Topographic and vegetation controls of the spatial distribution of snow depth in agro-forested environments by UAV-lidar
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Abstract. Accurate knowledge of snow depth distributions in forested regions is crucial for applications in hydrology and ecology. Understanding and assessing the effect of vegetation and topographic conditions on the snow depth variability is useful for the accurate prediction of snow depths. In this study, the spatial distribution of snow depth in two agro-forested sites and one coniferous site in eastern Canada was analyzed for topographic and vegetation effects on snow accumulation. Spatially distributed snow depths were derived by Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Light Detection and Ranging (UAV-lidar) surveys conducted in 2019 and 2020. Distinct patterns of snow accumulation and erosion in open areas (fields) versus adjacent forested areas were observed in lidar-derived snow depth maps at all sites. Omnidirectional semi-variogram analysis of snow depths showed the existence of a scale break distance less than 10 m in the forested area at all three sites, whereas open areas showed scale invariance or comparatively large scale break distances (i.e., 18 m). The effect of vegetation and topographic variables on the spatial variability of snow depths at each site was investigated with random forest models. Results show that including wind-related forest edge proximity effects improved the model accuracy by more than 50 % in agro-forested sites, whereas incorporating canopy characteristics improved the model accuracy by more than 60 % in the coniferous site. Hence the underlying topography and the wind-redistribution of snow along forest edges govern the snow depth variability at agro-forested sites, while forest structure variability dominates snow depth variability in the coniferous environment. These results highlight the importance of including and better representing these processes in process-based models for accurate estimates of snowpack dynamics. This study also demonstrates the usefulness of UAV-lidar to resolve and understand high-resolution snow depth heterogeneity in agro-forested environments and boreal forests.

1 Introduction / problematic

Knowledge of spring snowpack conditions is essential to accurately estimate water availability and flood peaks following the onset of melt (Hopkinson et al., 2004). Many studies showed that addressing the spatial distribution of snow depth prior to melting is more important than spatial differences in melt behavior when estimating melt dynamics of the snowpack (e.g.,
Schirmer and Lehning, 2011; Egli et al., 2012). Evaluating snowpack conditions in forested regions is particularly crucial as the forest cover significantly modifies snow accumulation and ablation processes due to canopy interception and changes in energy balance processes within the canopy. These changes produce a marked effect on the downstream hydrograph (Roth and Nolin, 2017). In addition, forests can also influence the differential snow accumulation by preferential deposition of wind-blown snow along the forest edges (Essery et al., 2009; Currier and Lundquist, 2018).

Spatial variability of the snow cover is mainly controlled by topography and vegetation type, and density (Golding and Swanson, 1986; Jost et al., 2007; Varhola et al., 2010a; Koutantou et al., 2022). With the advent of remote sensing techniques, airborne (piloted and unpiloted) laser (lidar: light detection and ranging) scanning techniques have been extensively used to monitor snowpacks due to their strong penetration ability through the canopy to detect underlying snow cover/ground (Hopkinson et al., 2004; Morsdorf et al., 2006; Hopkinson et al., 2010; Harpold et al., 2014; Zheng et al., 2016; Currier and Lundquist, 2018; Zheng et al., 2018; Mazzotti et al., 2019; Harder et al., 2020; Jacobs et al., 2021). Lidar scanning also typically allows capturing high-resolution (<100 m) and mesoscale (100 m–10 km) variability and allows producing high resolution (<10 m) snow depth/cover maps.

Snow spatial variability can occur on more than one scale due to different processes acting over multiple scales (Deems et al., 2006). Several studies emphasized a multiscale behavior of snow depths with two distinct regions (scales) separated by a scale break at a location varying from meters to tens of meters, with a more strongly spatially correlated snow depth structure before the scale break (Deems et al., 2006; Fassnacht and Deems, 2006; Trujillo et al., 2007; Deems et al., 2008; Trujillo et al., 2009; Mott et al., 2011; Schirmer and Lehning, 2011; Mendoza et al., 2020). In turn, this suggests the existence of different processes controlling the snow accumulation, and distribution over these two distinct scales. For instance, these studies emphasized that a short scale break distance in forested areas (9–12 m) is reflected by canopy interception where the effect of wind redistribution is minimal (Deems et al., 2006; Trujillo et al., 2007). Comparatively a longer distance (15–65 m) in tundra regions is reflected by the interaction of wind, vegetation, and terrain roughness (Trujillo et al., 2009), while a shorter (6 m) and longer (20 m) distance in non-vegetated areas are explained by the interaction of the wind with terrain roughness in sheltered and exposed mountain slopes respectively (Mott et al., 2011; Schirmer and Lehning, 2011). The knowledge of this scale break location is important to choose the resolution required for remotely sensed or in situ data collection efforts in order to represent the snowpack variability at different scales.

In addition to the scaling properties of snow distribution, the relationships between snow depth, topography, and forest structure are also an important aspect in understanding/assessing small-scale snow heterogeneity in forested environments.

The need to quantify these complex relationships has inspired the development of modeling approaches like empirical models (e.g., Anderton et al., 2004; Winkler et al., 2005; Grünewald et al., 2013) and process-based models (e.g., Hedstrom and Pomeroy, 1998; Liston and Elder, 2006). While process-based models are applicable to a wide range of conditions, they do require an extensive amount of input data. Contrarily, empirical models are useful in establishing a general relationship between the variables and provide a first-order estimate of their effects on snow processes. However, they do not explicitly account for governing processes, and thus may not make accurate predictions under specific conditions (Varhola et al.,
2010a). Nevertheless, the use and effectiveness of empirical models like multiple linear regressions (MLR) (Jost et al., 2007; Lehning et al., 2011; Grünewald et al., 2013; Revuelto et al., 2014; Zheng et al., 2016; Zheng et al., 2018) and binary regression trees (BRT) (Elder et al., 1995; Elder et al., 1998; Winstral et al., 2002; Anderton et al., 2004; Molotch et al., 2005; Baños et al., 2011; Revuelto et al., 2014) to relate snow depth/SWE patterns with terrain and land cover predictors is well documented. Compared to linear methods, tree-based methods have the ability to describe more complex and nonlinear relationships between snow depth and the independent variables (Erxleben et al., 2002; Veatch et al., 2009; Bair et al., 2018). In recent years, the random forest (RF) model, an ensemble machine learning algorithm that combines several randomized decision trees and aggregates their predictions, started gaining popularity in water science and hydrological applications (Tyralis et al., 2019). The use of the ensemble bagging approach in RF models reduces overfitting, which is a well-known issue with traditional decision trees, and provides more accurate and unbiased error estimates (Breiman, 2001). As yet, there is only a handful of studies that used RF models to estimate snow depths/SWE (Bair et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020) other than those that used RF algorithm to express the relative importance of predictor variables (Zheng et al., 2016) or to predict spatially distributed lidar vertical errors (Tinkham et al., 2014).

To our knowledge, to date, there are only a few previous studies that estimated snow depths by unpiloted aerial vehicle (UAV) based lidar (Harder et al., 2020; Cho et al., 2021; Jacobs et al., 2021; Koutantou et al., 2021; Dharmadasa et al., 2022; Koutantou et al., 2022; Proulx et al., 2022). None of them explicitly examined how terrain and vegetation characteristics influence the snow heterogeneity in different landscapes. From previous studies, Koutantou et al. (2022) successfully used UAV-lidar data on two opposing slopes with a heterogeneous forest cover at a high spatio-temporal scale to show the effect of canopy structure and solar radiation on snow dynamics excluding the effect of microtopography. The main objective of this paper is to study the small-scale spatial variability of snow depth by UAV-lidar and investigate the terrain and vegetation controls on this snow depth heterogeneity in an agro-forested and a boreal landscape. The study sites are based in southern Québec, Canada, where forests intertwined with mosaics of open agricultural fields in low-lying lands (agro-forested landscapes) play a significant role in altering the spatial distribution of the snow cover (Aygün et al., 2020). Much uncertainty still exists about the micro and meso scale spatial variability of snow cover and associated hydrological processes in these landscapes, partly due to lack of detailed and simultaneous micrometeorological and snowpack observations (Brown, 2010; Sena et al., 2017; Valence et al., 2022). To our knowledge, there has been no application of UAV laser scanning to investigate the small-scale snow cover heterogeneity in this type of landscape. As well, this paper provides some of the earliest results of snow depth mapping by UAV-lidar. This study will specifically explore: (1) how the snow accumulation and its scaling characteristics vary between and within forested and open environments, and (2) the relationship between snow depth, topography, and forest structure.
2 Data and methods

2.1 Study sites

Small-scale snow depth heterogeneity was investigated at three selected sites that represent the typical landscape in southern Québec (Fig. 1). Of the three sites, Sainte-Marthe and Saint-Maurice are agro-forested sites located in the St. Lawrence River lowlands. Irrigation canals and streams flowing through the open agricultural areas are very common in these agro-forested landscapes. The main crop type in the agricultural areas is soya. The forested area in Sainte-Marthe consists of a dense deciduous forest with sugar maple (Acer saccharum), red maple (Acer rubrum), and a small conifer plantation to the Southwest. Saint-Maurice has a high to moderate dense mixed forest with poplar (Populus x canadensis), red maple, white pine (Pinus strobus), and balsam fir (Abies balsamea) being the dominant tree species. Forêt Montmorency (hereafter Montmorency) is a dense boreal forest with balsam fir, black spruce (Picea mariana), and white spruce (Picea glauca) tree species farther north on the Canadian Shield. Forest gaps associated with clear-cutting and regeneration practices are common in this area. Adjacent to the forest is an open area hosting the NEIGE-FM snow research station, which hosts a variety of precipitation gauges and snowpack measuring sensors, and is part of the World Meteorological Organization’s (WMO) (Royer et al., 2021). Table 1 summarizes the physiographic and climatic conditions at each site. Land use information presented in Fig.1 was obtained from the Québec Ministry of Forests, Wildlife, and Parks (MFFP). For the interpretation purpose, open agricultural areas in Sainte-Marthe and Saint-Maurice and the small open area in Montmorency (NEIGE-FM site) are referred to as “field” herein.
Figure 1. Overview of the study sites with lidar extents. (a) Sainte-Marthe, (b) Saint-Maurice and (c) Montmorency. Contour intervals intentionally differ between sites for better readability. (Adapted from the data from MFFP)

Table 1. Site characteristics and lidar data collection information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sainte-Marthe</th>
<th>Saint-Maurice</th>
<th>Montmorency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation range, m</td>
<td>70–78</td>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>670–700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAT, °C</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total precipitation, mm/y</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowfall/Total Precipitation, %</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter season</td>
<td>November–March</td>
<td>November–March</td>
<td>October–April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidar extent, km²</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest area/Total area, %</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest type</td>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Boreal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mean canopy density, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt;80</th>
<th>60–80</th>
<th>60–80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snow-on flight date</td>
<td>12 March 2020</td>
<td>11 March 2020</td>
<td>29 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow-off flight date</td>
<td>11 May 2020</td>
<td>02 May 2020</td>
<td>13 June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAAT= mean annual air temperature. Climatic data presented here were based on the climate averages (1981–2010) at the nearest Environment and Climate Change Canada (2021a) meteorological stations to the sites (Station climate ID 7016470, 7017585, and 7042388 for Sainte-Marthe, Saint-Maurice and Montmorency).

### 2.2 Data processing

All lidar surveys were performed with a GeoMMS system mounted onto a DJI M600 Pro UAV platform. The GeoMMS system is comprised of a Velodyne VLP-16 lidar sensor, a real-time dual-antenna global navigation satellite system (GNSS) aided inertial navigation system (INS) for precise heading, and a tactical MG346 inertial measurement unit (IMU). The nominal accuracy of the point cloud provided by GeoMMS is ±5 cm (RMS, root mean square) (Geodetics, 2018) whereas the nominal uncorrelated relative error of two lidar point clouds is approximately ±7 cm (√5^2 + 5^2). Flight paths for the surveys were prepared in UgCS flight control software (Sph-Engineering, 2019) and the flight parameters were optimized to reduce overall INS errors and maximize the mapping efficiency in the forested areas. Table 2 outlines the flight parameters and equipment settings used in surveys.

Raw lidar data sets collected from the flights were post-processed in Geodetics LiDARTool (Geodetics, 2019) with post-processing kinematic (PPK) correction. The PPK option regenerated a significantly more accurate trajectory file by combining the onboard GNSS data with GNSS base station data. Then, this post-processed trajectory file was merged with the raw laser data to produce a geo-referenced x,y,z point cloud. Noise removal was applied next. We also employed a trial-and-error, manual boresight calibration method to correct for boresight errors in the data, as recommended by the manufacturer (Geodetics, 2019). The final post-processed point clouds have an absolute accuracy range of 3–6 cm and a relative accuracy range of 4–6 cm (Dharmadasa et al., 2022).

To classify the bare surface points, we used the multiscale curvature algorithm (Evans and Hudak, 2007) implemented in the commercial Global Mapper software (Blue Marble Geographics, 2020). Parameters of the algorithm were adjusted according to the vertical spread of the flight strips over open terrain, the local slope of the terrain and canals/streams, and the presence/absence of buildings. The reader is referred to Dharmadasa et al. (2022) for a comprehensive overview of the UAV-lidar system and post-processing of raw data.
Table 2. Flight parameters and equipment settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight parameters</th>
<th>Equipment settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flying speed</td>
<td>Wavelength 905 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m s⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight altitude</td>
<td>Laser pulse repetition rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 m AGL</td>
<td>18.08 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of view (horizontal)</td>
<td>Field of view (vertical) ±15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between parallel</td>
<td>Laser RPM 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flight lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground overlap</td>
<td>Return type Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 points m⁻²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1 Snow depth maps

Snow depth maps were quantified by differencing winter (snow-on) and summer (snow-off) digital elevation models (DEMs) generated from bare surface points at each site. Bare surface points were aggregated to a grid resolution of 1.4 m using the binning method in Global Mapper (Blue Marble Geographics, 2020). This grid resolution was selected based on the manual snow depth sampling strategy used by Dharmadasa et al. (2022) to validate the snow depth maps (five snow depth measurements were taken at each sampling location in a diagonal cross shape at 1 m apart, and the average of these five measurements was considered to represent a 1.4x1.4 m (√1.4² + 1.4²) grid cell) and aimed to minimize the effect of positional errors of the manual measurements made with GNSS. As final filtering, spurious negative snow depths were set to zero, as they are physically inconsistent and need to be filtered (Hopkinson et al., 2012). Negative snow depths accounted for a very small portion of the total area (<0.1 %) sampled and had a negligible effect on the statistics derived from the snow depth maps. The validation of UAV-lidar snow depths with manual measurements showed a RMSE of 0.079–0.160 m in the deciduous forested environment, and 0.096–0.190 m in the coniferous forested environment (Dharmadasa et al., 2022), which is comparable to previous efforts with UAV-lidar (Harder et al., 2016; Jacobs et al., 2021) and airborne lidar (Harpold et al., 2014; Painter et al., 2016). When taking into account the 2–10 cm thick ice layer that was typically observed at the base of the snowpack in the deciduous environment which limited the penetration of the snow depth manual probe into the soil, and the positional errors due to the multipath effect in the coniferous environment, our UAV-lidar snow depths maps were deemed to be robust and to represent an improvement over previous studies. As well, the higher RMSE in the coniferous forested environment has a comparatively smaller impact due to the deeper snowpack observed at the site, i.e., the relative RMSE error (RMSE/mean snow depth) in the coniferous forested environment (0.068–0.135) is much lower than the relative error (0.321–0.420) in the deciduous forested environment where the snowpack is shallower. More details about the snow depth validation can be found in Dharmadasa et al. (2022).
2.2.2 Terrain metrics

To typify the terrain characteristics, we derived four variables from the summer DEM, i.e., elevation (*Elevation*), slope (*Slope*), aspect (*Aspect*), and topographic wind sheltering index (*TWSI*). Topographic variables other than elevation need to be considered when studying areas that encompass a small elevation range (Zheng et al., 2016), such as our sites. *Elevation* was obtained directly from the DEM, while *Slope* and *Aspect* were derived using ArcGIS 10.2 software. *Slope* was calculated as the first derivative of the DEM, while *Aspect* was derived in two orthogonal components, i.e., west-east (*Aspect_WE*) and south-north (*Aspect_SN*) exposures. *Aspect_WE* (west-negative, east-positive) and *Aspect_SN* (south-negative, north-positive) were calculated directly as the sine and cosine of the aspect, respectively. The *TWSI* was produced using the RSAGA package in CRAN. This variable considers the sheltering effects of the local topography in the dominant wind direction. Several studies showed that *TWSI* is a good measure to characterize sheltering and exposure of the local terrain which gives a reasonable representation of the local wind field and thus the redistribution of snow by wind (Winstral et al., 2002; Winstral and Marks, 2002; Plattner et al., 2004; Molotch et al., 2005). Negative *TWSI* values correspond to terrain exposure and positive values to sheltering from the wind. Dominant wind directions were extracted from the hourly wind data for the period 2019–2021 at each site (Fig. 2). Wind data was collected from an automatic weather station located 1.4 km away from the Sainte-Marthe site and the closest Environment Canada wind measuring stations at the other sites. The closest station to Saint-Maurice (climate ID 7018561) was 19 km away from the site and 0.25 km away from the Montmorency site (climate ID 7042395) (ECCC, 2021b).

![Figure 2. Wind rose plots of the sites. (a) Sainte-Marthe, (b) Saint-Maurice and (c) Montmorency](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2022-124)

2.2.3 Vegetation descriptors

Vegetation-related variables were rasterized from the classified winter point cloud in LiDAR360 (Greenvalley-International, 2020). The forestry module of LiDAR360 contains tools that allow users to calculate essential forest metrics and accurately
extract individual tree parameters like crown diameter, crown area, and tree diameter by breast height from airborne lidar data. In this study, the leaf area index (LAI), canopy cover (CC), and gap fraction (GF) were estimated for the forest cover higher than 2 m. A 2 m height threshold was selected as canopies > 2 m have been shown to have a strong influence on snow accumulation (Varhola et al., 2010b; Zheng et al., 2016; Zheng et al., 2019). The function used to calculate LAI is based on the Beer-Lambert law (Richardson et al., 2009). The estimated LAI is contingent on the average scan angle, GF, and the extinction coefficient. GF is calculated as the total number of ground points to the total number of lidar points within a grid cell. CC is calculated as the total number of vegetation returns to total returns (Morsdorf et al., 2006). Refer to Richardson et al. (2009) and Morsdorf et al. (2006) for the equations used to estimate the forest metrics. In addition, canopy height (CH) was derived by subtracting the DEM from the digital surface model (DSM). For rasterizing, a grid cell size slightly larger than the maximum individual crown diameter was selected to ensure that at least one tree was present within a grid cell (Li et al., 2012; Greenvalley-International, 2020). Grid resolutions obtained using this method were 20, 15, and 10 m in Sainte-Marthe, Saint-Maurice, and Montmorency, respectively.

2.2.4 Forest edge descriptors

We investigated forest edge effects on snow accumulation using an approach inspired from Currier and Lundquist (2018) using Matlab software. Analogous to their analysis, we added directionality to forest edges to examine if preferential snow accumulation occurred windward or leeward of forest edges due to snow redistribution by wind or reduced ablation due to shading from the forest. Pixels were first classified as north-facing (NFE) when they were within a maximum search distance \( d_{\text{max}} \) northward of the forest edge. Based on previous results by Currier and Lundquist (2018), \( d_{\text{max}} \) was set to 2H, where H is the typical tree height derived from the 1.4 m resolution canopy height model at each site. H is 15 m in Sainte-Marthe, 20 m in Saint-Maurice, and 12 m in Montmorency. A tolerance of ±45° was used for the search direction for NFE. Pixels were classified as windward (WFE) and leeward (LFE) when they were within a maximum search distance of the forest edge in the dominant wind direction. A range of search directions was used to constrain the dominant wind directions at each site, based on wind roses (Fig. 2). Two dominant wind cones, 270±15°, and 50±15° were used in Sainte-Marthe, and one dominant wind cone in Saint-Maurice (210±15°) and Montmorency (310±15°). \( d_{\text{max}} \) was initially varied between 6–10H for pixels in open terrain based on Currier and Lundquist (2018) which represents the typical length scale of preferential snow accumulation at the forest edge. After a few trials, a final value of 10H was retained, which showed the highest correlation with snow depth. Moreover, the 10H distance at each site (150 m, 200 m, and 120 m in Sainte-Marthe, Saint-Maurice, and Montmorency respectively) encompassed the preferential snow accumulation seen along the forested edges on the lidar-derived snow depth maps. A maximum search distance of 1H was used for pixels within the forest in order to detect if preferential accumulation from blowing snow penetrated the forest. This value was chosen based on visual observations in the field, which suggested limited penetration of blowing snow inside the forest. A novel index of proximity to the forest edge, \( FE \), was calculated by scaling the distance between each pixel and the forest edge \( (d) \) by the maximum search distance, \( d_{\text{max}} \).
FE (either NFE, WFE, or LFE, depending on the initial classification) is equal to one when a pixel is situated on the forest edge and equal to zero when it is located at, or beyond the maximum search distance $d_{\text{max}}$. The novelty of this approach is to derive a continuous predictor of forest edge proximity, as opposed to the simpler binary classification introduced by Currier and Lundquist (2018).

2.3 Data analysis

Data analysis was primarily focused on assessing the small-scale snow depth heterogeneity at the selected sites. Lidar-derived snow depth data were analyzed for inter (agro-forested versus coniferous) and intra (field versus forest) site variability. First, the scale dependence of snow depth variability was explored using semi-variogram analysis. Then, the site-specific topographic and vegetation control on the snow depth spatial heterogeneity was examined with RF regression models. All the statistical analyses were performed in R software.

2.3.1 Spatial correlation analysis

To analyze the small-scale spatial variability of the snow depth map in each study site, omnidirectional semi-variograms were used. Semi-variogram analysis allows constraining the dominant scales of snow depth variability and to compare them between land cover types and sites. Canals/streams were discarded from the snow depth maps for this analysis to ensure stationarity of the surface. i.e., snow depths in canals/streams would have a unidirectional spatial correlation which could alter the relationship of the overall terrain by introducing biases. The semi-variogram $\gamma(r)$ is expressed as:

$$\gamma(r_k) = \frac{1}{2N(r_k)} \sum_{(i,j) \in N(r_k)} (z_i - z_j)^2$$  

Where $r$ is the lag distance of bin $k$, $N(r_k)$ is the total number of pairs of points in the $k$th bin and $z_i$ and $z_j$ are the snow depth values at two different point locations $i$ and $j$ (Webster and Oliver, 2007).

We used 50 log-width bins for the semi-variogram analysis. Log-width distance bins provide equal bin widths when semi-variograms are transformed to log-log scale, and help resolve the variogram at short length scales by allowing greater bin density at shorter lag distance compared to linear-width bins (Deems et al., 2006).

In the case of scale invariance, the variogram can be described by a power law:

$$\gamma(r) = ar^b$$

Where $a$ and $b$ are coefficients selected to minimize the squared residuals.

2.3.2 Random forest model

To investigate the effect of vegetation and topographic variables on the spatial variability of snow depth, we applied RF regression models on the rasters derived from lidar data. Generally in a RF model, two-thirds of the sample data (in-bag) is
used to train the model, while the remaining one-third (out-of-bag, OOB) is used to estimate how well the trained model performs (as a validation set). These OOB observations are used to calculate predictor importance, which shows the relative contribution of each predictor (independent) variable to the response variable.

To have a consistent grid resolution in the analysis, the snow depth, terrain metrics, and CH were aggregated to the grid resolution of the vegetation descriptors. Thus, the analyses were conducted with grid resolutions of 20 m, 15 m, and 10 m in Sainte-Marthe, Saint-Maurice, and Montmorency, respectively. Apart from the derived variables mentioned in section 2.2, a binary variable (Site) representing forested (1), and field (0) pixels was included in the regression analysis to investigate systematic effects, if any, of land cover that was not captured by vegetation or terrain metrics. As a precautionary measure, we also excluded collinear variables prior to building the RF models using the variance inflation factor (VIF) function in R. This was done mainly because our objective was to investigate the relative contribution of different variables to snow depth variability in forest versus the field, rather than deriving a model with maximum predictive capacity. While RF can handle collinearity in a predictive mode, collinearity makes it difficult to separately evaluate the predictive power (variable importance) of the predictors (Bair et al., 2018). The number of trees in the ensemble (ntree) and the number of variables at each node (mtry) were optimized for each RF model. RF model results are first presented according to the relative importance of predictor variables (variable importance plots), which has proven to be useful for evaluating the relative contribution of input variables (Tyralis et al., 2019). The value of the variable importance of a variable reflects how much removing this variable would decrease the accuracy of the model and vice versa. Then the partial relationships of the variables with the snow depth were examined and presented. Finally, the performance of RF models in terms of validation statistics (OOB) was compared between different land cover types and sites.

3 Results

3.1 General snow accumulation patterns

Figure 3 depicts the snow depth maps derived from UAV-lidar data at the study sites. Montmorency shows the highest overall snow accumulation with a maximum of 3.7 m. Higher snow accumulation in canals/streams (area 1 in Fig. 3a, b) and along the forest edge (area 2 in Fig. 3a, b) is evident in Sainte-Marthe and Saint-Maurice, whereas in Montmorency, forest gaps (area 4 in Fig. 3c) seem to accumulate more snow. The highest snow depth in Montmorency corresponds to localized, artificial snow piles adjacent to the main road as observed during the field campaign (area 5 in Fig. 3c). Concentric snow accumulation patterns around the double fence precipitation gauges are also noticeable in Montmorency snow depth map (area 6 in Fig. 3c). Compared to the other two sites, the Montmorency snow depth map comprises more data gaps in the forested area. Paved roads in Sainte-Marthe (area 3 in Fig. 3a) and Montmorency (area 3 in Fig. 3c) and the area surrounding the small house (area 7 in Fig. 3a and Fig. 3d) in the forest at Sainte-Marthe appear snow-free due to the snow clearing operations, as confirmed in field campaigns. Snow clearing in the proximity of the house in Sainte-Marthe accounts for a significant portion of zero and/or small snow depths (Fig. 3d) and biases the mean snow depth in the forest. When this
portion is discarded, the mean snow depth in the forest increases from 0.246 to 0.275 m. Hence in Sainte-Marthe, the mean snow depth in the field area is higher than that in the adjacent forested area (Fig. 3d), whereas, at the other two sites, mean snow depths in the field and forest are similar considering the measurement error of the lidar system (Fig. 3e, f). Although the maximum snow depth is higher in Sainte-Marthe (1.9 m) compared to Saint-Maurice (1.6 m), snow depths in Sainte-Marthe (0.246–0.369 m) appear to be lower on average than in Saint-Maurice (0.592–0.600 m).

![Figure 3](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2022-124)

**Figure 3.** UAV-lidar derived snow depth maps (grid size 1.4 m) and histograms of snow depth distribution. (a, d) Sainte-Marthe map with snow surveying date and histogram; (b, e) Saint-Maurice map with snow surveying date and histogram; (c, f) Montmorency map with snow surveying date and histogram. Features 1 to 7 are discussed in the text.

3.2 Spatial correlation analysis

Omnidirectional semi-variograms of snow depth at the study sites are shown on a log-log scale in Fig 4. Semi-variograms were discretely developed for field and forested areas to assess the effect of landcover on the snow depth variability. Overall, forested areas show more variable (higher semi-variance values) snow depths than field snow depths at all sites. Snow depths seem to be more variable in the coniferous forest than in deciduous and mixed forests. Forested areas at all three sites
show a typical multifractal behavior, where the semi-variance between neighboring snow depths increases rapidly up to a scale break located at distances less than 10 m (Fig. 4), followed by a slower increase after. The Sainte-Marthe field area does not exhibit a distinct scale break. In contrast, both Saint-Maurice and Montmorency field areas show multiscale behavior.

Figure 4. Omnidirectional semi-variogram for the field and forested areas at (a) Sainte-Marthe, (b) Saint-Maurice and (c) Montmorency. Vertical lines indicate the dominant scale breaks.

3.3 Random forest analysis

3.3.1 Potential predictors of RF model

We discarded Elevation from the analysis since the elevation difference at any of the three sites was too small (Table 1) to produce any meaningful local orographic effect on precipitation, or adiabatic effects on air temperature, e.g., Mazzotti et al. (2019). As well, LFE was found to have a negligible influence on snow depth, hence was also excluded from the list of potential predictors. CC and the binary Site variable were further excluded due to collinearity issues. Collinearity analysis suggested discarding GF and CH in favor of LAI at the two agro-forested sites, while LAI was instead flagged as colinear instead of GF and CH in the coniferous site. Since LAI, GF and CH are strongly intercorrelated ($r = 0.84$–$0.97$), and because LAI has been shown to be a strong predictor of snow accumulations in forests (Hedstrom and Pomeroy, 1998; Pomeroy et al., 1998; Broxton et al., 2015; Lendzioch et al., 2016) we chose to retain LAI as a common forest metric and discard GF and CH to allow for a better intercomparison of the snow depth variability with vegetation across all three sites. The final potential predictor variables retained for all three sites were Slope, Aspect_WE, Aspect_SN, TWSI, LAI, WFE, and NFE.

3.3.2 Relative importance of topography and vegetation on snow depth variability

The relative importance of predictor variables in Fig. 5 summarizes the relative contribution of the different topographic, vegetation, and forest edge effects on snow depth spatial variability at each site. The windward forest edge proximity (WFE) has the strongest influence on snow depth variability in both Sainte-Marthe (50 %) and Saint-Maurice (76 %) when both landscape units (field+forest) are combined, and the north-facing forest edge proximity index (NFE) has the least influence
In Montmorency, LAI and WFE respectively have the highest (64 \%) and least (3 \%) impact on snow depth variability for the combined landscape unit. The importance of variables somewhat changes when forests and fields are modelled independently, implying different dominant factors/processes acting in forests and fields. For instance, in Sainte-Marthe, the northern exposure (Aspect_SN) seems to be the dominant variable (31 \%) for snow depth variability in the forest followed by TWSI (28 \%), Slope (22 \%), and LAI (17 \%). In Sainte-Marthe field, WFE (58 \%), Slope (25 \%), and TWSI (25 \%) are the most important variables. WFE (13 \%), TWSI (13 \%), and LAI (6 \%) have the highest influence on snow depth within the Saint-Maurice forest whereas in the adjacent field WFE (69 \%), TWSI (39 \%), and Slope (33 \%) predominate. The importance of LAI (73 \%), TWSI (28 \%), and Aspect_WE (20 \%) is higher for snow depths within the coniferous forest with gaps in Montmorency, whereas the snow depths in the small field are mostly influenced by NFE (15 \%), Aspect_SN (12 \%), and LAI (9 \%).

![Figure 5. Relative importance of variables in predicting snow depths. (a) Sainte-Marthe, (b) Saint-Maurice and (c) Montmorency.](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2022-124)

### 3.3.3 Partial relationships of predictor variables with snow depth

As seen in Fig. 6, all variables exhibit a non-linear relationship with snow depth across all sites. Note that the positive LAI values in field areas correspond to a few isolated LAI pixels along the forest edges, the boundary between field and forest. The following sections describe the results obtained at each site.

**Sainte-Marthe**

The mild slopes of this site do not show a strong relationship with snow depths in field+forest and forest, but field snow depths show a slight increase at higher slopes (Fig. 6a). There is no apparent preferential accumulation of snow on either west or east-facing slopes (Aspect_WE). However, snow seems to accumulate preferentially on northern exposed slopes, especially within the forest (Aspect_SN graph in Fig. 6a). The general relationship of snow depth with TWSI suggests that increased topographic sheltering from the wind (increasing TWSI values), leads to higher snow accumulation. There is a
decrease in snow depths in response to increasing LAI for the combined field+forest and within the forest, though the relation is weak in the forest, with snow depth increasing up to a LAI of 0.5 which could reflect the forest edge transition, and decreasing afterward. Snow depth in the field and field+forest increases in response to increasing WFE, whereas snow depth in the forest does not show any significant change. NFE does not show a substantial effect on snow depths.

Saint-Maurice

Snow depths in Saint-Maurice (Fig. 6b) seem to increase with increasing slopes in the field while the reverse relationship is seen in the forest for higher slopes. There is a slight increase in snow depth from westerly to easterly slopes in the forest, ending with a sharp decrease for easterly slopes in the forest (Aspect_WE>0.5), due to fewer easterly pixels in the forest (Supplement Fig. S2). Field snow depths show a slight increase from west to east aspects but do not show any visible dependence on south-north aspects. Similar to Sainte-Marthe, snow accumulation in the forest is favored on northerly slopes. Snow depth shows a general increase in response to increasing TWSI, with the greatest contribution to this relation from field snow depths. A non-linear decrease of snow depth with increasing LAI, stronger than that seen in Sainte-Marthe, is clearly visible in Saint-Maurice. However, contrary to Sainte-Marthe, the overall relationship is dominated by intra forest variations in LAI rather than the difference between the field and forest. Field and field+forest snow depths show a similar pattern to Sainte-Marthe with an increase in response to WFE. On the contrary, forest snow depth shows a slight decrease with increasing WFE. However, snow depth in the field shows an increase in more northerly oriented forest edge pixels (NFE).

Montmorency

Slopes in the Montmorency forest (Fig. 6c) seemingly govern the overall snow depth-Slope relationship in this site. Snow depths increase linearly until Slope reaches ~5° and then remain nearly constant afterward. There is no apparent preferential accumulation of snow on either west or east-facing slopes (Aspect_WE). Contrary to other sites, Montmorency forest does not show any preferential snow accumulation on northerly or southerly slopes, but field slopes with southern aspects seemingly accumulate higher snow depths than northern aspects. Forest TWSI appears to govern the overall snow depth-TWSI relationship, probably due to its larger extent compared to the other sites. The range of TWSI values in Montmorency, especially the positive (sheltering) ones, are much higher than in the other two sites, due to the more rugged topography in Montmorency. The snow depth-TWSI relationship is complex, but generally shows a positive trend. This site shows a relationship of snow depth with LAI similar to the other sites, especially Saint-Maurice, with snow depth decreasing until LAI reaches ~1.5. WFE does not show a considerable effect on snow depths in Montmorency. However, snow depth in the field shows an increase in more northerly oriented forest edge pixels.
Figure 6. Partial relationship of predictor variables with snow depth. (a) Sainte-Marthe, (b) Saint-Maurice and (c) Montmorency. Predictor variables are presented by rows and sites by columns. Y axes represent the snow depth in m.
3.3.4 Performance of RF models at each site

Figure 7 displays the observed versus RF model estimates of the snow depth with corresponding OOB statistics for each site. Statistics are presented individually for the field, forest, and combined landscapes. Among the three sites, Sainte-Marthe RF model generally performs better with an OOB $R^2$ of 0.52 and RMSE of 0.084 m, and Montmorency shows the weakest performance with an $R^2$ of 0.28 and RMSE of 0.160 m. Sainte-Marthe field and forest models have similar $R^2$ and RMSE statistics (Fig. 7a), while Saint-Maurice field model performance is comparatively better (higher $R^2$ and lower RMSE, Fig. 7b) than that in the forest. On the contrary, Montmorency forest model performs better than that of the field (Fig. 7c).

![Figure 7. RF model performance against observed snow depths. (a) Sainte-Marthe, (b) Saint-Maurice and (c) Montmorency. The stippled line depicts the 1:1 relationship.](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2022-124)

4 Discussion

4.1 Spatial variability of forest versus field snow depths

Snow depths in Fig. 3 show a remarkable microtopographic variability across all sites. Our results in Sainte-Marthe underpin the previous finding that forested areas accumulate less snow than the adjacent open areas due to canopy interception and sublimation losses and sheltering from wind (Pomeroy and Granger, 1997; Hopkinson et al., 2004; Varhola et al., 2010a; Zheng et al., 2018; Hojatimalekshah et al., 2021). But other two sites show on average, a similar amount of snow accumulation in the field and forest. The dense coniferous canopy cover in Montmorency prevented laser shots from reaching the ground at some locations and consequently showed up as data gaps in the snow depth map (Fig. 3c). The snow depth patterns in the coniferous site thus appear to be dominated by canopy closure, i.e., forest clearings have higher snow depths than adjacent canopies. Such patterns have been previously reported by both ALS and UAV-lidar studies in western alpine/pre-alpine environments with different climates (Hopkinson et al., 2004; Zheng et al., 2016; Mazzotti et al., 2019; Jacobs et al., 2021).
In the agro-forested sites, comparatively higher snow depths observed in the open field compared to the adjacent forest patches are in contrast to what Aygün et al. (2020) observed in similar environments in southern Québec. They measured a lower snow accumulation in exposed agricultural fields (excluding the canals and the forest edge) compared to the adjacent deciduous and mixed forests. In our results, higher snow depth values at the two agro-forested sites principally correspond to canal/stream locations in the field and forest edges, which trap the snow blown from the open field with greater fetches. Hence canals/streams and forest edges constitute the main structuring elements of snow spatial variability at these sites. However, if canals and forest edge snow depths are discarded, agro-forested snow depth maps illustrate somewhat similar phenomena to Aygün et al. (2020), where snow depths in the exposed field appear to be slightly lower than those in the forest. Clusters of high snow depth values in the central area of the Saint-Maurice field in Fig. 3b could be due to local redeposition of snow by the wind in the microtopography or larger-scale effects. This could not be verified as unfortunately, the manual measurements in Saint-Maurice could not be retrieved due to a probe malfunctioning (Dharmadasa et al., 2022).

Yet, the TWSI map (Supplement Fig. S2) suggests microtopographic wind sheltering could be the reason for the local snow deposition closer to the forest edge. But the probable cause for the other high snow depth cluster between two streams in the field could not be resolved from available data. However, as the canopy interception and losses in deciduous and mixed forests are expected to be small (Hopkinson et al., 2010; Aygün et al., 2020), the amount of differential snow depths between the open field and shaded forest would mostly depend on the amount of erosion in the field, and perhaps snowmelt losses in the field prior to peak snow accumulation. As well, a visual comparison of the inter-site snow depth maps suggests that the snow accumulation along the forest edges is a prime process in agro-forested landscapes.

### 4.2 Scaling characteristics of forest versus field snow depths

Semi-variogram analyses revealed distinct scaling behaviors in forest versus field snow depths (Fig. 4). Our results suggest a more variable (high semi-variance values) and more spatially continuous (larger scale break distance) snowpack in the Montmorency boreal forest compared to the temperate forest sites. The snowpack in the mixed forest at Saint-Maurice was less variable and more spatially continuous than that in the Sainte-Marthe deciduous forest. Compared to forested areas, the snowpack in field areas was less variable and more spatially continuous. Shorter scale break distances in forested areas compared to open field areas (Fig. 4) is analogous to previous studies that studied the fractal distribution of snow depths with lidar data. Previous studies reported scale break distances of 7–9 m for high to moderately dense coniferous forests (Trujillo et al., 2007; Trujillo et al., 2009), 12 m for a moderately dense deciduous forest (Trujillo et al., 2007; Trujillo et al., 2009), 15.5 m for a dense coniferous forest with open meadows (Deems et al., 2006; Fassnacht and Deems, 2006), and 16.5 m for a sparse coniferous forest (Deems et al., 2006; Fassnacht and Deems, 2006). We found the shortest scale break distance of 4.1 m for the dense deciduous forest in Sainte-Marthe, an intermediate distance of 5 m for the moderately dense mixed forest in Saint-Maurice, and a value of 7 m for the dense coniferous forest interspersed with gaps in Montmorency. These values are rather smaller than those reported by the previous studies. This could be due to inherent characteristics of the forests such as canopy density and size of open areas (gaps). It is also plausible that the dense point cloud provided by UAV (~150–600
points m⁻², (Zhang et al., 2019; Harder et al., 2020; Jacobs et al., 2021; Dharmadasa et al., 2022)) was able to resolve spatially distributed snow depth patterns at finer scales than that permitted by previous ALS surveys, which had typical point densities of ~8–16 points m⁻² (Kirchner et al., 2014; Broxton et al., 2015; Broxton et al., 2019; Currier et al., 2019).

The relatively higher scale break distance in Montmorency forest could be due to the prevailing large gaps in the forest as a result of silvicultural practices and inherent efficient canopy interception of conifers. Coniferous trees have a substantial impact on snow depths as they intercept snow efficiently and unload around the crown (Zheng et al., 2019). Thus, a longer correlation length (at least the diameter of a tree crown) is expected as well as greater variability of snow depth in the coniferous environment compared to the more random deciduous tree structures which have reduced and more transient snow storage. Leafless deciduous trees aid faster unloading of snow through branches as opposed to unloading around the crown in conifers and thus can result in a smaller correlation length in snow depth.

The largest scale break distance was found in the Saint-Maurice field (18 m). With the absence of vegetation in the field in winter and its high exposure to wind (Fig. 2b), this value is of similar magnitude to those reported for wind-exposed slopes in alpine environments by Schirmer and Lehning (2011), Mott et al. (2011), and Mendoza et al. (2020). Scale invariance in the Sainte-Marthe field suggests a more spatially continuous snowpack. This interpretation is supported by the snow depth maps in Fig. 3, which show a smooth snow depth pattern that is only disrupted by preferential accumulation within irrigation canals/streams. The comparatively smaller scale break distance in the Montmorency field (8.5 m) could be due to its small extent and the influence of preferential accumulation near the meteorological equipment (concentric snow accumulations patterns around the two double-fenced precipitation gauges in Fig. 3c).

Generally, the scale break distances found in this study suggest that the scale selected for modeling or sampling in similar environments should be well below these values, in order to represent the small-scale variability of the snow depth.

4.3 Relationship of snow depth to topographic and vegetation characteristics

Our results affirm the non-linearity between snow depth and the variables considered and the importance of considering this non-linearity in statistical models. During the analysis, some consistent patterns emerged between all three sites, which have been found in previous studies, i.e., snow depth generally decreases with an increase in LAI values (Varhola et al., 2010b), and snow depth increases with an increase of TWSI (Revelto et al., 2014). In the two agro-forested sites, field snow depth variability is governed by the preferential snow accumulation in canals/streams and the microtopography of the local terrain. In fact, the highest wind sheltering values were found in canals/streams which accumulated more snow (Fig. 3 and Supplement Fig. S1, S2). Within the forested areas, the influence of forest structure (LAI) was not as strong as expected; instead, the influence of microtopography appeared to be governing the snow depth variability. The lower influence of LAI at these sites probably reflects the abundance of leafless trees in winter, which reduce interception losses and concurrent spatial snowpack variability. Moreover, the microtopography of these landscapes is closely related to the surficial geology of the sites. Preserved forested patches in the St. Lawrence River lowlands often correspond to less favorable soil conditions, such as glacial till and/or with bedrock outcrops and associated
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rougher microtopography. Whereas agricultural fields are associated with glaciomarine or fluvioglacial sediments that are flatter in nature and exhibit even more flatter surface conditions because of machinery usage (MFFP, Québec Research and Development Institute for the Agri-Environment (IRDA) and La Financière Agricole du Québec (FADQ)). Under limited wind transport, this rougher microtopography in forested surfaces creates a directional bias that promotes lateral transport of snow particles (bounce/roll/ejection) and therefore enhances the smoothing of the snow surface (Filhol and Sturm, 2019) and dominates the snow heterogeneity within the forest. The absence of apparent preferential snow accumulation on different slope orientations in agricultural fields suggests a smoothening of snow cover due to wind redistribution in the field. More rugged microtopography of the forested soil seems to influence the snow cover through radiation resulting in more snow accumulations on northerly slopes in the forest (Fig. 6a, b).

At the combined scale (field+forest), the agro-forested sites are dominated by blowing snow accumulation along the forest edges (Fig. 5a, b). This effect is well visible on lidar-derived snow depth maps as well (Fig. 3a, b). Comparatively high wind speeds and dominant wind directions (Fig. 2a, b) at these sites create favorable conditions for preferential deposition of blowing snow at the forest edge due to the large expanses of open terrain upwind of the windward forest edges. Preferential snow deposition by wind-induced snow drifting along the forest edge has been previously reported in alpine environments by Veatch et al. (2009), Essery et al. (2009), Broxton et al. (2015), and Currier and Lundquist (2018). However, there seems to be limited penetration of blowing snow inside the forest (WFE forest points in Fig. 6a, b).

Forest shading seemingly does not have a significant influence on the snow depth variability in these sites during the accumulation season. Shading effects would however probably have some influence on snow depth patterns in the melting season (Hojatimalekshah et al., 2021). This high spatial heterogeneity of snow depths and associated processes challenge the distributed snow modeling using hydraulic response units (HRUs) in agro-forested landscapes (Aygün et al., 2020), where HRUs are classified as field and forest patches but disregard boundary effects. Aygün et al., (2020) successfully modelled blowing snow transport in fields and the preferential accumulation in canals and streams and assumed that once these were filled, any further blown snow accumulated in the forest. Our results confirm the preferential accumulation in field canals and streams but suggest that further blown snow first preferentially accumulates at the forest edge, which should eventually be represented as distinct HRUs in distributed hydrological models of agro-forested landscapes.

The findings in agro-forested sites are in contrast with the boreal forested environment, where forest structure (LAI) predominates on the variability of snow depth (Fig. 5 and Fig. 6). The small field appears to have fewer microtopographic features and is mostly sheltered from the most frequent winds coming from the northwest direction (Fig. 2c). Relatively greater positive TWSI values in this site imply more rugged microtopography and a larger degree of wind sheltering in the forested terrain. However, since wind is mostly impeded by the coniferous trees, the TWSI-snow depth relationship in the forest suggests that the snow displacement is driven by small-scale bounce/ejection/roll mechanisms, and preferential snow deposition is driven by immobilizing mechanisms such as adhesion, cohesion, and physical interlocking of snow particles (Filhol and Sturm, 2019) and unloading of snow by the canopy (Zheng et al., 2019). The lesser importance of TWSI (28 % compared to 73 % of LAI, the dominant variable, Fig. 5) as a predictor in the coniferous forest compared to deciduous and
mixed forests, and the more or less constant snow depth values for slopes higher than 5° (Fig. 6c) suggest that microtopography has a more restricted influence on deeper snowpack at this site compared to the shallower snowpack at other sites, i.e., in absence of wind, increasing snow depths reduce/inhibit surface undulations and promote more spatially continuous snow cover (Filhol and Sturm, 2019). The spatial arrangement of the trees may have a larger control on snow depths in the boreal forest, i.e., forest gaps in the coniferous forest with various slopes and aspects create pronounced and distinct snow depth variabilities inside the forest (Woods et al., 2006). For instance, in Montmorency, superimposed TWSI and LAI maps (Supplement Fig. S3) show that the high snow depth values associated with TWSI values from 10–12 (Fig. 6c) are associated with a forest gap that likely prevents snow interception and accumulates more snow. The counterintuitive preferential snow accumulation on southern slopes in the field at Montmorency could be due to the influence of the various meteorological stations at the site. Our results support the findings of previous studies that the snow depth distribution of the coniferous environments is mainly governed by the canopy characteristics such as structure, distribution, and type of vegetation (Winkler et al., 2005; López-Moreno and Latron, 2008; Varhola et al., 2010a; Zheng et al., 2018; Koutantou et al., 2022). But the microtopography, even under wind-sheltered conditions in the forest, still explains part of the spatial variability.

While not a major focus of our study, we believe our RF model performances, with overall validation $R^2$ of 0.28–0.52 (Fig. 7), are in an acceptable range for the purpose of our study. All sites have different climates. The higher performance at Sainte-Marthe could be due to a combination of different factors. Early melt of snow due to frequent rain-on-snow events in this region (Paquotte and Baraer, 2021) and the presence of basal ice as observed in the field campaign might have contributed to a more structured snowpack in the Sainte-Marthe forest and hence improved the prediction of snow depth compared to the other agro-forested site. Reasonably high $R^2$ values in agricultural fields at both agro-forested sites (0.39 in Sainte-Marthe and 0.45 in Saint-Maurice) indicate that the models captured the relevant processes through the predictor variables considered. In contrast, Saint-Maurice forest has the worst performance (0.10). This could be due to underlying processes/variables not considered in our model, possibly associated with the canopy structure of the mixed forest. Comparatively low $R^2$ in Montmorency (0.17) field must have been a result of the concentric snow accumulation patterns around the precipitation gauges and other meteorological instruments that eventually degraded the prediction power of snow depth in the RF model. Moreover, the reduced sampling under coniferous trees due to limited lidar penetration could also have affected grid-scale mean snow depth and resulting relationships with landscape metrics.

The previous studies that used RF model to estimate snow depths/SWE (Bair et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020) were mainly focused on mountainous watersheds with large elevation gradients and with less or no vegetation and reported average Nash–Sutcliffe efficiencies as high as ~0.7, where the major part of this variance was explained by elevation. In addition, the abundance of studies that employed MLR (Jost et al., 2007; Lehning et al., 2011; Grünewald et al., 2013; Revuelto et al., 2014; Fujihara et al., 2017) and BRT (Winstral et al., 2002; Anderton et al., 2004; Molotch et al., 2005; Revuelto et al., 2014) in alpine environments with rocky outcrops and pasture or no vegetation also reported $R^2$ of 0.25–0.91 where a substantial portion of the snow depth variability was explained by terrain parameters, mostly elevation. However, model
performances are shown to be degraded with the presence of forests. Studies conducted in forested terrain with relatively small elevation ranges reported $R^2$ of 0.25–0.51 by MLR (Zheng et al., 2016; Zheng et al., 2018) and BRT (Erxleben et al., 2002; Veatch et al., 2009; Baños et al., 2011). Musselman et al. (2008) proved that including detailed vegetation information like micro-scale vegetation-induced solar radiation, distance to the canopy, and tree bole could improve BRT performance to 0.68 in a forested area. Similarly, our inclusion of small-scale vegetation characteristics and terrain variables in RF model has contributed to an improved model fit (better validation $R^2$) compared to previous works in forested terrain.

4.4 Limitations of the study

This study provides an insight into the scaling properties of the snowpack and the effect of different topographic, vegetation, and forest edge characteristics on snow depth variability in open versus forested areas with different canopy covers. However, there are potential limitations with some of the methods presented in this study. For instance, despite our efforts to incorporate processes/variables influencing the snow spatial distribution with available data, comparatively lower performance of RF models in Saint-Maurice and Montmorency indicate there could still be some processes/variables we were unable to account for (e.g., soil parameters, snowpack state, and meteorological variables). Especially in Montmorency, there were observation gaps by UAV-lidar due to the thick canopy cover that eventually affected the accuracy of snow depth raster and other variable raster delineations (e.g., slope, LAI, etc.). As well, the aggregation of high-resolution rasters to larger grid sizes for use in the RF models would have averaged some small-scale variations. The dominant predictors might also depend on the timing of the survey date (e.g., near peak snow accumulation versus early and mid-winter, or melt period). Hence, repeat surveys with UAV-lidar to track the temporal evolution of the snowpack would be required to fully address this question in the future.

5 Conclusions

In this study, including wind-related forest edge effects improved the statistical prediction accuracy of snow depth spatial variability by more than 50% in agro-forested sites, whereas incorporating canopy characteristics improved the predictive accuracy by more than 60% in the coniferous site. This implies the importance of including and better representing these processes in process-based models. Taken together, our results suggest that in agro-forested landscapes of the St. Lawrence valley, geomorphological assemblages drive the differential snow accumulation between field and forested areas, i.e., rugged glacial deposits with preserved forests favor more snow accumulation whereas flat glaciomarine sediments in the exposed fields promote less snow accumulation and more snow erosion. The blowing snow redistributed from the fields gets trapped in canalsSTREAMS and accumulates along the forest edges, accounting for the highest local snow depths in these landscapes. As well, within deciduous/mixed forests, it is rather the underlying topography and/or the forest edges that govern the snow depth variability, while within the coniferous environment, it is the forest structure variability. More often, these processes are not fully represented in process-based models. For instance, most of the process-based models like CRHM (Pomeroy et
al., 2007), and SnowModel (Liston and Sturm, 1998) prescribe a single, typical LAI for land cover classes. This ignores the variability within stands which could compromise larger scale estimates of snowpacks. Our results suggest that snow redistribution in forest edges, forest structure variability, and better representation of prominent topographical features such as canals are important processes/variables that should be taken into account in process-based models. This highlights the advantage of using high resolution data to characterize small-scale processes and therefore explicitly resolve snow depth variability.

In addition, since the selected sites are representative of typical agro-forested and boreal landscapes in southern Québec, the findings of this study could be applied/extrapolated to similar landscapes in the region and any similar environments where similar processes operate. It is worth noting that future efforts in designing modeling parameterizations that include forest edge effects would benefit from incorporating the meteorological conditions together with topographic and vegetation characteristics.
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