

GeoHealth

Supporting Information for

Compound Risks of Hurricane Evacuation amid the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States

Sen Pei1***, Kristina A. Dahl**2***, Teresa K. Yamana**¹ **, Rachel Licker**² **, Jeffrey Shaman**¹

¹Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY 10032, USA

²Climate & Energy Program, Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, MA, Washington, DC, and Oakland, CA, USA

Contents of this file

Text S1 to S2 Figures S1 to S6 Tables S1 to S5

Introduction

The information here supports the manuscript listed above and includes text, figures, and tables. The data were generated in July and August, 2020.

Text S1. Transmission model for 3,142 US counties

We formulate COVID-19 transmission as a discrete Markov process during both day and night. Daytime transmission lasts for dt_1 days and the nighttime transmission dt_2 days ($dt_1 + dt_2 =$ 1). Here, we assume daytime transmission lasts for 8 hours and nighttime transmission lasts for 16 hours, i.e., $dt_1 = 1/3$ day and $dt_2 = 2/3$ day. The transmission dynamics are depicted by the following equations.

Daytime transmission:

$$
E_{ij}(t + dt_1) = E_{ij}(t) + \frac{\beta S_{ij}(t) \sum_k l_{ki}^r(t)}{N_i^D(t)} dt_1 + \frac{\mu \beta S_{ij}(t) \sum_k l_{ik}^u(t)}{N_i^D(t)} dt_1 - \frac{E_{ij}(t)}{Z} dt_1
$$

+ $\theta dt_1 \frac{N_{ij} - l_{ij}^r(t)}{N_i^D(t)} \sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\overline{N}_{ik} \sum_l E_{kl}(t)}{N_k^D(t) - \sum_l l_{lk}^r(t)} - \theta dt_1 \frac{E_{ij}(t)}{N_i^D(t) - \sum_l l_{li}^r(t)} \sum_{k \neq i} \overline{N}_{ki}$ (1)

$$
I_{ij}^r(t + dt_1) = I_{ij}^r(t) + \alpha \frac{E_{ij}(t)}{Z} dt_1 - \frac{l_{ij}^r(t)}{D} dt_1
$$
 (2)

$$
I_{ij}^{u}(t + dt_{1}) = I_{ij}^{u}(t) + (1 - \alpha) \frac{E_{ij}(t)}{Z} dt_{1} - \frac{I_{ij}^{u}(t)}{D} dt_{1} + \theta dt_{1} \frac{N_{ij} - I_{ij}^{r}(t)}{N_{i}^{D}(t)} \sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\overline{N}_{ik} \sum_{l} I_{kl}^{u}(t)}{N_{k}^{D}(t) - \sum_{l} I_{lk}^{r}(t)} - \theta dt_{1} \frac{I_{ij}^{u}(t)}{N_{i}^{D}(t) - \sum_{l} I_{li}^{r}(t)} \sum_{k \neq i} \overline{N}_{ki} (3)
$$
\n
$$
R_{ij}(t + dt_{1}) = R_{ij}(t) + \frac{I_{ij}^{r}(t)}{D} dt_{1} + \frac{I_{ij}^{u}(t)}{D} dt_{1} + \theta dt_{1} \frac{N_{ij} - I_{ij}^{r}(t)}{N_{i}^{D}(t)} \sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\overline{N}_{ik} \sum_{l} R_{kl}(t)}{N_{k}^{D}(t) - \sum_{l} I_{lk}^{r}(t)} - \theta dt_{1} \frac{R_{ij}(t)}{N_{i}^{D}(t) - \sum_{l} I_{li}^{r}(t)} \sum_{k \neq i} \overline{N}_{ki} (4)
$$
\n
$$
N_{i}^{D}(t) = N_{ii} + \sum_{k \neq i} I_{ki}^{r}(t) + \sum_{k \neq i} (N_{ik} - I_{ik}^{r}(t)) (5)
$$

Nighttime transmission:

$$
E_{ij}(t+1) = E_{ij}(t+dt_1) + \frac{\beta S_{ij}(t+dt_1) \sum_k l_{kj}^r(t+dt_1)}{N_j^N} dt_2
$$

+ $\frac{\mu \beta S_{ij}(t+dt_1) \sum_k l_{kj}^u(t+dt_1)}{N_j^N} dt_2 - \frac{E_{ij}(t+dt_1)}{Z} dt_2$
+ $\theta dt_2 \frac{N_{ij}}{N_j^N} \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\overline{N}_{jk}}{N_k^N} - \sum_l l_{lk}^r(t+dt_1)$
- $\theta dt_2 \frac{E_{ij}(t+dt_1)}{N_j^N - \sum_k l_{kj}^r(t+dt_1)} \sum_{k \neq j} \overline{N}_{kj}$ (6)

$$
I_{ij}^r(t+1) = I_{ij}^r(t+dt_1) + \alpha \frac{E_{ij}(t+dt_1)}{Z} dt_2 - \frac{I_{ij}^r(t+dt_1)}{D} dt_2
$$
 (7)

$$
I_{ij}^u(t+1) = I_{ij}^u(t+dt_1) + (1-\alpha) \frac{E_{ij}(t+dt_1)}{Z} dt_2 - \frac{I_{ij}^u(t+dt_1)}{D} dt_2
$$

+ $\theta dt_2 \frac{N_{ij}}{N_j^N} \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\overline{N}_{jk}}{N_k^N} \sum_{k \neq j} I_{lk}^r(t+dt_1)$
- $\theta dt_2 \frac{I_{ij}^u(t+dt_1)}{N_j^N - \sum_k I_{kj}^r}(t+dt_1) \sum_{k \neq j} \overline{N}_{kj}$ (8)

$$
R_{ij}(t+1) = R_{ij}(t+dt_1) + \frac{I_{ij}^r(t+dt_1)}{D} dt_2 + \frac{I_{ij}^u(t+dt_1)}{D} dt_2 + \theta dt_2 \frac{R_{ij}(t+dt_1)}{N_j^N} - \sum_k I_{kj}^r(t+dt_1) \sum_{k \neq j} \overline{N}_{kj}
$$
 (9)

$$
N_i^N = \sum_k N_{ki}
$$
 (10)

Here, S_{ij} , E_{ij} , I_{ij}^n , I_{ij}^u , R_{ij} and N_{ij} are the susceptible, exposed, reported infected, unreported infected, recovered and total populations in the subpopulation commuting from county *j* to county *i* ($i \leftarrow j$), where $S_{ij} = N_{ij} - E_{ij} - I_{ij}^r - I_{ij}^u - R_{ij}$; β is the transmission rate of reported infections; μ is the relative transmissibility of unreported infections; Z is the average latency period (from infection to contagiousness); D is the average duration of contagiousness; α is the fraction of documented infections; θ is a multiplicative factor adjusting random movement; $\overline{N}_{ij} = (N_{ij} + N_{ji})/2$ is the average number of commuters between counties i and j ; and N^D_i and N_i^N are the daytime and nighttime populations of county i .

Text S2. The pseudo-code for the greedy optimization algorithm

Input: Origin $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ Destination $j = 1, 2, ..., m$, where $R_e(1) \ge R_e(2) \ge \cdots \ge R_e(m)$ Evacuation matrix $V = \{V_{ji}\}\,$, V_{ji} is the number of evacuees from origin *i* to destination *j* in the baseline scenario Capacity of evacuees that can be accommodated by each destination: C_i The fraction of evacuees that can't be reallocated for each origin-destination pair: p

Variables:

 u_i :: the current number of evacuees in origin *i* that could be reallocated to different counties v: the currently available destination county with lowest R_e .

M: the current evacuation matrix, $M_{\nu i}$ is the number of evacuees assigned from origin *i* to destination v .

Initial conditions:

$$
\begin{aligned} v &= m \\ u_i &= (1 - p) \sum_j V_{ji} \\ M &= pV \end{aligned}
$$

```
Algorithm:
While max(u_i) > 0For i = 1 to nM^i = M: reallocating from origin i to v
                   M_{vi}^{i} = \min(M_{vi} + (C_v - \sum_j M_{vj}), M_{vi} + u_i)u_{temp}^i = u_i - (M_{vi}^i - M_{vi})Run projection using M^iInf_i: total infection in all origin and destination counties
         End
         k = \min_{i} Inf_iM = M^ku_k = u_{temp}^kIf \sum_j \mathbf{M}_{vj} == \mathbf{C}_vv = v - 1End
```
End

Output M as the optimized evacuation matrix.

Figure S1. Statistics in destination counties. (a) The number of evacuees accepted by 165 destination counties in the baseline scenario. (b) The estimated effective reproductive numbers, R_e , for both origin and destination counties on July 23, 2020.

Figure S2. Comparison of total cases in the origin and destination counties combined (left column), the origin counties only (middle column) and destination counties only (right column) for the no-evacuation, baseline, low and high evacuation scenarios. Simulations were performed for three settings: no increase (top row), 10% increase (middle row) and 20% increase (bottom row) of transmission rates in destination counties. Box plots show the median and interquartile and whiskers show the 95% CIs. Asterisks indicate that excess cases are significantly higher than the no-evacuation scenario (Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p < 10^{-5}$).

Figure S3. Time series for confirmed cases in origin and destinations counties. Simulations were performed for the no-evacuation scenario (blue line) and the high evacuation scenario with 20% increase of transmission rate in destination counties (red line). Blue and red dashed lines indicate 95% CIs of simulation results from 100 runs.

Figure S4. Evolution of the total cases (blue lines) and the number of assigned evacuees (red lines) in the greedy algorithm. Results are shown for the settings with no increase, 10% increase and 20% increase of transmission rates in destination counties. The optimization starts from an evacuation matrix $0.1 \times V$, where V represents the evacuation matrix in the baseline scenario.

Figure S5. The change in the number of evacuees to destination counties in the optimized evacuation plan compared with the baseline evacuation scenario. Evacuation was optimized for the setting in which transmission rates in destination counties increase by 10%.

Figure S6. Sensitivity analysis of optimization assuming 20% of evacuees cannot be relocated. Excess cases for the baseline and optimized evacuation scenarios are compared for the origin and destination counties combined (left column), only origin counties (middle column) and only destination counties (right column). Simulations were performed with no increase of transmission rates in destination counties. Boxes and whiskers show the median, interquartile and 95% CIs. Asterisks indicate that excess cases are significantly lower than the baseline scenario (Wilcoxon signed rank test, $p < 10^{-5}$). Results are obtained from 100 model simulations.

Table S1. Parameter settings in the full model simulation and optimization. The prior transmission rate in each county is scaled by population density using a baseline transmission rate β_0 as inferred through March 13, 2020. The relative transmission rate (μ), latency period (Z), infectious period (D) and mobility factor (θ) are fixed at posterior values inferred through March 13, 2020. Values are shown for the median and 95% CIs in the parentheses.

Table S2. The median number of total cases in origin and destination counties for different evacuation scenarios (no evacuation, baseline, low and high) and levels of elevated transmission rates (R_e) in destination counties (no change, 10% increase, 20% increase). In the no evacuation scenario (R_e) in destination counties is not increased. Note that the median excess cases shown in Table 1 is not necessarily the difference of the median total cases between the evacuation and non-evacuation scenarios shown in Table S1. That is, $median(total case_{eva}(i)$ $totalcase_{noeva}(i) \neq median(totalcase_{eva}(i)) - median(totalcase_{noeva}(i)),$ where totalcas $e_{eva}(i)$ and totalcas $e_{noeva}(i)$ are the total numbers of cases for evacuation and nonevacuation scenarios in the *i*th simulation.

Table S3. The optimized evacuation plan (no increase of transmission rates in destination counties). We show the top 20 destinations for each origin county.

Table S4. The optimized evacuation plan (10% increase of transmission rates in destination counties). We show the top 20 destinations for each origin county.

Table S5. The optimized evacuation plan (20% increase of transmission rates in destination counties). We show the top 20 destinations for each origin county.