



## 33 1. Introduction

34 In the summer of 2012, the central United States experienced severe and widespread drought  
35 conditions. Precipitation during May-August 2012 was the lowest since instrumental records  
36 began, and summer heat waves made conditions worse [Hoerling *et al.*, 2013a; Hoerling *et al.*,  
37 2013b]. The severity of the 2012 drought caused significant losses in crops and had an even  
38 larger economic impact on the livestock industry; this triggered federal agencies such as the U.S.  
39 Department of Agriculture and a number of states to declare disaster areas [USDA, 2012]. In  
40 hindsight, one unique feature of the 2012 drought was its rapid intensification during the early  
41 summer, coined a “flash drought” by a NOAA Assessment Report [Hoerling *et al.*, 2013a]. A  
42 figure from the NOAA report [Hoerling *et al.*, 2013a], shown here in Fig. 1a, depicts the rapid  
43 expansion of drought conditions in Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska and South/North  
44 Dakota, evolving over a mere month from moderate to severe status (categorized as per the U.S.  
45 Drought Monitor).

46  
47 The timing of the Central Plains’s drought intensification coincided with a common feature of  
48 seasonal drying: Climatologically, precipitation in the central U.S. generally is reduced by about  
49 25% from June to July (as shown in Fig. 1b by the long-term monthly rainfall averaged over the  
50 central U.S.). Such a rainfall reduction occurs in association with the development of the North  
51 American Monsoon (NAM) and the concurrent formation of the upper-level anticyclone over the  
52 western U.S., nudging the jet stream northward [Barlow *et al.*, 1998; Higgins *et al.*, 1997; S-Y  
53 Wang and Chen, 2009]. The precipitation difference of July minus June (Fig. 1c), **denoted**  
54 **hereafter as “July-June”**, depicts a distinct zone of rainfall reduction to the north and east of  
55 the NAM region, covering the Central Plains and the Great Plains. While this seasonal rainfall

56 reduction is a well-known phenomenon, the extent to which a progression of drying may have  
57 amplified has not been examined.  
58  
59 The extremity and extensive impacts of the 2012 drought have prompted a number of studies,  
60 including those dealing with the meteorological processes and drought prediction [*Hoerling et*  
61 *al.*, 2013a; *Hoerling et al.*, 2013b; *Kumar et al.*, 2013], drought depiction using various  
62 monitoring tools [*Mallya et al.*, 2013], drought recovery forecasts [*Pan et al.*, 2013], the  
63 connection with low-frequency climate variability and trends [*Barandiaran et al.*, 2013; *S-Y*  
64 *Wang et al.*, 2013b], the impacts on agriculture and economy [*Al-Kaisi et al.*, 2013] and global  
65 food security [*Boyer et al.*, 2013]. However, the lack of prominent large-scale forcing factors in  
66 the tropics, such as that of ENSO, is a probable reason that has impeded climate forecast models'  
67 prediction of the 2012 drought [*Hoerling et al.*, 2013b; *H Wang et al.*, 2014]. Therefore, the  
68 focus of this study was to examine possible forcing factors other than ENSO, as well as regional  
69 drivers and mechanisms that may be related to the 2012 flash drought, including the role of land-  
70 atmosphere interactions, circulation patterns, their interaction and, subsequently, how some or all  
71 of these may have changed.

72

73 To accomplish our analysis, we utilized an array of surface observations and global reanalysis  
74 datasets; these are outlined in Section 2. Surface conditions associated with the change in the  
75 June-to-July circulation transition are presented in Section 3, followed by an analysis of the  
76 atmospheric and oceanic conditions in Section 4. A climate attribution analysis is presented in  
77 Section 5. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 6.

78

79

## 80 2. Data and models

### 81 a. Data sources

82 Global reanalysis products are an ideal set of data to support this study. However, any  
83 exploration of long-term changes using a single reanalysis is of concern due to changing  
84 observation systems that may result in spurious trends [Paltridge *et al.*, 2009]. Thus, to obtain an  
85 optimal estimate of long-term trends in the atmosphere, we utilized an array of global reanalyses  
86 and sought consensus. We used four post-1979 datasets that cover the satellite era – the  
87 acronyms, full names, and description of each dataset are provided in Table 1. The data group  
88 consists of MERRA [Rienecker *et al.*, 2011], CFSR [Saha *et al.*, 2010], ERA-Interim [Dee *et al.*,  
89 2011] and the NCEP/DOE “R-2” reanalyses [Kanamitsu *et al.*, 2002]. In the following analyses,  
90 the atmospheric variables are derived from an ensemble of these four reanalysis datasets using  
91 equal-weight averaging. In addition, the NARR regional reanalysis data [Mesinger *et al.*, 2006]  
92 was used for the analysis of boundary layer heights. Other observational datasets included the  
93 monthly Climatic Research Unit (CRU) precipitation and surface air temperature data  
94 (<http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/data/>) and the Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI) at 1/8° – derived  
95 from the Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM)  
96 (<http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/wwdt/batchdownload.php>). We also analyzed the NOAA Extended  
97 Reconstructed SST (ERSST) Version 3b data [Smith *et al.*, 2008] for the depiction of ocean  
98 states.

99

100 Land surface analyses were obtained from the Mosaic [Koster and Suarez, 1994] and Noah [Ek  
101 *et al.*, 2003] land surface models as part of the recently released North American Land Data  
102 Assimilation System project Phase 2 (NLDAS-2) [Xia *et al.*, 2012]. All land surface models  
103 were run offline at 1/8° horizontal resolution using gauge and bias-corrected atmospheric

104 (NLDAS-2) forcing data. Monthly means were calculated across the period of record (1979-  
105 2012) while linear trends were calculated up to 2011 (to leave 2012 out for validation).

106

#### 107 *b. Model simulations*

108 To investigate the possible sources of change in the June-to-July transition, we also examined a  
109 set of idealized model simulations using the NASA Goddard Earth Observing System Model,  
110 Version 5 (GEOS-5) Atmospheric General Circulation Model (AGCM). The AGCM simulations  
111 consist of a control run forced with a seasonally varying SST climatology (1901-2004), and three  
112 anomaly runs forced with a warm trend pattern, a cold Pacific pattern, and a warm Atlantic  
113 pattern (superimposed onto the seasonally varying SST climatology). Following *Schubert et al.*  
114 [2009], the warming trend, Pacific pattern and Atlantic pattern were obtained as the three leading  
115 rotated empirical orthogonal functions (REOFs) of annual mean SST over the period 1901-2004.  
116 The amplitudes for the imposed Pacific and Atlantic SST patterns corresponded to two standard  
117 deviations of their principal components (PCs), with the assumption of linear model response.  
118 Global warming trend was imposed on the model in separate runs to simulate the impact of  
119 warming during the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The model response to a leading SST pattern  
120 was obtained as the mean difference between the control run and the anomaly run. For these  
121 experiments, the GEOS-5 AGCM was run with 72 hybrid-sigma vertical levels extending to  
122 0.01hPa, and 1° horizontal resolution on a latitude/longitude grid. *Schubert et al.* [2009] provides  
123 more details of the leading SST patterns and the AGCM experiment design. The GEOS-5  
124 AGCM is described in *Rienecker et al.* [2008] and *Molod et al.* [2012], with the latter providing  
125 a comprehensive assessment of model fidelity. All the AGCM simulations were 50 years long.

126

127

### 128 **3. Surface and PBL conditions**

129 The linear trend of the post-1979 change in the July-June (i.e. July minus June) precipitation  
130 difference is shown in Fig. 2a. In comparison with Fig. 1c, the precipitation deficit from June to  
131 July is noticeably intensified in the northern part of the U.S., covering both the Central Plains  
132 and the northern Rockies. Around Iowa, Nebraska and part of Illinois, the precipitation  
133 reduction has diminished twofold when compared to that of the 1980s. Likewise, the linear trend  
134 of the July-June PDSI difference (Fig. 2b) indicates that drought conditions have tended to  
135 intensify over the Central Plains and the northern Rockies during the June-to-July transition. A  
136 trend analysis conducted on the difference between the averages of May and June (MJ) and July  
137 and August (JA) also yielded a similar result in both precipitation and PDSI (not shown).

138

139 Another factor worth noting is the trend in the July-June net downward radiation flux at the  
140 surface (Fig. 2c) – derived from NLDAS-2 data. The increased (positive) trend in the July-June  
141 net downward radiation flux reveals a pattern very similar to the decreased (negative) trend in  
142 precipitation, i.e. meridionally elongated pattern with a particularly strong increase in the  
143 northern Rockies and the northern Great Plains. The pattern of net downward radiation flux  
144 results primarily from the change in downward shortwave radiation (DSWR) flux (Fig. 2d)  
145 caused by change in cloud cover or cloud thickness. In comparison, the trend in the July-June  
146 downward longwave radiation (DLWR; Fig. 2e) depicts an east-west dipole pattern with  
147 increased radiation in the southwest and decreased radiation in the northeast. The net result  
148 indicates that the central U.S. received either increased shortwave radiation in July or decreased  
149 radiation in June, or a combination of both (this will be discussed further with Fig. 4).

150

151 The impact of the downward radiation shift on the near-surface meteorology was examined by  
152 computing the trend in the 2-m air temperature (T2m) for (a) June, (b) July and (c) July-June;  
153 this is shown in Fig. 3. In June, warming was observed over the Southwest U.S. and south of the  
154 U.S.-Mexico border. There was a slight cooling in the northwest. In July, a distinct warming  
155 trend is observed to cover the entire Interior West. Therefore, the July-June change in T2m  
156 depicts a marked warming centered around Idaho, Montana and surrounding states (Fig. 3c); this  
157 suggests an enhancement in the seasonal warming from June to July. The observed warming is  
158 consistent with the increase in net radiation and enhanced drying over the northern Rockies (Fig.  
159 2). Consequently, the atmospheric thickness between 200 and 700 hPa has increased: the line  
160 graph in Fig. 3d shows the seasonal evolution of thickness during the recent era (1996-2012) and  
161 the earlier era (1979-1995), and their difference is highlighted in yellow. The air mass in July  
162 has evidently expanded, hence the increasing rate of change in the thickness from June to July  
163 (bar graph). These results suggest that the regional warming is accompanied by an upper-air  
164 ridge formation. A stationary ridge in this vicinity is known to induce dry conditions over the  
165 Central Plains; this will be discussed further.

166  
167 Next, we examined the changes in near-surface variables and the land-atmosphere coupling by  
168 computing (a) the evaporative fraction (EF), (b) soil moisture in the near-surface (top 40 cm.)  
169 soil layer, and (c) the planetary boundary layer (PBL) height; these are shown in Fig. 4 and were  
170 derived from the Mosaic model. Here, EF is the ratio of evaporation flux to available energy  
171 calculated as the difference between net radiation and soil heat flux. The trends were also  
172 computed using the Noah model where the outputs were very similar in sign and spatial pattern,  
173 and therefore are not shown here. Both the Mosaic and Noah models calculated EF using the  
174 Penman-Monteith formulations containing soil moisture-based surface conductance algorithms.

175 The EF estimates are therefore dependent of precipitation inputs and assumed soil properties and  
176 generally do not reflect the influence of irrigation, which can substantially increase ET rates  
177 across a region (Ozturk et al. 2013). The linear trends of EF, soil moisture and PBL variables  
178 were computed for June, July and the July-June difference for the period 1979-2011, and  
179 compared with the 2012 anomalies of the July-June difference. The decreasing trend in EF (Fig.  
180 4a) in the Central/Northern Great Plains indicates that there is a larger transition in the rain-fed  
181 surface energy balance from June to July. Further, it appears that the soil moisture has increased  
182 in June but subsequently decreased rather quickly during July (Fig. 4b), in which June has  
183 become significantly wetter in the Northern Plains while July has become slightly drier  
184 [Barandiaran et al., 2013]. A trend such as this increased the difference in EF between the two  
185 months. In the southern Great Plains (e.g. Oklahoma and especially southern Texas), the  
186 situation is reversed owing to an overall drying in the month of June and increased wetness in  
187 July.

188

189 The patterns of the 2012 July-June change in the EF, soil moisture, and the PBL height (bottom  
190 row of Fig. 4) are consistent with those of the long-term trend. Surface drying and PBL growth  
191 from June to July 2012 are particularly pronounced over the Central Plains (Kansas, Missouri,  
192 Illinois and Indiana). Analyses of satellite-derived greenness vegetation fraction from MODIS  
193 (not shown) support the fact that negative anomalies in vegetation amount and health were  
194 already present in summer 2012. Likewise, as was shown in Santanello et al. (manuscript  
195 submitted to Journal of Climate), the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement-Southern Great  
196 Plains Facility at Lamont, OK observed a record increase in the PBL height in July during the  
197 entire period of record. Apparently, the land-PBL feedbacks have tended to take hold more  
198 suddenly in recent years, leading to a rapid drying of the lower atmosphere, an increase in the

199 PBL height and, inferring from Fig. 4c, an increased entrainment in July. *Cattiaux and Yiou*  
200 [2013] also indicated that, during the 2012 “flash drought”, the record high temperature and lack  
201 of rains in May played an important role in the later development of the drought through land  
202 surface processes. These processes can establish a deep residual boundary layer that promotes  
203 further desiccation of the soil [*Santanello et al. 2007, 2011*]. A positive feedback such as this is  
204 manifest in the greater July-June change in EF and the PBL during the 2012 flash drought.

205

#### 206 **4. Circulation and SST**

207 As previously noted, the development of the NAM is associated with a noticeable transition in  
208 upper-level circulations from the cold season regime (trough) to mid-summer regime (ridge); this  
209 is illustrated in Fig. 5. In June, the upper-level circulation is characterized by a stationary trough  
210 near the West Coast with the jet exit located over the Central Plains (Fig. 5a). In July, the  
211 monsoonal anticyclone develops, pushing the jet stream northward to about 50°N (Fig. 5b);  
212 consequently the circulation change from June to July forms an anticyclonic anomaly over the  
213 western U.S. (Fig. 5c) and creates subsidence over the Central Plains [*Barlow et al., 1998;*  
214 *Higgins et al., 1997*]. The linear trends in these circulations (Figs. 5d-f) reveal an intensification  
215 manifest as a deepened western trough in June and enhanced western ridge in July. As a result,  
216 the July-June shift in the circulation (Fig. 5f) depicts an amplified ridge in the northwestern U.S.  
217 and a deepened trough in the northeastern U.S. The ridge corresponds well with increased  
218 surface warming and tropospheric thickening (*ref., Fig. 3*). Such a change in the circulation is  
219 apparent as a distinct short-wave pattern with a zonal wave-5 structure, a feature of which has  
220 been found to suppress summer moisture in the central U.S. [*Barlow et al., 2001; Lau and Weng,*  
221 *2002; S-Y Wang and Chen, 2009; Weaver and Nigam, 2008*].

222

223 Subsidence over the central U.S. also has strengthened. The trend in the July-June velocity  
224 potential at 200 hPa (Fig. 6a) shows an increase in the upper-level convergence over the central  
225 U.S. Increased subsidence is illustrated by the trend in 500-hPa vertical velocity (Fig. 6b) and  
226 suggests a tendency for any spring drought to quickly intensify during the June-to-July transition.  
227 These changes in the tropospheric circulation also support the observed trend in EF, since they  
228 provide the subsidence, clear sky conditions and surface warming that allow the soil to dry. For  
229 instance, the largely negative trend in EF (Fig. 4a) appears to be linked to enhanced surface  
230 drying in July and this is consistent with positive feedbacks enhancing drought conditions, as  
231 was the case in 2012 [*Cattiaux and Yiou, 2013*].

232

233 For further comparison, the circulation anomalies associated with the 2012 drought are shown in  
234 Fig. 7 for a) June, b) July and c) July-June. The persistent anticyclonic anomalies throughout the  
235 summer of 2012 are evident. In June, the anticyclonic anomaly over the central U.S. is known to  
236 suppress precipitation [*Bates et al., 2001; Chen and Newman, 1998*] while in July, the  
237 anticyclonic anomaly anchored over the U.S./Canada border (Fig. 7b) is conducive to heat waves  
238 [*Chang and Wallace, 1987*]. In terms of long-term change, the July circulation over North  
239 America has become increasingly anticyclonic over the western U.S. [*S-Y Wang et al., 2013a*].  
240 Combined, the July-June circulation anomalies in 2012 (Fig. 7c) formed a short-wave structure  
241 broadly similar to that of the trend in the July-June circulation (*ref.*, Fig. 5f). Such a similarity  
242 suggests a link between the intensified ridge in July 2012 and the enhanced suppression of July  
243 rainfall in the Central Plains.

244

245 Summer anticyclonic anomalies in western North America are frequently connected to remote  
246 forcing in the North Pacific and Asia [*Newman and Sardeshmukh, 1998; Teng et al., 2013*].

247 Thus, to explore the climatic forcing of the circulation patterns, we expanded the analysis  
248 domain to show the large-scale SST and 200-hPa streamfunction anomalies associated with the  
249 July-June change in 2012 (Fig. 8a). Despite the large SST anomalies in the midlatitude North  
250 Pacific, the tropical SST anomalies are generally weak; this feature is consistent with earlier  
251 studies indicating the lack of prominent tropical forcing in 2012 [*Hoerling et al.*, 2013b; *Kumar*  
252 *et al.*, 2013; *H Wang et al.*, 2014]. Fig. 8b displays the trends in the July-June SST and 200-hP  
253 streamfunction and reveals a marked similarity with the 2012 situation, suggesting a contribution  
254 of the post-1979 trend. The distinct short-wave train across the midlatitudes implies a link with  
255 remote forcing that triggers a circumglobal teleconnection, from which wave energy propagates  
256 zonally along the jet stream and affects North America [*Schubert et al.*, 2011; *Teng et al.*, 2013;  
257 *H Wang et al.*, 2014; *S-Y Wang et al.*, 2013a]. By comparison, trends in the June and July  
258 circulation and SST (Figs. 8c and 8d) reveal a La Niña type of SST change in both months,  
259 consistent with previous studies of the global SST trends (e.g., *Xie et al.* [2010]). However, July  
260 is accompanied by a stronger warming over the central North Pacific in comparison to June,  
261 while the circulation anomalies between the two months are quite different. June circulation  
262 exhibits a teleconnection emanating from the central tropical Pacific through the “PNA route”,  
263 yet such a teleconnection is lacking in July.

264

265 The implication from Fig. 8 is that the July-June circulation is not directly related to the July-  
266 June SST anomalies, but rather is related to the monthly evolution of climatological SST (which  
267 determines atmospheric circulation forcing such as diabatic heating) and the tropospheric  
268 background flow (which in large measure determines atmospheric teleconnections). For  
269 example, given a diabatic heating anomaly in the tropics, the mean flow in June could still  
270 facilitate some Rossby wave propagation from the tropics to the U.S. [*Newman and*

271 *Sardeshmukh, 1998*], as is suggested in Figs. 8c and 8d. However, the mean flow in July would  
272 prohibit such meridional propagation of Rossby waves but would instead facilitate zonally  
273 propagating short waves under the guidance of summer jets, as was proposed in previous  
274 research [*Ding and Wang, 2007; Schubert et al., 2011; S-Y Wang et al., 2010*]. Likewise, an  
275 increase in regional warming over the Rocky Mountains (*ref.*, Fig. 3b), which acts to thicken the  
276 middle to upper troposphere, also can facilitate the rapid drying in the central U.S.

277

## 278 **5. Climate attribution**

279 Previous studies have suggested that the trends in T2m and precipitation over the U.S. are  
280 attributable to a combined contribution from phase changes of natural decadal-to-multidecadal  
281 oscillations, such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation  
282 (AMO), in addition to global warming [*Robinson et al., 2002; H Wang et al., 2009; Weaver et*  
283 *al., 2009*]. During the analysis period (1979-2012), the PDO in the late 1990s had shifted from  
284 the positive to negative phase; likewise the AMO had shifted from negative to positive phase,  
285 and the prominence of global warming has become increasingly so. Thus, to understand the  
286 extent to which the phase changes of PDO, AMO and global warming might have contributed to  
287 the observed trend in the July-June difference, we undertook a set of idealized GEOS-5 AGCM  
288 experiments forced with three leading SST patterns: the cold Pacific pattern (i.e. warmer SST in  
289 the central North Pacific), the warm Atlantic pattern and the warm trend pattern (*ref.*, Section  
290 2b). These SST patterns respectively reflect the phase changes of the PDO and AMO during  
291 1979-2012, and global warming [*Schubert et al., 2009*]. While the cold Pacific pattern contains  
292 both PDO and ENSO signals and thus may exaggerate the effect of the PDO, it echoes the  
293 substantial SST warming across 40°N as that shown in Fig. 8d. The responses of GEOS-5

294 AGCM to these SST patterns and global warming can be used to suggest their relative  
295 contribution to the overall observed trends.  
296

297 Fig. 9 displays the AGCM responses of the July-June shifts in (a) precipitation, (b) T2m and (c)  
298 200-hPa geopotential height (with the magnitudes scaled to one standard deviation  
299 corresponding to the SST forcing). In terms of precipitation anomalies (Fig. 9a), the warming  
300 trend SST forcing produced a substantial drying that covers the Midwest and this might  
301 exacerbate the weak drying in response to both the cold Pacific and warm Atlantic forcings.  
302 However, the cold Pacific pattern forced a surface warming and an anticyclonic anomaly over  
303 the northwest U.S. (Fig. 9b, c), alone with a cooling and a cyclonic anomaly over the  
304 northeastern U.S., resembling the observed trends. Neither the warm Atlantic nor the warming  
305 trend produced a T2m or circulation pattern that corresponds with the observation. The  
306 implication from these modeling experiments is that both the Pacific decadal variability (i.e. cold  
307 Pacific) and the warming trend (similar to a La Nina response) were contributing to the  
308 intensified drying over the central U.S. in the June-to-July seasonal transition.  
309

310 In order to provide a quantitative assessment for the contribution of the post-1979 trends in the  
311 aforementioned climate anomalies to the 2012 flash drought, we calculated the ratio of the July-  
312 June PDSI (percent) between those of the 1979-2011 trend and the 2012 drought. For the central  
313 U.S., an estimated 30% of the rapid intensification of the 2012 drought is linked to the trend in  
314 the June-to-July seasonal transition (Fig. 10a, within the domain as outlined). Estimates in the  
315 percent of contribution in precipitation, upper-level streamfunction and T2m are also shown for  
316 comparison purposes. The precipitation pattern (Fig. 10b) is apparently closer to the PDSI  
317 pattern than streamfunction and T2m (Figs. 10c,d). The ratio of contributions in EF, soil

318 moisture and PBL height (not shown) ranges between the ratios in precipitation and T2m.  
319 Combined, these features suggest a predominant effect of the precipitation reduction on drought  
320 intensification. Arguably however, the changing T2m and streamfunction (ridge) patterns did  
321 play an essential role as well, because the intensified ridge over the northwestern U.S.  
322 (contributing ~30% to in the ridge center) acts to induce subsidence in the central U.S., and this  
323 would further suppress rainfall through local feedbacks. It is important to note that these  
324 analyses assumed linearity and therefore further analysis is needed to capture the nonlinear  
325 interactions involved in the changing seasonal transition and its impact on recent drought events  
326 – this will require comprehensive model simulations to achieve.

327

## 328 **6. Concluding remarks**

329 In general, precipitation in the central U.S. decreased by about 25% during the June-to-July  
330 seasonal transition. Since 1979, this precipitation reduction in the central U.S. has become more  
331 severe, having decreased twice as much in recent years. Such a long-term change has potentially  
332 intensified recent events of summer drought. In particular, the analyses presented here indicated  
333 a marked resemblance between the June-to-July PDSI, precipitation, temperature and circulation  
334 shifts in their long-term evolution change and the 2012 “flash drought” – one which was  
335 characterized by a rapid expansion over the Central Plains in early summer. Approximately 30%  
336 of the drought intensification from June to July 2012 was estimated to be due to long-term  
337 changes (based on PDSI); this contribution seems more closely related to the increase in  
338 precipitation deficit (from June to July) and the subsequent reduction in soil moisture with  
339 enhanced sensible heat flux. At the larger scale, examination of T2m and tropospheric  
340 circulation change in the western U.S. indicated that dynamical forcing was present that  
341 enhanced subsidence while, at the same time, suppressing rainfall in the central U.S.

342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354

Even though the 2012 drought is seemingly unpredictable at seasonal time scales [*Hoerling et al.*, 2013b], this study did show systematic factors related to the drought development. One factor was land-atmosphere feedbacks over the U.S., i.e. the enhanced anticyclonic anomalies stationed over the western U.S. can lead to further reductions in precipitation and soil moisture in the Central U.S. In turn, the long-term changes in land surface moisture and temperature can sustain or amplify the evolution of the overlying anticyclonic circulation and precipitation deficit. In the long run, the land surface feedback to the atmospheric circulation anomalies is strong and can affect future drought expansion in the central U.S. These processes could help anticipate future drought in the central U.S., especially those that occur in spring and can worsen in summer.

355 **References:**

- 356 Al-Kaisi, M. M., et al. (2013), Drought impact on crop production and the soil environment:  
357 2012 experiences from Iowa, *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 68(1), 19A-24A.
- 358 Barandiaran, D., S.-Y. Wang, and K. Hilburn (2013), Observed trends in the Great Plains low-  
359 level jet and associated precipitation changes in relation to recent droughts, *Geophys. Res.*  
360 *Lett.*, 40(23), 2013GL058296.
- 361 Barlow, M., S. Nigam, and E. H. Berbery (1998), Evolution of the North American Monsoon  
362 System, *J. Climate*, 11(9), 2238-2257.
- 363 Barlow, M., S. Nigam, and E. Berbery (2001), ENSO, Pacific decadal variability, and US  
364 summertime precipitation, drought, and stream flow, *J. Climate*, 14(9), 2105-2128.
- 365 Bates, G. T., M. P. Hoerling, and A. Kumar (2001), Central U.S. Springtime Precipitation  
366 Extremes: Teleconnections and Relationships with Sea Surface Temperature, *J. Climate*,  
367 14(17), 3751-3766.
- 368 Boyer, J., P. Byrne, K. Cassman, M. Cooper, D. Delmer, T. Greene, F. Gruis, J. Habben, N.  
369 Hausmann, and N. Kenny (2013), The US drought of 2012 in perspective: A call to  
370 action, *Global Food Security*, 2(3), 139-143.
- 371 Cattiaux, J., and P. Yiou (2013), Explaining Extreme Events of 2012 from a Climate Perspective  
372 - Ch. 4: U.S. heat waves of spring and summer 2012 from the flow-analogue perspective,  
373 *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 94(9), S1-S74.
- 374 Chang, F.-C., and J. M. Wallace (1987), Meteorological Conditions during Heat Waves and  
375 Droughts in the United States Great Plains, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 115(7), 1253-1269.
- 376 Chen, P., and M. Newman (1998), Rossby Wave Propagation and the Rapid Development of  
377 Upper-Level Anomalous Anticyclones during the 1988 U.S. Drought, *J. Climate*, 11(10),  
378 2491-2504.
- 379 Dee, D. P., et al. (2011), The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data  
380 assimilation system, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 137(656),  
381 553-597.
- 382 Ding, Q., and B. Wang (2007), Intraseasonal Teleconnection between the Summer Eurasian  
383 Wave Train and the Indian Monsoon, *J. Climate*, 20(15), 3751-3767.
- 384 Ek, M., K. Mitchell, Y. Lin, E. Rogers, P. Grunmann, V. Koren, G. Gayno, and J. Tarpley  
385 (2003), Implementation of Noah land surface model advances in the National Centers for  
386 Environmental Prediction operational mesoscale Eta model, *Journal of Geophysical*  
387 *Research: Atmospheres* (1984–2012), 108(D22).
- 388 Higgins, R. W., Y. Yao, and X. L. Wang (1997), Influence of the North American Monsoon  
389 System on the U.S. Summer Precipitation Regime, *J. Climate*, 10(10), 2600-2622.
- 390 Hoerling, M., S. Schubert, K. Mo, and H. B. A. AghaKouchak, J. Dong, M. Hoerling, A.  
391 Kumar, V. Lakshmi, R. Leung, J. Li, X. Liang, L. Luo, B. Lyon, D. Miskus, K. Mo, X.  
392 Quan, S. Schubert, R. Seager, S. Sorooshian, H. Wang, Y. Xia, N. Zeng (2013a), An  
393 Interpretation of the Origins of the 2012 Central Great Plains Drought, edited by  
394 NOAA/CPO/MAPP, p.

395 <http://cpo.noaa.gov/ClimatePrograms/ModelingAnalysisPredictionsandProjections/MAPTTaskForces/DroughtTaskForce/2012CentralGreatPlainsDrought.aspx>, NOAA.  
396

397 Hoerling, M., J. Eischeid, A. Kumar, R. Leung, A. Mariotti, K. Mo, S. Schubert, and R. Seager  
398 (2013b), Causes and Predictability of the 2012 Great Plains Drought, *Bull. Amer. Meteor.*  
399 *Soc.*

400 Kanamitsu, M., W. Ebisuzaki, J. Woollen, S.-K. Yang, J. J. Hnilo, M. Fiorino, and G. L. Potter  
401 (2002), NCEP–DOE AMIP-II Reanalysis (R-2), *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 83(11), 1631-  
402 1643.

403 Koster, R. D., and M. J. Suarez (1994), The components of a ‘SVAT’ scheme and their effects on  
404 a GCM's hydrological cycle, *Advances in water resources*, 17(1), 61-78.

405 Kumar, A., M. Chen, M. Hoerling, and J. Eischeid (2013), Do extreme climate events require  
406 extreme forcings?, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40(13), 3440-3445.

407 Lau, K.-M., and H. Weng (2002), Recurrent Teleconnection Patterns Linking Summertime  
408 Precipitation Variability over East Asia and North America, *Journal of the*  
409 *Meteorological Society of Japan*, 80(6), 1309-1324.

410 Mallya, G., L. Zhao, X. Song, D. Niyogi, and R. Govindaraju (2013), 2012 Midwest Drought in  
411 the United States, *J. Hydro. Engineering*, 18(7), 737-745.

412 Mesinger, F., et al. (2006), North American Regional Reanalysis, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*,  
413 87(3), 343-360.

414 Molod, A., L. Takacs, M. J. Suarez, J. Bacmeister, I.-S. Song, and A. Eichmann (2012), The  
415 GEOS-5 Atmospheric General Circulation Model: Mean Climate and Development from  
416 MERRA to FortunaRep., 117 pp, NASA TM—2012-104606.

417 Newman, M., and P. D. Sardeshmukh (1998), The Impact of the Annual Cycle on the North  
418 Pacific/North American Response to Remote Low-Frequency Forcing, *J. Atmos. Sci.*,  
419 55(8), 1336-1353.

420 Ozturk, D., A. Kilic, R. Oglesby, S. Hul, and T. Hubbard (2013), Evaluation of ET Simulated by  
421 WRF 3.5.1 Coupled to CLM 4.0 with Remotely Sensed Data. Abstract, Amer. Geophys.  
422 Union Fall Meeting.

423 Paltridge, G., A. Arking, and M. Pook (2009), Trends in middle- and upper-level tropospheric  
424 humidity from NCEP reanalysis data, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 98(3), 351-  
425 359.

426 Pan, M., X. Yuan, and E. F. Wood (2013), A probabilistic framework for assessing drought  
427 recovery, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40(14), 3637-3642.

428 Rienecker, M. M., et al. (2011), MERRA: NASA's Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for  
429 Research and Applications, *J. Climate*, 24(14), 3624-3648.

430 Rienecker, M. M., et al. (2008), The GEOS-5 data assimilation system—Documentation of  
431 versions 5.0.1, 5.1.0, and 5.2.0. Rep., 95 pp, NASA/TM-2007-104606.

432 Robinson, W. A., R. Reudy, and J. E. Hansen (2002), General circulation model simulations of  
433 recent cooling in the east-central United States, *Journal of Geophysical Research:*  
434 *Atmospheres*, 107(D24), 4748.

- 435 Saha, S., et al. (2010), The NCEP Climate Forecast System Reanalysis, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*,  
436 91(8), 1015-1057.
- 437 Schubert, S., H. Wang, and M. Suarez (2011), Warm season subseasonal variability and climate  
438 extremes in the Northern Hemisphere: The role of stationary Rossby waves, *J. Climate*,  
439 24, 4773–4792.
- 440 Schubert, S., et al. (2009), A U.S. CLIVAR Project to Assess and Compare the Responses of  
441 Global Climate Models to Drought-Related SST Forcing Patterns: Overview and Results,  
442 *J. Climate*, 22(19), 5251-5272.
- 443 Smith, T. M., R. W. Reynolds, T. C. Peterson, and J. Lawrimore (2008), Improvements to  
444 NOAA’s Historical Merged Land–Ocean Surface Temperature Analysis (1880–2006), *J.*  
445 *Climate*, 21(10), 2283-2296.
- 446 Teng, H., G. Branstator, H. Wang, G. A. Meehl, and W. M. Washington (2013), Probability of  
447 US heat waves affected by a subseasonal planetary wave pattern, *Nature Geoscience*,  
448 6(12), 1056-1061.
- 449 USDA (2012), U.S. Drought 2012: Farm and Food Impacts, edited by USDA,  
450 [http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/in-the-news/us-drought-2012-farm-and-food-](http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/in-the-news/us-drought-2012-farm-and-food-impacts.aspx)  
451 [impacts.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/in-the-news/us-drought-2012-farm-and-food-impacts.aspx) - .Ux3WzWRdVYQ.
- 452 Wang, H., S. Schubert, R. Koster, Y.-G. Ham, and M. Suarez (2014), On the Role of SST  
453 Forcing in the 2011 and 2012 Extreme U.S. Heat and Drought: A Study in Contrasts,  
454 *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, (in press).
- 455 Wang, H., S. Schubert, M. Suarez, J. Chen, M. Hoerling, A. Kumar, and P. Pegion (2009),  
456 Attribution of the Seasonality and Regionality in Climate Trends over the United States  
457 during 1950–2000, *J. Climate*, 22(10), 2571-2590.
- 458 Wang, S.-Y., and T.-C. Chen (2009), The Late-Spring Maximum of Rainfall over the U.S.  
459 Central Plains and the Role of the Low-Level Jet, *J. Climate*, 22(17), 4696-4709.
- 460 Wang, S.-Y., R. E. Davies, and R. R. Gillies (2013a), Identification of extreme precipitation  
461 threat across midlatitude regions based on short-wave circulations, *Journal of*  
462 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(19), 2013JD020153.
- 463 Wang, S.-Y., L. E. Hipps, R. R. Gillies, X. Jiang, and A. L. Moller (2010), Circumglobal  
464 teleconnection and early summer rainfall in the US Intermountain West, *Theor. Appl.*  
465 *Climatol.*, 102, 245-252.
- 466 Wang, S.-Y., D. Barandiaran, K. Hilburn, P. Houser, B. Oglesby, M. Pan, R. Pinker, J.  
467 Santanello, S. Schubert, and H. Wang (2013b), Could the 2012 Drought Have Been  
468 Anticipated?—A NASA NEWS Initiative, paper presented at NWS Science and  
469 Technology Infusion Climate Bulletin., National Weather Service.
- 470 Weaver, S. J., and S. Nigam (2008), Variability of the Great Plains Low-Level Jet: Large-Scale  
471 Circulation Context and Hydroclimate Impacts, *J. Climate*, 21(7), 1532-1551.
- 472 Weaver, S. J., S. Schubert, and H. Wang (2009), Warm Season Variations in the Low-Level  
473 Circulation and Precipitation over the Central United States in Observations, AMIP  
474 Simulations, and Idealized SST Experiments, *J. Climate*, 22(20), 5401-5420.

475 Xia, Y., K. Mitchell, M. Ek, J. Sheffield, B. Cosgrove, E. Wood, L. Luo, C. Alonge, H. Wei, and  
476 J. Meng (2012), Continental- scale water and energy flux analysis and validation for the  
477 North American Land Data Assimilation System project phase 2 (NLDAS- 2): 1.  
478 Intercomparison and application of model products, *Journal of Geophysical Research:*  
479 *Atmospheres (1984–2012)*, 117(D3).

480 Xie, S.-P., C. Deser, G. A. Vecchi, J. Ma, H. Teng, and A. T. Wittenberg (2010), Global  
481 Warming Pattern Formation: Sea Surface Temperature and Rainfall\*, *J. Climate*, 23(4),  
482 966-986.

483

484