1	<b>Topographic control of snowpack</b>
2	distribution in a small catchment in the
3	central Spanish Pyrenees: intra- and inter-
4	annual persistence
5	
6	J.Revuelto <sup>1</sup> , J.I. López-Moreno <sup>1</sup> , C. Azorin-Molina <sup>1</sup> , S.M. Vicente-Serrano <sup>1</sup>
7	
8	<sup>1</sup> Instituto Pirenaico de Ecología, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (IPE-
9	CSIC) Departamento de Procesos Geoambientales y Cambio Global, Campus de Aula Dei,
10	P.O. Box 13034, 50059, Zaragoza, Spain
11	
12	
13	Email addresses: jrevuelto@ipe.csic.es, nlopez@ipe.csic.es, cazorin@ipe.csic.es,
14	svicen@ipe.csic.es
15	
16	
17	* Corresponding author: jrevuelto@jpe.csic.es
18	
19	
20	
21	

### 22 Abstract:

23 In this study we analyzed the relations between terrain characteristics and snow depth distribution in a small alpine catchment located in the central Spanish Pyrenees. Twelve field 24 25 campaigns were conducted during 2012 and 2013, which were years characterized by very different climatic conditions. Snow depth was measured using a long range terrestrial laser 26 scanner and analyses were performed at a spatial resolution of 5 m. Pearson's r correlation, 27 28 multiple linear regressions and binary regression trees were used to analyze the influence of topography on the snow depth distribution. The analyses were used to identify the 29 topographic variables that best explain the snow distribution in this catchment, and to assess 30 whether their contributions were variable over intra- and inter-annual time scales. The 31 topographic position index (index that compares the relative elevation of each cell in a digital 32 elevation model to the mean elevation of a specified neighborhood around that cell with a 33 specific shape and searching distance), which has rarely been used in these types of studies, 34 most accurately explained the distribution of snow accumulation. Other variables affecting the 35 36 snow depth distribution included the maximum upwind slope, elevation, and northing. The models developed to predict snow distribution in the basin for each of the 12 survey days 37 were similar in terms of the explanatory variables. However, the variance explained by the 38 39 overall model and by each topographic variable, especially those making a lesser contribution, differed markedly between a year in which snow was abundant (2013) and a year when snow 40 was scarce (2012), and also differed between surveys in which snow accumulation or melting 41 conditions dominated in the preceding days. The total variance explained by the models 42 clearly decreased for those days on which the snow pack was thinner and more patchily. 43 Despite the differences in climatic conditions in the 2012 and 2013 snow seasons, similarities 44 in snow distributions patterns were observed which are directly related with terrain 45 topographic characteristics. 46

47 Keywords: snow depth distribution, snowpack evolution, topography, mountains, cold region

## 48 **1. Introduction**

Assessing the snow distribution in mountain areas is important because of the number of 49 processes in which snow plays a major role, including erosion rates (Pomeroy and Gray, 50 1995), plant survival (Keller et al., 2000; Wipf et al., 2009), soil temperature and moisture 51 (Groffman et al., 2001), and the hydrological response of mountain rivers (Bales and 52 Harrington, 1995; Barnett et al., 2005; Liston, 1999; Pomeroy et al., 2004). As mountain areas 53 54 are highly sensitivity to global change (Beniston, 2003), snow accumulation and melting processes are likely to be subject to marked changes in coming decades, affecting all 55 processes influenced by the presence of snow (Caballero et al., 2007; López-Moreno et al., 56 2011, 2012b; Steger et al., 2012). For these reasons, much effort has been devoted to 57 understanding the main factors that control the spatial and temporal dynamics of snow (Egli et 58 59 al., 2012; López-Moreno et al., 2010;; Mott et al., 2010; Schirmer et al., 2011).

One of the main difficulties in snow studies is obtaining reliable information of the variables 60 that describe snow distribution, including snow depth (SD), snow water equivalent (SWE) 61 62 and snow covered area (SCA). Manual measurements have traditionally been used to provide information on the distribution of snowpack, with different sampling strategies having been 63 applied at various spatial scales (Jost et al., 2007; López-Moreno et al., 2012a; Watson et al., 64 65 2006). However, manual sampling is not feasible for large areas because of the time involved, especially when SWE measurements are also acquired. In the last decade the use of airborne 66 laser scanners (ALS) (Deems et al., 2006) and terrestrial laser scanners (TLS) (Prokop, 2008), 67 both of which are based on LiDAR (light detection and ranging) technology, have provided 68 for major advances in obtaining data on the SD distribution at unprecedented spatial 69 70 resolutions. These developments have enabled studies of several factors that in the past have been only marginally considered, including scaling issues (Fassnacht and Deems, 2006; Mott 71 et al., 2011; Schirmer and Lehning, 2011; Trujillo et al., 2007), the detailed dynamics of snow 72 accumulation and ablation (Grünewald et al., 2010; Schirmer et al., 2011; Scipión et al., 73

74 2013), and snow transport processes (Mott et al., 2010). In addition, the high density 75 measurements provided by LiDAR technologies are a valuable resource for detailed 76 investigation of the linkage between snow distribution and topography. In the past, this 77 linkage has mostly been studied using manual measurements, and hence with generally 78 limited spatial and temporal resolution (López-Moreno et al., 2010).

Previous studies have highlighted the marked control of topography on snow distribution in 79 mountain areas (Anderton et al., 2004; Erickson et al., 2005 Lehning et al., 2011; Mott et al., 80 2013), and the importance of vegetation and wind exposure (Erxleben et al., 2002; Trujillo et 81 al., 2007). The most commonly used approach has been to develop digital elevation models 82 (DEM) that describe the spatial distribution of elevation, from which other terrain variables 83 are derived such as slope, terrain aspect, curvature, wind exposure or sheltering, and potential 84 solar radiation. This enables to analyze the linear or non-linear relation of these variables to 85 86 punctual SD or SWE values to be established (Grünewald et al., 2010; Schirmer et al., 2011). Various statistical methods have been applied for this purpose, including linear regression 87 88 models (Fassnacht et al., 2003; Hosang and Dettwiler, 1991), generalized additive models (GAM) (López-Moreno and Nogués-Bravo, 2005), and binary regression trees (BRT) 89 (Breiman, 1984) which have been widely applied in a diversity of regions (Elder et al., 1991; 90 Erxleben et al., 2002; McCreight et al., 2012;) 91

The extent to which topographic variables explain snow distribution can change during the 92 snow season; the variability of terrain characteristics can drive processes related to the spatial 93 variability of snow accumulation (snow blowing, terrain curvature) (Lehning et al., 2008), or 94 95 affect the energetic exchange between terrain and the snowpack (temperature, incoming solar radiation), so the importance of topographic variables is modified during the season (Molotch 96 et al., 2005). In addition, during a snow season the terrain changes markedly (is smoothed) by 97 snow accumulation (Schirmer et al., 2011). However, few studies have systematically 98 analyzed the intra- and inter-annual persistence of the relation between snow distribution and 99

topography. Recent studies have assessed whether the influence of topography is constant among different years; e.g. the similarities observed at the end of the accumulation season (Schirmer and Lehning, 2011; Schirmer et al., 2011), or the consistent fractal dimensions in two analyzed years (Deems et al., 2008); in both cases there was a relation with the dominant wind direction, which highlights the predictive ability of topographic variables.

The main focus of this study was to assess the influence of topography on the spatial 105 distribution of snowpack and its evolution over time. The high temporal and spatial density of 106 107 the dataset collected during the study enabled analysis of the main topographic factors controlling snow distribution, and assessment of whether topographic control of the snowpack 108 varied during the snow season and between years having very contrasting climatic conditions. 109 For this purpose, we conducted 12 surveys over 2012 (6) and 2013 (6) in a small mountain 110 catchment representing a typical subalpine environment in the central Spanish Pyrenees, and 111 112 obtained high resolution SD measurements using LIDAR technology using a TLS.

## 113 **2.** Study area and snow and climatic conditions

The Izas experimental catchment (42°44'N, 0°25'W) is located in the central Spanish 114 Pyrenees (Fig. 1). The catchment is on the southern side of the Pyrenees, close to the main 115 divide (Spain-France border), in the headwaters of the Gallego River valley, and ranges in 116 elevation from 2000 to 2300 m above sea level. The catchment is predominantly east-facing, 117 with some areas facing north or south, and has a mean slope of 16°. There are no trees in the 118 study area, and the basin is mostly covered by subalpine grasslands dominated by Festuca 119 120 eskia and Nardus stricta, with rocky outcrops in the steeper areas; flat, concave and convex areas occur in the basin. 121

122 The climatic conditions are influenced by the proximity of the Atlantic Ocean, with the 123 winters being humid compared with zones of the Pyrenees more influenced by mediterranean 124 conditions. The mean annual precipitation is 2000mm, of which snow accounts for

approximately 50% (Anderton et al., 2004). The mean annual air temperature is 3°C, and the 125 mean daily temperature is  $< 0^{\circ}$ C for an average of 130 days each year (del Barrio et al., 126 127 1997). Snow covers a high percentage of the catchment from November to the end of May The two years analyzed in the study represent climatic extremes during recent decades. 128 129 Severe drought occurred during 2012, leading to snow accumulation well below the long-term average. The thickness of the snowpack, measured at the automatic weather station (AWS, 130 Fig. 1), during winter in this year was less than the 25th percentile of the available historical 131 data series of this AWS (1996-2011) (Fig. 2). Only at the end of spring did late snowfall 132 events increase the amount of snow, but this rapidly melted. The opposite occurred in 2013, 133 which was a year in which the deepest snowpack and the longest snow season of recent 134 decades were recorded. Winter and spring in 2013 were extremely humid, with temperatures 135 mostly between the 25th and 75th percentiles of the AWS historical series. Snow depth 136 accumulation was very high between February and June (exceeding the 75th percentile); in 137 some areas of the basin it lasted until late July, which is one month longer than in most of the 138 preceding years for which records are available. 139

### 140 **3. Data and methods**

#### 141 **3.1. Snow depth measurements**

During the study period high resolution SD maps were generated using a long range TLS (Riegl LPM-321), which enables safe acquisition of SD information with short acquisition times from remote areas, compared with measurements obtained manually. This technique has been extensively tested (Prokop et al., 2008; Revuelto et al., 2014; Schaffhauser et al., 2008), and systematically applied to the study of snow distribution in mountain terrain (Egli et al., 2012; Grünewald et al., 2010; Mott et al., 2013; Schirmer et al., 2011). In a previous study the mean absolute error in the most distant areas of the catchment was less than 10cm (Revuelto et al., 2014), which is consistent with errors reported in previous studies
(Grünewald et al., 2010; Prokop, 2008; Prockop et al., 2008; Schaffauser et al., 2008).

TLS provides high resolution three dimensional information on the terrain Nevertheless, error 151 152 sources need to be considered because they can have large effects on the measurements. To reduce the influences of TLS instability (originated by small displacements of the tripod 153 because TLS vibrations while it is operating), which leads to misalignment with reference 154 points; and atmospheric change, a well-defined protocol must be applied. The protocol 155 applied in this study for generating high resolution SD maps with a 1m cell size was described 156 by Revuelto et al., (2014). This protocol has these main points: data collection; which 157 includes experimental setup design and information acquisition by the scanning procedure; 158 and data processing, where data is filtered, quality checked and the SD maps generated. 159 Mainly, the methodology was based on differences between DEMs obtained with snow 160 161 coverage in the study area and a DEM taken at 18 July 2012, when the catchment had no snow cover. Twelve snow depth maps at a spatial resolution of 5m were generated for the 162 163 2012 and 2013 snow seasons (Fig. 3). In each year three surveys were undertaken from February to April (2012: 22 February, 2 April, 17 April; 2013: 17 February, 3 April, 25 164 April), and three were undertaken from May to June when dominated intense melting 165 conditions (2012: 2, 14 and 24 May; 2013: 6, 12 and 20 June). The average SD and SCA, and 166 the maximum SD are shown in Table 1. It shows that much lower SD and SCA were observed 167 in 2012 compared to 2013. 168

## 169 **3.2. Digital elevation model and topographic variables**

From the two scan stations located in the study area (Fig. 1), 86% of the total area of the catchment was surveyed using TLS. DEMs of 1m grid size were initially obtained from point clouds of varying density in different areas, but always with a minimum of 1point/m<sup>2</sup> (Revuelto et al., 2014). Some of the predictor variables cannot be calculated where data gaps occur in the DEM (e.g. the topographic position index), and others require a DEM with a

greater surface than the area scanned during the study (e.g. to calculate the potential solar 175 radiation, including the shadow effect from surrounding topography, or to calculate the 176 maximum upwind slope parameter, it is included topographic information for distances up to 177 1200m from the exterior limit of the DEM obtained with the TLS). Thus, a DEM having a 5 178 m grid-size, available from the Geographical National Institute of Spain (Instituto Geográfico 179 Nacional, www.ign.es), was combined with the snow-free DEM obtained using the TLS 180 resampled from 1 m to 5 m resolution (the empty raster of the Geographical National Institute 181 was used for the resampling, averaging all values within each cell). The 1 m grid-size SD 182 maps were also resampled to 5 m to enable matching of the two different data sources. 183

To characterize the terrain characteristics, eight variables were derived from the final DEM, including: (i) elevation (*Elevation*), (ii) slope (*Slope*), (iii) curvature (*Curvature*), (iv) potential incoming solar radiation under clear sky conditions (*Radiation*), (v) easting exposure (*Easting*), (vi) northing exposure (*Northing*), (vii) the topographic position index (*TPI*) and (viii) maximum upwind slope (*Sx*).

189 Elevation was obtained directly from the DEM, while the other variables were calculated 190 using ArcGIS10.1 software. This calculates Slope as the maximum rate of change in value from a specific cell to that of its neighbors (10 m window size), and Curvature is determined 191 from the second derivative of the fitted surface to the DEM in the direction of maximum slope 192 of the terrain for the neighbors cells (10 m window size too). Radiation was obtained using 193 the algorithm of Fu and Rich (2002) and reported in Wh/m<sup>2</sup> meter based on the average 194 conditions for the 15-day period prior to each snow survey. This algorithm calculates the 195 potential clear sky radiation, which logically may strongly differ from the real radiation as a 196 consequence of cloud cover. This measure provided the relative difference in the 197 198 extraterrestrial incoming solar radiation among areas of the catchment for a given period under given topographical conditions (Fassnacht et al., 2013). Easting and Northing exposure 199 were calculated directly as the sine and cosine, respectively, of the angle between direction 200

north and terrain orientation or aspect. It provided information on the east (positive)/west 201 (negative) exposure and the north (positive)/south (negative) exposure. 202

The TPI provides information on the relative position of a cell in relation to the surrounding 203 terrain at a specific spatial scale. Thus, this index compares the elevation of each cell with the 204 average cell elevation at specific radial distances as follows (De Reu et al., 2013; Weiss, 205 2001): 206

208

 $TPI = z_o - \overline{z}$ 

$$\overline{z} = \frac{1}{n_R} \sum_{i \in R} z_i \tag{2}$$

Where  $z_o$  is the elevation of the cell in which *TPI* is calculated and  $\overline{z}$  is the average elevation 209 of surrounding cells obtained from (2) for a radial distance R. For each pixel the TPI was 210 calculated for 5, 10, 15, 25, 50, 75, 100, 125, 150 and 200 meters radial distances (scale 211 factors). 212

For specific wind directions, the maximum upwind slope parameter, averaged for 45° upwind 213 windows (Sx dash; Winstral et al., 2002) provided information on the exposure or sheltering 214 of individual cells at various distances, resulting from the topography. Rather than 215 considering the contribution for the dominant wind directions (Molotch et al., 2005), Sx dash 216 (Sx further on) values for eight directions were selected and directly related to the SD. The 217 directions were: 0° for north (N), 45° for northeast (NE), 90° for east (E), 135° for southeast 218 (SE), 180° for south (S), 225° for southwest (SW), 270° for west (W), and 315° for northwest 219 (NW). For Sx the searching distances (Winstral et al., 2002) considered were 100, 200, 300 220 221 and 500m. These distances were selected to enable assessment of the range at which Sxexhibited greatest control on SD dynamics, as has occurred in previous studies (Schirmer et 222 al., 2011; Winstral et al., 2002). 223

224 3.3. Statistical analysis The 12 SD maps at 5 m spatial resolution were related to each of the topographic variables considered (including the 40 *Sx* combinations, and the 9 distances for *TPI*). The large number of cells for which snow depth data were available enabled robust correlations between topography and snow distribution to be obtained, and provided a very large dataset for training and validation of the SD distribution models.

Pearson's r coefficients were obtained between SD and each topographic variable. Using the 230 whole dataset each variable was correlated, for all available points, against the SD value for 231 the specific survey day. Given the large amount of data for surveys, the degrees of freedom 232 for the correlation analyses were very high and hence it can inform of statistically significant 233 234 correlations even with very low correlation coefficients. Moreover, the use of a very dense dataset of observations may have associated problems derived from spatial autocorrelation 235 (Elsner and Schmertmann, 1994). For this reason we followed a Monte Carlo procedure, in 236 237 which 1000 random samples of 100 SD cases were extracted from the entire dataset and correlated with topographic variables for assessing significance. A threshold 95% confidence 238 interval ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ) was used to assess the significance of correlations (r = +/- 0.197, based on 239 100 cases). The spatial scales of Sx and TPI for which SD showed a higher correlation; 200m 240 and 25m respectively, were selected for further analysis (not presented in the manuscript). 241

To assess the explanatory capacity when all topographic variables were considered 242 simultaneously, two statistical models were used: (1) multiple linear regressions (MLRs) and 243 (2) binary regression trees (BRTs). A wide variety of regression analyses for interpretation of 244 much more complex spatial data are available with greater capacity than MLRs and BRTs to 245 deal with spatial autocorrelation issues and the non-linear nature of the relationship between 246 predictors and the response variable (Beale et al., 2010). However, in this study we used 247 MLRs and BRTs because these methods have been and are still widely used in snow studies, 248 and because both enable to isolate accurately the weight of each independent variable within 249 the model, which was the main objective of this research, rather than deriving models with 250

maximum predictive capacity. Prior to run the models a principal component analysis (PCA) 251 was applied to the topographic variables for detecting correlations between independent 252 variables that could originate multicolinearity in MLR and BRT. This analysis (not shown) 253 grouped the topographic variables in three components, from which it is observed that TPI 254 and Curvature are highly correlated, and also Northing and Radiation (but in this case 255 inversely) presented almost identical correlations with the three identified components. As 256 TPI and Northing showed higher correlations with their respective components and also show 257 in general higher Pearson's r coefficients with SD (see result section), the variables Curvature 258 and Radiation were discarded as predictors in MLR and BRT analyses. 259

(1) Multiple linear regression estimates the linear influence of topographic variables on SD. 260 Despite its simplicity and the rather limited capability under nonlinear conditions (López-261 Moreno et al., 2010), MLR was used to quantify the relative contribution of each variable 262 263 to the entire SD distribution model. SD was calculated from the topographic variables at a specific location for a given day. The threshold for a variable to enter in the model was 264 set at  $\alpha < 0.05$ . Beta coefficients (obtained dividing the standardized units by the 265 coefficients by the mean value of each variable) were used to compare the weight of each 266 variable within the regression models. Again, in order to avoid an excessive number of 267 observations that may lead to spurious identification of statistically significant predictor 268 variables, we first randomly extracted a reduced dataset (1000 cases) for selecting the 269 topographic variables by means of a stepwise procedure. Once variables to be included 270 for each survey were determined, they were used to obtain the final model, but using the 271 entire data set (except 5000 cases for model validation), forcing variables entrance in 272 models. 273

(2) *Binary regression trees* have been widely used to model snowpack distribution from
topographic data (Erxleben et al., 2002; Molotch et al., 2005). These are nonparametric
models that recursively split the data sample, based on the predictor variable that

minimizes the square of the residuals obtained (Breiman, 1984). One BRT was created 277 for each sampling date. The BRTs were run until a new split was not able to account for 278 1% of the explained variance, or when a node had less than 500 cases; a maximum of 15 279 terminal nodes was set, to reduce tree complexity. As there were no over-fitting problems 280 associated with sample size, 15,000 cases were used to grow the trees and 5,000 cases 281 were used for validation. By scaling the explained variance of each variable introduced 282 into each BRT (based on the % of the total explained variance by the BRT), we were able 283 to compare the relative importance of each topographic variable between the different 284 models. 285

Coefficients of determination (r<sup>2</sup>) and Willmott's D statistic were used to assess the ability of
each model to predict snow depth over an independent random sample of 5,000 cases.
Willmott's D was determined using equation (3) (Willmott, 1981):

289

$$D = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (P_i - O_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (P_i - O_i + |O_i - O_i|)^2}$$
(3)

where N is the number of observations,  $O_i$  is the observed value,  $P_i$  is the predicted value, and  $\overline{o}$  is the mean of the observed values. The index ranges from 0 (minimum) to 1 (maximum predictive ability).

## 293 **4. Results**

#### 294 4.1. Single correlations

Table 2 shows the correlation between SD and *Sx* for the eight wind directions at a distance of 200 m (identified as the best correlated searching distance in previous analysis). Despite differences in magnitude, the correlations for surveys carried out at the beginning of the season (22 February 2012 and 17 February 2013) in each year showed that SD was clearly affected by N and NW wind directions. This was particularly evident in 2013, as the correlation values were higher for both days. The contribution of N and NW wind directions is clearly evident for the surveys on 17 February 2013 (Figure 4, were wind roses with

average wind speeds and direction, for the 15 day period before each survey are presented), 302 when greater SD was recorded in the leeward slopes from a northerly direction (Fig. 3, upper 303 areas of the maps). In the two years of the study a correlation with W and SW wind directions 304 was observed to increase progressively during the snow season (Fig. 4 and Table 2 305 correlations). In 2013 this phenomenon was less marked because of the greater SD 306 accumulation at the beginning of the snow season accompanied with NW direction winds, 307 which resulted in only moderate changes in the Sx for the most strongly correlated wind 308 directions. It was also observed that in both study years once the snow had started to melt (the 309 last three surveys in each season) the snow distribution did not change in relation to Sx 310 directions. When the best correlated Sx directions for each survey are compared with wind 311 roses (Fig. 4) a good agreement is observed. These directions for survey days are: 315° for 22 312 Feb. 2012, 270° for 02 and 17 April 2012, and 225° for the three surveys in May 2012; in 313 2013, 315° was the best correlated direction for 17 Feb. and 270° for the other five surveys of 314 the snow season 315

Correlations between the most correlated *Sx* direction for each day and SD were compared with correlations between SD and the other topographic variables (Table 3). This showed that *Sx* had one of the greatest coefficient of correlation with SD (range 0.22–0.56). The correlations were higher during the accumulation periods, especially in the 2013 snow season, with a reduction in correlations values occurring during the melt period at the end of each snow season.

The *TPI* at 25 m showed the highest correlation with SD for nearly all of the 12 sampled days. During 2012 the mean correlation values ranged from -0.32 to -0.58 for those surveys during which snow accumulation dominated in the days preceding the surveys. The r values were closer to the significance level for the surveys where the preceding days were dominated by melting conditions (14 and 24 May). In 2013, the *TPI* was more highly correlated with SD than in 2012, with Pearson's r coefficients < -0.6 for all survey days. *Curvature* also had a high correlation with SD, and similar to *TPI* with a 25 m searching distance was significantly correlated on all the survey dates, but unlike the *TPI*, the correlation of *Curvature* with SD did not decrease during the snowmelt periods. The significant correlations of *TPI* and *Curvature* with SD highlight the importance of terrain curvature on the SD distribution. The importance of terrain curvature at different scales for SD distribution is clearly evident in Figure 3, which shows that higher SD values were usually found for concave areas, which showed snow presence until the end of each snow season.

The correlation between *Elevation* and SD varied among survey days (Table 3). The 335 correlations were usually positive, but only statistically significant (or approaching 336 significance) for days when melting dominated (the last two surveys in 2012 and 2013). Slope 337 was relatively weakly correlated with SD during the 2012 snow season. In 2013 the 338 correlation was greater, and was statistically significant on some days. As with *Elevation*, the 339 correlation between Slope and SD was variable between the two study years, and showed a 340 similar temporal pattern to *Easting*, probably because of the presence of steeper areas on the 341 342 east-facing slopes.

343 The correlation between Northing and SD was rarely statistically significant, was highly variable, and contributed to explaining SD in a very different ways in 2012 and 2013. In 2012 344 no correlation between SD and Northing was found during the accumulation period, but 345 during the melting period a slight positive correlation was observed, as snow remained longer 346 on north-facing slopes. The 2013 snow season started with a large precipitation event 347 dominated by strong winds from a northerly direction, leading to high levels of snow 348 accumulation on the south-facing slopes. This explains the strong and statistically significant 349 negative correlation of SD with Northing for 17 February 2013. This event influenced the rest 350 351 of the season (as evident in Table 2 in 2013), but a progressive decrease in its influence was evident for the following survey days. *Radiation* had an almost opposite influence on SD to 352 that observed for *Northing*. During the melting period in each year the Pearson's r correlation 353

between SD and *Radiation* was negative, indicating a thinner snowpack on the most irradiated
slopes; the relation was statistically significant at the end of the 2013 snow season. However,
during the accumulation period in 2013 statistically significant positive correlations were
observed with *Northing* and *Radiation*, which are connected to the strong snow redistribution
by winds from N-NW directions.

## 4.2. Multiple Linear Regression and Binary Regression Tree models

Figure 5 shows the Willmott's D values and the coefficients of determination  $(r^2)$  obtained in 360 the comparison of observed and predicted values using MLRs and BRTs for a dataset 361 reserved for validation (5000 cases). The MLRs produced  $r^2$  values ranging from 0.25 to 0.65 362 and Willmott's D values ranging from 0.60 to 0.88, while the BRTs produced  $r^2$  values 363 ranging from 0.39 to 0.58 and Willmott's D values ranging from 0.72 and 0.85. For both 364 methods the relationship between the observed and predicted values was stronger for 2013. 365 366 Accuracy decreased at the end of the snow season, when the snowpack was mostly patchy across the basin; this was particularly the case for the end of the 2012 season. Overall, the 367 368 performance of the MLRs was more variable than that of the BRTs, which were more constant amongst the various snow surveys. For those days on which the models were most 369 accurate in predicting SD variability, the MLRs showed slightly better scores than the BRTs. 370 However, for days on which the accuracy between predictions and observations was lower, 371 the BRTs provided better estimates than the MLRs. For 2012, slightly better results were 372 obtained using MLRs, while the opposite occurred in 2013. Nevertheless, only large 373 differences in the accuracy of each model were evident by the end of 2012 snow season, in 374 the two last surveys, which were characterized by thin and patchy snowpack. In general, there 375 was good agreement between the models for each survey day, so results obtained with each 376 model could be compared. 377

As shown for single correlations, the *TPI* variable explained most of the variance in MLR
models developed for all analyzed days (Table 4). The contribution of the other variables

varied markedly among surveys, particularly when the two years were compared. In most 380 cases, *Elevation* was the second most important variable explaining the SD distribution in 381 2012, followed by Sx and Slope. The other variables made a much smaller contribution, or 382 were not included in the models. The contribution of *Elevation* was much less in 2013, and it 383 was not included in three of the six surveys, whereas in 2012 it was included in all surveys. 384 For the entire 2013, Sx was the second most important variable, followed by *Easting*, which 385 had an almost negligible influence in 2012. Northing was only included in the models for the 386 surveys carried out during periods dominated by snow accumulation, and was not included in 387 the models during the periods dominated by melting. 388

Figure 6 shows two examples of BRTs, obtained for the days 2 May 2012 (upper panel) and 3 April 2013 (bottom panel), which accounted for the largest amount of snow accumulation in each of the two years. The variable *TPI* determined the first branching point, and this occurred in the majority of the trees obtained (not shown). After the first branching, other variables were significant in the model, including *Sx* and *TPI* for 2 May 2012,and *Sx* and *Northing* for 3 April 2013, demonstrating the importance of these variables in the subsequent branching of the trees.

The relative importance (scaled from 0 to 100) of each topographic variable in each BRT is 396 shown in Table 5. This shows that TPI was the first most important variable explaining SD 397 for all survey days. For the 2012 snow season, TPI explained more than 67% of the total 398 explained variance in all BRTs, and 75% during the accumulation period (the first three 399 surveys). Thus, for most of the survey days the variance explained by the other variables was 400 <30%. The second most important variable explaining the SD distribution in 2012 differed 401 amongst the survey days. Thus, Sx was the second most influential variable during May 402 403 (except for 24 May 2012), following the largest snowfall in the season (which occurred the 1 May 2012), and *Elevation* was the most important variable in the other surveys during 2012. 404 Northing also had an evident influence during the two first surveys of the year, but 405

subsequently had minimal explanatory capacity, as was the case for all the other variables. In 406 2013 TPI was also the main contributor to the total explained variance, exceeding 50% for 407 almost all survey days, and approaching or > 70% during the snowmelt period. The influence 408 409 of Sx was more important in 2013 than in the previous year. At the beginning of 2013 the contribution of Sx to the total explained variance was almost 46%, and remained  $\geq 20\%$  for the 410 rest of the snow season; an exception was the last survey, when melting dominated and its 411 effect declined to 12%. When snow was not mobilized for long periods by wind, the SD 412 distribution was more dependent on variables related to terrain curvature (TPI and 413 Curvature). During 2013, Elevation contributed approximately 5% to the total explained 414 variance during the entire snow season. *Northing* made a significant contribution to the model 415 (14.7%) on only one day (3 April 2013), and a much smaller contribution on the following 416 survey day (25 April 2013). Where included in the BRTs, the other variables (Easting, 417 418 *Radiation*) made no, or only minor, contributions to the total explained variance.

## 419 **5. Discussion**

The distribution of snow in mountain areas is highly variable in space and time, as was shown for the Izas experimental catchment during two consecutive years. Many meteorological and topographic parameters affect the snow distribution and its evolution through time with different weights subjected to several factors. In this context, we demonstrated that topography was a major controlling factor affecting SD in a subalpine catchment, and showed that its effect evolved during the snow accumulation and melting periods over two years having highly contrasting climatic conditions and levels of snow accumulation.

There have been many studies analyzing the spatial distribution of SD in mountain areas (Anderton et al., 2004; Erickson et al., 2005; López-Moreno et al., 2010; Mccreight et al., 2012). Besides some researches have also focused their attention in long-term inter-annual snow distribution analyses (Jepsen et al., 2012; Sturm and Wagner, 2010, Winstral and Marks, 2014) but there are very few datasets that have enabled investigation of the intra- and

inter-annual variability of the topographic control on the snowpack distribution, being 432 important to investigate both time scales. The results of previous research have highlighted 433 the difficulties in fully explaining the distribution of snow in complex mountainous terrain. In 434 addition, the results have differed among studies, and suggest that different variables govern 435 the distribution of snowpack among areas as consequence of their differing characteristics and 436 geographical settings, including surface area and altitudinal gradients, the importance of wind 437 redistribution, the presence or absence of vegetation, and the topographic complexity 438 (Grünewald et al., 2013). 439

Most of the topographic variables investigated in this study have been included in previous 440 studies, including Elevation, Slope, Radiation, Curvature and Sx. Other variables, in 441 particular TPI, have received little attention in previous research (López-Moreno et al., 2010). 442 We showed that *TPI* at a scale of 25 m had the greatest capacity to explain the SD distribution 443 444 in the study catchment. *Curvature* (which refers to a small spatial scale of terrain curvature) was also highly correlated with the SD distribution, but not as highly as TPI, reinforcing the 445 446 importance of considering terrain curvature at various scales in explaining the SD distribution in mountain environments. The correlation between snowpack and the TPI decreased during 447 melting periods, whereas the correlation with *Curvature* remained constant. This suggests that 448 snow accumulates more in small, deep concavities, but is shallower at the end of the season in 449 wider concave areas that were identified by the 25 m TPI scale. This effect was evident at the 450 451 end of the snow season, when snow was present only in deep concavities, as shown in Figure 3. To explain the snow distribution, Anderton et al. (2004) compared the relative elevation of 452 453 a cell with the terrain over a 40 m radius, and observed that this had a major role on SD distribution, what reinforces curvature importance at different scales. 454

The maximum upwind slope (Sx; Winstral et al., 2002) has also been identified as a key variable explaining snow distribution, improving the results obtained when it is introduced into models. Our results are comparable with those of other studies that have shown that the

optimum searching distance for correlating Sx with the SD distribution is 300 m (Schirmer et 458 al., 2011), so it is not a large difference for the considered distances in this work which 459 reaches 500m. As it is observed from the reported wind information, Izas experimental 460 461 catchment has W-NW dominant wind direction what is consistent with the best correlated Sx directions. For this reason, the Sx preferred direction for each date was selected, and showed 462 that there were intra-annual shifts in the most highly correlated direction. The change in the 463 most important Sx direction was similar between the 2012 and 2013 snow seasons; it started 464 with a northerly component and evolved to a dominant westerly direction. We also found a 465 decrease in the correlation between Sx and the snow distribution at the end of each snow 466 467 season, when melting conditions dominated; this is consistent with the findings of previous studies (Winstral and Marks, 2002). 468

Sx parameter takes into account sheltering effects with topographic origin in relation to wind 469 directions. As it has been observed in this study, higher SD amounts are observed in leeward 470 slopes, which for this study site are in E-SE slopes, being perceived this effect in the SD 471 472 distribution maps. TPI is not able to explain snow drifts, because this index considers the topographic characteristics in all directions. Nevertheless, terrain characteristics at the study 473 site in relation to SD distribution have shown a higher importance of TPI when compared to 474 Sx. The most likely explanation of this result is that the basin has a rather reduced size, shows 475 the same general aspect (SE facing) and topography is relatively gentle. Under such 476 conditions, during wind blowing events snow is accumulated in all the wide concavities of the 477 basin (represented by TPI) independently of its specific location. Nonetheless, wind 478 479 redistribution will be affected by a combination of local topography in relation to the main wind directions; what makes necessary to consider the Sx parameter, and this effect lasts in 480 481 time until the melting season is advanced. Nonetheless, under such conditions more snow is accumulated according to main wind directions; what makes necessary to consider Sx482 parameter, and this effect lasts in time until the melting season is advanced. 483

Only for two days (22 February 2012 and 2 April 2012) was there no (or a minor) contribution of *Sx* to SD, according to the BRTs and MLRs. On these days *Northing* was introduced into the models, and was found to explain some of the variance of *Sx* from northerly direction (the best correlated direction for these days (Table 2).

Although *Elevation* has been found to largely explain the snow distribution in areas having 488 marked altitudinal differences (Elder et al., 1998; Erxleben et al., 2002; Molotch and Bales, 489 2005) in our study no strong association was found between SD and Elevation, with 490 significant correlations occurring only during the snowmelt period. This is because of the low 491 elevation range of the study area (300 m). During the accumulation period the entire 492 catchment is generally above the freezing height. However, during spring the 0°C isotherm 493 shifts to higher elevations, which may lead to different melting rates within the basin. Despite 494 the relatively weak correlation between Elevation and SD, this variable was introduced as a 495 predictor in the MLRs and BRTs for most of the days analyzed. Similarly, López-Moreno et 496 al. (2010) reported that elevation was of increasing importance as the grid size increased. 497 Anderton et al. (2004) also informed about the importance of elevation to explain snowpack 498 distribution in the same study area. The results of the present study suggest the increase in 499 importance of Elevation at the end of the snow season, and particularly when it is considered 500 in combination with other topographic variables in MLR and BRT models. 501

*Slope* was only a weak explanatory factor for snow distribution, probably because the slope in most of the catchment is not sufficient to trigger gravitational movements including avalanches and slushes during the snowmelt period, which could thin the snowpack on the steepest slopes (Elder et al., 1998). Maybe some of *Slope* explanatory capacity is included on *Radiation* explanatory capacity, because it affects solar light incident angle, and also, the steeper areas of the catchment are in south facing zones, nevertheless quantifying such kind of effects is highly difficult due to the high complexity of SD dynamic in mountain terrain.

*Radiation*, *Northing* and *Easting* showed no close correlation with the snowpack distribution; 509 their relationships with SD were variable over time, with statistically significant correlations 510 occurring on some days and only weak correlations on other days. The results suggested that 511 512 *Radiation* and *Northing* (which showed almost opposite patterns) may be related to SD for two different reasons. During the accumulation period in 2013 heavy snowfalls associated 513 with northerly winds led to the accumulation of deep snow on south-facing (more irradiated) 514 surfaces, whereas during the snowmelt period the greater exposure of the southern slopes to 515 solar energy led to a positive (negative) correlation with Northing (Radiation). This 516 phenomenon was also observed by López-Moreno et al. (2013), using a physically-based 517 snow energy balance model in the same study area. Moreover, the high and opposite 518 correlation between Northing and Radiation obtained in PCA results (not shown in the 519 manuscript), prevented us of potential problems of multicollinearity. Thus, only Northing was 520 521 considered for MLRs and BRTs (the same occurred with TPI and Curvature, being only considered in statistical models the TPI). Although Northing did not show a significant 522 523 correlation with SD during accumulation periods, when the surveys were closer to the snowmelt period the negative correlation of this variable with SD was much more evident, 524 possibly due to the increase of the difference in the energetic exchange between the sun 525 exposed and shaded areas. The importance of Northing in MLR models, combined with the 526 contribution of *Easting* during the accumulation period may be related to the high snow 527 redistribution originated by wind directions from N- NW directions. In such a way terrain 528 aspect (considered with Northing and Easting) during winter is more related to the 529 accumulation patterns resulting from wind redistribution, whereas in spring they were 530 associated with the unequal distribution of solar radiation, which leads to higher melting rates 531 on the most irradiated slopes, what has shown better explanatory capacity than Radiation at 532 Izas Experimental catchment. 533

The MLRs and BRTs provided reasonably high accuracy scores when observed and predicted 534 SD data were compared. The scores were comparable, and in some cases better, to values 535 reported in previous researches using similar methods. Molotch et al., (2005) reported  $r^2$ 536 values between 0.31 and 0.39 with BRT; and Winstral et al., (2002), considering different 537 number of terminal nodes of BRT with similar topographic variables, obtained an optimal tree 538 size of 16 nodes (which is guite similar to the tree size selected in this study, in spite of 539 differences in the study area, the nature of the dataset, etc) with an  $r^2$  value close to 0.4. 540 Moreover results presented here were obtained from a separate dataset, and data used to create 541 the models are not considered for testing, thanks to the large available data set. One reason for 542 the improvement may be the use of the TPI as a SD predictor, as this variable has not been 543 considered in previous studies. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the study sites considered 544 in other studies, could differ in terms on complexity of terrain, and also in SD accumulation 545 546 amounts. For the 12 survey days the TPI had the greatest explanatory capacity in both approaches. However, based on comparison of the different dates and surveys, the other 547 548 variables made more varying contributions, as a result of the different roles they play during 549 the snow accumulation and melting periods, and the wind conditions during the main snowfall events. The models had less capacity to explain spatial variability of the snowpack when the 550 snow was thinner and patchy. The BRT and MLR approaches were consistent with respect to 551 552 error estimates. The results obtained using each approach were comparable, so the trends in the variable ranking for both models for each survey day were very similar. Only during 553 conditions of snow scarcity did the BRT approach demonstrate better capability to relate SD 554 to topography. This is probably a consequence of the greater capacity of BRTs to take account 555 of the nonlinear response of the snowpack to topography, and the occurrence of sharp 556 557 thresholds typical of days when the snowpack is patchy (López-Moreno et al., 2010; Molotch et al., 2005). 558

In spite of model results differ between survey days and years, some variables are always 559 present in the models and their contribution to the total explained variances are rather similar. 560 Moreover for 2012 and 2013 a consistent inter-annual distribution of the snow pack in the 561 catchment is observed; the areas of maximum SD and the location of snow free zones were 562 consistent between both years of the study, and more importantly there is a strong consistency 563 of the effect of topography on SD is clear. This spatial consistency of snowpack has 564 implications for soil dynamics and plant cycles, because some parts of the basin will tend to 565 remain free of snow cover during longer periods favoring the presence of temporary frozen 566 soils, and reducing the isolation effect of snowpack to the plants (Keller et al., 2000; Pomeroy 567 568 and Gray, 1995). Moreover, it suggests that the information acquired from TLS during several years could be useful to design long-term monitoring strategies of SD in the basin based on 569 few manual measurements in representative points according their terrain characteristics. 570

# 571 6. Conclusions

Topographic variables related to terrain curvature were shown to contribute more to 572 573 explaining snow distribution than other variables. In particular, the TPI at a 25 m searching distance was the major variable explaining SD in the Izas experimental catchment. This 574 suggests the importance of including this index in future snow studies, and the need to 575 576 establish the best searching distance for relating this variable to SD distribution at other study sites. The maximum upwind slope at a searching distance of 200 m was also an important 577 578 variable explaining the SD distribution. However, its influence varied markedly between years and surveys, depending of the specific wind conditions during the main snowfall events. 579 The influence of the other topographical variables on the spatial distribution of SD was less, 580 and showed greater intra- and inter-annual variability. The results from BRTs and MLRs 581 models were consistent, and the explanatory capacities of the main variables were very 582 similar for all surveys. This suggests that the effect of topography on snow distribution has 583 relatively high intra- and inter-annual consistency in the study catchment. Terrain 584

characteristics have shown a major role on snow distribution, as *TPI* explanatory capacity. When snow distribution could be affected by wind action (mainly during the accumulation period), its distribution is modified tightly related with main wind directions and sheltering effects, well described with *Sx* parameter. Several interesting temporal evolutions during the two snow seasons were found in the relation of some topographic variables to SD.

## 590 7. Acknowledgments

591 This study was supported by the research project Hidrología nival en el Pirineo Central Español: Variabilidad espacial, importancia hidrológica y respuesta a la variabilidad y cambio 592 climático (CGL2011-27536/HID, Hidronieve) "CGL2011-27574-CO2-02 and CGL2011-593 27536, financed by the Spanish Commission of Science and Technology and FEDER; LIFE 594 MEDACC, financed by the LIFE programme of the European Commission; "El glaciar de 595 Monte Perdido: Monitorización y estudio de su dinámica actual y procesos criosféricos 596 asociados como indicadores de procesos de cambio global844/2013, financed by MAGRAMA 597 National Parks and CTTP1/12 "Creación de un modelo de alta resolución espacial para 598 599 cuantificar la esquiabilidad y la afluencia turística en el Pirineo bajo distintos escenarios de cambio climático", financed by the Comunidad de Trabajo de los Pirineos. The first author is 600 a recipient under the pre-doctoral FPU grant program 2010 (Spanish Ministry of Education 601 602 Culture and Sports). The third author was the recipient of the postdoctoral grants JAE-DOC043 (CSIC) and JCI-2011-10263 (Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation). The 603 604 authors thank Adam Winstral for the use of his algorithm for calculating maximum upwind slope. The authors wish to acknowledge the editor and the two reviewers for their detailed and 605 helpful comments to the original manuscript. 606

# 607 **8. References**

Anderton, S.P., White, S.M., and Alvera, B.: Evaluation of spatial variability in snow water
equivalent for a high mountain catchment. Hydrol. Process., 18, 435–453, 2004.

- Bales, R.C., and Harrington, R.F.: Recent progress in snow hydrology. Reviews of
  Geophysics Supplement, 33, 1011–1020, 1995.
- Barnett, T.P., Adam, J.C., and Lettenmaier, D.P.: Potential impacts of a warming climate on
  water availability in snow-dominated regions. Nature, 438, 303–309, 2005.
- 614 Del Barrio, G., Alvera, B., Puigdefabregas, J., and Diez, C.: Response of high mountain
- landscape to topographic variables: Central pyrenees. Landscape Ecol., 12, 95–115, 1997.
- Beale, C.M., Lennon, J.J., Yearsley, J.M., Brewer, M.J., and Elston, D.A.: Regression
  analysis of spatial data. Ecol. Lett., 13, 246–264, 2010.
- Beniston, M.: Climatic Change in Mountain Regions: A Review of Possible Impacts. Climatic
  Change, 59, 5–31, 2003.
- Breiman, L.: Classification and regression trees (Wadsworth International Group). 1984.
- 621 Caballero, Y., Voirin-Morel, S., Habets, F., Noilhan, J., LeMoigne, P., Lehenaff, A., and
- 622 Boone, A.: Hydrological sensitivity of the Adour-Garonne river basin to climate change.
- 623 Water Resour., Res. 43, W07448, 2007.
- Deems, J.S., Fassnacht, S.R., and Elder, K.J.: Fractal Distribution of Snow Depth from Lidar
  Data. J. Hydrometeorol., 7, 285–297, 2006
- 626 De Rue, J., Bourgeois, J., Bats, M., Zwertvaegher, A., Gelorini, V., De Smedt., P.M., Chu,
- 627 W., Antrop., M., De Maeyer, P., Finke., P., Mairvanne, M.V., Verniers., J. and Crombé., P.:
- 628 Application of the topographic position index to heterogeneous landscapes. Geomorphology.
- **629** 186 , 39-49. 2013.
- 630 Deems, J.S., Fassnacht, S.R., and Elder, K.J.: Interannual Consistency in Fractal Snow Depth
- Patterns at Two Colorado Mountain Sites. J. Hydrometeorol. 9, 977–988, 2008
- 632 Egli, L., Jonas, T., Grünewald, T., Schirmer, M., and Burlando, P.: Dynamics of snow
- ablation in a small Alpine catchment observed by repeated terrestrial laser scans. Hydrol.
- 634 Process., 26, 1574–1585. 2012.

- Elder, K., Dozier, J., and Michaelsen, J.: Snow accumulation and distribution in an Alpine
  Watershed. Water Resour. Res., 27, 1541–1552. 1991.
- Elder, K., Rosenthal, W., and Davis, R.E.: Estimating the spatial distribution of snow water
  equivalence in a montane watershed. Hydrol. Process. 12, 1793–1808, 1998.
- Elsner, J.B., and Schmertmann, C.P. (1994). Assessing Forecast Skill through Cross
- 640 Validation. Wea. Forecasting 9, 619–624.
- 641 Erickson, T.A., Williams, M.W., and Winstral, A.: Persistence of topographic controls on the
- spatial distribution of snow in rugged mountain terrain, Colorado, United States. Water
  Resour. Res., 41 (4), 1–17, 2005.
- 644 Erxleben, J., Elder, K., and Davis, R.: Comparison of spatial interpolation methods for
- estimating snow distribution in the Colorado Rocky Mountains. Hydrol. Process., 16, 3627–
  3649, 2002.
- Fassnacht, S.R., and Deems, J.S.: Measurement sampling and scaling for deep montane snow
  depth data. Hydrol. Process., 20, 829–838, 2006.
- Fassnacht, S.R., Dressler, K.A., and Bales, R.C.: Snow water equivalent interpolation for the
  Colorado River Basin from snow telemetry (SNOTEL) data. Water Resour. Res., 39 (8),
  SWC31–SWC310, 2003.
- 652 Fassnacht, S.R., López-Moreno, J.I., Toro, M., and Hultstrand, D.M.: Mapping snow cover
- and snow depth across the Lake Limnopolar watershed on Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island,
- 654 Maritime Antarctica. Antarct. Sci. 25, 157–166, 2013.
- Fu, P., and Rich, P.M.: A geometric solar radiation model with applications in agriculture and
  forestry. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 37, 25–35, 2002.
- 657 Groffman, P.M., Driscoll, C.T., Fahey, T.J., Hardy, J.P., Fitzhugh, R.D., and Tierney, G.L.:
- 658 Colder soils in a warmer world: A snow manipulation study in a northern hardwood forest
- 659 ecosystem. Biogeochemistry, 56, 135–150, 2001.

- Grünewald, T., Schirmer, M., Mott, R., and Lehning, M. Spatial and temporal variability of
  snow depth and ablation rates in a small mountain catchment. The Cryosphere, 4, 215–225,
  2010.
- 663 Grünewald, T., Stötter, J., Pomeroy, J.W., Dadic, R., Moreno Baños, I., Marturià, J., Spross,
- 664 M., Hopkinson, C., Burlando, P., and Lehning, M.: Statistical modelling of the snow depth
- distribution in open alpine terrain. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 17, 3005–3021. 2013
- Hosang, J., and Dettwiler, K.: Evaluation of a water equivalent of snow cover map in a small
  catchment area using a geostatistical approach. Hydrol. Process., 5, 283–290., 1991.
- Jepsen, S.M., Molotch, N.P., Williams, M.W., Rittger, K.E., and Sickman, J.O. (2012).
- 669 Interannual variability of snowmelt in the Sierra Nevada and Rocky Mountains, United
- 670 States: Examples from two alpine watersheds. Water Resour. Res. 48, W02529.
- Jost, G., Weiler, M., Gluns, D.R., and Alila, Y.: The influence of forest and topography on
  snow accumulation and melt at the watershed-scale. Journal of Hydrology, 347, 101–115,
  2007.
- 674 Keller, F., Kienast, F., and Beniston, M.: Evidence of response of vegetation to environmental
- change on high-elevation sites in the Swiss Alps. Reg. Environ. Change, 1, 70–77, 2002.
- Lehning, M., Löwe, H., Ryser, M., and Raderschall, N.: Inhomogeneous precipitation
  distribution and snow transport in steep terrain. Water Resour. Res., 44, W07404, 2008.
- Lehning, M., Grünewald, T., and Schirmer, M. (2011). Mountain snow distribution governed
  by an altitudinal gradient and terrain roughness. Geophysical Research Letters 38.
- 680 Liston, G.E.: Interrelationships among Snow Distribution, Snowmelt, and Snow Cover
- Depletion: Implications for Atmospheric, Hydrologic, and Ecologic Modeling. J. Appl.
  Meteorol., 38, 1474–1487, 1999.
- 683 López-Moreno, J.I., and Nogués-Bravo, D.: A generalized additive model for the spatial
- distribution of snowpack in the Spanish Pyrenees. Hydrol. Process., 19, 3167–3176, 2005.

- López-Moreno, J.I., Latron, J., and Lehmann, A.: Effects of sample and grid size on the
  accuracy and stability of regression-based snow interpolation methods. Hydrol. Process., 24,
  1914–1928, 2010.
- López-Moreno, J.I., Vicente-Serrano, S.M., Morán-Tejeda, E., Lorenzo-Lacruz, J., Kenawy,
  A., and Beniston, M.: Effects of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) on combined
  temperature and precipitation winter modes in the Mediterranean mountains: Observed
  relationships and projections for the 21st century. Global Planet. Change, 77, 62–76, 2011.
- López-Moreno, J.I., Fassnacht, S.R., Heath, J.T., Musselman, K.N., Revuelto, J., Latron, J.,
  Morán-Tejeda, E., and Jonas, T.: Small scale spatial variability of snow density and depth
  over complex alpine terrain: Implications for estimating snow water equivalent. Adv. Water
  Resour., 55, 40–52, 2012a.
- López-Moreno, J.I., Pomeroy, J.W., Revuelto, J., and Vicente-Serrano, S.M.: Response ofsnow processes to climate change: spatial variability in a small basin in the Spanish Pyrenees.
- 698 Hydrol. Process., 27, 2637–2650, 2012b.
- 699 McCreight, J.L., Slater, A.G., Marshall, H.P., and Rajagopalan, B.: Inference and uncertainty
- of snow depth spatial distribution at the kilometre scale in the Colorado Rocky Mountains:
- 701 The effects of sample size, random sampling, predictor quality, and validation procedures.
- 702 Hydrol. Process., 28, 933–957. 2014.
- Molotch, N.P., and Bales, R.C.: Scaling snow observations from the point to the grid element:
- 704 Implications for observation network design. Water Resour. Res., 41, W11421, 2005.
- Molotch, N.P., Colee, M.T., Bales, R.C., and Dozier, J.: Estimating the spatial distribution of
  snow water equivalent in an alpine basin using binary regression tree models: the impact of
- digital elevation data and independent variable selection. Hydrol. Process., 19, 1459–1479,
  2005.
- 709 Mott, R., Schirmer, M., Bavay, M., Grünewald, T., and Lehning, M.: Understanding snow-
- transport processes shaping the mountain snow-cover. The Cryosphere, 4, 545–559, 2010.

- Mott, R., Schirmer, M., and Lehning, M.: Scaling properties of wind and snow depth
  distribution in an Alpine catchment. J. Geophy. Res.-Atmos., 116, D06106, 2011.
- 713 Mott, R., Gromke, C., Grünewald, T., and Lehning, M. (2013). Relative importance of
- advective heat transport and boundary layer decoupling in the melt dynamics of a patchy
- snow cover. Advances in Water Resources 55, 88–97.
- Pomeroy, J.W., and Gray, D.M.: Snowcover accumulation, relocation, and management.
  National Hydrology Research Institute, Saskatoon, Sask., Canada, 1995.
- 718 Pomeroy, J., Essery, R., and Toth, B. Implications of spatial distributions of snow mass and
- melt rate for snow-cover depletion: observations in a subarctic mountain catchment. Ann.
  Glaciol., 38, 195–201, 2004.
- Prokop, A.: Assessing the applicability of terrestrial laser scanning for spatial snow depth
  measurements. Cold Reg. Sci. .Technol., 54, 155–163, 2008.
- Prokop, A., Schirmer, M., Rub, M., Lehning, M., and Stocker, M., A comparison of
  measurement methods: terrestrial laser scanning, tachymetry and snow probing for the
  determination of the spatial snow-depth distribution on slopes. Ann. Glaciol., 49, 210–216,
  2008.
- Revuelto, J., López-Moreno, J.I., Azorin-Molina, C., Zabalza, J., Arguedas, G., and VicenteSerrano, S.M.: Mapping the annual evolution of snow depth in a small catchment in the
  Pyrenees using the long-range terrestrial laser scanning. Journal of Maps, 1–15., DOI:
  10.1080/17445647.2013.869268, 2014.
- Schaffhauser, A., Adams, M., Fromm, R., Jörg, P., Luzi, G., Noferini, L., and Sailer, R.:
  Remote sensing based retrieval of snow cover properties. Cold Reg. Sci. .Technol., 54, 164–
  175, 2008.
- 734 Schirmer, M., and Lehning, M.: Persistence in intra-annual snow depth distribution: 2. Fractal
- analysis of snow depth development. Water Resour. Res., 47, W09517, 2011.

- Schirmer, M., Wirz, V., Clifton, A., and Lehning, M.: Persistence in intra-annual snow depth
  distribution: 1.Measurements and topographic control. Water Resour. Res., 47, W09516,
  2011.
- Scipión, D.E., Mott, R., Lehning, M., Schneebeli, M., and Berne, A.: Seasonal small-scale
  spatial variability in alpine snowfall and snow accumulation. Water Resour. Res., 49, 1446–
  1457, 2013.
- Steger, C., Kotlarski, S., Jonas, T., and Schär, C.: Alpine snow cover in a changing climate: a
  regional climate model perspective. Clim. Dynam., 1–20, 2012.
- 544 Sturm, M., and Wagner, A.M. (2010). Using repeated patterns in snow distribution modeling:
- An Arctic example. Water Resources Research 46.
- Trujillo, E., Ramírez, J.A., and Elder, K.J.: Topographic, meteorologic, and canopy controls
  on the scaling characteristics of the spatial distribution of snow depth fields. Water Resour.
  Res., 43, W07409, 2007.
- Watson, F.G.R., Anderson, T.N., Newman, W.B., Alexander, S.E., and Garrott, R.A.:
  Optimal sampling schemes for estimating mean snow water equivalents in stratified
  heterogeneous landscapes. Journal of Hydrology 328, 432–452, 2006.
- Weiss, A.D.: Topographic position and landforms analysis. ESRI user conference, San DiegoUSA, 2001.
- Willmott, C.J. On the Validation of Models. Phys. Geogr., 2, 184–194, 1981.
- Winstral, A., and Marks, D.: Simulating wind fields and snow redistribution using terrainbased parameters to model snow accumulation and melt over a semi-arid mountain
  catchment. Hydrol. Process., 16, 3585–3603, 2002.
- 758 Winstral, A., Elder, K., and Davis, R.E.: Spatial Snow Modeling of Wind-Redistributed Snow
- Using Terrain-Based Parameters. Journal of Hydrometeorol., 3, 524–538, 2002.

760	Winstral, A., and Marks, D. (2014). Long-term snow distribution observations in a mountain
761	catchment: Assessing variability, time stability, and the representativeness of an index site.
762	Water Resour. Res. 50, 293–305.
763	Wipf, S., Stoeckli, V., and Bebi, P.: Winter climate change in alpine tundra: plant responses
764	to changes in snow depth and snowmelt timing. Climatic Change, 94, 105-121, 2009.
765	
766	
767	
768	
769	
770	
771	
772	
773	
774	
775	
776	
777	
778	
779	
780	
781	
782	
783	
784	
785	
786	

		5	Snow sea	ason 2012	2	Snow season 2013							
	22/02	02/04	17/04	02/05	14/05	24/05	17/02	03/04	25/04	06/06	12/06	20/06	
Mean													
SD (m)	0.72	0.58	0.60	0.97	0.71	0.70	2.98	3.22	2.53	2.28	2.09	1.61	
Max													
SD (m)	5.5	3.8	5.3	6.1	4.4	4.3	10.9	11.2	10.1	9.6	8.9	7.9	
SCA (%)	67.2	33.5	94.1	98.8	30.9	18.9	98.8	100.0	96.3	86.4	77.1	67.0	

**Table 1:** Summary statistics of the snowpack distribution and the snow covered area of the basin. Note that snow covered area is expressed as a % of the total area surveyed by the TLS, and the mean SD is the average of all SDs not including zero values.

		Snow s	eason 20	12		Snow season 2013							
	22/02	02/04	17/04	02/05	14/05	24/05	17/02	03/04	25/04	06/06	12/06	20/06	
Sx 0°	0,19	0,13	0,09	-0,11	0,06	-0,01	0,51*	0,40*	0,31*	0,23*	0,22*	0,20*	
Sx 45°	0,15	-0,02	0,00	-0,16	-0,08	-0,09	0,36*	0,25*	0,17	0,12	0,12	0,12	
<b>Sx 90°</b>	0,12	-0,14	-0,07	0,11	-0,11	-0,03	-0,15	-0,15	-0,10	-0,09	-0,09	-0,10	
Sx 135º	0,02	-0,05	0,05	0,26*	0,01	0,11	-0,27*	-0,19	-0,10	-0,06	-0,06	-0,06	
Sx 180°	0,02	0,14	0,15	0,38*	0,17	0,21*	-0,19	-0,08	0,02	0,08	0,08	0,12	
Sx 225°	0,12	0,29*	0,26*	0,44*	0,32*	0,23*	0,06	0,18	0,26*	0,29*	0,29*	0,31*	
Sx 270°	0,20*	0,33*	0,34*	0,26*	0,27*	0,21*	0,48*	0,52*	0,49*	0,45*	0,42*	0,43*	
Sx 315°	0,22*	0,26*	0,27*	0,01	0,22*	0,12	0,56*	0,50*	0,41*	0,34*	0,32*	0,33*	

792

**Table 2:** Pearson's r coefficients between SD and *Sx*, calculated for the eight studied wind directions over the survey days. \* marks those correlations that were statistically significant ( $\alpha$ <0.05) in at least the half of the samples (500 out of 1000 samples) from the Monte Carlo approach, and bold r coefficients represent the best correlated *Sx* direction for a specific survey day.

798

799

		Snow s	eason 20	12		Snow season 2013								
	22/02	02/04	17/04	02/05	14/05	24/05	17/02	03/04	25/04	06/06	12/06	20/06		
Elev.	0,09	0,26*	0,16	0,10	0,29*	0,19	0,09	0,18	0,13	0,18	0,21*	0,26*		
Slope	0,06	0,18	0,02	-0,03	0,20*	0,03	0,25*	0,27*	0,20*	0,20*	0,21*	0,26*		
Curv	-0,44*	-0,45*	-0,47*	-0,49*	-0,41*	-0,37*	-0,39*	-0,40*	-0,40*	-0,39*	-0,38*	-0,38*		
North	-0,06	0,00	0,04	0,19	0,07	0,11	-0,38*	-0,27*	-0,19	-0,09	-0,06	-0,11		
East.	0,09	0,21*	0,13	0,13	0,13	0,11	0,25*	0,26*	0,27*	0,22*	0,18	0,14		
Rad	0,05	0,04	-0,06	-0,22*	-0,12	-0,11	0,36*	0,21*	0,10	-0,09	-0,12	-0,23*		
TPI 25	-0,56*	-0,46*	-0,54*	-0,58*	-0,40*	-0,32*	-0,66*	-0,68*	-0,68*	-0,66*	-0,63*	-0,61*		
Sx	0,22*	0,33*	0,34*	0,44*	0,32*	0,23*	0,56*	0,52*	0,49*	0,45*	0,42*	0,43*		

**Table 3:** Pearson's r coefficients between SD and the topographic variables. \* marks those correlations that were statistically significant ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ) in at least the half of the samples (500 out of 1000 samples) from the Monte Carlo approach, and bold r coefficients represent the best correlated topographic variable for a specific survey day.

			Snow sea	ison 2012	2	Snow season 2013						
	22/02	02/04	17/04	02/05	14/05	24/05	17/02	03/04	25/04	06/06	12/06	20/06
TPI	-0,69	-0,53	-0,60	-0,59	-0,48	-0,40	-0,78	-0,72	-0,73	-0,80	-0,74	-0,72
Sx		0,11	0,28	0,26	0,20	0,16	0,36	0,31	0,43	0,37	0,38	0,31
Elev.	0,09	0,22	0,34	0,27	0,27	0,35		0,14		0,08		0,13
Slope		-0,25	-0,29	-0,24	-0,21	-0,21		-0,10	-0,14	-0,16	-0,09	-0,15
North	-0,22	0,13	-0,16				-0,12	-0,11	-0,11			
East.	0,10						0,29	0,25	0,25	0,31	0,23	0,20
r2	0,45	0,31	0,40	0,47	0,33	0,25	0,65	0,63	0,60	0,60	0,57	0,51

808 Table 4: Multiple linear regression beta coefficients for each independent variable and809 sampled day.

		S	Snow sea	ason 2012	2	Snow season 2013						
	22/02	02/04	17/04	02/05	14/05	24/05	17/02	03/04	25/04	06/06	12/06	20/06
TPI	83.2	78.8	75.0	71.7	74.0	66.9	49.1	56.4	64.4	71.2	69.9	77.5
Sx			4.6	12.7	13.4	10.8	45.9	23.1	23.0	21.8	20.1	12.5
Elev.	5.7	6.8	13.2	9.1	8.2	15.2	5.0	5.7	5.0	3.3	5.9	5.4
Slope	1.7	5.4	5.7	6.5	3.2	7.0			2.1		•	2.6
North	9.3	8.1	1.5		1.3			14.7	4.3	2.4	2.9	3.6
East.	0.54	0.40	0.50	0.54	0.46	0.20	0.50	0.54	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.0
r2	0.56	0.42	0.52	0.54	0.46	0.39	0.58	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.53	0.51
Table	5: Con	tributio	n of th	e variou	us topo	graphic	variab	les to tl	he expl	ained v	ariance	of SD
distrib	ution ir	the bi	nary re	gressio	n mode	ls for 2	2012 an	d 2013	. Value	s have	been re	escaled
from (	to 100											



Figure 1: Location of the Izas experimental catchment, and the digital elevation model
showing the positions of the scan stations and the automatic meteorological station. The two
images in the bottom part of the figure, from Scan Station 1, show the terrain characteristics
with (1) and without snow cover (2).



844

Figure 2: Daily average temperature, snow depth and net solar radiation at the automatic weather station (AWS) for the 2012 (left) and 2013 (right) snow seasons. The continuous lines represent the daily values for 2012 and 2013, and the dashed lines show the 25th and 75th percentiles of historical daily series (1996–2011). The vertical dashed lines show the TLS survey days. Note that during some surveys no snow was present at the AWS, but some areas of the Izas experimental catchment were covered by snow.

- 851
- 852
- 853
- 854





Figure 3: Spatial distribution of snow depth in the Izas experimental catchment in the surveysundertaken in 2012 and 2013.

858

Figure 4: Wind roses from the automatic weather station placed at the catchment obtained fora 15 day period.



Figure 5: Willmott's D and  $r^2$  values between the observed and predicted SD, based on the multiple linear and binary regression models for all survey days.

#### **Binary Regression Trees**





Figure 6: Binary regression tree obtained for 2 May 2012(top) and 3 April 2013 (bottom). The final nodes (with ellipses) show the predicted SD in the zone having the specified terrain characteristics. At each branch point, one topographic variable is considered; if the value is less than the specified value, the left branch is selected, but if it is equal to or greater than the specified value, the right branch is selected.