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INTRODUCTION

The western United States is a mosaic of diverse vegetation, soils, topography, and hydrology. Today, it is home to a substantial portion of the nation’s agricultural land and population. California alone accounts for 12% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau 2016) and agricultural sector output of the U.S. economy (USDA ERS 2016). As a whole, eight of the western states (WA, OR, CA, NV, AZ, UT, NM, ID) contain 23% of the farmed land, 20% of the agricultural output, and 21% of the population in the country. Surface water usage constitutes 91% of total water withdrawals for the West (Maupin et al 2010) and is highly sensitive to changing precipitation and temperature. Anthropogenic warming is expected to raise global temperatures 1-2°C within the next century (IPCC 2014), potentially increasing evaporation rates and taxing crucial surface water resources. However, future changes in precipitation patterns are less certain because of high natural variability within the climate system (IPCC 2014). Given the hydrologic sensitivity, agricultural significance, and high water demand in the West, it is critical to understand the mechanisms that have driven past periods of drought, and how these are manifested spatially across the West to predict what might possibly occur in the future.

California recently suffered the worst moisture deficit seen in the past 1200 years, as indicated by historical and tree ring records (Griffin and Anchukaitis 2014). The primary driver of the severity of the recent drought (2012-2015) is thought to be significantly high temperature anomalies leading to higher evaporation rates co-occurring with low, but not unusual, precipitation levels (Griffin and Anchukaitis 2014; Diffenbaugh et al., 2015). The precipitation deficit resulted from the formation of a resilient high pressure ridge that diverted moisture north of California and much of the western U.S. coast (Swain et al 2014). It is unclear from climate models of future scenarios whether similar high pressure ridging and drought is a natural feature of the climate system (Seager et al., 2014), or one that will be and has been exacerbated with anthropogenic warming (Swain et al., 2014). Thus, the influence of future warming on drought frequency and intensity in the West is uncertain.

Terrestrial climate archives suggest widespread aridity was a persistent feature of western North American climate during the mid-Holocene (8.2-3.5kyr BP) (Thompson et al 1993), a time of greater summer insolation and lower winter insolation than present. Although the boundary conditions between the mid-Holocene and the present differ, investigating the driving mechanisms of mid-Holocene aridity may shed light on the prospects of drought in a warmer world. While general (global) and regional circulation models (GCMs and RCMs, respectively) reproduce the sign of temperature patterns during the mid-Holocene, previous model-proxy comparisons have suggested that these models have difficulty predicting the precipitation changes noted in the proxy record (Diffenbaugh and Sloan 2004, Harrison et al 2014). However, these previous model-proxy comparisons have focused on global model-proxy agreement (Harrison et al 2014), used qualitative vs. quantitative comparisons (Thompson et al 1993; Mock and Brunelle Daines 1999; Diffenbaugh and Sloan 2004), drawn climate information from a single proxy type (Harrison et al 2014), or used too few paleoclimate records to sufficiently characterize the western U.S. (Harrison et al 2014; Diffenbaugh and Sloan 2004). To reconcile these issues, I have conducted a systematic comparison of the annual and seasonal precipitation and effective moisture results from twelve mid-Holocene GCM simulations to a diverse collection of 164 mid-Holocene moisture-sensitive proxy records from the western U.S. I use
the Cohen’s Weighted Kappa Statistic ($K_w$) to quantitatively assess agreement between the model output and proxy records. I then compare model-proxy agreement with atmospheric patterns to determine what large-scale processes likely drove hydroclimatic changes in the western U.S. during the mid-Holocene. The atmospheric patterns seen in the western U.S. during the mid-Holocene will help give context to periods of drought observed today and expressed by predictive models of future climate change.

**BACKGROUND**

COHMAP, the Cooperative Holocene Mapping Project, was an early effort to characterize changes in global climate in response to orbital position and ice sheet growth/decay in 3 kyr timeslices from 18 kyr BP to present (Kutzbach and Ruddiman 1993). This single-model time slice approach allowed for identification of large scale atmospheric patterns for comparison with precipitation and temperature estimates from proxy records. Thompson et al. (1993) compiled a thorough network of Late Glacial and Holocene paleoclimate records from the western U.S for comparison with COHMAP’s NCAR CCM atmospheric-only model. In general, the model indicated that atmospheric conditions leading to the observed mid-Holocene moisture patterns in the western U.S. included a stronger North Pacific High and an enhanced monsoon in the Southwest during the summer (Thompson et al 1993). However, the CCM model had coarse resolution grid cells (4°lat x 7.5°lon., Kutzbach and Ruddiman 1993) which could not take into account the topographic complexity of the western U.S. Thompson et al. (1993) focused mainly on summer changes, typically excluding discussion of the winter season, when the West receives a significant portion of annual precipitation. Globally, these early models were valuable for assessing large scale circulation patterns and general patterns of changing atmospheric circulation, but lacked the resolution necessary to properly assess detailed moisture changes in the West.

As computational power rose, models moved forward from atmosphere-only to coupled ocean-atmosphere-vegetation models, providing dynamic interactions to variables previously prescribed, such as vegetation distribution (Bracconot et al 2012). Additionally, these newer models were run for longer time periods (100+ years [Bracconot et al 2012] vs. 5-10 years [Kutzbach and Ruddiman 1993]), allowing analysis of inter-annual and multi-decadal variability. The longer model runs especially benefit the Pacific Ocean and western North America because ocean-atmosphere interactions such as the El Niño-Southern Oscillation on 2-7 year time scales and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation on 20-70 year timescales have significant implications for the distribution and amount of precipitation reaching the West (Wise 2010).

The Paleoclimate Modelling Intercomparison Project (PMIP) emerged from COHMAP. PMIP recognized that results from models depended on the parameterization and input given to GCMs, and sought to analyze how different models performed in response to the same forcings. PMIP has produced several phases of models with increasing complexity, the most recent of which is Phase 3, or PMIP3. For the mid-Holocene simulations, all parameters were identical to the pre-industrial control (piControl) simulation except for the orbital parameters (Taylor et al 2011). A recent study compared PMIP3 model output from the Last Glacial Maximum (21 ka) and mid-Holocene (6 ka) for agreement with speleothem records of precipitation variability from around the world, finding that agreement was strongly dependent on the variable being observed (Harrison et al 2014). However, this comparison included only three records from the U.S., and
none west of the Rocky Mountains and is therefore insufficient to understand the ability of PMIP3 models to simulate proxy-inferred changes in moisture and temperature in this region during the mid-Holocene. Analysis of an RCM of the western U.S. indicates that although temperature changes in the mid-Holocene are well-represented in the model, effective moisture (precipitation – evaporation) shows poor agreement with the proxy record (Diffenbaugh and Sloan 2004). In this study, I statistically compared a large collection of mid-Holocene moisture-sensitive proxy records from the western U.S. against PMIP3 GCM simulations to assess agreement and to determine potential atmospheric drivers of climate change during the mid-Holocene.

METHODOLOGY

I compiled a network of 164 published moisture-sensitive proxy records from the western United States that cover the mid-Holocene (Figure 1, Table 1). I defined mid-Holocene sites as those that were shown to cover the interval 8.0-4.0 kyr BP (6.0 +/- 2.0 kyr BP) by absolute dating, or were previously classified as mid-Holocene by Thompson et al (1993). As some proxy records are interpreted to reflect variable moisture conditions through this interval, I focused on the period of time closest to 6 kyr BP for comparison with the PMIP3 mid-Holocene simulations. The network includes proxies from lake sediments, packrat middens, speleothems, and other terrestrial archives of climate change. Based on the authors’ interpretation of each proxy site for the mid-Holocene, I classified sites as recording drier (D) conditions, wetter (W) conditions, or no change (NC) relative to modern.

Some locations, such as Vancouver Island, contained many sites within a small area, often from a single study (Figure 1). To prevent the over-representation of densely studied areas, I used ArcGIS to outline a 25km radius buffer around each site and combined proxy sites with overlapping buffer zones to create a new set of site coordinates manually selected at center of overlap (Figure 2). Buffer zones have been used in previous model-proxy comparisons to reduce over-representation of densely studied areas (DiNezio and Tierney 2013). Because the western U.S. is topographically complex, I used a 25km buffer radius (50km separation distance) such that local changes in altitude were not oversimplified within the proxy network. I determined the moisture classification for these aggregate sites by counting the number of overlapping sites that fall into each category (D/W/NC; Table 2). In most instances, I was able to use the category of the majority of the sites as the classification for the new “buffer site.” In several cases, conflicts between D/W and NC were resolved by selecting either D or W. At two sites, there was an equal split of D and W, or a split between D, W, and NC. In both cases of equal splits, I chose to classify the buffer site as NC. The final proxy network (Figure 3) after combining sites contained 98 geographic coordinates for climate model data extraction with 64 classified as drier, 18 classified as no change, and 16 classified as wetter relative to preindustrial conditions (Table 3).
Figure 1: Mid-Holocene Paleoclimate Proxies of the Western United States

Figure 1: The observed proxy network used in this study. The majority of moisture proxies for the mid-Holocene (6 +/- 2 kyr BP) come from pollen records from lake sediments. Here, "Lake/Lake Sediments" entail studies that used proxies other than pollen or in addition to pollen, while "Terrestrial Pollen" records are lake or other terrestrial sediments that rely strictly on pollen analysis. Many of the records here are originally compiled in Thompson et al. 1993 and Metcalfe et al. 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Moisture Classification</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlatl Cave</td>
<td>-107.9</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Betancourt and Van Devender 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground Lake</td>
<td>-122.49</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Barnosky 1985a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lake</td>
<td>-114.03</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Louderback and Rhode 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carp Lake</td>
<td>-120.88</td>
<td>45.92</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Whitlock et al 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>-122.84</td>
<td>39.07</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Adam 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estancia Basin</td>
<td>-106.62</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Menking and Anderson 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka View</td>
<td>-117.78</td>
<td>37.33</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Spaulding 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmire</td>
<td>-122.78</td>
<td>37.99</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Anderson et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Lake Bog</td>
<td>-122.04</td>
<td>43.65</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Sea and Whitlock 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Lake</td>
<td>-111.44</td>
<td>43.06</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Beiswenger 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Cave</td>
<td>-118.63</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Wigand and Mehringer 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestead Cave</td>
<td>-112.93</td>
<td>41.16</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Grayson 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Slough</td>
<td>-107.9</td>
<td>42.48</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Beiswenger 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Tree National Monument</td>
<td>-116.18</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Holmgren et al 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Babicora</td>
<td>-107.82</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Roy et al 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Cahuilla (Salton Basin)</td>
<td>-116.05</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Li et al 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Cochise</td>
<td>-109.87</td>
<td>32.17</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Waters 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>-117.35</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Kirby et al 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Lake</td>
<td>-123.58</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Worona and Whitlock 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Moisture Classification</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Willow Lake</td>
<td>-121.39</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>West 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney Lake</td>
<td>-119.58</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Lowe et al 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Mountains</td>
<td>-115.58</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Spaulding 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCullough Range</td>
<td>-115.17</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Spaulding 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Lake</td>
<td>-121.6</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Starratt 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescal Mountain</td>
<td>-115.55</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Koehler et al 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Cross Bog</td>
<td>-115.48</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montezuma Well</td>
<td>-112</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Davis and Shafer 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens Lake</td>
<td>-117.96</td>
<td>36.44</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Bacon et al 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomas Basin</td>
<td>-107.42</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Castiglia and Fawcett2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Panther Cave</td>
<td>-105.17</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Asmerom et al 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato Lake</td>
<td>-111.35</td>
<td>34.46</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Anderson 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramid Lake</td>
<td>-119.56</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Benson et al 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattlesnake Cave</td>
<td>-112.63</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Beiswenger 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Rock Lake</td>
<td>-105.54</td>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Maher 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Lake/Marsh</td>
<td>-115.51</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Mountains</td>
<td>-105.92</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Van Devender et al 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Agustin Plain</td>
<td>-108.57</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Markgraf et al 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio Creek Section</td>
<td>-120.49</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Anderson et al 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier Lake</td>
<td>-113.13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Oviatt 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Bacha</td>
<td>-112.5</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Anderson and Van Devender 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowbird Bog</td>
<td>-111.92</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Madsen and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Moisture Classification</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Bog</td>
<td>-105.75</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Jimenez-Moreno et al 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare Lake</td>
<td>-119.75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Davis et al 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle Lake</td>
<td>-124.96</td>
<td>49.33</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valleyview</td>
<td>-114.72</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Thompson 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountains</td>
<td>-118.33</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Jennings and Elliot-Fisk 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenkner Valley section</td>
<td>-123</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Heusser 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlins Cave</td>
<td>-115.03</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cub Lake</td>
<td>-111.18</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Pond</td>
<td>-118.33</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etna</td>
<td>-114.62</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Lake</td>
<td>-118.63</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose Lake</td>
<td>-119.34</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna Bog</td>
<td>-119.38</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Cleveland</td>
<td>-113.65</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Trail Pass Bog</td>
<td>-113.97</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphey's rock shelter</td>
<td>-116.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinecrest Lake</td>
<td>-121.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes Canyon</td>
<td>-106.75</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Fen</td>
<td>-117.58</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Moisture Classification</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-125.08</td>
<td>48.773</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-124.49</td>
<td>47.942</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-123.73</td>
<td>48.542</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-124.12</td>
<td>49.191</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-122.27</td>
<td>49.028</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-118.61</td>
<td>48.255</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-119.34</td>
<td>48.694</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-122.26</td>
<td>47.753</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-121.96</td>
<td>46.761</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-115.37</td>
<td>48.236</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-117.19</td>
<td>48.758</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-112.23</td>
<td>46.479</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-110.66</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-110.23</td>
<td>44.281</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-108.45</td>
<td>45.091</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-123.42</td>
<td>42.066</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-122.54</td>
<td>41.333</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-111.76</td>
<td>42.189</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-107.34</td>
<td>39.711</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-106.93</td>
<td>38.813</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-109.61</td>
<td>37.596</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-114.11</td>
<td>39.326</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-115.15</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-116.77</td>
<td>38.999</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-119.47</td>
<td>38.074</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-119.29</td>
<td>37.086</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-120.04</td>
<td>38.963</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-116.5</td>
<td>35.473</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-116.85</td>
<td>34.151</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-115.34</td>
<td>31.151</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Proxy Sites Used in $\kappa_w$ Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Moisture Classification</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-114.08</td>
<td>32.439</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-113.18</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-111.47</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-112.06</td>
<td>36.282</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-108.88</td>
<td>31.397</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-110.42</td>
<td>31.467</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-122.88</td>
<td>44.59</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Proxy site locations and moisture classifications for extraction of GCM data. Italicized site names are sites for which I was unable to access the original reference, and proxy interpretations come directly from the interpretation in Thompson et al 1993. Numbered sites are locations which combined multiple proxy records and are explained in detail in Table 2.
Figure 2: Proxy Network with 25km Buffer
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Figure 2: Original proxy network with 25km buffer zones (yellow). Areas of overlap (red) were used to identify locations where sites needed to be combined and reclassified to reduce overall proxy network density in highly studied areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number (Site Name)</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Moisture Class</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Aggregate Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Effingham Island Bog</td>
<td>-125.32</td>
<td>48.87</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Whyac Lake Bog</td>
<td>-124.84</td>
<td>48.67</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hoh River Valley Site</td>
<td>-124.50</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Heusser 1974</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Soleduck Bog</td>
<td>-124.47</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Heusser 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Wentworth Lake</td>
<td>-124.53</td>
<td>48.01</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Heusser 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Wessler Bog</td>
<td>-124.50</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Heusser 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 East Sooke Fen</td>
<td>-123.68</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Heal Lake</td>
<td>-123.47</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Langford Lake</td>
<td>-123.53</td>
<td>48.45</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pixie Lake</td>
<td>-124.20</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Porphyry Lake</td>
<td>-123.83</td>
<td>48.91</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Brown and Hebda 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rhammus Lake</td>
<td>-123.72</td>
<td>48.63</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Walker Lake</td>
<td>-124.00</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown and Hebda 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Boomerang Lake</td>
<td>-124.16</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Enos Lake</td>
<td>-124.16</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Brown et al 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Marion Lake</td>
<td>-122.55</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mathewes 1973</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mosquito Lake</td>
<td>-122.12</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Hansen and Easterbrook 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pangborn Bog</td>
<td>-122.27</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Hansen and Easterbrook 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Surprise Lake</td>
<td>-122.56</td>
<td>49.32</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mathewes 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Simpson’s Flatts</td>
<td>-118.58</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Waitts Lake</td>
<td>-118.67</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonaparte Meadows</td>
<td>-119.06</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mack et al 1979</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mud Lake</td>
<td>-119.63</td>
<td>48.59</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mack et al 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hall Lake</td>
<td>-122.30</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lake Washington</td>
<td>-122.22</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Leopold et al 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Lake Washington</td>
<td>-121.96</td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Leopold et al 1982</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number (Site Name)</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Moisture Class</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Aggregate Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Davis Lake</strong></td>
<td>-122.25</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Barnosky 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jay Bath</strong></td>
<td>-121.77</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Dunwiddie 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Log Wallow</strong></td>
<td>-121.75</td>
<td>46.78</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Dunwiddie 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mineral Lake</strong></td>
<td>-122.20</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nisqually Lake</strong></td>
<td>-122.22</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection Pond</strong></td>
<td>-121.73</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Dunwiddie 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>-115.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.236</strong></td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McKillop Creek Pond</strong></td>
<td>-115.26</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Mack et al 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teepee Lake</strong></td>
<td>-115.50</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>-117.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.758</strong></td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Meadow</strong></td>
<td>-117.42</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mack et al 1978c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hager Lake</strong></td>
<td>-116.97</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mack et al 1978d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>-112.23</td>
<td>46.479</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest Lake</strong></td>
<td>-112.17</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telegraph Creek Marsh</strong></td>
<td>-112.33</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>-110.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.93</strong></td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blacktail Pond</strong></td>
<td>-110.60</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Beiswenger 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gardiners Hole</strong></td>
<td>-110.73</td>
<td>44.92</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>-110.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.281</strong></td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buckbean Fen</strong></td>
<td>-110.25</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Baker 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cub Creek Pond</strong></td>
<td>-110.25</td>
<td>44.51</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Waddington and Wright 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lilypad Pond</strong></td>
<td>-110.25</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>-108.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.091</strong></td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Pryor</strong></td>
<td>-108.65</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Lyford et al 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Pryor</strong></td>
<td>-108.25</td>
<td>45.05</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Lyford et al 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>-123.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.066</strong></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolan Lake</strong></td>
<td>-123.46</td>
<td>42.02</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Briles et al 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Caves National Monument</strong></td>
<td>-123.41</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Ersek et al 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>-122.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.333</strong></td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bluff Lake</strong></td>
<td>-122.56</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mohr et al 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cedar Lake</strong></td>
<td>-122.50</td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mohr et al 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crater Lake</strong></td>
<td>-122.58</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Mohr et al 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>-111.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.189</strong></td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number (Site Name)</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Moisture Class</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Aggregate Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnetonka Cave</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>-111.52</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Lundeen et al 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Lake</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td>-111.99</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Beiswenger 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-107.34</td>
<td>39.711</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Robust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison Lake</td>
<td>-107.35</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Anderson 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Lake</td>
<td>-107.35</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Anderson 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-106.93</td>
<td>38.813</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Robust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkali Lake</td>
<td>-106.83</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Markgraf and Scott 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Iron Bog</td>
<td>-107.03</td>
<td>38.87</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Fall 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-109.61</td>
<td>37.596</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Robust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Cave</td>
<td>-109.58</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Betancourt 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishmouth Cave</td>
<td>-109.65</td>
<td>37.42</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Betancourt 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-114.11</td>
<td>39.326</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Conflict Type B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Hall Cave</td>
<td>-114.10</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman Cave</td>
<td>-114.22</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Steponaitis et al 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Creek Cave</td>
<td>-114.10</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Thompson 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-115.15</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert View</td>
<td>-115.03</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Range</td>
<td>-115.25</td>
<td>36.58</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Spaulding 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tule Springs</td>
<td>-115.18</td>
<td>36.32</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-116.77</td>
<td>38.999</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Conflict Type A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatecliff Shelter</td>
<td>-116.78</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatecliff/June Canyon</td>
<td>-116.75</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-119.47</td>
<td>38.074</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirman Lake</td>
<td>-119.50</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Bloom 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono Lake</td>
<td>-119.01</td>
<td>38.01</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Davis 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siesta Lake</td>
<td>-119.66</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Brunelle and Anderson 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Lake</td>
<td>-119.58</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Reinemann et al 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swamp Lake Yosemite</td>
<td>-119.82</td>
<td>37.95</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Smith and Anderson 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tioga Pass Pond</td>
<td>-119.27</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Anderson 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-119.29</td>
<td>37.086</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsam Meadows</td>
<td>-119.50</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Davis et al 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number (Site Name)</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Moisture Class</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Aggregate Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchequer Meadow</td>
<td>-119.08</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-120.04</td>
<td>38.963</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Lindstrom 1990</td>
<td>Drier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgood Swamp</td>
<td>-120.08</td>
<td>38.83</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-116.5</td>
<td>35.473</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Koehler et al 2005</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibex</td>
<td>-116.33</td>
<td>35.78</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Koehler et al 2005</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Basin</td>
<td>-116.73</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Koehler et al 2005</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Name East</td>
<td>-116.57</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Koehler et al 2005</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake</td>
<td>-116.11</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Kirby et al 2015</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-116.85</td>
<td>34.151</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Kirby et al 2012</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear Lake</td>
<td>-116.94</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Bird and Kirby 2006</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Lake</td>
<td>-116.83</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>King 1976</td>
<td>Drier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucerne Valley</td>
<td>-117.00</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Wahl 2002</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skunk Cabbage Meadow</td>
<td>-116.65</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Wahl 2002</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taquitz Meadow</td>
<td>-116.65</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Wahl 2002</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-115.34</td>
<td>31.151</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Roy et al 2010</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Seca San Felipe</td>
<td>-115.25</td>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Holmgren et al 2011</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra San Pedro Martir</td>
<td>-115.43</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Hall et al 1988</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-114.08</td>
<td>32.439</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Hall et al 1988</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinajas Altas Mountains</td>
<td>-114.05</td>
<td>32.28</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Hall et al 1988</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellton Hills</td>
<td>-114.12</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-113.18</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>McAuliffe and Van Devender 1998</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Eye Mts</td>
<td>-113.17</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Hall et al 1988</td>
<td>Robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornaday Mts</td>
<td>-113.60</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Van Devender 1987</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Blanco Mountains</td>
<td>-112.78</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Van Devender 1987</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-111.47</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Anderson and Van Devender 1991</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman Mts</td>
<td>-111.50</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolcott Peak</td>
<td>-111.47</td>
<td>32.45</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Thompson et al 1993</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-112.06</td>
<td>36.282</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Weng and Jackson 1999</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number (Site Name)</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Moisture Class</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Aggregate Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuar Valley</td>
<td>-111.92</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Cole 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracas Lake</td>
<td>-112.24</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Weng and Jackson 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Point</td>
<td>-111.98</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Cole 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Cloverdale</td>
<td>-108.83</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Krider 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peloncillo Mts</td>
<td>-108.94</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Holmgren et al 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of the Bells</td>
<td>-110.47</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Wagner 2006</td>
<td>Conflict Type A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Springs</td>
<td>-110.18</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
<td>Mehringer et al 1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-110.42</td>
<td>31.467</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Type A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Lake</td>
<td>-123.18</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Walsh et al 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Prairie Fen</td>
<td>-122.58</td>
<td>44.63</td>
<td>Drier</td>
<td>Sea and Whitlock 1995</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Aggregates Sites and Their Constituents

Table 2: Sites combined using a 25km buffer radius. Bold sites are the aggregate locations, and italicized sites are the constituents. Overall, the 37 sites listed here are comprised of 103 individual proxy sites. See Table 3 for description and treatment of conflicts.
Figure 3: The final proxy network used in Kw analyses. Combining sites reduced the number of sites from 164 to 98.
### Table 3: Criteria for Moisture Classification of Aggregate Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Moisture Classification</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All sites agree</td>
<td>Category of all sites</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Majority rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of sites agree</td>
<td>Category of majority of sites</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Majority rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50 split between Drier/Wetter and No Change</td>
<td>Drier/wetter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conservative estimate for disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50 split between Drier and Wetter</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Average of conflict indicates no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal split between Drier, Wetter, and No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Average of conflict indicates no change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The scheme used to determine the moisture classification of aggregate sites. Most aggregate sites’ moisture classifications reflect either perfect or a majority agreement between constituent sites.

Using NCAR Command Language (NCL), I interpolated precipitation (P) and effective moisture (EM) values at the coordinates of each of the buffer sites from the output of the mid-Holocene (6 ka) and Pre-Industrial (0 ka) runs from twelve PMIP3 models (Table 4). Next, I calculated P and EM anomalies between the 6ka and 0ka simulations using the following equations:

\[
EM_t = P_t - E_t
\]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[
P_{\text{Anom}} = \frac{P_{6\text{ka}}}{P_{0\text{ka}}} \times 100
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

\[
EM_{\text{Anom}} = \frac{EM_{6\text{ka}}}{EM_{0\text{ka}}} \times 100
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where EM is effective moisture, P is precipitation, E is evapotranspiration, and the subscript “t” is the timeframe of interest (either 6ka or 0ka). To compare the results of the model to the proxy network, I computed the Cohen’s Weighted Kappa (K_w) statistic, which measures categorical data agreement between two raters who classify items (sites) into categories (D/W/NC) relative to the probability of random agreement (Cohen 1968). Recent model-proxy intercomparisons have used the K_w statistic to analyze the ability of models to reflect precipitation changes during the Last Glacial Maximum over the Indo-Pacific (DiNezio and Tierney 2013) and the western U.S. (Oster et al 2015).

K_w is calculated using the following equation:
where $w_{ij}$ is the weight matrix, $x_{ij}$ is the observed matrix, and $m_{ij}$ is the matrix of scores expected by random chance (Cohen 1968). Here, I assigned a weight of 1 for complete disagreement (e.g. proxy says D and model says W), 0.5 for sites with moderate disagreement (e.g. proxy says NC and model says D or W), and 0 for complete agreement (e.g. proxy and model both say D). To test the robustness of agreement between models and proxies, I varied the threshold of change required for the model responses to fall into the wetter or drier category from 2-50% and calculated 95% confidence limits for the maximum $K_w$ for each model. For example, at a threshold of 10%, a model must simulate mid-Holocene precipitation of ≥ 110% modern for a site to be classified as wetter and ≤ 90% for a site to be classified as drier. Values from 91–109% modern were classified as “no change.” Computed $K_w$ values range from -1 to 1, where -1 is perfect disagreement, 0 is no agreement greater than random chance, and 1 is perfect agreement (Cohen 1968). I compared the proxy network to modeled P and EM anomaly values to generate $K_w$ statistics for both P and EM.

Table 4: Model Spatiotemporal Resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Name</th>
<th>Model ID</th>
<th>Number of Grid Cells (Latitude)</th>
<th>Number of Grid Cells (Longitude)</th>
<th>Mid-Holocene simulation length (years)</th>
<th>piControl simulation length (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCC-CSM1-1</td>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSM4</td>
<td>CCSM4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRM-CM5</td>
<td>CNRM</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO-MK3-6-0</td>
<td>CSIRO 360</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO MK3L-1-2</td>
<td>CSIRO 312</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGOALS-G2</td>
<td>FGOALS G2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGOALS-S2</td>
<td>FGOALS S2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISS-E2-R</td>
<td>GISS</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSL-CM5A-LR</td>
<td>IPSL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIROC-ESM</td>
<td>MIROC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-P</td>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI-CGCM3</td>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: PMIP3 models used in this study. The model ID is the shorthand code used for each model in this study. For reference, the highest resolution model (MRI) has a grid cell size of 1.25°lat x 1.25°lon, and the coarsest model (CSIRO 312) has a grid cell size of 3.2°lat x 5.6°lon.
To analyze pressure system strength and position within each model run, I identified model grid cells with maximum and minimum pressures over the Pacific Ocean to locate the North Pacific High and Aleutian Low, respectively. I compared the changes in latitude, longitude, sea level pressure, and the pressure difference between the high and low with the \( K_w \) statistics for each model by 1) utilizing an Akaike information criterion for selecting the combination of variables to regress (Bartoń 2014), and then 2) performing a multiple linear regression analysis to determine whether the pressure configuration correlated with model agreement for \( P \) and \( EM \) on an annual basis. I also analyzed wind anomalies at the 250mbar and 850mbar heights to identify when and where changes in moisture advection may be occurring.

Additionally, I used the \( Kw \) statistic to compare the mid-Holocene proxy network with precipitation patterns seen in the modern California drought to determine if modern drought spatial patterns are similar to those seen in the mid-Holocene. Precipitation anomalies for the modern drought were calculated using the PRISM (Parameter elevation Regression on Independent Slopes Model) total annual precipitation dataset for 2013, the most intense year of the drought, using the following equation:

\[
P_{\text{Anom}} = \frac{P_{2013}}{P_{\text{Average}}} \times 100 \quad (5)
\]

where \( P_{2013} \) is the annual precipitation total for 2013 and \( P_{\text{Average}} \) is the PRISM 30-year average annual precipitation amount from 1981-2010 (PRISM 2016).

RESULTS

THE MID-HOLOCENE MOISTURE PROXY RECORD

The compiled mid-Holocene proxy network indicates drier conditions over most of the study area (Figure 3). In particular, the Pacific Northwest and Northern Rockies are exclusively drier or unchanged at 6ka relative to modern. California is mostly drier at 6ka, while sites in the Great Basin and southern Rockies indicate a mixture of wetter, drier, and unchanged conditions relative to present. Proxies suggest the southwestern U.S., especially at the U.S.-Mexico border is wetter at 6ka, although much of Arizona and New Mexico are drier than modern.

MODEL ANNUAL PATTERNS

Most models show annual surface air temperatures within +/- 1°C of modern over the West and the Pacific Ocean (15-70°N, 150°E-90°W; Figure 4). However, FGOALS G2 stands out because it has annual temperatures between 0-2°C colder than modern conditions over the entire domain, including a large band of 2°C or colder anomalies over most of the area above 50°N. All models show an increase in annual \( P \) at 6ka in the Southwest (Figure 5). For other regions, the \( P \) pattern is less consistent among models. For example, half of the models show decreased or unchanged \( P \) at 6ka in the Pacific Northwest (FGOALS G2, FGOALS S2, IPSL, MIROC, MRI, and MPI), while the other half show an increase in \( P \) for the same region (BCC, CCSM4, CNRM, CSIRO_360, CSIRO_312, and GISS). Evaporation is higher in the mid-Holocene in the Southwest and northwestern Mexico in all models to some degree (Figure 6). In addition, several of the models (e.g. CSIRO_312, IPSL, MIROC, MPI) have a core region of increased evaporation values (110-120% modern) that occurs over Arizona, New Mexico, and northwestern Mexico. FGOALS G2 and FGOALS S2 both show decreased evaporation at 6ka over most of the study area, which is notably different than all other models.
Modelled EM differs substantially among models (Figure 7). For example, most models indicate higher EM in the Southwest, but CCSM4 and MRI have patches of lower or unchanged EM. Three models (FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI) are relatively consistent with one another, having higher than modern EM in the Southwest and lower than modern EM nearly everywhere else. In particular, FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI have exclusively lower or near-modern EM above 42°N, whereas all other models have at least some coverage of higher EM in the Pacific Northwest and/or northern Rockies.
Both FGOALS G2 and MPI have relatively high $K_w$ values for $P$ compared to other models (0.270 at the 2% threshold and 0.234 at the 2% threshold, respectively) and tend to agree with the proxy record for $P$ in most of the Pacific Northwest and the northern Rockies, as well as near the U.S.-Mexico border (Figure 8a). FGOALS G2 and MPI show mixed agreement with the proxy network in the northern Great Basin and Rocky Mountains and generally poor agreement in most of California and along the Colorado Plateau (Figure 8a). In general, FGOALS G2 shows better agreement with the proxy network than MPI does between 37°N and 42°N, a region...
where most proxies indicate drier conditions, suggesting that FGOALS G2 best simulates the boundary between the dry north and wet Southwest. The remaining ten models show little to no agreement with the proxy network in Washington, California, and the Colorado Plateau (Figure 8b). However, these same ten models show better agreement with locations in the southern Great Basin which mainly are classified as NC (Figure 8b).

**Figure 8: Model-Proxy Agreement by Proxy Site Based on Annual Precipitation (P)**

**A** P Agreement Top Models

**B** P Agreement Remaining Models

![Figure 8: Number of models that show agreement for P at each proxy site for the top two (A), and the bottom ten (B) models. A) The top models based on P K_w results, FGOALS G2 and MPI, show perfect agreement with the proxy record in Washington, the northern Rockies, and the U.S.-Mexico border. B) The models with lower P K_w values perform poorly in most locations except the central Great Basin and the U.S.-Mexico border.](image)

Overall, K_w values for EM agreement tend to be higher than K_w values for P agreement (Table 5). The models FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI have the highest K_w for EM (0.303, 0.279, and 0.361, respectively, all at the 2% threshold). Each of these models shows lower than modern EM in the northern U.S. and Pacific Northwest (typically above 40°N) and higher than modern EM in the Southwest (Figure 9a). Importantly, these models show excellent agreement with most sites in the Pacific Northwest and northern Rockies. The most noticeable difference between these three models is that MPI displays higher EM in California, especially along the coast, than IPSL and FGOALS G2. Some models (BCC, CCSM4, CSIRO_312, and GISS) show very poor agreement with the proxy network (K_w for EM = 0.113, -0.016, 0.016, and 0.1208, respectively)
resulting from overall higher EM over most of the study area during the mid-Holocene. Although, FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI all have exclusively lower EM north of 42°N, all other models contain at least some areas of higher EM in this region. Similar to P, there is a clustering of non-agreement in most of California and the Colorado Plateau, a pattern that is consistent among all models (Figure 9). There is also strong agreement among all models at the U.S.-Mexico border and most of northern Mexico where models and proxies indicate wetter conditions. Once again, most of the lower nine models agree relatively well with the proxy network in the southern Great Basin where proxy records indicate EM that is similar to modern (Figure 9b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Max $K_w$</th>
<th>Threshold (%)</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Weak Disagree</th>
<th>Strong Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGOALS G2</td>
<td>0.2698</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>0.2338</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSL</td>
<td>0.1649</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO 312</td>
<td>0.1441</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIROC</td>
<td>0.1437</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO 360</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>0.1231</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGOALS S2</td>
<td>0.1138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRM</td>
<td>0.1127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>0.0770</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISS</td>
<td>0.0629</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSM4</td>
<td>0.0166</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Max $K_w$</th>
<th>Threshold (%)</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Weak Disagree</th>
<th>Strong Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>0.3612</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGOALS G2</td>
<td>0.3032</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSL</td>
<td>0.2787</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISS</td>
<td>0.1208</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO 360</td>
<td>0.1131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>0.1113</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>0.1027</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRM</td>
<td>0.1003</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIROC</td>
<td>0.0973</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGOALS S2</td>
<td>0.0747</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO 312</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSM4</td>
<td>-0.0157</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Maximum precipitation and effective moisture $K_w$ values and their associated thresholds for each model. Cells highlighted in green represent models that perform notably better than other models, typically showing 50% or more agreement with the proxy network. Model names highlighted in either green or purple have $K_w$ values which are statistically significant and greater than zero at the 95% confidence interval. Non-highlighted models were not significantly different than zero.

**Figure 9: Model-Proxy Agreement by Proxy Site Based on Annual Effective Moisture (EM)**

**MID-HOLOCENE SEASONAL PATTERNS**

Winter temperature is reduced relative to modern in all models over most or all of the study area. FGOALS G2 has the largest winter temperature decrease (1-2°C cooler than modern; Figure 10a) over most of North America, whereas all other models except MRI typically have winter temperatures between 0-1°C cooler than modern. Winter precipitation patterns indicate drier than modern conditions over almost the entire study area for FGOALS G2, the highest scoring model for $P K_w$ (Figure 10d). IPSL and MPI show wetter winter conditions in the Pacific Northwest (Figure 10e,f). Winter evaporation is consistently lower than modern over the majority of North America across all models. FGOALS G2 is the only model to show lower
than modern winter EM conditions over parts of the Pacific Northwest (Figure 10j). All other models show higher mid-Holocene EM in at least the Pacific Northwest. Models with high $K_w$ values for annual EM (FGOALS G2, IPSL, MPI) all exhibit lower mid-Holocene EM than modern in California (Figure 10j-l), though CSIRO 360, CSIRO 360, and CNRM also have lower EM in California relative to modern.

Spring temperatures are consistently colder than modern, and FGOALS G2 once again has temperatures colder than all other models over much of North. In all models, large positive springtime P anomalies (>120% modern) persist between 20-40°N over the Desert Southwest. FGOALS G2, MPI, and IPSL all show a drier springtime Pacific Northwest (Figure 11d-f), and the former two models also have a drier northern Rocky Mountain region, similar to the spatial patterns seen in the annual P results. However, this pattern is also present in some models which show much lower agreement with the proxy network (FGOALS S2, GISS, BCC). Evaporation is similar across all models, with less evaporation in the northern study area, and increased evaporation around the Gulf of California and northwestern Mexico. Models with high annual $K_w$ values for EM (FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI) all suggest at least part of the Pacific Northwest was drier than modern during the mid-Holocene spring (Figure 11j-l), though other models also show partially dry conditions there (BCC, GISS, CNRM).

All models show an increase in summer temperatures. FGOALS G2 shows lower or near-modern summer evaporation over most of the study area (Figure 12g), while all other models (except FGOALS S2) show increased summer evaporation over most or the entire region. The largest increases in summer evaporation occur over the Southwest and northern Mexico. IPSL and MPI show large (>120% modern) increases in P in the Southwest (Figure 12e,f). In contrast, FGOALS G2 shows lower summer P conditions relative to modern in almost the entire study area, with increased precipitation only occurring offshore of the west coast of Mexico (Figure 12d). Summer P does not show a consistent spatial pattern in models other than FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI. Additionally, all models except FGOALS G2 and GISS show positive summer EM anomalies over the entire study area relative to modern.

Autumn temperature, precipitation, and EM anomalies are generally inconsistent among all models. Among FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI, temperatures over most of the study area are warmer than modern (Figure 13a-c). FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI show lower than modern P in the northern Rockies and higher than modern P in northwestern Mexico and the Desert Southwest (Figure 13d-f). FGOALS G2 and MPI, the top performing models for $K_w$ P, also have lower than modern P in the Pacific Northwest during the autumn months. All models except MPI and FGOALS G2 indicate higher EM than modern in the Pacific Northwest during the autumn months (Figure 13j-l). MPI and FGOALS G2 also look similar in that they have largely drier than modern conditions over most of the study area except for much of California and parts of the Southwest. In contrast to other variables, autumn evaporation is relatively consistent in most models. All models have lower-than or near-modern evaporation in the Pacific Northwest and northern Rockies, and all models except GISS and BCC have some extent of positive evaporation anomalies (110-120% modern) in the Southwest.
Figure 10: Mid-Holocene winter temperature anomalies (DEGREES C, A-C), precipitation anomalies (% modern, D-F), evaporation anomalies (% modern, G-I), and effective moisture anomalies (% modern, J-L) for FGOALS G2 (A,D,G,J), IPSL (B,E,H,K), and MPI (C,F,I,L).
Figure 11: Mid-Holocene spring temperature anomalies (DEGREES C, A-C), precipitation anomalies (% modern, D-F), evaporation anomalies (% modern, G-I), and effective moisture anomalies (% modern, J-L) for FGOALS G2 (A,D,G,J), IPSL (B,E,H,K), and MPI (C,F,I,L).
Figure 12: Summer (JJA) Variables for Top Performing Models

Figure 12: Mid-Holocene summer temperature anomalies (DEGREES C, A-C), precipitation anomalies (% modern, D-F), evaporation anomalies (% modern, G-I), and effective moisture anomalies (% modern, J-L) for FGOALS G2 (A,D,G,J), IPSL (B,E,H,K), and MPI (C,F,I,L).
ANNUAL SURFACE WIND AND WINTER 250MBAR WIND PATTERNS

The models that show the best agreement with the proxy network (FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI) display a distinct boundary between stronger annual westerly winds north of 45°N and weaker annual westerly winds between 30-45°N during the mid-Holocene (Figure 14a-c), though
these annual anomalies are small (+/- 1m/s). All other models either do not have this boundary, or it is shifted to a different latitude. Additionally, the center of the North Pacific High (NPH) in FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI is exclusively characterized by weaker annual westerly winds, whereas other models have areas of stronger annual westerly winds over the NPH (Figure 14d-f).

Winter 250mbar wind vector anomalies in FGOALS G2, MPI, and CSIRO 312 all show stronger than modern zonal winds in the northeast Pacific offshore of Canada and weaker than modern zonal winds offshore of southern California (Figure 15a-c). Additionally, FGOALS G2, MPI, and CSIRO 312 show stronger than modern poleward winds over the Pacific Ocean and stronger than modern equatorward flow along the U.S. West Coast (Figure 15d-f). These wind anomalies coincide with areas of higher than modern sea level pressure and form an anticyclonic anomaly centered between 150°W-130°W, offshore of northern California and the Pacific Northwest (Figure 16a,c,e), and. The presence of an anticyclonic anomaly in CSIRO 312 indicates that such wind patterns are not exclusive to models with high $K_w$ values, though the highest scoring models (FGOALS G2 and MPI) have them.

![Figure 14: Annual Zonal Wind Anomalies and 6ka Sea Level Pressure](image-url)

*Figure 14:* Annual zonal wind anomalies (6ka-modern) for various models. The Aleutian Low and North Pacific High are denoted by blue L’s and red H’s, respectively, and dashed contours represent 6ka absolute sea level pressure (mbar). In A-C, the green line separates stronger westerly winds in the north and weaker westerly winds to the south in the top three performing models around 45°N. In D-F, this zonal boundary line is not present or displaced. Additionally, A-C show a North Pacific High that entails strictly weaker westerly flow in the top 4mbar contours, whereas D-F show cross-cutting of stronger westerly flow in these strong high pressure zones. The remaining models (not shown here) typically do not have a defined zonal boundary line, and if they do, it extends further south than 45°N.
ANNUAL REGRESSION RESULTS

$K_w$ for annual P shows strong correlation with the NPH strength and westerly position, as well as the pressure difference between the NPH and AL ($R^2=0.8908$, $p=0.0001$). The sign of the regression model coefficients indicates $K_w$ for annual P is higher when the NPH is shifted to the west and has higher absolute sea level pressure, and the pressure difference between the NPH and AL is decreased. This suggests that a weaker pressure contrast and higher sea level pressure at both the NPH and AL exert a strong influence on precipitation patterns in western North America.

$K_w$ for annual EM shows slightly weaker correlation with atmospheric pressure variables ($R^2=0.8162$, $p=0.001$) than $K_w$ for annual P. The best regression model of EM $K_w$ has two variables that are significant at the 95% CI (NPH and AL sea level pressure). This model's coefficients indicate that EM $K_w$ is highest when the NPH is west shifted (not significant at 95% CI) with lower than modern sea level pressure, and the AL has higher than modern sea level pressure, resulting in an overall decreased pressure difference.

**Figure 15**: 250mbar Winter (DJF) Zonal and Meridional Wind Anomalies

![250mbar Winter (DJF) Zonal and Meridional Wind Anomalies](image)

**Figure 15**: Winter (DJF) 250mbar zonal wind (A-C), meridional wind (D-F), for CSIRO 312 (A,D), FGOALS G2 (B,E), and MPI (C,F). Contours for all figures are mid-Holocene sea level pressure (hPa). Red shades represent stronger eastward and northward flow, respectively.
Figure 16: 250mbar wind anomalies (vectors; A,C,E), sea level pressure anomalies (colors; A,C,E), and precipitation anomalies (B,D,F) for the mid-Holocene relative modern. A,C, and E show anticyclonic wind anomalies centered over an area of higher than modern sea level pressure offshore of the Pacific Northwest. B,D, and F show significantly reduced precipitation over California during the winter season.
Compared with the $K_w$ values for PMIP3 model agreement for the observed 2013 P anomalies from the PRISM dataset is the third highest $K_w$ ($K_w = 0.172$ at the 5-6% threshold). The greatest disagreement between the 2013 P anomalies and the proxy network occurs in the southern Great Basin, Desert Southwest, and Rocky Mountains (Figure 17). Annual precipitation anomalies for 2013 show strong agreement with the mid-Holocene proxy network in the Pacific Northwest and California (29/30 sites in agreement). Thus, although the overall $K_w$ value is not high, there is near perfect agreement when comparing the mid-Holocene proxy record to precipitation anomalies from the 2013 drought at sites where the majority of annual precipitation occurs as winter precipitation from the westerly storm track.

**DISCUSSION**
Previous analysis of PMIP3 model simulations of mid-Holocene and Last Glacial Maximum climates indicates that models are generally capable of capturing large-scale features of paleoclimate, such as the North American Monsoon. However, the ability of models to predict the proper magnitude of change, especially on a regional basis, is still an area in need of improvement (Harrison et al 2015). This study, however, suggests that even the sign of change is poorly represented and inconsistent among the PMIP3 simulations of mid-Holocene hydroclimate in western North America, although some models perform notably better than others.

Regional climate models (RCMs) also show disagreement between moisture-sensitive proxy records and simulated mid-Holocene effective moisture (EM) in western North America (Diffenbaugh and Sloan 2004), with RCMs indicating wetter than modern conditions over northern California and southwestern Oregon and proxy records indicating drier than modern conditions. The same model-proxy disagreement is clearly shown in nine of the twelve PMIP3 global climate models (GCMs) considered here (Figure 8b). Of these twelve PMIP3 models, FGOALS G2 and MPI show the best agreement with the proxy network for the mid-Holocene in western North America based on precipitation \(K_w\) values. In particular, both models display negative annual precipitation anomalies in the Pacific Northwest and northern Rockies, in agreement with proxies that indicate drier mid-Holocene conditions (Figure 18a and 18d). FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI show good agreement with the proxy network for EM, stemming from the prediction of reduced effective moisture in the Pacific Northwest and Northern Rockies (Figure 9a). Most of the PMIP3 models investigated here are producing some combination of too much precipitation and not enough evaporation in the northern study area and thus do not reflect the increased aridity recorded by the proxy network. However, each of the three models that show good agreement in the Pacific Northwest achieves reduced annual EM through slightly different combinations of change in precipitation and evaporation. For example, MPI combines decreased precipitation and increased evaporation in the Pacific Northwest, resulting in overall drier conditions during the mid-Holocene (Figure 18a-c) whereas FGOALS G2 predicts decreased evaporation and a larger decrease in precipitation to compensate (Figure 18d-f). Importantly, the \(K_w\) values for EM are consistently higher in FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI than those for \(P\), indicating a larger number of proxy sites are accurately represented by moisture balance rather than precipitation alone.

Outside of the Pacific Northwest, several areas of disagreement persist across all models. For example, all models fail to predict EM in the Sierra Nevada and northern Arizona and New Mexico (Figure 9), where proxies indicate drier than modern conditions. FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI show excellent agreement at the U.S.-Mexico border where proxies predict wetter mid-Holocene conditions. These models, however, show poor agreement north of the border in the southwestern US where proxies predict drier conditions (Figure 9a). This contrast results from modeled wet conditions in Arizona and New Mexico, suggesting that the models simulate a more expanded mid-Holocene North American Monsoon than is indicated by the proxy record. This may result from relatively coarse resolution topography at the GCM scale (Figure 19), which would lead to the stronger monsoon being able to penetrate further northward because it is not being blocked by orographic barriers.
One potential contributing factor to the model-proxy mismatch might be the short duration of model runs. The models used in this study were run for differing amounts of time (Table 4), and only five models are run long enough (200+ years) to capture multiple phases of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO). The PDO is essentially a lower frequency and lower magnitude phase of the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) and acts on timescales ranging from 20-70 years (Minobe 1999). For the western U.S., cool PDO phases lead to drier conditions in the southern half of the study area and wetter conditions in the Pacific Northwest, while warm phases result in a wetter southern study area and drier Pacific Northwest (Wise 2010). The phase of the PDO also has profound impacts on the magnitude of ENSO events, serving to amplify El Niño events during positive (warm) PDO phases and dampen El Niño events during negative (cool) PDO phases (Wise 2010). Given that a single phase of the PDO can last up to 70 years (Minobe 1999), longer runs of all PMIP3 models to allow for multiple PDO cycles would mitigate potential bias against a particular phase of the PDO and may improve agreement with the proxies. For example, if a simulation is dominated by a cool phase PDO, the Pacific Northwest would be wetter than average and the southern portion of the study area (California, especially) would be drier than average. The cool phase PDO could potentially raise P in the Pacific Northwest and reduce model-proxy agreement there, and at the same time, reduce P in California and increase model-proxy agreement in that region. However, in this analysis, neither P nor EM Kw values correlate strongly with model run time, and thus it is unclear if bias toward a single phase of the PDO influenced model results.
Despite differences between models, the models that show the best agreement with the proxy network for P (FGOALS G2 and MPI) and EM (FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI) have some similar characteristics. Each of these three models shows positive annual westerly surface wind anomalies north of 45°N and negative westerly surface wind anomalies between 30-45°N at 6ka (Figure 14a-c) indicating northward shifted zonal winds relative to modern. Multivariate results
indicate that stronger $K_w$ P agreement corresponds with a strengthened and west-shifted NPH and a weaker contrast between the NPH and AL. The regression models for $K_w$ EM do not have correlations as strong as $K_w$ P, but still indicate that a weaker contrast between the NPH and AL plays a strong role in EM spatial patterns. The weaker correlation for $K_w$ EM likely results from the influence of other factors, such as insolation-driven temperature enhancing evaporation potential. It is clear that changes in large-scale pressure system dynamics in the Pacific and changes in wind strength correspond to changes in spatial patterns of precipitation in the West, and changes in evapotranspiration seem to improve the model-proxy agreement based on higher $K_w$ EM scores than $K_w$ P scores for FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI. However, there are consistent problem areas even for the best scoring models, such as California and the Desert Southwest north of the U. S.-Mexico border (Figure 9a).

Precipitation patterns for 2013 show better agreement with the proxy network than all PMIP3 simulations of mid-Holocene precipitation with the exception of FGOALS G2 and MPI. During the mid-Holocene, proxy records indicate wetter than modern conditions in the Desert Southwest (Figure 3), and these changes were driven by a stronger than modern monsoon season due to increased summer insolation (Metcalfe et al 2015). Today, the North American Monsoon is not as strong as the mid-Holocene, and therefore, would not be expected to show wetter conditions in the Desert Southwest. Indeed, the 2013 precipitation anomalies and the 6ka proxy network show most disagreement in the Desert Southwest and southern Great Basin, while sites in the Pacific Northwest and California show almost perfect agreement (29/30 sites; Figure 17). Today, the majority of annual precipitation for the Pacific Northwest and California comes from the westerly storm track during the winter season. During the 2013 drought year, a combination of 1) weaker westerly winds over the Pacific south of ~50°N; 2) stronger westerly winds over Alaska; 3) stronger equatorward flow over the Pacific Northwest; and 4) stronger poleward flow on the western flank of the pressure ridge, all acted in tandem to deflect precipitation north of the U.S. west coast (see Figure 2.1 in Swain et al., 2014).

The mid-Holocene winter season is characterized in the CSIRO 312, FGOALS G2, and MPI simulations by a combination of greater than modern sea level pressure anomalies and 250mbar anticyclonic wind vector anomalies offshore of the Pacific Northwest around 140°W (Figure 16a,c,e). The presence of anticyclonic winter wind anomalies and higher sea level pressure offshore of the U.S. west coast are strikingly similar to conditions seen in the 2013 drought year (Seager et al 2014; Swain et al 2014). However, the latitude of the wind anomalies is further south-shifted in the mid-Holocene simulations than what is observed in the 2013 drought year. Additionally, the configuration of anticyclonic wind anomalies for MPI is a more elongated southwest-northeast trending pattern (Figure 16e), while the modern pressure ridge is more symmetrical. This similarity between the 2013 annual atmospheric configuration and simulated configuration during mid-Holocene winters suggests that anticyclonic wind anomalies and higher sea level pressure offshore of western North America are important features that lead to dry conditions in California in both cases. Interestingly, the 2013 drought matches the annual precipitation pattern seen in the mid-Holocene proxy network perfectly in California (Figure 17), while mid-Holocene models consistently fail in this region on an annual basis (Figure 8). However, the winter season in the CSIRO 312, FGOALS G2, and MPI mid-Holocene simulations displays similar atmospheric conditions to the 2013 drought year, and these models successfully simulate drier conditions in California and parts of the Pacific Northwest during the winter season (Figure 16). CSIRO 312 shows poor agreement with the proxy network for annual
P despite showing anticyclonic anomalies during mid-Holocene winters, and this results from higher than modern P in the spring and autumn seasons over most of the study area. The strong agreement between mid-Holocene proxies and 2013 precipitation anomalies indicates that large scale atmospheric patterns which controlled precipitation in 2013 are likely a key component of mid-Holocene aridity, although most models do not produce wind and pressure anomalies consistent with those seen in 2013. Nevertheless, the strong agreement between the mid-Holocene proxy network and 2013 precipitation anomalies in the Pacific Northwest and California provides evidence that the mid-Holocene may be a good comparative case study for modern droughts, and conversely, the modern drought may provide insight into atmospheric drivers of climate during the arid mid-Holocene.

CONCLUSIONS

I have compiled an updated network of moisture-sensitive proxy records for western North America during the mid-Holocene. The proxy network indicates drier than modern conditions in the Pacific Northwest, California, northern Great Basin, and northern Rocky Mountains, while climate was wetter than modern in the Desert Southwest, parts of the southern Great Basin, and the Colorado Plateau due to a stronger North American Monsoon. Using the K_w statistic to measure model-proxy agreement, I found that effective moisture (P-E) shows better model-proxy agreement than precipitation alone. I have also established that the models that show the closest agreement with the proxy network capture arid conditions in the Pacific Northwest during the mid-Holocene, though there are multiple combinations of evaporation and precipitation changes that lead to successful agreement with the proxy network. In the southern portion of the study area, topographic complexity may not be adequately captured by GCMs, leading to most models simulating much wetter conditions north of the U.S.-Mexico border than is evident in the proxy record, possibly resulting from monsoonal moisture penetrating too far northward in the models. Of the twelve models examined here, I find that FGOALS G2, IPSL, and MPI best reflect mid-Holocene EM conditions in the western U.S. The mechanisms driving more arid conditions over much of the West include weaker annual westerly winds across the Pacific Ocean from 30-45°N, the development of anticyclonic 250mbar wind anomalies offshore of the Pacific Northwest during the winter, and increased evaporation rates over much of the study area, especially during the summer. The 2013 drought year shows similar annual atmospheric configuration to that observed in the mid-Holocene simulations. In fact, proxy records from regions where precipitation is dominated by winter westerly storms more closely match the 2013 drought pattern than the precipitation patterns simulated in mid-Holocene model simulations. The similarities between precipitation patterns seen in paleodroughts and those seen today suggests that atmospheric conditions of modern droughts must be better represented in climate models in order to properly recreate drought conditions of the mid-Holocene. Comparison of the 2013 drought year, mid-Holocene moisture proxies, and GCM simulations for 6ka reveal that although key differences exist between modern and past droughts, the mid-Holocene likely provides a good case study for comparison to current conditions in California and the Pacific Northwest.
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