

**Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal The Cryosphere (TC).  
Please refer to the corresponding final paper in TC if available.

# Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater to the bed of Leverett Glacier, southwest Greenland

C. C. Clason<sup>1</sup>, D. W. F. Mair<sup>2</sup>, P. W. Nienow<sup>3</sup>, I. D. Bartholomew<sup>3</sup>, A. Sole<sup>4</sup>, S. Palmer<sup>5</sup>, and W. Schwanghart<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology, Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>2</sup>Geography and Environment, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, AB24 3UF, UK

<sup>3</sup>School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH8 9XP, UK

<sup>4</sup>Department of Geography, University of Sheffield, S10 2TN, UK

<sup>5</sup>Geography, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4RJ, UK

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Earth and Environmental Science, University of Potsdam, 14476 Potsdam-Golm, Germany

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Received: 23 June 2014 – Accepted: 17 July 2014 – Published: 29 July 2014

Correspondence to: C. C. Clason (caroline.clason@natgeo.su.se) and D. W. F. Mair (d.mair@abdn.ac.uk)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

**TCD**

8, 4243–4280, 2014

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Abstract

Meltwater delivered to the bed of the Greenland Ice Sheet is a driver of variable ice-motion through changes in effective pressure and enhanced basal lubrication. Ice surface velocities have been shown to respond rapidly both to meltwater production at the surface and to drainage of supraglacial lakes, suggesting efficient transfer of meltwater from the supraglacial to subglacial hydrological systems. Although considerable effort is currently being directed towards improved modelling of the controlling surface and basal processes, modelling the temporal and spatial evolution of the transfer of melt to the bed has received less attention. Here we present the results of spatially-distributed modelling for prediction of moulins and lake drainages on the Leverett Glacier in south-west Greenland. The model is run for the 2009 and 2010 ablation seasons, and for future increased melt scenarios. The temporal and spatial patterns of modelled lake drainages are qualitatively comparable with those seen from analyses of satellite imagery. The modelled timings and locations of delivery of meltwater to the bed match well with observed temporal and spatial patterns of ice surface speed ups. This is particularly true for the lower catchment (< 1000 m a.s.l.) where both the model and observations indicate that the development of moulins is the main mechanism for the transfer of surface meltwater to the bed. At higher elevations (e.g. 1250–1500 m a.s.l.) the development and drainage of supraglacial lakes becomes increasingly important. At these higher elevations, the delay between modelled melt generation and subsequent delivery of melt to the bed matches the observed delay between the peak air temperatures and subsequent velocity speed ups. Although both moulins and lake drainages are predicted to increase in number for future warmer climate scenarios, the lake drainages play an increasingly important role in both expanding the area over which melt accesses the bed and in enabling a greater proportion of surface melt to reach the bed.

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



# 1 Introduction

In the last decade it has been demonstrated that across large regions of the Greenland Ice Sheet (GrIS) surface meltwater is capable of penetrating through many hundreds of metres of cold ice via full-ice thickness crevasses, or moulins, and by the drainage of supraglacial lakes (e.g. Zwally et al., 2002; Das et al., 2008; Doyle et al., 2013). Evidence from remote sensing has shown the temporal and spatial patterns in lake formation and drainage during the melt seasons (e.g. McMillan et al., 2007; Sundal et al., 2009; Fitzpatrick et al., 2014) which indicates that the process is spatially extensive, with lake formation above 1800 m a.s.l. (Fitzpatrick et al., 2014). Once meltwater reaches the bed, the seasonal evolution of subglacial drainage system efficiency (e.g. Chandler et al., 2013), has been suggested to exert an important control on the dynamic response of the GrIS to surface meltwater inputs due to its modulation of the relationship between surface meltwater inputs and subglacial water pressure (Bartholomew et al., 2010, 2011a; Colgan et al., 2011; Hoffman et al., 2011; Sole et al., 2013). Consequently there has been renewed interest and significant progress in developing spatially distributed, coupled models of subglacial hydrology and ice flow at the glacier and ice sheet scale (e.g. Hewitt, 2013; de Fleurian et al., 2014).

There has, however, been less attention focused on the development of models which can simulate the delivery of surface run-off to the bed of the ice sheet, i.e. modelling the temporal and spatial evolution of surface-to-bed meltwater connections (Clason et al., 2012; Banwell et al., 2013). This is a significant limitation since it is increasingly clear that the dynamics of the overlying ice may be most sensitive to hydrology when and where there are transient changes in meltwater delivery to the bed (Schoof, 2010; Bartholomew et al., 2012), and where ice thickness and surface slope precludes the formation of stable channelized drainage (Meierbachtol et al., 2013; Doyle et al., 2014). Aside from the overall contribution to dynamics through basal sliding, modelling of surface-to-bed meltwater connections may also be important for glacier dynamics through ice deformation, due to a potential influence on cryo-hydrologic warming

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





and 2010 melt seasons when peak discharge in the proglacial river was  $317 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $398 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$  respectively (Bartholomew et al., 2011a).

### 3 Method

The main components of the model, which has been applied in a previous version to the Croker Bay catchment of the Devon Ice Cap (Clason et al., 2012), comprise: (1) a degree-day model for meltwater generation; (2) an algorithm for routing meltwater across the ice surface (Schwanghart and Kuhn, 2010) and storing meltwater within supraglacial lakes; and (3) a model for calculating penetration depths of water-filled crevasses, after Van der Veen (2007). The model, which is run here with a spatial resolution of 500 m and a temporal resolution of 1 day, is the first predictive (rather than prescriptive) model for moulin formation and the transfer of meltwater to the ice-bed interface applied to the Greenland ice sheet. Model outputs provide information on the location and timing of formation of surface-to-bed connections, the drainage of supraglacial lakes, the quantity of meltwater stored supraglacially and the quantity of meltwater delivered to the bed through each connection on each day.

#### 3.1 Melt modelling and supraglacial meltwater retention

A lack of appropriate input data for energy balance modelling precludes its use here, so a degree-day model (Appendix A) was chosen for this application. Degree-day modelling is a simple approach for estimation of melting, but it has performed well in characterising the relationship between melt and discharge in previous studies (Bartholomew et al., 2011b). Well calibrated degree-day factors (DDFs) for the catchment were calculated and calibrated for the Leverett glacier during 2009 (Appendix A). Meteorological data used for input to the degree-day model (Appendix A) were acquired at seven sites extending from the terminus of Leverett Glacier at 457 m (site 1, Fig. 1) into the ice sheet interior to 1716 m elevation (site 7, Fig. 1) (Bartholomew et al., 2011a). Daily

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



accumulation was obtained from UDG measurements of surface height, and spring snowpack depth on 6 May 2009 was recorded at each site (Fig. 1), resulting in an accumulation gradient of 256.6 mm w.e. per 1000 m ( $R^2 = 0.76$ ).

Following application to the Croker Bay catchment (Clason et al., 2012) the model has been developed to include both refreezing within the snowpack and a delay in meltwater routing across snow-covered cells. Model runs for the Leverett catchment without the inclusion of refreezing and runoff delay predicted lake drainages as early as May, which was not supported by observations, and studies such as Lefebvre et al. (2002) and (Box et al., 2006) demonstrate the considerable effect of refreezing on runoff. After Reeh (1991), meltwater retention due to refreezing in the snowpack was included by implementing the simple  $P_{max}$  coefficient, with a standard value of 0.6, supported by observations in the lower accumulation zone on west Greenland by Braithwaite et al. (1994). This coefficient is the fraction of the winter snowpack subject to refreezing over the course of a melt season, such that at the start of the model run  $P_{max}$  is applied to the spring snowpack to determine refreezing potential in each cell. At each time step meltwater is refrozen instantaneously until the refreezing potential in each cell is met, whereby future melting is allowed to runoff. Following Schuler et al. (2007) we do not differentiate between pore-water refreezing and formation of superimposed ice.

To account for percolation and meltwater flow through the basal saturated layer a simple runoff delay, governed by local snow depth, was applied in all snow-covered cells. The length of the delay was based on flow rates for dye percolation through the snowpack and along the basal saturated layer of Haut Glacier d'Arolla (Campbell, 2007). The range of measured flow rates from Campbell (2007) give runoff delays ranging from 1 to 16 days for meltwater flow through 1 m deep snow and along a 500 m flow path (model spatial resolution). In our model we incorporate a moderately high meltwater routing delay of 10 days for 1 m deep snow, scaling this delay linearly with local snow depth such that there is no delay when there is no snow.

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

## 3.2 Meltwater routing and accumulation in supraglacial lakes

A single-flow direction algorithm is applied to route available surface meltwater across the ice surface based on surface elevation (Schwanghart and Kuhn, 2010; Schwanghart and Scherler; 2014), where the amount of meltwater in each cell weights downstream flow accumulation. The 100 m Palmer et al. (2011) DEM was resampled to the standard model spatial resolution of 500 m. We do not define a threshold for discrete stream formation due to the spatial resolution of the DEM; instead meltwater is distributed across the ice surface by flow accumulation only. A total of 93 supraglacial lakes within the Leverett catchment were manually digitised in ArcGIS from maximum lake extents visible on Landsat 7 ETM+ imagery acquired on 15 and 31 July 2009 (Fig. 1). A fixed number of lakes are thus prescribed at the start of the season, rather than expanding up-glacier as the area experiencing melt becomes larger. Lake surface area was used to estimate lake volume based on a linear relationship derived between lake volume and surface area from data recorded by Box and Ski (2007) using MODIS for south-west Greenland. Filling and overtopping of supraglacial lakes is accounted for within the flow accumulation routine (Clason et al., 2012) such that meltwater routed into a lake-containing cell will accumulate until reaching the prescribed lake volume, at which point the lake will overtop and contribute to downstream runoff if it has not already drained. Supraglacial lakes in southwest Greenland are more numerous, have a larger total area, and have a larger frequency of fast drainage than anywhere else on the ice sheet (Selmes et al., 2011), making them an important feature of the Leverett glacier catchment.

## 3.3 Modelling crevasse location and depth

Synthetic aperture radar data from RADARSAT (Joughin et al., 2010) provided annual mean ice surface velocity data for the Leverett catchment from which velocity components (Fig. 2) and surface stresses could be calculated. The Von Mises criteria,  $\sigma_v$ , after Vaughan (1993) was applied for calculation of tensile stresses, and crevasse locations

### Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

were predicted based upon a prescribed tensile strength (Appendix B). The depth of each crevasse is calculated using a model of water-filled crevasse penetration based on linear elastic fracture mechanics (Van der Veen, 2007) driven by accumulated surface meltwater and the surface tensile stress regime (Fig. 2; Appendix C). The volume flux of meltwater to the ice-bed interface is calculated at the bottom of each full ice thickness crevasse. In addition to the propagation of surface crevasses, fracture beneath supraglacial lakes, and their consequent drainage, is also permitted when lake meltwater volume is large enough to drive a fracture through the ice thickness at a specific location according to equation C1 (Appendix C). Drainage of supraglacial lakes is permitted regardless of whether the tensile stress exceeds the prescribed ice tensile strength, since supraglacial lakes have been found to form in areas of low tensile or compressive surface stress (Catania et al., 2008).

## 4 Result

### 4.1 Application to Leverett 2009 and 2010 melt seasons

The model was first run for the 2009 melt season (run 1) with prescribed standard parameters of 75 kPa tensile strength, a 1 m depth-averaged crevasse width, an ice fracture toughness of  $150 \text{ kPa m}^{1/2}$ ,  $P_{max}$  of 0.6, and a runoff delay of 10 days where snow is 1 m deep. In all subsequent runs these parameters remain the same unless otherwise stated. The timing of moulins first reaching the ice-bed interface in run 1 is depicted in Fig. 3b, where the number of moulins formed is shown to increase in elevation with time. This is due to expansion of the area experiencing melting, retreat of the snowline, increased meltwater delay with elevation, and also due to the thicker ice through which moulins at higher elevation must penetrate to reach the bed. Supraglacial lake drainages also occur at higher elevations over time, as supported by remote sensing observations in southwest Greenland (Morriss et al., 2013).

**Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The model was also run using meteorological data from the 2010 melt season (run 2), covering the same time period as 2009 (day 130 to day 228), allowing for an assessment of model response to increased meltwater production in the Leverett catchment. During this period daily average temperatures at site 1 were on average 1 °C higher than for 2009 (Fig. 3a). 2010 was characterised by high temperatures and significantly increased melt days across the GrIS, with temperatures highest in the west (Box et al., 2010). Melting occurred for up to 50 days longer than the 1979–2007 mean in areas of the western ice sheet, and during the month of May surface temperatures were as much as 5 °C higher than the 1971–2000 average according to Reanalysis data from NCEP/NCAR. Figure 3c illustrates the modelled temporal formation of surface-to-bed connections during the 2010 melt season, where moulin begin forming one week earlier in comparison to the cooler 2009 season.

In 2009 modelled surface-to-bed connections form up to ca. 1400 m (Fig. 4a), delivering 76.3% of surface-generated meltwater to the bed. Below 1000 m elevation there are large clusters of moulin, which are cells for which sufficient meltwater is produced to allow for full-thickness fracture propagation of a single crevasse without relying on inflow from upstream accumulated meltwater. The model sets the runoff ratio, or the proportion of meltwater transferred to the next downstream cell, to zero when routed meltwater is captured by a crevasse, however at low elevations melt rates are highest, enhanced by a smaller delay in meltwater transfer through cells with low spring snowpack depths. For the 2010 season the model predicts an increase in total moulin numbers of 43.7% (Table 1) compared to 2009. Modelled lake drainages also increase in number from 17 in 2009 to 27 in 2010 (Table 1). Higher moulin numbers and lake drainages in 2010 causes the percentage of total meltwater that is a) transferred to the bed to increase (by 9%), and b) stored supraglacially to decrease (by 5.7%). (Table 1). In 2010 there is a notable increased clustering of moulin just below 1000 m and an increased number of lake drainages between 1100 m and 1200 m elevation (Fig. 4b).

## 4.2 Sensitivity analysis

To investigate the influence of including refreezing within the model,  $P_{max}$  was changed to 0.4 and 0 in runs 3 and 4. Moulin numbers showed a modest increase of 3.9 and 8.6 % for runs 3 and 4 respectively (Table 1). Associated increase in meltwater transfer to the bed of 4 and 10 % was balanced by a near identical 4.3 and 10.5 % decrease in supraglacial meltwater storage, highlighting a strong control imposed by refreezing on meltwater availability for moulin formation. The model was also tested for the upper and lower limits for runoff delay in runs 5 and 6, as derived from data by Campbell (2007). When a delay of only 1 day (at 1 m snow depth) was applied there was a small increase in moulin numbers of 5.2 %, due to the extended period during which melt is available to drive fracture propagation. Despite the increase in moulin numbers there was less than 1 % change in meltwater transfer to the bed and supraglacial storage (Table 1). Increasing the delay to 16 days for 1 m of snow had very little effect, with changes in meltwater transfer, storage and moulin numbers all less than 1 %. This is unsurprising as only the most upper reaches of the catchment are subject to the full meltwater transit delay, in an area receiving significantly less melt than in the lower elevation regions, where moulins are much less likely to form.

A constraint of the model is the control of spatial resolution on the number of crevasses with the potential to form connections to the bed. In runs 7 and 8 we thus ran the model at resolutions of 250 m and 1 km respectively, excluding supraglacial lakes. Runs 7 and 8 produced a 49.5 % increase and 67 % decrease in moulin numbers respectively (Table 1), strongly controlled by the consequent changing number of surface crevasses. Although meltwater must be split between the available crevasses at each resolution, the available surface-produced meltwater is more than sufficient to drive many of these crevasses to the bed, resulting in only a small decrease in meltwater transfer of 5.1 % in run 7 and a small increase of 4.9 % in run 8. There was no change in the amount of meltwater stored supraglacially in between run 7 and 8 due to static controls on meltwater production and transport (Table 1). Instead, with

TCD

8, 4243–4280, 2014

### Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



an increase/decrease in crevasse numbers, the amount of water stored englacially in crevasses that do not reach the bed increases/decreases in runs 7 and 8 respectively. Since crevasse length is modified to equal cell width at each resolution, crevasse volume is also modified, resulting in a smaller quantity of meltwater necessary to produce the level of water-filling required to drive a crevasse to the bed.

Model sensitivity to tensile strength, fracture toughness and crevasse width was also tested for the Leverett domain, as described for application to the Croker Bay catchment on the Devon Ice Cap in Clason et al. (2012). Results of these tests illustrated the same model sensitivity to altering these parameters as was previously described: altering fracture toughness has no significant effect, altering tensile strength strongly influenced the total number of moulins due to controlling the number of surface crevasses, and that while altering crevasse width has no impact on crevasse numbers, it does influence the number of moulins through altering the volume of the crevasse and thus how much water is necessary to drive it to the bed. In summary these tests show that the most important control on the spatial extent of moulins is the value of the tensile stress. Parameters which define crevasse geometry affect the rate at which water will fill a crevasse and are most important in determining the timing of the delivery of surface meltwater to the bed.

### 4.3 Moulin and lake densit

The spatial densities of modelled moulins and drained lakes in different elevation bands was calculated to investigate how the model characterises the change in the mechanism for delivery of meltwater to the bed with elevation (Fig. 5). During the 2009 melt season, the model predicts a marked reduction in moulin density above 1000 m. Lake drainages only occur above 750 m elevation, with the highest density of drainages occurring between 1000 m and 1250 m, incorporating site 4 (1061 m) and site 5 (1229 m) (Fig. 1), which exhibit the largest velocity peaks of the four sites above 1000 m.

## 4.4 Sensitivity to atmospheric warming

To investigate the sensitivity of ice surface-to-bed meltwater connections across the catchment to enhanced atmospheric warming, the model was run with the 2009 Lev-  
5 erett meteorological data revised to reflect the IPCC (2007) A1B scenario June, July  
and August air temperature projections for the Arctic region. 2009 was an average  
melt season based on the 1981–2010 mean (Sole et al., 2013), from which the three  
A1B scenarios, minimum, mean and maximum, represent temperature rises of 1.2 °C,  
2.1 °C, and 5.3 °C, respectively (IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, 2007). The results  
of running the model for increased future temperature scenarios (runs 9, 10 and 11; Ta-  
10 ble 1) show that in addition to an increase in moulin numbers (+46.5, 67.9 and 109.5%)  
and much increased occurrence of lake drainages (+58.8, 182.4 and 447.1%), apply-  
ing these scenarios also resulted in increases of 8.8, 13.6 and 19.7% in the percentage  
of surface-derived meltwater that is transferred to the bed.

Focussing on the mean scenario, below 750 m no change in moulin density is ob-  
15 served due to the smaller ice thicknesses and higher melt production resulting in all  
possible crevasses experiencing sufficient melt-filling to drive them to the bed. Although  
the melt-season starts just a few days earlier, a temporal shift in moulin formation is  
evident, with moulins at higher elevation forming much earlier than for the standard  
2009 model run (Fig. 6), and with an additional increase in the density of moulins at  
20 elevations above 750 m (Fig. 7). Furthermore, there is an increase in occurrence of  
lake drainages at higher elevations, resulting in more widespread delivery of meltwater  
to the bed through large ice thicknesses, beginning earlier in the melt season (Figs. 6  
and 7).

TCD

8, 4243–4280, 2014

### Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## 5 Assessment of model performance

### 5.1 Modelled and observed patterns of supraglacial lake drainage

A comparison between the modelled pattern of lake drainages shown in Fig. 3a and a remote sensing-based assessment of lake drainage events in 2009 undertaken by Bartholomew et al. (2011, their Fig. 2a) shows qualitative agreement. In both approaches: most lakes drain between early June and mid-August; drained lakes mostly occur between 1000 and 1400 m elevation, and there is a general trend showing an up-glacier progression in the timing of lake drainages of ~6–8 m elevation per day. These comparisons demonstrate that the general patterns of behaviour reproduced by the model, in terms of sources of spatial controls on ice surface velocities, fit well with field evidence.

### 5.2 Modelled meltwater delivery to bed and measured dynamic responses during 2009

We further assess the performance of the model through the consistency between modelled patterns in the delivery of meltwater to the subglacial drainage system and measured dynamic response of the ice sheet to changing meltwater inputs for the 2009 melt season. During the 2009 melt season horizontal ice surface velocities were measured at seven GPS units, sites 1 to 7 (Fig. 1), extending from the Leverett glacier at 456 m up onto the ice sheet at 1716 m elevation (Bartholomew et al., 2011b). The period of the melt season characterised by highest velocities began later at sites of increasing elevation, with initial acceleration recorded at sites 1 and 2 shortly after the onset of melting, while sites 5 and 6 remained near winter background levels for longer. This is due to retreat of the snowline and onset of melting at increasingly high elevation. Furthermore, the periods of enhanced velocity at sites 4, 5 and 6 (all above 1061 m) are not strongly associated with high positive degree days at these sites, in contrast to sites 1, 2 and 3 (all below 800 m).

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Meltwater transferred to the bed each day within each elevation band was calculated to compare the timing of modelled meltwater discharge to the bed with the timings of significant speed-up events within each elevation band (Fig. 8). Between 0 m and 499 m elevation, there is relatively little meltwater delivered to the bed through moulins, which reflects the very small area of the Leverett catchment below 500 m. Periods of increasing meltwater delivery to the bed between 500 m and 999 m match well with periods of velocity increase early in the season (Fig. 8). At the highest elevations within the catchment, above 1250 m, between ~ day 200 and 210 there is also good agreement between the timing of meltwater delivery to the bed and the glacier speed-up. Between 1250 m and 1500 m (Fig. 8), meltwater delivery to the bed is predicted in near-equal amounts from moulins and the drainage of supraglacial lakes, highlighting the greater significance of lake drainages at high elevations.

## 6 Discussion

In light of future climate scenarios, incorporating the transfer of surface-derived meltwater to the bed is imperative if ice sheet models are to fully consider the behaviour and development of the subglacial drainage system, and the consequent ice velocity responses that drive ice sheet evolution and contribution to sea level change. This study has applied a model for prediction of moulin formation and lake drainages to data sets for the Leverett Glacier catchment in southwest Greenland, simulating the delivery of meltwater from the ice surface to the bed. The model was run for the 2009 and 2010 melt seasons and predicts high spatial densities of moulins below 1000 m as the principal mechanism for rapid delivery of meltwater to the glacier bed, a finding that is consistent with interpretations from field measurements of surface melting and velocity. Bartholomew et al. (2011b) suggested that at lower elevations, ice surface velocities respond to supraglacial meltwater routed quickly to the ice-bed interface through moulins, while at higher elevations the lack of correlation between positive degree days and ice velocities may be indicative of a dynamic response to the delayed

release of meltwater stored in supraglacial lakes. Our model results are consistent with this finding, showing a similar change in the mechanism for the delivery of meltwater to the bed with elevation such that moulines are more dominant below 1000 m and drained lakes of more importance above this (Fig. 5). Above ca. 1000 m lake drainages play a much greater role in ensuring that meltwater reaches the bed through propagation of crevasses up to 1100 m deep (cf. Doyle et al., 2013), and into the ice sheet interior.

Many previous studies have demonstrated that the most likely cause of short-term ice surface speed-ups is the creation of areas of high water pressure at the bed of the ice sheet in response to high meltwater inputs to a drainage system that is not hydraulically efficient enough to accommodate transient high discharges at low pressure (Hoffmann et al., 2011; Bartholomew et al., 2012; Sole et al., 2013). Across most of the catchment there is a strong association between periods when the model predicts rapid increases in meltwater delivery to the bed and episodes of ice surface speed-up. The model output is therefore consistent with previous process interpretations. At GPS sites 1, 2 and 3 the period when the modelled meltwater discharges to the bed rise to a peak are not associated with speed-ups (~ day 200). This is consistent with the proposition from interpretation of field evidence that in these regions of the ice sheet hydraulically efficient subglacial drainage channels eventually evolve which can accommodate high discharges at low pressures (e.g. Chandler et al., 2013). The association between modelled meltwater delivery to the bed and observed ice sheet speed-ups is less obvious between 1000 and 1249 m a.s.l. (GPS sites 4 and 5). This may reflect model inadequacies or the effects of presenting modelled discharge as integrated values across an elevation band that covers a large horizontal extent. This elevation band is also likely to encompass the up-glacier limit in the extent to which efficient subglacial channels can evolve. Chandler et al. (2013) argued that channelized drainage could evolve up to 41 km from the ice sheet margin where the ice surface lies at a little over 1000 m a.s.l., i.e. at the lower range of this elevation band. However this study also showed that channels did not extend as far as 57 km where the ice sheet surface was 1230 m a.s.l. which is close to the upper range of the elevation band. It is

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





therefore likely that in this elevation band there is considerable spatial heterogeneity in subglacial drainage system evolution which would reduce the likelihood of observing a clear temporal association between spatially integrated modelled discharge and ice surface velocity.

At the highest elevations within the catchment several processes combine to delay the delivery of meltwater to the bed: the vertical percolation and refreezing of melt in the snowpack, the slowing of horizontal surface runoff through the snowpack, and the accumulation of sufficient water in supra-glacial lakes to initiate full-depth crevasse formation. The close agreement between the timing of modelled meltwater delivery to the bed and surface velocity speed-ups at the highest elevations in the catchment indicate that the model is able to characterise these processes effectively. This meltwater is delivered to the bed several days after the peak atmospheric temperatures during a relatively cool period between days 200 and 210 (cf. Figs. 3a and 8).

The comparison between 2009 and the warmer 2010 melt season and the testing of the sensitivity of the model results to atmospheric warming provides insight into how the catchment's hydrology may change under a warmer climate. The model shows the potential for an increased proportion of supraglacial meltwater to reach the bed, and that a larger area of the bed is directly affected by surface meltwater inputs, owing to the up-glacier expansion in the area affected by supraglacial lake drainages. This latter model outcome is supported by observations of an expansion in lake-covered area during warm years in the Russell Glacier catchment (Fitzpatrick et al., 2014). The modeled quantities of meltwater accessing the bed through lake drainage events shown here under the warmer climate scenarios are likely to give us a conservative view of what might be expected across the GrIS more generally, for two reasons. Firstly, the model uses a fixed, prescribed pattern of supraglacial lake cells which does not expand higher up-glacier as the melt extent increases. Secondly, the Leverett catchment only extends to ca. 1550m elevation and so cannot characterize the potential for a vast increase in the area where supraglacial lakes could form under a warmer climate. Both of these could be addressed by coupling this model with one that can predict the location of

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

the formation of supra-glacial lakes (e.g. Leeson et al., 2012). Nevertheless, the model clearly indicates that under a moderately warmer climate there will be an increase in the relative importance of supraglacial lake drainage in delivering melt to the bed of the ice sheet in the high elevation areas of the ice sheet (above 1000 m elevation) despite ice thicknesses in excess of 1 km.

It is not clear what the long-term impact of more spatially extensive and more frequent lake drainages may be on longer-term ice dynamics across high elevation areas of the ice sheet. Across the ablation area of the ice sheet it has been shown that there is no significant correlation between normalised surface melt and annual ice flow (Sole et al., 2013). It has been proposed that increased summer melting sustains large, widespread low-pressure subglacial channels which in turn promote more extensive and prolonged drainage of high pressure water from adjacent regions resulting in a greater drop in net basal water pressure and reduced displacement over the subsequent winter (Sole et al., 2013; Tedstone et al., 2013). This preconditioning of the ice-bed interface for reduced winter velocity limits the ice sheet's dynamic sensitivity to interannual variations in surface temperature and melt. However a positive relationship between warmer summer air temperatures and annual velocities may be expected well above the ELA where the development of low-pressure channelized drainage is likely hindered by greater ice thicknesses and shallow surface slopes (Meierbachtol et al., 2013; Doyle et al., 2014). The long-term implications of increased melting during warmer years, such as that witnessed in 2010 and 2012 (Tedstone et al., 2013), on subglacial drainage configuration, basal water pressure, and consequently ice dynamics are difficult to assess without coupling a model such as the one presented here to subglacial drainage and ice flow models (e.g. Hewitt, 2013; de Fleurian et al., 2014; Hoffman and Price, 2014).

Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## 7 Conclusions

A spatially-distributed model for predicting the temporal and spatial patterns of moulin formation and lake drainages has been applied to the Leverett Glacier in southwest Greenland. With minimal data requirements and a simple structure, the model is easily transferable to other areas, including those without supraglacial lakes. The model was run for the 2009 and 2010 ablation seasons, driven by in situ meteorological and melt observations, and assessed by comparison with independent interpretations of melt-water delivery to the bed based on analyses of ice dynamic response to atmospheric forcings. The response of the catchment's hydrology to future climate scenarios is also investigated, as is the model sensitivity to parameterisation of refreezing, horizontal meltwater transit through surface snowpacks and the model's spatial resolution.

The model is successful in characterising the spatial variation in the mechanisms for meltwater transfer from the surface to the bed. For the lower part of the catchment (< 1000 m a.s.l.) both the model and previous observations indicate that the development of moulins is the main mechanism for the transfer of surface meltwater to the bed. At the highest elevations (e.g. 1250–1500 m a.s.l.) the development and drainage of supraglacial lakes becomes increasingly important.

At the higher elevations, the delay between modelled melt generation and subsequent delivery of melt to the bed matches the observed delay between the peak air temperatures and subsequent velocity speed ups. This indicates that the model effectively characterises processes which delay the delivery of surface generated melt to the ice sheet bed.

The temporal and spatial patterns of modelled lake drainages compare favourably with those seen from analyses of satellite imagery. The modelled timings and locations of delivery of meltwater to the bed match well with observed temporal and spatial patterns of ice surface speed ups.

Results of modelling moulin formation and lake drainage for the warmer 2010 season, and particularly for future climate scenarios, indicate the potential for increased

### Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



absolute and relative transfer of supraglacial meltwater to the bed during periods of increased surface melting. With atmospheric warming lake drainages play an increasingly important role in both expanding the area over which surface-derived melt accesses the bed and in enabling a greater proportion of surface melt to reach the bed.

5 Model sensitivity testing demonstrates that the proportion of melt reaching the bed is relatively insensitive to refreezing thresholds, runoff delays and the spatial resolution of the model.

This work contributes to efforts to couple physically-based models of surface meltwater generation, subglacial hydrology and ice sheet dynamics which will be required to fully understand past, contemporary and future sensitivity of ice sheet mass balance and dynamics to climate change.

### Appendix A: Degree-day modelling

The model runs at a daily time step, and values of total melting each day,  $M_t$ , are determined by the application of a degree-day factor (DDF) for every day where mean temperature,  $T_t$ , equals or exceeds  $0^\circ\text{C}$ :

$$M_t = (\text{DDF} \cdot T_t) \quad T_t \geq 0^\circ\text{C} \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$M_t = 0 \quad T_t < 0^\circ\text{C} \quad (\text{A2})$$

The sum of daily melt values occurring over  $N$  days thus gives total ablation,  $A$ :

$$A = \sum_1^N M_t \quad (\text{A3})$$

A DDF for snow ( $\text{DDF}_s$ ) is applied for snow-covered cells, with a DDF for ice ( $\text{DDF}_i$ ) applied when the cumulative melt exceeds the prescribed spring snowpack depth. Precipitation falling as snow is added to the snowpack depth, but rainfall, where air temperature is above  $1^\circ\text{C}$ , is not included within the melt model due to the very small contribution it makes to total melt.

Temperature was recorded at 15min intervals at each of seven sites in the Leverett catchment (Fig. 1) during the 2009 and 2010 melt seasons. The model is run for the contemporaneous period of data collection from 10 May (day 130) to 16 August (day 228) for each year. An air temperature lapse rate of 5.5 °C per 1000 m was calculated from the 2009 data ( $R^2 = 0.96$ ). Degree-day factors for snow and ice ( $DDF_s$  and  $DDF_i$ ) of 5.81 mm w.e.  $d^{-1} °C^{-1}$  and 7.79 mm w.e.  $d^{-1} °C^{-1}$  respectively were determined based on calibration against ablation rates recorded by ultrasonic depth gauges (UDG) during 2009.

## Appendix B: Identification of areas of surface crevassing

Velocity data was first resolved into its longitudinal and transverse components (Fig. 2), the directional derivatives of which were then used to calculate strain rates,  $\dot{\epsilon}_{ij}$ . After Nye (1957) the constitutive relation was applied to convert strain rates to stresses,  $\sigma_{ij}$ :

$$\sigma_{ij} = B \dot{\epsilon}_e^{(1-n)/n} \dot{\epsilon}_{ij} \quad (B1)$$

where  $\dot{\epsilon}_e$  is effective strain, and  $n$  is the flow law exponent with a value of 3.  $B$  is a viscosity parameter sensitive to ice temperature, and is related to the flow law as  $B = A^{-1/n}$  (Viellet et al., 2006). For the Leverett catchment we apply an ice temperature of  $-5 °C$ , giving a flow law parameter,  $A$ , value of  $1.6 \times 10^{-15} s^{-1} kPa^{-3}$  (Paterson, 1994) and a viscosity parameter,  $B$ , value of  $271 kPa a^{1/3}$ .

For determining areas containing surface crevassing, ice surface tensile stresses,  $R_{ij}$ , were calculated based on the Von Mises criteria,  $\sigma_v$ , after Vaughan (1993):

$$\sigma_v = (\sigma_1 \sigma_1) + (\sigma_3 \sigma_3) - (\sigma_1 \sigma_3) \quad (B2)$$

Where the maximum and minimum principal stresses,  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_3$  are calculated from:

$$\sigma_1 = \sigma_{\max} = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy}) + \sqrt{\left[\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{yy})\right]^2 + \tau_{xy}^2} \quad (B3)$$

$$\sigma_3 = \sigma_{\min} = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy}) - \sqrt{\left[\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{yy})\right]^2 + \tau_{xy}^2} \quad (B4)$$

5 and where  $\sigma_{xx}$ ,  $\sigma_{yy}$  and  $\tau_{xy}$  are the longitudinal, transverse and shear stresses respectively. The tensile stress is thus related to the Von Mises criteria as:

$$R_{ij} = \sqrt{\sigma_v} \quad (B5)$$

10 Model cells containing surface crevassing were determined by prescribing a value of tensile strength, based on matching the calculated surface tensile stresses (Fig. 2) with the occurrence of crevassing visible on Landsat 7 imagery. A tensile strength of 75 kPa was prescribed in the standard model parameters. The tensile stresses are used both as an input to crevasse depth modelling and also for determining the runoff ratio of meltwater routed across the ice surface. The runoff ratio is 1 where cells no not  
15 contain crevasses, and 0 when tensile stresses exceed the prescribed tensile strength, such that upstream runoff is captured by surface crevasses, resetting downstream flow accumulation to zero.

### Appendix C: Calculation of crevasse depths

20 The model uses accumulated surface meltwater and the surface tensile stress regime (Fig. 2) as inputs to a model of water-filled crevasse penetration to calculate crevasse depth,  $d$ , based on linear elastic fracture mechanics, after Van der Veen (2007):

$$K_I = 1.12R_{xx}\sqrt{\pi d} - 0.683\rho_i g d^{1.5} + 0.683\rho_w g b^{1.5} \quad (C1)$$

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The net stress intensity factor,  $K_I$ , which describes elastic stresses incident on the tip of a crevasse, is found by summing the terms on the right which describe stress intensity factors relating to the tensile stress, the lithostatic stress of the ice, and the effect of water-filling within the crevasse. Acceleration due to gravity,  $g$ , density of ice,  $\rho_i$ , and density of freshwater,  $\rho_w$  are assigned the standard values of  $9.81 \text{ m s}^{-2}$ ,  $918 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  and  $1000 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$  respectively. Surface tensile stresses,  $R_{xx}$ , derived from velocity data are used as input to the first term on the right-hand side. Meltwater accumulated in each cell determines the water level in a crevasse,  $b$ , in the third term using  $Q$ , the rate at which a crevasse is filled with water, and time,  $t$ , where,

$$b = Qt \quad (\text{C2})$$

The level of the meltwater,  $b$ , in a crevasse is also controlled by crevasse geometry. Accumulated daily surface meltwater is calculated as a depth of water equivalent generated across each  $500 \text{ m} \times 500 \text{ m}$  cell. This water then converges into the prescribed surface area of a crevasse when applied to Eq. (9). The model assumes one crevasse per cell, and crevasse surface dimensions are prescribed as a depth-averaged width of  $1 \text{ m}$  and a length of  $500 \text{ m}$  (cell width) for the standard model runs.

The fracture toughness of ice,  $K_{IC}$ , is the critical stress at which a pre-existing flaw will begin to propagate, for which we prescribe a fracture toughness of  $150 \text{ kPa m}^{1/2}$  as an average of values calculated by Fischer et al. (1995) and Rist et al. (1999). Solving iteratively for depth,  $d$ , until  $K_I$  is less than the prescribed ice fracture toughness,  $K_{IC}$ , the model calculates the propagation depth of each crevasse. Crevasse propagation depths are calculated each day for cells where  $R_{xx}$  equals or exceeds the prescribed tensile strength, with depth increasing with time while propagation continues in response to daily accumulated surface meltwater. The locations of moulins, delivering meltwater to the ice-bed interface, are predicted when crevasse depth equals ice thickness, which is based upon a  $5 \text{ km}$  ice thickness dataset derived from ice penetrating radar (Bamber et al., 2001). In this study we imply that a moulin is any connection where surface meltwater has forced propagation of a crevasse through the full ice

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



thickness between the ice surface and the ice-bed interface, including crevasses beneath drained lakes. Intersection of supraglacial streams and surface crevasses can initiate the formation of traditional, circular moulins, although many of these connections will close within one year due to refreezing and due to creep closure of crevasses when the supply of meltwater is shut off (Van der Veen, 2007). It is thus not assumed that the modelled surface-to-bed connections must take the form of traditional moulins, nor does the model account for perennial moulins reopened after the accumulation season.

The drainage of supraglacial lakes, identified by manual digitisation of Landsat imagery, is accounted for within the model where it is assumed that a crevasse is present beneath each lake. The volume of meltwater stored in each lake is used to calculate the depth of meltwater within a crevasse,  $b$ , at each daily time step, converting stored meltwater in mm w.e. to crevasse water depth in m w.e., adjusted for crevasse width and length. Drainage of lakes within one 24 h time step is supported by the sub-daily drainage of supraglacial lakes witnessed in southwest Greenland by Das et al. (2008) and Doyle et al. (2013). Thus when Eq. (9) is solved for  $K_I \geq K_{IC}$ , where  $d$  is set to equal the ice thickness, lakes drain to the bed within one model time step since lake meltwater content has reached a level sufficient for crevasse propagation through the full ice thickness.

*Author contribution.* The modelling approach was developed by C. C. Clason, with meteorological and velocity data for Leverett glacier contributed by A. Sole and I. D. Bartholomew. The experimental concept was developed by C. C. Clason, D. W. F. Mair and P. W. Nienow. S. Palmer contributed the ice surface DEM, and W. Schwanghart developed the flow accumulation and lake filling subroutine. C. C. Clason wrote the original manuscript with contribution from D. W. F. Mair.

*Acknowledgements.* We acknowledge the College of Physical Sciences, University of Aberdeen, the Leverhulme Trust through a Study Abroad Studentship and the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority, for funding awarded to C. Clason. Data collection was supported by the UK Natural Environment Research Council (through a studentship to I. Bartholomew and grants to P. Nienow and D. Mair) and the Edinburgh University Moss Centenary Scholarship



(I. Bartholomew). We acknowledge I. Joughin for providing InSAR velocity data, and the National Snow and Ice Data Centre, University of Colorado, and J. Bamber for ice thickness data.

## References

- 5 Bamber, J. L., Layberry, R. L., and Gogineni, S. P.: A new ice thickness and bed data set for the Greenland ice sheet: 1. Measurement, data reduction, and errors, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 33773–33780, 2001.
- Banwell, A. F., Willis, I. C., and Arnold, N. S.: Modeling subglacial water routing at Paakitsoq, W Greenland, *J. Geophys. Res.-Earth*, 118, 1282–1295, 2013.
- 10 Bartholomew, I., Nienow, P., Mair, D., Hubbard, A., King, M., and Sole, A.: Seasonal evolution of subglacial drainage and acceleration in a Greenland outlet glacier, *Nat. Geosci.*, 3, 408–411, 2010.
- Bartholomew, I., Nienow, P., Sole, A., Mair, D., Cowton, T., Palmer, S., and Wadham, J.: Supraglacial forcing of subglacial drainage in the ablation zone of the Greenland ice sheet, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 85, L08502, doi:10.1029/2011GL047063, 2011a.
- 15 Bartholomew, I. D., Nienow, P., Sole, A., Mair, D., Cowton, T., King, M. A., and Palmer, S.: Seasonal variations in Greenland Ice Sheet motion: inland extent and behaviour at higher elevations, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, 307, 271–278, 2011b.
- Bartholomew, I., Nienow, P., Sole, A., Mair, D., Cowton, T., and King, M. A.: Short-term variability in Greenland Ice Sheet motion forced by time-varying meltwater drainage: implications for the relationship between subglacial drainage system behaviour and ice velocity, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, F03002, doi:10.1029/2011JF002220, 2012.
- 20 Box, J. E., Bromwich, D., Veenhuis, B., Bai, L. S., Stroeve, J., Rogers, J., Steffen, K., Haran, T., and Wang, S. H.: Greenland Ice Sheet surface mass balance variability (1988–2004) from calibrated polar MM5 output, *J. Climate*, 19, 2783–2800, 2006.
- 25 Box, J. E. and Ski, K.: Remote sounding of Greenland supraglacial melt lakes: implications for subglacial hydraulics, *J. Glaciol.*, 53, 257–265, 2007.
- Box, J. E., Cappelen, J., Decker, D., Fettweis, X., Mote, T., Tedesco, M., and van de Wal, R. S. W.: Greenland, Arctic Report Card 2010, available at: <http://www.arctic.noaa.gov/reportcard> (last access: 17 June 2014), 2010.

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Braithwaite, R. J., Laternser, M., and Pfeffer, W. T.: Variations of near-surface firn density in the lower accumulation area of the Greenland ice sheet, *Pakitsoq, West Greenland*, *J. Glaciol.*, 40, 477–485, 1994.

Campbell, F. M. A.: The role of supraglacial snowpack hydrology in mediating meltwater delivery to glacier systems, Ph.D. thesis, available at: <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/2871/> (last access: 17 June 2014), University of Glasgow, UK, 227 pp., 2007.

Catania, G. A., Neumann T. A., and Price, S. F.: Characterizing englacial drainage in the ablation zone of the Greenland ice sheet, *J. Glaciol.*, 54, 567–578, 2008.

Chandler, D. M., Wadham, J. L., Lis, G. P., Cowton, T., Sole, A., Bartholomew, I., Telling, J., Nienow, P., Bagshaw, E. B., Mair, D., Vinen, S., and Hubbard, A.: Evolution of the subglacial drainage system beneath the Greenland Ice Sheet revealed by tracers, *Nat. Geosci.*, 6, 195–198, 2013.

Clason, C. C., Mair, D. W. F., Burgess D. O., and Nienow, P. W.: Modelling the delivery of supraglacial meltwater to the ice/bed interface: application to the southwest Devon Ice Cap, Nunavut, Canada, *J. Glaciol.*, 58, 361–374, 2012.

Colgan, W., Steffen, K., Mclamb, W. S., Abdalati, W., Rajaram, H., Motyka, R., Phillips, T., and Anderson, R.: An increase in crevasse extent, West Greenland: hydrologic implications, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L18502, doi:10.1029/2011GL048491, 2011.

Das, S. B., Joughin, I., Behn, M. D., Howat, I. M., King, M. A., Lizarralde, D., and Bhatia, M. P.: Fracture propagation to the base of the Greenland Ice Sheet during supraglacial lake drainage, *Science*, 320, 778–781, 2008.

de Fleurian, B., Gagliardini, O., Zwinger, T., Durand, G., Le Meur, E., Mair, D., and Råback, P.: A double continuum hydrological model for glacier applications, *The Cryosphere*, 8, 137–153, doi:10.5194/tc-8-137-2014, 2014.

Doyle, S. H., Hubbard, A. L., Dow, C. F., Jones, G. A., Fitzpatrick, A., Gusmeroli, A., Kulesa, B., Lindback, K., Petterson, R., and Box, J. E.: Ice tectonic deformation during the rapid in situ drainage of a supraglacial lake on the Greenland Ice Sheet, *The Cryosphere*, 7, 129–140, doi:10.5194/tc-7-129-2013, 2013.

Fischer, M. P., Alley, R. B., and Engelder, T.: Fracture toughness of ice and firn determined from the modified ring test, *J. Glaciol.*, 41, 383–394, 1995.

Fitzpatrick, A. A. W., Hubbard, A. L., Box, J. E., Quincey, D. J., van As, D., Mikkelsen, A. P. B., Doyle, S. H., Dow, C. F., Hasholt, B., and Jones, G. A.: A decade (2002–2012) of supraglacial

## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



lake volume estimates across Russell Glacier, West Greenland, *The Cryosphere*, 8, 107–121, doi:10.5194/tc-8-107-2014, 2014.

Hewitt, I. J.: Seasonal changes in ice sheet motion due to melt water lubrication, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, 371–372, 16–25, 2013.

5 Hoffman, M. J., Catania, G. A., Neumann, T. A., Andrews, L. C., and Rumrill, J. A.: Links between acceleration, melting, and supraglacial lake drainage of the western Greenland Ice Sheet, *J. Geophys. Res.-Earth*, 116, F04035, doi:10.1029/2010JF001934, 2011.

Hoffman, M. and Price, S.: Feedbacks between coupled subglacial hydrology and glacier dynamics, *J. Geophys. Res.-Earth*, 119, 414–436, 2014

10 IPCC: Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M., and Miller, H. L. (eds.): *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007.

Joughin, I., Smith, B. E., Howat, I. M., Scambos, T., and Moon, T.: Greenland flow variability from ice-sheet-wide velocity mapping, *J. Glaciol.*, 56, 415–430, 2010.

Leeson, A. A., Shepherd, A., Palmer, S., Sundal, A., and Fettweis, X.: Simulating the growth of supraglacial lakes at the western margin of the Greenland ice sheet, *The Cryosphere*, 6, 1077–1086, doi:10.5194/tc-6-1077-2012, 2012.

Lefebre, F., Gallée, H., Van Ypersele, J., and Huybrechts, P.: Modelling of large-scale melt parameters with a regional climate model in south Greenland during the 1991 melt season, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 35, 391–397, 2002.

20 McMillan, M., Nienow, P., Shepherd, A., Benham, T., and Sole, A.: Seasonal evolution of supraglacial lakes on the Greenland Ice Sheet, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, 262, 484–492, 2007.

Meierbachtol, T., Harper, J., and Humphrey, N.: Basal drainage system response to increasing surface melt on the Greenland ice sheet, *Science*, 341, 777–779, 2013.

25 Morriss, B. F., Hawley, R. L., Chipman, J. W., Andrews, L. C., Catania, G. A., Hoffman, M. J., Lüthi, M. P., and Neumann, T. A.: A ten-year record of supraglacial lake evolution and rapid drainage in West Greenland using an automated processing algorithm for multispectral imagery, *The Cryosphere*, 7, 1869–1877, doi:10.5194/tc-7-1869-2013, 2013.

30 Nye, J. F.: The distribution of stress and velocity in glaciers and ice sheets, *Proc. R. Soc. Lon. Ser.-A*, 239, 113–133, 1957.

Palmer, S., Shepherd, A., Nienow, P., and Joughin, I.: Seasonal speedup of the Greenland Ice Sheet linked to routing of surface meltwater, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, 302, 423–428, 2011.

**Modelling the  
transfer of  
supraglacial  
meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Paterson, W. S. B.: The Physics of Glaciers, 3rd edn., Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1994.
- Phillips, T., Rajaram, H., and Steffen, K.: Cryo-hydrologic warming: a potential mechanism for rapid thermal response of ice sheets, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37, L20503, doi:10.1029/2010GL044397, 2010.
- 5 Reeh, N.: Parameterization of melt rate and surface temperature on the Greenland ice sheet, *Polarforschung*, 59, 113–128, 1991.
- Rist, M. A., Sammonds, P. R., Murrell, S. A. F., Meredith, P. G., Doake, C. S. M., Oerter, H., and Matsuki, K.: Experimental and theoretical fracture mechanics applied to Antarctic ice fracture and surface crevassing, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 2973–2986, 1999.
- 10 Schoof, C.: Ice sheet acceleration driven by melt supply variability, *Nature*, 468, 803–306, 2010.
- Schuler, T. V., Loe, E., Taurisano, A., Eiken, T., Hagen, J. O., and Kohler, J.: Calibrating a surface mass-balance model for Austfonna ice cap, Svalbard, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 46, 241–248, 2007.
- Schwanghart, W. and Kuhn, N. J.: TopoToolbox: a set of Matlab functions for topographic analysis, *Environ. Modell. Softw.*, 25, 770–781, 2010.
- 15 Schwanghart, W. and Scherler, D.: Short Communication: TopoToolbox 2 – MATLAB-based software for topographic analysis and modeling in Earth surface sciences, *Earth Surf. Dynam.*, 2, 1–7, doi:10.5194/esurf-2-1-2014, 2014.
- Selmes, N., Murray, T., and James, T. D.: Fast draining lakes on the Greenland Ice Sheet, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L15501, doi:10.1029/2011GL047872, 2011.
- 20 Sole, A., Nienow, P., Bartholomew, I., Mair, D., Cowton, T., Tedstone, A., and King, M. A.: Winter motion mediates dynamic response of the Greenland Ice Sheet to warmer summers, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 3940–3944, 2013.
- Sundal, A. V., Shepherd, A., Nienow, P., Hanna, E., Palmer, S., and Huybrechts, P.: Evolution of supra-glacial lakes across the Greenland Ice Sheet, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 113, 2164–2171, 2009.
- 25 Tedstone, A. J., Nienow, P. W., Bartholomew, I. D., Sole, A. J., Cowton, T. R., Mair, D. W. F., and King, M. A.: Greenland ice sheet motion insensitive to exceptional meltwater forcing, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 110, 19719–19724, 2013.
- van der Veen, C. J.: Fracture propagation as means of rapidly transferring surface meltwater to the base of glaciers, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L01501, doi:10.1029/2006GL028385, 2007.
- 30 Vaughan, D. G.: Relating the occurrence of crevasses to surface strain rates, *J. Glaciol.*, 39, 255–266, 1993.

Vieli, A., Payne, A. J., Du, Z., and Shepherd, A.: Numerical modelling and data assimilation of the Larsen B ice shelf, Antarctic Peninsula, *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. A*, 364, 1815–1839, 2006.  
Zwally, J. H., Abdalati, W., Herring, T., Larson, K., Saba, J., and Steffen, K.: Surface melt-induced acceleration of Greenland Ice Sheet flow, *Science*, 297, 218–222, 2002.

TCD

8, 4243–4280, 2014

**Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.

**Table 1.** Total number of surface-to-bed connections formed, the percentage of surface-generated meltwater delivered to the bed and the percentage of surface-generated meltwater stored supraglacially for each model run.

Run name	Moulin numbers		Meltwater transfer		Supraglacial storage	
	Total moulins (number of lake drainages)	% change from initial run	% transfer from surface to bed	change from initial run	% of total generated meltwater	change from initial run
1 (2009)	327 (17)	n/a	76.3	n/a	17.1	n/a
2 (2010)	470 (27)	+43.7	85.3	+9.0	11.4	-5.7
3 (Pmax = 0.4)	340 (17)	+3.9	80.3	+4.0	12.8	-4.3
4 (Pmax = 0)	355 (17)	+8.6	86.3	+10.0	6.6	-10.5
5 (1 day runoff delay)	344 (16)	+5.2	77.2	+0.9	16.6	-0.5
6 (16 day runoff delay)	329 (17)	+0.6	76.1	-0.2	17.3	+0.2
7 (250 m resolution)	489 (n/a)	+49.5	71.2	-5.1	17.1	0
8 (1 km resolution)	108 (n/a)	-67.0	81.2	+4.9	17.1	0
9 (A1B JJA min.)	479 (27)	+46.5	85.1	+8.8	11.7	-5.4
10 (A1B JJA mean)	549 (48)	+67.9	89.9	+13.6	8.0	-9.1
11 (A1B JJA max.)	685 (93)	+109.5	96.0	+19.7	3.7	-13.4

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶


Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion






**Figure 1.** Leverett glacier surface hydrological catchment (outlined in green). Contours show ice surface elevation (m.a.s.l.); locations of meteorological data collection are depicted by red triangles; the location of proglacial discharge measurements is represented by the yellow star; and supraglacial lakes are highlighted in blue. The background image is from Landsat 7, band 2, captured on 5 August 2005.

**Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	





**Figure 2.** Longitudinally-resolved (along-flow) ice surface velocities from InSAR data for the Leverett catchment (Joughin et al., 2010). Contours depict the ice surface tensile stress regime.

**Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.


Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	





## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.



**Figure 3.** (a) Daily average air temperatures at site 1 (457 m a.s.l.) for 2009 and 2010, and moulin formation through the (b) 2009 and (c) 2010 melt seasons with elevation.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

Modelling the  
transfer of  
supraglacial  
meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.




Figure 4. Spatial distribution of moulin and lake drainages for (a) 2009 and (b) 2010.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.



**Figure 5.** Density of moulins and lake drainages for 2009 within 250 m ice surface elevation bands. Sites of GPS velocity measurements (Fig. 1; Bartholomew et al., 2011b) are shown against the Leverett catchment ice surface profile. N.B. only a very small area of the derived Leverett catchment lies below 500 m elevation, where outlet glaciers emerge at the margin of the ice sheet.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





**Figure 6.** Spatial distribution of moulins and lake drainages for the 2009 melt season and the A1B mean June, July and August Arctic scenario of +2.1 °C (IPCC Fourth Assessment Report) applied to 2009 meteorological data.

**Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater**

C. C. Clason et al.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Modelling the transfer of supraglacial meltwater

C. C. Clason et al.



**Figure 7.** Density of moulins and lake drainages for A1B mean June, July and August Arctic scenario within 250 m ice surface elevation bands.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





**Figure 8.** Supraglacial meltwater delivered to the bed each day through lake drainages and moulins within ice surface elevation bands of 250 m during 2009. Ice surface velocities from GPS sites 1–6 are plotted within their respective elevation bands (after Bartholomew et al., 2011b).