Quantifying fire-specific smoke severity
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Abstract

Rapidly changing wildfire regimes across the Western US has driven more frequent and severe wildfires, resulting in wide-ranging societal threats from the wildfires themselves and the smoke that they generate. However, common measures of fire severity focus on what is burned and do not account for the societal impacts of the smoke generated from each fire. We combine satellite-derived fire scars, air parcel trajectories from individual fires, and predicted smoke PM2.5 to link source fires to resulting smoke PM2.5 experienced by populations in the contiguous United States from April 2006-2020. We develop a new metric of fire-specific severity based on the cumulative population exposed to smoke PM2.5 over the duration of a fire. This measure is only weakly correlated with common measures of wildfire severity, including burned area, structures destroyed, and suppression cost. We find that while recent California fires contributed nearly half of the country’s experienced smoke severity during our study period, the most severe individual fire was the 2007 Bugaboo fire in the Southeast. We estimate that a majority of experienced smoke PM2.5 comes from sources outside the local jurisdictions where the smoke is experienced, with 87% coming from fires in other counties and 60% from fires in other states. Our approach enables broad-scale assessment of whether specific fire characteristics affect smoke toxicity or impact, informs assessment of the cost-effectiveness of how suppression resources are allocated, and helps clarify the growing transboundary nature of local air quality.

The paper is a non-peer reviewed preprint submitted to EarthArXiv. It has been submitted for publication in a peer reviewed journal, but has yet to be formally accepted for publication.
Introduction

Wildfire regimes have changed in recent decades due to a combination of climate change and a century of fire suppression, and this increase has driven a greater frequency of large wildfire events that result in physical and health related damages from the fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) in smoke.$^{1-4}$ While total PM$_{2.5}$ has been improving in the decades since the Clean Air Act, recent evidence suggests that wildfire smoke PM$_{2.5}$ has begun to reverse this trend, especially in the Western United States.$^{5-7}$ This reversal is concerning as recent research suggests that PM$_{2.5}$ from wildfire smoke could be more toxic than PM$_{2.5}$ from other sources,$^{4}$ and that existing air quality regulation is poorly equipped to regulate smoke from wildfires.$^{7}$ Smoke PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations have now been well measured at broad temporal and spatial scales in the US,$^{6}$ and increasing concentrations have been linked to an array of negative societal outcomes, including premature deaths,$^{8}$ preterm births,$^{9}$ and lower test performance in school-aged children,$^{10}$ underscoring the growing social costs of wildfire smoke PM$_{2.5}$ exposure.

Despite growing knowledge of the broad-reaching negative impacts of wildfire smoke exposure, commonly-used metrics of wildfire severity currently do not reflect the societal harm from smoke. Instead, severity metrics typically focus on the number of structures burned, lives tragically lost in the fire itself, the cost of firefighting, and/or total burned area, with the latter a particularly problematic measure given the agreed-upon need for more low-intensity fire (such as prescribed fire) in order to reduce the likelihood of more extreme fires.$^{11-13}$

An inability to link specific fires to their smoke impacts is problematic for at least three reasons. First, the health and societal impacts of smoke from specific fires are plausibly a large proportion of their damage, and the lack of information about the magnitude of these damages hampers efforts to understand whether taxpayer-funded wildfire suppression efforts$^{14,15}$ are being allocated to the most damaging fires. Fires that burn structures could produce substantially less smoke than remote fires that send smoke into populated regions. Second, it is increasingly hypothesized that the same amount of smoke from different fires need not have equivalent damages, given that some fires (for example) incinerate chemicals in buildings or burn and aerosolize metals or fungi found in specific soils.$^{16-18}$ But these hypotheses remain hard to test on a large scale absent a method to link specific smoke exposures to source fire characteristics. Third, linking smoke exposures to their source fires is important for understanding the transboundary nature of wildfire smoke, and in turn for designing strategies and policies to mitigate smoke exposures. If smoke exposures tend to originate from source fires that are outside county or state jurisdictions where the exposure occurs, as research increasingly suggests,$^{19-21}$ then the historic approach of air quality regulation of
relying on local jurisdictions to manage exposures by managing local emissions will not be practicable. Jurisdictions are increasingly submitting exceptional event applications to flag and omit air quality exceedances from events such as wildfires,\textsuperscript{22} and although these allowances help the jurisdictions remain in attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, the growth in their use means that transboundary wildfire air pollution issues are basically ignored and residents are unprotected from this important pollution source.

Here, we combine high-resolution estimates of daily smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5}\textsuperscript{6} with a physical model of fire-specific air parcel trajectories to develop a new method for linking specific source fires to the smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} generated by that fire. Our method uses the inverse distance weighted sum of simulated smoke trajectory points to proportionally attribute the daily smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} for each 10km gridcell-day to specific smoke producing fires. This allows us to estimate the share of smoke that each fire has plausibly contributed to downwind locations. We then use this method to derive a novel wildfire smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} severity metric based on the cumulative concentration of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} that populations experience from each fire, for all identified smoke producing fires between April 2006 and December 2020 (Methods). This metric aggregates the µg/m\textsuperscript{3} of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} experienced by the affected population over the duration of exposure to a specific fire.

The accumulated smoke severity metric allows us to quantify and rank the smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} impacts of individual fires, accounting for the severity, duration, and number of people exposed. This metric does not quantify the health-related impacts from the exposure, but rather provides estimates of the smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} exposure from specific fires at a 10km resolution across the US. We then compare this smoke severity metric to other commonly used wildfire severity and suppression effort metrics such as burned area, suppression cost, and structures burned. Finally, we use our linked estimates to quantify changing patterns and magnitudes of transboundary smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} movement, quantifying how the regional sources of smoke exposure have changed between an earlier, less smokey 2006-2010 period versus a later more smokey 2016-2020 period. We also combine the fire-smoke linked data with estimates of total PM\textsubscript{2.5} for 11 Western states\textsuperscript{23} to quantify the proportion of total PM\textsubscript{2.5} from out-of-county source fires – a quantity relevant to discussions of how to manage local air quality.

**Results**

Our method of linking source fires to smoke exposure is shown in Figure 1, using a particularly active fire period in CA in 2018 as an example. During this period, three large active fires gen-
erated smoke that covered much of California, and this smoke was readily apparent in satellite imagery, recorded in analyst-delineated smoke plumes, and identified in gridded smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} data (Figure 1A-1C). We associated daily analyst estimates of smoke-producing fire locations with fire extent polygons and ran forward trajectories of smoke particles emitted at each fire location (Figure 1D). Trajectories were then used to partition the contribution of each source fire to estimated wildfire smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} (Figure 1E, Methods), and fire-specific smoke severity calculated as the sum of population exposed to each µg/m\textsuperscript{3} of smoke on each day for the duration of each fire (Supplemental Figure S1). Validation of our approach on days in which only one fire was burning shows that our approach captures nearly all of the smoke emitted by a given fire and aligns closely with visible satellite imagery on the same day, though we note that satellite resolution constraints can lead to conservative estimates of contributed smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} in some cases (Methods, Supplemental Figure S2-S3). On days in which multiple fires are burning and locations experience overlapping smoke from multiple fires, fire-specific attributions are less certain, and we thus compute a fire-specific “attribution certainty score” that calculates the percent of a fire’s overall attributed severity that occurs on days when smoke from other fires is not present (Methods, Supplemental Figure S4); more isolated fires have attributed severities that are more certain.

We rank the top fires by accumulated smoke severity and show the top 9 fires in Figure 2 and the top 20 fires in Supplemental Table S1. Out of the top 9, 6 of the fires are from the 2020 fire season and 7 of these top fires originated in California. Perhaps surprisingly, the Bugaboo fire, which originated in Georgia in 2007 and is the only top fire that originated on the East coast, is ranked as the most severe fire by our accumulated smoke severity metric, nearly twice as severe as the next most severe fire. This fire spread dense smoke across highly populated areas of the US Southeast for over a month (Supplemental Figure S5). The four other fires in the top 5 most severe fires were all in California. Three of these fires – August Complex, Dolan, and Bobcat, all in 2020 – were in late summer, a period during which prevailing winds carried smoke across much of the US West and Midwest for weeks. The fourth, the 2018 Camp Fire, was during late fall, where easterly winds blew thick smoke into highly-populated CA regions for a short period. On a population-weighted basis, we calculate that the Camp Fire generated the densest smoke of the fires in our sample, with the Bugaboo Fire second (Supplemental Table S1). Other fires in the top ten tended to be late summer fires on the West Coast (CA, OR), where large amounts of smoke were again blown east across much of the US West and Midwest.

We compare our accumulated smoke severity metric with different commonly used wildfire severity and suppression effort metrics, including burned area, structures burned, and fire suppression cost. Smoke severity is positively but weakly correlated with burned area, one of the most
commonly used measures of fire activity and severity. We estimate that variation in log burned
area between fires only explains about 12% of the variation in log smoke severity (Figure 3A).
While there are few very large fires with low smoke severity, we see a substantial number of rela-
tively small fires with high smoke severity, indicating that the specific location and timing of fire
starts can exert large influence over the population exposed to a fire’s smoke. We see similarly
positive but weak relationships between our smoke severity measure and expenditures on fire sup-
pression (Figure 3B) and counts of structures destroyed in each fire (Figure 3C). Regarding fire
suppression, while the most smoke-severe fires were those that tended to receive the most sup-
pression resources (upper right corner of Figure 3B), we document a substantial number of fires
where smoke severity was high but suppression efforts modest (points in upper left), and a sim-
ilarly high number where suppression costs were high but smoke impacts modest (lower right).
Consistent with this relationship and with the recent finding that fire suppression costs are over-
whelmingly determined by the threat of fires to physical structures,26 we find that smoke severity
only weakly tracked structure damage.

We use our linked fire-smoke estimates to quantify the changing overall burden of smoke expo-
sure, to locate the main sources of this exposure, and to characterize the transboundary nature of
overall exposure. The magnitude of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ that the US population experienced doubled
from the early less smokey period in 2006-2010 to the more smokey late period in 2016-2020
(Figure 4A). California was by far the largest source and recipient of wildfire smoke in both pe-
riods, with the contribution of CA-sourced smoke to total smoke severity growing from 26% in
the early period to 40% in the late period. While multiple states in the Midwest, South, and East
were in the top-5 smoke recipients prior to 2010, a ranking driven in part by large populations
in those states, the recent rapid increase in fire activity in the West has meant that Western states
now bear a much larger share of the accumulated smoke exposure, sourced from themselves or
nearby states.

On average across the US over our study period, we calculate that nearly 93% of the experienced
smoke severity came from “trans-county” sources (i.e. source fires outside the county where
the smoke was experienced) and 62% from trans-state sources. In many states, a large portion
of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ remains within state borders, but Western US states, such as California, Idaho,
and Montana, contribute large amounts of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ to neighboring states (Supplemental Fig-
ure S6). For recipients of this smoke, large percentages of smoke exposure (e.g. 94% in Nevada)
come from out-of-state. Regarding international smoke transport, we find that the share of overall
smoke severity experienced in the US attributable to fires in Canada and Mexico has held steady
in both periods at around 8% and 3%, respectively, suggesting that a large proportion (nearly
90%) of experienced smoke severity in the US comes from domestic fires.
Using independent gridded estimates of total PM$_{2.5}$, we quantify the contribution of trans-boundary wildfire smoke PM$_{2.5}$ to total PM$_{2.5}$ between the early (2006-2010) and late (2016-2020) periods. We find that all counties in the Western US (414 counties) experienced an increase in the proportion of total PM$_{2.5}$ from out-of-county fire sources (Figure 4B). This finding aligns with recent literature suggesting a reversal of trends in overall air pollution due to wildfire smoke and links these reversals to transboundary out-of-county fire sources. In the later period, we calculate that for 120 counties, over a quarter of the total PM$_{2.5}$ in that county was from trans-county smoke sources (there were no such counties in the early period) and in 3 counties, over half of total PM$_{2.5}$ was from trans-county sources.

Discussion

Our study develops a new method for measuring wildfire severity by connecting individual wildfires to the smoke PM$_{2.5}$ experienced by populations downwind of each fire. Using our smoke severity metric, we find that many of the most severe wildfires are from the recent 2020 California wildfire season, other fire severity and suppression effort metrics are only moderately correlated with the smoke severity measure, and that the transboundary share of wildfire smoke has been increasing in recent years and is a substantial contributor to total PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations in many counties in the West.

Compared to existing efforts that aim to link smoke to fire sources, our method provides granular fire-specific attribution of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ and estimates of impacts across the contiguous US at a 10km spatial resolution from April 2006 to December 2020. Existing literature has used the HYSPLIT model to understand smoke transport, but focused on regional transport of smoke rather than specific fire transport and also did not quantify the attributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$. Recent research has used other simplified Lagrangian particle transport models to produce back trajectories of simulated air parcels arriving at specific locations and provide estimates of PM$_{2.5}$ from wildfire smoke. However, this analysis focused on summer months and only conducted population smoke PM$_{2.5}$ analysis for 33 population centers, as compared to our analysis which extends beyond the summer months and covers the contiguous US. The relatively coarse resolution of these analyses’ source regions make it challenging to consider the impact from specific fires.

Other researchers have used a combination of chemical transport models (CTMs), simplified transport models, and close proximity air pollution monitors to study the impact of wildfires on ambient air quality. However, these studies have primarily only considered the impact of ac-
tive fires on a relatively small spatial area and the analyses do not cover multiple fires and years.

In our work, we consider all smoke-producing fires identified by satellite imagery and trained analysts from April 2006-2020. Although CTMs are commonly used to estimate the impact of specific air pollutants on downwind communities, uncertainty around surface fuel characteristics and emission inventories result in highly variable estimates of particulate matter air pollution from fires. Additionally, the computational burden of running these models limits their applicability in our context, as comprehensive characterization of smoke contributions would require a separate model run for each of the fires in our data. Related studies that use satellite imagery or surface observations to analyze air pollution trends in the Western US provide insight into the overall contribution of wildfire to regional air quality trends but are unable to link smoke to specific source fires.

Our smoke-linking method provides a conservative estimate of the smoke PM contributed by specific fires, as shown by analysis of isolated fires where our method captures most but not all of nearby smoke (Supplemental Figure S2-S3). Attributions are limited in part by analysts’ abilities to identify smoke-producing fire points, from which HYSPLIT trajectories are initialized, and our ability to accurately match fire points to fire polygons. Future work that leverages satellite sensors with higher spatial and temporal resolution could improve the identification of smoke producing fires and/or active fire burned areas and refine the fire ignition point to fire polygon match. Improved estimates of plume injection heights could also improve estimates, as literature suggests that the injection height of smoke plumes play a large role in smoke transport but that accurate estimates of fire-specific injection heights are limited. To account for uncertainty in the injection height of plumes, we initialize trajectories at 3 different injection heights for each fire (Methods), and future improvements that incorporate satellite observed or modeled plume injection heights could result in more accurate trajectories.

Our smoke severity metric assumes that severity is a linear function of accumulated daily exposure, and that populations in different locations respond similarly to accumulated exposure. We believe this linearity assumption is broadly consistent with the pollution-health literature, which has recently described all-source PM mortality concentration-response functions that are roughly linear at both low and high concentrations of particulate exposure, and wildfire-specific mortality concentration-response functions that are similarly linear in smoke PM. In the absence of additional evidence on whether response functions differ across locations, we follow this literature and assume linear impacts, which allows straightforward aggregation of severity using the sum of contributed smoke PM that populations experience from specific fires. Our approach could account for nonlinear mappings of exposure to severity, or heterogeneous impacts by location, if future data support such revisions.
Our analysis identifies the Bugaboo Scrub Fire in 2007 as producing the highest smoke severity during our study period. One potential reason for the high impact of this fire is its proximity to large urban areas and that smoke from this fire transported across much of the Eastern Seaboard (Supplemental Figure S5). Recent research also suggests that slower burning smouldering fires, similar to the peatland fires in the Bugaboo fire, could release large amounts of harmful particulate matter due to incomplete combustion of surface matter, which ultimately results in high smoke PM$_{2.5}$ emissions.\textsuperscript{37, 45} Better understanding the landscape features that predict smoke severity is an active and important area for additional work. While the Bugaboo fire could have truly been more smoke-producing than other fires, we note that the fire had a higher attribution certainty (score of 89\%) compared to other top fires, such as the 2020 California fires (attribution certainty scores around 50\%) suggesting greater uncertainty around the smoke severity of the 2020 California fires because multiple other fires were occurring at the same time and contributing smoke to the same locations (Supplemental Table S1).

The weak correlation between our smoke severity metric and other common measures of fire severity is consistent with the large observed share of suppression resources spent on limiting physical property damage.\textsuperscript{26, 46} Fires close to urban areas threaten structures (and, in a direct way, lives) and receive more suppression effort, but often expose much smaller populations to smoke; fires further from populated areas threaten fewer structures and receive less suppression effort, but can generate large amounts of smoke that have more indirect but likely very large health impacts, including increased mortality. Further recognition and quantification of these downwind impacts may help inform and shift future resource allocation decisions.\textsuperscript{12}

Our method links smoke PM$_{2.5}$ to source fires, which enables further analysis to better understand the drivers of differential smoke toxicity. Recent literature suggests that wildfires can convert and release toxic elements, such as hexavalent chromium, into the atmosphere, but analysis has been limited to specific study sites.\textsuperscript{47} This work provides an approach to investigate these findings at a broader-scale and also enables further research into whether burning specific materials, such as man-made structures, results in more toxic air pollution.\textsuperscript{48}

As the climate continues to warm and wildfires increase across much of the Western US and beyond,\textsuperscript{1, 49} particulate matter air pollution from these events is trending upward and expected to worsen in the coming decades.\textsuperscript{5–7, 50} A growing literature finds that exposure to wildfire smoke results in a range of negative societal impacts, including impacts on respiratory-related morbidity and all-cause mortality,\textsuperscript{34, 51, 52} interrupted learning,\textsuperscript{10, 53} and decreased labor productivity.\textsuperscript{54} Our work provides a method to connect these smoke PM$_{2.5}$ impacts back to specific source fires, and can help clarify policy options that aim to better allocate resources to address this growing envi-
ronmental challenge.

Methods

HYSPLIT trajectories for smoke-producing fires  In this work, we leverage the Hybrid Single-Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory (HYSPLIT) model\(^{55}\) to track the movement of smoke emitted from particular fires and to allocate PM\(_{2.5}\) surfaces back to source fires. These data represent simulated forward trajectories of smoke particles emitted at smoke-producing fire points (HYSPLIT points) for all automatically detected and manually added fire hotspots identified by trained Hazard Mapping System (HMS) analysts\(^{19,56}\) between April 2006 and December 2020. The satellite-detected fire points are validated and identified as smoke-producing by HMS analysts and false positives are removed to generate a set of HYSPLIT initialization points, from which forward trajectories are run (see supplemental information of Childs et al. (2022)\(^{6}\) for details of trajectory generation). To incorporate uncertainty about smoke injection heights, we initialize three trajectories at each point beginning at different altitudes (500, 1500, and 2500 meters above ground level).

In total, there are 2.4 million distinct HYSPLIT points from April 2006 - December 2020 that each have three associated 6-day trajectories (one for each initial altitude). Each trajectory is defined as a sequence of estimated latitude, longitude, and height coordinates at hourly time steps following initialization. For each trajectory, we calculate the cumulative rainfall and minimum height so far on the trajectory path. We truncate each trajectory path by removing trajectory points that have been rained out or that have collided with the ground. With the remaining trajectory points, we calculate the cumulative trajectory distance from the fire polygon centroid or initial HYSPLIT point (if the initialization point did not fall within any fire polygons) to each successive point on the trajectory path, which we later use to distribute smoke PM\(_{2.5}\). For each HYSPLIT point, HMS analysts assign a "duration" value that represents the number of hours that the specific fire produces smoke and analysts may duplicate fire points to represent severe smoke producing fires. We run trajectories over the duration of each fire and remove duplicated fire points to reduce computation. After generating fire trajectories, we weigh each initialization point to account for the duplicated fire points that had been identified for that initialization time.

Assigning HYSPLIT initialization points to fires  To group HYSPLIT points, which are not associated with specific named fires, belonging to the same source fire, we match the location of HYSPLIT points to a separate database of known fires. We use fire boundary shapes from
the GlobFire v3 dataset subsetted to North America from April 2006-2020. These fire polygons represent the final area of fires detected by NASA’s Moderate-Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) satellite and provide a single polygon of the total burned area for each detected fire with start and end dates. After matching the fire polygons with the locations of the smoke-producing HYSPLIT points, we filter for points that fall between the initial date and end date of the fire polygons. The resulting matched dataset represents the fire polygons and associated smoke-producing fire points.

Because a large number of HYSPLIT points are satellite derived, the accuracy of the fire location is dependent on the resolution of the satellite product used to identify these fires and recent literature has suggested that the accuracy of HYSPLIT points is around 2-3km. As shown in Supplemental Figure S7, the HYSPLIT points, which are partially algorithmically identified as thermal hotspots, appear to follow a rectangular grid and result in some smoke producing HYSPLIT points that fall outside of the buffered fire polygon. These points likely belong to the fire as there are no other fires nearby at this time and could contribute to decreased attribution of contributed smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} to this specific fire. Aligned with recent research that has shown a 2km median spatial offset between the MODIS burned area product and identified fire points, we add a 2km buffer to the boundary of detected fire polygons to account for this potential resolution-based inaccuracy. A larger buffer around the fire polygon would lead to more associated HYSPLIT points per fire and therefore potentially larger smoke severity estimates, at the potential cost of associating HYSPLIT points with the wrong fire. We take the conservative approach and use a 2km buffer, as suggested by the literature.

About 65% (1546271/2372751) of the nearly 2.4 million HYSPLIT points (smoke-producing fires) are matched to a fire polygon with a majority of the unmatched HYSPLIT points occurring in recent years (Supplemental Figure S8). One potential reason for more unmatched fire points in recent years is the inclusion of the hotspot detections from the Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) sensor starting in 2016, which has a higher resolution and detects more thermal anomalies than previous thermal sensors used by the HMS system. To ensure that we do not ignore the smoke generated from the unmatched HYSPLIT points, we assume that if a HYSPLIT point does not fall into a buffered fire polygon, then it is a separate fire.

**Calculating smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} from specific fires** To estimate the contribution of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} from specific fires, we combine the fire polygon matched trajectories with previous estimates of daily 10-kilometer (km) smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} over the period from April 2006-2020. We first match trajectory points to 10km gridcells using the trajectories described above for all of North America from April 2006-2020.
After linking trajectory points (and initial source fire) to overlapping gridcells, we use a window function (spatial buffer) to account for the spatial dispersion of smoke particulates, as trajectory points represent a single point estimate of the likely location that an air parcel traveled. In reality, the air pollution from smoke could disperse and affect a larger area. We considered different window sizes ranging from no buffering around the gridcell where a trajectory point landed (just consider the 10km gridcell where a trajectory point landed), all immediately neighboring gridcells (effectively a 30km window centered on the gridcell where a trajectory point landed), and two rings of neighboring 10km gridcells (a 50km window centered on the gridcell where the trajectory point landed). We find that the 10km window potentially underestimates the amount of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} leaving on average over 60% of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} unaccounted for (Supplemental Figure S9). We conduct the analysis with the 30km window, which is more conservative than the 50km window but makes up for a large portion of the smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} that the 10km window misses.

To distribute smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} at the gridcell to individual fires, we consider the number of trajectory points and cumulative trajectory distance of those points from a source fire. Specifically, as shown in Supplemental Figure S1, for an individual gridcell, we first calculate the denominator total gridcell weight as the sum of inverse distance weighted trajectory point counts. In the supplemental figure example of the multiple fire, there are 5 trajectory points in gridcell 3 with 2 belonging to fire A and 3 belonging to fire B. Each of these trajectory points has a cumulative trajectory distance. The total gridcell weight is the sum of these inverse cumulative trajectory distances. This simplified example does not consider the spatial buffer described above, but the 30km spatial buffer used in the main analysis would work similarly and also count trajectory points in the neighboring ring of gridcells. After calculating this total gridcell weight, we calculate a fire-specific gridcell share, which sums the inverse distance weighted trajectory counts from a specific fire and normalizes the value by the total gridcell weight. In Supplemental Figure S1, fire A is calculated to have 10% share of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} in gridcell 3 and fire B accounts for the remaining 90% share of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5}. The calculation of smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} from a single fire is the same as in the multiple fire case; however, because there are no trajectory points from other fires the calculated share for the single fire is 100%. Lastly, to distribute the smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} in a specific gridcell to individual fires, we multiply the share with the total smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} in the gridcell.

**Estimating population smoke severity in each gridcell**  We estimate the population impacted by smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} from specific fires by combining the wildfire attributed smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} with gridded population data from WorldPop.\textsuperscript{60} We use the unconstrained individual countries 2000-2020 UN adjusted (1km resolution) dataset (https://hub.worldpop.org/doi/10.5258/SOTON/ WP00671) and download data for the US. We first calculate the yearly population in 10km gridcells aligning with our smoke PM\textsubscript{2.5} grid by taking an area-weighted sum of the 1km WorldPop
grid cells that fall into our 10km smoke PM$_{2.5}$ grid across the contiguous US from 2006-2020. Then to calculate the daily smoke severity at the gridcell, we multiply the fire-specific contributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$ with the population at the gridcell. In Supplemental Figure S1, for the multiple fire case, gridcell 3 has a population of 10 so the smoke severity from fire A is the product of fire A’s share, the total smoke PM$_{2.5}$, and the population in the gridcell, which equals 20 person µg/m$^3$. Smoke severity for fire B follows a similar calculation and is estimated to have 180 person µg/m$^3$ smoke severity. To calculate the smoke severity for an individual fire over the duration of the fire, we sum the daily smoke severity across gridcells and days.

**Comparison with fire suppression costs and structures burned**  To estimate the relationship between suppression costs and population-weighted smoke PM$_{2.5}$ exposure, we use data from Baylis and Boomhower (2019),$^{26}$ which includes fire suppression costs for fires in 11 Western states from 2006-2016. Due to lack of consistent fire suppression cost reporting, we focus analysis on fires larger than 300 acres. The fire fighting suppression costs are collected from different Freedom of Information Act and public records requests to six federal and state agencies. We direct interested readers to Baylis and Boomhower (2019)$^{26}$ for additional details. We match the fire suppression cost data to specific fires by identifying observations that fall into buffered (500m) fire polygons and by ensuring that the ignition date present in the suppression dataset falls within 2 days of the initial start date of the fire polygon. We match the destroyed structures dataset$^{25}$ to individual fires in a similar way by filtering to the matching year and finding structure burned locations that fall within the buffered fire polygons.

**Calculating total PM$_{2.5}$ for transboundary analysis**  In order to compare smoke PM$_{2.5}$ to total PM$_{2.5}$ for counties, we calculate the average daily total PM$_{2.5}$ for each 10km gridcell in 11 Western States from 2006-2020 using data from Swanson et al. (2022).$^{23}$ We use the exactextractr R package and take the area weighted mean of the 1km gridcells that fall into the smoke PM$_{2.5}$ 10km gridcells. We then identify the 10km gridcells that overlap with counties and sum over the gridcell-days for both smoke PM$_{2.5}$ and total PM$_{2.5}$. Using the location of the source fire and the amount of contributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$ in each gridcell, we can calculate the proportion of total PM$_{2.5}$ in each gridcell that comes from out-of-county source fires.

**Calculating attribution certainty score for each fire**  The fire-specific attribution certainty score estimates the percent of a fire’s smoke severity that happens on days when there is no smoke from other fires. To calculate this score, we take a weighted average of the share of gridcell smoke PM$_{2.5}$ weighting by the smoke severity of a specific fire. We walk through an example of this calculation for the single versus multiple fire case in Supplemental Figure S4. As described above, the share calculation of a fire takes into account the number of trajectory points and the cumu-
relative trajectory distance of the points that belong to a specific fire divided by the gridcell total weight.

**Code and data availability** Data and code to replicate all results in the paper will be made available upon publication.
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Figure 1: **Attributing wildfire smoke PM$_{2.5}$ to source fires**, using active fires in CA on July 29th, 2018 as an example. 

A. Geostationary satellite imagery over California with visible smoke. 

B. Hazard Mapping System smoke plume annotations shown in gray. Active fires are shown as red polygons. 

C. Wildfire smoke PM$_{2.5}$ from all fires with smoke PM$_{2.5}$ capped at 100µg/m$^3$, using data from ref. 6. 

D. Hybrid Single-Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory (HYSPLIT) trajectories for three main active fires on July 29th. Each path represents the movement of a particle that originated within the fire polygon up to 5 days before July 29th. Darker paths suggest that more particles followed that trajectory. 

E. July 29th snapshot of the estimated contribution of each fire to smoke PM$_{2.5}$. 
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Figure 2: **Top fires by ranked accumulated smoke severity from April 2006-2020.** Each small multiple map shows the total accumulated smoke PM$_{2.5}$ severity aggregated over the duration of the fire. This severity metric considers the amount of smoke PM$_{2.5}$, the population affected, and the total number of days of smoke exposure. The line chart shows the smoke severity over time from the initial day of the fire. Initial fire locations are cyan colored and outlined in black.
Figure 3: **Comparison between common fire-related metrics and accumulated smoke severity.** From left to right, the panels show the relationship between the natural log of burned area (acres), fire suppression cost (2017 dollars), or structures destroyed (# structures) versus accumulated smoke severity (person μg/m³) with the color of the hexbin indicating the count of individual fires. In the left plot, the burned area is calculated from the GlobFire dataset for fires from April 2006-2020 ($n = 18,606$). For the center plot, only fires greater than 300 acres burned from April 2006-2016 in the Western US are shown due to inconsistent fire suppression cost data for smaller fires and the limited time frame of the fire cost source dataset ($n = 984$). The right plot shows available data on destroyed structures data for the contiguous US from April 2006-2020 ($n = 558$). The blue dotted lines represent the fitted regression lines.
Figure 4: Trans-state and -county boundary transport of smoke PM$_{2.5}$, and contribution of transboundary smoke to total PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations. A. Alluvial diagram of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ from source to receptor states in the early (2006-2010) and late (2016-2020) periods. Percentages represent the % of total smoke severity contributed by that state. The dark blue flows represent within state, light blue outside state, and green flows outside country transport of smoke PM$_{2.5}$. B. The fraction of total PM$_{2.5}$ from source fires that are outside of the county in the early (2006-2010) and late (2016-2020) periods has grown dramatically especially across the Pacific Northwest, California, Idaho, and Montana.
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[60] WorldPop. Global 1km population total adjusted to match the corresponding UNPD estimate, 2020.
Figure S1: Smoke severity calculation. Smoke severity for a specific fire considers the smoke PM$_{2.5}$ contributed by a fire and the total population within affected gridcells. The calculation shown here for gridcell 3 in both the multiple and single fire case represents the smoke severity for each fire in the gridcell. The smoke severity for the fire as a whole aggregates the daily gridcell smoke severity over the duration of the fire. The share of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ contributed by a specific fire is calculated as a function of the number of trajectory points and the cumulative distance of these trajectory points from the initial fire location.
Figure S2: **American Fire contributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$ vs. raw smoke PM$_{2.5}$**. Trajectories, satellite imagery, and smoke PM$_{2.5}$ product all show the smoke generated by the American Fire. The successive concentric buffers around the centroid of the fire calculate the percent of total smoke PM$_{2.5}$ captured by the contributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$ method in this cropped area. The smoke PM$_{2.5}$ in this example appears to come mainly from the American fire with other small plumes noticeable in the “Smoke PM$_{2.5}$” panel.
Figure S3: **Camp Fire contributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$ vs. raw smoke PM$_{2.5}$**. The ratio of contributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$ vs. smoke PM$_{2.5}$ is lower for the Camp Fire compared to the American Fire. Other smoke sources are likely producing smoke that is being considered in the total smoke PM$_{2.5}$ calculation. The contributed smoke PM$_{2.5}$ method does not associate these additional plumes to the Camp Fire.
Figure S4: Attribution certainty score calculation. The attribution certainty score is a fire-specific estimate of the percent of a given fire’s smoke severity that is not coincident with smoke from other fires. Specifically, the measure takes into account the number of trajectory points contributed by a fire, the distance of trajectory points from the source fire, and the smoke PM$_{2.5}$ severity of the fire. A fire with an attribution certainty score of one is a fire whose smoke never overlapped smoke from any other fire. When smoke from multiple fires overlaps, there is less certainty about fire-specific smoke attribution, and the attribution certainty score is lower.
Figure S5: Bugaboo fire satellite imagery. The Bugaboo/Georgia Complex fire burned from April - June 2007 and resulted from several different fires combining together. The smoke PM$_{2.5}$ generated by the fire traveled along much of the Eastern seaboard. The images are from 4 separate days showing the dispersion of smoke. Clouds are also visible in the imagery but are white compared to the gray smoke.
Figure S6: **State-to-state source receptor matrix.** A large proportion of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ affects within state communities although West coast states such as California also contribute a large amount of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ to other states.
Figure S7: **Camp Fire fire polygon, buffered polygon, and HYSPLIT initialization points.** Smoke producing fire points on November 8-9th show large amounts of overlap with the Camp Fire location, but several HYSPLIT initialization points fall outside of the fire polygon. The rectangular grid of HYSPLIT initialization points suggests that the points were identified by satellite thermal sensors, which may have limited spatial resolution and cause points to fall outside the 2km buffer around fire polygons.
Figure S8: **Yearly distribution of matched vs. unmatched HYSPLIT points.** The trajectories used to distribute smoke PM$_{2.5}$ were generated from analyst identified smoke generating fire points (Method). Over time, different satellite sensors were used to identify fire hotspots with higher resolution satellites introduced around 2016 potentially leading to a greater number of detected thermal anomalies.

Figure S9: **Comparison of different window sizes to aggregate trajectory points.** The window sizes compare the amount of smoke PM$_{2.5}$ that remains after aggregating neighboring gridcells that may also be affected by smoke. The 10km window does not aggregate neighboring gridcells and only links smoke PM$_{2.5}$ based on the gridcells that intersected with trajectory points. This approach results in the largest amount of unaccounted for smoke PM$_{2.5}$ because smoke is likely to disperse over space away from the path of an average air parcel. Increasing the window size of aggregated neighbors reduces the amount of unaccounted for smoke PM$_{2.5}$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Attribution certainty score</th>
<th>Days elapsed</th>
<th>Population smoke PM$_{2.5}$ (billion person µg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>Average smoke PM$_{2.5}$ (µg/m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bugaboo Fire</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>GA &amp; FL</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Complex Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Fire</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Fire (Mendocino Complex)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiam Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Fire (North Complex)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCU Lightning Complex Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Fire (SQF Complex)</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Farm Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallow Fire</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennesey Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin Complex Fire</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie Creek Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Fire</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klondike Fire</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>