

Interactive comment on “Modelling of snow processes in catchment hydrology by means of downscaled WRF meteorological data fields” by K. Förster et al.

R. Webb

ryan.webb@colostate.edu

Received and published: 5 May 2014

The paper presented the scope and purpose well, as well as the need for this type of study. The methods were well presented, but the methods changed from what was presented in the methods section to the results section. The point is made that downscaling the precipitation was not accurate and so actual observations were used. This defeats the down-scaling purpose of this study, especially for such a driving factor for snow processes such as precipitation. I also think more insight should be given into the information presented in figure 11 for the Sieber catchment. Why is ESCIMO resulting in net losses and Utah model resulting in net gains, were there any attempts to estimate

C1255

actual fluxes?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 11, 4063, 2014.