|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | p-value for KW between Group A – Group B | | |
| Date | Flight Altitude (AGL) | Snow Surface SfM – Bare-ground SfM | Snow Surface SfM – 3DEP 1/3 Arc Second | 3DEP 1/3 Arc Second – Bare-ground SfM |
| Mar. 11, 2021 | 10 m | .154 | .123 | **.023** |
| 15 m | .147 | .071 | **.001** |
| 20 m | .109 | .66 | **.047** |
| Mar. 18, 2021 | 10 m | .602 | .14 | **.047** |
| 15 m | .544 | .385 | .153 |
| 20 m | .391 | .305 | .07 |
| Apr. 28, 2021 | 10 m | .352 | **.021** | **.001** |
| 20 m | .304 | .092 | **.009** |
| 30 m | .819 | .098 | .065 |

**Table S3:** Kruskal-Wallis test (KW) p-values for topographically corrected UAV data. The test compares the distribution of 3 groups of data for each date and survey altitude: (1) UAV albedo corrected with SfM snow surface model, (2) UAV albedo corrected with SfM bare-ground model, and (3) UAV albedo corrected with a USGS 3DEP 1/3 arc-second DEM. A p-value < 0.05 (in bold) indicates that the difference between the means of the compared groups is statistically significant. Overall, UAV albedo measurements topographically corrected using the two SfM models were statistically indifferent. Additionally, the corrections utilizing the coarser-resolution 3DEP DEM were most comparable to corrections that utilized the SfM models at higher flight altitudes (20 – 30 m).