

applications, models other estimating

- replacing current snowmelt component in MAC-HBV
- simple degree-day based snowmelt routine and SNOW-17 within MAC-HBV hydrological model
- peak flow prediction

- Grande River Basin(LGRB) located in North-Central Quebec
- elevation from ~6m to ~1139m
- water(3%) [2]
- Precipitation, Tmax and Tmin data: 1970-2005 Observed flow data varies based upon sub-basin



Acknowledgement: Thanks to Canadian Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) for providing the data required for this analysis.

# **Evaluation of Snowmelt Estimation Techniques for Enhanced Peak Flow Prediction Using MAC-HBV**

Jetal Agnihotri; Tara Razavi; Paulin Coulibaly; Dominique Tapsoba

NSERC Canadian FloodNet, Water Resources and Hydrological Modeling Lab, McMaster University

iouer r enformance Statistics. Even rears campration
--

NSF			Degree Day Snowmelt Routine	
	VE	NSE	VE	
0.8008	0.0305	0.2945	0.2983	
0.7529	0.0266	0.4009	0.1865	
0.7208	0.0476	0.4228	0.2069	
0.6514	0.1191	0.1853	0.2650	
	0.8008 0.7529 0.7208 0.6514	0.80080.03050.75290.02660.72080.04760.65140.1191	0.80080.03050.29450.75290.02660.40090.72080.04760.42280.65140.11910.1853	

Snowmelt Routine	SNOW-17 model within MAC-HBV		Degree Day Snowmelt Routine	
Basin name	NSE	VE	NSE	VE
Caniapiscau	0.7949	0.0221	0.1789	0.3044
La_Grande_3	0.4166	0.1626	-0.0152	0.3103
La_Grande_2_et_Lac_Sakami	0.7226	0.1636	0.0041	0.3070
Lac_Opinaca	0.6211	0.1815	0.0906	0.3155



### Discussion

The performance evaluation of current MAC-HBV model consisting of degree-day based snowmelt routine indicated that acceptable NSE values were obtained during calibration period(i.e., Even years) while for the validation period(i.e., Odd years), model failed to predict observed flow correctly for all the 4 sub-basins considered in the study. For SNOW-17 model adapted within MAC-HBV, the model performed better during both calibration and validation periods. SNOW-17 model performance could be better owing to consideration of gagecatch deficiencies and rain-snow partitioning while modeling snow accumulation and melt. Further improvements might be achieved by using high temporal resolution(hourly data) or by adapting other snowmelt estimation techniques such as radiation energy methods.

The mean absolute error calculation for the peak flows reveals that SNOW-17 model within MAC-HBV capture peak flows better for Lac-Opinaca, Caniapiscau and La-Grande-2 sub-basins than simple degree-day method. While, for La-Grande -3 sub-watershed both snowmelt estimation techniques poorly simulates peak flows and at times overestimates peak flows. This performance evaluation indicates that there is still a need to identify robust snowmelt estimation technique that can better predict amount and time of peak flow.

### **Future work**

To improve the results and identify robust snowmelt estimation technique, we are planning to do the following:

- Changing the calibration and validation periods for the selected snowmelt routines
- different estimation Adapting snowmelt techniques such as Radiation energy based algorithm
- Use of higher temporal resolution data (Hourly data)
- Employ chosen snowmelt estimation techniques within different hydrological model to test its robustness

## References

[1] Essery, R., Morin, S., Lejeune, Y., Ménard, C.B., 2013. A comparison of 1701 snow models using observations from an alpine site. Adv. Water Resour. 55, 131-148.

[2] Coulibaly P, Keum J, 2016. Snow Network Design and Evaluation for La Grande River Basin, Hydro-Quebec, Canada (Project No. 016-0223-24134). McMaster University.