**Abstract**

Background: People using electricity-dependent durable medical equipment (DME) may be particularly vulnerable to health effects from wildfire smoke, residence near wildfires, or residence in evacuation zones. No studies have examined their healthcare utilization during wildfires.

Methods: We obtained 2016-2020 daily counts of residential Zip Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) level outpatient, inpatient, and emergency department visits made by DME using Kaiser Permanente Southern California members 45+. We linked counts to daily ZCTA-level wildfire PM2.5 estimates and wildfire boundary and evacuation data from the 2018 Woolsey and 2019 Getty wildfires. We tested the association of immediate and lagged (up to 7 days) wildfire PM2.5 and wildfire proximity and evacuation and healthcare visit frequency with negative binomial and difference-in-differences models.

Results: Among 236,732 DME users, increased wildfire PM2.5 concentration (per 10 𝜇𝑔/𝑚3) was associated with reduced risk (RR = 0.96, 95% CI: 0.94, 0.99) of all-cause outpatient visits one day after exposure and increases on 4/5 subsequent days (RR range 1.03-1.12). Wildfire PM2.5 was not associated with inpatient or ED visits. Woolsey Fire proximity (<20km) was associated with reduced all-cause outpatient visits, while evacuation and proximity were associated with increased inpatient cardiorespiratory visits (proximity RR = 1.45, 95% CI: 0.99, 2.12, evacuation RR = 1.72, 95% CI: 1.00, 2.96). Neither Getty Fire proximity nor evacuation was associated with healthcare visit frequency.

Conclusions: Wildfire smoke or proximity may interrupt DME users’ outpatient care, as patients at risk may shelter in place. However, smoke and fire still appeared to increase healthcare utilization in this vulnerable group.
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**Introduction**

Wildfires are widespread, have increased in severity because of climate change, and will worsen in coming decades1-5. Development in the wildland-urban interface has placed more communities in the path of these increasingly frequent disasters.6 The immediate impacts of wildfire, such as evacuations, power outages, and destruction of infrastructure cause trauma, stress, financial strain, and physical injury in affected communities.7,8 Simultaneously, 70% of the US population is exposed to wildfire smoke annually as winds blow smoke over major cities.9–11

Among other hazardous components, wildfire smoke contains fine particulate matter (PM2.5). Of PM2.5 sources, wildfire PM2.5 may be particularly harmful because it consists of more organic and elemental carbon.12–14 It also constitutes most extreme PM2.5 exposure in California, accounting for 71% of total PM2.5 on days that exceed US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) annual standard of 12 𝜇𝑔/𝑚3 .

Most studies examining wildfire PM2.5 exposure have focused on respiratory and cardiovascular disease outcomes. Exposure has been associated with asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease symptom exacerbation,15–17 increases in ED and inpatient visits related to cardiorespiratory disease,18–21 and increased mortality risk.22–24

Several studies have documented the effects of stress, evacuation, property destruction, or injury due to wildfire disasters7,8,21,25,27–31. We seek to expand on this literature. We hypothesize that residential proximity to wildfire, and evacuations due to wildfire, could influence health outcomes primarily through stress. This pathway may operate differently than wildfire PM2.5 exposure. Residents living near active wildfires are exposed to smoke, which in addition to biological effects can cause substantial worry80. Proximate residents also experience the disruption of usual activities in their communities, and face the threat of injury, evacuation, or longer-term displacement. Evacuation may cause more severe stress as these threats materialize. Evacuation, however, may also disrupt access to healthcare and could result in a temporary reduction in utilization.81

People who use durable medical equipment may be particularly vulnerable to both wildfire PM2.5 exposure and stress from wildfire proximity or evacuation. DME use is common among older adults and is associated with respiratory illness and other disabilities.29 A prior study among Kaiser Permanente Southern California (KPSC) members found increasing prevalence of DME rentals from 2008-2018 and the highest prevalence of use among older adults.30 DME types included bilevel positive airway pressure (BiPAP) machines, enteral feeding machines, infusion pumps, oxygen equipment, suction pumps, ventilators, and wheelchairs.30

This group may face unique challenges during wildfire events. Prior studies have found elevated effect estimates between wildfire smoke exposure and respiratory and cardiovascular disease outcomes among older adults compared to younger populations.16,31 Further, people using DME may have co-occurring medical conditions such as cardiovascular disease that make them more vulnerable to both the effects of wildfire PM2.5 and wildfire-related stressors beyond wildfire smoke (e.g., threatened or actual evacuation). Limited mobility or need for electricity access may result in increased difficulty evacuating disaster zones.30,32

Here, we use 2016-2020 Kaiser Permanente Southern California (KPSC) electronic health records of older adults using DME from seven Southern California counties to examine the relationship between wildfire exposure and healthcare utilization. We evaluate exposure to wildfire via (1) wildfire PM2.5 concentrations, and by (2a) residential proximity to major active fires, and (2b) residence in an evacuated area. Our study period includes two major wildfire events in populated areas: the Woolsey Fire, which burned around 400km2 from November 8th to 21st, 2018 in Los Angeles and Ventura counties, destroying 1643 structures, displacing 295,000 people, and killing three,33,34 and the Getty Fire, which necessitated evacuations in densely populated Los Angeles, and burned 3km2 from October 28th to November 5th, 2019.35,36

**Methods**

**Study population**

We used electronic health record data from KPSC to identify all individuals who were 45 or older as of October 28th, 2019 and had rented DME in the year prior. KPSC patients represent the underlying population in the region, except for slight under-representation of individuals living in the highest and lowest SES communities. We excluded younger DME renters in order to focus on socially and medically vulnerable older adults, but also to exclude breast pump users, a healthy subgroup of the otherwise vulnerable DME using population, who we did not hypothesize to be particularly vulnerable to wildfire exposure. Electronic health record data included each patient’s Zip Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) of residence. We obtained daily counts of healthcare visits–not necessarily related to DME use –by this population by residential ZCTA in seven counties in Southern California from January 1st, 2016 to March 15th, 2020. We obtained daily counts of healthcare visits by this population at the Zip Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) level, in seven counties in Southern California from January 1st, 2016 to March 15th, 2020. 236,732 DME patients lived in the study area, which covered most of San Bernardino, Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, Ventura, and Kern counties (Figure 1). The area consisted of 582 ZCTAs, each containing 1-1773 patients. During 2018 and 2019, these seven counties experienced 23 wildfires that each burned over 3 km2 in California,34,36 contributing to wildfire smoke in the area.

The KPSC Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this study, and the Columbia IRB did not consider it human subjects research, since the data were fully de-identified before researchers at Columbia received them.

**Exposure Definition**

**Wildfire PM2.5**

We measured wildfire smoke exposure by estimating daily wildfire and non-wildfire PM2.5 concentrations at the ZCTA level using a multistage approach described elsewhere40. Briefly, we first estimated daily levels of PM2.5 (from any source) at the ZCTA level using a validated ensemble model combining multiple machine learning algorithms (e.g., random forest, gradient boosting) and multiple predictors (e.g. PM2.5 measurements from US EPA Air Quality System (AQS), meteorological factors such as temperature, precipitation or wind patterns, satellite-derived aerosol optical depth or land-use variables). We identified smoke-plume exposed ZCTA codes/days with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) Hazard Mapping System (HMS) using a smoke binary variable by intersecting ZCTA polygons with smoke polygons. We then estimated the counterfactual PM2.5 values in the absence of wildfire smoke using spatio-temporal imputation models (relying on estimated PM2.5 on surrounding days and ZCTA). We finally estimated the difference between such counterfactual values (i.e. PM2.5 that would have been observed in the absence of the smoke event on a given ZCTA/day) to observed values of PM2.5 during an exposure to wildfire smoke. This difference between counterfactual values and observed estimated during a smoke event on a given ZCTA/day can thus be interpreted as daily/ZCTA levels of wildfire smoke PM2.5. Said differently, after identifying ZCTA/days exposed to wildfire smoke (yes/no, using HMS products), we imputed the level of PM2.5 that would have been observed in the absence of the smoke event on a given ZCTA/day and then compared this -counterfactual- value to what has been actually observed in such ZCTA/days to obtain wildfire smoke PM2.5. This ensemble model achieved high accuracy with R2 of 0.86 and RMSE of 3.48 (see details in Aguilera et al.).

We calculated daily wildfire and non-wildfire PM2.5 by averaging concentrations across the higher-level spatial groupings of several ZCTAs based on spatial proximity (hereafter ‘ZCTA groupings’; grouping method described in the eAppendix).

**Proximity to wildfire**

To measure direct exposure to wildfire, we obtained data on the fire boundaries and evacuation zones of two significant Southern California wildfires – the Woolsey Fire and the Getty Fire. We chose these fires because they affected a significant number of people in our study area, during the study period. The Woolsey Fire, which burned from November 8th, 2018 until November 21st, 2018, required the evacuation of 295,000 people from Los Angeles and Ventura counties. It burned 1643 structures and almost 400 km2 of land, making it particularly destructive.33,36 The Getty Fire, which ignited on October 28th, 2019 and burned until November 5th, 2019, was notable because it necessitated evacuations during its 9-day duration in densely populated Los Angeles.34,35

Notably, The Thomas Fire also burned over 1100 km2 during our study period.38 However, most of the fire burned in the rural northern corner of Ventura County and outside the study area. Therefore, we did not include the Thomas Fire in the proximity analyses, since very few participants would have been exposed to it. Still, smoke from this fire contributed substantially to wildfire PM2.5 in Ventura County in December 2017, and therefore was included in our PM2.5 analyses (Figure 2b).

We obtained shapefiles of the total areas burned during the Getty and Woolsey fires from the CALFIRE Fire and Resource Assessment Program.39 These perimeters represented the approximately the maximum burned areas of each fire40 and we used them to define exposure. US-based studies have evaluated exposure to wildfire disasters in different ways, including self-reported impact,68 wildfire damage to own home,69 evacuation from own home,70,71 residence in a community where structures burned72, residence in a county where a wildfire burned74, and residential proximity to a wildfire75. We selected the Getty and Woolsey wildfires a priori, then linked exposure via proximity to the wildfire boundaries, selecting a distance of 20km as one that could elicit a stress response; prior studies have found impacts on wellbeing and mental health at similar distances.76

Next, we created an evacuation exposure metric. GIS data on evacuation zones were not available for either fire. Therefore, we reviewed webpages (described in the eAppendix) containing maps of the evacuation zones and digitized boundaries around all areas ever evacuated during either fire in QGIS42 (Figure 1). Using these data, we considered ZCTAs exposed to evacuation stress if they were within 10 km of any evacuation zone boundary (Figure 1) on days where a fire was active. Like close residence to a wildfire burn area, evacuation and anticipating potential fire or evacuation can cause stress, which we aimed to capture with this exposure definition.7,8,41 We chose a 10km buffer rather than the previous 20km buffer because evacuation zones themselves can be large.

**Outcome Definition**

We obtained daily counts of all-cause outpatient visits, all-cause inpatient admissions, and all-cause emergency department (ED) visits, as well as inpatient admissions and ED visits specifically for circulatory or respiratory disease outcomes made by KPSC members 45 and older who rented DME. These visits were not necessarily related to DME use. We identified cause-specific visit counts using *International Classification of Diseases 10* codes I00-I99 (circulatory) and J00-J99 (respiratory). We included visits from January 1st, 2016 to March 15th, 2020.

Daily visit counts by ZCTA were low and often zero (median outpatient visits = 1, IQR = 3, median ED and inpatient visits = 0, IQR = 0). For the wildfire PM2.5 analyses, to avoid zero-inflation in our models, and to increase statistical power, we could have aggregated ZCTA counts to the weekly level. However, prior studies of wildfire smoke exposure have found associations between same-day air pollution and healthcare visits over the course of the following week.18–21 To evaluate a lagged effect in our data, we required daily healthcare visit counts, therefore, we opted to aggregate our data into higher-level spatial groupings of several ZCTAs based on spatial proximity (hereafter ‘ZCTA groupings’; grouping method described in the eAppendix).

For proximity and evacuation analyses, we used ZCTA level daily visit counts aggregated to the weekly level. We aggregated to the weekly level because we used last recorded fire boundaries and last recorded evacuation zones rather than daily PM2.5 concentrations as we had available for our air pollution analyses. By aggregating, we also removed weekend-weekday patterns in outpatient visits, increased power, and reduced zero inflation. We considered a week exposed if the Woolsey or Getty fire burned any day that week.

**Analysis**

**Wildfire PM2.5**

To evaluate the relationship between daily wildfire PM2.5 and daily ZCTA grouping-level healthcare visit counts, we used negative binomial regression. Many studies on lagged effects of air pollution use constrained distributed lag models to estimate stable coefficients in the presence of highly autocorrelated (and therefore highly co-linear) lagged exposures.43 We examined the autocorrelation of wildfire PM2.5 concentrations and found only weak autocorrelation (lags 1-7 days each had <0.25 correlation with lag 0). Unlike other sources of air pollution, wildfire PM2.5 concentrations increased dramatically on certain days, then decreased just as quickly (Figure 2b). We therefore created unconstrained models, including separate terms for wildfire PM2.5 lags 0-7 days. We also performed an additional analysis examining weekly wildfire PM2.5 levels lagged up to two weeks. We created separate models for each healthcare visit type: all-cause outpatient, inpatient, and ED visits, and inpatient and ED visits for circulatory or respiratory disease endpoints.

We included offsets accounting for the number of KPSC members over 45 using DME

in each ZCTA grouping. We controlled for temperature using a penalized spline term, as

temperature can predict respiratory and cardiovascular healthcare utilization44 and

wildfire,45 using daily temperature data from the PRISM Climate Group.46 We also

controlled for long-term seasonal trends not caused by exposure with a natural spline

term, and used the number of years in the study period (four) to determine the natural

spline flexibility (12 degrees of freedom). We controlled for non-wildfire PM2.5, since

non-wildfire PM 2.5 concentrations were high during the study period: mean daily non-wildfire PM2.5 by grouping was 11.0 𝜇𝑔/𝑚3 (SD = 6.69), just under the annual USEPA National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 12 μg/m3 (Figure 2a). We also added a fixed effect for weekends to the outpatient visits model, accounting for fewer visits on weekend days.

We included fixed effects for a comprehensive set of socioeconomic variables to account for correlation between ZCTA groupings. We obtained values by ZCTA from the 5-year 2015-2019 ACS47 including median household income, home ownership (% homes occupied by owner), poverty (percent households below threshold income), age structure (percent of population 20-64, and 65+ years), and racial/ethnic composition (percent Hispanic, percent non-Hispanic white, percent non-Hispanic Black). We took a simple mean within ZCTA groupings to obtain average covariate values by ZCTA grouping or summed within ZCTA groupings when appropriate (for example, we summed total population across groupings).

**Proximity to wildfire and evacuation**

To evaluate the association between proximity to and evacuation from wildfire and weekly ZCTA-level healthcare visit counts, we used a difference-in-differences (DID) analysis with negative binomial regression. We evaluated each relationship separately for each fire, for evacuation and proximity, and for each type of healthcare visit. The DID estimators subtracted the change in visit frequency when the Getty or Woolsey Fire was burning versus not burning among control ZCTAs (difference 1) from the change in visit frequency when the Getty or Woolsey Fire was burning versus not burning among ZCTAs exposed to the fire or evacuation zone (difference 2). If all models were specified correctly and parallel trends conditions were met, the DID estimator corresponded to the difference in visit frequency attributable to direct wildfire exposure. We assessed the parallel trends assumption visually (plots are included in the eAppendix).

To avoid bias in our analyses due to exposure to fires, we excluded certain observations from specific ZCTAs from the control pool. If a ZCTA was exposed (i.e., within 20km) to the Getty and Woolsey Fires or exposed to any other large fire (>500 km2) during the study period, we excluded observations from that ZCTA after the date the Getty, Woolsey, or large fire ignited. We used a CALFIRE fire perimeter data36 to identify all fires > 500 km2.

As in the wildfire PM2.5 models, we included offsets accounting for the population exposed and controlled for temperature with a penalized spline. We controlled for long-term seasonal trends not caused by exposure with a penalized spline term, as our data in these analyses were at the weekly level. We did not control for wildfire PM2.5 in these proximity and evacuation models, as we considered this a mediator rather than a confounder.

We tested all models for sensitivity to parameterization of splines, by re-running all analyses with natural splines in place of penalized splines. We also tested all models for sensitivity to the size of the buffer around the wildfire perimeters and evacuation zones, by re-running analyses with a 30km buffer instead of a 20km buffer, expanding the exposed zone to include people further away from the fire or evacuation boundary. We conducted all analyses in R,48 using the mgcv package.49 All analysis code and model equations are available on GitHub at https://github.com/heathermcb/wildfires\_DME.

**Results**

**Health data description**

The study population consisted of 236,732 KPSC DME users who between January 1, 2016 to March 15th, 2020 had a daily average of 2.5 (SD = 4.7) outpatient visits, 0.1 (SD = 0.4) inpatient visits, and 0.1 (SD = 0.5) ED visits per ZCTA grouping. There were on average 8 (SD = 8.9) outpatient visits per week per ZCTA, 0.2 (SD = 0.8) inpatient visits, and 0.5 (SD = 1.5) ED visits. The most common diagnoses were for circulatory or respiratory disease: of the 62,892 ED visits made over the study period, 49,364 (78%) were for circulatory or respiratory disease concerns, as were 30,325 (90%) of inpatient visits.

**PM2.5 exposure**

Mean daily wildfire PM2.5 concentration by ZCTA grouping throughout the study period was 0.22 𝜇𝑔/𝑚3 (SD = 2.67) (Figure 2b), since most groupings on most days (85% of days) had 0 wildfire PM2.5, while the maximum wildfire PM2.5 concentration was 551.53 𝜇𝑔/𝑚3 . On the 366 days (23%) when study area wildfire PM2.5 was non-zero, the mean concentration in groupings with non-zero measurements was 5.6 𝜇𝑔/𝑚3 (SD = 12.1). On days where wildfire PM 2.5 exceeded USEPA air quality standards, in ZCTA groupings over the standard, wildfire PM2.5 made up 91% of total PM2.5.

In adjusted negative binomial models, a daily 10 𝜇𝑔/𝑚3 increase in wildfire PM2.5 was associated with a decrease in risk of outpatient visits one day later (RR = 0.96, 95% CI: 0.94, 0.99), but increases on four of the five subsequent days (Table 1a). Wildfire PM2.5 levels were not associated with the count of all-cause ED or inpatient visits or ED or inpatient visits for cardiorespiratory concerns.

In our additional analysis examining weekly wildfire PM2.5 levels lagged up to two weeks, a 10 increase in weekly PM2.5 concentration was associated with a next-week increase in outpatient visits (RR = 1.04, 95% CI: 1.00, 1.09), consistent with the daily outpatient visit model. Additionally, there were increases in weekly outpatient visits two weeks later (Table 1b). We did not interpret the same-week coefficient due to issues with temporality – our outcome may have preceded the exposure. Weekly wildfire PM2.5 was not associated with the frequency of any other visits.

**Proximity to wildfire**

There were 54 ZCTAs (9%) within 20 km of the Woolsey Fire boundary, which we considered exposed to the fire. Despite the comparatively small size of the Getty Fire (~3 km2 vs ~400 km2), 98 ZCTAs (17%) met our exposure definition, as the Getty Fire was closer to population centers. We estimated that 20 and 21 ZCTAs were evacuation exposed during the Woolsey and Getty fires, respectively. However, all evacuation exposed ZCTAs were also within 20km of the fire boundaries, meaning that the evacuation exposed ZCTAs were a subset of the wildfire proximate ZCTAs in both cases.

**Woolsey Fire proximity and evacuation exposure**

Residence within 20km of the Woolsey Fire boundary during the fire was associated with increased inpatient admissions for cardiorespiratory disease compared residence outside of it (RR = 1.48, 95% CI: 1.01, 2.17), and associated with decreased all-cause outpatient visits compared to residence outside of it (RR = 0.89, 95% CI: 0.79, 1.00), though the confidence interval was wide (Figure 3). We observed similar associations, with narrower confidence intervals, between Woolsey Fire evacuation exposure and healthcare visits. Residence in versus outside of an evacuation zone plus 10km of the Woolsey Fire during the fire was also associated with decreased all-cause outpatient and increased inpatient admissions for cardiorespiratory disease visits (RR = 1.76, 95% CI: 1.02, 3.05, RR = 0.87, 95% CI: 0.73, 1.04 respectively) (Figure 3).

**Getty Fire proximity and evacuation exposure**

We observed no association between Getty Fire proximity during the fire and risk of all visits types (Figure 3). Residence within an evacuation zone plus 10km was associated with reduced risk of all types of visits, though confidence intervals were very wide (Figure 3).

None of our results were sensitive to spline flexibility, or the size of the buffer around exposures. Visual inspection of model residuals and Moran’s I results indicated that our model residuals were not exhibit spatial autocorrelation (plots included in the eAppendix).

**Discussion**

Using electronic health data describing 236,732 Kaiser Permanente DME-using patients from 2016-2020, we found that an increase in wildfire PM2.5 concentration was associated with brief (next-day) decreases in all-cause outpatient visits but increases in all-cause outpatient visits up to two weeks later. Increases in wildfire PM2.5 were not associated with the frequency of ED or inpatient visits among DME users. Residential proximity of DME users to the large Woolsey Fire was also associated with fewer all-cause outpatient visits, as well as more cardiorespiratory inpatient visits, but not with other visit types. Results for Woolsey Fire evacuation exposure were similar. Getty Fire evacuation or proximity was not significantly associated with frequency any kind of healthcare visit. Our study was unique in that we evaluated healthcare utilization among DME users, a group hypothesized to be susceptible to disaster and wildfire smoke exposures, included inpatient, ED, and outpatient visits, and examined residence near a wildfire or an evacuation zone in addition to wildfire PM2.5 exposure.

The literature describes a strong relationship between wildfire smoke exposure and respiratory health20, and a strong relationship between PM 2.5 exposure and cardiovascular health77, though the relationship between wildfire PM2.5 and cardiovascular health are still being characterized. Large studies measure this association through healthcare utilization and have found increased risk of hospital admissions and ED visits for cardiorespiratory outcomes following wildfire PM2.5, PM10, or general smoke exposure in the U.S., Canada, Australia, and Brazil.50–55 Fewer studies have examined wildfire PM2.5 exposure in vulnerable populations.15,56 Of studies examining older adults, all have reported associations between smoke exposure and same or next-day increased inpatient and ED visit frequency50,54,57,58 and while some studies find older adults at elevated risk compared to younger adults16,52,57 others found no difference.26,50 Surprisingly, we observed no association between wildfire PM2.5 and ED or inpatient visits among DME users. We hypothesized that older adult DME users would be particularly susceptible to wildfire PM2.5 due to probable high prevalence of underlying cardiorespiratory disease.29 The observed null association between wildfire PM2.5 and ED or inpatient visits may indicate that DME users, especially those vulnerable to smoke, may take precautions to protect themselves from effects described in other studies or study limitations may obscure associations between smoke and more urgent healthcare use.

Limited studies have assessed outpatient care utilization during smoke exposure and most have focused on outpatient visits for respiratory concerns, reporting increases during smoke exposure.50,59–62 None of those studies examined all-cause outpatient care use. Hutchinson et al. 2018 simultaneously reported decreases in all-cause outpatient visits during smoke exposure and increases in visits for respiratory concerns only, during a five-day period following smoke exposure. Similarly, Henderson et al. 2011 found increased physician visits for asthma and all-respiratory outcomes related to same-day wildfire smoke exposure but no increase in physician visits for cardiovascular disease. In models with daily lags, we observed an initial same-day and next-day decrease in all-cause outpatient visits, and then a positive association between wildfire PM2.5 and all-cause outpatient visits among DME users for the week following exposure. In models with weekly lags, we observed increased outpatient visits in the two weeks following exposure, suggesting that there is overall an increase in all-cause outpatient visits among DME users following wildfire PM exposure. These findings are consistent with much of the literature in that they indicate increased healthcare utilization following smoke exposure. Very few prior studies have evaluated lags of short-term exposure to wildfire PM2.5 beyond 7 days78, but our results indicate that outpatient visits remained elevated for up to two weeks.

Few studies have evaluated proximity to wildfire boundaries or wildfire evacuation as risk factors for healthcare utilization or adverse health outcomes.63–65 Proximity to wildfires can affect health through a stress pathway, on top of risks related to smoke exposure. Qualitative studies emphasize this point, and several have documented the immense stress experienced by those displaced by wildfire.7,8,41 After the 2014 Canadian Northwest Territory wildfires, one interviewee said: “Well, it took a toll on me because being stressed out from the fires and never knowing when we had to leave to be evacuated we didn’t know if we were going to come home to a community or to our houses.”28 Agyapong et al. 2021 estimated the likely prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder among Canadian Fort McMurray wildfire survivors at 12.8%, twice the baseline population prevalence.66 We attempted to assess this proximity/evacuation pathway for two major fires in our study area using a difference-in-differences analysis. We found no association between exposure and healthcare visits during the Getty Fire. However, during the Woolsey Fire, we observed an increase in cardiorespiratory inpatient visits and a decrease in all-cause outpatient visits with both fire proximity and evacuation among DME users. The 400 km2 Woolsey Fire, which caused $3 billion in damages,67 was much larger than the 3 km2 Getty Fire, which destroyed 10 homes,35 that null associations between Getty proximity exposure and all visit types could be due to its smaller size; it may have not been large enough to produce a detectable effect in visit changes. A larger analysis examining several wildfires, rather than two, could be informative.

Study limitations could have influenced our results. First, we only had access to data on visits to Kaiser Permanente clinics and hospitals made by Kaiser members who rented DME in the year prior to October 29, 2019, which we used as an indicator of vulnerability. These patients would be highly motivated to seek care at Kaiser, given their membership status, however they may have sought urgent care at other clinics or hospitals. Such alternate utilization would have produced artificially reduced visit counts, especially for inpatient and emergency visits. If patients sought care at other clinics only during wildfires (whether during evacuations or while a fire was burning nearby) this could have biased association estimates towards the null.

Second, we lacked individual-level information on participants. Therefore, we did not know if patients sought care for DME-related issues and only used prior DME use as a vulnerability metric. We also were not able to assess differences in healthcare use by type of DME or stratify by age group or sex beyond limiting our study population to those age 45 or older. Excluding younger people excluded most breast pump users, a generally healthy subpopulation who constitute 30% of DME users of all ages at KPSC33. Subgroups such as those using ventilators or those using breast pumps likely have vastly different health needs and outcomes. We chose to focus on DME users aged 45 and older who were likely the most susceptible to wildfire. However, subgroups in our study may also have differing needs and outcomes, which we did not examine.

Third, days with 0 visits made by patients living in a spatial grouping were common. Inpatient and ED visits were much less frequent over the study period (both mean = 0.1 daily visits) than outpatient visits (mean = 2.5 daily visits). All models may have been underpowered to detect visit changes. For example, during the Woolsey Fire, we observed decreased outpatient visits in ZCTAs proximate to the fire and among evacuation exposed ZCTAs but, for both, confidence intervals were wide, likely due to sample size.

Lastly, as in any observational study, residual confounding could affect our results. We attempted to account for residual spatial confounding by including a set of ZCTA-level covariates that measured different facets of socioeconomic status.

**Conclusion**

As wildfires become more frequent and severe with climate change, we must understand how they affect both local populations and those exposed to wildfire PM2.5. Protecting vulnerable populations that may be harmed by exposures which others can avoid or endure is essential. More work is needed to understand we can best support those affected by smoke, fire, and evacuation.

**References**

1. Spracklen DV, Mickley LJ, Logan JA, et al. Impacts of climate change from 2000 to 2050 on wildfire activity and carbonaceous aerosol concentrations in the western united states. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres. 2009;114(D20). doi:https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010966

2. Fried JS, Torn MS, Mills E. The impact of climate change on wildfire severity: A regional forecast for northern california. Climatic Change. 2004;64(1):169-191. doi:10.1023/B:CLIM.0000024667.89579.ed

3. Westerling AL, Hidalgo HG, Cayan DR, Swetnam TW. Warming and earlier spring increase western u.s. Forest wildfire activity. Science. 2006;313(5789):940-943. <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1128834>

4. Abatzoglou JT, Williams AP. Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2016;113(42):11770-11775. doi:10.1073/pnas.1607171113

5. Williams AP, Abatzoglou JT, Gershunov A, et al. Observed impacts of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire in california. Earth’s Future. 2019;7(8):892- 910.

6. Radeloff VC, Helmers DP, Kramer HA, et al. Rapid growth of the US wildlandurban interface raises wildfire risk. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2018;115(13):3314-3319.

7. Belleville G, Ouellet MC, Morin CM. Post-traumatic stress among evacuees from the 2016 fort McMurray wildfires: Exploration of psychological and sleep symptoms three months after the evacuation. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2019;16(9). doi:10.3390/ijerph16091604

8. McCaffrey Sarah SM Rhodes Alan. Wildfire evacuation and its alternatives: Perspectives from four united states’ communities. International Journal of Wildland Fire. 2014;24:170-178.

9. Liu JC, Mickley LJ, Sulprizio MP, et al. Particulate air pollution from wildfires in the western US under climate change. Clim Change. 2016;138(3):655-666. doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1762-6

10. O’Dell K, Bilsback K, Ford B, et al. Estimated mortality and morbidity attributable to smoke plumes in the united states: Not just a western US problem. GeoHealth. 2021;5(9):e2021GH000457. doi:https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GH000457

11. Lassman W, Ford B, Gan RW, et al. Spatial and temporal estimates of population exposure to wildfire smoke during the washington state 2012 wildfire season using blended model, satellite, and in situ data. GeoHealth. 2017;1(3):106-121. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GH000049

12. Nakayama Wong LS, Aung HH, Lamé MW, Wegesser TC, Wilson DW. Fine particulate matter from urban ambient and wildfire sources from california’s san joaquin valley initiate differential inflammatory, oxidative stress, and xenobiotic responses in human bronchial epithelial cells. Toxicology in Vitro. 2011;25(8):1895-1905. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2011.06.001

13. Aguilera R, Corringham T, Gershunov A, Benmarhnia T. Wildfire smoke impacts respiratory health more than fine particles from other sources: Observational evidence from southern california. Nature Communications. 2021;12(1):1493. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21708-0

14. Liu JC, Peng RD. The impact of wildfire smoke on compositions of fine particulate matter by ecoregion in the western US. Journal of exposure science & environmental epidemiology. 2019;29(6):765-776.

15. Colleen Reid MMM. Wildfire smoke exposure under climate change. Pulmonary Medicine. Published online 2019.

16. Anjali Haikerwal ADM Muhammad Akram, Dennekamp M. Impact of fine particulate matter (PM 2.5) exposure during wildfires on cardiovascular health outcomes. JAHA. Published online 2015.

17. Yao J, Brauer M, Wei J, McGrail KM, Johnston FH, Henderson SB. Sub-daily exposure to fine particulate matter and ambulance dispatches during wildfire seasons: A case-crossover study in british columbia, canada. Environ Health Perspect. 2020;128(6):67006. doi:10.1289/EHP5792

18. Reid CE, Considine EM, Watson GL, Telesca D, Pfister GG, Jerrett M. Associations between respiratory health and ozone and fine particulate matter during a wildfire event. Environ Int. 2019;129:291-298. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2019.04.033

19. Hutchinson JA, Vargo J, Milet M, et al. The san diego 2007 wildfires and medi-cal emergency department presentations, inpatient hospitalizations, and outpatient visits: An observational study of smoke exposure periods and a bidirectional case-crossover analysis. PLoS Med. 2018;15(7):e1002601. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002601

20. Reid CE, Brauer M, Johnston FH, Jerrett M, Balmes JR, Elliott CT. Critical review of health impacts of wildfire smoke exposure. Environ Health Perspect. 2016;124(9):1334-1343. doi:10.1289/ehp.1409277

21. Liu JC, Wilson A, Mickley LJ, et al. Who Among the Elderly Is Most Vulnerable to Exposure to and Health Risks of Fine Particulate Matter From Wildfire Smoke? American Journal of Epidemiology. 2017;186(6):730-735. doi:10.1093/aje/kwx141

22. Kollanus V, Tiittanen P, Niemi JV, Lanki T. Effects of long-range transported air pollution from vegetation fires on daily mortality and hospital admissions in the helsinki metropolitan area, finland. Environ Res. 2016;151:351-358. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2016.08.003

23. Doubleday A, Schulte J, Sheppard L, et al. Mortality associated with wildfire smoke exposure in washington state, 2006-2017: A case-crossover study. Environ Health. 2020;19(1):4. doi:10.1186/s12940-020-0559-2

24. Liu JC, Pereira G, Uhl SA, Bravo MA, Bell ML. A systematic review of the physical health impacts from non-occupational exposure to wildfire smoke. Environ Res. 2015;136:120-132. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2014.10.015

25. Ian P. Davies JCR Ryan D. Haugo. The unequal vulnerability of communities of color to wildfire. PLOS ONE. Published online 2018.

26. Rappold AG, Reyes J, Pouliot G, Cascio WE, Diaz-Sanchez D. Community vulnerability to health impacts of wildland fire smoke exposure. Environmental Science & Technology. 2017;51(12):6674-6682. doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b06200

27. Aguilera R, Corringham T, Gershunov A, Leibel S, Benmarhnia T. Fine particles in wildfire smoke and pediatric respiratory health in california. Pediatrics. 2021;147(4). doi:10.1542/peds.2020-027128

28. Dodd W, Scott P, Howard C, et al. Lived experience of a record wildfire season in the northwest territories, canada. Canadian Journal of Public Health. 2018;109(3):327- 337.

29. Jacobs BC, Lee JA. Durable medical equipment: Types and indications. Medical Clinics. 2014;98(4):881-893.

30. Casey JA, Mango M, Mullendore S, et al. Trends from 2008 to 2018 in electricitydependent durable medical equipment rentals and sociodemographic disparities. Epidemiology. 2021;32(3):327-335. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000001333

31. Mahsin MD, Cabaj J, Saini V. Respiratory and cardiovascular condition-related physician visits associated with wildfire smoke exposure in Calgary, Canada, in 2015: a population-based study. International Journal of Epidemiology. Published online September 2021. doi:10.1093/ije/dyab206

32. Kivimaki S M. Effects of stress on the development and progression of cardiovascular disease. Nat Rev Cardiol. Published online 2018.

33. Los Angeles Fire Department. LAFD news: Woolsey fire. Published 2019. <https://www.lafd.org/news/woolsey-fire>

34. Cal Fire 2018 Incident Archive. Published 2018. <https://www.fire.ca.gov/incidents/2018>

35. Los Angeles Fire Department. LAFD news: Getty fire. Published 2018. <https://www.lafd.org/news/getty-fire>

36. Cal Fire 2019 Incident Archive. Published 2019. https://www.fire.ca.gov/incidents/2019/

37. Aguilera R, Luo N, Basu R, Wu J, Gershunov A, Benmarhnia T. Using machine learning to estimate wildfire PM2. 5 at california ZIP codes (2006-2020). Published online 2021.

38. Los Angeles Fire Department. LAFD news: Getty fire. Published 2018. <https://www.lafd.org/news/getty-fire>

39. CALFIRE Fire and Resource Assessment Program. Published 2022. <https://frap.fire.ca.gov/mapping/gis-data/>

40. National Interagency Fire Center. Historic wildland fire open data. Published 2022. <https://datanifc.opendata.arcgis.com/search?tags=Category%2Chistoric_wildlandfire_opendata>

41. Christianson AC, McGee TK. Wildfire evacuation experiences of band members of whitefish lake first nation 459, alberta, canada. Natural Hazards. 2019;98(1):9-29.

42. Team QD. QGIS geographic information system. Published online 2009. <http://qgis.org>

43. Dormann CF, Elith J, Bacher S, et al. Collinearity: A review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. Ecography. 2013;36(1):27- 46.

44. Rochelle S. Green BM Rupa Basu. The effect of temperature on hospital admissions in nine california counties. International Journal of Public Health. 2010;55:113-121.
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