An assessment of two automated snow water equivalent instruments during the WMO Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment

Craig D. Smith, Anna Kontu, Richard Laffin, and John W. Pomeroy

Response to reviewers #3 comments

The final comments from reviewer #3 are contained in an annotated manuscript. The comments below reproduce those comments where appropriate and a response is provided.

Page 4, Line 2: I think you could also cite more recent work by Jerry Johnson, e.g.:
Johnson, J. B., Gelvin, A. B., Duvoy, P., Schaefer, G. L., Poole, G. and Horton, G. D.: Performance characteristics of a new electronic snow water equivalent sensor in different climates, Hydrol. Process., 29(6), 1418–1433, doi:10.1002/hyp.10211, 2015.

Response: after reviewing this suggested paper, the reference was added

Page 6, Line 9: If I understand this correctly, the FOV is 120°, following more conventional definitions ...(I don't care about the manufacturer's definition of the coverage angle!)

Response: Changed the reference to the "FOV" to 120°, removed "from centre" and changed the following reference of "FOV" to "response area". This was modified throughout, as suggested and where appropriate.

Page 6, Line 21: I recommend to use consistently 'snowpack'

Response: changed "snow pack" to "snowpack" throughout.

Page 8, Line 16: What about 'real' conditions? Maybe the following paper could be cited here: Sturm, M., Taras, B., Liston, G. E., Derksen, C., Jonas, T. and Lea, J.: Estimating Snow Water Equivalent Using Snow Depth Data and Climate Classes, J. Hydrometeor, 11(6), 1380–1394, doi:10.1175/2010JHM1202.1, 2010.

Response: The statement "…in ideal conditions" was to indicate that the ESC-30, in itself, is considered to be an accurate instrument. A discussion of "real conditions" is included in Section 4.1.5. Added the following statement here: "Errors associated with sampling in less than ideal conditions are discussed later." The suggested reference validates some of the estimates presented in Section 4.1.5 and will be cited in this section.

Page 13, Line 2: Sorry, I guess I missed that one in my first review. Indeed, I expect melting periods to be characterised by both strong enough winds and temperatures above freezing. This may explain why some/many of your 'melting periods' do not match with jumps in Δswe. You should be able to do such an analysis quite quickly, but I don't know if in time for that paper ...

Response: I'm not exactly sure what the reviewer is indicating here, but the purpose of noting the melting temperatures and high wind is to indicate the potential for the formation of ice layers on top and within the snowpack, possibly infiltration of melt water into the frozen sandy soil, both of which could lead to errors discussed in Section 4. I will clarify this.

Page 13, Line 18: I still have hard times to understand how air temperatures raise temperatures within the soil while the latter is still snow covered! Was the snow cover patchy at that time? Did solar radiation penetrate through a shallow snowpack? How do you explain it?

Response: The air temperature doesn't have to raise the temperature of the soil. Infiltration can occur into these frozen soils because of the high sand content. However, the soil temperature sensors indicate that the soil temperatures near the surface rise above 0 C in mid-March. This could be related to patchiness as the reviewer suggests, or an increase in the near surface temperature as a result of melt water. Photos suggest that it could be either.

This is clarified in the manuscript with the following addition: "The near surface (0 to 5 cm) soil temperatures rose above freezing even with snow on the surface. The snowpack was patchy (verified from hourly photos) and shallow, and meltwater was likely percolating through the snow and into the top layers of the soil."

Page 14, Line 2: In your answer you showed that you can estimate GWC from WFV, and vice versa. Why don't you do it here to simplify the comparison for the reader?

Response: As stated before, the soil moisture instrument reports volumetric water content (VWC; note that we updated this from water fraction by volume) while the calibration for the CS725 is entered as gravimetric water content (GWC). They are related through the specific gravity of the soil, which is about 1.4 for loose sand, verified by measurement at a nearby site. Therefore, WFV~GWC*1.4. This is added to the text, including references and the discussion is updated accordingly. After doing the conversion, we can now more accurately state the errors related to change in soil moisture. These errors are slightly lower than those calculated when assuming that GWC~VWC. For example, the increase in soil moisture prior to freeze up only explains 30% of the error, not 40% as previously calculated. These numbers and the discussion are updated accordingly.

Page 14, Line 20: I guess you also need to consider the different ranges for the three sites. My impression is that measurements at Fortress Mountain are not worse than at Caribou Creek, but quite different from Sodankylä (slope).

Response: We are not exactly sure what the reviewer is asking here.

Page 15, Line 23: Insert second sentence of last paragraph of section 4.2 here.

Response: This doesn't really seem to fit well here. We will consider other options

Page 16, Line 13: Errors may compensate each other.

Response: This is probably correct, added this statement in the paragraph

Page 17, Line 8: Is this the mean of RMB? Or is it only for the combined values?
If this is the case, than corresponding r2 are 0.90 and 0.92

Response: Clarified this in the text. The reported "average bias" did indeed only refer to the combined seasons.

Page 20, Line 2: Again, it would be very useful to the reader if he could easily relate GWC to WFV. If you can't provide this relation, I doubt you can calibrate your sensors anyway.

Response: This was fixed, see note above

Page 20, Line 11: As the manual measurements are not shown in Figure 6, it is really hard to follow your argumentation by trying to compare with Figure 4. It looks like the measurement area was snow free around 1 April 2015. Was the snow cover patchy before that date? This could also explain why the soil thawed.

Response: Sorry, Figure 6 was inserted incorrectly into this version. It has now been fixed with the inclusion of the SWE bias. See the response to "Page 12, Line 18" for clarification on why the soil moisture and temperature were changing at this time.

Page 21, Line 5: I'd rather say that further increases due to new snowfall will not be recorded. Thus this would explain a constant value over time. Decreases, however, may rather be due to processes occurring near the soil and/or the sensor surface. See e.g. Johnson, J. B.: A theory of pressure sensor performance in snow, Hydrol. Process., 18(1), 53–64, doi:10.1002/hyp.1310, 2004.

Response: We agree with the reviewer's statement and the sentence "thus potentially decreasing the weight on the pillow of scale" is changed to "causing an underestimate of measured SWE with further accumulation on the surface." The reference was added to point readers towards the physical explanation of these and other errors.

Page 24, Line 13: Which, in view of my own experience and literature (Sturm, 2010), is absolutely realistic!

Response: Sturm (2010) reports an average error of about 7%. This is quoted and referenced.

Page 24, Line 16: Measurements at Sodankylä are coupled to snow pit profiles (like at Weissfluhjoch) that facilitate taking account of thinner ice layers. Thus maybe not that surprising!

Response: Actually, the snow pit measurements are not done in the SPICE intercomparison field and are therefore not coupled to the snow core measurements near the SWE instruments.

Page 25, Line 7: I concur with the editor that the two first paragraphs are results. Thus I'd definitely put them at the end of section 3, but not in the discussion.

The third paragraph is also misplaced in the discussion, still being a mix of setup and results. What about placing the first sentence under section 2.2 on p7, line 13. The second sentence could then be slightly altered and placed at the end of section 3.2.1 on p15, line 23:

"To avoid problems due to flooding of the electronics box, the manufacturer now provides longer cables allowing a better installment of the box."

Response: Moved Section 4.2 to the end of Section 3 to become Section 3.4. Removed the last paragraph in this section which discussed the fix to the SSG1000 failure issue and augmented the last sentence in section 3.2.1 to read "…data are missing due to a sensor failure caused by water damage to the electronics (an issue later remedied by the manufacturer)."

Page 26, Line 11: gain, do a proper comparison as the average SWE values do not correspond to your ranges of r^2

Response: To be consistent with the Discussion, the Conclusion states the MRB and correlations for the combined seasons, and then states that the interseasonal variability in both of these measures were higher at Caribou Creek for the reasons stated.

Page 26, Line 18: Which is also due to another range of measured SWE values!

Response: To be consistent, we now state the correlation and mean bias for Fortress Mountain for the whole season with the caveat that there is only one intercomparison season for this site.

Page 27, Line 9-10: Needs to be reformulated in view of other error producing mechanisms.

Response: Revised the statement in question to: "..likely due to bridging of the snowpack on the weighing plate but we also have to consider errors related to the manual measurements and other processes going on at the snow-soil-sensor interface (as outlined in Johnson, 2004)."

Page 28, Line 4: Relative to what. This is unquantified as are any adjectives like good, fair etc. Quantify or reword the sentence.

Response: Replaced "…relatively good agreement…" with "high correlations (generally higher than 0.90, Caribou Creek being the exception)…"

Page 28, Line 7: suggested changing "potential" to "potential error".

Response: done

Page 28, Line 10: This is pure speculation! At least you would need to show that the measurement makes sense, which is not the case in the paper.

Response: We are confident that the increasing error in the CS725 SWE measurements at the end of the season at both Caribou Creek and Sodankyla are because of infiltration into the sand, and we showed that the increase in soil moisture at the end of the ablation season accounts for much of the error. We agree that there is some speculation here because we only have one season of data at one site to back this up, and will therefore change those last sentences to "Although more verification work is required on the impact of soil moisture change on the CS725 bias, aggregating sub-surface moisture in the SWE estimate could potentially be useful from a hydrological perspective as it ultimately impacts the amount of water available for runoff. Nevertheless, it is recommended to co-locate the CS725 with ancillary measurements of soil moisture, soil temperature, and snow depth to guide the user in interpreting the data."

Page 33, Line 2: I'd suggest you explain in the caption why there are values in parentheses. Putting them below the symbols is ambiguous, particularly for MRB, which should have (%) and then no units added to each value. What is n?

Response: caption now becomes "Table 1: Regression coefficients and other statistical measures for the multi-season intercomparison of the CS725 with manual SWE at Sodankylä, Caribou Creek and Fortress Mountain (where β and ε are the slope and intercept of the regression line). Values inside and outside of the parenthesis represent the respective Thallium and Potassium output from the sensor. "Accumulation" indicates that data occurring after maximum seasonal SWE is omitted from the analysis, "Combined" indicates that data from both seasons are included, and n represents the sample size." Added "%" to the MRB column heading and removed "%" from the column data.

Page 34, Line 1: What is n? Add (%) to MRB in the top row and delete it from table values.

Response: fixed, as above

Page 35, Line 1: I would get rid of the x-axis legend "Date (UTC)" as it is evident you show a date, However, I'd really prefer having an ISO date format as dd-mm-yyyy instead of the ambiguous mm/dd/yyyy.

Response: Removed the x-axis title from all time series figures and changed the date format to the ISO 8601 standard of yyyy-mm-dd

Page 38, Figure 5: Y-axis labeling could still be improved by using both axes: left for "Air temperature at 1.5 m (°C)", right for "Difference in SWE (mm w.e.) Also, a better placement could reduce overlap of panels.

Response: added a right y-axis for "Instrument Bias" with air temperature remaining on the left y-axis. Panels no longer overlap.

Page 39, Figure 6: I guess in blue? Where are they?

Response: fixed the caption to say that the soil moisture line is blue. Oops…the figure in this version was an older figure that didn't have the instrument bias plotted on it…this was fixed.

Page 40, Figure 7: You could use different colors to differentiate between both seasons.

Response: We opted not to do this in previous figures as it made them too busy and difficult to read. Rather, we have the reader see the seasonal differences in the time series plots following the scatterplot. To be consistent, we combined the two seasons in this plot as well.

Page 42, Figure 9 caption: should be blue dots / blue triangles

Response: fixed

1 # An assessment of two automated snow water
2 # equivalent instruments during the WMO Solid
3 # Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment
4

5 Craig D. Smith[1], Anna Kontu[2], Richard Laffin[3], John W. Pomeroy[4]

6 [1]Environment Canada, Saskatoon, S7N 3H5, Canada

7 [2]Finnish Meteorological Institute, Sodankylä, FI-99600, Finland

8 [3]Campbell Scientific, Edmonton, T5L 4X4, Canada

9 [4]Centre for Hydrology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, S7N 5C8, Canada

10 Correspondence to: Craig D. Smith (craig.smith2@canada.ca)

11

12 ## Abstract

13 During the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment (SPICE),

14 automated measurements of snow water equivalent (SWE) were made at the Sodankylä (Finland),

15 Weissfluhjoch (Switzerland) and Caribou Creek (Canada) SPICE sites during the Northern Hemisphere winters of

16 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. Supplementary intercomparison measurements were made at Fortress Mountain

17 (Kananaskis, Canada) during the 2013/2014 winter. The objectives of this analysis are to compare automated

18 SWE measurements with a reference, comment on their performance, and where possible to make

19 recommendations on how to best use the instruments and interpret their measurements. Sodankylä, Caribou

20 Creek and Fortress Mountain hosted a Campbell Scientific CS725 passive gamma radiation SWE sensor.

21 Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch hosted a Sommer Messtechnik SSG1000 snow scale. The CS725 operating

22 principle is based on measuring the attenuation of soil emitted gamma radiation by the snowpack and relating

1 the attenuation to SWE. The SSG1000 measures the mass of the overlying snowpack directly by using a

2 weighing platform and load cell. Manual SWE measurements were obtained at the intercomparison sites on a

3 bi-weekly basis over the accumulation/ablation periods using ~~either~~ bulk density samplers ~~or snow pit density~~

4 ~~profiles~~. These manual measurements are considered to be the reference for the intercomparison. Results

5 from Sodankylä and Caribou Creek showed that the CS725 generally overestimates SWE as compared to

6 manual measurements by roughly 30 to 35 % with correlations (r^2) as high as 0.99 for Sodankylä and 0.90 for

7 Caribou Creek. The RMSE varied from 30 to 43 mm water equivalent (mm w.e.) and 18 to 25 mm w.e. at

8 Sodankylä and Caribou Creek, which had respective SWE maximums of approximately 200 mm w.e. and 120

9 mm w.e. The correlation at Fortress Mountain was 0.94 (RMSE of 48 mm w.e. with a maximum SWE of

10 approximately 650 mm w.e.) with no systematic overestimation. The SSG1000 snow scale, having a different

11 measurement principle, agreed quite closely with the manual measurements at Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch

12 throughout the periods when data were available (r^2 as high as 0.99 and RMSE from 8 to 24 mm w.e. at

13 Sodankylä and 56 to 59 mm w.e. at Weissfluhjoch, where maximum SWE was approximately 850 mm w.e.).

14 When the SSG1000 was compared to the CS725 at Sodankylä, the agreement was linear until the start of

15 ablation period when the positive bias in the CS725 increases substantially relative to the SSG1000. Since both

16 Caribou Creek and Sodankylä have sandy soil, water from the snowpack readily infiltrates into the soil during

17 melt, even if the soil is frozen. However, ~~but~~ the CS725 does not differentiate this water from the un-melted

18 snow. This issue can be identified, at least during the late spring ablation period, with soil moisture and

19 temperature observations like those measured at Caribou Creek. With a less permeable soil and surface runoff,

20 the increase in the instrument bias during ablation period is not as significant, as shown by the Fortress

21 Mountain intercomparison.

22

1   Introduction

The measurement of snow water equivalent (SWE) is vital for flood and water resource forecasting, drought monitoring, climate trend analysis, and hydrological and climate model initialization (Barnett et al., 2005; Gray et al., 2001; Bartlett et al., 2006; Laukkanen, 2004). Many of these applications require accurate and timely information about how much water is being held within the snowpack (Pomeroy and Gray, 1995). SWE measurements can be made in-situ, either manually or via automated instrumentation, or derived from remote sensing platforms, and are usually expressed as units of mass per area (kg m^{-2}) or in equivalent units of millimetres of water equivalent (mm w.e.). Manual measurements of SWE are typically made using a multi-point bulk density sampling technique along an established transect or snow course (WMO, 2008). Snow course measurements are often time consuming and expensive, especially if required in remote locations (Pomeroy and Gray, 1995). This means that manual SWE measurements may be infrequent or only undertaken when the snowpack is estimated to be at its seasonal maximum. Prohibitive costs of manual snow course observations have led to the reduction of these measurements by many agencies, including Environment and Climate Change Canada, where operational snow course numbers have decreased from over 100 in the 1980s to less than 30 (Barry, 1995; Brown et al, 2000). Since the early 1990s, manual SWE measurements have been augmented or replaced by remote sensing techniques such as passive microwave retrievals (Goodison and Walker, 1995) but these techniques still require accurate and reliable in-situ measurements for ground-truthing and retrieval development (Derksen et al., 2005; Takala et al., 2011).

With the reduced availability of manual SWE measurements, automated instruments for the measurement of SWE are becoming more necessary and more commonplace. Snow pillows have been used for the automated measurement of SWE in remote locations since the 1960s (Beaumont, 1965) by measuring the overlying pressure of the snowpack on a fluid filled bladder. The SNOTEL network in the United States is based on snow pillow measurements (Serreze et al., 1999). More recently, similar measurements are obtained using snow

1   scales that use a weighing surface and load cell to measure the weight of the overlying snow (Beaumont, 1966;

2   Johnson et al., 2007; Johnson et al., 2011)). Several indirect methods exist to measure SWE that include the use

3   of neutron probes (Harding, 1989) in which a radiation source is placed under the snowpack and the scattering

4   of neutrons through the snow is measured by a detector. Cosmic ray proton probes (Kodama et al., 1979;

5   Rasmussen et al., 2012) work in a similar manner but do not require an active source. The probes described by

6   Kodama et al. are installed under the snow while the system described by Rasmussen et al. (called COSMOS) is

7   installed above the snow. Kinar and Pomeroy (2007; 2015a) outline a method of non-invasive sonic

8   reflectometry through the snowpack to determine snow density, liquid water content, and temperature. Other

9   passive radiation sensors are mounted above the surface and measure the attenuation of naturally emitted

10 radiation from the soil as it passes through the snowpack and then relate this attenuation to SWE content

11 (Choquette et al., 2008; Martin et al., 2008). Each of these instruments and techniques have advantages and

12 disadvantages, which are not discussed here (see Kinar and Pomeroy (2015b) for a more comprehensive

13 description of snow measurement methods and related issues). Rather, this analysis assesses the use and

14 accuracy of two instruments that were tested during the World Meteorological Organization (WMO-Solid

15 Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment (SPICE) (Nitu et al., 2012; Rasmussen et al., 2012), namely the

16 Campbell Scientific CS725 and the Sommer Messtechnik SSG1000 snow scale.

17

18 The CS725 (previously known as GMON or GMON3) has been previously field tested by Hydro Québec

19 (Choquette et al., 2008; Martin et al., 2008) as well as by Wright et al. (2011). Results by Choquette et al. (2008)

20 showed an average error of +18 % when comparing to 8 manual snow cores over 3 seasons in Quebec. They

21 obtained a somewhat better agreement with total SWE calculated from density profiles (with an average error

22 of +5 %) but only had 4 samples over 2 seasons. Wright et al. (2011) showed intercomparison results between

23 GMON3 sensors and snow pillows, precipitation gauges, and snow courses at Sunshine Village (Alberta,

24 Canada) and Tony Grove Ranger Station (Utah, USA). Results showed high correlations between the sensor and

1   (unadjusted) accumulated precipitation (0.99) and between the sensor and snow pillow observations (0.99) but

2   lower correlations (0.83) with snow course observations (during one season at Sunshine Village). The authors

3   question the quality and inherent biases in the snow course samples but do not comment on the sources of

4   error or the proximity of the snow course to the instrument.

5

6   Instrument intercomparisons that included the SSG1000 have been limited but some results are reported by

7   Stranden and Grønsten (2014), who showed parallel SWE measurements between snow pillows, snow scales,

8   and manual snow courses. With mitigating circumstances (e.g. snow drifting and scale issues), they concluded

9   that the measurement surface area had an impact on the measurement quality and that the Sommer scale

10   gave "promising results" but that further intercomparison was required.

11

12   One of the over-all objectives of the WMO-SPICE project is to assess the performance of automated

13   instrumentation for the measurement of snow, including snow on the ground (SoG). This is accomplished by

14   comparing the tested instruments to an established reference measurement. In total, fifteen countries are

15   participating in the WMO-SPICE project with about 20 intercomparison sites. Of these, 7 countries and 9

16   intercomparison sites are hosting SoG instrumentation. The instrumentation for WMO-SPICE has either been

17   provided by the instrument manufacturers or by the site hosts. For SoG, 13 different instruments are under

18   test with 9 measuring snow depth and 4 measuring SWE. The CS725 and the SSG1000 SWE instruments

19   examined here were installed at the Sodankylä (Finland), Caribou Creek (Canada) and Weissfluhjoch

20   (Switzerland) intercomparison sites (Fig. 1). To supplement the CS725 data collected for WMO-SPICE, data was

21   added from an additional CS725 instrument installed at the Fortress Mountain ski area in the Kananaskis region

22   of the Canadian Rocky Mountains.

23

2 Instrumentation and Methods

2.1 Campbell Scientific CS725

The CS725 (Fig. 2 left) is a passive gamma sensor developed by Hydro Québec in collaboration with Campbell Scientific (Canada) Corp. (Choquette et al., 2008; Martin et al., 2008). The instrument is installed above the snow surface and determines SWE by measuring naturally emitted gamma radiation from Potassium and Thallium sources in the soil that is attenuated by the snowpack. Each gamma ray detected by the sensor element is counted over a user defined period, the resulting distribution is compared to the distribution when there was no snow cover, and the difference is used to calculate SWE. The sensor field of view ~~(FOV)~~ is approximately 120~~60~~° ~~from centre~~ resulting in a ~~FOV~~measurement area of approximately 80 m^2 when installed 3 m above the snowpack and with the collimator attached. The collimator serves to shield the instrument from gamma rays emitted from sources that are not in the target area. The effective range of the instrument is 0 to 600 mm w.e. with a measurement accuracy of +/- 15 mm w.e. from 0 to 300 mm w.e. and 15 % from 300 to 600 mm w.e. (Campbell Scientific CS725 Manual, https://s.campbellsci.com/documents/ca/manuals/cs725_man.pdf).

The two CS725 instruments for WMO-SPICE were both installed in October 2013 at Sodankylä, Finland, and Caribou Creek, Canada, and operated over the Northern Hemisphere winters of 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. Both instruments were mounted so that the bottom of the instrument was approximately 2 m above the ground and both were installed with the manufacturer provided collimator. Data was output every 6 hours. The instrument at Sodankylä was moved approximately 10 m during the summer of 2014 to avoid some buried cables in the measurement area~~FOV~~, but any potential impact of the move are considered to be negligible because of the consistency in the snow-pack at this site. The impact of spatial variability is addressed in Section 4.

6

The third CS725 used in this analysis was not a WMO-SPICE instrument, but was loaned to the University of Saskatchewan for testing and intercomparison by the instrument manufacturer. This instrument was installed in a clearing near the Fortress Mountain ski resort in the Kananaskis Valley, Alberta, Canada. The CS725 was mounted at a height of approximately 3.5 m above the ground. The distance to the trees around the instrument was approximately 10 m from the centre of the instrument, FOV, putting them outside of the response area. Data collected by this instrument from October 2013 through June 2014 is used in this analysis. Like the other CS725 instruments, SWE data was output every 6 hours.

2.2 Sommer SSG1000

The SSG1000 snow scale (Fig. 2 right) manufactured by Sommer Messtechnik, Austria, measures SWE through the use of a weighing platform and load cells. Unlike the CS725, it makes a direct measurement of the weight of the snowpack on top of the weighing platform and converts this weight to SWE. The entire platform consists of 7 perforated panels, each 0.8 m x 1.2 m, that are attached to a frame and installed level with the surface of the ground. The entire instrument surface is 2.8 m x 2.4 m (6.72 m^2) but only the centre panel is weighed by the load cell. According to the manufacturer, the purpose of the larger surface surrounding the centre measurement panel is to "stabilize" the overlying snowpack and prevent ice bridging (http://www.sommer.at/en/products/snow-ice/snow-scales-ssg). The SSG1000, as tested for WMO-SPICE, has a measurement range of 0 to 1000 mm w.e., and a manufacturer stated resolution and accuracy of 0.1 mm w.e. and 0.3 % of full scale (3 mm w.e.), respectively.

The SSG1000 snow scales in this analysis were installed in the Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch SPICE sites. The Weissfluhjoch instrument was provided by the WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research SLFSwiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research (WSL) Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research (SLF). Data collection from the instrument started in October 2013 and continued for the 2013/2014 and

1 2014/2015 Northern Hemisphere winters. The SSG1000 at Sodankylä was located in the North East quadrant of

2 the SPICE Field, approximately 22 m southeast of the original location of the CS725. At Weissfluhjoch, it is

3 located in the southwest corner of the instrument field. SWE observations from the instruments were recorded

4 once per minute during the two intercomparison seasons.

5

6 ## 2.3 Reference SWE measurements

7 The reference SWE manual measurements for this intercomparison differed by site. All ~~except Weissfluhjoch~~

8 were bulk density snow samples made with a snow sampling tube of a known diameter that has one end

9 capable of penetrating and cutting into the snowpack. The tube was inserted into the snowpack either down to

10 the surface of the ground or to a plate inserted into the snowpack, and the sample was extracted. Along with

11 the sample, the depth of the snowpack was also obtained. The sampled snow was then either bagged and

12 weighed or was weighed inside the tube using a cradle and balance. The snow sampler used in Canada is

13 different than the tube used in Finland and these differences, as well as any other differences in sampling

14 technique, are described below. ~~The SWE measurements at Weissfluhjoch were done via snow pit density~~

15 ~~samples and depth measurements.~~

16

17 At Caribou Creek, the reference SWE measurements were obtained using an ESC-30 snow tube with a 30 cm^2

18 cutting area. Farnes et al. (1983) and Goodison et al. (1987) show that the ESC-30, when used correctly and in

19 ideal conditions, has a mean measurement error of less than 0.5 % of the true SWE. Errors associated with

20 sampling in less than ideal conditions are discussed later. Bulk density samples at Caribou Creek were taken

21 just inside the response area ~~FOV~~ of the CS725, bagged, and weighed. A 30 cm^2 sample from within the

22 response area~~FOV~~ is assumed to have a negligible impact on future sensor measurements considering the total

23 sensor ~~footprint~~ response area is 80 m^2, but it was filled in with discarded snow when possible. These manual

SWE measurements were made about every two weeks in conjunction with a full 5 point snow course across the Intercomparison Field and into the forest canopy on each side.

At Sodankylä, the reference SWE measurement was made using a Finnish bulk density sampling tube, with a sampling area of 78.54 cm^2, and balance (Kuusisto, 1984) at roughly the same location in the Intercomparison Field every two weeks. Only one sample was measured at a time. During the winter of 2013/2014, the bulk density SWE sample was obtained approximately 12 m from the centre of the CS725 measurement areaFOV and approximately 16 m from the centre of the SSG1000. In 2014/2015, after the CS725 was moved, the manual sampling was done approximately 6 m from the CS725 measurement areaFOV and approximately 25 m from the SSG1000.

An ESC-30 snow tube was used at the Fortress Mountain site. A full snow survey was conducted at the site once per month, transitioning to bi-weekly during the ablation period. Although the actual snow survey course was through the forested area, supplemental measurements were taken in the clearing where the instrumentation is located. The distance between the sensor and the manual measurements was approximately 10 m.

The manual SWE measurements at Weissfluhjoch were performed by-weekly on the SLF study plot using a bulk density Aluminum sampling tube with a sampling area of 70 cm^2 and length of 55 cm. The weight was measured with a cradle and balance (Jonas et al., 2009). made by SLF and derived via bi-weekly snow pit density profiles obtained in the centre of the instrument field. The distance between the sensor and manual snow measurement varied from observation to observation as the location of the snow pit was relocated for each bi-weekly measurement. The average distance was approximately 20 m.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1 cm

2.4 Intercomparisons

The intercomparisons are not completely consistent amongst the four sites because of the different instrumentation and manual methods for measuring reference SWE. At Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch, the sensors can both be compared with the manual SWE measurements made nearby, although the manual measurements are not within the measuring areaFOV of either instrument. The timestamps of both instruments were matched as closely as possible to the manual observation time. Since the CS725 only reports every 6 hours, the measurement output closest to the manual observation time was used for the intercomparison. Since the SSG1000 reports every minute, no time adjustment was necessary. The same procedure was used to compare the CS725 to the SSG1000. No SSG1000 was present at Caribou Creek or Fortress Mountain and no CS725 sensors were installed at Weissfluhjoch.

For the CS725, which outputs a SWE value derived from both the Potassium (K) and Thallium (Tl) counts, the manufacturer suggests that the output with the higher count is generally the most reliable. For Sodankylä, the K/Tl ratio is always greater than 1 (varying from 3.5 to 8.0) indicating that the Potassium counts are greater than the Thallium counts. For Caribou Creek, the ratio varies from 2.8 to 4.0. For Fortress Mountain, the ratio varies from 0.3 to 8.5 but is above 1 approximately 70 % of the time. Therefore, the CS725 analysis is based on the Potassium output although the statistics for Thallium are shown in parenthesisbrackets in Table 1. This will allow us to determine if there were any obvious differences in the statistics related to the output derived from one source or the other.

3 Results

3.1 CS725 vs. manual

The comparison between the CS725 measurements and the manual SWE observations are shown in Fig. 3 with the Potassium output in red circles and the Thallium output in blue triangles. The black line in the figure represents the 1:1 line and the error bars represent the manufacturer's stated sensor accuracy. Figure 4 shows the time series of automated and manual SWE measurements. Figure 5 shows the difference between the CS725 and the manual measurement (red, ~~difference divided by 2 for visualization~~) and the measured air temperature (blue) through the two seasons. The regression analysis coefficients and summary statistics are listed in Table 1. The statistics are provided for each individual season and for the two seasons combined. The statistics for the individual seasons are also refined further to show results for the accumulation period (delineated from the ablation period by the timing of maximum seasonal SWE). This will help to eliminate the effects of snow melt on both the manual measurement and the various potential impacts on the CS725 measurement. These figures and tables are further analyzed for each site in the following subsections.

3.1.1 Sodankylä

Throughout the intercomparison periods at Sodankylä, the CS725 overestimated SWE on average by 30 % (mean relative bias or MRB) as compared to the manual measurements. From Table 1, the regression analysis for the CS725 as compared to manual SWE over the entire season results in a slope (β) of 1.24 for 2013/2014 and 1.06 for 2014/2015. The difference in β between the K and Tl outputs is small. The intercepts (ε) for the entire seasons are 8.77 mm w.e. for 2013/2014 increasing to 26.9 mm w.e. for 2014/2015. This difference might be in part a result of moving the instrument to a new location. The correlation coefficient, r^2, is 0.92 for 2013/2014 and 0.96 for 2014/2015. With the period of ablation eliminated from the analysis, the impact on β and ε are relatively small although the intercept ε decreases almost 9 mm w.e. and 4 mm w.e. for the

1   respective seasons. The accumulation period r^2 increases to 0.97 and 0.99 for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

2   seasons respectively suggesting that more scatter is introduced into the relationship during the ablation

3   period. This is discussed further below.

4

5   Figure 4 (top) shows the time series for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons at Sodankylä. In this

6   figure, the overestimation of the CS725 (red and blue lines) can be seen when compared to manual SWE (black

7   circles). In general, the instrument trends are the same as for the manual measurements with differences

8   between the measurements increasing after the start of the ablation periods and in January 2014 and

9   December 2014. Although it appears from Fig. 5 that the difference between the measurements is simply

10   increasing with time (or SWE amount), we believe that at least part of this increase is a result of melting in the

11   snowpack which occurs during some relatively warm days. In 2013/2014 (Fig. 5, left), a large increase in the

12   difference occurs after the > 0 °C temperatures in mid to late April. In 2014/2015 (Fig. 5, right), there is a

13   moderate increase after some > 0 °C temperatures in March but a much larger jump after the beginning of the

14   ablation period in April.

15

16   3.1.2   Caribou Creek

17   The comparison of the CS725 instrument and the manual SWE measurements made at Caribou Creek are

18   shown in Fig. 3 and summarized in Table 1. As with Sodankylä, the difference between the two sensor outputs

19   (Potassium vs. Thallium) is negligible. Also like Sodankylä, the CS725 at Caribou Creek consistently

20   overestimates total SWE such that the MRB is 35 %. However, the relationships between the instrument and

21   the manual SWE measurements are different than at Sodankylä. At Caribou Creek, the slopes of the regression

22   line, β, are less than 1 for all scenarios in Table 1 with the exception of the accumulation period in 2014/2015.

23   The intercepts (ε) are all larger than seen at Sodankylä, with the accumulation period in 2014/2015 being the

12

1   exception once again. The r^2 values range from 0.90 for the combined (2013/2014 and 2014/2015) data to 0.55

2   for the accumulation period in 2014/2015.

3

4   For both the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons, the time series for Caribou Creek (Fig. 4 middle) shows a rapid

5   increase in SWE in early winter related to heavier, wet snowfall events that most likely began as rain and

6   transitioned to snow. For 2013/2014, the CS725 time series generally follows the trend of the manual SWE

7   measurements with a large deviation developing mid- to late-March with the onset of seasonal ablation. Figure

8   5 (middle) shows the time series of the difference between the CS725 and manual SWE (in red, divided by 2 for

9   visualization purposes) and the temperature time series (blue) for both seasons. In 2013/2014 (Fig. 5 middle

10   left), there is an increase in the difference that occurs in late January. This could be due to a melt period where

11   temperatures at the site exceeded 4 °C preceding the increase in the instrument bias. A much larger jump in

12   the difference occurs mid-March possibly due to significantly higher temperatures (exceeding 10 °C) earlier

13   that month. In 2014/2015 (Fig. 5 right), the deviation between the measurements occurs earlier in the season

14   (mid- to late-January) coinciding with a January snow melt period characterized by above 0 °C air temperatures

15   and high wind speeds (not shown) that resulted in ice layers on top and within the snowpack (which make

16   accurate manual SWE measurements more difficult) and possibly infiltration of melt water into the frozen

17   sandy soil. Differences decrease after snowfall events in February only to increase again after the start of

18   ablation in March.

19

20   In reaction to an observed offset after the 2013/2014 intercomparison season, soil moisture and temperature

21   probes were installed at the Caribou Creek site with the objective of correlating post-calibration, overwinter,

22   and ablation soil moisture changes with sensor offsets. The instruments were installed at three depths: 0 to 5

23   cm (vertically), 5 cm (horizontally) and 20 cm (horizontally). Unfortunately, the probes only measure liquid

24   water (volumetric water content, or VWC)fraction by volume (WFV) so the analysis is mostly limited to when

1 the soil temperatures (also measured by the probe) are above 0 °C when we assume that most of the water in

2 the soil is unfrozen.

3

4 Figure 6 shows the time series of soil moisture near the surface (0 to 5cm) along with the difference between

5 the CS725 and manual measurements (scaled by a factor of 100 for visualization) for the 2014/2015 season.

6 The red markers indicate when the soil temperature at this level is above 0 °C. It is easy to see from the time

7 series when the liquid soil moisture (near the surface) freezes in late fall resulting in a rapid drop in measured

8 VWCWFV. Following the freezing of the near surface layer, which occurs 8 November 2014, the measured soil

9 moisture in this layer remains fairly static until mid-March 2015 when a period of positive air temperatures

10 (Fig. 5 middle right) raises the near surface soil temperatures above freezing, transitioning frozen soil moisture

11 to liquid and allowing for further infiltration of snow melt water into the sandy soil at this site. The near surface

12 (0 to 5 cm) soil temperatures rose above freezing even with snow on the surface. The snowpack was patchy

13 (verified from hourly photos) and shallow, and meltwater was likely percolating through the snow and into the

14 top layers of the soil.

15

16 The freezing of the 0 to 5 cm depths in early November is preceded by rain/snow events in late October that

17 are represented by the large jump in CS725 SWE shown in Fig. 4 (middle right) and confirmed with snow depth

18 measurements (not shown). During the transition from rain to snow and prior to the surface freezing, Fig. 6

19 shows fluctuations in near surface soil moisture (measured by the soil moisture sensor as volumetric water

20 content or VWC) related to the precipitation events in late October and early November. The Considering that

21 the soil moisture calibration of the CS725 sensor was entered as a gravimetric water content (GWC) of 0.10

22 (gravimetric water content or GWC), which can be converted to VWC by multiplying by the specific gravity of

23 the soil (Lambe and Whitman, 1969). The specific gravity of the loose sand near the surface at Caribou Creek

24 was estimated to be 1.4 based on nearby measurements taken during the BOREAS campaign (Anderson, 2000).

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

14

1   ~~t~~The increase in measured ~~VWC~~WFV from the calibration value to 0.18 (GWC of 0.13) prior to freezing has the

2   potential to create a small but potentially perpetuating offset of up to 3 mm w.e. in the CS725 SWE estimates

3   and may explain at least some of the bias shown by the instrument beginning in mid-December.

4

5   In addition to the offset in the CS725 SWE measurements that occurs at the beginning of the season, it was

6   anticipated that the rapid increase in the difference between the CS725 and Manual SWE at the end of January

7   2015 could also be attributed to a change in near surface soil moisture, as this was a time of mid-season snow

8   melt. However, a change in the liquid soil moisture during the melt period could not be detected by the soil

9   moisture sensors so it is unlikely that the increase in the instrument offset can be attributed to infiltration of

10   melt water into the sandy soil. A more plausible explanation are manual measurement errors that could result

11   from attempting to sample a complex ~~snow pack~~snowpack containing ice layers in the pack or at the snow/soil

12   interface. Ice layers would have formed due to mid-season melt and re-freezing. The increase in the difference

13   between the manual measurement and CS725 in mid- to late-March could be a result of snow melt infiltrating

14   into the top layers of the sandy soil as the soil thaws or forming a basal ice layer (Woo et al., 1982; Lilbaek and

15   Pomeroy, 2008) on top of the soil. A corresponding spike in measured soil moisture during early spring snow

16   melt is shown in Fig. 6.

17

18   ### 3.1.3   Fortress Mountain

19   The intercomparison of the CS725 instrument and the manual SWE measurements made at Fortress Mountain

20   are shown in Fig. 3 (bottom) and summarized in Table 1. Unlike the other two sites, the CS725 and manual SWE

21   measurements generally fall on the 1:1 line with no systematic overestimation (MRB < -5 %). This can also be

22   seen in the time series shown in Fig. 4 (bottom). The slope of the regression line is 0.88 with a small decrease

23   to 0.76 when excluding the ablation period. The intercept is 32.4 mm w.e. increasing to 84.4 mm w.e. when

24   excluding the ablation period. The r^2 is comparable to Sodankylä at 0.92 (increasing to 0.94 by excluding the

1 ablation period). It is unfortunate that the sample size is relatively small (n=8) but regardless, the instrument

2 compares quite well to the manual measurements at this site.

3

4 ## 3.2   SSG1000 vs. Manual

5 The regression analysis for the SSG1000 intercomparisons is shown in Fig. 7 with the time series for both

6 seasons shown in Figure 8. The comparison statistics are in Table 2. This analysis, as for the CS725 above, is

7 organized by site.

8

9 ### 3.2.1   Sodankylä

10 The SSG1000 regression analysis with the manual SWE measurements shown in Fig. 7 (top) and summarized in

11 Table 2 has an r^2 for the entire 2014/2015 period of 0.99 but is only 0.84 for the 2013/2014 period. However,

12 the SWE data from the SSG1000 is not available for the ablation period in 2014/2015 due to an instrument

13 malfunction. To have a consistent intercomparison for the two seasons, the ablation period (post maximum

14 SWE) was removed from the 2013/2014 period and the r^2 becomes 0.97, very similar to 2014/2015. Combining

15 the two seasons, the slope of the regression, β, becomes 0.99 with an offset ε of -7.27 mm w.e. with an r^2 of

16 0.88. The MRB for the two seasons combined is -11 %.

17

18 The time series of these data are shown in Fig. 8 (top) for both the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right)

19 seasons. For both seasons, the sensor measurements track quite well with the manual measurements. The

20 outliers that appear in Fig. 7 (top) can also be seen in the 2013/2014 time series (Fig. 8 top left) beginning mid-

21 way through the ablation period. It is unknown if this occurs during the 2014/2015 ablation period because the

22 data are missing due to a sensor failure caused by water damage to the electronics (an issue later remedied by

23 the manufacturer).

24

1   3.2.2   Weissfluhjoch

2   The regression analysis for the SSG1000 and the manual SWE measurements is shown in Fig. 7 (bottom) with

3   the time series in Fig. 8 (bottom). This alpine site has a much deeper ~~snow pack~~snowpack than either Caribou

4   Creek or Sodankylä but comparable to Fortress Mountain, which unfortunately did not have concurrent

5   SSG1000 measurements. The r^2 for both seasons is quite high at 0.97, similar to the accumulation period

6   intercomparison at Sodankylä, but β is less (0.72 and 0.82) and ε is much higher (91.7 and 79.0 mm w.e.) for

7   both seasons (2013/2014 and 2014/2015). The outliers are obvious in Fig. 8 (bottom) when the manual SWE

8   measurements are substantially higher than the sensor measurements. Unlike Sodankylä, these outliers mostly

9   occur before maximum seasonal SWE, which is why we don't break the season down as we do with Sodankylä.

10   They are, however, likely a result of sensor bridging which is discussed more in Section 4. There are also

11   outliers that occur late in the ablation periods, where the sensor substantially overestimates SWE, and these

12   are perhaps due to issues with the manual sampling of a complex (melting or melting/refreezing) ~~snow~~

13   ~~pack~~snowpack. When combining the two seasons, the resulting low MRB of 8% (for combined seasons) is

14   somewhat surprising given the obvious outliers. Perhaps the low combined MRB is a reflection of errors in one

15   season compensating the errors in the other season.

16

17   3.3   CS725 vs. SSG1000

18   The intercomparison with manual measurements for both the CS725 and the SSG1000 are suggesting that the

19   agreements are the most favourable during accumulation rather than during ablation. Figure 7 shows the

20   relationship between the CS725 and the SSG1000 for both seasons at Sodankylä with the 2014/2015 season

21   shown in red circles and the 2013/2014 season shown in blue dots~~circles~~ (changing to blue triangles at the

22   approximate onset of ablation). The relationship for both years appears to be linear up to the time where

23   maximum SWE is reached. At the onset of ablation, the relationship between the instruments (shown by the

24   blue triangles) deviates substantially from linear. This is confirmed by Table 3 which shows a higher r^2 when the

2013/2014 ablation period is not included in the analysis. This analysis could only be completed for the

2013/2014 season since the sensor data is missing for the 2014/2015 ablation period due to malfunction.

3.4   Sensor Reliability

Data quality control metrics for the CS725 sensors at each of the two SPICE sites demonstrated that the instruments performed at a high level of reliability, such that over 95 % of the sensor measurements were usable for intercomparison. No malfunctions were noted and no maintenance was required at any of the sites.

For the SSG1000, data quality control metrics show that the sensors performed reliably during the accumulation periods but malfunctioned at Sodankylä late in the spring of 2014 and again early spring of 2015. At Weissfluhjoch, 99% of the 1-minute data was usable for intercomparison. At Sodankylä, the malfunctions resulted in only 83 % and 67 % of the 1-minute data, for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons respectively, being available for intercomparison. The sensor malfunctions at Sodankylä were determined to be related to water damage to the electronics. Other than this, no other malfunctions were reported or maintenance required during the intercomparison.

The electronics box of the SSG1000 was originally designed to be installed below the instrument on the ground, which has the potential to be flooded during snowmelt. After SPICE, the manufacturer was asked by the Sodankylä site manager to provide longer cables allowing the installment of the electronics box about 0.5 m above the ground. This modification should help prevent water damage to the electronics and therefore resolve the issue.

4 Discussion

The regression analysis between the CS725 and the manual SWE measurements resulted in r^2 values ranging from 0.55 to 0.99, depending on site and season. Combined season r^2 values ranged from 0.90 to 0.92. Although generally lower than the correlations of 0.99 reported for intercomparisons with other instruments by Wright et al. (2011), our correlations are (on averaged by seasone) are similar to the r^2 of 0.83 that they reported for snow tube measurements. The (combined season)average bias shown here, which was between 30% and 35%, is substantially higher than the 18% reported by Choquette et al. (2008). The exception to this is the CS725 at Fortress Mountain which has a mean negative bias less than 5% when compared to the manual measurements. Besides the maximum SWE, the two major differences that Fortress Mountain has from Caribou Creek and Sodankylä are the soil and the topography. Soils at the Fortress Mountain site have higher clay and loam content, overlain with a layer of organics, and generally remain frozen and saturated for the duration of the winter. These, combined with the sloping terrain and faster meltwater runoff via drainage channels, likely minimizes the change in soil moisture during the transition seasons and thereby minimizes potential offsets in the CS725 measurements. Furthermore, the correlations for the CS725 for Caribou Creek are substantially lower than for Sodankylä and Fortress Mountain. This could be for several reasons. The spatial and seasonal variability are quite high at Caribou Creek and the sample size is low. This is especially the case for 2014/2015 where sample size is small due to a shorter and more variable winter where melt and re-freeze occurred several times over the course of the season (Fig. 5 middle right). Melting and re-freezing generally makes the manual SWE measurements more difficult and prone to error, creates basal ice, and results in higher spatial variability. Eliminating the ablation period improved the comparison statistics for 2013/2014 but made the statistics for 2014/2015 much worse due to the reduced sample size. Potential sources of error in the CS725 intercomparison are discussed further in the following sections.

Formatted: Superscript

1   The SSG1000 was quite highly correlated with the manual SWE measurements at both Sodankylä and

2   Weissfluhjoch with r^2 values as high as 0.99 at Sodankylä (when excluding the ablation period) and 0.97 at

3   Weissfluhjoch. However, when the ablation period is included in the intercomparison for 2013/2014 at

4   Sodankylä (it is not present in 2014/2015 at Sodankylä due to sensor malfunction), the r^2 drops to 0.84. The

5   more significant result at Sodankylä is the smaller MRB as compared to the CS725, which is -2% to -15%

6   (depending on the exclusion of ablation). The magnitude of the MRB is similar at Weissfluhjoch but the bias

7   here is a positive 8%. This is surprising considering the many occurrences of negative sensor bias (as seen in

8   Figure 8 bottom) but these negative outliers are balanced by some large (albeit inconspicuous) positive outliers

9   at the end of the ablation periods. The outliers for Sodankylä in Fig. 7 (top) occur during the ablation period in

10 late April to May 2014 but it is difficult to ascertain if the errors are related to the instrument or to the manual

11 measurement. The most likely explanation is that these are related to the occurrence of bridging. Bridging is

12 also suspected as the cause of the pre-ablation outliers at Weissfluhjoch since the sensor seems to agree quite

13 well with the manual measurements up to mid-March and early-April for both seasons. An intercomparison

14 with a collocated snow pillow (not shown here) suggests a similar albeit smaller negative bias during the same

15 period. Errors associated with bridging are discussed further in this section.

16

17 The CS725 and SSG1000 measurements at Sodankylä correlate very well with each other showing correlations

18 as high a 0.99 when excluding the ablation periods. The key result here, as shown in Fig. 9, is the deviation from

19 this linear correlation at the onset of melt in the 2013/2014 season. Although some of this deviation can be

20 blamed on differential melting at the site, we attribute a large portion of the deviation to the different

21 measurement principles of the sensors. At the onset of melt and the ripening of the ~~snow pack~~snowpack,

22 meltwater drains out of the ~~snow pack~~snowpack towards the ground surface. Once reaching the surface, the

23 meltwater can pool and re-freeze (potentially forming a basal layer of ice), runoff from the measurement area,

24 or infiltrate into the soil. Due to the flat measurement area and the sandy soil at Sodankylä, runoff is unlikely;

20

1   therefore the meltwater is either infiltrating into the sandy soil or re-freezing at the surface. Either way, the

2   same meltwater is likely draining through and away from the measurement plate of the SSG1000 and therefore

3   no longer being measured as SWE in the snowpack. However, this meltwater, whether infiltrated into the top

4   layer of the sandy soil or pooling at the surface, is still being registered by the CS725 as SWE. This contributes

5   to the overestimation of SWE by the CS725 as compared to the SSG1000 and to the non-linearity of the

6   intercomparison shown in Fig. 9 after ablation. Also, this meltwater is either difficult or impossible to include in

7   a snow tube sample, increasing the bias between the CS725 and the manual measurements.

8

9   ## 4.1   Sources of error

10   There are several possible sources of error that affect both the automated and manual SWE measurements.

11   They are discussed and analyzed for each instrument/method in this section.

12

13   ### 4.1.1   Soil moisture (CS725)

14   A ~~large~~ potential source of error for the CS725 can arise from a poor pre-snowpack soil moisture calibration or

15   a large post-calibration change in soil moisture prior to the freezing of the ground surface. Overwinter soil

16   moisture changes (Gray et al., 1985) or infiltration of snowmelt water into soils (Gray et al., 2001) could also

17   result in deviation between the manual and CS725 SWE measurements. Since the CS725 calculation of SWE is

18   based on gamma ray counts during wet and dry periods with no snow cover, incorrect measurements or faulty

19   assumptions with respect to the soil moisture calibrations could result in a sensor offset. Furthermore, if soil

20   moisture levels change significantly prior to freeze-up, during winter, or during ablation, then the SWE

21   estimates derived from the sensor are less reliable. The approximate error associated with an inaccurate

22   gravimetric soil moisture calibration, as provided by the manufacturer, is roughly 1_0_ mm w.e. of SWE for _a_ 0.1_0_

23   change in ~~fraction of~~ GWC. Figure 6 shows an increase in soil moisture at Caribou Creek up to a _VWC_~~water~~

24   ~~fraction~~ of 0.18 _(GWC of 0.13)_ prior to freeze-up in the fall of 2014_, an increase of 0.03 GWC and_

21

1   approximately 3 mm w.e. ~~Given that the gravimetric water content soil moisture calibration was~~

2   ~~approximately 0.10 (and assuming that changes in the GWC and WFV are roughly the same),~~ T~~t~~he resulting

3   calibration offset could explain up to 30~~40~~ % of the early season difference between the instrument and the

4   manual measurement ~~jump in SWE~~ shown in Fig. 4 (middle right) ~~and much of the offset between the sensor~~

5   ~~and the manual measurement shown by the first intercomparison point in~~and Fig. 5 (middle right). This

6   calibration issue would then perpetuate through the winter period and grow with any additional infiltration

7   into the soil beneath the snowpack. It is unfortunate that this same soil moisture and soil temperature data

8   are~~is~~ not available for Sodankylä or for the first season at Caribou Creek as this would have provided some

9   verification for the calibration offset.

10

11   From Fig. 6, there appears to be a coinciding jump in the CS725 bias and the jump in soil moisture (due to

12   above freezing soil temperatures and infiltration) in the spring of 2015 at Caribou Creek. Although the bias is

13   not as large as that seen in mid-winter, it is a significant increase of approximately 10 mm w.e. for each of the

14   final two intercomparison points in mid-March and early-April. Much of this 20 mm w.e. increase could be

15   explained by a corresponding increase in soil moisture from 0.18 VWC~~WFV~~ (0.13 GWC; ~~(~~estimated at freeze

16   up)~~ up~~ to 0.45 VWC~~WFV~~ (0.32 GWC; ~~(~~spike at thaw) or approximately 19 mm w.e., assuming that the CS725 is

17   interpreting this near surface soil moisture as SWE.

18

19   ~~Although t~~There is some ambiguity in the soil moisture results because the soil moisture sensors are incapable

20   of measuring moisture content below 0° C and because ,~~this is not the only source of error. However,~~ we think

21   that these soil measurements are useful for explaining at least some of the offsets seen between the sensor

22   and the manual SWE measurements, especially during the transition periods. More work is needed on these

23   linkages before a reliable sensor adjustment can be derived.

24

4.1.2 Ice bridging (SSG1000)

Ice bridging is a known issue affecting SWE measurements that are made by weight, such as snow pillows or the snow scale (e.g. Engeset et al., 2000). Bridging typically occurs when air temperature reaches 0 °C and then cools creating a melt-refreeze crust layer on the snow surface. This layer is very hard and supports the weight of the snow, thus causing an underestimate of measured SWE with further accumulation on the surface.potentially decreasing the weight on the pillow or scale. Probable bridging situations can be seen in Fig. 7 both at Sodankylä and at Weissfluhjoch. At Sodankylä, in December 2013, March 2014 and February-March 2015, the SWE values measured by the SSG1000 do not increase as quickly as the manual measurementsdecrease and are lower than the manual measurements. At the same time, air temperature first goes above 0 °C and then cools to as low as -30 °C creating perfect conditions for ice bridging. At Weissfluhjoch, the cause of potential ice bridging this is not so obvious, but it is difficult to explain the differences between manual and SSG1000 measurements otherwise. The snowpack was homogeneous (verified with terrestrial laser scans) and even though a co-located snow pillow (not shown here) showed some underestimation compared to the manual measurements, the underestimation was much smaller than by the SSG1000. However, snow pillows have been found to be less prone to ice bridging issues due to their larger surface area (Beaumont, 1966; Tollan, 1970). A more comprehensive description of the physical processes that cause measurement errors in SWE pressure sensors can be found in Johnson (2004).

4.1.3 Snow spatial variability

Another potential source of error in this analysis is due to the spatial variability at the intercomparison sites impacting the relative SWE between the sensor and manual measurement locations. At Sodankylä, the maximum distance between the sensors and the manual SWE measurements was 12 m for the CS725 (6 m after the move prior to the 2014/2015 season) and 25 m (16 m in 2013/2014) for the SSG1000. Unfortunately, only one SWE measurement is made at the intercomparison site, but generally the spatial variability is low with

1   snow depth exhibiting a coefficient of variation (COV) under 6 % (with a maximum snow depth of just over 80

2   cm). Therefore, the impact of spatial variability in SWE, even with a 25 m separation, is likely quite small for

3   most of the season. However, both webcam photos and snow depth measurements provide evidence that

4   snow melt rates during ablation vary across the site, largely dependent on exposure. Manual snow depth

5   measurements suggest that spatial differences in the area around the SWE measurements are small and are

6   perhaps as high as 4 cm in mid-April of 2014 and less in mid-April of 2015. These differences obviously account

7   for very little of the late season SWE deviation shown in Fig. 5 (top). This also suggests that the CS725 move

8   prior to the 2014/2015 season had a low impact on sensor bias from one season to the next.

9

10 Caribou Creek, with maximum snow depths of 56 cm and 41 cm for the two consecutive seasons, exhibits a

11 much higher spatial variability. Here, COV is about 15 % (19 %) at peak snow depth but increases to 30 % (90 %)

12 during ablation for 2013/2014 (2014/2015). With a full 5 point snow course performed here, mean SWE

13 maximum is approximately 125 mm w.e. in 2013/2014 and 75 mm w.e. in 2014/2015 with COV very similar to

14 those shown for snow depth. The manual measurement used in the intercomparison is made just inside the

15 measurement area~~footprint~~ of the sensor, approximately 5 m from the centre. Although relatively close, the

16 higher spatial variability could result in a spatial bias, especially during ablation. For example, in 2013/2014, we

17 estimate SWE to increase across the sensor measurement area~~FOV~~ by approximately 10 mm w.e. in late April

18 due to differential melting as a result of exposure. With the manual measurement closer to the lower SWE

19 estimate in the sensor measurement area~~FOV~~, up to 25 % of the difference in SWE between the sensor and the

20 manual measurement (as shown in Fig. 5 middle left) could be explained.

21

22 The spatial variability is not assessed for Fortress Mountain or Weissfluhjoch.

23

24

4.1.4 Experiment design

Some aspects of the design of the SWE intercomparison are less than ideal and often were a result of compromise amongst the overall SPICE objectives, site host resources, and nationally accepted practices. These compromises potentially contribute to some ambiguity of the study results and this commentary could form the basis for recommendations on the design of future SWE sensor intercomparisons.

Ideally, the manual reference at each site should have been identical using the same sampling equipment at a prescribed offset distance from each SWE sensor. Rather, each site host used their nationally accepted method of sampling SWE (as described in Section 2.3). Distances between the manual SWE measurement and the sensor varied from 5 m to 25 m, depending on site, but perhaps more significantly, the variation within the sensor measurement area FOV (especially for the CS725) was not properly assessed. This could certainly have been a factor at Caribou Creek but the intense sampling within the measurement areaFOV of the sensor would have caused too much disturbance and impacted sensor measurements. Also, increased frequency (i.e. weekly) of manual measurements is desirable especially after significant changes in the snow packsnowpack, albeit at the risk of disturbance. In the future, manual observers should pay special attention to the existence of basal ice layers which may have an impact on the overall accuracy of the manual SWE estimate.

Another ideal situation would have been the co-location of both SWE sensor types at each site. This, in combination with soil moisture and temperature sensors within the measurement areaFOV of the CS725 sensors, would have provided additional information for the assessment of sensor bias. Another good addition would be the automated and high frequency measurement of snow depth within the sensor measurement areasfootprints to provide an indicator of snow density and melt rates and perhaps an indicator of snow bridging on the weighing SWE sensors.

25

1 ### 4.1.5 Manual SWE measurements

2 As noted above, the manual SWE measurements differed by site, the exception being Caribou Creek and

3 Fortress Mountain that both used the ESC-30 snow tube and bagged and weighed the sample. We won't

4 comment further on possible bias associated with different samplers (Farnes et al., 1983; Goodison et al.,

5 1987), as these are generally small as compared to the differences in the measurements shown in these

6 results. We do, however, want to address possible errors associated with the manual measurement of a

7 complex ~~snow pack~~snowpack (i.e. a ~~snow pack~~snowpack with ice layers or during melt), especially with a snow

8 tube.

9

10 During the intercomparison, both Caribou Creek and Sodankylä experienced several freeze and thaw cycles

11 over the course of the winter (as seen in Fig. 5 top and middle) but one was especially pronounced at Caribou

12 Creek during mid- to late-January 2015 (Fig. 5 middle right). The result of freeze/thaw is usually a "crusty" ~~snow~~

13 ~~pack~~snowpack with several ice layers. In general, these characteristics make a ~~snow pack~~snowpack difficult to

14 sample with a snow tube as the tube cutters need to cut through multiple ice layers without snow escaping

15 from the bottom of the tube (Powell, 1987; Sturm et al., 2010). It is anticipated that even an expert user will

16 have difficulties obtaining an accurate sample in these conditions, exacerbated even more by the shallow pack

17 found at Caribou Creek in 2014/2015. It is difficult even at the time of the sample to estimate measurement

18 error, but it could easily result in a 5 to 10 % underestimate of SWE. Sturm et al. (2010) reported an average

19 underestimate from a snow tube of 7.1% as compared to layer-integrated snow pit measurements. Although

20 this may explain some of the bias in the CS725 measurements, especially at Caribou Creek, it is countered by

21 the relatively good agreement between the manual and SSG1000 measurements for Sodankylä. However, mid-

22 winter melting could also result in basal ice as the meltwater percolates through the snow and refreezes at the

23 surface (providing that the surface is below 0 °C) or in the top layer of the sandy substrate. Not only would this

24 ice layer be difficult to measure with a snow tube (which is difficult to cut through and often results in an

1 underestimate), the meltwater may drain off of the SSG1000 measurement surface and be underestimated by

2 that measurement as well. This may partially explain the often (but sometimes inconsistent) increase in sensor

3 bias shown by manual SWE measurements following mid-winter freeze/thaw cycles in Fig. 5 (top and middle).

4 Unfortunately, the observer's notes did not indicate when a basal ice layer was observed so much of this is

5 speculation.

6

7 During ablation, measures were taken to sample the ~~snow pack~~snowpack before it ripened but this could not

8 always be accomplished due to travel time to the site (especially for Caribou Creek). Because the sample was

9 bagged and weighed rather than weighed in the tube, a wet sample would experience some errors because of

10 the bagging process (liquid water or sticky snow left in the tube) and result in an ~~small~~ underestimate of SWE

11 (perhaps 5 % as a rough estimate).

12

13 ~~4.2~~1.1 Sensor Reliability

14 ~~Data quality control metrics for the CS725 sensors at each of the two SPICE sites demonstrated that the~~

15 ~~instruments performed at a high level of reliability, such that over 95 % of the sensor measurements were~~

16 ~~usable for intercomparison. No malfunctions were noted and no maintenance was required at any of the sites.~~

17

18 ~~For the SSG1000, data quality control metrics show that the sensors performed reliably during the~~

19 ~~accumulation periods but malfunctioned at Sodankylä late in the spring of 2014 and again early spring of 2015.~~

20 ~~At Weissfluhjoch, 99% of the 1-minute data was usable for intercomparison. At Sodankylä, the malfunctions~~

21 ~~resulted in only 83 % and 67 % of the 1-minute data, for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons respectively,~~

22 ~~being available for intercomparison. The sensor malfunctions at Sodankylä were determined to be related to~~

23 ~~water damage to the electronics. Other than this, no other malfunctions were reported or maintenance~~

24 ~~required during the intercomparison.~~

5   Summary and Conclusions

Two automated SWE sensors were tested at three WMO-SPICE sites (Sodankylä, Weissfluhjoch and Caribou Creek) and at one additional Canadian site (Fortress Mountain) during the WMO-SPICE intercomparison (Northern Hemisphere) winters of 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. Instrument measurements were compared to periodic manual measurements of SWE at the sites and cross referenced with ancillary measurements of air temperature and soil moisture and soil temperature (at Caribou Creek) to try to determine causality for some of the bias seen in the intercomparison. The objective was~~is~~ not necessarily to determine which instrument makes the most accurate measurement, but to inform users of potential measurement issues that may influence their data interpretation.

Intercomparison results for the CS725 show that it overestimates SWE on average by 30 % and 35 % at Sodankylä and Caribou Creek respectively with combined season~~higher~~ correlations (r^2) of 0.92 at Sodankylä ~~(r^2 ranging from 0.92 to 0.99) than~~and 0.90 at Caribou Creek ~~(r^2 ranging from 0.55 to 0.90)~~. Interseasonal variability in both the MRB and the correlations were higher at Caribou Creek, ~~T~~the difference~~s in correlations between the sites can be~~ attributed to smaller sample size~~s~~, higher spatial variability of SWE, and ice layers in the snowpack ~~at Caribou Creek~~. Offsets were generally higher at Caribou Creek which could be indicative of an inaccurate soil moisture calibration of the instrument, a change in soil moisture relative to the calibration prior

28

1   to or after the soil freezing, or sampling errors in the manual SWE measurement due to a more complex

2   snowpack. Correlations at Fortress Mountain are also quite high over the single intercomparison season

3   (r^2=0.924) with a mean negative bias of approximately less than 5 %, which is more comparable to the results

4   of Wright et al. (2011) in similar conditions. At the two sandy SPICE sites, the agreement between the CS725

5   and the manual SWE measurements are generally better prior to the start of seasonal ablation. We believe this

6   occurs largely because of early spring melt percolating through the snow packsnowpack and either forming a

7   basal ice layer or infiltrating into the sandy substrate. Either way, this water is difficult or impossible to

8   measure with a snow tube. However, because this water continues to attenuate the gamma radiation signal

9   detected by the CS725, the sensor still interprets this water as SWE and therefore appears to overestimate as

10 compared to the manual measurements. Seasonal ablation has no significant impact on the agreement at

11 Fortress Mountain due to saturated frozen soils that restrict infiltration and a mild slope that promotes runoff

12 of meltwater from the site.

13

14 The SSG1000 at both Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch, compared quite well to the manual SWE measurements

15 showing mean biases of less than -11 % and 8% at the respective sites. It did, however, experience some

16 technical issues at Sodankylä early in the 2014/2015 snowmelt period which limited the intercomparison for

17 that season. The correlations were quite high with the combined season r^2 ranging from 0.888 at Sodankylä4 to

18 0.969 at Sodankylä and 0.97 at Weissfluhjoch. Many of the outliers in the SSG1000 intercomparisons are most

19 likely due to bridging of the snowpack on the weighing plate but we also have to consider errors related to the

20 manual measurements and other processes going on at the snow-soil-sensor interface (as outlined in Johnson,

21 2004). At Weissfluhjoch, these outlier events occurred prior to maximum seasonal SWE while at Sodankylä they

22 occurred during ablation. Removing the ablation period in the 2013/2014 Sodankylä data resulted in a

23 substantial increase in r^2 from 0.84 to 0.97.

24

Comment [CS1]: To be consistent with the CS725 statements

1   The SSG1000 correlated very well with the CS725 at Sodankylä during the accumulation period. Although the

2   overestimation of SWE by the CS725 is quite apparent when compared against the SSG1000, the accumulation

3   period r^2 was 0.98 and 0.99 for the two respective seasons. Intercomparison of the two sensors clearly shows

4   how the overestimation of SWE by the CS725 increases at the onset of ablation in March/April of the

5   2013/2014 season. Independent of the manual measurements, this indicates that the deviation of the CS725

6   from manual SWE during ablation is most likely instrument related and a result of the CS725 misinterpreting

7   the melt water infiltrated into the sandy soils as SWE.

8

9   When comparing SWE instruments to a manual reference, there are several considerations that must be made

10   that ultimately impact the interpretation of the results. We know that the manual measurements of SWE are

11   not free of error. Experience proves that making a snow tube bulk density sample in a snowpack containing ice

12   layers or during melt is difficult and inherently prone to errors. We also have to consider the spatial variability

13   of the snow that we are sampling as the CS725 (and the SSG1000 to a lesser degree) have a much larger

14   measurement area~~footprint~~ than the manual point sample. Taking this and the technical capabilities of the

15   instruments into consideration, both sensors have high correlations (generally higher than 0.90, Caribou Creek

16   being the exception) with the ~~a relatively good agreement with the~~ manual reference measurements. We have

17   identified that the SSG1000 has had some technical issues during snowmelt but are satisfied that these issues

18   can be overcome with some installation modifications. The SSG1000 may also underestimate SWE on occasion

19   due to bridging so users need to be aware of this potential error. We have identified the potential for the

20   CS725 measurements to be misinterpreted, especially when deployed over sandy soils and during melting

21   conditions. Although more verification work is required on the impact of soil moisture change on the CS725

22   bias, aggregating sub-surface moisture in the SWE estimate could potentially be useful Ffrom a hydrological

23   perspective ~~, perhaps it is more useful to include this sub-surface moisture in the SWE estimate~~ as it ultimately

24   impacts the amount of water available for runoff. Nevertheless, it is ~~is certainly helpful~~recommended to co-

30

locate the CS725 with ancillary measurements of soil moisture, soil temperature, and snow depth to guide the user in interpreting the data~~set~~.

Acknowledgements and Disclaimers

References

Anderson, D. W.: BOREAS TE-01 SSA Soil Lab Data, http://www.daac.ornl.gov, from Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, U.S.A. doi:10.3334/ORNLDAAC/530, 2000.

Barry, R.G.: Observing systems and data sets related to the cryosphere in Canada. A contribution to planning for the Global Climate Observing System, Atmosphere-Ocean, 33, 771–807, 1995.

Barnett, T.P., Adam, J.C., Lettenmaier, D.P.: Potential impacts of a warming climate on water availability in snow dominated regions, Nature, 438(7066), 303–309, 2005.

Bartlett, P.A., MacKay, M.D., Verseghy, D.L.: Modified snow algorithms in the Canadian Land Surface Scheme: Model runs and sensitivity analysis at three boreal forest stands, Atmosphere-Ocean, 44, 207–222, 2006.

Beaumont, R.T.: Mt. Hood pressure pillow snow gage, J. Appl. Meteor., 4, 626–631, 1965.

Beaumont, R.: Snow accumulation, Proc. 34th Western Snow Conference, 3–6, 1966.

Beaumont, R. T.: Evaluation of the Mt. Hood pressure pillow snow gage and application to forecasting avalanche hazard, IASH Publications no. 69, pp. 341-349, 1966.

Brown, R.D., Walker, A.E., Goodison, B.: Seasonal snow cover monitoring in Canada: an assessment of Canadian contributions for global climate monitoring, 57th Eastern Snow Conference Proc. of the 2000 Annual Meeting, Hardy, J. (ed.), Syracuse, NY, USA, 131–141, 2000.

Choquette Y., Lavigne, P., Nadeau, M., Ducharme, P., Martin, J.P., Houdayer, A., Rogoza, J.: GMON, a new sensor for snow water equivalent via gamma monitoring, Proc. of the 2008 International Snow Science Workshop, Whistler, B.C., 2008.

Derksen, C., Walker, A., Goodison, B.: Evaluation of passive microwave snow water equivalent retrievals across the boreal forest/tundra transition of western Canada, Remote Sensing of Environment, 96(3/4), 315-327, 2005.

1 Engeset, R., Sorteberg, H., Udnaes, H.: Snow pillows: Use and verification, Snow engineering 2000:

2 Recent advances and developments – Proceedings of the fourth international conference on snow engineering,

3 Trondheim, Norway, 2000.

4 Farnes, P.F., Goodison, B.E., Peterson, N.R., Richards, R.P.: Metrication of manual snow sampling

5 equipment, Final report Western Snow Conference, Spokane, Washington 106 pp., 1983.

6 Goodison, B.E ,Glynn, J.E. ,Harvey, K.D.,Slater, J.E.: Snow surveying in Canada: A perspective, Canadian

7 Water Resources Journal, 12(2), 27-42, DOI: 10.4296/cwrj1202027, 1987.

8 Goodison, B.E., Walker, A.E.: Canadian development and use of snow cover information from passive

9 microwave satellite data, Passive Microwave Remote Sensing of Land-Atmosphere Interactions, 245–262,

10 Utrecht, The Netherlands, 1995.

11 Gray, D.M., Granger, R.J., Dyck, G.E.: Overwinter soil moisture changes, Transactions of the ASAE, 28(2),

12 443-447, 1985.

13 Gray D.M., Toth, B., Zhao, L., Pomeroy, J.W., Granger, R.J.: Estimating areal snowmelt infiltration into

14 frozen soils, Hydrological Processes 15(16), 3095–3111, 2001.

15 Harding, R. J., Entrasser, N., Escher-Vetter, H., Jenkins, A., Kaser, G., Kuhn, M., Morris, E. M., Tanzer, G.:

16 Energy and mass balance studies in the firn area of the Hintereisferner, Glacier fluctuations and climatic

17 change, 325-341, Springer, The Netherlands, 1989.

18 Johnson, J. B., Gelvin, A., Schaefer, G.: An engineering design study of electronic snow water equivalent

19 sensor performance, Proc. 75th Western Snow Conf., 23–30, 2007.

20 Johnson, J. B.: A theory of pressure sensor performance in snow, Hydrol. Process.,18(1), 53–64,

21 doi:10.1002/hyp.1310, 2004.

22 Johnson, J. B., Gelvin, A. B., Duvoy, P., Schaefer, G. L., Poole, G. and Horton, G. D.: Performance

23 characteristics of a new electronic snow water equivalent sensor in different climates, Hydrol. Process., 29(6),

24 1418–1433, doi:10.1002/hyp.10211, 2015.

Jonas, T., Marty, C. and Magnusson, J.: Estimating the snow water equivalent from snow depth measurements in the Swiss Alps, Journal of Hydrology, 378(1–2), 161–167, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.09.021, 2009.

Kinar N.J., Pomeroy, J.W.: Determining snow water equivalent by acoustic sounding, Hydrological Processes, 21(19), 2623–2640, 2007.

Kinar, N.J., Pomeroy, J. W.: SAS2: the system for acoustic sensing of snow, Hydrological Processes, 29(18), 2015a.

Kinar, N.J., Pomeroy, J.W.: Measurements of the physical properties of the snowpack, Reviews of Geophysics, 53(2), 2015b.

Kodama, M., Nakai, K., Kawasaki, S., Wada, M.: An application of cosmic-ray neutron measurements to the determination of the snow-water equivalent, Journal of Hydrology, 41, 85-92, 1979.

Kuusisto, E.: Snow accumulation and snowmelt in Finland, Publications of the Water Research Institute No. 55, National Board of Waters, Helsinki, Finland, 149 pp, 1984.

Lambe. W.T., Whitman, R.V.: Chapter 3: Description of an Assemblage of Particles, Soil Mechanics (First ed.), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 553 pp, 1969.

Laukkanen A.: Short term inflow forecasting in the Nordic power market, Master thesis, Physics and Mathematics, Helsinki University of Technology, Helsinki, 60 pp., 2004.

Lilbaek, G., Pomeroy, J.W.: Ion enrichment of snowmelt runoff water caused by basal ice formation, Hydrological Processes, 22, 2758-2766, 2008.

Martin, J.P., Houdayer, A., Lebel,C., Choquette, Y., Lavigne, P., Ducharme, P.-: An unattended gamma monitor for the determination of snow water equivalent (SWE) using the natural ground gamma radiation, 2008 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record, 983-988, 2008.

Nitu, R., Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Lanzinger, E., Joe, P., Yang, D., Smith, C., Roulet, Y., Goodison, B., Liang, H., Sabatini, F., Kochendorfer, J., Wolff, M., Hendrikx, J., Vuerich, E., Lanza, L., Aulamo, O., and V. Vuglinsky:

34

1 WMO intercomparison of instruments and methods for the measurement of solid precipitation and snow on

2 the ground: organization of the experiment, WMO Technical Conference on meteorological and environmental

3 instruments and methods of observations, pages 16–18, Brussels, Belgium, 2012.

4 Pomeroy, J.W., Gray, D.M.: Snowcover accumulation, relocation, and management, National Hydrology

5 Research Institute Science Report No. 7, National Water Research Institute, Saskatoon, Canada, 1995.

6 Powell, D.: Observations on consistency and reliability of field data in snow survey measurements, paper

7 presented at 55th Annual Meeting Western Snow Conference, Vancouver, B. C., 1987, 69‑77, 1987.

8 Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Kochendorfer, J., Meyers, T., Landolt, S., Fischer A.P., Black, J., Thériault, J.M.,

9 Kucera, P., Gochis, D., Smith, C., Nitu, R., Hall, M., Ikeda, K., and Gutmann, E.: How well are we measuring

10 snow: The NOAA/FAA/NCAR winter precipitation test bed, Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 93, 811–829, 2012.

11 Serreze, M.C., Clark, M.P., Armstrong, R.L., McGinnis, D.A. and Pulwarty, R.S.: Characteristics of the

12 western United States snowpack from snowpack telemetry (SNOTEL) data, Water Resources Research, 35(7),

13 2145-2160, 1999.

14 Stranden, H.B., Grønsten, H.A.: Filefjell Snow Research Station, Evaluation of recorded data for snow

15 seasons 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 (English Summary), Norwegian water resources- and energy directorate,

16 report no. 23/2011, 27 pp., 2011.

17 Sturm, M., Taras, B., Liston, G. E., Derksen, C., Jonas, T. and Lea, J.: Estimating Snow Water Equivalent

18 Using Snow Depth Data and Climate Classes, J. Hydrometeor, 11(6), 1380–1394, doi:10.1175/2010JHM1202.1,

19 2010.

20 Takala, M., Luojus, K., Pulliainen, J., Derksen, C., Lemmetyinen, J., Kärnä, J-P., Koskinen, J.: Estimating

21 northern hemisphere snow water equivalent for climate research through assimilation of space-borne

22 radiometer data and ground-based measurements, Remote Sensing of Environment, 115, 3517–3529, 2011.

23 Tollan, A.: Experiences with snow pillows in Norway, Bulletin of International Association of Scientific

24 Hydrology, 15:2, pp. 113-120, 1970.

1   Woo, M., Heron, R., Marsh, P.: Basal ice in high Arctic snowpacks, Arctic and Alpine Research, 14(3),

2   251-260,1982.

3   World Meteorological Organization: Guide to hydrological practices, Volume 1: Hydrology—From

4   measurements to hydrological information, WMO-No. 168, 6th Edition, Geneva, 296 pp, 2008.

5   Wright, M., Kavanaugh, K., Labine, C.: Performance analysis of the GMON3 snow water equivalency

6   sensor, Proc. of The Western Snow Conference, Stateline, NV, 2011.

Tables

Table 1: Regression coefficients and other statistical measures for the multi-season intercomparison of the CS725 with manual SWE at Sodankylä, Caribou Creek and Fortress Mountain (where β and ε are the slope and intercept of the regression line). Values inside and outside of the parenthesis represent Thallium and Potassium output, respectively, from the sensor. "Accumulation" indicates that data occurring after maximum seasonal SWE is omitted from the ~~analysis~~analysis. "Combined" indicates that data from both seasons are included, and n represents the sample size.~~.~~

| Site	Season	β ~~K(Tl)~~	ε ~~K(Tl)~~ mm w.e.	r² ~~K(Tl)~~	RMSE ~~K(Tl)~~ mm w.e.	Mean Relative Bias ~~(%K)~~	n
Sodankylä	2013/2014	1.24(1.27)	8.77(3.17)	0.92(0.92)	43.0(42.2)	30.1~~%~~	17
	2013/2014 (~~Aa~~ccumulation)	1.24(1.28)	0.0123(-6.63)	0.97(0.97)	35.6(33.9)	24.6~~%~~	13
	2014/2015	1.06(1.13)	26.9(24.2)	0.96(0.96)	36.6(42.2)	30.9~~%~~	13
	2014/2015 (~~Aa~~ccumulation)	1.05(1.12)	23.3(20.2)	0.99(0.99)	30.0(35.7)	28.1~~%~~	10
	Combined	1.16(1.21)	16.8(11.9)	0.92(0.92)	40.3(42.2)	30.4~~%~~	30
Caribou Creek	2013/2014	0.783(0.764)	40.6(46.9)	0.78(0.72)	22.8(27.5)	22.2~~%~~	12
	2013/2014 (~~Aa~~ccumulation)	0.982(0.997)	17.7(20.2)	0.79(0.75)	18.0(22.2)	15.4~~%~~	9
	2014/2015	0.849(0.849)	27.1(30.4)	0.77(0.71)	23.6(27.4)	63.0~~%~~	7
	2014/2015 (~~Aa~~ccumulation)	1.12(1.31)	-8.38(-14.5)	0.55(0.60)	25.4(29.5)	42.4~~%~~	4
	Combined	0.904(0.911)	27.5(31.0)	0.90(0.87)	23.1(27.4)	34.6~~%~~	19
Fortress Mountain	2013/2014	0.881	32.4	0.92	48.0	-4.5~~%~~	8
	2013/2014 (~~Aa~~ccumulation)	0.764	84.4	0.94	56.0	-3.6~~%~~	5

1   Table 2: Regression coefficients and other statistical measures for the multi-season intercomparison of the

2   SSG1000 with manual SWE at Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch (where β and ε are the slope and intercept of the

3   regression line). "Combined" indicates that data from both seasons are included and n indicates the sample

4   size.

Site	Season	β	ε mm w.e.	r²	RMSE mm w.e.	Mean Relative Bias %	n
Sodankylä	2013/2014	1.05	-15.5	0.84	24.2	-15.1%	17
	2014/2015	0.92	5.5	0.99	7.9	-2.3%	10
	Combined	0.99	-7.3	0.88	19.8	-10.8%	27
Weissfluhjoch	2013/2014	0.72	91.7	0.97	55.5	4.2	14
	2014/2015	0.82	79.0	0.97	58.6	11.3	17
	Combined	0.79	77.2	0.96	57.2	8.1	31

5

6   Table 3: Regression coefficients and coefficient of determination for the multi-season intercomparison of the

7   CS725 with the SSG1000 SWE measurements at Sodankylä (where β and ε are the slope and intercept of the

8   regression line). "Accumulation" indicates that data occurring after maximum seasonal SWE is omitted from

9   the analysis.

Season	β	ε mm w.e.	r²
2013/2014	1.20	15.7	0.90
2013/2014 (Accumulation)	1.24	4.29	0.98
2014/2015	1.19	11.9	0.99

10

Figures

Figure 1: Location of the CS725 (Sodankylä, Caribou Creek, Fortress Mountain) and SSG1000 (Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch) instrument intercomparisons.

Figure 2: The Campbell Scientific CS725 (left) installed at Caribou Creek and the Sommer Messtechnik SSG1000 (right) installed at Sodankylä.

Figure 3: CS725 vs Manual SWE for Sodankylä (top) and Caribou Creek (middle) for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons and Fortress Mountain (bottom) for the 2013/2014 season. Potassium output in red and Thallium output in blue. Black line is 1:1. Error bars represent manufacturer's stated sensor accuracy.

Figure 4: Time series of the CS725 SWE sensors and manual SWE measurements at Caribou Creek (top), Sodankylä (middle) for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons, and Fortress Mountain (bottom) for the 2013/2014 season.

Figure 4: Time series of the CS725 SWE sensors and manual SWE measurements at Caribou Creek (top), Sodankylä (middle) for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons, and Fortress Mountain (bottom) for the 2013/2014 season.

Figure 5: Time series of air temperature (blue) and difference between CS725 and manual measurements (divided by 2, red) at Sodankylä (top) and Caribou Creek (middle) for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons, and at Fortress Mountain (bottom) for the 2013/2014 season.

1

2

Figure 5: Time series of 1.5 m air temperature (blue, left axis) and difference between CS725 and manual measurements (red, right axis) at Sodankylä (top) and Caribou Creek (middle) for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons, and at Fortress Mountain (bottom) for the 2013/2014 season.

1

Caribou Creek Soil Moisture 2014/2015

Caribou Creek Soil Moisture and CS725 Bias 2014/2015

Figure 56: Time series of near surface (0 to 5 cm) soil moisture (~~water fraction by volume~~volumetric water content, blue) and the difference between the CS725 and manual measurements (dashed line and black boxes) at Caribou Creek for the 2014/2015 season. Red markers show where near surface soil temperatures are above 0°C.

1

2

Figure 67: SSG1000 vs Manual SWE at Sodankylä (top) and Weissfluhjoch (bottom) for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons. Black line is 1:1. Error bars represent manufacturer's stated sensor accuracy.

3

Formatted Table

48

Figure 8: Time series of the SSG1000 SWE sensors and manual SWE measurements at Sodankylä (top) and Weissfluhjoch (bottom) for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons.

1

49

1

Figure 9: CS725 vs SSG1000 for the 2013/2014 (blue dots/blue triangles~~magenta~~) and 2014/2015 (red) seasons
at Sodankylä. Black line is 1:1.