

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

10.1002/2017JF004349

## Key Points:

- A 3-D full-Stokes calving model was implemented in Elmer/Ice and applied to Store Glacier in West Greenland
- The model reproduces the seasonal characteristics of ice flow and calving without tuning
- Ice mélange and submarine melting link calving to the ocean, strongly modulated by basal topography

## Supporting Information:

- Supporting Information S1

## Correspondence to:

J. Todd,  
jat39@st-andrews.ac.uk

## Citation:

Todd, J., P. Christoffersen, T., Zwinger, P., Råback, N., Chauché, D. Benn, et al. (2018). A full-Stokes 3-D calving model applied to a large Greenlandic Glacier. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 123, 410–432. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JF004349>







Received 6 MAY 2017

Accepted 8 JAN 2018

Accepted article online 30 JAN 2018

Published online 1 MAR 2018

## A Full-Stokes 3-D Calving Model Applied to a Large Greenlandic Glacier

Joe Todd<sup>1,2</sup> , Poul Christoffersen<sup>2</sup> , Thomas Zwinger<sup>3</sup> , Peter Råback<sup>3</sup>, Nolwenn Chauché<sup>4</sup>, Doug Benn<sup>1</sup>, Adrian Luckman<sup>5</sup> , Johnny Ryan<sup>6</sup>, Nick Toberg<sup>2</sup>, Donald Slater<sup>7</sup> , and Alun Hubbard<sup>6,8</sup> 


<sup>1</sup>Department of Geography and Sustainable Development, University of St Andrews, St. Andrews, UK, <sup>2</sup>Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK, <sup>3</sup>CSC-IT Center for Science, Espoo, Finland, <sup>4</sup>Access Arctic SARL, Sauvigny les bois, France, <sup>5</sup>Department of Geography, College of Science, Swansea University, Swansea, UK, <sup>6</sup>Centre for Glaciology, Institute of Geography and Earth Sciences, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, UK, <sup>7</sup>School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, <sup>8</sup>Centre for Arctic Gas Hydrate, Environment and Climate, Department of Geology, Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

**Abstract** Iceberg calving accounts for around half of all mass loss from both the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets. The diverse nature of calving and its complex links to both internal dynamics and climate make it challenging to incorporate into models of glaciers and ice sheets. Here we present results from a new open-source 3-D full-Stokes calving model developed in Elmer/Ice. The calving model implements the crevasse depth criterion, which states that calving occurs when surface and basal crevasses penetrate the full thickness of the glacier. The model also implements a new 3-D discretization approach and a time-evolution scheme which allow the calving front to evolve realistically through time. We test the model in an application to Store Glacier, one of the largest outlet glaciers in West Greenland, and find that it realistically simulates the seasonal advance and retreat when two principal environmental forcings are applied. These forcings are (1) submarine melting in distributed and concentrated forms and (2) ice mélange buttressing. We find that ice mélange buttressing is primarily responsible for Store Glacier's seasonal advance and retreat. Distributed submarine melting prevents the glacier from forming a permanent floating tongue, while concentrated plume melting has a disproportionately large and potentially destabilizing effect on the calving front position. Our results also highlight the importance of basal topography, which exerts a strong control on calving, explaining why Store Glacier has remained stable during a period when neighboring glaciers have undergone prolonged interannual retreat.

**Plain Language Summary** Most freshwater on our planet is stored as ice in the ice sheets of Greenland and Antarctica. The ice sheet in Greenland is currently losing mass at a rate that is equal to 1 mm/year of sea level rise. Around half of the ice loss in Greenland is lost through icebergs released into the sea through a process called “calving.” Iceberg calving is poorly understood and has so far not been included in 3-D models needed to predict sea level rise. Recent studies show that warming of the air and ocean is linked to more calving, but we still do not understand these links sufficiently to make predictions. This study presents a new computer model, which is the first to simulate glacier flow and iceberg calving in 3-D, and investigates calving at Store Glacier in Greenland. We test the model by reproducing the present-day seasonal cycle of the glacier and find that fractures forming on the surface as well as the bottom of the glacier control the calving rate. We show that the calving rate is influenced by submarine melting of the calving ice front as well as by ice mélange, which is a mixture of icebergs and sea ice forming in front of the glacier in winter.

### 1. Introduction

Iceberg calving is the single most important ablation mechanism for Earth's polar ice sheets. In Antarctica, ice is lost primarily by calving and secondarily by bottom melting on ice shelves (Depoorter et al., 2013). In Greenland, ice is lost by calving and surface melting, with the former accounting for two thirds of the total ice loss in the 2000s (Rignot & Kanagaratnam, 2006) but less than half since 2010 (Enderlin et al., 2014). The variability of ice lost by calving in Greenland is thought to stem from a sensitive interaction of the ice sheet with the ocean (Holland et al., 2008), which brought warm waters into coastal seas in the 2000s (Christoffersen et al., 2011). Understanding how the ocean forces the ice sheet through calving is therefore vital.



**Figure 1.** Plan view of the 3-D model mesh of Store Glacier. The mesh resolution increases significantly toward the terminus.

Calving processes and their links to glacier and ice sheet dynamics are poorly understood for various reasons. First and foremost, calving includes fracture processes spanning a range of temporal and spatial scales, from the relatively slow propagation of several kilometer long rifts in Antarctica (Bassis et al., 2008) to the initiation and growth of microfractures in glacier ice (Borstad et al., 2012). Calving glaciers are diverse in their geometry and environmental setting, and their flow is largely controlled by conditions and processes operating at the ice-ocean interface and at the bed, all of which are difficult to observe. This complexity, combined with a paucity of data, makes dynamic mass loss from calving glaciers one of the most poorly constrained contributors to sea level rise in the 21st century and beyond (IPCC, 2013).

Early calving models focused on empirical relationships between calving and parameters such as water depth (Brown et al., 1982) or height above buoyancy (Van der Veen, 1996; Vieli et al., 2001). Recent efforts have focused on using the near-terminus stress field to predict calving (Alley et al., 2008; Benn, Hulton, et al., 2007; Benn, Warren, et al., 2007; Levermann et al., 2012; Morlighem et al., 2016; Van der Veen, 1998a, 1998b). Benn, Hulton, et al. (2007) introduced the crevasse depth calving criterion, suggesting that calving occurs when surface crevasses reach sea (or lake) level, at which point hydrofracture drives crevasses through the full glacier thickness. A modification by Nick et al. (2010) suggested that calving occurs when surface and basal crevasses collectively fracture the entire ice thickness near the terminus. These crevasse depth calving criteria have been implemented by several previous modeling studies (Cook et al., 2012; Cook et al., 2014; Nick et al., 2010; Otero et al., 2010; Pollard et al., 2015; Todd & Christoffersen, 2014; Vieli & Nick, 2011). To date, however, these models have either been implemented in only one or two dimensions, representing either flowline or depth-integrated glacier geometries, or do not permit evolution of the model domain through time. These limitations mean that the models inadequately capture important aspects of the calving mechanism, such as forward toppling due to terminus force imbalance, bending forces due to buoyancy, or the effect of lateral stress bridges. Simplified model domains also struggle to capture the impact of environmental forcings, which commonly include significant and spatially variable undercutting of the ice front by submarine melting (Luckman et al., 2015).

Here we develop a 3-D time-evolving full-Stokes calving model incorporating a modified crevasse depth calving law, in the glaciological model Elmer/Ice (Gagliardini et al., 2013; Zwinger et al., 2007; Zwinger & Moore, 2009). In addition to the implementation of the crevasse depth calving criterion, a rediscritization scheme is developed which allows complex terminus geometries to evolve through time without requiring the simulation to stop and restart. We present results from a case study of Store Glacier, a large tidewater glacier in West Greenland (Figure 1) to illustrate the capabilities of the model and provide validation. A full sensitivity analysis is available in the PhD thesis associated with this work (Todd, 2017).

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Modeling Calving in 3-D

We implement the 3-D calving model in the open-source glaciological model Elmer/Ice. Elmer/Ice is able to solve the full-Stokes equations with excellent scalability, tracks grounding line dynamics and provides inverse methods for basal (and internal) conditions. In this section we describe the calving model and its implementation in Elmer/Ice, before describing the model setup, including boundary conditions, in more detail. Detailed descriptions of parts of the calving and remeshing algorithms are provided as supporting text, and the model code is freely available as part of the open-source Elmer/Ice package (<http://elmerice.elmerfem.org>).

#### 2.1.1. Physical Calving Criteria

We implement an improved formulation of the crevasse depth calving criterion (Benn, Hulton, et al., 2007; Nick et al., 2010), which predicts calving based on the penetration of crevasses. Two variants of the crevasse depth calving criterion exist: The original formulation of Benn, Hulton, et al. (2007) specifies calving to occur when surface crevasses meet the waterline, at which point water flows in from the proglacial water body causing hydrofracturing, which leads to full thickness calving. This process may occur even at cold glaciers because the exchange of heat between intruding proglacial water and glacier crevasses/conduits should prevent them from freezing. An alternative crevasse criterion developed by Nick et al. (2010) considers the formation of basal crevasses and states that calving occurs when surface and basal crevasses meet. We consider both of these criteria to be feasible and implement both, which means that calving in our model occurs when either condition is met.

To predict the penetration of surface and basal crevasses, we follow previous studies (Benn, Hulton, et al., 2007; Nick et al., 2010; Otero et al., 2010) in using the Nye (1957) criterion, which we modify for use in 3-D, as described below. The Nye criterion is a simplified approach to predicting the extent of a *field of closely spaced crevasses*, as opposed to tracking the evolution of individual crevasses. Extension in the direction of flow dominates the stress field near calving termini, and this longitudinal extension opens fields of crevasses largely through Mode 1 fracture (Benn, Warren, et al., 2007; Van der Veen, 1998b). The Nye criterion predicts the opening of crevasses based solely on the extensional stress across the crevasse, making it the natural choice as a calving predictor.

Unlike the more complex Linear Elastic Fracture Mechanics (LEFM) approach (Krug et al., 2014; Van der Veen, 1998a, 1998b), the Nye criterion ignores stress concentration effects, which are negligible under the assumption of closely spaced crevasses (Cuffey & Paterson, 2010), and so does not require prior knowledge of crevasse spacing. Additionally, the Nye criterion has no free parameters, meaning the calving law cannot simply be calibrated to match observations. This allows us to more reliably assess the performance of the model. We also note that the focus of this study is the development of the modeling framework which allows time evolving calving in 3-D continuum simulations; other calving laws could easily be implemented.

Nye (1957) noted that, in the case of negligible surface slope, tensile stresses exist to a depth ( $d$ ) where:

$$\rho g d = 2\tau_{xx} \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho$  is ice density,  $g$  is gravity, and  $\tau_{xx}$  is longitudinal deviatoric stress. This equation effectively splits the Cauchy, or full, stress ( $\sigma$ ) into the ice overburden pressure on the left, and the deviatoric stress term ( $2\tau_{xx}$ ) on the right. This assumes first that the hydrostatic pressure assumption is valid ( $p = -\rho g d$ ) and second that  $\tau_{xx}$  is constant through depth. These assumptions allow crevasse penetration to be estimated purely from surface measurements (Mottram & Benn, 2009). This “observational” formulation of the crevasse depth is further exemplified by the work of Benn, Hulton, et al. (2007), who use Glen’s flow law to substitute the deviatoric stress term with a strain rate term.

Since we solve the full-Stokes flow solution, it is neither necessary nor desirable to split the Cauchy stress ( $\sigma$ ) into its hydrostatic and deviatoric components; instead, the Cauchy stress can be computed everywhere directly from the flow solution. In this case, the Nye (1957) crevasse depth model states that crevasses should exist to a depth where:

$$\sigma_{xx} = 0 \quad (2a)$$

which illustrates the simplicity of the Nye (1957) criterion, which states that crevasses exist where extensional stress exists to open them. This zero stress formulation ignores the yield strength which must be overcome to

initiate fracture (Cuffey & Paterson, 2010), and we justify this on the basis that ice near the front of calving glaciers is already heavily fractured (i.e., extensional stresses propagate existing fractures).

We make one further modification to equation (2a), replacing  $\sigma_{xx}$ , which is unsuitable for modeling calving in 3-D (Otero et al., 2010), with the largest principal stress:

$$\sigma_1 = 0 \tag{2b}$$

This modification is based on the assumption that crevasses on glaciers open by Mode I fracture (Benn, Warren, et al., 2007; Van der Veen, 1998b), so that crevasses are expected to open perpendicular to the largest extensional stress ( $\sigma_1$ ). This approach neglects crevasse history, but we find that surface crevasses in satellite imagery of Store Glacier tend to follow modeled principal stress direction which, in turn, tends to follow flow direction, especially near the terminus.

Equation (2b) allows us to define the depth of a surface crevasse field. To implement this in the model, we define, for both surface and basal crevasses, an effective principal stress (EPS) whose value is positive where crevasses exist, and negative where ice is intact:

$$\text{EPS}_{\text{surf}} = \sigma_1 \tag{3}$$

$$\text{EPS}_{\text{basal}} = \sigma_1 + P_w \tag{4}$$

Water pressure ( $P_w$ ) is included in equation (4) because calving glaciers typically experience high basal water pressure, which helps the opening of basal crevasses. Surface crevasses, on the other hand, are capable of opening without water pressure. Although previous work has specified water pressure in surface crevasses, we deliberately avoid this assumption because aerial photography has shown only a small number of Store Glacier's surface crevasses to be water-filled during summer (Ryan et al., 2015). Furthermore, the presence and depth of surface meltwater in crevasses are extremely difficult to predict, depending not only on surface melt rates but also on crevasse spacing and geometry and the supraglacial and englacial drainage systems, which are poorly constrained. We therefore choose to ignore this process.

Basal water pressure, on the other hand, is controlled by the subglacial hydrological system, which is important for glaciers in general but especially important for glaciers terminating in deep fjords. Because modeling of the subglacial system is nontrivial and beyond the scope of this work, we make the reasonable assumption that basal water pressure near the calving terminus is equal to the pressure exerted by the sea at the terminus. The water pressure at the base of the glacier ( $P_{wb}$ ) near the terminus is therefore:

$$P_{wb} = (z_{sl} - z_b)\rho_{sw}g \tag{5}$$

where  $Z_{sl}$  and  $Z_b$  are the elevation of sea level and the base of the glacier respectively and  $\rho_{sw}$  is the density of seawater. Given that basal crevasses will fill with buoyant freshwater from the subglacial hydrological system, the water pressure inside a basal crevasse ( $P_w$ ) is then given by:

$$P_w = P_{wb} - (z - z_b)\rho_{fw}g \tag{6}$$

where  $\rho_{fw}$  is the density of freshwater and  $z$  is elevation.

## 2.2. Calving Algorithm in 3-D

In 3-D, calving requires full crevasse penetration along an uninterrupted line connecting two points at the terminus, thereby isolating a portion of the front from the remainder of the glacier. This makes the algorithm for identifying calving events in 3-D significantly more complex compared to flowline models (Cook et al., 2012; Nick et al., 2010; Todd & Christoffersen, 2014) in which calving position is defined by a point along the length of the glacier. The change in glacier geometry after a calving event is also more complex in 3-D. In flowline models, the geometry of a calving event is sufficiently simple that the initial model mesh can simply be stretched or compressed in the direction of flow to accommodate the new shape (Todd & Christoffersen, 2014). However, in 3-D, the development of headlands and embayments, as well as undercutting, means that the model mesh quickly becomes degenerate, whereby 3-D elements change topology, leading to simulation breakdown. Thus, discretization of the domain ("remeshing") is required after calving events, to prevent the mesh from becoming degenerate.





Figure 2. The full calving algorithm implemented in Calving3D.

### 2.2.1. Calving Algorithm and Its Implementation

The calving model runs at the end of each time step, after the computation of the flow solution and stress field. The full algorithm for identifying calving is shown in Figure 2. The overall strategy is to first compute the 3-D extent of crevasse fields on the model mesh, then collapse this via vertical ray casting and interpolation into a 2-D map of crevasse depth on a separate planar mesh (Figure 3). Finally, calving events are identified on the planar mesh.

First,  $EPS_{surf}$  and  $EPS_{basal}$  (equations (3) and (4)) are computed everywhere in the 3-D domain, to determine where surface and basal crevasses exist. This is then collapsed to a 2-D field of crevasse penetration ( $H_{crev}$ ) on the planar mesh “PlaneMesh” (Figure 3). PlaneMesh is independent of the main model mesh; it encompasses the whole terminus region, extending 3 km upstream from the calving front. It also has a higher resolution (30 m) than the main model mesh. For each node in PlaneMesh, vertical ray casting is used to find a



**Figure 3.** Schematic showing 3-D calving algorithm. (a) For each node in PlaneMesh, vertical intersections with 3-D mesh are identified via ray casting. (b) Surface/basal crevasses exist to the depth/height where net stress (EPS) is 0. (c) The proportional crevasse penetration ( $H_{crev}$ ) is computed from the thickness and crevasse penetration, and (d) this is set on the relevant node of the PlaneMesh.

vertical profile through the main model mesh, from which proportional crevasse penetration ( $H_{crev}$ ) is computed on the basis of ice thickness and the depths of surface and basal crevasses:


$$H_{crev(surf)} = \frac{d_{surf}}{z} \tag{7}$$

$$H_{crev(basal)} = \frac{d_{surf} + d_{basal}}{H} \tag{8}$$

where  $d_{surf}$  and  $d_{basal}$  represent the depth of surface and basal crevasses respectively,  $z$  is the ice freeboard, and  $H$  is the ice thickness.  $H_{crev}$  is equal to 1 where crevasses penetrate fully, and between 0 and 0.99 elsewhere (Figure 4). We then use the  $H_{crev} = 1$  contours to identify potential calving events specified by a line of full crevasse penetration intersecting the ice/ocean interface at two locations, isolating an iceberg from the terminus (Figure 4). However, this was found to be an insufficient condition for calving; sometimes  $H_{crev} = 1$  contours form constrictions, before widening inland. In such cases, crevassed ice is laterally constrained by intact ice, and so cannot be evacuated into the fjord. Therefore, we add an extra filter in the calving algorithm (Text S1 in the supporting information), which automatically checks that the ice that calves off has a realistic geometry. This control inspects the geometry of the  $H_{crev} = 1$  contour and specifically ensures that ice cannot be lost through narrow constrictions. When a narrow constriction is found, the  $H_{crev} = 1$  contour is cut to make sure unphysical calving is prevented.

The final stage of the calving algorithm is to identify points on the 3-D calving front that lie within a region predicted to calve; for each 3-D mesh node on the calving front, we seek an upstream  $H_{crev} = 1$  contour line and, if found, mark the post-calving position of the node, which lies on this contour. For any node for which a





**Figure 4.** Crevasse penetration (%) on PlaneMesh. (a) Two concurrent calving events are delineated by yellow lines (the  $H_{\text{crev}} = 1$  contour). (b) Crevasse penetration in subsequent time step. The calving events have expanded crevassing in the surrounding ice.

corresponding post-calved position is found, we compute the “calving vector,” perpendicular to the overall orientation of the calving front, which represents the displacement from the pre-calved position to the post-calved position (Figure S6a). The calving vector is then passed to the remeshing algorithm, which displaces the calving front before beginning the remeshing.

We note that the model mesh is initially produced through vertical extrusion. If there were no undercutting or depth-dependent ice flow, the calving front would remain vertical and internal nodes would be arranged in vertical columns, making ray casting and interpolation onto a separate mesh unnecessary. This is, however, an idealized situation and we consider the nonvertical and evolving ice front to be a salient feature of our model.

### 2.2.2. Projectability of the Calving Front

The current remeshing implementation requires that the calving ice front remains projectable in some arbitrary coordinate system (chosen based on the orientation of the terminus). Essentially, this means the ice-ocean interface is not permitted to “overlap” itself in the direction of flow (Figure S6b). The effect that this projectability requirement has on the calving algorithm is that any ice which is directly downstream of a calving event is also calved. On the whole, this requirement of projectability should not be a major limitation, as a consideration of stress and calving stability would suggest that significant overlap of this kind would be difficult for a real glacier terminus to sustain.

### 2.2.3. Time-stepping

Calving events involve a change in terminus geometry which affects the state of stress in the glacier. As such, it is often possible for a calving event to immediately trigger subsequent calving events (Chapuis & Tetzlaff, 2014; O’Neel et al., 2004). For example, the two calving events shown in Figure 4a leave an exposed headland between them (Figure 4b), which would then calve due to the loss of lateral support. However, in a typical time-evolving model, these secondary calving events cannot occur until the next time step, introducing an

artificial delay in the calving rate. The instantaneous nature of this effect means that it cannot be solved by simply reducing the time step size.

In order to overcome this limitation, a time-stepping scheme was developed whereby, following a large calving event ( $>1.0 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ ), we effectively “pause” the simulation to recompute the velocity, stress, and calving criterion. We iterate until no more calving events occur and then resume the time evolution. We specify a minimum iceberg size for pausing because testing revealed that very small calving events were sometimes followed by other small events from different parts of the terminus. These are not genuine secondary calving events, but rather a result of the rediscrization of the model mesh slightly altering the stress field. The size threshold ensures that the model is only paused following calving events which can significantly alter the stress field.

### 2.3. Remeshing Algorithm

Remeshing is performed after every calving event. This involves the production of a new mesh from the post-calving geometry (rediscrization) and the interpolation of the field variables from the old to the new mesh. The remeshing algorithm is described in detail in Text S2 and illustrated in Figures S3 and S4.

## 3. Application of 3-D Calving Model to Store Glacier, West Greenland

To illustrate model performance, we implement the calving and remeshing scheme described above into a time-evolving simulation of the dynamics of Store Glacier, West Greenland. The model is implemented in the finite element model Elmer/Ice and makes extensive use of the existing glaciological code therein. The model implementation is described below and summarized in Figure S5.

### 3.1. Setting and Flow of Store Glacier

Store Glacier (Figure 1) is the second largest outlet glacier in West Greenland in terms of ice flux (Weidick & Bennike, 2007). Store Glacier's ice catchment extends 280 km inland to the ice divide and has a maximum width of 50 km, which narrows to 5 km at the terminus, where velocity typically peaks at around  $16 \text{ m d}^{-1}$  ( $\sim 5,800 \text{ m a}^{-1}$ ). Initial surface elevation is taken from the GIMP digital elevation model (DEM) product (Howat et al., 2015). We use a mass-conservation approach, constrained by thickness data from Operation IceBridge flight lines (<https://espo.nasa.gov/missions/oib/>), to determine Store Glacier's basal topography near the terminus (Todd & Christoffersen, 2014). At the terminus, this mass-conservation DEM is merged with bathymetric data collected adjacent to Store Glacier's terminus by S/V Gambo in July, 2012.

Store Glacier's calving ice front advances several hundred meters in winter and retreats equivalently in summer and has remained stable in its mean annual position during a period of at least 40 years, which saw many glaciers in the Uummannaq region and elsewhere undergoing substantial retreat (Howat et al., 2010). Basal topography reveals that, upstream of a large basal pinning point at the terminus, the glacier flows through a 30 km long overdeepening, reaching a depth of 900 m below sea level. As well as the basal pinning point, Store Glacier's terminus calves at a lateral valley constriction, which also contributes to its stability.

Aerial photography from Store Glacier (Ryan et al., 2015) indicates the presence of concentrated meltwater plumes at locations where vigorous upwelling is driven by localized subglacial discharge into the fjord. Direct observation of submarine melt rates at Store Glacier (Chauché, 2016) shows that there is a large degree of horizontal variability due to these concentrated plumes. In addition, both modeling (Rignot et al., 2016) and observations (Chauché, 2016) for Store Glacier indicate significant seasonal variability, with large volumes of surface meltwater being discharged subglacially in summer while winter discharge is limited to meltwater produced at the bed by frictional and geothermal heat fluxes.

Another important environmental process is the seasonal formation of ice mélange which buttresses the front of Store Glacier during the winter and spring (Howat et al., 2010). Under the assumption that all other environmental forcing remains constant, the buttressing exerted by seasonal mélange can be estimated from the velocity perturbation observed at the terminus as a result of its breakup. Walter et al. (2012) estimate a  $\sim 1.5 \text{ m d}^{-1}$  terminus velocity perturbation during breakup in late May 2008 from time-lapse camera imagery, from which they infer a mélange buttressing force of 30–60 kPa at Store Glacier. Here we justify a higher value for the buttressing force of 120 kPa based on a mean terminus velocity perturbation of  $\sim 4 \text{ m d}^{-1}$  determined from repeat UAV surveys conducted from 4 to 8 June 2014, during the period of mélange breakout (Hubbard et al., 2015; Toberg et al., 2016).



### 3.2. 3-D Model Domain

We choose a model domain that extends 112 km inland from Store Glacier's calving terminus and laterally follows the edges of the glacier's ice catchment (Figure 1). The length and width of the domain ensure that the terminus is far removed from any boundary effects. The initial model mesh is produced by extruding a 2-D footprint mesh, produced in GMSH (Geuzaine & Remacle, 2009), to 15 internal layers of equal thickness using Elmer/Ice's internal mesh extrusion scheme (Gagliardini et al., 2013). Horizontal mesh resolution varies from 100 m at the terminus to 2 km in the interior (Figure 1).

The domain is constrained by six boundary conditions: the base of the ice ( $\Gamma_{\text{base}}$ ), the upper ice surface ( $\Gamma_{\text{surf}}$ ), the inflow ( $\Gamma_{\text{inflow}}$ ), the calving front ( $\Gamma_{\text{term}}$ ), and the two lateral boundaries ( $\Gamma_{\text{left}}$  and  $\Gamma_{\text{right}}$ ). In the case of the basal boundary condition, we distinguish between grounded ice ( $\Gamma_{\text{base-G}}$ ) and floating ice ( $\Gamma_{\text{base-F}}$ ).

### 3.3. Ice Dynamics and Temperature

The model solves the full-Stokes equations for ice flow, with rheology defined by Glen's flow law (Cuffey & Paterson, 2010). During the spin-up phase, described below, we solve the coupled dynamics/temperature system. During the 5-year calving simulations, we keep the temperature field fixed and solve only for the velocity, as the short timescale of these simulations permits decoupling of temperature from velocity. This allows us to account for the effect of temperature on ice viscosity while maintaining computational efficiency.

Ice temperature is fixed on the surface and inflow boundary using the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) ice surface temperature product (<http://modis-snow-ice.gsfc.nasa.gov/?c=greenland>), averaged from 2000 to 2014. We account for heating due to basal friction and internal strain, as well as geothermal heat flux at  $75 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$  (Greve, 2005). The temperature-dependent rate factor ( $A$ ) in Glen's flow law is computed using the Arrhenius relation (Text S3).

On the inflow boundary ( $\Gamma_{\text{inflow}}$ ), we prescribe annual mean observed surface velocity from TerraSAR-X derived surface velocity data:

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_{\text{obs}} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{inflow}} \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}$  is the velocity vector. The lateral boundaries ( $\Gamma_{\text{left}}$ ,  $\Gamma_{\text{right}}$ ) are aligned with the edge of Store Glacier's ice catchment, and so we impose a no penetration condition on these boundaries. The flow of ice along these boundaries is controlled by a prescribed slip coefficient ( $\beta$ ). Thus, the lateral boundary condition is

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{left}}, \Gamma_{\text{right}}, \Gamma_{\text{base-G}} \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{t} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}) = -(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t})\beta \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{left}}, \Gamma_{\text{right}}, \Gamma_{\text{base-G}} \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{n}$  is the outward pointing surface normal and  $\mathbf{t}$  is either of the surface tangent vectors. The lateral friction coefficient ( $\beta$ ) was tuned to match observed velocities at the lateral margins: At ice/rock interfaces, the value is  $1.0 \times 10^{-2}$ , and at ice/ice interfaces, the value is  $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ . For grounded ice, the basal boundary condition ( $\Gamma_{\text{base-G}}$ ) is also described by equations (10) and (11), although rather than prescribing a constant value for  $\beta$ , we employ inverse methods to estimate the spatially and temporally variable  $\beta$  field, as described below.

When flotation occurs, basal traction disappears (equation (13)) and motion in the surface-normal direction occurs in response to external pressure from the sea (equation (12)):

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}) = \min(-\rho_w g(z - z_{sl}), 0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{base-f}}, \Gamma_{\text{term}} \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{t} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{base-f}}, \Gamma_{\text{term}} \quad (13)$$

The stress boundary condition on the calving front ( $\Gamma_{\text{term}}$ ) is identical to that for floating portions of the base (equations (12) and (13)). The upper ice surface ( $\Gamma_{\text{surf}}$ ) is stress free:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{term}} \quad (14)$$

### 3.4. Surface Evolution

Both the upper and lower ice surfaces are free surfaces, and so their evolution must be computed at each time step. The upper ice surface evolves in response to ice dynamics and surface mass balance. We apply seasonally constant surface mass balance from RACMO 2.3 data (Noël et al., 2015), averaged over the period 1958–2013.

The base of the ice is a contact/grounding line problem. Under most of the domain, the base of the ice rests on the bedrock. However, high water pressure near the terminus can lead to flotation. We compute the evolution of the grounding line using Elmer/Ice's in-built grounding line subroutine (Durand, Gagliardini, Zwinger, et al., 2009; Durand, Gagliardini, de Fleurian, et al., 2009; Favier et al., 2012), which compares the integrated external water pressure with the residual of the Stokes solution to determine grounding line contact during the nonlinear iteration of the flow solver. When flotation occurs and the floating region is connected to the proglacial fjord, we apply basal melting on the floating tongue at 1/10th of the maximum distributed melt rate applied on the much steeper calving front, described below.

### 3.5. Ice Front Evolution

The calving front in our model is also a free surface whose evolution must be computed. Unlike the upper and lower surfaces, front evolution occurs as a result of two distinct processes: continuous advance due to ice flow and instantaneous calving retreat. These processes are treated separately: Calving loss is dealt with by the remeshing algorithm. Initially, the kinematic-free surface equation, described above, was used to compute advance of the front, but this was found to be unstable due to the complex geometry of the front. Instead, we adopt a fully Lagrangian approach, in which the nodes on the terminus are free to move in any direction in response to velocity and ablation. In this approach, the displacement of nodes is a vector ( $\mathbf{d}$ ) defined by:

$$\mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{u} + a_{\perp}\mathbf{n})dt \quad (15)$$

where  $a_{\perp}$  is accumulation normal to the front,  $dt$  is the time step size, and  $\mathbf{n}$  is the outward pointing normal vector.

### 3.6. Model Spin Up

Inverse methods were used to determine basal slip underneath the model domain. Velocity maps from 20 TerraSAR-X image pairs spanning April 2014 to April 2015 were used to constrain the seasonal evolution of the basal slip parameter ( $\beta$ , equation (11)) using the adjoint method (Gillet-Chaulet et al., 2012). The resulting  $\beta$  maps were used to drive seasonal velocity fluctuations in the forward model.

The inversion strategy was complicated by the evolution of the upper ice surface; changes in driving stress caused the velocity field to drift. Thus, it was necessary to first iterate between phases of surface evolution and basal inversion. In this phase of the spin-up, annual average velocity was used for the inversion. After sufficient surface relaxation, the 20 seasonal inversions were computed, and the seasonally evolving forward model was spun up for 300 years at a 0.05 year time step. During this spin-up, the terminus position remained fixed and the calving model was not active, as it requires up to 100 times as many time steps per year of simulation time. This simplification is justified by Store Glacier's stable terminus position.

### 3.7. Model Forcing

The two principal processes investigated in this study are undercutting of the calving ice front by submarine melting and buttressing by proglacial ice mélange, both of which exhibit strong seasonal variability. In addition, we incorporate seasonal changes in basal traction, which drive seasonal variability in ice velocity.


#### 3.7.1. Ice Mélange

We impose the buttressing force from seasonally rigid ice mélange as an external pressure on the terminus, starting on 1 February and ending on 29 May each year, consistent with observations (Howat et al., 2010). We apply buttressing at a value of 120 kPa, over a thickness of 140 m. These estimates are based on surveys of the mélange in front of Store in 2014 (Toberg et al., 2016).

#### 3.7.2. Submarine Melting

We implement submarine melting as an ablation term in the frontal surface evolution (equation (15)), applied normal to the surface. Unlike flowline models (Cook et al., 2012; Todd & Christoffersen, 2014), the 3-D model allows laterally heterogeneous melting to be investigated. We split frontal melting into "distributed plume" melting covering the entire submerged ice front and "concentrated plume" melting at higher rates, imposed at two locations where these concentrated plumes are persistently observed (Figure 5c).

Point and line source buoyant plume models (Slater et al., 2016) were used to determine melt profiles from concentrated and distributed plumes, respectively. These plume models allow realistic plume geometries to be obtained from simple inputs, rather than fully resolving fjord dynamics, which is beyond the scope of this study.



**Figure 5.** (a) Vertical profile of conical plume width. (b) Melt profiles for concentrated plumes (green) and distributed plumes in summer (red) and winter (blue). (c) The red stars show the location of the two persistent concentrated conical plumes observed at Store Glacier. The yellow line indicates fluxgate used in analysis.

The plume models are driven with subglacial discharge values which maintain consistency with observed plume melt rates. The distributed melt profile is constrained by front-averaged melt rates for summer ( $3.1 \text{ m d}^{-1}$ ) and winter ( $1.3 \text{ m d}^{-1}$ ) consistent with observations (Chauché, 2016) as well as model results (Rignot et al., 2016). The concentrated melt profile is constrained by directly observed maximum in-plume melt rates of  $12 \text{ m d}^{-1}$  (Chauché, 2016).

Figure 5 shows concentrated plume width and melt profiles from the plume model. Distributed melting is applied at the summer rate from June to the end of August, the period when large volumes of surface melt-water enter the subglacial hydrological system (Chauché, 2016), and at the winter rate otherwise. Concentrated plume melting is applied only in summer. We assume that concentrated plume melt rates decay away from the plume centerline as a Gaussian curve (Turner, 1973):

$$m = m|_{x=0} e^{-\left(\frac{x}{W}\right)^2} \tag{16}$$

where  $x$  is the horizontal distance from the center of the plume and  $W$  is the width of the plume at the given elevation.

Figure 5 shows that the predicted plume melt rates reach a maximum value between 5 and 200 m above the base of the ice front, due to low plume temperature below this point. The effect of these melt profiles is to produce a front which is undercut, but with small, sharp “toes” remaining at the base. Slater et al. (2017) have shown that even with such melt profiles, toes may not form due to the shape of subglacial channels near the grounding line. On the other hand, such toes are known to exist in nature (Motyka, 1997; Warren et al., 1995) and tend to calve suddenly due to the buoyant force acting on them. We do not model subglacial channels, and the calving algorithm presented here cannot physically capture these toe calving events. Hence, we impose “toe calving” within the frontal melting algorithm, essentially assuming that the buoyant force on these toes causes them to calve as soon as they form. We keep track of this mass loss, which is separate from submarine melting for the purposes of data analysis.

In addition to submarine melting of the vertical calving front, we impose basal melting underneath the floating portion of the terminus. Basal melt is imposed at 10% of the maximum distributed frontal melt rate, following the analysis of Jenkins (2011), which shows that the gentle slope of the ice base effectively limits melting. Basal melting under grounded ice is not included in this model.

**Table 1**  
Environmental Forcings in Each Simulation

Run code	Mélange thickness (m)	Conc. melt max ( $\text{m d}^{-1}$ )	Dist. melt summer ave ( $\text{m d}^{-1}$ )	Dist. melt winter ave ( $\text{m d}^{-1}$ )
000	0	0	0	0
001	0	0	3.1	1.3
011	0	12	3.1	1.3
111	140	12	3.1	1.3

Note. The ice mélange season spans 1 February to 29 May. The summer melt season spans 1 June to 31 August.


### 3.8. Experimental Design

From the end of the 300 year spin-up phase, we run four combinations of three principal forcings: ice mélange buttressing, distributed melting, and concentrated melting (Table 1). Run 000 is our base run with no forcing, Run 001 includes distributed submarine melting only, Run 011 includes concentrated as well as distributed submarine melting, while Run 111 includes ice mélange and both types of submarine melting. Run 111 therefore represents our best attempt at modeling the “present-day” conditions at Store Glacier. Seasonal variations in basal slip are imposed in all simulations, as this seasonal forcing is present in the spin-up, and so removing it would result in immediate glacier-wide divergence from steady state.


## 4. Results

### 4.1. Seasonal Response to Forcing

Figure 6 shows the evolution of the model’s terminus position and velocity in response to the four forcing combinations. The different forcings produce markedly different patterns of terminus evolution. In Run



**Figure 6.** Mean (a) terminus position and (b) velocity for the four forcing combinations (Table 1) over the final 3 years of the simulations. Mean terminus position is relative to the fluxgate shown in Figure 5. The blue and red shading delineate the ice mélange and summer melt season, respectively. Run 000: no forcing; Run 001: distributed melt only; Run 011: distributed and concentrated melt; Run 111: distributed and concentrated melt as well as mélange.



**Figure 7.** Rendering of model terminus showing large tabular calving event at 1.41 years of Run 111. Transparent region defines the geometry of the tabular berg (and additional concurrent bergs) released following the ice *mélange* collapse. The large tabular berg is 1.6 km long in the flow direction, with a mass of 1.14 Gt and a volume of  $1.28 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$ .

000, in which only seasonally variable basal slip is applied, mean terminus position varies stochastically over an 800 m range without a seasonal signal. The simulations which include distributed submarine melting (Run 001) and concentrated as well as distributed submarine melting (Run 011) both produce a seasonal cycle of advance and retreat, with mean terminus position varying by around 200 m. In Run 011 we find that concentrated melting triggers a temporary but substantial retreat of 400 m after 4.5 years. Although the retreat is recovered during the following winter, the absence of a similar retreat in Run 001, which included distributed melting only, signifies a potentially sensitive response to concentrated melting. We discuss this result in greater detail below.

Ice *mélange* (Run 111) exerts the greatest influence on seasonal terminus dynamics, causing a 500 m advance of the terminus each spring, followed by rapid retreat when the *mélange* disappears. The calving of a large tabular berg when the buttressing force from *mélange* vanishes (Figure 7) is a consistent feature of our model. The model results also suggest that ice *mélange* helps stabilize the terminus against the impact of concentrated submarine melting; Run 111 does not undergo the significant retreat which occurs in Run 011 at 4.5 years (Figure 6).


Only ice *mélange* is able to substantially influence the terminus velocity, which follows the same seasonal pattern in all other runs as a result of varying basal drag. In simulations without *mélange*, ice velocity peaks in early summer at  $5,100 \text{ m a}^{-1}$ , before a deceleration through late summer to an annual minimum of  $4,200 \text{ m a}^{-1}$ . Following this late-summer minimum, the velocity steadily increases through the winter. When buttressing from ice *mélange* is applied in February in Run 111, the terminus rapidly decelerates from  $4,800$  to  $4,150 \text{ m a}^{-1}$  after which it gradually speeds up. At the end of May, when the buttressing force is removed, there is an equivalent rapid acceleration of ice flow at the terminus.

#### 4.2. Terminus Mass Budget

The seasonal advance and retreat of the model terminus can be investigated as a balance between flow of ice toward the terminus and various mass loss components. Figure 8 shows changes in this terminus mass budget for the “present-day” forcing simulation (Run 111). Influx through the fluxgate (Figure 5) is balanced by mass loss from calving, submarine melting, and (negligible) surface melting. Table 2 compares the average annual terminus mass budget for all four simulations.

Iceberg calving dominates terminus mass loss in the present-day simulation (Figure 8). In fact, 74% of the 8.96 Gt delivered to the terminus each year is lost through calving, with another 20% lost to distributed melting (Table 2). Concentrated melting accounts for only 1% of the total frontal ablation rate, yet calving in our model is quite sensitive to this process, as discussed above. Ice *mélange* greatly influences calving rate, which is reduced from around  $10 \text{ Gt a}^{-1}$  to less than  $1 \text{ Gt a}^{-1}$  at the start of the *mélange* season. As the terminus consequently advances, the calving rate gradually increases, but it is not until the end of the





**Figure 8.** Components of mass loss near the terminus (shaded regions), influx through the fluxgate shown in Figure 5 (green line), and glacier mass beyond the gate (black line) for present-day forcing scenario (Run 111). Changes in total mass beyond the fluxgate correspond to advance and retreat of the terminus, but the absolute value is irrelevant, given the arbitrary choice of fluxgate. The negligible contribution from surface melting beyond the fluxgate is omitted. For the sake of visual clarity, calving mass loss is smoothed by a moving average with a window size of 5 time steps (0.05 year window), as calving losses from tabular bergs up to 1.58 km in length and mass up to 1.14 Gt can dwarf all other ablation processes in a given time step.

mélange season that the terminus ceases to advance. The ~1 Gt of mass gained by the terminus through its advance during each mélange season is rapidly lost when the mélange disappears. A large proportion of this rapid frontal mass loss is in the form of a large tabular berg (e.g., Figure 7). Outside the mélange and melt seasons, loss through calving and melting balances influx toward the terminus, resulting in a stable terminus position.


Submarine melting, prescribed with different summer and winter rates, produces a clear stepped profile in frontal mass loss from melting (Figure 8). The slight increase in melting during the mélange season stems from the terminus developing a floating tongue, thus increasing the area exposed to seawater and thus melting. As a result, the mean annual loss from submarine melting for Run 111 is 0.09 Gt a<sup>-1</sup> greater than in Run 011.

Annual mean data (Table 2) reveal that terminus mass loss is dominated by calving in all simulations, though submarine melt processes remove a nonnegligible quantity of ice when present. Concentrated submarine melting never accounts for more than 1% of mass loss (0.11 Gt a<sup>-1</sup>), but Figure 6a demonstrates that this process can temporarily destabilize the terminus, causing retreat. In Run 001, which is forced with the same

**Table 2**  
Annual Mean Mass Gain and Loss (Gt a<sup>-1</sup>) for the Four Forcing Scenarios, for the Region Beyond the Fluxgate Shown in Figure 5

Run code	Influx	Submarine melt			Surface melt	Toe calving	Calving
		Distributed	Concentrated	Basal			
000	9.14	0	0	0	2.51e-2	0	8.6
001	9.18	1.74	0	0.29	2.34e-2	0.11	7.17
011	9.15	1.7	0.1	0.29	2.32e-2	0.13	6.99
111	8.96	1.77	0.11	0.3	2.39e-2	0.14	6.5

Note. The mass loss terms do not sum exactly to the influx due to changes in terminus position from the beginning to the end of the 5 year simulations.




**Figure 9.** Calving event locations and season for all 5 years for the four forcing combinations: (a) Run 000, (b) Run 001, (c) Run 011, and (d) Run 111.

quantity of distributed melt but has no concentrated plumes, the terminus remained stable throughout the simulation. Run 111 demonstrates how the buttressing from ice mélange reduces the mean annual influx toward the terminus. This change is seen in Figure 8, as a reduction from 9 to 8 Gt  $a^{-1}$  near the start of each year and in Figure 6 as a terminus deceleration of 500  $m a^{-1}$ .

### 4.3. Spatial and Temporal Iceberg Distribution

The 3-D calving model allows us to investigate calving at the individual event scale. Figure 9 shows the location, volume, and season of every calved iceberg produced in each of the 5 year long simulations. Figure S7 shows the frequency distribution of all icebergs from Run 111.

In the absence of either ice mélange or submarine melting (Run 000), the modeled terminus advances a persistent floating tongue in the south (Figure 9a), which calves predominantly large icebergs with no seasonal trend. The addition of distributed submarine melting (Run 001, Figure 9b) prevents the formation of this floating tongue, and terminus position remains fairly fixed through the year. In Run 011, which includes concentrated as well as distributed melting (Figure 9c), the seasonal calving cycle becomes more apparent, especially in the south where summer (0.4–0.6 years) calving events occur further upstream. However, there remains a dense distribution of calving events which delineates the typical terminus geometry. This pattern suggests not only that concentrated melting is able to promote calving and retreat in the south but also that the terminus is quick to readvance when concentrated melting ceases.



**Figure 10.** (a) Depth of surface crevasses and (b) height of basal crevasses from the present-day experiment (Run 111,  $t = 0.09$  years). The white line indicates grounding line. The two types of crevasses show distinctly different patterns. Surface crevasses are widespread and tend to vary smoothly in depth. Deepest surface crevasses occur where ice flows over bedrock rises. Basal crevasses are much more localized, and there are sharp transitions between intact basal ice and deep basal crevassing. Calving in the model occurs when surface crevasses reach the water line or when surface and basal crevasses intersect. Note different color scales.

Ice mélange buttressing (Run 111, Figure 9d) generates a stronger seasonal cycle in calving behavior than either submarine melt component. Calving during the mélange season is consistently further downstream compared to the rest of the year, apart from two very large icebergs. Interestingly, the melt-season retreat of the southern floating region observed in Run 011 (Figure 9c) is absent, despite the application of concentrated submarine melting.


Calving behavior is clearly dependent on the applied environmental forcing, but there are some persistent features. In all four simulations, the lateral margins of the terminus near the valley walls remain fixed in position and calve very small icebergs. The largest calving events in every simulation occur in the southern half of the terminus, which is floating. In the present-day forcing simulation (Run 111, Figure 9d), the five largest calving events in the south are an order of magnitude larger than those in the north. These tabular icebergs (e.g., Figure 7) equate to 3.54 Gt mass loss between them, 11% of the total calving loss for the simulation.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. Crevasse Penetration in 3-D

We can use our 3-D model of Store Glacier to gain a better understanding of the processes that govern the calving mechanism in general. Figure 10 illustrates how calving in our model can be triggered by two conditions. Either surface crevasses reach the water line or surface and basal crevasses collectively intersect the full ice thickness. The two conditions for calving manifest themselves in distinctly different patterns in our model. The surface crevasses are widespread and display a generally smooth transition from relatively deep near the terminus to relatively shallow farther inland. The deeper penetration of surface crevasses toward the terminus is a result of extensional ice flow and the ice cliff force imbalance which further increases the extensional stress near the surface (Hanson & Hooke, 2003). The southern side of the terminus is dominated by a region of very low crevasse penetration which occurs just downstream of the modeled grounding line. The grounding line acts as a hinge point where upward bending forces act to close surface crevasses.

Compared to surface crevasses, the opening of basal crevasses is much more localized (Figure 10b). Basal crevasses only form in ice which is at or near flotation, due to the requirement for high basal water pressure (Bassis & Walker, 2012; Ma et al., 2017). As a result, the southern side of the terminus experiences much more extensive basal crevassing than the north, which is mostly grounded. Furthermore, basal topography creates



**Figure 11.** Observed surface digital elevation model (DEM) showing extensive surface crevasse and prominent surface depression in south, overlain with modeled grounding line (red line) (Run 111, 1.58 years). Inset: Elevation profile compares modeled (blue) and observed (green) surface elevation along black-dashed profile, with modeled grounding line (dashed red). Surface elevation reaches a minimum upstream of the terminus, indicating a grounding line hinge point. DEM created by the Polar Geospatial Center from DigitalGlobe, Inc. imagery.

sharp transitions from compressive to extensive stress regimes, resulting in sharp boundaries between intact ice and deep basal crevasse fields.

The crevasse depth patterns shown in Figure 10 are a consistent feature in our simulations, largely irrespective of the applied environmental forcing. This suggests that the observed crevasse patterns, and the resulting calving behavior, are a product of the glacier geometry and topography. This finding is supported by previous calving modeling (Bassis & Jacobs, 2013; Krug et al., 2014; Ultee & Bassis, 2016) and remote sensing (Carr et al., 2013; McFadden et al., 2011; Moon et al., 2015) studies which highlight the importance of topography and geometry in determining calving style and glacier stability.


## 5.2. Model Versus Observations

In this section, we use satellite observations of surface elevation and terminus position, data not previously ingested into the model setup, to assess the performance of the calving model. We do not compare modeled versus observed velocities because, having inverted for basal friction, this comparison would be spurious. Figure 11 shows a surface DEM for Store Glacier's terminus overlain with the modeled grounding line position which neatly encompasses a distinct surface depression in the DEM.

The inset elevation profile clearly shows that the surface depression in the DEM forms a grounding line hinge point, a feature which the model successfully reproduces, and which indicates that the southern side of Store Glacier is floating up to 2 km inland from the terminus. This shows that the model successfully captures the detailed features of Store Glacier's grounding line dynamics. The upward bending moment at the grounding line hinge point and the apparent downward bending closer to the front are responsible for the distinct pattern of crevasses, which close and open in response to these bending forces (Figure 10a).

There is, however, a discrepancy in surface elevation around the modeled grounding line. This is likely due to inaccuracies in the bed topography, which is determined indirectly from mass conservation. There is a large bedrock bump here (which is responsible for the steep surface slope), and it may be that the mass conservation approach smoothes this feature. Modeled and observed surface elevation converge once again upstream of the grounding line.





**Figure 12.** Modeled (green) and observed (red) maximum, mean and minimum terminus position. Observations are from 24 TSX images from April 2014 to April 2015. Inset: Modeled (green) and observed (red) mean terminus position through time, with respect to fluxgate shown in Figure 5. Mean model positions are from the “present-day” simulation (Run 111), and observed positions from 2014 are repeated annually to allow for visual comparison. Imagery from Landsat 8 (USGS).

To further validate the 3-D model, we extract terminus geometries from 24 TerraSAR-X images collected from April 2014 to April 2015 and compare the observed terminus evolution with that of the model. Figure 12 compares modeled and observed maximum, minimum, and mean terminus positions for Run 111, as well as comparing mean terminus position through time.

There is a close fit for the minimum front position and a reasonable fit for the mean position but the maximum terminus extent in the model is up to 1 km farther downstream than observed. In terms of the seasonal pattern of terminus advance and retreat, there is a close match between the model and observations (Figure 12). Fast terminus advance begins in February and continues until May, in both the model and observations. This advance is followed by subsequent rapid retreat to a minimum terminus position in August. This retreat is followed by a slow and punctuated advance, which lasts until the start of the next winter when formation of the *mélange* once again promotes terminus advance.

The correspondence in the timing of advance and retreat strongly suggests that ice *mélange* drives seasonal changes in calving rate at Store Glacier. This is further supported by data from 1999 to 2010, which show a similar pattern of late winter advance when *mélange* is present and early summer retreat following *mélange* collapse (Howat et al., 2010). We note, however, that the model advances farther into the fjord than observed. Possible reasons for this are discussed below.

Overall, there is reasonably close agreement between the model and observed calving behavior, especially considering that the calving model is uncalibrated, untuned, and forced with only three simplified environmental processes: undercutting by distributed and concentrated submarine melting and the buttressing effect from seasonally rigid ice *mélange*. We cannot exclude the possibility that other environmental processes are important in reality. Nevertheless, the match between model and observations lends support for the use of the dual crevasse depth criteria used to predict calving in this study. A prior study implementing the crevasse depth criterion in a 2-D flowline model for Store Glacier (Todd & Christoffersen, 2014) did require tuning to produce realistic behavior, suggesting that flowline models may be fundamentally unable to capture important calving processes at Store Glacier. Evidence of lateral variability in crevasse patterns (Figure 11) (Ryan et al., 2015) and terminus position and range (Figure 12) support this hypothesis.



### 5.3. Environmental Processes Affecting Calving

Our results indicate that the 3-D calving model of Store Glacier is sensitive to present-day values of both submarine melting and ice mélange buttressing. We have also shown that the model's calving response to these processes is quite similar to observed. Distributed submarine melt plays an important role in the model, preventing the formation of a large and permanent floating tongue in the south (Figures 9a and 9b). This suggests that submarine melting may play an important role in determining Store Glacier's current terminus position.

The addition of concentrated melting from two conical plumes led to substantial additional summer retreat at 4.5 years (Figure 6a), despite those plumes contributing less than 5% of total melting. This increased seasonality is largely restricted to the floating southern portion of the terminus, where highly localized melt from these plumes progressively carves notches into the terminus, effectively isolating a portion of the terminus from the surrounding ice. Indentation of the ice front by localized melting effectively breaks stress bridges that provide lateral support to the ice front, a process that we term "the keystone effect." Through this mechanism, highly localized melt can trigger calving across a broad width of the terminus, amplifying its impact on rates of mass loss.

Our results thus indicate that the distribution of submarine melting may be more important than the total melt volume in terms of calving and terminus stability. Therefore, subglacial topography and hydrology, which control the location of concentrated buoyant plumes, may be of critical importance for the stability of calving glaciers. With more meltwater forming on the Greenland ice sheet as a consequence of climate change, we expect subglacial discharge into fjords to increase in the future. We thus expect the effect of concentrated plumes to become increasingly important for glaciers such as Store Glacier.

Ice mélange is the main driver of seasonal terminus position variability in the model, a finding which agrees with previous modeling studies (Krug et al., 2015; Todd & Christoffersen, 2014; Vieli & Nick, 2011), which found a significant effect on calving from ice mélange. In Run 111, mélange buttressing resulted in a mean advance of 500 m from winter to late spring. Figure 12 illustrates that the effect of the mélange is greatest in the southern part of the terminus, where the glacier reaches flotation and large seasonal advance occurs. We hypothesize that this is due to the difference in dynamics and stress across the terminus, an aspect we will continue to explore in future work.

In addition to driving seasonal cycles of advance and retreat, there are features of our model which indicate that ice mélange may stabilize the terminus against longer term retreat. Toward the end of Run 011, in which submarine melting is active but mélange is absent (Figure 6), the terminus undergoes substantial retreat; this retreat does not occur in Run 111, suggesting that the mélange is exerting a stabilizing influence on the terminus which extends beyond the mélange season. Mélange buttressing leads to deceleration and dynamic thickening of the terminus; this thickening stabilizes the terminus against increased melting in summer.

Comparing model results to observations (Figure 12) showed that the terminus in our model advances more than in reality when ice mélange is present. There are several potential reasons for this exaggerated effect. The application of a constant buttressing force is likely to be an oversimplification as glacier flow and especially large calving events probably disrupt and weaken the mélange, at least temporarily. Alternatively, the mélange buttressing pressure used in this study, which was derived at the end of the mélange season, may not be representative of the buttressing effect over the whole season.

### 5.4. Resolving Calving in Ice Sheet Models

Modern ice sheet models (Blatter, 1995; Cornford et al., 2013; Gudmundsson et al., 2012; Pattyn, 2003) typically neglect vertical stress terms which are of secondary importance at the ice sheet scale; this makes the computation of ice dynamics for an entire ice sheet computationally feasible. Furthermore, most prior calving modeling studies have implemented 1-D and 2-D flowline models for the sake of simplicity and efficiency (Cook et al., 2014; Nick et al., 2010; Todd & Christoffersen, 2014; Vieli & Nick, 2011). By contrast, the 3-D calving model presented here solves the full-Stokes equations, making it complex to implement and computationally expensive. However, our results indicate that Store Glacier is sensitive to processes such as concentrated plume melting and laterally variable topography, which cannot be represented in flowline models, as well as

buoyant bending forces (James et al., 2014) and ice cliff force imbalance (Deconto & Pollard, 2016), which cannot be directly represented in vertically integrated models. Thus, the goal of implementing calving into ice sheet models demands a compromise between fidelity and efficiency.

The calving dynamics of Store Glacier have previously been investigated by Morlighem et al. (2016), using a 2-D plan view model (Ice Sheet System Model (ISSM)). Comparing results from ISSM and the present study may help guide future calving model development. The calving law used by Morlighem et al. (2016) combines a velocity and stress-dependent calving rate and a hydrostatic condition which enforces calving when flotation is reached. Despite the difference in calving law and model physics, there are some similarities in model behavior. In both models, terminus position displays a seasonal cycle in response to variations in submarine melt rate, and the glacier terminus is interannually stable under present-day forcing. In both models, the stable terminus position is close to observed, although in the ISSM case, this is because the model forces calving when flotation occurs. This may also explain the mismatch between ISSM and observed terminus position in the southern half, which our model predicts to be floating.

The 2-D plan view model of Morlighem et al. (2016) is less computationally demanding than our full-Stokes approach; if the calibration of the calving law could be shown to be universally applicable, it could feasibly be extended to the entire ice sheet. However, the vertically integrated approach does not resolve vertical stress gradients, and so cannot capture the effect of buoyant bending or ice cliff force imbalance, both of which play a critical role in our model results. Therefore, the application of lower-dimensional ice sheet models to calving may depend on suitable parameterizations of these effects, just as large-scale fjord circulation models must parameterize subgrid plume dynamics (Cowton et al., 2015). Some progress has already been made in this direction. For example, the effect of the ice cliff force imbalance on the near-terminus stress regime has received a great deal of attention (Hanson & Hooke, 2000, 2003; O'Leary & Christoffersen, 2013). Based on the analysis of Bassis and Walker (2012), Pollard et al. (2015) implemented parameterizations for ice cliff failure and calving into a depth-integrated model of the Antarctic Ice Sheet.

A recent study by Ahlkrona et al. (2016) presented a mixed model capable of solving the SIA and the full-Stokes equations in different parts of the same model domain. This hybrid strategy, and the flexibility of finite element meshing, raises the possibility of developing an efficient model for an entire ice sheet, which is still capable of fully resolving the stress regime at high spatial resolution where necessary. Such an approach would avoid the need for parameterized stress effects entirely.

### 5.5. Future Work

We have presented a new 3-D calving model and demonstrated its ability to reproduce the observed calving behavior of Store Glacier. An upcoming publication will investigate, in more detail, the glacier's sensitivity to changes in these environmental processes and begin to address the question of Store Glacier's future stability; this sensitivity analysis is presently available in the thesis associated with this work (Todd, 2017). Our results strongly implicate submarine melting and ice mélange buttressing as important drivers of calving dynamics at Store Glacier, but more work is required to determine if these conclusions hold true for other outlet glaciers, and over longer time periods.

The calving criterion we implement in the model could be improved by incorporating stress history and damage mechanics (Krug et al., 2014). At present, the presence of crevasses does not feedback into the stress regime of the ice, and the model has no "memory" of previous crevasse fields from which to evolve. Future work should implement and investigate these effects to determine their importance for calving modeling. Implementing more sophisticated fracture mechanics to track the growth of individual crevasses may also yield interesting insights, though this may be overly complex for large scale calving models. Recent work by Benn et al. (2017) compares the 2-D Elmer/Ice calving model (Todd & Christoffersen, 2014) with a state-of-the-art discrete element calving model (Åström et al., 2013). A similar analysis of the 3-D model presented here would help inform future research into the nature of calving and calving laws.

## 6. Conclusions

The 3-D calving model developed in this study successfully reproduces the observed seasonal evolution of Store Glacier's calving terminus with three simple forcings and no calibration or tuning. The model features a physical, untuned calving law; 3-D full-Stokes ice dynamics; evolving nonvertical calving front; variable

mesh resolution; and realistic environmental forcing. These features allow the model to resolve important vertical and lateral stress gradients, simulate individual calving events across a range of magnitudes, and capture the glacier's response to seasonal changes in submarine melt undercutting (distributed and concentrated) and buttressing from proglacial ice mélange.

We find that ice mélange is primarily responsible for Store Glacier's seasonal advance and retreat and that submarine melting prevents the glacier from forming a permanent floating tongue. Concentrated plume melting can have a disproportionately large and destabilizing effect by breaking stress bridges and promoting calving. The model's response to these forcings differs from north to south due to topographic effects, with the floating southern side displaying a greater environmental sensitivity. Modeled calving events produce icebergs whose mass spans orders of magnitude, from "spalling" events less than a ton up to 1.19 Gt tabular bergs.

### Author Contributions

JT developed the 3-D calving model with substantial help from PC, TZ, and PR. The simulations were designed by JT and PC. NC provided data to constrain submarine melt rates and also provided fjord bathymetry. AH was the principal investigator on projects that devised and implemented the UAV and marine data collection. DB and AL supplied TSX data used to constrain basal friction through inversions. DB also advised on the numerical parameterization of calving processes. NT provided advice on the parameterization of mélange processes. JR aided by NT provided UAV data to constrain the mélange buttressing force. DS provided the plume model and fjord stratification data to compute plume melt rates. JT wrote the paper with substantial contributions from PC and coauthors. The authors are listed according to their contribution.

### Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the Natural Environment Research Council through a PhD studentship to J.T. (grant NE/K500884/1) and a research grant (NE/K005871/1) to P.C. We acknowledge that the results of this research have been achieved using the PRACE-3IP project DynaMITE (FP7 RI-312763) awarded to J.T. and P.C. with resource Sisu based in Finland at CSC. We thank Michiel van den Broeke for providing RACMO climate data. A.H. gratefully acknowledges field support from the BBC's Operation Iceberg, the Aberystwyth University Research Fund, and a Professorial Fellowship from the Centre for Arctic Gas Hydrate, Environment and Climate, funded by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence (grant 223259). We are grateful to the crew of S/V Gambo who conducted the side scan surveys. Acquisition of TerraSAR-X imagery was funded by the ConocoPhillips-Lundin Northern Area Program through the CRIOS project. P.C. also acknowledges support from the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 program (grant agreement 683043). The code constituting the 3-D calving model has been made freely available via integration with the Elmer/Ice source code, available at <https://github.com/ElmerCSC/elmerfem/tree/elmerice>. Model output data are available from the NERC Polar Data Centre at <http://doi.org/chg7>. Landsat Surface Reflectance products courtesy of the U.S. Geological Survey.

### References

- Ahlkrona, J., Lötstedt, P., Kirchner, N., & Zwinger, T. (2016). Dynamically coupling the non-linear Stokes equations with the shallow ice approximation in glaciology: Description and first applications of the ISCAL method. *Journal of Computational Physics*, *308*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2015.12.025>
- Alley, R. B., Horgan, H. J., Joughin, I., Cuffey, K. M., Dupont, T. K., Parizek, B. R., et al. (2008). A simple law for ice-shelf calving. *Science*, *322*(5906), 1344–1344. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1162543>
- Amundson, J. M., Fahnestock, M., Truffer, M., Brown, J., Lüthi, M. P., & Motyka, R. J. (2010). Ice mélange dynamics and implications for terminus stability, Jakobshavn Isbræ, Greenland. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *115*, F01005. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JF001405>
- Åström, J. A., Riihilä, T. I., Tallinen, T., Zwinger, T., Benn, D., Moore, J. C., & Timonen, J. (2013). A particle based simulation model for glacier dynamics. *The Cryosphere*, *7*, 1591–1602. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-7-1591-2013>
- Bassis, J. N., & Jacobs, S. (2013). Diverse calving patterns linked to glacier geometry. *Nature Geoscience*, *6*, 833–836. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1887>
- Bassis, J. N., & Walker, C. C. (2012). Upper and lower limits on the stability of calving glaciers from the yield strength envelope of ice. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *468*(2140), 913–931. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2011.0422>
- Bassis, J. N., Fricker, H. A., Coleman, R., & Minster, J. B. (2008). An investigation into the forces that drive ice-shelf rift propagation on the Amery Ice Shelf, East Antarctica. *Journal of Glaciology*, *54*(184), 17–27.
- Benn, D. I., Hulton, N. R. J., & Mottram, R. H. (2007). "Calving laws", "sliding laws" and the stability of tidewater glaciers. *Annals of Glaciology*, *46*(1), 123–130.
- Benn, D. I., Warren, C. R., & Mottram, R. H. (2007). Calving processes and the dynamics of calving glaciers. *Earth-Science Reviews*, *82*(3–4), 143–179.
- Benn, D. I., Åström, J., Zwinger, T., Todd, J., Nick, F. M., Cook, S., et al. (2017). Melt-under-cutting and buoyancy-driven calving from tidewater glaciers: New insights from discrete element and continuum model simulations. *Journal of Glaciology*, *63*(240), 691–702.
- Blatter, H. (1995). Velocity and stress fields in grounded glaciers: a simple algorithm for including deviatoric stress gradients. *Journal of Glaciology*, *41*(138), 333–344. <https://doi.org/10.3198/1995JoG41-138-333-344>
- Borstad, C. P., Khazendar, A., Larour, E., Morlighem, M., Rignot, E., Schodlok, M. P., & Seroussi, H. (2012). A damage mechanics assessment of the Larsen B ice shelf prior to collapse: Toward a physically-based calving law. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *39*, L18502. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL053317>
- Brown, C. S., Meier, M. F., Post, A., & Survey, G. (1982). Calving speed of Alaska tidewater glaciers, with application to Columbia Glacier. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Geological Survey.
- Carr, J. R., Vieli, A., & Stokes, C. (2013). Influence of sea ice decline, atmospheric warming, and glacier width on marine-terminating outlet glacier behavior in northwest Greenland at seasonal to interannual timescales. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, *118*, 1210–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrf.20088>
- Chapuis, A., & Tetzlaff, T. (2014). The variability of tidewater-glacier calving: Origin of event-size and interval distributions. *Journal of Glaciology*, *60*(222), 622–634. <https://doi.org/10.3189/2014JoG13J215>
- Chauché, N. (2016). Glacier-Ocean interaction at Store Glacier (West Greenland). PhD thesis, Aberystwyth University. Retrieved from <http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/42621>
- Christoffersen, P., Mugford, R. I., Heywood, K. J., Joughin, I., Dowdeswell, J. A., Syvitski, J. P. M., et al. (2011). Warming of waters in an East Greenland fjord prior to glacier retreat: Mechanisms and connection to large-scale atmospheric conditions. *The Cryosphere*, *5*(3), 701–714. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-5-701-2011>

- Cook, S., Zwinger, T., Rutt, I. C., O'Neel, S., & Murray, T. (2012). Testing the effect of water in crevasses on a physically based calving model. *Annals of Glaciology*, 53(60), 90–96. <https://doi.org/10.3189/2012AoG60A107>
- Cook, S., Rutt, I. C., Murray, T., Luckman, A., Zwinger, T., Selmes, N., & James, T. D. (2014). Modelling environmental influences on calving at Helheim Glacier in eastern Greenland. *The Cryosphere*, 8(3), 827–841. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-8-827-2014>
- Cornford, S. L., Martin, D. F., Graves, D. T., Ranken, D. F., Le Brocq, A. M., Gladstone, R. M., et al. (2013). Adaptive mesh, finite volume modeling of marine ice sheets. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 232(1), 529–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2012.08.037>
- Cowton, T., Slater, D., Sole, A., Goldberg, D., & Nienow, P. (2015). Modeling the impact of glacial runoff on fjord circulation and submarine melt rate using a new subgrid-scale parameterization for glacial plumes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 120, 796–812. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JC010324>
- Cuffey, K. M., & Paterson, W. S. B. (2010). *The physics of glaciers* (4th ed.). Amsterdam: Academic Press.
- Deconto, R. M., & Pollard, D. (2016). Contribution of Antarctica to past and future sea-level rise. *Nature*, 531(7596), 591–597. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature17145>
- Depoorter, M. A., Bamber, J. L., Griggs, J. A., Lenaerts, J. T. M., Ligtenberg, S. R. M., van den Broeke, M. R., & Moholdt, G. (2013). Calving fluxes and basal melt rates of Antarctic ice shelves. *Nature*, 502(7469), 89–92. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12567>
- Durand, G., Gagliardini, O., Zwinger, T., Le Meur, E., & Hindmarsh, R. C. A. (2009). Full Stokes modeling of marine ice sheets: Influence of the grid size. *Annals of Glaciology*, 50(52), 109–114. <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756409789624283>
- Durand, G., Gagliardini, O., de Fleurian, B., Zwinger, T., & Le Meur, E. (2009). Marine ice sheet dynamics: Hysteresis and neutral equilibrium. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 114, F03009. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JF001170>
- Enderlin, E. M., Howat, I. M., Jeong, S., Noh, M.-J., van Angelen, J. H., & van den Broeke, M. R. (2014). An improved mass budget for the Greenland ice sheet. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 866–872. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013GL059010>
- Favier, L., Gagliardini, O., Durand, G., & Zwinger, T. (2012). A three-dimensional full Stokes model of the grounding line dynamics: Effect of a pinning point beneath the ice shelf. *The Cryosphere*, 6(1), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-6-101-2012>
- Gagliardini, O., Zwinger, T., Gillet-Chaulet, F., Durand, G., Favier, L., de Fleurian, B., et al. (2013). Capabilities and performance of Elmer/Ice, a new-generation ice sheet model. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 6(4), 1299–1318. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-1299-2013>
- Geuzaine, C., & Remacle, J.-F. (2009). Gmsh: A 3-D finite element mesh generator with built-in pre- and post-processing facilities. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 79(11), 1309–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nme.2579>
- Gillet-Chaulet, F., Gagliardini, O., Seddik, H., Nodet, M., Durand, G., Ritz, C., et al. (2012). Greenland ice sheet contribution to sea-level rise from a new-generation ice-sheet model. *The Cryosphere*, 6(6), 1561–1576. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-6-1561-2012>
- Greve, R. (2005). Relation of measured basal temperatures and the spatial distribution of the geothermal heat flux for the Greenland ice sheet. *Annals of Glaciology*, 42(1), 424–432. <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756405781812510>
- Gudmundsson, G. H., Krug, J., Durand, G., Favier, L., & Gagliardini, O. (2012). The stability of grounding lines on retrograde slopes. *The Cryosphere*, 6(6), 1497–1505.
- Hanson, B., & Hooke, R. L. (2000). Glacier calving: A numerical model of forces in the calving-speed/water-depth relation. *Journal of Glaciology*, 46(153), 188–196.
- Hanson, B., & Hooke, R. L. (2003). Buckling rate and overhang development at a calving face. *Journal of Glaciology*, 49(167), 577–586. <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756503781830476>
- Holland, D. M., Thomas, R. H., de Young, B., Ribergaard, M. H., & Lyberth, B. (2008). Acceleration of Jakobshavn Isbræ triggered by warm subsurface ocean waters. *Nature Geoscience*, 1(10), 659–664. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo316>
- Howat, I. M., Box, J. E., Ahn, Y., Herrington, A., & McFadden, E. M. (2010). Seasonal variability in the dynamics of marine-terminating outlet glaciers in Greenland. *Journal of Glaciology*, 56(198), 601–613.
- Howat, I., Negrete, A., & Smith, B. (2015). *MEaSUREs Greenland Ice Mapping Project (GIMP) Digital Elevation Model, Version 1*. Boulder, Colorado USA: NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. <https://doi.org/10.5067/NV34YUJXLP9W>
- Hubbard, A., Ryan, J., Toberg, N., Todd, J., Christoffersen, P., Snooke, N., & Box, J. E. (2015). Tidewater dynamics at Store Glacier, West Greenland from daily repeat UAV survey. AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts 2015AGUFM.C33G.03H.
- IPCC (2013). Climate change 2013: The physical science basis. In T. F. Stocker, et al. (Eds.), *Contribution of Working Group I to the IPCC fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Vol. AR5, Chapter 13). Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- James, T. D., Murray, T., Selmes, N., Scharrer, K., & O'Leary, M. (2014). Buoyant flexure and basal crevassing in dynamic mass loss at Helheim Glacier. *Nature Geoscience*, 7(8), 593–596.
- Jenkins, A. (2011). Convection-driven melting near the grounding lines of ice shelves and tidewater glaciers. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 41(12), 2279–2294. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-11-03.1>
- Krug, J., Weiss, J., Gagliardini, O., & Durand, G. (2014). Combining damage and fracture mechanics to model calving. *The Cryosphere*, 8, 2101–2117. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tcd-8-1631-2014>
- Krug, J., Durand, G., Gagliardini, O., & Weiss, J. (2015). Modelling the impact of submarine frontal melting and ice mélange on glacier dynamics. *The Cryosphere*, 9(3), 989–1003. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-9-989-2015>
- Levermann, A., Albrecht, T., Winkelmann, R., Martin, M. A., Haseloff, M., & Joughin, I. (2012). Kinematic first-order calving law implies potential for abrupt ice-shelf retreat. *The Cryosphere*, 6(2), 273–286. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-6-273-2012>
- Löhner, R. (1995). Robust, vectorized search algorithms for interpolation on unstructured grids. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 118(2), 380–387. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcph.1995.1107>
- Luckman, A., Benn, D. I., Cottier, F., Bevan, S., Nilsen, F., & Inall, M. (2015). Calving rates at tidewater glaciers vary strongly with ocean temperature. *Nature Communications*, 6, 8566. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9566>
- Ma, Y., Tripathy, C. S., & Bassis, J. N. (2017). Bounds on the calving cliff height of marine terminating glaciers. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 1369–1375. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071560>
- McFadden, E. M., Howat, I. M., Joughin, I., Smith, B. E., & Ahn, Y. (2011). Changes in the dynamics of marine terminating outlet glaciers in west Greenland (2000–2009). *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116, F02022. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JF001757>
- Moon, T., Joughin, I., & Smith, B. (2015). Seasonal to multiyear variability of glacier surface velocity, terminus position, and sea ice/ice mélange in northwest Greenland. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 120, 818–833. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JF003494>
- Morlighem, M., Bondzio, J., Seroussi, H., Rignot, E., Larour, E., Humbert, A., & Rebuffat, S. (2016). Modeling of Store Gletscher's calving dynamics, West Greenland, in response to ocean thermal forcing. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 2659–2666. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL067695>
- Mottram, R. H., & Benn, D. I. (2009). Testing crevasse-depth models: A field study at Breiðamerkjökull, Iceland. *Journal of Glaciology*, 55(192), 746–752. <https://doi.org/10.3189/002214309789470905>

- Motyka, R. J. (1997). Deep-water calving at Le Conte Glacier, southeast Alaska. In C. J. Van der Veen (Ed.), *Calving Glaciers: Report of a Workshop*, Feb. 28–March 2, 1997. Byrd Polar Research Centre Report No. 15. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. (pp. 115–118).
- Nick, F. M., Van der Veen, C. J., Vieli, A., & Benn, D. I. (2010). A physically based calving model applied to marine outlet glaciers and implications for the glacier dynamics. *Journal of Glaciology*, *56*(199), 781–794.
- Noël, B., van de Berg, W. J., van Meijgaard, E., Kuipers Munneke, P., van de Wal, R. S. W., & van den Broeke, M. R. (2015). Evaluation of the updated regional climate model RACMO2.3: Summer snowfall impact on the Greenland ice sheet. *The Cryosphere*, *9*(5), 1831–1844. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-9-1831-2015>
- Nye, J. F. (1957). The distribution of stress and velocity in glaciers and ice-sheets. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *239*(1216), 113–133. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1957.0026>
- O'Leary, M., & Christoffersen, P. (2013). Calving on tidewater glaciers amplified by submarine frontal melting. *The Cryosphere*, *7*(1), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-7-119-2013>
- O'Neel, S., Echelmeyer, K. A., & Motyka, R. J. (2004). Short-term variations in calving of a tidewater glacier: LeConte Glacier, Alaska, U.S.A. *Journal of Glaciology*, *49*(167), 587–598. <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756503781830430>
- Otero, J., Navarro, F. J., Martin, C., Cuadrado, M. L., & Corcuera, M. I. (2010). A three-dimensional calving model: Numerical experiments on Johnsons Glacier, Livingston Island, Antarctica. *Journal of Glaciology*, *56*(196), 200–214. <https://doi.org/10.3189/002214310791968539>
- Pattyn, F. (2003). A new three-dimensional higher-order thermomechanical ice sheet model: Basic sensitivity, ice stream development, and ice flow across subglacial lakes. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *108*(B8), 2382. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JB002329>
- Pollard, D., DeConto, R. M., & Alley, R. B. (2015). Potential Antarctic ice sheet retreat driven by hydrofracturing and ice cliff failure. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *412*, 112–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2014.12.035>
- Rignot, E., & Kanagaratnam, P. (2006). Changes in the velocity structure of the Greenland ice sheet. *Science*, *311*(5763), 986–990. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1121381>
- Rignot, E., Xu, Y., Menemenlis, D., Mougnot, J., Scheuchl, B., Li, X., et al. (2016). Modeling of ocean-induced ice melt rates of five west Greenland glaciers over the past two decades. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *43*, 6374–6382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL068784>
- Ryan, J. C., Hubbard, A. L., Box, J. E., Todd, J., Christoffersen, P., Carr, J. R., et al. (2015). UAV photogrammetry and structure from motion to assess calving dynamics at Store Glacier, a large outlet draining the Greenland ice sheet. *The Cryosphere*, *9*(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-9-1-2015>
- Seddik, H., Greve, R., Zwinger, T., Gillet-Chaulet, F., & Gagliardini, O. (2012). Simulations of the Greenland ice sheet 100 years into the future with the full Stokes model Elmer/Ice. *Journal of Glaciology*, *58*(209), 427–440. <https://doi.org/10.3189/2012JoG111177>
- Slater, D. A., Goldberg, D. N., Nienow, P. W., & Cowton, T. R. (2016). Scalings for submarine melting at tidewater glaciers from buoyant plume theory. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, *46*(6), 1839–1855. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-15-0132.1>
- Slater, D. A., Nienow, P. W., Goldberg, D. N., Cowton, T. R., & Sole, A. J. (2017). A model for tidewater glacier undercutting by submarine melting. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *44*, 2360–2368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL072374>
- Toberg, N., Ryan, J., Christoffersen, C., Snooke, N., Todd, J., & Hubbard, A. (2016). Estimating ice-mélange properties with repeat UAV surveys over Store Glacier, West Greenland. EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts (Vol. 18).
- Todd, J. (2017). A 3D full Stokes calving model for Store Glacier, West Greenland. PhD thesis. University of Cambridge.
- Todd, J., & Christoffersen, P. (2014). Are seasonal calving dynamics forced by buttressing from ice mélange or undercutting by melting? Outcomes from full-Stokes simulations of Store Glacier, West Greenland. *The Cryosphere*, *8*(6), 2353–2365. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-8-2353-2014>
- Turner, J. S. (1973). *Buoyancy Effects in Fluids* (Vol. 0). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Ultee, L., & Bassis, J. (2016). The future is Nye: An extension of the perfect plastic approximation to tidewater glaciers. *Journal of Glaciology*, *62*(236), 1143–1152. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2016.108>
- Van der Veen, C. J. (1996). Tidewater calving. *Journal of Glaciology*, *42*(141), 375–385.
- Van der Veen, C. J. (1998a). Fracture mechanics approach to penetration of bottom crevasses on glaciers. *Cold Regions Science and Technology*, *27*(3), 213–223.
- Van der Veen, C. J. (1998b). Fracture mechanics approach to penetration of surface crevasses on glaciers. *Cold Regions Science and Technology*, *27*(1), 31–47.
- Vieli, A., & Nick, F. (2011). Understanding and modelling rapid dynamic changes of tidewater outlet glaciers: Issues and implications. *Surveys in Geophysics*, *32*(4–5), 437–458.
- Vieli, A., Funk, M., & Blatter, H. (2001). Flow dynamics of tidewater glaciers: A numerical modelling approach. *Journal of Glaciology*, *47*(159), 595–606.
- Walter, J. I., Jason, E., Tulaczyk, S., Brodsky, E. E., Howat, I. M., Yushin, A. H. N., & Brown, A. (2012). Oceanic mechanical forcing of a marine-terminating Greenland glacier. *Annals of Glaciology*, *53*(60), 181–192.
- Warren, C. R., Glasser, N. F., Harrison, S., Winchester, V., Kerr, A. R., & Rivera, A. (1995). Characteristics of tide-water calving at Glacier San-Rafael, Chile. *Journal of Glaciology*, *41*(138), 273–289.
- Weidick, A., & Bennike, O. (2007). Quaternary glaciation history and glaciology of Jakobshavn Isbræ and the Disko Bugt region, West Greenland: a review. *Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland*, *14*. Retrieved from [http://www.geus.dk/publications/bull/nr14/nr14\\_p01-13\\_A1b.pdf](http://www.geus.dk/publications/bull/nr14/nr14_p01-13_A1b.pdf)
- Zwinger, T., & Moore, J. C. (2009). Diagnostic and prognostic simulations with a full Stokes model accounting for superimposed ice of Midtre Lovénbreen, Svalbard. *The Cryosphere*, *3*(2), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-3-217-2009>
- Zwinger, T., Greve, R., Gagliardini, O., Shiraiwa, T., & Lyly, M. (2007). A full Stokes-flow thermo-mechanical model for firn and ice applied to the Gorskov crater glacier, Kamchatka. *Annals of Glaciology*, *45*(1), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756407782282543>