Response to referees' comments for:

*Future Snow? A Spatial-Probabilistic Assessment of the Extraordinarily Low Snowpacks of 2014 and 2015 in the Oregon Cascades*

Eric A. Sproles, Travis R. Roth, Anne W. Nolin


The authors would like to thank the referees for their time in providing comments and suggestions for this manuscript.

Referees' comments are in normal font.

*Authors' responses are in italics.*

## Referee #1

This paper is an interesting and detailed look, using modeling, at the snow volume in two recent years in a small (3000 km2) river basin in the western Oregon Cascade mountain range. The most interesting finding may be that there was virtually no snow below about 1300m in 2015, yet this finding is buried in the discussion. It should be highlighted in the abstract.


**big picture issues**

Selecting 2014, 2015, and a notional year that is 2 C warmer than a 30-year "normal" presents a muddled message. In some places, 2014 is presented as being exceptional (e.g. page 1 lines 23-24); but in other places, it does not seem so exceptional (e.g. page 7 line 2 and the caption of Figure 3). It is a little puzzling why the EP would be shown (Fig 3) for the +2 C world but not the 30-year normal. I don't know how to un-muddle this message.

*We apologize for any muddled messages and have worked through the text to help clarify any ambiguities. WY 2014 does compare differently. If you simply focus on long-term snowpack in previous years, it was well below normal. However, if you place it in the context of +2ºC conditions, it is slightly above average. This shift to framing the conversation to a warmer world is the premise of the paper.*

*We italicized the text at the end of the methods section to reiterate this point to the reader.*

1. The paper is fairly rife with unsubstantiated assertions. I mention several below.

*Thank you for identifying portions of the text that are unsubstantiated. We have provided some additional analysis that quantifies some of our statements and in other places changed the tone of the commentary.*

2. spatial domain. much of the introduction refers to western US or PNW, and only on page 4 do we learn that the study area is actually a small ( 3000 km2) sub-watershed of the Willamette River Basin, and it is there asserted (without evidence) that the McKenzie River Basin is 'characteristic for maritime snow in the Pacific North-west'.

*Thank you for comment. We have provided some additional analysis that quantifies some of our points and in other places changed the tone of the text. We have also shifted the comparison to the Willamette Basin and away from the PNW (Fig. 1b; page 2, lines 20 – 24).*

3. The abstract should make clear where the study was conducted, and either the attempts to relate this to the PNW should be dropped or some additional analysis should be conducted. I'm not suggesting repeating the full detailed analysis on a wider domain, but the interesting finding that there was essentially no snow below 1300m in 2015 should be easy to check with SNOTEL sites throughout the Cascades (perhaps with a latitude-elevation adjustment).

*We have added that the study area is the McKenzie River basin in the abstract and introduce it contextually in the fourth paragraph of the introduction.*

minutia:

4. word choice: snow volume is variously called snow water storage, snowpack storage, and just snowpack. I suggest picking a single term and using it consistently.

*We have incorporated this suggestion throughout the paper where appropriate. Thank you for the suggestion.*

5. page 2 lines 7-9: assertions about impacts need references.

*Thank you for the suggestion, and we have added references (page 2, lines 7-11).*

6. page 2 line 16 no definition of 'critical' fits this usage - the word is often, as here, misused in place of 'critically important' or just 'important'.

*This suggestion has been incorporated into the revised version.*

7. page 3 lines 2-3 why not? do you have evidence to back up this assertion?

*These lines have been removed from the manuscript.*

8. page 3 lines 11-13 i don't follow the argument here. these deterministic approaches can also be (and have been) used to simulte past and future. the sentence seems to be arguing that "not analogous" is a weakness, but it's not clear why that's a weakness. likewise, the last sentence in the paragraph returns to the notion of limitations but it's not clear why. and in lines 22-23 again, it's not clear whether this assertion is also a criticism of the deterministic approach (i.e. "Only an analog approach…) I suggest retooling the paragraphs on lines 9-29 (and possibly the next paragraph too) to better set up the strengths and weaknesses of deterministic modeling and analog approaches. Or just drop entirely.

*We apologize for any confusion and have retooled this section of the text. (page 3, line 9 through page 4, line 18).*

9. page 3 line 34 - again, not clear whether this paragraph is describing strengths and weaknesses. the first two sentences are about analogs, but are the models referenced on line 34 the standard deterministic distributed models? Given the last 1+ page of the introduction, I was surprised to find that the paper uses a physically based snow hydrology model instead of analogs.

*We apologize for any confusion and have retooled this section of the text in a (hopefully) improved format.*

10.   page 4 lines 13-14: another unsubstantiated assertion.

*Thank you for comment. We have provided some additional analysis that quantifies some of our points and in other places changed the tone of the text. We have also shifted the comparison to the Willamette Basin and away from the PNW (Fig. 1b; page 2, lines 20 – 24).*

11.   Page 4 line 28 "most SWE" clarify "per unit area" if that is what's meant

*This suggestion has been incorporated into the revised version.*

12.   page 4 lines 30-32 these are really valuable and interesting comparisons. Need a source for the reservoir storage statement.

*Completed.*

13.   page 5 line 20-22: just call it a sensitivity test. Mote & Salathé is dated (CMIP3 vs CMIP5; see e.g. Dalton et al., Island Press 2013) and the link to IPCC is dubious, since the number discussed in the 2013 IPCC report was not exactly a "threshold set" and moreover is a global number not regional.

*This paragraph has been restructured, and the reference to Mote and Salathé has been removed (page 6, line 4 -8).*

14.   page 6 lines 3-10 no rationale is given for this re-dimensionalizing. Perhaps if the meaning of "spatial exceedance probability" was clear.

*We have retooled this paragraph (page 6, line 27 to page 7, line 2).*

15.   page 6 lines 4-5 number agreement "dimensions...has" - maybe just delete "the dimen-sions of"

*Completed.*

16. page 7 line 11 - "is greatest" for the +2 C case. Figs 4 and 5 - these are a crucial point of the paper and perhaps its main contribution. can you comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the observing network in this elevation band? is it adequate? is there evidence that these findings apply outside MRB?

*Thank you for this thoughtful insight. We have added some additional text in the introduction and discussion, as well as adding the elevation bands of the SNOTEL monitoring network in figure 4 and 6.*

*We work closely with the National Resource Conservation Service and they do a great job keeping their stations up and running. However their network was designed for different goals and normal than we have today. One of the goals of this type of paper is to push for a retooling of the monitoring network.*

17. page 7 line 19 - what does "subsequent runoff" mean? wouldn't snowfall also produce "subsequent runoff" - just much later? is the subtext that snowmelt contributes more to groundwater recharge than rainfall does?

*Thank you for your comment. We have revised the text and added a bit more context (page 8, lines 16-21 and page 10, lines 8 - 11).*

18. page 7 line 22 "below until an elevation" - perhaps an extra word in here?

*Completed.*

19. page 7 lines 25-26 and possibly elsewhere: "From February-May" an em dash should not stand in for the preposition "to"

*We have incorporated this throughout.*

20. page 7 lines 29-30 - again, make it clear that this is only for the MRB. "the region" should be clarified. Without further analysis outside MRB, it's mere speculation to extend these results to a wider region like the Cascades or the Northwest.

*Thank you for your suggestions. We have added more content and changed the way we reference things geographically in the Discussion.*

21. page 8 line 5 "below normal compared with historical average conditions" - could just say "below historical average conditions" unless normal means something other than historical averages, in which case specify

*We have modified the text.*

Figures

22. Figure 2 - bar charts are a difficult way to present this kind of information, and using cumulative precipitation pegs the y-axis at large values, rendering the monthly values harder to distinguish. I suggest replacing the bar charts with something more intuitive like connected line segments with symbols, and also reporting the N-M and DJF values with monthly means instead of cumulative.

*Thank you for the feedback on the figures. We have modified the upper figure (now Fig 2a) to put the cumulative values on a separate y-axis. Because we shifted the axis, we left the cumulative values instead of monthly means. We left precipitation as a bar chart, as this format is more common with precipitation.*

*For temperature (now Fig. 2b) we shifted from bar charts to connected line segments, and we think it looks much better. Thank you for the input.*

*We have also added a third sub-figure (Fig. 2c), which displays snow water volume.*

23. Figure 3 - add the EP for the normal. Also I'm not a big fan of the format, showing the 2014 and 2015 values as horizontal lines - it's a lot of ink to convey very little informa-tion. I suggest showing just one panel with the EP curves (+0 and +2 C, perhaps for April), and replace the 6 panels with another time series showing the 2014 and 2015 snowpack, and the EP percentiles.

*Thank you for your comments. In presenting this research to water resource managers, this figure really resonates in its current format. For that reason, we have modified the horizontal lines to*

24.    Figures 3, 4, 6 - are these monthly averages or first-of-month?

*We have added text to the figures as well as additional text in the captions. Thanks for pointing this out.*

**Referee #2**

This paper described spatial probabilistic assessment of snowpack of WY 2014 and 2015 in Mckenzie River Basin. Here are my comments on this paper.

1. The results and analysis mainly came from the SnowModel estimates. However, the authors did not provide any detail information of model (inputs, calibration & evaluation statistics). Only authors mentioned, page 5, lines 11-12, "Model forcing data include temperature and precipitation from the SNOTEL network and additional meteorological data as described in Sproles et al. (2013)." I am not sure whether authors used an ex-actly same framework of Sproles et al. (2013) or not. Even though authors did, authors need to provide a concise summary of the model and model performance information. Without the information, the analysis may be lost the confidence of readers.

*Thank you for your comments regarding our paper. We have added more information on the original model regarding the model framework, methods used in the calibration and validation process, and metrics regarding performance (page 5 line 27 to page 6 line 8).*

2. Authors used 20-year periods (WY 1989-2009) to calculate EP with +2C condition. But the authors also presented that, page 5, line 11, "The calibration period for our model was WY2006 through WY2012." Why did authors include the period WY 2010-2012 that did not contain the experimental periods? Also, lines page 5, lines 16-18: is not clear for the reason for selecting the calibration period.

*We have extended the analysis through 2012. Thank you for you the suggestion.*

3. The authors mentioned several times in the manuscript, "extreme low snowpacks of 2013-2014 and 2014-2015." But I am confused - Page 6, lines 25-26: "For N–M in WY 2014, precipitation was at 112% of the 30-year normal and temperatures at SNOTEL stations in the MRB were 0.9 C warmer than normal." - Page 7, lines 1-2: "we see that the April 1 basin-wide snow water storage for WY 2014 corresponds to 40% EP, meaning that WY 2014 snowpack storage is slightly above average for a +2 C model perturbation." Is WY 2014 dry year in MRB?

*We apologize for any ambiguity. The snowpacks of WY 2014 and WY 2015 were well below historical conditions, not because of precipitation but because of warmer temperatures. Temperature drives snowpack evolution and ablation in this region. We have added additional commentary regarding the warmer temperatures throughout the revised manuscript.*

*Additionally we have highlighted the text before the results that 2015 and 2015 are unperturbed, but they will be compared to +2ºC conditions.*

4. As the authors mentioned that EP is generally used to show a probability of a natural hazard event occurring annually. Thus, page 6, lines 1-2, "90% EP describes the statistical likelihood of a measurement that would be met or exceeded in 90% of the time, or a 9 in 10 chance of occurring in any year, and represents a relatively low SWE value." may lead to confusion (e.g., dry season, like WY2015, may happen 90% probability in any years.) I suggest that author may use a new term or a different way of expression to clear over the entire manuscript.

*We have modified the text to include **met or exceeded** for clarity, as this is the definition of exceedance probability.*

5. Only 2/10 pages used to explain methods and results. Authors may more focus on their methods and results. Also, this paper pretended to perform over Pacific Northwest area. Please clearly mention that this is a case study for MBR (3,041km2) in abstract and introduction. Also, I recommended that "2 Research Methods" need to divide into two sections, study area and methods to clear.

*Thank you for your comments. We have modified the text to introduce the McKenzie River basin in the abstract much earlier in the introduction. Additionally we shifted the text form the PNW to the greater Willamette River watershed. We also added a basic analysis of the hypsometry of the McKenzie and the Willamette to support our statements of similarity.*

*The study area paragraph is only one paragraph, and for this reason we kept it in the Methods section.*

6. Fig 2 & page 6, line 28: "30-year" – where is coming from? Authors used 20-year model estimate. But without any description, authors used 30-year average air temper-ature and precipitation dataset for comparison, not 20-year model inputs or estimates.

*Thank you for pointing out any ambiguity. We have added detail in the text (page 7, lines 15 –30) and in the figure captions.*

7. The authors mentioned that page 6, lines 25-26, "For the DJF period, WY 2014 monthly precipitation was 103% of normal and SNOTEL temperatures were 0.7C warmer than normal." In Fig 2., Why WY2014 for DJF is less than 30-year normal? Please check your dataset

*Thank you for pointing out this discrepancy, it has been rectified.*

8. page 7, lines 7-9 – author may need to provide a figure for SWE and precipitation of WY 2014 and 2015 to clear the description.

*We have added a third sub-figure (Fig. 2c), which displays snow water storage for the WY 2014 and 2015. We have also added this figure to the reference to the figure found in the text.*

9. page 7, lines 13-14 – "393 km2 is essentially snow-free (Fig. 4)." Where is "393 km2" coming from?

*We have added clarification (page 8, lines 12-13).*

10. page 7, lines 17-19 – Authors should provide references to support their insistence.

*Thank you for the comment. We have modified the text in the manuscript and page 10, lines 8 - 11), however the Jefferson et al., 2008, and Tague and Grant, 2008 stand as the primary references.*

11. page 7, line 22-23 "This ratio does not exceed 0.20 below until an elevation of 1500 m in WY 2014, which is still markedly lower than the mean SWE:P at the McKenzie SNOTEL site (0.58, 1454 m)." - Why is so much different between your estimates and SNOTEL?

*We have modified the text to improve readability (page 8, lines 23 -30).*

12. page 8, line 1 – "slightly warmer conditions (+1–2C)" – Author already mentioned in the manuscript that 0.9C was increased in N-M for WY2014. Why +1-2C? Please mentioned specifically not an ambiguous word.

*We have modified the text to only reference 2014 to +1ºC conditions (page 9, line 10).*

13. I have more comments, but I stop to review the manuscript. Please keep focusing on your method and results, not the general idea.

*We would like to thank this referee for their time, expertise and insights. The goal of the paper was to compare the low extraordinarily low snowpacks of 2014 and 2014 to conditions that are 2ºC warmer. These goals are specifically highlighted in our introduction:*

> *- How does snow water storage from WY 2014 and WY 2015 compare to snow water storage under +2ºC conditions?*
> *- What is the probability that similar snowpacks and snow water storage will occur in the future?*
> *- How does snow water storage during WY 2014 and WY 2015 vary by elevation?*

*In our methods we describe how we accomplished these analyses. The spatial probability approach is simple and straightforward. This is reflected in the describing the methodology.*

*Snow analogs are more of a concept than a methodology, thus it is in the introduction, discussion, and conclusion.*

*Admittedly, we focus more on Discussion than model Methodology. The goal of the paper is not to re-introduce published models and papers, but rather provide new ways of applying deterministic model results to help better prepare for current climate trends. For that reason our manuscript is focused on the context and the discussion. However we do not dismiss the importance of methodology and results.*

*While we applied model results, this manuscript was not focused on the model itself. Following your suggestions we added additional descriptions to the manuscript regarding the modeling framework, calibration and validation procedure, and performance metrics.*

*The Methods and Results account for 2157 of the 5739 words (37%) in the revised manuscript. The first six paragraphs of the Discussion also o provide context to the results. Additionally the figures present our results in data rich graphics.*

*We understand your concern that a manuscript contains the proper emphasis on methods and results. And we have devoted over 1/3 of the manuscript to meet this goal. Additionally we have addressed your specific comments, and also added content to the manuscript itself.*

# Future Snow? A Spatial-Probabilistic Assessment of the Extraordinarily Low Snowpacks of 2014 and 2015 in the Oregon Cascades

Eric A. Sproles[1,2], Travis R. Roth[2], Anne W. Nolin[2]

[1]Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Zonas Áridas, Universidad de La Serena, Raul Bitran 1305, La Serena, Chile
[2]College of College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences; Oregon State University, 104 CEOAS Admin Bldg, Corvallis, OR, 97331-5503, USA

*Correspondence to*: Eric A. Sproles (eric.sproles@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** In the Pacific Northwest, USA, the extraordinarily low snowpacks of winters 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 stressed regional water resources and the social-environmental system. We introduce two new approaches to better understand how seasonal snow water storage during these two winters would compare to snow water storage under warmer climate conditions. The first approach calculates a spatial-probabilistic metric representing the likelihood that snow water storage of 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 would occur under +2ºC perturbed climate conditions. We computed snow water storage (basin-wide and across elevations), and the ratio of snow water equivalent to cumulative precipitation (across elevations) for the McKenzie River basin (3 041 km[2]), a major tributary to the Willamette River in Oregon, USA. We applied these computations to calculate the occurrence probability for similarly low snow water storage under climate warming. Results suggest that, relative to +2ºC conditions, basin-wide snow water storage during winter 2013–2014 would be above average while that of winter 2014–2015 would be far below average. April 1 snow water storage corresponds to a 40% (2013–2014) and 90% (2014–2015) probability of being met or exceeded in any given year. The second approach introduces the concept of snow analogs to improve the anticipatory capacity of climate change impacts on snow derived water resources. The use of a spatial-probabilistic approach and snow analogs provide new methods of assessing basin-wide snow water storage in a non-stationary climate, and are readily applicable in other snow dominated watersheds.

## 1 Introduction

In the Pacific Northwest (PNW), mountain snowpacks during the winters of 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 were at or near record lows and well below 50% of the historic median value (National Resource Conservation Service, 2014, 2015b). For several decades the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Snowpack Telemetry (SNOTEL) network has provided measurements of snow water equivalent (SWE; the amount of water contained within the snowpack) and meteorological data. These station-based measurements have historically served as a proxy for basin-wide snow storage and provide an effective SWE index for estimating streamflow, however under a shifting climate these statistical relationships have also

1

changed (Montoya et al., 2014). The extreme low snowpacks and subsequent snow water storage of 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 highlight the limitations of location-specific measurements in a shifting climate.

On March 1, 2015, 47% of snow monitoring sites in the Willamette River Basin (WRB, 29 730 km$^2$, Fig. 1) registered zero SWE while snow was still present at higher elevations. The absence of snow during the winter of 2014–2015 stands in contrast to cumulative winter precipitation, which was at 83% of normal (778 mm) for November to February (derived from PRISM data (Daly et al., 2008). While the concurrent drought in California received substantial attention, the economic and environmental impacts in the PNW were also profound. These two extreme low snowpacks in the PNW led to ski area closures, recreation restrictions, municipal water limitations, severe wildfires, low streamflows, nearly dry reservoirs, harmful algal blooms, and high fish mortality (Associated Press, 2015; Bend Bulletin, 2015; Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015; The Oregonian, 2015a; The Oregonian, 2015b). These types of externalities highlight the importance of mountain snow water storage and the implications of snow drought.

Mountain snow water storage in the western Oregon Cascades and across the western United States serves as vital inter-seasonal storage from cool, wet winters with low water demand to hot, dry summers when demand peaks (Oregon Water Supply and Conservation Initiative, 2008; United States Army Corps of Engineers, 2001). The western Oregon Cascades form the eastern boundary of the WRB (Fig.1), and abundant winter precipitation falling in these mountains (up to 3000 mm yr$^{-1}$) sustains the 13th highest streamflow in the conterminous United States (Hulse et al., 2002). Even in such a wet place, snowmelt is critically important. Brooks et al. (2012) estimated that over 60–80% of summer base flow in the Willamette River derives from the snow zone at elevations over 1200 m, though this elevational zone represents only 12% of the land area and 15.6% of the annual precipitation in the basin.

The McKenzie River Basin (MRB, 3 041 km$^2$) is a major tributary to the WRB (Fig. 1), and is located in the main part of the Willamette's "at-risk" snow zone (Nolin and Daly, 2006). Snowmelt in MRB is critical to meeting environmental and societal demands of the WRB, supplying almost 25% of the river's summer discharge at its confluence with the Columbia River near Portland, Oregon (Hulse et al., 2002), despite only occupying 10% of its area. The hypsometry of the MRB and WRB are visually similar (Fig 1b) and statistically similar when tested using a two-parameter Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for sample distribution (Young, 1977).

The maritime snowpacks of the MRB, WRB, and the PNW are deep (>1.5 m), relatively warm (Sturm et al., 1995), and SWE typically reaches its basin-wide maximum on approximately April 1 (Serreze et al., 1999; Stewart et al., 2004). Nolin and Daly (2006) identified snow in the WRB as climatologically "at-risk" since it typically accumulates at close to 0ºC and can convert to rainfall with just a slight increase in temperature. As a result of changes in circulation patterns and warmer temperatures there have been declines in April 1 SWE in the PNW (Barnett et al., 2005; Kapnick and Hall, 2012; Luce and Holden, 2009; Mote, 2006; Mote et al., 2005; Service, 2004; Stoelinga et al., 2010), and peak streamflow has shifted to earlier in the year (Fritze et al., 2011; Stewart, 2009).

These shifts in streamflow highlight the challenges of using location specific measurements of SWE for prediction in changing climate. While SNOTEL sites provide valuable and robust data, they typically occupy a limited elevation range

that leads to an under-sampling of both the high elevation snow zone and the lower elevation rain-snow transition zone (Molotch and Bales, 2006; Montoya et al., 2014; Nolin, 2012). This limited range holds true in the MRB, where the mean elevation is 1424 m and the elevational range between the five stations is only 245 m.

5 Elevational shifts in snowpack accumulation due to observed temperature increases make the past less representative of the future (Dozier, 2011; Milly et al., 2008). Additionally, patterns of snow accumulation and melt in the PNW vary as non-linear functions of elevation, slope, aspect, and landcover (Tennant et al., 2015). Augmenting point-based measurements of SWE with metrics that effectively estimate snow water storage in a mountain landscape would include calculations for normal and extreme years across elevations and at the basin scale—especially under current climate trends (Dozier, 2011).

The dimensionless ratio of SWE to precipitation (SWE:P) represents the proportion of snow water equivalent relative to 10 cumulative precipitation (snowfall plus rainfall) over a specified time interval (Serreze et al., 1999). This ratio normalizes snow water storage by cumulative precipitation, emphasizing the impacts of temperature on snowpack accumulation and melt. When computed for April 1, the time of year when maximum basin-scale SWE is considered to occur, this ratio can be an effective measure of the stages of accumulation and melt (Clow, 2010).

Understanding how relationships between snowpack, precipitation, and temperature will be expressed at the basin scale is 15 particularly important in the maritime PNW. Physically-based modelling studies of climate impacts in the PNW describe reduced snow water storage and earlier streamflow across the region (Elsner et al., 2010; Hamlet, 2011; Sproles et al., 2013). These deterministic approaches provide a range of outputs of past and future conditions. However these approaches stop short of an analog approach that links an individual year from the past, particularly a low snow year, to projected conditions. Climate analogs serve as a useful device to examine potential impacts on societally relevant of predictands (e.g. forest 20 health, environmental flows, municipal water supply), and applies previous conditions to represent potential future conditions (Hallegatte et al., 2007; McLeman and Hunter, 2010; Ramírez-Villegas et al., 2011; Webb et al., 2013). For example, Ramírez-Villegas et al. (2011) developed analogs of climate and agricultural practices to identify prior climatic events that may provide insights into the impacts of future climate change in both time and space.

Incorporating an analog approach allows planners and managers to develop anticipatory capacity, the ability to better 25 anticipate changing scenarios as needs and context change over time (Nelson et al., 2008; Rhodes and Ross, 2009). Using the extreme low snow water storage of 2014-2015 as an example, residents of the Willamette Valley raised concerns regarding the safety and taste of domestic drinking water during the summer months. These changes in water characteristics led public works departments to examine future strategies and equipment to mitigate future water quality concerns (Hall, 2015). From a hydrological perspective, this same analog approach is also used in describing streamflow, and is most commonly framed 30 using statistical metrics. For example, the spatial extent for a previous 100-year flood event serves as an analog of floodplain dynamics and provides anticipatory capacity for land use planners and water managers.

Based on the premise that future snow water storage conditions will resemble previous winters that were warm, Luce et al. (2014) developed spatial and temporal analogs of snow water storage sensitivity to temperature and precipitation across the western United States using point-based SNOTEL data. Similarly, Cooper et al. (2016) applied model-based analyses to

3

compare the winters of 2014 and 2015 to projected future conditions using individual metrics of snowpack (Snow Disappearance Date, Date of Peak SWE, and Duration of Snow Cover) at SNOTEL locations in the Oregon Cascades. This approach is informative, even though point-based analysis in projected warmer conditions may not represent basin-wide conditions (Dozier, 2011; Milly et al., 2008), specifically as the rain-snow transition shifts towards higher elevations (Nolin et al., 2012; Nolin and Daly, 2006).

5

To develop statistically valid analogs for snow water storage and snow water storage at the basin scale requires a spatially explicit, probabilistic approach that calculate the statistical likelihood of SWE across a topographically complex mountain basin. For example, to address the question "What is the likelihood that the snow droughts of WYs 2014 and 2015 will occur in the future?" can be addressed by developing statistical thresholds of SWE and SWE:P with regards to time and location.

10

This spatial-probabilistic approach develops upper or lower limits of predicted snow water storage conditions throughout a watershed. While probabilistic approaches are common to streamflow hydrology, spatial approaches to probabilistic questions are less common. A notable application of a spatial-based, probabilistic approach was developed by Graf (1984). This research applied 107 years of channel migration records to calculate the probability of subsequent erosion in a given parcel, creating a probabilistic map of river movement. The map outlined the character of the river system that identified

15

areas where channel migration was more likely to occur. Margulis et al. (2016) characterized the extreme California snow deficit of 2015, but did not compare this snow drought to potentially warmer climatic conditions. Snow hydrology models can readily incorporate climate change projections (Adam et al., 2009; Sproles et al., 2013) and model outputs can be assessed using a spatial-probabilistic framework that explicitly accounts for elevation.

This research introduces a physically based, spatial-probabilistic modelling framework to compare the extraordinarily low

20

snow winters of WY 2014 and WY 2015 (WY=Water Year, defined as 1 October – 30 September in the western United States) in the context of warmer climatic conditions. Our approach captures the spatial variability of mountain snow water storage under warmer temperatures across decades by simulating the variability of SWE and SWE:P at the basin scale for 23 WYs using +2°C conditions. These outputs are used to frame the snow water storage of WY 2014 and WY 2015 in the context of future snow and snow analogs. This approach is intended to build anticipatory capacity for climate change

25

impacts in the PNW through snow analogs. While limited to the McKenzie River Basin (a well-studied watershed that is characteristic for maritime snow in the WRB (Nolin and Daly, 2006), regional sensitivity to climate warming makes PNW snowpack and snow water storage, and those in similar maritime climates, acutely vulnerable to snow drought (Leibowitz et al., 2014; Nolin and Daly, 2006).

Specifically, we ask:

30

- How does snow water storage from WY 2014 and WY 2015 compare to snow water storage under +2°C conditions?

- What is the probability that similar snowpacks and snow water storage will occur in the future?

- How does snow water storage during WY 2014 and WY 2015 vary by elevation?

4

## 2 Research Methods

Our approach applies a spatial-distributed and physically-based snow hydrology model to compute probabilities of SWE and SWE:P for 23 WYs under +2C winter conditions. We then model WY 2014 and WY 2015 snow water storage, and these outputs to provide probabilistic context for the snow water storage of those two winters. Below we provide details on the study area and specific methods used in this approach.

This study focuses on the McKenzie River Basin. In addition to the MRB being a major tributary to the Willamette River, it has a well-developed network of meteorological stations associated with the HJ Andrews Long Term Ecological Research site, four SNOTEL stations, four dams for flood control and hydropower, serves as the primary source of domestic water for 200 000 people, and is home to federally protected salmonids, amphibians, and mussels. The MRB is characterized by wet winters and dry summers, with average annual precipitation ranging from 1000 mm to 3000 mm that follows the elevation gradient (114–3147 m). Elevations between 1000 and 2000 m comprise 42% of the MRB's total area (Fig. 1a) and 93% of the total snow water storage in the MRB (Sproles et al., 2013). While elevations above 2000 m accumulate the most SWE per unit area, that zone comprises only 1% of total area and 6% of the total snow water storage for the MRB. In terms of volume, snow is the primary seasonal water storage mechanism in the MRB with historic mean basin-wide snow water storage (SWE × area; 1989–2009) of 1.26 km$^3$ on April 1 (Sproles et al., 2013), compared with total reservoir storage of 0.40 km$^3$ (United States Army Corps of Engineers, 2016; United States Department of Agriculture, 2016). By comparison groundwater storage for the MRB was estimated to be roughly 4 km$^3$, with a mean transit time of seven years (Jefferson et al., 2006).

Spatially distributed values of precipitation and SWE were computed using SnowModel (Liston and Elder, 2006a, 2006b) for WY 1989–2012. SnowModel is a spatially distributed, process based model that computes temperature, precipitation, and the full winter season evolution of SWE including accumulation, canopy interception, wind redistribution, sublimation, evaporation, and melt. The model framework applied in this study is the same as applied in Sproles et al. (2013), with the addition of a multi-layer snowpack algorithm. Because the modelling framework is physically-based and spatially distributed, perturbations to temperature inputs will propagate throughout the model including absolute humidity and energy balance calculations, thus maintaining the dependencies between snowpack and temperature. WY 2005 was excluded due to prolonged regional temperature inversions that were not resolved in the model (Sproles et al., 2013).

Model input data were derived from SNOTEL and station data within the study area (six stations in total), nearly spanning the full elevation range of the MRB (Fig. 1; Sproles et al., 2013). The 23-year set of model forcing data includes winters with above average, normal, and below average snowpack; positive, negative, and neutral ENSO climate patterns; and cool and warm phases of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (Brown and Kipfmueller, 2012). The model was run at a daily time step and 100-m grid resolution. In the calibration and validation phase, the model was first calibrated to temperature and precipitation, with mean Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiencies (Legates and McCabe, 1999; Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) of 0.80 and 0.97 respectively, in order to ensure that the model results were representative of these first order inputs. The model was then calibrated for

5

physical snowpack conditions (mean Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency of 0.83 for automated stations, 0.70 for field locations, and an overall spatial accuracy of 82% compared with Landast fSCA data). For a detailed description of the model structure, calibration, validation, and performance please refer to Sproles et al. (2013).

Using the validated model, we increased temperatures by +2ºC and re-ran the model over the same timeframe and spatial domain. Projections for future precipitation in the WRB and the PNW are highly uncertain (Safeeq et al., 2016), and in the Oregon Cascades temperature, not precipitation, dominates the accumulation and melt cycles of snowpack (Sproles, 2012; Sproles et al., 2013). Our delta increase to temperature is intended to be straightforward, and to avoid the uncertainties associated with precipitation in this region.

We extracted SWE and precipitation (P) data, and computed 5-day averages for each centered on the first day of each month for January to June, for every year in the model run, and for each grid cell in the model domain. These 5-day mean values were used to minimize any effects from individual events (melt, snowfall) while still capturing the overall snow water storage characteristics at the beginning of the month.

Exceedance probability (EP) is a widely used hydrologic metric describing the statistical likelihood that a value of a given magnitude or greater will occur in a specified time period (e.g. annually) (Sadovský et al., 2012; Salas and Obeysekera, 2013). Expressed as a percentage, it is calculated as:

$$EP = \left(\frac{m}{n+1}\right) \times 100 \qquad (1)$$

where, $m$ is the rank of the data value (ranked from highest to lowest) and $n$ is the total number of data values (Dingman, 2002).

For example, a low annual exceedance probability, 20% EP is the statistical likelihood that a value could be met or exceeded 20% of the time, or a 1 in 5 chance of occurring or being exceeded in any year. 20% EP represents a relatively large value. A high annual exceedance probability, 90% EP, describes the statistical likelihood of a measurement that would be met or exceeded in 90% of the time, and represents a relatively low value. EP is commonly applied to point-based data such as a stream gage or SNOTEL station. However, because mountain snow water storage varies by elevation, slope, aspect, and landcover (Tennant et al., 2015), we expanded point-based EP calculations to the watershed scale to include normal and extreme years.

To accomplish a spatial perspective of exceedance probability, we applied 23 years of model output to compute the EP for the first of the month (January to June) based upon the 5-day averaged SWE and SWE:P values for each grid cell in the model domain. The dimensions of the model domain is a grid of 759 rows × 1121 columns. In order to sort each grid cell individually across the 23 datasets (years), the two-dimensional data sets (759 rows × 1121 columns) was decomposed into 23 one-dimensional vectors (1 × 850,839) then combined to create a 23 × 850,839 matrix. The location information of each grid cell was retained for subsequent mapping and analysis. For each year, the 23 values in each row were sorted from

6

highest to lowest. The 23 × 850,839 data matrix was recomposed into 23 data matrices of dimension 759 × 1121 creating a corresponding spatial exceedance probability matrix. This was completed for each month (January to June).

To respond to the question "How do snow water storage from WY 2014 and WY 2015 compare to snow water storage under a warmer climate?" we modeled SWE and SWE:P using SnowModel with meteorological forcing data from WY 2014 and WY 2015 for the MRB, with the same stations as from our previously validated model runs. These model runs were also validated using the same methods as described in Sproles et al. (2013). We then compared the snowpack metrics from these two winters with model output from the +2°C climate scenario.

Elevation is the most important physiographic variable in determining SWE in this basin (Nolin, 2012) so we aggregated the data into 50-m elevation bands (Fig.1a). In each of these bands we computed snow water storage (km$^3$) and mean SWE:P (m/m). This allowed us to understand the variation of snowpack properties by elevation, their spatial probability of occurrence, and the statistical context for the extraordinary snowpacks of WY 2014 and WY 2015.

*An important point to bear in mind is that the EP values were computed using perturbed meteorological forcing data (+2°C), while values for WY 2014 and WY 2015 were derived from unperturbed meteorological forcing data.*

## 3 Results

For context, historically in the MRB, 62% of precipitation falls in the November to March (N–M) time period as calculated from monthly precipitation data from 30-year PRISM gridded climate normals (Daly et al., 2008). Within that period, December to February (DJF) are historically the coldest and wettest months (Daly et al., 2008). For N–M in WY 2014, precipitation was at 102% of the 30-year normal (calculated from PRISM data) and temperatures at SNOTEL stations in the MRB were 0.9°C warmer than normal (National Resource Conservation Service, 2015a).  For the DJF period, WY 2014 monthly precipitation was 96% of normal and SNOTEL temperatures were 0.7°C warmer than normal. During WY 2015, N–M precipitation was 81% of the 30-year average but temperatures in the snow zone were 2.7°C warmer than average. For the DJF period of WY 2015, monthly precipitation was 78% of normal and temperatures in the snow zone were 3.3°C warmer than normal (National Resource Conservation Service, 2015a). To provide historical context, Fig. 2 graphically presents the 30-year climate normals from the PRISM datasets for WYs 2014 and 2015 and snowpack simulations. A warmer than normal Jan 2014 limited snowpack accumulation during the early portion of the winter, and wetter than normal conditions in Feb 2014 accompanied by near normal mean temperatures increased basin-wide snow water storage to near average/above average snowpack conditions (as compared to a +2°C perturbation) for the remainder of the season (Fig. 2c). The warmer than normal conditions that persisted throughout WY2015 greatly inhibited seasonal snowpack accumulation, despite above average precipitation in Mar 2015 (Fig. 2c). For a more detailed long-term climate analysis please refer to Abatzoglou et al. (2014).

E Sproles 7/21/16 10:34 AM
**Eliminado:** 0…× 850,839 data matrix was ... [15]

E Sproles 9/26/16 5:08 AM
**Eliminado:** snowpack…now water storage ... [16]

E Sproles 9/22/16 9:37 AM
**Eliminado:** inset chart in …ig.1a). In each ... [17]

E Sproles 9/23/16 9:35 AM
**Con formato:** Fuente: Cursiva

E Sproles 9/21/16 9:45 AM
**Eliminado:** I…n the MRB,…62% of preci ... [18]

**3.1 Snow Water Storage**

In the context of our exceedance probability framework, we see that the April 1 basin-wide snow water storage for WY 2014 falls between the 42 and 46% EP, meaning that WY 2014 snow water storage is slightly above average for a +2ºC model perturbation (Figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5a and c). Snowfall occurring after April 1, 2014 improved late season snow water storage

5 corresponding to 33% and 25% EP for May and June, respectively (Figs. 3 and 4). In WY 2015 basin-wide snow water storage was well below historical conditions, even when compared with +2ºC conditions. April 1 snow water storage for WY 2015 corresponds to 92% EP (Figs. 3, 4, 5b, and 5d). In that year, there was little late spring snowfall, so unlike WY 2014 basin-wide snow water storage did not increase (Fig. 3). WY 2015 was also notable in that peak snow water storage occurred in January and was only 0.21 km$^3$, corresponding to 79% EP (Figs. 3 and 4).

10 Fig. 4 shows the spatial exceedance probabilities for the +2ºC model runs, aggregated into 50-m elevation increments (WY2014, 42% EP; WY2015, 92% EP). For most years, the total amount of April 1 snow water storage is greatest within the elevation range of 1300–1800 m. However in WY 2015 this mid-elevation zone (1300–1800 m), representing 393 km$^2$ (as calculated from the elevation dataset) is essentially snow-free (Fig. 4). Snow water storage in this elevation range is critical for late season runoff, as 1200 m represents the elevation threshold for summer baseflow contributions (Brooks et al.,

15 2012). From a spatial perspective, Fig. 5 presents the distribution of SWE in the MRB in WYs 2014 and 2015 on April 1, as compared to the 46% and 92% EP (as compared to a +2ºC perturbation), respectively. These figures show snow water storage is almost entirely limited to the upper portions of the basin, and that the more spatially extensive mid-elevations where snow accumulates historically are snow free. In other words, in WY 2014 and 2015 the zone where snowmelt has historically contributed most to groundwater recharge (Jefferson et al., 2008; Tague and Grant, 2009), shifted to rain.

20 Jefferson et al. (2008) showed that the recharge signal varies spatially and temporally, and that the location of the rain-snow transition is the dominant control on recharge for at the watershed scale.

**3.2 SWE:P**

This elevation dependent shift from rain to snow is evident in Fig. 6, where at an elevation of 1200 m, SWE:P is below 0.06 for the period January to June in both WY 2014 and 2015. This ratio does not exceed 0.20 until an elevation of 1500 m in

25 WY 2014, which is still markedly lower than the long-term mean SWE:P at the McKenzie SNOTEL site (0.58, 1454 m). In WY 2015 this 0.20 threshold is not reached until an elevation of 1750 m, approximately 300 m above the highest elevation SNOTEL site in the MRB, and thus was not captured in the SNOTEL data. From February to May in WY 2014, SWE:P increases due to late season storms that added snow water storage, and remained above 50% EP when compared with +2ºC conditions. From February to May in WY 2015, SWE:P never surpasses the 0.60 threshold, and remains below 90% EP

30 when compared with +2ºC conditions.

8

## 4 Discussion and Conclusion

The winters of 2014 and 2015 had very low snowpacks across the Pacific Northwest due to higher than normal winter temperatures but average or near-average precipitation (Fig. 2, *National Resource Conservation Service*, 2014, 2015b). Basin-wide mean precipitation was 1382 mm (WY 2014) and 1098 mm (WY 2015) for November to June. In the MRB snow zone mean temperatures (November-March) in WY 2014 were 0.9ºC above the 30-year normal, while WY 2015 were 2.7ºC above normal.

The warm, maritime snowpack of the Oregon Cascades is particularly sensitive to increased temperatures and approximately 51% of "at risk" snow in the PNW is in the Oregon Cascades (Nolin and Daly, 2016). As such, these two winters' extraordinarily low snowpacks offer an analog perspective for projected future snow conditions in the MRB and potentially the Willamette River Basin, with 2014 serving as an analog for slightly warmer conditions (+1ºC) and 2015 as an analog for winter temperatures increasing beyond 3ºC. April 1 snow water storage for 2014 was 470% greater than on the same date 2015. The volumetric difference between the two years (0.56 km$^3$) is 1.4 times more than the total reservoir storage capacity of the MRB (United States Army Corps of Engineers, 2016; United States Department of Agriculture, 2016).

Using spatial exceedance probability we calculate that WY 2014 maximum snow water storage was slightly above average for +2ºC conditions with an EP between 42 and 46%.  By comparison, maximum snow water storage for +2ºC conditions during WY 2015 had an EP of about 92% and would be considered extraordinarily low snow years even for a +2ºC future climate scenario.

These low snow years persisted even under normal and slightly below normal annual precipitation. For N-M, precipitation was 102% (WY2014) and 81% (WY2015) of the 30-year climate normal in the MRB. Instead of using point-based measurements of SWE and P, computing SWE:P for elevation bands across the basin provides a simple yet telling description of precipitation phase (rainfall vs. snowfall) and evolution of snow water storage (accumulation and ablation). The SWE:P metric shows that increased temperature rather than reduced precipitation is the primary reason for the diminished snow water storage of WY 2014 and WY 2015, especially at mid elevations.

For example there is little difference between SWE:P at 1200 m in April 2014 (0.04) and April 2015 (0.01), as this elevation band is almost entirely snow free. However, at 1500 m the April SWE:P values for the two years are considerably different (Fig. 6; 2014 SWE:P = 0.22; 2015 SWE:P = 0.04). For WY2014 SWE:P conditions over 1500 m were slightly below average (60% EP), but increased to more than 40% EP in May and June due to late season storms. In 2015, EP values for SWE:P were at or below 80% throughout the winter, indicating the effect of warm temperatures. During March and April, which are typically the months with highest annual SWE, the EP for SWE:P ratios were 95% EP.

These shifts from rain to snow highlight the limitations of a monitoring network that occupies a limited range. In the MRB the SNOTEL stations occupy a mean elevation of 1424 m with a range of only 245 m. During WY 2014 and 2015, this limited range did not capture zones with maximum snow water volume and were essentially below the rain-snow transition

9

(Figs. 4 and 6). This same under representation of snowpack was found throughout the greater WRB with 47% of snow monitoring sites registering zero SWE while snow was still present at higher elevations on March 1, 2015.

As precipitation shifts from snow to rain, the SWE:P metric can augment individual values of SWE and P to provide key information on shifts in water storage throughout the course of a winter and valuable insights to water resource managers in a non-stationary climate. A low SWE:P ratio in March under normal winter precipitation conditions could indicate peak streamflow has occurred or most likely would occur earlier in the year, which has important implications for water resource management in subsequent months. At more broad timescales the shift from snow to rain at mid-elevations could also potentially impact groundwater recharge. The rain-snow transition is the dominant control on recharge in the MRB, and varies spatially and temporally (Jefferson et al. 2008). Because groundwater storage is large and transit times in the MRB are approximately 7 years (Jefferson et al. 2008), the full impacts of WY2014 and WY2015 on ground and surface water resources are not yet known.

Low snow water storage and shifts in streamflow negatively impact water quantity, water quality, hydropower operations, winter snow sports, and summer recreation. In WY 2015, record low snow water storage led to summer drought declarations, extreme fire danger, and modified hydropower operations in the MRB. The typical consistent flow of the groundwater-fed McKenzie River was at 63% of August-September median flow (United States Geological Survey, 2015). Hoodoo Ski Area, located at Santiam Pass, was open for only a few weekends in WY 2014 and in WY 2015 they suspended operations in mid-January, the shortest season in their 77-year history. In the adjacent Santiam River Basin (north of the MRB), diminished snow water storage and less-than-anticipated spring rains in WY 2015 pushed the Detroit Reservoir (storage capacity 0.35 km$^3$) to historic low levels. In May harmful blue-green algae concentrations were above acceptable amounts by seven-fold, and July reservoir levels were approximately 21-m below capacity. Concerns over the taste and safety of domestic drinking water in the Willamette Valley prompted municipal water managers to explore options for upgrading water treatment facilities.

Water quality, energy production, and recreation externalities are not well represented in deterministic models, but become challenging realities that the public faces in years with low snow. Intervention strategies can fail because they lack adequate information about the impacts of climate change that are not incorporated into deterministic physical models and play out at the human scale (Ramírez-Villegas et al., 2011). Transitioning from purely deterministic approaches (i.e. snow water storage is reduced by a certain percentage) to ones that link climate and snow conditions with real world impacts provide a complementary perspective for mitigation and adaptation. Our analog approach combines projected climate impacts with the extreme low snow years of 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 for insights into improved management in shifting conditions. Such an analog approach allows planners and managers to develop adaptation and mitigation strategies that use the past to demonstrate what did or did not work under climate stress, and help build a more informed understanding of ways to improve future planning efforts (Ramírez-Villegas et al., 2011).

Climate change impacts are often expressed in probabilistic terms (Randall et al., 2007) and so it is logically consistent to estimate snowpacks and snow water storage in this manner. This research does not assume that the probabilities presented

here are based upon a precise representation of future conditions nor that future climates will be +2ºC warmer every winter. We present these results as a way to frame the likelihood of future basin-wide snow water storage in the context of our current understanding of climate change. These probabilistic insights are then used to identify WY 2014 and WY 2015 as analogs years for managers and decision makers. The WY 2014 snow water storage would be slightly above average for +2ºC conditions; and the WY 2015 snow water storage would be very low snow water storage for +2ºC conditions, but not a record low. These analog years thus provide guidance for adaptation strategies to mitigate potential failures of existing management plans.

Our spatially explicit approach augments information from the existing SNOTEL network. While SNOTEL data continue to play a key role for seasonal streamflow forecasting under historic climatic conditions, these statistical relationships have been changing (Montoya et al., 2014). While providing modern scientific equipment, SNOTEL sites in the MRB occupy a limited range (245 m) in the mid-elevations and may not capture basin-wide snow water storage in warmer conditions. For example, in the MRB all SNOTEL sites in the MRB were snow-free for most of February to March 2015 and therefore incapable of providing predictive skill for water resource management. Our basin-scale probabilistic approach provides a more complete picture of water storage and captures the elevation variability absent in point-based measurements.

The winters of WY 2014 and WY 2015 demonstrate a considerable departure from the stationary snow water storage conditions on which present-day management plans are based. With continued current warmer climates, the snow water storage conditions represented by these two winters are more likely to occur. In the meantime, the value of spatially explicit probabilistic calculations rests in the ability to better define the range of statistical outcomes of subsequent winters that are representative of basin-wide conditions. Framing the low snow water storage of WY 2014 and WY 2015 as analogs of future snow provides insights into potential climate impacts and externalities on social and environmental systems. Together, probabilistic metrics and snow water storage analogs can help build capacity to better anticipate hydrologic changes in a warming climate.

11

**Acknowledgements**

5

12

E Sproles 9/27/16 4:09 AM

**Eliminado:** The initial research that supported the development of the snowpack model and spatially-probabilistic approach was provided by National Science Foundation grant #0903118 and further supported by grant #1039192. The data for Figs. 3, 4, and 6 can be downloaded at http://people.oregonstate.edu/~sprolese/snow_frequency/.

**References**

Abatzoglou, J. T., Rupp, D. E. and Mote, P. W.: Seasonal climate variability and change in the Pacific Northwest of the United States, J. Clim., 27(5), 2125–2142, 2014.

Adam, J. C., Hamlet, A. F. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Implications of global climate change for snowmelt hydrology in the twenty-first century, Hydrol. Process., 23(7), 962–972, doi:10.1002/hyp.7201, 2009.

Associated Press: Drought has city near Eugene imposing water restrictions, Washingt. Times, 29th July [online] Available from: http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jul/29/drought-has-city-near-eugene-imposing-water-restri/, 2015.

Barnett, T. P., Adam, J. C. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Potential impacts of a warming climate on water availability in snow-dominated regions, Nature, 438(7066), 303–309, doi:10.1038/nature04141, 2005.

Brooks, J. R., Wigington, P. J., Phillips, D. L., Comeleo, R. and Coulombe, R.: Willamette River Basin surface water isoscape ($\delta$18O and $\delta$2H): temporal changes of source water within the river, Ecosphere, 3(5), art39, doi:10.1890/ES11-00338.1, 2012.

Brown, D. P. and Kipfmueller, K. F.: Pacific Climate Forcing of Multidecadal Springtime Minimum Temperature Variability in the Western United States, Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr., 102(3), 521–530, doi:10.1080/00045608.2011.627052, 2012.

Clow, D. W.: Changes in the timing of snowmelt and streamflow in Colorado: a response to recent warming, J. Clim., 23(9), 2293–2306, 2010.

Cooper, M. G., Nolin, A. W. and Safeeq, M.: Testing the recent snow drought as an analog for climate warming sensitivity of Cascades snowpacks, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(8), 84009 [online] Available from: http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/11/i=8/a=084009, 2016.

Daly, C., Halbleib, M., Smith, J. I., Gibson, W. P., Doggett, M. K., Taylor, G. H., Curtis, J. and Pasteris, P. P.: Physiographically sensitive mapping of climatological temperature and precipitation across the conterminous United States, Int. J. Climatol., 28(15), 2031–2064, 2008.

Dingman, S. L.: Physical hydrology, Book, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, N.J., 2002.

Dozier, J.: Mountain hydrology, snow color, and the fourth paradigm, Eos, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union, 92(43), 373, doi:10.1029/2011EO430001, 2011.

Elsner, M. M., Cuo, L., Voisin, N., Deems, J. S., Hamlet, A. F., Vano, J. A., Mickelson, K. E. B., Lee, S.-Y. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Implications of 21st century climate change for the hydrology of Washington State, Clim. Change, 102(1–2), 225–260, 2010.

Fritze, H., Stewart, I. T. and Pebesma, E.: Shifts in Western North American Snowmelt Runoff Regimes for the Recent

13

Warm Decades, J. Hydrometeorol., 12(5), 989–1006, doi:10.1175/2011jhm1360.1, 2011.

Hall, B.: Something in the water: Complaints about taste trickle in, Corvallis Gazette-Times, 5th August [online] Available from: http://www.gazettetimes.com/news/something-in-the-water-complaints-about-taste-trickle-in/article_c2472c7c-2e32-56be-bb38-11d8ad9ccde7.html, 2015.

5 Hallegatte, S., Hourcade, J.-C. and Ambrosi, P.: Using climate analogues for assessing climate change economic impacts in urban areas, Clim. Change, 82(1–2), 47–60, 2007.

Hamlet, A. F.: Assessing water resources adaptive capacity to climate change impacts in the Pacific Northwest Region of North America, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 15(5), 1427–1443, doi:10.5194/hess-15-1427-2011, 2011.

Hulse, D., Gregory, S., Baker, J. P. and Pacific Northwest Ecosystem Research, C.: Willamette River Basin planning atlas : 10 trajectories of environmental and ecological change, Book, Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR., 2002.

Jefferson, A., Grant, G. and Rose, T.: Influence of volcanic history on groundwater patterns on the west slope of the Oregon High Cascades, Water Resour. Res., 42(12), 2006.

Jefferson, A., Nolin, A., Lewis, S. and Tague, C.: Hydrogeologic controls on streamflow sensitivity to climate variation, Hydrol. Process., 22(22), 4371–4385, doi:10.1002/hyp.7041, 2008.

15 Kapnick, S. and Hall, A.: Causes of recent changes in western North American snowpack, Clim. Dyn., 38(9–10), 1885–1899, 2012.

Legates, D. R. and McCabe, G. J.: Evaluating the use of "goodness-of-fit" measures in hydrologic and hydroclimatic model validation, Water Resour. Res., 35(1), 233–241 [online] Available from: <Go to ISI>://000078123800021, 1999.

Leibowitz, S. G., Comeleo, R. L., Wigington Jr., P. J., Weaver, C. P., Morefield, P. E., Sproles, E. A. and Ebersole, J. L.: 20 Hydrologic landscape classification evaluates streamflow vulnerability to climate change in Oregon, USA, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(9), 3367–3392, doi:10.5194/hess-18-3367-2014, 2014.

Liston, G. E. and Elder, K.: A Distributed Snow-Evolution Modeling System (SnowModel), J. Hydrometeorol., 7(6), 1259–1276 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JHM548.1, 2006a.

Liston, G. E. and Elder, K.: A Meteorological Distribution System for High-Resolution Terrestrial Modeling (MicroMet), J. 25 Hydrometeorol., 7(2), 217–234 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JHM486.1, 2006b.

Luce, C. H. and Holden, Z. A.: Declining annual streamflow distributions in the Pacific Northwest United States, 1948–2006, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36(16), L16401, doi:10.1029/2009gl039407, 2009.

Margulis, S. A., Cortés, G., Girotto, M., Huning, L. S., Li, D. and Durand, M.: Characterizing the extreme 2015 snowpack deficit in the Sierra Nevada (USA) and the implications for drought recovery, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(12), 6341–6349, 2016.

30 McLeman, R. A. and Hunter, L. M.: Migration in the context of vulnerability and adaptation to climate change: insights from

14

analogues, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang., 1(3), 450–461, 2010.

Meunier, A.: Oregon's wildfire season is over for 2015, Forestry Department says, The Oregonian, 25th October [online] Available from: http://www.oregonlive.com/wildfires/index.ssf/2015/10/oregons_wildfire_season_is_ove.html, 2015.

Milly, P. C. D., Betancourt, J., Falkenmark, M., Hirsch, R. M., Kundzewicz, Z. W., Lettenmaier, D. P. and Stouffer, R. J.: Stationarity Is Dead: Whither Water Management?, Science (80-. )., 319(5863), 573–574, doi:10.1126/science.1151915, 2008.

Molotch, N. P. and Bales, R. C.: SNOTEL representativeness in the Rio Grande headwaters on the basis of physiographics and remotely sensed snow cover persistence, Hydrol. Process., 20(4), 723–739, 2006.

Montoya, E. L., Dozier, J. and Meiring, W.: Biases of April 1 snow water equivalent records in the Sierra Nevada and their associations with large‑scale climate indices, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41(16), 5912–5918, 2014.

Morical, M.: Is Hoodoo done? Barely-there snow has Oregon ski areas wondering if season is over, Bend Bull., 11th February, 1 [online] Available from: http://www.bendbulletin.com/outdoors/2854005-151/barely-there, 2015.

Mote, P. W.: Climate-Driven Variability and Trends in Mountain Snowpack in Western North America&#42, J. Clim., 19(23), 6209–6220 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3971.1, 2006.

Mote, P. W., Hamlet, A. F., Clark, M. P. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Declining Mountain Snowpack in Weatern North America, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 86(1), 39–49 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-86-1-39, 2005.

Nash, J. E. and Sutcliffe, J. V: River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I: a discussion of principles, J. Hydrol., 10(3), 282–290 [online] Available from: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022169470902556, 1970.

National Resource Conservation Service: Weekly Snowpack / Drought Monitor Update, Washington, D.C., 2014.

National Resource Conservation Service: NRCS SNOTEL data, edited by United States Department of Agriculture, [online] Available from: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/or/snow/ (Accessed 9 September 2015a), 2015.

National Resource Conservation Service: Weekly Water and Climate Update, Washington, D.C. [online] Available from: http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/ftpref/support/drought/dmrpt-20150326.pdf, 2015b.

Nelson, N., Geltzer, A. and Hilgartner, S.: Introduction: the anticipatory state: making policy-relevant knowledge about the future, Sci. Public Policy , 35(8), 546–550, doi:10.3152/030234208X370648, 2008.

Nolin, A. W.: Perspectives on Climate Change, Mountain Hydrology, and Water Resources in the Oregon Cascades, USA, Mt. Res. Dev., 32(S1), S35–S46, doi:10.1659/mrd-journal-d-11-00038.s1, 2012.

Nolin, A. W. and Daly, C.: Mapping "At Risk" Snow in the Pacific Northwest, J. Hydrometeorol., 7(5), 1164–1171 [online] Available                                                                                                      from:

15

http://proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=22988202&site=ehost-live, 2006.

Nolin, A. W., Sproles, E. A. and Brown, A.: Climate change impacts on snow and water resources in the Columbia, Willamette, and McKenzie River Basins, USA: A nested watershed study. , in Transboundary River Governance in the Face

5 of Uncertainty: The Columbia River Treaty, edited by B. Cosens, Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR., 2012.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife: Higher water temperatures primary cause of early spring Chinook mortality, [online] Available from: http://www.dfw.state.or.us/news/2015/june/061815.asp (Accessed 18 July 2016), 2015.

Oregon Water Supply and Conservation Initiative: Southern Willamette valley municipal water providers final report, Report., 2008.

10 Ramírez-Villegas, J., Lau, C., Kohler, A. K., Jarvis, A., Arnell, N., Osborne, T. and Hooker, J.: Climate analogues: finding tomorrow's agriculture today, CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security, Cali, Colombia., 2011.

Randall, D. A., Wood, R. A., Bony, S., Colman, R., Fichefet, T., Fyfe, J., Kattsov, V., Pitman, A., Shukla, J., Srinivasan, J., Stouffer, R. J., Sumi, A. and Taylor, K. E.: Climate Change 2007 - The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I

15 Contribution to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, edited by S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller, Book, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA., 2007.

Rhodes, D. H. and Ross, A. M.: Anticipatory capacity: Leveraging model-based approaches to design systems for dynamic futures, in Model-Based Systems Engineering, 2009. MBSE'09. International Conference on, pp. 46–51, IEEE., 2009.

20 Sadovský, Z., Faško, P., Mikulová, K. and Pecho, J.: Exceptional snowfalls and the assessment of accidental snow loads for structural design, Cold Reg. Sci. Technol., 72, 17–22, doi:10.1016/j.coldregions.2011.12.003, 2012.

Safeeq, M., Shukla, S., Arismendi, I., Grant, G. E., Lewis, S. L. and Nolin, A.: Influence of winter season climate variability on snow–precipitation ratio in the western United States, Int. J. Climatol., 36(9), 3175–3190, doi:10.1002/joc.4545, 2016.

Salas, J. and Obeysekera, J.: Revisiting the Concepts of Return Period and Risk for Nonstationary Hydrologic Extreme

25 Events, J. Hydrol. Eng., 19(3), 554–568, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0000820, 2013.

Serreze, M. C., Clark, M. P., Armstrong, R. L., McGinnis, D. A. and Pulwarty, R. S.: Characteristics of the western United States snowpack from snowpack telemetry (SNOTEL) data, Water Resour. Res., 35(7), 2145–2160, doi:10.1029/1999wr900090, 1999.

Service, R. F.: As the West Goes Dry, Science (80-. )., 303(5661), 1124–1127 [online] Available from:

30 http://www.jstor.org/stable/3836265, 2004.

16

Sproles, E. A.: Climate change impacts on mountain snowpack presented in a knowledge to action framework, Thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. [online] Available from: http://hdl.handle.net/1957/28640, 2012.

Sproles, E. A., Nolin, A. W., Rittger, K. and Painter, T. H.: Climate change impacts on maritime mountain snowpack in the Oregon Cascades, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 17(7), 2581–2597, doi:10.5194/hess-17-2581-2013, 2013.

5 Stewart, I. T.: Changes in snowpack and snowmelt runoff for key mountain regions, Hydrol. Process., 23(1), 78–94, doi:10.1002/hyp.7128, 2009.

Stewart, I. T., Cayan, D. R. and Dettinger, M. D.: Changes in Snowmelt Runoff Timing in Western North America under a `Business as Usual' Climate Change Scenario, Clim. Change, 62(1), 217–232 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:CLIM.0000013702.22656.e8, 2004.

10 Stoelinga, M. T., Albright, M. D. and Mass, C. F.: A New Look at Snowpack Trends in the Cascade Mountains, J. Clim., 23(10), 2473–2491, doi:10.1175/2009JCLI2911.1, 2010.

Sturm, M., Holmgren, J. and Liston, G. E.: A Seasonal Snow Cover Classification-System for Local to Global Applications, J. Clim., 8(5), 1261–1283, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(1995)008<1261:assccs>2.0.co;2, 1995.

Tague, C. and Grant, G. E.: Groundwater dynamics mediate low-flow response to global warming in snow-dominated alpine 15 regions, Water Resour. Res., 45(7), W07421, doi:10.1029/2008wr007179, 2009.

Tennant, C. J., Crosby, B. T., Godsey, S. E., VanKirk, R. W. and Derryberry, D. R.: A simple framework for assessing the sensitivity of mountain watersheds to warming‐driven snowpack loss, Geophys. Res. Lett., 42(8), 2814–2822, 2015.

United States Army Corps of Engineers: Comprehensive water supply study - An examination of current water supply issues, edited by T. M. Hillyer, Report., 2001.

20 United States Army Corps of Engineers: US Army Corps - Portland District, [online] Available from: www.nwp.usace.army.mil/Locations/Willamette-Valley (Accessed 16 July 2016), 2016.

United States Department of Agriculture: Carmen-Smith Hydroelectric Project Area Map, [online] Available from: http://www.fs.usda.gov/detailfull/willamette/landmanagement/resourcemanagement/?cid=stelprdb5043611&width=full (Accessed 16 July 2016), 2016.

25 United States Geological Survey: USGS Current Conditions for Oregon, [online] Available from: http://waterdata.usgs.gov/or/nwis/uv? (Accessed 18 August 2015), 2015.

Wang, A.: Detroit Lake residents, visitors warned of toxic algae bloom, The Oregonian, 15th May, 1, 2015.

Webb, L. B., Watterson, I., Bhend, J., Whetton, P. H. and Barlow, E. W. R.: Global climate analogues for winegrowing regions in future periods: projections of temperature and precipitation, Aust. J. Grape Wine Res., 19(3), 331–341, 2013.

30 Young, I. T.: Proof without prejudice: use of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for the analysis of histograms from flow systems

17

and other sources., J. Histochem. Cytochem., 25(7), 935–941, 1977.

18

**Figures:**



Figure 1: Context map of the McKenzie River basin, and its geographic relationship to the Willamette River basin. The geographic locations of the SNOTEL other meteorological stations used as model forcings show the altitudinal range of inputs. Inset figure a) represents the area by elevation for the McKenzie River basin. Inset figure b) presents the Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDF) for the elevation of the Willamette and McKenzie River Basins for elevations above 1000 m, and is separated into 50m bins.

**McKenzie River Basin - Precipitation, Air Temperature, and Snow**

a) (Precipitation mm)

b) (Mean Temperature °C) — 30 - year normal; WY 2014; WY 2015

c) (Basin-wide Snow Water Storage km³) — Modeled 23 - year normal with + 2°C; WY 2014; WY 2015

**Figure 2:** The total precipitation (a) and mean temperatures (b) for the McKenzie River basin for water years 2014 and 2015 as compared to the 30-year normal (from the PRISM datasets). The lower figure (c) represents Basin-wide Snow Water Storage for the McKenzie River Basin for water years 2014 and 2015 and the normals (+2°C) calculated from the 23 years used in this study. The calculations for snowpack are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.

**Figure 3: The exceedance probability of basin-wide snow water storage under +2°C conditions. During 2014 snow water storage increased considerably in March to reach above average conditions. The snowpack during the winter of 2015 was extremely low, and never increased beyond 0.21 km³. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

21

**Figure 4: Volumetric snow water storage binned by 50 m elevation bands. The corresponding basin-wide snow water storage (km³) for 2014 and 2015 is provided for each month. Larger snowpacks (lower exceedance probability) have considerable contributions at between 1000 – 1300 m. During 2014 and 2015, this elevation range had minimal snowpack, despite close to normal precipitation. Note that on the vertical axes, snow water storage below 500 m and above 2500 m are not included for visual clarity. These elevations contribute minimally to basin-wide snow water storage. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

22

**Figure 5: The spatial distribution of SWE on April 1$^{st}$ from water years 2014 and 2015 as compared to the corresponding EP. Both the distribution and magnitude of SWE are strikingly similar. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

23

**Figure 6: The ratio of SWE:P binned by 50 m elevation bands. The relationship between elevation and SWE:P is evident across all exceedance probabilities. Under +2°C simulations and in 2014 and 2015, roughly 1500 m is the elevation at which SWE:P begins to increase substantially along the horizontal axis. Note that on the vertical axes, snow water storage below 500 m and above 2500 m are not included for visual clarity. These elevations contribute minimally to basin-wide snow water storage. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

# Future Snow? A Spatial-Probabilistic Assessment of the Extraordinarily Low Snowpacks of 2014 and 2015 in the Oregon Cascades

Eric A. Sproles[1,2], Travis R. Roth[2], Anne W. Nolin[2]

5   [1]Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Zonas Áridas, Universidad de La Serena, Raul Bitran 1305, La Serena, Chile
[2]College of College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences; Oregon State University, 104 CEOAS Admin Bldg, Corvallis, OR, 97331-5503, USA

*Correspondence to*: Eric A. Sproles (eric.sproles@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** In the Pacific Northwest, USA, the extraordinarily low snowpacks of winters 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 stressed
10   regional water resources and the social-environmental system. We introduce two new approaches to better understand how seasonal snow water storage during these two winters would compare to snow water storage under warmer climate conditions. The first approach calculates a spatial-probabilistic metric representing the likelihood that snow water storage of 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 would occur under +2ºC perturbed climate conditions. We computed snow water storage (basin-wide and across elevations), and the ratio of snow water equivalent to cumulative precipitation (across elevations) for the
15   McKenzie River basin (3 041 km²), a major tributary to the Willamette River in Oregon, USA. We applied these computations to calculate the occurrence probability for similarly low snow water storage under climate warming. Results suggest that, relative to +2ºC conditions, basin-wide snow water storage during winter 2013–2014 would be above average while that of winter 2014–2015 would be far below average. April 1 snow water storage corresponds to a 40% (2013–2014) and 90% (2014–2015) probability of being met or exceeded in any given year. The second approach introduces the concept
20   of snow analogs to improve the anticipatory capacity of climate change impacts on snow derived water resources. The use of a spatial-probabilistic approach and snow analogs provide new methods of assessing basin-wide snow water storage in a non-stationary climate, and are readily applicable in other snow dominated watersheds.

## 1 Introduction

In the Pacific Northwest (PNW), mountain snowpacks during the winters of 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 were at or near
25   record lows and well below 50% of the historic median value (National Resource Conservation Service, 2014, 2015b). For several decades the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Snowpack Telemetry (SNOTEL) network has provided measurements of snow water equivalent (SWE; the amount of water contained within the snowpack) and meteorological data. These station-based measurements have historically served as a proxy for basin-wide snow storage and provide an effective SWE index for estimating streamflow, however under a shifting climate these statistical relationships have also

changed (Montoya et al., 2014). The extreme low snowpacks and subsequent snow water storage of 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 highlight the limitations of location-specific measurements in a shifting climate.

On March 1, 2015, 47% of snow monitoring sites in the Willamette River Basin (WRB, 29 730 km$^2$, Fig. 1) registered zero SWE while snow was still present at higher elevations. The absence of snow during the winter of 2014–2015 stands in contrast to cumulative winter precipitation, which was at 83% of normal (778 mm) for November to February (derived from PRISM data (Daly et al., 2008). While the concurrent drought in California received substantial attention, the economic and environmental impacts in the PNW were also profound. These two extreme low snowpacks in the PNW led to ski area closures, recreation restrictions, municipal water limitations, severe wildfires, low streamflows, nearly dry reservoirs, harmful algal blooms, and high fish mortality (Associated Press, 2015; Bend Bulletin, 2015; Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015; The Oregonian, 2015a; The Oregonian, 2015b). These types of externalities highlight the importance of mountain snow water storage and the implications of snow drought.

Mountain snow water storage in the western Oregon Cascades and across the western United States serves as vital inter-seasonal storage from cool, wet winters with low water demand to hot, dry summers when demand peaks (Oregon Water Supply and Conservation Initiative, 2008; United States Army Corps of Engineers, 2001). The western Oregon Cascades form the eastern boundary of the WRB (Fig.1), and abundant winter precipitation falling in these mountains (up to 3000 mm yr$^{-1}$) sustains the 13$^{th}$ highest streamflow in the conterminous United States (Hulse et al., 2002). Even in such a wet place, snowmelt is critically important. Brooks et al. (2012) estimated that over 60–80% of summer base flow in the Willamette River derives from the snow zone at elevations over 1200 m, though this elevational zone represents only 12% of the land area and 15.6% of the annual precipitation in the basin.

The McKenzie River Basin (MRB, 3 041 km$^2$) is a major tributary to the WRB (Fig. 1), and is located in the main part of the Willamette's "at-risk" snow zone (Nolin and Daly, 2006). Snowmelt in MRB is critical to meeting environmental and societal demands of the WRB, supplying almost 25% of the river's summer discharge at its confluence with the Columbia River near Portland, Oregon (Hulse et al., 2002), despite only occupying 10% of its area. The hypsometry of the MRB and WRB are visually similar (Fig 1b) and statistically similar when tested using a two-parameter Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for sample distribution (Young, 1977).

The maritime snowpacks of the MRB, WRB, and the PNW are deep (>1.5 m), relatively warm (Sturm et al., 1995), and SWE typically reaches its basin-wide maximum on approximately April 1 (Serreze et al., 1999; Stewart et al., 2004). Nolin and Daly (2006) identified snow in the WRB as climatologically "at-risk" since it typically accumulates at close to 0ºC and can convert to rainfall with just a slight increase in temperature. As a result of changes in circulation patterns and warmer temperatures there have been declines in April 1 SWE in the PNW (Barnett et al., 2005; Kapnick and Hall, 2012; Luce and Holden, 2009; Mote, 2006; Mote et al., 2005; Service, 2004; Stoelinga et al., 2010), and peak streamflow has shifted to earlier in the year (Fritze et al., 2011; Stewart, 2009).

These shifts in streamflow highlight the challenges of using location specific measurements of SWE for prediction in changing climate. While SNOTEL sites provide valuable and robust data, they typically occupy a limited elevation range

2

that leads to an under-sampling of both the high elevation snow zone and the lower elevation rain-snow transition zone (Molotch and Bales, 2006; Montoya et al., 2014; Nolin, 2012). This limited range holds true in the MRB, where the mean elevation is 1424 m and the elevational range between the five stations is only 245 m.

Elevational shifts in snowpack accumulation due to observed temperature increases make the past less representative of the future (Dozier, 2011; Milly et al., 2008). Additionally, patterns of snow accumulation and melt in the PNW vary as non-linear functions of elevation, slope, aspect, and landcover (Tennant et al., 2015). Augmenting point-based measurements of SWE with metrics that effectively estimate snow water storage in a mountain landscape would include calculations for normal and extreme years across elevations and at the basin scale—especially under current climate trends (Dozier, 2011).

The dimensionless ratio of SWE to precipitation (SWE:P) represents the proportion of snow water equivalent relative to cumulative precipitation (snowfall plus rainfall) over a specified time interval (Serreze et al., 1999). This ratio normalizes snow water storage by cumulative precipitation, emphasizing the impacts of temperature on snowpack accumulation and melt. When computed for April 1, the time of year when maximum basin-scale SWE is considered to occur, this ratio can be an effective measure of the stages of accumulation and melt (Clow, 2010).

Understanding how relationships between snowpack, precipitation, and temperature will be expressed at the basin scale is particularly important in the maritime PNW. Physically-based modelling studies of climate impacts in the PNW describe reduced snow water storage and earlier streamflow across the region (Elsner et al., 2010; Hamlet, 2011; Sproles et al., 2013). These deterministic approaches provide a range of outputs of past and future conditions. However these approaches stop short of an analog approach that links an individual year from the past, particularly a low snow year, to projected conditions.

Climate analogs serve as a useful device to examine potential impacts on societally relevant of predictands (e.g. forest health, environmental flows, municipal water supply), and applies previous conditions to represent potential future conditions (Hallegatte et al., 2007; McLeman and Hunter, 2010; Ramírez-Villegas et al., 2011; Webb et al., 2013). For example, Ramírez-Villegas et al. (2011) developed analogs of climate and agricultural practices to identify prior climatic events that may provide insights into the impacts of future climate change in both time and space.

Incorporating an analog approach allows planners and managers to develop anticipatory capacity, the ability to better anticipate changing scenarios as needs and context change over time (Nelson et al., 2008; Rhodes and Ross, 2009). Using the extreme low snow water storage of 2014-2015 as an example, residents of the Willamette Valley raised concerns regarding the safety and taste of domestic drinking water during the summer months. These changes in water characteristics led public works departments to examine future strategies and equipment to mitigate future water quality concerns (Hall, 2015). From a hydrological perspective, this same analog approach is also used in describing streamflow, and is most commonly framed using statistical metrics. For example, the spatial extent for a previous 100-year flood event serves as an analog of floodplain dynamics and provides anticipatory capacity for land use planners and water managers.

Based on the premise that future snow water storage conditions will resemble previous winters that were warm, Luce et al. (2014) developed spatial and temporal analogs of snow water storage sensitivity to temperature and precipitation across the western United States using point-based SNOTEL data. Similarly, Cooper et al. (2016) applied model-based analyses to

compare the winters of 2014 and 2015 to projected future conditions using individual metrics of snowpack (Snow Disappearance Date, Date of Peak SWE, and Duration of Snow Cover) at SNOTEL locations in the Oregon Cascades. This approach is informative, even though point-based analysis in projected warmer conditions may not represent basin-wide conditions (Dozier, 2011; Milly et al., 2008), specifically as the rain-snow transition shifts towards higher elevations (Nolin

5   et al., 2012; Nolin and Daly, 2006).

To develop statistically valid analogs for snow water storage and snow water storage at the basin scale requires a spatially explicit, probabilistic approach that calculate the statistical likelihood of SWE across a topographically complex mountain basin. For example, to address the question "What is the likelihood that the snow droughts of WYs 2014 and 2015 will occur in the future?" can be addressed by developing statistical thresholds of SWE and SWE:P with regards to time and location.

10   This spatial-probabilistic approach develops upper or lower limits of predicted snow water storage conditions throughout a watershed. While probabilistic approaches are common to streamflow hydrology, spatial approaches to probabilistic questions are less common. A notable application of a spatial-based, probabilistic approach was developed by Graf (1984). This research applied 107 years of channel migration records to calculate the probability of subsequent erosion in a given parcel, creating a probabilistic map of river movement. The map outlined the character of the river system that identified

15   areas where channel migration was more likely to occur. Margulis et al. (2016) characterized the extreme California snow deficit of 2015, but did not compare this snow drought to potentially warmer climatic conditions. Snow hydrology models can readily incorporate climate change projections (Adam et al., 2009; Sproles et al., 2013) and model outputs can be assessed using a spatial-probabilistic framework that explicitly accounts for elevation.

This research introduces a physically based, spatial-probabilistic modelling framework to compare the extraordinarily low

20   snow winters of WY 2014 and WY 2015 (WY=Water Year, defined as 1 October – 30 September in the western United States) in the context of warmer climatic conditions. Our approach captures the spatial variability of mountain snow water storage under warmer temperatures across decades by simulating the variability of SWE and SWE:P at the basin scale for 23 WYs using +2ºC conditions. These outputs are used to frame the snow water storage of WY 2014 and WY 2015 in the context of future snow and snow analogs. This approach is intended to build anticipatory capacity for climate change

25   impacts in the PNW through snow analogs. While limited to the McKenzie River Basin (a well-studied watershed that is characteristic for maritime snow in the WRB (Nolin and Daly, 2006), regional sensitivity to climate warming makes PNW snowpack and snow water storage, and those in similar maritime climates, acutely vulnerable to snow drought (Leibowitz et al., 2014; Nolin and Daly, 2006).

Specifically, we ask:

30        - How does snow water storage from WY 2014 and WY 2015 compare to snow water storage under +2ºC conditions?

     - What is the probability that similar snowpacks and snow water storage will occur in the future?

     - How does snow water storage during WY 2014 and WY 2015 vary by elevation?

## 2 Research Methods

Our approach applies a spatial-distributed and physically-based snow hydrology model to compute probabilities of SWE and SWE:P for 23 WYs under +2C winter conditions. We then model WY 2014 and WY 2015 snow water storage and these outputs to provide probabilistic context for the snow water storage of those two winters. Below we provide details on the study area and specific methods used in this approach.

This study focuses on the McKenzie River Basin. In addition to the MRB being a major tributary to the Willamette River, it has a well-developed network of meteorological stations associated with the HJ Andrews Long Term Ecological Research site, four SNOTEL stations, four dams for flood control and hydropower, serves as the primary source of domestic water for 200 000 people, and is home to federally protected salmonids, amphibians, and mussels. The MRB is characterized by wet winters and dry summers, with average annual precipitation ranging from 1000 mm to 3000 mm that follows the elevation gradient (114–3147 m). Elevations between 1000 and 2000 m comprise 42% of the MRB's total area (Fig. 1a) and 93% of the total snow water storage in the MRB (Sproles et al., 2013). While elevations above 2000 m accumulate the most SWE per unit area, that zone comprises only 1% of total area and 6% of the total snow water storage for the MRB. In terms of volume, snow is the primary seasonal water storage mechanism in the MRB with historic mean basin-wide snow water storage (SWE × area; 1989–2009) of 1.26 km$^3$ on April 1 (Sproles et al., 2013), compared with total reservoir storage of 0.40 km$^3$ (United States Army Corps of Engineers, 2016; United States Department of Agriculture, 2016). By comparison groundwater storage for the MRB was estimated to be roughly 4 km$^3$, with a mean transit time of seven years (Jefferson et al., 2006).

Spatially distributed values of precipitation and SWE were computed using SnowModel (Liston and Elder, 2006a, 2006b) for WY 1989–2012. SnowModel is a spatially distributed, process based model that computes temperature, precipitation, and the full winter season evolution of SWE including accumulation, canopy interception, wind redistribution, sublimation, evaporation, and melt. The model framework applied in this study is the same as applied in Sproles et al. (2013), with the addition of a multi-layer snowpack algorithm. Because the modelling framework is physically-based and spatially-distributed, perturbations to temperature inputs will propagate throughout the model including absolute humidity and energy balance calculations, thus maintaining the dependencies between snowpack and temperature. WY 2005 was excluded due to prolonged regional temperature inversions that were not resolved in the model (Sproles et al., 2013).

Model input data were derived from SNOTEL and station data within the study area (six stations in total), nearly spanning the full elevation range of the MRB (Fig. 1; Sproles et al., 2013). The 23-year set of model forcing data includes winters with above average, normal, and below average snowpack; positive, negative, and neutral ENSO climate patterns; and cool and warm phases of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (Brown and Kipfmueller, 2012). The model was run at a daily time step and 100-m grid resolution. In the calibration and validation phase, the model was first calibrated to temperature and precipitation, with mean Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiencies (Legates and McCabe, 1999; Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) of 0.80 and 0.97 respectively, in order to ensure that the model results were representative of these first order inputs. The model was then calibrated for

5

physical snowpack conditions (mean Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency of 0.83 for automated stations, 0.70 for field locations, and an overall spatial accuracy of 82% compared with Landast fSCA data). For a detailed description of the model structure, calibration, validation, and performance please refer to Sproles et al. (2013).

Using the validated model, we increased temperatures by +2ºC and re-ran the model over the same timeframe and spatial domain. Projections for future precipitation in the WRB and the PNW are highly uncertain (Safeeq et al., 2016), and in the Oregon Cascades temperature, not precipitation, dominates the accumulation and melt cycles of snowpack (Sproles, 2012; Sproles et al., 2013). Our delta increase to temperature is intended to be straightforward, and to avoid the uncertainties associated with precipitation in this region.

We extracted SWE and precipitation (P) data, and computed 5-day averages for each centered on the first day of each month for January to June, for every year in the model run, and for each grid cell in the model domain. These 5-day mean values were used to minimize any effects from individual events (melt, snowfall) while still capturing the overall snow water storage characteristics at the beginning of the month.

Exceedance probability (EP) is a widely used hydrologic metric describing the statistical likelihood that a value of a given magnitude or greater will occur in a specified time period (e.g. annually) (Sadovský et al., 2012; Salas and Obeysekera, 2013). Expressed as a percentage, it is calculated as:

$$\text{EP} = \left(\frac{m}{n+1}\right) \times 100 \tag{1}$$

where, $m$ is the rank of the data value (ranked from highest to lowest) and $n$ is the total number of data values (Dingman, 2002).

For example, a low annual exceedance probability, 20% EP is the statistical likelihood that a value could be met or exceeded 20% of the time, or a 1 in 5 chance of occurring or being exceeded in any year. 20% EP represents a relatively large value. A high annual exceedance probability, 90% EP, describes the statistical likelihood of a measurement that would be met or exceeded in 90% of the time, and represents a relatively low value. EP is commonly applied to point-based data such as a stream gage or SNOTEL station.. However, because mountain snow water storage varies by elevation, slope, aspect, and landcover (Tennant et al., 2015), we expanded point-based EP calculations to the watershed scale to include normal and extreme years.

To accomplish a spatial perspective of exceedance probability, we applied 23 years of model output to compute the EP for the first of the month (January to June) based upon the 5-day averaged SWE and SWE:P values for each grid cell in the model domain. The dimensions of the model domain is a grid of 759 rows × 1121 columns. In order to sort each grid cell individually across the 23 datasets (years), the two-dimensional data sets (759 rows × 1121 columns) was decomposed into 23 one-dimensional vectors (1 × 850,839) then combined to create a 23 × 850,839 matrix. The location information of each grid cell was retained for subsequent mapping and analysis. For each year, the 23 values in each row were sorted from

6

highest to lowest. The 23 × 850,839 data matrix was recomposed into 23 data matrices of dimension 759 × 1121 creating a corresponding spatial exceedance probability matrix. This was completed for each month (January to June).

To respond to the question "How do snow water storage from WY 2014 and WY 2015 compare to snow water storage under a warmer climate?" we modeled SWE and SWE:P using SnowModel with meteorological forcing data from WY 2014 and

5 WY 2015 for the MRB, with the same stations as from our previously validated model runs. These model runs were also validated using the same methods as described in Sproles et al. (2013). We then compared the snowpack metrics from these two winters with model output from the +2°C climate scenario.

Elevation is the most important physiographic variable in determining SWE in this basin (Nolin, 2012) so we aggregated the data into 50-m elevation bands (Fig.1a). In each of these bands we computed snow water storage (km$^3$) and mean SWE:P

10 (m/m). This allowed us to understand the variation of snowpack properties by elevation, their spatial probability of occurrence, and the statistical context for the extraordinary snowpacks of WY 2014 and WY 2015.

*An important point to bear in mind is that the EP values were computed using perturbed meteorological forcing data (+2ºC), while values for WY 2014 and WY 2015 were derived from unperturbed meteorological forcing data.*


## 3 Results

15 For context, historically in the MRB 62% of precipitation falls in the November to March (N–M) time period as calculated from monthly precipitation data from 30-year PRISM gridded climate normals (Daly et al., 2008). Within that period, December to February (DJF) are historically the coldest and wettest months (Daly et al., 2008). For N–M in WY 2014, precipitation was at 102% of the 30-year normal (calculated from PRISM data) and temperatures at SNOTEL stations in the MRB were 0.9ºC warmer than normal (National Resource Conservation Service, 2015a). For the DJF period, WY 2014

20 monthly precipitation was 96% of normal and SNOTEL temperatures were 0.7ºC warmer than normal. During WY 2015, N–M precipitation was 81% of the 30-year average but temperatures in the snow zone were 2.7ºC warmer than average. For the DJF period of WY 2015, monthly precipitation was 78% of normal and temperatures in the snow zone were 3.3ºC warmer than normal (National Resource Conservation Service, 2015a). To provide historical context, Fig. 2 graphically presents the 30-year climate normals from the PRISM datasets for WYs 2014 and 2015 and snowpack simulations. A warmer than

25 normal Jan 2014 limited snowpack accumulation during the early portion of the winter, and wetter than normal conditions in Feb 2014 accompanied by near normal mean temperatures increased basin-wide snow water storage to near average/above average snowpack conditions (as compared to a +2ºC perturbation) for the remainder of the season (Fig. 2c). The warmer than normal conditions that persisted throughout WY2015 greatly inhibited seasonal snowpack accumulation, despite above average precipitation in Mar 2015 (Fig. 2c). For a more detailed long-term climate analysis please refer to Abatzoglou et al.

30 (2014).

### 3.1 Snow Water Storage

In the context of our exceedance probability framework, we see that the April 1 basin-wide snow water storage for WY 2014 falls between the 42 and 46% EP, meaning that WY 2014 snow water storage is slightly above average for a +2ºC model perturbation (Figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5a and c). Snowfall occurring after April 1, 2014 improved late season snow water storage corresponding to 33% and 25% EP for May and June, respectively (Figs. 3 and 4). In WY 2015 basin-wide snow water storage was well below historical conditions, even when compared with +2ºC conditions. April 1 snow water storage for WY 2015 corresponds to 92% EP (Figs. 3, 4, 5b, and 5d). In that year, there was little late spring snowfall, so unlike WY 2014 basin-wide snow water storage did not increase (Fig. 3). WY 2015 was also notable in that peak snow water storage occurred in January and was only 0.21 km$^3$, corresponding to 79% EP (Figs. 3 and 4).

Fig. 4 shows the spatial exceedance probabilities for the +2ºC model runs, aggregated into 50-m elevation increments (WY2014, 42% EP; WY2015, 92% EP). For most years, the total amount of April 1 snow water storage is greatest within the elevation range of 1300–1800 m. However in WY 2015 this mid-elevation zone (1300–1800 m), representing 393 km$^2$ (as calculated from the elevation dataset) is essentially snow-free (Fig. 4). Snow water storage in this elevation range is critical for late season runoff, as 1200 m represents the elevation threshold for summer baseflow contributions (Brooks et al., 2012). From a spatial perspective, Fig. 5 presents the distribution of SWE in the MRB in WYs 2014 and 2015 on April 1, as compared to the 46% and 92% EP (as compared to a +2ºC perturbation), respectively. These figures show snow water storage is almost entirely limited to the upper portions of the basin, and that the more spatially extensive mid-elevations where snow accumulates historically are snow free. In other words, in WY 2014 and 2015 the zone where snowmelt has historically contributed most to groundwater recharge (Jefferson et al., 2008; Tague and Grant, 2009), shifted to rain. Jefferson et al. (2008) showed that the recharge signal varies spatially and temporally, and that the location of the rain-snow transition is the dominant control on recharge for at the watershed scale.

### 3.2 SWE:P

This elevation dependent shift from rain to snow is evident in Fig. 6, where at an elevation of 1200 m, SWE:P is below 0.06 for the period January to June in both WY 2014 and 2015. This ratio does not exceed 0.20 until an elevation of 1500 m in WY 2014, which is still markedly lower than the long-term mean SWE:P at the McKenzie SNOTEL site (0.58, 1454 m). In WY 2015 this 0.20 threshold is not reached until an elevation of 1750 m, approximately 300 m above the highest elevation SNOTEL site in the MRB, and thus was not captured in the SNOTEL data. From February to May in WY 2014, SWE:P increases due to late season storms that added snow water storage, and remained above 50% EP when compared with +2ºC conditions. From February to May in WY 2015, SWE:P never surpasses the 0.60 threshold, and remains below 90% EP when compared with +2ºC conditions.

# 4 Discussion and Conclusion

The winters of 2014 and 2015 had very low snowpacks across the Pacific Northwest due to higher than normal winter temperatures but average or near-average precipitation (Fig. 2, *National Resource Conservation Service*, 2014, 2015b). Basin-wide mean precipitation was 1382 mm (WY 2014) and 1098 mm (WY 2015) for November to June. In the MRB snow zone mean temperatures (November-March) in WY 2014 were 0.9ºC above the 30-year normal, while WY 2015 were 2.7ºC above normal.

The warm, maritime snowpack of the Oregon Cascades is particularly sensitive to increased temperatures and approximately 51% of "at risk" snow in the PNW is in the Oregon Cascades (Nolin and Daly, 2016). As such, these two winters' extraordinarily low snowpacks offer an analog perspective for projected future snow conditions in the MRB and potentially the Willamette River Basin, with 2014 serving as an analog for slightly warmer conditions (+1ºC) and 2015 as an analog for winter temperatures increasing beyond 3ºC. April 1 snow water storage for 2014 was 470% greater than on the same date 2015. The volumetric difference between the two years (0.56 km$^3$) is 1.4 times more than the total reservoir storage capacity of the MRB (United States Army Corps of Engineers, 2016; United States Department of Agriculture, 2016).

Using spatial exceedance probability we calculate that WY 2014 maximum snow water storage was slightly above average for +2ºC conditions with an EP between 42 and 46%.  By comparison, maximum snow water storage for +2ºC conditions during WY 2015 had an EP of about 92% and would be considered extraordinarily low snow years even for a +2ºC future climate scenario.

These low snow years persisted even under normal and slightly below normal annual precipitation. For N-M, precipitation was 102% (WY2014) and 81% (WY2015) of the 30-year climate normal in the MRB. Instead of using point-based measurements of SWE and P, computing SWE:P for elevation bands across the basin provides a simple yet telling description of precipitation phase (rainfall vs. snowfall) and evolution of snow water storage (accumulation and ablation). The SWE:P metric shows that increased temperature rather than reduced precipitation is the primary reason for the diminished snow water storage of WY 2014 and WY 2015, especially at mid elevations.

For example there is little difference between SWE:P at 1200 m in April 2014 (0.04) and April 2015 (0.01), as this elevation band is almost entirely snow free. However, at 1500 m the April SWE:P values for the two years are considerably different (Fig. 6; 2014 SWE:P = 0.22; 2015 SWE:P = 0.04). For WY2014 SWE:P conditions over 1500 m were slightly below average (60% EP), but increased to more than 40% EP in May and June due to late season storms. In 2015, EP values for SWE:P were at or below 80% throughout the winter, indicating the effect of warm temperatures. During March and April, which are typically the months with highest annual SWE, the EP for SWE:P ratios were 95% EP.

These shifts from rain to snow highlight the limitations of a monitoring network that occupies a limited range. In the MRB the SNOTEL stations occupy a mean elevation of 1424 m with a range of only 245 m. During WY 2014 and 2015, this limited range did not capture zones with maximum snow water volume and were essentially below the rain-snow transition

9

(Figs. 4 and 6). This same under representation of snowpack was found throughout the greater WRB with 47% of snow monitoring sites registering zero SWE while snow was still present at higher elevations on March 1, 2015.

As precipitation shifts from snow to rain, the SWE:P metric can augment individual values of SWE and P to provide key information on shifts in water storage throughout the course of a winter and valuable insights to water resource managers in a non-stationary climate. A low SWE:P ratio in March under normal winter precipitation conditions could indicate peak streamflow has occurred or most likely would occur earlier in the year, which has important implications for water resource management in subsequent months. At more broad timescales the shift from snow to rain at mid-elevations could also potentially impact groundwater recharge. The rain-snow transition is the dominant control on recharge in the MRB, and varies spatially and temporally (Jefferson et al. 2008). Because groundwater storage is large and transit times in the MRB are approximately 7 years (Jefferson et al. 2008), the full impacts of WY2014 and WY2015 on ground and surface water resources are not yet known.

Low snow water storage and shifts in streamflow negatively impact water quantity, water quality, hydropower operations, winter snow sports, and summer recreation. In WY 2015, record low snow water storage led to summer drought declarations, extreme fire danger, and modified hydropower operations in the MRB. The typical consistent flow of the groundwater-fed McKenzie River was at 63% of August-September median flow (United States Geological Survey, 2015). Hoodoo Ski Area, located at Santiam Pass, was open for only a few weekends in WY 2014 and in WY 2015 they suspended operations in mid-January, the shortest season in their 77-year history. In the adjacent Santiam River Basin (north of the MRB), diminished snow water storage and less-than-anticipated spring rains in WY 2015 pushed the Detroit Reservoir (storage capacity 0.35 km$^3$) to historic low levels. In May harmful blue-green algae concentrations were above acceptable amounts by seven-fold, and July reservoir levels were approximately 21-m below capacity. Concerns over the taste and safety of domestic drinking water in the Willamette Valley prompted municipal water managers to explore options for upgrading water treatment facilities.

Water quality, energy production, and recreation externalities are not well represented in deterministic models, but become challenging realities that the public faces in years with low snow. Intervention strategies can fail because they lack adequate information about the impacts of climate change that are not incorporated into deterministic physical models and play out at the human scale (Ramírez-Villegas et al., 2011). Transitioning from purely deterministic approaches (i.e. snow water storage is reduced by a certain percentage) to ones that link climate and snow conditions with real world impacts provide a complementary perspective for mitigation and adaptation. Our analog approach combines projected climate impacts with the extreme low snow years of 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 for insights into improved management in shifting conditions. Such an analog approach allows planners and managers to develop adaptation and mitigation strategies that use the past to demonstrate what did or did not work under climate stress, and help build a more informed understanding of ways to improve future planning efforts (Ramírez-Villegas et al., 2011).

Climate change impacts are often expressed in probabilistic terms (Randall et al., 2007) and so it is logically consistent to estimate snowpacks and snow water storage in this manner. This research does not assume that the probabilities presented

here are based upon a precise representation of future conditions nor that future climates will be +2ºC warmer every winter. We present these results as a way to frame the likelihood of future basin-wide snow water storage in the context of our current understanding of climate change. These probabilistic insights are then used to identify WY 2014 and WY 2015 as analogs years for managers and decision makers. The WY 2014 snow water storage would be slightly above average for

5    +2ºC conditions; and the WY 2015 snow water storage would be very low snow water storage for +2ºC conditions, but not a record low. These analog years thus provide guidance for adaptation strategies to mitigate potential failures of existing management plans.

Our spatially explicit approach augments information from the existing SNOTEL network. While SNOTEL data continue to play a key role for seasonal streamflow forecasting under historic climatic conditions, these statistical relationships have

10    been changing (Montoya et al., 2014). While providing modern scientific equipment, SNOTEL sites in the MRB occupy a limited range (245 m) in the mid-elevations and may not capture basin-wide snow water storage in warmer conditions. For example, in the MRB all SNOTEL sites in the MRB were snow-free for most of February to March 2015 and therefore incapable of providing predictive skill for water resource management. Our basin-scale probabilistic approach provides a more complete picture of water storage and captures the elevation variability absent in point-based measurements.

15    The winters of WY 2014 and WY 2015 demonstrate a considerable departure from the stationary snow water storage conditions on which present-day management plans are based. With continued current warmer climates, the snow water storage conditions represented by these two winters are more likely to occur. In the meantime, the value of spatially explicit probabilistic calculations rests in the ability to better define the range of statistical outcomes of subsequent winters that are representative of basin-wide conditions. Framing the low snow water storage of WY 2014 and WY 2015 as analogs of future

20    snow provides insights into potential climate impacts and externalities on social and environmental systems. Together, probabilistic metrics and snow water storage analogs can help build capacity to better anticipate hydrologic changes in a warming climate.

**Acknowledgements**

5

12

## References

Abatzoglou, J. T., Rupp, D. E. and Mote, P. W.: Seasonal climate variability and change in the Pacific Northwest of the United States, J. Clim., 27(5), 2125–2142, 2014.

Adam, J. C., Hamlet, A. F. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Implications of global climate change for snowmelt hydrology in the twenty-first century, Hydrol. Process., 23(7), 962–972, doi:10.1002/hyp.7201, 2009.

Associated Press: Drought has city near Eugene imposing water restrictions, Washingt. Times, 29th July [online] Available from: http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jul/29/drought-has-city-near-eugene-imposing-water-restri/, 2015.

Barnett, T. P., Adam, J. C. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Potential impacts of a warming climate on water availability in snow-dominated regions, Nature, 438(7066), 303–309, doi:10.1038/nature04141, 2005.

Brooks, J. R., Wigington, P. J., Phillips, D. L., Comeleo, R. and Coulombe, R.: Willamette River Basin surface water isoscape ($\delta$18O and $\delta$2H): temporal changes of source water within the river, Ecosphere, 3(5), art39, doi:10.1890/ES11-00338.1, 2012.

Brown, D. P. and Kipfmueller, K. F.: Pacific Climate Forcing of Multidecadal Springtime Minimum Temperature Variability in the Western United States, Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr., 102(3), 521–530, doi:10.1080/00045608.2011.627052, 2012.

Clow, D. W.: Changes in the timing of snowmelt and streamflow in Colorado: a response to recent warming, J. Clim., 23(9), 2293–2306, 2010.

Cooper, M. G., Nolin, A. W. and Safeeq, M.: Testing the recent snow drought as an analog for climate warming sensitivity of Cascades snowpacks, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(8), 84009 [online] Available from: http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/11/i=8/a=084009, 2016.

Daly, C., Halbleib, M., Smith, J. I., Gibson, W. P., Doggett, M. K., Taylor, G. H., Curtis, J. and Pasteris, P. P.: Physiographically sensitive mapping of climatological temperature and precipitation across the conterminous United States, Int. J. Climatol., 28(15), 2031–2064, 2008.

Dingman, S. L.: Physical hydrology, Book, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, N.J., 2002.

Dozier, J.: Mountain hydrology, snow color, and the fourth paradigm, Eos, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union, 92(43), 373, doi:10.1029/2011EO430001, 2011.

Elsner, M. M., Cuo, L., Voisin, N., Deems, J. S., Hamlet, A. F., Vano, J. A., Mickelson, K. E. B., Lee, S.-Y. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Implications of 21st century climate change for the hydrology of Washington State, Clim. Change, 102(1–2), 225–260, 2010.

Fritze, H., Stewart, I. T. and Pebesma, E.: Shifts in Western North American Snowmelt Runoff Regimes for the Recent

13

Warm Decades, J. Hydrometeorol., 12(5), 989–1006, doi:10.1175/2011jhm1360.1, 2011.

Hall, B.: Something in the water: Complaints about taste trickle in, Corvallis Gazette-Times, 5th August [online] Available from: http://www.gazettetimes.com/news/something-in-the-water-complaints-about-taste-trickle-in/article_c2472c7c-2e32-56be-bb38-11d8ad9ccde7.html, 2015.

5  Hallegatte, S., Hourcade, J.-C. and Ambrosi, P.: Using climate analogues for assessing climate change economic impacts in urban areas, Clim. Change, 82(1–2), 47–60, 2007.

Hamlet, A. F.: Assessing water resources adaptive capacity to climate change impacts in the Pacific Northwest Region of North America, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 15(5), 1427–1443, doi:10.5194/hess-15-1427-2011, 2011.

Hulse, D., Gregory, S., Baker, J. P. and Pacific Northwest Ecosystem Research, C.: Willamette River Basin planning atlas :
10  trajectories of environmental and ecological change, Book, Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR., 2002.

Jefferson, A., Grant, G. and Rose, T.: Influence of volcanic history on groundwater patterns on the west slope of the Oregon High Cascades, Water Resour. Res., 42(12), 2006.

Jefferson, A., Nolin, A., Lewis, S. and Tague, C.: Hydrogeologic controls on streamflow sensitivity to climate variation, Hydrol. Process., 22(22), 4371–4385, doi:10.1002/hyp.7041, 2008.

15  Kapnick, S. and Hall, A.: Causes of recent changes in western North American snowpack, Clim. Dyn., 38(9–10), 1885–1899, 2012.

Legates, D. R. and McCabe, G. J.: Evaluating the use of "goodness-of-fit" measures in hydrologic and hydroclimatic model validation, Water Resour. Res., 35(1), 233–241 [online] Available from: <Go to ISI>://000078123800021, 1999.

Leibowitz, S. G., Comeleo, R. L., Wigington Jr., P. J., Weaver, C. P., Morefield, P. E., Sproles, E. A. and Ebersole, J. L.:
20  Hydrologic landscape classification evaluates streamflow vulnerability to climate change in Oregon, USA, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(9), 3367–3392, doi:10.5194/hess-18-3367-2014, 2014.

Liston, G. E. and Elder, K.: A Distributed Snow-Evolution Modeling System (SnowModel), J. Hydrometeorol., 7(6), 1259–1276 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JHM548.1, 2006a.

Liston, G. E. and Elder, K.: A Meteorological Distribution System for High-Resolution Terrestrial Modeling (MicroMet), J.
25  Hydrometeorol., 7(2), 217–234 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JHM486.1, 2006b.

Luce, C. H. and Holden, Z. A.: Declining annual streamflow distributions in the Pacific Northwest United States, 1948–2006, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36(16), L16401, doi:10.1029/2009gl039407, 2009.

Margulis, S. A., Cortés, G., Girotto, M., Huning, L. S., Li, D. and Durand, M.: Characterizing the extreme 2015 snowpack deficit in the Sierra Nevada (USA) and the implications for drought recovery, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(12), 6341–6349, 2016.

30  McLeman, R. A. and Hunter, L. M.: Migration in the context of vulnerability and adaptation to climate change: insights from

14

analogues, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang., 1(3), 450–461, 2010.

Meunier, A.: Oregon's wildfire season is over for 2015, Forestry Department says, The Oregonian, 25th October [online] Available from: http://www.oregonlive.com/wildfires/index.ssf/2015/10/oregons_wildfire_season_is_ove.html, 2015.

Milly, P. C. D., Betancourt, J., Falkenmark, M., Hirsch, R. M., Kundzewicz, Z. W., Lettenmaier, D. P. and Stouffer, R. J.:
5  Stationarity Is Dead: Whither Water Management?, Science (80-. )., 319(5863), 573–574, doi:10.1126/science.1151915, 2008.

Molotch, N. P. and Bales, R. C.: SNOTEL representativeness in the Rio Grande headwaters on the basis of physiographics and remotely sensed snow cover persistence, Hydrol. Process., 20(4), 723–739, 2006.

Montoya, E. L., Dozier, J. and Meiring, W.: Biases of April 1 snow water equivalent records in the Sierra Nevada and their
10  associations with large‑scale climate indices, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41(16), 5912–5918, 2014.

Morical, M.: Is Hoodoo done? Barely-there snow has Oregon ski areas wondering if season is over, Bend Bull., 11th February, 1 [online] Available from: http://www.bendbulletin.com/outdoors/2854005-151/barely-there, 2015.

Mote, P. W.: Climate-Driven Variability and Trends in Mountain Snowpack in Western North America&#42, J. Clim., 19(23), 6209–6220 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3971.1, 2006.

15  Mote, P. W., Hamlet, A. F., Clark, M. P. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Declining Mountain Snowpack in Weatern North America, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 86(1), 39–49 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-86-1-39, 2005.

Nash, J. E. and Sutcliffe, J. V: River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I: a discussion of principles, J. Hydrol., 10(3), 282–290 [online] Available from: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022169470902556, 1970.

20  National Resource Conservation Service: Weekly Snowpack / Drought Monitor Update, Washington, D.C., 2014.

National Resource Conservation Service: NRCS SNOTEL data, edited by United States Department of Agriculture, [online] Available from: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/or/snow/ (Accessed 9 September 2015a), 2015.

National Resource Conservation Service: Weekly Water and Climate Update, Washington, D.C. [online] Available from: http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/ftpref/support/drought/dmrpt-20150326.pdf, 2015b.

25  Nelson, N., Geltzer, A. and Hilgartner, S.: Introduction: the anticipatory state: making policy-relevant knowledge about the future, Sci. Public Policy , 35(8), 546–550, doi:10.3152/030234208X370648, 2008.

Nolin, A. W.: Perspectives on Climate Change, Mountain Hydrology, and Water Resources in the Oregon Cascades, USA, Mt. Res. Dev., 32(S1), S35–S46, doi:10.1659/mrd-journal-d-11-00038.s1, 2012.

Nolin, A. W. and Daly, C.: Mapping "At Risk" Snow in the Pacific Northwest, J. Hydrometeorol., 7(5), 1164–1171 [online]
30  Available    from:

http://proxy.library.oregonstate.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=22988202 &site=ehost-live, 2006.

Nolin, A. W., Sproles, E. A. and Brown, A.: Climate change impacts on snow and water resources in the Columbia, Willamette, and McKenzie River Basins, USA: A nested watershed study. , in Transboundary River Governance in the Face

5    of Uncertainty: The Columbia River Treaty, edited by B. Cosens, Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR., 2012.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife: Higher water temperatures primary cause of early spring Chinook mortality, [online] Available from: http://www.dfw.state.or.us/news/2015/june/061815.asp (Accessed 18 July 2016), 2015.

Oregon Water Supply and Conservation Initiative: Southern Willamette valley municipal water providers final report, Report., 2008.

10   Ramírez-Villegas, J., Lau, C., Kohler, A. K., Jarvis, A., Arnell, N., Osborne, T. and Hooker, J.: Climate analogues: finding tomorrow's agriculture today, CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security, Cali, Colombia., 2011.

Randall, D. A., Wood, R. A., Bony, S., Colman, R., Fichefet, T., Fyfe, J., Kattsov, V., Pitman, A., Shukla, J., Srinivasan, J., Stouffer, R. J., Sumi, A. and Taylor, K. E.: Climate Change 2007 - The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I

15   Contribution to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, edited by S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller, Book, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA., 2007.

Rhodes, D. H. and Ross, A. M.: Anticipatory capacity: Leveraging model-based approaches to design systems for dynamic futures, in Model-Based Systems Engineering, 2009. MBSE'09. International Conference on, pp. 46–51, IEEE., 2009.

20   Sadovský, Z., Faško, P., Mikulová, K. and Pecho, J.: Exceptional snowfalls and the assessment of accidental snow loads for structural design, Cold Reg. Sci. Technol., 72, 17–22, doi:10.1016/j.coldregions.2011.12.003, 2012.

Safeeq, M., Shukla, S., Arismendi, I., Grant, G. E., Lewis, S. L. and Nolin, A.: Influence of winter season climate variability on snow–precipitation ratio in the western United States, Int. J. Climatol., 36(9), 3175–3190, doi:10.1002/joc.4545, 2016.

Salas, J. and Obeysekera, J.: Revisiting the Concepts of Return Period and Risk for Nonstationary Hydrologic Extreme

25   Events, J. Hydrol. Eng., 19(3), 554–568, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0000820, 2013.

Serreze, M. C., Clark, M. P., Armstrong, R. L., McGinnis, D. A. and Pulwarty, R. S.: Characteristics of the western United States snowpack from snowpack telemetry (SNOTEL) data, Water Resour. Res., 35(7), 2145–2160, doi:10.1029/1999wr900090, 1999.

Service, R. F.: As the West Goes Dry, Science (80-. )., 303(5661), 1124–1127 [online] Available from:

30   http://www.jstor.org/stable/3836265, 2004.

16

Sproles, E. A.: Climate change impacts on mountain snowpack presented in a knowledge to action framework, Thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. [online] Available from: http://hdl.handle.net/1957/28640, 2012.

Sproles, E. A., Nolin, A. W., Rittger, K. and Painter, T. H.: Climate change impacts on maritime mountain snowpack in the Oregon Cascades, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 17(7), 2581–2597, doi:10.5194/hess-17-2581-2013, 2013.

5    Stewart, I. T.: Changes in snowpack and snowmelt runoff for key mountain regions, Hydrol. Process., 23(1), 78–94, doi:10.1002/hyp.7128, 2009.

Stewart, I. T., Cayan, D. R. and Dettinger, M. D.: Changes in Snowmelt Runoff Timing in Western North America under a `Business as Usual' Climate Change Scenario, Clim. Change, 62(1), 217–232 [online] Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:CLIM.0000013702.22656.e8, 2004.

10   Stoelinga, M. T., Albright, M. D. and Mass, C. F.: A New Look at Snowpack Trends in the Cascade Mountains, J. Clim., 23(10), 2473–2491, doi:10.1175/2009JCLI2911.1, 2010.

Sturm, M., Holmgren, J. and Liston, G. E.: A Seasonal Snow Cover Classification-System for Local to Global Applications, J. Clim., 8(5), 1261–1283, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(1995)008<1261:assccs>2.0.co;2, 1995.

Tague, C. and Grant, G. E.: Groundwater dynamics mediate low-flow response to global warming in snow-dominated alpine

15   regions, Water Resour. Res., 45(7), W07421, doi:10.1029/2008wr007179, 2009.

Tennant, C. J., Crosby, B. T., Godsey, S. E., VanKirk, R. W. and Derryberry, D. R.: A simple framework for assessing the sensitivity of mountain watersheds to warming‐driven snowpack loss, Geophys. Res. Lett., 42(8), 2814–2822, 2015.

United States Army Corps of Engineers: Comprehensive water supply study - An examination of current water supply issues, edited by T. M. Hillyer, Report., 2001.

20   United States Army Corps of Engineers: US Army Corps - Portland District, [online] Available from: www.nwp.usace.army.mil/Locations/Willamette-Valley (Accessed 16 July 2016), 2016.

United States Department of Agriculture: Carmen-Smith Hydroelectric Project Area Map, [online] Available from: http://www.fs.usda.gov/detailfull/willamette/landmanagement/resourcemanagement/?cid=stelprdb5043611&width=full (Accessed 16 July 2016), 2016.

25   United States Geological Survey: USGS Current Conditions for Oregon, [online] Available from: http://waterdata.usgs.gov/or/nwis/uv? (Accessed 18 August 2015), 2015.

Wang, A.: Detroit Lake residents, visitors warned of toxic algae bloom, The Oregonian, 15th May, 1, 2015.

Webb, L. B., Watterson, I., Bhend, J., Whetton, P. H. and Barlow, E. W. R.: Global climate analogues for winegrowing regions in future periods: projections of temperature and precipitation, Aust. J. Grape Wine Res., 19(3), 331–341, 2013.

30   Young, I. T.: Proof without prejudice: use of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for the analysis of histograms from flow systems

17

and other sources., J. Histochem. Cytochem., 25(7), 935–941, 1977.

**Figures:**



**Figure 1: Context map of the McKenzie River basin, and its geographic relationship to the Willamette River basin. The geographic locations of the SNOTEL other meteorological stations used as model forcings show the altitudinal range of inputs. Inset figure a) represents the area by elevation for the McKenzie River basin Inset figure b) presents the Cumulative Distribution Functions (CDF) for the elevation of the Willamette and McKenzie River Basins for elevations above 1000 m, and is separated into 50m bins.**

19

**Figure 2: The total precipitation (a) and mean temperatures (b) for the McKenzie River basin for water years 2014 and 2015 as compared to the 30-year normal (from the PRISM datasets). The lower figure (c) represents Basin-wide Snow Water Storage for the McKenzie River Basin for water years 2014 and 2015 and the normals (+2ºC) calculated from the 23 years used in this study. The calculations for snowpack are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

**Figure 3: The exceedance probability of basin-wide snow water storage under +2°C conditions. During 2014 snow water storage increased considerably in March to reach above average conditions. The snowpack during the winter of 2015 was extremely low, and never increased beyond 0.21 km³. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

**Figure 4: Volumetric snow water storage binned by 50 m elevation bands. The corresponding basin-wide snow water storage (km³) for 2014 and 2015 is provided for each month. Larger snowpacks (lower exceedance probability) have considerable contributions at between 1000 – 1300 m. During 2014 and 2015, this elevation range had minimal snowpack, despite close to normal precipitation. Note that on the vertical axes, snow water storage below 500 m and above 2500 m are not included for visual clarity. These elevations contribute minimally to basin-wide snow water storage. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

**Figure 5: The spatial distribution of SWE on April 1$^{st}$ from water years 2014 and 2015 as compared to the corresponding EP. Both the distribution and magnitude of SWE are strikingly similar. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**

23

**Figure 6: The ratio of SWE:P binned by 50 m elevation bands. The relationship between elevation and SWE:P is evident across all exceedance probabilities. Under +2°C simulations and in 2014 and 2015, roughly 1500 m is the elevation at which SWE:P begins to increase substantially along the horizontal axis. Note that on the vertical axes, snow water storage below 500 m and above 2500 m are not included for visual clarity. These elevations contribute minimally to basin-wide snow water storage. The calculations are 5-day averages centered on the first day of each month.**