UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

The Changing Risk and Burden of Wildfire in the Us

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5134m9d8>

Authors

Burke, Marshall

Driscoll, Anne

Xue, Jenny

et al.

Publication Date

2020-06-01

Peer reviewed

The changing risk and burden of wildfire in the United States

Marshall Burke^{a,b,c,1}, Anne Driscoll^b, Sam Heft-Neal^b, Jiani Xue^b, Jennifer Burney^d, and Michael Wara^e

Edited by B. L. Turner, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, and approved November 24, 2020 (received for review June 30, 2020)

Recent dramatic and deadly increases in global wildfire activity have increased attention on the causes of wildfires, their consequences, and how risk from wildfire might be mitigated. Here we bring together data on the changing risk and societal burden of wildfire in the United States. We estimate that nearly 50 million homes are currently in the wildland–urban interface in the United States, a number increasing by 1 million houses every 3 y. To illustrate how changes in wildfire activity might affect air pollution and related health outcomes, and how these linkages might guide future science and policy, we develop a statistical model that relates satellite-based fire and smoke data to information from pollution monitoring stations. Using the model, we estimate that wildfires have accounted for up to 25% of $PM_{2.5}$ (particulate matter with diameter $<2.5\ \mu m$) in recent years across the United States, and up to half in some Western regions, with spatial patterns in ambient smoke exposure that do not follow traditional socioeconomic pollution exposure gradients. We combine the model with stylized scenarios to show that fuel management interventions could have large health benefits and that future health impacts from climate-change-induced wildfire smoke could approach projected overall increases in temperature-related mortality from climate change—but that both estimates remain uncertain. We use model results to highlight important areas for future research and to draw lessons for policy.

wildfire | air pollution | climate change | health impacts

Over the past four decades, burned area from wildfires has roughly quadrupled in the United States (Fig. 1A) (1). This rapid growth has been driven by a number of factors, including the accumulation of fuels due to a legacy of fire suppression over the last century (2) and a more recent increase in fuel aridity (Fig. 1B, shown for the western United States), a trend which is expected to continue as the climate warms (3, 4). These increases have happened parallel to a substantial rise in the number of houses in the wildland–urban interface (WUI). Using data on the universe of home locations across the United States and updated national land cover maps, we update earlier studies (5, 6) and estimate that there are now ~49 million residential homes in the WUI, a number that has been increasing by roughly 350,000 houses per year over the last two decades (Fig. 1C and *SI Appendix*). As firefighting effort focuses substantially on the protection

of private homes (7), these factors have contributed to a steady rise in spending on wildfire suppression by the US government (Fig. 1D), which in recent years has totaled ~\$3 billion/y in federal expenditure (1). Total prescribed burn acreage has increased in the southeastern United States but has remained largely flat elsewhere (Fig. 1E), suggesting to many that there is underinvestment in this risk-mitigation strategy, given the massive overall growth in wildfire risk (8).

What are the consequences of this change in fire activity for overall air quality and for health outcomes, and how should policy respond? Large increases in wildfire activity have been accompanied by substantial increases in the number of days with any smoke in the air across the United States (Fig. 1F), as estimated from satellite data (9). Such increases have been observed throughout the continental United States, not

^aDepartment of Earth System Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305; ^bCenter on Food Security and the Environment, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305; ^cNational Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA 02138; ^dSchool of Global Policy and Strategy, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093; and ^eWoods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

Author contributions: M.B., A.D., S.H.-N., and M.W. designed research; M.B., A.D., J.X., and J.B. performed research; A.D., S.H.-N., J.X., and J.B. analyzed data; and M.B., S.H.-N., J.X., J.B., and M.W. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no competing interest.

This article is a PNAS Direct Submission.

This open access article is distributed under [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License 4.0 \(CC BY-NC-ND\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

¹To whom correspondence may be addressed. Email: mburke@stanford.edu.

This article contains supporting information online at <https://www.pnas.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1073/pnas.2011048118/-/DCSupplemental>.

Published January 11, 2021.

Fig. 1. Trends in the drivers and consequences of wildfire. (A and B) Increases in burned area in public and private US lands (A) (1) have been driven in part by rising fuel aridity, shown here over the western United States (4) (B). (C and D) The number of homes in the WUI has also risen quickly (C, our calculations; [SI Appendix](#)), which has contributed to rising suppression costs (D) incurred by the federal government. (E) Prescribed burn area has increased substantially in the South but is flat in all other regions (1). (F and G) Smoke days have increased throughout the United States (F), perhaps undermining decadal improvements in air quality across the United States (G). (H) We calculate an increasing proportion of overall $PM_{2.5}$ attributable to wildfire smoke, particularly in the West. Red and blue lines in each plot indicate linear fits to the historical data, with slopes reported in the upper left of each panel; all are significantly different from zero ($P < 0.01$ for each), except for prescribed burn in regions outside the South. Red lines indicate underlying data are from published studies or government data, and blue lines indicate novel estimates from this paper.

just in the West, and threaten to undo the substantial improvements in air quality observed across the United States over the last two decades (Fig. 1G). The fingerprints of wildfire are already visible in upward-trending spring- and summertime organic carbon concentrations observed in rural areas in the US South and West ([SI Appendix, Fig. S1](#)), respectively, and studies find that having any smoke in the air can increase morbidity and mortality among exposed populations (10, 11).

A challenge in understanding the broader contribution of changing wildfire activity to air quality is the difficulty in accurately linking fire activity to related pollutant exposures in often-distant population centers (12). Satellite-based measures of smoke exposure are increasingly available and are appealing because plume monitoring intuitively links source and receptor regions. Such data, however, cannot yet be used to precisely measure smoke density or to separate surface-level smoke from smoke higher in the atmospheric column, and thus they are difficult to link to existing exposure–health response relationships (13, 14). Chemical

transport models (CTMs), which can directly model the movement and evolution of wildfire emissions, offer an alternate approach for linking local pollution concentrations to specific fire activity. However, generating accurate exposure estimates from CTMs requires surmounting several major uncertainties in the pathway between source and receptor. First, large uncertainties in wildfire emissions inventories have been shown to lead to many-fold differences in wildfire-attributed $PM_{2.5}$ (particulate matter with diameter $< 2.5 \mu m$) concentrations across the United States (and $> 20\times$ regional differences in high fire years) when different inventories are used as input to the same CTM (15, 16), and integration of satellite observations only slightly improves performance (17). Second, the detailed conditions surrounding emissions such as the height of emissions injections and very localized meteorology and their transport may not be captured by models and can dramatically impact downstream exposure estimates (18, 19). Finally, CTM representations of atmospheric chemistry may not accurately capture the evolution of wildfire smoke (20–24). In addition to model-related uncertainty, the computational

expense of running CTMs over large spatial and temporal scales means that models are rarely validated against the long time series of concentration measurements available from hundreds of ground stations across the United States.

To further understand the changing contribution of wildfire to particulate matter exposure across the United States and to illustrate key remaining scientific and policy questions at the intersection of wildfire, pollution, and climate, we train and validate a statistical model that relates changes in satellite-estimated smoke plume exposure and fire activity to ground-measured $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations across regions in the United States (SI Appendix, Fig. S2). Our model is particularly trained to predict variation in $PM_{2.5}$ over time at many individual locations—variation which is increasingly exploited to understand how changes in air pollutants affect key health outcomes. Our approach does not rely on uncertain emissions inventories and alleviates difficulties in modeling plume dispersion, and results can easily be validated against over a decade of ground data on which the model was not trained. Model estimates are robust to alternate ways of incorporating fire and plume data (SI Appendix, Fig. S3 and Tables S1–S3) and performance in predicting variation in overall $PM_{2.5}$ is on par with benchmark remote-sensing-based approaches (SI Appendix, Fig. S4) and exceeds reported performance of CTMs (SI Appendix). We compare estimates from this reduced-form approach to other region-specific estimates of smoke concentrations in the literature, finding that our approach provides similar estimates of the share of overall $PM_{2.5}$ from

smoke as recent studies covering smaller regions or periods (SI Appendix, Fig. S5).

Our results show that the contribution of wildfire smoke to $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations in the US has grown substantially since the mid 2000s, and in recent years has accounted for up to half of the overall $PM_{2.5}$ exposure in western regions as compared to <20% a decade ago (Fig. 1H). While increases in contribution of smoke to $PM_{2.5}$ are concentrated in the western US, they can also be seen in other regions (Fig. 2 A and B), a result of long-distance transport of smoke from large fires. Indeed, in midwestern and eastern regions of the United States, a growing share of smoke is estimated to originate from fires in the western United States or from outside the United States (13) (Fig. 2 C and D), mirroring recent findings on the substantial transboundary movement of overall $PM_{2.5}$ within the United States (25). Exposure patterns are also pertinent to environmental justice debates: We find that while counties with higher proportions of non-Hispanic Whites in the population are less exposed to total $PM_{2.5}$, as has long been recognized in the environmental justice community, they are actually more exposed on average to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ from wildfire smoke (Fig. 2 E and F). How these differences in ambient smoke-based $PM_{2.5}$ exposure translate to actual individual exposures will depend on a variety of individual factors, including disparities in time spent outdoors and in the characteristics of indoor home and work environments, many of which could correlate with socioeconomic factors. For instance, infiltration of outdoor pollutants into homes is known to be higher on average for older, smaller homes and for lower-income households

Fig. 2. The quantity, source, and incidence of wildfire smoke. (A and B) Average predicted micrograms per cubic meter of $PM_{2.5}$ attributable to wildfire smoke in 2006 to 2008 and 2016 to 2018, as calculated from a statistical model fitting satellite-derived smoke plume data. (C) Share of smoke originating outside the United States, June to September 2007 to 2014 (calculated from ref. 13), with a substantial amount of smoke in the Northeast and Midwest originating from Canadian fires and about 60% of smoke in the Northeast originating outside the country; nationally, ~11% of smoke is estimated to originate outside the country. (D) The share of smoke originating in the western United States, June to September 2007 to 2014. Smoke originating in the western United States accounts for 54% of the smoke experienced in the rest of the United States. (E and F) Racial exposure gradients are opposite for particulate matter from smoke compared to total particulate matter: Across the coterminous United States, counties with a higher population proportion of non-Hispanic whites have lower average particulate matter exposure but higher average ambient exposure to particulate matter from smoke ($P < 0.01$ for both relationships).

(26), and these differences could lead to disparities in overall individual exposure even if ambient exposures are not different.

These trends and patterns highlight important points of tension between existing air quality regulation and the growing threat from wildfire smoke and raise important unanswered research questions that will be critical to informing policy choice. Current approaches to regulation in the United States treat air quality primarily as a local problem, wherein counties are penalized if pollutant concentrations exceed designated short- or long-term thresholds. Current regulation under the Clean Air Act also potentially exempts wildfire smoke—but not smoke from prescribed burns—from attainment designation. These approaches appear at odds with the transboundary nature and growing contribution of wildfire smoke to air quality.

To better guide policy, a first key scientific contribution will be a better quantification of smoke exposures and agreed-upon methods for validating these exposures. Both statistical and transport-based approaches to exposure assessment have their strengths and shortcomings, and the performance of both should be evaluated based on metrics relevant to the measurement of downstream health responses. In particular, to isolate smoke exposure from potential confounds, most statistical approaches in recent health impact studies use variation over time in pollution exposure to estimate health effects. This implies that smoke models used for estimating health impacts should be evaluated in their ability to predict temporal variation in $PM_{2.5}$ at relevant locations, not just spatial patterns in $PM_{2.5}$ levels; most existing validation efforts focus on the latter. To guard against overfitting, these evaluations must be done on ground data not used in model training. Our model shows how a relatively simple statistical approach can reasonably accurately predict variation in smoke-based $PM_{2.5}$, but such approaches—either alone or in combination with CTMs—can likely be substantially

improved. [While we do not consider them here, enhanced wildfire activity could also have meaningful negative impacts on water quality through increased runoff and subsequent suspension of particles, trace metals, and chemicals (27); better measuring these exposures and their health impacts is another key area for research.]

A second key scientific question is the nature of health responses to wildfire smoke. Growing evidence indicates a range of negative health consequence associated with wildfire smoke exposure (10, 28), consistent with a vast literature on the broader health consequences of polluted air. Most recent evidence suggests that there is no “safe” level of exposure to key pollutants such as $PM_{2.5}$ (29, 30), but differences in the shape of the pollution–health response function at low levels of exposure can have large implications for the benefits of pollution reduction.

To illustrate this sensitivity, we combine pollution changes predicted from our statistical model with three recently published mortality response functions (29, 31, 32) to simulate changes in older-adult mortality predicted by various changes in $PM_{2.5}$ exposure induced by mitigating wildfire smoke. Guided by existing estimates of how prescribed burning reduces subsequent wildfire activity (33) (*SI Appendix*), we evaluate stylized scenarios in which the use of prescribed burning changes the interannual distribution and overall amount of $PM_{2.5}$ from smoke. Estimates of the annual number of lives saved among older adults for a given change in smoke differ by a factor of 3 across published response functions, implying large average differences in the benefits of smoke mitigation (Fig. 3). Evidence on whether certain populations are more susceptible to smoke exposure is also lacking (10, 28).

The large potential health benefits of smoke mitigation also raise key questions about wildfire management strategies. For instance, existing evidence does not provide a comprehensive understanding of how a given prescribed burning intervention will

Fig. 3. Health consequences of changes in smoke exposure depend on the assumed dose–response function and on the magnitude of management- or climate-driven changes in smoke. (A) Distributions of $PM_{2.5}$ for all grid-cell years in the contiguous United States, 2006 to 2018, under several stylized wildfire management strategies and climate change scenarios (see *SI Appendix* for details). The baseline distribution of total predicted $PM_{2.5}$ from all sources is in black. Gray distributions show alternative scenarios in which the timing and/or amount of overall smoke-related $PM_{2.5}$ is altered through management interventions or increased due to climate, including the (hypothetical) full elimination of smoke $PM_{2.5}$. **(B and C)** Annual number of avoided premature deaths in the US population age 65+ y for each management strategy, calculated by combining the $PM_{2.5}$ distributions in A with published long-run $PM_{2.5}$ exposure–response functions depicted in C (29, 31, 32).

change the timing, amount, and spatial distribution of smoke, and we find that alternate estimates of the efficacy of prescribed burning in reducing the subsequent size of wildfires (33) can lead to more than twofold differences in estimated health benefits of prescribed burns (Fig. 3). Similarly, current fire suppression efforts understandably focus on protecting homes and structures, but the overall population health impact of a heavily polluting wildfire that does not threaten structures could be much worse than that of a smaller fire that does threaten structures. In addition, fuels management activities are targeted at local community protection and ecosystem benefits and do not consider likely downstream impacts of wildfire on large populations. Additional quantitative work is needed to help navigate these difficult trade-offs.

A third key question is whether source-agnostic $PM_{2.5}$ -health-response functions are appropriate for estimating wildfire-smoke-specific health impacts. Although it is commonly hypothesized, existing literature is mixed on whether exposure to wildfire smoke has different health impacts than exposure to other sources of $PM_{2.5}$ (34), with some evidence that differences are outcome specific (35). Improved science on this topic—including necessary investments in speciated monitoring to distinguish wildfire-specific pollutants—will be critical for understanding wildfire impacts.

Fourth, how might the interaction of climate change and wildfire risk shape policy priorities? A warming climate is responsible for roughly half of the increase in burned area in the United States (4), and future climate change could lead to up to an additional doubling of wildfire-related particulate emissions in fire-prone areas (36) or a many-fold increase in burned area (37, 38). Costs from these increases include both the downstream economic and health costs of smoke exposure, as well as the cost of suppression activities, direct loss of life and property, and other adaptive measure (e.g., power shutoffs) that have widespread economic consequences. It is currently unknown whether accounting for these wildfire-related costs meaningfully increases the estimated overall economic damages from climate change.

To begin to quantify the possible cost of climate-induced wildfire increases, we use our statistical model and stylized scenarios to calculate the change in smoke exposure and resulting mortality associated with projected increases in wildfire risk. Using projected increases in future smoke broadly consistent with existing literature (36–38), we calculate that increased mortality from climate-change-induced wildfire smoke could approach projected overall increases in temperature-related mortality—itsself the largest estimated

contributor to economic damages in the United States (39) (*SI Appendix*). More detailed studies are needed to refine these estimates in terms of their magnitude, their geographic specificity, and the particular subpopulations that might be the most affected. A key related policy question will be whether and to what degree to modify current exceptions to the Clean Air Act granted to states for pollution impacts from wildfire smoke, as these erode gains from efforts aimed at reducing $PM_{2.5}$ from other pollution sources.

Finally, wildfires have strongly interacted with the COVID-19 pandemic in ways that require further study. COVID-19 has to some degree impeded the ability of government and the private sector to respond to wildfire risk, before, while, and after fires occur. The scale of the 2020 wildfire season in many parts of the West, where drought in the 2019 to 2020 rainy season followed an accumulation of fuels during a relatively wet 2018 to 2019 season has presented particularly acute challenges. Wildland firefighter trainings were delayed or sometimes canceled, convict firefighter crews were unavailable due to early release from state prisons to avoid COVID outbreaks, many fuels management treatments did not occur in winter and spring, utilities faced at least some delays in wildfire risk reduction activities, and traditional approaches to wildfire evacuation have proved more challenging due to lowered capacity at evacuation centers resulting from social distancing requirements. It is currently unknown but probable that the historic fire season, and consequent smoke impacts, has also worsened COVID-related health outcomes, as early evidence suggests that exposure to air pollution increases both COVID cases and deaths in the United States (40, 41) (a finding consistent with the relationship between pollution and other viral respiratory illness) (42, 43). A better causal understanding of the impact of air pollution on COVID outcomes, including that from wildfires, is a critically urgent research priority, and scholars have provided guidelines on how air pollution/COVID relationships might be best studied (44). Findings from this research could be important in guiding labor- and finance-constrained firefighting effort and fuels management strategies as the pandemic continues.

Data Availability. Data and code have been deposited in GitHub (github.com/burke-lab/wildfire-map-public) (45).

Acknowledgments

We thank the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and NSF (CNH 1715557) for generous funding.

- 1 National Interagency Fire Center, *Wildland Fire Statistics*, National Interagency Fire Center, *Wildland Fire Statistics*. https://www.nifc.gov/fireInfo/fireInfo_statistics.html. Accessed 25 June 2020.
- 2 J. R. Marlon et al., Long-term perspective on wildfires in the western USA. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**, E535–E543 (2012).
- 3 A. L. Westerling, H. G. Hidalgo, D. R. Cayan, T. W. Swetnam, Warming and earlier spring increase western US forest wildfire activity. *Science* **313**, 940–943 (2006).
- 4 J. T. Abatzoglou, A. P. Williams, Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **113**, 11770–11775 (2016).
- 5 A. Bar-Massada, S. I. Stewart, R. B. Hammer, M. H. Mockrin, V. C. Radeloff, Using structure locations as a basis for mapping the wildland urban interface. *J. Environ. Manage.* **128**, 540–547 (2013).
- 6 V. C. Radeloff et al., Rapid growth of the US wildland-urban interface raises wildfire risk. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **115**, 3314–3319 (2018).
- 7 P. Baylis, J. Boomhower, Moral hazard, wildfires, and the economic incidence of natural disasters. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, 10.3386/w26550 (2019).
- 8 C. A. Kolden, We're not doing enough prescribed fire in the western United States to mitigate wildfire risk. *Fire* **2**, 30 (2019).
- 9 W. Schroeder et al., Validation analyses of an operational fire monitoring product: The hazard mapping system. *Int. J. Rem. Sens.* **29**, 6059–6066 (2008).
- 10 W. E. Cascio, Wildland fire smoke and human health. *Sci. Total Environ.* **624**, 586–595 (2018).
- 11 N. Miller, D. Molitor, E. Zou, Blowing smoke: Health impacts of wildfire plume dynamics. http://www.eric-zou.com/s/smoke_MMZ_201710.pdf. Accessed 25 June 2020.
- 12 A. L. Johnson, M. J. Abramson, M. Dennekamp, G. J. Williamson, Y. Guo, Particulate matter modeling techniques for epidemiological studies of open biomass fire smoke exposure: A review. *Air Qual. Atmos. Heal.* **13**, 35–75 (2020).
- 13 S. J. Brey, M. Ruminski, S. A. Atwood, E. V. Fischer, Connecting smoke plumes to sources using hazard mapping system (HMS) smoke and fire location data over North America. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **18**, 1745–1761 (2018).
- 14 K. O'Dell, B. Ford, E. V. Fischer, J. R. Pierce, Contribution of wildland-fire smoke to US $PM_{2.5}$ and its influence on recent trends. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **53**, 1797–1804 (2019).

- 15 S. N. Koplitz, C. G. Nolte, G. A. Pouliot, J. M. Vukovich, J. Beidler, Influence of uncertainties in burned area estimates on modeled wildland fire PM_{2.5} and ozone pollution in the contiguous US. *Atmos. Environ.* **191**, 328–339 (2018).
- 16 T. S. Carter et al, How emissions uncertainty influences the distribution and radiative impacts of smoke from fires in North America. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **20**, 2073–2097. (2020).
- 17 F. H. Johnston et al, Estimated global mortality attributable to smoke from landscape fires. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **120**, 695–701 (2012).
- 18 R. A. Kahn et al, Wildfire smoke injection heights: Two perspectives from space. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **35**, L04809 (2008).
- 19 Y. Rastigejev, R. Park, M. P. Brenner, D. J. Jacob, Resolving intercontinental pollution plumes in global models of atmospheric transport. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **115** (2010).
- 20 L. Zhang et al, Sources contributing to background surface ozone in the US intermountain West. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **13**, 25871–25909 (2014).
- 21 J. C. Liu et al, Wildfire-specific fine particulate matter and risk of hospital admissions in urban and rural counties. *Epidemiology* **28**, 77–85 (2017).
- 22 H. Forrister et al, Evolution of brown carbon in wildfire plumes. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **42**, 4623–4630 (2015).
- 23 S. Tomaz et al, Photochemical cloud processing of primary wildfire emissions as a potential source of secondary organic aerosol. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **52**, 11027–11037 (2018).
- 24 M. J. Gansch et al, Ubiquitous influence of wildfire emissions and secondary organic aerosol on summertime atmospheric aerosol in the forested Great Lakes region. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **18**, 3701–3715 (2018).
- 25 I. C. Dedoussi, S. D. Eastham, E. Monier, S. R. Barrett, Premature mortality related to United States cross-state air pollution. *Nature* **578**, 261–265 (2020).
- 26 W. R. Chan, J. Joh, M. H. Sherman, Analysis of air leakage measurements of US houses. *Energy Build.* **66**, 616–625 (2013).
- 27 H. G. Smith, G. J. Sheridan, P. N. Lane, P. Nyman, S. Haydon, Wildfire effects on water quality in forest catchments: A review with implications for water supply. *J. Hydrol.* **396**, 170–192 (2011).
- 28 C. E. Reid et al, Critical review of health impacts of wildfire smoke exposure. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **124**, 1334–1343 (2016).
- 29 Q. Di et al, Air pollution and mortality in the Medicare population. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **376**, 2513–2522 (2017).
- 30 T. Deryugina, G. Heutel, N. H. Miller, D. Molitor, J. Reif, The mortality and medical costs of air pollution: Evidence from changes in wind direction. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **109**, 4178–4219 (2019).
- 31 R. Burnett et al, Global estimates of mortality associated with long-term exposure to outdoor fine particulate matter. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **115**, 9592–9597 (2018).
- 32 J. D. Sacks et al, The environmental benefits mapping and analysis program–community edition (benmap–ce): A tool to estimate the health and economic benefits of reducing air pollution. *Environ. Model. Software* **104**, 118–129 (2018).
- 33 M. Cochrane et al, Estimation of wildfire size and risk changes due to fuels treatments. *Int. J. Wildland Fire* **21**, 357–367 (2012).
- 34 C. Black, Y. Tesfaigzi, J. A. Bassein, L. A. Miller, Wildfire smoke exposure and human health: Significant gaps in research for a growing public health issue. *Environ. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* **55**, 186–195 (2017).
- 35 S. DeFlorio-Barker, J. Crooks, J. Reyes, A. G. Rappold, Cardiopulmonary effects of fine particulate matter exposure among older adults, during wildfire and non-wildfire periods, in the United States 2008–2010. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **127**, 037006 (2019).
- 36 M. D. Hurteau, A. L. Westerling, C. Wiedinmyer, B. P. Bryant, Projected effects of climate and development on California wildfire emissions through 2100. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **48**, 2298–2304 (2014).
- 37 X. Yue, L. J. Mickley, J. A. Logan, J. O. Kaplan, Ensemble projections of wildfire activity and carbonaceous aerosol concentrations over the western United States in the mid-21st century. *Atmos. Environ.* **77**, 767–780 (2013).
- 38 USGCRP, 2017: *Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment*, D. J. Wuebbles, D. W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D. J. Dokken, B. C. Stewart, T. K. Maycock, Eds. (U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, 2017), vol. I.
- 39 S. Hsiang et al, Estimating economic damage from climate change in the United States. *Science* **356**, 1362–1369 (2017).
- 40 X. Wu, R. C. Nethery, M. B. Sabath, D. Braun, F. Dominici, Air pollution and COVID-19 mortality in the United States: Strengths and limitations of an ecological regression analysis. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, 45 (2020).
- 41 C. Persico et al, “Deregulation in a time of pandemic: Does pollution increase coronavirus cases or deaths?” (Discussion Paper 13231, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn, Germany, 2020).
- 42 Y. Cui et al, Air pollution and case fatality of SARS in the People’s Republic of China: An ecologic study, *Environ. Health* **2**, 15 (2003).
- 43 J. S. G. Zivin, M. J. Neidell, N. J. Sanders, G. Singer, When externalities collide: Influenza and pollution. National Bureau of Economic Research, 10.3386/w27982 (2020).
- 44 P. J. Villeneuve, M. S. Goldberg, Methodological considerations for epidemiological studies of air pollution and the SARS and COVID-19 coronavirus outbreaks. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **128**, 095001 (2020).
- 45 M. Burke, A. Driscoll, S. Heft-Neal, J. Xue, J. Burney, M. Wara, Replication data for “The changing risk and burden of wildfire in the United States.” GitHub. <https://github.com/burke-lab/wildfire-map-public>. Deposited 1 December 2020.

1

2 **Supplementary Information for**

3 **The changing risk and burden of wildfire in the US**

4 **Marshall Burke, Anne Driscoll, Sam Heft-Neal, Jenny Xue, Jennifer Burney, Michael Wara**

5 **Corresponding Author name.**
6 **E-mail: mburke@stanford.edu**

7 **This PDF file includes:**

- 8 Supplementary text
- 9 Figs. S1 to S6 (not allowed for Brief Reports)
- 10 Tables S1 to S3 (not allowed for Brief Reports)
- 11 SI References

Supporting Information Text

Estimating houses in WUI. The wildland urban interface (WUI) is the area where houses and other man-made structures are near or overlap wildland vegetation. The U.S. Federal Register defines two types of WUI(1). Intermix WUI is defined as an area with more than one structure per 40 acres ($6.17 \text{ houses}/\text{km}^2$) and with over 50% wildland vegetation. Interface WUI is defined as an area with less than 50% vegetation but that lies within 1.5 miles (2.4km) of a 5km^2 or larger area that is at least 75% wildland vegetation. We follow these Federal definitions in our analysis.

To map WUI in the conterminous U.S., we use an approach similar to Bar-Massada et al(2) and Radeloff et al(3), where we create two rasters: 1) a household density map of the conterminous U.S.; and 2) a wildland vegetation density map identifying areas with high levels of vegetation. The household density raster was created using CoreLogic household data, a proprietary dataset which includes detailed information on all existing housing structures (including the year the structure was built, longitude and latitude, household value, and so on). We convert the dataset into a spatial points layer, and filter for residential houses only. For households without a recorded year built we assume that the household was built on or before the year 2000 and code the missing year as 2000. The vegetation density raster was computed using the National Land Cover Dataset, a 30m resolution raster of land type across the U.S. We use the same vegetation classification as Radeloff et al.(4)(3), where we classify forests (classes 41-43), shrublands (classes 51 and 52), grasslands (class 71), and woody wetlands (class 90) as wildland vegetation.

We use the vegetation and housing density rasters to compute intermix WUI. To speed up computation time, instead of calculating household and vegetation density using a cell-level moving window approach(2), we aggregate the 30m resolution NLCD dataset up to 1km cells. To obtain vegetation density, we sum the area that is wildland vegetation within each 1km cell and code “1” for each cell where wildland vegetation is over 50% and “0” otherwise. To obtain housing density, we compute the number of houses per 1km cell and code “1” for each cell where there are more than 6.17 houses, and “0” otherwise. Intermix WUI is then calculated by multiplying the household density and vegetation density rasters. The resulting intermix raster has a cell value of “1” if household density is over 6.17 houses and wildland vegetation is over 50% and “0” otherwise.

To calculate interface WUI, we first identify continuous patches of wildland vegetation by converting the vegetation density raster into spatial polygons. We keep polygons that are over 5km^2 , and create a buffer of 2.4km around each polygon. The polygons are then converted into a vegetation buffer raster, where cells that fall within the 2.4km buffer around each polygon are labelled “1”, and “0” otherwise. Interface WUI is then calculated by multiplying the household density raster and the vegetation buffer raster. The resulting interface raster has a value of “1” if household density is over 6.17 and if cells fall within the buffered area.

Finally, we calculate the number of households that fall within either the interface or the intermix WUI by using the CoreLogic spatial points layer which contains the individual household locations. For each household, we identify whether the household falls into either WUI category by extracting the intermix and interface raster cell values. For each year the NLCD is available, we create new household density and vegetation rasters and classify WUI status for all households. Finally, we count the number of households inside the interface and intermix WUI areas for each year. Annual estimates are plotted in Fig. 1c.

Our approach is overall similar to both Radeloff et al(3) and Bar Massada et al(2) with a few minor differences. Radeloff et al aggregated both vegetation estimates and housing counts to the census block level (which average 0.9sq km in the US, so quite close to our 1km grids). Bar-Massada et al created buffers of different sizes around 30m wildland pixels from NLCD and used a point-level household location dataset like ours to generate housing density estimates in the surrounding buffers, and then used those estimates to designate the WUI. Bar Massada et al find that the estimated size of the WUI depends on the chosen buffer size, with larger buffers yielding larger estimates of the number of houses in the WUI. They note that this choice is in effect up to the user, with different local policy-makers able to define buffers as they see fit. At buffers of $r=500\text{m}$ (or roughly the size of our 1km grid squares), their approach gave very similar estimates to the Radeloff et al census block averaging approach applied to their data, and this helped guide our choice of 1km grid squares in our analysis.

Nevertheless, as emphasized by Bar Massada et al(2), the estimated size and number of households in the WUI is sensitive to choices over the spatial scale at which the analysis is conducted, and our estimates in Fig 1 reflect to some extent these choices.

Estimating $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ attributable to wildfire smoke. To quantify the variation in $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ attributable to wildfire smoke, we estimate a statistical model that relates satellite-derived data on wildfire smoke and fire activity along to $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ data collected by ground monitors. Our goal is to provide a tractable way to measure the contribution of smoke to overall $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ at a local level and across time in the US using a model that can be directly and easily validated across wide geographies against ground data on which the model was not trained.

The advantage of this “reduced-form” statistical approach, relative to chemical transport model (CTM) based approaches, is that it does not rely directly on uncertain emissions inventories or on an ability to correctly model atmospheric chemistry or plume dispersion, both of which have been shown to challenge CTM-based approaches. Furthermore, the model can easily be run at large spatial and temporal scale, and estimates of overall $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ can be readily validated against ground data on which the model was not trained using cross-validation. Generating temporal data across many locations is important, as such variation is what is typically exploited in recent studies to estimate the impacts of air pollution on health outcomes(5, 6). The disadvantage of the statistical approach is an inability to easily constrain where the smoke is in the atmospheric column or a way to directly measure smoke density in each plume, and the lack of foolproof way of linking particular smoke plumes to source fires, although methods for the latter are being explored(7). We describe and validate our approach to indirectly constraining these factors below.

We train a statistical model that relates variation in nearby emissions sources and both near and distant fires to ground-measured concentrations of PM_{2.5} at 100km grid cells throughout the US:

$$PM_{irt} = f(plumes_{irt}) + Z_{irt} + \alpha_r + \delta_t \quad [1]$$

where PM_{irt} is annual average PM_{2.5} concentration at grid cell i in region r in year t , calculated as the average of any EPA monitoring stations reporting in that grid cell. The variable $plumes_{irt}$ includes the count, size, and source of wildfire plumes that overlay the grid cell in a given year, as derived from remotely-sensed smoke and fire variables, and Z_{irt} is a vector of time-varying sources of particulate emissions (direct or precursor) derived from a range of data sources. Any other sources of average difference in PM_{2.5} between regions (e.g. unmodeled sources of stable regional emissions) is picked up by the vector of regional intercepts α_r , and any additional time-varying sources of PM_{2.5} that are common across all grid cells are accounted for by the vector of year intercepts δ_t .

Regions are defined starting from the USGS physiographic divisions but are adapted to ensure that they are similarly sized and contain at least two reporting EPA monitors. We initially define our regions following USGS's second level divisions ("provinces"). However, for the five largest provinces (each of which covers 11-25% of the lower 48) we use the next level USGS division referred to as "sections". The 9 sections that did not have the required two EPA stations are manually merged with their smallest neighbor, leaving a final count of 42 regions (Fig S2).

Our *plumes* measure includes both fire and smoke variables constructed from satellite-based estimates of smoke plumes and of fire activity compiled as part of NOAA's Hazard Mapping System (HMS) Fire and Smoke Product (8). Both sources are generated by trained analysts who analyze sub-daily animated imagery primarily from the geostationary operational environmental satellite system (GOES). The system has provided a measure of smoke and fire activity every few hours throughout the daytime across the entire US for more than a decade, and we utilize the daily lists of active fires and smoke plumes. Our *plumes* measure is constructed as follows:

1. Beginning with HMS daily fire location data, which is provided as active fire points on a given day, we group contiguous fire points into a single fire by creating a buffer of 2.9 km around each point and merging points whose buffers overlap. We use 2.9km as each cell is 4km across, so from the centroid to the edge of the cell is $\sqrt{(2^2 + 2^2)} = 2.83 \sim 2.9$ km. In order to capture large fires that are burning over several days, and have produced large plumes over that time, we use fire points from the day in question as well as the three days prior.
2. For each plume, we identify the largest intersecting fire active on that day and associate the plume with that "origin fire".
3. We then find the distance from each grid cell the plume overlaps to the origin fire, also noting the size of the origin fire.
4. Finally, for each grid-cell-year we generate counts of plumes overlapping that grid cell in each of nine classes, where the classes are a combination of origin fire size tercile (small = <140 acres, medium == 140-800 acres, large == >800 acres) and distance to origin fire tercile (close = <280km, med = 280-1000km, far>1000km). In our baseline model, these nine covariates are used as regressors in Equation 1.

The goal of our binning approach is to provide the model information that can proxy for the density of smoke and where it is in the atmospheric column: fires further away are likely to be higher in the column(7), and larger and more nearby fires are likely to generate more smoke near the ground. Even though our method of matching to origin fire is likely imperfect, our binning approach does appear to improve on alternative specifications that do not use this information: models that simply count overhead plumes and do not use information on distance or size of origin fire perform less well and over-attribute high smoke PM_{2.5} to the Midwest, which experiences many plumes from distant fires (Fig S3 and Table S3). Our binned model attributes less smoke PM_{2.5} to the Midwest, and overall attributes a somewhat smaller share of overall PM_{2.5} to wildfire smoke (Fig S3) – although the temporal and spatial patterns are largely similar.

Non-wildfire-related time-varying sources of PM_{2.5} are collected from various sources and informed by the EPA's National Emissions Inventory (NEI), which identifies key sources of particulate emissions across US counties. We assemble annual information on activity related to industrial processes, aircraft traffic, natural gas production, mining, power plants, transportation, and agriculture. In particular, we assemble county-year-level data on population, construction payroll, mining payroll, airport locations and taxi times, natural gas production, and cattle head count. In addition, we assemble zip code-year-level data on power plant emissions as well as 1km grid cell-year-level data on traffic. Each covariate is harmonized to our 100km grid by overlaying the relevant administrative boundary at which the data are available with our grid. For missing data in grid cells that have 2 or more non-missings, we linearly interpolate between years. For grid cells that are entirely missing a variable, we impute using all other variables. We chose not to include weather and climate variables as they are likely to capture some of the variation in PM_{2.5} that is attributable to smoke, i.e. locations or years that are especially arid are likely to have higher PM_{2.5} concentrations given the role of fuel aridity in fire risk.

The last important components of Equation 1 are the region and year fixed effects which account for average differences between regions and common changes over time in both smoke exposure and overall PM_{2.5}. The fixed effects offer a parsimonious way of dealing with remaining uncertainties in non-smoke sources of PM_{2.5}. For instance, they help ensure that the model learns that the co-occurrence of lower average smoke exposure and higher average PM_{2.5} (e.g. in the Central and Northeast regions) does not indicate that reducing smoke exposure will increase average PM_{2.5}. Similarly, the year fixed effects help the model learn that the overall increase in smoke exposure over our study period and the average decline in overall PM_{2.5} again

does not imply that increasing smoke exposure decreases average PM_{2.5}. The fixed effects will be particularly important in this task if our time-varying data on non-smoke sources of PM_{2.5} are either poorly measured or missing key contributors to PM_{2.5}.

Once we have built the model with these variables, we use it to predict PM_{2.5} across the nation at observed smoke levels, then to predict the counterfactual by setting smoke exposure to 0. Predictions are bottom coded at 0, and the amount of PM_{2.5} attributed to smoke is the difference between the two predictions.

To train and validate the model, we focus on grid cells with at least one EPA station reporting at any point during our sample. We then partition these cells into disjoint sets for 10-fold cross validation, where all years in a given cell are in one fold. To be able to estimate the region and year fixed effects, all folds contain cells with PM_{2.5} observations in all regions and all years, and no cell (and thus no monitoring station) contributes information to more than one fold.

Model validation and robustness Our model validates well against data on which it was not trained, explaining 60% of the variation in overall PM_{2.5} at these held out locations (Fig S4a). This performance is very close to performance of benchmark satellite-based PM_{2.5} data generated by van Donkelaar et al (9) in the US, which we aggregate to our 100km grids for comparison (Fig S4b). The van Donkelaar data have been used widely for US and global pollution-health studies, although we emphasize that van Donkelaar are using satellite information from multiple sensors to predict overall PM_{2.5} variation, and are not attempting to estimate the wildfire component explicitly. Our temporal and spatial predictive performance in the continental US also mirrors that of van Donkelaar et al (Fig S4c-d).

Our performance appears to exceed that of many CTM-based studies in predicting overall variation in PM_{2.5}, although many smoke-based CTM studies do not report validation performance or are not directly validated on the same monitoring stations or over time, hampering comparison. To our knowledge the most comprehensive comparison of CTM and ground-based PM observations reports an $r^2 = 0.16$ for GEOS-Chem (a leading CTM) over western North America(10). Comparatively (and excluding the part of Canada in their estimates) our model has an $R^2 = 0.44$ over that region.

Our baseline model that uses binned counts of plumes by fire size and distance outperforms other ways of using the smoke and fire data (Table S3), but both temporal and spatial patterns of wildfire-attributed PM_{2.5} are generally consistent using these alternate approaches (Fig S3).

A remaining concern with our attributable smoke share estimates is that our simplified statistical model could be missing key non-smoke sources of PM_{2.5}, which would lead us to underestimate total PM_{2.5} (the denominator in the shares calculation) and thus perhaps lead to upward-biased estimates of attributable smoke share reported in Figs 1-3. However, for reasons stated above, non-smoke sources of PM_{2.5} tend to have opposite temporal and spatial relationships with overall PM_{2.5} as compared to smoke: overall PM_{2.5} has been trending down while smoke has trended up, and regions with fewer fires have historically had higher average PM_{2.5}. This means that exclusion of key non-smoke sources of PM_{2.5} could bias estimates of the impact of smoke in Equation 1 downward, resulting in smaller attributable shares.

To understand the direction of bias in attributable shares, we systematically dropped key non-smoke sources of PM_{2.5} in our data individually and jointly re-calculated the attributable shares. Dropping individual sources appeared to have minimal effect on overall estimated smoke shares (Table S1), but dropping them jointly or dropping the fixed effects as well substantially reduced the estimated smoke shares – again consistent with expected downward bias in coefficients in Equation 1 if spatial and temporal patterns in non-smoke PM_{2.5} are not accounted for. This exercise suggests that our overall estimates of attributable smoke shares are, if anything, conservative.

Comparison to other estimates We compare our results to three studies that provided temporal estimates of wildfire-attributable PM_{2.5} at either regional or national scale.

Fann et al (11) run CMAQ with and without wildfire emissions to estimate the contribution of wildfire smoke to total PM_{2.5} across the continental US between the years 2008-2012. They do not provide validation of model runs against ground data. We compare spatial and temporal patterns in smoke-attributed PM_{2.5} finding general agreement in overall spatial patterns, and similarity in the level and trend in mean smoke-attributed PM_{2.5} (Fig S5). Overall, we have higher estimates in the midwest, which is partially attributable to the fact that we also include international fires, which contribute significantly to the midwest.

Wilkins et al(12) similarly run CMAQ with and without wildfire emissions to estimate the contribution of wildfire smoke to total PM_{2.5} across the continental US between the years 2008-2012. They estimate that wildfire-derived PM_{2.5} constitute 10.5% of total PM_{2.5} over the period, which is close to our estimate of 9.2% for the same period (Fig S5f)

O'Dell et al (13) use both a statistical approach and a CTM to estimate the contribution of wildfire smoke to PM_{2.5} in the Pacific Northwest. They do not provide validation of CTM results against ground data. They report percent of PM_{2.5} attributable to smoke during the summer months (July, August, and September) from 2006-2016. As our estimates are annual, we calculate a comparable version of their estimates by assuming there is no PM_{2.5} from smoke in other months (as summer is the main fire season - see sinusoidal seasonal pattern across IMPROVE sites in Figure S1) and the PM_{2.5} in other months is equivalent to the summer non-smoke PM_{2.5}.

$$\text{Comparable yearly O'Dell estimate} = \frac{\text{summer smoke PM}_{2.5}}{\text{total summer PM}_{2.5} + (\text{summer non-smoke PM}_{2.5}) * 3}$$

These assumptions are likely to cause an underestimate of O'Dell's full year estimate of the percent of PM_{2.5} from smoke, as the assumption that there is no PM_{2.5} from smoke in other months is typically incorrect; 33% of smoke days in our data are outside that period. Nonetheless the trend in our estimates matches those of O'Dell, and our estimates are only slightly higher than theirs, as approximated from their figure data (Fig S5d).

Jaffe et al.(14) estimate statistical models that relate station-measured PM_{2.5} to nearby burned area, and use these models to estimate the contribution of wildfire smoke to overall PM_{2.5} across five regions in the Western US for the years 1988-2004. Jaffe et al use data from the IMPROVE network, which are mainly located in rural environments in which the share of anthropogenic PM_{2.5} will likely be lower than the EPA stations that are the focus of our analysis. The difference in time periods between their analysis and ours (1988-2004 versus 2006-2018) also makes comparison difficult, but we proceed as it is one of the few other papers that provides comparable estimates. We aggregate our gridded data to the five regions used in Jaffe et al and compare regional PM_{2.5} smoke shares (Fig S5e). Despite the differences in time periods, we see similar overall regional patterns, with our estimates smaller than Jaffe et al in Rockies and larger in coastal western states (Jaffe et al regions 4 and 5).

Finally, we compare our results to estimates of wildfire PM_{2.5} contributions from EPA National Emissions Inventory (NEI) data in 2008, 2011, 2014 and 2017. To estimate wildfire emissions, EPA uses data on burned area collected by national and local agencies with information on fuel type and fuel-specific emissions factors to convert burned area to local emissions. Importantly, these estimates will represent the smoke emitted from a given location, not the overall contribution of smoke to PM_{2.5} in that location (as much of this smoke will originate from fires elsewhere), and so differences between NEI and our estimates could in large part reflect the importance of non-local smoke to local PM_{2.5} concentrations. They could also reflect agency uncertainty or disagreement over whether a specific fire is a wildfire, human-caused agricultural fire, or prescribed burn. For comparison, we aggregate both our and NEI results to the state-year level, comparing estimates of wildfire-attributed PM_{2.5}, where NEI estimates are calculated as emissions per acre to make them comparable. Estimates are positively related (Fig S5g) but the differences in some years are large, again likely reflecting the importance of non-local sources of smoke and the value of alternate methods (other than official inventories) of measuring wildfire contribution to smoke exposure.

Estimating health impacts of changes in smoke exposure We use three published exposure-response curves that relate changes in overall PM_{2.5} to older-age (65+) mortality to investigate how changing forest management strategies and climate scenarios might change the overall health impacts of wildfire smoke (15–17). This exercise requires a number of assumptions. First, we assume that changes in exposure to wildfire-derived PM_{2.5} have the same effect on mortality as changes in overall exposure to PM_{2.5}. Existing work has clearly shown that smoke exposure increases mortality risk (5, 18), but does not yet conclude whether these impacts are different from other sources of PM_{2.5} exposure. A second key assumption is that these response curves reflect the causal effect of changes in PM_{2.5} on mortality. This is also an area where further research could improve estimates, as the studies we use (which are also those used in current policymaking and research on air quality impacts) use cohort-based or cross-sectional study designs that likely cannot fully isolate variation in PM_{2.5} from other factors that affect mortality risk. More recent quasi-experimental research designs (e.g. (5, 6)) will likely prove useful in this regard. Finally, our scenario analyses are highly stylized, and are meant to explore the rough magnitude of changes in smoke and health impacts and the sensitivity of overall estimates to input parameters. Our approach could be expanded to incorporate a more detailed assessment of how specific management interventions would shape pollution exposures and downstream health outcomes.

We create several different stylized scenarios for changes in smoke-related PM_{2.5} exposure under different management regimes or changes in climate. These scenarios use our statistical model to predict grid-level changes in total PM_{2.5} as smoke variables are perturbed. The changing overall distribution of PM_{2.5} across grid cells are shown in Fig 3. The specific scenarios are as follows:

- **Original Model/Baseline.** Use the total modeled PM_{2.5} for each grid-cell year.
- **Redistribute PM_{2.5} from smoke equally across years.** For each grid cell, sum up all PM_{2.5} from smoke over the 13 year study period, divide it equally and add it to the predicted PM_{2.5} with no smoke for each year. This results in a slight shrinkage of the distribution, years with high smoke have reduced PM_{2.5}, and years with low PM_{2.5} from smoke have increased PM_{2.5}. This scenario is meant to mimic a scenario in which prescribed burning increases smoke in low-wildfire years and decreases it in otherwise high-wildfire years, but the total amount of smoke-derived PM_{2.5} does not change.
- **Redistribute PM_{2.5} from smoke and reduce the total amount of PM_{2.5} from smoke.** Here we assume that fuels management strategies are able to reduce the overall amount of wildfire smoke by 25%, and that these strategies redistribute the smoke evenly across years. This stylized scenario is roughly consistent with a tripling of prescribed burn area, given existing research that suggests that each hectare burned under a prescribed burn leads to an average of 1.8 fewer hectares burned in wildfires (19), and that an acre of prescribed burn produces half the PM_{2.5} as an acre of wildfire burned(20) (as wildfires are estimated in recent work to have higher particulate emissions factors and consume more fuel). In historical data, prescribed burned acreage is roughly 5% of total wildfire acreage in western US states (this ratio is higher in the Southern US, see Fig 1e). In a scenario with A acres of total burned area (wildfire + prescribed burn), $A * 0.05$ of those would be from prescribed burn and the remaining $A * 0.95$ from wildfire.

$$\text{original abstracted total emissions} = 0.95A + (0.05A) * 0.5 = 0.975A$$

$$\text{burned area w/ X extra Rx burning} = A + X - (1.8X) = A - 0.8X$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{emissions w/ } X \text{ extra Rx burning} &= \frac{\text{new wildfire acreage} + (\text{new prescribed acreage} * 0.5)}{\text{original total acreage}} \\
&= \frac{(0.95A - 1.8X) + (0.05A + X) * 0.5}{0.95A + (0.05A) * 0.5} \\
&= \frac{0.975A - 1.3X}{0.975A} \\
&= \frac{1,702,144 - 249,648}{1,702,144} = 0.85
\end{aligned}$$

Using A equal to the average total burned area in the western US states and assuming that prescribed burn area triples ($X = A * 0.11$; $A = 1,745,789$) leads to a reduction in smoke of about 15%. We reduce our predicted smoke (as summed over all 13 years and spread equally within each grid cell) by 15%. We note that prescribed burn area in the Southeastern US has more than tripled in the last decade, suggesting such increases are in principle possible.

- **Redistribute all PM_{2.5} from smoke and dramatically reduce the total amount of PM_{2.5} derived from smoke.** Similarly, research shows in area where prescribed burning is successful each hectare burned under a prescribed burn leads to 4.9 fewer hectares burned in wildfires (19). Using the same method as above, we substitute this improved efficacy of prescribed burning, leading to a reduction in smoke of about 50%.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{emissions w/ } X \text{ extra Rx burning} &= \frac{(0.95A - 4.9X) + (0.05A + X) * 0.5}{0.95A + (0.05A) * 0.5} \\
&= \frac{0.975A - 4.5X}{0.975A} \\
&= \frac{1,702,144 - 864,165}{1,702,144} = 0.49
\end{aligned}$$

- **Remove all smoke-derived PM_{2.5}.** Use the predictions for each grid-cell year when smoke is set to 0. This functions as an estimate of the overall mortality attributable to PM_{2.5} from smoke.
- **Climate change increases smoke PM_{2.5} by 25%.** Climate change is likely to substantially increase wildfire burned area and wildfire emissions, with estimates ranging from a 25% increase in burned area in parts of the US to many-fold increases (21–23). Here we simulate the impact of the an increase in smoke in the lower range of those estimate – a 25% increase in smoke PM_{2.5}. We assume that all portions of the US experience this 25% increase. This is about half the median projected change in wildfire emissions in California (21). In our data we find that smoke PM_{2.5} is roughly linear in burned area at the regional level, and that a 50% increase in burned area would be needed on average to generate a 25% increase in smoke PM_{2.5} (see Fig S6).
- **Climate change increases smoke PM_{2.5} by 50%.** This estimate is near the median estimate for changes in wildfire emissions in California(21), but remains lower than other estimates (22, 23).

Changes in the cell-level distribution of smoke are shown in Fig 3a. These changes are then applied to the three exposure-response functions in Fig 3c, with changes in the mortality rate calculated as the response-function-specific difference in mortality rate between a given scenario s and base scenario b , i.e. $f_r(PM_s) - f_r(PM_b)$. Changes in mortality rate are calculated at each grid cell, applied to grid-level population estimates, and then summed across grids to get the change in older-age premature deaths shown in Fig 3b. For simplicity, we assume that changes in PM_{2.5} exposure are applied to the current population of 65+, and thus do not account for future population growth in this demographic or changes in the underlying older-age mortality rate.

Comparison of temperature versus smoke mortality impacts under climate change Existing studies on the impact of climate change in the US find that the impacts of future temperature change on mortality are by far the largest component of total monetized impacts of climate change(24).

We calculate that a 50% increase in smoke would lead to an average $0.35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ change in PM_{2.5}, which existing dose/response functions indicate would lead to an increase in deaths of older age adults of between 9-20 per 100,000 people. Estimates in Hsiang et al (24) suggest that each additional degree C increase in temperature leads to roughly 24 additional deaths per 100,000 older age adults (using linear function reported in Hsiang et al Table S12).

IMPROVE Network

Fig. S1. Regional trends in organic carbon (OC) particulate concentrations. **a** Locations of IMPROVE stations measuring organic carbon and total PM_{2.5}. **b**. Top right panels show seasonal trends by region show increasing OC in the Southeast in the spring, and in the West in the summer, consistent with observed fire activity. **c** Bottom plots show time series of OC and total PM_{2.5} by region; spikes in OC are coincident with large fire events in most regions.

Fig. S2. The adapted USGS physiographic sections used in the statistical smoke model.

Fig. S3. Statistical model is robust to alternate approaches to incorporating fire and smoke data. Our baseline model associates each plume with its likely source fire, and allows the impact of that plume on station $PM_{2.5}$ to differ as a function of the size of the source fire and the distance of the source fire from the location of interest. Estimates from this baseline model are similar but slightly more conservative than estimates from simpler models that model smoke simply as a function of the count of overhead plumes (purple line) or the counts of overhead plumes by size (red line), and more conservative than a model that uses plume size and allows distance to fire to enter non-linearly (blue line). Spatial patterns across models are also similar, although our baseline model attributes less smoke to the US midwest (despite that region having a high number of overhead plumes), consistent with these plumes being from distant fires and their smoke being higher in the column (7).

Fig. S4. Comparison of model performance in predicting overall PM_{2.5} to existing benchmarks. Our statistical model shows similar predictive performance to benchmark remote-sensing/statistical approaches (“van Donkelaar”, (9)) in predicting variation in PM_{2.5} from remote data. **a** Comparison of predicted versus observed PM_{2.5} from our model, evaluated on US monitoring stations on which model was not trained; each dot is a station-month. **b** Comparison of observed versus predicted PM_{2.5} from van Donkelaar, evaluated on US monitoring stations; these stations contributed to model development in van Donkelaar(9), and so are not “held out” as in (a). **c-d** Predictive performance of our model and the van Donkelaar model across years and regions in the US show very similar patterns of performance.

Fig. S5. Comparison of our estimates of attributable PM_{2.5} from smoke to other estimates. **a-b** Comparison with estimates in ref (11) for 2008-2012 show similarities in both spatial and temporal patterns of wildfire-attributed annual mean PM_{2.5}. Our estimates for the Midwest appear higher, perhaps because we include plumes originating from fires outside the US, which is important in the upper Midwest which is estimated to receive between 30 and 60 percent of smoke from outside the US(7). **c** Comparison with estimates in (11). **d** Comparison with estimates in ref (13) for the Pacific Northwest. O'Dell reports percentages for the July, August, September season, while our estimates are annual. To create a comparable number we assume that there is 0 smoke PM_{2.5} in other seasons, and calculate (smoke PM)/(total summer PM + 3*summer non-smoke pm). **e** Comparison with ref (14), who generate estimates of 5 regions in the Western US over the years 1988-2004. Comparison is imperfect as our estimates are for 2006-2018, but estimates follow a similar regional pattern. Even though burned area has grown substantially, our estimates are more conservative than Jaffe et al's estimates in three regions; our estimates are higher in Regions 4 and 5 (California, Oregon, Washington) where burned area has grown most rapidly. **f** Comparison with ref (12), using data from 2008-2012 across the lower 48 states. **g** Comparison with National Emissions Inventory (NEI) estimates of primary PM_{2.5} emitted from wildfires, aggregated to the state-year level for 2014 and 2017. NEI data provides total μg emitted from wildfires, here it is reported by thousandths of a μg per acre, while the modeled value is μg per m³; estimates of total PM from smoke in a county, much of which comes from distant fires, should not necessarily correlate well with estimates of wildfire emissions from that county.

Fig. S6. Relationship between detrended burned area and detrended predicted $PM_{2.5}$ from smoke is linear. Each dot represents a region-year, using the same nine regions in Fig 1e to calculate burned area from wildfires (data from ref(25)) and using our model to calculate smoke-derived $PM_{2.5}$. The slope of the relationship between log detrended smoke $PM_{2.5}$ and log detrended wildfire burned area is 0.55, suggesting a doubling of burned area in a region leads to a ~50% increase in smoke in a given region. This calculation will not capture smoke that leaves the region.

Table S1. Sensitivity of mean estimated % PM_{2.5} from wildland fire smoke upon removal of different covariates from statistical model. Overall estimates are not sensitive to removal of individual co-variates, but change when all co-variates are removed and change substantially when fixed effects are also removed, as expected.

None	Coal	Cattle	Mining	Traffic	All	All+FE
13.5%	13.7%	13.3%	13.4%	13.5%	10.1%	2.1%

Table S2. Sensitivity of mean estimated % PM_{2.5} from wildland fire smoke using observed total PM_{2.5} instead of predicted total PM_{2.5} in denominator. “Observed” total PM_{2.5} is the average computed from monitoring data each monitoring station. The sample is thus limited in this comparison to the subset of locations in our data that have monitoring stations

Share using modeled PM _{2.5}	Share using observed PM _{2.5}
10.2%	8.5%

Table S3. Model performance across different methods of quantifying PM_{2.5} from smoke. We compare overall model performance (as measured by r^2 between observed PM_{2.5} and predicted PM_{2.5}) between a model with no smoke or fire variables but all other inputs, and a model that includes those inputs plus the smoke and fire variables, coded in different ways. Performance is evaluated on held-out stations on which the model was not trained. Our baseline model that uses counts of plumes by fire size and distance explains an additional 6% of variation in observed PM_{2.5} relative to a model with no smoke variables. Alternate models that also use fire distance variables perform nearly as well, and simpler models that use only counts of plumes perform less well.

Binned by fire & distance	Weighted by log distance to fire	Binned by size of plume	Raw count
7.1%	7.0%	5.7%	5.5%

References

1. D Glickman, B Babbitt, Urban wildland interface communities within the vicinity of federal lands that are at high risk from wildfire. *Fed. Regist.* **66**, 751–777 (2001).
2. A Bar-Massada, SI Stewart, RB Hammer, MH Mockrin, VC Radeloff, Using structure locations as a basis for mapping the wildland urban interface. *J. environmental management* **128**, 540–547 (2013).
3. VC Radeloff, et al., Rapid growth of the us wildland-urban interface raises wildfire risk. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, 3314–3319 (2018).
4. VC Radeloff, et al., The wildland–urban interface in the united states. *Ecol. applications* **15**, 799–805 (2005).
5. N Miller, D Molitor, E Zou, Blowing smoke: Health impacts of wildfire plume dynamics. *working paper* (2017).
6. T Deryugina, G Heutel, NH Miller, D Molitor, J Reif, The mortality and medical costs of air pollution: Evidence from changes in wind direction. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **109**, 4178–4219 (2019).
7. SJ Brey, M Ruminski, SA Atwood, EV Fischer, Connecting smoke plumes to sources using hazard mapping system (hms) smoke and fire location data over north america. *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.* **18**, 1745–1761 (2018).
8. W Schroeder, et al., Validation analyses of an operational fire monitoring product: The hazard mapping system. *Int. J. Remote. Sens.* **29**, 6059–6066 (2008).
9. A Van Donkelaar, et al., Global estimates of fine particulate matter using a combined geophysical-statistical method with information from satellites, models, and monitors. *Environ. science & technology* **50**, 3762–3772 (2016).
10. A Van Donkelaar, et al., Global estimates of ambient fine particulate matter concentrations from satellite-based aerosol optical depth: development and application. *Environ. health perspectives* **118**, 847–855 (2010).

11. N Fann, et al., The health impacts and economic value of wildland fire episodes in the us: 2008–2012. *Sci. total environment* **610**, 802–809 (2018).
12. JL Wilkins, G Pouliot, K Foley, W Appel, T Pierce, The impact of us wildland fires on ozone and particulate matter: a comparison of measurements and cmaq model predictions from 2008 to 2012. *Int. J. Wildland Fire* **27**, 684–698 (2018).
13. K O'Dell, B Ford, EV Fischer, JR Pierce, Contribution of wildland-fire smoke to us pm_{2.5} and its influence on recent trends. *Environ. science & technology* **53**, 1797–1804 (2019).
14. D Jaffe, W Hafner, D Chand, A Westerling, D Spracklen, Interannual variations in pm_{2.5} due to wildfires in the western united states. *Environ. science & technology* **42**, 2812–2818 (2008).
15. Q Di, et al., Air pollution and mortality in the medicare population. *New Engl. J. Medicine* **376**, 2513–2522 (2017).
16. R Burnett, et al., Global estimates of mortality associated with long-term exposure to outdoor fine particulate matter. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, 9592–9597 (2018).
17. JD Sacks, et al., The environmental benefits mapping and analysis program–community edition (benmap–ce): A tool to estimate the health and economic benefits of reducing air pollution. *Environ. Model. & Softw.* **104**, 118–129 (2018).
18. WE Cascio, Wildland fire smoke and human health. *Sci. total environment* **624**, 586–595 (2018).
19. M Cochrane, et al., Estimation of wildfire size and risk changes due to fuels treatments. *Int. J. Wildland Fire* **21**, 357–367 (2012).
20. X Liu, et al., Airborne measurements of western us wildfire emissions: Comparison with prescribed burning and air quality implications. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres* **122**, 6108–6129 (2017).
21. MD Hurteau, AL Westerling, C Wiedinmyer, BP Bryant, Projected effects of climate and development on california wildfire emissions through 2100. *Environ. science & technology* **48**, 2298–2304 (2014).
22. X Yue, LJ Mickley, JA Logan, JO Kaplan, Ensemble projections of wildfire activity and carbonaceous aerosol concentrations over the western united states in the mid-21st century. *Atmospheric Environ.* **77**, 767–780 (2013).
23. DJ Wuebbles, DW Fahey, KA Hibbard, Climate science special report: fourth national climate assessment, volume i. (2017).
24. S Hsiang, et al., Estimating economic damage from climate change in the united states. *Science* **356**, 1362–1369 (2017).
25. National Interagency Fire Center, Wildland fire statistics, National interagency fire center, wildland fire statistics. (2019).