# **@AGU**PUBLICATIONS

Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems

#### Supporting Information for

#### Deep Learning provides substantial improvements to county-level fire weather forecasting over the western United States

Rackhun Son<sup>1</sup>, Po-Lun Ma<sup>2</sup>, Hailong Wang<sup>2</sup>, Philp J. Rasch<sup>2,3</sup>, Shih-Yu (Simon) Wang<sup>4</sup>, Hyungjun Kim<sup>5,9,10</sup>, Jee-Hoon Jeong<sup>6</sup>, Kyo-Sun Sunny Lim<sup>7</sup>, Jin-Ho Yoon<sup>8,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biogeochemical Integration, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany.

<sup>2</sup>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Atmospheric Science, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA.

<sup>4</sup>Department of Plants, Soils, and Climate, Utah State University Logan, U.S.A.

<sup>5</sup>Moon Soul Graduate School of Future Strategy, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon, Korea.

<sup>6</sup>Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Chonnam National University, Gwangju, Korea.

<sup>7</sup>School of Earth System Sciences, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea.

<sup>8</sup>School of Earth Sciences and Environmental Engineering, Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology, Gwangju, Korea.

<sup>9</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon, Korea.

<sup>10</sup>Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

\*Correspondence to: Jin-Ho Yoon (yjinho@gist.ac.kr)

### Contents of this file

Figures S1 to S8 Tables S1 and S2



**Figure S1. Comparison of the time-series of forecasted FWI in Mendocino county.** Time-series of FWI averaged over Mendocino county for PRISM (black), CFS-SR (blue), interpolated FWI from CFSv2 (magenta) and persistence forecast (green) and. **a-h.** The lead time 1 to 21 days are individually compared for the outbreak of Mendocino Complex Fire (16/08/2018~, light red shade).







**Figure S3. Comparison of the time-series of forecasted FWI in Butte county.** Timeseries of FWI averaged over Mendocino county for PRISM (black), CFS-SR (blue), persistence forecast (red) and interpolated FWI from CFSv2 (green). **a-h.** The lead time 1 to 21 days are individually compared for the outbreak of Camp Fire (08/11/2018~, light red shade).



**Figure S4. Forecasting skill comparison in Butte county.** Heidke Skill Score (HSS) is compared for the dichotomous forecasting performance in **a.** the moderate danger state (FWI >11.2) and **b.** the extreme danger state (FWI>50.0). **c.** Talyor diagram compares the three different forecast for Butte county, which are CFS-SR (blue), the interpolated FWI from CFSv2 (magenta) and Persistence forecast (green) for leading time 1-21days (annotated with numbers). Prism (target) is marked by orange point.



**Figure S5. FWI map before the Camp Fire occurrence. a.** PRISM, **b-j.** CFS-SR forecasting results leading time from 1 to 21 days. The mapping domain is set (122.3-120.9W, 39.1-40.3N) to include fire damage area: Butte county.







**Figure. S7. The spatial comparison of occlusion sensitivity test for extreme wildfire risk days.** The rate of changes in forecasting errors are spatially compared by occluding each input variable for days where FWI recorded higher than 50 test period in the test period (01/06/2018-30/11/2019). Each column is sorted from 1 to 7 day of leading time and the rows are arranged by each variable.



**Figure S8. FWI forecasting map for the August complex Fire (16-19/08/2020).** CFS-SR forecasting results leading time from 1 to 21 days. The mapping domain is set (124-121.2W, 38.8-41.3N) to include fire damage area: Glenn, Lake, Mendocino, Tehama, Trinity and Shasta county.

Fire danger classes	FWI ranges
Very low	< 5.2
Low	5.2 ~ 11.2
Moderate	11.2 ~ 21.3
High	21.3 ~ 38.0
Very high	$38.0\sim50.0$
Extreme	> 50.0

 Table S1. Fire danger classes with FWI ranges. (https://effis.jrc.ec.europa.eu/about-effis/technical-background/fire-danger-forecast/)

## Table S2. Contingency table.

	Observation		
		Yes	No
Forecast	Yes	hits (A)	false alarms (B)
	No	misses (C)	correct rejection (D)