



AMS

American Meteorological Society

Supplemental Material

Weather and Forecasting

Sources of Subseasonal Skill and Predictability in Wintertime California Precipitation Forecasts

<https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-21-0061.1>


© [Copyright 2021 American Meteorological Society](#) (AMS)

For permission to reuse any portion of this work, please contact permissions@ametsoc.org. Any use of material in this work that is determined to be “fair use” under Section 107 of the U.S. Copyright Act (17 USC §107) or that satisfies the conditions specified in Section 108 of the U.S. Copyright Act (17 USC §108) does not require AMS’s permission. Republication, systematic reproduction, posting in electronic form, such as on a website or in a searchable database, or other uses of this material, except as exempted by the above statement, requires written permission or a license from AMS. All AMS journals and monograph publications are registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (<https://www.copyright.com>). Additional details are provided in the AMS Copyright Policy statement, available on the AMS website (<https://www.ametsoc.org/PUBSCopyrightPolicy>).

Supplemental Information for
Sources of Subseasonal Skill for Wintertime California Precipitation

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. S1. By forecast lead time (x-axis), the correlation between observed and GEFS predicted California statewide average precipitation anomalies. The colors indicate different averaging windows ranging from daily to monthly during November-March 1999-2016. Top panel shows a range of correlations between a single member (lower limit) and theoretical infinite member estimate (upper limit). Bottom panel shows the results from the ensemble mean.	3
Fig. S2. Same as the previous figure, except showing FIM.	4
Fig. S3. Same as the previous figure, except showing CFSv2.	5
Fig. S4. Same as the previous figure, except showing CCSM4.	6
Fig. S5. Same as the previous figure, except showing GEOS.	7
Fig. S6. Same as the previous figure, except showing GEM.	8
Fig. S7. Same as the previous figure, except showing NRL.	9
Fig. S8. Random Walk of FIM versus GEFS for California precipitation anomalies (a) and the zonal wind index (b) for 32-day averages during 1999-2016. Each line represents a different 4-member permutation of the GEFS ensemble mean in order to compare against the 4-member FIM model. The random walk is based on the sign test described in DelSole and Tippett (2016). Because of serial correlation in the forecast start times, the Bretherton et al. (1999) test was used to estimate the effective degrees of freedom. A step was taken in the positive direction if the FIM model had smaller error than the GEFS for at least two of the three consecutive start times. A step was taken in the negative direction if the GEFS had smaller error than the FIM. Values outside of the shaded grey region are statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level.	10
Fig. S9. Same as Figure 3, except showing daily averages.	11



1 FIG. S1. By forecast lead time (x-axis), the correlation between observed and GEFS predicted
 2 California statewide average precipitation anomalies. The colors indicate different averaging win-
 3 dows ranging from daily to monthly during November-March 1999-2016. Top panel shows a range
 4 of correlations between a single member (lower limit) and theoretical infinite member estimate
 5 (upper limit). Bottom panel shows the results from the ensemble mean.





FIG. S2. Same as the previous figure, except showing FIM.





FIG. S3. Same as the previous figure, except showing CFSv2.





FIG. S4. Same as the previous figure, except showing CCSM4.





FIG. S5. Same as the previous figure, except showing GEOS.





FIG. S6. Same as the previous figure, except showing GEM.





FIG. S7. Same as the previous figure, except showing NRL.



6 FIG. S8. Random Walk of FIM versus GEFS for California precipitation anomalies (a) and
 7 the zonal wind index (b) for 32-day averages during 1999-2016. Each line represents a different
 8 4-member permutation of the GEFS ensemble mean in order to compare against the 4-member
 9 FIM model. The random walk is based on the sign test described in DelSole and Tippett (2016).
 10 Because of serial correlation in the forecast start times, the Bretherton et al. (1999) test was used
 11 to estimate the effective degrees of freedom. A step was taken in the positive direction if the FIM
 12 model had smaller error than the GEFS for at least two of the three consecutive start times. A step
 13 was taken in the negative direction if the GEFS had smaller error than the FIM. Values outside of
 14 the shaded grey region are statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level.




FIG. S9. Same as Figure 3, except showing daily averages.