

Towards a fully physical representation of snow on Arctic sea ice using a 3D snow-atmosphere model

David N. Wagner^{1,2}, David Clemens-Sewall³, Markus M. Frey⁴, Océane Hames^{1,2}, Mahdi Jafari¹, Amy R. Macfarlane¹, Adrien Michel^{1,5}, Martin Schneebeli¹, Matthew D. Shupe^{6,7}, Nander Wever¹, and Michael Lehning^{1,2}

¹WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research SLF, Davos, Switzerland

²CRYOS, School of Architecture, Civil and Environmental Engineering, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland

³Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA

⁴British Antarctic Survey – Natural Environment Research Council, Cambridge, UK

⁵Federal Office of Meteorology and Climatology MeteoSwiss, Geneva, Switzerland

⁶NOAA Physical Science Laboratory, Boulder, CO, USA

⁷Cooperative Institute for the Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA

Key Points:

- A 3D-snow modeling setup including snow transport and temporally changing detailed snow properties was adjusted for Arctic sea ice.
- The model reproduces snow transport with high accuracy, and performed well in modelling the surface density with some uncertainty.
- The model will allow to investigate the insulating effect on spatial ice thermodynamics, especially in ridged areas.

Corresponding author: David N. Wagner, wagner.david@posteo.net

Abstract

Snow plays a crucial role in the heat transfer between the ocean and atmosphere in sea ice due to its insulating properties. However, wind-induced transport causes the snow distribution to be inhomogeneous, as snow forms dunes and accumulates mostly around pressure ridges and, leading to a heterogeneous underlying ice growth and melt. While models can help to understand the complex interactions of snow and sea ice, there is currently no 3D snow cover model for sea ice that considers detailed snow cover properties. This study presents the first application of the 3D-snow cover-atmosphere model ALPINE3D with the drifting snow module to Arctic sea ice. The model was calibrated and validated with measurements from the MOSAiC expedition. Wind fields used by the snow drift routine were generated with OpenFOAM which was forced by observations. A sensitivity analysis showed the impact of an increased fluid threshold on snow redistribution. The model performed well in simulating snow transport and mass fluxes, but underestimated erosion and poorly reproduced dune formation due to the missing dynamic mesh. The density was partially reproduced very well by the model, but uncertainties still exist in some cases. Comparing the surface snow density results with 1-D SNOWPACK simulations, ALPINE3D produced smaller differences but larger temporal variation in between setups. The study also investigated details of deposition and erosion using cross sections, showing good agreements of snow height differences between model and observations and revealing spatially high-resolution parameters such as age of deposited snow, density, and thermal conductivity.

Plain Language Summary

Snow affects the exchange of heat between the ocean and atmosphere in sea ice. It can insulate the underlying ice and affect how it grows and melts, but it is distributed unevenly by wind because the ice is often heavily deformed and wind also produces dunes. We used a computer model to simulate the distribution of snow on Arctic sea ice. We tested the model by comparing its results with measurements from the MOSAiC expedition. We found that the model performed well in simulating how snow is transported, but it underestimated erosion and was not able to accurately reproduce dune formation. ALPINE3D also computed the surface snow density, which showed at times good agreements with observations, but there are still some uncertainties. We compared the results with 1-D simulations from a model called SNOWPACK, and different ALPINE3D setups produced smaller differences in the end but a larger variation with time. The study also investigated details of deposition and erosion using cross sections, showing good agreements of snow height differences between model and observations and revealing information about snow age, density, and thermal conductivity. Overall, this study provides new insights into the complex interactions of snow and sea ice.

1 Introduction

The snow cover on Arctic sea ice forms a central element in the heat balance between the ocean and the atmosphere. On average, the snow cover in this area usually does not exceed 30 cm (Sturm et al., 2002; Wagner et al., 2022). However, due to its very high insulating capacity and high albedo, it may regulate the timing and speed of ice growth in autumn and winter, and melt in spring and summer (Nicolaus et al., 2006; Persson, 2012; Sturm & Massom, 2016). It further inhibits or delays ice melt during occasional warm-air intrusions that may occur even in winter (Persson et al., 2017).

Snow transport – the movement of snow particles due to wind – is initiated when a certain wind speed threshold is exceeded. This threshold depends on various processes, but mainly on vertical transport of horizontal momentum from the wind towards the surface and on the weight and the inter-granular bond strength of the snow grains. When

70 this threshold is exceeded, grains may start to creep, going into saltation or suspension
71 mode when wind speeds are higher (Bagnold, 1941; R. A. Schmidt, 1980; Melo et al., 2021).

72 Where wind speeds are lower, net deposition of the grains may occur and leading
73 to surface accumulation. These drifts occur in the form of dunes (Filhol & Sturm, 2015)
74 - or around obstacles. On sea ice, these obstacles are mostly pressure ridges formed by
75 differential ice motion (Liston & Elder, 2006a). On a small scale, these drifts may de-
76 termine how the ice grows and melts locally, e.g. they may modify the formation of melt
77 ponds (Petrich et al., 2012; Lecomte et al., 2015). The snow cover and snow transport
78 over sea ice have been investigated several times in the past. Déry and Tremblay (2004)
79 modeled blowing snow transport including blowing snow sublimation over sea ice with
80 the PIEKTUK model and focused on the effect of snow mass loss into leads on the mass
81 balance. However, Déry and Tremblay (2004) did not make use of a saltation model, prob-
82 ably strongly underestimating horizontal mass fluxes. Leonard and Maksym (2011) mod-
83 eled snow transport with the PIEKTUK model, as well, but with a saltation model in
84 addition. The saltation transport threshold wind speed in this case was used as by Li
85 and Pomeroy (1997), which is exclusively a function of the ambient temperature. Ele-
86 vated temperatures lead to rapid sintering of the snow (i.e. increased formation of bonds
87 between the snow grains) (Colbeck et al., 1997; Colbeck, 1998; Blackford, 2007) and there-
88 fore an increased threshold of wind-induced snow transport. The saltating mass flux it-
89 self is computed with the model from Pomeroy and Gray (1990). However, (Melo et al.,
90 2021) showed in a model-intercomparison that this model underestimated the integrated
91 mass flux significantly.

92 Liston et al. (2018, 2020) modeled snow transport in a very detailed way with their
93 SnowModel, with statistically computed 2D-wind fields (Liston & Elder, 2006b) and a
94 bulk-density snow cover representation. The core model for snow redistribution within
95 SnowModel is SnowTran-3D (Liston & Sturm, 1998; Liston et al., 2007), whose thresh-
96 old friction velocity is exclusively a function of a constant snow density (Liston et al.,
97 2007). Liston et al. (2007) argue that this simple approach was sufficient for very low
98 temperatures in winter in their studies, since a nearly constant surface-shear strength
99 for the snow occurred under these conditions. However, they included the caveat that
100 this approach may reach its limits for higher temperatures and detailed developments
101 during snowstorms when more complex ambient conditions arise. SNOWPACK, a 1-D
102 snow cover model applied recently to sea ice (Lehning et al., 1999; Wever et al., 2020),
103 uses a saltation model to simulate snow transport if needed, which takes into account
104 the surface properties of the temporally changing snow microstructure as well as the snow
105 density (Doorschot & Lehning, 2002). Therefore, we believe that this approach could pro-
106 vide an advantage when studying snow cover on Arctic sea ice in a warming climate in-
107 cluding warm air intrusions in winter, as well as during warmer months. In a saltation
108 model inter-comparison, Melo et al. (2021) could show that with respect to integrated
109 mass flux, the model from Doorschot and Lehning (2002) performed well for the tested
110 specific bed types.

111 SNOWPACK has been applied in a distributed way in the form of ALPINE3D (Lehning
112 et al., 2006), mostly for the Alps (Mott et al., 2010; Gerber et al., 2017; Schlögl et al.,
113 2016), but for sea ice, as well (Wever et al., 2021). However, Wever et al. (2021) did not
114 run the model with snow transport, i.e. without the SnowDrift module as presented in
115 Lehning et al. (2008). Another approach recently applied to a sea ice topography was
116 modelling snow transport with a gas-particle two-phase turbulent flow solver Hames et
117 al. (2022). While the results regarding the locations of erosion and deposition are gen-
118 erally promising, no snowpack is implemented in the model; rather, the surface basically
119 represents an infinite resource for snow mass, which itself does not represent an influ-
120 ence on the transport threshold because it does not represent any physical properties.

121 As already mentioned, ALPINE3D was mainly applied for larger Alpine scale sim-
122 ulations in the past. However, snow processes on sea ice are in principle not different than

123 snow processes that occur in mountains, and there are only few snow models that are
 124 capable to conduct detailed snow transport modeling at this time. Hence, we built upon
 125 these previous studies by combining individual state-of-the-art methods as a novel ap-
 126 proach of modeling of snow on sea ice, which – to our knowledge – has not been used
 127 in any other model setup so far:

- 128 • Detailed spatial modeling of the snow cover with very high resolution ($dx, dy =$
 129 0.35 m) by means of SNOWPACK/ALPINE3D (Lehning et al., 1999, 2006).
- 130 • modeling snow saltation (Doorschot et al., 2004), suspension, erosion and depo-
 131 sition with ALPINE3D based on high-resolution Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes
 132 (RANS) equations based wind fields modeled with OpenFOAM (Weller et al., 1998).
- 133 • Making use of a very detailed digital elevation model (DEM) based on terrestrial
 134 laser scans (TLS) collected during the Multidisciplinary drifting Observatory for
 135 the Study of Arctic Climate (MOSAiC) expedition (Nicolaus et al., 2021) to have
 136 a realistic initial grid.
- 137 • Force the models with a detailed dataset of measured atmospheric parameters dur-
 138 ing the MOSAiC field campaign (Shupe et al., 2022).
- 139 • Validate the model with highly detailed spatial measurements of the height and
 140 density of the snow cover collected during MOSAiC as described in Nicolaus et
 141 al. (2021) and Wagner et al. (2022).

142 The goals of our study are to:

- 143 1. Calibrate and validate the model setup for the given conditions on sea ice during
 144 polar night.
- 145 2. Investigate the mass balance of snow.
- 146 3. Investigate how a changed snow transport threshold may lead to a change of trans-
 147 port rates and therefore a change in deposition/erosion patterns.
- 148 4. Evaluate the modelled snow surface density.

149 **2 Methods and Data**

150 **2.1 Area and time selection**

151 Snow- and atmospheric data was collected during the MOSAiC expedition (Nicolaus
 152 et al., 2021; Shupe et al., 2022) on sea ice in the high Arctic.

153 The exact study area on the ice floe and the time period were selected based on
 154 available observations that can be used to drive and evaluate the model. We also ensured
 155 that at least one drifting snow event occurred within this time period and TLS before
 156 and after the period were conducted, which required calm conditions. In addition, the
 157 topography in the study area should be sufficiently uneven in order for snow to accumu-
 158 late. Hence, we decided for the 10-day long time period 25 Jan – 4 Feb 2020 (Fig. 1) cov-
 159 ering the area of the northern transect (Fig. 2, a fixed track, which crossed an area con-
 160 sisting of second-year ice (SYI), on which snow depth measurements were taken weekly
 161 with high spatial resolution using a Magnaprobe (Sturm & Holmgren, 2018; Itkin et al.,
 162 2021; Nicolaus et al., 2021; Wagner et al., 2022)). Within this period, 4 more distinct
 163 drifting snow occurred, marked in yellow in Fig. 1. For this period, continuous meteo-
 164 rological measurements were available (Shupe et al., 2021, 2022), as well as one TLS on
 165 25 Jan and one on 4 Feb for the northern transect area. In addition, occasional detailed
 166 snow cover and transect snow depth measurements were available for this area and pe-
 167 riod (Fig. 2). Based on drifting snow measurements with the snow particle counter (SPC)
 168 installed on the flux tower that was installed in the MOSAiC Central Observatory (Shupe
 169 et al., 2022) at 0.1 m above the snow surface we could determine the drifting snow pe-
 170 riods. Detailed descriptions of the flux tower setup and snow measurements follow in a

171 later section. In Fig. 1d, it can well be seen that one TLS was conducted on 25 Jan 2020
172 before the start of the drifting snow period and one after the drifting snow periods on
173 4 Feb 2020. The initial scan on 25 Jan 2020 was used to produce digital elevation mod-
174 els (DEMs) to be used as lower boundary topography for the model. The vertical dif-
175 ference between both scans is used to evaluate snow height distribution differences found
176 in the simulations. It should precede the rest of the manuscript, that the conditions with
177 4 drifting snow events under different wind directions are not ideal for a calibration of
178 the model, however, the aggravated conditions on the moving ice (Nicolaus et al., 2021)
179 have to be taken into account, which rarely allowed for a referencing of the TLS at dif-
180 ferent days. We have been able to investigate two of these rare days here.




Figure 1. Time series of measured parameters between 16 Jan and 10 Feb 2020, for a) wind speed measured at 2 m height on the flux tower, b) wind direction with respect to the wind speed shown in a), c) 2 m air temperature at the flux tower, d) cumulative precipitation sums measured on the ship-based optical PWD22 sensor, retrieved from the K_a -Band Radar on the ship, ERA-5 reanalysis snowfall, Pluvio² pluviometer measured snowfall on the ice and e) cumulative horizontal mass flux for the snow particle counters (SPCs) on the flux tower, measured at 0.1 m and 10 m height, respectively. The green vertical lines in e) mark the days where transect measurements were conducted and the red vertical lines mark the days on which TLS were conducted in the same area. The yellow shaded areas in a) and e) mark the time periods of the drifting snow events. The green shaded area mark a suspicious increase of mass flux at the SPC installed at 10 m while wind speeds would theoretically not allow for snow transport. More details about snowfall measurements- and retrieval and SPC measurements can be found in Shupe et al. (2021); Wagner et al. (2022); Matrosov et al. (2022); Shupe et al. (2022).




Figure 2. a) Shows the DEM derived from TLS on floe-scale, with the embedded model-domain. It also covers the northern transect and the location of FS Polarstern in the lower left corner. b) Shows the DEM on a smaller scale, including elevation magnitude and snow pit locations 1 – 4, where weekly SMP measurements were conducted.

181

2.2 DEM processing

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

TLS data was collected during the MOSAiC field campaign. Scans were conducted on 25 Jan and 4 Feb 2020 and referenced to obtain one large point cloud for each day in the same coordinate system (Clemens-Sewall et al., 2023). A cloth simulation filter (Zhang et al., 2016) was applied to the surface with CloudCompare (2023), in order to remove artefacts like flags, persons, tents or machines from the point clouds. In the following, the points were rasterized to a resolution of $\Delta x = \Delta y = \Delta z = 0.1$ m in order to obtain a digital elevation model using the SAGA Geographical Information System (Conrad et al., 2015). Afterward, gaps were closed with spline interpolation, followed by applying a filter to remove further non-ground cells (Vosselman, 2000). Subsequently, a multilevel B-spline interpolation (Lee et al., 1997) and a multi direction lee filter (Selige et al., 2006) were applied in order to smooth the surface. These steps are essential in order to remove sharp edges that might lead to issues with grid generation or numerical instabilities in either OpenFOAM or ALPINE3D. The DEMs were aligned with respect to true north and squares with side lengths of 200 by 200 m were cut out. DEMs as shown for the TLS observation on 25 Jan 2020 (Fig. 2) were obtained. The lowest point in the DEM on 25 Jan was set to zero reference for all surrounding cells and also for the second scan on 4 Feb 2020. The DEMs show generally heterogeneous elevation, with a maximum height of 1.8 m on the highest ridges.

200

2.3 OpenFOAM wind field modeling

201

2.3.1 Mesh setup

202

203

204

205

206

207

Before the actual meshing, a horizontal flat buffer zone of 20 m width was added at each side with a smooth transition into the domain with the approach from Hames et al. (2022). This is necessary to avoid numerical instabilities under periodic boundary conditions. Afterwards, similar to Hames et al. (2022), to border the domain for the mesh, walls of 25 m height were added to each side and a top was added. Within these borders, a cartesian terrain-following mesh was generated using the cfMesh open source library

208 (Juretic et al., 2021) for OpenFOAM. The mesh consists of polyhedral cells in the tran-
 209 sition regions where cell sizes are different and of hexahedral cells in the regions where
 210 cells sizes do not change anymore. The first layer above the ground has a height of 0.05 m,
 211 and the layer spacing as well as the horizontal cell size increases gradually with the dis-
 212 tance from the ground. Further above, the cell size was set to Δx , Δy , $\Delta z = 1$ m. Even
 213 if 1 m seems relatively large, it should be sufficient for the low-turbulence areas well above
 214 the surface. The approach provided stable solutions and also has a lower computational
 215 cost. For the lateral boundaries, the patches were set to a cyclic Arbitrary Mesh Inter-
 216 face (AMI), which represents periodic boundary conditions.

217 **2.3.2 OpenFOAM model settings and parameters**

218 For wind field modeling, we used OpenFOAM® v2106 with the simpleFoam solver,
 219 which is solving the continuity and momentum equations for in-compressible, turbulent
 220 flow until a steady-state is obtained. To force the model, we used measured 1 h average
 221 wind data at 10 m height above the ice from the flux tower, for the time period 26 Jan
 222 – 4 Feb 2020. For each hour, that means one time step, 1 h average u , v and w compo-
 223 nents from 10 m were written into the OpenFOAM fvOption file as velocity which is trans-
 224 lated into volume-averaged momentum source by the model. Hence, for each hour, an
 225 OpenFOAM simulation is ran until steady state of the vector field is reached. With this
 226 approach, short-term wind peaks, which certainly give strong impulses for the initiation
 227 of snow transport, are averaged out - however, we see this as the only reasonable approach
 228 if we want to calculate the snow transport itself in ALPINE3D also in hourly time steps.
 229 Once a steady-state solution is found for the domain-wide wind field, a new simulation
 230 starts with a new domain-averaged target wind vector. Thus we obtained a 3-D wind
 231 field for each hour. Additionally, we determined a constant roughness length of $z_0 = 5 \cdot$
 232 10^{-3} m as target roughness length in the model for the wall functions at the lower bound-
 233 ary for turbulent dissipation rate ϵ ($\text{kg}^2 \text{s}^{-3}$) and turbulent viscosity ν_t ($\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$), by com-
 234 paring measured with modeled wind profiles and reducing its error (Fig. 3). Note that
 235 the comparison is limited, as we compare the horizontally averaged (height above the
 236 surface per layer) wind from the model with point measurements at the flux tower. The
 237 tower is not covered by the TLS scans (and therefore the model domain) for this period,
 238 it was located approximately 750 m south-east from the center of the domain. Further-
 239 more, due to strong motion of the ice, the tower was quickly surrounded by high pres-
 240 sure ridges that affected the wind field. In addition, a hut was set up to the north-west,
 241 where the measurement data from various instruments were collected and pre-processed.
 242 Nonetheless, Weiss et al. (2011) found a median z_0 of $4.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$ m for Antarctic pack
 243 ice and 10^{-4} m for young ice, which is close to the obtained values from our compari-
 244 son.




Figure 3. Comparison of wind measurements at the tower versus horizontally averaged model wind over time at the heights 2 m, 6 m and 10 m above the ice for a) wind speed and b) wind direction.

245

2.4 Snow cover and snow transport modeling

246

247

248

249

250

251

In order to conduct the actual snow cover- and transport modeling, we applied ALPINE3D (Lehning et al., 2008), which is a snow-atmosphere model using the 1-D layered SNOWPACK model for simulating the snow cover at each grid point (Lehning et al., 1999; Bartelt & Lehning, 2002). ALPINE3D enables to exchange surface mass fluxes and sublimation laterally between the connected grid cells. Its adjusted setup for sea ice is described in the following.

252

2.4.1 Meshing and wind field interpolation

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

As ALPINE3D requires a grid with hexa-hedral cells (Lehning et al., 2006, 2008), a new grid was required to be generated from the OpenFOAM unstructured mesh. To achieve this, we made use of the TerrainBlockMesher tool for OpenFOAM (J. Schmidt, 2014). By choosing cell increments (here: $\Delta x, \Delta y = 0.35$ m), a vertical spacing of 0.2 m close to the surface with an exponential increase and a vertical extent of $h(z) = 25$ m, TerrainBlockMesher reads the DEM of the sea ice and generates a structured grid on top which follows the terrain. The 3D wind fields from OpenFOAM were interpolated onto this structured grid with a Gaussian interpolation kernel by means of the PyVista Python library (Sullivan & Kaszynski, 2019). To run ALPINE3D, we chose a sub-section of the original DEM as shown in Fig. 2, a square with a side length of 100 by 100 m and a domain height reduced to 13 m which led to a 4-fold reduction in computation time when compared with the original domain size.

265 **2.4.2 General model settings and parameters**

266 The whole functionality of ALPINE3D is described in detail in Lehning et al. (2006,
 267 2008). For saltation modeling, we applied the ALPINE3D-integrated saltation model from
 268 Doorschot and Lehning (2002). Although ALPINE3D's snowdrift routine is capable of
 269 computing sublimation of snow in suspension, we switched off that option, after finding
 270 only negligible differences. The reason is the small horizontal extent of the domain and
 271 the short time-span of the model run, leading to negligible snow mass sublimation in sus-
 272 pension for the meteorological conditions for the given time and location.

273 **2.4.3 Meteorological Forcing**

274 Besides the already described wind velocities, measurements of air temperature (mea-
 275 sured at the flux tower at 2 m height), relative humidity with respect to ice (measured
 276 at the flux tower at 2 m height), precipitation rate (mm h^{-1}) as retrieved from the K_a -
 277 band zenith radar (KAZR) installed on research vessel (RV) *Polarstern*, and incoming
 278 longwave radiation, measured near the flux tower, were used in the model. Note that no
 279 shortwave radiation input was required, as the research time period was during the pol-
 280 ar night, without any incoming and outgoing shortwave radiation. General information
 281 about the MOSAiC atmospheric measurement setup including flux tower, radiation mea-
 282 surements, and KAZR can be found in Shupe et al. (2021, 2022). Detailed information
 283 about the KAZR can be found in Widener et al. (2012) while KAZR data can be found
 284 under Lindenmaier et al. (2020). The KAZR retrieval used in this paper follows Matrosov
 285 (2007); Matrosov et al. (2008) was applied by Wagner et al. (2022) and later evaluated
 286 by Matrosov et al. (2022) in detail.

287 **2.4.4 Deposited snow density and microstructure**

288 Regardless of whether it is new snow or previously eroded and redeposited snow,
 289 SNOWPACK uses the same parameterization for both density and microstructure with
 290 respect to this deposited snow. These parameters are calculated in ALPINE3D for each
 291 cell individually, mainly depending on the wind speed. For the deposited snow density
 292 ρ_n , we applied the following formula, adapted from Groot Zwaaftink et al. (2013)

$$\rho_n = \begin{cases} \rho_1 \cdot \log_{10}(U) + \rho_0, & \text{if } U \geq 1 \\ 33, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

293 where U is the instantaneous wind speed at a grid cell. For ρ_1 we set 361 kg m^{-3} as in
 294 Groot Zwaaftink et al. (2013) and $\rho_0 = 33 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ in order to allow low snow densities
 295 at very low wind speeds. Contrary to Groot Zwaaftink et al. (2013), we also did not ap-
 296 ply long-term averaged wind speeds in the formula but instantaneous wind speeds at each
 297 grid cell.

298 We further applied the POLAR variant of SNOWPACK which comes along with
 299 further surface compaction mechanics due to wind and changes in the snow settling which
 300 are described in Groot Zwaaftink et al. (2013); Steger et al. (2017).

301 For the deposited snow microstructure, in the POLAR variant, compared against
 302 the DEFAULT variant, various deposited snow properties differ, partially depending on
 303 the wind speed. In general (independently of the wind speed), the new snow sphericity
 304 is increased (0.75) compared to the DEFAULT variant (0.5), while the dendricity is de-
 305 creased (0.5 vs. 1.0). At high wind speeds ($> 5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$), the sphericity is increased even
 306 further (1.0 vs. 0.75) while the dendricity is decreased further (0.15 vs. 0.5), reflecting
 307 mechanical destruction of grains from transport by wind. Further, new snow bond size
 308 gets stronger with a factor of 3 compared to the DEFAULT variant. The POLAR vari-
 309 ant also exhibits a stronger compaction of the near surface layers by wind, by applying

310 a magnifying factor. In addition, we applied a factor of 5 that is multiplied in addition
 311 to favor wind slab formation.

312 **2.4.5 Fluid threshold**

The drifting snow routine from ALPINE3D (Doorschot & Lehning, 2002) is computing drifting snow mass flux based on a fluid threshold shear stress initiating snow grain motion τ_{th} (Pa) determined as:

$$\tau_{th} = A \rho_i g r_g (\psi + 1) + B \sigma N_3 \frac{r_b^2}{r_g^2} \quad (2)$$

313 where $A = 0.023$ and $B = 0.0035$ are empirically determined constants (Clifton et al.,
 314 2006), $\rho_i = 917$ (kg m^{-3}) is the density of ice, $g = 9.81$ (m s^{-2}) is the gravitational ac-
 315 celeration, r_g is the grain radius in m, r_b is the bond radius in m, ψ is the sphericity of
 316 snow grains which can be between 0 and 1, $\sigma = 300$ (Pa) is an empirically determined
 317 bond strength and N_3 is the three-dimensional coordination number.

The threshold friction velocity which must be exceeded by the wind at the surface to initiate snow transport is defined as:

$$u^*_{th} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{th}}{\rho_a}}, \quad (3)$$

318 where $\rho_a = 1.1$ kg m^{-3} is the density of air.

319 In order to investigate the dependence of the snow redistribution on the strength
 320 of the fluid-threshold in the further course of the work, we introduce the factor α , which
 321 allows us to scale the fluid threshold:

$$\tau_{th}^* = \alpha \cdot \tau_{th}. \quad (4)$$

322 For the base setup, we kept α at 1.0, which we called reference setup (R). However,
 323 we also performed simulations with $\alpha = 3.0$, which led to changes in the mass balance
 324 and density, which we would therefore like to present in addition. In the following, we
 325 call these simulations comparison scenario (C).

326 **2.4.6 Mass balance treatment**

327 The ALPINE3D drifting snow routine (Doorschot & Lehning, 2002) computes for
 328 each time step a global steady state condition for the location of snow mass in the air.
 329 The location and magnitude of eroded mass that is entrained into the air (and deposits
 330 somewhere else) depends on the fluid threshold that is explained in section 2.4.5. Hence,
 331 at each pixel in the domain, a SNOWPACK simulation returns the amount of snow eroded/deposited
 332 at each time step to the ALPINE3D model kernel. The drifting snow routine can only
 333 erode one snow layer at a SNOWPACK model timestep, which is 15 min. in this study.
 334 As the computed amount of mass in the air depends on the snow properties of the up-
 335 permost snow layer, deeper layers can exhibit a stronger bond and higher density, reduc-
 336 ing the erosion. In this approach, at a certain cell, the computed eroded mass may be
 337 greater than either the actual available mass of the surface layer. It might also be the
 338 case that the total mass on the ground is less than the eroded mass computed by the
 339 drifting snow routine. In both cases, the suspended (and later deposited) mass is greater
 340 than the total snow mass actually available for erosion. In addition, since precipitation
 341 is consumed in the drifting snow routine and snow is allowed to remain in suspension,
 342 snow might never be deposited and the deposition rate might be lower than the precip-
 343 itation rate. In order to close the mass balance, the following approach was implemented
 344 in the model:

- 345 1. For each pixel and time step, the erosion mass returned by the drifting module
346 is limited to the mass of the uppermost layer.
- 347 2. The global mass balance, i.e. the deposition plus the precipitation minus the cor-
348 rected erosion is computed.
- 349 3. If the mass balance is positive, the deposition is linearly decreased for all pixels
350 in order to obtain a zero value for the mass balance. If the mass balance is neg-
351 ative, the deposition is linearly increased for all pixels in order to obtain a zero
352 value for the mass balance.

353 At deposition time, the density of deposited new snow is set to the deposited snow
354 density (Section 2.4.4).

355 *2.4.7 Snow cover measurements*

356 SnowMicroPen (SMP) resistance force measurements (Schneebeli & Johnson, 1998)
357 conducted at the same four positions along the Northern transect at around 12 UTC on
358 16 Jan, 30 Jan and 6 Feb (Fig. 2). At each location and on each day, 5 measurements
359 were conducted. Out of the collected force profiles, densities were computed as by King
360 et al. (2020) Wagner et al. (2022) and the 5 density profiles were averaged after align-
361 ing with the snow surface. Out of the four positions, only the profile of SMP3 was cover-
362 ed by the model domain (Fig. 2b). The surface density determined in this way will be
363 used for comparison with the model.

364 In addition, a Magnaprobe (Sturm & Holmgren, 2018) was used to measure snow
365 depths along the Northern Transect on a weekly basis, ice and weather conditions per-
366 mitting. The methodology of the measurements and the data set are described in de-
367 tail by Itkin et al. (2021). Furthermore, we derived snow depths from the SMP measure-
368 ments. We use the snow depth data from both instruments to compare the differences
369 between the individual days with those of the model.

370 *2.4.8 Initial snow cover*

371 To initialize the ALPINE3D snow cover, we first created a snow profile for SNOW-
372 PACK based on an horizontally averaged SMP density profile measured on 16 Jan from
373 all the SMP1 – SMP4 locations, on the northern transect (Fig. 2b). The 20 single pro-
374 files were first aligned along the surface and made an horizontally averaged profile. As
375 the middle part of the profile was mostly vertically constant in terms of density but not
376 the lowest part (due to temperature gradient metamorphism) and the most upper part
377 (due to wind compaction), and in order to get the best estimate for temperature and den-
378 sity, we extracted the upper 11 cm and the lower 11 cm of this average profile and cre-
379 ated an initial SNOWPACK composite profile out of the extracted upper and lower part.
380 The average density of the initial profile is 285 kg m^{-3} . With this profile, we made a sin-
381 gle (1D) SNOWPACK spin-up run until 26 Jan 1000 UTC forced by the meteorologi-
382 cal measurements. The density state on 26 Jan 1000 UTC of the profile is shown in Fig. 4.
383 The increase of snow height between 16 and 26 Jan is only 1 cm, which corresponds to
384 1.3 mm of SWE. The profile properties are rather constant with height, however with
385 a slightly decreased density toward the bottom due to depth hoar formation and a wind
386 slab at the top. The profile mostly consists out of depth hoar in the lower part (dark blue
387 in Fig. 4), faceted grains (light blue) in the upper part, a layer of rounded grains (ma-
388 genta) in the upper part as wind slab. This profile out of the spin-up was then distributed
389 uniformly over the ALPINE3D domain and is used as initial state on 26 Jan 1000 UTC.
390 The total height of the initial profile (23 cm) is approximately consistent with the av-
391 erage snow depth of the northern transect measured with the Magnaprobe on 30 Jan (26.7 cm).




Figure 4. The initial profile after spin-up at 26 Jan 1000 UTC, which was distributed over the domain as ALPINE3D initial snow cover state at each grid cell. The colors indicate the grain shapes as classified by Fierz et al. (2008), where the legend on the left describes the relationship between the shown colors and grain type symbol.

392

2.4.9 1D SNOWPACK simulations

393

394

395

396

397

398

In order to investigate whether the computationally expensive ALPINE3D setup offers advantages over a computationally very cost-effective 1D SNOWPACK simulation with regard to the calculation of the surface density, we set up 2 SNOWPACK simulations for comparison, which we ran from 16 Jan based on the initial profile (Section 2.4.8). Both simulations were set up with the same settings as R and C - only 1-dimensional - therefore they are called SP_R and SP_C in the following.

399

3 Results and Discussion

400

3.1 Drifting snow mass fluxes

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

In the following, we evaluate the model in terms of snow transport SPC measurements, which took place at the same flux tower as the wind measurements used to drive the model. To make a comparison possible, we defined a normalized mass flux for the lower SPC at 0.1 m above the surface simply as a ratio of instantaneously measured mass flux relative to the maximum measured over the whole investigation period. For the model, we used the spatial average of the instantaneous absolute values at each grid cell with respect to deposited and eroded saltation mass (kg m^{-2}). As for the SPC, we normalized the averaged absolute saltating mass. By doing so, we are able to compare the tim-

409 ing of snow transport as well as the relative magnitudes with the measurements. The
 410 normalized mass flux, measured at the lower SPC at 0.1 m above the surface, is very well
 411 represented by the normalized mass flux in the reference model setup (Fig. 5c,d). The
 412 frequency distributions of measured mass flux at the 0.1 m SPC versus the modeled mass
 413 flux plotted as a wind rose (Fig. 6) indicate well simulated mass flux with respect to wind
 414 direction, as well. Note that the ratio in the NNW sector is under-represented in the model.
 415 The reason is probably that in reality the SPC was wind-shadowed by relatively high
 416 ridges in the NNW sector and the mentioned installed hut, leading to under-sampling
 417 of drifting snow particles for this wind direction.




Figure 5. a) 2-meter tower-observed wind speed (1 h avg) versus horizontally averaged 2-meter modeled wind speed from OpenFOAM. b) Same as for a), but for wind direction, c) modeled (R) and measured normalized drifting and blowing snow mass flux over time. d) modeled (R) and measured cumulative normalized drifting snow mass flux over time.

418 However, also note that average (domain-wide) modeled mass flux is compared with
 419 point measurements that were measured a few hundreds of meters away from the area
 420 that is represented in the model. In addition, the SPC was partially wind-shadowed by

421 ridges in its Western and North-western direction, making accurate absolute compar-
 422 isons very difficult.

423 Nevertheless, the results show that the model can be used to determine the tim-
 424 ing of drifting snow events and relative mass flux with very high accuracy ($r = 0.92$).




Figure 6. a) Wind rose for the measured mass flux with the lower SPC (0.1 m). b) Wind rose for the modeled spatially averaged absolute saltation deposited and eroded flux.

425 *3.1.1 Potential uncertainties regarding the drift threshold*

426 It is noteworthy that A and B in Equation 2 are empirically determined. We choose
 427 the values as used by Clifton et al. (2006) ($A = 0.023$ and $B = 0.0035$). However Keenan

et al. (2021), for instance used the parameters $A = 0.02$ and $B = 0.0015$ as it was recently implemented in SNOWPACK. In our case, we found a tendency of the model to compute the initiation of saltation at too low wind speeds relative to the measured mass flux, extending the drifting snow time periods in the model over the measured ones. Hence, as increased A and B parameters increase the fluid threshold, we chose to use the older values.

Note, that the surface snow density - hence the used deposited snow density parameterization (Equation 1) is indirectly affecting the fluid threshold, and therefore the re-distribution. The coordination number N_3 - a factor in the second term of the fluid threshold equation (Equation 2) - fitted by Lehning et al. (2002) and used in the recent SNOWPACK version in the following form, is directly dependent on the bulk density of snow ρ_s :

$$N_3 = 1.42 - 7.56 \cdot 10^{-5} \rho_s + 5.15 \cdot 10^{-5} \rho_s^2 - 1.73 \cdot 10^{-7} \rho_s^3 + 1.81 \cdot 10^{-10} \rho_s^4. \quad (5)$$

Hence, the adjusted deposited snow density is affecting directly N_3 and hence indirectly affecting u_{*th} (Equation 3), leading to an increased u_{*th} with increasing density.

Since only wind measurements took place outside the model domain, we were only able to fit wind speeds in the model as domain-average to the measurements from a station slightly outside the model domain. Thus, the model wind profile may not fit the measurements well in every case. Furthermore, the values for A , B and σ were found empirically, either in a wind tunnel or from experiments in the Alps. In fact, general wind and environmental wind conditions are quite different to conditions in the Alps and most likely, wind tunnels as well. In addition, there are several other factors, like the particle entrainment coefficient, where the value currently used in SNOWPACK has been found empirically (Groot Zwaafink et al., 2014) at it is likely that the environmental conditions during that study do not resemble those of our study. Hence, several other empirical fitting parameters are not necessarily correct for snow on sea ice, as well.

3.2 General mass balance

In this section we want to examine the following points, related exclusively to the parameter of the snow depth difference:

1. Investigate basic spatial statistics of the modeled snow height differences and how it compares to the measurements.
2. Conduct spatial correlations of snow height differences compared to model measurements and compared to previous studies on sea ice (Sturm et al., 2002; Liston et al., 2018).
3. Do a qualitative evaluation of spatial differences model versus observation.
4. Having a statistical view on the spatio-temporal change of snow distribution in the model.

3.2.1 Frequency distributions of snow height differences

The frequency distribution of the spatial snow depth difference between the two laser scans can well be described by a Cauchy distribution (Fig. 7a).

In order to evaluate the spatial snow distribution of the various model runs quantitatively with time, first we generated maps of 2-dimensional snow depth differences $\Delta HS_{i,j,t-t_0}$ for both, model output and TLS:

$$\Delta HS_{i,j,t-t_0} = HS_{i,j}(t) - HS_{i,j}(t = 0). \quad (6)$$

where $HS_{i,j}(t)$ is the total snow height at each point of the grid at time t , with i, j being the horizontal indices for the grid points in x and y direction, respectively, and $HS_{i,j}(t = 0)$ is the total snow height at each point of the grid at time $t = 0$.

464 In Fig. 7a we see that the distribution is almost symmetrical along the y-axis, how-
 465 ever, also slightly skewed. The location on the x-axis x_0 also indicates that the peak is
 466 slightly shifted toward negative values.

467 The distribution is generally well reproduced by the model (Fig. 7a). However, the
 468 modeled distribution is rather described by a Gaussian than a Cauchy distribution as
 469 observed. Especially, it is noticeable that the negative range of the distribution is less
 470 pronounced for more negative values, which indicates less area of erosion for higher depths
 471 in the model.




Figure 7. Frequency distributions for modeled snow depth differences between first and last hour of the model output and TLS measured difference. a) shows the reference, b) the C scenario

472 One reason for this could be the neglect of the spatial variability of the snowpack
 473 in the initialization of our model. Areas where snow drifts were deposited shortly be-
 474 fore 25 Jan will be relatively easier to erode than snow that has deposited earlier and
 475 sintered for a longer time. The negative tail in the observations could be the erosion of
 476 these recent drifts. Because the model uses uniform snow properties, it does not resolve
 477 these recent drifts and hence misses the negative tail. Hence, bringing the distribution
 478 from the model output in closer agreement with observations is very difficult, if not im-
 479 possible, as we not only had to guess the initial distribution of snow mass but also the
 480 distribution of the snow properties based on point measurements.

481 Compared to the R scenario, the C scenario with $\tau_{th}^* = 3.0$ (Fig. 7b) shows a less
 482 compressed distribution, but also with less pronounced legs to the sides. For us, this is
 483 an indicator that less redistribution has taken place in the C scenario due to the higher
 484 fluid threshold.

485
486

3.2.2 Statistical view on the spatio-temporal change of snow distribution

487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500

The model enables the detailed study of events within the time-span of two laser-scans. To examine the temporal evolution of the spatial distribution in detail statistically, we consider histogram time series for the modeled snow depth difference of the reference scenario (Fig. 8a) versus the comparison scenario (Fig. 8b) based on Equation 6. Although we detected 4 main drifting snow events within the investigation period initially by means of the measurements (Fig. 1), the histogram time series of the reference (Fig. 8a) shows that the snow cover in the simulation was affected by re-distribution most of the time. However, simulation C shows less dynamics (Fig. 8b), and the distinct events for this setup can mainly be reduced to the 4 main events as detected solely with the measurements. This raises the question which scenario is more realistic - relative mass flux comparisons (Fig. 5c) suggest that the mass flux for the reference run was too high. From this we conclude that the redistribution in the C scenario is probably more realistic. A detailed verification over time does require a significantly higher frequency of measurements of the snow depth difference.




Figure 8. 2-D time series of the frequency distributions as shown in Fig. 7a, for a) R scenario and b) for the C scenario. Each time step shows one histogram for the difference of snow depth at the time with respect to the snow depth at $t = 0$. The color indicates the density.

501

3.2.3 Spatial correlation

To evaluate the spatial correlation of snow depth differences, we can look at semi-variograms, which have been generated using the Python SciKit-GStat library (Mälicke, 2022). To estimate the semi-variance, we used a Matheron estimator function (Matheron, 1963):

$$\gamma(h) = \frac{1}{2N(h)} \sum_{i=1}^{N(h)} (x(P_i) - x(P_{i+h})), \quad (7)$$

502 where $N(h)$ is the number of point pairs for the lag distance h (in meter), and x (in meter)
 503 is the observed value at its location P . Hence, semi-variograms describe the spatial
 504 correlation of point pairs as a function of their distances from each other. The computed
 505 semi-variogram for the snow height difference of the observation and the R scenario is
 506 shown in Fig. 9a. The measured difference has a smoother transition from highest correlation
 507 towards least (constant) correlation, which is reached at a range of approximately
 508 6 m distance. The transition towards least correlation in the model is less smooth, though
 509 also reached at approximately 6 m distance. The correlation decrease occurs fast in the
 510 model, with a quick decrease from 0 to 2 m distance, and less decrease from 2 m onward.
 511 The differences between reference (Fig. 9a) and comparison scenario (Fig. 9b) are not
 512 large, although a generally larger positive deviation of the semi-variance is observed for
 513 the comparison scenario for the whole lag distance.

514 We expect a less smooth transition from high towards low (steady) correlation to
 515 be a result of less long-stretched deposition and erosion patterns in the model output.
 516 The reason could be that our grid is static and does not dynamically adapt to the snow
 517 surface over time. In order to get the model to produce dunes, an adaptive mesh that
 518 accounts for newly deposited or eroded snow at each time step, would be required. This
 519 is not implemented in the current setup.




Figure 9. Semi-variance for modeled snow depth differences between first and last hour of the model output and TLS measured difference for a) the reference scenario R, b) scenario C.

520 It is noteworthy that, in a qualitative comparison, ranges of semi-variograms for
 521 absolute snow depth distributions over Arctic sea ice compares with other studies on Arctic
 522 sea ice (Sturm et al., 2002; Liston et al., 2018). Liston et al. (2018), for example, ex-
 523 amined semi-variograms based on snow depth measurements along various transects mea-

524 sured during the Norwegian Young Sea Ice Experiment (N-ICE2015) field campaign and
525 a snow cover model which models the snow height spatially for the respective same area.
526 For both the measurements and the model, a range of almost 6 m was observed, simi-
527 lar to our results. Sturm et al. (2002), on the other hand, examined semi-variograms based
528 on snow depth measurements along various transects during the Surface Heat Budget
529 of the Arctic Ocean (SHEBA) campaign of the years 1997-1998. Here, mostly larger ranges
530 between 13 and 30 m were found, but most of them in the lower end of this range. Since
531 we compare snow depth difference in our case with absolute snow depth in the other two
532 studies, the absolute values of the semi-variance are logically of different magnitudes. How-
533 ever, it is clear that during our measurements, and the measurements during SHEBA,
534 fundamentally different snow conditions prevailed. Webster et al. (2014), for example,
535 has calculated that between the years 1950 and 2014 the mean snow depth on Arctic sea
536 ice decreased by 2.9 cm per year. If we now look at the relatively large mean snow depths
537 at the end of the winter season during SHEBA (33.7 cm) and extrapolate over the value
538 would arrive at 27.4 cm for MOSAiC, which is not far from the measured value from Wagner
539 et al. (2022) (24.9 cm). In addition, Merkouriadi et al. (2017) reports strongly different
540 proportions of depth hoar or faceted grains and wind slab in the snowpack for N-ICE2015
541 compared to SHEBA and Sturm et al. (2002) reported consistently low temperatures that
542 favored the development of depth hoar, while both Merkouriadi et al. (2017) reported
543 warm air intrusions in winter, as did Shupe et al. (2022) for MOSAiC. Overall, then, we
544 must assume that snow conditions differed greatly, particularly between SHEBA and N-
545 ICE2015 or MOSAiC.

546 Nevertheless, the strong similarity of the values between (Liston et al., 2018) and
547 our study suggest that snow conditions were more similar between N-ICE2015 and MO-
548 SAiC, especially in terms of spatial snow distribution.

549 *3.2.4 Qualitative evaluation of spatial differences*

550 Spatial correlations allow for quantitative comparisons, however, they do not re-
551 veal all properties of spatial variation. Therefore, qualitative comparisons with respect
552 to the localization of drifting snow patterns are made in the following section.

553 Absolute snow height outputs for the R and the C model are shown in Fig. 10a and
554 Fig. 10b, respectively. Surface densities (discussed later) are shown in Fig. 10c,d. Over-
555 all, higher maximum snow heights can be observed for the C scenario (Fig. 10b). We as-
556 sume that this is due to initially precipitated snow (precipitated under conditions when
557 snowfall and wind prevail at the same time) that is less prone to erosion and therefore
558 removal.




Figure 10. a) modeled (R) absolute snow height, b) modeled (C) snow height, c) modeled (R) surface density $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ and d) modeled (C) surface density $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$.

559 The comparison of the spatial distribution of absolute snow depth differences between
 560 model reference and TLS measurements is shown in Fig. 11a,b. Purely visually,
 561 the spatial distribution does not appear to be particularly well reproduced by the model.
 562 In addition, as already mentioned, dunes in flat areas are almost not reproduced. How-
 563 ever, there are locally good model results, and examples for this are marked in orange
 564 circles. In addition, as in the TLS observations, snow mass is preferably deposited along
 565 the distinct ridge in the lower left corner of the domain - although the specific locations
 566 and scales of the deposited mass are different from those that are observed. Erosion does
 567 occur in the model as well, although at a much lower magnitude than observed, espe-
 568 cially around the distinct ridge. Correlations and anti-correlations between model and
 569 TLS can also be observed, which depend primarily on the topography. Besides the ridge
 570 at the bottom left of the domain, stronger structures at the top left are visible in both
 571 the model and the TLS. The same is true for an edge that runs from about $x = 40$, $y = 90$
 572 to $x = 100$, $y = 20$. However, this edge is clearly of an anti-correlative nature. The
 573 reasons for this are currently unknown. Another location where erosion and deposition
 574 is well reproduced in the model is cross section S1 (discussed in detail in Section 3.4.1.
 575 We further will look into detail at cross section 2 and cross section 3. In order to see if
 576 the total accumulated snow is affecting the patterns visually, we normalized the abso-
 577 lute distributions for model and TLS respectively (Fig. 11c,d), i.e. the respective differ-
 578 ence values at each index point were divided by the highest difference value per domain.

579
580

In this representation, the differences between the model and TLS are no longer quite so drastic.




Figure 11. a) modeled snow depth difference between 26 Jan and 4 Feb for the R model run, b) is the measured snow depth difference via TLS between 26 Jan and 4 Feb, c) shows the modeled normalized snow depth difference for the R model run and d) shows the measured normalized snow depth difference from the TLS.

581
582

3.2.5 Time series averages and comparisons with 1-D SNOWPACK simulations

583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593

For a more detailed view of individual domain-averaged model parameters, we look at Fig. 12. Here, the individual events are more clearly visible for both, the reference and C scenario (Fig. 12). As expected, the C scenario ($\tau_{th}^* = 3.0$) does most of the time produce lower snow transport rates, but partially even computes higher transport rates in comparison. This is valid for a short time span on the 30 Jan and on 1 Feb. Reasons for this rather uncommon behaviour still need to be investigated. Averaged snow height differences of the ALPINE3D C and R scenarios and their standard deviations, as well as two 1-D SNOWPACK simulation scenarios are shown in Fig. 12d and Tab. 1, compared against TLS-measured snow height averaged difference, Northern Transect Magnaprobe snow height averaged difference and SMP-derived snow height differences. For the SNOWPACK simulations, all parameters in the setup were kept the same as in ALPINE3D R

594 and C , the only difference is that there is no snow transport available like in the 3D drift
595 simulations.

596 The TLS-based difference on 4 Feb for the model domain only gives +0.007 m, while
597 the Northern transect on 6 Feb gives +0.042 m. However, note that when considering
598 a larger area, the TLS increase is approximately +0.014 m. If we only choose the sec-
599 tion of the transect that is covered by the domain (Fig. 2b), the transect-based increase
600 is +0.031 m. Hence, the modeled averaged A3D snow height difference by the end of the
601 simulation period lays between the lowest and highest average values of measurements
602 available. The intermediate transect-based measurement on 30 Jan shows an increase
603 of +0.012 m (short section: +0.009 m).




Figure 12. Time series (1h avg) of a) horizontally averaged wind speed (2m), b) horizontally averaged wind direction (2m), c) average of absolute deposited and eroded saltation mass per grid cell, d) spatially averaged modeled snow depth and its standard deviation, e) spatially averaged $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ modeled snow density, f) cumulative precipitation sum retrieved from KAZR and spatially averaged cumulative ΔSWE , g) cumulative sublimated or deposited ice mass (negative = vapor deposition).

604
605

One should consider the following measurement uncertainties in this regard: First, note that the low TLS difference is in part due to erosion of snow drifts along the first-

606 year ridge (in the lower left, Fig. 10). However, the transect does not include this ridge,
 607 so it misses this erosion. Additionally, it might be possible that the characteristic flut-
 608 ing and scalloping erosional patterns of sastrugi (Filhol & Sturm, 2015) and the steep
 609 snow topography of drifts around ridges (e.g., Fig. 11) cause the Magnaprobe measure-
 610 ments to be biased high due to the 25 cm diameter Magnaprobe basket getting propped
 611 up on a local high point. In other words, each Magnaprobe observation measures approx-
 612 imately the maximum snow thickness within the basket footprint. However, there are
 613 currently no concrete evaluations of this in the literature. Detailed methodological com-
 614 parison of transect and TLS measurements is beyond the scope of this manuscript and
 615 will be investigated in future work.

616 The standard deviation with time serves as an approximate indicator of snow re-
 617 distribution over time, making the four drifting snow events clearly visible. However, there
 618 is no clear difference between R and C. Based on other simulation results, we can say
 619 that if there is a more significant difference in the factors α for τ_{th}^* used, a significant dif-
 620 ference is also visible in the standard deviation: with a higher standard deviation for lower
 621 τ_{th}^* values. Fig. 2e shows the same as in Fig. 12d but for the average surface density of
 622 the first 5 cm of the snowpack ($\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$). A consequence of the decreased snow transport
 623 in the C scenario is, that the averaged density is increased over the R scenario. Possi-
 624 ble reasons for this are discussed in detail in the next section. Fig. 2f shows the modeled
 625 averaged snow-water equivalent (SWE) difference over time, compared with northern transect-
 626 derived SWE as reported by Wagner et al. (2022). The mean increase in SWE in the model
 627 here is equivalent to the precipitation sum for the same period, which was used as the
 628 model input. This is the retrieval based on the Ka-band cloud radar as used in Wagner
 629 et al. (2022). It is noteworthy, that although the model shows a slight difference rela-
 630 tive to the intermediate measurement, it fits exactly the estimated SWE increase of 9 mm
 631 (based on the whole transect). Fig. 12h shows the modeled surface sublimation with time.
 632 Negative values corresponds with vapor deposition. Based on this time series, we can rule
 633 out the possibility that 1) sublimation occurred at all and 2) that water vapor deposi-
 634 tion occurred in relevant amounts that significantly affected the surface mass balance
 635 in a positive way.

636 3.3 Surface snow density

637 In the following, we compare the modelled snow densities - with a focus on the sur-
 638 face density - with measurements. We compare the surface density rather than the den-
 639 sity of the total snowpack because, first, it is relevant to the timing, location and mag-
 640 nitude of the mass of erosion as a function of wind speed and fluid threshold, as described
 641 in Section 2.4.5 and Section 2.4.6. Second, the upper centimeters of the snowpack on sea
 642 ice often consist of wind slab (Sturm et al., 2002; Merkouriadi et al., 2017), which re-
 643 duces the horizontal variability of density when averaging vertically. Since we only have
 644 20 individual measurements available with the SMP per measurement day (5 per pit lo-
 645 cation), we therefore have better comparability with the model using this approach.

646 3.3.1 Measured snow density

647 Fig. 13 shows the horizontally averaged snow densities for the snowpack's top 5 cm
 648 ($\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$) based on Pit 1 – Pit 4 measured with the SMP (locations shown in Fig. 2), for
 649 16 Jan, 30 Jan and 6 Feb. $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ increases from 16 to 30 Jan and then further until 6 Feb.
 650 For each day, seen from the surface, a rapid increase in density is observed as the snow
 651 depth decreases downwards, followed by a slow decrease. This is probably due to wind
 652 slab, a compaction of near-surface snow due to high wind speeds. The minimum is a lit-
 653 tle bit under 260 kg m^{-3} on 16 Jan while the maximum is 320 kg m^{-3} on 6 Feb. Below
 654 the wind slab we find more snow that has undergone temperature gradient metamorphism
 655 and thus has a lower density. Similar observations of surface compaction during the MO-
 656 SAiC expedition were described by Nandan et al. (2022), with even stronger expressions

Parameter	Observation			Model (avg \pm σ)			
	Device / Location	Date	OBS (avg \pm σ)	A3D R	A3D C	SP R	SP C
ΔHS (m)	MP Transect	16 Jan	0	-	-	(-0.004)	(-0.004)
	SMP	16 Jan	-	-	-	-	-
	TLS	25 Jan	-	-	0	-	-
	MP Transect	30 Jan	0.02 ± 0.138	0.001 ± 0.037	0.0 ± 0.039	-0.01	0.003
	SMP	30 Jan	-0.07 ± 0.13	-	-	-	-
	TLS	4 Feb	0.007 ± 0.05	0.028 ± 0.067	0.028 ± 0.072	0.006	0.03
	MP Transect	6 Feb	0.05 ± 0.135	-	-	0.009	0.033
$\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ (kg m^{-3})	-	16 Jan	268.9 ± 42.5	-	-	270.2	270.2
	-	26 Jan	-	268.6	268.6	268.6	268.6
	SMP	30 Jan	279.7 ± 25.2	280.1 ± 12.3	281.4 ± 13.1	272.2	267.0
	-	4 Feb	-	281.9 ± 17.5	285.4 ± 18.3	292.6	272.4
	-	6 Feb	307.8 ± 40.3	-	-	293.1	280.3

Table 1. Observed average snow height differences ΔHS derived from the Magnaprobe (MP) measurements along the transect and by TLS differences with time as well as its respective standard deviations σ ; observed averaged density of the uppermost 5 cm of the snow cover ($\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$) and its respective standard deviation over time, derived from the SMP along the transect, and the corresponding values from the modeled ALPINE3D (A3D) R and C scenarios and modeled SNOWPACK (SP) R and C scenarios. The bracketed negative values of the SP scenarios on Jan 16 represent the difference in the Jan 26 value minus the Jan 16 value for illustrative purposes, although the values themselves cannot be used for comparisons with the A3D model.

657 measured at a different location - a few hundred meters away a few weeks earlier, in November
 658 as well as early December.




Figure 13. Horizontally averaged snow surface density profiles (5 cm depth) from snow pit 1-4 over time. Zero denotes the snow surface.

659 Fig. 14a confirms that for most of the pits, $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ increases with time, and increases
660 for all pits averaged from around 270 kg m^{-3} on 30 Jan to 308 kg m^{-3} on 6 Feb. In con-
661 trast to the surface density, however, the total density (Fig. 14b) shows a somewhat dif-
662 ferent picture: While for $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$, the average density increases from 16 Jan to 30 Jan from
663 270 kg m^{-3} by 10 kg m^{-3} to around 280 kg m^{-3} (Tab. 1), the average density for the whole
664 profile decreases first slightly below 280 kg m^{-3} and then increases to little over 290 kg m^{-3} .
665 Most interestingly, for the whole profile, the spread is strongly reduced on 30 Jan, com-
666 pared to the spread before (16 Jan) and after (6 Feb). This is likely due to the fact that
667 net erosion has occurred from the respective areas of the 4 snow pits: Mean snow depths
668 derived from SMP measurements have decreased at each individual pit between 16 and
669 30 Feb, namely -0.85 cm at Pit 1, -17.2 cm at Pit 2, -9.6 cm at Pit 3, and -2.0 cm at Pit
670 4. This results in an average decrease of 7.4 cm. When we look at our initial snow pro-
671 file on 16 Jan (Fig. 4) and the snow densities of the upper 5 cm (Fig. 14), it becomes clear
672 that the decrease in density is probably attributed, at least partially, to erosion of the
673 upper layers. However, it is also likely that snowfall at low wind speeds contributed to
674 a reduction in density, as well, which occurred between 29 and 30 Jan (Fig. 12g). In con-
675 trast to 30 Jan, the mean density of the entire profile increased between 16 Jan and 6
676 Feb. At the same time, the mean height has decreased, but only by 4.3 cm on average.
677 This corresponds to an increase of 3 cm compared to 30 Jan.




Figure 14. a) Averaged snow surface densities (upper 5 cm) for snow pits 1–4. The black dashed line notes the total average over time. Error bars show the corresponding upper and lower limit for the standard deviation at each pit location at each time. b) same as in a) but averaged for the whole vertical profile.

678

3.3.2 Modeled snow density

679

680

681

682

683

684

We now analyse if the model is able to reproduce the $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ increase with time found in the manual snow pits. Spatially modeled snow density fields for the top 5 cm of the snowpack, $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$, for R and C simulations, respectively, are shown in Fig.10c and Fig.10d. Spatial differences of the density between R and C are visible. For the C scenario, the density is higher on average, and the surface appears smoother, while for the R scenario, the spatial variation appears larger with lower maximum densities.

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

As discussed in the previous section, the smaller fluid threshold in scenario R increases snow transport and consequently increases the spatial snow distribution. There is also a significant increase in $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ with time (Fig. 12e, Tab. 1). SMP-based horizontally averaged $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ and their respective standard deviations are shown for 16 Jan, 30 Jan and 6 Feb in the same figure. Most of the time, in the C scenario, the surface density is slightly higher. While during the first event the densities increase to approximately the same value of slightly over 280 kg m⁻³. Subsequently, the R scenario density drops to lower values. At a later time, during the snowfall event, the densities are almost equal again, and this behaviour continues. At the beginning of the simulation period, the den-

694 city is about the same as the measurements on 16 Jan (269 kg m^{-3}). The reason for this
 695 is that the 1-D SNOWPACK model was initiated with the density measurements on 16
 696 Jan, and during the spin-up period of 10 days until 26 Jan (Fig. 4). Accordingly, the sur-
 697 face density remained about the same between 16 Jan and 26 Jan (which also justifies
 698 a comparison of the measurements from 16 Jan with the model on 26 Jan, also regard-
 699 ing snow depth and SWE). On 30 Jan, the measured average is 280 kg m^{-3} , which is well
 700 captured by the R scenario, where the C scenario models slightly too high values. By
 701 the end of the simulation, neither simulation correctly reproduces the averaged measured
 702 density (308 kg m^{-3}); however, both models are within the lower standard deviation of
 703 the measurement. The R scenario generally shows a stronger variability of the density
 704 with time, in particular it shows stronger decreases in the intermediate time. Here, we
 705 note that the modeled average surface density may decrease significantly with time due
 706 to 3 reasons:

- 707 1. Due to snowfall during low wind speeds, which produces low density layers on top.
- 708 2. When at certain locations in the domain the wind speed is sufficient to generate
 709 snow transport, i.e. when the threshold friction velocity u_{*th} is exceeded, while at
 710 the same time, the deposited snow density function (Equation 1) computes rel-
 711 atively low densities for the re-deposition of the snow that has been eroded from
 712 high-density surfaces. This might lead to a decrease, on average.
- 713 3. When erosion may expose lighter layers lower down in the snow cover.

714 The difference between the R and C simulations is attributed to point 2, as the snow-
 715 fall rate and wind speed are identical for both scenarios. An increased u_{*th} leads to less
 716 re-distribution and hence less fluctuation in the density. However, the significant drop
 717 of $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ for both scenarios - R and C - is attributed to snowfall (explained under point
 718 1 above), as snowfall occurred before the wind started on 1 Feb. Interestingly, $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ of
 719 the R and C scenario converge during the subsequent event with the highest measured
 720 wind speed on 1 Feb, which occurred under significant snowfall conditions.

721 *3.3.3 Comparison with 1-D SNOWPACK simulations*

722 To evaluate whether a time- and computationally intensive calculation with ALPINE3D
 723 gives an advantage in terms of averaged properties over very short time and low com-
 724 putationally intensive 1-dimensional simulations, we compared two SNOWPACK sim-
 725 ulations, R_SP and C_SP with ALPINE3D R and C. The $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ time series shown in Fig. 12e),
 726 reveal that neither of the two SNOWPACK setups is able to simulate the $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ increase
 727 on 30 Jan 1200 UTC. For the measurement at this time, the density is underestimated
 728 for SP_R by 8 kg m^{-3} and for SP_C by 13 kg m^{-3} . In contrast to that, the R and C sce-
 729 narios of ALPINE3D show an excellent agreement for $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ with the measurements at
 730 this time. However, by the end of the simulation period neither one of the A3D simu-
 731 lations nor one of the SNOWPACK simulations captures the average measured density
 732 accurately. However, SP_R is closest to the measured $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$, while SP_C is similar to C.
 733 This is somewhat surprising, as intuitively, we would have expected that a decreased fluid
 734 threshold would lead to more erosion, and consequently a decreased $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$.

735 Unlike the A3D setups, neither of the SNOWPACK simulations shows lots of vari-
 736 ability with time. All of the modeled densities lay within the lower standard deviation
 737 of the measured density. While the differences in results between SP_R and SP_C are
 738 quite high at the end of the simulation time, they are smaller for the same change in the
 739 α parameter. Based on these findings, one could perhaps argue that using ALPINE3D
 740 with the snowdrift module reduces the probability of being way off in the results. The
 741 temporal fluctuation of $\bar{\rho}_{5cm}$ in the ALPINE3D setups may not seem realistic, but it is
 742 at least as questionable how likely it is that - as simulated by SNOWPACK - there is
 743 almost no fluctuation except for very punctual events.

744

3.4 Cross sections

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

In a final step, we evaluate the model in terms of snow deposition in detailed cross sections. Cross sections in typical wind-erosion/deposition areas allow for a detailed investigation, for instance in terms of snow height, grain ratios, snow age, density or thermal conductivity. This is particularly interesting when considering that the model in its current state does not form dunes on level areas. In addition, considering that ridges are main accumulation zones, the cross sections might show a potential to investigate thermodynamic ice growth in these areas in future work. The located cross sections are shown in Fig. 11 as sections 1–3 (S1–S3)

753

3.4.1 S1

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

S1 is the cross section where the model reproduced erosion and deposition in best agreement with TLS measurements (Fig. 15a). It is noteworthy that this section is characterized first and foremost by the fact that it is aligned approximately 90° to a distinct pressure ridge of about 1 m height. The model reproduces here the snow depth difference very well, and the most pronounced difference is that it computes a sharp accumulation peak on top of the ridge that is not seen in the measurements (Fig. 15a). On the other hand, the model also reproduces the depth decrease at approximately 10 m distance.




Figure 15. Cross section plots related to cross section 1 (S1) of the reference simulation (R), as shown in Fig. 11, of a) snow depth difference (4 Feb – 25 Jan) of the model output and TLS, b) snow age, c) snow density and d) thermal conductivity of snow.

761 Fig. 15d shows that most of the snow has been accumulated in approximately the
 762 last three days in the model run, which corresponds to the time period 1 – 4 Feb.
 763 For the same period, the highest densities of deposited snow are computed (Fig. 15c).

764 Detailed computed thermal conductivities (Fig. 15d) show the potential of the model.
 765 The modeled values of the deposited snow on top are probably too low here, as Macfarlane
 766 et al. (2023) found an time- and spatial average K_{eff} of $0.25 \pm 0.05 \text{ W K}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}$ for MO-
 767 SAiC. Reasons for the low modeled K_{eff} are not known at this time, and need to be re-
 768 searched further. Macfarlane et al. (2023) also state that the thermal conductivity of snow
 769 around ridges does not significantly differ from snow on level areas, however, they found
 770 that the thermal resistance instead was about 3 times higher on ridges areas and they
 771 conclude that therefore ridges should be separately considered for modeling. This find-
 772 ing and the ability of our model to represent the thermal properties of snow in spatial
 773 detail reinforces our approach.

774 The detailed cross section 2 is shown in Fig. 16. While on the ridged area right to
 775 the highest point of the ridge at approximately 18 cm distance, the model accumulates
 776 too much snow, the snow height is accurately modeled left of the ridge peak (Fig. 16a).




Figure 16. As in Fig. 15, but for cross section S2 as shown in Fig. 11.

777 The colours in the snow age (Fig. 16a) indicate, that most of the deposition occurred
 778 during one event. In the large accumulation between around 17 and 20 m distance, a strong
 779 spatial variability in density is observed (Fig. 16c), clearly showing the increased density
 780 of the freshly deposited snow. K_{eff} (Fig. 16d) again shows quite low values which
 781 need to be investigated. The large snow accumulation highlights why the thermal resistance
 782 can be large around ridges (Macfarlane et al., 2023).

783 In cross section 3, we wanted to investigate the highly variable accumulation in form
 784 of waves that was observed (Fig. 11b,d). The spatial variability of the measurement is
 785 seen in Fig. 17a. The model does not model these highly accurately, however, it appears
 786 like there is a correlation, and that mainly the phase is shifted, especially for the first
 787 10 m. Generally, the model reproduces here the differences well. Fig. 17b reveals that
 788 the snow accumulation occurred much more homogeneously compared to cross section
 789 1 and 2. This shows that a flat surface tends to lead to more homogeneous accumulation,
 790 contrary to ridged areas.




Figure 17. As in Fig. 15, but for cross section S3 as shown in Fig. 11.

791 The density (Fig. 17c) and thermal conductivity (Fig. 17d) reveal not many large
 792 conspicuities compared to cross section 1 and cross section 2.

793 4 Conclusions and Outlook

794 We applied the 3D-snow cover-atmosphere model ALPINE3D with the drifting snow
 795 module to Arctic sea ice for the first time, for an area of 100 x 100 m. The fitted model
 796 simulated a 10-day simulation period in which the model would be fed by measurement
 797 data collected during the winter of the Multidisciplinary drifting Observatory for the Study
 798 of Arctic Climate expedition (MOSAiC). A digital elevation model (DEM) was used as
 799 the underlying topography, based on terrestrial laser scans (TLS) conducted during the
 800 expedition. As wind field input, we used RANS steady state wind fields computed with
 801 OpenFOAM based on in-situ measurements of wind speed and direction, collected on
 802 a meteorological tower. Other measurement data from and around the tower used to drive
 803 the model were air temperature, relative humidity and incoming longwave radiation. Snow
 804 depth and detailed snow density measurements were used to initialise and evaluate the
 805 model. For comparison of the modelled mass fluxes, horizontal mass fluxes derived from
 806 a Snow Particle Counter (SPC) measurement at the meteorological tower were used. Af-
 807 ter calibration, we conducted a sensitivity study, with respect to an increased fluid thresh-
 808 old. In addition, we made comparisons with 1-D SNOWPACK simulations. A detailed

809 study of spatio-temporal snow-redistribution and surface snow densification has been con-
810 ducted. Finally, detailed snow profiles along three selected cross sections in the domain
811 were investigated.

812 The model shows a very good timing for snow transport compared to measurements
813 and estimates relative mass fluxes well with high correlation of $r = 0.92$. The histograms
814 of the snow depth differences do not deviate largely from the measurements, but when
815 using an increased fluid threshold, the compression of the distribution gets significantly
816 decreased - which is due to a reduced wind-induced transport of snow. When looking
817 at the spatial correlation in the form of a semi-variogram, it is noticeable that generally
818 the modeled semi-variance is significantly higher than the measured - however, the range
819 of 6 m is about the same for both the model and the measurements. Interestingly, Liston
820 et al. (2018) also found a range of 6 m (for measurements of absolute height), and Sturm
821 et al. (2002) found values at least close to 6 m. The initially strongly increasing semi-
822 variance in the model in the lower range is probably due to the missing generation of dunes,
823 which can be clearly seen in the measurements. Using time series of statistical snow dis-
824 tribution, we were able to visualize the wind-induced redistribution of snow. These show
825 that significantly less snow redistribution occurs when the fluid threshold is increased.
826 While in the reference simulation redistribution occurs almost continuously, in the com-
827 parison scenario redistribution can essentially be reduced to the four events that stand
828 out clearly from the measurements. The qualitative comparisons between model and mea-
829 surements show that dunes are hardly formed in the model, which is probably due to a
830 missing dynamic mesh in the model, as the near-surface wind field does not adapt to the
831 freshly deposited snow from the previous period. However, there are some areas where
832 the model reproduces the accumulation excellently, and even if on a very small scale matches
833 do not necessarily prevail, the model calculates large amounts of snow - as in the mea-
834 surements - in the ridged areas. Erosion occurs in the model, but is generally underes-
835 timated compared to the measurements.

836 The time course of the spatially averaged surface density of the upper 5 cm shows
837 that wind slab formed, with a value of 269 kg m^{-3} on 16 Jan, 280 kg m^{-3} on 30 Jan, and
838 307.8 kg m^{-3} on 6 Feb, becoming increasingly stronger. The averaged density over the
839 entire profile, unlike the surface density, shows a decrease at 30 Jan, while it increases
840 again at 6 Feb. The reason is probably that as erosion increased, the density fraction of
841 layers below, consisting mostly of depth hoar or faceted grains, increased relatively within
842 the mean. The averaged surface density in the model is excellently reproduced at 30 Jan,
843 but at 6 Feb it is underestimated by 26 kg in the reference and by 22 kg in the compar-
844 ison, although both modeled means are still within the standard deviation of the mea-
845 surements. SNOWPACK, on the other hand, models a too low density at 30 Jan (referen-
846 underestimated by 15 kg; comparison underestimated by 13 kg), while it is closer to the
847 measurements, at least with α of 3.0 at 6 Feb (reference underestimated by 8 kg; com-
848 parison underestimated by 28 kg). The temporal variation of the density is significantly
849 higher for ALPINE3D than for SNOWPACK, which is especially the case for the refer-
850 ence. The strong decreases in densities at times are rather unrealistic and due to the
851 fact that in the current settings the model erodes too easily at low fluid threshold, and
852 then calculates too low densities with the given density parameterization for just deposited
853 snow, which corresponds to a decrease in density on average. Overall, the differences be-
854 tween the two ALPINE3D setups are smaller than between the two SNOWPACK setups,
855 leading us to conclude that using an ALPINE3D drifting snow setup reduces the like-
856 lihood of being wrong with an adjusted fluid threshold.

857 The cross sections reveal details of deposition and erosion, both in terms of height
858 differences between model and simulation, as well as spatially high-resolution parame-
859 ters, such as age of the deposited snow, density, or thermal conductivity. For the selected
860 cross sections 1-3, the model simulates the snow depth differences extremely well for the
861 most part, especially for cross section 1. However, the visible correlations in cross sec-

tions 2 and 3, as well as the accurately calculated snow depth difference left of the ridge cross section 2 are also remarkable. The observed waves in cross section 3 are not clearly reproduced, but it is apparently phase-shifted at a similar wave-length. The snow age in the cross sections allows to investigate when the snow has settled. The density in the cross sections reveal stronger spatial variations for the snow that has accumulated over time. The plots of the effective thermal conductivity show - even if the conductivity of the freshly deposited snow appears too high (under the assumption of drifting snow) - how the effects of the snow cover on sea ice growth in ridged areas could be investigated.

Our adjusted ALPINE3D setup using the snowdrift routine with RANS wind fields and a high resolution sea ice topography, allows for detailed investigation of the Arctic snow cover. For the first time, snow redistribution on sea ice is modelled in dependence of temporally varying detailed snow properties. This approach could be particularly relevant for modeling during highly variable weather, e.g., storms or warm air intrusions (Liston et al., 2007), because it then causes the microstructure of the snow surface to change significantly with time due to sintering. An Arctic undergoing major climatic changes with increasing temperatures increases this demand. We see several applications as well as further developments in the future. A combination of our setup with the sea ice variant of ALPINE3D (Wever et al., 2020, 2021) could allow a detailed study of the spatial variability of the thermodynamically driven growth and melt of sea ice. By studying our cross sections, we have already shown an approach to conduct this, e.g., it would be possible to study the effect of the effective thermal conductivity of snow on the ice growth on and around pressure ridges. Furthermore, we believe that a dynamic mesh would again greatly improve the model, allowing for dune formation. In combination with the general approach to study sea ice mass balances, this would be of great relevance e.g. for the formation of melt ponds (Petrich et al., 2012; Lecomte et al., 2015). However, dunes could also be generated, for example, within a sub-model using a cellular automaton (Sharma et al., 2019).

5 Open Research

A3D and SNOWPACK Setup data (include OpenFOAM generated wind fields) are available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7723224> (Wagner & Lehning, 2023). TLS point clouds can be obtained from <https://arcticdata.io/data/10.18739/A26688K9D/> (Clemens-Sewall et al., 2023). The flux tower wind measurements can be downloaded from ftp://ftp2.psl.noaa.gov/Projects/MOSAIc/tower/3_level_archive/level3.4/ (Cox et al., 2023). KAZR data can be obtained from the ARM data center: <https://doi.org/10.5439/1498936> (Lindenmaier et al., 2020). All SMP profiles are available on <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.935554> (Macfarlane et al., 2021). Transect Magnaprobe snow depths can be downloaded from <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.937781> (Itkin et al., 2021). SWE derived from Transect and SMP can be downloaded under <https://doi.pangaea.de/10.1594/PANGAEA.927460> (Wagner et al., 2021). Preliminary SPC data can be obtained from <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7715728> (Wagner & Frey, 2023). Source code for the adjusted ALPINE3D model can be obtained from <https://gitlabext.wsl.ch/snow-models/alpine3d.git> under the "alpine3d_mosaic" branch. Source code for the adjusted SNOWPACK model can be obtained from <https://gitlabext.wsl.ch/snow-models/snowpack.git> under the "snowpack_mosaic" branch. The source code for OpenFOAM® v2106 can be downloaded from <https://develop.openfoam.com/Development/openfoam.git>.

Acknowledgments

David N. Wagner and Michael Lehning were supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant no. SNSF-200020_179130). Martin Schneebeli, Amy R. Macfarlane and David N. Wagner were supported by the Swiss Polar Institute (grant no. DIRCR-2018-003). Martin Schneebeli and Amy R. Macfarlane were supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program projects ARICE (grant no. 730965) for berth fees associated with the participation of the DEARice project and the WSL

913 Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research SLF (grant no. WSL_201812N1678). David
 914 Clemens-Sewall was supported by NSF OPP-1724540. Matthew D. Shupe was supported
 915 by the DOE Atmospheric System Research Program (grant nos. DE-SC0019251 and DE-
 916 SC0021341). Data used in this paper were produced as part of the international Mul-
 917 tidisciplinary drifting Observatory for the Study of the Arctic Climate (MOSAiC) with
 918 the tag MOSAIC20192020 and the project ID: AWI_PS122.00. Met tower data were sup-
 919 ported by the National Science Foundation (grant no. OPP-1724551) and by NOAA’s
 920 Physical Sciences Laboratory (PSL) and Global Ocean Monitoring and Observing Pro-
 921 gram (GOMO). KAZR reflectivities for precipitation retrieval were obtained from the
 922 Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) user facility, a U.S. Department of Energy
 923 (DOE) Office of Science user facility managed by the Biological and Environmental Re-
 924 search Program. The authors thank all MOSAiC participants for contributing to the pa-
 925 per in one way or another: the MOSAiC logistics team, the ship’s personnel, all the dif-
 926 ferent team members (ICE, ATMOS, BGC, ECO, OCEAN), the ARM crew, the project
 927 coordination and the MOSAiC project board. We also refer to the extended acknowl-
 928 edgement for MOSAiC (Nixdorf et al., 2021). We thank Daniel Kückenbrink for the help-
 929 ful information on proper point cloud processing with open source software.

930 References

- 931 Bagnold, R. A. (1941). *The physics of blown sand and desert dunes / by r.a. bagnold*
 932 [Book]. William Morrow New York.
- 933 Bartelt, P., & Lehning, M. (2002). A physical SNOWPACK model for the Swiss
 934 avalanche warning Part I: numerical model. *Cold Regions Science and Technol-*
 935 *ogy*, *35*(3), 123–145. doi: 10.1016/s0165-232x(02)00074-5
- 936 Blackford, J. R. (2007, oct). Sintering and microstructure of ice: a review. *Journal*
 937 *of Physics D: Applied Physics*, *40*(21), R355–R385. Retrieved from [https://](https://doi.org/10.1088%2F0022-3727%2F40%2F21%2Fr02)
 938 doi.org/10.1088%2F0022-3727%2F40%2F21%2Fr02 doi: 10.1088/0022-3727/
 939 40/21/r02
- 940 Clemens-Sewall, D., Polashenski, C., Raphael, I., Perovich, D., Fons, S., Itkin, P., ...
 941 Svavarsdottir, S. (2023). *High-resolution repeat topography of drifting ice floes*
 942 *in the arctic ocean from terrestrial laser scanning collected on the multidisci-*
 943 *plinary drifting observatory for the study of arctic climate expedition*. [Data
 944 set]. (Arctic Data Center.) doi: 10.18739/A26688K9D
- 945 Clifton, A., Rüedi, J.-D., & Lehning, M. (2006). Snow saltation threshold measure-
 946 ments in a drifting-snow wind tunnel. *Journal of Glaciology*, *52*(179), 585–596.
 947 doi: 10.3189/172756506781828430
- 948 CloudCompare. (2023). *Cloudcompare source code*. Retrieved from [https://github](https://github.com/CloudCompare/CloudCompare)
 949 [.com/CloudCompare/CloudCompare](https://github.com/CloudCompare/CloudCompare)
- 950 Colbeck, S. (1998). Sintering in a dry snow cover. *Journal of Applied Physics*,
 951 *84*(8), 4585-4589. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.368684> doi:
 952 10.1063/1.368684
- 953 Colbeck, S., of Engineers, U. S. A. C., Research, C. R., & (U.S.), E. L. (1997). *A re-*
 954 *view of sintering in seasonal snow*. U.S. Army Cold Regions Research and En-
 955 gineering Laboratory. Retrieved from [https://books.google.ch/books?id=](https://books.google.ch/books?id=D_CHKAAACAAJ)
 956 [D_CHKAAACAAJ](https://books.google.ch/books?id=D_CHKAAACAAJ)
- 957 Conrad, O., Bechtel, B., Bock, M., Dietrich, H., Fischer, E., Gerlitz, L., ...
 958 Böhner, J. (2015). System for automated geoscientific analyses (saga)
 959 v. 2.1.4. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *8*(7), 1991–2007. Retrieved
 960 from <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/8/1991/2015/> doi:
 961 10.5194/gmd-8-1991-2015
- 962 Cox, C., Gallagher, M., Shupe, M., Persson, O., Solomon, A., Fairall, C., ... Uttal,
 963 T. (2023). *Continuous observations of the surface energy budget and meteorol-*
 964 *ogy over the arctic sea ice during mosaic*. (Multidisciplinary Drifting Observa-
 965 tory for the Study of Arctic Climate (MOSAiC), central Arctic, October 2019 -

- September 2020. Scientific Data. Submitted.) doi: 10.18739/A2PV6B83F
- 966 D ery, S. J., & Tremblay, L.-B. (2004). Modeling the effects of wind redi-
 967 stribution on the snow mass budget of polar sea ice. *Journal of Physi-*
 968 *cal Oceanography*, *34*(1), 258–271. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(2004)034<0258:MTEOWR>2.0.CO;2)
 969 [10.1175/1520-0485\(2004\)034<0258:MTEOWR>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(2004)034<0258:MTEOWR>2.0.CO;2) doi: 10.1175/
 970 [10.1175/1520-0485\(2004\)034<0258:MTEOWR>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(2004)034<0258:MTEOWR>2.0.CO;2)
 971
- 972 Doorschot, J. J. J., & Lehning, M. (2002). Equilibrium saltation: Mass fluxes, aero-
 973 dynamic entrainment, and dependence on grain properties. *Boundary-Layer*
 974 *Meteorology*, *104*(1), 111–130. doi: 10.1023/a:1015516420286
- 975 Doorschot, J. J. J., Lehning, M., & Vrouwe, A. (2004, Dec 01). Field measure-
 976 ments of snow-drift threshold and mass fluxes, and related model simulations.
 977 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, *113*(3), 347–368. Retrieved from [https://](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-004-8659-z)
 978 doi.org/10.1007/s10546-004-8659-z doi: 10.1007/s10546-004-8659-z
- 979 Fierz, C., Armstrong, R., Durand, Y., Etchevers, P., Greene, E., Mcclung, D., ...
 980 Sokratov, S. (2008, 09). The 2008 international classification of seasonal snow
 981 on the ground. In (p. 579–580).
- 982 Filhol, S., & Sturm, M. (2015). Snow bedforms: A review, new data, and a for-
 983 mation model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *120*(9), 1645-
 984 1669. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2015JF003529)
 985 [10.1002/2015JF003529](https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JF003529) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JF003529>
- 986 Gerber, F., Lehning, M., Hoch, S. W., & Mott, R. (2017). A close-ridge small-scale
 987 atmospheric flow field and its influence on snow accumulation. *Journal of Geo-*
 988 *physical Research: Atmospheres*, *122*(15), 7737–7754. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JD026258)
 989 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JD026258 doi:
 990 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026258>
- 991 Groot Zwaaftink, C. D., Cagnati, A., Crepaz, A., Fierz, C., Macelloni, G., Valt, M.,
 992 & Lehning, M. (2013, 02). Event-driven deposition of snow on the antarctic
 993 plateau: Analyzing field measurements with snowpack. *The Cryosphere*,
 994 *Volume 7, Issue 1, 2013, pp.333-347*, *7*, 333–347. doi: 10.5194/tc-7-333-2013
- 995 Groot Zwaaftink, C. D., Diebold, M., Horender, S., Overney, J., Lieberherr, G.,
 996 Parlange, M. B., & Lehning, M. (2014, Oct 01). Modelling small-scale drift-
 997 ing snow with a lagrangian stochastic model based on large-eddy simulations.
 998 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, *153*(1), 117–139. Retrieved from [https://](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-014-9934-2)
 999 doi.org/10.1007/s10546-014-9934-2 doi: 10.1007/s10546-014-9934-2
- 1000 Hames, O., Jafari, M., Wagner, D. N., Raphael, I., Clemens-Sewall, D., Polashen-
 1001 ski, C., ... Lehning, M. (2022). Modeling the small-scale deposition of
 1002 snow onto structured arctic sea ice during a mosaic storm using snowbed-
 1003 foam 1.0. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *15*(16), 6429–6449. Retrieved
 1004 from <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/15/6429/2022/> doi:
 1005 [10.5194/gmd-15-6429-2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-6429-2022)
- 1006 Itkin, P., Webster, M., Hendricks, S., Oggier, M., Jaggi, M., Ricker, R., ... Liston,
 1007 G. E. (2021). *Magnaprobe snow and melt pond depth measurements from the*
 1008 *2019-2020 mosaic expedition*. (PANGAEA) doi: 10.1594/PANGAEA.937781
- 1009 Juretic, F., Philippose, R., & Clifford, I. (2021). *cfmesh source code*. Retrieved from
 1010 <https://sourceforge.net/p/cfmesh/code/ci/development/tree/>
- 1011 Keenan, E., Wever, N., Dattler, M., Lenaerts, J. T. M., Medley, B.,
 1012 Kuipers Munneke, P., & Reijmer, C. (2021). Physics-based snowpack model
 1013 improves representation of near-surface antarctic snow and firn density. *The*
 1014 *Cryosphere*, *15*(2), 1065–1085. Retrieved from [https://tc.copernicus.org/](https://tc.copernicus.org/articles/15/1065/2021/)
 1015 [articles/15/1065/2021/](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-1065-2021) doi: 10.5194/tc-15-1065-2021
- 1016 King, J., Howell, S., Brady, M., Toose, P., Derksen, C., Haas, C., & Beckers,
 1017 J. (2020). Local-scale variability of snow density on Arctic sea ice. *The*
 1018 *Cryosphere*, *14*(12), 4323–4339. doi: 10.5194/tc-14-4323-2020
- 1019 Lecomte, O., Fichet, T., Flocco, D., Schroeder, D., & Vancoppenolle, M.
 1020 (2015). Interactions between wind-blown snow redistribution and melt

- ponds in a coupled ocean–sea ice model. *Ocean Modelling*, 87, 67–80. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1463500314001784> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2014.12.003>
- Lee, S., Wolberg, G., & Shin, S. (1997). Scattered data interpolation with multilevel b-splines. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 3(3), 228–244. doi: 10.1109/2945.620490
- Lehning, M., Bartelt, P., Brown, B., Fierz, C., & Satyawali, P. (2002). A physical snowpack model for the swiss avalanche warning: Part ii. snow microstructure. *Cold Regions Science and Technology*, 35(3), 147 - 167. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165232X02000733> doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-232X\(02\)00073-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-232X(02)00073-3)
- Lehning, M., Bartelt, P., Brown, B., Russi, T., Stöckli, U., & Zimmerli, M. (1999). snowpack model calculations for avalanche warning based upon a new network of weather and snow stations. *Cold Regions Science and Technology*, 30(1), 145 - 157. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165232X99000221> doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-232X\(99\)00022-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-232X(99)00022-1)
- Lehning, M., Löwe, H., Ryser, M., & Raderschall, N. (2008). Inhomogeneous precipitation distribution and snow transport in steep terrain. *Water Resources Research*, 44(7). Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2007WR006545> doi: 10.1029/2007WR006545
- Lehning, M., Völksch, I., Gustafsson, D., Nguyen, T. A., Stähli, M., & Zappa, M. (2006). Alpine3d: a detailed model of mountain surface processes and its application to snow hydrology. *Hydrological Processes*, 20(10), 2111–2128. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hyp.6204> doi: 10.1002/hyp.6204
- Leonard, K. C., & Maksym, T. (2011). The importance of wind-blown snow redistribution to snow accumulation on bellingshausen sea ice. *Annals of Glaciology*, 52(57), 271–278. doi: 10.3189/172756411795931651
- Li, L., & Pomeroy, J. W. (1997). Estimates of Threshold Wind Speeds for Snow Transport Using Meteorological Data. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 36(3), 205–213. doi: 10.1175/1520-0450(1997)036<0205:eotwsf>2.0.co;2
- Lindenmaier, I., Nelson, D., Isom, B., Hardin, J., Matthews, A., Wendler, T., & Castro, V. (2020). *Ka arm zenith radar (kazrcfrge)*. (Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) user facility.) doi: 10.5439/1498936
- Liston, G. E., & Elder, K. (2006a). A distributed snow-evolution modeling system (snowmodel). *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 7(6), 1259–1276. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM548.1> doi: 10.1175/JHM548.1
- Liston, G. E., & Elder, K. (2006b). A Meteorological Distribution System for High-Resolution Terrestrial Modeling (MicroMet). *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 7(2), 217–234. doi: 10.1175/jhm486.1
- Liston, G. E., Haehnel, R. B., Sturm, M., Hiemstra, C. A., Berezovskaya, S., & Tabler, R. D. (2007). Simulating complex snow distributions in windy environments using snowtran-3d. *Journal of Glaciology*, 53(181), 241–256. doi: 10.3189/172756507782202865
- Liston, G. E., Itkin, P., Stroeve, J., Tschudi, M., Stewart, J. S., Pedersen, S. H., ... Elder, K. (2020). A lagrangian snow-evolution system for sea-ice applications (snowmodel-lg): Part i—model description. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 125(10), e2019JC015913. Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JC015913> (e2019JC015913 2019JC015913) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015913>
- Liston, G. E., Polashenski, C., Rösel, A., Itkin, P., King, J., Merkouriadi, I., & Haapala, J. (2018). A distributed snow-evolution model for sea-ice applications (snowmodel). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 123(5), 3786–3810. Retrieved from <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/>

- 1076 10.1002/2017JC013706 doi: 10.1002/2017JC013706
- 1077 Liston, G. E., & Sturm, M. (1998). A snow-transport model for complex terrain.
1078 *Journal of Glaciology*, 44(148), 498–516. doi: 10.3189/S002214300002021
- 1079 Macfarlane, A. R., Löwe, H., Gimenes, L., Wagner, D. N., Dadic, R., Ottersberg,
1080 R., ... Schneebeli, M. (2023). Thermal conductivity of snow on arctic sea
1081 ice. *EGUsphere*, 2023, 1–22. Retrieved from [https://egusphere.copernicus](https://egusphere.copernicus.org/preprints/egusphere-2023-83/)
1082 [.org/preprints/egusphere-2023-83/](https://egusphere.copernicus.org/preprints/egusphere-2023-83/) doi: 10.5194/egusphere-2023-83
- 1083 Macfarlane, A. R., Schneebeli, M., Dadic, R., Wagner, D. N., Arndt, S., Clemens-
1084 Sewall, D., ... Tavri, A. (2021). Snowpit SnowMicroPen (SMP) force
1085 profiles collected during the MOSAiC expedition [data set]. PANGAEA.
1086 Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.935554> (In: Mac-
1087 farlane, AR et al. (2021): Snowpit raw data collected during the MOSAiC
1088 expedition. PANGAEA, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.935934>) doi:
1089 10.1594/PANGAEA.935554
- 1090 Mälicke, M. (2022). Scikit-gstat 1.0: a scipy-flavored geostatistical variogram esti-
1091 mation toolbox written in python. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 15(6),
1092 2505–2532. Retrieved from [https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/15/](https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/15/2505/2022/)
1093 [2505/2022/](https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/15/2505/2022/) doi: 10.5194/gmd-15-2505-2022
- 1094 Matheron, G. (1963, 12). Principles of geostatistics. *Economic Geology*, 58(8), 1246-
1095 1266. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsecongeo.58.8.1246> doi:
1096 10.2113/gsecongeo.58.8.1246
- 1097 Matrosov, S. Y. (2007). Modeling Backscatter Properties of Snowfall at Millimeter
1098 Wavelengths. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 64(5), 1727–1736. doi: 10
1099 .1175/jas3904.1
- 1100 Matrosov, S. Y., Shupe, M. D., & Djalalova, I. V. (2008). Snowfall Retrievals Using
1101 Millimeter-Wavelength Cloud Radars. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Cli-*
1102 *matology*, 47(3), 769–777. doi: 10.1175/2007jamc1768.1
- 1103 Matrosov, S. Y., Shupe, M. D., & Uttal, T. (2022, 04). High temporal resolution
1104 estimates of Arctic snowfall rates emphasizing gauge and radar-based retrievals
1105 from the MOSAiC expedition. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene*, 10(1).
1106 Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2021.00101> (00101)
1107 doi: 10.1525/elementa.2021.00101
- 1108 Melo, D. B., Sharma, V., Comola, F., Sigmund, A., & Lehning, M. (2021). Modeling
1109 snow saltation: the effect of grain size and interparticle cohesion. *Earth and*
1110 *Space Science Open Archive*, 29. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1002/](https://doi.org/10.1002/essoar.10507087.1)
1111 [essoar.10507087.1](https://doi.org/10.1002/essoar.10507087.1) doi: 10.1002/essoar.10507087.1
- 1112 Merkouridi, I., Gallet, J.-C., Graham, R. M., Liston, G. E., Polashenski, C., Rösel,
1113 A., & Gerland, S. (2017). Winter snow conditions on arctic sea ice north of
1114 svalbard during the norwegian young sea ice (n-ice2015) expedition. *Journal*
1115 *of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122(20), 10,837–10,854. Retrieved
1116 from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JD026753)
1117 [2017JD026753](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JD026753) doi: 10.1002/2017JD026753
- 1118 Mott, R., Schirmer, M., Bavay, M., Grünewald, T., & Lehning, M. (2010). Un-
1119 derstanding snow-transport processes shaping the mountain snow-cover. *The*
1120 *Cryosphere*, 4(4), 545–559. Retrieved from [https://www.the-cryosphere](https://www.the-cryosphere.net/4/545/2010/)
1121 [.net/4/545/2010/](https://www.the-cryosphere.net/4/545/2010/) doi: 10.5194/tc-4-545-2010
- 1122 Nandan, V., Willatt, R., Mallett, R., Stroeve, J., Geldsetzer, T., Scharien, R., ...
1123 Hoppman, M. (2022). Wind transport of snow impacts ka- and ku-band radar
1124 signatures on arctic sea ice. *The Cryosphere Discussions*, 2022, 1–38. Re-
1125 trieved from <https://tc.copernicus.org/preprints/tc-2022-116/> doi:
1126 10.5194/tc-2022-116
- 1127 Nicolaus, M., Haas, C., Bareiss, J., & Willmes, S. (2006). A model study
1128 of differences of snow thinning on arctic and antarctic first-year sea ice
1129 during spring and summer. *Annals of Glaciology*, 44, 147–153. doi:
1130 10.3189/172756406781811312

- 1131 Nicolaus, M., Perovich, D., Spreen, G., Granskog, M., Albedyll, L., Angelopou-
 1132 los, M., . . . Wendisch, M. (2021). Overview of the mosaic expedition
 1133 - snow and sea ice. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene*, 9. Re-
 1134 trieved from <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2021.000046> doi:
 1135 10.1525/elementa.2021.000046
- 1136 Nixdorf, U., Dethloff, K., Rex, M., Shupe, M., Sommerfeld, A., Perovich, D. K., . . .
 1137 Boetius, A. (2021, September). *Mosaic extended acknowledgement*. Zen-
 1138 odo. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5541624> doi:
 1139 10.5281/zenodo.5541624
- 1140 Persson, P. O. G. (2012). Onset and end of the summer melt season over sea ice:
 1141 thermal structure and surface energy perspective from SHEBA. *Climate Dy-*
 1142 *namics*, 39(6), 1349–1371. doi: 10.1007/s00382-011-1196-9
- 1143 Persson, P. O. G., Shupe, M. D., Perovich, D., & Solomon, A. (2017). Linking at-
 1144 mospheric synoptic transport, cloud phase, surface energy fluxes, and sea-ice
 1145 growth: observations of midwinter SHEBA conditions. *Climate Dynamics*,
 1146 49(4), 1341–1364. doi: 10.1007/s00382-016-3383-1
- 1147 Petrich, C., Eicken, H., Polashenski, C. M., Sturm, M., Harbeck, J. P., Perovich,
 1148 D. K., & Finnegan, D. C. (2012). Snow dunes: A controlling factor of melt
 1149 pond distribution on arctic sea ice. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*,
 1150 117(C9). Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2012JC008192)
 1151 [abs/10.1029/2012JC008192](https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JC008192) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JC008192>
- 1152 Pomeroy, J. W., & Gray, D. M. (1990). Saltation of snow. *Water Resources Re-*
 1153 *search*, 26(7), 1583-1594. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/WR026i007p01583)
 1154 [.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/WR026i007p01583](https://doi.org/10.1029/WR026i007p01583) doi: [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1029/WR026i007p01583)
 1155 [10.1029/WR026i007p01583](https://doi.org/10.1029/WR026i007p01583)
- 1156 Schlögl, S., Marty, C., Bavay, M., & Lehning, M. (2016). Sensitivity of alpine3d
 1157 modeled snow cover to modifications in dem resolution, station coverage and
 1158 meteorological input quantities. *Environmental Modelling Software*, 83, 387-
 1159 396. Retrieved from [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364815216300378)
 1160 [pii/S1364815216300378](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.02.017) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.02.017>
- 1161 Schmidt, J. (2014). *terrainblockmesher*. GitHub. Retrieved from [https://](https://github.com/jonasIWES/terrainBlockMesher)
 1162 github.com/jonasIWES/terrainBlockMesher (IWESOL - IWES Open Li-
 1163 brary, Fraunhofer IWES, Oldenburg, Germany)
- 1164 Schmidt, R. A. (1980). Threshold wind-speeds and elastic impact in snow transport.
 1165 *Journal of Glaciology*, 26(94), 453–467. doi: 10.3189/S0022143000010972
- 1166 Schneebeli, M., & Johnson, J. B. (1998). A constant-speed penetrometer for high-
 1167 resolution snow stratigraphy. *Annals of Glaciology*, 26, 107–111. doi: 10.3189/
 1168 1998AoG26-1-107-111
- 1169 Selige, T., Böhner, J., & Ringeler, A. (2006, 01). Processing of srtm x-sar data to
 1170 correct interferometric elevation models for land surface applications. *Göttinger*
 1171 *Geographische Abhandlungen*, 115.
- 1172 Sharma, V., Braud, L., & Lehning, M. (2019). Understanding snow bedform for-
 1173 mation by adding sintering to a cellular automata model. *The Cryosphere*,
 1174 13(12), 3239–3260. Retrieved from [https://www.the-cryosphere.net/13/](https://www.the-cryosphere.net/13/3239/2019/)
 1175 [3239/2019/](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-13-3239-2019) doi: 10.5194/tc-13-3239-2019
- 1176 Shupe, M., Chu, D., Costa, D., Cox, C., Creamean, J., de Boer, G., . . . Wagner, D.
 1177 (2021, 6). Multidisciplinary drifting observatory for the study of arctic climate
 1178 (mosaic) (field campaign report). Retrieved from [https://www.osti.gov/](https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1787856)
 1179 [biblio/1787856](https://doi.org/10.2172/1787856) doi: 10.2172/1787856
- 1180 Shupe, M., Rex, M., Blomquist, B., Persson, P., Schmale, J., Uttal, T., . . . Yue, F.
 1181 (2022). Overview of the mosaic expedition—atmosphere. *Elementa: Science of*
 1182 *the Anthropocene*, 10(1). doi: 10.1525/elementa.2021.000060
- 1183 Steger, C. R., Reijmer, C. H., van den Broeke, M. R., Wever, N., Forster, R. R.,
 1184 Koenig, L. S., . . . Noël, B. P. Y. (2017). Firn meltwater retention on the
 1185 greenland ice sheet: A model comparison. *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 5,

- 1186 3. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/feart.2017.00003> doi: 10.3389/feart.2017.00003
- 1187
- 1188 Sturm, M., & Holmgren, J. (2018). An Automatic Snow Depth Probe for Field Val-
1189 idation Campaigns. *Water Resources Research*, 54(11), 9695–9701. doi: 10
1190 .1029/2018wr023559
- 1191 Sturm, M., Holmgren, J., & Perovich, D. K. (2002). Winter snow cover on the
1192 sea ice of the arctic ocean at the surface heat budget of the arctic ocean
1193 (sheba): Temporal evolution and spatial variability. *Journal of Geophysical*
1194 *Research: Oceans*, 107(C10), SHE 23-1-SHE 23-17. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2000JC000400)
1195 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2000JC000400 doi:
1196 10.1029/2000JC000400
- 1197 Sturm, M., & Massom, R. A. (2016). Snow in the sea ice system: friend or foe?
1198 In *Sea ice* (p. 65-109). John Wiley and Sons, Ltd. Retrieved from [https://](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118778371.ch3)
1199 onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118778371.ch3 doi: 10
1200 .1002/9781118778371.ch3
- 1201 Sullivan, C. B., & Kaszynski, A. (2019, May). PyVista: 3D plotting and mesh anal-
1202 ysis through a streamlined interface for the Visualization Toolkit (VTK). *Jour-*
1203 *nal of Open Source Software*, 4(37), 1450. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01450)
1204 [10.21105/joss.01450](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01450) doi: 10.21105/joss.01450
- 1205 Vosselman, G. (2000, 01). Slope based filtering of laser altimetry data. *IAPRS*,
1206 *XXXIII*.
- 1207 Wagner, D. N., & Frey, M. M. (2023, March). *Preliminary data of drifting snow*
1208 *mass flux from the lower SPC at MOSAiC (2020-01-26 to 2020-02-04) for the*
1209 *submitted paper "Towards a fully physical representation of snow on Arctic sea*
1210 *ice using a 3D snow-atmosphere model"* [dataset]. Zenodo. Retrieved from
1211 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7715728> doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7715728
- 1212 Wagner, D. N., Jaggi, M., Macfarlane, A. R., Arndt, S., Krampe, D., Regnery, J., ...
1213 Schneebeli, M. (2021). *Snow water equivalent retrievals from snowmicropen*
1214 *data from mosaic leg 1 - leg 3*. (PANGAEA) doi: 10.1594/PANGAEA.927460
- 1215 Wagner, D. N., & Lehning, M. (2023, March). *Preliminary DOI/Repository of*
1216 *ALPINE3D and SNOWPACK data of the submitted paper "Towards a fully*
1217 *physical representation of snow on Arctic sea ice using a 3D snow-atmosphere*
1218 *model"* [dataset]. Zenodo. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.5281/](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7723224)
1219 [zenodo.7723224](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7723224) doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7723224
- 1220 Wagner, D. N., Shupe, M. D., Cox, C., Persson, O. G., Uttal, T., Frey, M. M.,
1221 ... Lehning, M. (2022). Snowfall and snow accumulation during the mo-
1222 saic winter and spring seasons. *The Cryosphere*, 16(6), 2373–2402. Re-
1223 trieved from <https://tc.copernicus.org/articles/16/2373/2022/> doi:
1224 10.5194/tc-16-2373-2022
- 1225 Webster, M. A., Rigor, I. G., Nghiem, S. V., Kurtz, N. T., Farrell, S. L., Perovich,
1226 D. K., & Sturm, M. (2014). Interdecadal changes in snow depth on arctic
1227 sea ice. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119(8), 5395–5406.
1228 Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014JC009985)
1229 [10.1002/2014JC009985](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014JC009985) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JC009985>
- 1230 Weiss, A. I., King, J., Lachlan-Cope, T., & Ladkin, R. (2011). On the effective
1231 aerodynamic and scalar roughness length of weddell sea ice. *Journal of Geo-*
1232 *physical Research: Atmospheres*, 116(D19). Retrieved from [https://agupubs](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2011JD015949)
1233 [.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2011JD015949](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2011JD015949) doi: 10.1029/
1234 2011JD015949
- 1235 Weller, H. G., Tabor, G., Jasak, H., & Fureby, C. (1998). A tensorial approach to
1236 computational continuum mechanics using object-oriented techniques. *Comput-*
1237 *ers in Physics*, 12(6), 620. doi: 10.1063/1.168744
- 1238 Wever, N., Leonard, K., Maksym, T., White, S., Proksch, M., & Lenaerts, J. T. M.
1239 (2021). Spatially distributed simulations of the effect of snow on mass balance
1240 and flooding of antarctic sea ice. *Journal of Glaciology*, 67(266), 1055–1073.

- 1241 doi: 10.1017/jog.2021.54
1242 Wever, N., Rossmann, L., Maaß, N., Leonard, K. C., Kaleschke, L., Nicolaus, M.,
1243 & Lehning, M. (2020). Version 1 of a sea ice module for the physics-based,
1244 detailed, multi-layer snowpack model. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13(1),
1245 99–119. Retrieved from <https://www.geosci-model-dev.net/13/99/2020/>
1246 doi: 10.5194/gmd-13-99-2020
1247 Widener, K., Bharadwaj, N., & Johnson, K. (2012). *Ka-Band ARM Zenith Radar*
1248 *(KAZR) Handbook*. (Tech. Rep.). (ARM user facility. DOE/SC-ARM/TR-
1249 106.)
1250 Zhang, W., Qi, J., Wan, P., Wang, H., Xie, D., Wang, X., & Yan, G. (2016). An
1251 easy-to-use airborne lidar data filtering method based on cloth simulation. *Re-*
1252 *mote Sensing*, 8(6). Retrieved from [https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/8/6/](https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/8/6/501)
1253 501 doi: 10.3390/rs8060501