

Yukon River streamflow response to seasonal snow cover changes

Daqing Yang,^{1*} Yuanyuan Zhao,¹ Richard Armstrong² and David Robinson³

¹ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Water and Environmental Research Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK 99775, USA

² National Snow and Ice Data Center, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0449, USA

³ Department of Geography, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8054, USA

Abstract:

We used remotely sensed weekly snow water equivalent (SWE) and snow cover extent (SCE) data to investigate streamflow response to seasonal snowcover change over the Yukon watershed. We quantified the seasonal cycles and variations of snowcover (both SWE and SCE) and river streamflow, and identified a clear correspondence of river discharge to seasonal snowcover change. We also examined and compared the weekly mean streamflow with the weekly basin SWE and SCE. The results revealed a strong relation between the streamflow and snowcover change during the spring melt season. This relationship provides a practical procedure of using remotely sensed snowcover information for snowmelt runoff estimation over the large northern watersheds. Analyses of extreme (high/low) streamflow cases (years) and basin snowcover conditions indicate an association of high (low) flood peak with high (low) maximum SWE. Comparative analyses of weekly basin SWE versus SCE, peak snowmelt floods, and climatic variables (temperature and winter precipitation) indicate consistency among basin SWE, SCE, and temperature, but there is some incompatibility between basin SWE and winter precipitation. The inconsistency suggests uncertainties in determination of basin winter snowfall amounts and limitations in applications of the SWE retrieval algorithm over large watersheds/regions with different physical characteristics. Overall, the results of this study demonstrate that the weekly SWE and SCE data/products derived from remote sensing technology are useful in understanding seasonal streamflow changes in the northern regions. Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

KEY WORDS runoff and streamflow; snow and ice; remote sensing

Received 4 June 2008; Accepted 14 October 2008

INTRODUCTION

River discharge is a major element of freshwater budget for the Arctic Ocean and the high-latitude seas. The amount and variation of this freshwater inflow critically affect the salinity and sea ice formation, and may also exert significant control over global ocean circulation (Aagaard and Carmack, 1989). Northern hydrologic systems exhibit large temporal variability (Grabs *et al.*, 2000; Prowse and Flegg, 2000; Shiklomanov *et al.*, 2000) because of large-scale changes in atmospheric circulation (Proshutinsky *et al.*, 1999; Semiletov *et al.*, 2000; Walsh, 2000). This variation significantly influences the cross-shelf movement of water, nutrients and sediments. Examination of streamflow changes in the large northern river basins and their relations to surface climate and atmosphere is critical to better understand and quantify the atmosphere–land–ocean interactions in the Polar Regions and their consequent global impacts.

Snow cover is a main component of global cryosphere system. Snow cover significantly affects atmosphere, hydrology, permafrost, and ecosystem in the high-latitude

regions. Snowcover melt and associated floods are the most important hydrologic event of the year in the northern river basins (Kane, 1997; Woo, 1986; Kane *et al.*, 2000). Recent investigations document the shrinking of the cryosphere, particularly in the Polar Regions (Ye *et al.*, 1998; Serreze *et al.*, 2000). For instance, snowmelt has started earlier over the recent decades in the northern regions, such as Canada, Alaska, and Siberia, associated with warming in winter and spring seasons (Brabets *et al.*, 2000; Serreze *et al.*, 2000; Whitfield and Cannon, 2000; Lammers *et al.*, 2001; Zhang *et al.*, 2001; Yang *et al.*, 2002; Ye *et al.*, 2003). Studies demonstrate that the timing and magnitude of northern river streamflow are strongly allied with cold season snowcover storage and subsequent melt (Rango, 1997; Cao *et al.*, 2002; Yang *et al.*, 2003, 2007). The changes in snowmelt runoff pattern may indicate a hydrologic regime shift over the high latitudes (Serreze *et al.*, 2002; Yang *et al.*, 2002).

Snow depth data have been routinely collected at the operational networks in the United States and Canada. As a result of differences and changes in methods of observations and data-processing procedures, these data are subject to errors and inconsistency over time and space, particularly across national borders. The operational networks in the northern regions are very sparse.

* Correspondence to: Daqing Yang, Water and Environmental Research Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, Alaska 99775-5860, USA. E-mail: ffdy@uaf.edu

It is therefore a challenge to combine regional snow data to generate basin snow information or gridded products for the high-latitude regions or large watersheds (Robinson, 1989; Dyer and Mote, 2006). Dyer (2008) recently used snow depth and discharge data to analyse patterns of snow volume and discharge in major North American watersheds (including the Yukon basin), and found, through statistical analysis, that snow accumulation during late fall and winter is useful to predict spring discharge particularly in the cold Yukon basin and Mackenzie watersheds. Dyer pointed out that snow water equivalent (SWE) and snow density data should be used to better define the snow accumulation and melt processes; however, reliable SWE and density estimates are difficult to obtain, especially for the continental-scale watersheds in the northern regions. Our current knowledge of large-scale snowmelt processes and their interaction with climatic change and variation is incomplete, particularly for the northern regions with insufficient ground-based observations (Vörösmarty *et al.*, 2001). This limits our ability of understanding past changes and predicting future changes of the hydrology system under a warming climate in the high-latitude regions.

Remotely sensed snow data have been very useful to cold region climate and hydrology investigations (Steffen *et al.*, 1993; Massom, 1995). For instance, the NOAA weekly snowcover dataset (maps) over the Northern Hemisphere permits quantitative assessments of changes and variations in regional snow extent (Robinson *et al.*, 1993; Serreze *et al.*, 1993; Clark *et al.*, 1997; Frei and Robinson, 1999a,b; Robinson and Frei, 2000), and they are useful for hydrologic and snowmelt runoff models (Rango, 1996, 1997; Rango and Shalaby, 1999). Yang *et al.* (2003) used the weekly NOAA snowcover extent (SCE) data to study streamflow hydrology in the large Siberian rivers, and discovered that SCE could predict spring discharge with the acceptable accuracy. In addition, long-term SWE data have been derived from the passive microwave sensors (Chang *et al.*, 1987; Chang, 1997; Armstrong and Brodzik, 2001, 2002). Their potential value for large-scale hydrology and climate studies in the high-latitude regions has not been systemically evaluated. This study will assess the compatibility of the passive microwave SWE data over the Yukon watershed, and examine the streamflow response to snowcover change particularly during the spring melt season. The objective is to determine the potential of using remotely sensed snow cover information to enhance our capability of snowmelt runoff modelling over the large northern regions with continuous and discontinuous permafrost (Brown and Haggerty, 1998; Zhang *et al.*, 1999). Changes in seasonal snow cover conditions may have significantly contributed to the ground surface temperature increase. The influence of seasonal snow cover on soil temperature, soil freezing and thawing processes, and permafrost has considerable impact on carbon exchange between the atmosphere and the ground and on the hydrologic cycle in cold regions/cold seasons (Zhang,

2005). The results of this study will improve our understanding of hydrologic effects of a shrinking (changing) cryosphere.

BASIN DESCRIPTION, DATA SETS, AND METHODS OF ANALYSES

The Yukon has a drainage area of 840 000 km². It is 3185-km long, with 1149 km in Canada. The Yukon River rises from the Atlin Lake and flows northwest to Fort Yukon, and then turns southwest and enters the Bering Sea (Figure 1). Its major tributaries are the Teslin, Pelly, White, Stewart, Porcupine, Tanana, and Koyukuk rivers. The Yukon basin consists of 37% rolling topography and gentle slopes, 24% low mountains, 20% plains and low mountains, 17% moderately high rugged mountains, and 2% extremely high rugged mountains. The Yukon River is one of the largest rivers in the northern regions. It contributes 203 km³ year⁻¹ freshwater to the Bering Sea. It is the fifth largest river in terms of annual total discharge in the northern regions. Hydrologic conditions and its changes of the Yukon River significantly affect regional biologic and ecologic systems. The US Geological Survey and Environment Canada maintain a hydrologic network in the Yukon River basin. In this study, long-term daily discharge records collected at the basin outlet station (the Pilot station, 61.9 N, 162.9 W, near the river mouth) during 1975–2001 are used for analyses. Large dams and reservoirs were built in the northern regions for power generation, flood control, and irrigation. Studies show that reservoirs' regulation alters hydrologic regimes particularly in the regulated sub-basins (Ye *et al.*, 2003; Yang *et al.*, 2004a,b). There are no large dams in the Yukon basin; discharge data collected over this basin are reliable indicator of climate change and variation. Unlike other large northern rivers, Yukon River has received less research attention. The




Figure 1. The Yukon River basin and its tributaries

USGS produced a report to document the major hydrologic patterns within the basin (Brabets *et al.*, 2000). Zhang *et al.* (2001) found that large parts of southern Canada and Yukon Territories have experienced reduced runoff.

Maps of snow extent and SWE derived from passive microwave satellite data (Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer (SMMR) and Special Sensor Microwave Radiometer (SSM/I)) for the Northern Hemisphere have been produced at the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) (Armstrong and Brodzik, 2001, 2002) using a modified version of the Chang *et al.* (1987) algorithm. The validation data set used in the Armstrong and Brodzik (2002) study was a topographically consistent subset of data from the 'Former Soviet Union Hydrological Surveys' (FSUHS) (Haggerty and Armstrong, 1996). This subset (45–60° north latitude, 25–45° east longitude) contains a high station density (approximately one transect per 100-km grid cell) and is primarily composed of non-complex terrain (grassland steppe) with maximum elevation differences of less than 500 m. The validation results indicated a general tendency for the algorithms to underestimate SWE in the range of 5–25 mm, particularly as forest cover density begins to exceed 30–40%. Regional maps and products have also been developed in Canada from the SMMR and SSM/I data, and used for analyses of snowcover variations over space and time (Walker and Goodison, 1993; Derksen *et al.*, 2000; Walker and Silis, 2002). Although the algorithm used in this study (i.e. Armstrong and Brodzik, 2002) is not able to consistently detect wet snow, only night time or early morning ('cold') orbits are used here, reducing the chance that wet snow is present. A sub-set of the NSIDC data representing the Arctic watersheds for the period 1988–2001 is used in this study to examine the seasonal and inter-annual variations of snowcover. Oelke *et al.*, (2003) applied these SWE data for the active layer depth modelling in the Arctic and produced reasonable results.

In addition, the NOAA weekly snowcover maps based on visible data are quite reliable to map snow cover extent (SCE) at many times and in many regions including the high latitudes. Mapping frequency and spatial resolution increased with the introduction of daily Interactive Multisensor *Snow* and Ice Mapping System (IMS) maps in June 1999. However, a lower-resolution weekly map has continued to be generated from the IMS and is used in this study (Robinson, 2003). This pseudo-weekly map involved taking high-resolution IMS grid cells for the fifth map of a week (continuing the weekly NOAA calendar) and determining whether more than 38% (determined from a comparison of both products that were produced independently during 2-year evaluation period) of the 64 IMS cells within a coarse resolution weekly cell were snow covered. If so, the coarse cell was considered snow covered (the 38% value was). Intercomparisons of visible, microwave, and station data derived weekly snow maps suggest strong agreement between the three, though admittedly lower in mountainous regions and near the

periphery of the snow pack. The SCE maps have been widely used for hydrologic and climatic analyses in the cold regions, such as development of basin snowcover depletion curves (Rango, 1996, 1997; Skaugen, 1999), study of streamflow response to snowcover changes in large northern rivers (Yang *et al.*, 2003), input snowcover data to regional hydrologic and snowmelt runoff models (Rango, 1997), and validation of climate model performance (Frei and Robinson, 1999a; Yang *et al.*, 1999).

The daily NSIDC Northern Hemisphere SWE data (Equal-Area Scalable Earth Grid (EASE-grid)) (Brodzik and Knowles, 2002) have been used in this study to generate weekly basin-mean SWE time-series for the Yukon River during 1988–2001. On the basis of these weekly records, we examine the seasonal changes of snowcover mass, by defining the SWE climatology based on weekly statistics, determining the dates of snowcover formation/disappearance and duration of snowcover/snow-free days, and quantifying the rates of snowcover mass change during the accumulation and melt seasons. We also derive weekly discharge time-series from the daily streamflow data collected near the basin outlet, and use the weekly data to describe the seasonal streamflow changes, including discharge regime, rates of streamflow rise, and peak flow during the melt period. We calculate the weekly correlation of streamflow with basin SWE, and determine the consistency between SWE and streamflow changes over the seasons. Furthermore, we identify extreme snowmelt streamflow cases and examine their correspondence with basin snowcover conditions. These analyses define the weekly relationship between snowmelt runoff and basin SWE changes for the Yukon River. In addition to streamflow and snowcover data, basin-mean weekly precipitation and temperature time series during 1966–1998 have been created based on gridded global data sets (Hulme, 1991; Jones, 1994), and used to investigate the compatibility of SWE/SCE data with climate variables and to explain the streamflow response to seasonal snowcover changes.

It is important to note that the approach of this analysis is not a complete water budget calculation; rather, we focus on the major terms in basin water budget, i.e. SWE, winter precipitation, and streamflow. We relate snow cover data (SWE and SCE) with streamflow data measured near the basin outlet, since discharge represents the integrated response of basin hydrology to climate influence. To be compatible with discharge data, we need basin-mean snow and climate data for our analysis. To generate basin-averaged data, it is necessary to define the basin boundary. A river network grid by Fekete *et al.* (2001) was used over the Yukon basin and overlaid onto the gridded snow and climate data. All the grids inside the basin and those with more than 50% within the basin boundary were counted as the basin grids and used to produce basin averages. A simple average was calculated without taking into account topography effects on snow, precipitation, and temperature distributions. Similar approach has been applied for other large watersheds in North America and

Siberia (Yang *et al.*, 2003; Dyer, 2008). Given the large size of the Yukon watershed and the focus of this analysis on the consistency examination of various data, the use of basin average is effective and appropriate.

BASIN HYDRO-CLIMATIC REGIME

To understand the climatic and hydrologic regime of the Yukon basin, we present below the basin-mean temperature, precipitation, snowcover, and discharge data. The weekly timescale is used here for accurate discussions of the seasonal cycles of basin hydrology and climate, particularly for snowcover and streamflow.

Temperature

Figure 2 shows the basin mean weekly temperature regime. The basin is cold, with mean temperatures between -10 and -20 °C, during weeks 42–14; and it is relatively warm during weeks 20–38, when basins' mean temperatures vary from 0 to 12 °C. Basin temperatures rise from -10 °C to near 0 °C during weeks 15–19, and decline from 0 to -10 °C during weeks 39–41. The inter-annual fluctuations in winter temperatures are significantly greater (ranging from -35 to -5 °C) than the differences in the summer temperatures (ranging from 8 to 15 °C). During the period 1966–2002, Yukon basin mean annual air temperature is about -5.1 °C (SD = 0.98 °C), with the lowest annual air temperature of -6.8 °C in 1974, and the highest being -2.9 °C in 1993. Similar to other northern regions, Yukon basin has experienced a significant ($\alpha = 0.05$ level) warming trend (0.03 °C/year) during 1966–2002.

Precipitation

Similar to temperatures, a strong seasonal cycle exists for precipitation over the Yukon basin (Figure 3). Precipitation is high (10–15 mm) during the warm season (weeks 21–43) and low (5–10 mm) during the winter season (weeks 44–20). During the period of 1988–2002 ($n = 15$), the mean annual total precipitation in Yukon basin is 384.6 mm (SD = 37.7 mm). The lowest annual precipitation is 312.3 mm in 1999, and the highest annual

precipitation is 442.0 mm in 1994. The mean annual total snowfall (defined as the precipitation during the period when basin mean air temperature is below 0 °C) is 180.4 mm (or 47% of the yearly total precipitation). The lowest annual snowfall is 102.3 mm in 1998, and the highest annual snowfall is 258.9 mm in 1992. Winter precipitation is generally lower than summer precipitation over the Yukon basin. On the 52nd week of 1999 and the 3rd week of 2000, weekly precipitation was about 31 and 24 mm, respectively; they were unusually higher for winter season perhaps due to strong snowfall events over the lower parts of the basin. No significant trends were found for yearly total precipitation and annual total snowfall for the study period 1988–2002.

Snowcover

Figures 4 and 5 present the basin weekly snow cover percent (SCP) and SWE cycles. They illustrate that snow accumulation during weeks 37–44, when basin SCE rises from 10 to 90%; a complete snowcover (100% SCE) during weeks 44–16; snowmelt during weeks 17–24, when SCE drops from 90 to 10% over the basin; and a minimum SCE of 5–10% in summer (weeks 25–36) due to glacier and snowcover in the high revelations. The SCE data show significant interannual variations. For the maximum SCE case, we see 100% SCE lasting during weeks 40–24, a fast melt in 2–3 weeks during weeks




Figure 2. Basin-mean weekly temperature in (T , °C) for the Yukon watershed, 1966–2002




Figure 3. Basin-mean weekly precipitation (P , mm) over the Yukon watershed, 1988–2002




Figure 4. Basin-mean weekly snow cover percentage (SCP, %) over the Yukon watershed, 1966–2002




Figure 5. Basin-mean weekly snow water equivalent (SWE, mm) over the Yukon watershed, 1988–2001

25–28, a higher minimum SCE of 20–30% in the mid-summer, and an early snow accumulation during weeks 36–40. On the other hand, for the minimum SCE case, we observe a 100% snow cover during the weeks 50–16, a slow snowmelt in weeks 17–22, almost snow free during weeks 24–39, and a late snow accumulation in weeks 40–48.

Similar pattern exists for the SWE (Figure 5). Snow pack accumulates during weeks 38–4, reaches a stable state during weeks 5–16, with the mean max SWE of 90–100 mm around week 8–12. Snow pack starts to shrink slightly after the peak SWE. Snowcover melts during weeks 16–22, with SWE dropping from the peak to near 0 mm at week 23. Basin becomes snow free during weeks 23–37, when the average SCE is about 5%, with max being as high as 30%, due to glaciers and snowcover in the high elevations. SWE condition varies among the years, for instance, the peak SWE range from 60–70 to 110–120 mm. The rate and length of snowmelt season also varies greatly, depending on the spring temperature and amount of peak SWE. A shorter melt season usually suggests a faster melt of snowcover due to late onset of melt associated with higher temperatures during late spring. During the period of 1988–2002 ($n = 14$), the mean peak SWE in Yukon basin is about 106 mm ($SD = 13.0$ mm). The lowest and highest peak SWEs are 81 mm in 1991 and 125 mm in 1998, respectively. No significant trends were found for the SCP or SWE over the study period 1988–2002.

Discharge

The seasonal cycle of discharge near the basin outlet is illustrated in Figure 6. It generally shows low flows during November to April (weeks 45–17), highest flow in June (weeks 22–24) due to snowmelt runoff, high flow in summer (weeks 25–40) due to glacier melt, and recession of flow in fall season (weeks 40–44). Streamflow of the Yukon River peaks at weeks 22–24 (or mid June), when the basin is covered by a small patchy snowpack, i.e. approximately 4% SCE and 1 mm SWE over the watershed. The basin SWE amounts are very low at the time of peak streamflow, reflecting a long lag of streamflow response to snowmelt and flow routing within




Figure 6. Mean weekly discharge (m^3/s) near the basin outlet, 1975–1996

the large watershed. Streamflow decreases at the end of the snowmelt season, although heavy rainfall events and glacier melt in mid-summer generate secondary floods over the basin. The inter-annual variations of weekly streamflow are generally small in the cold season and large over summer months mainly due to rainfall storm activities and associated streamflow fluctuations. It also indicates noticeable differences in streamflow characteristics between years mainly due to different climate and snow conditions over the basin. The annual peak discharge in Yukon basin is 19 178 m^3/s , with the lowest and highest peak discharges being 12 969 m^3/s in 1978, and 30 299 m^3/s in 1985, respectively. It is important to note that the year having the highest annual flow was the same year for the highest peak flow, and the year having the lowest annual flow also has the lowest peak flow. This indicates that the peak flow in spring and summer dominates the annual flow. No significant changes were found for peak discharge or annual total discharge during the study period.

COMPATIBILITY OF BASIN SNOWCOVER DATA

Temperature and precipitation are the main factors affecting snowcover characteristics including accumulation and melt processes. To evaluate the compatibility of snowcover data over the Yukon region, we compare weekly basin snow data with weekly (winter) precipitation and air temperature. We also use a linear regression approach to define the weekly relationship between snowcover and other variables.

Basin SWE versus winter precipitation

To understand the winter snow mass budget, we compare the basin SWE with the accumulated precipitation (AP) (Figure 7) over the period when the basin mean weekly temperatures are below $0^\circ C$. The AP may include some rainfall events in early spring and late fall seasons particularly over the southern parts of the watersheds. The contribution of rainfall events is small to the winter total precipitation. Figure 7 shows significant variation in the AP among the years. Both the high and low AP winters




Figure 7. Comparisons of basin snow water equivalent (SWE, mm) with winter accumulated precipitation (AP, mm) during 1988/1989 to 2000/2001

were associated with similar SWE amounts, although in most years the basin SWE is generally less than the AP during the snowcover season. It is interesting to note that the amounts of maximum SWE are closer to AP in low snowfall winters, and much less than AP in high snowfall winters. It is reasonable to expect that basin maximum SWE should be generally close to winter total snowfall amount. The lack of correspondence of the basin SWE to AP variation indicates some inconsistency between the SWE and precipitation data. This is not completely unexpected given the large biases in precipitation data over the high-latitude regions (Yang *et al.*, 1998; Yang and Ohata, 2001; Yang *et al.*, 2005) and limitations in remote sensing snowcover algorithm (Walker and Goodison, 1993; Armstrong and Brodzik, 2001). In addition, sublimation loss from snowpack over winter is another factor contributing to the uncertainty in SWE and AP compatibility. Studies reported that sublimation from the snow surface accounts for up to 1/3 of total accumulation in the northern regions (Benson, 1982; Benson and Sturm, 1993; Pomeroy *et al.*, 1993; Liston and Sturm, 1998, 2004). Sublimation over large basins and regions is difficult to determine through direct measurements. Snow models taking into account the blowing and drifting snow processes can provide reasonable estimate of regional winter sublimation amount (Pomeroy *et al.*, 1993; Liston and Sturm, 1998, 2002).

The ratios of maximum basin SWE versus AP are 37–120% (mean 77%) for the Yukon River. The ratios close to 100% reflect less difference between the SWE and AP. The inter-annual variations in the SWE/AP ratios

are mainly due to fluctuations in snowfall amounts and temperatures over the winter season. The low (high) ratios are found associated with high (low) AP and warm (cold) winter. It is important to note that the Yukon basin SWE was greater than the AP for several winters (i.e. 1995–1996, 1996–1997, 1997–1998, and 1998–1999). This unexpected result indicates uncertainties in the SWE and AP estimations over the region. Precipitation gauge undercatch of snowfall may be a factor, since studies (Yang *et al.*, 1998; Benning and Yang, 2005) found underestimation of yearly precipitation by 25–50% over Alaska. In addition, determination of timing of snowcover accumulation is also a challenge. In this study, basin-mean temperatures at 0°C were used to estimate the beginning date (week) of snowcover formation, i.e. the starting point for AP. Given the very large size of the watershed, basin-mean temperatures do not always represent the thermal conditions over the entire basin, particularly during spring and fall transition periods. Sub-basin scale analyses might be necessary to better examine the compatibility between basin SWE and winter precipitation.

Basin SCP and SWE versus temperature

To examine and quantify the impact of temperature on basin snowcover conditions, a linear regression is applied to the temperature and SCE/SWE data sets for each week in a year. Figures 8 and 9 present the scatter plots of (snow cover percent = SCE) SCP versus temperature and SWE versus temperature for the 53 weeks. The regression functions and R^2 are displayed in the plots for




Figure 8. Scatter plots and regression equations of basin weekly SCP (%) versus weekly air temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) for the 53 weeks in a year during 1966–2001

the weeks with significant relationships ($\alpha = 0.15$). The results generally show that the snowcover changes as a function of temperature. The basin SCP and SWE are the highest in the beginning of the year when temperatures are very cold between -15 and -20°C . Both SCP and SWE decrease in spring from very high to very low in a short time period when basin mean temperatures are around 0°C . The basin is almost snow-free in the short summer season except in the mountain regions with glaciers and snowcover all year around. Snowcover forms when temperatures drop back to around 0°C in fall and continues to accumulate over the fall–winter seasons. Regression analyses identify strong negative correlations between basin SCP/SWE and temperature, particularly when temperatures are close to 0°C during the snow accumulation and melt seasons (Figures 8 and 9). These correlations demonstrate the association of (high) low SWE/SCP with (low) high temperatures.

WEEKLY RELATION BETWEEN STREAMFLOW AND BASIN SWE

The seasonal changes of the basin SWE and streamflow in each individual year are displayed in Figure 10 for the

Yukon basin. They clearly indicate a general response of river runoff to seasonal snow cover changes, i.e. an association of high discharge with low SCE and SWE during summer, a decrease in discharge associated with increasing SCE and SWE in fall, an association of low stream flow with high SCE and SWE during the cold season, and an increase in discharge associated with decreasing SCE and SWE during the spring melt periods. They also show the inter-annual variations in both SWE and streamflow. Relative to the basin SWE, streamflow varies much more between years. For instance, the Yukon River peak streamflow was high ($23\,000\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) in 1991 and low ($18\,000\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) in 1996, while the maximum basin SWE was low (about 75 mm) in 1991 and high (about 90 mm) in 1996. A similar peak SWE was found for 1988, 1989, 1990, 1994, 1995, and 2001, while the spring peak flow differs significantly among these years, particularly between 1994 (low flow) and 2001 (high flow). This discrepancy between basin snowcover and streamflow variations may suggest uncertainties in basin SWE data perhaps due to algorithm limitations (Armstrong and Brodzik, 2002), particularly for the mountain regions within the Yukon basin.




Figure 9. Scatter plots and regression equations of basin weekly SWE (mm) versus weekly air temperature (°C) for the 53 weeks in a year during 1988–2001

To quantify the response of river streamflow to basin snowcover variation, we examine and compare the weekly mean streamflow with the weekly basin SWE for the study period 1988–1999. The results generally confirm a meaningful relation between the streamflow and SWE during the spring melt season over the Yukon watershed (Figure 11). In the early melt period (weeks 16–18), basin SWE reduces from 120 to 50 mm. Most of the melt water is stored in ponds, lakes, and river valleys. River ice breaks up around this time in the upper parts of the basin, but streamflow at the basin outlet does not show a clear response due to ice jams in the river valleys. As snowmelt progresses (weeks 19–21), SWE decreases from 70 to 20 mm, releasing more water to satisfy the surface storage within the basin. During weeks 22–24, river channels open up in the downstream parts of the watershed and discharge at the basin mouth starts to rise and reach the maximum. This response of streamflow to snowmelt is reflected by a negative correlation between streamflow and basin SWE in weeks 19–21. In the late melt period (weeks 23–25), streamflow response to snowmelt weakens due to reduced snowmelt runoff contribution. The results of

regression analyses are shown in Figure 11. They explain 30–70% of streamflow variability, although they are statistically significant at 85–95% confidence. It is useful to quantify these relationships, as they suggest a practical procedure of using remotely sensed SWE information for snowmelt runoff estimation over the large northern watersheds.

EXTREME STREAMFLOW AND ASSOCIATED SNOWCOVER CONDITION

The basin snowcover and discharge data show that weekly snowcover and snowmelt peak flows vary significantly among years. To understand the variability in snowmelt runoff, it is necessary to examine extreme streamflow and its association with the snowcover condition, such as the peak accumulation and melt process.

Two sample years of highest and lowest streamflow cases were selected for the Yukon River in this analysis, i.e. peak flows during the snowmelt season of 13 900 m³/s in 1996 and 24 110 m³/s in 1990. Figure 12 compares the SCE and SWE data with the extreme




Figure 10. Comparisons of basin snow water equivalent (SWE, mm) with river discharge (Q , m^3/s) during 1988–1996 and 2001

streamflow for the 2 years. It shows that, for the SCE, a similar process (rate) of snowcover depletion during the early melt season (weeks 17–20) between the 2 years, and a slower melt and longer SCE recession for the low flow year during the late melt season (weeks 21–25) (Figure 12a). The peak snow accumulation over the basin is about 115 mm for the high flow year of 1990 and 100 mm for the low flow year of 1996, indicating higher (lower) flows associated with higher (lower) basin SWE. The melt patterns were very similar between the two extreme years, with the snowmelt beginning around week 16 and ending around week 21. The timing of the peak flow was 1 week earlier in the low flow year than the high flow year; the shape of the spring hydrograph is sharp (with a single high peak) in the high flow year and flat (with two low peaks) in the low flow year. It is important to note that the difference in peak SWE was only 15 mm, while the peak spring flow difference was about 10 210 m^3/s (Figure 12b). The difference in peak flows is much higher than the difference in basin SWE between the extreme years. This seems to suggest inconsistency between basin SWE and streamflow. In addition to the winter maximum SWE over the basin, other factors such as temperature, precipitation, soil moisture condition, and ground thaw processes during the melt periods also affect snowmelt processes and influence the timing and magnitude of peak snowmelt floods.

CONCLUSIONS

Validation and evaluation of available remotely sensing products are important to develop our capability of observing and monitoring the earth system from the space. This study applied remotely sensed SWE, SCE, and gridded climatic data to investigate snowmelt runoff response to seasonal snowcover change over the Yukon watershed. It defined the seasonal cycles and variations of snowcover and river streamflow, and identified a clear correspondence of river streamflow to seasonal snowcover change, i.e. an association of low streamflow with high snowcover mass during the cold season and an increase in discharge associated with a decrease of snowcover extent and SWE during the melt periods. It also examined the compatibility of the basin SWE data with the SCE, peak snowmelt floods, and climatic variables (temperature and winter precipitation), and found consistency among the basin SWE, SCE, and temperature. On the other hand, it detected incompatibility between basin SWE and winter precipitation, suggesting limitations in SWE retrieval algorithm and uncertainties in the determination of basin winter snowfall amounts.

To quantify the relation between river streamflow and basin snowcover variations, this study compared the weekly mean streamflow with the weekly basin SWE for the study period (1988–2000). The results revealed a meaningful linkage between streamflow and




Figure 11. Scatter plots and regression equations of weekly discharge (Q , m^3/s) versus weekly basin snow water equivalent (SWE, mm) for the 53 weeks in a year, 1988–2001

basin SWE during the spring melt season, and developed a statistically significant weekly streamflow–SWE relation. It is important to define these relationships, as they improve our understanding of the most important arctic hydrologic process—snowmelt peak floods, and they also suggest practical procedures of using remotely sensed snowcover information for snowmelt runoff forecasting over the large northern watersheds with insufficient ground observations. Furthermore, analyses of extreme (high/low) streamflow cases (years) and basin snowcover conditions indicate a general association of high (low) flow peak with high (low) maximum SWE over the basin, although some inconsistencies exist between extreme flow and basin SWE. These results point to a need to further search for the best snowmelt–streamflow relationship, and to develop the most useful snowmelt runoff forecasting methods for the large northern rivers.

The results of this study demonstrate that remote sensing snowcover data are useful in understanding streamflow characteristics and changes in the arctic regions with a very sparse observational network. The methods and results of this investigation are important to seasonal hydrologic forecasting, snowmelt model, and process studies. They improve our understanding

of the spatial and temporal variability of high-latitude snowcover and its contribution to river runoff in the arctic regions. Snow depth and water equivalent data obtained by ground observations are also useful to better understand snowmelt and runoff processes (Dyer, 2008). Long-term snow observations particularly over the Siberian regions have been found valuable for cold region climate studies (Ye *et al.*, 1998; Armstrong and Brodzik, 2001). There is a need to investigate the compatibility of the basin SWE with *in situ* snowcover observations. Our efforts continue to divide the large northern watersheds into sub-basins for more detailed analyses of snow–runoff relationship. We also compile and evaluate *in situ* snow cover data, so as to integrate remote sensing and ground-based snow datasets for land surface process modelling and simulation of hydrologic change over the cold regions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the NSF grants ARC-0230083/ARC-0612334, NOAA/CIFAR grant NA17RJ-1224, and NASA Research Grant—NNG04GN38G.




Figure 12. Comparison of extreme discharge (Q , m^3/s) cases with SCP (a) and SWE (b) over the Yukon watershed

REFERENCES

- Aagaard K, Carmack EC. 1989. The role of sea ice and other fresh water in the arctic circulation. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **94**(C10): 14,485–14,498.
- Armstrong RL, Brodzik MJ. 2001. Recent Northern Hemisphere snow extent: a comparison of data derived from visible and microwave sensors. *Geophysical Research Letters* **28**(19): 3673–3676, 10.1029/2000GL012556.
- Armstrong RL, Brodzik MJ. 2002. Hemispheric-scale comparison and evaluation of passive microwave snow algorithms. *Annals of Glaciology* **34**: 38–44.
- Benning J, Yang D. 2005. Adjustment of daily precipitation data at Barrow and Nome Alaska for 1995–2001. *Arctic Antarctic and Alpine Research* **37**(3): 267–283.
- Benson CS. 1982. *Reassessment of Winter Precipitation on Alaska's Arctic Slope and Measurement on the Flux of Wind Blown Snow Report*. Geophysical Institute of the University of Alaska: Fairbanks, AK; 26.
- Benson CS, Sturm M. 1993. Structure and wind transport of seasonal snow on the Arctic slope. *Annals of Glaciology* **18**: 261–267.
- Brabets T, Wang B, Meade R. 2000. Environmental and hydrologic overview of the Yukon river basin, Alaska and Canada, USGS, Water-Resources Investigation Report 99–4204, 106.
- Brodzik MJ, Knowles KW. 2002. EASE-Grid: a versatile set of equal-area projections and grids. In *Discrete Global Grids*, Goodchild M (ed.). National Center for Geographic Information & Analysis: Santa Barbara, CA, <http://www.ncgia.ucsb.edu/globalgrids-book/ease-grid/>.
- Brown J, Haggerty C. 1998. Permafrost digital databases now available. *EOS Transactions-American Geophysical Union* **79**(52): 634.
- Cao Z, Wang M, Proctor B, Strong G, Stewart R, Ritchie H, Burnford J. 2002. On the physical processes associated with the water budget and discharge of the Mackenzie basin during the 1994/95 water year. *Atmosphere-Ocean* **40**(2): 125–143.
- Chang ATC. 1997. Snow parameters derived from microwave measurements during the BOREAS winter field campaign. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **102**(D24): 29663–29671.
- Chang ATC, Foster JL, Hall DK. 1987. Nimbus 7 SMMR derived global snow cover parameters. *Annals of Glaciology* **9**: 39–44.
- Clark MP, Serreze MC, Robinson DA. 1997. Atmospheric controls on Eurasian snow extent. *International Journal of Climatology* **19**(1): 27–40.
- Derksen C, LeDrew E, Goodison B. 2000. Temporal and spatial variability of North American prairie snow cover (1988–1995) inferred from passive microwave-derived snow water equivalent imagery. *Water Resources Research* **36**(1): 255–266.
- Dyer J. 2008. Snow depth and streamflow relationships in large North American watersheds. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **113**: D18113, DOI:10.1029/2008JD010031.
- Dyer JL, Mote TL. 2006. Spatial variability and trends in snow depth over North America. *Geophysical Research Letters* **33**: L16503, DOI:10.1029/2006GL027258.
- Frei A, Robinson DA. 1999a. Northern Hemisphere snow extent: regional variability 1972–1994. *International Journal of Climatology* **19**(14): 1535–1560.

- Frei A, Robinson DA. 1999b. Evaluation of snow extent and its variability in the atmospheric model intercomparison project. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **103**(D8): 8859–8871.
- Fekete BM, Vörösmarty CJ, Lammers RB. 2001. Scaling gridded river networks for macroscale hydrology: Development, analysis, and control of error. *Water Resources Research* **37**(7): 1955–1967.
- Grabs WE, Fortmann F, De Couel T. 2000. Discharge observation networks in Arctic regions: computation of the river runoff into the Arctic Ocean, its seasonality and variability. *The Freshwater Budget of the Arctic Ocean*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Research Workshop, Tallin, Estonia, 27 April–1 May, 1998. Kluwer Acad.: Norwell, MA; 249–268.
- Haggerty CD, Armstrong RL. 1996. Snow trends within the Former Soviet Union. *Eos* **77**(46): [Abstract] Fall Meeting Supplement, F191.
- Hulme M. 1991. An intercomparison of model and observed global precipitation climatologies. *Geophysical Research Letters* **18**: 1715–1718.
- Jones PD. 1994. Hemispheric surface air temperature variations: a reanalysis and an update to 1993. *Journal of Climate* **7**: 1794–1802.
- Kane DL. 1997. The impact of Arctic hydrologic perturbations on Arctic ecosystems induced by climate change. *Global Change and Arctic Terrestrial Ecosystems, Ecological Studies 124*. Springer-Verlag: New York; 63–81.
- Kane DL, Hinzman LD, McNamara JP, Zhang Z, Benson CS. 2000. An overview of a nested watershed study in Arctic Alaska. *Nordic Hydrology* **4/5**: 245–266.
- Lammers R, Shiklomanov A, Vorosmarty C, Fekete B, Peterson B. 2001. Assessment of contemporary arctic river runoff based on observational discharge records. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **106**(D4): 3321–3334.
- Liston GE, Sturm M. 1998. A snow-transport model for complex terrain. *Journal of Glaciology* **44**: 498–516.
- Liston GE, Sturm M. 2002. Winter precipitation patterns in Arctic Alaska determined from a blowing-snow model and snow-depth observations. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* **3**: 646–659.
- Liston GE, Sturm M. 2004. The role of winter sublimation in the Arctic moisture budget. *Nordic Hydrology* **35**(4): 325–334.
- Massom R. 1995. Satellite remote sensing of polar now and ice: present status and future directions. *Polar Record* **31**(177): 99–114.
- Oelke C, Zhang T, Serreze MC, Armstrong RL. 2003. Regional-scale modeling of soil freeze/thaw over the Arctic drainage basin. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **108**(D10): 4314, DOI:10.1029/2002JD002722.
- Pomeroy JW, Gray DW, Landine PG. 1993. The prairie blowing snow model: Characteristics, validation, operation. *Journal of Hydrology* **144**: 165–192.
- Proshutinsky A, Polyakov I, Johnson M. 1999. Climate states and variability of Arctic ice and water dynamics during 1946–1997. *Polar Research* **18**(2): 135–142.
- Prowse TD, Flegg PO. 2000. Arctic river flow: a review of contributing areas. *The Freshwater Budget of the Arctic Ocean*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Research Workshop, Tallin, Estonia, 27 April–1 May 1998. Kluwer Acad.: Norwell, MA; 269–280.
- Rango A. 1996. Spaceborne remote sensing for snow hydrology applications. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* **41**(4): 477–494.
- Rango A. 1997. Response of areal snow cover to climate change in a snowmelt-runoff model. *International Symposium on Representation of the Cryosphere in Climate and Hydrological Models, Victoria, British Columbia, Aug. 12–15, 1996*, vol. 25, Walsh JE (eds). Annals of Glaciology: Cambridge, UK; 232–236.
- Rango A, Shalaby AI. 1999. *Current Operational Applications of Remote Sensing in Hydrology*, Operational Hydrology Report, No. 43. World Meteorological Organization (WMO): Geneva; 73.
- Robinson DA. 1989. Construction of a United States historical snow data base. *Proceedings of Eastern Snow Conference* **45**: 50–59.
- Robinson DA. 2003. *Recent Variability of Northern Hemisphere Snow Cover*, Preprints: Seventh Conference on Polar Meteorology and Oceanography, paper 13-12. American Meteorological Society: Hyannis, MA; 6.
- Robinson DA, Dewey KF, Heim RR Jr. 1993. Global snow cover monitoring: an update. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **74**: 1689–1696.
- Robinson DA, Frei A. 2000. Seasonal variability of Northern Hemisphere snow extent using visible satellite data. *Professional Geographer* **52**(2): 307–314.
- Semiletov IP, Savelieva NI, Weller GE, Popko II, Pugach SP, Gukov Yu, Vasilevskaya LN. 2000. The dispersion of Siberian river flows into coastal waters: meteorological, hydrological and hydrochemical aspects. *The Freshwater Budget of the Arctic Ocean*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Research Workshop, Tallin, Estonia, 27 April–1 May 1998. Kluwer Acad.: Norwell, MA; 323–366.
- Serreze MC, Maslanik JA, Scharfen G, Barry RG. 1993. Interannual variations in snow melt over arctic sea ice and relationships to atmospheric forcings. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Remote Sensing of Snow and Ice*, vol. 17, May 17–22, 1992. Annals of Glaciology: Boulder, CO; 327–331.
- Serreze MC, Bromwich DH, Clark MP, Etringer AJ, Zhang T, Lammers RB. 2002. The large scale-hydro-climatology of the terrestrial arctic drainage system. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **107**: 8160, DOI:10.1029/2001JD000919.
- Serreze MC, Walsh JE, Chapin EC, Osterkamp T, Dyugorov M, Romanovsky V, Oechel WC, Morison J, Zhang T, Barry RG. 2000. Observation evidence of recent change in the northern high-latitude environment. *Climatic Change* **46**: 159–207.
- Shiklomanov IA, Shiklomanov AI, Lammers RB, Peterson BJ, Vorosmarty CJ. 2000. The dynamics of river water inflow to the Arctic Ocean. *The Freshwater Budget of the Arctic Ocean*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Research Workshop, Tallin, Estonia, 27 April–1 May 1998. Kluwer Acad.: Norwell, MA; 281–296.
- Skaugen T. 1999. Estimating the mean areal snow water equivalent by integration in time and space. *Hydrological Processes* **13**(12/13): 19992051–2066.
- Steffen K, Bindshadler R, Casassa G, Comiso J, Eppler D. 1993. Snow and ice applications of AVHRR in polar regions. 3rd Symposium on Remote Sensing of Snow and Ice, Boulder, CO, May 17–22, 1992, NASA Technical Memorandum, NASA-TM-113076, 16.
- Vörösmarty CJ, Hinzman LD, Peterson BJ, Bromwich DH, Hamilton LC, Morison J, Romanovsky VE, Sturm M, Webb RS. 2001. *The Hydrologic Cycle and its Role in Arctic and Global Environmental Change: A Rationale and Strategy for Synthesis Study*. Arctic Research Consortium of the U.S.: Fairbanks, AK; 84.
- Walker AE, Goodison BE. 1993. Discrimination of a wet snow cover using passive microwave satellite data. *Annals of Glaciology* **17**: 307–311.
- Walker AE, Silis A. 2002. Snow-cover variations over the Mackenzie River basin, Canada, derived from SSM/I passive-microwave satellite data. *Annals of Glaciology* **34**: 8–14.
- Walsh JE. 2000. Global atmospheric circulation patterns and relationships to Arctic freshwater fluxes. *The Freshwater Budget of the Arctic Ocean, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Research Workshop, Tallin, Estonia, 27 April–1 May 1998*. Kluwer Acad.: Norwell, MA; 21–41.
- Whitfield P, Cannon A. 2000. Recent climate moderated shifts in Yukon hydrology, In *Water Resources in Extreme Environments*, AWRA, May 1–3, Anchorage, Alaska, 257–262.
- Woo M-K. 1986. Permafrost hydrology in North America. *Atmosphere-Ocean* **24**(3): 201–234.
- Yang D, Goodison BE, Benson CS, Ishida S. 1998. Adjustment of daily precipitation at 10 climate stations in Alaska: application of WMO Intercomparison results. *Water Resources Research* **34**(2): 241–256.
- Yang D, Kane D, Hinzman L, Zhang X, Zhang T, Ye H. 2002. Siberian Lena river hydrologic regime and recent change. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **107**(D23): 4694, DOI: 10.1029/2002JD00254.
- Yang D, Kane D, Zhang Z, Legates D, Goodison B. 2005. Bias-corrections of long-term (1973–2004) daily precipitation data over the northern regions. *Geophysical Research Letters* **32**: L19501, DOI:10.1029/2005GL024057.
- Yang D, Ohata T. 2001. A bias corrected Siberian regional precipitation climatology. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* **2**(1): 122–139.
- Yang D, Robinson D, Zhao Y, Estilow T, Ye B. 2003. Streamflow response to seasonal snow cover extent changes in large Siberian watersheds. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **108**(D18): 4578, DOI:10.1029/2002JD003149.
- Yang D, Ye B, Kane D. 2004a. Streamflow changes over Siberian Yenisei river basin. *Journal of Hydrology* **296**: 59–80.
- Yang D, Ye B, Shiklomanov A. 2004b. Streamflow characteristics and changes over the Ob river watershed in Siberia. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* **5**(4): 595–610.
- Yang ZL, Dickinson RE, Hahmann AN, Niu G-Y, Shaikh M, Gao X, Bales RC, Sorooshian S, Jin J. 1999. Simulation of snow mass and extent in general circulation models. *Hydrological Processes* **13**(12/13): 2097–2113.
- Yang D, Zhao Y, Armstrong R, Robinson D, Brodzik M-J. 2007. Streamflow response to seasonal snow cover mass changes over large Siberian watersheds. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **112**: F02S22, DOI:10.1029/2006JF000518.

- Ye H, Cho H, Gustafson PE. 1998. The changes in Russian winter snow accumulation during 1936–1983 and its spatial patterns. *Journal of Climate* **11**: 856–863.
- Ye B, Yang D, Kane D. 2003. Changes in Lena river streamflow hydrology: human impacts vs. natural variations. *Water Resources Research* **39**(8): 1200, DOI: 10.1029/2003WR001991.
- Zhang T. 2005. Influence of the seasonal snow cover on the ground thermal regime: An overview. *Reviews of Geophysics* **43**: RG4002, DOI:10.1029/2004RG000157.
- Zhang T, Barry RG, Knowles K, Heginbottom JA, Brown J. 1999. Statistics and characteristics of permafrost and ground-ice distribution in the Northern Hemisphere. *Polar Geography* **23**(2): 132–154.
- Zhang X, Harvey KD, Hogg WD, Yuzyk TR. 2001. Trends in Canadian streamflow. *Water Resources Research* **37**: 987–998.