambient conditions) could require higher temper-

atures for ignition. Thus, the ignition temperature should be treated as a useful engineering concept but not a fundamental material property.

The solution of Eq. 1 gives the variation with time of the fuel bed temperature along the fuel layer depth. As mentioned above the solution is not simple. However, assuming the fuel starts to pyrolyze once the fuel reaches the pyrolysis temperature, and that there is enough heat input for the fuel to pyrolyze and form a flammable mixture with the air near the fuel surface, in the presence of a strong pilot, flaming ignition would occur. The formulation of the problem can then be simplified to the point that an analytical expression can be obtained for the temperature of the fuel bed and the time required for ignition. In a phenomenological manner, the solid fuel ignition process can be described as follows: the solid fuel sample, considered initially at ambient temperature, T_∞ , is suddenly exposed to an incident heat flux (q''_{ext}) from an external source. The temperature of the solid rises until the surface reaches the temperature at which the fuel first pyrolyzes, T_p , at which point the fuel ignites.

The energy required to ignite the fuel can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{ign} \approx & \int_{\delta} A \rho_f (1 - \phi) c_f (T_p - T_0) dx \\
 & + \int_{\delta} A \rho_f (1 - \phi) FMC \Delta h_{vap} dx \\
 & + \int_0^{t_{ign}} \int_{\delta} A (\dot{\omega}'''_{p,en} \Delta h_{p,en} - \dot{\omega}'''_{p,ex} \Delta h_{p,ex}) dx dt \\
 & + \int_0^{t_{ign}} A (h_{conv} (T_{surf} - T_\infty) \\
 & + \epsilon \sigma T_{surf}^4 - q''_{ext}) dt + E_{gas}
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where δ is the thickness of the thin layer on the surface of the sample that is significantly, heated, dried, and pyrolyzed. Here A is the fuel exposed

to the heat source and E_{gas} is the energy needed to ignite the gas phase fuel/air mixture.

The time required for the fuel surface to attain T_p will be referred to as the pyrolysis time, t_p . After attaining T_p , increasing amounts of fuel vapors (pyrolysate) leave the surface, through diffusion or convection away from the sample, and subsequently mix with the ambient air and create a flammable mixture near the solid surface. This period will be referred to here as the mixing time (t_m). The external flux, fuel properties, oxidizer flow, and geometrical characteristics determine the mixing time and a characteristic surface mixing temperature, T_m , at the end of this mixing period; if the mixture temperature is increased by a pilot or other mechanisms, a combustion reaction between the fuel and the air may become vigorous enough to overcome the heat losses to the solid and ambient surroundings, thereby becoming self-sustaining, at which point ignition will occur. This the time over which the reaction happens is called the induction time (t_{ind}) and is determined by combustion chemical kinetics as well as the flow and pilot conditions. The ignition delay time (t_{ign}) can then be described by

$$t_{ign} \approx t_p + t_m + t_{ind} \tag{6}$$

In general, the pyrolysis time of solid fuels, t_p , is much larger than the mixing and induction time. Thus, ignition time becomes the same as the pyrolysis time, which is given by the solution of the inert version of Eq. 1, i.e., the heat equation for a thermally thick fuel. Then the ignition time is given by

$$t_{ign} = \frac{\pi}{4} k_f c_f (1 - \phi) \rho_f \frac{(T_{ign} - T_0)^2}{(\dot{q}_s'')^2} \tag{7}$$

where \dot{q}_s'' is the net heat flux at the surface of the fuel.

By examining Eqs. 1 and 7, it is seen that as the porosity is increased, the energy required for ignition and the time for ignition decrease. Also, since the density and thermal conductivity of the fuel bed are small, the ignition time is also small. These are very specific ignition characteristics of

replace with: "particles"

473 wildland fuel beds that make them particularly
474 hazardous in comparison with other solid com-
475 bustible materials.

476 Regarding the "ignition temperature,"
477 $T_{ign} \sim T_p$, its value is dependent on the method by
478 which the fuel is ignited and the environment
479 conditions. The literature has studies on
480 several ignition scenarios such as a hot plate
481 at a fixed temperature (Pitts 2007) thermal
482 radiation (Torero and Simeoni 2010), convection
483 (McAllister and Finney 2017; McAllister
484 and Finney 2014), and hot metal ~~particle~~
485 glowing/burning embers (Urban et al. 2016,
486 2018; Fernandez-Pello et al. 2014; Manzello
487 et al. 2006). In the case of radiantly ignited
488 pine needles, an ignition temperature of 412 °C
489 was determined although it was dependent
490 on the convective heat losses to the ambient
491 surroundings (J. L. Torero and Simeoni 2010).
492 For the ignition of pine needles with a hot flat
493 surface, a hot plate temperature of 310 °C without
494 wind and up to 320 °C at low wind speeds were
495 reported (Pitts 2007). In the case of ignition of
496 a fuel by embers or firebrands, the requirements
497 for ignition can be more difficult because as the
498 ember burns out, the energy transferred to the
499 fuel bed decreases. For hot metal particles/sparks
500 landing on the fuel bed, the particle loses energy
501 as it heats the fuel, and depending on its energy
502 and temperature, it may, or may not, be able
503 to ignite the fuel. For this reason, the particle
504 temperature and size (energy) at landing on the
505 fuel bed are important in determining the ignition
506 capability of the particle. For different types of
507 fuel beds, it has been found that there is an inverse
508 relationship between particle temperature and
509 size for the particle to ignite the wildland fuel,
510 with the temperature increasing as the size of the
511 particle decreases (Fernandez-Pello et al. 2014).

512 Conclusions

513 In wildland and WUI environments, wildland
514 surface fuels (duff, needles, grass, etc.) are easy
515 to ignite by short flame contact, radiation, or
516 even individual embers. Consequently, flames
517 will spread very fast along their surface, which

518 make them very hazardous. This is because the
519 fuel beds are porous, with large void fraction,
520 and have low density and thermal conductivity,
521 and when exposed to an external heat source, the
522 heat is retained in a thin layer near the surface.
523 Typically, the fuels in the surface layer are mostly
524 dead, and in hot, dry days, the fuel temperature
525 increases rapidly resulting in short ignition times
526 and rapid flame spread. Similar fire conditions
527 occur in dense tree canopies, although if the fuel
528 (leaves, pine needles) is live, the ignition process
529 may be more complex than with dead fuels.
530 Structure fuels are much larger and require larger
531 sources of heat such as longer flame or radiation
532 contact or accumulations of firebrands/embers,
533 unlike the finer porous fuels, or they must be
534 ignited from adjacent accumulations of fine
535 fuels such as pine needles and leaves. Despite
536 the differences in their energy and heating
537 requirements, they, both accumulations of fine
538 natural fuels and larger fuels found in structures,
539 can often behave as thermally thick fuels.

540 Predicting the ignition of fuels in the wildland
541 and WUI is difficult because of the complexity
542 and varieties of the fuels. The wildland fuel beds
543 have a varied morphology (from powders to thick
544 branches), porous with a heterogeneous structure,
545 moisture levels that change with the ambient
546 conditions, and dead and live fuels. Structure
547 fuels are more difficult to ignite, and the ignition
548 process becomes dependent on the ability to ig-
549 nite a comparatively large, dense fuel by either
550 igniting kindling/tinder first, substantial ember
551 accumulations, and/or reradiation to reduce heat
552 losses. This reduces the possibility of assigning
553 a value to an "ignition temperature" to fuels,
554 thus limiting the application of simplified anal-
555 ysis of the wildland and structure fuel ignition
556 (including the analysis presented here). Thus,
557 when evaluating the ignition of a fuel, aspects
558 of the problem beyond the characteristics of the
559 fuel must also be considered such as the envi-
560 ronmental parameters (i.e., humidity, wind speed,
561 ambient temperature, etc.), the ignition source
562 (e.g., radiant heater, hot object/surface, burning
563 firebrand/ember, flame contact lightning, etc.),
564 as well as the natural variations that exist in
565 biomass fuels.

566 **Cross-References**

- 567 ▶ [Combustion](#)
 568 ▶ [Conduction](#)
 569 ▶ [Convection](#)
 570 ▶ [Data on Wildland Ignition Sources](#)
 571 ▶ [Direct Flame Contact](#)
 572 ▶ [Firebrands and Embers](#)
 573 ▶ [Radiant Heat](#)
 574 ▶ [Radiation Pyrolysis](#)

575 **Nomenclature**

- 576 *FMC* Fuel moisture content $FMC = \frac{m_{\text{moisture}}}{m_{\text{dry fuel}}}$
 577 ϕ Void fraction
 578 *A* Area
 579 c_f Specific heat capacity of the solid
 580 ρ_f Density of solid fuel
 581 $\dot{\omega}'''_{p,i}$ Rate of consumption by *i*th pyrolysis
 582 reaction
 583 $\Delta h_{p,i}$ Energy absorbed or released by *i*th
 584 pyrolysis reaction

585 **References**

- 586 Ahrens M (2013) Brush, grass, and forest fires. National
 587 Fire Protection Association, Fire Analysis and Re-
 588 search Division, Quincy
 589 Atreya A (1998) Ignition of fires. *Philos*
 590 *Trans R Soc Lond A* 356(1748):2787–2813.
 591 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1998.0298>
 592 Babrauskas V (2003) Ignition handbook. Fire Science
 593 Publishers, Issaquah
 594 Balch JK, Bradley BA, Abatzoglou JT, Chelsea Nagy
 595 R, Fusco EJ, Mahood AL (2017) Human-started
 596 wildfires expand the fire niche across the United
 597 States. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 114(11):2946–2951.
 598 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1617394114>
 599 Caton SE, Hakes RSP, Gorham DJ, Zhou A, Gollner
 600 MJ (2016) Review of pathways for building
 601 fire spread in the wildland urban interface
 602 part I: exposure conditions. *Fire Technol*:1–45.
 603 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10694-016-0589-z>. Springer
 604 US
 605 Cohen J, Stratton R (2008) Home de-
 606 struction examination Grass Valley Fire.
 607 <http://www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/31544>
 608 Consalvi JL, Nmira F, Fuentes A, Mindykowski P, Por-
 609 terie B (2011) Numerical study of piloted ignition
 610 of forest fuel layer. *Proc Combust Inst* 33(2):2641–
 2648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proci.2010.06.025> El-
 sevier Inc
 Cote AE (2003) Fire protection handbook
 Drysdale DD (2011) An introduction to fire dynamics.
 Wiley, West Sussex
 Fernandez-Pello AC (1994) The solid phase. In: Cox G
 (ed) Combustion fundamentals of fire. Academic Press,
 pp 31–100
 Fernandez-Pello AC (2011) On fire ignition. In: Fire
 safety science – proceedings of the tenth international
 symposium, pp 25–42
 Fernandez-Pello AC (2017) Wildland fire spot igni-
 tion by sparks and firebrands. *Fire Saf J* 91:2–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.firesaf.2017.04.040>
 Fernandez-Pello AC, Lautenberger C, Rich D, Zak C,
 Urban JL, Hadden R, Scott S, Fereres S (2014) Spot fire
 ignition of natural fuel beds by hot metal particles, em-
 bers, and Sparks. *Combust Sci Technol* 187(1–2):269–
 295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00102202.2014.973953>
 Kanury AM (1988) Flaming ignition of solid fuels. In:
 DiNunno PJ (ed) SFPE handbook of fire protection
 engineering, 1st edn. Society of Fire Protection Engi-
 neers, National Fire Protection Association, Boston, p
 1-326-339
 Lautenberger C, Fernandez-Pello AC (2008) Pyrolysis
 modeling, thermal decomposition, and transport pro-
 cesses in combustible solids. In: Sunden B, Faghri
 M (eds) Transport phenomena in fires. WIT Press,
 Southampton, pp 209–259
 Manzello SL, Suzuki S (2014) Exposing decking
 assemblies to continuous wind-driven firebrand
 showers. *Fire Safety Science* 11:1339–1352.
<https://doi.org/10.3801/IAFSS.FSS.11-1339>
 Manzello SL, Cleary TG, Shields JR, Yang JC (2006) On
 the ignition of fuel beds by firebrands. *Fire Mater* 30.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/fam.901>
 Manzello SL, Shields JR, Cleary TG, Maranghides
 A, Mell WE, Yang JC, Hayashi Y, Nii D, Kurita
 T (2008) On the development and characterization of
 a firebrand generator. *Fire Saf J* 43:258–268.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.firesaf.2007.10.001>
 Manzello SL, Park SH, Cleary TG (2009)
 Investigation on the ability of glowing firebrands
 deposited within crevices to ignite common
 building materials. *Fire Saf J* 44(6):894–900.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.firesaf.2009.05.001>
 Manzello SL, Hayashi Y, Yoneki T, Yamamoto
 Y (2010) Quantifying the vulnerabilities of
 ceramic tile roofing assemblies to ignition
 during a firebrand attack. *Fire Saf J* 45(1):35–43.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.firesaf.2009.09.002>
 Manzello SL, Suzuki S, Nii D (2017) Full-scale
 experimental investigation to quantify building
 component ignition vulnerability from mulch beds
 attacked by firebrand showers. *Fire Technol* 53(2):535–
 551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10694-015-0537-3>.
 Springer US
 Maranghides A, Mell W (2013) Framework for
 addressing the national wildland urban interface
 fire problem – determining fire and ember

- 671 exposure zones using a WUI hazard scale. 703
 672 NIST Technical Note 1748 Framework:1–33. 704
 673 <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.TN.1748> 705
- 674 McAllister S, Finney M (2014) Convection ignition 706
 675 of live forest fuels. *Fire Saf Sci* 11:1312–1325. 707
 676 <https://doi.org/10.3801/IAFSS.FSS.11-1312> 708
- 677 McAllister S, Finney M (2017) Autoignition of 709
 678 wood under combined convective and radiative 710
 679 heating. *Proc Combust Inst* 36(2):3073–3080. 711
 680 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proci.2016.06.110> 712
- 681 Mcallister S, Weise DR (2017) Effects of season 713
 682 on ignition of live wildland fuels using the 714
 683 forced ignition and flame spread test apparatus. 715
 684 *Combust Sci Technol* 182(2):2321–2247. 716
 685 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00102202.2016.1206086> 717
- 686 Mell WE, Manzello SL, Maranghides A, Butry D, Rehm 718
 687 RG (2010) The wildland–urban interface fire problem – 719
 688 current approaches and research needs. *Int J Wildland* 720
 689 *Fire* 19:238–251. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WF07131> 721
- 690 Mindykowski P, Fuentes A, Consalvi JL, 722
 691 Porterie B (2011) Piloted ignition of 723
 692 wildland fuels. *Fire Saf J* 46(1–2):34–40. 724
 693 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.firesaf.2010.09.003> Elsevier 725
- 694 Pitts WM (2007) Ignition of cellulosic fuels by heated and 726
 695 radiative surfaces
- 696 Quintiere JG (2006) Fundamental of fire phenomena. 727
 697 <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470091150>
- 698 Suzuki S, Manzello SL (2017) Experimental 728
 699 investigation of firebrand accumulation zones 729
 700 in front of obstacles. *Fire Saf J* 94(April):1–7. 730
 701 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.firesaf.2017.08.007> Elsevier 731
 702 Ltd
- Suzuki S, Manzello SL, Lage M, Laing G (2012) 703
 Firebrand generation data obtained from a full-scale 704
 structure burn. *Int J Wildland Fire* 21(8):961–968. 705
<https://doi.org/10.1071/WF11133> 706
- T'ien JS, Shih HJ, Jiang CB, Ross HD, Miller FJ, Torero 707
 JL, Walther DC, Carlos Fernandez-Pello A (2001) 708
 Mechanisms of flame spread and smolder wave prop- 709
 agation. In: Ross HD (ed) *Microgravity combustion*. 710
 Academic Press, San Diego, pp 299–367 711
- Torero J (2016) Flaming ignition of solid fuels. In: Hurley 712
 MJ (ed) *SFPE handbook of fire protection engineering*, 713
 5th edn. Springer, New York, pp 633–661 714
- Torero JL, Simeoni A (2010) Heat and mass transfer in 715
 fires: scaling laws, ignition of solid fuels and applica- 716
 tion to forest fires. *Open Thermodyn J* 4(1):145–155. 717
<https://doi.org/10.2174/1874396X01004010145> 718
- Urban JL, Zak CD, Song J, Fernandez-Pello C (2016) 719
 Smoldering spot ignition of natural fuels by a hot 720
 metal particle. *Proc Combust Inst* 36(2):3211–3218. 721
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proci.2016.09.014> 722
- Urban JL, Zak C, Fernandez-Pello C (2018) Spot fire 723
 ignition of natural fuels by hot aluminum particles. *Fire* 724
Technol. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10694-018-0712-4>. 725
 Springer US 726

AU9

UNCORRECTED

Author Queries

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's response
AU1	Please be aware that your name and affiliation and if applicable those of you co-author(s) will be published as presented in this proof. If you want to make any changes, please correct the details now. Note that corrections after publication will no longer be possible.	Please add zip code: CA, 94720-1740
AU2	Please provide "Synonyms".	fire initiation
AU3	Please provide opening parenthesis to sentence starting "These vulnerable components..."	Please remove the final parenthesis
AU4	Equations has been renumbered to maintain the sequential order. Please check if okay.	Ok
AU5	Please provide publisher name and location for Cote (2003)	National Fire Protection Association, Boston, MA
AU6	Please provide publisher location for Fernandez-Pello (1994).	Academic Press Limited San Diego, CA
AU7	Please provide proceedings location for Fernandez-Pello (2011).	College Park, MD Also, please include DOI: 10.3801/IAFSS.FSS.10-25
AU8	Please check if inserted publisher location for Lautenberger and Fernandez-Pello (2008) is okay.	Ok
AU9	Please provide complete details for Pitts (2007).	See below

727

728

Note:

If you are using material from other works please make sure that you have obtained the necessary permission from the copyright holders and that references to the original publications are included.

Pitts WM (2007) NIST Technical Note 1481: Ignition of Cellulosic Fuels by Heated and Radiative Surfaces. (Gaithersburg, MD)

Author Edits

line numbers: 60, 67-68, 138, 484

Annotations are provided in the text with edits from the authors