



Report 302

October 2016

21st Century Changes in U.S. Heavy Precipitation Frequency Based on Resolved Atmospheric Patterns

Xiang Gao, C. Adam Schlosser, Paul O’Gorman, Erwan Monier and Dara Entekhabi

MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change combines cutting-edge scientific research with independent policy analysis to provide a solid foundation for the public and private decisions needed to mitigate and adapt to unavoidable global environmental changes. Being data-driven, the Joint Program uses extensive Earth system and economic data and models to produce quantitative analysis and predictions of the risks of climate change and the challenges of limiting human influence on the environment—essential knowledge for the international dialogue toward a global response to climate change.

To this end, the Joint Program brings together an interdisciplinary group from two established MIT research centers: the Center for Global Change Science (CGCS) and the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research (CEEPR). These two centers—along with collaborators from the Marine Biology Laboratory (MBL) at

Woods Hole and short- and long-term visitors—provide the united vision needed to solve global challenges.

At the heart of much of the program’s work lies MIT’s Integrated Global System Model. Through this integrated model, the program seeks to discover new interactions among natural and human climate system components; objectively assess uncertainty in economic and climate projections; critically and quantitatively analyze environmental management and policy proposals; understand complex connections among the many forces that will shape our future; and improve methods to model, monitor and verify greenhouse gas emissions and climatic impacts.

This reprint is intended to communicate research results and improve public understanding of global environment and energy challenges, thereby contributing to informed debate about climate change and the economic and social implications of policy alternatives.

—*Ronald G. Prinn and John M. Reilly,*
Joint Program Co-Directors

21st Century Changes in U.S. Heavy Precipitation Frequency Based on Resolved Atmospheric Patterns

Xiang Gao^{1,2}, C. Adam Schlosser¹, Paul O’Gorman³, Erwan Monier¹ and Dara Entekhabi⁴

Abstract: Gridded precipitation-gauge observations and global atmospheric reanalysis are combined to develop an analogue method for detecting the occurrence of heavy precipitation events based on the prevailing large-scale atmospheric conditions. Combinations of different atmospheric variables for circulation features (geopotential height and wind vector) and moisture plumes (surface specific humidity, column precipitable water, and precipitable water up to 500hPa) are examined to construct the analogue schemes for the winter (DJF) of the Pacific Coast California (PCCA) and the summer (JJA) of the Midwestern United States (MWST). The detection diagnostics of various analogue schemes are calibrated with 27-yr (1979–2005) and then validated with 9-yr (2006–2014) NASA Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for Research and Applications (MERRA). All of the analogue schemes are found to significantly improve upon MERRA precipitation in characterizing the number and interannual variations of observed heavy precipitation events in the MWST which is one of weakest regions for MERRA summer precipitation. When evaluated with the late 20th century simulations from an ensemble of climate models participating in the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5), all analogue schemes produce model medians of heavy precipitation frequency that are more consistent with observations and have smaller inter-model discrepancies when compared with the model-based precipitation. Further, the performances of analogue schemes with vector winds are comparable to those of geopotential height, and no analogue scheme with one of three water vapor content variables is clearly superior to another. Under two radiative forcing scenarios (Representative Concentration Pathways 4.5 and 8.5), the CMIP5-based analogue schemes produce a trend in the occurrence of heavy events through the 21st century consistent with the model-based precipitation, but with smaller inter-model disparity. The strongest reduction in the disparity of the results is seen for the RCP8.5 scenario. The median trends in DJF heavy precipitation frequency for PCCA are positive, but for JJA heavy event frequency over the MWST region, the median trends are slightly negative. Overall, the presented analyses highlight the potential of the analogue as a powerful diagnostic tool for model deficiencies and its complementarity to an evaluation that considers modeled precipitation alone to assess heavy precipitation frequency. The consistency found here between projections from analogues and model precipitation increases confidence in projected heavy precipitation frequency changes in a warming climate.

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. DATASETS	3
2.1 OBSERVED PRECIPITATION	3
2.2 NASA-MERRA REANALYSIS	3
2.3 CLIMATE MODEL SIMULATIONS	3
2.4 DATA PROCESSING	4
3. CALIBRATION AND VALIDATION OF ANALOGUE METHOD	4
3.1 SYNOPTIC CONDITION COMPOSITES	5
3.2 ANALOGUE DETECTION DIAGNOSTICS	6
3.3 CALIBRATION AND VALIDATION	7
4. SIMULATED LATE 20TH CENTURY HEAVY PRECIPITATION FREQUENCY	12
5. PROJECTED FUTURE CHANGES IN HEAVY PRECIPITATION FREQUENCY	15
6. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS	20
7. REFERENCES	22

1 Joint Program of the Science and Policy of Global Change, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
2 Corresponding author (Email: xgao304@mit.edu)
3 Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
4 Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

1. Introduction

Over the last two decades, the analysis of extreme precipitation events has attracted much attention because of their significant impacts on natural and human systems. In particular, many studies have shown that extreme precipitation events are likely to respond substantially to anthropogenically enhanced greenhouse forcing with changes in their frequency and intensity (Wehner, 2005; Kharin *et al.*, 2007; Sun *et al.*, 2007; Kao and Ganguly, 2011; Min *et al.*, 2011; Pall *et al.*, 2011; Dominguez *et al.*, 2012; Kharin *et al.*, 2013; Sillmann *et al.*, 2013; Monier and Gao, 2015). Such shifts could have dramatic ecological, economic, and sociological consequences (Field, 2012). Understanding how extreme precipitation events will change in the future—and enabling consistent and robust projections—is therefore important for the public and policy makers as we prepare for consequences of climate change.

Simulations with global coupled ocean–atmosphere general circulation models (CGCMs) forced with projected greenhouse gas and aerosol emissions are the primary tools for assessing possible future changes in climate extremes. However, previous studies have shown that climate models generally do not correctly reproduce the frequency and intensity distribution of present-day precipitation (Dai, 2006; Sun *et al.*, 2006; Wilcox and Donner, 2007; DeAngelis *et al.*, 2013). In future projections with comprehensive climate models, studies find that there can be a wide disagreement about the sign of change or the rate of increase in precipitation extremes among models, particularly in the tropics (Sillmann *et al.*, 2013; O’Gorman, 2012; Kharin *et al.*, 2007; Sun *et al.*, 2007; Kharin *et al.*, 2013). These results suggest that model differences appear to be the main source of uncertainty in the projected changes in precipitation extremes (Kharin *et al.*, 2007). Lack of skill in climate models regional distributions of precipitation is largely attributed to the bulk description of poorly understood processes such as moist convection and topographical features at the sub-grid scale (1–10 km). How such processes and features are parameterized or represented with typical coarse spatial resolution of climate models (~100 km or more) varies considerably among models, and this can have a large effect on the precipitation intensity distribution (e.g., Wilcox and Donner, 2007).

On the other hand, it has been shown that climate models simulate fairly realistic large-scale atmospheric circulation features associated with heavy precipitation events compared to observations, mostly because these features represent solutions of the common well-understood and numerically resolved equations. DeAngelis *et al.* (2013) found that climate models from phase 3 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP3) capture realis-

tically the large-scale physical mechanisms linked to extreme precipitation over North America although there exist biases in intensity of heavy and extreme precipitation among the models. Kawazoe and Gutowski Jr (2013) showed that the climate models from phase 5 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5) produce very heavy precipitation in the upper Mississippi region under the same synoptic conditions seen in the observations. Based on regional climate model simulations of contemporary and future climates, Gutowski *et al.* (2008) assessed the synoptic circulations con-

ducive to the extreme cold-season precipitation in the central United States. They showed that the model reproduces the observed synoptic conditions for extremes even though it exhibits difficulty in simulating the precipitation intensity, and such circulation behavior is rather robust in the face of climate change. These results suggest that we can place more confidence in the quality of the circulation simulation associated with extreme precipitation than in the resulting precipitation amount. In other words, analyses of such resolved atmospheric circulation features accompanying extreme events may give more robust indication or projections of their occurrence and changes. This has been, in fact, illustrated in several studies. Hewitson and Crane (2006) demonstrated that precipitation downscaled from synoptic-scale atmospheric circulation changes in multiple GCMs can provide a more consistent projection of precipitation change than the GCM’s precipitation. More recently, Gao *et al.* (2014) developed an “analogue method” to detect the occurrence of heavy precipitation events over the United States. The method employs composites to identify prevailing large-scale atmospheric conditions associated with widespread, heavy precipitation events at local scale. They found that the method, when applied to an ensemble of CMIP5 twentieth-century climate model simulations, produces multi-model medians of heavy precipitation frequency that are more consistent with observations and have smaller inter-model spreads as opposed to using model-simulated precipitation.

This study is a continuation of the previous work on the development and evaluation of analogue methods for detecting heavy precipitation events under contemporary climate conditions (Gao *et al.*, 2014). The motivations of this study are to answer such questions as follows: Is the superior performance of the analogue method exemplified in Gao *et al.* (2014) specific to certain large-scale atmospheric variables or robust across choices of alternative variables?

How does the method apply for projecting heavy precipitation frequency in the future? Here we expand upon the analogue method presented in Gao *et al.* (2014) with additional atmospheric fields and examine the perfor-

mances of the augmented methods in quantifying the present-day heavy precipitation frequency and their projected changes in response to different anthropogenic forcing scenarios using CMIP5 model simulations. In Gao *et al.* (2014), the analogue detection diagnostics for heavy precipitation are constructed with the characterizations of 500hPa geopotential height and vertical motion as well as total precipitable water in combination. Preliminary examination of CMIP5 model simulations under future emission scenarios indicates that the overall increasing trend of geopotential height associated with climate warming dilutes the anomalous dipole structure (see Figures 3–4 in Gao *et al.*, 2014) based against the current climate, thus making the use of geopotential-height anomalies problematic within the analogue framework for future climates (shown in Section 3b). Furthermore, the increases in precipitation extremes as the climate warms has been widely found to be associated with atmospheric water vapor content increase (Allen and Ingram, 2002; Pall *et al.*, 2007). O’Gorman and Schneider (2009) examined the scaling of the total condensation rate in extreme precipitation events and found that the amount of near-surface or low-level water vapor may be more relevant to precipitation extremes than the total column water vapor. Given these considerations, herein we evaluate how the performance of the analogue scheme constructed with 500hPa horizontal wind vectors compares as opposed to 500hPa geopotential height (anomalies). We are also interested in whether the analogue scheme is sensitive to the use of different variables to represent atmospheric water vapor content relevant to heavy precipitation as the climate warms, such as near-surface specific humidity, lower-tropospheric precipitable water as represented by precipitable water up to certain level (500hPa is used here due to high orography in some regions), and total precipitable water.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the datasets (observations, reanalysis, and climate model simulations). The development, calibration and validation of the expanded analogue schemes are given in section 3. The evaluation of the expanded analogue schemes with the CMIP5 late 20th century historical climate experiment is discussed in section 4. Section 5 presents comparisons of the projected changes in heavy precipitation frequency under two CMIP5 radiative forcing scenarios based on the augmented analogue schemes and model-simulated precipitation, respectively. Summary and discussions are provided in section 6.

2. Datasets

2.1 Observed precipitation

Daily precipitation observations were obtained from the NOAA CPC (Climate Prediction Center) unified rain

gauge-based analysis (Higgins *et al.*, 2000b). These observations, spanning from 1948 to present, are confined to the continental United States land areas and gridded to a $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$ resolution from roughly 10,000 daily station reports. The analysis was produced using an optimal interpolation scheme and went through several types of quality control including duplicate station and buddy checks, among others. Previous assessments of gridded analyses and station observations over the United States have shown that gridded analyses are reliable for studies of fluctuations in daily precipitation as long as the station coverage is sufficiently dense and rigorous quality control procedures are applied to the daily data (Higgins *et al.*, 2007).

2.2 NASA-MERRA reanalysis

We use Modern Era Retrospective-analysis for Research and Applications (MERRA) (Rienecker *et al.*, 2011) to analyze the large-scale atmospheric circulations associated with the heavy precipitation, and to calibrate and validate the analogue schemes. The MERRA use the GEOS5 atmospheric circulation model, the Catchment land surface model, and an enhanced three-dimensional variational data assimilation (3DVAR) analysis algorithm. The data assimilation system of GEOS-5 implements Incremental Analysis Updates (IAU) procedure in which the analysis correction is applied to the forecast model states gradually. This has ameliorated the spin-down problem with precipitation and greatly improved aspects of stratospheric circulation. MERRA’s physical parameterizations have also been enhanced so that the shock of adjusting the model system to the assimilated data is reduced. In addition, MERRA incorporates observations from NASA’s Earth Observing Systems (EOS) satellites, particularly those from EOS/Aqua, in its assimilation framework. The MERRA is updated in real time, spanning the period from 1979 to the present. The three-dimensional 3 hourly atmospheric diagnostics on 42 pressure levels are available at a 1.25° resolution.

2.3 Climate model simulations

We use the climate model simulations from the CMIP5 historical experiment (years 1850–2005) and experiments for the 21st century (years 2006–2100) employing two different radiative forcing scenarios. The historical runs were forced with observed temporal variations of anthropogenic and natural forcings and, for the first time, time-evolving land cover (Taylor *et al.*, 2012). The future scenarios, called Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs, Moss *et al.*, 2010), are designed to accommodate a wide range of possibilities in social and economical development consistent with specific radiative forcing paths. The estimated radiative forcing values by year 2100 are 4.5 Wm^{-2} and 8.5 Wm^{-2} in the two experiments con-

sidered here, namely RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. In comparison with Table 1 of Gao *et al.* (2014), model CMCC-CM and MIROC-ESM do not provide the near-surface specific humidity and vertical velocity in two RCP experiments, respectively. Removal of these two results in a total of 18 models that provide all the essential meteorological variables for the analogue schemes across the three experiments considered here. The models are ACCESS1-0, ACCESS1-3, BCC-CSM1-1, BCC-CSM1-1-m, BNU-ESM, CanESM2, CCSM4, CNRM-CM5, GFDL-CM3, GFDL-ESM2G, GFDL-ESM2M, IPSL-CM5A-LR, IPSL-CM5A-MR, IPSL-CM5B-LR, MIROC5, MIROC-ESM-CHEM, MRICGCM3, and NorESM1-M. In this study, only one ensemble member from each model is analyzed.

2.4 Data processing

The same set of meteorological variables are assembled or derived from both the MERRA reanalysis and climate model simulations, including 500hPa geopotential height, 500hPa vector winds, 500hPa vertical velocity, near-surface specific humidity, total precipitable water, precipitable water up to 500hPa and vertically integrated water vapor flux vector up to 500hPa. To account for the regions of high orography, vertical integration is performed up to 500hPa instead of 850 hPa. The vertically integrated water vapor flux is employed here to illustrate the moisture transport feeding the heavy precipitation events in local areas (but is not used in the development of analogue schemes). The more relevant diagnostic is vapor convergence. However, its estimation based on reanalysis is problematic due to the required total mass balance correction.

The 3 hourly MERRA atmospheric diagnostics are first averaged into daily. All the daily fields, including the precipitation observation as well as the precipitation and meteorological fields from MERRA reanalysis and each CMIP5 climate model, are then regridded to the common $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$ resolution via area averaging. Such conservative regridding procedure has been shown to especially improve agreement between observed and simulated extreme precipitation metrics (Chen and Knutson, 2008). The period with the greatest overlap among the CPC observations, MERRA reanalysis, and CMIP5 historical experiment is 1 January 1979 – 31 December 2005. So at each grid cell, we convert the meteorological fields of each data source to normalized anomalies based on their respective seasonal climatological mean and standard deviation of this 27-yr period. The same seasonal climatological means and standard deviations are also employed to obtain the normalized anomalies for the meteorological fields of MERRA reanalysis from 2006 to 2014 and CMIP5 two RCP experiments from 2006 to 2100. We use the CPC observed precipitation to identify the heavy precipitation events, while the MERRA reanalysis is employed to construct the large-scale composites of atmospheric patterns asso-

ciated with identified heavy precipitation events, and to calibrate and validate the analogue schemes. The present analogue approach allows for the characterization of the heavy precipitation frequency only. Due to the limits of deterministic predictability of weather, the reproduction of the exact heavy precipitation date is not expected when this method is applied to the CMIP5 historical simulations. Rather, our intent is to examine the collective performances of the CMIP5 models in detecting the cumulative occurrence of the heavy precipitation events under contemporary climate, to document their potential changes as climate warms—over a given spatial and temporal domain of interest—based on prevailing large-scale physical mechanisms, and to evaluate how such analogue approach compares with observations and traditional model-simulated precipitation.

3. Calibration and Validation of Analogue Method

In this study, a precipitation event is a daily amount above 1 mm/day at one observational or model grid at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$. A heavy precipitation event at any gridcell is defined as the daily amount exceeding the 95th percentile of all precipitation events at that gridcell during a specific period (season). The 95th percentile of the distribution from the precipitation observation based on contemporary climate (1979–2005) is used to extract the heavy precipitation events for MERRA reanalysis from 1979 to 2014 as well as for CMIP5 model simulations of historical experiment from 1979 to 2005 and RCP experiments from 2006 to 2100. We then pool all extracted events at all data gridcells within the regions of our interest from the observations, MERRA reanalysis and CMIP5 model simulations separately. It should be noted that at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$ grid resolution, we do not account for the “widespread” heavy precipitation events on any particular day as we did at $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$ grid resolution in Gao *et al.* (2014). The MERRA reanalysis large-scale atmospheric fields from 1979 to 2005 will be used to develop and calibrate the analogue schemes, and from 2006 to 2014 to validate them.

We focus our analyses on two regions: Pacific Coast California (PCCA), where heavy precipitation events occur most frequently in the winter season (DJF), and the Midwestern United States (MWST), where heavy precipitation events dominate mostly in the summer season (Figure 1 in Gao *et al.*, 2014). The PCCA, a domain bounded by 123.75° – 118.75° W and 33° – 41° N at the $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$ resolution (red rectangle in Figure 1a), is a typical region where large-scale flows and complex topography may contribute to the occurrence of heavy precipitation events. The missing values along the land-sea boundary results in 8 gridcells from a total of 15 gridcells in red rectangle. For the Midwestern United States, we focus on the northern




Figure 1. Composite fields as normalized anomalies for the Southern Pacific Coast (California, PCCA) in DJF: a) 500hPa geopotential height (shaded, h_{500}) and the vertical integrated water vapor flux vector up to 500hPa (arrow) based on 165 heavy precipitation events at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$; b) 500hPa vertical velocity (contour, w_{500}) and total precipitable water (shaded, tpw); c) and d) are same as a) and b) but for the Mid-western United States in JJA based on 566 heavy precipitation events at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$. The red rectangles depict our study regions.

US Great Plains, a region bounded by 98.75° – 88.75° W and 39° – 45° N at the $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$ resolution (20 gridcells shown as red rectangle in Figure 1c), including the states of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. This region is shown to be representative of an area of relatively high summer precipitation variance compared to elsewhere over the continent (Dirmeyer and Kinter III, 2010). Outstanding recent cases of large-scale flooding in this region include those of late spring and summer of 1993 and 2008.

3.1 Synoptic condition composites

We extract the 165 and 566 heavy precipitation events from the observations of 1979–2005 at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$ for the

DJF of PCCA and JJA of MWST, respectively. We examine various atmospheric fields, which provide insight into the preferred synoptic conditions conducive to heavy precipitation events. **Figure 1** shows the composites as standardized anomalies for two regions, produced by averaging over the observed event days from the MERRA reanalysis.

For the PCCA region, the composite shows heavy events occurring when a deep trough develops around the eastern North Pacific Ocean and an anomalous cyclonic circulation center is located to the south, promoting a more pronounced southwesterly flow of moist air from near Hawaii to the west coast of the United States (Figure 1a). Also evident are moister air and strong upward motion

centered over the northern California and Nevada, but extending into the interior of the western United States (Figure 1b). Studies have demonstrated that major winter precipitation events along the Pacific Coast are mostly associated with the “Pineapple Express” (Higgins *et al.*, 2000a; Warner *et al.*, 2012). Compared with the Figures 1a and 1b, the standardized anomalies of all the meteorological fields is weaker for the Midwestern United States. Nevertheless, the presence of lower heights to the west and higher heights to the east of the analysis region is still evident (Figure 1c). A key ingredient for heavy precipitation in the region is the transport of warm, moist air from the Gulf of Mexico north-northeastward across the North Central States, mainly by the general circulation as the period is not dominated by intense tropical cyclone activity (Dirmeyer and Kinter III, 2010). The origins of this moisture plume may extend farther south and east toward the Caribbean Sea. The composites exhibit characteristics of the “Maya Express” that fetches moisture from the subtropics or tropics, originating as evaporation from the Gulf of Mexico, eastern Mexico, or in particular the Caribbean Sea, and links into the Great Plains low-level jet, creating a much longer “atmospheric river” of moisture (Dirmeyer and Kinter III, 2010). Moist air and strong upward motion are also clearly observed, centered around our study region (Figure 1d).

3.2 Analogue detection diagnostics

In Gao *et al.* (2014), 500hPa geopotential height (herein after referred to as h_{500}), 500hPa vertical velocity (w_{500}), and total-column precipitable water (“tpw”) in combination have been used to construct the analogue scheme for detecting the occurrence of heavy precipitation events. Examination of CMIP5 model simulations under future emission scenarios indicates that the overall increasing trend of geopotential height associated with climate warming disrupts the anomalous dipole structure with respect to current climate conditions, making its application in analogue methods for future climates problematic (Figure 2). In contrast, the distinct patterns of composite horizontal wind vector components over the study region are fairly well preserved between the current and future climates. Here we examine the alternative analogue scheme constructed with 500hPa horizontal winds (uv_{500}) in place of geopotential height. Besides the total precipitable water, we also assess the performances of the analogue schemes with the use of two other atmospheric water vapor content variables relevant to heavy precipitation, namely near-surface specific humidity (q_{2m}) and precipitable water up to 500hPa (tpw_{500}). The synoptic behaviors exhibited by the composites of three atmospheric water vapor content variables and 500hPa vertical velocity are also found to be fairly consistent between the contemporary and projected climates (not

shown). This suggests that there are no apparent shifts in circulation regimes of these atmospheric variables (except for h_{500}) associated with heavy precipitation, and can thus be applied for assessing the heavy precipitation frequency changes in a future climate. In total, we examine six combinations of atmospheric variables to construct the analogue schemes, hereafter referred to as:

$hw_{500}q_{2m}$ = 500hPa height and vertical wind, as well as near-surface specific humidity

$hw_{500}tpw_{500}$ = 500hPa height and vertical wind, as well as total precipitable water to 500hPa

$hw_{500}tpw$ = 500hPa height and vertical wind, as well as total-column precipitable water

$uvw_{500}q_{2m}$ = 500hPa horizontal and vertical winds, as well as near-surface specific humidity

$uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$ = 500hPa horizontal and vertical winds, and total precipitable water to 500hPa

$uvw_{500}tpw$ = 500hPa horizontal and vertical winds, as well as total-column precipitable water

We employ two metrics, “hotspot” and spatial anomaly correlation coefficient (SACC), to characterize the distinct synoptic conditions conducive to heavy precipitation events shown in composites (Gao *et al.*, 2014). The “hotspot” metric diagnoses the extent to which the composite of each atmospheric field is representative of any individual event. It involves the calculation of sign count at each grid cell by recording the number of individual members whose standardized anomalies have consistent signs with the composite. Hotspots are identified as the grid cells where the members used to construct the composites exhibit strong sign consistency with the composite itself (i.e. the larger sign counts). SACC is calculated between the MERRA atmospheric fields and the corresponding composites for each day of DJF or JJA from 1979 to 2005. The exact region used for SACC calculation is arbitrary, but its boundaries are chosen such that the coherent structures of the composite fields are captured and centered. We then assess ten ranges of SACC thresholds from 0.0 to 1.0 with an interval of 0.1. We tested the SACC calculations for regions with small differences in their size and aspect ratio, but find that the resulting optimal thresholds (described later) are insensitive to these differences for all the analogue combinations examined.

We follow the same “criteria of detection” for the analogue scheme $hw_{500}tpw$ in Gao *et al.* (2014), but adapt them to the use of horizontal vector winds and other water vapor content variables, simply by treating two horizontal wind components as two variables corresponding to the trough and ridge of geopotential height. The criteria are: 1) At least 3 out of 4 variables have consistent signs with the corresponding composites over the selected hotspot




Figure 2. Comparison of composite fields of 500hPa geopotential height (left column, h_{500}), 500hPa zonal (middle column, u_{500}) and meridional (right column, v_{500}) wind as normalized anomalies from MERRA reanalysis (top row) based on 566 heavy precipitation events and from an example of CMIP5 models (GFDL-ESM2M) based on extracted heavy precipitation events of 1979 to 2005 (historical) and 2067 to 2093 (RCP8.5 scenario) using models 95th percentiles of 1979–2005 for the Mid-Western United States in JJA.

grid cells; 2) at least 1 out of 3 variables has SACC larger than the determined thresholds; and 3) All the SACCs have to be positive. This last criterion is only applicable for DJF of PCCA as we find that it is too strict for JJA of MWST (resulting in too few heavy precipitation events in calibration).

3.3 Calibration and validation

For each of the six analogue schemes, we employ automatic calibration to determine the cutoff values for the number of hotspots and thresholds for SACC of all relevant atmospheric fields simultaneously (i.e. h , w , and tpw). The calibration is performed by running different combinations of the number of hotspots and ranges of SACC values across all relevant atmospheric fields, and

assessing the daily MERRA atmospheric fields in DJF or JJA from 1979 to 2005 to determine whether the “criteria of detection” described above is met for that day. If so, the day is considered as having a heavy precipitation event occurring. We use the “confusion matrix” commonly employed in the binary classification as goodness-of-fit criteria to evaluate how well the analogue scheme reproduces the observed heavy precipitation events. The same measures are also employed to assess how well the analogue schemes with optimized threshold values apply for the independent MERRA reanalysis from year 2006 to 2014, compared to the observed and MERRA precipitation.

The confusion matrix features four values, namely, the number of true positives (TP), false positives (FP, type I

error), true negatives (TN), and false negatives (FN, type II error). We employ five more metrics as performance measures derived from these four numbers:

- i) True positive rate (TPR)

$$\text{TPR} = \text{TP} / (\text{TP} + \text{FN})$$

- ii) False positive rate (FPR)

$$\text{FPR} = \text{FP} / (\text{FP} + \text{TN})$$

- iii) Precision (PPV)

$$\text{PPV} = \text{TP} / (\text{TP} + \text{FP})$$

- iv) Accuracy (ACC)

$$\text{ACC} = (\text{TP} + \text{TN}) / (\text{TP} + \text{FP} + \text{TN} + \text{FN})$$

- v) F1 score is the harmonic mean of precision and true positive rate and calculated as

$$\text{F1} = 2 * \text{TP} / (2 * \text{TP} + \text{FP} + \text{FN})$$

Accuracy, though widely used to evaluate the robustness of a model for making predictions, is not a reliable metric for the real performance of a classifier, because it will yield misleading results if the data set is unbalanced (that is, when the number of samples in different classes vary greatly) just like the case of extreme versus non-extreme events. The additional meaningful measures to evaluate such a classifier are precision and true positive rate, which can be thought of as measures of a classifier exactness and completeness, respectively. A low precision and low true positive rate indicate a large number of false positive and false negative, respectively. F1 score conveys the balance between the precision and the true positive rate. In our study, the optimal cut-off values for the number of hotspots and thresholds for SACC are achieved by producing the observed number of heavy precipitation events (equal to TP+FP) with the best TPR. In this case, FP is equal to FN, and F1 score is equal to PPV and TPR.

Table 1 shows performance measures of using various analogue schemes to detect heavy precipitation events in DJF of PCCA during calibration (1979–2005) and validation (2006–2014) periods. MERRA precipitation has better performance metrics than the analogue schemes, with higher TPRs, PPVs, and F1 scores, slightly higher ACCs and slightly lower FPRs. The TPRs, PPVs, F1 scores, ACCs, and FPRs during the calibration period are 53–58%, 53–58%, 53–58%, 94% and 3% across analogue schemes in comparison with 58%, 66%, 62%, 95%, and 2% for MERRA precipitation. Performances during the validation period are worse than those during the calibration period for both MERRA precipitation and analogue schemes, with lower TPRs, PPVs, and F1 scores. The FPRs and ACCs are fairly insensitive measures with only minor changes. The TPRs, PPVs, F1 scores, ACCs, and FPRs are 35–40%, 43–51%, 39–44%, 94% and 3% across analogue schemes in comparison with 42%, 53%, 47%, 94%, and

2% for MERRA precipitation. Little changes in ACC values across two periods and two analyses (MERRA precipitation versus analogue schemes) are mostly attributed to our unbalanced data set with non extreme events (and thus TN) occupying the large portion, while little changes in FPR values are associated with both the dominance of TN and the same order of detected total events (and thus FP) by two analyses. Among the three water vapor content analogues, there is no superior choice in terms of performance. During the calibration period, the schemes with tpw and tpw₅₀₀ perform similarly and slightly better than those with q_{2m}. During the validation period, the schemes with q_{2m} display a marginal improvement over those with tpw and tpw₅₀₀. Furthermore, the analogue schemes with uv₅₀₀ have comparable performance to their geopotential height counterpart during both periods.

Table 2 shows similar statistics to Table 1, but for JJA of MWST. Immediately evident is poorer performance of MERRA precipitation for MWST than for PCCA during both periods, with much lower TPRs (35% and 26% decrease for calibration and validation, respectively), ACCs (14% and 20% decrease), and F1 scores (27% and 20% decrease). However, PPVs are higher because they are mostly associated with the partition of predicted heavy precipitation events between TP and FP. Note that MERRA precipitation gives a much lower number of heavy precipitation events (30% and 20%) in comparison with the observation. Nevertheless, the relatively larger portion of TP results in higher PPVs. Bosilovich (2013) examined the interannual variations of MERRA summertime precipitation over the United States and found out that the Midwest is one of the weakest regions where significant biases exist for the seasonal mean. In contrast, the analogue schemes appear fairly robust across two regions in terms of TPRs, PPVs, and F1 scores, with comparable and better values for MWST during the calibration and validation period, respectively. The analogue schemes also tend to underestimate the number of heavy precipitation events during the validation period, but to a much lesser extent than MERRA precipitation. Both analogue schemes and MERRA precipitation exhibit performance degradation during the validation period, with lower TPRs, ACCs, PPVs, and F1 scores, but higher FPRs than those during the calibration period. All analogue schemes outperform MERRA precipitation during both periods in terms of TPRs and F1 scores. However, FPRs are higher due to the larger FP from the analogues than from MERRA precipitation, associated with the large difference in their detected total events (566 versus 169 for calibration and 50 versus 177 – 210 for validation). As the number of “tagged” occurrences increases, both TPR and FPR are expected to increase accordingly. The ACCs remain fairly comparable between two analyses as they are largely dominated by TN. Similarly, there is no clearly

Table 1. Calibration and validation statistics with different combinations of atmospheric variables to construct analogue diagnostics for DJF of PCCA. FNR and TNR are not included in the table as they can be simply derived from TPR and FPR, respectively. The numbers highlighted in light gray indicate the better performance in analogue than in MERRA precipitation. The numbers highlighted in dark gray indicate the total number of observed heavy precipitation events.

Scheme	TPR	FPR	ACC	PPV	F1 Score	Total Events
1979–2005 (165)						
MERRA	0.582	0.022	0.951	0.658	0.618	146
hw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.539	0.033	0.938	0.539	0.539	165
hw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	0.564	0.032	0.941	0.564	0.564	165
hw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.570	0.031	0.942	0.570	0.570	165
uvw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.533	0.034	0.937	0.533	0.533	165
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	0.564	0.032	0.941	0.564	0.564	165
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.576	0.031	0.943	0.576	0.576	165
2006–2014 (48)						
MERRA	0.417	0.024	0.943	0.526	0.465	38
hw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.375	0.022	0.942	0.514	0.434	44
hw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	0.375	0.029	0.936	0.450	0.409	40
hw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.354	0.030	0.933	0.425	0.386	40
uvw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.396	0.026	0.94	0.487	0.437	39
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	0.354	0.026	0.937	0.459	0.400	37
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.375	0.025	0.940	0.486	0.423	37

Table 2. Same as Table 1, but for JJA of MWST.

Scheme	TPR	FPR	ACC	PPV	F1 Score	Total Events
1979–2005 (566)						
MERRA	0.226	0.021	0.8071	0.757	0.348	169
hw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.549	0.133	0.795	0.549	0.549	566
hw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	0.564	0.129	0.801	0.564	0.564	566
hw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.560	0.130	0.800	0.560	0.560	566
uvw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.572	0.126	0.805	0.572	0.572	566
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	0.571	0.127	0.804	0.571	0.571	566
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.567	0.128	0.803	0.567	0.567	566
2006–2014 (244)						
MERRA	0.16	0.023	0.739	0.74	0.265	50
hw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.410	0.132	0.733	0.565	0.475	177
hw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	451	0.137	0.742	0.579	0.507	190
hw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.459	0.142	0.740	0.574	0.510	195
uvw ₅₀₀ Q _{2m}	0.434	0.130	0.742	0.582	0.497	182
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw ₅₀₀	0.484	0.158	0.737	0.562	0.520	210
uvw ₅₀₀ tpw	0.475	0.154	0.737	0.563	0.515	206

superior choice of analogues associated with three water vapor content representations in terms of various performance measures. The analogue group with uv₅₀₀ shows marginal improvements over the the group with h₅₀₀ during both periods based on most of the performance measures, but the overall differences in the performance metrics among all analogue schemes are relatively small.

We also examine the performances of various analogue schemes in depicting the interannual variations of seasonal heavy precipitation frequency from 1979 to 2005 (calibration) and 2006 to 2014 (validation) as opposed to the observation and MERRA precipitation at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$ over two study regions (**Figure 3** and **Figure 4**). For the DJF season, the number of heavy precipitation events




Figure 3. Comparisons of interannual variations of seasonal heavy precipitation frequency obtained from various analogue schemes, MERRA precipitation (MERRA), and the observation (obs) for DJF of PCCA during the calibration (1979–2005) and validation (2006–2014) period.

for each “year” is computed based on the numbers in December of current year and the numbers in January and February of the subsequent year (thus, the results for January and February of 1979 and in December of 2014 are not included). So December 1979–February 1980 is labeled on graph as 1979, and so on. For PCCA, the analogue schemes and MERRA precipitation reproduce the observed interannual variations of winter heavy precipitation frequencies reasonably well with the temporal correlation above 0.75 and a root mean square error (RMSE) of less than 3 days during the calibration period (Figure 3a and 3b). All the analogue schemes outper-

form MERRA precipitation with higher correlations and smaller RMSEs. During the validation period, the analogue group with h_{500} exhibits some degradation in these statistics, but the analogue group with uv_{500} consistently shows better performances than MERRA precipitation. More specifically, we find that both MERRA precipitation and all or some analogue schemes capture more salient multi-year peaks, such as the heavy precipitation that occurred during February 1986, winter 1992–1993, 1996–1997, 2005–2006, and 2010–2011 as well as valleys for winter 1984–1985, 1986–1987, 1988–1989, 1993–1994, 2000–2001 and 2008–2009. Both analyses




Figure 4. Same as Figure 3, but for JJA of MWST the CMIP5 model precipitation (all at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$ resolution).

strongly underestimate the observed number of events for winter 1982–1983 (a very strong ENSO year) and winter 2004–2005. MERRA precipitation also significantly underestimates the observed number of events for winter 1979–1980, 1994–1995, and 2009–2010, but overestimates that for winter 1997–1998.

In comparison with the PCCA, MERRA precipitation in the MWST exhibits rather poor performance in tracking year-to-year variations of heavy events with lower temporal correlation (0.52 versus 0.76 for validation and 0.58 versus 0.72 for calibration) and much larger RMSE (15.65 versus 2.75 days and 22.90 versus 2.45 days). Immediately evident is its significant underestimation of heavy events throughout the entire 27-year period. The performanc-

es of various analogue schemes are slightly worse than for the PCCA with lower correlations (0.62 – 0.75) and larger RMSEs (6 – 10 days). Both MERRA precipitation and analogue schemes exhibit clear degradations during the validation period in representing the magnitude of heavy precipitation frequency with much larger RMSEs than during the calibration period, but capture rather well the observed interannual variability with higher correlations. We see that various analogue schemes (especially with uv_{500}) capture the heavy precipitation of 1990, 1993, and 2010 as well as years with relatively low frequency of events such as 1988, 1991, 1997, 2003, and 2012. The analogue schemes significantly underestimate the observed number of events for 2007–2008 and 2014, but overestimate the 1980 and 1987 number of events. Nevertheless,




Figure 5. Comparisons of the number of winter season (DJF) heavy precipitation events in PCCA estimated from CMIP5 model-simulated precipitation and various analogue schemes applied to CMIP5 model-simulated atmospheric synoptic conditions during the period of 1979 to 2005. The whisker plot shows the minimum, the lower and upper quartile, median, and the maximum across 18 CMIP5 models. The dashed and dash-dot lines indicate the number of heavy precipitation events identified from the Higgins *et al.* (2000a) gridded observations and MERRA precipitation at $2.5^\circ \times 2^\circ$, respectively. The 95th percentile of 1979–2005 observed precipitation is used to extract precipitation-based heavy precipitation events from CMIP5 and MERRA.

all the analogue schemes greatly improve upon the MERRA precipitation with higher correlations and much lower RMSEs across a) the analogue scheme group with geopotential height (hw_{500}^*) and b) the analogue scheme group with horizontal vector winds (uvw_{500}^*). Also shown in the parentheses of figure legend are temporal correlations and RMSE between various schemes and observation during two periods, the calibration and validation.

4. Simulated Late 20th Century Heavy Precipitation Frequency

Next we apply various analogue schemes to the CMIP5 late 20th century model simulations. We examine the capabilities of current state-of-the-art climate models to realistically replicate the “resolved” large-scale atmospheric conditions associated with heavy precipitation events. Validating the circulation behaviors linked to these events in climate models can ensure the assess-

ment of their future changes with greater confidence. This is achieved by judging the CMIP5 model-simulated daily meteorological conditions of 1979 to 2005 against the constructed composites (e.g. Figure 1) for their similarity in terms of the established “criteria of detection” (described in Section 3b). In this way, any day when the “criteria of detection” are met would be considered as a heavy precipitation event. We then compare the results of the analogue schemes with the heavy precipitation events identified from the observations, MERRA precipitation, and Figure 5 displays the comparisons of the number of 1979–2005 winter heavy precipitation events obtained from the CMIP5 model precipitation and various analogue schemes across 18 climate models for the PCCA region. Also included are the number of heavy precipitation events estimated from the observation and MERRA precipitation. We can see that the precipitation-based analyses (the “pr” whisker plot) from all the models strongly




Figure 6. Same as Figure 5, but for summer season (JJA) of MWST

overestimate the number of heavy precipitation events—with the observation far below the minimum. Wet biases over the west coast of the United States were also observed for the CMIP3 20th century annual precipitation of all the 22 participating models against the CMAP (Xie and Arkin, 1997) observation-based climatology (the Supplementary Material, Figures S8.9b in Solomon *et al.*, 2007). However, different models exhibit a varying degree of overestimation and the resulting heavy precipitation frequencies demonstrate a wide interquartile range (IQR, ~200 days) and inter-model spread (~400 days). In contrast, the results from all the analogue schemes produce more consistent multi-model medians with the observation as well as largely reduced IQRs (25–50 days) and inter-model ranges (~100 days). Overall, the central tendencies of various analogue schemes are to overestimate the number of heavy precipitation events—with the observation generally falling in the first or second quartiles. Among three water vapor content representations, the analogue schemes with q_{2m} have the largest IQRs. There are no salient differences between the performances of the analogue schemes with h_{500} versus uv_{500} in terms of the multi-model medians. MERRA precipitation is found to slightly underestimate the number of events.

Both model precipitation and analogue schemes display larger model discrepancies for MWST than for PCCA (Figure 6). In the MWST region, recycling ratios increase during summer and thus increase the dependence of precipitation on the boundary layer parameterization and the land model (through its representation of evaporation). The weaker performances of the analogue schemes are likely associated with the weaker influence of large-scale atmospheric dynamics in the summer and the greater role of convective processes. We can see that precipitation from all 18 models and MERRA reanalysis underestimates the number of heavy precipitation events with the deviations ranging from 4 to 506 days. Such dry biases over the Midwest of the United States are consistent with the CMIP3 20th century annual precipitation from a majority of models and the multi-model mean (the Supplementary Material, Figures S8.9b in Solomon *et al.*, 2007). The analogue schemes based on h_{500} underestimate the heavy precipitation frequencies with the observation close to the upper quartile, while those based on uv_{500} show slightly better performances with the observed frequency closer to median values. Nevertheless, the model medians of all analogue schemes are more consistent with the observed number of events




Figure 7. Scatterplots of late 20th century CMIP5 model precipitation-based and three uv_{500} analogue scheme-based heavy precipitation frequencies for a) the DJF of PCCA and b) the JJA of MWST. The two dash gray lines represents observed heavy precipitation frequencies. The solid gray lines represent 2 standard errors of the observed heavy precipitation frequency calculated using 500 bootstrap samples.

than model-simulated precipitation, and the results are also less uncertain with smaller IQRs and inter-model ranges. The analogue schemes with q_{2m} contain the largest inter-model spread, while those with tpw and tpw_{500} perform similarly.

Overall, all analogue schemes improve upon the model precipitation in terms of their assessment of late 20th century heavy precipitation frequency from the perspectives of both accuracy (consistencies of multi-model medians with observation) and precision (inter-model spreads) over two study regions, regardless of water vapor content variables chosen to construct the analogue scheme. This clearly suggests that current state-of-the-art climate models are capable of realistically simulating the atmospheric synoptic conditions associated with heavy precipitation events with reasonable frequencies. Accordingly, the analogue schemes based on resolved large-scale circulation features can provide more useful skill in detecting heavy precipitation events. The largest inter-model spread from the q_{2m} -based analogue scheme indicates that climate models may not be well constrained in simulating q_{2m} compared with tpw and tpw_{500} , mostly because the surface humidity in the climate models is usually controlled by a number of processes, including vertical mixing, surface evaporation which is affected by wind speed, soil moisture, solar heating, and other factors. Similar performances between tpw -based and tpw_{500} -based analogue schemes as well as h_{500} -based and uv_{500} -based are

somewhat expected as simulations of these counterparts in climate models are based on the essentially same or similar numerical ingredients. We further examine the consistency between the heavy precipitation frequency from the model precipitation and from all the analogue schemes on a per model basis for both study regions. Here we only show uv_{500} -based analogue schemes as their h_{500} -based counterparts give very similar results (**Figure 7**). Immediately evident is that climate models exhibit a wide range of levels of consistency between precipitation-based and analogue-based results as well as among various analogue results over both regions. For example, “A” represents a climate model showing strong consistency and robustness in simulating three atmospheric water vapor content variables, reasonably frequent and realistically simulated atmospheric synoptic conditions linked to heavy precipitation events, and apparent disconnection between model precipitation and their large-scale circulation features. The resulting heavy precipitation frequencies from three analogue schemes match well with the observation, but there exists a large bias in precipitation-based frequency. On the other hand, “B” is an example of a climate model with correctly simulated precipitation for the MWST region. In general the three atmospheric water vapor content variables are not always consistent with each other and the analogue variables are rarely consistent with the model precipitation. One caveat in our analyses is that unforced variability is likely responsible for some of the differences between

climate models (for both precipitation and analogues) as well as between models and observations. Nevertheless, Sriver *et al.* (2015) demonstrated that 34 CMIP5 models yield a considerable larger spread in representing local-scale daily summer precipitation maxima than the 50 Community Earth System Model (CESM) ensemble simulations with different initial conditions – and therefore implying that inter-model biases amongst CMIP models still possess a larger source of discrepancy than that from internal variability. We assess the uncertainty of observed heavy precipitation frequency by performing a block bootstrap with each year as a block (non-overlapping). Using 2 standard errors of observed heavy precipitation frequency calculated from 500 bootstrap samples (about 18 days for CASM and 27 days for MWST) as thresholds for evaluation of model performance, we further divide the climate models into four groups. The blue area represents the climate models that are capable of realistically simulating precipitation and large-scale circulation conditions conducting the heavy precipitation events, while the white area is characteristic of those that are rather poor in both regards. The purple area represents climate models with realistically simulated synoptic conditions but not precipitation, while the pink is opposite to the purple. In our case, none of climate models fall into the blue area over both study regions and only one into the pink area in the MWST, mainly due to the poorly simulated precipitation from CMIP5 models. A majority of models fall into the purple region with some or all analogue-based frequencies consistent with observation, while several fall into the white region with none of analogue-based frequencies close to the observation. Furthermore, regardless of what region the climate models lie in, the consistency among different atmospheric water vapor content variables is not always guaranteed. As expected, tpw and tpw₅₀₀ are more consistent with each other in comparison with q_{2m}, especially in the MWST.

In summary, various climate models demonstrate different skills in reproducing precipitation and large-scale circulation features, and therefore choices of analogue schemes based on different atmospheric variables can lead to different skills in detecting heavy precipitation events. Through such analyses, the analogue method can be potentially employed as a powerful diagnostic tool to evaluate the representation of heavy precipitation events in climate models, and the diagnosed model deficiencies can further provide useful insights into model development and improvement. Given the comparable performances of the analogue schemes based on uv₅₀₀ to those based on h₅₀₀, in the following analyses, we will employ only the uv₅₀₀-based analogue schemes to assess the projected changes in heavy precipitation frequencies due to the aforementioned complication of geopotential height changes under warming climate.

5. Projected Future Changes in Heavy Precipitation Frequency

We use the 95th percentile values of the 1979–2005 seasonal precipitation observation to extract the heavy precipitation events of RCP experiments from 2006 to 2100. The use of fixed thresholds is one of the ways to examine how the predefined events (i.e. heavy or extreme precipitation) migrate in a changing climate. We convert the CMIP5 model-simulated daily meteorological fields from 2006 to 2100 to normalized anomalies relative to the seasonal climatological means and standard deviations of each model from the CMIP5 historical simulations (1979–2005). We analyze the projected changes in heavy precipitation frequency during seven 27-year periods centered at year 2020, 2030, 2040, 2050, 2060, 2070, and 2080, respectively. So the first period spans from 2007 to 2033, and so on. The relative change of each model is calculated relative to its respective seasonal heavy precipitation frequency from 1979 to 2005 and expressed as a number of events per year. This is done for both model-based precipitation and three analogue schemes based on uv₅₀₀.

Figure 8 displays the general evolution of the changes in heavy precipitation frequency estimated from an ensemble of model precipitation and the analogue scheme uvw₅₀₀tpw under RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios for DJF of PCCA. Under the RCP8.5 scenario, the multi-model medians of both analyses indicate pronounced increases in heavy precipitation frequency, with medians of precipitation and analogue results showing 1.3–2.7 and 1.3–3.1 more events/year throughout the examined periods, respectively (Figure 8a). There is an upward trend in the medians with the largest increases occurring near or at the end of the century. The medians of the analogue results are generally larger (indicative of stronger increases) than those of the corresponding model precipitation. Both analyses show some disagreements in the sign of change with the majority of models indicating increases in the frequency. However, the analogue results demonstrate reduced disagreements in the sign of change in comparison with model precipitation, with all the models consistently showing the increases in the frequency during five out of seven periods (including the last three). Inter-model disagreements in the magnitude of change remain larger for model precipitation than for analogue results, ranging from 3.5 fewer to 8.5 more and 1 fewer to 7.5 more events per year, respectively, throughout the entire period. Especially during the middle-late periods, the model precipitation results exhibit rather marked increases in both IQRs and inter-model spreads compared with the early periods. In contrast, IQRs and inter-model spreads in the analogue results remain fairly consistent throughout the entire period.




Figure 8. The changes in heavy precipitation frequency estimated from an ensemble of model precipitation (blue lines) and the analogue scheme uvw_{500tpw} (whisker bar) under (a) RCP8.5 and (b) RCP4.5 scenarios for DJF of PCCA across the periods centered at year 2020, 2030, 2040, 2050, 2060, 2070, and 2080, respectively. The solid, dash, and dotted blue lines represent median, Q1 and Q3, minimum and maximum values, respectively.

As expected, the increases in the frequency from both analyses are less pronounced under the lower emission scenario (RCP4.5), with multi-model medians showing 0.2 fewer to 2.2 more events/year for precipitation and 0.7–2 more events/year for the analogue scheme throughout the entire period, with the larger increases occurring in the late periods (Figure 8b). Likewise, during most of the periods, the medians of analogue results exhibit slightly stronger increases than the corresponding precipitation results. The mitigation tends

to shift not only the multi-model medians but also the entire distributions toward the smaller increases in heavy precipitation frequency across all the periods. As a result, both analyses show stronger disagreements in the sign of change than under the RCP8.5 scenario, with more models showing decreases in frequency, especially in the early periods. However, inter-model disagreements in the magnitude of change are slightly reduced due to the smaller radiative forcing, ranging from a decrease of 5 to an increase of 5 events per year for precipitation,




Figure 9. The changes in heavy precipitation frequency during the period of 2067 to 2093 (centered at 2080) estimated from an ensemble of CMIP5 model precipitation and synoptic conditions employed by various analogue schemes under RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios for DJF of PCCA.

and a decrease of 2 to an increase of 6 events per year for analogue across the entire period. Overall, the analogue scheme $uvw_{500}tpw$ produces smaller inter-model spreads as compared with model precipitation during all the periods, especially under the RCP8.5 scenario.

Evolutions of frequency changes from the analogue schemes $uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$ and $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$ illustrate very similar features to those from the analogue scheme $uvw_{500}tpw$, except that the multimodel medians of $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$ demonstrate stronger increases of 1.4–3.8 and 0.8–2.0 events/year under the RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios, respectively (not shown). **Figure 9** displays the comparison of frequency changes from model precipitation and three analogue schemes during the period of year 2067 to year 2093 (centered at year 2080) under both RCP scenarios. All the analogue schemes improve upon model precipitation by producing reduced disagreements in the sign of frequency changes and smaller inter-model spreads, especially under the higher emission (RCP8.5) scenario. The mitigation effect of lower emission (RCP4.5) is evident with smaller increases consistent for both analyses. Among three analogue schemes, no scheme is clearly superior in consistently producing the smallest inter-model spreads under both scenarios, which is observed during other periods as well (not shown). The general evolution of the changes in JJA MWST heavy precipitation frequency estimated from an ensemble of model-simulated precipitation and the analogue scheme $uvw_{500}tpw$ is displayed in **Figure 10** under the RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios. Immediately evident and distinctively different from DJF of PCCA is the multi-model medians of both analyses generally exhibit small decreases in heavy pre-

cipitation frequency throughout the examined periods under both RCP scenarios. Wehner (2013) also reported the decreases in the projected mid-century summer precipitation extremes over large parts of North America based on NARCAPP regional climate model simulations. Under the RCP8.5 scenario, the multi-model medians show 0.0–0.6 fewer events/year for precipitation and 0.3–0.9 fewer events/year for the analogue scheme throughout the periods (Figure 10a). There is no evident downward trend in the medians. Both analyses exhibit wide disagreements in the sign of change with about 50–75% of the models showing decreases in frequency during different periods. It is worth noting the distinctively large inter-model discrepancies in the magnitude of change from model precipitation during the middle-late periods, which are more than doubled those in the early periods. By the end of the century, the discrepancies can range from an increase of 6 to a decrease of 7 events. In contrast, the inter-model discrepancies from analogue scheme $uvw_{500}tpw$ remain fairly constant and consistently smaller than those from model precipitation across the periods. Both analyses also produce IQRs rather consistent throughout the entire period.

The mitigation effect with the lower emission (RCP4.5) is rather weak except that the inter-model spreads are much reduced in the middle-late periods for precipitation and in most of the periods for the analogue results. The magnitudes of change throughout the entire period range from an increase of 4 to a decrease of 7 and an increase of 2.5 to a decrease of 3.5 events per year for the precipitation and analogue scheme, respectively. The multi-model medians and disagreements in the sign of change from




Figure 10. Same as Figure 8 but for JJA of MWST.

both analyses remain fairly similar to the corresponding counterparts under the RCP8.5 scenario throughout the period (Figure 10b). Overall, the analogue scheme $uvw_{500}tpw$ produces much smaller inter-model spreads than model precipitation during all the periods under both RCP scenarios. We see similar characteristics in evolutions of frequency changes from the analogue schemes $uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$ and $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$ to those from the analogue scheme $uvw_{500}tpw$, except that their multi-model medians can show slightly stronger or slightly weaker decreases during different periods (not shown). The comparison of frequency changes from model precipitation and three analogue schemes are displayed in **Figure 11** for the last

period (centered at year 2080) under both RCP scenarios. All the analogue schemes are superior to model precipitation by producing smaller inter-model spreads of frequency changes, especially under the higher emission RCP 8.5 scenario. The mitigation of lower emission is not evident, except that the inter-model spreads are reduced for both analyses. Among three analogue schemes, $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$ exhibits the largest intermodel discrepancies under both scenarios, which are also observed during other periods (not shown). The correspondence between precipitation-based and each of analogue-based frequency changes on a per model basis is also examined in the last period under the RCP8.5 scenario for two study regions




Figure 11. The changes in heavy precipitation frequency during the period of 2067 to 2093 (centered at 2080) estimated from an ensemble of CMIP5 model precipitation and synoptic conditions employed by various analogue schemes under RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios for JJA of MWST.

(**Figure 12**). The degree of divergence across all the models is assessed with root-mean-squared-deviation (RMSD). Over the PCCA, 16 out of 18 climate models consistently show the increases in the frequency changes from both analyses (Figure 12a). The overall degree of divergence is 2.4, 2.3, and 2.7 events/year between precipitation-based and each of analogue-based ($uvw_{500}tpw$, $uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$ and $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$) frequency changes, respectively. Among three analogue-based frequency changes, no model exhibits the sign inconsistency (Figure 12a), but different models demonstrate a varying degree of consistency in the magnitudes with the divergence of single model ranging from 0.1 to 2.3 events/year. The overall degree of divergence is 0.4, 0.6 and 0.9 events/year for pairs of analogue schemes $uvw_{500}tpw - uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$, $uvw_{500}tpw - uvw_{500}q_{2m}$, and $uvw_{500}tpw_{500} - uvw_{500}q_{2m}$, respectively. Over the MWST, fewer climate models show the sign consistencies between precipitation-based and analogue-based frequency changes. Furthermore, the sign can be opposite for different models although more models indicate decreases in precipitation-based frequency changes than increases. The overall degree of divergence is 2.5, 2.7, and 3.0 events/year between precipitation-based and each of the analogue-based ($uvw_{500}tpw$, $uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$ and $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$) frequency changes, respectively, slightly larger than the corresponding values over the PCCA. We also see more models show the sign inconsistencies in three analogue-based frequency changes in comparison with the PCCA (dashed circles in Figure 12b). The divergences in the magnitudes of single model ranges from 0.2 to 2.7 events/year and the overall degree of divergence remains 1.2, 1.3, and 1.5 events/year for pairs of analogue schemes $uvw_{500}tpw - uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$, $uvw_{500}tpw - uvw_{500}q_{2m}$, and

$uvw_{500}tpw_{500} - uvw_{500}q_{2m}$, respectively—slightly larger than the corresponding PCCA values as well. In summary, the performance of model precipitation in the projected heavy precipitation frequency changes is inferior for the summer of MWST to that for the winter of PCCA in terms of larger inter-model spreads in the late periods under both RCP scenarios. Additionally, fewer models exhibit the sign consistencies between precipitation-based and each of the analogue-based frequency changes, and the overall degree of divergences in the magnitudes are larger. This is likely due to the regional and seasonal differences in the nature of heavy precipitation. During summer in the MWST region, land–atmosphere interactions and unresolved convection are important, leading to significant differences in model skill. Seeley and Romps (2015) also found that CMIP5 ensembles future changes in the frequency of environments favorable for severe thunderstorms in the central United States under RCP8.5 forcing are considerably more diverse in summer than in spring, and the disagreement on the sign of changes is closely tied to changes in boundary layer humidity. Together with the largest inter-model discrepancies exhibited by $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$ (in comparison with $uvw_{500}tpw$ and $uvw_{500}tpw_{500}$) for the summer of MWST under both scenarios, this suggests that improving the representation of low-level humidification processes, such as the influence of soil moisture or water vapor advection from the Gulf of Mexico into the Great Plains, is likely an important step toward further constraining the climate models in assessing future heavy precipitation frequency changes, regardless of whether model-precipitation or analogue scheme $uvw_{500}q_{2m}$ is employed. Overall, the performances of various analogue schemes, remain fairly consistent and robust across two




Figure 12. Scatterplots of changes in heavy precipitation frequencies per year during year 2067–2093 with respect to year 1979–2005 based on CMIP5 model precipitation and synoptic features employed by three uv_{500} analogue schemes for a) the DJF of PCCA and b) the JJA of MWST. The solid gray line represents 1:1 line. The solid circles represent the minimum and maximum divergences in the magnitudes of frequency changes from three analogue schemes of specific climate model. The dashed circles represent the models with the inconsistency in the sign of frequency changes among three analogue schemes. The parenthesis shows the RMSDs between the precipitation-based and each of analogue-based frequency changes for the PCCA (first number) and MWST (second number).

seasons (regions) and RCP scenarios. The analogue-based projections improve upon precipitation-based results in terms of generally smaller inter-model discrepancies, especially under the higher emission RCP8.5 scenario.

6. Summary and Discussions

In this study, gridded precipitation gauge observations and atmospheric reanalysis are combined to develop an analogue method for detecting the occurrence of heavy precipitation event based on the prevailing large-scale atmospheric conditions (“composite”). The composites are constructed for the winter season of the Pacific Coast California (PCCA) and for the summer season of the Mid-Western United States (MWST), where the heavy precipitation exhibit the typical “Pineapple Express” and “Maya Express” characteristics, respectively. The identified synoptic regimes demonstrate interactions between flow fields and regional moisture supply. Composites in both regions feature the presence of an upper-level dipole pattern associated with a trough and a ridge over a much larger spatial scale, strong flow as well as moist air and strong synoptic-scale upward motion directly over the study regions.

We examine the combinations of different atmospheric circulation variables (geopotential height and horizontal wind vectors) and water vapor content variables (near surface specific humidity, column precipitable water, and

precipitable water up to 500mb) to construct the analogue schemes. The detection diagnostics of various analogue schemes are first calibrated with 27-year (1979–2005) and then validated with 9-year (2006–2014) MERRA reanalysis. The performance of MERRA precipitation in detecting the observed number of heavy precipitation events is weaker in the MWST than in the PCCA, with much lower TPRs, ACCs, and F1 Scores during both calibration and validation periods. In contrast, the performances of various analogue schemes remain fairly consistent across the two regions with comparable or even better TPRs, PPVs, and F1 Scores in the MWST during both periods, though at the expense of FPR and ACCs. Both analyses show regional differences in representing the observed interannual variations of heavy precipitation frequencies, especially during the validation period, with lower temporal correlation but much higher RMSE against the observation in the MWST than in the PCCA. Nevertheless, various analogue schemes are found to significantly outperform MERRA precipitation in characterizing the observed number and interannual variability of heavy precipitation events in the MWST which is one of the weakest regions for MERRA summer precipitation. Among three water vapor content variables considered for the analogues, there was no superior choice. In addition, the analogue schemes based on 500hPa hori-

zonal wind vector (uv_{500}) are fairly comparable to those based on 500hPa geopotential height (h_{500}).

With regard to the late 20th century (1979–2005) heavy precipitation frequencies from an ensemble of CMIP5 models, precipitation from all the models tend to strongly overestimate the winter (DJF) frequencies in the PCCA, but underestimate the summer (JJA) frequencies in the MWST. In contrast, the results from all analogue schemes based on the calibrated optimal threshold values produce more consistent multi-model medians with the observations and also have smaller inter-model spreads. This clearly indicates that the climate models are able to realistically simulate the large-scale atmospheric conditions associated with heavy precipitation events with reasonable frequencies. Both model precipitation and analogue results display much larger divergences in the MWST than in the PCCA, possibly attributed to the increased dependence of summer precipitation on the boundary layer parameterization and the land model as well as the greater role of convection and weaker control by synoptic forcing in summer. Likewise, the performances of the analogue schemes based on uv_{500} and h_{500} are comparable to each other. Among three water vapor content representations, the analogue schemes based on q_{2m} display the largest inter-model discrepancies, likely resulting from the low degree of consensus among climate models in representing low-level humidification processes over land.

The multi-model medians of both model precipitation and uv_{500} -based analogue schemes indicate strong increases and weak decreases in heavy precipitation frequency throughout the seven 27-yr periods for the PCCA and MWST, respectively. The increases in the PCCA are more pronounced under the higher emission scenario (RCP8.5), and the largest increases usually occur near or at the end of the century. The mitigation with the lower emission (RCP4.5) tends to shift the multi-model central tendency and distributions toward smaller increases, suggesting that the climate policies adopted in the coming decades will affect the occurrence of heavy precipitation in this region. Under the RCP8.5, both model precipitation and analogue schemes demonstrate reduced disagreements in the sign of change with reference to the RCP4.5, while model precipitation shows increased discrepancies in the magnitude of change, especially during the middle-late periods. In the MWST, the mitigation effect is weak with multi-model medians and disagreements in the sign of change from both analyses remaining similar under both scenarios, except that the inter-model spreads are much reduced in the middle-late periods for precipitation and in most of the periods for the analogue results. Regardless of the RCP scenarios and study regions, all the analogue schemes exhibit similar characteristics to one another. In the PCCA no analogue scheme is clearly su-

perior to another, while in the MWST q_{2m} -based analogue scheme exhibits the consistently largest inter-model discrepancies under both warming scenarios. Nevertheless, all the analogue schemes improve upon model precipitation in terms of having smaller inter-model spreads, especially under RCP8.5 scenario.

The analogue method presented here can be potentially employed as a powerful diagnostic tool to evaluate the representation of heavy precipitation, consistency in different large-scale ingredients of heavy precipitation, and the correspondence between precipitation and these ingredients in climate models. Our analyses indicate that current state-of-the-art climate models show varying degrees of skill with significant divergence in reproducing the observed heavy precipitation in the current climate, consistently representing the large-scale ingredients, and predicting future heavy precipitation frequency changes. On a per-model basis, the performances of precipitation-based and analogue-based results can be remarkably different in various ways and the consistency among different atmospheric water vapor content variables is not guaranteed. Therefore, choices of analogue schemes based on different large-scale ingredients can lead to different skills in detecting heavy precipitation events as well. Regardless of precipitation or analogue schemes employed, the common feature is the weaker performances in characterizing heavy precipitation events for the summer in the MWST than for the winter in the PCCA, which is likely attributed to poorly constrained low-level humidification processes among climate models or great importance of smaller-scale convective events in the warmer months. Such diagnosed deficiencies can thus provide useful insights into model development and improvement and further constraining the climate models in assessing heavy precipitation frequencies and their changes. Furthermore, observed rainfall intensity has been previously found to scale with convective available potential energy (CAPE) (Lepore *et al.*, 2015), and it would be interesting to assess whether also including measures of convective instability such as CAPE would improve the accuracy of the analogue schemes, especially for summer-time precipitation.

The goals of this study are to expand our previously developed analogue scheme with additional atmospheric variables, to assess the abilities of these additional schemes in detecting the late 20th century heavy precipitation events based on the resolved large-scale atmospheric ingredients from an ensemble of CMIP5 models, and to evaluate the resulting heavy precipitation frequency changes from increasing atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations. The analogue schemes are found to perform significantly better than the MERRA precipitation in characterizing the observed number and interannual variations of sum-

mer heavy precipitation events. They also improve upon the CMIP5 model precipitation over both study regions by producing: 1) more consistent multi-model medians of the late 20th century heavy precipitation frequencies with the observation and, 2) consistent median trends in future heavy precipitation frequency but with smaller inter-model discrepancies under both climate-change scenarios. It is worth noting that the analogue method is implemented under the supposition that large-scale atmospheric conditions play a dominant role. Thus, al-

terations of small-scale processes associated with climate change that are not captured by the analogue schemes may introduce a bias in our assessment. Nevertheless, our results indicate that the analogue schemes based on “resolved” large-scale atmospheric features provide skillful assessments of late 20th century heavy precipitation frequencies and more consistent future changes from climate models and show promise as improved and value-added diagnoses against an evaluation that considers model precipitation alone.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the NASA Energy and Water Cycle Study Research Announcement (NNH07ZDA001N) and MacroSystems Biology Program Grant (NSF-AES EF#1137306) from the National Science Foundation. We acknowledge the modeling groups, the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), and the WCRPs Working Group on Coupled Modeling (WGCM) for their roles in making available the WCRP CMIP5 multimodel dataset. We thank the NOAA Climate Prediction Center for the global gridded precipitation observations and the NASA Global Modeling and Assimilation Office for the MERRA Reanalysis data.

7. References

- Allen, M.R. and W.J. Ingram, 2002: Constraints on future changes in climate and the hydrologic cycle. *Nature*, 419(6903): 224–232.
- Bosilovich, M.G., 2013: Regional climate and variability of NASA MERRA and recent reanalyses: US summertime precipitation and temperature. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 52(8): 1939–1951.
- Chen, C.T. and T. Knutson, 2008: On the verification and comparison of extreme rainfall indices from climate models. *Journal of Climate*, 21(7): 1605–1621.
- Dai, A., 2006: Precipitation characteristics in eighteen coupled climate models. *Journal of Climate*, 19(18): 4605–4630.
- DeAngelis, A.M., A.J. Broccoli and S.G. Decker, 2013: A comparison of CMIP3 simulations of precipitation over North America with observations: Daily statistics and circulation features accompanying extreme events. *Journal of Climate*, 26(10): 3209–3230.
- Dirmeyer, P.A. and J.L. Kinter III, 2010: Floods over the US Midwest: A regional water cycle perspective. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 11(5): 1172–1181.
- Dominguez, F., E. Rivera, D. Lettenmaier and C. Castro, 2012: Changes in winter precipitation extremes for the western United States under a warmer climate as simulated by regional climate models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(5).
- Field, C.B., 2012: Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: special report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change. Cambridge University Press.
- Gao, X., C.A. Schlosser, P. Xie, E. Monier and D. Entekhabi, 2014: An analogue approach to identify heavy precipitation events: Evaluation and application to CMIP5 climate models in the United States. *Journal of Climate*, 27(15): 5941–5963.
- Gutowski, W.J., S.S. Willis, J.C. Patton, B.R. Schwedler, R.W. Arritt and E.S. Takle, 2008: Changes in extreme, cold-season synoptic precipitation events under global warming. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(20).
- Hewitson, B. and R. Crane, 2006: Consensus between GCM climate change projections with empirical downscaling: precipitation downscaling over South Africa. *International Journal of Climatology*, 26(10): 1315–1337.
- Higgins, R., J.E. Schemm, W. Shi and A. Leetmaa, 2000a: Extreme precipitation events in the western United States related to tropical forcing. *Journal of Climate*, 13(4): 793–820.
- Higgins, R., W. Shi, E. Yarosh and R. Joyce, 2000b: Improved US precipitation quality control system and analysis. NCEP/Climate Prediction Center ATLAS No. 7. Camp Springs, Maryland. Available at http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/research_papers/ncep_cpc_atlas/7/index.html
- Higgins, R., V. Silva, W. Shi and J. Larson, 2007: Relationships between climate variability and fluctuations in daily precipitation over the United States. *Journal of Climate*, 20(14): 3561–3579.
- Kao, S.C. and A.R. Ganguly, 2011: Intensity, duration, and frequency of precipitation extremes under 21st-century warming scenarios. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116(D16).
- Kawazoe, S. and W.J. Gutowski Jr, 2013: Regional, very heavy daily precipitation in CMIP5 simulations. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 14(4): 1228–1242.
- Kharin, V.V., F.W. Zwiers, X. Zhang and G.C. Hegerl, 2007: Changes in temperature and precipitation extremes in the IPCC ensemble of global coupled model simulations. *Journal of Climate*, 20(8): 1419–1444.
- Kharin, V.V., F. Zwiers, X. Zhang and M. Wehner, 2013: Changes in temperature and precipitation extremes in the CMIP5 ensemble. *Climatic Change*, 119(2): 345–357.
- Lepore, C., D. Veneziano and A. Molini, 2015: Temperature and CAPE dependence of rainfall extremes in the eastern United States. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42(1): 74–83.
- Min, S.K., X. Zhang, F.W. Zwiers and G.C. Hegerl, 2011: Human contribution to more-intense precipitation extremes. *Nature*, 470(7334): 378–381.
- Monier, E. and X. Gao, 2015: Climate change impacts on extreme events in the United States: an uncertainty analysis. *Climatic Change*, 131(1): 67–81.
- Moss, R.H., J.A. Edmonds, K.A. Hibbard, M.R. Manning, S.K. Rose, D.P. Van Vuuren, T.R. Carter, S. Emori, M. Kainuma, T. Kram *et al.*, 2010: The next generation of scenarios for climate change research and assessment. *Nature*, 463(7282): 747–756.
- O’Gorman, P.A., 2012: Sensitivity of tropical precipitation extremes to climate change. *Nature Geoscience*, 5(10): 697–700.

- O’Gorman, P.A. and T. Schneider, 2009: The physical basis for increases in precipitation extremes in simulations of 21st-century climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(35): 14773–14777.
- Pall, P., M. Allen and D. Stone, 2007: Testing the Clausius–Clapeyron constraint on changes in extreme precipitation under CO₂ warming. *Climate Dynamics*, 28(4): 351–363.
- Pall, P., T. Aina, D.A. Stone, P.A. Stott, T. Nozawa, A.G. Hilberts, D. Lohmann and M.R. Allen, 2011: Anthropogenic greenhouse gas contribution to flood risk in England and Wales in autumn 2000. *Nature*, 470(7334): 382–385.
- Rienecker, M.M., M.J. Suarez, R. Gelaro, R. Todling, J. Bacmeister, E. Liu, M.G. Bosilovich, S.D. Schubert, L. Takacs, G.K. Kim *et al.*, 2011: MERRA: NASA’s modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications. *Journal of Climate*, 24(14): 3624–3648.
- Seeley, J.T. and D.M. Romps, 2015: The effect of global warming on severe thunderstorms in the United States. *Journal of Climate*, 28(6): 2443–2458.
- Sillmann, J., V. Kharin, F. Zwiers, X. Zhang and D. Bronaugh, 2013: Climate extremes indices in the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble: Part 2. Future climate projections. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(6): 2473–2493.
- Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. Averyt, M. Tignor and H. Miller, 2007: *IPCC fourth assessment report (AR4)*. Retrieved 4/13/2011.
- Sriver, R.L., C.E. Forest and K. Keller, 2015: Effects of initial conditions uncertainty on regional climate variability: An analysis using a low-resolution CESM ensemble. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42(13): 5468–5476.
- Sun, Y., S. Solomon, A. Dai and R.W. Portmann, 2006: How often does it rain? *Journal of Climate*, 19(6): 916–934.
- Sun, Y., S. Solomon, A. Dai and R.W. Portmann, 2007: How often will it rain? *Journal of Climate*, 20(19): 4801–4818.
- Taylor, K.E., R.J. Stouffer and G.A. Meehl, 2012: An overview of CMIP5 and the experiment design. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(4): 485.
- Warner, M.D., C.F. Mass and E.P. Salathe Jr, 2012: Wintertime extreme precipitation events along the Pacific Northwest coast: Climatology and synoptic evolution. *Monthly Weather Review*, 140(7): 2021–2043.
- Wehner, M., 2005: Changes in daily precipitation and surface air temperature extremes in the IPCC AR4 models. *US CLIVAR Variations*, 3(3): 5–9.
- Wehner, M.F., 2013: Very extreme seasonal precipitation in the NARCCAP ensemble: model performance and projections. *Climate Dynamics*, 40(1–2): 59–80.
- Wilcox, E.M. and L.J. Donner, 2007: The frequency of extreme rain events in satellite rain-rate estimates and an atmospheric general circulation model. *Journal of Climate*, 20(1): 53–69.
- Xie, P. and P.A. Arkin, 1997: Global precipitation: A 17-year monthly analysis based on gauge observations, satellite estimates, and numerical model outputs. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 78(11): 2539.

Joint Program Report Series - Recent Articles

For limited quantities, Joint Program Reports are available free of charge. Contact the Joint Program Office to order.

Complete list: <http://globalchange.mit.edu/publications>

302. **21st Century Changes in U.S. Heavy Precipitation Frequency Based on Resolved Atmospheric Patterns.** *Gao et al., Oct 2016*
301. **Combining Price and Quantity Controls under Partitioned Environmental Regulation.** *Abrell and Rausch, Jul 2016*
300. **The Impact of Water Scarcity on Food, Bioenergy and Deforestation.** *Winchester et al., Jul 2016*
299. **The Impact of Coordinated Policies on Air Pollution Emissions from Road Transportation in China.** *Kishimoto et al., Jun 2016*
298. **Modeling Regional Carbon Dioxide Flux over California using the WRF-ACASA Coupled Model.** *Xu et al., Jun 2016*
297. **Electricity Investments under Technology Cost Uncertainty and Stochastic Technological Learning.** *Morris et al., May 2016*
296. **Statistical Emulators of Maize, Rice, Soybean and Wheat Yields from Global Gridded Crop Models.** *Blanc, May 2016*
295. **Are Land-use Emissions Scalable with Increasing Corn Ethanol Mandates in the United States?** *Ejaz et al., Apr 2016*
294. **The Future of Natural Gas in China: Effects of Pricing Reform and Climate Policy.** *Zhang and Paltsev, Mar 2016*
293. **Uncertainty in Future Agro-Climate Projections in the United States and Benefits of Greenhouse Gas Mitigation.** *Monier et al., Mar 2016*
292. **Costs of Climate Mitigation Policies.** *Chen et al., Mar 2016*
291. **Scenarios of Global Change: Integrated Assessment of Climate Impacts.** *Paltsev et al., Feb 2016*
290. **Modeling Uncertainty in Climate Change: A Multi-Model Comparison.** *Gillingham et al., Dec 2015*
289. **The Impact of Climate Policy on Carbon Capture and Storage Deployment in China.** *Zhang et al., Dec 2015*
288. **The Influence of Gas-to-Liquids and Natural Gas Production Technology Penetration on the Crude Oil-Natural Gas Price Relationship.** *Ramberg et al., Dec 2015*
287. **Impact of Canopy Representations on Regional Modeling of Evapotranspiration using the WRF-ACASA Coupled Model.** *Xu et al., Dec 2015*
286. **Launching a New Climate Regime.** *Jacoby & Chen, Nov 2015*
285. **US Major Crops' Uncertain Climate Change Risks and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Benefits.** *Sue Wing et al., Oct 2015*
284. **Capturing Natural Resource Dynamics in Top-Down Energy-Economic Equilibrium Models.** *Zhang et al., Oct 2015*
283. **Global population growth, technology, and Malthusian constraints: A quantitative growth theoretic perspective.** *Lanz et al., Oct 2015*
282. **Natural Gas Pricing Reform in China: Getting Closer to a Market System?** *Paltsev & Zhang, Jul 2015*
281. **Impacts of CO₂ Mandates for New Cars in the European Union.** *Paltsev et al., May 2015*
280. **Water Body Temperature Model for Assessing Climate Change Impacts on Thermal Cooling.** *Strzpek et al., May 2015*
279. **Emulating maize yields from global gridded crop models using statistical estimates.** *Blanc & Sultan, Mar 2015*
278. **The MIT EPPA6 Model: Economic Growth, Energy Use, and Food Consumption.** *Chen et al., Mar 2015*
277. **Renewables Intermittency: Operational Limits and Implications for Long-Term Energy System Models.** *Delarue & Morris, Mar 2015*
276. **Specifying Parameters in Computable General Equilibrium Models using Optimal Fingerprint Detection Methods.** *Koesler, Feb 2015*
275. **The Impact of Advanced Biofuels on Aviation Emissions and Operations in the U.S.** *Winchester et al., Feb 2015*
274. **Modeling regional transportation demand in China and the impacts of a national carbon constraint.** *Kishimoto et al., Jan 2015*
273. **The Contribution of Biomass to Emissions Mitigation under a Global Climate Policy.** *Winchester & Reilly, Jan 2015*
272. **Advanced Technologies in Energy-Economy Models for Climate Change Assessment.** *Morris et al., Dec 2014*
271. **International Trade in Natural Gas: Golden Age of LNG?** *Du & Paltsev, Nov 2014*
270. **Interprovincial Migration and the Stringency of Energy Policy in China.** *Luo et al., Nov 2014*
269. **A Framework for Analysis of the Uncertainty of Socioeconomic Growth and Climate Change on the Risk of Water Stress: a Case Study in Asia.** *Fant et al., Nov 2014*
268. **Characterization of the Solar Power Resource in Europe and Assessing Benefits of Co-Location with Wind Power Installations.** *Bozonnat & Schlosser, Oct 2014*
267. **Carbon emissions in China: How far can new efforts bend the curve?** *Zhang et al., Sep 2014*