**Feature Selection**

The features that we selected for our classification algorithms included:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | **Features** | **Notes** |
| Location dimension | Longitude  Latitude | This dimension contained other data such as the postal code, nearest intersection, and dissemination area id. We decided to use only the latitude and longitude because they were the most precise numerical values to use in the AI and the other location data would have been redundant anyway. |
| Date dimension | Month  Day  Day of week  Holiday  Time of day | This dimension contained other data as well such as the exact timestamp of the previous fires. Since those exact timestamps will never occur again, they are likely to overfit the AI to the training data. Instead, we only used the date features that are repeatable. |
| Weather dimension | Temperature  Relative humidity  Precipitation  Snow  Wind direction  Wind speed | We used almost all the features from this dimension because they could all potentially have a huge impact on how frequently fires can start and how damaging they may be. |
| Demographic dimension | Population  Median age  Total dwellings  Average household size  Median household income  Mother tongue official percentage  Mother tongue unofficial percentage | We used almost all the features from this dimension because, again, they could all potentially have an impact on the frequency and damage of fires. |
| Fire ward dimension | Stations in ward | This is the only feature in this dimension and it could have an affect on the response time to fires, thus limiting the damage. |

We left out all the measures from the fact table itself because most of them were measures that could only be determined during or after a fire. Since the purpose of our AI is to predict if some conditions could result in a ‘bad’ or ‘good’ fire, we can’t use any variables that occur during or after the fire to predict this. Instead, we categorized all the fires as bad or good based on the number of casualties, the number of people displaced, the damage in Canadian dollars, and the response time. A fire was considered bad if the total number of casualties plus the number of people displaced was 5 or more, the damage was $10,000 or more, or the response time was more than 20 minutes. A fire was considered ‘good’ or ‘acceptable’ otherwise.

In addition, we performed under-sampling of the bad outcomes because there was about a 3:1 ratio between the bad and good outcomes. We reduced the number of bad outcome samples to equal those of the good outcomes.

**Imputation**

Out of the features that we chose, there was only one that had any missing values. The holiday feature was mostly missing because only a small percentage of the fires in the data occurred on holidays. Since over 95% of the data was missing for that feature, we created a new value for it called ‘Not holiday’ and filled those missing values. The figure below shows the number of missing values in each column before imputation.
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**Handling categorical attributes**

When viewing the features, most of them were numerical, but holiday and time of day where categorical. Holiday contained the name of the holiday that was occurring and the time of day could have been night (midnight to 6am), morning (6am to noon), afternoon (noon to 6pm), or evening (6pm to midnight). We used one-hot encoding to split both of those into multiple columns with values of 0 or 1. This next figure is the type of data that is held by each column before the one-hot encoding.
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The following figure is the type of data that is help by each column after the one-hot encoding.
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**Normalization**

We normalized all the columns independently so they would be worth the same to the classification algorithms later. The following image is a sample of a few of the features after normalizing.
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**Classification algorithms**

After running the algorithms multiple times with different data subsets, we noticed some patterns emerging. The decision tree was always the fastest to train, followed by the random forest. The gradient boosting was always the slowest. By contrast, the accuracy was always the opposite. The gradient boosting was always the most accurate while the decision tree was the least accurate. The following three images show a classification report for each of the three different AI types.
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