



Spatial distribution and scaling properties of lidar-derived snow depth in the extratropical Andes

Pablo A. Mendoza, Thomas E. Shaw, Miguel A. Lagos, Keith N. Musselman, Jesús Revuelto, Shelley MacDonell & James McPhee



EGU General Assembly May 7, 2020

1. Motivation

Understanding snow distribution patterns can help to improve hydrological predictability



Newman et al. 2014 (JHM)

1. Motivation

- In the semi arid extratropical Andes, spring snowmelt runoff that accounts for more than 60 % of the total annual streamflow.
- The characterization of spatial variability in snow depth and SWE has been historically challenged by data limitations.
- Past studies describing the spatial variability of snow are based on scales >60 m.
- Emergence of lidar technology in Cryosphere studies, including the Andes (Shaw et al., 2020).

Key questions:

- How is the spatial distribution of snow depth at the hillslope scale (1-100 m) along the extra-tropical Andes?
- 2. How is the snow depth scaling behavior in the Andes, and how does it compare with other regions in the world?





- □ The three sites span a north-south hydroclimatic gradient, and high inter-annual variability in precipitation.
- □ VH west has some shrurbs and trees.

2. Study domain & data

Terrestrial LiDAR



SNOW 2

SNOW 1

REFERENCE

scanner – 3B laser class

Las Bayas experimental catchment

Diff ≈ 0

2. Study domain & data



3. Methods

1. Statistical distribution

- Snow depth statistics per elevation band.
- Probability distributions fit.
- 2. Variogram analysis

Semi-variance:

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

D

If the variable shows self-similar behavior:

$$\gamma(h) = \alpha h^{\beta}$$

Fractal dimension:

$$D_{S,L} = 3 - \frac{\rho_{1,2}}{2}$$

Mark and Aronson (1984)

3. Snow depth transects

• Examine potential relationship between *d* and scale break lengths *L*.



L is the scale break length Relevant for model scale selection



4. Results

(a) Tascadero 3.0 Sep 04, 2018 2.5 2.0 depth (m) 1.5 1.0 5 0 5 2.5 0.5 0.0 400 200 3675 3575 3375 3425 3475 3525 3625 Elevation (m a.s.l.) (b) Las Bayas 5 Aug 09, 2018 Snow depth (m) 4 m 3 76543210 2 1 0 3550 3850 3950 4050 3450 3650 3750 200 400 0 Elevation (m a.s.l.) (c) VH west 2.0 Snow depth (E) 1 Oct 25, 2018 0.5 1650 1675 1700 1725 1750 1775 1800 1825 1850 Elevation (m a.s.l.) (d) VH east 3.0 Oct 25, 2018 Snow depth (m) 2.5 2.0 1.5 1.0 0.5 0.0 2000 2050 2100 2150 2200 2250 2300 2350 400 200 Elevation (m a.s.l.)

Spatial distribution for the entire domain and per elevation bands

Probabilistic distribution

4. Results



Gamma distributions are preferred over lognormal distributions.

Variogram analysis

4. Results

- Scale breaks span 15-20 m in unvegetated areas.
- Shorter scale breaks are found in VH west.
- Multiscale behavior is found in all sites.

- Fractal behavior in bare earth topography up to 200-300 m.
- No direct links between spatial structure of topography and snow depth are found at the hillslope scale.



Snow depth transects

4. Results



Primary scale break lengths are of the same order of magnitude than mean 'd' values.

5. Summary

- We present, for the first time, a characterization of snow depth patterns at the hillslope scale in the extratropical Andes using lidar measurements.
- Our results suggest multiscaling behavior of snow depth along the extratropical Andes, and primary scale breaks of the same order than other mountain regions in the world (e.g., Colorado Rockies, Pyrenees, Swiss Alps).
- <u>Other findings</u>:
 - Gamma distributions are better than lognormal function to characterize probability of snow depth.
 - Links between scaling patterns of bare earth topography and snow depth are not evident in the domains analyzed.
 - Transect analyses suggest that primary scale break lengths are related with horizontal distances between local maxima in show depth fields.

Thank you!



Fig. from Thomas Shaw