



Overview of ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily – high-resolution observed and counterfactual daily climate data for the western United States, 1951–2025

A. Park Williams^{1,2}, John T. Abatzoglou³, Gavin D. Madakumbura¹, Haibo Liu⁴, Stefan Rahimi⁵,
Christopher Daly^{6,7}

¹Department of Geography; University of California, Los Angeles; Los Angeles, CA; USA

²Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences; University of California, Los Angeles; Los Angeles, CA; USA

³Management of Complex Systems Department; University of California, Merced; Merced, CA; USA

⁴Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory; Columbia University; Palisades, NY; USA

⁵Department of Atmospheric Science; University of Wyoming; Laramie, WY; USA

^{6,7}PRISM Climate Group; Northwest Alliance for Computational Science and Engineering; College of Engineering; Oregon State University; Corvallis, OR; USA

Correspondence to: A. Park Williams (williams@geog.ucla.edu)

Abstract. Extreme climate events and trends commonly elicit curiosity as to the role of anthropogenic climate change. In the western United States (US), severe droughts and heatwaves over the first quarter of the 21st century have strained water-management, agricultural, and ecological systems while also putting humans at risk from wildfires and hydrological hazards. Understanding whether and how climate change has promoted or intensified these processes requires estimating anthropogenic effects on a wide range of climate variables, including background mean conditions, higher-frequency variances, and how these changes have been distributed intra-annually and spatially. Here we introduce ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily, a new dataset of observed daily, high-resolution (~4 km) gridded climate data for the western US from 1951–2025 as well as a parallel, counterfactual realization of the observed sequence of climate but excluding anthropogenic changes in background mean climate or daily variances. Our dataset includes eight surface climate variables commonly used in hydrological, vegetation, and wildfire modeling: daily precipitation total, daily maximum and minimum temperature, and daily means of vapor pressure, wind velocity, downwelling shortwave and longwave radiation, and surface pressure. Anthropogenic climate change is estimated as the weighted mean change among 24 climate models relative to the second half of the 19th century according to the CMIP6 Historical experiment through 2014, extended with SSP2-4.5 for 2015–2025. Model weightings are based on agreement with global surface temperature trends, limiting the influence of models with likely unrealistic climate sensitivities to greenhouse-gas forcing. The ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily dataset will allow new opportunities to explore effects of anthropogenic climate change on western US hydroclimate and complex hydroclimatic impacts such as soil moisture, snowpack, streamflow, vegetation productivity, and wildfire.



1 Introduction

As the globe warms due to an intensifying anthropogenic greenhouse effect, some land areas are projected to become wetter on average, others drier, and most will experience increasingly variable hydroclimatic swings (Giorgi et al., 2011; Pendergrass et al., 2017; Pfahl et al., 2017; Cook et al., 2020; Swain et al., 2025). As hydroclimatic normals and variances
 35 change, it will be increasingly important to understand how anthropogenic forcing drives not only observed trends and extreme hydroclimate events, but also their complex impacts on hydrology, ecosystems, and wildfire.

In the western United States (US), the first quarter of the 21st century was likely as dry or drier on average than any similar-length period in at least 1200 years. This resulted from a shift toward lower precipitation around 2000 combined with a
 40 century-long warming trend that enhanced atmospheric evaporative demand (Williams et al., 2020, 2022b) and led to widespread hydrological impacts, including declines in snowpack, streamflow, reservoir storage, and groundwater (Faunt et al., 2016; Mote et al., 2018; Rodell et al., 2018; Xiao et al., 2018; Musselman et al., 2021; Williams et al., 2022a; Gottlieb and Mankin, 2024). These changes led to follow-on impacts such as shifts in agricultural activities (Howitt et al., 2014), tree
 45 mortality (Williams et al., 2013; Hicke et al., 2016; Berner et al., 2017; Anderegg et al., 2019), increased forest-fire sizes and severities (Juang et al., 2022; Parks et al., 2025), and reduced net primary productivity (Schwalm et al., 2012). Studies have shown that these significant hydroclimatic shifts in the western US over the last several decades were promoted by a combination of anthropogenic climate trends and natural climate variability, in part driven by a La Niña-like trend in the tropical Pacific (Lehner et al., 2018; Seager et al., 2023; Pillai et al., 2026).

50 Various methods exist to use climate models to quantitatively attribute observed climate trends or events to anthropogenic forcing versus natural variability (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016). A traditional approach is to identify an observed climate condition (e.g., a heat wave) and assess how anthropogenic forcing affected its probability by comparing simulations driven by observed historical forcings that include anthropogenic forcing to a counterfactual ensemble forced solely by natural drivers (Hannart et al., 2016). However, climate models may not adequately
 55 simulate the specific process of interest. For example, they appear to under-represent prolonged droughts (Ault et al., 2014), have spatiotemporal biases in the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Bellenger et al., 2014; Dieppois et al., 2021; Planton et al., 2021), and mis-represent heatwave characteristics (Hirsch et al., 2021). Additionally, global climate models do not reliably simulate many hydroclimatic impacts like soil moisture, snowpack, streamflow, ecosystem dynamics, or wildfire, particularly at the fine spatial scales of individual watersheds.

60

For many hydroclimatic impacts (e.g., streamflow), offline modeling – where climate model outputs force a separate impact model – may be necessary to realistically simulate the relevant processes. Offline modeling often requires multiple climate variables (e.g., precipitation, temperature, humidity, wind speed, and radiation) and may necessitate long simulations



(decades or centuries) if the impact of interest depends on slow processes like tree growth or more complex ecosystem dynamics such as forest disturbance, competition, and succession. Furthermore, offline modeling can be highly computationally demanding. Running the Noah-MP hydrological model (Niu et al., 2011) at 4-km spatial resolution across the western US, for example, takes approximately a day on a supercomputer to produce a one-year simulation. For these reasons, it is often infeasible to take the traditional paired-large-ensemble approach for climate-change attributions of many observed hydroclimatic impacts, particularly at fine spatial scales for ecosystem and hydrologic modeling.

Consequently, alternative methods have been developed to apply the counterfactual framework directly to climate observations. This allows the observed, factual climate record to be compared directly to a counterfactual realization of those same observations, as can outputs from offline simulations forced by factual and counterfactual records. Therefore, instead of large ensemble-based exploration of full probability distributions, these methods allow for comparing the magnitudes of observed, factual events (including trends) and their counterfactual counterparts, under the assumption that the exact same sequence of meteorological variability occurred in the counterfactual world.

One method for producing counterfactual observations is dynamical adjustment, where a counterfactual record is generated by statistically removing climate variations not accounted for by variations in large-scale atmospheric pressure patterns (dynamics) (Deser et al., 2016). A limitation is its simplifying assumptions: that atmospheric dynamics (wind) and thermodynamics (heat) are independent, that anthropogenic climate change does not affect dynamics, and that thermodynamically-driven trends are entirely externally forced. However, anthropogenic forcing is expected to drive poleward shifts in large-scale atmospheric circulation, including the descending branch of the Hadley cell, the jet stream, and synoptic features such as atmospheric rivers, and these changes may already be underway (Marvel and Bonfils, 2013; Payne and Magnusdottir, 2015; Li and Ding, 2024). Furthermore, isolating the dynamical component requires fitting statistical models between the climate variable and atmospheric pressure fields. Results are thus sensitive to observational or reanalysis data quality, as well as methodological choices like the spatial domain, sample size, and statistical modeling method. To date, no efforts have used dynamical adjustment to produce a large database of high-resolution daily climate grids across a broad domain like the western US for a wide range of variables, thus limiting the usefulness of the dynamical adjustment technique to explore complex processes requiring offline modeling.

Another counterfactual method was used for the Attributing Climate Impacts (ATTRICI) counterfactual dataset (Mengel et al., 2021), which provides global daily 0.5° resolution climate variables for 1901–2019. ATTRICI quantifies the relationship between background mean climate and a smoothed global mean temperature record, then statistically removes the correlation-inferred effect of global temperature changes from observed climate. This approximates a counterfactual world unaffected by low-frequency global temperature changes since 1901. Its strengths are being computationally straightforward and globally applicable. Drawbacks include the implicit assumption that all observed low-frequency global temperature



variations are anthropogenically forced, negating natural variations like ocean oscillations. Additionally, its spatial resolution is too coarse for many offline hydrological applications. Its global scope also necessitates using reanalysis products rather than true observations, and prior to 1979, the reliability of these products changes considerably due to shifting observational data density.

An increasingly common alternative is the “remove-the-modeled-trend” (RTMT) approach, which simply removes anthropogenically forced trends as simulated by climate models from observations. For example, Abatzoglou and Williams (2016) approximated anthropogenic trends in temperature and humidity as the multi-model mean low-pass filtered changes simulated by 27 CMIP5 models (Taylor et al., 2012). Counterfactual versions were calculated by subtracting these trends from observations to evaluate how anthropogenic effects altered fuel dryness metrics strongly related to annual area burned in western US forests. Diffenbaugh and Burke (2019) used a similar approach for temperature records to assess anthropogenic warming effects on global economic inequality. Williams et al. (2020) simulated a large ensemble of counterfactual monthly gridded soil moisture at 0.25° resolution across North America by removing CMIP5-simulated trends in temperature, humidity, and precipitation, later updated by Williams et al. (2022b) with the 6th phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6) (Eyring et al., 2016). These or similar counterfactual records have been used in a number of subsequent hydrological and ecological assessments (Stephens et al., 2023; Williams et al., 2024b; Dannenberg et al., 2025; Williams and Abatzoglou, 2025). The global dataset TerraClimate v1.1 (Abatzoglou et al., 2018) also recently added counterfactual monthly 4-km precipitation, temperature, vapor pressure, wind speed, and solar radiation covering 1950–2025, though it relies entirely on reanalysis climate.

A weakness of the RTMT approach to date is the assumption that the anthropogenic effect is simply a monotonic forcing on the background mean climate, with no effect on higher-frequency variability. Furthermore, by defining the anthropogenic forcing as the change in background mean state since 1901, most of these efforts ignore any anthropogenic forcing prior to 1901, though these effects are believed to be relatively small compared to those of the 20th and 21st centuries (Eyring et al., 2023).

Despite its limitations, the RTMT method is computationally efficient, allowing for easy real-time updates and application to the wide range of variables needed to force offline models of hydroclimatic impacts (e.g., hydrological, vegetation, or wildfire models). It does not require high-quality atmospheric pressure fields, unlike dynamical adjustment, and thus is not subject to changes in the quality of reanalysis pressure data. Additionally, RTMT methods should not be limited to removing background mean trends; they can also be applied to produce counterfactual realizations of daily data from which modeled trends in daily variance are removed. Anthropogenic forcing is understood to change not just background mean climate but also higher-frequency variations such as precipitation frequencies and extremes (Pfahl et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2021), but to our knowledge effects on climate variability have not been accounted for in prior RTMT efforts. Accounting for



anthropogenically forced changes in daily variances would be particularly helpful for offline simulation of processes that respond non-linearly to daily climate variability, such as snowpack and wildfire.

135 Here we present ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily, a database of observed and counterfactual daily climate for the western US at
1/24° resolution covering 1951–2025. The daily variables represented are precipitation total (prec, mm), maximum
temperature (tmax, °C), minimum temperature (tmin, °C), mean vapor pressure (ea, hPa), mean wind velocity 2 m above the
surface (wind, m s⁻¹), mean downwelling solar radiation at the surface (solar, W m⁻²), mean downwelling longwave radiation
at the surface (longwave, W m⁻²), and surface pressure (psfc, hPa). The fine spatial and temporal resolutions, alongside the
140 breadth of variables, enable straightforward use in an offline modeling framework. Anthropogenic climate trends are
assessed using outputs from 24 CMIP6 models, with the multi-model mean weighted by agreement with observed global
temperature trends to reduce the effect of models with unrealistically high sensitivity to greenhouse-gas forcing (Hausfather
et al., 2022). An advance of the counterfactual component of ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily is that, beyond removing
anthropogenic trends in background means, we also remove anthropogenic changes in distributions of daily departures from
145 those means. This paper details the methods underlying ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily, a parallel pair of observed and
counterfactual datasets designed to enable unprecedented long-term (75-year) assessments of western US hydroclimatic
events and their anthropogenic climate change contributions.

2 Data sources and methods

150 We produced daily grids of climate for the 75-year period from January 1 1951 to December 31 2025 at a geographic
resolution of 1/24° (~4 km) across the western US domain mapped in Fig. 1. We define the western US as the 11
westernmost states in the coterminous US (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon,
Utah, Washington, and Wyoming).




Figure 1: Observed climatological means (1951–2025) of the eight variables: (a) precipitation total (prec), (b) daily maximum temperature (tmax), (c) daily minimum temperature (tmin), (d) vapor pressure (ea), (e) wind velocity 2 m above the surface (wind), (f) downwelling solar radiation (solar), (g) downwelling longwave radiation (longwave), and surface pressure (psfc).

2.1 Observed climate

Maps of the observed long-term (1951–2025) climatologies for the eight variables are shown in Fig. 1.

Daily prec, tmax, and tmin data come from the 1/24° nClimGrid-daily dataset produced by the National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration, which covers 1951–present (Durre et al., 2022). We use the 1/24° latitude/longitude coordinates of the nClimGrid-daily dataset to define the resolution and grid-cell central locations of our data.

Daily ea data are calculated from the daily 1/24° gridded PRISM AN81d dataset, produced by the PRISM group at Oregon State University, which covers 1981–present (Daly et al., 2021). While PRISM does not provide ea grids directly, they provide daily mean dew point (tdew, °C). We estimate dew-point derived ea (ea_{tdew}) from tdew using the WMO (2008) Clausius Clapeyron formulation:

$$ea_{tdew} = 6.112e^{\left(\frac{17.62 \cdot tdew}{tdew + 243.12}\right)}. \quad (1)$$

Given exponential response of ea_{tdew} to tdew, ea_{tdew} is likely to be consistently lower than true ea. Because PRISM also provides daily grids of tmax and tmin as well as their associated vapor-pressure deficits (vpdmax and vpdmin, respectively;



hPa), we also calculate ea at tmax and tmin (ea_{tmax} and ea_{tmin} , respectively). To do this, we first calculate daily maximum and minimum saturation vapor pressure ($esmax$ and $esmin$, respectively; hPa):

$$esmax = 6.112e^{\left(\frac{17.62 \cdot tmax}{tmax + 243.12}\right)} \quad (2)$$

180

and

$$esmin = 6.112e^{\left(\frac{17.62 \cdot tmin}{tmin + 243.12}\right)}. \quad (3)$$

185 We then calculate ea_{tmax} and ea_{tmin} as:

$$ea_{tmax} = esmax - vpdmax \quad (4)$$

and

190

$$ea_{tmin} = esmin - vpdmin. \quad (5)$$

Finally, we estimate daily mean ea as the average of ea_{tdew} , ea_{tmax} , and ea_{tmin} :

$$195 \quad ea = (ea_{tdew} + ea_{tmax} + ea_{tmin})/3. \quad (6)$$

However, grid-cell locations of the 1/24° PRISM data are offset from those of our dataset's map by half of a grid width (1/48°) in the zonal and meridional directions. We address this by, for each 1/24° grid in our dataset's map, averaging across the values of all (usually four) overlapping PRISM grid cells. We then bias correct these spatially smoothed maps using monthly data from the high-resolution (1/120°) version of PRISM (AN81n). For each 1/24° grid cell in our western US domain, each month from 1981–2025, and each PRISM variable (tdew, tmax, tmin, vpdmax, and vpdmin), we calculate the true monthly mean as the average of all (usually 16) 1/120° gridded values within. We then additively adjust the daily 1/24° maps such that, for each month, each grid cell's daily values average to equal the true monthly mean value calculated from 1/120° data.

205

Because the PRISM daily product only goes back to 1981, we extend PRISM ea back to 1951 using a calibrated version of dynamically-downscaled ERA5 reanalysis (Hersbach et al., 2020) for the western US produced by Rahimi et al. (2022). The



Rahimi et al. dataset has a 9-km spatial resolution and covers September 1950 – March 2025. We use the Rahimi et al. daily outputs of mean specific humidity (q , $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$) and surface pressure ($psfc$, hPa) to calculate ea :

$$ea = psfc * q / (0.622 + 0.378 * q). \quad (7)$$

We bilinearly interpolate the 9-km grids of ea to $1/24^\circ$ resolution and use quantile mapping to calibrate such that, for each grid cell and each of the 12 months, the distributions of daily ea estimated from Rahimi et al. match those from PRISM during 1981–2020.

Because we obtain ea and temperature from different sources, there may be rare cases when daily mean ea exceeds the daily mean saturation vapor pressure (es ; hPa) that is implied by the temperature data. We do not adjust ea , $tmax$, or $tmin$ to correct for this, as the nonlinear nature of the Clausius Clapeyron equation dictates that any calculation of daily mean ea or es from the temporal means of dew point and temperature are merely estimates because ea and es relate non-linearly to dew point and temperature (He et al., 2025). We thus note that users of this dataset who are performing calculations of involving ea and es may wish to adjust ea to avoid cases in which ea exceeds their estimates of es .

For wind, we use the WTK-LED dynamically-downscaled ERA5 wind reanalysis as the primary dataset, which has 4-km geographic resolution and covers 2001–2020 (Draxl et al., 2024) and has been shown to be skillful across the western US (Peco et al., 2026). We calculate daily mean wind velocity from hourly means at 10-m above the surface and interpolated to our $1/24^\circ$ using nearest neighbor. We adjust the 10-m wind velocity values to represent those expected at a 2-m height by multiplying by 0.748 ($4.87/\ln(67.8*10 \text{ m} - 5.42)$) following the FAO56 Penman-Monteith methodology (Allen et al., 1998). We extend this dataset back to 1951 and forward through March 2025 using the daily mean 10-m wind velocity from the Rahimi et al. 9-km reanalysis, bilinearly interpolated to $1/24^\circ$ resolution, and multiplied by 0.748. Because this dataset ends in March 2025, we extend through December 2025 using 2-m daily mean wind velocity from GridMET, which covers 1979–present (Abatzoglou, 2013). We bias correct the Rahimi et al. and GridMET data using quantile mapping such that each dataset’s daily wind velocity distribution matches that of WTK-LED during 2001–2020 for each grid cell and each of the 12 months.

For solar, we use the newly available, observation-based daily $1/24^\circ$ dataset from PRISM AN81d as the primary dataset (Rupp et al., 2022), which covers 1981–present. As is the case for ea , this dataset is geographically offset by $1/48^\circ$ from our grid, so we follow the same correction approach as for ea to ensure that monthly means on our $1/24^\circ$ grid match those calculated from the high-resolution $1/120^\circ$ PRISM AN81n dataset. The solar dataset we use from PRISM accounts for the effect of topographic slope and aspect on incident downward solar radiation at the surface. We extend solar back to 1951



using daily mean downward solar radiation from the Rahimi et al. 9-km reanalysis, downscaled to $1/24^\circ$, and bias corrected using quantile mapping to match PRISM distributions during 1981–2020.

For longwave and psfc, we use the Rahimi et al. 9-km reanalysis, interpolated to $1/24^\circ$ resolution, as the primary source for 1951 through March 2025. For April–December 2025, we use the hourly climate forcing dataset produced for the second phase of the North American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS2), which has $1/8^\circ$ geographic resolution covers 1979–present (Xia et al., 2012). We calculate daily means, bilinearly interpolate to $1/24^\circ$ resolution, and bias correct using quantile mapping to match Rahimi et al. distributions during 1981–2020.

2.2 CMIP6-detrended climate

Here we produce a counterfactual version of the observed climate dataset described above, but where anthropogenic trends in background means and daily variances are removed such that the climatology is consistent with what would have been expected in the second half of the 1800s. Below, we describe the approach to selecting CMIP6 models and determining weightings for multi-model mean calculations, followed by descriptions of how we estimate anthropogenic changes in background means as well as changes in daily variations about those means.

2.2.1 CMIP6 models

We estimate anthropogenic climate change to be represented by the CMIP6 24-model weighted mean trends in background means and the variances of daily departures from those means. See Table 1 for a list of the 24 models considered and section 2.2.2 for a description of the model weighting. For 1850–2014 we use simulations from the CMIP6 Historical scenario and for 2015–2025 we use simulations from the Shared Socioeconomic Pathway 2-4.5 (SSP2-4.5) (Eyring et al., 2016). The SSP2-4.5 represents a commonly used middle-of-the-road future emissions trajectory. Notably, the degree of anthropogenic climate forcing in this scenario is not markedly different from that of other CMIP6 SSP scenarios during the 2015–2025 period of overlap with our dataset’s observational period (O’Neill et al., 2016). We consider anthropogenic climate trends to be departures in the 24-model mean climate conditions from an 1851–1900 baseline.

The 24 CMIP6 models considered are selected mainly based on data availability, with the primary criterion being that daily outputs are available via the CMIP6 data portal hosted by the Earth System Grid Federation (<https://aims2.llnl.gov/search/cmip6/>) for prec, temperature, ea, wind, solar, longwave, and psfc for at least one continuous ensemble member under the Historical and SSP2-4.5 scenarios. For temperature, most models provide tmax and tmin but for models missing these variables we use tave to estimate tmax and tmin based on the multi-model mean of offsets between tmax, tmin, and tave derived, for each of the 12 months, from the models that provide data for all three variables. At the time of our acquisition of CMIP6 data, 28 models provided daily outputs for the Historical and SSP2-4.5 scenarios for the



required variables. However, it is preferable that models are favored if they also provide *monthly* mean data for more than
 275 one realization of Historical and SSP2-4.5 climate. This is because anthropogenic climate change is dominated by changes in
 background mean conditions, as opposed to changes to higher-frequency variability, and thus a model's true anthropogenic
 change in climate is best represented by the average of multiple realizations. Of the 28 models with adequate daily data, we
 exclude four (CMCC-ESM2, GFDL-CM4, IITM-ESM, KIOST-ESM) because they provide monthly outputs for only a
 single realization. One additional model is represented by a single realization with monthly outputs (INM-CM4-8, Table 1)
 280 but this model is included because we found that this model simulates a relatively realistic mean western US climatology.
 The CMCC-CM2-SR5 also has only one realization available for some variables but we considered this model because it
 provides three historical realizations for prec and tave, variables that are particularly impactful for western US hydroclimate.

Because ea is not a standard CMIP6 output, we calculate daily and monthly means of CMIP6 ea from q and psfc using eq. 7.
 285 For some CMIP6 ensemble members, outputs are not available for ea or psfc but are available for relative humidity (rh, %) and temperature. We estimate ea for these ensemble members as $es * rh/100$, where es is estimated from tmax and tmin (or from tave when tmax and tmin are lacking). Additionally, some ensemble members lack outputs for psfc. In these cases we estimate psfc from mean sea level pressure (psl; hPa), tave, and elevation (h; m above sea level) following NOAA (1976):

$$290 \quad psfc = psl \left(1 - \frac{L * h}{tave + 273.15 + L * h} \right)^{\frac{g * M}{R * L}}, \quad (8)$$

where L is the standard temperature lapse rate (0.0065 °C/m), g is the gravitational acceleration (9.80665 m s⁻²), M is the molar mass of dry air (0.0289644 kg mol⁻¹), and R is the universal gas constant (8.31432 J mol⁻¹ K⁻¹).

295 All monthly and daily outputs of CMIP6 climate are regridded to a common 1° geographic resolution using bilinear interpolation. Notably, for solar and longwave, daily outputs from the Historical simulations from the ACCESS-CM2 and ACCESS-ESM1-5 models do not begin until 1950, so these models are not used to estimate anthropogenic effects on daily variances for these variables. Similarly, daily outputs for wind are not available for CNRM-CM6-1 and CNRM-ESM2-1 simulations under the SSP2-4.5 scenario, so those models do not contribute to our assessment of anthropogenic effects on
 300 daily wind variability.

Table1. CMIP6 models used to quantify anthropogenic climate trends. For each model, and climate variable, three values are provided. First value: number of Historical simulations considered. Second value: number of
 305 SSP2-4.5 simulations considered. Third value: Number of combinations of Historical and SSP2-4.5 simulations used to estimate trends in background monthly means (see section 2.2.2). For the five models without tmax and tmin data, we estimated tmax and tmin from average temperature (tave; Table 2) from those models and the mean offsets between tmax, tmin, and tave from the 19 models with data for all variables.

prec	tmax	tmin	ea	wind	solar	longwave	psfc
------	------	------	----	------	-------	----------	------



ACCESS-CM2	5/5/10	5/5/10	5/5/10	5/5/10	3/3/3	3/3/9	3/3/9	5/5/10
ACCESS-ESM1-5	40/40/40	40/40/40	40/40/40	40/40/40	19/19/19	18/18/18	19/19/19	40/40/40
CESM2	7/7/10	0/0/0	0/0/0	7/6/10	7/7/10	7/7/10	7/7/10	7/6/10
CESM2-WACCM	3/3/10	0/0/0	0/0/0	3/4/10	3/3/10	3/3/10	3/3/10	3/4/10
CMCC-CM2-SR5	3/3/3	0/0/0	0/0/0	3/1/3	3/3/3	3/3/3	3/3/3	3/1/3
CNRM-CM6-1	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10
CNRM-ESM2-1	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10
CanESM5	50/50/50	50/50/50	50/50/50	50/50/50	50/50/50	50/50/50	50/50/50	50/50/50
EC-Earth3	21/21/21	21/21/21	22/22/22	21/21/21	15/15/15	16/16/16	16/16/16	18/18/18
EC-Earth3-Veg	8/8/10	8/8/10	8/8/10	6/6/9	8/8/9	8/8/9	8/8/9	7/6/9
FGOALS-g3	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/4/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/6/10	6/4/10
GFDL-ESM4	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	1/1/1	2/2/2	3/3/6	3/3/9
HadGEM3-GC31-LL	5/5/5	5/5/5	5/5/5	5/1/5	5/5/5	5/5/5	5/5/5	5/1/5
INM-CM4-8	1/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1	1/1/1
INM-CM5-0	10/10/10	10/10/10	10/10/10	10/1/10	10/10/10	10/10/10	10/10/10	10/1/10
KACE-1-0-G	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9
MIROC-ES2L	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30
MIROC6	50/50/50	33/33/33	33/33/33	33/33/33	8/8/10	8/8/10	8/8/10	49/49/49
MPI-ESM1-2-HR	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/2/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/9/10	9/2/10
MPI-ESM1-2-LR	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30	30/30/30
MRI-ESM2-0	7/7/10	7/7/10	7/7/10	8/2/10	7/7/7	7/7/7	7/7/7	10/1/10
NorESM2-LM	3/3/9	0/0/0	0/0/0	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9	3/3/9
NorESM2-MM	3/3/6	0/0/0	0/0/0	3/2/6	3/3/6	3/3/6	3/3/6	3/2/6
UKESM1-0-LL	13/13/13	7/7/10	7/7/10	13/13/13	7/7/10	13/13/13	13/13/13	13/13/13

2.2.2 CMIP6 model weighting

310 In our use of CMIP6 multi-model means to represent anthropogenic climate change, we apply the ClimWIP method to
 weight each model's contribution based on model independence and performance (Knutti et al., 2017a; Sanderson et al.,
 2017; Lorenz et al., 2018; Brunner et al., 2020; Merrifield et al., 2020). The purpose of ClimWIP is to reduce risk of
 incorporating information from models unlikely to reliably simulate the process of interest while also not placing
 disproportionate weight on groups of closely related models (Sanderson et al., 2015; Knutti et al., 2017b). The weighting (w)
 315 is calculated as



$$w_i = P_i I_i, \quad (9)$$

where P is a performance metric and I is an independence metric for each model (m_i). The P metric is calculated as

$$P_i = e^{-\left(\frac{D_i}{\sigma_D}\right)^2}, \quad (10)$$

where D is a vector of each model's normalized difference from some observational target used to assess model performance and σ_D is a difference shape parameter, which we define to be 0.42, as described below. For our observational target variable, we use the least-squares linear change in global mean surface temperature from 1961–2025 as represented by three observational datasets. These datasets are from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Goddard Institute for Space Studies (NASA GISS), and Berkeley Earth and their respective changes in global mean surface temperature from 1961–2025 are +1.142°C, +1.184°C, and +1.223°C. For each model, we calculate the least-squares linear change in global mean surface air temperature (tas) from 1961–2025 for all available ensemble members for which monthly tas is available from the Historical and SSP2-4.5 experiments (see Table 2 for number of ensemble members per model). For each model, i , and ensemble member, we calculate the absolute difference from each of the three, k , observed trend values. For each model and observational value, the performance metric, d_{ik} , is calculated as the average absolute difference among ensemble members and then for each model, d'_i is calculated as the root mean of squared d_{ik} values. Finally, D_i is calculated by dividing each model's d'_i value by the all-model mean d' . Table 2 lists each model's ensemble-mean linear temperature change, the difference between this value and the mean of the three observational values, as well as the normalized values of D .

Our choice to use the global temperature trend as the basis of our observation-constrained weighting reflects the high likelihood that several CMIP6 models simulate an unrealistically high climate sensitivity (warming per doubling of CO_2) that is unsupported by observations, theory, and paleo-evidence (Knutti et al., 2017b; Zhu et al., 2020; Hausfather et al., 2022). Indeed, weighting models by their performance at simulating observed temperature trends leads to lower inferred rates of past and future anthropogenic warming (Brunner et al., 2020; Tokarska et al., 2020; Hausfather et al., 2022). There are many ways to assess model agreement with observed trends (e.g., global mean or spatially explicit, annual or seasonal). Our choice to weight based on agreement with the observed global trend over 1961–2025 reflects our prioritization of simplicity and interpretability. Weighting models based on reproduction of more nuanced characteristics of the observed climate record would risk overfitting our impression of anthropogenic trends to the observed record. Our choice of the 1961–2025 period reflects that, according to observations and most models, the vast majority of anthropogenic warming has occurred during this time following a multi-decade period of stable or cooling temperatures in the mid-19th century. Thus, focusing on 1961–



2025 allows us to reasonably characterize warming trends as linear while still capturing most of the anthropogenic warming
 350 to date.

The independence metric, I , is calculated as

$$I_i = 1 / \left(1 + \sum_{i \neq j}^M e^{-\left(\frac{S_{ij}}{\sigma_S} \right)^2} \right), \quad (11)$$

355

where S_{ij} is a matrix quantifying the similarity between all pairs of models, m_i and m_j ($i \neq j$), and σ_S is a similarity shape
 parameter, which we define to be 0.20 (described below). The goal in calculating the S matrix is to identify models with
 shared structural similarities such as offsets or spatial patterns in mean climate relative to other models, which would be
 interpreted as indicative of shared model components or parameterizations. Following Merrifield et al. (2020) and Brunner et
 360 al. (2020), we quantify similarity based on inter-model agreement on maps of climatological mean tas and atmospheric
 pressure and sea level (psl). For each model we calculate global maps of long-term mean tas and psl for the period 1951–
 2000 all ensemble members for which monthly mean data are available from the Historical scenario and then average across
 ensemble members. All maps are nearest-neighbor interpolated to a common 1° geographic grid. For each variable, v (tas
 and psl), a 24×24 similarity matrix, s_v , is calculated as the square root of area-weighted mean squared difference between all
 365 possible pairs of models:

$$s_{vij} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_l^L W_l (v_{il} - v_{jl})^2}{\sum_l^L W_l}}, \quad (12)$$

where W_l is the cosine of the latitude of each of the L grid cells in maps v_i and v_j . Diagonals in each similarity matrix (where
 370 $i=j$) are assigned zeros and we then calculate a normalized version of each similarity matrix (s'_v) by dividing by the mean of
 all values. The final similarity matrix, S , is then calculated by averaging the two s'_v matrices and again normalizing by
 dividing by the mean. See Table 2 for normalized values of I .

The shape parameters for performance and similarity, σ_D and σ_S , respectively, act to modulate the effects of D and S . Small
 375 σ_D values (values much smaller than the mean of D) cause performance weightings, P , to be skewed heavily toward the
 models with the smallest values of D (e.g., strongest agreement with observed temperature trend). Larger σ_D causes
 performance weightings to be more evenly distributed among models. The effect of the similarity parameter, σ_S , is generally
 more subtle than that of σ_D . When σ_S is very low, this causes the independence weighting, I , to converge toward one among
 models for which S (model uniqueness) is much larger than σ_S , leading to more evenly distributed values of I . On the other



380 hand, if σ_S is much higher than most or all values of S , this causes values of I to converge toward 0.5, again leading to more
evenly distributed independence weightings.

To determine appropriate values of σ_D and σ_S we use the “perfect-model” scheme described by Knutti et al. (2017a) and
Brunner et al. (2020). Briefly, each of the 24 climate models are treated, one at a time, as if its ensemble-mean temperature
385 trend from 1961–2025 is the true trend, and the remaining 23 models are used to produce a multi-model weighted
distribution of trends where weightings are calculated following the methods described above. For each withheld model, this
is done 2,500 times, each time with a unique combination of potential σ_D and σ_S values. For both parameters, 50 potential
values are tested, evenly spaced from 0.2 to 2.0. For each of the 2,500 pairs of values, it is tested whether the model-
weighting scheme produces a reasonable distribution of temperature-trend estimates. Specifically, we first develop a
390 weighted cumulative distribution (CDF) function of the 23 modeled trends and test whether the “true” trend from the
withheld model falls above the 10th percentile and below the 90th percentile (inner 80% range) within the weighted CDF.
After doing this for all withheld models, if $\geq 80\%$ of the 24 “true” temperature trends fall within the inner 80% range for a
given pair of σ_D and σ_S values, that pair of values is determined capable of producing reasonable weighted trend
distributions. Of all reasonable pairs of σ_D and σ_S values, we select the pair with the smallest sum, following Brunner et al.
395 (2020). We find these values to be 0.42 for σ_D and 0.20 for σ_S .

The final model weightings based on P and I from Table 2 are calculated following equations 10–11 and then rescaled to sum
to 1 (Table 2).

400 Table 2. CMIP6 model global mean temperature change (dTave) based on least-squares linear regression from
1961–2025, bias compared to observations, performance weightings based on agreement with the observed
temperature trend, independence weightings, and the final weightings (w ; eq. 9) used to estimate anthropogenic
climate trends (section 2.2.2). For each model, dTave is the average of linear temperature changes calculated
from all available (N) continuous ensemble members covering the Historical and SSP2-4.5 scenarios. Bias is
405 dTave minus the observed global mean temperature trend of +1.183°C. The observed trend considered here is
the average of trends from three observational datasets (NOAA: +1.142°C; NASA GISS: +1.184°C; Berkeley
Earth: +1.223°C). Performance values are values of P calculated from eq. 10, representing how closely each
model’s simulated temperature trend agrees with observations. Independence values are values of I calculated
from eq. 11, representing how dissimilar each model’s ensemble-mean maps of climatological mean surface air
410 temperature and sea-level pressure are to those of all other models.

	dTave (°C)	Bias (°C)	Performance (P)	Independence (I)	Weighting (w)	N
ACCESS-CM2	+1.439	+0.256	0.0052	0.8913	0.0011	3
ACCESS-ESM1-5	+1.377	+0.194	0.0304	1.0000	0.0070	19
CESM2	+1.361	+0.179	0.0742	0.6229	0.0106	6
CESM2-WACCM	+1.571	+0.388	6.455e-06	0.6220	9.212e-07	3



CMCC-CM2-SR5	+1.294	+0.111	0.3463	0.9961	0.0791	1
CNRM-CM6-1	+1.229	+0.047	0.3789	0.7655	0.0666	10
CNRM-ESM2-1	+1.086	-0.097	0.0713	0.7655	0.0125	9
CanESM5	+2.123	+0.940	5.188e-31	1.0000	1.191e-31	50
EC-Earth3	+1.344	+0.161	0.0071	0.5186	0.0008	21
EC-Earth3-Veg	+1.519	+0.336	8.581e-06	0.5186	1.021e-06	8
FGOALS-g3	+1.215	+0.032	0.7696	1.0000	0.1766	4
GFDL-ESM4	+1.222	+0.039	0.1055	1.0000	0.0242	3
HadGEM3-GC31-LL	+1.950	+0.767	6.969e-21	0.6680	1.068e-21	1
INM-CM4-8	+1.018	-0.165	0.1076	0.9463	0.0234	1
INM-CM5-0	+0.999	-0.183	0.0652	0.9463	0.0142	1
KACE-1-0-G	+1.787	+0.604	3.103e-13	0.9452	6.729e-14	3
MIROC-ES2L	+1.103	-0.080	0.5422	1.0000	0.1244	30
MIROC6	+0.955	-0.228	0.0155	1.0000	0.0036	50
MPI-ESM1-2-HR	+1.135	-0.048	0.5378	0.9960	0.1229	2
MPI-ESM1-2-LR	+1.098	-0.084	0.4492	0.9960	0.1027	30
MRI-ESM2-0	+1.355	+0.172	0.0886	1.0000	0.0203	5
NorESM2-LM	+1.124	-0.059	0.6205	0.9947	0.1416	3
NorESM2-MM	+1.065	-0.118	0.3077	0.9702	0.0685	2
UKESM1-0-LL	+1.751	+0.568	8.600e-12	0.7055	1.392e-12	14

2.2.3 Anthropogenic changes in background climate means

We estimate anthropogenic trends in background mean climate as CMIP6 24-model weighted mean low-pass filtered trends relative to the baseline mean conditions of the “pre-anthropogenic” period. While the climate of the late 1800s was not entirely free of anthropogenic influence, we treat it as such because the vast majority of anthropogenic forcing has occurred since that time. This approach is in line with prior efforts to approximate anthropogenic climate trends as those that have occurred since 1901 (Abatzoglou and Williams, 2016; Williams et al., 2015, 2020). To reduce the effect of internal climate variability on modeled trends, we consider as many realizations of Historical and SSP2-4.5 simulated climate as possible for each model. First, for each model we temporally append all pairs of Historical (1850–2014) and SSP2-4.5 (2015–2100) realizations that have common variant IDs (e.g., r1i1p1f1), as these realizations represent continuous runs (ensemble members). However, it is common for more ensemble members to be available for the Historical scenario than for the SSP2-4.5. For any model with fewer than 10 continuous ensemble member across the two scenarios, we produce additional sequences of climate by appending combinations of Historical and SSP2-4.5 ensemble members with non-matching variant



IDs. This is done either until there are 10 continuous climate records covering 1850–2100 or until all possible pairs of
 425 Historical and SSP2-4.5 variant IDs have been combined. The purpose of combining ensemble members is to better
 capitalize on the available Historical realizations, as most of the 1951–2025 period of our dataset within the CMIP6
 Historical period. Table 1 shows for each model and variable the number of Historical and SSP2-4.5 realizations with
 monthly data that are used as the number of combinations used.

430 For each climate variable (prec, tmax, tmin, ea, wind, solar, longwave, psfc), each CMIP6 model, and each combination of
 Historical and SSP2-4.5 realizations available for that variable-model, we convert the simulation outputs of monthly means
 to anomalies relative to 1851–1900 for each of the 12 months separately. For all variables except tmax and tmin we calculate
 relative anomalies by dividing by the 1851–1900 mean. We then calculate, for each of the 12 months, low-pass filtered time
 series of trends in these anomalies for each 1° grid cell using a 10-point butterworth filter. For all variables except prec, we
 435 use a 75-year filter. For prec we use a 100-year filter to reduce the effect of relatively high decadal variability in that
 variable.

To limit artificial end effects, we pad the beginnings and ends of all times series prior to filtering. At the beginning, we pad
 each time series with values from 1851 through 1851+N in reverse order, where N is the rounded value of the filter window
 440 length divided by two. We do the same at the end, using the values from 2100-N through 2099, except to avoid reversing
 anthropogenic trends we detrend these values and superimpose on an extrapolation of the trend established during 2100-N
 through 2099.

For each model, variable, and grid-month we then calculate the mean of low-pass filtered anomaly trends across all
 445 combinations of Historical and SSP2-4.5 realizations. Finally, the anthropogenic effect on background mean climate
 anomalies is calculated as the weighted multi-model mean trend.

As an example, Fig. 2a–e shows the low-pass filtered trends in western US annual and seasonally averaged tmax anomalies
 from 1851–2025 relative to the 1851–1900 mean for each of the 24 models as well as the 24-model mean, indicating all-
 450 model agreement on a warming of background mean tmax by 2025, with most models agreeing on an increase of 1–2 °C.
 Maps in Fig. 2f–j show the spatial distribution of the anthropogenic warming signal on tmax as of 2025, indicating generally
 more warming in the continental interior than near the Pacific coast. Fig. A1 shows a version of the same figure for tmin,
 indicating somewhat stronger anthropogenic warming than for tmax.

455




Figure 2: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of daily maximum temperature (tmax). Time series panels on left (a–e) show trends in mean annual (Jan–Dec) and seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) tmax according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as deviations from the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (f–j) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (k–o) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the anomaly expected during 2011–2025 minus that expected in 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (p–t) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentiles of daily anomalies during 2011–2025 minus those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background means. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.



470 Figure 3a–j is structured the same as Fig. 2a–j but for relative changes in background mean prec, showing considerable model disagreement in prec trends with the exception of increases of 5–10% in winter (Dec–Feb) across the central and high latitudes of the western US. Outside of winter (Fig. 3b,g), the anthropogenic forcing on background mean prec is estimated to be relatively flat, though in spring this is because increases of 5–10% in the northern latitudes are compensated by decreases in the southern latitudes (Fig. 3c,h). Figure 4a–j shows relative changes in the background means of annually
475 averaged ea, wind, solar, longwave, and psfc (see panels a–h of Figs. A2–A6 for breakdowns of background mean changes in these variables by season). As of 2025, the CMIP6 weighted-mean trends indicate increases in annually averaged western US ea of approximately 10%, little change in wind, decreased solar of 1–2%, increased longwave of approximately 4%, and a clear but negligible increase of psfc of approximately 0.075%.




Figure 3: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of precipitation total (prec). Time series panels on left (a–e) show trends in mean annual (Jan–Dec) and seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) prec according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as percent deviations relative to the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (f–j) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (k–o) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily non-zero prec anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the non-zero prec anomaly expected during 2011–2025 relative to that of 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (p–t) show multi-model mean (left) percent change in the frequency of non-zero prec days (P freq) and (right) 95th percentile anomalies of daily non-zero prec during 2011–2025 relative to those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background mean trends. In maps, stippling indicates



that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign of the value. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.




Figure 4: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of vapor pressure (ea), wind velocity (wind), downward solar and longwave radiation at the surface (solar and longwave, respectively), and surface pressure (psfc). Time series panels on left (a–e) show trends in mean annual anomalies for each variable according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as percent deviations relative to the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (f–j) show the multi-model mean trend magnitude as of 2025. Plots in (k–o) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the daily anomaly value expected



during 2011–2025 relative to that expected in 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (p–t) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentile anomalies of daily climate during 2011–2025 minus those of 1851–1910. In all analyses of daily anomalies, anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background mean trends. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.

2.2.4 Calculating anthropogenic changes in daily variances

We define the anthropogenic effect on daily variances as 24-model mean changes in the distributions of daily departures from the trends in background mean states quantified above. Because this step requires more data intensive work with daily CMIP6 data, we use only one continuous Historical-SSP2-4.5 realization per model rather than as many as possible. For each model, we obtain the first realization (e.g., r1i1p1f1) for which daily outputs are available for all necessary climate variables (acknowledging that solar, longwave, and wind outputs were available for 22 of the 24 models we consider, as described in section 2.2.1).

For each model and variable, we convert daily values to departures from the background mean state by dividing by (or subtracting away for temperature variables) the values in that model’s all-realization mean low-pass filtered monthly time series. We then quantify changes in the variations between the recent observational period and the second half of the 1800s by quantifying changes in the cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) of daily anomalies. Because anthropogenic forcing should cause daily climate variability to change over time, and because a large number of samples are needed to accurately characterize a distribution, we characterize distributions throughout the 1951–2025 observed period using 15-year CDFs staggered by five years. Specifically, for each of the 12 months and for each model, variable, and 1° grid cell, we use a kernel smoothing function (ksdensity in Matlab R2025b) to calculate the CDF of all daily departures from that model’s low-pass filtered mean climate for each of the 11 following 15-year periods: 1951–1965, 1956–1970, 1961–1975, 1966–1980, 1971–1985, 1976–1990, 1981–1995, 1986–2000, 1991–2005, 2006–2020, and 2011–2025. For each CDF calculated, we estimate the 101 data values that correspond to the 101 evenly spaced quantiles from zero to one.

We then assess each model’s anthropogenically forced change in daily distributions as the difference in the CDF for a given 15-year observational period of interest (e.g., 1956–1970) and the mean CDF from four distinct 15-year periods that begin in the 19th-century portion of the CMIP6 Historical scenario (1851–1865, 1866–1880, 1881–1895, 1896–1910). We characterize the pre-anthropogenic distribution as the mean of multiple 15-year CDFs rather than as a single CDF in order to maintain consistency with the 15-year period used for the observed-period CDFs. Finally, for each of the 11 observational 15-year periods, we calculate the anthropogenic effect on daily variability as the CMIP6 weighted 24-model mean difference between the observed-period CDF and the pre-anthropogenic CDF. For all non-temperature variables, the change in CDFs is assessed as, for each of the 101 evenly spaced quantiles, the corresponding daily anomaly value in the observed period’s



CDF divided by that of the pre-anthropogenic CDF. For temperature, the change is quantified by subtracting the pre-anthropogenic CDF values from the observed-period CDF values.

540

Figure 2k–o shows how the western US CMIP6 weighted-mean CDF of daily tmax anomalies relative to the background mean trend during 2011–2025 compares to that of the pre-anthropogenic period on annual and seasonal scales. The corresponding maps in Fig. 2p–t show how changes the 5th and 95th percentile tmax anomalies are distributed spatially. Overall there is much model disagreement regarding changes in the distribution of daily tmax anomalies with the exception of warming of the coolest tmax anomalies in winter of over 0.5°C across the northern portion of the Great Basin (Fig. 2l,q). Simulated changes in distributions of daily tmin anomalies are similar to those of tmax with the exception of a stronger tendency toward reduced winter extremes (warmer lows and cooler highs) east of the Cascades Range in the northwestern US as well the Great Basin (Fig. A1k–p).

545

550

Figure 3k–o shows CMIP6 weighted-mean changes in the CDFs of daily non-zero (≥ 0.1 mm) prec anomalies, again comparing distributions during 2011–2025 to those of the pre-anthropogenic period. In all seasons, models simulate reduced prec anomalies among the driest 10–20% of days with non-zero prec totals. The pairs of maps in Fig. 3p–t show changes in the frequency of days with non-zero prec as well as changes in the 95th percentile of non-zero prec anomalies relative to the background mean. The weighted-model mean indicates reductions in prec frequency, particularly in spring–fall, of 5–10% and increases in the most extreme precipitation anomalies (e.g., 95th percentile). Note that because daily prec anomalies are assessed relative to (percent of) the background mean, an increase in the background mean of X% automatically implies the expectation of a corresponding X% increase in non-zero daily prec totals. Thus, any changes in daily non-zero prec anomalies shown in Fig. 3k–t represent changes after accounting for the trends in background mean totals shown in Fig. a–j. This explains why models disagree regarding change in 95th percentile non-zero prec anomalies in winter (Fig. 3q) despite strong agreement on increases in background mean winter prec totals (Fig. 3b,g). Likewise, while CMIP6 models generally simulate historical increases in winter–spring 95th percentile prec totals in winter–spring in the northern latitudes of the western US (Williams et al., 2024a), Fig. 3 indicates this is largely accounted for by the simulated increase in background mean prec and the only places where 95th percentile anomalies relative to background means increase in the cool season are where the background mean trend is negative (Fig. 3l,m,q,r). On the other hand, CMIP6 models simulate enhanced daily summertime prec anomalies to become 10–20% more intense relative to the background mean across California and the Great Basin region (Fig. 3n) despite moderate increases of approximately 5% in background mean totals (Fig. 3i).

555

560

565

570

Figure 4k–t shows the CMIP6 weighted-mean changes daily anomaly distributions at the annual scale for ea, wind, solar, longwave, and psfc. See Figs. A2–A6 for changes in distribution by season for these variables. For ea, models suggest contracted daily distributions of anomalies, with stronger agreement on weakened positive anomalies than negative anomalies (Fig. 4k,p). Models also suggest contracted distributions of wind anomalies across much of the western US (Fig.



4l,q). There is relatively strong inter-model agreement on widening of the distribution of daily solar anomalies (Fig. 4m,r), driven mostly by decreases in the most negative winter and spring anomalies of 5–10% relative to the background mean, which is also reduced by approximately 1–3% in these seasons relative to the pre-anthropogenic mean (Fig. A4). Models show strong agreement on a contracted distribution of longwave radiation across the western US that is year-round, yet relatively small, with the most negative and positive daily departures from the background mean contracting toward the mean by approximately 1–1.5% (Fig. 4l,p). Contractions of longwave daily anomalies are largest, closer to 2%, in winter (Fig. A5). Models also generally suggest contracted distributions of daily psfc anomalies, but similar to the simulated increases in background mean psfc, the contraction of daily anomalies is very small Fig. 4o,t (Fig. A6).

2.2.5 Removing anthropogenic effects from observed daily climate

To remove the estimated anthropogenic changes in background means and daily variances described in sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 from the observed daily dataset described in section 2.1, we remove the anthropogenic trends in background means and then adjust daily variances.

The first step bilinearly interpolates monthly 1° grids of CMIP6 24-model weighted mean anthropogenic trends for the period of 1951–2025 to the $1/24^\circ$ resolution of the observational dataset. For non-temperature variables, the anthropogenic trend is represented as fractional change relative to the climatological mean of 1851–1900 for each of the 12 months. We thus remove these trends by, for each month from 1951–2025, dividing each day’s observational climate map by the corresponding $1/24^\circ$ map of interpolated fractional change values. The same is done for tmax and tmin except that anthropogenic trends, which are assessed as $^\circ\text{C}$ change from the 1851–1900 mean, are subtracted from observations.

Next, for each of the 12 months and each variable, we use the detrended observations described in the paragraph above to produce an observed CDF of daily anomalies for each $1/24^\circ$ grid cell for each of the 15-year periods from 1951–2025. For each 15-year period, the anomalies are calculated relative to the mean of that period and are thus meant to represent daily departures from the expected pre-anthropogenic 1851–1900 baseline. The departures are calculated as fraction of the mean for non-temperature variables. We then calculate, for each of the 12 months, each variable, and each $1/24^\circ$ grid cell, a CDF of these departure values for each 15-year period following the same method applied to the CMIP6 data such that there is an estimated climate value associated with each of the 101 evenly spaced quantiles from zero to one.

The next objective is to adjust the distributions of the observed departures from the pre-anthropogenic baseline climatology. This is done by, for each of the 12 months, each variable, each 15-year period from 1951–2025, and each $1/24^\circ$ grid cell, estimating the pre-anthropogenic CDF and then using quantile mapping to adjust the daily values for that period’s central five years accordingly. Recall from section 2.2.3 that the anthropogenic effect on daily variances in a given 15-year period



605 from the observational era was calculated, for non-temperature variables, as the observational-era CDF divided by the pre-anthropogenic CDF, and for temperature, the observational-era CDF minus the pre-anthropogenic CDF. Thus, for each 15-year period during 1951–2025 and each of the 101 evenly spaced quantiles from zero to one, we have a 1° -resolution map of how anthropogenic forcing altered that quantile’s associated daily departure values. We bilinearly interpolated these maps to $1/24^\circ$ resolution, resulting in, for each of the 12 months, each variable, each 15-year period in the observational era, and each
 610 $1/24^\circ$ grid cell, a set of 101 CDF adjustment values that can be used to transform the observed daily climate anomalies to take on a distribution consistent with that expected from the pre-anthropogenic era.

For each of the 12 months and each non-temperature variable, we estimate pre-anthropogenic CDFs by dividing each observed CDF (for each 15-year observed-era period and each $1/24^\circ$ grid cell) by its corresponding set of adjustment values.
 615 For temperature, we subtract the adjustment values from the observed CDFs. Then, we use quantile mapping to transform the observed daily departures from the pre-anthropogenic background mean to take on the pre-anthropogenic distribution. To do this, for each variable, each of the 12 months, each observed-era 15-year period, and each $1/24^\circ$ grid cell, we convert the observed daily departures from the pre-anthropogenic background means to quantiles. For the central 5 years of each 15-year period (but the first 10 years of the first 15-year period and last 10 years of the last 15-year period), we then use linear
 620 interpolation to associate each quantile value with the expected daily departure value expected of the pre-anthropogenic distribution. We then impose these adjusted daily departure values back onto the pre-anthropogenic background mean by, for non-temperature variables, multiplying the adjusted departure values by the 15-year period’s pre-anthropogenic mean. For temperature variables, the adjusted departure values are added to the 15-year pre-anthropogenic mean. In so doing, we produce full time series of daily data at $1/24^\circ$ resolution that follow the same sequence of daily to decadal climate variability
 625 as was observed from 1951–2025, but without CMIP6 24-model weighted mean trends in background means or daily variability.

3 Data Overview

The datasets provided are monthly netcdf files of observed and CMIP6-detrended daily $1/24^\circ$ resolution gridded maps of
 630 prec, tmax, tmin, ea, wind, solar, longwave, and psfc across the western US (11 westernmost states of the coterminous US) from January 1 1951 through December 31 2025. Figures 5–6 and Figs. A6–A9 provide time series and distribution plots that visualize western US regionally averaged trends and ranges of daily variability within the observed and CMIP6-detrended datasets. Specifically, Fig. 5 shows observed and CMIP6-detrended time series of annual and seasonally averaged tmax and tmin from 1951–2025 as well as annual and seasonal distributions of daily tmax and tmin values for the 2011–2025
 635 period. Figure 6 shows observed and CMIP6-detrended time series and distributions of prec at the annual and seasonal scales. The left column shows western US regionally averaged prec anomalies, the center column shows distributions of daily non-zero prec anomalies, and the right column shows time series of anomalies in the frequency of days with non-zero



prec. Fig. A7 shows annual and seasonal time series and daily distributions of western US ea and wind, Fig. A8 shows the same for solar and longwave, and Fig. A9 shows the same for psfc.

640




Figure 5: Observed and CMIP6-detrended daily maximum and minimum temperature (tmax and tmin, respectively) averaged across the western US. (a and c) Time series of mean annual tmax and tmin anomalies, respectively, according to observations (orange) and the CMIP6-detrended dataset (blue). (b and d) Kernel density plots of daily tmax and tmin, respectively, during 2016–2025. The following rows are as in (a–d) but for seasons (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov).

645




Figure 6: Observed and CMIP6-detrended precipitation (prec) anomalies averaged across the western US. (a) Time series of regionally averaged percent precipitation anomalies annual precipitation total relative to the 1951–2000 observed mean, according to observations (orange) and the CMIP6-detrended dataset (blue). (b) Daily distributions of non-zero precipitation anomalies during 2016–2025 relative to the 1951–2000 observed mean. (c) Time series of regionally averaged percent anomalies of annual non-zero precipitation frequency (pfreq). The following rows are as in (a–c) but for seasons (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov).

The variables represented in the ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily dataset can be used to derive many additional variables. For example, two derived variables often used to assess atmospheric aridity are vapor-pressure deficit (vpd; $e_s - e_a$) and relative



humidity (rh; $ea/es \cdot 100$). See Fig. A10 for time series and daily distributions of western US regionally averaged vpd and rh. To derive these variables we calculate es as the mean of esmax and esmin, calculated from eq. 2 and eq. 3.

660

A limitation of ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily is that the true anthropogenic contribution to observed climate is unknown and therefore not perfectly represented by the CMIP6 24-model weighted mean that we treated as our best approximation of anthropogenic climate change. In particular, there is a high degree of inter-model spread in terms of historical trends in background mean prec (Fig. 3). In winter, when all models evaluated simulate positive trends and the 24-model mean change
 665 in background mean prec as of 2025 (relative to 1851–1900) is +8%, the inter-model range is +4 to +14%. Given that the surface water balance and related variables such as streamflow and plant moisture content would be sensitive to even small changes in background mean prec, assessments of anthropogenic forcing on these variables are highly sensitive to uncertainties (Williams et al., 2020).

670

Another limitation is our use of a single ensemble member per model to estimate anthropogenic effects on daily variances. Ideally we would use as many ensemble members as possible, as we do for background mean trends, but this would increase computational expense considerably. However, anthropogenic changes in daily variances are generally much smaller than changes in background means, and thus background means are likely to account for most of the uncertainty in our assessment of anthropogenic climate change.

675

Related to this, we assume in our counterfactual-climate approach that a world free of anthropogenic forcing would have experienced the same sequence of climatic variations as was observed in the anthropogenically forced (e.g., strong El Niño in 1997–1998). In reality, with or without anthropogenic forcing, natural variability alone would dictate that any alternative realization of the past would follow a random sequence of climate variations largely distinct from those that arose in the
 680 observed world. Further, in a counterfactual realization in the absence of anthropogenic forcing, the effects of natural, externally forced variations such as volcanic events and solar cycles may have differed. Thus, the assumption of an observed sequence of variations in the counterfactual world free of anthropogenic forcing is not valid. Nonetheless, this assumption has proven useful for estimates of how anthropogenic forcing may have contributed to an observed climate event or trend of interest (Williams et al., 2015; Abatzoglou and Williams, 2016; Deser et al., 2016; Sippel et al., 2020; Williams et al., 2020,
 685 2024b).

Importantly, any use of climate models to estimate the effects of anthropogenic forcing on climate is subject to underlying errors in the climate models themselves. Of particular relevance to western US hydroclimate is uncertainty in anthropogenic effects on ocean circulation and ocean-atmosphere coupling in the tropical Pacific. In particular, the El Niño-Southern
 690 Oscillation (ENSO), as well as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) of the North Pacific, which is coupled to the ENSO (Newman et al., 2016), are important drivers of natural variability in western US hydroclimate, largely by modulating the



latitude of the cool-season jet stream and storm tracks (Ropelewski and Halpert, 1986; Dettinger et al., 1998; Gershunov and Barnett, 1998; Cayan et al., 1999; McCabe and Dettinger, 1999). Over the past approximately four decades, Pacific sea-surface temperatures (SSTs) trended toward the La Niña phase of ENSO and the cool phase of the PDO, both of which are associated with negative precipitation anomalies in the western US (Lehner et al., 2018; Seager et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2024). While multidecade variations in the ENSO and PDO are expected to be dominated by natural variability, there is much debate about the role for anthropogenic forcing, largely because the recent observed La Niña-like trend is in contrast to the more El Niño-like trends simulated by most climate models (Seager et al., 2019; Cai et al., 2021; Seager et al., 2022; Byrne et al., 2025). While the discrepancy between observed and modeled tropical Pacific trends may be due simply to an improbable natural variation in the observed climate, apparent model biases in ocean-atmosphere coupling over the tropical Pacific may indicate a systematic bias among models (Jiang et al., 2025). In this case, the true effect of anthropogenic forcing on western US hydroclimate may be not well represented by CMIP6 multi-model mean trends.

Related to the above, our decision to weight the influences of climate models based on their agreement with observed global temperature trends is symptomatic of a suspicion that some CMIP6 models may exhibit sensitivities to anthropogenic forcings that are too strong. Of the 24 models we considered, 15 simulate more rapid global warming than was observed from 1961–2025 and half of these simulate a warming that exceeds observations by more than 25% (0.21 °C) (Table 2). While the slower rate of observed warming relative to that simulated by most models may be due to natural variability, perhaps related to the tropical Pacific trends described above, it may also arise from model biases toward too much sensitivity to greenhouse gas forcing. For example, several models participating in the CMIP6 exhibit a stronger equilibrium climate sensitivity (global surface warming in response to a doubling of atmospheric CO₂ concentration) than did their CMIP5 counterparts (Forster et al., 2020). Further, more CMIP6 models exhibit sensitivities beyond the 4.0°C upper limit of the “likely” range according to the most recent report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Forster et al., 2020, 2021) and are also beyond the ranges estimated in many previous assessments constrained by observations, theory, and paleo-evidence (Knutti et al., 2017b; Zhu et al., 2020). The increase in climate sensitivity among CMIP6 models is due mostly to stronger positive feedbacks with losses of extratropical low clouds and albedo (Zelinka et al., 2020). While much work remains to assess the legitimacy of the modeled low-cloud feedbacks specifically, the shift toward heightened global temperature sensitivity among CMIP6 models is not well supported by observations (Brunner et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2020; Nijssen et al., 2020; Tokarska et al., 2020; Ribes et al., 2021). It is therefore recommended by the authors of the studies cited above and others (Hausfather et al., 2022) to diverge from the historical norm of giving all available models equal weight in assessments of climate sensitivity to a given forcing. Our choice to weight models by their similarity to the recent observed rate of global warming reflects our prioritization of simplicity and interpretability. More complex methods do exist, such as emergent constraints (Hall and Qu, 2006; Cox et al., 2018) as well as schemes to select or weight models based on skill at simulating multiple climate variables and/or quantities (e.g., means vs trends) for a specific region of interest (Krantz et al.,



2022; Pierce et al., 2022). However, applying a more complex model-weighting scheme here would involve subjective decisions regarding which variables and quantities to consider and how they should be prioritized.

4 Data availability

4.1 Datasets used to produce the ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily dataset

nClimGrid-daily 1/24° daily prec, tmax, and tmin (Durre et al., 2022): <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/products/land-based-station/ncimgrid-daily> (accessed Apr 12, 2026)

PRISM 1/24° daily and 1/120° monthly ea and solar (Daly et al., 2021): <https://prism.oregonstate.edu/> (accessed Apr 8, 2026)

WTK-LED 4-km dynamically downscaled ERA5 hourly 10-m wind (Draxl et al., 2024): <https://doi.org/10.25984/2504176> (accessed Apr 10, 2026)

WUS-D3 9-km dynamically downscaled ERA5 daily ea, 10-m wind, solar, and longwave (Rahimi et al., 2024): https://wrf-cmip6-noversioning.s3.amazonaws.com/index.html#downscaled_products/reanalysis/era5/postprocess/d02/ (accessed Nov 23, 2025)

GridMET 1/24° daily ea, wind, and solar (Abatzoglou, 2013): <https://www.climatologylab.org/gridmet.html> (accessed Apr 13, 2026)

NLDAS2 1/8° hourly longwave (Xia et al., 2012): https://hydro1.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.gov/data/NLDAS/NLDAS_FORA0125_H.2.0/ (accessed Feb 26, 2026)

Observed global surface air data come from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (Huang et al., 2026) (<https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/climate-at-a-glance/global/time-series>, accessed April 7, 2026), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISTEMP Team, 2024) (https://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/data_v4.html, accessed April 7, 2026), and Berkeley Earth (Rohde and Hausfather, 2020) (<https://berkeleyearth.org/data/>, accessed April 7, 2026).

CMIP6 climate model simulation outputs were accessed from the Earth System Grid Federation and Oak Ridge National Laboratory (<https://esgf-node.ornl.gov/search>, accessed Apr 15, 2026)



4.2 ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily

760 The daily 1/24° observational dataset is available from <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19636838> (Williams, 2026c).

The daily 1/24° counterfactual dataset after removing CMIP6 trends from observations is available for peer review from <https://tinyurl.com/yaab4rhj> (Williams, 2026b). This dataset will be made publicly available upon acceptance and publication of this manuscript.

765

5 Code availability

The code to produce the counterfactual dataset as well as the intermediary datasets produced to make the calculations are available for peer review from <https://tinyurl.com/yc6bzwnf> (Williams, 2026a). These files will be made publicly available
770 upon acceptance and publication of this manuscript.

6 Summary

ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily is a new pair of parallel datasets of daily, high resolution (~4 km) gridded surface climate data for the western US, representing observed climate from 1951–2025 as well as a counterfactual realization without
775 anthropogenic changes in background mean climate or daily variances. Climate variables are precipitation total, maximum and minimum temperature, mean vapor pressure, mean wind speed, mean downward solar and longwave radiation at the surface, and mean surface pressure. Unlike other counterfactual datasets available, ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily uses observational rather than reanalysis sources for precipitation, temperature, and humidity, and other variables are produced by a state-of-the-art dynamically downscaled reanalysis product. This is particularly important for precipitation, as reanalyses
780 commonly misrepresent precipitation extremes and trends (Sun et al., 2018; Hu and Franzke, 2020; Smith et al., 2025). Thus, in addition to the uniquely broad applicability of the counterfactual dataset for evaluation of climate-change impacts in the western US, the observational dataset will, on its own, provide unique value for evaluations of observed hydroclimatic variability, trends, and impacts, and the 1951–2025 temporal extent will allow for longer temporal context than other observation-based datasets that begin in 1979.

785

We developed the counterfactual dataset using the "remove-the-modeled-trend" (RTMT) approach, in which anthropogenic trends as simulated by 24 CMIP6 climate models are removed from observations. While it has been standard practice in RTMT approaches to remove anthropogenic trends only from background mean climate, we introduce the advance of also removing trends in daily departures from those background mean conditions. This is important because climate change not
790 only drives changes in background means, but also variability, particularly for precipitation. That said, all counterfactual realizations of observed climate are produced with the simplifying assumption that anthropogenic forcing does not affect



795 atmospheric dynamics. For example, while anthropogenic forcing could conceivably cause a given atmospheric circulation
feature to be impossible on a given day, the RTMT method (as well as dynamical downscaling and the regress-out-global-
warming method used for the ATTRICI dataset) cannot cancel a circulation event if it occurred in the observed record. These
methods can only modify the nature of the event by adjusting precipitation totals, temperature, wind speed, etc. While our
removal of anthropogenic effects on daily variability marks an advance, the approach to do so is relatively simple and
agnostic to how forced changes to daily variability may vary depending on atmospheric and/or oceanic states. Finally, any
model-based calculation of counterfactual climate is subject to uncertainties and biases in climate-model representations of
anthropogenic climate change. We plan to update the ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily when CMIP7 simulations outputs are
800 available from the next generation of climate models (Dunne et al., 2025).

Finally, a primary motivation behind ParallelClim-WestUS-Daily is to facilitate offline simulations of complex processes
downstream of hydroclimatic variability and unprecedented ability to assess effects of climate change on these processes.
Examples of such processes include surface hydrology, vegetation ecosystem dynamics, and wildfire. The ability to monitor
805 climate-change contributions to the complex hydroclimatic impacts that are not reliably simulated by global climate models
will enable a crucial new source guidance as to the rate at which these processes are likely to continue changing in the
coming decades.



Appendix A




Figure A1: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of daily minimum temperature (tmin). Time series panels on left (a–e) show trends in mean annual (Jan–Dec) and seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) tmin according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as deviations from the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (f–j) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (k–o) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the anomaly expected during 2011–2025 minus that expected in 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (p–t) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentiles of daily anomalies during 2011–2025 minus



those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background means. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.




Figure A2: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of daily mean vapor pressure (ea). Time series panels on left (a–d) show trends in mean seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) ea according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as percent deviations from the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (e–h) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (i–l) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the anomaly value expected during 2011–2025 relative to (%) that expected in 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (m–p) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentiles of daily anomalies during 2011–2025 relative to those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background means. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.




Figure A3: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of daily mean 2-m wind velocity (wind). Time series panels on left (a–d) show trends in mean seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) wind according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as percent deviations from the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (e–h) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (i–l) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the anomaly value expected during 2011–2025 relative to (%) that expected in the 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (m–p) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentiles of daily anomalies during 2011–2025 relative to those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background means. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.




Figure A4: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of daily mean downwelling solar radiation at the surface (solar). Time series panels on left (a–d) show trends in mean seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) solar according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as percent deviations from the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (e–h) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (i–l) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the anomaly value expected during 2011–2025 relative to (%) that expected in 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (m–p) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentiles of daily anomalies during 2011–2025 relative to those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background means. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.




Figure A5: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of daily mean downwelling longwave radiation at the surface (longwave). Time series panels on left (a–d) show trends in mean seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) longwave according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as percent deviations from the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (e–h) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (i–l) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the anomaly value expected during 2011–2025 relative to (%) that expected in the 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (m–p) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentiles of daily anomalies during 2011–2025 relative to those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background means. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.




Figure A6: Anthropogenic trends in background means and daily distributions of daily mean surface pressure (psfc). Time series panels on left (a–d) show trends in mean seasonal (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov) psfc according to (grey thin lines) each of 24 CMIP6 models and (black bold line) the multi-model mean from 1851–2025. Trends expressed as percent deviations from the 1851–1900 mean. Maps in (e–h) show multi-model mean trend magnitudes as of 2025. Plots in (i–l) show the multi-model mean change in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of daily anomalies (departures from the background mean trends) between 2011–2025 and 1851–1910. For a given quantile value (y-axis), the x-axis value is the anomaly value expected during 2011–2025 relative to (%) that expected in the 1851–1910. Pairs of maps on the right (m–p) show multi-model mean (left) 5th and (right) 95th percentiles of daily anomalies during 2011–2025 relative to those of 1851–1910. Daily anomalies are calculated relative to trends in background means. In maps, stippling indicates that fewer than two-thirds of models agree on the sign. Multi-model means are calculated using the weighted means shown in Table 2, as described in section 2.2.1.




Figure A7: Observed and CMIP6-detrended vapor pressure (ea) and 2-m wind velocity (wind) averaged across the western US. (a and c) Time series of mean annual ea and wind, respectively, according to observations (orange) and the CMIP6-detrended dataset (blue). (b and d) Kernel density plots of daily ea and wind, respectively, during 2016–2025. The following rows are as in (a–d) but for seasons (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov).




Figure A8: Observed and CMIP6-detrended downwelling solar and longwave radiation at the surface (solar and longwave, respectively) averaged across the western US. (a and c) Time series of mean annual solar and longwave, respectively, according to observations (orange) and the CMIP6-detrended dataset (blue). (b and d) Kernel density plots of daily solar and longwave, respectively, during 2016–2025. The following rows are as in (a–d) but for seasons (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov).





Figure A9: Observed and CMIP6-detrended surface pressure (psfc) averaged across the western US. (a) Time series of mean annual psfc according to observations (orange) and the CMIP6-detrended dataset (blue). (b) Kernel density plots of daily psfc, during 2016–2025. The following rows are as in (a–b) but for seasons (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA: Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov).



975 **Figure A10:** Observed and CMIP6-detrended vapor-pressure deficit (vpd) and relative humidity (rh) averaged
 across the western US. (a and c) Time series of mean annual vpd and rh, respectively, according to observations
 (orange) and the CMIP6-detrended dataset (blue). (b and d) Kernel density plots of daily vpd and rh, respectively,
 during 2016–2025. The following rows are as in (a–d) but for seasons (DJF: Dec–Feb, MAM: Mar–May, JJA:
 Jun–Aug, SON: Sep–Nov).

980 **Author contributions**

APW developed the methods, carried them out, and prepared the manuscript. GDM and HL helped to prepare the data. JTA, GDM, HL, SR, and CD provided critical guidance related to the methodology and edited the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.



985 Acknowledgements

Development of this dataset was only possible because of the careful and generous work by many individuals and organizations who are not on this author list. This includes, but is not limited to, those who established, maintained, and publicized the data from the in-situ weather stations that serve as the foundation of all of the observational data products that we used, the team that developed the NOAA nClimGrid-daily dataset (Durre et al., 2022), the team that developed the
 990 original, undownscaled ECMWF ERA5 reanalysis (Hersbach et al., 2020), individuals who contributed to the development, maintenance, and publication of the PRISM, GridMET, WTK-LED wind, WUS-D3 dynamically downscaled ERA5, and NLDAS2 gridded climate datasets; the global mean temperature datasets from NOAA, GISS, and Berkeley Earth; and the climate model simulations and associated datasets from the CMIP6. We also acknowledge the World Climate Research Programme, which, through its Working Group on Coupled Modelling, coordinated and promoted CMIP6. We thank the
 995 climate modeling groups for producing and making available their model output, the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) for archiving the data and providing access, and the multiple funding agencies who support CMIP6 and ESGF.

Financial support

This research was supported by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (13283), the UCLA Sustainable LA Grand Challenge, the USGS Southwestern Climate Adaptation Science Center (G24AC00611 and G24AC00080), and the US
 1000 National Park Service (P24AC00743-00).

References

- Abatzoglou, J. T.: Development of gridded surface meteorological data for ecological applications and modelling, *Int J Climatol*, 33, 121–131, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3413>, 2013.
- Abatzoglou, J. T. and Williams, A. P.: Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 113, 11770–11775, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1607171113>, 2016.
- Abatzoglou, J. T., Dobrowski, S. Z., Parks, S. A., and Hegewisch, K. C.: TerraClimate, a high-resolution global dataset of monthly climate and climatic water balance from 1958–2015, *Scientific data*, 5, 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2017.191>, 2018.
- Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., and Smith, M.: Crop evapotranspiration-Guidelines for computing crop water requirements-FAO Irrigation and drainage, paper 56, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 1998.
- Anderegg, W. R. L., Anderegg, L. D. L., Kerr, K. L., and Trugman, A. T.: Widespread drought-induced tree mortality at dry range edges indicates climate stress exceeds species' compensating mechanisms, *Global Change Biology*, 25, 3793–3802, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14771>, 2019.



- 1015 Ault, T. R., Cole, J. E., Overpeck, J. T., Pederson, G. T., and Meko, D. M.: Assessing the risk of persistent drought using climate model simulations and paleoclimate data, *Journal of Climate*, 27, 7529–7549, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00282.1>, 2014.
- Bellenger, H., Guilyardi, E., Leloup, J., Lengaigne, M., and Vialard, J.: ENSO representation in climate models: from CMIP3 to CMIP5, *Climate Dynamics*, 42, 1999–2018, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-013-1783-z>, 2014.
- 1020 Berner, L. T., Law, B. E., Meddens, A. J. H., and Hicke, J. A.: Tree mortality from fires, bark beetles, and timber harvest during a hot and dry decade in the western United States (2003–2012), *Environmental Research Letters*, 12, 065005, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa6f94>, 2017.
- Brunner, L., Pendergrass, A. G., Lehner, F., Merrifield, A. L., Lorenz, R., and Knutti, R.: Reduced global warming from CMIP6 projections when weighting models by performance and independence, *Earth System Dynamics Discussions*, 11, 995–1012, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-11-995-2020>, 2020.
- 1025 Byrne, H., Seager, R., and Smerdon, J. E.: CMIP6 models cannot capture long-term forced changes in the tropical Pacific sea surface temperature gradient, *Nat Commun*, 17, 142, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-66839-w>, 2025.
- Cai, W., Santoso, A., Collins, M., Dewitte, B., Karamperidou, C., Kug, J.-S., Lengaigne, M., McPhaden, M. J., Stuecker, M. F., Taschetto, A. S., Timmermann, A., Wu, L., Yeh, S.-W., Wang, G., Ng, B., Jia, F., Yang, Y., Ying, J., Zheng, X.-T., Bayr, T., Brown, J. R., Capotondi, A., Cobb, K. M., Gan, B., Geng, T., Ham, Y.-G., Jin, F.-F., Jo, H.-S., Li, X., Lin, X., McGregor, S., Park, J.-H., Stein, K., Yang, K., Zhang, L., and Zhong, W.: Changing El Niño–Southern oscillation in a warming climate, *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 2, 628–644, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-021-00199-z>, 2021.
- Cayan, D. R., Redmond, K. T., and Riddle, L. G.: ENSO and hydrologic extremes in the western United States, *Journal of Climate*, 12, 2881–2893, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1999\)012%3C2881:EAHEIT%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1999)012%3C2881:EAHEIT%3E2.0.CO;2), 1999.
- 1035 Cook, B. I., Mankin, J. S., Marvel, K., Williams, A. P., Smerdon, J. E., and Anchukaitis, K. J.: Twenty-first century drought projections in the CMIP6 forcing scenarios, *Earth’s Future*, 8, e2019EF001461, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001461>, 2020.
- Cox, P. M., Huntingford, C., and Williamson, M. S.: Emergent constraint on equilibrium climate sensitivity from global temperature variability, *Nature*, 553, 319–322, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25450>, 2018.
- 1040 Daly, C., Doggett, M. K., Smith, J. I., Olson, K. V., Halbleib, M. D., Dimcovic, Z., Keon, D., Loiselle, R. A., Steinberg, B., and Ryan, A. D.: Challenges in observation-based mapping of daily precipitation across the conterminous United States, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 38, 1979–1992, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-21-0054.1>, 2021.
- Dannenberg, M. P., McCabe, G. J., Wise, E. K., Johnston, M. R., Huntzinger, D. N., and Williams, A. P.: Recent increases in Missouri River streamflow driven by combined effects of climate variability, land-use change, and elevated CO₂, *AGU advances*, 6, e2024AV001432, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024AV001432>, 2025.
- 1045 Deser, C., Terray, L., and Phillips, A. S.: Forced and internal components of winter air temperature trends over North America during the past 50 years: Mechanisms and implications, *Journal of Climate*, 29, 2237–2258, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0304.1>, 2016.
- 1050 Dettinger, M. D., Cayan, D. R., Diaz, H. F., and Meko, D. M.: North-south precipitation patterns in western North America on interannual-to-decadal timescales, *J Climate*, 11, 3095–3111, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1998\)011%3C3095:NSPPIW%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1998)011%3C3095:NSPPIW%3E2.0.CO;2), 1998.



- Dieppois, B., Capotondi, A., Pohl, B., Chun, K. P., Monerie, P.-A., and Eden, J.: ENSO diversity shows robust decadal variations that must be captured for accurate future projections, *Communications Earth & Environment*, 2, 212, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-021-00285-6>, 2021.
- Diffenbaugh, N. S. and Burke, M.: Global warming has increased global economic inequality, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116, 9808–9813, 2019.
- Draxl, C., Wang, J., Sheridan, L., Jung, C., Bodini, N., Buckhold, S., Aghili, C. T., Peco, K., Kotamarthi, R., Kumler, A., Phillips, C., Purkayastha, A., Young, E., Rosenlieb, E., and Heidi, T.: WTK-LED: The wind toolkit long-term ensemble dataset, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Golden, CO, <https://doi.org/10.2172/2473210>, 2024.
- Dunne, J. P., Hewitt, H. T., Arblaster, J., Bonou, F., Boucher, O., Cavazos, T., Durack, P. J., Hassler, B., Juckes, M., Miyakawa, T., Mizielinski, M., Naik, V., Nicholls, Z., O’rourke, E., Pincus, R., Sanderson, B. M., Simpson, I. R., and Taylor, K. E.: An evolving Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 7 (CMIP7) and Fast Track in support of future climate assessment, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 18, 6671–6700, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-18-6671-2025>, 2025.
- Durre, I., Arguez, A., Schreck III, C. J., Squires, M. F., and Vose, R. S.: Daily high-resolution temperature and precipitation fields for the contiguous United States from 1951 to present, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 39, 1837–1855, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-22-0024.1>, 2022.
- Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization, *Geosci Model Dev*, 9, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016>, 2016.
- Eyring, V., Gillett, N. P., Achuta Rao, K. M., Barimalala, R., Barreiro Parrillo, M., Bellouin, N., Cassou, C., Durack, P. J., Kosaka, Y., McGregor, S., Min, S., Morgenstern, O., and Sun, Y.: Human influence on the climate system (Chapter 3), IPCC 2021: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 423–552, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.005>, 2023.
- Faunt, C. C., Sneed, M., Traum, J., and Brandt, J. T.: Water availability and land subsidence in the Central Valley, California, USA, *Hydrogeol J*, 24, 675–684, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-015-1339-x>, 2016.
- Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K., Collins, W., Dufresne, J.-L., Frame, D., Lunt, D. J., Mauritsen, T., Plamer, M. D., Watanabe, M., Wild, M., and Zhang, H.: The Earth’s Energy Budget, Climate Feedbacks, and Climate Sensitivity, in: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 923–1024, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.009>, 2021.
- Forster, P. M., Maycock, A. C., McKenna, C. M., and Smith, C. J.: Latest climate models confirm need for urgent mitigation, *Nature Climate Change*, 10, 7–10, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0660-0>, 2020.
- Gershunov, A. and Barnett, T. P.: ENSO influence on intraseasonal extreme rainfall and temperature frequencies in the contiguous United States: Observations and model results, *Journal of Climate*, 11, 1575–1586, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1998\)011%3C1575:EIOIER%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1998)011%3C1575:EIOIER%3E2.0.CO;2), 1998.
- Giorgi, F., Im, E.-S., Coppola, E., Diffenbaugh, N. S., Gao, X. J., Mariotti, L., and Shi, Y.: Higher hydroclimatic intensity with global warming, *J Climate*, 24, 5309–5324, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2011JCLI3979.1>, 2011.
- GISTEMP Team: GISS Surface Temperature Analysis (GISTEMP) (4), NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies [dataset], <https://doi.org/10.18739/A2WW77214>, 2024.



- 1090 Gottlieb, A. R. and Mankin, J. S.: Evidence of human influence on Northern Hemisphere snow loss, *Nature*, 625, 293–300, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06794-y>, 2024.
- Hall, A. and Qu, X.: Using the current seasonal cycle to constrain snow albedo feedback in future climate change, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL025127>, 2006.
- 1095 Hannart, A., Pearl, J., Otto, F. E. L., Naveau, P., and Ghil, M.: Causal counterfactual theory for the attribution of weather and climate-related events, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 97, 99–110, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00034.1>, 2016.
- Hausfather, Z., Marvel, K., Schmidt, G. A., and Nielsen-Gammon, J. W.: Climate simulations: recognize the ‘hot model’ problem, *Nature*, 605, 26–29, 2022.
- 1100 He, Q., Williams, A. P., Johnston, M. R., Juang, C. S., and Wang, B.: Influence of time-averaging of climate data on estimates of atmospheric vapor pressure deficit and inferred relationships with wildfire area in the western United States, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 52, e2024GL113708, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL113708>, 2025.
- 1105 Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Abellan, X., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Biavati, G., Bidlot, J., Bonavita, M., De Chiara, G., Dahlgren, P., Dee, D., Diamantakis, M., Dragani, R., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A., Haimberger, L., Healy, S., Hogan, R. J., Hólm, E., Janisková, M., Keeley, S., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Lupu, C., Radnoti, R., de Rosnay, P., Rozum, I., Vamorg, F., Villaume, S., and Thépaut, J.-N.: The ERA5 global reanalysis, *Q J Roy Meteor Soc*, 146, 1999–2049, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803>, 2020.
- Hicke, J. A., Meddens, A. J. H., and Kolden, C. A.: Recent tree mortality in the western United States from bark beetles and forest fires, *Forest Science*, 62, 141–153, <https://doi.org/10.5849/forsci.15-086>, 2016.
- 1110 Hirsch, A. L., Ridder, N. N., Perkins-Kirkpatrick, S. E., and Ukkola, A.: CMIP6 MultiModel evaluation of present-day heatwave attributes, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48, e2021GL095161, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL095161>, 2021.
- Howitt, R., Medellin-Azuara, J., MacEwan, D., Lund, J., and Sumner, D. A.: Economic analysis of the 2014 drought for California agriculture, UC Davis Center for Watershed Sciences, Davis, CA, 2014.
- Hu, G. and Franzke, C. L. E.: Evaluation of daily precipitation extremes in reanalysis and gridded observation-based data sets over Germany, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2020GL089624, 2020.
- 1115 Huang, B., Yin, X., Menne, M. J., and Vose, R.: NOAA Global Surface Temperature Dataset (NOAAGlobalTemp) (6.1.0), NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information [dataset], <https://doi.org/10.25921/vvaa-wq11>, 2026.
- Jiang, F., Seager, R., and Cane, M. A.: Historical subsurface cooling in the tropical Pacific and its dynamics, *Journal of Climate*, 37, 5925–5938, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-24-0007.1>, 2024.
- 1120 Jiang, F., Seager, R., Cane, M. A., Karamperidou, C., and Brizuela, N. G.: Subsurface cooling and sea surface temperature pattern formation over the equatorial Pacific, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 130, e2024JC022222, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024JC022222>, 2025.
- Juang, C. S., Williams, A. P., Abazoglou, J. T., Balch, J. K., Hurteau, M. D., and Moritz, M. A.: Rapid growth of large forest fires drives the exponential response of annual forest-fire area to aridity in the western United States, *Geophys Res Lett*, 49, e2021GL097131, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL097131>, 2022.



- 1125 Knutti, R., Sedláček, J., Sanderson, B. M., Lorenz, R., Fischer, E. M., and Eyring, V.: A climate model projection weighting scheme accounting for performance and interdependence, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 1909–1918, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL072012>, 2017a.
- Knutti, R., Rugenstein, M. A. A., and Hegerl, G. C.: Beyond equilibrium climate sensitivity, *Nature Geoscience*, 10, 727–736, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo3017>, 2017b.
- 1130 Krantz, W., Pierce, D., Goldenson, N., and Cayan, D.: Memorandum on Evaluating Global Climate Models for Studying Regional Climate Change in California, California Energy Commission, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 2022.
- Lehner, F., Deser, C., Simpson, I. R., and Terray, L.: Attributing the US Southwest’s recent shift into drier conditions, *Geophys Res Lett*, 45, 6251–6261, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL078312>, 2018.
- Li, Z. and Ding, Q.: A global poleward shift of atmospheric rivers, *Science Advances*, 10, eadq0604, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adq0604>, 2024.
- 1135 Liang, Y., Gillett, N. P., and Monahan, A. H.: Climate model projections of 21st century global warming constrained using the observed warming trend, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL086757, 2020.
- Lorenz, R., Herger, N., Sedláček, J., Eyring, V., Fischer, E. M., and Knutti, R.: Prospects and caveats of weighting climate models for summer maximum temperature projections over North America, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 123, 4509–4526, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JD027992>, 2018.
- 1140 Marvel, K. and Bonfils, C.: Identifying external influences on global precipitation, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 110, 19301–19306, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1314382110>, 2013.
- McCabe, G. J. and Dettinger, M. D.: Decadal variations in the strength of ENSO teleconnections with precipitation in the western United States, *International Journal of Climatology*, 19, 1399–1410, [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0088\(19991115\)19:13%253C1399::AID-JOC457%253E3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0088(19991115)19:13%253C1399::AID-JOC457%253E3.0.CO;2-A), 1999.
- 1145 Mengel, M., Treu, S., Lange, S., and Frieler, K.: ATTRICI v1. 1–counterfactual climate for impact attribution, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14, 5269–5284, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-5269-2021>, 2021.
- Merrifield, A. L., Brunner, L., Lorenz, R., Medhaug, I., and Knutti, R.: An investigation of weighting schemes suitable for incorporating large ensembles into multi-model ensembles, *Earth System Dynamics*, 11, 807–834, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-11-807-2020>, 2020.
- 1150 Mote, P. W., Li, S., Lettenmaier, D. P., Xiao, M., and Engel, R.: Dramatic declines in snowpack in the western US, *npj Climate Atmos Sci*, 1, 2, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-018-0012-1>, 2018.
- Musselman, K. N., Addor, N., Vano, J. A., and Molotch, N. P.: Winter melt trends portend widespread declines in snow water resources, *Nature Climate Change*, 11, 418–424, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01014-9>, 2021.
- 1155 National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine: Attribution of Extreme Weather Events in the Context of Climate Change, The National Academies Press, Washington, D. C., 166 pp., <https://doi.org/10.17226/68>, 2016.
- Newman, M., Alexander, M. A., Ault, T. R., Cobb, K. M., Deser, C., Di Lorenzo, E., Mantua, N. J., Miller, A. J., Minobe, S., Nakamura, H., Schneider, N., Vimont, D. J., Phillips, A. S., scott, J. S., and Smith, C. A.: The Pacific Decadal Oscillation, revisited, *Journal of Climate*, 29, 4399–4427, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0508.1>, 2016.



- 1160 Nijse, F. J. M. M., Cox, P. M., and Williamson, M. S.: Emergent constraints on transient climate response (TCR) and equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) from historical warming in CMIP5 and CMIP6 models, *Earth System Dynamics*, 11, 737–750, 2020.
- Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Mitchell, K. E., Chen, F., Ek, M. B., Barlage, M., Kumar, A., Manning, K., Niyogi, D., Rosero, E., Tewari, M., and Xia, Y.: The community Noah land surface model with multiparameterization options (Noah-MP): 1. Model description and evaluation with local-scale measurements, *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*, 116, D12109, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015139>, 2011.
- 1165 NOAA: US Standard Atmosphere, 1976, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, D. C., 1976.
- O'Neill, B. C., Tebaldi, C., Van Vuuren, D. P., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Hurtt, G., Knutti, R., Kriegler, E., Lamarque, J.-F., Lowe, J., Meehl, G. A., Moss, R., Riahi, K., and Sanderson, B. M.: The scenario model intercomparison project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6, *Geosci Model Dev*, 9, 3461–3482, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3461-2016>, 2016.
- 1170 Parks, S. A., Coop, J. D., and Davis, K. T.: Intensifying Fire Season Aridity Portends Ongoing Expansion of Severe Wildfire in Western US Forests, *Global Change Biology*, 31, e70429, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.70429>, 2025.
- Payne, A. E. and Magnusdottir, G.: An evaluation of atmospheric rivers over the North Pacific in CMIP5 and their response to warming under RCP 8.5, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120, 11–173, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023586>, 2015.
- 1175 Peco, K., Wang, J., Jung, C., Sever, G., Sheridan, L., Feinstein, J., Kotamarthi, R., Draxl, C., Young, E., Purkayastha, A., and Kumler, A.: Evaluation of a high-resolution regional climate simulation for surface and hub-height wind climatology over North America, *Wind Energy Science*, 11, 13–35, 2026.
- Pendergrass, A. G., Knutti, R., Lehner, F., Deser, C., and Sanderson, B. M.: Precipitation variability increases in a warmer climate, *Sci Rep-UK*, 7, 17966, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17966-y>, 2017.
- 1180 Pfahl, S., O’Gorman, P. A., and Fischer, E. M.: Understanding the regional pattern of projected future changes in extreme precipitation, *Nat Clim Change*, 7, 423–427, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3287>, 2017.
- Pierce, D. W., Cayan, D. R., Goodrich, J., Das, T., and Munévar, A.: Evaluating global climate models for hydrological studies of the upper Colorado River Basin, *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 58, 709–734, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12974>, 2022.
- 1185 Pillai, J. R., Armour, K. C., and Battisti, D. S.: The Influence of Historical Sea Surface Temperature Patterns on Regional Precipitation Trends, *Journal of Climate*, 39, 2333–2349, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-25-0446.1>, 2026.
- Planton, Y. Y., Guilyardi, E., Wittenberg, A. T., Lee, J., Gleckler, P. J., Bayr, T., McGregor, S., McPhaden, M. J., Power, S., Roehrig, R., Vialard, J., and Voldoire, A.: Evaluating climate models with the CLIVAR 2020 ENSO metrics package, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 102, E193–E217, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-19-0337.1>, 2021.
- 1190 Rahimi, S., Krantz, W., Lin, Y.-H., Bass, B., Goldenson, N., Hall, A., Lebo, Z. J., and Norris, J.: Evaluation of a Reanalysis-Driven Configuration of WRF4 Over the Western United States From 1980 to 2020, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 127, e2021JD035699, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035699>, 2022.
- Rahimi, S., Huang, L., Norris, J., Hall, A., Goldenson, N., Krantz, W., Bass, B., Thackeray, C., Lin, H., and Chen, D.: An overview of the Western United States Dynamically Downscaled Dataset (WUS-D3), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 2265–2286, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-2265-2024>, 2024.
- 1195



- Ribes, A., Qasmi, S., and Gillett, N. P.: Making climate projections conditional on historical observations, *Science Advances*, 7, eabc0671, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abc0671>, 2021.
- 1200 Rodell, M., Famiglietti, J. S., Wiese, D. N., Reager, J. T., Beaudoin, H. K., Landerer, F. W., and Lo, M.-H.: Emerging trends in global freshwater availability, *Nature*, 557, 651–659, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0123-1>, 2018.
- Rohde, R. A. and Hausfather, Z.: The Berkeley Earth land/ocean temperature record, *Earth System Science Data*, 12, 3469–3479, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-3469-2020>, 2020.
- 1205 Ropelewski, C. F. and Halpert, M. S.: North American precipitation and temperature patterns associated with the El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO), *Monthly Weather Review*, 114, 2352–2362, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1986\)114%253C2352:NAPATP%253E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1986)114%253C2352:NAPATP%253E2.0.CO;2), 1986.
- Rupp, D. E., Daly, C., Doggett, M. K., Smith, J. I., and Steinberg, B.: Mapping an observation-based global solar irradiance climatology across the conterminous United States, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 61, 857–876, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-21-0236.1>, 2022.
- 1210 Sanderson, B. M., Knutti, R., and Caldwell, P.: A representative democracy to reduce interdependency in a multimodel ensemble, *Journal of Climate*, 28, 5171–5194, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00362.1>, 2015.
- Sanderson, B. M., Wehner, M., and Knutti, R.: Skill and independence weighting for multi-model assessments, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 2379–2395, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-2379-2017>, 2017.
- 1215 Schwalm, C. R., Williams, C. A., Schaefer, K., Baldocchi, D., Black, T. A., Goldstein, A. H., Law, B. E., Oechel, W. C., U, K. T. P., and Scott, R. L.: Reduction in carbon uptake during turn of the century drought in western North America, *Nat Geosci*, 5, 551–556, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1529>, 2012.
- Seager, R., Cane, M., Henderson, N., Lee, D.-E., Abernathy, R., and Zhang, H.: Strengthening tropical Pacific zonal sea surface temperature gradient consistent with greenhouse gases, *Nat Clim Change*, 9, 517–522, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0505-x>, 2019.
- 1220 Seager, R., Henderson, N., and Cane, M.: Persistent discrepancies between observed and modeled trends in the tropical Pacific Ocean, *Journal of Climate*, 35, 4571–4584, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-21-0648.1>, 2022.
- Seager, R., Ting, M., Alexander, P., Liu, H., Nakamura, J., Li, C., and Newman, M.: Ocean-forcing of cool season precipitation drives ongoing and future decadal drought in southwestern North America, *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science*, 6, 141, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-023-00461-9>, 2023.
- 1225 Sippel, S., Meinshausen, N., Fischer, E. M., Székely, E., and Knutti, R.: Climate change now detectable from any single day of weather at global scale, *Nature climate change*, 10, 35–41, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0666-7>, 2020.
- Smith, E., Grant, N., Luo, X., and Diaz, D.: Evaluating the ability of gridded climate datasets to capture temperature and precipitation trends and extremes, *Scientific Reports*, 15, 12607, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-97570-7>, 2025.
- 1230 Stephens, S. L., Steel, Z. L., Collins, B. M., Fry, D. L., Gill, S. J., Rivera-Huerta, H., and Skinner, C. N.: Climate and fire impacts on tree recruitment in mixed conifer forests in northwestern Mexico and California, *Ecological Applications*, 33, e2844, <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2844>, 2023.



- Sun, Q., Miao, C., Duan, Q., Ashouri, H., Sorooshian, S., and Hsu, K.-L.: A review of global precipitation data sets: Data sources, estimation, and intercomparisons, *Reviews of geophysics*, 56, 79–107, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017RG000574>, 2018.
- 1235 Swain, D. L., Prein, A. F., Abatzoglou, J. T., Albano, C. M., Brunner, M., Diffenbaugh, N. S., Singh, D., Skinner, C. B., and Touma, D.: Hydroclimate volatility on a warming Earth, *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 6, 35–50, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-024-00624-z>, 2025.
- Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A.: An overview of CMIP5 and the experiment design, *B Am Met Soc*, 93, 485–498, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1>, 2012.
- 1240 Tokarska, K. B., Stolpe, M. B., Sippel, S., Fischer, E. M., Smith, C. J., Lehner, F., and Knutti, R.: Past warming trend constrains future warming in CMIP6 models, *Science Advances*, 6, eaaz9549, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaz9549>, 2020.
- Williams, A. P.: Code and data resources to remove CMIP6 anthropogenic trends from western US daily observed climate (1.0), 2026a.
- Williams, A. P.: Counterfactual version of 1/24-degree gridded daily observed climate for the western United States after removal of CMIP6 trends in background means and daily variances, 1951–2025, 2026b.
- 1245 Williams, A. P.: Gridded 1/24-degree daily climate for the western United States, 1951–2025 (1.0), <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19636838>, 2026c.
- Williams, A. P., Allen, C. D., Macalady, A. K., Griffin, D., Woodhouse, C. A., Meko, D. M., Swetnam, T. W., Rauscher, S. A., Seager, R., Grissino Mayer, H. D., Dean, J. S., Cook, E. R., Gangodagamage, C., Cai, M., and McDowell, N. G.: Temperature as a potent driver of regional forest drought stress and tree mortality, *Nat Clim Change*, 3, 292–297, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1693>, 2013.
- 1250 Williams, A. P., Seager, R., Abatzoglou, J. T., Cook, B. I., Smerdon, J. E., and Cook, E. R.: Contribution of anthropogenic warming to California drought during 2012–2014, *Geophys Res Lett*, 42, 6819–6828, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064924>, 2015.
- Williams, A. P., Cook, E. R., Smerdon, J. E., Cook, B. I., Abatzoglou, J. T., Bolles, K., Baek, S. H., Badger, A., and Livneh, B.: Large contribution from anthropogenic warming to a developing North American megadrought, *Science*, 368, 314–318, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz9600>, 2020.
- Williams, A. P., Livneh, B., McKinnon, K. A., Hansen, W. D., Mankin, J. S., Cook, B. I., Smerdon, J. E., Varuolo-Clarke, A. M., Bjarke, N. R., and Juang, C. S.: Growing impact of wildfire on western US water supply, *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA*, 119, e2114069119, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2114069119>, 2022a.
- 1260 Williams, A. P., Cook, B. I., and Smerdon, J. E.: Rapid intensification of the emerging southwestern North American megadrought in 2020–2021, *Nat Clim Change*, 12, 232–234, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01290-z>, 2022b.
- Williams, A. P., McKinnon, K. A., Anchukaitis, K. J., Gershunov, A., Varuolo-Clarke, A. M., Clemesha, R. E., and Liu, H.: Anthropogenic intensification of cool-season precipitation is not yet detectable across the western United States, *Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres*, 129, e2023JD040537, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JD040537>, 2024a.
- 1265 Williams, E. L. and Abatzoglou, J. T.: Climate change increases evaporative and crop irrigation demand in North America, *Earth's Future*, 13, e2025EF005931, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2025EF005931>, 2025.



Williams, E. L., Abatzoglou, J. T., Hegewisch, K. C., and Williams, A. P.: Anthropogenic climate change has reduced drought recovery probabilities across the western US, *Communications Earth & Environment*, 5, 546, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01640-z>, 2024b.

1270 WMO: Guide to Meteorological Instruments and Methods of Observation, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2008.

Xia, Y., Mitchell, K., Ek, M., Sheffield, J., Cosgrove, B., Wood, E., Luo, L., Alonge, C., Wei, H., Meng, J., Linvneh, B., Lettenmaier, D., Koren, V., Duan, Q., Mo, K., Fan, Y., and Mocko, D.: Continental-scale water and energy flux analysis and validation for the North American Land Data Assimilation System project phase 2 (NLDAS-2): 1. Intercomparison and application of model products, *J Geophys Res-Atmos*, 117, D03109, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016051>, 2012.

1275 Xiao, M., Udall, B., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: On the causes of declining Colorado River streamflows, *Water Resour Res*, 54, 6739–6756, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR023153>, 2018.

Zelinka, M. D., Myers, T. A., McCoy, D. T., Po-Chedley, S., Caldwell, P. M., Ceppi, P., Klein, S. A., and Taylor, K. E.: Causes of higher climate sensitivity in CMIP6 models, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL085782, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085782>, 2020.

1280 Zhang, W., Furtado, K., Wu, P., Zhou, T., Chadwick, R., Marzin, C., Rostron, J., and Sexton, D.: Increasing precipitation variability on daily-to-multiyear time scales in a warmer world, *Science advances*, 7, eabf8021, 2021.

Zhu, J., Poulsen, C. J., and Otto-Bliesner, B. L.: High climate sensitivity in CMIP6 model not supported by paleoclimate, *Nature Climate Change*, 10, 378–379, 2020.

1285