Physical Drivers of Thin Snowpack Spatial Structure from Unpiloted Aerial System (UAS) Lidar Observations

Eunsang Cho¹, Adam G. Hunsaker¹, Jennifer M Jacobs¹, Michael Palace¹, Franklin B. Sullivan¹, and Elizabeth Burakowski¹

¹University of New Hampshire

November 24, 2022

Abstract

Snow distribution is a function of interactions among static variables, such as terrain, vegetation, and soil properties, and dynamic meteorological variables, such as wind speed and direction, solar radiation, and soil moisture that occur over a range of spatial scales. However, identifying the dominant physical drivers responsible for spatial patterns of the snowpack, particularly for ephemeral, shallow snowpacks, has been challenged due to the lack of the high-resolution snowpack and physical variables with high vertical accuracy as well as inherent limitations in traditional approaches. This study uses an Unpiloted Aerial System (UAS) lidar-based snow depth and static variables (1-m spatial resolution) to analyze field-scale spatial structures of snow depth and apply the Maximum Entropy (MaxEnt) framework to identify primary controls over open terrain and forests at the Thompson Farm Research Observatory, New Hampshire, United States. We found that, among nine topographic and soil variables, plant functional type and terrain roughness contribute up to 80% and 76% of relative importance in MaxEnt to predicting locations of deeper or shallower snowpacks, respectively, across the landscape. Soil variables, such as organic matter and saturated hydraulic conductivity, were also important controls (up to 70% and 81%) on snow depth spatial variations for both open and forested landscapes suggesting spatial variations in soil variables under snow can control thermal transfer among soil, snowpack, and surface-atmosphere. This work contributes to improving land surface and snow models by informing parameterization of the sub-grid scale snow depths, downscaling remotely sensed snow products, and understanding field scale snow states.

Physical Drivers of Thin Snowpack Spatial Structure from Unpiloted Aerial System (UAS) Lidar Observations 3

- Eunsang Cho^{1,2*†}, Adam G. Hunsaker^{1,2}, Jennifer M. Jacobs^{1,2}, Michael Palace^{2,3}, Franklin B.
 Sullivan², Elizabeth A. Burakowski²
- 6

7 8 9 10 11 12	¹ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA ² Earth Systems Research Center, Institute for the Study of Earth, Oceans, and Space, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA ³ Department of Earth Sciences, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA
13 14 15 16 17	[†] Eunsang Cho's current affiliations are Hydrological Sciences Laboratory, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA, and Earth System Science Interdisciplinary Center, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
18	[*] Corresponding author: Eunsang Cho (<u>ec1072@wildcats.unh.edu</u>)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Highlights
25 26	• Dominant physical drivers of the snowpack spatial patterns from UAS-based lidar were identified using the Maximum Entropy (MaxEnt) framework
27 28	• Plant functional type and terrain roughness contribute up to 80% and 76% of the relative importance in MaxEnt across the landscape
29 30	• Soil variables were also important controls suggesting soils can control thermal transfer among soil, snowpack, and surface-atmosphere
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	Submitted to Water Resources Research
36	December 15, 2020

37 Abstract

38 Snow distribution is a function of interactions among static variables, such as terrain, vegetation, and soil properties, and dynamic meteorological variables, such as wind speed and 39 40 direction, solar radiation, and soil moisture that occur over a range of spatial scales. However, 41 identifying the dominant physical drivers responsible for spatial patterns of the snowpack, 42 particularly for ephemeral, shallow snowpacks, has been challenged due to the lack of the high-43 resolution snowpack and physical variables with high vertical accuracy as well as inherent 44 limitations in traditional approaches. This study uses an Unpiloted Aerial System (UAS) lidar-45 based snow depth and static variables (1-m spatial resolution) to analyze field-scale spatial 46 structures of snow depth and apply the Maximum Entropy (MaxEnt) framework to identify 47 primary controls over open terrain and forests at the Thompson Farm Research Observatory, 48 New Hampshire, United States. We found that, among nine topographic and soil variables, plant 49 functional type and terrain roughness contribute up to 80% and 76% of relative importance in 50 MaxEnt to predicting locations of deeper or shallower snowpacks, respectively, across the 51 landscape. Soil variables, such as organic matter and saturated hydraulic conductivity, were also 52 important controls (up to 70% and 81%) on snow depth spatial variations for both open and 53 forested landscapes suggesting spatial variations in soil variables under snow can control thermal 54 transfer among soil, snowpack, and surface-atmosphere. This work contributes to improving land 55 surface and snow models by informing parameterization of the sub-grid scale snow depths, 56 down-scaling remotely sensed snow products, and understanding field scale snow states. 57

58 **1. Introduction**

59 Snow plays a significant role in hydrologic and ecological processes globally (Barnett et al., 2005). It also benefits much of the world's population from climate services through the 60 61 retention of water for release during seasonally dry periods and land surface energy budgets 62 (Sturm et al., 2017). Snowpack structure and evolution determine snowmelt runoff, infiltration, 63 and groundwater recharge (Carroll et al., 2019; Earman et al., 2006; Harpold et al., 2015; Lundquist et al., 2004; Maurer and Bowling, 2014). Snow plays an important role in partitioning 64 65 incoming solar radiation and longwave radiation into outgoing longwave radiation, and latent heat, ground heat, and sensible heat fluxes (Ge and Gong, 2010; Lawrence and Slater, 2010; 66

67 Liston, 1999; Stieglitz et al., 2001). Snow's insulating properties control the underlying soils' freeze-thaw state (Groffman et al., 2001; Starkloff et al. 2017; Yi et al. 2019) affecting soil 68 69 respiration, carbon sequestration, nutrient retention, and microbial communities (Aase and 70 Siddoway, 1979; Isard and Schaetzel, 1998; Monson et al., 2006; Henry, 2008; Aanderud et al., 71 2013; Tucker et al., 2016; Sorensen et al., 2018; Reinmann and Templer, 2018). In addition to 72 the total amount of snow, the spatial nonuniformity of snow exerts a strong control on processes for patchy snow in shallow ephemeral snowpacks (Anderton et al., 2002; Lundquist and 73 74 Dettinger, 2004; Schlogl et al. 2018). When interactions among terrain, vegetation, and soils and 75 snowpack are captured, they can also be useful in parameterizing the sub-grid scale in snow 76 models to improve model accuracy (Luce et al., 1999; Sturm and Wagner, 2010) or to downscale 77 remotely sensed snow products (e.g., radar backscatter, passive microwave, and gamma 78 radiation; Cho et al., 2020; Derksen et al., 2010; Lemmetyinen et al., 2016; Saberi et al., 2020) 79 that are too coarse to provide an understanding of conditions at field scales.

80 The spatial variability in snow depth is a function of static and dynamic conditions over a 81 range of spatial scales (Clark et al., 2011). Fixed physical controls including terrain (Blöschl and 82 Kirnbauer, 1992; Lapen and Martz, 1996; Mott et al., 2011), vegetation (Gelfan et al., 2004; 83 DeBeer and Pomeroy, 2010; Currier and Lundquist, 2018), and even soil (Mott et al., 2013; 84 Shook et al., 1993; Pomeroy et al., 1998) are primary controls for variations in snow depth and 85 snow water equivalent at multiple scales across the landscape. In the absence of major vegetation 86 interactions, terrain elevation, slope, aspect, and roughness can control accumulation and 87 ablation patterns, with greater accumulation at higher elevations (Grünewald and Lehning, 88 2011), reduced snow depth on steep slopes (Blöschl and Kirnbauer, 1992), lee slope loading with 89 preferential wind deposition of precipitation (Mott et al. 2011), retention of snowpack on north 90 facing slopes during the ablation season (Gray and Male, 1981; Schirmer and Pomeroy, 2020), 91 and rougher terrain holding less snow than smoother terrain (Lehning et al., 2011). With tall 92 vegetation, canopy interception by coniferous forests (30-79%) can reduce accumulation on the 93 ground (McNay et al. 1988; Schmidt and Gluns, 1991; Pomeroy and Gray, 1995; Storck et al. 94 2002; Roth and Nolin, 2017, and others), though the magnitude of canopy interception depends 95 on storm type and canopy crown completeness. Less is known about deciduous forest canopy 96 interception, which ranges from 1% based on a hardwood forest study in Japan (Nakai et al. 97 1993) and up to 25% in a southern beech forest in Peru (Huerta et al. 2019). Vegetation can also

98 affect snow spatial variability during the ablation season through canopy shading (Essery et al. 99 2008; Musselman et al. 2008) and reduced sublimation (Roth and Nolin, 2017). Many western 100 U.S. studies have identified elevation and temperature as primary factors explaining differences 101 in forested versus open snowpack accumulation and duration (Lundquist et al., 2013; Roth and 102 Nolin, 2017). For soil-snow interactions, previous work indicates that the spatial distribution of 103 snowpack and melt timing controlled spatial patterns in soil moisture and temperature (Shook et 104 al., 1993; Mott et al., 2013). However, there is limited research regarding if and how soil 105 property spatial variations contribute to snow distribution during the accumulation and ablation 106 periods.

107 Traditional manual ground sampling methods have been used to characterize snow depth 108 spatial variability using statistical indicators, probability distributions, and fractal methods. 109 Using traditional point measurements with limited sample size requires a balance between the 110 sampling spatial extent and sample density. This impacts the ability to capture spatial variability 111 that naturally increases with spatial scale as compared to capturing small-scale spatial structures 112 (Clark et al. 2011). Remote sensing methods provide the ability to collect data over a continuous 113 spatial extent, thus expanding on the understanding of snow distribution (Broxton et al., 2019; 114 Deems et al., 2006; Painter et al., 2016; Jacobs et al., 2020; Tinkham et al., 2014).

115 Over the past two decades, airborne remote sensing methods, providing spatially 116 continuous, high-resolution snow depth maps at local and regional scales, have greatly advanced 117 the ability to characterize the spatiotemporal variability of snow depth over earlier work using 118 snow probes (see reviews in Deems et al., 2013; López-Moreno et al., 2017). Airborne laser 119 scanning (ALS) (Deems et al., 2013; Harpold et al., 2014; Kirchner et al., 2014), terrestrial laser 120 scanning (TLS) (Grünewald et al. 2010; Currier et al. 2019), and structure-from-motion 121 photogrammetry (SfM) (Nolan et al., 2015; Bühler et al., 2016; Goetz and Brenning, 2019) have 122 emerged as viable methods to map surface elevations with snow-off and snow-on conditions in 123 order to differentially map snow depths.

Many snowpack patterns are controlled by fixed physical controls including vegetation and topography that are relatively consistent from year to year (i.e., time stable; Grayson et al. 2002; Pflug & Lundquist, 2020; Revuelto et al., 2014). Because these snowpack patterns repeat on an annual basis, high-resolution snow depth datasets in combination of increasingly sophisticated and ubiquitous terrain, vegetation, and soil property datasets are well suited to

129 improve characterization of the role of fixed physical controls via data intensive methods (e.g., 130 generalized linear or additive models; ensembles of regression trees: random forests or boosted 131 regression trees) that have been used for many purposes in hydrology and ecology (Booker and 132 Woods, 2014; Cutler et al., 2007; He et al., 2016; Tinkham et al., 2014; Peters et al., 2007). One 133 such spatial modeling technique that has not been used to study snow depth patterns is Maximum 134 Entropy (MaxEnt) framework. The MaxEnt in combination with high-resolution remote sensing techniques has the potential to characterize the role of multiple physical variables simultaneously 135 136 on snow depth spatial variability as well as their relative importance.

137 MaxEnt is a machine learning approach that uses the spatial location of focal features and 138 predictor variables to extrapolate these features across a landscape where those predictor 139 variables are present (Baldwin, 2009; Phillips et al., 2004; 2006; Phillips & Dudík, 2008). In the 140 ecological science community, the MaxEnt framework has been widely used for a species 141 distribution modelling, with over 1000 published applications between 2006 to 2013 (Elith et al., 142 2006; Phillips & Dudík, 2008; Merow et al., 2013, Algeo et al., 2017). Using the MaxEnt model, 143 ecologists predicted habitat suitability of animal and plant species using related spatial-144 environmental factors as predictor variables (Dudik et al., 2007). The principle of the MaxEnt 145 model originates in information theory (Jaynes, 1957), but its application has been expanded to 146 various disciplines, such as archaeology (Howey et al., 2016, 2020), plant distribution 147 (McMichael et al., 2014), and soil and drought (Palace et al., 2017). MaxEnt has been applied in 148 hydrology to a range of problems (Singh 1997; Fischer et al., 2020; Westhoff et al., 2014) 149 including to constrain hydrologic model parameters (Westhoff and Zehe, 2012), map 150 groundwater (Rahmati et al. 2016), evaluate effect soil structure on hydrologic fluxes via 151 preferential flow paths (Zehe et al., 2010) and characterize land-surface hydrology (Wang and 152 Bras, 2011; Djebou and Singh, 2015). Importantly, the MaxEnt framework provides valuable 153 information about variable importance with a model reliability that dominates the overall 154 contribution for developing the MaxEnt model. While entropy-based methods have advantages 155 over traditional statistical methods (Mishra and Coulibaly, 2009), research regarding the use of 156 entropy theory for understanding snow variability across a landscape is limited to snow 157 monitoring network design (Keum et al., 2018) Among the diverse network design methods, the 158 entropy-based methods have emerged as promising alternatives to traditional statistical methods 159 (Mishra and Coulibaly, 2009).

160 The main objective of this study is to identify physical drivers controlling spatial 161 variability of snow depth focusing on shallow, ephemeral snowpacks using information from a UAS-based lidar platform. MaxEnt modeling efforts are used to evaluate the relative importance 162 163 of terrain, plant functional type, and soil variables in identifying the location of the shallowest 164 and deepest snowpack as well as the consistency of snow depth patterns. This paper is organized 165 as follows. Section 2 provides the study site information with general land characteristics and 166 weather conditions with several field photos. Section 3 describes the datasets including the UAS lidar snow depth and physical static variables. The description of the MaxEnt model is included 167 168 Section 3.3. Section 4 details the results of spatial patterns of the lidar snow depth from two 169 flights measured in different winters and the dominant drivers contributing the spatial variability 170 of snow depth. Section 5 offers a discussion about the similarities, differences, and new findings 171 in the results with respect to previous studies. Conclusions and future perspectives are drawn in 172 section 6.

173 **2. Study site**

174 This study was conducted at the University of New Hampshire Thompson Farm Research 175 Station in southeast New Hampshire, United States (N 43.10892°, W 70.94853°, 35 m above sea level), which was chosen for its mixed hardwood forest and open field land covers (Perron et al. 176 177 2004; Burakowski et al., 2015; Burakowski et al., 2018; Sanders-DeMott et al. 2020) that are characteristic of the region (Figure 1). Thompson Farm has an area of 0.83 km² and little 178 179 topographic relief (18 to 36 m ASL) (Perron et al., 2004). The agricultural fields are actively 180 managed for pasture grass. The mixed deciduous and coniferous forest is composed primarily of 181 white pine (*Pinus strobus*), northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), red maple (Acer rubrum), 182 shagbark hickory (Carya ovata), and white oak (Quercus alba) (Perron et al., 2004). There are 183 two "wood roads" that run north-south through the pasture and into the western forest section. 184 The winter climate at Thompson Farm is characterized by cold, maritime winter climate with a 185 mean winter air temperature of -3.0°C, snowfall of 114 cm (NH State Climate Office, 2014), and 186 three weeks to over three months of days with snow cover (Burakowski and Hamilton, 2020). 187 Snow depth can range from a trace up to 94 cm and typical snow density ranges from 100 to 400 188 kg/m^3 (Burakowski et al. 2013).



189

Figure 1. Study location with a leaf-off image of Thompson Farm, Durham, New Hampshire,
United States (left) with examples of photos showing the field and forest conditions (right) in
December 2019 (Snow-on image with flight lines is provided in Figure S1).

193 **3. Datasets and Methods**

194 **3.1 UAS lidar snow depth**

UAS lidar surveys were conducted at the Thompson Farm Research Station during two
consecutive winter seasons. This study compares two lidar derived snow depth products that
represent the distribution of snow depth at a spatial resolution of one meter. Snow surface
elevations were collected on January 23rd, 2019 and December 4th, 2019. The respective bare
earth baseline elevations were collected following snowmelt on April 11th, 2019 and March 18th,
2020. The total area surveyed was approximately 0.11 km², of which 0.7 km² was open field and
0.4 km² was mixed deciduous (dormant) and coniferous forest.

A heavy lift quadcopter manufactured by UAV-America was used to carry lightweight and inexpensive Lidar and GNSS-inertial sensors. The Lidar sensor used was the Velodyne VLP-16. The VLP-16 has 16 independent infrared lasers that rotate 360 degrees along the horizontal axis and are evenly spaced from -15 to +15 degrees along the vertical axis. The sensor was configured to only collect the strongest return per laser pulse, resulting in approximately 300,000

207 laser shots per second. Lidar distance observations were georeferenced using the UAS trajectory 208 and attitude observed with the Applanix APX-15 IMU/GPS. The APX-15 uses a high 209 performance GNSS receiver that achieves a positional accuracy of 2-5 cm following post-210 processing. Post-processing was accomplished using the POSPac UAS software package and a 211 nearby continuously operating reference station (CORS) GNSS base station. Micro 212 electromechanical systems (MEMS) sensors are also used by the APX-15 to capture UAS 213 attitude with uncertainties of 0.025-degree roll and pitch, and 0.08-degree true heading. The 214 APX-15 collects positional and attitude observations at a rate of 200 Hz, enabling the high 215 frequency Lidar observations to be accurately georeferenced. UAS flights were conducted at an 216 altitude of 81 meters. This altitude was selected to achieve maximum swath width (~150m) 217 while remaining in the operational range limits of the VLP-16 Lidar sensor. A lawn mower flight 218 plan with a targeted swath overlap of 40% was used on the January 23rd, 2019 survey and the 219 respective baseline. In an effort to achieve a denser point cloud, a crossed flight plan with a 220 target swath overlap of 40% between parallel flight lines was used for the December 4th, 2020 221 survey and the respective baseline (Figure 1). Similar point densities were achieved between the 222 two flights. A flight speed of 7 m/s was used for both flights.

Point Clouds were filtered to remove all non-ground laser returns using a progressive morphological filter as part of the R package LidR. Classified lidar returns were then averaged over a one-meter grid to create digital elevation models (DEMs) for the bare earth and snow surfaces. Snow depth maps were constructed by simply subtracting the snow-on DEM from the bare-earth DEM.

228 **3.2 Physical variables**

229 Topographic and soil variables were investigated as potential physical drivers of field 230 scale snow depth spatial variability. Variables included in this study were plant functional type, 231 roughness, slope, shading, aspect, inter-pixel variability of lidar returns (STD), topographic 232 compound index (TCI), saturated hydraulic conductivity (K_{sat}), and soil organic matter (Figure 233 2). Mapped at a one-meter scale, all physical variables are derived from our UAS observations 234 except the two soil variables. The soil variables, saturated hydraulic conductivity and organic 235 matter of the soil at depth of 0–5 cm, were obtained from Probabilistic Remapping of SSURGO 236 (POLARIS) soil property maps (30-m spatial resolution; Chaney et al., 2016; 2019).

237 The topographic variables, percent slope and aspect, were calculated using Horn's method 238 (Horn, 1981). Surface roughness was calculated as the largest intra-cell difference of a central 239 pixel and its eight surrounding cells. Inter-pixel variability of lidar returns (STD) is the standard 240 deviation of the lidar returns within each pixel and is a measure of the small-scale surface 241 roughness. Topographic compound index (TCI), also known as or topographic wetness index, is 242 used to estimate the surface water that might accumulate across a landscape (Sørensen et al., 243 2006; Howey et al., 2016). This metric is computed as $A/\tan B$, the cumulative upslope region 244 (A) that drains through a specific point along a contour path (B). Total shading represents the 245 number of hours from 7 am to 5 pm that a pixel was in the shade on the survey date and was 246 calculated using the unfiltered UAS-lidar DTM and the incidence angle of the sun on the survey 247 date. Binary shadow maps (shadow or no-shadow) were made for each hour from 7 am to 5 pm 248 then merged to count the number of hours that a pixel was in the shade. To characterise the local 249 variability of snow depth (~ 10 m), the local gradient of the snow surfaces and their respective 250 baselines (snow-off) were calculated using image convolution through a 9 x 9 pixel moving 251 window. The horizontal gradient within the moving window was calculated as the difference 252 between the mean pixel values to the left of the center column and the mean pixel values to the 253 right of the center column. The vertical gradient within the moving window was calculated as the 254 difference between the mean pixel values above the center row and the mean pixel values below 255 the center row. The total local gradient (LG) was then calculated by summing the gradient 256 components as follows:

- 257
- 258

Total local gradient =
$$\sqrt{Horizontal \ gradient^2 + Vertical \ gradient^2}$$
 (1)

259

At least 50% of the pixels within each window had to have snow depth data (e.g., percentage of pixels with data to the left of the center column). If this condition was not met for any portion of the window used to calculate the gradient components, a value of not available (NA) was recorded for the total gradient at this location.

264

3.3 Maximum Entropy (MaxEnt) model

265 To identify physical variables that control the spatial variations of the snow depth
266 estimated from a UAS lidar system, we used the MaxEnt framework in the context of a shallow,

267 ephemeral snowpack. The nine topographical and soil static variables (from section 3.2) were used to develop probability maps of snow distribution (shallow or deep) along with examining 268 269 the importance of the specific variables mentioned above (Figure 2). The important variables 270 identified from the MaxEnt models that predict the suitability of the area for relatively deep or 271 shallow snow depths can be considered as a proxy for physical drivers to generate spatial 272 variability of snowpack. There are two types of variable importance values from the MaxEnt 273 framework, percent contribution and permutation importance. The percent contribution values 274 are heuristically defined. They depend on the particular algorithm path that the MaxEnt model 275 uses to obtain the optimal solution. The permutation importance depends on the final MaxEnt 276 model, not the path. This importance for each input variable is determined by randomly 277 permuting the values of the variable among the training points (See details in Phillips, 2006). 278 Percent contribution is presented in the body of the paper, and permutation importance results 279 are included in the Supporting Information.

To check the reliability of the MaxEnt models, area under the receiver-operator curve (AUC) is used in this study, which indicates the predictive capacity of the model (Merow et al., 2013). AUC, which varies from 0 to 1, is interpreted as the probability that a randomly chosen presence location is ranked higher than a randomly chosen absence point. An AUC value of 0.5 is the same as a random guess of presence/absence. The closer an AUC value is to 1, the more reliable the predictions from the MaxEnt model. A model with an AUC over 0.75 is often considered to accurately estimate sample data (Phillip and Dudík, 2008).



287

Figure 2. Spatial maps of the nine topographic and soil variables plus the local gradient of baseline used as input variables for the Maximum Entropy model

4. Results

291 **4.1 Relationship among physical variables**

- 292 Before conducting the MaxEnt model analysis to identify physical drivers controlling
- 293 spatial variability of snow depth, cross-correlation matrices among the physical input variables
- were calculated for (1) landscape scale (fields and forest combined), (2) fields, and (3) forest.
- 295 Figure 3 shows the cross-correlation matrices with the Pearson correlation coefficients (R-
- 296 values) with different colors. For all three areas, roughness is strongly correlated with slope (R =

297 0.69, 0.95, and 0.69 for landscape scale, fields, and forest, respectively). While slope and 298 roughness are moderately correlated with standard deviation of lidar returns (STD; R: 0.63 for 299 both) in fields, they are less strongly correlated (R = 0.39 and 0.34) in forest areas. For the fields, 300 there is also a strong correlation (R = 0.65) between saturated hydraulic conductivity (K_{sat}) and 301 organic matter of soils.



302

Figure 3. Cross-correlation matrices for landscape scale, fields, and forest based on the boundaries from
 Figure 1

305

5 **4.2 Spatial patterns of snow depth**

306 The UAS lidar-based snow depths, mapped by subtracting snow-off DTMs from snow-on 307 DTMs, reveal a thin snow pack ranging from less than 2 cm to over 21 cm in January 2019 308 (mean: 9.4 cm; standard deviation: 9.7 cm) and depths exceeding 41 cm in December 2019 309 (mean: 26.9 cm; standard deviation: 15.2 cm) (Figure 4 and Table 1). As compared to in situ 310 magnaprobe (Sturm and Holmgren, 2018) snow depth measurements, the lidar snow depth 311 measurements had mean absolute differences (MAD) and root mean squared difference (RMSD) 312 values of 0.96 cm and 1.22 cm, respectively, in the open field, and the MAD and RMSD values 313 were 9.6 cm and 10.5 cm, respectively, in the forest in January 2019 (see details in Jacobs et al., 314 2020). The lidar snow depth map in December 2019 had MAD and RMSD of 1.6 cm and 2.0 cm, 315 respectively, in the open field and MAD and RMSD of 3.0 cm and 3.9 cm, respectively, in the 316 forest. 317 The shallower snow depths (lower 30%) were 6.4 cm and 24 cm and deeper snow depths

(higher than 70%) for each map) were 12 cm and 29 cm in January and December 2019,

319 respectively. Despite having different magnitudes of snow depth between the two dates, there 320 were similar spatial patterns. Deeper snow depth values (blue) existed in the fields and shallower 321 snow depths (red) in forest. Compared to the forest snowpack, the field snow depth had 322 relatively high spatial variability and less coherent patterns. In the field, the deeper snow is in the 323 northeast areas in January. However, in December, the deeper snow occurred in the middle and 324 east areas. A shallow and spatially consistent snowpack occurred in forest areas. In the deciduous 325 forest type, the snow depth was consistently higher than that in coniferous forest, especially in 326 the east forest (see the plant functional type map in **Figure 2**). The shallowest snowpack was 327 found in coniferous forest type.



329





spatial distribution of shallower (lower) or deeper (higher) values of snow depth (local gradient), the color
bars are divided by quantile values (0, 5, 10, 20, 30, 70, 80, 90, 95, and 99%) for each map.

335 Likewise, spatially coherent patterns of the local gradients of snow depth are readily

discernible between the two UAS surveys (Figure 4). Lower local gradient values (red),

indicating a relatively consistent snow depth, existed in the east fields. Higher gradients (blue)

338 were found in the field to forest transitions and roads. In the forest areas, the lower local

339 gradients generally appeared in coniferous forest. High local gradients are consistently found at

the forest edge.

341 Table 1. Summary of snow depth and local gradient of snow depth in January and December342 2019

Snow depth (cm)								Local gradient of snow depth (cm)							
	January 2019			Dece	December 2019			January 2019				December 2019			
Areas	Mean	Std	99%	Mean	Std	99%		Mean	Std	99%	-	Mean	Std	99%	
Landscape	9.4	9.7	21.7	26.9	15.2	40.9		2.7	10.8	19.8		2.7	6.7	19.3	
Fields	11	3.8	19.9	27.8	6.8	38.2		1.6	4.1	8.1		2	5.4	14.1	
Forest	7.2	13.8	27.4	25.8	21.1	46.8		3.9	15.3	35		3.6	7.8	21.5	

343

4.3 Physical drivers contributing spatial variability of snow depth

To determine the most relevant physical drivers that contribute to the spatial variability of snow depth, the relative importance of the input variables from the MaxEnt model with different thresholds was quantified. **Figure 5** shows relative contribution of the nine input variables from each MaxEnt run using the shallow and deep snow depth values within thresholds. Larger percentages indicate those variables that play a greater role in predicting the suitability of shallow or deeper snow depth.



Figure 5. Variable importance from the MaxEnt models for shallower and deeper snow depth observed in January (left) and December 2019 (right side of each subfigure). Shallower or deeper snow depth is determined by thresholds. Shallower snow depth is defined as less than 3% (extremely shallow) to 30% quantiles (moderately shallow) of the entire snow depth values for the three areas, landscape, fields, and forest, respectively. Deeper snow depth values are from larger than 97% (extremely deep) to 70% quantiles (moderately deep). Permutation importance values for the snow depth are also provided in Supporting information (**Figure S2**).

359 For shallow snow depths (top panels), plant functional type is the most important variable 360 in the landscape scale, especially in the January snow depths, which were shallower than the 361 snow depths from December 2019. For the snow depths in December 2019, soil organic matter 362 and roughness contribute somewhat (e.g., both are 27% for the lowest 3% quantile of snow 363 depth). In the fields, soil variables, organic matter and K_{sat} , and slope are generally important. 364 The contribution of soil organic matter to the shallow snow depths in December 2019 is very 365 strong, ranging up to 70%. In the forest, it seems that different variables influence the shallow snowpack for the two study snowpacks. While K_{sat} and aspect are clearly important to identify 366 367 shallow snow depth in January 2019 as compared to other variables, there are no dominant variables in December 2019. Organic matter (21 to 37%) and roughness (17 to 23%) are 368 369 somewhat important for extremely shallow snow depths (less than 3 to 5% quantiles). 370 For deep snow depths (bottom panels), different variables contribute to snow depth for

the two study snowpacks. While organic matter is the dominant control in January, landscape scale, roughness and STD are more important in December. In the fields, K_{sat} and organic matter indicate locations of deep snow in January, but roughness is the most important variable in

374 December. In the forest, the variable contributions differ by snowpack. For the deepest snow 375 depth (95 to 97% quantiles), roughness (and STD) is important but the contributions of K_{sat} and 376 organic matter gradually increase when the threshold for deep snow is decreased.

377 In summary, plant functional type is an important explanatory variable for mixed 378 vegetation areas, especially in predicting the shallow snow depth. Soil variables, organic matter 379 and K_{sat} , contribute to both shallow and deep snowpacks. Roughness and STD are also important 380 particularly for the snow depth in December 2019 rather than in January 2019. Contrary to 381 expectations, shadow hours, aspect, and TCI had limited ability to identify the relatively shallow 382 or deep snow depth in the MaxEnt framework.

383 Predicted suitability maps of shallower or deeper snow depth can be estimated from the 384 MaxEnt models developed for target ranges. Based on the training points with input variables, 385 the MaxEnt model provides potential locations with suitability where the range of snow depth 386 likely exists. For example, Figure 6 includes predicted suitability maps for the locations where 387 the snow depth is less than the 5% quantile and greater than the 95% snow depth quantile for the 388 two snowpacks. These maps are the combination of the two maps developed by the MaxEnt 389 models for fields and forest, respectively. In January, locations with high predicted suitability 390 (dark red) for shallow snowpack correspond to locations with shallow snow depth (e.g., west 391 forest, south fields, and central fields near ponds; see **Figure 4**). In December, distributions with 392 high suitability also agreed fairly well with the shallow values from the snow depth map (e.g., 393 southwest fields and east forest). For the 95% snow depth quantile, predicted maps with high 394 suitability values captured areas where deep snow depth exists (e.g., northeast fields in January 395 2019, central fields near the small buildings in December 2019, and east forest in both months).





400

396

In an effort to better discern the effect of the soil variables on the reliability of the
MaxEnt model, AUC values are compared for models that include and exclude soil variables
(Figure 5). The AUC values from the MaxEnt models for the shallowest (3 to 5%) and deepest
snow depths (95 to 97% quantiles) are higher than the moderate snow depths (10 to 30% and 70
to 95%). For both shallow and deep snow depths, the MaxEnt models with soil variables have
higher AUC values than the MaxEnt models without soil variables. This tendency is more
apparent in the field than the forest. For fields with shallow snow depth, AUC values with soil

- 408 variables range from 0.86 to 0.92 for the 3 to 5% snow depth quantiles, while the values without
- 409 soil variables range from 0.76 to 0.83. For fields with a deep snow pack, there is a more modest
- 410 influence. The AUC values with soil variables for the 95 to 97% quantiles range from 0.86 to
- 411 0.93, while the values without soil variables are range from 0.79 to 0.87.



412

Figure 5. Comparison of the Area Under the receiver-operator Curve (AUC) values of the MaxEnt
 models with and without soil variables (organic matter and saturated hydraulic conductivity) for shallow
 and deep snow depths observed in January and December 2019.

416 **4.4 Localized variability of snow depth**

- The relative contributions of the static variables on the snow depth local gradients werecomputed in the MaxEnt framework for locations having lower (less than 3 to 30%) and higher
- 419 local gradients (greater than 7% to 97%) (**Figure 6**). For this analysis, the static variable

420 included the nine input variables previously used as well as the local gradient mapped during the 421 baseline (snow-off) flight. Variables with larger percentages indicate that the input variables play 422 a greater role in predicting the local gradients and typically improving the MaxEnt's reliability. For low local gradients of snow depth, implying locally homogeneous snowpack conditions 423 424 within 10 m (top panels), plant functional type was the most important variable (32 - 49%) for 425 landscape scale, especially in the shallower snow depth map from January. Roughness and the 426 baseline local gradient were of secondary importance in January and December, respectively. 427 Roughness contributed 24% and baseline local gradient contributed 23% for the less than 3% 428 quantile of local gradients. In the fields, there were clear differences in important variables 429 between the two snowpacks. While soil variables, organic matter and K_{sat}, and roughness were 430 important for January, the baseline's local gradient was the strongest contributor for December. 431 In the forest, there were no dominant variables, except for the baseline's local gradient for 432 January. Aspect, shadow hours, STD, and TCI did not play a role in the location of low local 433 gradients for the overall site, nor for the field and forest areas.



Figure 6. Variable importance from the MaxEnt models for low (top) and high (bottom panel) local gradients of snow depth observed in January (left) and December 2019 (right side of each subfigure). Low or high local gradients of snow depth are determined by thresholds. Low local gradient is defined as less than 3% (extremely low) to 30% quantiles (moderately low) of the entire local gradient values for the three areas, landscape, fields, and forest, respectively. High local gradient values are from larger than 97% (extremely high) to 70% quantiles (moderately high). Permutation importance for the local gradients are also provided in Supporting information (Figure S3).

442 For high local gradients of snow depth (bottom panels), roughness and the baseline local 443 gradient are important for identifying landscape scale transitions. For the January snowpack, the 444 contributing percentage of the baseline's local gradient was around 70% for the extremely high 445 local gradients (95 to 97% quantiles). The contribution of the baseline local gradient decreased 446 with decreasing thresholds, and roughness's contribution increased indicating a transition 447 between the two highly correlated variables. In fields, the baseline local gradient was the 448 dominant control and contributed up to 80%. Organic matter was also somewhat important (up to 449 20 to 34%) for the highest local gradient of snow depth (higher than 95% quantiles). In the 450 forest, while there were no dominant variables as compared to fields or landscape scale, for 451 January, K_{sat} and baseline's local gradient were important (49% and 36%, respectively). 452 Contribution of roughness gradually increases with decreasing the quantiles (particularly from 70) 453 to 85% quantiles). 454 In summary, plant functional type is valuable for predicting the low local gradients of

In summary, plant functional type is valuable for predicting the low local gradients of snowpack at the landscape scale. Within a single plant functional type, the baseline's local gradient and roughness control the locations of both the low and high local gradients of snow depth. Soil variables also contribute modestly to identifying spatial variability in localized snowpack. Contrary to our expectations, shadow hours, aspect, and TCI had marginal contributions for localized snowpack variations at the 10 m scale using the MaxEnt framework.





461

In contrast with predicted suitability maps of snow depth, two predicted suitability maps of high local gradients have relatively similar spatial patterns for the two snowpacks, except for west forest (**Figure 7**). Because the baseline's local gradient and roughness were the dominant controls needed to predict the local gradients of snowpack, the spatial distributions of baseline's local gradient and roughness are reflected in the predicted maps (compare to the input variable maps in **Figure 2**).

470 **5. Discussion**

471 **5.1 Physical drivers: Comparison with previous findings**

472 Static features such as topography and vegetation rather than local meteorology and 473 precipitation patterns typically control snow distribution at the local scale. There are numerous 474 studies, which attempt to characterize spatial snow structures and to identify physical 475 characteristics affecting the spatial characteristics of snowpack. Bloschl and Kirnbauer (1992) 476 investigated the relationship between spatial snow patterns and terrain attributes (e.g., elevation 477 and slope) in a mountainous area in the Austrian Alps. They found no dominant relationship to 478 terrain parameters with spatial snow depth. Lapen and Martz (1996) found that spatial patterns of 479 snow depth are related to the terrain attributes that define sheltering by topographic obstacles, 480 indicating that drifting is a critical process in the prairie environment. Mott et al. (2011) 481 mentioned that the driving force for the drifting processes is the air flow near the surface layer, 482 which is partially shaped by the local terrain. Our results have similar findings in that there were 483 clear differences in snow depth within the fields (e.g., east versus west fields) and transitional 484 areas between fields and forest. Currier and Lundquist (2018) also found large differences in 485 snow depth for the forest-edge classifications in the western United States.

Soil properties are considered to be a potential feature that can affect spatial variability of snowpack, yet few studies have investigated how important soil properties are to inform spatial structure of snow depth as compared to other terrain characteristics. Shook et al. (1993) analyzed area-frequency relationships of snow and soil patches at different stages during the melting season in prairie and alpine environments. They found that snow and soil patches are fractals, and their size distribution is predictable, implying that soil properties may potentially influence such behaviour. Redding and Devito (2011) showed differences in the timing of snow 493 disappearance between two sites with different soil types. They found that mean snowmelt rates 494 at sites with sand soils were quicker than those at sites with loam soils. However, they could not 495 conduct significance tests due to the limited measurements from the loam soils. Our findings 496 indicate that soil properties, organic matter and hydraulic conductivity, are more important than 497 shadow hours, aspect, STD, and for modelling spatial distribution of snow depth, which is 498 probably because soil properties, especially soil organic matter, impact soil thermal conductivity 499 (Abu-Hamdeh and Reeder, 2000). The thermal conductivity of soil is highly dependent on soil 500 density, mineral type, grain size, and moisture content (Farouki, 1981; Penner, 1970; Parikh et 501 al., 1979). In frozen soils, the thermal conductivity is more sensitive to soil type than non-frozen 502 soils, because the thermal conductivity of ice is more than four times larger than that of liquid 503 water (Penner, 1970). Recently, Zhu et al. (2019) found that soil organic matter was a dominant 504 factor controlling the variability of thermal diffusivity at 200 field sites in the high latitude 505 regions. Our results suggest that spatial differences in soil properties may lead to spatial 506 discrepancy in heat transfer between snowpack and soil surface resulting in enhanced spatial 507 variability of snow depth even at local scales. With large spatial variability of soil temperature 508 (e.g., less than 10 m spatial correlation in fields; Mohanty et al., 1995) and frequent patchy snow 509 in shallow ephemeral snowpacks, the differences in energy transfer between snow and soil 510 surface across areas with different snow depths leads to a heterogeneous distribution of surface 511 temperatures (Mott et al., 2013). Harder et al. (2017) confirmed that local-scale sensible heat 512 advection driven by surface temperature heterogeneity is a main source of energy available for 513 snowmelt. Based on our results that soil properties are an important control on the spatial 514 patterns of shallower and deeper snow depths, future research is needed to address the role that 515 spatially distributed soil properties play in the spatial heterogeneity of energy transfer with 516 snowpack.

517

5.2 MaxEnt framework compared to traditional analysis

518 To our knowledge this study is the first to use the MaxEnt model to understand snow 519 distribution measured using a UAS-based lidar. In the natural science community, the MaxEnt 520 model is one of the most popular methods for species distribution and environmental modelling 521 (Elith et al., 2006; Merow et al., 2013). The MaxEnt framework provides accurate information 522 about the degree of importance among the input variables that dominate overall contribution to

develop the MaxEnt model with model reliability. For the snow science and hydrology
community, this approach can create novel opportunities to identify dominant physical variables
and to advance snow and land surface models by leveraging remotely sensed snow observations
at multiple scales.

527 As a traditional method, variogram approaches including fractal analysis have been 528 widely used to understand the spatial scaling patterns of snow depth (or SWE) based on the self-529 similarity of properties over multiple scales. Deems et al. (2006) conducted a variogram analysis of snow depth, topography, and vegetation topography data sets from three 1-km² study areas 530 531 using an airborne-based lidar system. They found the existence of two distinct scale areas from 532 the snow depth and vegetation topography data sets, separated by a scale break that varies 533 between 15 m and 40 m for snow depth, and between 31 m and 56 m for vegetation topography 534 (similar to the results from Arnold and Rees, 2003). Trujillo et al. (2007) also attempted to 535 determine whether the spatial distribution of snow depth has scale invariance, and the role of 536 physical drivers including vegetation, topography, and winds in such behaviour. Using fractal 537 analysis, Schirmer and Lehning (2011) investigated seasonal and spatial changes in scaling 538 behaviour of snow depth. They found that the scale break gradually increases throughout the 539 snow accumulation season indicating that roughness of the terrain surface buried by snow may 540 control the scaling behaviour.

541 Even though the variogram-type analyses have provided explicit information to 542 characterize the spatial structure of snowpack, limited information is available to determine the 543 relative importance among various physical characteristics related to the formation of spatial 544 structure of snow depth. Deems et al. (2006) speculated that the length of the scale break might 545 be due to the overall terrain relief, and that the process change revealed by the breaks in the 546 variograms of the vegetation topography potentially influences the scaling patterns of snow 547 depth. In Trujillo et al. (2007)'s results, none of the breaks in the slope of the log-log plots 548 between snow depth and the corresponding fields of topography and vegetation topography were 549 present, while the break in the scaling behavior was controlled by the vegetation characteristics 550 (e.g. canopy height, canopy-covered area, and distances between trees). Thus, it is expected that 551 the MaxEnt framework with spatially distributed snowpack data supplements the existing 552 approaches by providing various information about dominant predictor variables along with 553 spatially predicted suitability maps.

554 **5.3 UAS lidar snow depth sampling**

555 Reliable spatially distributed high-resolution snowpack measurements are essential to 556 discern physical processes that depend on the snow state. In this study, the UAS-based lidar 557 system provided a unique opportunity to characterize the spatiotemporal variability of snow 558 depth. Lidar observations can provide not only high resolution snow depths, but also map many 559 of the potential physical drivers of field scale snow depth spatial variability. Over the past two 560 decades, lidar techniques have been widely used to measure snow depth over various 561 spatiotemporal scales and resolutions primarily on aircraft or a fixed ground station (see reviews 562 in Deems et al., 2013; López-Moreno et al., 2017). Airborne laser scanning (ALS) is a well-563 known lidar technique that is currently leveraged by the Airborne Snow Observatory (ASO) 564 (Painter et al., 2016). The key advantage of ALS is the capability to cover large areas (Deems et 565 al., 2013; Harpold et al., 2014; Kirchner et al., 2014). However, the operation of the system is 566 extremely expensive with limited flexibility of deployment. Lidar sensors are not capable of 567 seeing through clouds, therefore Lidar observations from manned aircraft altitudes are only 568 achievable on clear sky days or when cloud altitudes exceed the aircraft altitude. The spatial 569 resolution of ALS systems is also considerably lower as compared to other Lidar platforms. ALS systems report ground return densities between 3 and 6 points/ m^2 (Broxton et al., 2019; Kirchner 570 571 et al., 2014), resulting in observational gaps in dense forested regions (Currier and Lundquist, 572 2018; Mazzotti et al., 2019). The limited spatial resolution of ALS would pose challenges to 573 discern the physical processes driving the spatial distribution of snow depth at all relevant scales. 574 Terrestrial laser scanning (TLS) employs high frequency Lidar sensors mounted on a tripod at a 575 fixed ground position (Fey et al., 2019; Hojatimalekshah et al., 2020; Prokop, 2008). TLS has the 576 advantage of being relatively low-cost and portable, making repeat observations possible per 577 day. However, this technique has additional uncertainties caused by large view angles and 578 occlusions from trees and hills (Prokop, 2008; Fey and Wichmann, 2017). Also, in order to 579 accurately georeference observations made with a TLS system it is critical that the tripod 580 remains stationary throughout each scan. In deep snowpacks it is often difficult to ensure the TLS system does not settle within the snowpack and shift position while scanning. Extremely 581 582 high point densities are achievable with TLS systems; however, the spatial extent of a typical 583 TLS survey is considerably smaller as compared to airborne platforms.

584 UAS-based lidar has been recently utilized for snow depth mapping (Harder et al., 2020; 585 Jacobs et al., 2020). A UAS platform can eliminate many of the drawbacks that arise from ALS 586 and TLS systems. Obscuration from clouds will rarely be an issue because UAS lidar surveys are 587 generally conducted at an altitude below 120 meters. Although spatial coverage is typically 588 greatly reduced in UAS missions relative to other ALS platforms, the aerial perspective and the 589 large sensor swath overlap facilitated by appropriate mission planning and post-processing 590 provides reduced uncertainties in elevation from those that can result from high off-nadir 591 viewing angles and occlusion in other ALS platforms. In the same vein, flight parameters can be 592 readily adjusted to achieve equally dense point clouds over open and forested areas, improving 593 ground finding and resulting in better characterization of vegetation and terrain mapping. For this 594 study, flight speeds were held constant over both fields and forests, which produced lower return 595 density over the forested part of our study site. There is some evidence that vegetation reduces 596 return density due to scattering and absorption (Liu et al., 2020; Jacobs et al., 2020), so reduced 597 flight speeds over vegetation to account for the reduction in returns could improve terrain 598 characterization in these settings.

599 **6.** Conclusion

600 Understanding the spatial variability of snow is valuable for hydrologists and ecologists 601 seeking to predict hydrological processes, species distributions, land-atmosphere interactions. 602 However, identifying dominant physical drivers controlling the spatial structure of snow depth 603 has been challenged due to the lack of the high-resolution snowpack and physical variables with 604 high vertical accuracy as well as limitations in traditional approaches. To overcome this, we first 605 employ the MaxEnt framework with 1-m spatial snow and terrain maps from a UAS-based lidar 606 system to identify physical variables controlling field scale spatial structures of shallow, 607 ephemeral snow depth over open terrain and forests. We found that, among the nine terrain, plant 608 functional type, and soil variables, plant functional type and roughness had important 609 contribution in the MaxEnt framework as needed to predict spatial locations in either deeper or 610 shallower snow depth across the landscape. Soil organic matter and saturated hydraulic 611 conductivity were revealed as important controls on snow depth spatial variations for both fields 612 and forest, suggesting spatial variations in the soil variables under the snowpack can control 613 thermal transfer between soil and snowpack along with near surface atmosphere. Despite the

614 difference in controls and locations of the relatively shallow and deep snowpacks, the transition

515 zones between areas with similar snow depths, as identified using local gradients, were

616 consistent for both dates and well characterized by the underlying local gradients of baseline

617 flights without snow. It is expected that the results will contribute to advancing snow and land

618 surface models by aiding in the parameterization at the sub-grid scale and helping to support the

619 down-scaling of retrieved remotely sensed snow products to characterize field scale conditions.

620 Data Availability Statement

621 The UAS snow depth maps with topographic input variables from this study are available

622 for download at [will add link to data from Hydroshare, currently being setup with an ODC

623 Attribution (ODC-BY) license for access without restrictions]. POLARIS Soil property data used

624 in this study are available from Chaney et al. (2019), respectively.

625 Acknowledgments

This study is based upon work supported by the Broad Agency Announcement Program

and the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center's Cold Region Research and

628 Engineering Laboratory (ERDC-CRREL) under contract number W913E5-18-C-005. Any

opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations in this material are those of the

630 author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Broad Agency Announcement Program

and the ERDC-CRREL. The authors are grateful to Christina Herrick for helping data collection

632 and providing valuable comments.

633

634 **References**

- Aanderud, Z. T., Jones, S. E., Schoolmaster Jr, D. R., Fierer, N., and Lennon, J. T. (2013).
 Sensitivity of soil respiration and microbial communities to altered snowfall, *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 57, 217-227.
- Aase, J. K. and Siddoway, F. H.: Crown-Depth Soil Temperatures and Winter Protection for
 Winter Wheat Survival1, *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 43, 1229-1233, 1979.

Abu-Hamdeh, N. H., & Reeder, R. C. (2000). Soil thermal conductivity effects of density,
moisture, salt concentration, and organic matter. *Soil science society of America Journal*, 64(4), 1285-1290.

- Algeo, T. P., Slate, D., Caron, R. M., Atwood, T., Recuenco, S., Ducey, M. J., ... & Palace, M. (2017). Modeling raccoon (Procyon lotor) habitat connectivity to identify potential corridors for rabies spread. *Tropical medicine and infectious disease*, 2(3), 44.
 Anderton, S. P., White, S. M., & Alvera, B. (2002). Micro-scale spatial variability and the timing of snow melt runoff in a high mountain catchment. *Journal of Hydrology*, 268(1-4), 158-176.
- Arnold, N. S., & Rees, W. G. (2003). Self-similarity in glacier surface characteristics. *Journal of Glaciology*, 49(167), 547-554.
- Baldwin, R. A. (2009). Use of maximum entropy modeling in wildlife research. *Entropy*, *11*(4),
 854-866.
- Barnett, T. P., Adam, J. C., & Lettenmaier, D. P. (2005). Potential impacts of a warming climate
 on water availability in snow-dominated regions. *Nature*, *438*(7066), 303-309.
- Blöschl, G., & Kirnbauer, R. (1992). An analysis of snow cover patterns in a small alpine
 catchment. *Hydrological Processes*, 6(1), 99-109.
- Booker, D. J., & Woods, R. A. (2014). Comparing and combining physically-based and
 empirically-based approaches for estimating the hydrology of ungauged
 catchments. *Journal of Hydrology*, 508, 227-239.
- Broxton, P. D., Van Leeuwen, W. J., & Biederman, J. A. (2019). Improving snow water
 equivalent maps with machine learning of snow survey and lidar measurements. *Water Resources Research*, 55(5), 3739-3757.
- Burakowski, E., and Hamilton. L., (2020). Are New Hampshire's Winters Warming? Yes, but
 fewer than half state residents recognize the trend. Regional Issue Brief #61. Carsey
 School of Public Policy, University of New Hampshire.
 https://dx.doi.org/10.34051/p/2020.377
- Burakowski, E., Tawfik, A., Ouimette, A., Lepine, L., Novick, K., Ollinger, S., ... & Bonan, G.
 (2018). The role of surface roughness, albedo, and Bowen ratio on ecosystem energy
 balance in the Eastern United States. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 249, 367-376.
- Burakowski, E., Wake, C. P., Dibb, J. E., & Stampone, M. (2013). Putting the capital 'A'in
 CoCoRAHS: an experimental programme to measure albedo using the Community
 Collaborative Rain, Hail & Snow (CoCoRaHS) Network. *Hydrological Processes*, 27(21), 3024-3034.
- 674 Carroll, R. W., Deems, J. S., Niswonger, R., Schumer, R., & Williams, K. H. (2019). The
 675 importance of interflow to groundwater recharge in a snowmelt-dominated headwater
 676 basin. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46(11), 5899-5908.
- 677 Chaney, N. W., Minasny, B., Herman, J. D., Nauman, T. W., Brungard, C. W., Morgan, C. L., ...
 678 & Yimam, Y. (2019). POLARIS soil properties: 30-m probabilistic maps of soil
 679 properties over the contiguous United States. *Water Resources Research*, 55(4), 2916680 2938.
- Chaney, N. W., Wood, E. F., McBratney, A. B., Hempel, J. W., Nauman, T. W., Brungard, C.
 W., & Odgers, N. P. (2016). POLARIS: A 30-meter probabilistic soil series map of the contiguous United States. *Geoderma*, 274, 54-67.
- Cho, E., Jacobs, J. M., & Vuyovich, C. M. (2020). The value of long-term (40 years) airborne
 gamma radiation SWE record for evaluating three observation-based gridded SWE data
 sets by seasonal snow and land cover classifications. *Water Resources Research*, 56(1),
 e2019WR025813.

- 688 Clark, M. P., Hendrikx, J., Slater, A. G., Kavetski, D., Anderson, B., Cullen, N. J., ... & Woods,
 689 R. A. (2011). Representing spatial variability of snow water equivalent in hydrologic and
 690 land-surface models: A review. *Water Resources Research*, 47(7).
- 691 Currier, W. R., & Lundquist, J. D. (2018). Snow depth variability at the forest edge in multiple
 692 climates in the western United States. *Water Resources Research*, 54(11), 8756-8773.
- 693 Cutler, D. R., Edwards Jr, T. C., Beard, K. H., Cutler, A., Hess, K. T., Gibson, J., & Lawler, J. J.
 694 (2007). Random forests for classification in ecology. *Ecology*, 88(11), 2783-2792.
- DeBeer, C. M., & Pomeroy, J. W. (2010). Simulation of the snowmelt runoff contributing area in
 a small alpine basin. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 14(7), 1205.
- Deems, J. S., Fassnacht, S. R., & Elder, K. J. (2006). Fractal distribution of snow depth from
 LiDAR data. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 7(2), 285-297.
- Deems, J. S., Painter, T. H., & Finnegan, D. C. (2013). Lidar measurement of snow depth: a
 review. *Journal of Glaciology*, 59(215), 467-479.
- Derksen, C., Toose, P., Rees, A., Wang, L., English, M., Walker, A., & Sturm, M. (2010).
 Development of a tundra-specific snow water equivalent retrieval algorithm for satellite
 passive microwave data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 114(8), 1699–1709.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2010.02.019
- Djebou, D. C. S., & Singh, V. P. (2015). Retrieving vegetation growth patterns from soil
 moisture, precipitation and temperature using maximum entropy. *Ecological Modelling*, 309, 10-21.
- Dudik M, Phillips S, Schapire R (2007) Maximum entropy density estimation with generalized
 regularization and an application to species distribution modeling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(6):1217–1260.
- Earman, S., Campbell, A. R., Phillips, F. M., & Newman, B. D. (2006). Isotopic exchange
 between snow and atmospheric water vapor: Estimation of the snowmelt component of
 groundwater recharge in the southwestern United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 111(D9).
- Essery, R.L., Bunting, P., Hardy, J. Link, T., Marks, D., Melloh, R., Pomeroy, J., Rowlands, A.,
 and Rutter., N. (2008). Radiative transfer modeling of a coniferous canopy characterized
 by airborne remote sensing. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 9: 228–241.
- Elith J, et al. (2006) Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence
 data. *Ecography* (Cop.) 29(2):129–151.
- Farouki, O. T. (1981). The thermal properties of soils in cold regions. *Cold Regions Science and Technology*, 5(1), 67-75.
- Fey, C., Schattan, P., Helfricht, K., & Schöber, J. (2019). A compilation of multitemporal TLS
 snow depth distribution maps at the Weisssee snow research site (Kaunertal,
 Austria). *Water Resources Research*, 55(6), 5154-5164.
- Fey, C., & Wichmann, V. (2017). Long-range terrestrial laser scanning for geomorphological
 change detection in alpine terrain–handling uncertainties. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 42(5), 789-802.
- Fischer, S., Bühler, P., Büttner, U., & Schumann, A. (2020). The use of maximum entropy to
 increase the informational content of hydrological networks by additional
 gauges. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 65(13), 2274-2285.
- Ge, Y., & Gong, G. (2010). Land surface insulation response to snow depth variability. *Journal* of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 115(D8).

733 Gelfan, A. N., Pomeroy, J. W., & Kuchment, L. S. (2004). Modeling forest cover influences on 734 snow accumulation, sublimation, and melt. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 5(5), 785-803. 735 Goetz, J., & Brenning, A. (2019). Quantifying uncertainties in snow depth mapping from 736 structure from motion photogrammetry in an alpine area. Water Resources 737 Research, 55(9), 7772-7783. 738 Gray, D. M., & Male, D. H. (1981). Handbook of snow: Principles, processes, management and 739 use. Toronto: Pergamon Press. 740 Grayson, R. B., Blöschl, G., Western, A. W., & McMahon, T. A. (2002). Advances in the use of 741 observed spatial patterns of catchment hydrological response. Advances in Water 742 Resources, 25(8-12), 1313-1334. 743 Groffman, P. M., Driscoll, C. T., Fahey, T. J., Hardy, J. P., Fitzhugh, R. D., & Tierney, G. L. 744 (2001). Colder soils in a warmer world: a snow manipulation study in a northern 745 hardwood forest ecosystem. Biogeochemistry, 56(2), 135-150. 746 Grünewald, T., and M. Lehning (2011), Altitudinal dependency of snow amounts in two small 747 alpine catchments: Can catchment-wide snow amounts be estimated via single snow or 748 precipitation stations, Annals of Glaciology, 52(58), 153–158, 749 doi:10.3189/172756411797252248. 750 Harder, P., Pomeroy, J. W., & Helgason, W. (2017). Local-scale advection of sensible and latent 751 heat during snowmelt. Geophysical Research Letters, 44(19), 9769-9777. 752 Harder, P., Pomeroy, J. W., & Helgason, W. D. (2020). Improving sub-canopy snow depth 753 mapping with unmanned aerial vehicles: lidar versus structure-from-motion 754 techniques. The Cryosphere, 14(6), 1919-1935. 755 Harpold, A. A., Guo, Q., Molotch, N., Brooks, P. D., Bales, R., Fernandez-Diaz, J. C., ... & 756 Flanagan, J. (2014). LiDAR-derived snowpack data sets from mixed conifer forests 757 across the Western United States. Water Resources Research, 50(3), 2749-2755. 758 Harpold, A. A., Molotch, N. P., Musselman, K. N., Bales, R. C., Kirchner, P. B., Litvak, M., & 759 Brooks, P. D. (2015). Soil moisture response to snowmelt timing in mixed-conifer 760 subalpine forests. Hydrological Processes, 29(12), 2782-2798. 761 He, X., Chaney, N. W., Schleiss, M., & Sheffield, J. (2016). Spatial downscaling of precipitation 762 using adaptable random forests. Water Resources Research, 52(10), 8217-8237. Henry, H. A. L. (2008). Climate change and soil freezing dynamics: historical trends and 763 764 projected changes, Climatic Change, 87, 421-434. Hojatimalekshah, A., Uhlmann, Z., Glenn, N. F., Hiemstra, C. A., Tennant, C. J., Graham, J. 765 766 D., ... & Enterkine, J. (2020). Tree canopy and snow depth relationships at fine scales 767 with terrestrial laser scanning. The Cryosphere Discussions, 1-35. 768 https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2020-277 769 Horn, B.K.P. (1981). Hill shading and the reflectance map. Proceedings of the IEEE, 69(1): 14-770 47. Doi: 10.1109/PROC.1981.11918. 771 Howey, M. C., Palace, M. W., & McMichael, C. H. (2016). Geospatial modeling approach to 772 monument construction using Michigan from AD 1000-1600 as a case study. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(27), 7443-7448. 773 774 Huerta, M.L, Molotch, N.P., and McPhee. J., (2019). Snowfall interception in a deciduous 775 Nothofagus forest and implications for spatial snowpack distribution. Hydrological 776 Processes, 33(13): 1818-1834. 777 Isard, S. A., & Schaetzl, R. J. (1998). Effects of winter weather conditions on soil freezing in 778 southern Michigan. Physical Geography, 19(1), 71-94.

- Jacobs, J. M., Hunsaker, A. G., Sullivan, F. B., Palace, M., Burakowski, E. A., Herrick, C., &
 Cho, E. (2020). Shallow snow depth mapping with unmanned aerial systems lidar
 observations: A case study in Durham, New Hampshire, United States. *The Cryosphere Discussions*, 1-20.
- Jaynes E. T. (1957) Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Physical Review*. 106(4):620–
 630.
- Keum, J., Coulibaly, P., Razavi, T., Tapsoba, D., Gobena, A., Weber, F., & Pietroniro, A.
 (2018). Application of SNODAS and hydrologic models to enhance entropy-based snow
 monitoring network design. *Journal of Hydrology*, *561*, 688-701.
- Kirchner, P. B., Bales, R. C., Molotch, N. P., Flanagan, J., & Guo, Q. (2014). LiDAR
 measurement of seasonal snow accumulation along an elevation gradient in the southern
 Sierra Nevada, California. *Hydrology & Earth System Sciences*, *18*(10).
- Lapena, D. R., & Martz, L. W. (1996). An investigation of the spatial association between snow
 depth and topography in a Prairie agricultural landscape using digital terrain
 analysis. *Journal of Hydrology*, 184(3-4), 277-298.
- Lawrence, D. M., & Slater, A. G. (2010). The contribution of snow condition trends to future
 ground climate. *Climate dynamics*, 34(7-8), 969-981.
- Lehning, M., Grünewald, T., & Schirmer, M. (2011). Mountain snow distribution governed by
 an altitudinal gradient and terrain roughness. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38(19).
- Lemmetyinen, J., Derksen, C., Rott, H., Macelloni, G., King, J., Schneebeli, M., Wiesmann, A.,
 Leppänen, L., Kontu, A. and Pulliainen, J., (2018). Retrieval of effective correlation
 length and snow water equivalent from radar and passive microwave measurements. *Remote Sensing*, 10(2), 170.
- Liston, G. E. (1999). Interrelationships among snow distribution, snowmelt, and snow cover
 depletion: Implications for atmospheric, hydrologic, and ecologic modeling. *Journal of applied meteorology*, *38*(10), 1474-1487.
- López-Moreno, J. I., Revuelto, J., Alonso-González, E., Sanmiguel-Vallelado, A., Fassnacht, S.
 R., Deems, J., & Morán-Tejeda, E. (2017). Using very long-range terrestrial laser scanner to analyze the temporal consistency of the snowpack distribution in a high mountain environment. *Journal of Mountain Science*, *14*(5), 823-842.
- Luce, C. H., Tarboton, D. G., & Cooley, K. R. (1999). Sub-grid parameterization of snow
 distribution for an energy and mass balance snow cover model. *Hydrological Processes*, 13(12-13), 1921-1933.
- Lundquist, J. D., Cayan, D. R., & Dettinger, M. D. (2004). Spring onset in the Sierra Nevada:
 When is snowmelt independent of elevation?. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 5(2), 327342.
- Lundquist, J. E., Dickerson-Lange, S.E. Lutz, J.A. and Cristea., N.C. (2013). Lower forest
 density enhances snow retention in regions with warmer winters: a global framework
 developed from plot-scale observations and modeling, *Water Resources Research*, 49:
 6356–6370, https://doi.org/10.1002/wrcr.20504, 2013.
- Mazzotti, G., Currier, W. R., Deems, J. S., Pflug, J. M., Lundquist, J. D., & Jonas, T. (2019).
 Revisiting snow cover variability and canopy structure within forest stands: Insights from airborne lidar data. *Water Resources Research*, 55(7), 6198-6216.
- Maurer, G. E., & Bowling, D. R. (2014). Seasonal snowpack characteristics influence soil
 temperature and water content at multiple scales in interior western US mountain
 ecosystems. *Water Resources Research*, 50(6), 5216-5234.

- McMichael, C. H., Palace, M. W., & Golightly, M. (2014). Bamboo-dominated forests and preColumbian earthwork formations in south-western Amazonia. *Journal of Biogeography*, 41(9), 1733-1745.
- McNay, R.S., Peterson, L.D., and Nyberg., J.B. (1988). The influence of forest stand
 characteristics on snow interception in the coastal forests of British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Forest Resources*, 18: 566-573.
- Merow, C., Smith, M. J., & Silander Jr, J. A. (2013). A practical guide to MaxEnt for modeling
 species' distributions: what it does, and why inputs and settings
 matter. *Ecography*, 36(10), 1058-1069.
- Mishra, A. K., & Coulibaly, P. (2009). Developments in hydrometric network design: A
 review. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 47(2).
- Mohanty, B. P., Klittich, W. M., Horton, R., & Van Genuchten, M. T. (1995). Spatio-temporal
 variability of soil temperature within three land areas exposed to different tillage
 systems. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *59*(3), 752-759.
- Monson, R. K., Lipson, D. L., Burns, S. P., Turnipseed, A. A., Delany, A. C., Williams, M. W.,
 and Schmidt, S. K. (2006). Winter forest soil respiration controlled by climate and
 microbial community composition, Nature, 439, 711.
- Mott, R., Schirmer, M., & Lehning, M. (2011). Scaling properties of wind and snow depth
 distribution in an Alpine catchment. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *116*(D6).
- Mott, R., Gromke, C., Grünewald, T., & Lehning, M. (2013). Relative importance of advective
 heat transport and boundary layer decoupling in the melt dynamics of a patchy snow
 cover. *Advances in Water Resources*, 55, 88–97.
- 848 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2012.03.001
- Musselman, K., Molotch, N.P., and Brooks., P.D. (2008). Effects of vegetation on snow
 accumulation and ablation in a mid-latitude sub-alpine forest. *Hydrological Processes*,
 22: 2767-2776., doi:10.1002/hyp.7050.
- Nakai, Y., Kitahara, H., Sakamoto, T., Saito, T., and Terajima. T., (1993). Evaporation of snow
 intercepted by forest canopies. Journal of Japan Forest Society, 75: 191-200 (in Japanese
 with English summary).
- New Hampshire State Climate Office (2014). Climate normals (1981-2010) for selected NH
 cities and towns. www.unh.edu/stateclimatologist/nhnormals.html
- Painter, T. H., Berisford, D. F., Boardman, J. W., Bormann, K. J., Deems, J. S., Gehrke, F., ... &
 Mattmann, C. (2016). The Airborne Snow Observatory: Fusion of scanning lidar,
 imaging spectrometer, and physically-based modeling for mapping snow water
 equivalent and snow albedo. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 184, 139-152.
- Palace, M. W., McMichael, C. N. H., Braswell, B. H., Hagen, S. C., Bush, M. B., Neves, E., ... &
 Frolking, S. (2017). Ancient Amazonian populations left lasting impacts on forest
 structure. *Ecosphere*, 8(12), e02035.
- Parikh, R. J., Havens, J. A., & Scott, H. D. (1979). Thermal diffusivity and conductivity of moist
 porous media. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 43(5), 1050-1052.
- Penner, E. (1970). Thermal conductivity of frozen soils. *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*, 7(3), 982-987.
- Perron, C.J., Bennett, K., & Lee, T.D. (2004). Forest stewardship plan: Thompson farm. NH:
 University of New Hampshire. Produced by Ossipee Mountain Land Company, West
 Ossipee, https://colsa.unh.edu/sites/default/files/thompson-farm-plan.pdf.

871	Peters, J., De Baets, B., Verhoest, N. E., Samson, R., Degroeve, S., De Becker, P., &
872	Huybrechts, W. (2007). Random forests as a tool for ecohydrological distribution
873	modelling. <i>Ecological Modelling</i> , 207(2-4), 304-318.
874	Phillips, S. J., Dudík, M., & Schapire, R. E. (2004). A maximum entropy approach to species
875	distribution modeling. In Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on
876	Machine learning (p. 83).
877	Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P., & Schapire, R. E. (2006). Maximum entropy modeling of species
878	geographic distributions. <i>Ecological modelling</i> , 190(3-4), 231-259.
879	Phillips, S., & Dudík, M. (2008) Modeling of species distributions with Maxent: New extensions
880	and a comprehensive evaluation. <i>Ecography</i> (Cop.) 31(2):161–175.
881	Pflug, J. M., & Lundquist, J. D. (2020). Inferring distributed snow depth by leveraging snow
882	pattern repeatability: Investigation using 47 lidar observations in the Tuolumne
883	watershed, Sierra Nevada, California. Water Resources Research, 56(9),
884	e2020WR027243.
885	Pomeroy, J.W. and Gray. D.M. (1995). Snowcover accumulation, relocation, and management.
886	National Hydrology Research Institute Science Report No. 7. Hydrological Sciences
887	Division, NHRI, Division of Hydrology, University of Saskatchewan. Environment
888	Canada.
889	Pomeroy, J. W., Gray, D. M., Shook, K. R., Toth, B., Essery, R. L. H., Pietroniro, A., &
890	Hedstrom, N. (1998). An evaluation of snow accumulation and ablation processes for
891	land surface modelling. Hydrological Processes, 12(15), 2339-2367.
892	Prokop, A. (2008). Assessing the applicability of terrestrial laser scanning for spatial snow depth
893	measurements. Cold Regions Science and Technology, 54(3), 155-163.
894	Rahmati, O., Pourghasemi, H. R., & Melesse, A. M. (2016). Application of GIS-based data
895	driven random forest and maximum entropy models for groundwater potential mapping:
896	a case study at Mehran Region, Iran. Catena, 137, 360-372.
897	Redding, T., & Devito, K. (2011). Aspect and soil textural controls on snowmelt runoff on
898	forested Boreal Plain hillslopes. Hydrology Research, 42(4), 250-267.
899	Reinmann, A. B. and Templer, P. H.: Increased soil respiration in response to experimentally
900	reduced snow cover and increased soil freezing in a temperate deciduous forest,
901	Biogeochemistry, 140, 359-371, 2018.
902	Revuelto, J., López-Moreno, J. I., Azorin-Molina, C., & Vicente-Serrano, S. M. (2014).
903	Topographic control of snowpack distribution in a small catchment in the central Spanish
904	Pyrenees: intra-and inter-annual persistence. The Cryosphere, 8(5), 1989-2006.
905	Roth, T.R. and Nolin. A.W. (2017). Forest impacts on snow accumulation and ablation across
906	and elevation gradient in a temperate montane environment. Hydrology and Earth System
907	Sciences, 21: 5427-5442, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-5427-2017.
908	Saberi, N., Kelly, R., Flemming, M., & Li, Q. (2020). Review of snow water equivalent retrieval
909	methods using spaceborne passive microwave radiometry. International Journal of
910	<i>Remote Sensing</i> , 41(3), 996-1018.
911	Sanders-DeMott, R., Ouimette, A. P., Lepine, L. C., Fogarty, S. Z., Burakowski, E. A., Contosta,
912	A. R., & Ollinger, S. V. (2020). Divergent carbon cycle response of forest and grass-
913	dominated northern temperate ecosystems to record winter warming. Global Change
914	<i>Biology</i> , 26(3), 1519-1531.

- Schlögl, S., Lehning, M., & Mott, R. (2018). How are turbulent sensible heat fluxes and snow
 melt rates affected by a changing snow cover fraction?. *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 6,
 154.
- Schmidt, R.A. and D.R. Gluns. (1991) Snowfall interception on branches of three conifer
 species. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 21:1262-1269.
- Schirmer, M., & Lehning, M. (2011). Persistence in intra-annual snow depth distribution: 2.
 Fractal analysis of snow depth development. *Water Resources Research*, 47(9).
- Schirmer, M., & Pomeroy, J. W. (2020). Processes governing snow ablation in alpine terrain–
 detailed measurements from the Canadian Rockies. Hydrology and Earth System
 Sciences, 24(1), 143-157.
- Shook, K., Gray, D. M., & Pomeroy, J. W. (1993). Temporal Variation in Snowcover Area
 During Melt in Prairie and Alpine Environments: Paper presented at the 9th Northern
 Res. Basin Symposium/Workshop (Whitehorse/Dawson/Inuvik, Canada-August
 1992). *Hydrology Research*, 24(2-3), 183-198.
- Singh, V. P. (1997). The use of entropy in hydrology and water resources. *Hydrological processes*, 11(6), 587-626.
- Sorensen, P. O., Finzi, A. C., Giasson, M.-A., Reinmann, A. B., Sanders-DeMott, R., and
 Templer, P. H. (2018). Winter soil freeze-thaw cycles lead to reductions in soil microbial
 biomass and activity not compensated for by soil warming, Soil Biology and
 Biochemistry, 116, 39-47.
- Sørensen, R., Zinko, U., and Seibert, J. (2006). On the calculation of the topographic wetness
 index: evaluation of different methods based on field observations, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 10, 101–112, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-10-101-2006.
- Starkloff, T., Stolte, J., Hessel, R., and Ritsema, C.: Investigating the development of shallow
 snowpacks on arable land, using comprehensive field observations and spatially
 distributed snow modelling, *Hydrology Research*, 49, 41-59, 2017.
- Stieglitz, M., Ducharne, A., Koster, R., & Suarez, M. (2001) The impact of detailed snow
 physics on the simulation of snow cover and subsurface thermodynamics at continental
 scales. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 2(3), 228-242.
- Storck, P., Lettenmaier, D.P. and Bolton. S.M. (2002) Measurement of snow interception and
 canopy effects on snow accumulation and melt in a mountainous maritime climate,
 Oregon, United States. *Water Resources Research*, 38(11): 1223. https://doi.org/10.1029/
 2002WR001281
- Sturm, M., Goldstein, M. A., & Parr, C. (2017). Water and life from snow: A trillion dollar
 science question. *Water Resources Research*, *53*(5), 3534-3544.
- Sturm, M., & Holmgren, J. (2018). An automatic snow depth probe for field validation
 campaigns. *Water Resources Research*, 54(11), 9695-9701.
- Sturm, M., & Wagner, A. M. (2010). Using repeated patterns in snow distribution modeling: An
 Arctic example. *Water Resources Research*, 46, W12549.
- Tinkham, W. T., Smith, A. M., Marshall, H. P., Link, T. E., Falkowski, M. J., & Winstral, A. H.
 (2014). Quantifying spatial distribution of snow depth errors from LiDAR using Random
 Forest. *Remote sensing of environment*, 141, 105-115.
- 957 Trujillo, E., Ramírez, J. A., & Elder, K. J. (2007). Topographic, meteorologic, and canopy
 958 controls on the scaling characteristics of the spatial distribution of snow depth
 959 fields. *Water Resources Research*, 43(7).

- Tucker, C. L., Tamang, S., Pendall, E., and Ogle, K. (2016). Shallow snowpack inhibits soil
 respiration in sagebrush steppe through multiple biotic and abiotic mechanisms,
 Ecosphere, 7, e01297.
- Yi, Y., Kimball, J. S., Chen, R. H., Moghaddam, M., and Miller, C. E. (2019). Sensitivity of
 active-layer freezing process to snow cover in Arctic Alaska, The Cryosphere, 13, 197.
- Wang, J., & Bras, R. L. (2011). A model of evapotranspiration based on the theory of maximum
 entropy production. *Water Resources Research*, 47(3).
- Westhoff, M. C., Zehe, E., & Schymanski, S. J. (2014). Importance of temporal variability for
 hydrological predictions based on the maximum entropy production
 principle. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41(1), 67-73.
- 270 Zehe, E., Blume, T., & Blöschl, G. (2010). The principle of 'maximum energy dissipation': a
 271 novel thermodynamic perspective on rapid water flow in connected soil
 272 structures. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*273 *Sciences*, 365(1545), 1377-1386.
- 274 Zhu, D., Ciais, P., Krinner, G., Maignan, F., Puig, A. J., & Hugelius, G. (2019). Controls of soil
 organic matter on soil thermal dynamics in the northern high latitudes. *Nature*276 *communications*, 10(1), 1-9.