Tephra deposition on glaciers and ice sheets on Mars: Influence on ice survival, debris content and flow behavior
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ABSTRACT

We examine the consequences of pyroclastic deposits being emplaced onto ice layers on Mars, both those in the polar caps and those forming glaciers on the flanks of some of the large shield volcanoes. We show that layers of pyroclasts greater than a few meters in thickness, whether emplaced cold (as fall deposits) or hot (as pyroclastic density current deposits) act almost exclusively to protect ice layers beneath them from sublimation, irrespective of whether they are emplaced at high or low elevations or high or low latitudes. Layers less than about 2 m thick, on the other hand, can cause significant ice loss by raising the surface temperature due to their low albedo and then transmitting that increased temperature to the underlying ice, especially on a diurnal time scale. This can have a significant bearing on the emplacement history of polar water ice and on the survival time of glacial ice on shield volcano flanks. A key factor in the latter case is the timing of the episodic volcanic activity relative to the cycles of climate change driven by Mars’ obliquity and eccentricity variations.
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1. Introduction

Water ice deposits, averaging ~3 km in thickness, currently exist at the poles of Mars (Smith et al., 1999; Phillips et al., 2007), and water ice is present at depths less than 1 m in the crust in both hemispheres at latitudes greater than ~50° (Boynton et al., 2002; Mellon et al., 2004). It has recently been realised that water ice has also been present as glaciers on the flanks of a number of tropical volcanic mountains, especially those in the Tharsis province (Head and Marchant, 2003; Shean et al., 2005, 2007; Milkovich et al., 2006; Kadish et al., 2008) (Fig. 1), and that the spatial extents of the glacial deposits on these mountains, which are currently as large as 17,000 km2, have varied significantly with time. Changes in the spatial extents and thicknesses of tropical mountain glaciers on the Tharsis volcanoes, and of glacial ice deposits at other latitudes (e.g., Head et al., 2006a,b), are influenced by temperature changes on a variety of time scales, the most important of which are controlled by changes in the obliquity of Mars’ spin axis and the eccentricity of its orbit around the Sun. Three time scales are prominent, ~100 ka, 2 Ma and 15 Ma (Laskar et al., 2002). However, these climatic controls may be modified by any other process that affects the temperature or reflectivity of an ice surface. The purpose of this paper is to explore the consequences of the deposition of volcanic fall and flow deposits onto glacial and polar ice layers on Mars.

Volcanic eruptions on Mars have taken place over protracted periods; the Tharsis volcanoes have been built up over time periods estimated to be of order 1 to 2 Ga (Schaber et al., 1978; Hodges and Moore, 1994). Dividing their volumes, which lie within a factor of 3 of 1.5 × 106 km3 (Wilson et al., 2001), by their ages gives a mean magma supply rate of ~0.05 m3 s−1, with a range that also spans a factor of at least 3. The most recent eruptions on these volcanoes are not easy to date, but impact crater counts on the floors of their calderas suggest that eruptions have taken place within the last 25–50 Ma (Neukum et al., 2004). All of the Tharsis volcanoes have multiple summit calderas, implying that each one has developed at least several magma chambers during its lifetime (e.g., Scott and Wilson, 2000). Thermal constraints (Wilson et al., 2001) mean that the initiation of a new magma reservoir requires a high magma supply rate (~150 m3 s−1) for many weeks; to maintain the reservoir requires an input of ~3 m3 s−1 (again with a range encompassing a factor of ~3) throughout its active lifetime. To allow an existing reservoir to cool and solidify, so that a subsequent reservoir can be constructed at a location offset from that of its predecessor, requires the absence of significant magma supply for at least several tens of Ma.

The simplest way to reconcile all of these requirements is to assume that each of these volcanoes is (intermittently) active for ~1 Ma and then dormant for ~100 Ma, this long-term cycle being repeated throughout most of the lifetime of the volcano (Wilson et al., 2001). Thus for a 1.5 Ga volcano lifetime, 15 such cycles would be required, with 100,000 km3 of magma being supplied to the summit...
reservoir per cycle. This volume would have to be erupted in each of the ∼1 Ma active periods. By analogy with shield volcanoes on Earth, eruptive activity may be dominated by short-term cycles of reservoir inflation and eruption (or intrusion) in which at most ∼1% of the reservoir magma is released per cycle (Blake, 1981). If so, then a 30 km diameter reservoir, typical of those implied by the calderas visible on martian shield volcanoes today, would have an event erupting or intruding ∼71 km³ of magma on average every ∼710 years.

To illustrate the possible effects of this kind of eruption we simulate below the dispersal of 100 km³ of magma erupted in a single event, noting that ∼1000 such eruptions may occur at ∼1000 year intervals during any 1 Ma active phase of the volcano. We also simulate the presumably much rarer events in which caldera subsidence occurs as a result of the rapid withdrawal of an unusually large volume of magma. Noting that the calderas of the martian shield volcanoes have depths up to ∼1 km, implying that a 30 km diameter reservoir underlying such a caldera could erupt as much as 7000 km³ of magma, we conservatively simulate the eruption of 1000 km³ of magma in a single event. Given that the low atmospheric pressure on Mars encourages explosive activity in magmas with much smaller volatile contents than those common on Earth (Wilson and Head, 1994), there are strong reasons for anticipating that a mixture of effusive and explosive deposits form the bodies of these volcanoes (Head and Wilson, 1998; Wilson et al., 1998). We focus here on explosive eruptions because, as we show in the next section, pyroclasts produced in such eruptions are likely to blanket much greater areas than are observed to be covered by lava flows.

2. Tephra production and injection into the atmosphere

The expectation that volcanic eruptions on Mars are inherently more likely to be explosive than eruptions of similar magmas on Earth because of the lower atmospheric pressure arises from two effects (Wilson and Head, 1994). First, available volatiles, all of which have solubilities that are pressure-dependent, exsolve to a greater degree; second, all of the gas bubbles formed from the volatiles released undergo a greater amount of expansion than on Earth. The combined effect on Mars is likely to be a greater degree of fragmentation of the magma, with the size of the largest pyroclast formed being much smaller than on Earth: Wilson and Head (1994) estimated a maximum grain size of a few mm, and for convenience here we adopt the value ∼5.6 mm, i.e. −2.5 phi units. The size of the smallest pyroclast is likely to be controlled by the size of the smallest bubble that can nucleate, ∼20 μm (Sparks, 1978), and we adopt ∼22 μm, i.e. +5.5 phi units. Thus the net effect is to produce a smaller range of grain sizes than on Earth and a smaller median size. These findings appear to be consistent with the sizes of the pyroclasts resulting from eruptions into a hard vacuum on the Moon, where the maximum sizes of the volcanic glass beads found in the lunar regolith are ∼1 mm (Weitz et al., 1998).

A second consequence of the low atmospheric pressure and enhanced gas expansion on Mars is higher exit velocities than on Earth in the ejected mixture of gas and pyroclasts for a given total magma volatile content (Wilson and Head, 1994). As a result the jet of gas and pyroclasts that emerges from the vent is able to entrain the surrounding atmospheric gas more efficiently. Furthermore, the small sizes of the pyroclasts mean that they remain locked to the gas motion (because they have small ratios of mass to cross-sectional area and hence small terminal fall velocities relative to the gas), and also that they can release their heat to the entrained gas efficiently (because the timescale for extracting the heat is proportional to the square of the radius). The net result is to maximize the thermal buoyancy of the plume formed from the mixing of atmosphere and volcanic materials and hence to maximize the rise height of that plume for a given mass eruption rate from the vent. Indeed, the great efficiency of entrainment of the pyroclasts into the gas flow means that eruptions which would shed a large proportional of their coarse pyroclasts not far above the vent on Earth, forming a lava fountain (often called fire fountain), will instead form a high convecting plume on Mars of the kind more commonly associated with plinian eruptions on Earth (Wilson and Head, 1994).

To a good approximation, the maximum heights of eruption plumes are proportional to the fourth root of the erupted mass flux (e.g., Wilson et al., 1978). However, this relationship is only valid as long as the atmospheric and volcanic gases obey the normal gas laws. At sufficiently great heights above the surface on Mars, the gas density becomes so low that the mean free path of molecules becomes very large, comparable to the sizes of pyroclasts, and interactions take place in the Knudsen regime (Glaze and Baloga, 2002). Both the support of clasts and the entrainment process then become very inefficient and, as a result, eruption plumes are not likely to be able to rise to heights.
much greater than ~20 km on Mars (Glaze and Baloga, 2002; Wilson and Head, 2007a). The mass eruption rates required to reach this height are so small (only $\sim 5000$ kg s$^{-1}$, corresponding to a dense rock equivalent volume eruption rate of $\sim 2$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$) that a very large proportion of all eruptions on Mars should produce eruption plumes reaching, but not greatly exceeding, a height of 20 km. The widths of the plumes at this height cannot be easily predicted because the theoretical models used to simulate martian explosive eruptions no longer apply near the 20 km level. However, the modeling of terrestrial eruptions (e.g., Carey and Sparks, 1986; Sparks, 1986; Wilson and Walker, 1987) suggests that the plume radius will be about 3.5 km at this height and reach the 20 km high re-entry point are irrelevant. For the intermediate size range, large (20–50 mm) clasts will fall extremely slowly (at $\sim 50$ m s$^{-1}$) and travel only a further 10 km from their re-entry point, so that they start their descent from the 20 km level at much greater radial distances ($\sim 10$ km) from the vent (Wilson and Head, 2007a). Pyroclasts may then travel to heights above the surface much greater than 20 km, but they will very quickly (1 to 3 min) fall back ballistically under gravity until they encounter the drag effects of the atmosphere as they descend through the ~20 km level. They will then fall to the ground with much the same duration of travel as if they had been transported to the 20 km level by an eruption with a much smaller mass eruption rate. The main difference is that their excursion out of, and back into, the lower atmosphere will mean that they start their descent from the 20 km level at much greater radial distances ($\sim 40$–60 km) from the vent (Wilson and Head, 2007a). The amount by which this affects their total travel distance then depends on the mean wind speed and their sizes. In a typical martian wind profile (Moudden and McConnell, 2005), where the speed increases steadily to values of $\sim 40$ m s$^{-1}$ at ~20 km, large ($\sim 2$ mm) clasts will fall quickly (at $\sim 50$ m s$^{-1}$) and travel only a further 10 km from their re-entry point, so the "umbrella" effect will significantly influence their dispersal. In contrast, the smallest (20 μm) clasts will fall extremely slowly (at $\sim 0.01$ m s$^{-1}$) and in principle could travel 60,000 km, about 3 times around the planet. Clearly for these small clasts the details of how they reach the 20 km high re-entry point are irrelevant. For the intermediate size of 200 μm clasts the fall speed from 20 km averages $\sim 1$ m s$^{-1}$ and in the distance traveled is $\sim 600$ km, so in this case too the details of what happens in the vicinity of the vent are of minimal importance.

3. Pyroclast dispersal and deposit thicknesses

The above finding, that most explosive eruptions on Mars will transport the bulk of their erupted pyroclasts to heights close to 20 km and release them from this height in a region that may extend horizontally from between $\sim 10$ and $\sim 50$ km from the vent, greatly simplifies modeling their dispersal. The grain size determines the fall speed and hence the travel distance in a typical wind profile after release into the lower atmosphere, and so the total grain size distribution released at the vent will be the control on the amount of material that falls at a given distance, and hence the local thickness of the deposit. There are no grain size distribution determinations for any of the explosive eruption deposits on Mars suggested by image analysis of volcano morphology (e.g. Edgett et al., 1997; Mouginis-Mark et al., 1982, 1988), and the suggested identification of mm-sized lapilli in strata examined by the Mars Exploration Rover Spirit in Gusev crater (Cabrol, 2006; Rice et al., 2006) does not provide a significant part of a size distribution.

We described above how estimates can be made of the largest and smallest grain sizes. To obtain a grain size distribution function for Mars we take a typical distribution found for very explosive eruptions on Earth and scale it to our predicted maximum and minimum martian grain sizes. Total grain size distributions are hard to measure for ancient explosive eruptions on Earth because of the difficulty of identifying thin, fine-grained, poorly-preserved distal deposits in the geological record, but data from some modern eruptions are summarized by Wilson (1999). Of these, the one with the most thoroughly fragmented magma is the Askja 1875 eruption, and we use grain size data for it, taken from Wilson (1999), as the basis for the proposed Martian grain size distribution (Table 1).

Deposit thickness is predicted as follows. We assume that erupted clasts of all sizes are carried to the 20 km height and release them at a chosen radial distance from the vent (in the range 10 and $\sim 50$ km identified above). We then use the equations given by Wilson and Head (2007a) for determining terminal fall velocities of clasts of a given density in a standard martian atmosphere to obtain the fall speed for each particle size as a function of height above the ground. The lateral displacement of each particle size as it falls is tracked via the atmospheric wind model of Moudden and McConnell (2005) and integrated until the clast size reaches the ground. If no other action were taken this process would lead to a one-to-one relationship between clast size (of a given density, in this case 1500 kg m$^{-3}$, a plausible pyroclast density) and travel distance, and this relationship is shown in Fig. 2. However, turbulence in a planetary atmosphere causes significant dispersion of falling particles, and we allow for this by smearing out the unique travel distance into a distribution that is centered at a chosen fraction $\alpha$ of the nominal range and has a standard deviation that is
4. Thermal consequences of pyroclast deposition

4.1. Basic considerations

The largest clasts expected to be erupted, ∼5 mm in size, require ∼230 s to descend from a height of ∼20 km in the standard Mars atmosphere (Wilson and Head, 2007a). The time τ required for a spherical clast of radius a to equilibrate in temperature with its surroundings is given by

\[ \tau = \frac{a}{c_0 \sqrt{\kappa}} \]

where c0 is the specific heat capacity of a material and \( \kappa \) is the thermal diffusivity. Reducing this time to a value of half the thickness of the deposit, \( t_{\text{th}} \), is required for a clast of size a with a emissivity, the mean (perhaps as low as 0.1) (Ward and Tomasko, 1981). The corresponding emissivities are 0.3–0.6 and 0.9, and so the effect of emplacing a layer of pyroclasts will be to increase the sublimation rate by a factor between (0.9/0.3)1/4 = 1.31 and (0.9/0.6)1/4 = 1.11. Fig. 4 shows the relationship between temperatures before and after emplacement of a low-albedo maﬁc pyroclast layer on bright ice. A surface previously at the mean martian surface temperature of ∼210 K will have its temperature raised to ∼276 K, about 3° above the melting point of ice. In polar and high-altitude locations where the temperature is very much less than the planetary mean (perhaps as low as ∼130 K – Mellon et al., 2004), the temperature will not be raised above the melting point; but the sublimation rate of H2O molecules (whether from a solid or a liquid surface) is an extremely strong function of the temperature, and there may still be a major effect on the long-term ice stability. At lower latitudes, where ice with a temperature signiﬁcantly greater than the

![Fig. 3](image-url) Predicted variation of pyroclastic fall deposit thickness with distance from vent on Mars for particles released from an eruption column, or injected into the lower atmosphere from above, at a height of 20 km above the ground. Curves are labelled with the two values of the total erupted magma volume modelled, 100 and 1000 km3.

![Fig. 4](image-url) Relationship between the temperature of an icy surface and temperature of the surface of a low-albedo maﬁc pyroclast layer emplaced on top of it under the same solar illumination conditions.
The temperature could in theory be raised well above the ice melting point. However, thermal observations from orbit (Kieffer et al., 1976a, b; Haberle et al., 2001; Grassi et al., 2005) suggest that no significant part of the martian surface is ever hotter than ~30 °C, and so we adopt 300 K as a realistic upper limit to the temperatures to be considered. We note in passing that both Viking (Kieffer et al., 1976a, b) and Mars Express (Grassi et al., 2005) data show that the summits and upper flanks of the large Tharsis shield volcanoes can attain daytime temperatures several degrees above 273 K. Given that the atmospheric pressure at the summits is ~130 Pa, only a fraction of the ~610 Pa vapor pressure of ice at 273 K, it is clear that long-term ice survival without a protective cover of some kind is not to be expected and, indeed, Mars Odyssey gamma ray and neutron spectrometer data show evidence for the presence of water ice within about 1 m of the surface on the lower north-west flanks of the Tharsis shields but not in the summit areas (Elphic et al., 2004).

Raising the surface temperature of a layer of pyroclasts to a value above the melting point of ice does not mean that ice buried beneath the pyroclasts will melt immediately. The response of the ice depends on the time taken by the heat input at the surface to penetrate to the ice, and hence on the deposit thickness. Solar heat inputs to the surface of Mars vary on two short time scales, the Mars solar day (1 sol = 24.624 h) and one Mars year (= 686.98 days), and on three longer time scales, those of the obliquity and eccentricity cycles (Laskar et al., 2004), ~100 ka, 2 Ma and 15 Ma. Table 2 shows the depth of penetration beneath the surface of a thermal wave driven by each of these five periodicities. Temperature fluctuations due to each of these driving periodicities will be significant down to depths 2 to 3 times greater than the values given. Clearly, for pyroclast layers less than about 2 m thick, buried ice will respond to the diurnal heating cycle. For layer thicknesses in the ~2 m to ~30 m range, the diurnal variations will be largely ignored but the annual cycle will be felt. Finally, all deposits will be influenced by all three of the long-term climate variation periodicities.

If the temperature of the ice at the bottom of the pyroclast layer rises to a value such that the temperature-dependent vapor pressure exceeds the local atmospheric pressure, molecules will begin to diffuse upward between the pyroclasts and be lost to the atmosphere at the surface. Their rate of loss depends on the porosity, pathway tortuosity and thickness of the pyroclast layer. Both the porosity and the tortuosity may be progressively changed from their initial values by the presence of ice temporarily deposited in pore spaces as molecules migrate. This problem has been treated for loss of ice from beneath a dust layer on comets (Fanale and Salvail, 1990) and on Mars’ satellite Phobos (Fanale and Salvail, 1990). The mass flux of H2O lost per unit area of the deposit, q_m, is given by

\[ q_m = \frac{4}{5} \frac{M}{RT} f \left( \frac{P_i - P_a}{\tau h} \right)^{1/2} \]

where \( M \) is the molecular mass of water (18.02 kg kmol\(^{-1}\)), \( Q \) is the universal gas constant (8.314 kg kmol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)), \( T \) is the ice temperature, \( f \) is the bulk porosity of the pyroclast layer, \( r \) is the typical size of the pathways between pyroclasts, \( \tau \) is the vapor pressure of the ice at temperature \( T \), \( P_a \) is the local atmospheric pressure, \( \tau \) is the tortuosity of the pyroclast layer, and \( h \) is the layer thickness. A likely value for \( \tau \) is 5 (Fanale and Salvail, 1990). To estimate \( f \) we note that we expect thorough disruption of the magma so that individual pyroclasts may not be very vesicular; close packing of the likely irregular particles will produce a porosity of ~35% (Latham et al., 2002). The requirement that the vapor pressure of the ice must exceed the local atmospheric pressure for sublimation to occur sets a lower limit to the ice temperature that needs to be considered. The greatest heights of volcano summits above the pressure datum on Mars are ~20 km, very close to two scales heights of the martian atmosphere. Thus for a mean surface pressure of ~700 Pa, the pressure at the top of the highest volcano is ~100 Pa, and this is the vapor pressure of ice at ~~20 °C, i.e. 253 K. We therefore identify this as the lowest temperature at which significant ice sublimation could ever occur in the absence of wind-driven loss (Wallace and Sagan, 1979), and of course winds will have no effect beneath a protective layer of pyroclasts.

Eq. (1) has been used to obtain water molecule mass fluxes for a range of ice or water temperatures and atmospheric pressures under a range of pyroclastic blanket thicknesses. The temperature range is taken as 253 to 300 K on the basis of the above arguments, and the pressure range is 700 to 100 Pa, covering all volcano summits and flanks. The water molecule mass fluxes are converted to ice thickness reduction rates by dividing the mass flux per unit area by the ice density. Multiplication of this by any given time interval yields the actual ice thickness loss during that time period.

### 4.2. Thin pyroclast deposits responding to diurnal temperature changes

Ice buried beneath pyroclast deposits with thicknesses less than ~2 m will respond to diurnal temperatures variations (Table 2). Pyroclast deposits with thicknesses in this range will be located at distances greater than ~200 km from the vent in the case of 100 km\(^3\) eruptions and greater than ~800 km for the rarer 1000 km\(^3\) events. Thus we are mainly concerned here with thin deposits that either fall on polar ice or on one volcano as a result of an eruption on some other volcano. Table 3 shows the depth of ice lost from an ice layer as a function of the ambient atmospheric pressure and the overlying pyroclast layer thickness in one sol (martian day). Note that ice is only lost during that part of the sol when the temperature at the base of the pyroclast layer is such that the ice vapor pressure exceeds the local atmospheric pressure. For the temperature range modeled, 140 to 300 K, this period is ~12% of the sol.

At the polar caps the atmospheric pressure is in the 600–800 Pa range and the maximum temperature is ~240 K (Haberle et al., 2001). With the maximum amount of heating (which Fig. 4 shows to be ~70 K) by the warming effect of a 0.1 m thick pyroclast layer, several hundred micrometers of ice could be lost each sol, and during the ~330 sol-long summer months the total loss could exceed 0.1 m. Modelling by Laskar et al. (2002) suggests that a thickness of only ~0.5 mm of water ice is deposited on each polar cap during each martian winter under present climatic conditions. Thus volcanic fall

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Time in seconds</th>
<th>Penetration depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mars day</td>
<td>8.86 × 10⁴</td>
<td>0.58 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars year</td>
<td>5.94 × 10⁷</td>
<td>15 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 century</td>
<td>3.36 × 10⁷</td>
<td>105 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ka</td>
<td>3.36 × 10¹⁰</td>
<td>345 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ka</td>
<td>3.36 × 10¹³</td>
<td>1.1 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 ka</td>
<td>3.36 × 10¹²</td>
<td>3.5 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ma</td>
<td>6.31 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>15 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ma</td>
<td>3.36 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>42 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospheric pressure in Pa</th>
<th>Pyroclast layer thickness in meters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1183 394 169 118 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>922 307 132 92 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>717 239 102 72 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>582 194 83 58 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
events could seriously disturb the long-term polar ice recycling due to obliquity and eccentricity changes. These issues merit more detailed investigation.

The situation is equally complex on the flanks of volcanoes. The time scale for glacier formation is the 100 ka obliquity variation, and measurements indicate that as much as 3 km of ice can accumulate (Dickson et al., 2008) on the Tharsis shield volcanoes. If this thickness accumulates over one half of 1 cycle, 50 ka, the average accretion rate is ∼170 μm per sol. The loss rate from an ice layer due to an overlying pyroclast layer can lie anywhere in the range 30 to 1200 μm per sol, with loss rates decreasing away from the summit and decreasing with increasing pyroclast layer thicknesses (Table 3). There are two extreme cases to consider.

First, assume that near the start of an orbital ice accumulation cycle ice deposition starts between the 500 Pa (lower flanks) and 100 Pa (summit) levels on a Tharsis volcano at the above average rate of 170 μm per sol. After the typical repose time of 1000 years an eruption occurs on a distant volcano that is in the 1 Ma active part of its 100 Ma activity cycle. This eruption deposits 0.3 m of ash on the accumulating ice deposit, which in 1000 years has accumulated to a thickness of 62 m. If the eruption ends early in the daylight hours, diurnal heating of the pyroclast layer rapidly penetrates the 0.3 m thick ash layer and ice beneath it begins to be lost at rates of 239, 307 and 394 μm per sol at the lower flank, upper flank and summit levels. If this loss rate continued indefinitely, all of the ice would be lost at these levels in 710, 553 and 431 years, respectively. However, on average ∼150 μm of fresh ice will be deposited onto the top of the pyroclast layer during the ∼88% of the next sol that the surface temperature is below 273 K. Given that we expect the grain sizes in the pyroclast layer to be at most 5 mm, i.e. 500 μm, this single night’s ice deposit should be enough to completely veneer the uppermost surface and drastically increase its albedo, thus destroying the potential heating process. In practice, the ice build-up rate is not likely to be constant at the average rate but is likely to be episodic depending on the sol-to-sol weather patterns. However, as long as one significant snow fall occurs on a time scale much less than a few centuries, most of the ice layer will survive. We therefore infer that eruptions taking place during an ice-accumulation period will not significantly interfere with the accumulation. Instead, they will simply interleave pyroclast layers with ice layers.

Now consider the case where an eruption occurs after an orbital ice accumulation cycle has finished. An ice layer 3 km thick is assumed to be present, onto which, as before, 0.3 m of ash is deposited by a distant eruption. Now no new ice is deposited overnight to interfere with the diurnal heating cycle. The ice loss rates from beneath the pyroclast layer will be those given above, 239, 307 and 394 μm per sol on the lower flanks, upper flanks and summit of the volcano, respectively. During the on-average 1000 years before the next eruption of the volcano forming the first pyroclast layer, the 3 km ice layer will have thinned by 87, 112 and 144 m, respectively, at the three locations. Assume that the next eruption deposits the same thickness of ash. The ice loss rates from beneath the new 0.6 m thick layer will be less than before, specifically 120, 154 and 197 μm per sol, and the ice thickness reductions during a subsequent 1000 year interval would be 44, 56 and 72 m, respectively. Assume that after this further 1000 years a third similar eruption occurs. The ice loss rates under the resulting 0.9 m thick ash layer will be 80, 102 and 131 μm per sol, and the ice thickness reductions will be 29, 37 and 48 m. Potentially this pattern can continue for a total of 50 eruptions at 1000 year intervals during the no-ice-accumulation part of the 100 ka obliquity cycle. If it does so, repetition of the above calculation shows that the total ice thickness removed from the lower flanks, upper flanks and summit of the volcano will be ∼390, 500 and 650 m, respectively. These thicknesses represent ∼13 to 22% of a 3 km thick ice layer.

The inverse relationship between pyroclast layer thickness and amount of ice loss shown in Table 3 implies that repetitive deposition of ash layers thinner than about 0.1 m could ultimately induce enough heating of underlying ice to completely remove a 3 km thick layer during the 50 ka period of non-accumulation. In practice there is no reason why eruptions should be equally spaced in time or should each produce exactly the same ash layer thickness. Also, re-working of ash deposits by the wind can lead to significant dune development on Mars (Parteli and Herrmann, 2007) so that layers might not be of uniform thickness, though deposition of ice in pore spaces as molecules migrate may act to stabilize ash layers on the upper flanks of volcanoes. Nevertheless, these illustrations give an impression of the possible significant consequences of repeated eruptions producing thin pyroclast deposits during a period of no ice deposition.

4.3. Thick pyroclast deposits responding to annual and longer-term temperature changes

As noted earlier, pyroclast deposits with thicknesses in the 2 to 30 m range will transmit temperature changes to underlying ice on a martian annual timescale. These deposits are predicted to be present at between ~30 and ~200 km from vents in the case of 100 km³ eruptions and at between ~150 and ~800 km for rare 1000 km³ eruptions. The ~30 and ~200 km range of 2–30 m thick deposits from the common 100 km³ eruptions would cover most of the flanks of all large shield volcanoes. Furthermore, this distance range encompasses the full extent of the current glacial deposits identified on the north-west flanks of the Tharsis Montes (Head and Marchant, 2003; Shean et al., 2005, 2007; Kadish et al., 2008). Thus these glacial deposits could potentially have been subjected to modifications on a martian annual timescale after any significant explosive eruption.

However, the temperature excursion driving these modifications would be the seasonal variation of the diurnal average temperature, not the hour-to-hour temperature that can be transmitted through thinner deposits. The diurnal average temperature on Mars currently varies as a function of season from ~205 to ~230 K at the equator and from ~140 to ~220 K at the poles (Kieffer et al., 1977). Thus nowhere is it likely that pyroclast deposits with thicknesses greater than a few meters would currently lead to loss of underlying ice. Simulations of the changes in the global temperature distribution due to the ~100 ka, 2 Ma and 15 Ma obliquity and eccentricity changes (e.g., Laskar et al., 2004) suggest that the same is true for longer time scales: although temperatures at the surface may exceed values that would cause significant ice evaporation at some time during the sol at low latitudes, the seasonal and longer-term variations in the diurnal mean temperatures that would be transmitted through pyroclast deposits more than a few meters thick would not be capable of causing significant loss of underlying ice.

This same argument applies to the even thicker pyroclast deposits predicted to be possible on volcano summits and upper flanks as a result of 100 km³ eruptions and at all locations on volcanoes as a result of 1000 km³ eruptions (see Fig. 3). The only consequence of such events is the preservation of underlying ice deposits.

5. Physical consequences of pyroclast deposition on glaciers

A typical 100 km³ eruption will deposit several meters of ash on the upper and middle volcano flanks at the range of distances where glacial deposits are inferred to have been located on the Tharsis volcanoes (e.g., Head and Marchant, 2003). Such eruptions occur at ~1000 year intervals during each 1 Ma active phase of the volcano. Fifty such eruptions might occur during the ~50 ka half of the 100 ka time scale on which a glacier was growing. If each eruption deposited 5 m of ash (see Fig. 3), the total added would be an equivalent thickness of (50 × 5 m = 250) m of pyroclasts. Given that the estimates of the current thicknesses of the glacial deposits are 2 to 3 km, it is clear that the silicate load of the glacier could easily be ~8–12%. If a rare 1000 km³ eruptive event should chance to happen during
the ice accretion period, an additional 30 m of ash could be added. The possibility that ~10% of a volcano-covering glacier may consist of pyroclasts may help to account for the common presence of extensive systems of drop moraines and sublimation till deposits identified in areas where the ice has retreated (e.g., Head and Marchant, 2003; Shean et al., 2005, 2007; Kadish et al., 2008).

An additional effect of the presence of layers of pyroclasts within glacial ice may be the modification of the rheological properties of the glacier. Glaciers on the flanks of martian shield volcanoes have cold bases (e.g., Head and Marchant, 2003) and glacial advance is accomplished by internal shear. The shearing force is the component of the glacier weight parallel to the slope and hence is a function of the glacier density. Loosely packed (say 35% void space) low-vesicularity mafic pyroclasts will have a density of ~2000 kg m\(^{-3}\), twice that of the ice above and below, potentially increasing glacial advance rates over what might otherwise be expected. Further, cold, unwelded pyroclast layers may represent zones of low resistance to shear stress. However, exploration of the consequences of these issues is beyond the scope of this paper.

6. Effects of pyroclastic density currents

It is common on Earth for large-volume silicic eruptions involving caldera collapse to produce not fall deposits but instead pyroclastic density currents, the final products of which are the deposits called ignimbrites. The largest of such deposits on Earth extend to many tens of km from the vent (Druitt, 1998). Mafic pyroclastic density currents are rare on Earth, but the greater degree of magma fragmentation expected in mafic explosive eruptions on Mars implies that mafic ignimbrites should be more common, and could be emplaced with temperatures of up to ~700 K (Wilson and Head, 1994). An explosive eruption from a 30 km diameter magma reservoir on Mars causing 1 km of vertical caldera collapse would release ~700 km\(^3\) of magma. Pyroclastic density currents on Mars are able to travel to greater distances than on Earth mainly because the greater expansion of released magmatic gas in the martian environment produces initial eruption speeds ~2.5 times greater than those on Earth (Wilson and Head, 1994). If such a current were to spread radially from a summit vent for 300 km (at the upper end of the plausible range of distances for martian conditions - Wilson and Head, 1994) it could produce a deposit ~2.5 m thick on top of an existing glacial ice layer. Wilson and Head (2007b) show that about half of the heat content of a mafic lava flow deposit overlying ice would be transferred to the underlying ice, and that this could melt an ice thickness approximately equal to 5 times the thickness of the mafic layer. In the case of a mafic deposit overlying ice on Mars an allowance must be made for the fact that to melt the ice it must first be warmed up from a typical temperature of 210 K to the melting point at ~273 K, requiring about 1.3 x 10\(^5\) J kg\(^{-1}\) of heat in addition to the 3.35 x 10\(^5\) J kg\(^{-1}\) needed to melt the ice. Thus the ratio of melted ice thickness to deposit thickness is reduced from ~5 to ~3.6, so that in the case of a 2.5 m deposit thickness about 9 m depth of ice would be melted. This is only a very small fraction of the ~2–3 km estimated maximum thickness of cold-based glaciers on the Tharsis Montes. If a pyroclastic density current were channeled by summit topography so that it spread only onto a sector of the volcano flanks instead of radially, then all of these depth and thickness estimates might be increased by a factor of up to 10, but even 90 m of melting would not represent a significant fraction of a 3 km thick glacier. However, after, and indeed before, it had completely cooled, the ignimbrite sheet would begin to influence the temperature of surviving ice beneath it in the same way as the fall deposits considered earlier. The same arguments as to its effectiveness would apply, with a layer less than a few meters thick possibly having a strong influence on the amount of ice melted over a long period. Overall, we infer that the consequences of the deposition of deposits from explosive eruptions are similar, irrespective of whether the eruptions produce fall or flow deposits.

7. Summary

1) Estimates of the amounts of magma erupted from magma chambers of the sizes observed on large shield volcanoes imply that the thicknesses of fall deposits produced by explosive eruptions may range from a few to many hundreds of meters in summit areas and from a few to a few tens of meters on the volcano flanks.
2) Fall deposits may commonly be 0.1 m thick at 1000 km distance from source and the largest eruptions can produce millimeter-thick layers half way around the planet.
3) Volcanic deposits act to reduce evaporation of ice by providing a tortuous pathway to the atmosphere but may cause increased ice loss if the low albedo of the deposit causes surface warming that is communicated by conduction to underlying ice.
4) In practice, thin (<~2 m thick) deposits able to transmit diurnal surface temperature variations to underlying ice are the only ones capable of causing net ice loss. However, these deposits may have a major effect on polar water ice because of the low seasonal water ice deposition rates. Such deposits may also cause significant thinning of glacial deposits on the flanks of low-latitude volcanoes during periods when no net deposition of ice is taking place.
5) Thick (~a few meters) volcanic deposits, however they are emplaced, always act to preserve underlying ice deposits.
6) Deposits from pyroclastic density currents (ignimbrites) emplaced onto ice may cause initial melting of a depth of ice up to 3.6 times the thickness of the volcanic deposit as they cool, but subsequently will act to preserve the remaining ice.
7) Loading of glacial ice deposits by layers of volcanic tephra will in general increase the shear stress within the glacier, thus increasing advance rates even in cold-based glaciers.
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