Dear Matthew Switanek, dear Co-authors,

Thank you for uploading your revised manuscript. I considered all comments and your answers to both reviewers in my assessment. Overall, I find the revisions acceptable in this form, in particular as you explained very clearly where and how the requested information is given (e.g., in which figure).

We would like to thank the editor for her time and her careful assessment of our paper.

At this stage, I ask you just for a short minor revision regarding two points (see below regarding 2 and 3) before acceptance for publication.
Comments from my side regarding the three major concerns of Reviewer 2 and your answers:
1) It makes sense that you changed the terminology to "estimates".

2) I agree with your argumentation and your answer to the major part of this comment. However, I agree with the last point of the comment of the reviewer that you should mention in the manuscript at least that 'blowing and sublimation of snow can greatly affect the snowpack, for that temperature and precipitation alone may not suffice as predictors'. Please add this point in a sentence in the discussion.

We have added in this point in the discussion. See L410.

3) I agree with the author's suggestion to rephrase the sentence to 'we find the model is quite capable of performing skillfully in that new terrain.' However, I would add that results still should be taken with some caution (as this would be the case with any/most (empirical-statistical) models).

We have added an additional sentence at L366.

I am looking forward to your submission of the revised manuscript.

Best regards,
Franziska Koch