

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

Craig D. Smith¹, Anna Kontu², Richard Laffin³, John W. Pomeroy⁴

¹Environment Canada, Saskatoon, S7N 3H5, Canada

²Finnish Meteorological Institute, Sodankylä, FI-99600, Finland

³Campbell Scientific, Edmonton, T5L 4X4, Canada

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

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

Abstract

During the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment (SPICE), automated measurements of snow water equivalent (SWE) were made at the Sodankylä (Finland), Weissfluhjoch (Switzerland) and Caribou Creek (Canada) SPICE sites during the Northern Hemisphere winters of 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. Supplementary intercomparison measurements were made at Fortress Mountain (Kananaskis, Canada) during the 2013/2014 winter. The objectives of this analysis are to compare automated SWE measurements with a reference, comment on their performance, and where possible to make recommendations on how to best use the instruments and interpret their measurements. Sodankylä, Caribou Creek and Fortress Mountain hosted a Campbell Scientific CS725 passive gamma radiation SWE sensor. Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch hosted a Sommer Messtechnik SSG1000 snow scale. The CS725 operating 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 but the CS725 does not differentiate this water from the un-melted snow. This issue can be identified, at
18 least during the spring ablation period, with soil moisture and temperature observations like those measured
19 at Caribou Creek. With a less permeable soil and surface runoff, the increase in the instrument bias during
20 ablation period is not as significant, as shown by the Fortress Mountain intercomparison.

21

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

scales that use a weighing surface and load cell to measure the weight of the overlying snow (Beaumont, 1966; Johnson et al., 2007). Several indirect methods exist to measure SWE that include the use of neutron probes (Harding, 1989) in which a radiation source is placed under the snowpack and the scattering of neutrons through the snow is measured by a detector. Cosmic ray proton probes (Kodama et al., 1979; Rasmussen et al., 2012) work in a similar manner but do not require an active source. The probes described by Kodama et al. are installed under the snow while the system described by Rasmussen et al. (called COSMOS) is installed above the snow. Kinar and Pomeroy (2007; 2015a) outline a method of non-invasive sonic reflectometry through the snowpack to determine snow density, liquid water content, and temperature. Other passive radiation sensors are mounted above the surface and measure the attenuation of naturally emitted radiation from the soil as it passes through the snowpack and then relate this attenuation to SWE content (Choquette et al., 2008; Martin et al., 2008). Each of these instruments and techniques have advantages and disadvantages, which are not discussed here (see Kinar and Pomeroy (2015b) for a more comprehensive description of snow measurement methods and related issues). Rather, this analysis assesses the use and accuracy of two instruments that were tested during the World Meteorological Organization (WMO-Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment (SPICE) (Nitu et al., 2012; Rasmussen et al., 2012), namely the Campbell Scientific CS725 and the Sommer Messtechnik SSG1000 snow scale.

The CS725 (previously known as GMON or GMON3) has been previously field tested by Hydro Québec (Choquette et al., 2008; Martin et al., 2008) as well as by Wright et al. (2011). Results by Choquette et al. (2008) showed an average error of +18 % when comparing to 8 manual snow cores over 3 seasons in Quebec. They obtained a somewhat better agreement with total SWE calculated from density profiles (with an average error of +5 %) but only had 4 samples over 2 seasons. Wright et al. (2011) showed intercomparison results between GMON3 sensors and snow pillows, precipitation gauges, and snow courses at Sunshine Village (Alberta, Canada) and Tony Grove Ranger Station (Utah, USA). Results showed high correlations between the sensor and

(unadjusted) accumulated precipitation (0.99) and between the sensor and snow pillow observations (0.99) but lower correlations (0.83) with snow course observations (during one season at Sunshine Village). The authors question the quality and inherent biases in the snow course samples but do not comment on the sources of error or the proximity of the snow course to the instrument.

Instrument intercomparisons that included the SSG1000 have been limited but some results are reported by Stranden and Grønsten (2014), who showed parallel SWE measurements between snow pillows, snow scales, and manual snow courses. With mitigating circumstances (e.g. snow drifting and scale issues), they concluded that the measurement surface area had an impact on the measurement quality and that the Sommer scale gave “promising results” but that further intercomparison was required.

One of the over-all objectives of the WMO-SPICE project is to assess the performance of automated instrumentation for the measurement of snow, including snow on the ground (SoG). This is accomplished by comparing the tested instruments to an established reference measurement. In total, fifteen countries are participating in the WMO-SPICE project with about 20 intercomparison sites. Of these, 7 countries and 9 intercomparison sites are hosting SoG instrumentation. The instrumentation for WMO-SPICE has either been provided by the instrument manufacturers or by the site hosts. For SoG, 13 different instruments are under test with 9 measuring snow depth and 4 measuring SWE. The CS725 and the SSG1000 SWE instruments examined here were installed at the Sodankylä (Finland), Caribou Creek (Canada) and Weissfluhjoch (Switzerland) intercomparison sites (Fig. 1). To supplement the CS725 data collected for WMO-SPICE, data was added from an additional CS725 instrument installed at the Fortress Mountain ski area in the Kananaskis region of the Canadian Rocky Mountains.

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 60° from centre resulting in a FOV of approximately 80 m² 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 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.

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 m²) 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), respectively.

The SSG1000 snow scales in this analysis were installed in the Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch SPICE sites. The Weissfluhjoch instrument was provided by the ~~Swiss 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 2014/2015 Northern Hemisphere winters. The SSG1000 at Sodankylä was located in the North East quadrant of the SPICE Field, approximately 22 m southeast of the original location of the CS725. At Weissfluhjoch, it is located in the southwest corner of the instrument field.

SWE observations from the instruments were recorded once per minute during the two intercomparison seasons.

2.3 Reference SWE measurements

The reference SWE manual measurements for this intercomparison differed by site. All ~~except Weissfluhjoch~~ were bulk density snow samples made with a snow sampling tube of a known diameter that has one end capable of penetrating and cutting into the snowpack. The tube was inserted into the snowpack down to the surface of the ground and the sample was extracted. Along with the sample, the depth of the snowpack was also obtained. The sampled snow was then either bagged and weighed or was weighed inside the tube using a cradle and balance. The snow sampler used in Canada is different than the tube used in Finland and these differences, as well as any other differences in sampling technique, are described below. ~~The SWE measurements at Weissfluhjoch were done via snow pit density samples and depth measurements.~~

At Caribou Creek, the reference SWE measurements were obtained using an ESC-30 snow tube with a 30 cm² cutting area. Farnes et al. (1983) and Goodison et al. (1987) show that the ESC-30, when used correctly and in ideal conditions, has a mean measurement error of less than 0.5 % of the true SWE. Bulk density samples at Caribou Creek were taken just inside the FOV of the CS725, bagged, and weighed. A 30 cm² sample from within the FOV is assumed to have a negligible impact on future sensor measurements considering the sensor footprint is 80 m², 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 cm², 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 FOV 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 FOV 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 ~~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.

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 FOV 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 brackets 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 (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 TI 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 respective seasons. The accumulation period r^2 increases to 0.97 and 0.99 for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons respectively suggesting that more scatter is introduced into the relationship during the ablation period. This is discussed further below.

Figure 4 (top) shows the time series for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons at Sodankylä. In this figure, the overestimation of the CS725 (red and blue lines) can be seen when compared to manual SWE (black circles). In general, the instrument trends are the same as for the manual measurements with differences between the measurements increasing after the start of the ablation periods and in January 2014 and December 2014. Although it appears from Fig. 5 that the difference between the measurements is simply increasing with time (or SWE amount), we believe that at least part of this increase is a result of melting in the snowpack which occurs during some relatively warm days. In 2013/2014 (Fig. 5, left), a large increase in the difference occurs after the $> 0^\circ\text{C}$ temperatures in mid to late April. In 2014/2015 (Fig. 5, right), there is a

moderate increase after some $> 0^{\circ}\text{C}$ temperatures in March but a much larger jump after the beginning of the ablation period in April.

3.1.2 Caribou Creek

The comparison of the CS725 instrument and the manual SWE measurements made at Caribou Creek are shown in Fig. 3 and summarized in Table 1. As with Sodankylä, the difference between the two sensor outputs (Potassium vs. Thallium) is negligible. Also like Sodankylä, the CS725 at Caribou Creek consistently overestimates total SWE such that the MRB is 35 %. However, the relationships between the instrument and the manual SWE measurements are different than at Sodankylä. At Caribou Creek, the slopes of the regression line, β , are less than 1 for all scenarios in Table 1 with the exception of the accumulation period in 2014/2015. The intercepts (ϵ) are all larger than seen at Sodankylä, with the accumulation period in 2014/2015 being the exception once again. The r^2 values range from 0.90 for the combined (2013/2014 and 2014/2015) data to 0.55 for the accumulation period in 2014/2015.

For both the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons, the time series for Caribou Creek (Fig. 4 middle) shows a rapid increase in SWE in early winter related to heavier, wet snowfall events that most likely began as rain and transitioned to snow. For 2013/2014, the CS725 time series generally follows the trend of the manual SWE measurements with a large deviation developing mid- to late-March with the onset of seasonal ablation. Figure 5 (middle) shows the time series of the difference between the CS725 and manual SWE (in red, divided by 2 for visualization purposes) and the temperature time series (blue) for both seasons. In 2013/2014 (Fig. 5 middle left), there is an increase in the difference that occurs in late January. This could be due to a melt period where temperatures at the site exceeded 4°C preceding the increase in the instrument bias. A much larger jump in the difference occurs mid-March possibly due to significantly higher temperatures (exceeding 10°C) earlier that month. In 2014/2015 (Fig. 5 right), the deviation between the measurements occurs earlier in the season

(mid- to late-January) coinciding with a January snow melt period characterized by above 0 °C air temperatures and high wind speeds (not shown). Differences decrease after snowfall events in February only to increase again after the start of ablation in March.

In reaction to an observed offset after the 2013/2014 intercomparison season, soil moisture and temperature probes were installed at the Caribou Creek site with the objective of correlating post-calibration, overwinter, and ablation soil moisture changes with sensor offsets. The instruments were installed at three depths: 0 to 5 cm (vertically), 5 cm (horizontally) and 20 cm (horizontally). Unfortunately, the probes only measure liquid water fraction by volume (WFV) so the analysis is mostly limited to when the soil temperatures (also measured by the probe) are above 0 °C when we assume that most of the water in the soil is unfrozen.

Figure 6 shows the time series of soil moisture near the surface (0 to 5cm) along with the difference between the CS725 and manual measurements (scaled by a factor of 100 for visualization) for the 2014/2015 season. The red markers indicate when the soil temperature at this level is above 0 °C. It is easy to see from the time series when the liquid soil moisture (near the surface) freezes in late fall resulting in a rapid drop in measured WFV. Following the freezing of the near surface layer, which occurs 8 November 2014, the measured soil moisture in this layer remains fairly static until mid-March 2015 when a period of positive air temperatures (Fig. 5 middle right) raises the near surface soil temperatures above freezing, transitioning frozen soil moisture to liquid and allowing for infiltration of snow melt water into the sandy soil at this site.

The freezing of the 0 to 5 cm depths in early November is preceded by rain/snow events in late October that are represented by the large jump in CS725 SWE shown in Fig. 4 (middle right) and confirmed with snow depth measurements (not shown). During the transition from rain to snow and prior to the surface freezing, Fig. 6 shows fluctuations in near surface soil moisture related to the precipitation events in late October and early

November. Considering that the soil moisture calibration of the sensor was entered as 0.10 (gravimetric water content or GWC), the increase in measured **WFV** to 0.18 prior to freezing has the potential to create a perpetuating offset in the CS725 SWE estimates and may explain at least some of the bias shown by the instrument beginning in mid-December

In addition to the offset in the CS725 SWE measurements that occurs at the beginning of the season, it was anticipated that the rapid increase in the difference between the CS725 and Manual SWE at the end of January 2015 could also be attributed to a change in near surface soil moisture, as this was a time of mid-season snow melt. However, a change in the liquid soil moisture during the melt period could not be detected by the soil moisture sensors so it is unlikely that the increase in the instrument offset can be attributed to infiltration of melt water into the sandy soil. A more plausible explanation are manual measurement errors that could result from attempting to sample a complex snow pack containing ice layers in the pack or at the snow/soil interface. Ice layers would have formed due to mid-season melt and re-freezing. The increase in the difference between the manual measurement and CS725 in mid- to late-March could be a result of snow melt infiltrating into the top layers of the sandy soil as the soil thaws or forming a basal ice layer (Woo et al., 1982; Lilbaek and Pomeroy, 2008) on top of the soil. A corresponding spike in measured soil moisture during early spring snow melt is shown in Fig. 6.

3.1.3 Fortress Mountain

The intercomparison of the CS725 instrument and the manual SWE measurements made at Fortress Mountain are shown in Fig. 3 (bottom) and summarized in Table 1. **Unlike the other two sites**, the CS725 and manual SWE measurements generally fall on the 1:1 line with no systematic overestimation ($MRB < -5\%$). This can also be seen in the time series shown in Fig. 4 (bottom). The slope of the regression line is 0.88 with a small decrease to 0.76 when excluding the ablation period. The intercept is 32.4 mm w.e. increasing to 84.4 mm w.e. when

1 excluding the ablation period. The r^2 is comparable to Sodankylä at 0.92 (increasing to 0.94 by excluding the
2 ablation period). It is unfortunate that the sample size is relatively small ($n=8$) but regardless, the instrument
3 compares quite well to the manual measurements at this site.

4 5 3.2 SSG1000 vs. Manual

6 The regression analysis for the SSG1000 intercomparisons is shown in Fig. 7 with the time series for both
7 seasons shown in Figure 8. The comparison statistics are in Table 2. This analysis, as for the CS725 above, is
8 organized by site.

9 10 3.2.1 Sodankylä

11 The SSG1000 regression analysis with the manual SWE measurements shown in Fig. 7 (top) and summarized in
12 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,
13 the SWE data from the SSG1000 is not available for the ablation period in 2014/2015 due to an instrument
14 malfunction. To have a consistent intercomparison for the two seasons, the ablation period (post maximum
15 SWE) was removed from the 2013/2014 period and the r^2 becomes 0.97, very similar to 2014/2015. Combining
16 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
17 0.88. The MRB for the two seasons combined is -11 %.

18
19 The time series of these data are shown in Fig. 8 (top) for both the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right)
20 seasons. For both seasons, the sensor measurements track quite well with the manual measurements. The
21 outliers that appear in Fig. 7 (top) can also be seen in the 2013/2014 time series (Fig. 8 top left) beginning mid-
22 way through the ablation period. It is unknown if this occurs during the 2014/2015 ablation period because the
23 data are missing.

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 than either Caribou Creek or
4 Sodankylä but comparable to Fortress Mountain, which unfortunately did not have concurrent SSG1000
5 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 pack.
13 When combining the two seasons, the resulting low MRB of 8% (for combined seasons) is somewhat surprising
14 given the obvious outliers.

15

16 3.3 CS725 vs. SSG1000

17 The intercomparison with manual measurements for both the CS725 and the SSG1000 are suggesting that the
18 agreements are the most favourable during accumulation rather than during ablation. Figure 7 shows the
19 relationship between the CS725 and the SSG1000 for both seasons at Sodankylä with the 2014/2015 season
20 shown in red circles and the 2013/2014 season shown in blue circles (changing to blue triangles at the
21 approximate onset of ablation). The relationship for both years appears to be linear up to the time where
22 maximum SWE is reached. At the onset of ablation, the relationship between the instruments (shown by the
23 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.

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. Although generally lower than the correlations of 0.99 reported for intercomparisons with other instruments by Wright et al. (2011), our correlations are (on average) similar to the r^2 of 0.83 that they reported for snow tube measurements. The 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.

The SSG1000 was quite highly correlated with the manual SWE measurements at both Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch with r^2 values as high as 0.99 at Sodankylä (when excluding the ablation period) and 0.97 at Weissfluhjoch. However, when the ablation period is included in the intercomparison for 2013/2014 at Sodankylä (it is not present in 2014/2015 at Sodankylä due to sensor malfunction), the r^2 drops to 0.84. The more significant result at Sodankylä is the smaller MRB as compared to the CS725, which is -2% to -15% (depending on the exclusion of ablation). The magnitude of the MRB is similar at Weissfluhjoch but the bias here is a positive 8%. This is surprising considering the many occurrences of negative sensor bias (as seen in Figure 8 bottom) but these negative outliers are balanced by some large (albeit inconspicuous) positive outliers at the end of the ablation periods. The outliers for Sodankylä in Fig. 7 (top) occur during the ablation period in late April to May 2014 but it is difficult to ascertain if the errors are related to the instrument or to the manual measurement. The most likely explanation is that these are related to the occurrence of bridging. Bridging is also suspected as the cause of the pre-ablation outliers at Weissfluhjoch since the sensor seems to agree quite well with the manual measurements up to mid-March and early-April for both seasons. An intercomparison with a collocated snow pillow (not shown here) suggests a similar albeit smaller negative bias during the same period. Errors associated with bridging are discussed further in this section.

The CS725 and SSG1000 measurements at Sodankylä correlate very well with each other showing correlations as high as 0.99 when excluding the ablation periods. The key result here, as shown in Fig. 9, is the deviation from this linear correlation at the onset of melt in the 2013/2014 season. Although some of this deviation can be blamed on differential melting at the site, we attribute a large portion of the deviation to the different measurement principles of the sensors. At the onset of melt and the ripening of the snow pack, meltwater

1 drains out of the snow pack towards the ground surface. Once reaching the surface, the meltwater can pool
2 and re-freeze (potentially forming a basal layer of ice), runoff from the measurement area, or infiltrate into the
3 soil. Due to the flat measurement area and the sandy soil at Sodankylä, runoff is unlikely; therefore the
4 meltwater is either infiltrating into the sandy soil or re-freezing at the surface. Either way, the same meltwater
5 is likely draining through and away from the measurement plate of the SSG1000 and therefore no longer being
6 measured as SWE in the snowpack. However, this meltwater, whether infiltrated into the top layer of the sandy
7 soil or pooling at the surface, is still being registered by the CS725 as SWE. This contributes to the
8 overestimation of SWE by the CS725 as compared to the SSG1000 and to the non-linearity of the
9 intercomparison shown in Fig. 9 after ablation. Also, this meltwater is either difficult or impossible to include in
10 a snow tube sample, increasing the bias between the CS725 and the manual measurements.

11

12 4.1 Sources of error

13 There are several possible sources of error that affect both the automated and manual SWE measurements.
14 They are discussed and analyzed for each instrument/method in this section.

15

16 4.1.1 Soil moisture (CS725)

17 A large potential source of error for the CS725 can arise from a poor pre-snowpack soil moisture calibration or
18 a large post-calibration change in soil moisture prior to the freezing of the ground surface. Overwinter soil
19 moisture changes (Gray et al., 1985) or infiltration of snowmelt water into soils (Gray et al., 2001) could also
20 result in deviation between the manual and CS725 SWE measurements. Since the CS725 calculation of SWE is
21 based on gamma ray counts during wet and dry periods with no snow cover, incorrect measurements or faulty
22 assumptions with respect to the soil moisture calibrations could result in a sensor offset. Furthermore, if soil
23 moisture levels change significantly prior to freeze-up, during winter, or during ablation, then the SWE
24 estimates derived from the sensor are less reliable. The approximate error associated with an inaccurate

1 gravimetric soil moisture calibration, as provided by the manufacturer, is roughly 1 mm w.e. of SWE for 0.1
2 fraction of GWC. Figure 6 shows an increase in soil moisture at Caribou Creek up to a water fraction of 0.18
3 prior to freeze up in the fall of 2014. Given that the gravimetric water content soil moisture calibration was
4 approximately 0.10 (and assuming that changes in the GWC and WFV are roughly the same), the resulting
5 calibration offset could explain up to 40 % of the early season jump in SWE shown in Fig. 4 (middle right) and
6 much of the offset between the sensor and the manual measurement shown by the first intercomparison point
7 in Fig. 5 (middle right). This calibration issue would then perpetuate through the winter period. It is
8 unfortunate that this same soil moisture and soil temperature data is not available for Sodankylä or for the first
9 season at Caribou Creek as this would have provided some 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 WFV (estimated at freeze up) up to 0.45 WFV
16 (spike at thaw), assuming that the CS725 is interpreting this near surface soil moisture as SWE.

17
18 Although there is some ambiguity in the results, we think that these soil measurements are useful for
19 explaining at least some of the offsets seen between the sensor and the manual SWE measurements, especially
20 during the transition periods. More work is needed on these linkages before a reliable sensor adjustment can
21 be derived.

1 4.1.2 Ice bridging (SSG1000)

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

16 4.1.3 Snow spatial variability

17 Another potential source of error in this analysis is due to the spatial variability at the intercomparison sites
18 impacting the relative SWE between the sensor and manual measurement locations. At Sodankylä, the
19 maximum distance between the sensors and the manual SWE measurements was 12 m for the CS725 (6 m
20 after the move prior to the 2014/2015 season) and 25 m (16 m in 2013/2014) for the SSG1000. Unfortunately,
21 only one SWE measurement is made at the intercomparison site, but generally the spatial variability is low with
22 snow depth exhibiting a coefficient of variation (COV) under 6 % (with a maximum snow depth of just over 80
23 cm). Therefore, the impact of spatial variability in SWE, even with a 25 m separation, is likely quite small for
24 most of the season. However, both webcam photos and snow depth measurements provide evidence that

snow melt rates during ablation vary across the site, largely dependent on exposure. Manual snow depth measurements suggest that spatial differences in the area around the SWE measurements are small and are perhaps as high as 4 cm in mid-April of 2014 and less in mid-April of 2015. These differences obviously account for very little of the late season SWE deviation shown in Fig. 5 (top). This also suggests that the CS725 move prior to the 2014/2015 season had a low impact on sensor bias from one season to the next.

Caribou Creek, with maximum snow depths of 56 cm and 41 cm for the two consecutive seasons, exhibits a much higher spatial variability. Here, COV is about 15 % (19 %) at peak snow depth but increases to 30 % (90 %) during ablation for 2013/2014 (2014/2015). With a full 5 point snow course performed here, mean SWE maximum is approximately 125 mm w.e. in 2013/2014 and 75 mm w.e. in 2014/2015 with COV very similar to those shown for snow depth. The manual measurement used in the intercomparison is made just inside the footprint of the sensor, approximately 5 m from the centre. Although relatively close, the higher spatial variability could result in a spatial bias, especially during ablation. For example, in 2013/2014, we estimate SWE to increase across the sensor FOV by approximately 10 mm w.e. in late April due to differential melting as a result of exposure. With the manual measurement closer to the lower SWE estimate in the sensor FOV, up to 25 % of the difference in SWE between the sensor and the manual measurement (as shown in Fig. 5 middle left) could be explained.

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

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 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 FOV 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 pack, 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 FOV 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 footprints to provide an indicator of snow density and melt rates and perhaps an indicator of snow bridging on the weighing SWE sensors.

4.1.5 Manual SWE measurements

As noted above, the manual SWE measurements differed by site, the exception being Caribou Creek and Fortress Mountain that both used the ESC-30 snow tube and bagged and weighed the sample. We won't

comment further on possible bias associated with different samplers (Farnes et al., 1983; Goodison et al., 1987), as these are generally small as compared to the differences in the measurements shown in these results. We do, however, want to address possible errors associated with the manual measurement of a complex snow pack (i.e. a snow pack with ice layers or during melt), especially with a snow tube.

During the intercomparison, both Caribou Creek and Sodankylä experienced several freeze and thaw cycles over the course of the winter (as seen in Fig. 5 top and middle) but one was especially pronounced at Caribou Creek during mid- to late-January 2015 (Fig. 5 middle right). The result of freeze/thaw is usually a “crusty” snow pack with several ice layers. In general, these characteristics make a snow pack difficult to sample with a snow tube as the tube cutters need to cut through multiple ice layers without snow escaping from the bottom of the tube (Powell, 1987). It is anticipated that even an expert user will have difficulties obtaining an accurate sample in these conditions, exacerbated even more by the shallow pack found at Caribou Creek in 2014/2015. It is difficult even at the time of the sample to estimate measurement error, but it could easily result in a 5 to 10 % underestimate of SWE. Although this may explain some of the bias in the CS725 measurements, especially at Caribou Creek, it is countered by the relatively good agreement between the manual and SSG1000 measurements for Sodankylä. However, mid-winter melting could also result in basal ice as the meltwater percolates through the snow and refreezes at the surface (providing that the surface is below 0 °C) or in the top layer of the sandy substrate. Not only would this ice layer be difficult to measure with a snow tube (which is difficult to cut through and often results in an underestimate), the meltwater may drain off of the SSG1000 measurement surface and be underestimated by that measurement as well. This may partially explain the often (but sometimes inconsistent) increase in sensor bias shown by manual SWE measurements following mid-winter freeze/thaw cycles in Fig. 5 (top and middle). Unfortunately, the observer’s notes did not indicate when a basal ice layer was observed so much of this is speculation.

During ablation, measures were taken to sample the snow pack before it ripened but this could not always be accomplished due to travel time to the site (especially for Caribou Creek). Because the sample was bagged and weighed rather than weighed in the tube, a wet sample would experience some errors because of the bagging process (liquid water or sticky snow left in the tube) and result in a ~~small~~ underestimate of SWE (perhaps 5 % as a rough estimate).

4.2 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.

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 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 higher correlations at Sodankylä (r^2 ranging from 0.92 to 0.99) than Caribou Creek (r^2 ranging from 0.55 to 0.90). The difference in correlations between the sites can be attributed to smaller sample size, 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 to or after the soil freezing, or sampling errors in the manual SWE measurement due to a more complex snowpack. Correlations at Fortress Mountain are also quite high ($r^2=0.94$) with a mean negative bias of less than 5 %, which is more comparable to the results of Wright et al. (2011) in similar conditions. At the two sandy SPICE sites, the agreement between the CS725 and the manual SWE measurements are generally better prior to the start of seasonal ablation. We believe this occurs largely because of early spring melt percolating through the snow pack and either forming a basal ice layer or infiltrating into the sandy substrate. Either way, this water is difficult or impossible to measure with a snow tube. However, because this water continues to attenuate the gamma radiation signal detected by the CS725, the sensor still interprets this water as SWE and therefore

1 appears to overestimate as compared to the manual measurements. Seasonal ablation has no significant
2 impact on the agreement at Fortress Mountain due to saturated frozen soils that restrict infiltration and a mild
3 slope that promotes runoff of meltwater from the site.

4

5 The SSG1000 at both Sodankylä and Weissfluhjoch, compared quite well to the manual SWE measurements
6 showing mean biases of ~~less than~~ -11 % and 8% at the respective sites. It did, however, experience some
7 technical issues at Sodankylä early in the 2014/2015 snowmelt period which limited the intercomparison for
8 that season. The correlations were quite high with the r^2 ranging from 0.84 to 0.99 at Sodankylä and 0.97 at
9 Weissfluhjoch. Many of the outliers in the SSG1000 intercomparisons are most likely due to bridging of the
10 snowpack on the weighing plate. At Weissfluhjoch, these events occurred prior to maximum seasonal SWE
11 while at Sodankylä they occurred during ablation. Removing the ablation period in the 2013/2014 Sodankylä
12 data resulted in a substantial increase in r^2 from 0.84 to 0.97.

13

14 The SSG1000 correlated very well with the CS725 at Sodankylä during the accumulation period. Although the
15 overestimation of SWE by the CS725 is quite apparent when compared against the SSG1000, the accumulation
16 period r^2 was 0.98 and 0.99 for the two respective seasons. Intercomparison of the two sensors clearly shows
17 how the overestimation of SWE by the CS725 increases at the onset of ablation in March/April of the
18 2013/2014 season. Independent of the manual measurements, this indicates that the deviation of the CS725
19 from manual SWE during ablation is most likely instrument related and a result of the CS725 misinterpreting
20 the melt water infiltrated into the sandy soils as SWE.

21

22 When comparing SWE instruments to a manual reference, there are several considerations that must be made
23 that ultimately impact the interpretation of the results. We know that the manual measurements of SWE are
24 not free of error. Experience proves that making a snow tube bulk density sample in a snowpack containing ice

1 layers or during melt is difficult and inherently prone to errors. We also have to consider the spatial variability
2 of the snow that we are sampling as the CS725 (and the SSG1000 to a lesser degree) have a much larger
3 measurement footprint than the manual point sample. Taking this and the technical capabilities of the
4 instruments into consideration, both sensors have a relatively good agreement with the manual reference
5 measurements. We have identified that the SSG1000 has had some technical issues during snowmelt but are
6 satisfied that these issues can be overcome with some installation modifications. The SSG1000 may also
7 underestimate SWE on occasion due to bridging so users need to be aware of this potential. We have identified
8 the potential for the CS725 measurements to be misinterpreted, especially when deployed over sandy soils and
9 during melting conditions. From a hydrological perspective, perhaps it is more useful to include this sub-
10 surface moisture in the SWE estimate as it ultimately impacts the amount of water available for runoff.
11 Nevertheless, it is certainly helpful to co-locate the CS725 with ancillary measurements of soil moisture, soil
12 temperature, and snow depth to guide the user in interpreting the data set.

13 Acknowledgements and Disclaimers

14 Many of the results presented in this work were obtained as part of the Solid Precipitation Intercomparison
15 Experiment (SPICE) conducted on behalf of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Commission for
16 Instruments and Methods of Observation (CIMO). The analysis and views described herein are those of the
17 authors at this time, and do not necessarily represent the official outcome of WMO-SPICE. Mention of
18 commercial companies or products is solely for the purposes of information and assessment within the scope
19 of the present work, and does not constitute a commercial endorsement of any instrument or instrument
20 manufacturer by the authors or the WMO. We wish to thank the WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche
21 Research SLF for kindly provided the SSG1000 and manual SWE measurements from Weissfluhjoch as well as
22 the countless other contributors to SPICE who helped to make the project a success.

23

1 References

- 2 Barry, R.G.: Observing systems and data sets related to the cryosphere in Canada. A contribution to
3 planning for the Global Climate Observing System, *Atmosphere-Ocean*, 33, 771–807, 1995.
- 4 Barnett, T.P., Adam, J.C., Lettenmaier, D.P.: Potential impacts of a warming climate on water availability
5 in snow dominated regions, *Nature*, 438(7066), 303–309, 2005.
- 6 Bartlett, P.A., MacKay, M.D., Verseghy, D.L.: Modified snow algorithms in the Canadian Land Surface
7 Scheme: Model runs and sensitivity analysis at three boreal forest stands, *Atmosphere-Ocean*, 44, 207–222,
8 2006.
- 9 Beaumont, R.T.: Mt. Hood pressure pillow snow gage, *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 4, 626–631, 1965.
- 10 Beaumont, R.: Snow accumulation, *Proc. 34th Western Snow Conference*, 3–6, 1966.
- 11 Beaumont, R. T.: Evaluation of the Mt. Hood pressure pillow snow gage and application to forecasting
12 avalanche hazard, *IASH Publications no. 69*, pp. 341-349, 1966.
- 13 Brown, R.D., Walker, A.E., Goodison, B.: Seasonal snow cover monitoring in Canada: an assessment of
14 Canadian contributions for global climate monitoring, 57th Eastern Snow Conference *Proc. of the 2000 Annual*
15 *Meeting*, Hardy, J. (ed.), Syracuse, NY, USA, 131–141, 2000.
- 16 Choquette Y., Lavigne, P., Nadeau, M., Ducharme, P., Martin, J.P., Houdayer, A., Rogoza, J.: GMON, a new
17 sensor for snow water equivalent via gamma monitoring, *Proc. of the 2008 International Snow Science*
18 *Workshop*, Whistler, B.C., 2008.
- 19 Derksen, C., Walker, A., Goodison, B.: Evaluation of passive microwave snow water equivalent retrievals
20 across the boreal forest/tundra transition of western Canada, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 96(3/4), 315-
21 327, 2005.
- 22 Engeset, R., Sorteberg, H., Udnaes, H.: Snow pillows: Use and verification, *Snow engineering 2000:*
23 *Recent advances and developments – Proceedings of the fourth international conference on snow engineering*,
24 *Trondheim, Norway*, 2000.

1 Farnes, P.F., Goodison, B.E., Peterson, N.R., Richards, R.P.: Metrication of manual snow sampling
2 equipment, Final report Western Snow Conference, Spokane, Washington 106 pp., 1983.

3 Goodison, B.E., Glynn, J.E., Harvey, K.D., Slater, J.E.: Snow surveying in Canada: A perspective, Canadian
4 Water Resources Journal, 12(2), 27-42, DOI: 10.4296/cwrj1202027, 1987.

5 Goodison, B.E., Walker, A.E.: Canadian development and use of snow cover information from passive
6 microwave satellite data, Passive Microwave Remote Sensing of Land-Atmosphere Interactions, 245–262,
7 Utrecht, The Netherlands, 1995.

8 Gray, D.M., Granger, R.J., Dyck, G.E.: Overwinter soil moisture changes, Transactions of the ASAE, 28(2),
9 443-447, 1985.

10 Gray D.M., Toth, B., Zhao, L., Pomeroy, J.W., Granger, R.J.: Estimating areal snowmelt infiltration into
11 frozen soils, Hydrological Processes 15(16), 3095–3111, 2001.

12 Harding, R. J., Entrasser, N., Escher-Vetter, H., Jenkins, A., Kaser, G., Kuhn, M., Morris, E. M., Tanzer, G.:
13 Energy and mass balance studies in the firn area of the Hintereisferner, Glacier fluctuations and climatic
14 change, 325-341, Springer, The Netherlands, 1989.

15 Johnson, J. B., Gelvin, A., Schaefer, G.: An engineering design study of electronic snow water equivalent
16 sensor performance, Proc. 75th Western Snow Conf., 23–30, 2007.

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

19 Kinar, N.J., Pomeroy, J. W.: SAS2: the system for acoustic sensing of snow, Hydrological Processes,
20 29(18), 2015a.

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

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

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

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

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

7 Martin, J.P., Houdayer, A., Lebel, C., Choquette, Y., Lavigne, P., Ducharme, P. : An unattended gamma
8 monitor for the determination of snow water equivalent (SWE) using the natural ground gamma radiation,
9 2008 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record, 983-988, 2008.

10 Nitu, R., Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Lanzinger, E., Joe, P., Yang, D., Smith, C., Roulet, Y., Goodison, B., Liang,
11 H., Sabatini, F., Kochendorfer, J., Wolff, M., Hendrikx, J., Vuerich, E., Lanza, L., Aulamo, O., and V. Vuglinsky:
12 WMO intercomparison of instruments and methods for the measurement of solid precipitation and snow on
13 the ground: organization of the experiment, WMO Technical Conference on meteorological and environmental
14 instruments and methods of observations, pages 16–18, Brussels, Belgium, 2012.

15 Pomeroy, J.W., Gray, D.M.: Snowcover accumulation, relocation, and management, National Hydrology
16 Research Institute Science Report No. 7, National Water Research Institute, Saskatoon, Canada, 1995.

17 Powell, D.: Observations on consistency and reliability of field data in snow survey measurements, paper
18 presented at 55th Annual Meeting Western Snow Conference, Vancouver, B. C., 1987, 69–77, 1987.

19 Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Kochendorfer, J., Meyers, T., Landolt, S., Fischer A.P., Black, J., Thériault, J.M.,
20 Kucera, P., Gochis, D., Smith, C., Nitu, R., Hall, M., Ikeda, K., and Gutmann, E.: How well are we measuring
21 snow: The NOAA/FAA/NCAR winter precipitation test bed, Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 93, 811–829, 2012.

22 Serreze, M.C., Clark, M.P., Armstrong, R.L., McGinnis, D.A. and Pulwarty, R.S.: Characteristics of the
23 western United States snowpack from snowpack telemetry (SNOTEL) data, Water Resources Research, 35(7),
24 2145-2160, 1999.

1 Stranden, H.B., Grønsten, H.A.: Filefjell Snow Research Station, Evaluation of recorded data for snow
2 seasons 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 (English Summary), Norwegian water resources- and energy directorate,
3 report no. 23/2011, 27 pp., 2011.

4 Takala, M., Luojus, K., Pulliainen, J., Derksen, C., Lemmetyinen, J., Kärnä, J-P., Koskinen, J.: Estimating
5 northern hemisphere snow water equivalent for climate research through assimilation of space-borne
6 radiometer data and ground-based measurements, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 115, 3517–3529, 2011.

7 Tollan, A.: Experiences with snow pillows in Norway, *Bulletin of International Association of Scientific*
8 *Hydrology*, 15:2, pp. 113-120, 1970.

9 Woo, M., Heron, R., Marsh, P.: Basal ice in high Arctic snowpacks, *Arctic and Alpine Research*, 14(3),
10 251-260, 1982.

11 World Meteorological Organization: Guide to hydrological practices, Volume 1: Hydrology—From
12 measurements to hydrological information, WMO-No. 168, 6th Edition, Geneva, 296 pp, 2008.

13 Wright, M., Kavanaugh, K., Labine, C.: Performance analysis of the GMON3 snow water equivalency
14 sensor, *Proc. of The Western Snow Conference*, Stateline, NV, 2011.

1 Tables

2 **Table 1:** Regression coefficients and other statistical measures for the multi-season intercomparison of the
 3 CS725 with manual SWE at Sodankylä, Caribou Creek and Fortress Mountain (where β and ϵ are the slope and
 4 intercept of the regression line). Accumulation indicates that data occurring after maximum seasonal SWE is
 5 omitted from the analysis.

Site	Season	β K(TI)	ϵ K(TI) mm w.e.	r^2 K(TI)	RMSE K(TI) 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 (accumulation)	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 (accumulation)	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 (accumulation)	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 (accumulation)	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 (accumulation)	0.764	84.4	0.94	56.0	-3.6%	5

6

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).


Site	Season	β	ϵ mm w.e.	r^2	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

4
 5 Table 3: Regression coefficients and coefficient of determination for the multi-season intercomparison of the
 6 CS725 with the SSG1000 SWE measurements at Sodankylä (where β and ϵ are the slope and intercept of the
 7 regression line). Accumulation indicates that data occurring after maximum seasonal SWE is omitted from the
 8 analysis.


Season	β	ϵ mm w.e.	r^2
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

9


1 **Figures**




2
3 Figure 1: Location of the CS725 (Sodankylä, Caribou Creek, Fortress Mountain) and SSG1000 (Sodankylä and
4 Weissfluhjoch) instrument intercomparisons.



5
6 Figure 2: The Campbell Scientific CS725 (left) installed at Caribou Creek and the Sommer Messtechnik SSG1000
7 (right) installed at Sodankylä.



1 Figure 3: CS725 vs Manual SWE for Sodankylä (top) and Caribou Creek (middle) for the 2013/2014 and
 2 2014/2015 seasons and Fortress Mountain (bottom) for the 2013/2014 season. Potassium output in red and
 3 Thallium output in blue. Black line is 1:1. Error bars represent manufacturer's stated sensor accuracy.



1 Figure 4: Time series of the CS725 SWE sensors and manual SWE measurements at Caribou Creek (top),
2 Sodankylä (middle) for the 2013/2014 (left) and 2014/2015 (right) seasons, and Fortress Mountain (bottom) for
3 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.




Figure 6: Time series of near surface (0 to 5 cm) soil moisture (water fraction by volume) 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.




Figure 7: 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.





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

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