

1                    **Evaluating the effects of burn severity and**  
2                    **precipitation on post-fire watershed responses using**  
3                    **distributed hydrologic models**

4                    **Zhi Li<sup>1</sup>, Bing Li<sup>1</sup>, Peishi Jiang<sup>1</sup>, Glenn E. Hammond<sup>1</sup>, Pin Shuai<sup>2</sup>, Faria T.**  
5                    **Zahura<sup>1</sup>, Ethan T. Coon<sup>3</sup>, Xingyuan Chen<sup>1</sup>**

6                    <sup>1</sup>Atmospheric, Climate and Earth Sciences Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland,  
7                    WA, United States

8                    <sup>2</sup>Utah Water Research Laboratory, Utah State University, Logan, UT, United States

9                    <sup>3</sup>Climate Change Science Institute & Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory,  
10                    Oak Ridge, TN, United States

11                    **Key Points:**

- 12                    • The fire-caused soil water repellency is quantified using burn severity products and  
13                    is incorporated into the integrated hydrologic model  
14                    • High burn severity wildfires cause increased peak flow discharges and decreased  
15                    infiltration after the first post-fire precipitation event  
16                    • Higher post-fire precipitation events induce larger increase of the peak flow dis-  
17                    charges due to the soil water repellency effect

---

Corresponding author: Xingyuan Chen, ([xingyuan.chen@pnnl.gov](mailto:xingyuan.chen@pnnl.gov))

**Abstract**

Wildfires can induce an abundance of vegetation and soil changes that may trigger higher surface runoff and soil erosion, affecting the water cycling within these ecosystems. In this study, we employed the Advanced Terrestrial Simulator (ATS), an integrated and fully distributed hydrologic model at watershed scale to investigate post-fire hydrologic responses in a few selected watersheds with varying burn severity in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States. The model couples surface overland flow, subsurface flow, and canopy biophysical processes. We developed a new fire module in ATS to account for the fire-caused hydrophobicity in the topsoil. Modeling results show that the watershed-averaged evapotranspiration is reduced after high burn severity wildfires. Post-fire peak flows are increased by 21-34% in the three study watersheds burned with medium to high severity due to the fire-caused soil water repellency (SWR). However, the watershed impacted by a low severity fire only witnessed a 2% surge in post-fire peak flow. Furthermore, the high severity fire resulted in a mean reduction of 38% in the infiltration rate within fire-impacted watershed during the first post-fire wet season. Hypothetical numerical experiments with a range of precipitation regimes after a high severity fire reveal the post-fire peak flows can be escalated by 1-34% due to the SWR effect triggered by the fire. This study implies the importance of applying fully distributed hydrologic models in quantifying the disturbance-feedback loop to account for the complexity brought by spatial heterogeneity.

**Plain Language Summary**

The increasing number of wildfires in the Pacific Northwest are changing the local soil and landscapes, potentially leading to increased water runoff, more soil erosion, and altered water quality. Despite attempts to study this, a thorough understanding of the long-term and large-scale impacts is lacking. We used a comprehensive computer model, including a new element for fire-induced soil water repellency, on freely available data to study watersheds affected by wildfires. Most showed an increase in peak water flow due to the fire's effect on soil, except one watershed with a less severe fire. Another watershed saw a decrease in water entering the soil after the fire. Our research compares water systems before and after fires, helping to further studies on the affects of fire on nutrients and sediment movement.

**1 Introduction**

In recent years, wildfires have caused “cascading hazards” across the globe (Hallemma et al., 2018; Wagenbrenner et al., 2021; Kemter et al., 2021; Robinne et al., 2021). The Pacific Northwest of the United States represents a primary locus of wildfire activity and is denoted as one of the most significantly impacted regions globally. Wildfires in the Pacific Northwest region have been and continue to escalate in both frequency and severity (Li et al., 2021; Abatzoglou, Battisti, et al., 2021). As a significant disturbance to the ecosystem, wildfires are directly responsible for the spatiotemporal redistribution of carbon and nitrogen nutrients (Roebuck Jr et al., 2022), deteriorated water and air qualities (Wine & Cadol, 2016; Moiseeva & Stull, 2021; Wilmot et al., 2022; Paul et al., 2022), debris flow hazards (Rengers et al., 2016; DiBiase & Lamb, 2020), water supply risks (Wieting et al., 2017), and extreme flooding (Moody & Ebel, 2012). Many of the previously mentioned post-fire hazard cascades are the consequences of indirect fire effects that involve other spatiotemporal non-fire factors, combined with a direct fire effect caused by combustion—the substantial change on the soil physical properties, leading to the occurrence of soil water repellency (SWR) (DeBano, 2000a, 2000b; Garcia-Chevesich et al., 2010; Moody, 2012; Ebel et al., 2012; Murphy et al., 2015; Ebel et al., 2016; Murphy et al., 2018; Agbeshie et al., 2022). In SWR, the hydrophobic layer that forms in the soil as a consequence of fire exhibits reduced permeability compared to its pre-fire state. As water is the main

68 medium of transport processes in the ecosystem, the repartitioning of water between the  
69 surface and subsurface due to the SWR effect can be substantial at large scales and fur-  
70 ther break the pre-fire dynamic patterns of transport processes post-fire.

71 The consideration of SWR in various numerical modeling efforts has been limited.  
72 Those efforts have been undertaken to investigate the hydrologic effects of wildfires across  
73 diverse spatial and temporal scales, ranging from 1D soil column simulations to 3D in-  
74 tegrated watershed analyses (Cydzik & Hogue, 2009; Chen et al., 2013; Kinoshita et al.,  
75 2014; Zema et al., 2020; Maina & Siirila-Woodburn, 2020; Wilder et al., 2021; Wampler  
76 et al., 2023). Ebel et al. (2023) summarized recent work evaluating the post-wildfire hy-  
77 drologic response using physically based numerical models and identified key future re-  
78 search directions. One of the key future directions pointed out by Ebel et al. (2023) is  
79 to *include vadose zone and saturated zone processes to better capture subsurface stream-*  
80 *flow generation.* To represent the fire impact on watershed hydrology, Maina and Siirila-  
81 Woodburn (2020) replaced the pre-fire land cover types in the burn scar areas with bar-  
82 ren soil, but neglected the SWR effect on watershed hydrology. There are limited stud-  
83 ies that employ high-resolution integrated hydrology specifically designed to account for  
84 the long-term effects of wildfires on a watershed-scale.

85 To address these gaps, in this study we employed a fully distributed hydrologic model  
86 known as the Advanced Terrestrial Simulator (ATS), which integrates surface overland  
87 flow, subsurface flow, and land surface processes including snow melt and canopy inter-  
88 ception. As pointed out by Cydzik and Hogue (2009) and Chen et al. (2013), physically-  
89 based approaches are encouraged to be applied for more accurate predictions of fire-impacted  
90 hydrology. To incorporate SWR into the model, we developed a novel fire module within  
91 the ATS high-performance computing framework. We set up models with higher tem-  
92 poral resolution (hours) and spatial resolution (tens of meters) to capture relevant fine-  
93 scale temporal variations and microtopographic features. The model inputs encompass  
94 extensive hydrographic, geologic, ecological, and climatological data from publicly ac-  
95 cessible sources, such as the National Land Cover Database (NLCD), Soil Survey Ge-  
96 ographic Database (SSURGO), and Daymet. The Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity  
97 (MTBS) and Burned Area Emergency Response (BAER) burn severity mapping prod-  
98 ucts were employed to assist in quantifying post-fire soil permeabilities. The Mckenzie  
99 River Watershed (Holiday Farm Fire in 2020), American River Watershed (Norse Peak  
100 Fire in 2017), Naches River Watershed (Schneider Springs Fire in 2021), and the We-  
101 nas Creek Watershed (Evans Canyon Fire in 2020) were selected as research areas, as  
102 the burned areas of the study fires are large ( $> 160 \text{ km}^2$ , or 40,000 acres) and the land  
103 cover types and climates of the watersheds are representative in the Pacific Northwest.  
104 We specifically seek to address the following research questions:

- 105 1. How does fire-induced reduction in the leaf area index (LAI) affect post-fire evap-  
106 otranspiration?
- 107 2. How does the burn severity of a wildfire event affect the post-fire peak flow dis-  
108 charges through the SWR effect?
- 109 3. What is the role of post-fire precipitation rate in impacting the post-fire peak dis-  
110 charges?
- 111 4. How does fire-induced infiltration change affect watershed function after a moderate-  
112 high severity fire?
- 113 5. How do fire-induced changes in Manning's  $n$  affect peak flow discharges after a low  
114 severity fire?

115 In this paper, we first introduce the study areas, the numerical model and its setup,  
116 how we represent fire impacts on soil and vegetation in the model, and the simulation  
117 scenarios for hypotheses testing in Section 2. In Section 3, we present and analyze the  
118 modeling results of the post-fire peak flow discharge and infiltration, and discuss the study  
119 limitations and key future work focuses, followed by conclusions in the final section.

## 2 Materials and Methods

### 2.1 Study sites

The focal watersheds in our study, subjected to recent wildfires in the Pacific Northwest, are the McKenzie River Watershed (impacted by the Holiday Farm Fire in 2020), the American River Watershed (impacted by the Norse Peak Fire in 2017), the Naches River Watershed (impacted by the Schneider Springs Fire in 2021), and the Wenas Creek Watershed (impacted by the Evans Canyon Fire in 2020). The watersheds of the American River, Naches River, and Wenas Creek reside within the Yakima River Basin, denoted by the Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 1703 in the State of Washington; whereas the McKenzie River Watershed is situated within the Willamette River Basin (HUC 1709) in the State of Oregon. Figure 1 illustrates their geographic positions within the Pacific Northwest. Importantly, the Holiday Farm Fire accounted for one of Oregon’s 2020 megafires driven by compound extremes (Abatzoglou, Rupp, et al., 2021), causing over 600 km<sup>2</sup> of devastation in the McKenzie River valley (Robbins, 2021).


Burn severity data serves as an integral remote sensing mapping product to evaluate wildfire-induced effects on vegetation biomass due to the fire’s heat pulse, rendering it a significant metric to quantify the fire impact (Parsons et al., 2010). We employed the Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity (MTBS) data to assess burn severity (Eidenshink et al., 2007) for the Holiday Farm Fire, Norse Peak Fire and the Evans Canyon Fire. The Burned Area Emergency Response (BAER) data (Parsons, 2003) was used for the Schneider Springs Fire. The key difference in the two data products is that BAER is used for immediate assessment purpose and MTBS is used for long-term monitoring purposes. The satellite images used in BAER are obtained as close to the fire events as possible, while the satellite images used in MTBS are of the next vegetation growing season (typically the next spring/summer).

Figure 2 depicts the burn severity statistics pertaining to the four studied wildfire events. Both the Holiday Farm Fire and Norse Peak fire-caused over 60% of the area to be subjected to moderate to high severity burning. Conversely, the Schneider Springs Fire and Evans Canyon Fire subjected approximately 40% and 15% of their areas to moderate to high severity burning, respectively. Details such as fire ignition dates, the size of the impacted areas, average daily total precipitation in the impacted watershed on an annual basis, and dominant land cover types are summarized in Table 1.

### 2.2 The burn severity dependent soil water repellency effect

To quantify the relationship between the strengths of the SWR effect and the hydrologic response is essentially to explain how the water conveyance capacity in porous media compares before and after combustion on top of the media. Soil burn severity, as a metric to assess the fire impact to soil, can be an appropriate metric in establishing the aforementioned relationship. However, existing studies show diverse conclusions (Vieira et al., 2015; Ebel & Moody, 2017; Robinne et al., 2020; Wagenbrenner et al., 2021; Carrà et al., 2021; Paul et al., 2022) and a comprehensive understanding on the relationship remains unclear. Despite the current inability and inaccuracy in quantitatively linking fire-induced SWR with burn severity in the hydrologic scientific community, some earlier studies have suggested that a reduction in hydraulic conductivity due to fire is inversely proportional to burn severity (Moody et al., 2015). Experiments by Hallema et al. (2018) pointed out the hydrophobic coating is highly related to the combustion temperature.

In both MTBS and BAER, burn severity is determined by the normalized burn ratio (NBR) and the differenced NBR (dNBR), whose practical value falls within the range of (−2000, +2000) (Eidenshink et al., 2007). In this study, we applied a simplified linear relationship to quantify the SWR effect caused by wildfires:



**Figure 1.** The fires and corresponding impacted watersheds within the Pacific Northwest. The McKenzie River Watershed in the State of Oregon is characterized as a subbasin (HUC8), while the American River Watershed, Naches River Watershed, and Wenas Creek Watershed in the State of Washington comprise multiple local sub-watersheds (multiple HUC12's). The perimeters of the fires and burn severity maps of the four scrutinized wildfires are shown.


**Table 1.** Basic information of the study wildfires and impacted watersheds

Wildfire (Impacted Watershed)	Ignition Date [mm/dd/yyyy]	Burned Area [km <sup>2</sup> ]	Annual Precip.* [mm] (climate classification <sup>†</sup> )	Dominant Land Cover Types <sup>‡</sup>
Holiday Farm Fire (Mckenzie River)	09/08/2020	642	1391 (Csb)	EF (80%) S/S (9%)
Norse Peak Fire (American River)	08/12/2017	188	868 (Dsc)	EF (87%) S/S (7%)
Schneider Springs Fire (Naches River)	08/04/2021	419	615 (Dsb)	EF (66%) S/S (21%) G/H (6%)
Evans Canyon Fire (Wenas Creek)	08/31/2020	281	406 (Dsb)	S/S (44%) EF (31%) G/H (22%)

\* Annual average total precipitation

<sup>†</sup> Dominant Köppen–Geiger climate classification (Csb = temperate, dry and warm summer; Dsb = cold, dry and warm summer; Dsc = cold, dry and cold summer)

<sup>‡</sup> EF = Evergreen Forest; S/S = Shrub/Scrub; G/H = Grassland/Herbaceous




**Figure 2.** Burn severity statistics relative to the study wildfires: (a) the Holiday Farm Fire, with a mean burn severity of 2.87 and 63.0% of its area burned with moderate to high severity; (b) the Norse Peak Fire, with a mean of 2.88 and 61.2% of its area burned with moderate to high severity; (c) the Schneider Springs Fire, with a mean of 2.34 and 38.8% of its area burned with moderate to high severity; and (d) the Evans Canyon Fire, with a mean of 2.04 and a mere 15.2% of its area burned with moderate to high severity.

$$\text{Permeability}_{\text{post-fire}} = \text{Permeability}_{\text{pre-fire}} \cdot (1 - 20\% \cdot \text{Burn Severity}) \quad (1)$$

170 where *Burn Severity* can take integers 1, 2, 3, and 4 to represent no-low, low, moder-  
 171 ate, and high burn severities, respectively.

172 In Figure 3, the pre-fire soil permeabilities are informed by the Soil Survey Geo-  
 173 graphic Database (SSURGO) database. Within the fire perimeter, after applying Equa-  
 174 tion 1, the topsoil permeability reduces to 80%, 60%, 40%, and 20% of its pre-fire value  
 175 if the local burn severity is equal to 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Thus, the ratio of the  
 176 pre-fire topsoil permeability and the post-fire topsoil permeability represents exactly the  
 177 burn severity integer indexes (see *Burn Severity* definition in Equation 1), as shown in  
 178 the last panel of Figure 3. Note that the 0–5 cm soil layer is defined as the topsoil based  
 179 on literature findings that the 0–5 cm layer is the most affected by fires (Roth et al., 2023).



**Figure 3.** A graphic illustration of the post-fire topsoil permeability change. The Schneider Springs Fire in the Naches River Watershed is shown here as an example. The pre-fire soil permeability comes from the SSURGO database. The post-fire topsoil permeability has been updated using the burn severity map from the MTBS database.

180 The modifications in chemical and physical soil properties induced by fire were condensed  
 181 into a single overarching effect, the SWR effect, accounting for the hydrophobic  
 182 transformation of topsoil attributable to fire heat. This is a limitation engendered by the  
 183 simplification of fire impact depiction in our model, since we did not conduct explicit and  
 184 proactive simulations of the fire-originated ash layer. The ash layer is easily removed by  
 185 the first post-fire flush, hence, the effects of the ash layer on the SWR effect is neglected.  
 186 Anticipated future work includes integrating additional physics-based processes into the  
 187 model to more accurately portray fire’s impact on the underlying soil.

### 188 2.3 Model description

189 This study used the ATS version 1.4.1 (Coon et al., 2019, 2020). ATS is a high per-  
 190 formance computing (HPC) code solving fully distributed and ecosystem-based integrated  
 191 hydrology. It uses process kernels (PKs) and multi-process-couplers (MPCs) to allow cus-  
 192 tom coupling among different physical and biophysical processes. Here we used the wa-  
 193 tershed water balance MPC to couple the canopy water PK, the snow water PK, and  
 194 the surface-subsurface flow MPC to simulate the integrated watershed hydrology. The  
 195 surface-subsurface flow MPC couples the subsurface flow PK and the overland flow PK.  
 196 ATS performance has been evaluated at different watersheds within the continental United  
 197 States (Shuai et al., 2022; Bhanja et al., 2023). ATS divides the modeling domain into  
 198 a terrain following two-dimensional (2D) surface domain and a three-dimensional (3D)  
 199 subsurface domain, on which the diffusion wave equation for overland flow and the Richards  
 200 equation for variably saturated groundwater flow are solved, respectively.

201 The water mass conservation equation on the surface domain reads:

$$\frac{\partial \Theta_s}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_s = \mathbf{Q}_s + \mathbf{Q}_e \quad (2)$$

202 where  $\Theta_s$  is the mass of surface water per unit surface area;  $\mathbf{q}_s$  is the overland flow rate  
 203 per unit surface area;  $\mathbf{Q}_s$  is the sources and sinks, including rainfall, snowmelt, evapo-  
 204 ration and transpiration; and  $\mathbf{Q}_e$  is the surface water-groundwater flux. If  $\mathbf{Q}_e < 0$ , wa-  
 205 ter flows from surface to subsurface domain, i.e., infiltration.

206 Note that the canopy component of water storage is wrapped into the sources and  
 207 sinks term,  $\mathbf{Q}_s$ , and the conservation of water in canopy is defined by,

$$\frac{d\Theta_{canopy}}{dt} = I - D_{snow} - D_{rain} - E_{canopy} \quad (3)$$

208 where  $\Theta_{canopy}$  is the canopy water storage;  $I$  is the canopy interception and is associ-  
 209 ated with the leaf area index (LAI);  $D_{snow}$  and  $D_{rain}$  are the drainage of water from snow  
 210 and rain from the canopy, respectively; and  $E_{canopy}$  is the evaporation of canopy water.

211 The water mass is written in terms of the water pressure  $p_s$ , the primary variable,  
 212 through ponded depth  $h$  in the surface domain,

$$\Theta_s = \eta h \quad (4)$$

$$h = H \frac{(p_s - p_{atm})^2}{\rho g} \quad (5)$$

213 where  $\eta$  is the molar density of water;  $p_{atm}$  is the atmospheric pressure;  $\rho$  is the mass  
 214 density of water;  $g$  is gravitational acceleration; and  $H$  is the Heaviside function to en-  
 215 sure non-negativity of water ponded depth.

216 The water flow rate on the surface domain is determined by the diffusion wave equa-  
 217 tion,

$$q_s = -\eta h \frac{h^{4/3}}{n \sqrt{|\nabla z|}} \nabla(h + z) \quad (6)$$

218 where  $n$  is the Manning's surface roughness coefficient and  $z$  is the elevation of the land  
 219 surface.

220 In the 3D subsurface domain, the water mass conservation is governed by,

$$\frac{\partial \Theta_g}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_g = \mathbf{Q}_g \quad (7)$$

221 where  $\Theta_g$  is the mass of groundwater per unit volume;  $q_s$  is the water flow rate in the  
 222 subsurface domain; and  $Q_g$  is the sources/sinks term, representing processes such as in-  
 223 jection or pumping wells.

224 The water pressure  $p_g$  is also used as the primary variable in the subsurface do-  
 225 main to solve the coupled water mass conservation by requiring  $p_g|_{\partial\Omega} = p_s$ . Subsur-  
 226 face water content is,

$$\Theta_g = \eta S_w \phi \quad (8)$$

227 and the Darcy’s flow,  $q_g$ , is,

$$q_g = -\frac{\eta}{\mu} k_r K (\nabla p + \rho g z) \quad (9)$$

228 where  $\phi$  is the porosity of the medium;  $S_w$  is the water saturation;  $\mu$  is the water vis-  
229 cosity;  $k_r$  is the relative permeability; and  $K$  is the absolute permeability.

## 230 2.4 Model setup and simulated scenarios


231 To drive the integrated hydrologic model, an extensive set of hydrography, digital  
232 elevation model (DEM), land cover, subsurface material structures/properties, and me-  
233 teorological data are essential. The Watershed Workflow package (Coon & Shuai, 2022)  
234 was employed to systematically retrieve and compile the requisite input data from pub-  
235 licly available sources spanning various data-providing and managing agencies such as  
236 the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and oth-  
237 ers. A comprehensive inventory detailing the input data utilized and their respective sources  
238 can be found in Table A1 in Appendix A.

239 The computational meshes (triangular prism 3D cells) are generated also using Wa-  
240 tershed Workflow. A 3D mesh is vertically extruded from a terrain following 2D trian-  
241 gular mesh generated through Delaunay triangulation, leveraging the `Triangle` library  
242 (Shewchuk, 2002), a Delaunay triangulator widely applied in computational physics. Through  
243 the mesh extrusion, each soil column contains 15 layers with a total thickness ranging  
244 from 40-50 m, determined by the depth to bedrock data in the SoilGrids database (Poggio  
245 et al., 2021). The 2D and 3D mesh refinements are done along stream networks informed  
246 by the NHDPlus High Resolution dataset (U.S. Geological Survey, 2023b), and in the  
247 top 2 meters of soil, respectively. The smallest triangle area is approximately 20,000 m<sup>2</sup>  
248 in the Mckenzie River Watershed and approximately 5,000 m<sup>2</sup> in the other three water-  
249 sheds, resulting in approximately 1.8 million 3D cells in the Mckenzie River Watershed  
250 and approximately 600 thousands to 1 million 3D cells in the other three watersheds.

251 Figure 4 shows an example setting up the model for one of the study watersheds,  
252 the Naches River Watershed. The canopy biophysical processes and ground surface en-  
253 ergy balance are computed on the surface domain of the model, thus the associated pa-  
254 rameters (e.g., rooting profiles, photosynthetic parameters, albedo, and others) are stored  
255 in 2D cells with spatial variation. The LAI of each plant functional type is extracted from  
256 the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) dataset and has both tem-  
257 poral and spatial variations. In each 3D cell, the subsurface material properties, e.g., per-  
258 meability and porosity, are assigned with the values from the national databases as *a pri-*  
259 *ori* information (Bhanja et al., 2023). Nonetheless, we acknowledge that the ATS-simulated  
260 fire-affected watershed hydrology necessitates reinforcement from *in-situ* post-fire soil  
261 data acquisition through field campaigns, which are both logistically challenging and ex-  
262 ceptionally valuable.

263 The meteorological forcing data is from the Daymet dataset, which provides 1 km  
264 × 1 km resolution gridded precipitation, air temperature, incoming shortwave radiation,  
265 and vapor pressure data across continental North America beginning in 1980. Rain and  
266 snow are partitioned from precipitation based on the air temperature. The gridded tran-  
267 sient forcing data is mapped onto the computational mesh at each time step, which varies  
268 from several minutes to approximately 1 hour, depending on the Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy  
269 (CFL) condition. Linear interpolation on the Daymet dataset is performed to provide  
270 subdaily forcing data. We recognize the crucial nature of subdaily precipitation data when  
271 considering post-fire watershed hydrology. Existing research pertaining to fire impacts  
272 has illuminated that the initial 30 minutes of a precipitation event exert the most influ-  
273 ence on post-fire surface runoff (Moody, 2012; Ebel et al., 2012; Murphy et al., 2015).


274 Nonetheless, to effectively tackle spatial heterogeneity at the watershed or sub-basin scales,  
 275 we opted for the Daymet dataset over other publicly available meteorological forcing datasets  
 276 with superior temporal resolution but inferior spatial resolution. A comparative study  
 277 by Shuai et al. (2022) of three publicly accessible gridded meteorological forcing datasets,  
 278 namely Daymet (used in this study), the Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independ-  
 279 ent Slopes Model (PRISM), and the North American Land Data Assimilation System  
 280 (NLDAS), concluded that a higher spatial resolution is more advantageous for scientific  
 281 enquiries involving significant spatial heterogeneity within the framework of ATS water-  
 282 shed hydrology simulations. In scenarios where a higher spatial resolution is indispens-  
 283 able, employing statistical downscaling techniques (Rastogi et al., 2022) on meteorolog-  
 284 ical forcing data may become a necessity for executing fire hydrologic impact assessments  
 285 at a finer temporal resolution, to be addressed in future work.



**Figure 4.** Key components of model setup for the Naches River Watershed. (a) DEM, (b) land cover type, (c) soil and geology properties, and (d) the 3D computational mesh.

286 In each watershed, a 500-year simulation using the annual mean precipitation rate  
 287 (rainfall only) was first performed as the model cold spin-up. Next, using the final steady-  
 288 state model output from the cold spin-up as the initial condition, a 40-year simulation  
 289 was performed to reach the cyclic steady state using “typical year” meteorological forc-  
 290 ing (Figure 5) and LAI data, as the model hot spin-up. Seasonal variabilities of surface  
 291 water and groundwater flow as well as evaporation and transpiration are the featured  
 292 results from the model hot spin-up simulations. Finally, transient simulations with me-  
 293 teorological forcing data were initialized using the model output of the final time step  
 294 in model hot spin-up.


295 The duration of the transient run is constrained by the availability of two dynamic  
 296 raster datasets, namely meteorological forcing data from Daymet covering the period from  
 297 1980 to 2021 and LAI data from MODIS spanning from 2002 to 2023. Consequently, we  
 298 initiated the transient simulations on October 1, 2002 and concluded them on Decem-  
 299 ber 31, 2021, in the American River Watershed, Naches River Watershed, and Wenas  
 300 Creek Watershed. However, in the case of the McKenzie River Watershed, the tempo-  
 301 ral extent was curtailed to October 1, 2012 to December 31, 2021, due to the substan-  
 302 tial computational burden arising from its large size.



**Figure 5.** Watershed-averaged precipitation pattern in a “typical year” in the Pacific North-  
 west. Wildfire season is from late-June to mid-September. All four wildfires in this study oc-  
 curred in the typical wildfire season in the Pacific Northwest. The wet season is from early-  
 September to late-November. Snow season is from late-November to late-March of the next year.  
 Two parallel simulations, with and without the fire-caused SWR effect, are performed after fire  
 ignition.

303 As shown in Figure 5, the Pacific Northwest summer wildfire season is typically fol-  
 304 lowed by a wet season in the fall, which explains the increased risks for post-fire flood-  
 305 ing and debris flow hazards (Wall et al., 2020). After a fire ignition date, two parallel  
 306 simulation are performed to compare with and without the fire-caused SWR effect on  
 307 watershed hydrology (Figure 5).

308 The evaluation of the hydrologic response of a watershed to a wildfire disturbance  
 309 is a typical disturbance response test in dynamical systems theory. Hence, except for the  
 310 post-fire wet season in the actual fire year (e.g., 2021 for the Schneider Springs Fire in  
 311 the Naches River Watershed), the fire impacted watershed hydrology is also examined  
 312 using historical wet seasons from 1980 and 2021. Figure 6a displays the annual pattern  
 313 of daily total rainfall in the Naches River Watershed (as an example). Figure 6b-c zoom  
 314 in to the wet season in between September 1 and November 30 and highlight the daily  
 315 total rainfall in wet seasons in 2021 and 2006, respectively. The post-fire wet season  
 316 in the actual fire year, 2021, did not encounter a historically large rainfall event. Thus, the  
 317 historical greatest daily rainfall event that occurred in 2006 was used to test the water-  
 318 shed response to the fire-caused SWR effect under extreme meteorological forcing. Simi-  
 319 larly, the top 10 greatest daily rainfall events were examined (Table B1 in Appendix B).  
 320 The simulated scenarios are listed in Table 2.



**Figure 6.** The historical rainfall events in wet season in the Naches River Watershed as an example. (a) Annual pattern of daily total rainfall in the Naches River Watershed. The blue bars are the 1980 to 2021 daily total rainfall. The mean and the the 95th percentile are plotted by the yellow dashed line and red soil line. (b) The red bars highlight the daily total rainfall in 2021 wet season. The Schneider Springs Fire occurred in the wildfire season of 2021. (c) The red bars highlight the daily total rainfall in the 2006 wet season, when the greatest daily rainfall occurred.

**Table 2.** Simulated scenarios

Scenario	Time Period [mm/dd/yyyy]	Fire-caused LAI reduction	Fire-caused SWR effect	Meteorological Forcing Data*	Fire-caused Manning's n Reduction
Mckenzie-long	10/01/2012–12/31/2021	Yes	No	$P_0$	No
American-long	10/01/2002–12/31/2021	Yes	No	$P_0$	No
Naches-long	10/01/2002–12/31/2021	Yes	No	$P_0$	No
Wenas-long	10/01/2002–12/31/2021	Yes	No	$P_0$	No
Mckenzie-l- $N^{**}$	09/08/2020–12/01/2020	Yes	No	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
Mckenzie-ls- $N$	09/08/2020–12/01/2020	Yes	Yes	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
American-l- $N$	08/12/2017–12/01/2017	Yes	No	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
American-ls- $N$	08/12/2017–12/01/2017	Yes	Yes	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
Naches-l- $N$	08/04/2021–12/01/2021	Yes	No	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
Naches-ls- $N$	08/04/2021–12/01/2021	Yes	Yes	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
Wenas-l- $N$	08/31/2020–12/01/2020	Yes	No	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
Wenas-ls- $N$	08/31/2020–12/01/2020	Yes	Yes	$P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{10}$	No
Wenas-lsm	08/31/2020–12/01/2020	Yes	Yes	$P_0$	Yes
American-nl	08/12/2017–12/01/2017	No	No	$P_0$	No

\*  $P_0$  is the meteorological forcing data in the post-fire wet season in the actual fire year;  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{10}$  are the 10 greatest daily rainfall wet seasons from historical data.

\*\*  $N$  is an integer from 0 to 10 to represent  $P_0$ – $P_{10}$ , respectively.

321 The simulations were performed using 256 to 1,024 cores on Cori (Intel Xeon E5-  
322 2698 v3) and Perlmutter (AMD EPYC 7763), two National Energy Research Scientific  
323 Computing Center (NERSC) supercomputers.

## 324 2.5 Model performance evaluation metrics

325 Model evaluation was performed by comparing to both simulated streamflow dis-  
326 charge and total evapotranspiration (ET) with observations. Daily continuous stream-  
327 flow data at the outlets of the Mckenzie River Watershed and the American River Wa-  
328 tershed for 1980 to 2021 were obtained from the USGS National Water Information Sys-  
329 tem (NWIS). Since no observations are available in the Naches River Watershed and the  
330 Wenas Creek Watershed, river flow discharges from the National Water Model (NWM)  
331 are used for model to model comparison. The NWM is a specific configuration of WRF-  
332 Hydro covering the entire continental United States, simulating hourly surface and sub-  
333 surface hydrologic processes. The backbone of the surface process includes Noah-MP sim-  
334 ulating land surface process, a quasi-3D flow module simulating the subsurface flow, and  
335 a 2D diffusion wave equation simulating surface water. The resulting overland flows are  
336 then aggregated to the catchment streamflow using a Muskingum scheme, based on NHD-  
337 Plus catchment delineation. Lastly, the 8-day averaged gap-filled ET from the MODIS  
338 database (product name: MOD16A2 V6) is used for the total ET.

339 We used the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), the Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE)  
340 (Equation 10) and the modified Kling-Gupta efficiency (mKGE) (Equation 11-12) as the  
341 key metrics for evaluating the model performance (Nash & Sutcliffe, 1970; Gupta et al.,  
342 2009; Kling et al., 2012):

$$NSE = -\left(\frac{\mu_{sim} - \mu_{obs}}{\sigma_{obs}}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{\sigma_{sim}}{\sigma_{obs}}\right)^2 + \frac{2\sigma_{sim}\rho}{\sigma_{obs}} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
KGE &= 1 - \sqrt{(R-1)^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma_{sim}}{\sigma_{obs}} - 1\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\mu_{sim}}{\mu_{obs}} - 1\right)^2} \\
&= 1 - \sqrt{(R-1)^2 + (\gamma-1)^2 + (\beta-1)^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$mKGE = \frac{KGE + \sqrt{2} - 1}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{12}$$

where *sim* and *obs* are the simulated and observed time series (of streamflow discharge and total ET in this study), respectively;  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$  represent standard deviation and mean, respectively;  $\rho$  is the Pearson correlation coefficient;  $R$  is the coefficient of correlation;  $\gamma$  is the variability ratio; and  $\beta$  is the bias ratio. Note that the key difference between NSE and KGE/mKGE is that KGE/mKGE is not derived from the mean squared error—it simply uses the  $L^2$  norm of correlation, standard deviation, and bias. Both NSE and mKGE lie in  $(-\infty, 1]$ . Negative NSE or mKGE values imply poor model performance. When  $NSE = 0$  or  $mKGE = 0$ , the model performance is same as predictions using the mean of the observations, i.e.,  $\mu_{obs}$ . Model prediction is perfect when  $NSE = 1$  or  $mKGE = 1$ .


### 3 Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Model performance evaluation

The model showed generally good performance in simulated flow discharge compared to observed flow discharge (USGS) and NMW-simulated flow discharge (Figure 7). The modeling result on flow discharge at watershed outlet in the American River Watershed is more accurate than in the other three watersheds. The  $R^2$ , NSE and mKGE scores are 0.708, 0.576 and 0.742, respectively, indicating outstanding model performance (Figure 7b). In the Mckenzie River Watershed and Naches River Watershed, the  $R^2$  scores are 0.749 and 0.506, the NSE scores are 0.232 and 0.414, and the mKGE scores are 0.436 and 0.608, respectively (Figure 7a and 7c). The model performance on flow discharge in these two watersheds is good, but worse than in the American River Watershed. The performance difference can be explained by the watershed size differences—the American River Watershed modeling domain is significantly smaller, at only 6.9% and 26.5% of the size of the Mckenzie River Watershed and the Naches River Watershed modeling domains. Fully distributed hydrologic models like ATS commonly perform better at smaller spatial scales than at larger spatial scales (Merz et al., 2009), due to larger uncertainties and increased challenges in calibrating spatially varying parameters.

Though model correctly predicts the basic seasonable variations, the simulated flow discharge at the watershed outlet in the Wenas Creek Watershed shows the worst performance of the studied watersheds. The  $R^2$ , NSE, and mKGE scores are 0.159, 0.233, and 0.228, respectively. The scatter plot in Figure 7d shows a large deviation when ATS predicts near zero flow discharge. However, the NWM predicts higher flow discharge. This discrepancy may explain the low performance scores of ATS—the base flow predicted by ATS is relatively inaccurate compared to its peak flow predictions, implying inaccuracy in ET predictions during hot and dry days. The variability ratio  $\gamma = 1.382$  and the bias ratio  $\beta = 0.702$ , implying that ATS streamflow predictions have larger standard deviation and lower mean compared to the NWM predictions, caused by the low performance of ATS in base flow predictions. Note that the NWM flow discharge result in the Wenas Creek Watershed is assumed as the ground truth, which may bring uncertainties to evaluating ATS modeling results.

Figure 8 shows the ATS model performance for watershed-averaged total ET in the study watersheds. In the Mckenzie River Watershed, American River Watershed, and



**Figure 7.** ATS model performance of flow discharge in the (a) Mckenzie River, (b) American River, (c) Naches River, and (d) Wenass Creek.

385 Naches River Watershed, the  $R^2$ , NSE, and mKGE scores are all greater than 0.7, sug-  
 386 gesting that model predictions are accurate on watershed-averaged total ET by ATS in  
 387 these three watersheds. However, the ATS predicted watershed-averaged total ET in the  
 388 Wenas Creek Watershed is underestimated in winter seasons, leading to lower performance  
 389 scores compared to the other three watersheds. The  $R^2$ , NSE, and mKGE scores are 0.689,  
 390 0.557, and 0.405, respectively. A difference in the dominant land cover type between the  
 391 Wenas Creek Watershed and the other three watersheds may explain the ATS predicted  
 392 ET performance difference. As seen in Table 1, the dominant land cover type in the We-  
 393 nas Creek Watershed is shrub/scrub (44%), evergreen forest (31%) and grassland/herbaceous  
 394 (22%). In the other three watersheds, evergreen forest is greatly dominant (66%–87%).  
 395 This discrepancy suggests that the biophysical parameters used to compute evaporation  
 396 and transpiration (e.g., Priestley-Taylor constants, LAI, etc.) are less accurate for shrub/scrub  
 397 than evergreen forest, even though they are both referenced from the CLM 4.5 techni-  
 398 cal notes (Oleson et al., 2010).

399 In general, the ATS modeling results compare well with both the USGS observed  
 400 flow discharges and the NWM predicted flow discharges. This agrees with the results of  
 401 Bhanja et al. (2023) that ATS has reasonably good performance without modeling do-  
 402 main specific calibration when using only *a priori* information. Through the long term  
 403 pre-fire simulations, we are also able to visualize the watershed hydrologic conditions (top-  
 404 soil saturation and surface water ponded depth) on the fire ignition dates and the first  
 405 significant rainfall event dates (Figure 9).

### 406 **3.2 Watershed average evapotranspiration is reduced after high burn** 407 **severity wildfires**


408 The research question, “*how much does the fire-caused LAI reduction affect the post-*  
 409 *fire evapotranspiration*”, is analyzed through the Norse Peak Fire within the American  
 410 River Watershed. Figure 10 shows two concurrent five-year simulations that span from  
 411 2017—the inception of the Norse Peak Fire—to 2022. These portrayed the simulation  
 412 scenarios American-l and American-nl, which are delineated in Table 2.

413 The time series of simulated ET utilizing the LAI data extracted from the MODIS  
 414 dataset are displayed in Figure 10a. The red dashed and gold dotted curves denote two  
 415 predominant land cover classes within the American River Watershed, evergreen forest  
 416 and shrub/scrub, respectively. In the aftermath of the Norse Peak Fire in 2017, a de-  
 417 crease followed by a recovery phase was observed in the LAI for both evergreen forest  
 418 and shrub/scrub over the next four years. This dynamic shift had a direct influence on  
 419 the simulated ET, as depicted by the green solid curve. The simulated ET registered a  
 420 decline during 2018-2020 and an approximate restoration to its antecedent, pre-fire con-  
 421 dition by 2021.


422 To explore the influence of fire-induced LAI diminution on simulated ET, we repli-  
 423 cated the 2017 LAI data for both evergreen forest and shrub/scrub in subsequent years,  
 424 specifically 2018-2021. This simulation scenario represents a theoretical condition, dis-  
 425 regarding any vegetation impact due to the Norse Peak Fire in 2017. As demonstrated  
 426 in Figure 10b, the simulated ET retains identical seasonal magnitudes. A comparative  
 427 analysis of simulation outcomes from scenarios American-l and American-nl provides di-  
 428 rect evidence that the watershed-averaged ET is significantly altered by the reduction  
 429 in LAI resulting from a high burn severity fire.

### 430 **3.3 High burn severity wildfires cause increased post-fire peak flow dis-** 431 **charges**


432 We found that high burn severity fires cause increased post-fire peak flow discharges,  
 433 while low burn severity fires can hardly yield similar impacts. Figure 11 shows that the



**Figure 8.** ATS model performance on watershed-averaged total evapotranspiration in the (a) Mckenzie River, (b) American River, (c) Naches River, and (d) Wenas Creek.



**Figure 9.** Watershed dry conditions on the fire ignition dates and wet conditions during the first significant post-fire precipitation events. (a) 09/08/2020 (dry) and 11/16/2020 (wet) in the Mckenzie River Watershed, (b) 08/12/2017 (dry) and 10/21/2017 (wet) in the American River Watershed, (c) 08/04/2021 (dry) and 11/15/2021 (wet) in the Naches River Watershed, and (d) 08/31/2020 (dry) and 11/18/2020 (wet) in the Wenas Creek Watershed.




**Figure 10.** The comparison between scenarios (a) with and (b) without the fire caused LAI reduction and its affect on the simulated ET.


434 modeling results for the simulation scenarios Mckenzie-l and Mckenzie-ls (Figure 11a),  
 435 American-l and American-ls (Figure 11b), Naches-l and Naches-ls (Figure 11c), and Wenas-  
 436 l and Wenas-ls (Figure 11d). Comparison between Figure 11a-c and Figure 11d reveals  
 437 the burn severity plays a key role in post-fire peak discharge increases, since the mean  
 438 burn severities of the Holiday Farm Fire, the Norse Peak Fire, and the Schneider Springs  
 439 Fire are 2.87, 2.88, and 2.34, respectively, while the mean burn severity of the Evans Canyon  
 440 Fire is 2.04. The post-fire peak flows in the Mckenzie River Watershed, Ameircan River  
 441 Watershed and the Naches River Watershed increased 21-34%, owing to the fire caused  
 442 SWR effect. In the Wenas Creek Watershed, the post-fire peak flow discharge increase  
 443 is merely 2%, implying no significant fire impact through the SWR effect.

### 444 3.4 Increased peak flow discharges due to high-burn severity fires are 445 intensified by increased post-fire precipitation

446 Another key finding of our study is that high burn severity fires-caused increased  
 447 peak flow discharges immediately post-fire are intensified by higher precipitation rates;  
 448 while low burn severity fire is insensitive to the increased post-fire higher precipitation  
 449 rates. Figure 12 shows the modeling results from the simulation scenarios: Mckenzie-l-  
 450 1 to -10 and Mckenzie-ls-1 to -10 (Figure 12a), American-l-1 to -10 and American-ls-1  
 451 to -10 (Figure 12b), Naches-l-1 to -10 and Naches-ls-1 to -10 (Figure 12c), and Wenas-  
 452 l-1 to -10 and Wenas-ls-1 to -10 (Figure 12d). With respect to a fire of certain burn sever-  
 453 ity statistics and spatial distribution, a reduced post-fire precipitation rate inflicts minimal  
 454 hydrologic disturbance, whereas a higher post-fire precipitation rate culminates in  
 455 significant post-fire peak flows. This indicates that fire-induced watershed hydrology al-  
 456 terations are exacerbated by increased post-fire precipitation rates. However, in the We-  
 457 nas Creek Watershed, even a threefold increase in post-fire precipitation rate did not yield  
 458 significant differences in hydrologic response when comparing scenarios with and with-  
 459 out the fire-induced SWR effect, a consequence of the low burn severity of the Evans Canyon  
 460 Fire.



**Figure 11.** Post-fire peak discharges with and without the fire-caused SWR effect in (a) the Mckenzie River Watershed, (b) the American River Watershed, (c) the Naches River Watershed, and (d) the Wenas Creek Watershed.




**Figure 12.** Correlation between the post-fire peak discharge with and without the fire-caused Soil Water Repellency effect and the post-fire maximum daily precipitation in (a) the Mckenzie River Watershed, (b) the American River Watershed, (c) the Naches River Watershed, and (d) the Wenas Creek Watershed.

### 3.5 High burn severity wildfires suppress infiltration through soil water repellency (SWR) effect

We used the Norse Peak Fire in the American River Watershed as a case study to answer the research question, “*how does the infiltration changed by the fire caused SWR effect after a moderate-high severity fire*”. This decision was predominantly driven by the superior performance of the model concerning surface water flow discharge and ET among all watersheds incorporated in this study. The investigations revealed that fires with high burn severity have the potential to inhibit infiltration due to the SWR effect.

The time series of the magnitudes of the watershed maximum infiltration in scenarios with and without the fire-induced SWR effect are shown in Figure 13a. By incorporating the influence of the fire-induced SWR effect, a noticeable decrease in the magnitudes of infiltration is observed. A mean reduction of 38% in the infiltration rate within the American River Watershed was evident. The two top-view panels in Figure 13b and 13c elucidate the spatial distribution of infiltration within the American River Watershed, both with and without the influence of the fire-induced SWR effect. Subsequent to the Norse Peak Fire in 2017, the first substantial precipitation event in the wet season presented a higher infiltration rate than years with an active fire-induced SWR effect. This observation can be attributed to the fact that the fire-induced hydrophobic layer on the topsoil impedes infiltration.



**Figure 13.** (a) The watershed maximum infiltration rate in the American River Watershed after the Norse Peak Fire for the two scenarios, without and with the SWR effect. (b-c) The spatial distribution of infiltration in the American River Watershed on the day with first significant precipitation event after the Norse Peak Fire for the two scenarios, without and with the SWR effect.

### 3.6 Fire-caused Manning’s $n$ reduction causes increased post-fire peak flow discharges

We addressed research question, *how does the fire caused Manning’s  $n$  reduction affect the post-fire peak flow discharges after a low severity fire*, by studying the Evans Canyon Fire-affected Wenas Creek Watershed. This area was selected due to previous findings that suggested that the SWR effect does not exert a significant influence on the post-fire peak flow discharge, thereby necessitating an examination of the sensitivity of

487 the Manning's  $n$  reduction on the post-fire peak flow discharge. As delineated in Fig-  
488 ure S3 in the Supporting Information (SI) document, both the dashed blue and solid red  
489 red curves symbolize scenarios (Wenas-1 and Wenas-1s) previously depicted in Figure 12d.  
490 The green solid-dotted curve shows the impact of Manning's  $n$  on the post-fire peak flow  
491 discharge. The decrease in the Manning's coefficient as a consequence of vegetation loss,  
492 attributable to fire, led to increases in post-fire peak flows. This is supported by a 5-19%  
493 escalation detected during several post-fire precipitation events, as indicated in Figure  
494 S3 in the SI. Of note, the reduction in Manning's  $n$  attributed to the fire is not solely  
495 in river channels, but is distributed across all the combusted regions to account for the  
496 loss of vegetation. The influence of Manning's  $n$  on surface runoff is unsurprising, given  
497 its role as a paramount factor in determining flow discharge within the overland flow model  
498 that solves the diffusion wave equation.

#### 499 **4 Conclusions and Future Work**

500 Most post-fire processes are driven by water flow in an ecosystem (Martin, 2016),  
501 hence, a deeper understanding of how fires impact water flow is crucial. The present re-  
502 search highlights the implementation of a high-resolution, fully distributed, integrated  
503 hydrologic model designed to assess hydrologic alterations precipitated by wildfires in  
504 the Pacific Northwest. The four wildfires investigated in this study each display unique  
505 characteristics in terms of burn severity statistics and spatial distributions. The climatic  
506 regimes and landscape cover types of the watersheds influenced by these fires are pre-  
507 sentative in the Pacific Northwest. The impact of SWR induced by the fires within their  
508 respective fire perimeters was incorporated into the model and found to significantly in-  
509 fluence watershed hydrologic functions.

510 Modeling results reveal the LAI reduction caused by fire directly resulted in a de-  
511 crease of simulated ET within the American River Watershed. This reduction can per-  
512 sist for years post-fire, gradually reverting to pre-fire dynamics with the recovery of the  
513 LAI. In a hypothetical scenario devoid of fire-induced LAI reduction, no significant changes  
514 in ET were observed.

515 An augmentation of 21-34% in post-fire peak flows were seen from the modeling  
516 results in the McKenzie River Watershed, the American River Watershed, and the Naches  
517 River Watershed as a result of the SWR effect triggered by fire. The Wenas Creek Wa-  
518 tershed, conversely, only witnessed a 2% surge in post-fire peak flow, as a result of the  
519 Evans Canyon Fire's low burn severity. The Norse Peak Fire resulted in a mean reduc-  
520 tion of 38% in the infiltration rate within the American River Watershed during the post-  
521 fire wet season. Additionally, post-fire peak flows in the McKenzie River Watershed and  
522 the Naches River Watershed escalated by 1-34% due to the SWR effect.

523 In a specific fire impacted watershed, a low post-fire precipitation rate inflicts min-  
524 imal hydrologic disturbance, whereas a higher post-fire precipitation rate culminates in  
525 significant post-fire peak flows. This finding indicates that fire-induced watershed hy-  
526 drology alterations are exacerbated by increased post-fire precipitation rates. However,  
527 as a consequence of the low burn severity of the Evans Canyon Fire, even a threefold in-  
528 crease in the post-fire precipitation rate did not yield significant differences in hydrologic  
529 response when comparing scenarios with and without the fire-induced SWR effect in the  
530 Wenas Creek Watershed. Moreover, for the same fire, the reduction in the Manning's  
531 coefficient due to vegetation loss attributable to the fire was observed to be more reac-  
532 tive to increasing post-fire peak flows, with a rise of 5-19% witnessed during various post-  
533 fire precipitation events.

534 Future work includes coupling ATS (integrated hydrology model) with PFLOTRAN  
535 (reactive transport model) (Hammond et al., 2014) and the PFLOTRAN sandbox (Hammond,  
536 2022) to investigate the biogeochemistry of fire-affected watersheds. The model coupling

537 can be done through the Alquimia interface library (Andre et al., 2013). The coupled  
538 ATS-PFLOTRAN model (Molins et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2022) offers a robust framework  
539 for determining high-resolution biogeochemical spatial hot spots and key temporal mo-  
540 ments in carbon and nitrogen cycling, in addition to identifying the fates of pyrogenic  
541 nutrients in fire-impacted watersheds.

## 542 **Open Research**

543 The source codes of the Advanced Terrestrial Simulator (ATS) model are available un-  
544 der the Berkeley Software Distribution (BSD) License at [https://github.com/amanzi/](https://github.com/amanzi/ats)  
545 [ats](https://github.com/amanzi/ats). Publicly available data used in this study and their sources are summarized in Ta-  
546 ble A1 in Appendix A. Other input/output data from the model and the scripts to pro-  
547 duce the figures of the manuscript are available at [https://data.ess-dive.lbl.gov/](https://data.ess-dive.lbl.gov/datasets/doi:10.15485/2006549)  
548 [datasets/doi:10.15485/2006549](https://data.ess-dive.lbl.gov/datasets/doi:10.15485/2006549) (Li et al., 2023). Figures were made with Python 3.10  
549 (<https://www.python.org/>), Matplotlib version 3.5.1 (<https://matplotlib.org/>),  
550 and Paraview version 5.10.1 (<https://www.paraview.org/>). The study site map was  
551 made with ArcGIS Pro version 3.1.2 ([https://www.esri.com/en-us/arcgis/products/](https://www.esri.com/en-us/arcgis/products/arcgis-pro/overview)  
552 [arcgis-pro/overview](https://www.esri.com/en-us/arcgis/products/arcgis-pro/overview)).

## 553 **Acknowledgments**

554 This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Sci-  
555 ence (SC) Biological and Environmental Research (BER) program, as part of BER’s En-  
556 vironmental System Science (ESS) program. This research originates from the River Cor-  
557 ridor Scientific Focus Area (SFA) at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) and  
558 the IDEAS-Watersheds project (funded by DOE, SC, BER program). PNNL is oper-  
559 ated for DOE by Battelle Memorial Institute under contract DE-ACO5-76RL01830. This  
560 research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center  
561 (NERSC), which is supported by the DOE SC under contract DE-AC02-05CH11231. This  
562 paper describes objective technical results and analysis. Any subjective views or opin-  
563 ions that might be expressed in the paper do not necessarily represent the views of DOE  
564 or the United States government.

565  
566**Appendix A. List of publicly available data used in this study as model inputs and for model performance evaluation****Table A1.** Data sources and references

Inputs	Sources (Data managing agencies*)	References
Vector data		
Watershed boundary	NHDPlus HR (USGS)	U.S. Geological Survey (2023b)
Stream network	NHDPlus HR (USGS)	U.S. Geological Survey (2023b)
Fire perimeter	MTBS (USDA, USGS)	Eidenshink et al. (2007)
Static raster data		
DEM	3DEP (USGS)	U.S. Geological Survey (2023a)
Land cover	NLCD (USGS)	U.S. Geological Survey (2019)
Soil properties	SSURGO (USDA)	USDA Soil Survey Staff (2023)
Geology properties	GLHYMPS (Borealis)	Gleeson et al. (2014)
Soil thickness	SoilGrids (ISRIC)	Poggio et al. (2021)
Depth to bedrock	SoilGrids (ISRIC)	Poggio et al. (2021)
Burn severity	MTBS (USDA, USGS)	Eidenshink et al. (2007)
Dynamic raster data		
Meteorological forcing	Daymet (ORNL)	Thornton et al. (2022)
Leaf area index	MODIS (NASA)	Myneni et al. (2015)
Model evaluation data		
Streamflow discharge	NWIS (USGS)	U.S. Geological Survey (2023c)
Evapotranspiration	MODIS (NASA)	Running et al. (2017)

\*USGS: U.S. Geological Survey;  
 USDA: U.S. Department of Agriculture;  
 Borealis: Canadian Dataverse Repository;  
 ISRIC: International Soil Reference and Information Centre;  
 ORNL: Oak Ridge National Laboratory;  
 NASA: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**Appendix B. List of highest daily rainfall in the study watersheds****Table B1.** High rainfall events in the wet seasons in 1980–2021

Year with High Rainfall Event in Wet Season	Daily Total Rainfall [mm]	Year with High Rainfall Event in Wet Season	Daily Total Rainfall [mm]
Mckenzie River		American River	
1996	110 ( $P_1$ )	2006	122 ( $P_1$ )
1999	72 ( $P_2$ )	2008	94 ( $P_2$ )
2012	64 ( $P_3$ )	2017	81 ( $P_3$ )
1998	62 ( $P_4$ )	1990	77 ( $P_4$ )
1994	57 ( $P_5$ )	2015	71 ( $P_5$ )
2013	55 ( $P_6$ )	1994	63 ( $P_6$ )
1984	50 ( $P_7$ )	2013	62 ( $P_7$ )
2006	49 ( $P_8$ )	1999	60 ( $P_8$ )
2016	48 ( $P_9$ )	1997	58 ( $P_9$ )
2017	46 ( $P_{10}$ )	2012	57 ( $P_{10}$ )
Naches River		Wenas Creek	
2006	91 ( $P_1$ )	2006	53 ( $P_1$ )
2008	68 ( $P_2$ )	2017	42 ( $P_2$ )
2017	62 ( $P_3$ )	1994	38 ( $P_3$ )
1990	57 ( $P_4$ )	1997	37 ( $P_4$ )
1997	52 ( $P_5$ )	2008	36 ( $P_5$ )
2015	50 ( $P_6$ )	1980	35 ( $P_6$ )
1994	48 ( $P_7$ )	1990	34 ( $P_7$ )
1980	46 ( $P_8$ )	2021	31 ( $P_8$ )
1999	45 ( $P_9$ )	2015	28 ( $P_9$ )
2021	43 ( $P_{10}$ )	2016	25 ( $P_{10}$ )

**References**

- Abatzoglou, J. T., Battisti, D. S., Williams, A. P., Hansen, W. D., Harvey, B. J., & Kolden, C. A. (2021). Projected increases in western us forest fire despite growing fuel constraints. *Communications Earth & Environment*, 2(1), 227.
- Abatzoglou, J. T., Rupp, D. E., O'Neill, L. W., & Sadegh, M. (2021). Compound extremes drive the western oregon wildfires of september 2020. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(8), e2021GL092520.
- Agbeshie, A. A., Abugre, S., Atta-Darkwa, T., & Awuah, R. (2022). A review of the effects of forest fire on soil properties. *Journal of Forestry Research*, 33(5), 1419–1441.
- Andre, B., Molins, S., Johnson, J., & Steefel, C. (2013, aug). *Alquimia*. [Computer Software] <https://doi.org/10.11578/dc.20210416.49>. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.11578/dc.20210416.49> doi: 10.11578/dc.20210416.49
- Bhanja, S. N., Coon, E. T., Lu, D., & Painter, S. L. (2023). Evaluation of distributed process-based hydrologic model performance using only a priori information to define model inputs. *Journal of Hydrology*, 618, 129176.
- Carrà, B. G., Bombino, G., Denisi, P., Plaza-Álvarez, P. A., Lucas-Borja, M. E., & Zema, D. A. (2021). Water infiltration after prescribed fire and soil mulching with fern in mediterranean forests. *Hydrology*, 8(3), 95.

- 587 Chen, L., Berli, M., & Chief, K. (2013). Examining modeling approaches for the  
588 rainfall-runoff process in wildfire-affected watersheds: Using san dimas experi-  
589 mental forest. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*,  
590 *49*(4), 851–866.
- 591 Coon, E. T., Moulton, J. D., Kikinzon, E., Berndt, M., Manzini, G., Garimella, R.,  
592 ... Painter, S. L. (2020). Coupling surface flow and subsurface flow in complex  
593 soil structures using mimetic finite differences. *Advances in Water Resources*,  
594 *144*, 103701.
- 595 Coon, E. T., & Shuai, P. (2022). Watershed workflow: A toolset for parameterizing  
596 data-intensive, integrated hydrologic models. *Environmental Modelling & Soft-  
597 ware*, *157*, 105502.
- 598 Coon, E. T., Svyatsky, D., Jan, A., Kikinzon, E., Berndt, M., Atchley, A., ...  
599 Molins, S. (2019). *Advanced Terrestrial Simulator*. Retrieved from  
600 <https://doi.org/10.11578/dc.20190911.1> doi: 10.11578/dc.20190911.1
- 601 Cydzik, K., & Hogue, T. S. (2009). Modeling postfire response and recovery us-  
602 ing the hydrologic engineering center hydrologic modeling system (hec-hms)  
603 1. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, *45*(3),  
604 702–714.
- 605 DeBano, L. F. (2000a). The role of fire and soil heating on water repellency in wild-  
606 land environments: a review. *Journal of hydrology*, *231*, 195–206.
- 607 DeBano, L. F. (2000b). Water repellency in soils: a historical overview. *Journal of  
608 hydrology*, *231*, 4–32.
- 609 DiBiase, R. A., & Lamb, M. P. (2020). Dry sediment loading of headwater chan-  
610 nels fuels post-wildfire debris flows in bedrock landscapes. *Geology*, *48*(2),  
611 189–193.
- 612 Ebel, B. A., & Moody, J. A. (2017). Synthesis of soil-hydraulic properties and infil-  
613 tration timescales in wildfire-affected soils. *Hydrological Processes*, *31*(2), 324–  
614 340.
- 615 Ebel, B. A., Moody, J. A., & Martin, D. A. (2012). Hydrologic conditions control-  
616 ling runoff generation immediately after wildfire. *Water Resources Research*,  
617 *48*(3).
- 618 Ebel, B. A., Rengers, F. K., & Tucker, G. E. (2016). Observed and simulated hydro-  
619 logic response for a first-order catchment during extreme rainfall 3 years after  
620 wildfire disturbance. *Water Resources Research*, *52*(12), 9367–9389.
- 621 Ebel, B. A., Shephard, Z. M., Walvoord, M. A., Murphy, S. F., Partridge, T. F., &  
622 Perkins, K. S. (2023). Modeling post-wildfire hydrologic response: Review and  
623 future directions for applications of physically based distributed simulation.  
624 *Earth's Future*, *11*(2), e2022EF003038.
- 625 Eidenshink, J., Schwind, B., Brewer, K., Zhu, Z.-L., Quayle, B., & Howard, S.  
626 (2007). A project for monitoring trends in burn severity. *Fire ecology*, *3*(1),  
627 3–21.
- 628 Garcia-Chevesich, P., Pizarro, R., Stropki, C., Ramirez de Arellano, P., Ffolliott, P.,  
629 DeBano, L. F., ... Slack, D. (2010). Formation of post-fire water-repellent  
630 layers in monterrey pine (*pinus radiata* d. don) plantations in south-central  
631 chile. *Journal of soil science and plant nutrition*, *10*(4), 399–406.
- 632 Gleeson, T., Moosdorf, N., Hartmann, J., & Van Beek, L. (2014). A glimpse be-  
633 neath earth's surface: Global hydrogeology maps (glhymps) of permeability  
634 and porosity. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*(11), 3891–3898.
- 635 Gupta, H. V., Kling, H., Yilmaz, K. K., & Martinez, G. F. (2009). Decomposi-  
636 tion of the mean squared error and nse performance criteria: Implications for  
637 improving hydrological modelling. *Journal of hydrology*, *377*(1-2), 80–91.
- 638 Hallema, D. W., Sun, G., Caldwell, P. V., Norman, S. P., Cohen, E. C., Liu, Y.,  
639 ... McNulty, S. G. (2018). Burned forests impact water supplies. *Nature  
640 communications*, *9*(1), 1307.
- 641 Hammond, G. E. (2022). The pflotran reaction sandbox. *Geoscientific Model Devel-*

- 642 *opment*, 15(4), 1659–1676.
- 643 Hammond, G. E., Lichtner, P. C., & Mills, R. (2014). Evaluating the performance  
644 of parallel subsurface simulators: An illustrative example with pflotran. *Water*  
645 *resources research*, 50(1), 208–228.
- 646 Kemter, M., Fischer, M., Luna, L., Schönfeldt, E., Vogel, J., Banerjee, A., . . . Thon-  
647 icke, K. (2021). Cascading hazards in the aftermath of australia’s 2019/2020  
648 black summer wildfires. *Earth’s Future*, 9(3), e2020EF001884.
- 649 Kinoshita, A. M., Hogue, T. S., & Napper, C. (2014). Evaluating pre-and post-fire  
650 peak discharge predictions across western us watersheds. *JAWRA Journal of*  
651 *the American Water Resources Association*, 50(6), 1540–1557.
- 652 Kling, H., Fuchs, M., & Paulin, M. (2012). Runoff conditions in the upper danube  
653 basin under an ensemble of climate change scenarios. *Journal of hydrology*,  
654 424, 264–277.
- 655 Li, Z., Angerer, J. P., & Wu, X. B. (2021). Temporal patterns of large wildfires  
656 and their burn severity in rangelands of western united states. *Geophysical Re-*  
657 *search Letters*, 48(7), e2020GL091636.
- 658 Li, Z., Li, B., Jiang, P., Hammond, G., Shuai, P., Zahura, F., . . . Chen, X. (2023).  
659 Data and scripts associated with the manuscript evaluating the hydrologic  
660 responses of the pacific northwest watersheds to wildfires. *River Cor-*  
661 *ridor and Watershed Biogeochemistry SFA, ESS-DIVE repository*. doi:  
662 10.15485/2006549
- 663 Maina, F. Z., & Siirila-Woodburn, E. R. (2020). Watersheds dynamics following  
664 wildfires: Nonlinear feedbacks and implications on hydrologic responses. *Hy-*  
665 *drological Processes*, 34(1), 33–50.
- 666 Martin, D. A. (2016). At the nexus of fire, water and society. *Philosophical Transac-*  
667 *tions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371(1696), 20150172.
- 668 Merz, R., Parajka, J., & Blöschl, G. (2009). Scale effects in conceptual hydrological  
669 modeling. *Water resources research*, 45(9).
- 670 Moisseeva, N., & Stull, R. (2021). Wildfire smoke-plume rise: a simple energy  
671 balance parameterization. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 21(3), 1407–  
672 1425.
- 673 Molins, S., Svyatsky, D., Xu, Z., Coon, E. T., & Moulton, J. D. (2022). A multicom-  
674 ponent reactive transport model for integrated surface-subsurface hydrology  
675 problems. *Water Resources Research*, 58(8), e2022WR032074.
- 676 Moody, J. A. (2012). *An analytical method for predicting postwildfire peak dis-*  
677 *charges*. US Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey.
- 678 Moody, J. A., & Ebel, B. A. (2012). Hyper-dry conditions provide new insights into  
679 the cause of extreme floods after wildfire. *Catena*, 93, 58–63.
- 680 Moody, J. A., Ebel, B. A., Nyman, P., Martin, D. A., Stoof, C., & McKinley, R.  
681 (2015). Relations between soil hydraulic properties and burn severity. *Interna-*  
682 *tional Journal of Wildland Fire*, 25(3), 279–293.
- 683 Murphy, S. F., McCleskey, R. B., Martin, D. A., Writer, J. H., & Ebel, B. A. (2018).  
684 Fire, flood, and drought: extreme climate events alter flow paths and stream  
685 chemistry. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 123(8), 2513–  
686 2526.
- 687 Murphy, S. F., Writer, J. H., McCleskey, R. B., & Martin, D. A. (2015). The role  
688 of precipitation type, intensity, and spatial distribution in source water quality  
689 after wildfire. *Environmental Research Letters*, 10(8), 084007.
- 690 Myneni, R., Knyazikhin, Y., & Park, T. (2015). Mod15a2h modis leaf area in-  
691 dex/fpar 8-day l4 global 500m sin grid v006. nasa eosdis land processes daac.  
692 *LP DAAC, Terra*, 6(1).
- 693 Nash, J. E., & Sutcliffe, J. V. (1970). River flow forecasting through conceptual  
694 models part i—a discussion of principles. *Journal of hydrology*, 10(3), 282–  
695 290.
- 696 Oleson, K., Lawrence, D., Bonan, G., Drewniak, B., Huang, M., Koven, C., . . . oth-

- ers (2010). Technical description of version 4.5 of the community land model (clm), near tech. *Notes (NCAR/TN-478+ STR)*, 605.
- Parsons, A. (2003). Burned Area Emergency Rehabilitation (BAER) soil burn severity definitions and mapping guidelines. *USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Missoula*.
- Parsons, A., Robichaud, P. R., Lewis, S. A., Napper, C., & Clark, J. T. (2010). *Field guide for mapping post-fire soil burn severity* (Vol. 243). Citeseer.
- Paul, M., LeDuc, S., Lassiter, M., Moorhead, L., Noyes, P., & Leibowitz, S. (2022). Wildfire induces changes in receiving waters: A review with considerations for water quality management. *Water Resources Research*, 58(9), e2021WR030699.
- Poggio, L., de Sousa, L. M., Batjes, N. H., Heuvelink, G. B. M., Kempen, B., Ribeiro, E., & Rossiter, D. (2021). Soilgrids 2.0: producing soil information for the globe with quantified spatial uncertainty. *SOIL*, 7(1), 217–240. Retrieved from <https://soil.copernicus.org/articles/7/217/2021/> doi: 10.5194/soil-7-217-2021
- Rastogi, D., Kao, S.-C., & Ashfaq, M. (2022). How may the choice of downscaling techniques and meteorological reference observations affect future hydroclimate projections? *Earth's Future*, 10(8), e2022EF002734.
- Rengers, F. K., McGuire, L. A., Kean, J. W., Staley, D. M., & Hobley, D. (2016). Model simulations of flood and debris flow timing in steep catchments after wildfire. *Water Resources Research*, 52(8), 6041–6061.
- Robbins, W. G. (2021). Oregon and climate change: The age of megafires in the american west. *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, 122(3), 250–277.
- Robinne, F.-N., Hallema, D. W., Bladon, K. D., & Buttle, J. M. (2020). Wildfire impacts on hydrologic ecosystem services in north american high-latitude forests: A scoping review. *Journal of Hydrology*, 581, 124360.
- Robinne, F.-N., Hallema, D. W., Bladon, K. D., Flannigan, M. D., Boisramé, G., Bréthaut, C. M., ... others (2021). Scientists' warning on extreme wildfire risks to water supply. *Hydrological Processes*, 35(5), e14086.
- Roebuck Jr, J. A., Bladon, K. D., Donahue, D., Graham, E. B., Grieger, S., Morgenstern, K., ... others (2022). Spatiotemporal controls on the delivery of dissolved organic matter to streams following a wildfire. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49(16), e2022GL099535.
- Roth, H. K., McKenna, A. M., Simpson, M. J., Chen, H., Srikanthan, N., Feghel, T. S., ... Borch, T. (2023). Effects of burn severity on organic nitrogen and carbon chemistry in high-elevation forest soils. *Soil & Environmental Health*, 100023.
- Running, S., Mu, Q., & Zhao, M. (2017). Mod16a2 modis/terra net evapotranspiration 8-day l4 global 500m sin grid v006. *LP DAAC, Terra*.
- Shewchuk, J. R. (2002). Delaunay refinement algorithms for triangular mesh generation. *Computational geometry*, 22(1-3), 21–74.
- Shuai, P., Chen, X., Mital, U., Coon, E. T., & Dwivedi, D. (2022). The effects of spatial and temporal resolution of gridded meteorological forcing on watershed hydrological responses. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 26(8), 2245–2276.
- Thornton, M., Shrestha, R., Wei, Y., Thornton, P., Kao, S.-C., & Wilson, B. (2022). *Daymet: Daily surface weather data on a 1-km grid for north america, version 4 r1*. ORNL Distributed Active Archive Center. Retrieved from [https://daac.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/dsviewer.pl?ds\\_id=2129](https://daac.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/dsviewer.pl?ds_id=2129) doi: 10.3334/ORNLDAAAC/2129
- U.S. Geological Survey. (2019). National Land Cover Database (NLCD) 2016 Land Cover Science Product).
- U.S. Geological Survey. (2023a). 1 Arc-second Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) - USGS National Map 3DEP Downloadable Data Collection.

- 752 U.S. Geological Survey. (2023b). National Hydrography Dataset Plus High Resolu-  
753 tion (NHDPlus HR).
- 754 U.S. Geological Survey. (2023c). National Water Information System data available  
755 on the World Wide Web (USGS Water Data for the Nation).
- 756 USDA Soil Survey Staff. (2023). Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database.
- 757 Vieira, D., Fernández, C., Vega, J., & Keizer, J. (2015). Does soil burn severity  
758 affect the post-fire runoff and interrill erosion response? a review based on  
759 meta-analysis of field rainfall simulation data. *Journal of Hydrology*, *523*,  
760 452–464.
- 761 Wagenbrenner, J. W., Ebel, B. A., Bladon, K. D., & Kinoshita, A. M. (2021). Post-  
762 wildfire hydrologic recovery in mediterranean climates: A systematic review  
763 and case study to identify current knowledge and opportunities. *Journal of*  
764 *Hydrology*, *602*, 126772.
- 765 Wall, S., Roering, J., & Rengers, F. K. (2020). Runoff-initiated post-fire debris flow  
766 western cascades, oregon. *Landslides*, *17*, 1649–1661.
- 767 Wampler, K., Bladon, K., & Faramarzi, M. (2023). Modeling wildfire effects on  
768 streamflow in the cascade mountains, oregon, usa. *Journal of Hydrology*, *621*,  
769 129585.
- 770 Wieting, C., Ebel, B. A., & Singha, K. (2017). Quantifying the effects of wildfire  
771 on changes in soil properties by surface burning of soils from the boulder creek  
772 critical zone observatory. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, *13*, 43–57.
- 773 Wilder, B. A., Lancaster, J. T., Cafferata, P. H., Coe, D. B., Swanson, B. J., Lind-  
774 say, D. N., . . . Kinoshita, A. M. (2021). An analytical solution for rapidly  
775 predicting post-fire peak streamflow for small watersheds in southern californ-  
776 nia. *Hydrological Processes*, *35*(1), e13976.
- 777 Wilmot, T. Y., Mallia, D. V., Hallar, A. G., & Lin, J. C. (2022). Wildfire plumes in  
778 the western us are reaching greater heights and injecting more aerosols aloft as  
779 wildfire activity intensifies. *Scientific reports*, *12*(1), 12400.
- 780 Wine, M. L., & Cadol, D. (2016). Hydrologic effects of large southwestern usa wild-  
781 fires significantly increase regional water supply: fact or fiction? *Environmental*  
782 *Research Letters*, *11*(8), 085006.
- 783 Xu, Z., Molins, S., Özgen-Xian, I., Dwivedi, D., Svyatsky, D., Moulton, J. D., &  
784 Steefel, C. (2022). Understanding the hydrogeochemical response of a moun-  
785 tainous watershed using integrated surface-subsurface flow and reactive trans-  
786 port modeling. *Water Resources Research*, *58*(8), e2022WR032075.
- 787 Zema, D. A., Lucas-Borja, M. E., Fotia, L., Rosaci, D., Sarnè, G. M., & Zimbone,  
788 S. M. (2020). Predicting the hydrological response of a forest after wildfire and  
789 soil treatments using an artificial neural network. *Computers and electronics in*  
790 *agriculture*, *170*, 105280.