

1                               **The role of a mid-air collision in drifting snow**

2   **Shuming Jia<sup>1,2</sup>, Zhengshi Wang<sup>1,2</sup>, Shumin Li<sup>1,2</sup>**

3   <sup>1</sup> State Key Laboratory of Aerodynamics, China Aerodynamic Research and Development  
4   Center, Mianyang Sichuan 621000, China

5   <sup>2</sup> Computational Aerodynamics Institute, China Aerodynamics Research and Development  
6   Center, Mianyang, Sichuan 621000, China

7   **Correspondence:** Zhengshi Wang ([wangzs@cardc.cn](mailto:wangzs@cardc.cn))

8    **Abstract.** Drifting snow, a common two-phase flow movement in high and cold areas,  
9    contributes greatly to the mass and energy balance of glacier and ice sheets and  
10   further affects the global climate system. Mid-air collisions occur frequently in  
11   high-concentration snow flows; however, this mechanism is rarely considered in  
12   current models of drifting snow. In this work, a three-dimensional model of drifting  
13   snow with consideration of inter-particle collisions is established; this model enables  
14   the investigation of the role of a mid-air collision mechanism in openly drifting snow.  
15   It is found that the particle collision frequency increases with the particle  
16   concentration and friction velocity, and the blown snow with a mid-air collision effect  
17   produces more realistic transport fluxes since inter-particle collision can enhance the  
18   particle velocity under the same condition. However, the snow saltation mass flux  
19   basically shows a cubic dependency with friction velocity, which distinguishes it from  
20   the quadratic dependence of blown sand movement. Moreover, the snow saltation flux  
21   is found to be largely sensitive to the particle size distribution since the suspension  
22   snow may restrain the saltation movement. This research could improve our  
23   understanding of the role of the mid-air collision mechanism in natural drifting snow.

## 1 Introduction

As one of the most important indicators of global climate change, snow cover is widely distributed over high latitude regions (Mann et al., 2000;Gordon and Taylor, 2009;Huang and Shi, 2017). Drifting snow is an important natural phenomenon in which air flow carries snow particles traveling near the surface, which not only profoundly changes the mass and energy balance of polar ice sheets (Déry and Yau, 2002;Gallée et al., 2013;Huang et al., 2016) but also may induce various natural disasters, such as avalanches, landslides and mudslides (Christen et al., 2010;Schweizer et al., 2003;Sovilla et al., 2006). In-depth studies of the laws of snow particle motion and various influencing factors are essential for understanding this complex phenomenon.

Drifting snow in the turbulent boundary layer contains both saltation particles that jumps towards downwind at the near surface and suspension particles higher in the air. Inter-particle collision within aeolian snow/sand cloud changes trajectories of saltating grains, and further affects the structures and transportation features of the particle flow. Numerous of investigations have shown that mid-air collision effect plays an non-neglected role in wind-blown sand movement (Carneiro et al., 2013;Dong et al., 2005;Huang et al., 2007;Li et al., 2013). However, this mechanism has been rarely investigated in a drifting snow transport with more suspended grains and smaller particle response time.

Numerical simulations have become one of the most effective ways of exploring the blown snow movement, and plenty of drifting snow models have been established

since the end of last century. Generally, drifting snow models can be divided into Euler-Euler models (Bintanja, 2000;Déry and Yau, 1999;Lehning et al., 2008;Schneiderbauer and Prokop, 2011;Uematsu et al., 1991;Vionnet et al., 2013;Xiao et al., 2000) and Euler-Lagrange models (Huang et al., 2016;Huang and Shi, 2017;Huang and Wang, 2015, 2016;Nemoto and Nishimura, 2004;Zhang and Huang, 2008;Zwaafink et al., 2014), in which snow particles are treated as one kind of continuous medium and individual particles, respectively. However, mid-air collisions, an important mechanism that influences the transportation of snow particles and the development of drifting snow, are hardly considered by current models. The Lagrange tracking model can capture the inter-particle collision process more explicitly and directly, and thus is more suitable for establishing the mid-air collision model.

In this work, a trajectory-based mid-air collision model for drifting snow is established on the basics of a three-dimensional drifting snow model in the turbulent boundary layer, and the effects of mid-air collision on the snow transportation and particle motion are mainly explored. This paper is structured as follows: Sect. 2 briefly introduces the model and method, Sect. 3 presents the model validation and simulation results, Sect. 4 discusses the results in detail, and Sect. 5 presents the conclusions.

## **2 Model and method**

### **2.1 Turbulent boundary layer**

The wind field is obtained from a large eddy simulation model of the Advanced

Regional Prediction System (ARPS, version 5.3.3) (Xue et al., 2001). Considering the coupling effect between the snow particles and air flow, the fluid governing equations can be written as (Dupont et al., 2013; Vinkovic et al., 2006):

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\rho \bar{u}_i) = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho u_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho u_i u_j}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial \tilde{p}^*}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial \tau_{ij}}{\partial x_j} + S_i \quad (2)$$

where  $\rho$  is the air density,  $t$  is time,  $x_i$  and  $u_i$  are the position coordinate and instantaneous wind velocity component, respectively, along three directions,  $\tilde{p}^* = p' - \alpha \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u})$  includes the pressure perturbation and damping term ( $\alpha$  is the damping coefficient),  $\tau_{ij}$  is the sub-grid stress that is modeled by the Lagrangian dynamic closure model of Meneveau et al. (1996), and  $S_i$  is the source term that comes from the reaction force of the snow particles (Yamamoto et al., 2001):

$$S_i = -\frac{1}{\rho V_{grid}} \sum_{s=1}^{N_p} F_{D,i} \quad (3)$$

where  $V_{grid}$  and  $N_p$  are the volume and the number of particles in the grid cell, respectively.  $F_D = m_p V_r f(Re_p) / T_p$  is the fluid drag force, where  $m_p$  is the mass of snow particle and  $V_r$  represents the relative speed between the snow particle and wind field,  $T_p = \rho_p d_p^2 / 18 \rho \nu$  is the particle relaxation time and represents the time of particle speed changing from one steady state to another, and  $\rho_p$  is the density of the snow particle.  $Re_p = d_p V_r / \nu$  is the particle Reynolds number, where  $d_p$  is the particle diameter and  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity of air.  $f(Re_p)$  is a correction factor of particle drag coefficient and can be expressed as (Clift et al., 1978):

$$f(Re_p) = \begin{cases} 1 & (Re_p < 1) \\ 1 + 0.15 Re_p^{0.687} & (Re_p \geq 1) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

## 2.2 Mid-air collision model

The Lagrange particle tracking method is used to calculate the trajectory of each snow particle. Considering the fluid drag force and gravity, the governing equation of particle motion can be read as (Anderson and Haff, 1988; Lopes et al., 2013):

$$\frac{dx_{pi}}{dt} = u_{pi} \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{du_{pi}}{dt} = F_{Di} + g_i \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_p}\right) \quad (6)$$

where  $x_p$  and  $u_p$  are the position and velocity of snow particle, respectively,  $F_{Di}$  is the drag force component along the  $i$ -th direction, and  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration.


During the process of particle motion, the judgment criterion for a mid-air collision is  $l < (d_A + d_B)/2$ , in which  $l = \sqrt{\sum (x_{Ai} - x_{Bi})^2}$  is the center distance of particle  $A$  and  $B$ . If particles  $A$  and  $B$  contact each other within a time step  $(t, t + \Delta t)$ , there must exists a root  $\delta t$  ( $0 < \delta t < \Delta t$ ) that satisfies the following relation:

$$\frac{d_A + d_B}{2} = \sqrt{\sum ((x_{Ai} - u_{Ai}\delta t) - (x_{Bi} - u_{Bi}\delta t))^2} \quad (7)$$

in which the smaller root will be used if two roots exist. Thus, the collision time of particles  $A$  and  $B$  is  $t + \delta t$ . Since mid-air particles judge collision event in sequence, each particle only seeks downstream particles to reduce computation.

To obtain particle information after the collision, the original coordinate system  $(X, Y, Z)$  is rotated to a new coordinate system  $(X_r, Y_r, Z_r)$ , as shown in Fig. 1, in

108 which the  $X_r$  axis points from the center of particle A to that of B. In this condition,  
 109 only the particle velocity component along the  $X_r$  axis is changed after the collision.



110

111 **Figure 1.** Schematic diagram of the rotation of the coordinate system.

112 Then, the particle velocity components ( $u_{Aci}$  and  $u_{Bci}$ ) in the new coordinate  
 113 system can be calculated by the coordinate transformation algorithm. Since central  
 114 collisions without particle rotation do not generate friction force, the particle velocity  
 115 along the  $X_r$  axis after the collision in the new coordinate system can be expressed  
 116 as:

$$117 \quad \begin{cases} u'_{Acl} = u_{Acl} - \gamma d_B^3 (u_{Acl} - u_{Bcl}) \\ u'_{Bcl} = u_{Bcl} + \gamma d_A^3 (u_{Acl} - u_{Bcl}) \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

118 where  $\gamma = (1+e)/(d_A^3 + d_B^3)$  and  $e$  is the recovery coefficient of ice. According to  
 119 Higa et al. (1998), the recovery coefficient of ice typically has a constant value  $e_{qe}$  at  
 120 the quasi-elastic region and a decrement tendency at the inelastic region, which can be  
 121 described by a piecewise function:

$$122 \quad e = \begin{cases} e_{qe} & v_n < v_c \\ e_{qe} \left( \frac{v_n}{v_c} \right)^{-\log(v_n/v_c)} & v_n > v_c \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

123 in which  $e_{qe} = 0.027(1+\hat{d}^3)^{0.1}(1+\hat{d})^{0.2}(d_A/0.05)^{-0.5}$  and  $\hat{d} \equiv d_A/d_B$ ,  $v_n$  is the

normal relative velocity of particle  $A$  and  $B$ , and  $v_c$  is the critical impact velocity for the transition from the quasi-elastic region to the inelastic region, which can be expressed as:

$$v_c = v_0 \left(1 + \hat{d}^3\right)^a \left(1 + \hat{d}\right)^b \exp\left(\frac{c}{2RT}\right) \left(\frac{d_A}{d_0}\right)^{-0.5} \quad T \geq 229K \quad (10)$$

where  $v_0 = 5.72e-4$ ,  $a = 3/4$ ,  $b = -7/4$  and  $d_0 = 0.03$  are parameters,  $R$  is the gas constant ( $287.0 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1}$ ) and  $T$  is the temperature ( $258.13 \text{ K}$  in this simulation).

Finally, the new coordinate system is rotated to the original location, and the particle velocity after the collision  $u'_{pi}$  can be obtained. The particle position after the collision can also be updated through  $x'_{pi} = x_{pi} - u_{pi} \delta t + u'_{pi} (\Delta t - \delta t)$ .

### 2.3 Simulation details

A computational domain of  $2 \text{ m} \times 1 \text{ m} \times 1 \text{ m}$  is adopted in this simulation. The grid number is  $100 \times 50 \times 50$ , and grid stretch technology is used in the vertical direction (the finest grid scale is  $2 \text{ mm}$ ). Under this grid resolution, the subgrid-scale (SGS) fluctuating velocity of particles has a negligible impact on particle motions, because the lifetime of SGS eddies is much smaller than the particle response time-scale (Dupont et al., 2013). The turbulence inflow boundary is used (Lund et al., 1998), and the outlet is an open radiation boundary condition. The periodic boundary conditions are adopted along the spanwise direction. The inlet flow obeys the logarithmic wind profile with a boundary layer depth of  $H=0.5 \text{ m}$  and a roughness height of  $z_0 = 3.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$  (Nemoto and Nishimura, 2004, 2001). The bottom boundary is a rigid wall, and the top boundary obeys a stress-free boundary condition.



It is notable that the combined boundary conditions along streamwise are only used to generate some initial wind fluctuations, and the periodic boundary conditions are adopted after that. The evolution time equals to 10 times of the large-eddy turnover time  $t_*$  ( $t_* \equiv H/u_*$ , where  $u_*$  is the friction velocity) under periodic boundary conditions. Drifting snow simulation begins after the turbulent boundary layer is fully developed, and the lateral boundary conditions for snow particles are the same as the wind field. Here, the friction velocity is obtained from the time and spatial averaged wind profile of a fully developed turbulent boundary layer without drifting snow according to the logarithmic law:

$$U(z) = \frac{u_*}{\kappa} \ln\left(\frac{z + z_0}{z_0}\right) \quad (11)$$


where  $\kappa = 0.4$  is the Karman constant.

The aerodynamic entrainment scheme of (Zwaafink et al., 2014) is used to induce a drifting snow in the turbulent boundary layer. In addition, the splash function for snow (Sugiura and Maeno, 2000) is used to describe the grain-bed interaction. Detailed formula for the aerodynamic entrainment and splash scheme can be seen in App. 1. Since the splash function is obtained from wind tunnel observations at low friction velocities, only the results at lower friction velocities (e.g., smaller than 0.5  $\text{ms}^{-1}$ ) are mainly discussed. Furthermore, the fracturing of the snow particle is not considered during particle collision, and the rotation of the particle is also neglected because the duration time of inter-particle collision is very short.

### 3 Results

### 3.1 Snow transport flux

The inter-particle collision within the drifting snow changes the trajectories of saltating particles, and further affect the structure and transport flux of the snow flow. Thus, the established drifting snow model is first verified by comparing the predicted snow transport flux with the measurements and other models.



**Figure 2.** Particle size distribution in the simulation.


The particle size distribution of the snow sample is similar to that adopted by Nemoto and Nishimura (2004), as shown in Fig. 2, which follows the gamma function with a mean diameter of 250  $\mu m$ . The gamma function can be written as:

$$P(d_p) = \frac{1}{\beta_p^{\alpha_p} \Gamma(\alpha_p)} d_p^{\alpha_p-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d_p}{\beta_p}\right) \quad (12)$$

where  $\alpha_p = 5$  and  $\beta_p = 50$  are parameters. This distribution is also basically consistent with the experimental snow samples of Sugiura et al. (1998).

Before calculating the drifting snow process with mid-air collision, the validity of the collision model is examined firstly. Since the collision model judges collisions along the continuous particle trajectories within a particle integral time step, thus, the

time resolution of the particle trajectory determines the accuracy of the model. Fig. 3 shows the predicted collision frequency versus particle concentration under various particle integral time steps  $\Delta t_p$ , which is also compared with theoretical results. Here, collision frequency is defined as the mean collision times per unit time of a particle.




**Figure 3.** Comparison between theoretical collision frequency and simulation results under various particle integral time steps. The simulation condition is that a certain number of randomly released particles with uniform grain size moves in an airtight box (0.1 m×0.1 m×0.1 m). The initial velocity is 2.0 ms<sup>-1</sup> with random directions, and the energy loss during inter-particle collision is neglected. The mirror reflection conditions without energy loss are adopted at boundaries. And the predicted collision frequency is the mean value of 10 s physical time. Besides, the theoretical collision frequency is calculated by the existence probability of particles in the control volume given by the inset ( $\pi d_p^2 u_p \Delta t_p$ ). Thus, the theoretical collision frequency equals to  $\pi d_p^2 u_p c$ , where  $c$  is the number concentration of particles.

From Fig. 3, the predicted collision frequency is directly related to the particle

integral time step, and the differences between various particle time steps increase with particle concentration. A critical value of  $\Delta t_p = 1.0 \times 10^{-4}$  s is necessary to capture overall particle collisions. As a matter of fact, this critical value also ensures that most particle displacement increments are smaller than the mean inter-particle gap (e.g., a particle concentration of  $1.25 \times 10^8 \text{ m}^{-3}$  corresponding a mean inter-particle gap of  $1.75 \times 10^{-3}$  m). However, a larger time step for particle may miss part of collisions, because the displacement increments of particle are larger than the mean inter-particle distance. In this simulation, the selected time step ensures that the error between simulation and theoretical results under extreme condition (maximum particle concentration and particle velocity) is smaller than 5%.

Snow transport fluxes with and without a mid-air collision mechanism are shown in Fig. 4. From this figure, it can be seen that without mid-air collisions, the snow transport flux at various friction velocities are consistent with the simulation results of Nemoto and Nishimura (2004), mainly because the same splash function is adopted.




**Figure 4.** Snow transport flux versus friction velocity.

However, the snow transport flux is obviously enhanced with inter-particle collisions than without mid-air collisions, and the snow transport flux with mid-air collisions is obviously closer to the measurements (Okaze et al., 2012; Sugiura et al., 1998), which indicates that mid-air collisions are not negligible within drifting snow. At the same time, the enhanced proportion increases with increasing friction velocity. For example, at approximately the critical friction velocity (the smallest friction velocity for a drifting snow), the snow transport flux with and without mid-air collisions is almost equal. However, when the friction velocity reaches  $0.489 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ , the enhanced proportion by mid-air collisions is up to 38.97%. The reason could be that frequent collisions between higher and lower particles in the snow flow, on the one hand, increase the momentum of the impacting particles, and on the other hand, send the falling particles back to high altitude to obtain more energy. At the same time, saltating particles reduce the wind at the near surface, however, mid-air collisions reduce the surface wind speed to a more smaller value, which also implies that the mass flux is enhanced by mid-air collision effect, detailed discussion can be seen in Sec. 4.2.

### **3.2 Collision frequency**

The collision frequency under various friction velocities is shown in Fig. 5. Here, the collision frequency is defined as the collision times per unit time of a saltating particle. It can be seen that the collision frequency is directly related to the particle concentration. When the particle concentration is below  $1.0 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^{-3}$ , inter-particle collisions rarely occur. However, with the further increment in the particle

concentration, the frequency of the inter-particle collision event increases rapidly, and one particle may experience over 10 collisions per second when the particle concentration is  $1.0 \times 10^8 \text{ m}^{-3}$ .




**Figure 5.** Inter-particle collision frequency versus particle concentration under various friction velocities (inset: mean particle momentum of saltating snow particle in drifting snow).

In addition, the collision frequency also increases with the friction velocity at the same particle concentration. The reason could be that the mean particle momentum increases with friction velocity, and as shown in the inset, the mean particle momentum tends to increase with friction velocity, which is also consistent with the experimental measurements (Nishimura et al., 2015; Nishimura and Hunt, 2000).

As a matter of fact, the particle volume fraction of snow cloud reflects the gaps among solid particles, and determines the collision frequency more directly. Elghobashi [1994] reported that the inter-particle collision effect is not negligible

when the particle volume fraction exceeds  $10^{-3}$ , which corresponds to a particle concentration of  $\sim 10^8 \text{ m}^{-3}$  in our simulation. For a drifting snow process, only the near surface transport particle cloud achieves this condition, and our simulation results also show that the structures of near surface snow cloud are largely reshaped by mid-air collisions. From Fig. 5, it can be seen that the collision frequency is about 10 per second, which implies that almost each saltation process is affected by mid-air collisions (the time scale of a saltation process is approximately 0.1s).

From the above analysis, drifting snow generally exists at a critical height, i.e., mid-air collisions frequently occur below this height, while there are few collision events above this height. As shown in Fig. 6, the critical height  $h_c$  basically increases linearly with the friction velocity when the critical particle concentration of  $1.0 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^{-3}$  is adopted, and the function of  $h_c = 1.42 + 20.8u_*$  properly describes the tendency.




**Figure 6.** Critical height for the mid-air collision in drifting snow.

## 4 Discussions

### 4.1 Effect of mid-air collision on the structure of drifting snow

Mid-air collision changes trajectories of saltating grains, and further affects the structure of transport snow cloud. Fig. 7 shows snow transport flux profiles with and without mid-air collisions. Generally, drifting snow models without mid-air collision always tends to overestimate the mass flux at the near surface, as shown in Fig. 7 and predictions by Nemoto and Nishimura (2004). However, with the mid-air collision effect into consideration, it can be seen that the mass flux at the near surface is largely reduced, while the snow transport flux higher in the air is largely enhanced, and the modified transport flux profile is closer to the tendency of observations. The main reason could be that numbers of particles are extruded out from the high concentration snow cloud at the near surface by frequent mid-air collisions.




**Figure 7.** Mass flux profiles with and without mid-air collisions.

Since mid-air collisions plays an important role in conveying particles to high altitude, the enhanced total transport flux under mid-air collision should be mainly contributed by the increased transport flux higher in the air. This is substantially accord with the findings of Carneiro et al. (2013). In this way, the particle concentration profile is also modified by mid-air collisions. As shown in Fig. 8, part




of the near surface particles are transported to higher altitude by inter-particle collision, and the particle concentration profiles is largely changed by mid-air collision effect. The inset shows the particle concentration profile at the near surface.



**Figure 8.** Profiles of particle number concentration with and without mid-air collisions under various friction velocities (Solid lines: with mid-air collisions; dashed lines: without mid-air collisions).

Seen from Fig. 8, the thickness of the drifting snow layer is increased by mid-air collision effect under the same friction velocity, which is also a positive contribution to the increment of the total mass flux. Mid-air collisions also increase the particle concentration higher in the air but reduce that at the near surface, agree well with the mass flux profiles.



**Figure 9.** Profiles of particle mean diameter under various friction velocities.


At the same time, the thickness of the drifting snow layer with atmospheric turbulence is much larger than that without turbulence, which also increases with friction velocity. The reason could be that turbulent vortex brings particles to higher in the air when the local vertical wind speed exceeds the particle's terminal velocity, and turbulent intensity also increases with friction velocity. Generally, smaller particles are easier to be transported to higher altitude, thus, the mean particle diameter decreases with height, as shown in Fig. 9. However, with mid-air collision effect into consideration, more larger snow particles are transported to higher in the air, thus, the mean particle diameter at higher altitude becomes larger. This tendency is closer to the observations by Nemoto and Nishimura (2005).

#### 4.2 Surface shear stress with and without collision

In steady-state drifting snow, part of the downward horizontal momentum flux in the saltation layer is carried by saltating snow particles, and thus the total downward momentum flux  $\tau$  equals the sum of the horizontal momentum fluxes due to particles  $\tau_p$  and the fluid  $\tau_f$ , that is,  $\tau = \tau_p + \tau_f$  (Kok et al., 2012; Raupach, 1991). The

residual fluid shear stress  $\tau_f$ , also called the impact threshold, represents the threshold of the fluid shear stress that retains the particle splash process and is commonly treated as a constant in the steady-state saltation (Bagnold, 1941;Owen, 1964).

However, several recent physically based numerical saltation models and measurements indicate that  $\tau_f$  in fact decreases with the friction velocity mainly because the larger wind speed higher in the saltation layer should be compensated by a decrease in the wind speed lower in the saltation layer (Kok et al., 2012;Walter et al., 2015). This is also true for drifting snow, as shown in Fig. 6(a). In this simulation, coarse snow particles are adopted since pure saltation with least suspended snow is wanted, the particle size distribution is shown in Fig. 6(b). It can be seen that the particle size is larger than 100  $\mu\text{m}$  because the diameter of the suspension snow is basically smaller than 100  $\mu\text{m}$  (Gordon and Taylor, 2009;Huang and Wang, 2015;Nemoto and Nishimura, 2004;Nishimura and Hunt, 2000).



**Figure 6.** (a) Variation in the fluid stress versus friction velocity, and (b) particle size distribution for the pure saltation simulation.

Additionally, the presence of mid-air collisions further decreases the impact

threshold to a great extent. As shown in Fig. 6(a), under the same friction velocity condition, the residual fluid shear stress  $\tau_f$  with the mid-air collision effect is smaller than that without mid-air collisions, mainly because frequent inter-particle collisions convey part of particles to higher in the air where the wind speed is larger, the overall particle energy and thus the saltation is enhanced.

It is known that the saltation mass flux can be derived from the momentum balance in the saltation layer as(Kok et al., 2012;Sørensen, 2004):

$$Q = \rho(u_*^2 - u_{*f}^2)L / \Delta\bar{V} \quad (13)$$

where  $u_{*f}$  is the critical impact friction velocity,  $L$  is the mean saltation length, and  $\Delta\bar{V}$  is the mean velocity difference of the impact and lift-off particles. Many numerical and experimental investigations present the scaling of the saltation mass flux  $Q$  with  $u_*^3$  (Bagnold, 1941;Clifton et al., 2006;Nishimura and Hunt, 2000;Owen, 1964;Vionnet et al., 2013) by assuming that the particle speeds can be linearly scaled with the friction velocity  $u_*$ , and  $u_{*f}$  is commonly approximate with the critical fluid friction velocity  $u_{*t}$ . Whereas the critical impact friction velocity  $u_{*f}$  may be larger or smaller than the critical fluid friction velocity  $u_{*t}$  as a matter of fact, as shown in Fig. 6(a).

For wind-blown sand movement, recent studies have proved that the saltation mass flux actually shows a quadratic dependency with the friction velocity since the mean particle speed in the saltation layer is independent of the friction velocity (Durán et al., 2011;Ho et al., 2011;Kok et al., 2012). For drifting snow, however, the mean particle speed at the near surface is essentially proportional to the friction

velocity (Nishimura and Hunt, 2000; Nishimura et al., 2015) probably due to the smaller response time of the snow particle, which supports the fact that the snow saltation flux typically shows a cubic dependency.

Interestingly, Nemoto and Nishimura (2004) reported an increasing tendency of the fluid stress  $\tau_f$  with the friction velocity when suspension snow is included, as shown in Fig. 6(a). This increase may be because suspended snow reduces the wind speed higher in the air, which in turn needs a larger wind speed lower in the saltation layer to replenish the particle momentum. Thus, the suspension snow may restrain the saltation movement. The measurements of Nishimura and Hunt (2000) with various snow grain sizes also support this point.

In this way, the saltation mass flux (or residual fluid stress) of drifting snow largely depends on the particle size. For pure saltation movement as in above simulation (e.g., coarse grain size),  $\tau_f$  decreases with the friction velocity and results in a larger saltation flux. Whereas for drifting snow with considerable suspended snow particles,  $\tau_f$  may increase with friction velocity, and thus reduce the saltation mass flux. That is, snow samples with different grain sizes may have different saltation mass fluxes under the same wind condition. The particle borne stress  $\tau_p$  from the above simulation is approximately 4.5 times that predicted by the model of Nemoto and Nishimura (2004) when the friction velocity is  $0.39 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ , and thus, the snow saltation flux may be considerably different.

As a matter of fact, measurements of Sugiura et al. (1998) have shown that the total mass flux (including saltation and suspension) is rather sensitive to the particle

size, because the suspension mass flux varies significantly. From this study, the suspension and saltation snows also influence each other. Most previous drifting snow models adopted by the mass balance studies of glaciers of ice caps consider the saltation and suspension processes independently (Gallée et al., 2001; Lehning et al., 2008; Vionnet et al., 2013). From above analysis, this may increase the uncertainty of prediction with varying grain sizes. A coupling model that includes the interactions between saltation and suspension snows is necessary to model the drifting snow process more exactly.

## **5 Conclusions**

In this work, a three-dimensional drifting snow model in the turbulent boundary layer with consideration of a mid-air collision mechanism is established based on tracking the trajectory of each snow particle; this model enables the exploration of the mid-air collision mechanism on the drifting snow process exactly.

In the traveling snow flow, mid-air collisions play an important role in enhancing the snow transport flux. The enhanced total transport flux is mainly contributed by the increased mass flux higher in the air, since mid-air collisions change the structure of drifting snow layer by reducing the mass flux at the near surface but increasing that higher in the air. In addition, there exists a critical particle concentration in which inter-particle collisions rarely occur below this value. However, above the critical concentration, the collision frequency as well as the role of inter-particle collisions is found to increase with the friction velocity.

Furthermore, mid-air collisions also enhance the particle velocity by conveying

more particles to higher in the air, and thus further reduces the residual fluid stress during drifting snow conditions. The snow saltation flux is also found to be sensitive to particle size distribution of the snow samples because suspension snow may restrain saltation movement to a great extent, and the snow saltation flux may vary several times for different particle size distribution.

## Acknowledgements

This work is supported by National key research and development program (2016YFC0500901), Forestry industry research special funds for key public welfare projects (201404306), National Natural Science Foundation of China (11772143) and 111 Project, B14044, CARD C Fundamental and Frontier Technology Research Fund (FFTRF-2017-08, FFTRF-2017-09).

## References

- Anderson, R. S., and Haff, P. K.: Simulation of Eolian Saltation, *Science*, 241, 820-823, 1988.
- Anderson, R. S., and Haff, P. K.: Wind modification and bed response during saltation of sand in air, *Acta. Mech.*, 1, 21-51, 1991.
- Bagnold, R. A.: *The Physics of Wind Blown Sand and Desert Dunes*, Methuen, London, 1941.
- Bintanja, R.: Snowdrift suspension and atmospheric turbulence. Part I: Theoretical background and model description, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 95, 343-368, 2000.
- Carneiro, M. V., Araújo, N. A., Pähitz, T., and Herrmann, H. J.: Midair collisions enhance saltation, *Phys.rev.lett*, 111, 058001, 2013.
- Christen, M., Kowalski, J., and Bartelt, P.: RAMMS: Numerical simulation of dense snow avalanches in three-dimensional terrain, *Cold Regions Science & Technology*, 63, 1-14, 2010.
- Clift, R., Grace, J. R., and Weber, M. E.: *Bubbles, drops, and particles*, Academic Press, 263-264 pp., 1978.
- Clifton, A., Rüedi, J. D., and Lehning, M.: Snow saltation threshold measurements in a drifting-snow wind tunnel, *Journal of Glaciology*, 52, 585-596, 2006.

425 Déry, S. J., and Yau, M. K.: A Bulk Blowing Snow Model, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 93,  
 426 237-251, 1999.

427 Déry, S. J., and Yau, M. K.: Large - scale mass balance effects of blowing snow and surface  
 428 sublimation, *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*, 107, 8-17, 2002.

429 Dong, Z., Huang, N., and Liu, X.: Simulation of the probability of midair interparticle collisions in  
 430 an aeolian saltating cloud, *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*, 110, 2005.

431 Doorschot, J. J. J., and Lehning, M.: Equilibrium Saltation: Mass Fluxes, Aerodynamic  
 432 Entrainment, and Dependence on Grain Properties, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 104, 111-130,  
 433 2002.

434 Dupont, S., Bergametti, G., Marticorena, B., and Simoëns, S.: Modeling saltation intermittency,  
 435 *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*, 118, 7109-7128, 2013.

436 Durán, O., Claudin, P., and Andreotti, B.: On aeolian transport: Grain-scale interactions,  
 437 dynamical mechanisms and scaling laws, *Aeolian Research*, 3, 243-270,  
 438 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2011.07.006>, 2011.

439 Gallée, H., Guyomarc'H, G., and Brun, E.: Impact Of Snow Drift On The Antarctic Ice Sheet  
 440 Surface Mass Balance: Possible Sensitivity To Snow-Surface Properties, *Boundary-Layer*  
 441 *Meteorology*, 99, 1-19, 2001.

442 Gallée, H., Trouvilliez, A., Agosta, C., Genthon, C., Favier, V., and Naaim-Bouvet, F.: Transport of  
 443 Snow by the Wind: A Comparison Between Observations in Adélie Land, Antarctica, and  
 444 Simulations Made with the Regional Climate Model MAR, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 146,  
 445 133-147, 2013.

446 Gordon, M., and Taylor, P. A.: Measurements of blowing snow, Part I: Particle shape, size  
 447 distribution, velocity, and number flux at Churchill, Manitoba, Canada, *Cold Regions Science &*  
 448 *Technology*, 55, 63-74, 2009.

449 Higa, M., Arakawa, M., and Maeno, N.: Size Dependence of Restitution Coefficients of Ice in  
 450 Relation to Collision Strength, *Icarus*, 133, 310-320, 1998.

451 Ho, T. D., Valance, A., Dupont, P., and Ould, E. M. A.: Scaling laws in aeolian sand transport,  
 452 2011, 1059-1062.

453 Huang, N., Zhang, Y., and D'Adamo, R.: A model of the trajectories and midair collision  
 454 probabilities of sand particles in a steady state saltation cloud, *Journal of Geophysical Research*



455 Atmospheres, 112, 2007.

456 Huang, N., and Wang, Z. S.: A 3-D simulation of drifting snow in the turbulent boundary layer,  
 457 Cryosphere Discussions, 9, 301-331, 2015.

458 Huang, N., Dai, X., and Zhang, J.: The impacts of moisture transport on drifting snow sublimation  
 459 in the saltation layer, Atmospheric Chemistry & Physics, 16, 7523-7529, 2016.

460 Huang, N., and Wang, Z. S.: The formation of snow streamers in the turbulent atmosphere  
 461 boundary layer, Aeolian Research, 23, 1-10, 2016.

462 Huang, N., and Shi, G.: The significance of vertical moisture diffusion on drifting Snow  
 463 sublimation near snow surface, Cryosphere, 11, 3011-3021, 2017.

464 Kok, J. F., Parteli, E. J. R., Michaels, T. I., and Karam, D. B.: The physics of wind-blown sand and  
 465 dust, Rep Prog Phys, 75, 106901, 10.1088/0034-4885/75/10/106901, 2012.

466 Lehning, M., Löwe, H., Ryser, M., and Raderschall, N.: Inhomogeneous precipitation distribution  
 467 and snow transport in steep terrain, Water Resources Research, 44, 278-284, 2008.

468 Li, D., Wang, Y., Guo, L., and Xiao, F.: Inter-particle collision effects on the entrained particle  
 469 distribution in aeolian sand transport, International Journal of Heat & Mass Transfer, 58, 97-106,  
 470 2013.

471 Lopes, A., M. G., Oliveira, L., A., Ferreira, Almerindo, D., Pinto, and J., P.: Numerical simulation  
 472 of sand dune erosion, Environmental Fluid Mechanics, 13, 145-168, 2013.

473 Lund, T. S., Wu, X., and Squires, K. D.: Generation of Turbulent Inflow Data for  
 474 Spatially-Developing Boundary Layer Simulations, Journal of Computational Physics, 140,  
 475 233-258, 1998.

476 Mann, G. W., Anderson, P. S., and Mobbs, S. D.: Profile measurements of blowing snow at Halley,  
 477 Antarctica, Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres, 105, 24491-24508, 2000.

478 Meneveau, C., Lund, T. S., and Cabot, W. H.: A Lagrangian dynamic subgrid-scale model of  
 479 turbulence, Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 319, 353-385, 1996.

480 Nemoto, M., and Nishimura, K.: Direct Measurement Of Shear Stress During Snow Saltation,  
 481 Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 100, 149-170, 2001.

482 Nemoto, M., and Nishimura, K.: Numerical simulation of snow saltation and suspension in a  
 483 turbulent boundary layer, Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres, 109, D18206, 2004.

484 Nemoto, M., and Nishimura, K.: Blowing snow at Mizuho station, Antarctica, Philosophical

485 Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 363,  
 486 1647-1662, 10.1098/rsta.2005.1599, 2005.

487 Nishimura, K., and Hunt, J. C. R.: Saltation and incipient suspension above a flat particle bed  
 488 below a turbulent boundary layer, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 417, 77-102, 2000.

489 Nishimura, K., Yokoyama, C., Ito, Y., Nemoto, M., Naaim - Bouvet, F., Bellot, H., and Fujita, K.:  
 490 Snow particle speeds in drifting snow, *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*, 119,  
 491 9901-9913, 2015.

492 Okaze, T., Mochida, A., Tominaga, Y., Nemoto, M., Sato, T., Sasaki, Y., and Ichinohe, K.: Wind  
 493 tunnel investigation of drifting snow development in a boundary layer, *Journal of Wind  
 494 Engineering & Industrial Aerodynamics*, 104-106, 532-539, 2012.

495 Owen, P.: Saltation of uniform grains in air, *Plenum Press*, 41, 344-353, 1964.

496 Raupach, M. R.: Saltation layers, vegetation canopies and roughness lengths, *Springer Vienna*, 1,  
 497 83-96, 1991.

498 Sørensen, M.: On the rate of aeolian sand transport, *Geomorphology*, 59, 53-62,  
 499 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2003.09.005>, 2004.

500 Schneiderbauer, S., and Prokop, A.: The atmospheric snow-transport model: SnowDrift3D,  
 501 *Journal of Glaciology*, 57, 526-542, 2011.

502 Schweizer, J., Jamieson, J. B., and Schneebeli, M.: Snow avalanche formation, *Reviews of  
 503 Geophysics*, 41, 1-25, 2003.

504 Sovilla, B., Burlando, P., and Bartelt, P.: Field experiments and numerical modeling of mass  
 505 entrainment in snow avalanches, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111, F03007, 2006.

506 Sugiura, K., Nishimura, K., Maeno, N., and Kimura, T.: Measurements of snow mass flux and  
 507 transport rate at different particle diameters in drifting snow, *Cold Regions Science & Technology*,  
 508 27, 83-89, 1998.

509 Sugiura, K., and Maeno, N.: Wind-Tunnel Measurements Of Restitution Coefficients And Ejection  
 510 Number Of Snow Particles In Drifting Snow: Determination Of Splash Functions,  
 511 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 95, 123-143, 2000.

512 Uematsu, T., Nakata, T., Takeuchi, K., Arisawa, Y., and Kaneda, Y.: Three-dimensional numerical  
 513 simulation of snowdrift, *Cold Reg.sci.technol*, 20, 65-73, 1991.

514 Vinkovic, I., Aguirre, C., Ayrault, M., and Simoëns, S.: Large-eddy Simulation of the Dispersion

of Solid Particles in a Turbulent Boundary Layer, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 121, 283-311, 2006.

Vionnet, V., Martin, E., Masson, V., Guyomarc'H, G., Naaimbouvét, F., Prokop, A., Durand, Y., and Lac, C.: Simulation of wind-induced snow transport in alpine terrain using a fully coupled snowpack/atmosphere model, *Cryosphere Discussions*, 7, 2191-2245, 2013.

Walter, B., Horender, S., Voegeli, C., and Lehning, M.: Experimental assessment of Owen's second hypothesis on surface shear stress induced by a fluid during sediment saltation, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 6298-6305, 2015.

Xiao, J., Bintanja, R., Déry, S. J., Mann, G. W., and Taylor, P. A.: An Intercomparison Among Four Models Of Blowing Snow, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 97, 109-135, 2000.

Xue, M., Droegemeier, K. K., Wong, V., Shapiro, A., Brewster, K., Carr, F., Weber, D., Liu, Y., and Wang, D.: The Advanced Regional Prediction System (ARPS) – A multi-scale nonhydrostatic atmospheric simulation and prediction tool. Part II: Model physics and applications, *Meteorology & Atmospheric Physics*, 76, 143-165, 2001.

Yamamoto, Y., Pothhoff, M., Tanaka, T., Kajishima, T., and Tsuji, Y.: Large-eddy simulation of turbulent gas-particle flow in a vertical channel: effect of considering inter-particle collisions, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 442, 303-334, 2001.

Zhang, J., and Huang, N.: Simulation of Snow Drift and the Effects of Snow Particles on Wind, *Modelling & Simulation in Engineering*, 2008, 408075, 2008.

Zwaafink, C. D. G., Diebold, M., Horender, S., Overney, J., Lieberherr, G., Parlange, M. B., and Lehning, M.: Modelling Small-Scale Drifting Snow with a Lagrangian Stochastic Model Based on Large-Eddy Simulations, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 153, 117-139, 2014.

## Appendix 1

The aerodynamic entrainment scheme describes the information of fluid entrained particles from the bed surface. The number of entrained particles per unit area per unit time can be written as (Anderson and Haff, 1991):

$$N_{ae} = \eta(\tau - \tau_t) \quad (A1)$$

where  $\eta = C / (8\pi d_p^2)$  (Doorschot and Lehning, 2002)  $\tau$  is the surface shear stress and  $\tau_t = A^2 g \bar{d}_p (\rho_p - \rho)$  is the critical surface shear stress (Clifton et al., 2006), in which  $C = 1.5$  and  $A = 0.2$  are constants, and  $\bar{d}_p$  is the mean diameter of snow particles.

The grain-bed interactions are described by the ejecta number, horizontal and vertical restitution coefficients, respectively. The ejecta number  $n_e$  follows the binomial distribution (Sugiura and Maeno, 2000):

$$S_e(n_e) = C_l^{n_e} q^{n_e} (1-q)^{l-n_e} \quad (A2)$$

where  $q$  and  $l$  are both functions of impact velocity  $v_{in}$  and incident angle  $\theta_{in}$ :

$$l = \frac{0.26 v_{in}^{1.2} \theta_{in}^{0.32}}{0.51 v_{in}^{0.6} \theta_{in}^{0.16} - 0.18 v_{in}^{-0.27} \theta_{in}^{0.05}} \quad (A3)$$

$$q = 1 - 0.35 v_{in}^{-0.87} \theta_{in}^{-0.11} \quad (A4)$$

The horizontal restitution coefficient  $e_h$  and vertical restitution coefficient  $e_v$  can be described by a normal and gamma distribution, respectively:

$$P(e_h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{(e_h - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (A5)$$

$$P(e_v) = \frac{1}{\beta^\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)} e_v^{\alpha-1} \exp\left(-\frac{e_v}{\beta}\right) \quad (A6)$$

where  $\mu$ ,  $\sigma^2$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are all expressions of  $v_{in}$  and  $\theta_{in}$ , as shown in Tab. A1.

Parameters		Compact snow	Fresh snow
$\alpha$		$\begin{cases} 1.22\theta_{in}^{0.47} & v_{in} \geq 0.84 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 1.22(v_{in} / 0.84)^{\log(v_{in}/0.84)} \theta_{in}^{0.47} & 0.84 < v_{in} \leq 1.23 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 1.22(v_{in} / 0.84)^{\log(v_{in}/0.84)} (v_{in} / 1.23)^{-2\log(v_{in}/1.23)} \theta_{in}^{0.47} & v_{in} \geq 1.23 \text{ ms}^{-1} \end{cases}$	
$\beta$		$\begin{cases} 12.85\theta_{in}^{-1.41} & v_{in} \geq 0.84 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 12.85(v_{in} / 0.84)^{-\log(v_{in}/0.84)} \theta_{in}^{-1.41} & 0.84 < v_{in} \leq 1.23 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 12.85(v_{in} / 0.84)^{-\log(v_{in}/0.84)} (v_{in} / 1.23)^{\log(v_{in}/1.23)} \theta_{in}^{-1.41} & v_{in} \geq 1.23 \text{ ms}^{-1} \end{cases}$	
$\mu$		$\begin{cases} 0.48\theta_{in}^{0.01} & v_{in} \leq 1.27 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 0.48(v_{in} / 1.27)^{-\log(v_{in}/1.27)} \theta_{in}^{0.01} & v_{in} > 1.27 \text{ ms}^{-1} \end{cases}$	
$\sigma^2$		$\begin{cases} 0.17\theta_{in}^{-0.25} & v_{in} \leq 1.27 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 0.17(v_{in} / 1.27)^{-\log(v_{in}/1.27)} \theta_{in}^{-0.25} & v_{in} > 1.27 \text{ ms}^{-1} \end{cases} (u_* = 0.19 \text{ ms}^{-1})$ $\begin{cases} 0.08\theta_{in}^{0.01} & v_{in} \leq 1.34 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 0.08(v_{in} / 1.34)^{-\log(v_{in}/1.34)} \theta_{in}^{0.01} & v_{in} > 1.34 \text{ ms}^{-1} \end{cases} (u_* = 0.25 \text{ ms}^{-1})$	$\begin{cases} 0.07\theta_{in}^{-0.06} & v_{in} \leq 0.52 \text{ ms}^{-1} \\ 0.07(v_{in} / 0.52)^{-\log(v_{in}/0.52)} \theta_{in}^{-0.06} & v_{in} > 0.52 \text{ ms}^{-1} \end{cases}$

**Table R1.** Parameters of splash function.