

# FREE: The Foundational Semantic Recognition for Modeling Environmental Ecosystems

Shiyuan Luo  
University of Pittsburgh  
shl298@pitt.edu

Juntong Ni<sup>†</sup>  
University of North Carolina at  
Chapel Hill  
juntongni02@gmail.com

Shengyu Chen  
University of Pittsburgh  
shc160@pitt.edu

Runlong Yu  
University of Pittsburgh  
ruy59@pitt.edu

Yiqun Xie  
University of Maryland  
xie@umd.edu

Licheng Liu  
University of Minnesota  
lichengl@umn.edu

Zhenong Jin  
University of Minnesota  
jinzn@umn.edu

Huaxiu Yao  
University of North Carolina at  
Chapel Hill  
huaxiu@cs.unc.edu

Xiaowei Jia  
University of Pittsburgh  
xiaowei@pitt.edu

## ABSTRACT

Modeling environmental ecosystems is critical for the sustainability of our planet, but is extremely challenging due to the complex underlying processes driven by interactions amongst a large number of physical variables. As many variables are difficult to measure at large scales, existing works often utilize a combination of observable features and locally available measurements or modeled values as input to build models for a specific study region and time period. This raises a fundamental question in advancing the modeling of environmental ecosystems: *how to build a general framework for modeling the complex relationships amongst various environmental data over space and time?* In this paper, we introduce a new framework, FREE, which maps available environmental data into a text space and then converts the traditional predictive modeling task in environmental science to the semantic recognition problem. The proposed FREE framework leverages recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) to supplement the original input features with natural language descriptions. This framework facilitates capturing the data semantics and allows harnessing the irregularities of input features. When used for long-term prediction, FREE has the flexibility to incorporate newly collected observations to enhance future prediction. The efficacy of FREE is evaluated in the context of two societally important real-world applications, predicting stream water temperature in the Delaware River Basin and predicting annual corn yield in Illinois and Iowa. Beyond the superior predictive performance over multiple baselines, FREE is shown to be more data- and computation-efficient as it can be pre-trained on simulated data generated by physics-based models.

## KEYWORDS

Environmental Ecosystems, Large Language Models, Spatio-temporal Data, Pre-training, Data Assimilation

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding the dynamics of environmental ecosystems is critical for the sustainable management of natural resources and mitigating

natural disasters such as algal blooms and floods. This is becoming ever more important given the compelling need to balance demands for food and water supply by a growing world population and a more unpredictable climate [22, 36, 42]. Modeling environmental ecosystems is challenging as these systems are shaped by the complex interactions of a large number of physical variables, such as weather, soil, water, and plants. Hence, it often requires the combination of data from the network of weather stations, remote sensing, and field measurements to jointly model complex system dynamics. However, many physical variables cannot be easily measured over a large scale, and they are only available for certain locations or time periods, or modeled based on known physical theories. Even for those observable variables, they are often sparse due to the substantial cost required for the data collection (e.g., sensor deployment and field survey).

This paper is focused on two important applications, predicting stream water temperature and predicting annual crop yield. Success on both of these prediction tasks can assist a range of applications in optimizing resource allocation and management strategies. For example, the changing climate is making it harder to grow crops in the US Corn Belt, threatening food supplies and farmer livelihoods; drinking water reservoir operators in the Delaware River Basin (our study region) need to supply safe drinking water to over 15 million people while also maintaining sufficient cool water temperatures in the river network downstream of the reservoirs [65]. Given the importance of these two tasks in ensuring food and water security, scientists from multiple domains, including hydrology, agronomy, meteorology, and environmental engineering, have been developing physics-based models (also referred to as process-based models) to simulate underlying physical processes for different components of the aquatic and agricultural ecosystems. Despite their extensive use, the majority of physics-based models are necessarily approximations of reality due to incomplete knowledge or excessive complexity in modeling certain processes [21, 37, 43]. More recently, machine learning (ML) models have been increasingly considered as an alternative approach for modeling environmental ecosystems given their computational efficiency in the prediction phase and their ability in automatically extracting complex data

<sup>†</sup>Work was done during Juntong Ni's remote internship at UNC.

patterns. ML methods have found success in many environmental applications, including climate science [8, 52], hydrology [11, 54], and agriculture [16, 39].

However, current ML approaches face several major challenges in fully leveraging available data for modeling ecosystems. First, ML models often treat input physical variables as independent numerical features but do not explicitly capture the nature of these variables and their interdependent physical and ecological relationships. This is further exacerbated by the scarcity of observation data in many real-world environmental ecosystems, which limits the ability of ML models to automatically extract generalizable feature relationships. Second, traditional ML approaches are unable to harness inconsistent feature inputs. Current studies on local environmental ecosystems often enhance the prediction of their target study region by leveraging multiple types of input features related to the target variable, but the selected features are often different across different studies. Besides meteorological data (e.g., solar radiation and precipitation) that are commonly used to drive physics-based models, prior works also explored including other measurements on the environment and target system (e.g., soil properties [10, 39], land use and geometric structures [13]), proxy observations derived from remote sensing [39, 44], and other physical variables simulated by physics-based models [30, 33]. These features may not always be available for every data sample, which poses a challenge to train a global model that can utilize different input features. Finally, there is a lack of a general pipeline for dynamically incorporating auxiliary observations into the current methods, hindering their ability to achieve better performance in long-term prediction. Current works on assimilating auxiliary observations rely on task-specific learning mechanisms or model structures, e.g., Kalman filtering for incorporating new observations [31, 71], and graph convolution and invertible network layers for assimilating observations from neighboring samples [9].

In this paper, we propose a novel method, **Foundational semantic Recognition for modeling Environmental Ecosystems (FREE)**, as a general framework for modeling environmental ecosystems. The key idea is to translate the heterogeneous data inputs into natural language descriptions using large language models (LLMs) and then estimate the target variable through semantic recognition in the text space. This enables addressing the challenges in utilizing different data sources by only manipulating the text space while maintaining the same predictive modeling component (i.e., semantic recognition). In particular, the translation process is only focused on the available features for each data point and thus allows different or incomplete input features for different data points. Moreover, it can easily incorporate auxiliary observations (e.g., newly collected observations from the previous day) into the textual description with a properly designed prompt. For semantic recognition, we utilize a separate language model to embed the obtained textual description and then create additional network layers (e.g., long-short term memory (LSTM)) to capture data dependencies. The use of the language model on textual descriptions enables better capturing of the nature and semantics of input features. To further enhance the embedding performance of the language model on environmental descriptions, we pre-train the semantic recognition component using abundant simulated samples generated by physics-based models. This pre-training process also helps the

model better learn the general physical relationships encoded in the physics-based models and mitigate the challenge posed by the sparse observations in tuning the model.

We evaluate the proposed method on two real-world datasets: (1) stream water temperature data from the Delaware River Basin, and (2) corn yield data in Illinois and Iowa. Both of them cover a diverse set of locations and long time periods. The results demonstrate the superior predictive performance of the proposed FREE method over multiple baselines, especially using sparse observations. The method is shown to be able to effectively handle different input features and incorporate auxiliary observations. The pre-training process also helps improve the prediction of the model when adapted to different locations.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Physics-based models have been widely used to simulate complex environmental processes, including different components in water cycles [1, 2, 26, 41, 59] and plant growth in agroecosystems [20, 32, 55, 70]. However, these models are necessarily approximations of reality and often rely on approximations and parameterizations [21, 37, 43]. With the recent advances in ML, there is a huge opportunity for modeling environmental ecosystems using the rapidly growing Earth observation data and ground observations about water, plants, soils, and climate. In particular, prior research has shown the promise of ML-based approaches in modeling agroecosystems [19, 28, 38, 39, 61] and freshwater ecosystems [24, 47, 50, 64]. Importantly, the outcomes of these models can be used to inform critical actions (e.g., distribution of subsidies [3, 5, 46]) to mitigate natural disturbance-incurred food and freshwater shortages, which is necessary for continued sustainability and stability. Given the limitations of both physics-based and ML-based models, the improvement of prediction accuracy made through the proposed research would significantly benefit many societally relevant decision-making activities.

Data assimilation has been widely used for assimilating auxiliary observations to adjust the model state of a system. There are many data assimilation approaches used for modeling environmental ecosystems with distinct assumptions about the distributions of the model, data predictions, and speed of computation. The Kalman filter, which iteratively estimates the next state through a forward process and then updates the state using new observations, is a popular technique. Many variations of the Kalman filter have also been implemented [15]. Yet these approaches can be computationally expensive to implement when we have a large state space and/or non-linear system dynamics. Recently, researchers have started to use neural networks as an alternative way for implementing data assimilation [6, 9, 17, 67]. Note that this is different from online incremental learning in that model parameters remain the same but only states are changed. The intuition of data assimilation is to adjust the model state when they are disturbed by external factors that are not captured by input features.

To mitigate the need for large training data in training ML models, one promising direction is to transfer knowledge embodied in physical simulations to ML models. Simulated data can be generated by physics-based models that represent underlying physical processes using a series of mathematical equations. For example,

prior work has shown that ML models pre-trained using simulated data can perform much better under data-scarce scenarios for modeling freshwater and agricultural ecosystems [29, 39, 50]. Similar ideas have been pursued in other disciplines [18, 23, 48]. Alternatively, some works have explored using simulated target variables to augment input data [27, 33] or supervise the training of intermediate neural network representations [34, 39], and these methods achieved improved predictive performance.

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable performance in solving language tasks based on human instructions [7, 12, 14, 57, 60, 68]. More recently, these models have been applied to other types of data. For example, LLMs have been used to textualize tabular information and handle question-answering tasks [4, 69]. Textualized tabular data offers the advantage of being able to handle inputs with different feature sets and is more robust in dealing with missing values. Prior work also investigated the use of LLMs on a variety of geoscience applications [40].

### 3 METHOD

In this section, we define the problem and introduce our proposed framework. The objective is to predict the target variable  $y$  (e.g., water temperature or crop yield) at multiple locations  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and over a period of time. For clarity, we denote by  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$  the input features at the location  $i$  on date  $t$ . The input features contain the set of meteorological variables (e.g., solar radiation, rainfall) that are commonly used as drivers for physics-based models. Besides, we include some other physical variables estimated by physics-based models (e.g., cloud cover fraction, potential evapotranspiration, groundwater properties) or obtained from other data sources (e.g., soil properties). It is worth noting that these features may be absent for certain locations or time steps. Detailed descriptions of the data are available in Section 4.1. We represent the observations of the target variable at each location  $i$  as  $y_i = \{y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,T}\}$  over multiple time steps. In some applications, the observations  $y$  are only sparsely available for certain time steps and locations.

As outlined in Fig. 1, the proposed framework FREE converts the traditional predictive modeling task in environmental science to the semantic recognition problem in a text space created by LLMs (e.g., GPT). A clear benefit of this framework is in its ability to harness inputs of different feature sets and incorporate auxiliary information, e.g., new observations collected from the previous day. We also introduce additional model components (e.g., BERT and LSTM) to embed the text data and capture the temporal dependencies. To mitigate the need for large training samples for different ecosystems, we propose to pre-train the model using abundant simulated data generated by existing physics-based models. In the following, we will describe these components in detail.

#### 3.1 Overall architecture

The proposed FREE framework (shown in Fig. 1) consists of two major components in its architecture.

**Input data conversion:** To address the inconsistencies in the feature set and incorporate auxiliary observations, we propose to transform the original data sample into a corresponding natural language description. This approach facilitates the handling of

diverse and potentially incomplete feature sets for different data points, enabling a uniform textual representation of data across varying input scenarios.

Specifically, we leverage existing LLM GPT-3.5 to transform each data point, represented as  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ , into clear, natural language descriptions  $d_{i,t}$ . To effectively communicate with GPT-3.5, we construct prompts that consist of a context-setting prefix, the linearized data input, and a directive suffix. The prefix ( $p$ ) provides the model with a background of the dataset, while the suffix ( $s$ ) instructs the model on how to format its output (see an example in Fig. 2). The complete prompt is thus formulated as

$$d_{i,t} = \text{LLM}(p, \text{linearize}(\mathbf{x}_{i,t}), s). \quad (1)$$

As depicted in Fig. 2, the linearization technique, introduced by Wang et al. (2023) [63], formats the input features  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$  of  $K$  dimensions into a sequence pairing column names  $c_{i,t}^k$  with the corresponding feature values  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}^k$  (e.g., {rainfall: 0}, [solar radiation: 151.14154]). This process can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{linearize}(\mathbf{x}_{i,t}) = \{[c_{i,t}^k : \mathbf{x}_{i,t}^k]\}_{k=1}^K. \quad (2)$$

Given the prompt, the LLM can generate feature summaries that are both descriptive and succinct, such as: "On December 4, 2006, there was no recorded rainfall in the Delaware River Basin. The average air temperature was -3.364 degrees Celsius, where freezing-thawing and phase change may occur. The solar radiation measured was 108.25592 watts per square meter."


The obtained textual descriptions, alongside the observations in the original dataset, form paired data samples as  $\{d_{i,t}, y_{i,t}\}$ , which are then used for tuning the semantic recognition component (to be discussed later).

In summary, the proposed input conversion process helps generate an understandable and flexible representation of input features. More importantly, the use of LLM enables supplementing the raw feature values with semantically meaningful text descriptions and interpreting underlying physical phenomena, which facilitates subsequent modeling components to capture the complex nature and the interactions of input features.


**Semantic recognition:** Once obtaining the textual descriptions  $d_{i,t}$ , we utilize a separate language model (LM)  $f$  to process the obtained text data and embed them as

$$\mathbf{e}_{i,t} = f(d_{i,t}). \quad (3)$$

In this work, we use the DistilBERT model [53] in this step. It is vital to note that the embeddings  $\mathbf{e}_{i,t}$  are generated independently across different data points. To effectively capture the intricate data dependencies, we introduce additional network layers that combine multiple data embeddings. In particular, this work uses the long-short term memory (LSTM) layers to capture common temporal data dependencies in the environmental ecosystem, e.g., seasonal changes, and the effect of heavy rainfall on soil water in the next few days. We will keep the exploration of other advanced network structures, e.g., graph neural networks for modeling streams [30] and crop yield [16], as future work.



**Figure 1: The overall flow of FREE.** Input features are first transformed into natural language descriptions. These descriptions are then processed by a separate language model (LM) to generate embeddings, which are fed to an LSTM layer for making predictions. Simulated data generated by a physics-based model are used to pre-train the LM and LSTM layers, followed by fine-tuning with true observations of the target variable.



**Figure 2: Input data conversion process.** Green arrows indicate FREE handling inputs of diverse feature sets with three major inputs in the prompt: prefix  $p$ , linearized data, and suffix  $s$ . Red arrow suggests that traditional ML models might need separate preprocessing methodologies (e.g., imputation) to address data irregularities effectively.

### 3.2 Handling different inputs and auxiliary information

One major goal of modeling environmental ecosystems is for long-term prediction over large regions. There are opportunities to enhance ML models towards this goal from two aspects. First, the predictive model often has larger predictive errors as time progresses in the test phase due to the accumulated bias in the model state. One could investigate leveraging newly collected observations in the testing phase (e.g., the observations collected at time  $t$ ) to mitigate the current model bias and enhance the future prediction (e.g., the prediction at  $t + 1$ ). Second, for some data samples, we may have access to additional features such as local soil properties or modeled variables from physics-based models. These additional features can be combined with the original features to enhance the model prediction. Under the proposed FREE framework, we can

make use of the additional observations and features by simply modifying the prompt while keeping the predictive model (i.e., the semantic recognition component) the same.

**Incorporating auxiliary observations:** In this study, we consider incorporating two types of auxiliary observations to enhance the prediction of data sample  $x_{i,t}$ : (1) the newly collected observation from the previous time  $t - 1$  and at the same location  $i$ , and (2) the newly collected observations from the neighboring locations of the target location  $i$ .

We modify the linearized input data (i.e.,  $\text{linearize}(x_{i,t})$ ) to incorporate the auxiliary data. As observations are collected from different dates (e.g., the previous day) with the existing features in  $x_{i,t}$ , we need to explicitly include the exact date information for the auxiliary observations and original features. If we consider the auxiliary observations being collected at the date  $t - 1$  from both the current location  $i$  and its neighbor  $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$ , the updated linearization process can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{linearize}([x_{i,t}, y_{i,t-1}, y_{j,t-1}]_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)}) \\ &= [\text{date} : t - 1] \cup [c_i^y : y_{i,t-1}] \cup [c_j^y : y_{j,t-1}] \\ & \cup [\text{date} : t] \cup \{[c_{i,t}^k : x_{i,t}^k]\}_{k=1}^K, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $c_i^y$  denotes the column name for the observed labels (e.g., observed water temperature),  $c_j^y$  denotes the column name for the observed labels from the neighboring location  $j$  (e.g., observed upstream water temperature), and  $\cup$  represents the concatenation operation across the sequences. Consider an example with a new observed water temperature from the previous day. The linearized data can be { [date: 2006-10-30], [observed water temperature: 6.5], [date: 2006-10-31], [rainfall: 0], [average air temperature: 10.29000], [solar radiation: 151.14154] }. The GPT then follows the instructions by  $p$  and  $s$  to generate the description like: "On October 30, 2006, the observed water temperature in the Delaware River Basin was 6.5 degrees Celsius. On the following day, October 31, 2006, there was no recorded rainfall. The average air temperature for that day was

10.29 degrees Celsius. Additionally, the solar radiation measured on October 31, 2006, was approximately 151.14.”

We have also explored modifying the prefix  $p$  to explicitly instruct the GPT model to pay attention to the columns of new observations in the linearized data. However, we found that the GPT-3.5 model can generate accurate descriptions in practice even using the unmodified general prefix. It is also noteworthy that the auxiliary observations may not always be available from the previous day or neighboring locations. When creating the linearized data, we include the columns of the auxiliary observations (e.g.,  $[c_i^y : y_{i,t-1}]$  and  $[c_j^y : y_{j,t-1}]$ ) only if they are available and skip them otherwise.

**Handling different input features:** The proposed method can also handle different input features by using only the available features to create the linearized data while skipping missing features. In particular, if a feature  $k$  is not available for the data sample  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ , then the pair  $[c_{i,t}^k : \mathbf{x}_{i,t}^k]$  will be skipped and not included in the input to the LLM. This entails the LLM generating natural descriptions that focus only on the available features.


The proposed approach enables the use of a combination of heterogeneous data sources for modeling complex environmental ecosystems. It also allows the subsequent semantic recognition to proceed seamlessly on the generated text without the need for manual adjustments to account for data irregularities.

### 3.3 Pre-training using physical simulations

In the semantic recognition phase, the LM function  $f$  (Eq. 3) embeds the textual description  $d_{i,t}$  into a latent representation  $\mathbf{e}_{i,t}$ . The intent is for the obtained embeddings to capture the semantic information in the descriptions and the complex interconnections among the input features. However, the pre-trained LMs are not inherently trained on data specific to the target environmental ecosystems, which often results in a failure to effectively capture feature dependencies within the descriptions. As evidenced in Fig. 3 (b), the input features from samples in different seasons tend to be mixed in the latent embedding space of the original pre-trained DistilBERT model. This indicates that a standard LM, when applied directly, may fall short of capturing semantics from the text generated for our target task.

Tuning the LM towards the target domain requires sufficient observed data samples, which are often not available in real-world ecosystems. To address this issue, we turn to the simulated data  $\{\mathbf{x}_{i,t}, \tilde{y}_{i,t}\}$ , generated by a physics-based model, and use them to pre-train the semantic recognition modeling component. Fig. 3 (a) shows that the samples of different seasons can now be distinguished in the updated embedding space, which confirms that the LM model tuned with simulated data can better capture semantics in the textual descriptions  $d_{i,t}$ .

This simulation-based pre-training approach also brings an additional benefit in that it facilitates training the semantic recognition component to emulate general physical processes encoded in the physics-based model. This helps enhance the model’s generalizability as many physical processes generally hold across space and time. Upon completing this pre-training, we find that it requires only a few epochs of fine-tuning using true observations before reaching a quality model.



**Figure 3: Distribution of data points randomly sampled from summer and winter in their embedding space visualized by t-SNE. (a) demonstrates a pronounced segregation between different seasons after domain-specific tuning. (b) shows an overlapping distribution of embeddings created by the original DistilBERT model.**

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present our datasets and provide a comprehensive assessment of the proposed methods. Our primary emphasis lies on the predictive performance using sparse data, underscoring the efficacy of the proposed FREE framework and the simulation-based pre-training. Besides, we delve into additional experiments that validate our model’s capability to harness diverse input features and auxiliary observations. We further examine its performance under transfer learning scenarios and analyze its performance sensitivity by freezing the LM in the semantic recognition component during the fine-tuning phase.

We set the window size to be 100 days for water temperature prediction and 365 days for crop yield prediction. We implemented our methods using PyTorch == 2.0.1, on an RTX 4090 GPU, and employed an ADAM[35] optimizer with a  $1e-5$  learning rate for DistilBERT, and 0.00025/0.0001 pre-training/fine-tuning learning rates for LSTM.

### 4.1 Datasets and baselines

We introduce the two datasets for predicting stream water temperature and predicting annual crop yield.

**Stream dataset on the Delaware River Basin:** The dataset is collected from the Delaware River Basin, an ecologically diverse region and a watershed along the east coast of the United States. The datasets are pulled from the U.S. Geological Survey’s National Water Information System [58] and the Water Quality Portal [49], the largest standardized water quality data set for inland and coastal waterbodies [49]. Observations at a specific latitude and longitude were matched to river segments that vary in length from 48 to 23,120 meters. These segments were defined by the national geospatial fabric used for the National Hydrologic Model as described by [51], and the river segments are split up to have at maximum a one-day water travel time. We match observations to river segments by snapping observations to the nearest stream segment within a tolerance of 250 meters, excluding those over 5,000 meters from a segment’s outlet. Segments with multiple observation sites were aggregated to a single daily average water temperature value.

We conduct our study on a subset of river segments of the Delaware River Basin, specifically focusing on the river segments that converge into the main stem of the Delaware River at Wilmington, DE. This large dataset is referred to as the Christina River

**Table 1: Prediction RMSE for stream water temperature using 1%, 2%, 4%, and 100% randomly selected training labels. The methods highlighted in gray (FREE-C, FREE-CU, and HRGN-DA) incorporate observation data.**

Dataset	Method	100%	4%	2%	1%
SS	LSTM	1.90	1.95	2.14	2.23
	Transformer	1.79	2.05	2.20	2.27
	FREE	1.70	1.71	1.90	2.09
	FREE-C	1.11	1.11	1.18	1.25
CRW	LSTM	1.90	2.33	2.80	2.87
	Transformer	2.14	2.20	2.19	2.30
	RGRN	1.78	2.31	2.61	2.80
	Gr-CNN	1.80	2.38	2.69	3.56
	HydroNets	1.87	2.51	2.77	3.75
	HRGN-DA	0.92	1.65	2.00	2.10
	FREE	1.61	1.68	1.62	1.65
	FREE-CU	1.03	1.16	1.16	1.28

Watershed (**CRW**), which contains 42 river segments. Separately, we also studied a distinct stream segment, named “single stream (**SS**)”, which has the largest number of water temperature observations. This allows us to test the capacity of models under data-sparse scenarios by intentionally withholding a fraction of training samples.

Our dataset spans a long period from October 31, 2006, to March 30, 2020 (4900 days). On a daily scale, we incorporated basic meteorological features (the day of the year, rainfall, daily average air temperature, and solar radiation). In addition to these, we also considered other features, namely average cloud cover fraction, groundwater temperature, subsurface temperature, and potential evapotranspiration.

While daily average water temperature observations were present for certain segments, they were not consistently available for every date. The count of temperature readings for each segment varied, ranging from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 4,682. In total, “CRW” comprises 205,800 temperature observations distributed across all its segments and dates, and “SS” has 4,676 temperature observations. Besides true observations, we also use the simulated water temperature data for CRW and SS generated by the physics-based PRMS-SNTemp model [41]. For the following experiments, the pre-training process used simulated data from October 31, 2006, to March 30, 2020. We train each ML model using data from the first 2,450 days (October 31, 2006 to July 8, 2013) and then test in the next 2,450 days (July 8, 2013 to March 30, 2020).

We compare model performance to multiple state-of-the-art baselines developed for stream modeling, including Basic LSTM model (LSTM) (considered to be the state of the art in many environmental modeling problems [54]), Transformer[62], Recurrent Graph Model (RGRN) [30], Graph-temporal convolutional network (Gr-CNN) [56], HydroNets [45]. Besides, we include a baseline method that assimilates new observations for updating the model, the Heterogeneous Recurrent Graph Networks with data assimilation (HRGN-DA) [9].

**Table 2: Prediction RMSE for annual corn yield using 10%, 20%, 50%, and 100% randomly selected training labels.**

Dataset	Method	100%	50%	20%	10%
Crop	LSTM	73.56	79.67	78.88	84.52
	PG-GNN	79.92	71.68	72.72	79.04
	PG-AN	96.83	114.40	90.52	100.36
	FREE	65.24	63.74	63.75	64.28

**Crop dataset:** We use the corn yield data in Illinois and Iowa from the years 2000-2020 provided by USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) <sup>†</sup>. In particular, there are in total 199 counties in our study region (100 counties in Illinois and 99 counties in Iowa). The corn yield data (in  $\text{gCm}^{-2}$ ) are available for each county each year. The observed annual crop yield labels cover 199 countries spanning 21 years from 2000-2020, with daily records for each year. The input data include seven features, namely, the surface downward shortwave radiation, the maximum air temperature, the maximum humidity, the wind speed, the precipitation, the depth-weighted averaged bulk density in the soil, and the depth-weighted averaged sand content in the soil. The feature data collected from NLDAS-2 climate data [66], 0-30cm gSSURGO soil properties<sup>‡</sup>, and the crop type information.

Besides the true observed yield labels, we use the physics-based Ecosys model [70] to simulate ecosystem autotrophic respiration (Ra), ecosystem heterotrophic respiration (Rh), net ecosystem exchange (NEE), and crop yield for 10,335 synthetic sample locations in the United States from the years 2000-2020. All synthetic data are used for pre-training. To reduce computational load, we randomly sample 1/7 of synthetic data in the pre-training phase. We use the observational data from 2000-2017 for training and the data from 2018-2020 for testing. We compare the proposed method with the LSTM-based model and two other baselines that have both proven effective in crop yield prediction, i.e., the physics-guided attention network (PG-AN) [25], and the graph neural network-based model [16] pre-trained with the same simulated data (PG-GNN).

## 4.2 Overall predictive performance


Table 1 and Table 2 show the performance of various methods for predicting stream water temperature and predicting annual crop yield, respectively. The notation FREE represents a model pre-trained on synthetic data and then fine-tuned on observational data. FREE-C refers to the model that incorporates auxiliary observed water temperatures of the current river segment from the prior day (when they are available), as described in Section 3.2. The method FREE-CU includes auxiliary observation data from the prior day of both the current and the upstream river segment. For the single stream (SS) test case, we only consider incorporating auxiliary observation data from the current segment on the prior day.

We also conduct the sparsity test on both datasets. For this sparsity test, training was conducted using only {4%, 2%, 1%} and {50%, 20%, 10%} of training data randomly sampled from the whole training period on the stream dataset and the crop dataset, respectively.

<sup>†</sup><https://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/>

<sup>‡</sup><https://gdg.sc.egov.usda.gov/>





**Figure 4: Comparison of pre-trained FREE models and the baseline LSTM on stream water temperature prediction. (a) SS test case with full training data. (b) SS test case with 1% training data. (c) an example segment in CRW with full training data from CRW. (d) the same example segment in CRW with 1% training data from CRW.**

According to Table 1, the FREE-based models outperform almost all the baseline methods when data are abundant, which confirms the effectiveness of the proposed method in capturing the semantics and relationships of input features from textual descriptions. Notably, the FREE-based models maintain good performance regardless of label volume while other models generally have much worse performance in data-sparse scenarios. This underscores the model enhancement brought by the simulation-based pre-training in learning generalizable and domain-specific semantics. Moreover, pre-training our model before fine-tuning significantly reduces the required observational data and time for effective fine-tuning (about one-tenth of the time compared to direct fine-tuning).

It can also be seen that the performance of FREE-C and FREE-CU surpasses that of FREE. This shows that our proposed approach can process auxiliary observation data effectively. This further underscores the method’s capacity to integrate valuable information derived from the natural descriptions of auxiliary observations. It is worth mentioning that the baseline HRGN-DA, also incorporating new observational data, initially achieves close performance with the proposed FREE-CU approach using the complete training dataset. Nonetheless, when the available labeled data is reduced, our FREE-CU models surpass HRGN-DA in accuracy.

Table 2 presents similar comparisons between the proposed methods and the baseline in predicting annual corn yield. The proposed models FREE achieve a significant improvement over other baselines, underscoring its ability to leverage generalizable data patterns and the inherent knowledge extracted from the natural language descriptions. When label availability is limited to 10%, the performance of FREE maintains its advantage. This is because the pre-training furnishes the model with a wealth of prior knowledge, allowing it to be fine-tuned with fewer samples and thereby facilitating easier adaptation to different domains. We also observe that

some methods can have slightly better performance with reduced training data. This is because the data samples are highly heterogeneous across different counties and years in this dataset, and the randomly sampled training data have a chance to get slightly closer to the testing data.

In Fig. 4, we show the predicted water temperature over one year for the SS test case and another river segment within the CRW test case to demonstrate the alignment of predictions and true observations. The figure clearly shows that our method outperforms the baseline model under different data sparsity scenarios (100% and 1%), especially in capturing the water temperature oscillations in the summertime. The LSTM model’s predictions, while reasonably tracking the general trend, fall short in replicating the nuanced variations, especially as the training data becomes sparser. In scenarios with limited data, the LSTM struggles to recognize subtle changes and creates smooth predictions, overlooking smaller peaks and valleys that our method consistently identifies and traces.

### 4.3 Handling auxiliary information

We also evaluate the performance of our method in harnessing auxiliary observations and diverse input features. We use FREE-C, FREE-U, and FREE-CU to represent the variants of the proposed FREE method by including auxiliary labels from the previous day over the current river segment (C), the upstream river segment (U), or from both upstream and current segments (CU), respectively. On the other hand, we consider variants of FREE using different sets of features. To mimic different input features in real scenarios, we create data samples with the following assumption. All the data samples have access to the meteorological features (e.g., solar radiation and precipitation) as the daily weather data are publicly available over the United States. Different data samples may have different features from other data sources (e.g., soil properties, and physical variables estimated by physics-based models), which are randomly sampled. We use FREE- $A_m$  to represent the variant of the FREE method that uses the meteorological features and  $m$  randomly selected additional features.

Referencing Fig. 5, two primary observations are evident: (1) The integration of auxiliary observations improves the performance of the stream modeling dataset. Notably, FREE-CU in CRW and FREE-C in SS yield the most favorable outcomes separately. In CRW, the use of new observations from the upstream segment is less helpful compared to the use of new observations from the same segment. (2) For both datasets, the use of additional features can slightly reduce the prediction errors. We will explore using more diverse input features in future work.

### 4.4 Evaluation on model transferability

We assess the performance of adapting a model pre-trained using simulated data from CRW to the river segment in a different region (SS). In particular, we compared the transferred models (FREE<sub>trs</sub> and FREE-A4<sub>trs</sub>) to the models trained on observational data directly without pre-training (FREE<sup>nprt</sup> and FREE-A4<sup>nprt</sup>) and the models pre-trained on the same segment in SS (FREE, FREE-A4). Here we use the subscript “trs” to represent the model being pre-trained on CRW. As Figure 6 shows, The pre-trained models (FREE<sub>trs</sub>, FREE-A4<sub>trs</sub>, FREE, FREE-A4) consistently outperform the




Figure 5: Evaluation of FREE with auxiliary information. the variation in test errors for (a) predicting stream water temperature (in SS and CRW) upon the inclusion of extra observations, (b) predicting stream water temperature upon the integration of additional features, (c) predicting corn yield upon the integration of additional features.




Figure 6: Comparison between the original FREE, the pre-trained FREE, and the transferred FREE (pre-trained from CRW and tested in SS) under different sparsity levels in the target SS. Comparison amongst the models trained on (a) meteorological features. (b) meteorological features and four additional modeled variables from the physics-based models.

models  $\text{FREE}^{nprt}$ ,  $\text{FREE-A4}^{nprt}$  under different data sparsity levels, maintaining stable performance despite reduced label availability. Remarkably, the pre-trained model from the different domain CRW can have a similar degree of contribution to performance enhancement compared to the model pre-trained on the same target segment. These findings emphasize the pre-trained models' ability to not only address the challenges caused by sparse labels but also to transfer learning capabilities. This shows the potential of building a global pre-trained model over large regions, which can then be adapted efficiently to different target regions with small training data.

#### 4.5 Fine-tuning analysis

We investigate the effect of two different fine-tuning strategies: (1) fine-tuning all the parameters of the semantic recognition model, i.e., LM+LSTM (FT-All), and (2) fine-tuning only the parameters of the LSTM layer while fixing the embeddings created by the LM model (FT-LSTM). The underlying assumption for the fine-tuning approach (2) is that the LM can generate semantics-aware embeddings after being pre-trained on simulations, eliminating the need to be further adjusted on true observations. The results presented in Table 3 show that comprehensive fine-tuning FT-All over all the parameters within our pre-trained models yields better results. Interestingly, the partial fine-tuning approach FT-LSTM, where we

Table 3: Prediction RMSE for stream water temperature and crop yield using different fine-tuned models. FT-All means fine-tuning the whole model using training labels, and FT-LSTM means only fine-tuning the LSTM layer.

Dataset	Method	FT-All	FT-LSTM
SS	FREE	1.70	1.71
	FREE-C	1.11	1.70
	FREE-A2	1.73	1.98
	FREE-A3	1.68	1.93
CRW	FREE-A4	1.63	1.94
	FREE	1.61	2.22
	FREE-C	1.02	2.35
	FREE-U	1.50	2.28
	FREE-CU	1.03	2.27
	FREE-A2	1.68	2.18
Crop	FREE-A3	1.61	1.98
	FREE-A4	1.65	2.11
	FREE-A0	65.70	66.73
	FREE-A1	65.45	66.68
	FREE-A2	65.24	66.01

fix the parameters of the LM and only adjust those of the LSTM, also delivers decent performance. While this tuning approach (FT-LSTM) slightly compromises the predictive accuracy compared to the comprehensive fine-tuning approach (FT-All), requires much less computational cost, which can be a convenient and practical alternative in resource-limited scenarios.

## 5 CONCLUSION

This paper introduces FREE, a novel LLM-based framework for modeling environmental ecosystems. FREE is shown to outperform existing methods in the context of predicting stream water temperature and predicting annual crop yield. This demonstrates the potential of FREE in better capturing the semantics of environmental features by converting them to natural language descriptions. FREE also has the flexibility to utilize different input features and auxiliary observations for different data samples to enhance predictive performance. Moreover, FREE maintains high predictive performance even under data-sparse scenarios. This is attributed to the model initialization through the pre-training on simulated data. The simulation-based pre-training also aids in extracting physically



consistent data patterns, which improves the generalizability and transferability to different regions.

We anticipate the proposed FREE framework to serve as a stepping stone to building foundational solutions for modeling complex environmental and physical systems. This framework remains limited in (1) its computational cost (e.g., caused by the increasing length of textual description) when combining a large number of physical variables as inputs, (2) the ability to integrate known physical and causal relationships in the complex ecosystems, and (3) effectively handling highly erratic or noisy data beyond incomplete or missing data scenarios. We will investigate these directions in future work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Amanzi-ATS. <https://amanzi.github.io/>. Accessed: 2022-06-31.
- [2] ARNOLD, J. G., MORIASI, D. N., GASSMAN, P. W., ABBASPOUR, K. C., WHITE, M. J., SRINIVASAN, R., SANTHI, C., HARMEI, R., VAN GRIENSVEN, A., VAN LIEW, M. W., ET AL. Swat: Model use, calibration, and validation. *Transactions of the ASABE* 55, 4 (2012), 1491–1508.
- [3] BAILEY, J. T., AND BORYAN, C. G. Remote sensing applications in agriculture at the usda national agricultural statistics service. Tech. rep., Research and Development Division, USDA, NASS, Fairfax, VA, 2010.
- [4] BORISOV, V., SESSLER, K., LEEMANN, T., PAWELCZYK, M., AND KASNECI, G. Language models are realistic tabular data generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06280* (2022).
- [5] BORYAN, C., YANG, Z., MUELLER, R., AND CRAIG, M. Monitoring us agriculture: the us department of agriculture, national agricultural statistics service, cropland data layer program. *Geocarto International* 26, 5 (2011), 341–358.
- [6] BRAJARD, J., CARRASSI, A., BOCQUET, M., AND BERTINO, L. Combining data assimilation and machine learning to emulate a dynamical model from sparse and noisy observations: a case study with the lorenz 96 model. *Journal of Computational Science* 44 (2020), 101171.
- [7] BROWN, T., MANN, B., RYDER, N., SUBBIAH, M., KAPLAN, J. D., DHARIWAL, P., NEELAKANTAN, A., SHYAM, P., SASTRY, G., ASKELL, A., ET AL. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [8] CHATTERJEE, S., STEINHAUSER, K., BANERJEE, A., CHATTERJEE, S., AND GANGULY, A. Sparse group lasso: Consistency and climate applications. In *Proceedings of the 2012 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining* (2012), SIAM, pp. 47–58.
- [9] CHEN, S., APPLING, A., OLIVER, S., CORSON-DOSCH, H., READ, J., SADLER, J., ZWART, J., AND JIA, X. Heterogeneous stream-reservoir graph networks with data assimilation. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)* (2021), IEEE, pp. 1024–1029.
- [10] CHEN, S., XIE, Y., LI, X., LIANG, X., AND JIA, X. Physics-guided meta-learning method in baseflow prediction over large regions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)* (2023), SIAM, pp. 217–225.
- [11] CHEN, S., ZWART, J. A., AND JIA, X. Physics-guided graph meta learning for predicting water temperature and streamflow in stream networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (2022), pp. 2752–2761.
- [12] CHIANG, W.-L., LI, Z., LIN, Z., SHENG, Y., WU, Z., ZHANG, H., ZHENG, L., ZHUANG, S., ZHUANG, Y., GONZALEZ, J. E., STOICA, I., AND XING, E. P. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality, March 2023.
- [13] CHO, K., AND KIM, Y. Improving streamflow prediction in the wrf-hydro model with lstm networks. *Journal of Hydrology* 605 (2022), 127297.
- [14] CHOWDHERY, A., NARANG, S., DEVLIN, J., BOSMA, M., MISHRA, G., ROBERTS, A., BARHAM, P., CHUNG, H. W., SUTTON, C., GEHRMANN, S., ET AL. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311* (2022).
- [15] EVENSEN, G., ET AL. *Data assimilation: the ensemble Kalman filter*, vol. 2. Springer, 2009.
- [16] FAN, J., BAI, J., LI, Z., ORTIZ-BOBEA, A., AND GOMES, C. P. A gnn-rnn approach for harnessing geospatial and temporal information: application to crop yield prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence* (2022), vol. 36, pp. 11873–11881.
- [17] FANG, K., AND SHEN, C. Near-real-time forecast of satellite-based soil moisture using long short-term memory with an adaptive data integration kernel. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 21, 3 (2020), 399–413.
- [18] FINKELDEY, F., VOLKE, J., ZARGES, J.-C., HEIM, H.-P., AND WIEDERKEHR, P. Learning quality characteristics for plastic injection molding processes using a combination of simulated and measured data. *Journal of Manufacturing Processes* 60 (2020), 134–143.
- [19] GHAZARYAN, G., SKAKUN, S., KÖNIG, S., REZAEI, E. E., SIEBERT, S., AND DUBOVYK, O. Crop yield estimation using multi-source satellite image series and deep learning. In *IGARSS 2020-2020 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium* (2020), IEEE, pp. 5163–5166.
- [20] GRANT, R., BLACK, T. A., JASSAL, R. S., AND BRUEMMER, C. Changes in net ecosystem productivity and greenhouse gas exchange with fertilization of douglas fir: Mathematical modeling in ecosys. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* 115, G4 (2010).
- [21] GUPTA, H. V., AND NEARING, G. S. Debates—the future of hydrological sciences: A (common) path forward? using models and data to learn: A systems theoretic perspective on the future of hydrological science. *Water Resources Research* (2014).
- [22] HALL, J. W., GREY, D., GARRICK, D., FUNG, F., BROWN, C., DADSON, S. J., AND SADOFF, C. W. Coping with the curse of freshwater variability. *Science* 346, 6208 (2014), 429–430.
- [23] HAN, H., AND CHOI, S. Transfer learning from simulation to experimental data: Nmr chemical shift predictions. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* 12, 14 (2021), 3662–3668.
- [24] HANSON, P. C., STILLMAN, A. B., JIA, X., KARPATNE, A., DUGAN, H. A., CAREY, C. C., STACHELEK, J., WARD, N. K., ZHANG, Y., AND READ, J. S. Predicting lake surface water phosphorus dynamics using process-guided machine learning. 109136.
- [25] HE, E., XIE, Y., LIU, L., CHEN, W., JIN, Z., AND JIA, X. Physics guided neural networks for time-aware fairness: an application in crop yield prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (2023), vol. 37, pp. 14223–14231.
- [26] HIPSEY, M. R., BRUCE, L. C., BOON, C., BUSCH, B., CAREY, C. C., HAMILTON, D. P., HANSON, P. C., READ, J. S., DE SOUSA, E., WEBER, M., ET AL. A general lake model (glm 3.0) for linking with high-frequency sensor data from the global lake ecological observatory network (gleon). *Geoscientific Model Development* 12, 1 (2019), 473–523.
- [27] JIA, X., CHEN, S., XIE, Y., YANG, H., APPLING, A., OLIVER, S., AND JIANG, Z. Modeling reservoir release using pseudo-prospective learning and physical simulations to predict water temperature. In *Proceedings of the 2022 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)* (2022), SIAM, pp. 91–99.
- [28] JIA, X., KHANDELWAL, A., MULLA, D. J., PARDEY, P. G., AND KUMAR, V. Bringing automated, remote-sensed, machine learning methods to monitoring crop landscapes at scale. *Agricultural Economics* 50 (2019), 41–50.
- [29] JIA, X., WILLARD, J., KARPATNE, A., READ, J. S., ZWART, J. A., STEINBACH, M., AND KUMAR, V. Physics-guided machine learning for scientific discovery: An application in simulating lake temperature profiles. *ACM/IMS Transactions on Data Science* 2, 3 (2021), 1–26.
- [30] JIA, X., ZWART, J., SADLER, J., APPLING, A., OLIVER, S., MARKSTROM, S., WILLARD, J., XU, S., STEINBACH, M., READ, J., ET AL. Physics-guided recurrent graph model for predicting flow and temperature in river networks. In *Proceedings of the 2021 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)* (2021), SIAM, pp. 612–620.
- [31] JIN, X., KUMAR, L., LI, Z., FENG, H., XU, X., YANG, G., AND WANG, J. A review of data assimilation of remote sensing and crop models. *European Journal of Agronomy* 92 (2018), 141–152.
- [32] JONES, J. W., HOOGENDOORN, G., PORTER, C. H., BOOTE, K. J., BATCHELOR, W. D., HUNT, L., WILKENS, P. W., SINGH, U., GUSMAN, A. J., AND RITCHIE, J. T. The dssat cropping system model. *European journal of agronomy* 18, 3-4 (2003), 235–265.
- [33] KARPATNE, A., WATKINS, W., READ, J., AND KUMAR, V. Physics-guided neural networks (pgnn): An application in lake temperature modeling. *arXiv:1710.11431* (2017).
- [34] KHANDELWAL, A., XU, S., LI, X., JIA, X., STIENBACH, M., DUFFY, C., NIEBER, J., AND KUMAR, V. Physics guided machine learning methods for hydrology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.02854* (2020).
- [35] KINGMA, D. P., AND BA, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [36] KONAR, M., DALIN, C., SUWEIS, S., HANASAKI, N., RINALDO, A., AND RODRIGUEZ-ITURBE, I. Water for food: The global virtual water trade network. W05520.
- [37] LALL, U. Debates—the future of hydrological sciences: A (common) path forward? one water. one world. many climes. many souls. *Water Resources Research* (2014).
- [38] LICHENG, L., ZHOU, W., JIN, Z., TANG, J., JIA, X., JIANG, C., GUAN, K., PENG, B., XU, S., YANG, Y., ET AL. Estimating the autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration in the us crop fields using knowledge guided machine learning. In *AGU Fall Meeting 2021* (2021), AGU.
- [39] LIU, L., XU, S., TANG, J., GUAN, K., GRIFFIS, T. J., ERICKSON, M. D., FRIE, A. L., JIA, X., KIM, T., MILLER, L. T., ET AL. Kgml-ag: a modeling framework of knowledge-guided machine learning to simulate agroecosystems: a case study of estimating n<sub>2</sub> o emission using data from mesocosm experiments. *Geoscientific Model Development* 15, 7 (2022), 2839–2858.
- [40] MAI, G., HUANG, W., SUN, J., SONG, S., MISHRA, D., LIU, N., GAO, S., LIU, T., CONG, G., HU, Y., ET AL. On the opportunities and challenges of foundation models for geospatial artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06798* (2023).
- [41] MARKSTROM, S. L. *P2S-coupled Simulation with the Precipitation-Runoff Modeling System (PRMS) and the Stream Temperature Network (SNTemp) Models*. US Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey, 2012.
- [42] MBOW, C., ROSENZWEIG, C. E., BARIONI, L. G., BENTON, T. G., HERRERO, M., KRISHNAPILLAI, M., RUANE, A. C., LIWENGA, E., PRADHAN, P., RIVERA-FERRE,

- M. G., ET AL. Food security. Tech. rep., IPCC, 2020.
- [43] McDONNELL, J. J., AND BEVEN, K. Debates—the future of hydrological sciences: A (common) path forward? a call to action aimed at understanding velocities, celerities and residence time distributions of the headwater hydrograph. *Water Resources Research* 50, 6 (2014), 5342–5350.
- [44] MKHABELA, M., BULLOCK, P., RAJ, S., WANG, S., AND YANG, Y. Crop yield forecasting on the canadian prairies using modis ndvi data. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 151, 3 (2011), 385–393.
- [45] MOSHE, Z., METZGER, A., ELIDAN, G., KRATZERT, F., NEVO, S., AND EL-YANIV, R. Hydronets: Leveraging river structure for hydrologic modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00595* (2020).
- [46] OF SCIENCES ENGINEERING & MEDICINE, N. A., ET AL. *Improving crop estimates by integrating multiple data sources*. National Academies Press, 2018.
- [47] RAHMANI, F., LAWSON, K., OUYANG, W., APPLING, A., OLIVER, S., AND SHEN, C. Exploring the exceptional performance of a deep learning stream temperature model and the value of streamflow data. *Environmental Research Letters* 16, 2 (2021), 024025.
- [48] RASP, S., AND THUREY, N. Data-driven medium-range weather prediction with a resnet pretrained on climate simulations: A new model for weatherbench. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* 13, 2 (2021), e2020MS002405.
- [49] READ, E., CARR, L., DE CICCO, L., DUGAN, H., HANSON, P., HART, J., KREFT, J., READ, J., AND WINSLOW, L. Water quality data for national-scale aquatic research: The water quality portal. *Water Resources Research* 53 (2017).
- [50] READ, J. S., JIA, X., WILLARD, J., APPLING, A. P., ZWART, J. A., OLIVER, S. K., KARPATNE, A., HANSEN, G. J., HANSON, P. C., WATKINS, W., ET AL. Process-guided deep learning predictions of lake water temperature. *Water Resources Research* 55, 11 (2019), 9173–9190.
- [51] REGAN, R. S., ET AL. Description of the national hydrologic model for use with the precipitation-runoff modeling system (prms). Tech. rep., US Geological Survey, 2018.
- [52] ROLNICK, D., DONTI, P. L., KAACK, L. H., KOCHANSKI, K., LACOSTE, A., SANKARAN, K., ROSS, A. S., MILOJEVIC-DUPONT, N., JAQUES, N., WALDMAN-BROWN, A., ET AL. Tackling climate change with machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 55, 2 (2022), 1–96.
- [53] SANH, V., DEBUT, L., CHAUMOND, J., AND WOLF, T. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108* (2019).
- [54] SHEN, C., AND LAWSON, K. Applications of deep learning in hydrology. *Deep Learning for the Earth Sciences: A Comprehensive Approach to Remote Sensing, Climate Science, and Geosciences* (2021), 283–297.
- [55] SRINIVASAN, R., ZHANG, X., AND ARNOLD, J. Swat ungauged: hydrological budget and crop yield predictions in the upper mississippi river basin. *Transactions of the ASABE* 53, 5 (2010), 1533–1546.
- [56] SUN, A. Y., JIANG, P., MUDUNURU, M. K., AND CHEN, X. Explore spatio-temporal learning of large sample hydrology using graph neural networks. *Water Resources Research* 57, 12 (2021), e2021WR030394.
- [57] TAORI, R., GULRAJANI, I., ZHANG, T., DUBOIS, Y., LI, X., GUESTRIN, C., LIANG, P., AND HASHIMOTO, T. B. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca), 2023.
- [58] US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY. National water information system data available on the world wide web (usgs water data for the nation).
- [59] THEURER, F., VOOS, K., AND MILLER, W. Instream water temperature model. instream flow information paper 16. us fish wildl serv. *Div. Biol. Serv., Tech. Rep. FWS OBS 84*, 15 (1984), 11–42.
- [60] TOUVRON, H., LAVRIL, T., IZACARD, G., MARTINET, X., LACHAUX, M.-A., LACROIX, T., ROZIÈRE, B., GOYAL, N., HAMBRO, E., AZHAR, F., ET AL. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
- [61] VAN KLOMPENBURG, T., KASSAHUN, A., AND CATAL, C. Crop yield prediction using machine learning: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 177 (2020), 105709.
- [62] VASWANI, A., SHAZEER, N., PARMAR, N., USZKOREIT, J., JONES, L., GOMEZ, A. N., KAISER, L., AND POLOSUKHIN, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [63] WANG, Z., GAO, C., XIAO, C., AND SUN, J. Anypredict: Foundation model for tabular prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12081* (2023).
- [64] WILLARD, J. D., READ, J. S., APPLING, A. P., OLIVER, S. K., JIA, X., AND KUMAR, V. Predicting water temperature dynamics of unmonitored lakes with meta-transfer learning. *Water Resources Research* 57, 7 (2021), e2021WR029579.
- [65] WILLIAMSON, T. N., LANT, J. G., CLAGGETT, P. R., NYSTROM, E. A., MILLY, P. C., NELSON, H. L., HOFFMAN, S. A., COLARULLO, S. J., AND FISCHER, J. M. Summary of hydrologic modeling for the delaware river basin using the water availability tool for environmental resources (water). Tech. rep., US Geological Survey, 2015.
- [66] XIA, Y., ET AL. Continental-scale water and energy flux analysis and validation for north american land data assimilation system project phase 2 (nldas-2): 2. validation of model-simulated streamflow. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* (2012).
- [67] YANG, Q., LIU, L., ZHOU, J., GHOSH, R., PENG, B., GUAN, K., TANG, J., ZHOU, W., KUMAR, V., AND JIN, Z. A flexible and efficient knowledge-guided machine learning data assimilation (kgml-da) framework for agroecosystem prediction in the us midwest. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 299 (2023), 113880.
- [68] ZHANG, S., ROLLER, S., GOYAL, N., ARTETXE, M., CHEN, M., CHEN, S., DEWAN, C., DIAB, M., LI, X., LIN, X. V., ET AL. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068* (2022).
- [69] ZHAO, Y., ZHANG, H., SI, S., NAN, L., TANG, X., AND COHAN, A. Large language models are effective table-to-text generators, evaluators, and feedback providers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14987* (2023).
- [70] ZHOU, W., GUAN, K., PENG, B., TANG, J., JIN, Z., JIANG, C., GRANT, R., AND MEZBAHUDDIN, S. Quantifying carbon budget, crop yields and their responses to environmental variability using the ecosys model for us midwestern agroecosystems. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 307 (2021), 108521.
- [71] ZWART, J. A., OLIVER, S. K., WATKINS, W. D., SADLER, J. M., APPLING, A. P., CORSON-DOSCH, H. R., JIA, X., KUMAR, V., AND READ, J. S. Near-term forecasts of stream temperature using deep learning and data assimilation in support of management decisions. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 59, 2 (2023), 317–337.