Supplement of Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 21, 1137–1147, 2017
http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci.net/21/1137/2017/
doi:10.5194/hess-21-1137-2017-supplement

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
Open Access
EGU

Supplement of

Developing a representative snow-monitoring network in a forested mountain watershed

Kelly E. Gleason et al.

Correspondence to: Kelly E. Gleason (kgleason@dri.edu)

Table S1. Accuracy assessment matrix comparing the BRT classes derived from the normal snow year 2009 with those from the high snow year 2008. Overall there is less error in the lowest and highest elevation BRT classes, whereas the mid- elevations there is more error between models. Many classes were reassigned when the BRT model was rerun between years, underestimating the accuracy of the overall spatial variability between models.

BRT Class																						
2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Comission
2008																						error (%)
1	55402	6035																				10
2		16467																				0
3		369	22960																			2
4		52		3930																		1
5					9879																	0
6					5486																	100
7						3232	3232															50
8								4667														0
9									2524													0
10								2053		4007												34
11										5276	5740											48
12									486			2900										14
13											1965	339	5421									30
14													5252	4338	617							57
15														13692	1948	719						88
16																10260	14155					58
17																		23580				100
18																			5931	705		100
19																				1850		100
20																				1057	1025	51
21																					2039	0
Omission	0	28	0	0	36	100	0	31	16	57	26	10	49	76	24	7	100	100	100	71	33	
error (%)																			Overall accuracy			63

Table S2. Accuracy assessment matrix comparing the BRT classes derived from the normal snow year 2005 with those from the high snow year 2008. Overall there is less error in the lowest and highest elevation BRT classes, whereas the mid- elevations there is more error between models. Many classes were reassigned when the BRT model was rerun between years, underestimating the accuracy of the overall spatial variability between models.

BRT Class																						
2009	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Comission
2005																						error (%)
1	55402	22923	22960	3930	15365	3232	6013	3365	2243													59
2								3355		9283	5840											100
3									767			2900										100
4											1965		9212	12939								100
5														5091	757	3973						100
6												339	1461		1808	879						100
7																3718						100
8																	2194					100
9																	3622					100
10																	2697					100
11																	3702					100
12																	1815					100
13																		7239				100
14																		4776				100
15																		4045				100
16																		2347				100
17																		3253				100
18																		1923	512			21
19																			3857			0
20																			1562	3612	421	35
21																					2643	0
Omission	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	92	35	0	14	
error (%)																		Overall accuracy				28