Hot extremes have become drier in the US Southwest
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Summary paragraph

The impacts of summer heat extremes are mediated by the moisture content of the atmosphere. Increases in temperatures due to human-caused climate change are generally expected to increase specific humidity; however, it remains unclear how humidity extremes may change, especially in climatologically dry regions. Here, using in situ measurements and reanalyses, we show that specific humidity on low humidity days in the American Southwest has decreased over the past seven decades, and that the greatest decreases co-occur with the hottest temperatures. Hot, dry summers have anomalously low evapotranspiration that is linked to low summer soil moisture. The recent decrease in summer soil moisture is explained by declines in pre-summer soil moisture, whereas the interannual variability is controlled by summer precipitation. Climate models project continued declines in pre-summer soil moisture but increases in summer precipitation, leading to uncertainty as to how summer soil moisture and hot, dry days will change in the future.
Main text

The semiarid climate of the Southwestern United States is caused by its location south of the Pacific storm track during winter and at the eastern edge of the North Pacific high during summer, which lead to climatologically low precipitation, soil moisture, and humidity [1]. Against this backdrop of semiarid conditions, increased atmospheric demand for moisture due to increased temperatures and/or decreased humidity can have three major adverse consequences, particularly during the warm season: increases in fire risk [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], increases in evaporative demand from surface reservoirs [7], and increases in tree mortality [8]. While a substantial body of work has focused on the important role of rising temperatures in causing each of these impacts [e.g., 9, 10, 11], there has been less of a focus on changes in specific humidity, which can amplify or damp the effect of temperature.

Here, we analyze in situ and reanalysis-based measurements of temperature and humidity to determine how and why dry extremes on hot summer days have changed over the past seven decades, and may change in the future. Summer is defined as July-August-September (JAS), which are the climatologically warmest three months in the Southwest. Because warming temperatures are an expected consequence of increasing greenhouse gases, we focus on changes in the extremes of specific humidity conditional on a fixed definition of a hot day. This allows for a separation of changes in the temperature-specific humidity relationship – our focus in this work – from changes in specific humidity that would be expected given increasing temperatures with a fixed covariance structure.

Decreases in humidity are amplified at hot temperatures

We first focus on estimating changes in changes in specific humidity on dry days. Our
approach is demonstrated at two example locations from the Integrated Surface Database [ISD, 12] in Fig. 1. The middle panels show summer temperature ($T'$) and specific humidity ($q'$) anomalies from 1973-2019 at Perry Stokes Airport, Colorado and Fresno Yosemite International Airport, California. These stations were chosen because they show distinct underlying $T'$ vs. $q'$ relationships: $q'$ generally decreases with $T'$ at Perry Stokes, whereas it increases with $T'$ at Fresno, although the relationships are nonlinear with different behavior at the center and tails. The Southwest is a unique region because both types of relationships are common, as shown in Fig. S1 with the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. We quantify the dependence of $q'$ on $T'$ using semiparametric quantile smoothing splines [13] for the 5th, 50th, and 95th percentile of $q'$ (black lines in middle panels of Fig. 1). While the focus of this work is on low humidity days, described with the 5th percentile ($q'_5$), we present the other two percentiles for context.

In order to assess how the $T'$ vs. $q'_5$ relationship is changing, we allow the quantile smoothing splines to vary linearly with the lowpass filtered (1/10 year frequency cutoff) global mean temperature anomaly (GMTA) using the methods of [14]. Specifically, both the average value of $q'_5$ and the shape of the $T'$ vs. $q'_5$ spline are permitted to change; the complexity of the spline is selected by minimizing a high-dimensional Bayesian Information Criterion [15]. The method has previously been shown to perform well for synthetic data with properties similar to daily $T'$ and $q'$ [see Data and Methods; 14]. The fitted model then provides an estimate of $q'_5$ for any co-occurring local $T'$ and GMTA, so can be queried to quantify how $q'_5$ has changed with increasing GMTA. The change in Perry Stokes and Fresno is illustrated by comparing the gray and black lines in Fig. 1c,f: the gray line is the $T'$ vs. $q'_5$ relationship conditioned on the GMTA of 1973, whereas the black line is conditioned on the GMTA of 2019. At both locations, there has been a decrease in $q'_5$ when $T'$ is at the 95th percentile (hereafter $q'_{5,T95}$, see the change from the gray to the
black line along the vertical red line in Fig. 1c,f), although they differ in other types of changes. For example, Perry Stokes shows an increase in the 95th percentile of \( q' \) on hot days, whereas Fresno shows a decrease.

We perform the same analysis at all high-quality ISD stations in the United States with near-continuous records from 1973-2019 (see Data and Methods), with a focus on changes in \( q'_{5,T95} \). Across the Southwest, \( q'_{5,T95} \) has decreased by an average of 1.04 g/kg per degree increase GMTA, or 0.94 g/kg since 1973 (Fig. 2a). The distribution of trends is skewed towards greater decreases, such that a quarter of the stations in the Southwest, primarily in California, have decreases in excess of 2 g/kg per degree increase GMTA. To contextualize these changes, the empirical 5th percentile of specific humidity on hot days averaged across ISD stations in the Southwest for 1973-2019 is 4.31 g/kg; thus, the average magnitude of the decreases in specific humidity on hot, dry days is over 20% of the baseline value.

It is also possible to examine how \( q'_{5} \) has changed conditional on different percentiles of \( T' \). A consistent picture emerges across the region where the magnitude of the decrease in \( q'_{5} \) increases with the co-occurring \( T' \) (Fig. 2b). On average, \( q'_{5} \) has increased when \( T' \) is low (< 26th percentile), exhibits a small decrease of 0.27 g/kg per degree increase GMTA on days with the median \( T' \), and shows increasingly large decreases at higher \( T' \), with an average decrease of 1.32 g/kg per degree increase GMTA when \( T' \) is at the 99th percentile. Due to this amplification, analyses of changes in \( q'_{5} \) without accounting for the relationship with \( T' \) would underestimate the changes on hot days, when the impacts are greatest.

**Hot days have gotten drier since 1950**

The foregoing analysis offers the advantage of using direct measurements from weather stations of the near-surface layer, but is hindered by data availability. Spatially, only 28 high-
quality stations are available across the region, which is topographically diverse; further, all stations are at airports, raising concerns that they are not representative of the region as a whole. Temporally, the relatively short duration of the data record (48 years, 1973-2019) provides only a limited view into the potential role of low-frequency ocean-driven variability versus anthropogenic forcings in contributing to the observed trends.

To address both of these issues, we first turn to additional sources of information. To allow for intercomparison between data sources in terms of both trends and variability, we define an annual amplification index for the full Southwest region. The index is the average probability across the region of having a dry day given the occurrence of a hot day. A hot day is defined at each location as a day in the 85th-95th percentile range (combined red and orange polygons in Fig. 1b,e) and a dry day has a specific humidity below the temperature-dependent 10th quantile of specific humidity for a GMTA of zero (orange polygon in Fig. 1b,e). The thresholds for hot and dry are less extreme than the percentiles used in the prior analysis because calculating the probability of extreme events through empirical counts is noisier than employing a semiparametric model. Counts are summed across stations, weighted by the area they represent, to produce the annual amplification index.

As expected, the amplification index calculated using the ISD data from 1973-2019, ISD_{1973}, shows an increase in the probability of having low humidity conditions on hot days, particularly post-2000 (Fig. 3a). In addition, there is substantial interannual variability, with 1979, 1987-1989, and 1993-1995 all exhibiting above-average dryness early in the record. We next calculate the same index using the ERA5 reanalysis [16] in order to assess if the index is biased by the spatial distribution and limited number of stations. The two indices closely track each other in both their variability and their trend, and are correlated at 0.88 across their shared period of record of 1979-2019, suggesting that the signal of drying is
sufficiently large-scale across the Southwest that it can be captured by a small number of
station measurements. Finally, we extend the time series record using the 12 stations in the
region that have measurements beginning in 1950 (ISD_{1950}, Fig. S2, Data and Methods)
and the JRA-55 reanalysis [17], the only third-generation reanalysis product that begins
before 1979 as of this writing. All four estimates of the index paint a similar picture: the
ISD_{1950} index is correlated with the ISD_{1973} and ERA5 indices at 0.82 and 0.75, and the
JRA-55 index is correlated with the ISD_{1950}, ISD_{1973}, and ERA5 indices at 0.72, 0.90, and
0.92, respectively.

Using all four data sources (ERA5, JRA-55, ISD_{1950}, and ISD_{1973}), we calculate a single
average amplification index (black line in both panels of Fig. 3) that spans seven decades.
Because the number of datasets being averaged increases over time, we expect more vari-
ability during the earlier period; however, the subsequent results are qualitatively similar
when using the ISD_{1950} index alone. By extending the time series before the 1970s, we can
see that multiple years in the 1950-1965 period exhibited an increased probability of dry
extremes on hot days. This phasing and behavior is consistent with Atlantic Multidecadal
Variability (AMV): the positive phase of the AMV, which occurred from roughly 1926-
1965 and 1998-2014, causes increased subsidence, decreased precipitation, and decreased
humidity in the Southwest [18, 19, 20]. However, the recent uptick is unprecedented in
the record, suggesting an additional role of human influence. As an initial estimate of
the relative roles of these two factors, we fit a multiple linear regression model for the
amplification index using the AMV index and GMTA, both of which are lowpass filtered
with a frequency cutoff of 1/10 years. The regression coefficient associated with predicting
the amplification index with the AMV is twice that for GMTA (Table S1), but the range
of GMTA over the 1950-2019 period is 0.96°C, compared to 0.44°C for the AMV, so the
total change explained by each factor in the regression model is very similar. A regres-
sion model that also includes the December-January-February Niño 3.4 index and/or the annual Pacific Decadal Oscillation index does not show a significant contribution of either mode.

*Summers with hot, dry extremes have low soil moisture*

We next turn to explaining the physical mechanisms that lead to increases in the probability of dry conditions on hot days. Decreases in near-surface atmospheric humidity can come from three sources: (1) increases in horizontal and/or vertical moisture divergence; (2) decreases in evapotranspiration; and/or (3) increases in precipitation. Due to our focus on the driest days in an already semiarid region, precipitation is not a relevant factor for directly causing humidity levels well below saturation, leaving us to assess (1) and (2).

We first consider the potential role of horizontal moisture divergence. Using ERA5, we calculate the spatial pattern of vertically integrated moisture divergence anomalies (VIMD′) associated with low humidity years as the difference between a composite of the summer VIMD′ during the years in the top tercile (33%) of the ERA5-based amplification index, minus those in the bottom tercile. In addition, we compare the time series of the amplification index to that of the summer-averaged, domain-averaged VIMD′ (Fig. S3). The composite map does not show a coherent pattern of divergence or convergence across the Southwest, and neither the raw nor detrended time series are significantly correlated with the raw or detrended amplification index. Since moisture divergence in the Southwest is closely related to the North American monsoon, which varies in its strength throughout the summer season, we additionally compare month-by-month VIMD′ to the amplification index. The July composite map shows a coherent region of increased divergence in Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado, and the detrended July VIMD′ is weakly but significantly
(Pearson’s r: 0.47, p-value: 0.001) correlated with the detrended amplification index (not shown). This suggests a role of the North American monsoon for the interannual variability in the amplification index that we will return to below.

We next examine whether near-surface drying is associated with a vertical redistribution of moisture from the near-surface to other parts of the atmospheric column through creating top tercile of the ERA5 amplification index minus bottom tercile composites of the average vertical profile of specific humidity between 850 and 200 hPa over the Southwest (note that 47% of the Southwest domain is below 850 hPa on average; for all levels, gridboxes where a given level is below the surface are masked). The vertical profile shows negative specific humidity anomalies throughout the column (Fig. S3), indicating that vertical redistribution of moisture cannot explain the near-surface behavior.

Having found only weak relationships between moisture divergence and the amplification index, we turn to our second physical mechanism, decreases in evapotranspiration. The composite map and time series, made in the same manner as for VIMD’, show that years with a high number of dry extremes on hot days are associated with lower than average evapotranspiration (the sign of evapotranspiration is defined here as positive from surface to atmosphere) across the Southwest (Fig. 4a). The time series of Southwest-average evapotranspiration and the amplification index are significantly correlated both in their raw and detrended versions (Fig. 4b), suggesting the importance of moisture from the land surface in controlling the probability of dry conditions. The variability and recent decrease in evapotranspiration is reflective of surface soil moisture (Fig. 4c,d): due to the aridity of the Southwest, summer evapotranspiration is moisture-limited [21, 22, 23], so evapotranspiration is responding to, rather than driving, surface soil moisture variability.

Since evapotranspiration is limited by surface soil moisture, what drives the variability and
trend in the soil moisture itself? Summer soil moisture is controlled by a simple balance
between (1) the initial soil moisture at the beginning of the summer season, and (2) changes
in moisture availability during summer. Because evapotranspiration in the Southwest is
moisture-limited and the contribution of runoff is an order of magnitude smaller than the
other variables (Fig. S4), factor (2) is dominated by changes in precipitation. Using soil
moisture from ERA5 and precipitation from the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre
[GPCC, 24], we indeed find that summer soil moisture is very well predicted (Pearson’s
r: 0.93) by June top 1m soil moisture and JAS precipitation (Fig. 4i). June soil moisture
has been decreasing since 1979, consistent with the trend in summer surface soil moisture
(Fig. 4e,f). On the other hand, summer precipitation does not exhibit a significant trend
during the ERA5 period, but better explains the interannual variability around the trend
through its ability to recharge soil moisture levels throughout the summer (Fig. 4g,h).

To link these controls on summer soil moisture back to hot, dry days, we fit a multiple
linear regression model for the amplification index using June soil moisture and summer
precipitation as predictors. Using soil moisture from either ERA5 (1979-2019), JRA-55
(1958-2019), or NASA Global Land Data Assimilation System Version 2.0 [GLDAS2.0,
1950-2014 25], and precipitation from GPCC, the model captures the low-frequency vari-
ability and recent uptick in the amplification index, although it tends to overestimate the
index in the 1970s and underestimate it in the recent period (compare the colored and
black lines in Fig. 3b). The regression coefficients for both soil moisture and precipitation
are significant in all cases (see Table S1), except for GLDAS2.0 soil moisture, which has a
weaker relationship with the amplification index (p-value: 0.014) because it shows a smaller
recent decrease in soil moisture than the other two datasets (Fig. 5a). The predicted ampli-
fusion index using ERA5, JRA-55, and GLDAS2.0 is correlated with the observed average
amplification index at 0.63, 0.52, and 0.51 for their respective periods.
Future projections are uncertain due to precipitation

We finally consider the implications of our results for future projections. In our analysis, we have found that June soil moisture has been decreasing since the 1980s (Fig. 5a), which has led to decreased summer soil moisture, decreased evapotranspiration, and an increase in the probability of dry conditions on hot days (recall Fig. 4). While precipitation plays an important role in the interannual variability of moisture availability, it does not yet appear to have a significant (Fig. 4h) or forced [e.g., 26] trend. How will these factors change in the future? To provide one answer to this question, we use the CMIP6 archive [27] to estimate forced changes from 1950 to 2100 as the mean of the available simulations for the historical and SSP5-8.5 future scenarios [28]. Consistent with ERA5, summer surface soil moisture in the CMIP6 models is well-predicted by June column soil moisture and summer precipitation, with an ensemble median correlation of 0.95 between the fitted and actual summer soil moisture. The CMIP6 ensemble mean shows a decrease in June soil moisture beginning around 1980, and the majority (79%) of models project a negative trend over 2015-2100 (Fig. 5), reflecting decreased snowpack and increased evapotranspiration during winter and spring [29, 30]. In addition, 68% of models project an increase in summer precipitation, which stands in contrast to a current lack of forced precipitation trend. As a result, the models are split about whether summer soil moisture will increase or decrease (Fig. 5b). Further, changes in plant physiology driven by increased CO\textsubscript{2} levels has the potential to alter the historical link between soil moisture and evapotranspiration if plants close their stomata and increase their water use efficiency [31]. Thus, while the trend in summer soil moisture and the probability of dry conditions on hot days appears driven by pre-summer soil moisture in the historical record, future conditions will additionally depend on summer precipitation and the response of the biosphere to elevated CO\textsubscript{2}.

In summary, although specific humidity is expected to increase overall with warming due
to greater evaporation from the ocean and the increased water vapor holding capacity of
the atmosphere, we find that it has decreased during the summer over the semiarid South-
west since 1950, with the greatest decreases co-occurring with hot days. In the historical
record, the probability of dry conditions on hot days, quantified by the amplification in-
dex, exhibits low-frequency variability consistent with the AMV, and a recent uptick that
is unprecedented since 1950, although a formal attribution study is needed to parse the
role of these factors versus others, such as internal atmospheric variability, in contributing
to the observed changes. The proximal cause of the recent increase in the amplification
index is a decrease in moisture fluxes from the surface due to low summer soil moisture,
which follows from decreases in June soil moisture. Forecasting the future of Southwest
dry extremes, however, requires reducing climate model spread in soil moisture and rainfall
projections.
Methods

Integrated Surface Database data Temperature and humidity data are from the Integrated Surface Database [ISD, 12] provided by the National Centers for Environmental Information. The database is composed of in situ weather station measurements taken on sub-daily timescales, and is the only direct source of publicly available non-remotely sensed humidity data for the United States. Humidity information is provided via measurements of dew point. We mark any measurement with a suspect quality control flag as missing. In particular, we remove data points with a source flag of 2, A, B, O, or 9; a report type flag of 99999; a call sign flag of 99999; and a quality control flag of V01. We additionally remove days that do not have four or more valid observations. Our ISD-based analysis focused on two time periods: 1973-2019 and 1950-2019. There is a large increase in the number of weather stations reporting to the ISD database beginning in 1973, so the shorter time period allows for greater selectivity and more complete spatial coverage. In both cases, a given weather station is only included in the analysis if at least 80% of years have less than 20% missing data in both temperature and dew point for the summer season of each year, and have some measurements during the first and last three years of the time period of interest. For the 1973-2019 period, we additionally remove stations that have more than one missing year in a row.

Calculating daily-average specific humidity Daily average specific humidity ($q$ in g/kg) is calculated from sub-daily (at least six hourly) values of dew point ($T_d$ in degrees Celsius) and pressure ($p$ in hPa) using the following approximation [32]:

$$e = 6.112 \exp \left( \frac{17.67 T_d}{T_d + 243.5} \right)$$

(1)
Anomaly calculation Daily temperature and specific humidity are considered as anomalies from the climatological seasonal cycle, with the seasonal cycle calculated as the first three seasonal harmonics of the daily climatology for temperature, and ten harmonics for specific humidity. The larger number of bases for specific humidity is necessary in this region because the onset of the Southwestern monsoon can lead to a rapid increase in specific humidity over a short period of time.

ERA5 data For the calculation of the amplification index using ERA5 [16], we use 6-hourly 2-meter air temperature, 2-meter dew point, and surface pressure; surface pressure and dew point are used to calculate specific humidity as with the ISD data. To understand the causes of the variability and trend in the amplification index, we use the monthly-averaged reanalysis for evapotranspiration, vertically integrated moisture divergence, runoff, and soil moisture. The effective accumulation period for evapotranspiration, vertically integrated moisture divergence and runoff is one day. We group soil moisture into surface (swvl1, 0-7cm) and top 1m (swvl1, swvl2, and swvl3). All ERA5-based analyses span 1979-2019.

JRA-55 data For the calculation of the amplification index in JRA-55 [17], we use 6-hourly 2-meter air temperature and 2-meter specific humidity. We calculate the index using both the analysis and forecast variables, the former which incorporates screen-level observations through optimal interpolation, but is not subsequently coupled back into the forecast. The results using the analysis output are presented in the main paper. The amplification index calculated using the forecast variables alone, however, is inconsistent with all other estimates of the amplification index in both the low-frequency and high-frequency variability. JRA-55 soil moisture is provided as a wetness fraction for three
layers of soil. We integrate the soil wetness fraction across the top 1m of soil assuming a
vegetation type of broadleaf shrubs with groundcover, which is dominant in the Southwest
[e.g. Fig. 5 in 33]. The layer thicknesses for broadleaf shrubs with groundcover are 0.02m,
0.47m, and 1m. All JRA-55-based analyses span 1958-2019.

**GLDAS data** The GLDAS-based regression model in Fig. 3b uses the top 1m soil moisture
for the 1950-2014 period, where the end date is limited by the availability of GLDAS 2.0.
GLDAS 2.0 is forced by the Princeton meteorological forcing dataset [34], and does not
use data assimilation.

**CMIP6 data** We use the following models from the CMIP6 archive, based on their hav-
ing at least one ensemble member with monthly-average total column soil moisture (mrso),
surface soil moisture (mrsos), and precipitation (pr) for both the historical and SSP5-8.5
scenarios: ACCESS-CM2, ACCESS-ESM1-5, BCC-CSM2-MR, CAMS-CSM1-0, CESM2,
CESM2-WACCM, CMCC-CM2-SR5, CNRM-CM6-1, CNRM-CM6-1-HR, CNRM-ESM2-
1, CanESM5, CanESM5-CanOE, EC-Earth3, EC-Earth3-Veg, FGOALS-f3-L, FGOALS-
g3, GFDL-CM4, GFDL-ESM4, GISS-E2-1-G, IPSL-CM6A-LR, MIROC-ES2L, MIROC6,
MPI-ESM1-2-HR, MPI-ESM1-2-LR, MRI-ESM2-0, NorESM2-LM, NorESM2-MM, and
UKESM1-0-LL. For CMIP6 models that have more than one ensemble member, we first
average the available ensemble members before calculating the ensemble mean such that
each model contributes equally to our analysis. The standardized soil moisture anomalies
in Fig. 5a are calculated using the 1979-2014 period as a reference, to match the overlapping
availability of the three observation-based datasets. The trends in Fig. 5b are calculated
over the SSP5-8.5 scenario only, 2015-2100.

**Global mean temperature and sea surface temperature modes** Global mean tem-
perature anomalies (GMTA) are from the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature dataset
The Atlantic Multidecadal Variability (AMV) index is calculated as per [36] by removing the near-global mean (60°S-60°N) sea surface temperature (SST) anomaly from the SST anomaly over the North Atlantic (0°-60°N, 80°W-0°) at each timestep using monthly average data from ERSSTv5 [37]. All analyses with GMTA and AMV use a lowpass filtered time series calculated with a third-order Butterworth filter with a cutoff frequency of 1/10 years. The Niño 3.4 and Pacific Decadal Oscillation indices are provided by the National Center for Environmental Information.

**Amplification index** The amplification index is the empirical count of hot, dry days normalized by hot days in a given summer. Because some gridboxes and stations may not have any hot days in a given summer, we first sum the counts across stations or gridboxes, weighted by the area they represent, before performing the division.

**Quantile smoothing splines method** To assess changes in the distribution of specific humidity anomalies conditional on the co-occurring local temperature anomalies and global mean temperature anomalies (GMTA), we use quantile smoothing splines [13] that can vary linearly with GMTA. Specifically, we model a given quantile, $\tau$, of specific humidity anomalies on day $t$ as

$$q'_\tau(t) = \beta_{0,\tau} + s_{0,\tau}(T'(t)) + \beta_{1,\tau}G'(t) + G'(t)s_{1,\tau}(T'(t))$$

where $T'(t)$ is the co-occurring temperature and $G'(t)$ is the lowpass filtered GMTA. The first two terms on the right-hand side summarize the quantiles of specific humidity anomalies, including the dependence on local temperature anomalies, for a GMTA of zero. The second two terms allow the quantiles of specific humidity anomalies, including the dependence on local temperature anomalies, to change linearly with GMTA. The terms $s_{0,\tau}(T'(t))$ and $s_{1,\tau}(T'(t))$ are quantile smoothing splines that summarize the potentially nonlinear
relationship between a given quantile of specific humidity and temperature anomalies. The complexity of the spline is controlled by a regularization parameter, which was selected in [14] through minimization of a high-dimensional Bayesian Information Criterion [15]. Here, we draw upon the results of [14] and model the log of the regularization parameter as linearly related to the standard deviation of the temperature anomalies at each station (see their Fig. S5). We fit the 5th, 10th, 50th, 90th, and 95th percentile of specific humidity anomalies, although the focus of the work is primarily on the 5th percentile. A non-crossing constraint is enforced during the fitting procedure following [38] such that a lower percentile of specific humidity anomalies cannot be higher than a higher one at any time. Fitting the changes in $q'_\tau(t)$ as linearly related to GMTA rather than time reduces the influence of internal variability in the trend estimates and allows for the analysis of longer time periods over which anthropogenic influence may not have been linear.

**Spatial domain and area weighting** We focus on the American Southwest, defined as including Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and non-coastal California (see outline in Fig. 2). Values presented as averages over the domain are weighted by approximations of the amount of area represented by each weather station or gridbox. For the 1973-2019 period, during which stations are more plentiful, the station weights are the areas associated with each station after performing a Voronoi tessellation on all stations in the United States. For the 1950-2019 period, due to the reduced number of stations that border the Western US domain, the station weights are instead calculated as the minimum distance between a station and any other station within the Southwest domain. Results are insensitive to reasonable choices of station weighting. For the reanalyses, gridboxes are weighted by the cosine of latitude.

**Correlations and significance** All correlation values are Pearson correlation coefficients, with the exception of Fig. S1, which uses the Spearman rank correlation due to the nonlin-
earity in the temperature-specific humidity relationship. The effective degrees of freedom
used for the estimation of p-values is calculated as $n_{eff} = \frac{1-\phi^2}{1+\phi^2}N - 2$ for the raw corre-
lations, and $n_{eff} = \frac{1-\phi^2}{1+\phi^2}N - 3$ for the detrended correlations [39], where the reduction of
two degrees of freedom is due to controlling for the mean and variance, and the reduction
of an additional degree of freedom in the detrended case is due to controlling for a linear
time trend. The value of $\phi$ is the empirical lag-1 autocorrelation coefficient of the residuals
for the regression model associated with each correlation value ($y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \epsilon$ for raw
correlations, and $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 t + \epsilon$ for detrended correlations). All p-values are one-
sided, because the expected direction of the relationships is a priori known. Unless stated
otherwise, significance is assessed at the 0.01 level.
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Figure 1: Changes in the distribution of specific humidity as a function of increasing global mean temperature anomalies (GMTA) and local temperature. Observed summer daily-average temperature and specific humidity from 1973-2019 at Perry Stokes Airport in southern Colorado (a-c) and Fresno Yosemite International Airport in central California (d-f) are shown as two-dimensional histograms. (a, d) Data from the first half of the record, and the quantile smoothing spline fit conditional on the 1973 lowpass filtered GMTA of -0.43°C. (b, e) Data from the full record, and the quantile smoothing spline fit conditional on the average GMTA (0°C by definition). (c, f) Data from the second half of the record, and the quantile smoothing spline fit conditional on the 2019 lowpass filtered GMTA of 0.51°C. The spline fits from panels (a, d) are reproduced in gray in panels (c, f) to show changes in the temperature-specific humidity relationship as a function of increasing GMTA. The vertical red line shows the 95th percentile of temperature anomalies calculated over the full record. The amplification index is defined graphically in (b, e) as the count of days in the orange polygon (hot and dry) normalized by those in the orange and red polygons (hot only).
Figure 2: **Decreases in specific humidity in the American Southwest are amplified on hot days**. (a) Estimated changes in the 5th percentile of specific humidity on hot (95th percentile in temperature anomalies) days ($q_{5,T95}'$) for a 1°C increase in GMTA at high-quality ISD stations across the continental United States. The Southwest domain is outlined in black. Contours show the 5th percentile of July-August-September specific humidity from ERA5; the lowest contour is 3 g/kg, and the contour interval is 1 g/kg. (b) The estimated change in the 5th percentile of specific humidity ($q_{5}'$) as a function of temperature percentile at each station in the Southwest (thin grey lines) and the area-weighted average across stations (thick black line).
Figure 3: **The observed and fitted amplification index from 1950-2019.** (a) The amplification index estimated from four datasets (thin colored lines) and the average across the estimates (thick black line). Note that the number of datasets used to calculate the average changes over time as a function of dataset availability. The low-frequency behavior (gray line) is estimated based on a regression onto the GMTA and AMV, both which are lowpass filtered with a 1/10 year cutoff frequency. (b) The fitted amplification index using June soil moisture from three different datasets and summer precipitation. The average amplification index (black) is reproduced from (a).
Figure 4: Increased probability on hot, dry days linked to reduced surface evapotranspiration and soil moisture. (a) The composite JAS evapotranspiration on years in the top tercile (33%) of the amplification index minus the bottom tercile. (b) The time series of the amplification index (orange) and the Southwest-average evapotranspiration (teal, y-axis inverted). (c) The composite JAS surface soil moisture on years in the bottom tercile of Southwest-average evapotranspiration minus the top tercile. (d) The time series of Southwest-average JAS evapotranspiration (orange) and JAS surface soil moisture (teal). (e) The composite June 1m soil moisture on years in the bottom tercile of Southwest-average JAS surface soil moisture minus the top tercile. (f) The time series of Southwest-average JAS surface soil moisture (orange) and June 1m soil moisture (teal). (g) The composite JAS precipitation on years in the bottom tercile of Southwest-average JAS surface soil moisture minus the top tercile. (h) The time series of Southwest-average JAS surface soil moisture (orange) and JAS precipitation (teal). (i) The observed (orange) and fitted (teal) JAS surface soil moisture; the fitted values are based on a multiple linear regression model using June 1m soil moisture and JAS precipitation as covariates. All data besides precipitation are from ERA5, whereas precipitation is from the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre. Evapotranspiration and precipitation are both the total per day. Raw (detrended) correlation and p-values for each time series are shown in the associated title.
Figure 5: **CMIP6 projections of pre-summer column soil moisture, summer precipitation, and summer surface soil moisture.** (a) The June total column soil moisture in the CMIP6 models (gray lines, gray shading shows 50% range) and the ensemble mean (black line) from 1950-2100 using the historical and SSP5-8.5 scenarios. Three observational estimates of top 1m June soil moisture are shown in colors. All time series are normalized to have zero mean and unity variance for the overlapping period of 1979-2014. The CMIP6 models show a wide spread of behavior, although most models project decreases. (b) The relationship between the linear trend in June column soil moisture (horizontal axis), JAS precipitation (vertical axis), and JAS surface soil moisture (colors) across CMIP6 models. The CMIP6 models are split about trends in JAS surface soil moisture based on the extent to which precipitation increases counterbalance June soil moisture decreases. Trends are calculated over 2015-2100, and normalized to per 50 years.
Predictors: AMV and GMTA

| Predictor name     | Regression coefficient (95% range) | p-value |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| Lowpass GMTA      | 0.0597 (0.018, 0.101)              | 0.006   |
| Lowpass AMV index | 0.1253 (0.034, 0.217)              | 0.008   |
| Nino3.4 index     | -0.005 (-0.013, 0.012)             | 0.934   |
| PDO index         | 0.0019 (-0.015, 0.019)             | 0.830   |

Predictors: Soil moisture and precipitation

| Predictor name     | Regression coefficient (95% range) | p-value |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| ERA5 soil moisture| -0.025 (-0.040, -0.010)            | <0.001  |
| GPCC precip (ERA5)| -0.026 (-0.041, -0.011)            | <0.001  |
| JRA-55 soil moisture| -0.017 (-0.029, -0.005)            | 0.004   |
| GPCC precip (JRA-55)| -0.022 (-0.034, -0.010)            | <0.001  |
| GLDAS2.0 soil moisture| -0.013 (-0.024, -0.001)            | 0.014   |
| GPCC precip (GLDAS2.0)| -0.023 (-0.034, -0.012)            | <0.001  |

Table S1: Regression coefficients, 95% confidence intervals, and p-values associated with two multiple linear regression models for the amplification index. The AMV-GMTA fitted model is shown as the gray line in Fig. 3a. GMTA and the AMV index are lowpass filtered with a cutoff frequency of 1/10 years using a third-order Butterworth filter. The Nino3.4 index and PDO index are not used in the fitting of the AMV-GMTA model. The soil moisture and precipitation fitted model is shown as the colored lines in Fig. 3b. All fitted models use GPCC precipitation; the soil moisture product used in conjunction with the GPCC precipitation is shown in parentheses.
Figure S1: The Spearman rank correlation between July-August-September daily average temperature and specific humidity using ERA5 reanalysis (contours) and in situ station data from the Integrated Surface Database (circles).
Figure S2: As in Fig. 2, but with the limited number of stations with data beginning in 1950.
Figure S3: (Left) The vertical profile of specific humidity on top tercile minus bottom tercile amplification index years. (Right) As in Fig. 4, but for the vertically integrated moisture divergence from ERA5. Vertically integrated moisture divergence is total per day.
Figure S4: As in Fig. 4, but for runoff from ERA5. Runoff is the total per day.