

# Estimating the snow water equivalent on glacierized high elevation areas (Forni Glacier, Italy)

Senese Antonella<sup>1</sup>, Maugeri Maurizio<sup>1</sup>, Meraldi Eraldo<sup>2</sup>, Verza Gian Pietro<sup>3</sup>, Azzoni Roberto Sergio<sup>1</sup>, Compostella Chiara<sup>4</sup>, Diolaiuti Guglielmina<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Environmental Science and Policy, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy.

<sup>2</sup> ARPA Lombardia, Centro Nivometeorologico di Bormio, Bormio, Italy.

<sup>3</sup> Ev-K2-CNR - Pakistan, Italian K2 Museum Skardu Gilgit Baltistan, Islamabad, Pakistan.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Earth Sciences, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy.

*Correspondence to:* Antonella Senese (antonella.senese@unimi.it)

## Abstract.

We present and compare 11 years of snow data (snow depth and snow water equivalent, *SWE*) measured by an Automatic Weather Station corroborated by data resulting from field campaigns on the Forni Glacier in Italy. The aim of the analyses is to estimate the *SWE* of new snowfall and the annual peak of *SWE* based on the average density of the new snow at the site (corresponding to the snowfall during the standard observation period of 24 hours) and automated depth measurements, as well as to find the most appropriate method for evaluating *SWE* at this measuring site.

The results indicate that the daily SR50 sonic ranger measures allow a rather good estimation of the *SWE* (RMSE of 45 mm w.e. if compared with snow pillow measurements), and the available snow pit data can be used to define the mean new snow density value at the site. For the Forni Glacier measuring site, this value was found to be  $149 \pm 6$  kg m<sup>-3</sup>. The *SWE* derived from sonic ranger data is quite sensitive to this value: a change in new snow density of  $\pm 25$  kg m<sup>-3</sup> causes a mean variation in *SWE* of  $\pm 106$  mm w.e. for each hydrological year (corresponding to about 17% of the mean total cumulative *SWE* considering all hydrological years), ranging from  $\pm 43$  mm w.e. to  $\pm 144$  mm w.e..

**Keywords:** Snow depth; Snow water equivalent (SWE); SPICE (Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment) project; Forni Glacier.

## 1. Introduction and scientific background

The study of the spatial and temporal variability of water resources deriving from snow melt (i.e. Snow Water Equivalent, *SWE*) is very important for estimating the water balance at the catchment scale. In particular, many areas depend on this freshwater reservoir for civil use, irrigation and hydropower, thus making it necessary to have an accurate and updated

36 evaluation of *SWE* magnitude and variability. In addition, a correct *SWE* assessment also supports early strategies for  
37 managing and preventing hydro-meteorological risks (e.g. flood forecasting, avalanche forecasting).

38 In high mountain areas, however, often only snowfall measures are available: a correct evaluation of new snow density  
39 ( $\rho_{new\ snow}$ ) is therefore needed to calculate the *SWE*. Since new snow density is site specific and depends on atmospheric and  
40 surface conditions, the main aim of this study is to investigate the magnitude and rates of variations in  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  and to  
41 understand how an incorrect assessment of this variable may affect the estimation of the *SWE*. This was possible by means of  
42 systematic manual and automatic measurements carried out at the surface of the Forni Glacier (Stelvio Park, Italian Alps, Fig.  
43 1a and b). The Forni Glacier (the largest valley glacier in Italy) is a Site of Community Importance (SCI, code IT2040014)  
44 located inside an extensive natural protected area (the Stelvio Park). It is a wide valley glacier (ca. 11.34 km<sup>2</sup> of area, D'Agata  
45 et al., 2014), covering an elevation range from 2600 to 3670 m a.s.l.. Since 2005, an Automatic Weather Station (AWS1  
46 Forni) has been acquiring snow data at the glacier surface, in addition to snow pit measurements of snow depth and *SWE*  
47 carried out by expert personnel (Citterio et al., 2007; Senese et al., 2012a; 2012b; 2014). The snow data thus acquired refer to  
48 snowfall or new snow (i.e. depth of freshly fallen snow deposited over a standard observation period, generally 24 hours, see  
49 WMO, 2008; Fierz et al., 2009) and to snow depth (i.e. the total depth of snow on the ground at the time of observation, see  
50 WMO, 2008). The long sequence of meteorological and glaciological data permitted the introduction of the AWS1 Forni into  
51 the SPICE (Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment) project managed and promoted by the WMO (World  
52 Meteorological Organization) and the CryoNet project (Global Cryosphere Watch's core project, promoted by the WMO).

53 In general, precipitation can be measured mechanically, optically, by capacitive sensing and by radar. Some examples of  
54 available sensors are: the heated tipping bucket rain gauge (as precipitation is collected and melted in the gauge's funnel,  
55 water is directed to a tipping bucket mechanism adjusted to tip and dump when a threshold volume of water is collected), the  
56 heated weighing gauge (the weight of water collected is measured as a function of time and converted to rainfall depth), the  
57 disdrometer (measuring the drop size distribution and the velocity of falling hydrometeors). The precipitation sensor is indeed  
58 a relevant feature; however, the efficiency of solid precipitation collection is even more important for the correct measurement  
59 of new snow. In particular, for the Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment (1989-1993), the International Organizing  
60 Committee designated the following method as the reference for Intercomparison and named it the Double Fence  
61 Intercomparison Reference (DFIR): "The octagonal vertical double-fence inscribed into circles 12 m and 4 m in diameter,  
62 with the outer fence 3.5 m high and the inner fence 3.0 m high surrounding a Tretyakov precipitation gauge mounted at a  
63 height of 3.0 m. In the outer fence there is a gap of 2.0 m and in the inner fence of 1.5 m between the ground and the bottom  
64 of the fences." (WMO/TD-872/1998, section 2.2.2). Even if all these methods mentioned provide accurate measurements, it  
65 is very difficult to follow them in remote areas like a glacier site. For this reason, at the Forni Glacier snow data have been  
66 acquired by means of sonic ranger and snow pillow instrumentations, and in particular no fences have been used.

67 New snow-density assessment is important also for snowfall forecasting based on orographic precipitation models (Judson  
68 and Doesken, 2000; Roebber et al., 2003), estimation of avalanche hazards (Perla, 1970; LaChapelle, 1980; Ferguson et al.,  
69 1990; McClung and Schaerer, 1993), snowdrift forecasting, as an input parameter in the snow accumulation algorithm (Super  
70 and Holroyd, 1997), and general snow science research. Following Roebber et al. (2003), new snow density is often assumed  
71 to conform to the 10-to-1 rule: the snow ratio, defined by the density of water (1000 kg m<sup>-3</sup>) to the density of new snow  
72 (assumed to be 100 kg m<sup>-3</sup>), is 10:1. As noted by Judson and Doesken (2000), the 10-to-1 rule appears to originate from the  
73 results of a nineteenth-century Canadian study. More comprehensive measurements (e.g., Currie, 1947; LaChapelle, 1962;

74 Power et al., 1964; Super and Holroyd, 1997; Judson and Doesken, 2000) have established that this rule is an inadequate  
75 characterization of the true range of **new** snow densities. Indeed, they can vary from  $10 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  to approximately  $350 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$   
76 (Roebber et al., 2003). Bocchiola and Rosso (2007) report a similar range for the Central Italian Alps with values **varying**  
77 from  $30 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  to  $480 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ , **and** an average sample value of  $123 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ . Usually, **the lower bound of new snow density is**  
78 about  $50 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  (Gray, 1979; Anderson and Crawford, 1990). Judson and Doesken (2000) found densities of **new** snow  
79 observed from six sheltered avalanche sites in the Central Rocky Mountains to range from 10 to  $257 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ , and average  
80 densities at each site based on four years of daily observations to range from 72 to  $103 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ . Roebber et al. (2003) found  
81 that the 10-to-1 rule may be modified slightly to 12 to 1 or 20 to 1, depending on the mean or median climatological value of  
82 **new** snow density at a particular station (e.g. Currie 1947; Super and Holroyd, 1997). Following Pahaut (1975), the **new** snow  
83 density ranges from 20 to  $200 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  and increases with wind speed and air temperature. Wetzel and Martin (2001) analyzed  
84 all empirical techniques evolved in the absence of explicit snow-density forecasts. As argued in Schultz et al. (2002), however,  
85 these techniques might be not fully adequate and the accuracy should be **carefully** verified for a large variety of events.  
86 **New** snow density is regulated by i) in-cloud processes that affect the shape and size of **ice crystal growth**, ii) sub-cloud  
87 thermodynamic stratification through which **the ice crystals fall** (**since** the low-level air temperature and relative humidity  
88 regulate the processes of sublimation or melting of a snowflake), and iii) ground-level compaction due to prevailing weather  
89 conditions and snowpack metamorphism. Understanding how these processes affect **new** snow density is difficult because  
90 direct observations of cloud microphysical processes, thermodynamic profiles, and surface measurements are often  
91 unavailable.

92 Cloud microphysical research indicates that many factors contribute to the final structure of an ice crystal. The shape of the  
93 ice crystal is determined by the environment in which the ice crystal grows: pure dendrites have the lowest density (Power et  
94 al., 1964), although the variation in the density of dendritic aggregates is large (from approximately 5 to  $100 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ , Magono  
95 and Nakamura, 1965; Passarelli and Srivastava, 1979). Numerous observational studies over decades clearly demonstrate that  
96 the density varies inversely with size (Magono and Nakamura, 1965; Holroyd, 1971; Muramoto et al., 1995; Fabry and  
97 Szyrmer, 1999; Heymsfield et al., 2004; Brandes et al., 2007). The crystal size is related to the ratio between ice and air  
98 (Roebber et al., 2003): large dendritic crystals will occupy much empty air space, whereas smaller crystals will pack together  
99 into a denser assemblage. In addition, as an ice crystal falls, it passes through varying thermodynamic and moisture conditions.  
100 Then, the ultimate shape and size of crystals depend on factors that affect the growth rate and are a combination of various  
101 growth modes (e.g. Pruppacher and Klett, 1997).

102 To contribute to the understanding of all the above topics, in this paper we **discuss** and compare all the available snow data  
103 measured at the Forni Glacier surface in the last decade to: i) suggest the most suitable measurement system **for evaluating**  
104 **SWE** at **the** glacier surface (i.e. snow pillow, sonic ranger, snow pit or snow weighing tube); ii) **assess the capability to obtain**  
105 **SWE values from the depth measurements** and their accuracies; iii) check the validity of the  $\rho_{\text{new snow}}$  value previously found  
106 (i.e.  $140 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ , see Senese et al., 2014) in order to support **SWE** computation; and iv) evaluate effects and impacts of  
107 uncertainties in the  $\rho_{\text{new snow}}$  value **in relation to** the derived **SWE** amount.

108  
109

## 110 2. Data and Methods

111 Snow data at the Forni Glacier have been acquired by means of i) a Campbell SR50 sonic ranger from October 2005 (snow  
112 depth data), ii) manual snow pits from January 2006 (snow depth and *SWE* data), iii) a Sommer USH8 sonic ranger from May  
113 2014 (snow depth data), iv) a Park Mechanical SS-6048 snow pillow from May 2014 (*SWE* data), v) a manual snow weighing  
114 tube (Enel-Valtecnica ©) from May 2014 (snow depth and *SWE* data). These measurements were made at the two automatic  
115 weather stations (AWSs): AWS1 Forni and AWS Forni SPICE. The first station (AWS1 Forni, Fig. 1b) was installed on 26<sup>th</sup>  
116 September 2005 at the lower sector of the eastern tongue of Forni Glacier (Citterio et al., 2007; Senese et al., 2012a, 2012b;  
117 2014; 2016). The WGS84 coordinates of AWS1 Forni are: 46° 23' 56.0" N, 10° 35' 25.2" E, 2631 m a.s.l. (Fig. 1a, yellow  
118 triangle). The second station (AWS Forni SPICE, Fig. 1b) was installed on 6<sup>th</sup> May 2014 close to AWS1 Forni (at a distance  
119 of about 17 m).

120 AWS1 Forni is equipped with sensors for measuring air temperature and humidity (a naturally ventilated shielded sensor),  
121 wind speed and direction, air pressure, and the four components of the radiation budget (longwave and shortwave, both  
122 incoming and outgoing fluxes), liquid precipitation (by means of an unheated precipitation gauge), and snow depth by means  
123 of the Campbell SR50 sonic ranger (Table 1, see also Senese et al., 2012a).

124 AWS Forni SPICE is equipped with a snow pillow (Park Mechanical steel snow pillow, 150 x 120 x 1.5 cm) and a barometer  
125 (STS ATM.1ST) for measuring the snow water equivalent (Table 1, Beaumont, 1965). The measured air pressure permits  
126 calibration of the output values recorded by the snow pillow. The snow pillow pressure gauge is a device similar to a large air  
127 or water mattress filled with antifreeze. As snow is deposited on this gauge, the pressure increase is related to the accumulating  
128 mass and thus to *SWE*. On the mast, an automated camera was installed to photograph the four graduated stakes located at the  
129 corners of the snow pillow (Fig. 1b) in order to observe the snow depth. When the snow pillow was installed at AWS Forni  
130 SPICE, a second sonic ranger (Sommer USH8) was installed at AWS1 Forni.

131 Comparing the datasets from the Campbell and Sommer sensors, a very good agreement is found ( $r = 0.93$ ). This means that  
132 both sensors have worked correctly. In addition, from 2015 onwards, the double snow depth datasets could mean better data  
133 for the *SWE* estimate.

134 The main challenges in installing and managing AWS1 Forni and AWS Forni SPICE were due to the fact that the site is  
135 located on the surface of an Alpine glacier, not always accessible, especially during wintertime when skis and skins are needed  
136 on the steep and narrow path, and avalanches can occur. Moreover, the glacier is a dynamic body (moving up to 20-30 m  $y^{-1}$ ,  
137 Urbini et al., 2017) and its surface also features a well-developed roughness due to ice melting, flowing meltwater, differential  
138 ablation and opening crevasses (Diolaiuti and Smiraglia, 2010; Smiraglia and Diolaiuti, 2011). In addition, the power to be  
139 supplied to instruments and sensors is only provided by solar panels and lead-gel batteries. Then, a thorough and accurate  
140 analysis of instruments and devices (i.e. energy supply required, performance and efficiency operation at low temperatures,  
141 noise in measuring due to ice flow, etc.) is required before their installation on the supraglacial AWSs to avoid interruptions  
142 in data acquisition and storage.

143 The whole systems of both AWS1 Forni and AWS Forni SPICE are supported by four-leg stainless steel masts (5 m and 6 m  
144 high, respectively) standing on the ice surface. In this way, the AWSs stand freely on the ice, and move together with the  
145 melting surface during summer (with a mean ice thickness variation of about 4 m per year).

146 Data points are sampled at 60-second intervals and averaged over a 60-minute time period for the SR50 sonic ranger, wind  
147 sensor and barometer, over a 30-minute time period for the sensors recording air temperature, relative humidity, solar and  
148 infrared radiation, and liquid precipitation, and over a 10-minute time period for the USH8 sonic ranger and snow pillow. All

149 data are recorded in a flash memory card, including the basic distribution parameters (minimum, mean, maximum, and  
150 standard deviation values).

151 Due to the formation of ring faults, in November 2015 both AWSs were moved to the Forni glacier central tongue  
152 (46°23'42.40"N and 10°35'24.20"E at an elevation of 2675 m a.s.l., the red star in Fig. 1a). Ring faults are a series of circular  
153 or semicircular fractures with stepwise subsidence (caused by englacial or subglacial meltwater) that could compromise the  
154 stability of the stations because they could create voids at the ice-bedrock interface and eventually the collapse of cavity roofs  
155 (Azzoni et al., 2017; Fugazza et al., 2017).

156 In addition to the measurements recorded by the AWSs, since winter 2005-2006, personnel from the Centro Nivo-  
157 Meteorologico (namely CNM Bormio-ARPA Lombardia) of the Lombardy Regional Agency for the Environment have  
158 periodically used snow pits (performed according to the AINEVA protocol, see also Senese et al., 2014) in order to estimate  
159 snow depth and *SWE*. In particular, for each snow pit  $j$ , the thickness ( $h_{ij}$ ) and the density ( $\rho_{ij}$ ) of each snow layer ( $i$ ) are  
160 measured for determining its snow water equivalent, and then the total  $SWE_{snow-pit-j}$  of the whole snow cover ( $n$  layers) is  
161 obtained:

$$162 \quad SWE_{snow-pit-j} = \sum_{i=1}^n h_{ij} \cdot \frac{\rho_{ij}}{\rho_{water}} \quad (1)$$

163 where  $\rho_{water}$  is water density. As noted in a previous study (Senese et al., 2014), the date when the snow pit is dug is very  
164 important for not underestimating the actual accumulation. For this reason, we considered only the snow pits excavated before  
165 the beginning of snow ablation. In fact, whenever ablation occurs, successive *SWE* values derived from snow pits show a  
166 decreasing trend (i.e., they are affected by mass losses).

167 The snow pit *SWE* data were then used, together with the corresponding total new snow derived from sonic ranger readings,  
168 to estimate the site average  $\rho_{new\ snow}$ , in order to update the value of 140 kg m<sup>-3</sup> that was found in a previous study of data of  
169 the same site covering the period 2005-2009 (Senese et al., 2012a). We need to update our figures for  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  as this is the  
170 key variable for estimating *SWE* from the sonic ranger's new snow data. Specifically, for each snow pit  $j$ , the corresponding  
171 total new snow was first determined by:

$$172 \quad \Delta h_{snow-pit-j} = \sum_{t=1}^m (\Delta h_{tj}) \quad (2)$$

173 where  $m$  is the total number of days with snowfall in the period corresponding to snow pit  $j$  and  $\Delta h_{tj}$  corresponds to the depth  
174 of new snow on day  $t$ . In particular, we considered the hourly snow depth values recorded by the sonic ranger in a day and  
175 we calculated the difference between the last and the first reading. Whenever this difference is positive (at least 1 cm), it  
176 corresponds to a new snowfall. All data are subject to a strict control to avoid under- or over-measurements, to remove outliers  
177 and nonsense values, and to filter possible noises.  $\sum_{t=1}^m (\Delta h_{tj})$  is therefore the total new snow measured by the Campbell  
178 SR50 from the beginning of the accumulation period to the date of the snow pit survey. The average site  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  was then  
179 determined as:

$$180 \quad \rho_{new\ snow} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k SWE_{snow-pit-j}}{\sum_{j=1}^k (\Delta h_{snow-pit-j})} \quad (3)$$

181 where  $j$  identifies a given snow pit and the corresponding total new snow and the sum extends over all  $k$  available snow pits.  
182 Instead of a mere average of  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  values obtained from individual snow pit surveys, this relation gives more weight to  
183 snow pits with a higher  $SWE_{snow-pit}$  amount.

184 The *SWE* of each day ( $t$ ) was then estimated by:

$$SWE_{SR-t} = \begin{cases} \Delta h_t \frac{\rho_{new\ snow}}{\rho_{water}} & \text{if } \Delta h_t \geq 1\text{ cm} \\ 0 & \text{if } \Delta h_t < 1\text{ cm} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

186  
187

### 188 3. Results

189 Figure 2 represents the 11-year dataset of snow depth measured by the SR50 sonic ranger from 2005 to 2016. The last data  
190 (after October 2015) were recorded in a different site than the previous one because of the AWS's relocation in November  
191 2015. As the distance between the two sites is about 500 m, the difference in elevation is only 44 m and the aspect is very  
192 similar, so we do not expect a noticeable impact of the site change on snow depth.

193 A large inter-annual variability is seen, with the peak of 280 cm (on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2008). In general, the maximum snow depth  
194 exceeds 200 cm, except in the period 2006-2007, which is characterized by the lowest maximum value (134 cm on 26<sup>th</sup> March  
195 2007). These values are in agreement with findings over the Italian Alps in the period 1960-2009. In fact, Valt and Cianfarra  
196 (2010) reported a mean snow depth of 233 cm (from 199 to 280 cm) for the stations above 1500 m a.s.l. The snow  
197 accumulation period generally starts between the end of September and the beginning of October. Whereas, the snow appears  
198 to be completely melted between the second half of June and the beginning of July (Fig. 2).

199 Because of the incomplete dataset from the Sommer USH8 sonic ranger, only the data from the Campbell SR50 sensor are  
200 considered for analysis.

201 The updated value of  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  is 149 kg m<sup>-3</sup>, similar to findings considering the 2005-2009 dataset (equal to 140 kg m<sup>-3</sup>, Senese  
202 et al., 2012a). Figure 3 reports the cumulative  $SWE_{SR}$  values (i.e. applying Eq. 4) and the ones obtained using snow pit  
203 techniques ( $SWE_{snow-pit}$ ) from 2005 to 2016. As found in previous studies (Senese et al., 2012a, 2014), there is a rather good  
204 agreement (RMSE = 58 mm w.e.) between the two datasets (i.e. measured  $SWE_{snow-pit}$  and derived  $SWE_{SR}$ ). Whenever sonic  
205 ranger data are not available for a long period, the derived total  $SWE$  value appears to be incorrect. In particular, it is clear  
206 that the period of the year without data is very important for not underestimating the actual accumulation. During the snow  
207 accumulation period 2010-2011, the data gap from 15 December 2010 to 12 February 2011 (totally 60 days) produces an  
208 underestimation of 124 mm w.e. corresponding to 16% of the measured value (on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2011  $SWE_{SR} = 646$  mm w.e. and  
209  $SWE_{snow-pit} = 770$  mm w.e., Fig. 3). During the hydrological years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, there were some problems with  
210 sonic ranger data acquisition thus making it impossible to accumulate these data from 31<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 25<sup>th</sup> April 2013.  
211 In these cases, there are noticeable differences between the two datasets: on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2012  $SWE_{snow-pit} = 615$  mm w.e. and  
212  $SWE_{SR} = 254$  mm w.e., and on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2013  $SWE_{snow-pit} = 778$  mm w.e. and  $SWE_{SR} = 327$  mm w.e., with an underestimation  
213 of 59% and 58%, respectively (Fig. 3).

214 Figure 4 reports the comparison between the  $SWE_{SR}$  values and the ones obtained using the snow pillow (2014-2016 period).  
215 From this graph, it is evident that the snow pillow has some measuring problems at the beginning of the snow season when  
216 snow cover is low. Apart from this first period without snow, the curve of  $SWE$  measured by the snow pillow follows the  
217  $SWE_{SR}$  curve (Fig. 4), thus suggesting that in spite of the problems at the beginning of the snow season, the snow pillow seems  
218 to give reasonable results. In order to better assess the reliability of our derived  $SWE_{SR}$  values, a scatter plot of measured (by  
219 means of snow pillow, snow weighing tube and snow pit) versus derived  $SWE$  data is shown (Fig. 5). The chosen period is  
220 the snow accumulation time frame during 2014-2015 and 2015-2016: from November 2014 to March 2015 and from February  
221 2016 to May 2016 (i.e. the snow accumulation period, excluding the initial period in which the snow pillow seems to have

222 significant measuring problems). There is a general underestimation of  $SWE_{SR}$  compared to the snow pillow values,  
223 considering the 2014-2015 data, though the agreement strengthens in the 2015-2016 dataset (Fig. 5): 54 mm w.e. and 29 mm  
224 w.e. of RMSE regarding 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, respectively. Considering the whole dataset, the RMSE is 45 mm w.e. If  
225 compared with the snow pit, the difference is 35 mm w.e. (6% of the measured value). Nevertheless, numerous measurements  
226 made using the snow weighing tube (Enel-Valtece ©) around the AWSs on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2015, showed wide variations of  
227 snow depth over the area (mean value of 165 cm and standard deviation of 29 cm) even if the snow surface seemed to be  
228 homogenous. This was mainly due to the roughness of the glacier ice surface. Indeed, on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2015 the snow pillow  
229 recorded a  $SWE$  value of 493 mm w.e., while from the snow pit the  $SWE$  was equal to 555 mm w.e., and from the snow  
230 weighing tube the  $SWE$  ranged from 410 to 552 mm w.e. (Fig. 5), even if all measurements were performed very close to each  
231 other.

232

#### 233 4. Discussion

234 Defining a correct algorithm for modeling  $SWE$  data is very important for evaluating the water resources deriving from snow  
235 melt. The approach applied to derive  $SWE_{SR}$  is highly sensitive to the value used for the new snow density, which can vary  
236 substantially depending on both atmospheric and surface conditions. In this way, the error in individual snowfall events could  
237 be quite large. Moreover, the technique depends on determining snowfall events, which are estimated from changes in snow  
238 depth, and the subsequent calculation and accumulation of  $SWE_{SR}$  from those events. Therefore, missed events due to gaps in  
239 snow depth data could invalidate the calculation of peak  $SWE_{SR}$ . For these reasons, we focused our analyses on understanding  
240 how an incorrect assessment of  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  or a gap in snow depth data may affect the estimation of the  $SWE$ .

241 First, we evaluated the  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  estimate (applying Eq. 3, found to be equal to 149 kg m<sup>-3</sup> considering the 2005-2015 dataset),  
242 by means of the leave-one-out cross-validation technique (LOOCV, a particular case of leave-p-out cross-validation with p =  
243 1), to ensure independence between the data we use to estimate  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  and the data we use to assess the corresponding  
244 estimation error. In this kind of cross-validation, the number of “folds” (repetitions of the cross-validation process) equals the  
245 number of observations in the dataset. Specifically, we applied Eq. 3 once for each snow pit ( $j$ ), using all other snow pits in  
246 the calculation ( $LOOCV\ \rho_{new\ snow}$ ) and using the selected snow pit as a single-item test ( $\rho_{new\ snow}$  from snow pit  $j$ ). In this way,  
247 we avoid dependence between the calibration and validation datasets in assessing the new snow density. The results are shown  
248 in Table 2. They give evidence that the standard deviation of the differences between the  $LOOCV\ \rho_{new\ snow}$  values and the  
249 corresponding single-item test values ( $\rho_{new\ snow}$  from snow pit  $j$ ) is 18 kg m<sup>-3</sup>. The error of the average value of  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  can  
250 therefore be estimated dividing this standard deviation for the square root of the number of the considered snow pits. It turns  
251 out to be 6 kg m<sup>-3</sup>. The new and the old estimates (149 and 140 kg m<sup>-3</sup>, respectively) therefore do not have a statistically  
252 significant difference. The individual snow accumulation periods instead have a naturally higher error and the single snow pit  
253 estimates for  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  range from 128 to 178 kg m<sup>-3</sup>. In addition, we attempted to extend this analysis considering each single  
254 snow layer ( $h_{ij}$ ) instead of each snow pit  $j$ . In particular, we tried to associate to each snow pit layer the corresponding new  
255 snow measured by the sonic ranger (Citterio et al., 2007). However, this approach turned out to be too subjective to contribute  
256 more quantitative information about the real representativeness of the  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  value we found.

257 Moreover, we investigated the  $SWE$  sensitivity to changes in  $\rho_{new\ snow}$ . In particular, we calculated  $SWE_{SR}$  using different values  
258 of new snow density ranging from 100 to 200 kg m<sup>-3</sup> at 25 kg m<sup>-3</sup> intervals (Fig. 6). An increase/decrease of the density by 25  
259 kg m<sup>-3</sup> causes a mean variation in  $SWE_{SR}$  of  $\pm 106$  mm w.e. for each hydrological year (corresponding to about 17% of the

260 mean total cumulative  $SWE$  considering all hydrological years), ranging from  $\pm 43$  mm w.e. to  $\pm 144$  mm w.e. A reliable  
261 estimation of  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  is therefore a key issue.

262 In addition to an accurate definition of new snow density, an uninterrupted dataset of snow depth is also necessary in order to  
263 derive correct  $SWE_{SR}$  values. It is therefore necessary to put in place all the available information to reduce the occurrence of  
264 data gaps to a minimum. It is also important to stress that potential errors in individual snowfall events could affect peak  
265  $SWE_{SR}$  estimation. A large snowfall event with a considerable deviation from the mean new snow density will result in large  
266 errors (e.g. a heavy wet snowfall). These events are rather rare at the Forni site: only 3 days in the 11-year period covered by  
267 the data recorded more than 40 cm of new snow (the number of days decreases to 1 if the threshold increases to 50 cm). More  
268 in detail, we found the following distribution of new snow: 382 days with values between 1 and 10 cm, 95 days with values  
269 between 10 and 20 cm, 33 days with values between 20 and 30 cm, 11 days with values between 30 and 40 cm. Beside  
270 investigating the distribution of new snow values, we also checked if the days in the different new snow intervals have  
271 significantly different average temperatures. The calculated average temperature values are  $-5.7 \pm 4.5^\circ\text{C}$ ,  $-5.2 \pm 4.2^\circ\text{C}$ , and  $-$   
272  $4.8 \pm 3.2^\circ\text{C}$  (for days with 1-10 cm, 10-20 cm, and  $>20$  cm of new snow depth, respectively), suggesting that there is no  
273 significant change of air temperature in these three classes. As far as data gaps are concerned, the introduction of the second  
274 sonic ranger (Sommer USH8) at the end of the 2013-2014 snow season was an attempt to reduce the impact of this problem.  
275 The second sonic ranger, however, was still in the process of testing in the last years of the period investigated within this  
276 paper. We are confident that in the years to come it can help reduce the problem of missing data. Multiple sensors for fail-  
277 safe data collection are indeed highly recommended. In addition, the four stakes installed at the corners of the snow pillow at  
278 the beginning of the 2014-2015 snow season were another idea for collecting more data. Unfortunately, they were broken  
279 almost immediately after the beginning of the snow accumulation period. They can be another way to deal with the problem  
280 of missing data, provided we figure out how to avoid breakage during the winter season.

281 Our new snow data could be affected by settling, sublimation, snow transported by wind, and rainfall. As far as settling is  
282 concerned,  $\Delta h_{snow-pit-j}$  from Eq. 2 would indeed be higher if  $\Delta h_{tj}$  values were calculated considering an interval shorter  
283 than 24 hours. However, this would not be possible because on the one hand, the sonic ranger data's margin of error is too  
284 high to consider hourly resolution, and on the other hand, new snow is defined by the WMO within the context of a 24-hour  
285 period. Therefore, settling could not be considered in our analyses since new snow as defined by the WMO already includes  
286 the settling that occurs in the 24-hour period. Regarding the transport by wind, the effect that is potentially more relevant is  
287 new snow that is recorded by the sonic ranger but then blown away in the following days. It is therefore considered in  
288  $\Delta h_{snow-pit-j}$  but not in  $SWE_{snow-pit-j}$ , thus causing an underestimation of  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  (see Eq. 3). The snow transported to  
289 the measuring site can also influence  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  even if in this case the effect is less important as it measured both by the sonic  
290 ranger and by the snow pit. Here, the problem may be an overestimation of  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  as snow transported by wind usually  
291 has a higher density than new snow. We considered the problem of the effect of wind on snow cover when we selected the  
292 station site on the glacier. Even though sites not affected by wind transport simply do not exist, we are confident that the site  
293 we selected has a position that can reasonably minimize this issue. Moreover, sublimation processes would have an effect that  
294 is similar to those produced by new snow that is recorded by the sonic ranger but then blown away in the following days. In  
295 any case, the value we found for the site average new snow density (i.e.  $149\text{ kg m}^{-3}$ ) does not seem to suggest an  
296 underestimated value. Finally, another possible source of error in estimating new snow density and in deriving the daily  $SWE$   
297 is represented by rainfall events. In fact, one of the effects is an enhanced snow melt and then a decrease in snow depth, as



298 rain water has a higher temperature than the snow. Therefore, especially at the beginning of the snow accumulation season,  
299 we could detect a snowfall (analyzing snow depth data) but, whenever it was followed by a rainfall, the new fallen snow could  
300 partially or completely melt, thus remaining undetected when measured at the end of the accumulation season using snow pit  
301 techniques. This is therefore another potential error that, besides the ones previously considered, could lead to underestimation  
302 of the  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  value, even if, as already mentioned, the found value of  $149\text{ kg m}^{-3}$  does not seem to suggest this. On the  
303 other hand, rain can also increase the *SWE* measured using the snow pit techniques without giving a corresponding sign in the  
304 sonic ranger measurements of snow depth whenever limited amounts of rain fall over cold snow. Anyway, rain events are  
305 extremely rare during the snow accumulation period.

306 As regards the instrumentation, we found some issues related to the derived snow information. Focusing on the beginning of  
307 the snow accumulation period, it appears that neither system of measurement (i.e. sonic ranger and snow pillow) is able to  
308 correctly detect the first snowfall events. With the sonic ranger, the surface roughness of the glacier ice makes it impossible  
309 to distinguish a few centimeters of freshly fallen snow. In fact, the surface heterogeneity (i.e. bare ice, ponds of different size  
310 and depth, presence of dust and fine or coarse debris that can be scattered over the surface or aggregated) translates into a  
311 differential ablation, due to different values of albedo and heat transfer. These conditions cause differences in surface elevation  
312 of up to tens of centimeters and affects the angular distribution of reflected ultrasound. At 3 m of height, the diameter of the  
313 measuring field is 1.17 m for the SR50. For these reasons, the sonic ranger generally records inconsistent distances between  
314 ice surface and sensor. This issue does not occur with thick snow cover as the snow roughness is very minor compared to that  
315 of ice. Regarding the snow pillow methodology, analyzing the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 data, it seems to work correctly  
316 only with a snow cover thicker than 50 cm (Fig. 4). In fact, with null or very low snow depth, *SWE* values are incorrectly  
317 recorded. The results from the snow pillow are difficult to explain as this sensor has been working for only two winter seasons  
318 and we are still in the process of testing it. Analyzing data from the years to come will allow a more robust interpretation.  
319 However, we have searched for a possible explanation of this problem and this error could be due to the configuration of the  
320 snow pillow.

321 In order to assess the correct beginning of the snow accumulation period and overcome the instrument issues, albedo  
322 represents a useful tool, as freshly fallen snow and ice are characterized by very different values (e.g. Azzoni et al., 2016). In  
323 fact, whenever a snowfall event occurs, albedo immediately rises from about 0.2 to 0.9 (typical values of ice and freshly fallen  
324 snow, respectively, Senese et al., 2012a). This is also confirmed by the automated camera's hourly pictures. During the  
325 hydrological year 2014-2015, the first snowfall was detected on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2014 by analyzing albedo data, and it is verified  
326 by pictures taken by the automated camera. Before this date, the sonic ranger did not record a null snow depth, mainly due to  
327 the ice roughness; therefore, we had to correct the dataset accordingly.

328 With regard to the snow pillow methodology, some of the under-measurement or over-measurement errors can commonly be  
329 attributed to differences in the amount of snow settlement over the snow pillow, compared with that over the surrounding  
330 ground, or to bridging over the snow pillow with cold conditions during development of the snow cover (Beaumont, 1965).  
331 In addition, another major source of *SWE* snow pillow errors is generally due to measuring problems of this device, which is  
332 sensitive to the thermal conditions of the sensor, the ground and the snow (Johnson et al., 2015). In fact, according to Johnson  
333 and Schaefer (2002) and Johnson (2004) snow pillow under-measurement and over-measurement errors can be related to the  
334 amount of heat conduction from the ground into the overlying snow cover, the temperature at the ground/snow interface and  
335 the insulating effect of the overlying snow. This particular situation can not be recognized at the Forni Glacier as the surface

336 consists of ice and not of soil . Therefore, in our particular case the initial error could be due to the configuration of the snow  
337 pillow.

338 Concerning the *SWE* as determined by the snow weighing tube, this device is pushed vertically into the snow to fill the tube.  
339 The tube is then withdrawn from the snow and weighed. Knowing the length of tube filled with snow, the cross-sectional area  
340 of the tube and the weight of the snow allows a determination of both the *SWE* and the snow density (Johnson et al., 2015).  
341 The measurements carried out around the AWSs on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2015 showed a great spatial variability in *SWE* (Fig. 5).  
342 This could explain the differences found analyzing data acquired using the snow pillow techniques, measured by the snow  
343 pit, and derived by the sonic ranger. Nevertheless, the *SWE* variability highlighted by the snow weighing tube surveys can be  
344 also due to oversampling by this device (Work et al., 1965). Numerous studies have been conducted to verify snow tube  
345 accuracy in determining *SWE*. The most recent studies by Sturm et al. (2010) and Dixon and Boon (2012) found that snow  
346 tubes could under- or over-measure *SWE* from -9% to +11%. Even if we allow for  $\pm 10\%$  margin of error in our snow tube  
347 measurements, the high *SWE* variability is confirmed. Nevertheless, a drawback to using snow tubes is that they are labor  
348 intensive, which is one reason why snow pressure sensors were developed to provide continuous *SWE* measurements that can  
349 be automatically monitored and transmitted from remote locations to a data center for analysis and dissemination to the user  
350 community. In fact, snow tubes have been in use since the 1930s and are the oldest method for determining *SWE* that is still  
351 widely used, while, snow pillows, instead, came into use in the mid-1960s as a way to continuously measure *SWE*.

352 Finally, the last approach for measuring *SWE* is represented by the snow pit. This method (like the snow tube) has the  
353 downside that it is labor intensive and it requires expert personnel. Moreover, as discussed in Senese et al. (2014), it is very  
354 important to select a correct date for making the snow pit surveys in order to assess the total snow accumulation amount.  
355 Generally, 1<sup>st</sup> April is the date considered the most indicative of the peak cumulative *SWE* in high mountain environments of  
356 the midlatitudes, but this day is not always the best one. In fact, Senese et al. (2014) found that using a fixed date for measuring  
357 the peak cumulative *SWE* is not the most suitable solution. In particular, they suggest that a correct temperature threshold can  
358 help to determine the most appropriate time window of analysis, indicating the starting time of snow melting processes and  
359 then the end of the accumulation period. From the Forni Glacier, the application of the  $+0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  daily temperature threshold  
360 allows for a consistent quantification of snow ablation while, instead, for detecting the beginning of the snow melting  
361 processes, a suitable threshold has proven to be at least  $-4.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ . A possible solution to this problem could be to repeat the  
362 snow pit surveys over the same period to verify the variability of microscale conditions. This can be useful especially in those  
363 remote areas where no snowfall information is available. However, this approach involves too much time and resources and  
364 is not always feasible.

365 Even if the generally used sensors (such as the heated tipping bucket rain gauge, the heated weighing gauge, or the  
366 disdrometer) provide more accurate measurements, in remote areas like a glacier, it is very difficult to install and maintain  
367 them. One of the limitations concerns the power to be supplied to instruments, which can only consist in solar panels and  
368 lead-gel batteries. In fact, at the Forni site we had to choose only unheated low-power sensors. The snow pillow turned out to  
369 be logistically unsuitable, as it required frequent maintenance. Especially with bare ice or few centimeters of snow cover, the  
370 differential ablation causes instability of the snow pillow, mainly due to its size. Therefore, the first test on this sensor seems  
371 to indicate that it did not turn out to be appropriate for a glacier surface or a remote area in general. We will, however, try to  
372 get better results from it in the coming years. The snow pit can represent a useful approach but it requires expert personnel  
373 for carrying out the measurements, and the usefulness of the data so-obtained depends on the date for excavating the snow

374 pits. The automated camera provided hourly photos, but for assessing a correct snow depth at least two graduated rods have  
375 to be installed close to the automated camera. However, over a glacier surface, glacier dynamics and snow flux can  
376 compromise the stability of the rods: in fact, at the AWS Forni SPICE we found them broken after a short while. Finally, the  
377 SR50 sonic ranger features the unique problem of the definition of the start of the accumulation period, but this can be  
378 overcome using albedo data.

379

380

## 381 5. Conclusions

382 For the SPICE project, snow measurements at the Forni Glacier (Italian Alps) have been implemented by means of several  
383 automatic and manual approaches since 2014. This has allowed an accurate comparison and evaluation of the pros and cons  
384 of using the snow pillow, sonic ranger, snow pit, or snow weighing tube, and of estimating SWE from snow depth data. We  
385 found that the mean new snow density changes based on the considered period was:  $140 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  in 2005-2009 (Senese et al.,  
386 2014) and  $149 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  in 2005-2015. The difference is however not statistically significant. We first evaluated the new snow  
387 density estimation by means of LOOCV and we found an error of  $6 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ . Then, we benchmarked the derived  $SWE_{SR}$  data  
388 against the information from the snow pillow (data which was not used as input in our density estimation), finding a RMSE  
389 of 45 mm w.e. These analyses permitted a correct definition of the reliability of our method in deriving SWE from snow depth  
390 data. Moreover, in order to define the effects and impacts of an incorrect  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  value in the derived SWE amount, we found  
391 that a change in density of  $\pm 25 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  causes a mean variation of 17% of the mean total cumulative SWE considering all  
392 hydrological years. Finally, once  $\rho_{new\ snow}$  is known, the sonic ranger can be considered a suitable device on a glacier, or in a  
393 remote area in general, for recording snowfall events and for measuring snow depth values in order to derive SWE values. In  
394 fact, the methodology we have presented here can be interesting for other sites as it allows estimating total SWE using a  
395 relatively inexpensive, low power, low maintenance, and reliable instrument such as the sonic ranger, and it is a good solution  
396 for estimating SWE at remote locations such as glacier or high alpine regions.

397 The sensors generally used (e.g. heated tipping bucket rain gauges, heated weighing gauges, or disdrometers) can provide  
398 more accurate measurements compared to the ones installed at the Forni Glacier. The problem is that in remote areas like a  
399 glacier at a high alpine site, it is very difficult to install and maintain them. The main constrictions concern i) the power supply  
400 to the instruments, which consists in solar panels and lead-gel batteries, and ii) the glacier dynamics, snow flux and differential  
401 snow/ice ablation that can compromise the stability of the instrument structure. Therefore, for our limited experience in such  
402 remote areas, a sonic ranger could represent a useful approach for estimating SWE, since it does not require expert personnel,  
403 nor does it depend on the date of the survey (as do such manual techniques as snow pits and snow weighing tubes); it is not  
404 subject to glacier dynamics, snow flux or differential ablation (as are graduated rods installed close to an automated camera  
405 and snow pillows), and it does not required a lot of power (unlike heated tipping bucket rain gauges). The average new snow  
406 density must, however, be known either by means of snow pit measurements or by the availability of information from similar  
407 sites in the same geographic area.

408

## 409 Acknowledgements

410 The AWS1 Forni was developed under the umbrella of the SHARE (Stations at High Altitude for Research on the  
411 Environment) program, managed by the Ev-K2-CNR Association from 2002 to 2014; it was part of the former CEOP network

412 (Coordinated Energy and Water Cycle Observation Project) promoted by the WCRP (World Climate Research Programme)  
413 within the framework of the online GEWEX project (Global Energy and Water Cycle Experiment); it was inserted in the  
414 SPICE (Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment) project managed and promoted by the WMO (World Meteorological  
415 Organization), and in the CryoNet project (core network of Global Cryosphere Watch promoted by the WMO), and it was  
416 applied in the ESSEM COST Action ES1404 (a European network for a harmonised monitoring of snow for the benefit of  
417 climate change scenarios, hydrology and numerical weather prediction).

418 This research has been carried out under the umbrella of a research project funded by Sanpellegrino Levissima Spa, and young  
419 researchers involved in the study were supported by the DARAS (Department of regional affairs, autonomies and sport) of  
420 the Presidency of the Council of Ministers of the Italian government through the GlacioVAR project (PI G. Diolaiuti).  
421 Moreover, the Stelvio Park - ERSAF kindly supported data analyses and has been hosting the AWS1 Forni and the AWS  
422 SPICE at the surface of the Forni Glacier thus making possible the launch of glacier micro-meteorology in Italy.

423

#### 424 **References**

- 425 Anderson, E.A. and Crawford, N.H.: The synthesis of continuous snowmelt hydrographs on digital computer. Tech. Rep. n.  
426 36, Department Of Civil Engineering of the Stanford university, as reported in: Bras, 1990; 1964.
- 427 Azzoni, R.S., Senese, A., Zerboni, A., Maugeri, M., Smiraglia, C., and Diolaiuti, G.: Estimating ice albedo from fine debris  
428 cover quantified by a semi-automatic method: the case study of Forni Glacier, Italian Alps. *The Cryosphere*, 10, 665–679.  
429 2016doi:10.5194/tc-10-665-2016. Available online at <http://www.the-cryosphere.net/10/665/2016/tc-10-665-2016.pdf>
- 430 Azzoni, R.S., Fugazza, D., Zennaro, M., Zucali, M., D'Agata, C., Maragno, M., Smiraglia, C., and Diolaiuti, G.A.: Recent  
431 structural evolution of Forni Glacier tongue (Ortles-Cevedale Group, Central Italian Alps). *Journal of Maps* 13(2) 870-  
432 878, 2017.
- 433 Beaumont, R.T.: Mt. Hood pressure pillow snow gauge, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 4, 626–631, 1965.
- 434 Bocchiola, D. and Rosso, R.: The distribution of daily snow water equivalent in the central Italian Alps. *Advances in Water*  
435 *Resources* 30 (2007) 135–147, 2007.
- 436 Brandes, E.A., Ikeda, K., Zhang, G., Schonhuber, M., and Rasmussen, R.M.: A statistical and physical description of  
437 hydrometeor distributions in Colorado snowstorms using a video disdrometer. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, 46, 634–650,  
438 2007.
- 439 Citterio, M., Diolaiuti, G., Smiraglia, C., Verza, G., and Meraldi, E.: Initial results from the automatic weather station (AWS)  
440 on the ablation tongue of Forni Glacier (Upper Valtellina, Italy), *Geogr. Fis. Din. Quat.*, 30, 141-151, 2007.
- 441 Currie, B. W., 1947: Water content of snow in cold climates. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 28, 150–151.
- 442 D'Agata, C., Bocchiola, D., Maragno, D., Smiraglia, C., and Diolaiuti, G.A.: Glacier shrinkage driven by climate change in  
443 The Ortles-Cevedale group (Stelvio National Park, Lombardy, Italian Alps) during half a century (1954-2007).  
444 *Theoretical Applied Climatology*, April 2014, Volume 116, Issue 1-2, pp 169-190, 2014.  
445 <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00704-013-0938-5>
- 446 Diolaiuti, G. and Smiraglia, C.: Changing glaciers in a changing climate: how vanishing geomorphosites have been  
447 driving deep changes in mountain landscapes and environments, *Geomorphologie*, 2, 131–152, 2010.
- 448 **Dixon, D. and Boon, S.: Comparison of the SnowHydro snow sampler with existing snow tube designs. *Hydrologic Processes***  
449 **26 (17), 2555-2562, 2012.**

450 Fabry, F. and Szyrmer, W.: Modeling of the melting layer. Part II: Electromagnetic. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 56, 3593–3600, 1999.

451 Ferguson, S. A., Moore, M.B., Marriott, R.T., and Speers-Hayes, P.: Avalanche weather forecasting at the northwest  
452 avalanche center, Seattle, WA. *J. Glaciol.*, 36, 57–66, 1990.

453 Fugazza, D., Scaioni, M., Corti, M., D'Agata, C., Azzoni, R.S., Cernuschi, M., Smiraglia, C., and Diolaiuti, G.: Combination  
454 of UAV and terrestrial photogrammetry to assess rapid glacier evolution and conditions of glacier hazards. *Nat. Hazards  
455 Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-198>, in review, 2017.

456 Gray, D.M.: Snow accumulation and distribution. In: Colbeck SC, Ray M, eds., *Proceedings: proceedings, modeling of snow  
457 cover runoff*, Hanover, NH, 3–33, 1979.

458 Heymsfield, A.J., Bansemer, A., Schmitt, C., Twohy, C., and Poellot, M.R.: Effective ice particle densities derived from  
459 aircraft data. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 61, 982–1003, 2004.

460 Holroyd, E.W., III: The meso- and microscale structure of Great Lakes snowstorm bands: A synthesis of ground  
461 measurements, radar data, and satellite observations. Ph.D. dissertation, University at Albany, State University of New  
462 York, 148 pp, 1971.

463 Johnson, J.B. and Schaefer, G.: The influence of thermal, hydrologic, and snow deformation mechanisms on snow water  
464 equivalent pressure sensor accuracy. *Hydrological Processes* 16: 3529–3542, 2002.

465 Johnson, J.B.: A theory of pressure sensor performance in snow. *Hydrological Processes* 18, 53–64, 2004.

466 Johnson, J.B., Gelvin, A.B., Duvoy, P., Schaefer, G.L., Poole, G., and Horton, G.D.: Performance characteristics of a new  
467 electronic snow water equivalent sensor in different climates. *Hydrological Processes*, 29(6), 1418-1433, 2015.

468 Judson, A. and Doesken, N.: Density of freshly fallen snow in the central Rocky Mountains. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 81,  
469 1577–1587, 2000.

470 LaChapelle, E.R.: The density distribution of new snow. Project F, Progress Rep. 2, USDA Forest Service, Wasatch National  
471 Forest, Alta Avalanche Study Center, Salt Lake City, UT, 13 pp, 1962.

472 LaChapelle, E.R.: The fundamental process in conventional avalanche forecasting. *J. Glaciol.*, 26, 75–84, 1980.

473 Magono, C. and Nakamura, T.: Aerodynamic studies of falling snow flakes. *J. Meteor. Soc. Japan*, 43, 139–147, 1965.

474 McClung, D.M. and Schaerer, P.A.: *The avalanche handbook*. Seattle, WA, The Mountaineers, 1993.

475 Muramoto, K.I., Matsuura, K., and Shiina, T.: Measuring the density of snow particles and snowfall rate. *Electron. Commun.  
476 Japan*, 78, 71–79, 1995.

477 Nolin, A.W., Fetterer, F.M., and Scambos, T.A.: Surface roughness characterizations of sea ice and ice sheets: Case studies  
478 with MISR data. *IEEE transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 40(7), 1605-1615, 2002.

479 Pahaut, E.: *Les cristaux de neige et leurs metamorphoses*. Monographies de la Meteorologie Nationale, 1975.

480 Passarelli, R.E.Jr. and Srivastava, R.C.: A new aspect of snowflake aggregation theory. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 36, 484–493, 1979.

481 Perla, R.: On contributory factors in avalanche hazard evaluation. *Can. Geotech. J.*, 7, 414–419, 1970.

482 Power, B.A., Summers, P.W., and d'Avignon, J.: Snow crystal forms and riming effects as related to snowfall density and  
483 general storm conditions. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 21, 300–305, 1964.

484 Pruppacher, H.R. and Klett, J.D.: *Microphysics of Clouds and Precipitation*. 2d ed. Kluwer Academic, 954 pp, 1997.

485 Roebber, P.J., Bruening, S.L., Schultz, D.M., and Cortinas Jr, J.V.: Improving snowfall forecasting by diagnosing snow  
486 density. *Weather and Forecasting*, 18(2), 264-287, 2003.

487 Schultz, D.M., Cortinas Jr., J.V., and Doswell III, C.A.: Comments on “An operational ingredients-based methodology for  
488 forecasting midlatitude winter season precipitation.” *Wea. Forecasting*, 17, 160–167, 2002.

489 Senese, A., Diolaiuti, G., Mihalcea, C., and Smiraglia, C.: Energy and mass balance of Forni Glacier (Stelvio National Park,  
490 Italian Alps) from a 4-year meteorological data record, *Arct. Antarct. Alp. Res.*, 44, 122–134, 2012a.

491 Senese, A., Diolaiuti, G., Verza, G. P., and Smiraglia, C.: Surface energy budget and melt amount for the years 2009 and 2010  
492 at the Forni Glacier (Italian Alps, Lombardy), *Geogr. Fis. Din. Quat.*, 35, 69–77, 2012b.

493 Senese, A., Maugeri, M., Vuillermoz, E., Smiraglia, C., and Diolaiuti, G.: Using daily air temperature thresholds to evaluate  
494 snow melting occurrence and amount on Alpine glaciers by T-index models: the case study of the Forni Glacier (Italy).  
495 *The Cryosphere*, 8, 1921–1933, 2014. [www.the-cryosphere.net/8/1921/2014/](http://www.the-cryosphere.net/8/1921/2014/)

496 Senese, A., Maugeri, M., Ferrari, S., Confortola, G., Soncini, A., Bocchiola, D., and Diolaiuti, G.: Modelling shortwave and  
497 longwave downward radiation and air temperature driving ablation at the Forni Glacier (Stelvio National Park, Italy).  
498 *Geogr. Fis. Dinam. Quat.*, 39 (1), 89-100, 2016. DOI 10.4461/GFDQ. 2016.39.9

499 Super, A.B. and Holroyd III, E.W.: Snow accumulation algorithm for the WSR-88D radar: Second annual report. Bureau  
500 Reclamation Tech. Rep. R-97-05, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Denver, CO, 77 pp., 1997. [Available from National Technical  
501 Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161.]

502 Smiraglia, C. and Diolaiuti, G.: Epiglacial morphology. In Singh VP, Haritashya UK, Singh P eds *Encyclopedia of Snow, Ice  
503 and Glaciers* Springer, Berlin, 2011.

504 Sturm, M., Taras, B., Liston, G.E., Derksen, C., Jones, T., and Lea, J.: Estimating snow water equivalent using snow depth  
505 data and climate classes. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 11: 1380–1394, 2010.

506 Urbini, S., Zirizzotti, A., Baskaradas, J., Tabacco, I.E., Cafarella, L., Senese, A., Smiraglia, C., and Diolaiuti, G.: Airborne  
507 Radio Echo Sounding (RES) measures on Alpine Glaciers to evaluate ice thickness and bedrock geometry: preliminary  
508 results from pilot tests performed in the Ortles Cevedale Group (Italian Alps). *Annals of Geophysics*, 60(2), 0226, 2017.

509 Valt, M. and Cianfarra, P.: Recent snow cover variability in the Italian Alps. *Cold Regions Science and Technology*, 64, 146-  
510 157, 2010.

511 Wetzel, S.W. and Martin, J.E.: An operational ingredients-based methodology for forecasting midlatitude winter season  
512 precipitation. *Wea. Forecasting*, 16, 156–167, 2001.

513 Work, R.A., Stockwell, H.J., Freeman, T.G., and Beaumont, R.T.: Accuracy of field snow surveys, Tech. Rep. 163, U.S.  
514 Army Cold Reg. Res. and Eng. Lab., Hanover, N. H., 1965.

515 WMO Solid Precipitation Measurement Intercomparison: Final report. WMO/TD - No. 872. Instruments and observing  
516 methods, Report No. 67, 202 pp, 1998.

517 WMO: Guide to Meteorological Instruments and Methods of Observation – WMO-No. 8 - Seventh edition, 2008.

518

519 Table 1: Instrumentation at the Forni Glacier with instrument name, measured parameter, manufacturer, and starting date.

<b>Instrument name</b>	<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Manufacturer</b>	<b>Date</b>
Babuc ABC	Data logger	LSI LASTEM	Sept. 2005
CR200	Data logger	Campbell	May 2014
CR1000	Data logger	Campbell	May 2014
Sonic ranger SR50	Snow depth	Campbell	Sept. 2005
Sonic ranger USH8	Snow depth	Sommer	May 2014
Snow pillow	SWE	Park Mechanical Inc.	May 2014
Thermo-hygrometer	Air temperature and humidity	LSI LASTEM	Sept. 2005
Barometer	Atmospheric pressure	LSI LASTEM	Sept. 2005
Net Radiometer CNR1	Short and long wave radiation fluxes	Kipp & Zonen	Sept. 2005
Pluviometer unheated	Liquid precipitation	LSI LASTEM	Sept. 2005
Anemometer 05103V	Wind speed and direction	Young	Sept. 2005


520

521 Table 2: The leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV). For each survey, we reported the  $SWE$  values measured by means of  
 522 the snow pit ( $SWE_{snow-pit}$ ), the values of the new snow density applying the Eq. 3 ( $\rho_{new\ snow}$  from snow pit  $j$ ), and the new snow  
 523 density obtained applying the LOOCV method ( $LOOCV\ \rho_{new\ snow}$ ).

<b>Date of survey</b>	<b><math>SWE_{snow-pit}</math></b> <b>(mm w.e.)</b>	<b><math>\rho_{new\ snow}</math> from snow pit <math>j</math></b> <b>(kg m<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	<b>LOOCV <math>\rho_{new\ snow}</math></b> <b>(kg m<sup>-3</sup>)</b>
24/01/06	337	147	150
02/03/06	430	128	153
30/03/06	619	147	150
07/05/08	690	135	152
21/02/09	650	143	151
27/03/10	640	156	149
25/04/11	770	178	147
20/02/15	555	159	149
<b>MEAN</b>		<b>149</b>	<b>150</b>


524





525  
 526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531

Figure 1: (a) The study site. The yellow triangle indicates the location of the AWS1 Forni and the Forni AWS SPICE until November 2015. The red star refers to the actual location after securing the stations. (b) AWS1 Forni (on the right) and AWS Forni SPICE (on the left) photographed from the North-East on 6<sup>th</sup> May 2014 (immediately after the installation of the AWS Forni SPICE). The distances between the stations are shown.




532

533 **Figure 2: Daily** snow depth measured by the Campbell SR-50 sonic ranger at the AWS1 Forni from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005  
 534 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016. The dates shown are dd/mm/yy.

535


536



537

538 **Figure 3: Daily SWE data derived from snow depth by the Campbell SR50 (using the new snow density of 149 kg m<sup>-3</sup>)**  
 539 **and measured by snow pits from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016. The periods without data are shown in light**  
 540 **grey.** The dates shown are dd/mm/yy.

541




542

543

544

545


Figure 4: Daily SWE data derived from snow depth measured by Campbell SR50 (using the new snow density of 149 kg m<sup>-3</sup>) and measured by snow pits and snow pillow from October 2014 to July 2016. The dates shown are dd/mm/yy.



546

547 **Figure 5:** Scatter plots showing SWE measured by snow pillow and snow pit and derived applying Eq. (4) to data  
 548 acquired by Campbell SR50 (using the new snow density of  $149 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ ). Two accumulation periods of measurements  
 549 are shown from November 2014 to March 2015 and from February 2016 to May 2016. Every dot represents a daily  
 550 value.

551



552

553

554

555

556

Figure 6: Comparison among daily SWE values derived from snow depth data acquired by SR50 sonic ranger (applying different values of new snow density) and SWE values measured by snow pits from 2005 to 2016. The dates shown are dd/mm/yy.