Characteristics of the meltwater field from a large Antarctic iceberg using $\delta^{18}O$
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Abstract

Large tabular icebergs represent a disruptive influence on a stable water column when drifting in the open ocean. This is a study of one iceberg, C18A, encountered in the Powell Basin in the Weddell Sea in March 2009, formed from iceberg C18 (76×7 km) originating from the Ross Ice Shelf in May 2002. C18A was lunate in shape with longest dimensions of 31 km×7 km×184 m. The meltwater field from C18A was characterized using $\delta^{18}O$ from water samples collected near C18A (Near-field, 0.4–2 km) and contrasted with a Far-field comprised of samples from an Away site (19 km from C18A), a Control site (70 km away), and a region populated with small icebergs (Iceberg Alley, 175 km away). The in-sample fractions of meteoric water were calculated relative $\delta^{18}O$ in iceberg ice and Weddell Deep Water and converted to meteoric water height (m) and a percentage within 100 m depth bins. The Near-field and Far-field difference from surface to 200 m was 0.51 ± 0.28%. The concentration of meteoric water dropped to approximately half that value below 200 m, approximate keel depth of the iceberg, although detectable to 600 m. From surface to 600 m, the overall difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.0001$). From this, we estimate the Near-field volume astern of the iceberg (0.16 km$^3$d$^{-1}$) as a continuous source of meteoric water.

1. Introduction

A massive inventory of icebergs, ranging in size from growlers and bergy bits to very large tabular icebergs, circulates around the Antarctic continent. On average, there are an estimated 2×10$^7$ icebergs in the Southern Ocean with linear dimensions greater than 50 meters (m) [Orheim, 1988; Williams et al., 1999]. The majority of these range from 60 to 2200 m in length, with thicknesses that vary from 150 to 550 m [Gladstone et al., 2001].

Large tabular icebergs originate from ice shelves in the Ross, Bellingshausen, and Weddell Seas [Scambos et al., 2008; Long et al., 2002; Lazzara et al., 1999] and become entrained in the counterclockwise, circumpolar countercurrent (Antarctic Coastal Current). This standing mass of icebergs is comparable in magnitude (~10$^{15}$–10$^{16}$ kg) [Silva et al., 2006; Tournadre et al., 2012] to the maximum mass of seasonal sea ice that surrounds Antarctica [Timco and Frederking, 1996; Cavalieri and Parkinson, 2008; Worby et al., 2008]. Silva et al. [2006] estimated that giant icebergs accounted for half the mass loss of the Antarctic ice sheet over the 25 year period from 1979 to 2003; approximately 1.1 ×10$^{15}$ kg yr$^{-1}$. More recently, Rignot et al. [2013] estimated mass loss from calving to be 1089 ±139 Gtyr$^{-1}$ (1.1 ±0.14×10$^{15}$ kg yr$^{-1}$) and from basal ice-shelf melting at 1325±235 Gtyr$^{-1}$ (1.3±0.24×10$^{15}$ kg yr$^{-1}$).

Icebergs shrink with age due to ablation: a combination of melting, fracturing, calving, wave-enhanced erosion, sublimation, and evaporation [Kristensen, 1983; Scambos et al., 2005]. To the east of the Antarctic Peninsula and west of the South Orkney Islands, a strong northward flow in the northwestern Weddell Sea [Thompson et al., 2009] concentrates large numbers of abating icebergs of all sizes from various locations around Antarctica [Ballantine, 2002; Schodlok et al., 2006] after being transported into the southeastern Weddell Sea by the counterclockwise Antarctic Coastal Current [Stuart and Long, 2011]. Within the Weddell Sea, the Larsen and Filchner-Ronne ice shelves are local sources of iceberg production as well.

Meltwater from the abating icebergs alters the geophysical, chemical, and biological properties of the ambient seawater in which it is deposited and mixed [Smith, 2011a]. Likewise, seawater surface-mapping
[Helly et al., 2011a, 2011b] and hydrocasts through the pycnocline [Stephenson et al., 2011] have been used to describe the Near-field and Far-field spatial and temporal distributions of salinity and temperature in relation to a large free-drifting iceberg.

Turbulent structures and vertical advection have also been reported in association with icebergs in the North Atlantic and Antarctica [Pisarevskaya and Popov, 1991; Pisarevskaya and Volkov, 2007]. Those results are consistent with the convection of warm water near icebergs [Neshyba, 1977] in the Antarctic and penetration of the Atlantic water heat to the upper layer of the Arctic Ocean through transient apertures in the pycnocline.

### 1.1. Oxygen Isotopes

Here we report new results using $\delta^{18}O$ to derive an estimate of the meteoric water fraction contributed by an iceberg to ambient seawater. The hydrological context for using $\delta^{18}O$ as a tracer to determine the source of water is based on the fractionation of the oxygen isotopes in water molecules, by both evaporation and condensation, into molecules containing the lighter ($O^{16}$) or heavier ($O^{18}$) isotopes of oxygen. Lighter water molecules containing $O^{16}$ evaporate more readily, so precipitation resulting from the evaporated light water is enriched in $O^{16}$ and depleted in $O^{18}$ relative to a seawater standard. At the surface of the ocean, $\delta^{18}O$ is increased by evaporation and decreased by precipitation while away from the surface it is a conservative tracer [Meredith et al., 2008].

Oxygen isotopic results are reported in parts per thousand ($\delta_{\text{VSMOW}}$) relative to VSMOW (Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water) and normalized such that the oxygen isotopic values of Standard Light Antarctic Precipitation (SLAP) are $-55.5\%\text{o}$, according to equation (1) [Coplen, 1994].

$$\delta^{18}O_{\text{VSMOW}} = \left( \frac{\text{sample}}{\text{standard}} - 1 \right) \times 1000$$

The glacial ice that covers Antarctica is supplied by precipitation (meteoric water) and therefore has a value of $\delta^{18}O < 0$, signifying that it is depleted in $\delta^{18}O$ relative to the VMSOW. By contrast, values of $\delta^{18}O > 0$ are characteristic of deeper ocean waters not in contact with the atmosphere. Values for Antarctic ecosystems dominated by atmospheric deposition (e.g., glaciers) range from $-57\%\text{o}$ to $-13\%\text{o}$, while seawater values range from $-0.35\%\text{o}$ to $-0.05\%\text{o}$ (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>Spatial Domain</th>
<th>$\delta^{18}O_{\text{VSMOW}}$ Range or $\bar{x} \pm \text{SD}$</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glacial ice core</td>
<td>Filchner-Ronne Ice Shelf</td>
<td>$[-33.5, -26]$</td>
<td>Oster et al. [1992]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>Western Antarctic Peninsula</td>
<td>$\sim -20$</td>
<td>Meredith et al. [2008]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacial meltwater</td>
<td>Western Antarctic Peninsula</td>
<td>$\sim -13$</td>
<td>Meredith et al. [2008]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic surface water (AASW)</td>
<td>Weddell Sea</td>
<td>$[-0.35, -0.30]$</td>
<td>Weiss [1979]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter water (WW)</td>
<td>Weddell Sea</td>
<td>$[-0.30, -0.23]$</td>
<td>Weiss [1979]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm deep water (WDW)</td>
<td>Weddell Sea</td>
<td>$[-0.05, -0.01]$</td>
<td>Weiss [1979]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumpolar deep water (CDW)</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>$-0.07 \pm 0.024$</td>
<td>Jacobs and Fairbanks [1984]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large tabular icebergs are masses of glacial ice that have been set adrift; they therefore have meteoric values of $\delta^{18}O < 0$. Icebergs are distinct from sea ice in this regard. Sea ice shares the ambient isotopic signature of the seawater out of which it has frozen [Lehmann and Siegenthaler, 1991]. Factors that affect $\delta^{18}O$ in Antarctic seawater include meteoric water (i.e., glacial meltwater and local precipitation) and advection of sea ice that may nonconservatively import or export water molecules.

By analyzing water samples collected near and far from an iceberg and applying a mixing model, we estimate (1) the marginal concentration of meteoric water in the ocean due to the presence of a large iceberg, (2) the daily ablation rate of a large tabular iceberg, and (3) the quasi-static amount of freshwater attributable to the iceberg’s presence (i.e., a persistent, Near-field and Far-field that slowly mixes back to ambient conditions).
1.2. Water Masses

The Weddell Sea (Figure 1) has distinct water masses that are characterized by their temperature and salinity [Weiss, 1979; Jacobs and Fairbanks, 1984; Garabato et al., 2002; Stephenson et al., 2011]. Those of interest in this study are, in order from the surface to depth: Antarctic surface water (AASW), winter water (WW), Warm Deep Water (WDW), which is a type of circumpolar deep water (CDW) [Garabato et al., 2002], and Weddell Sea Deep Water (WSDW). Below WSDW is Weddell Sea Bottom Water (WSBW) which, when exported out of the Weddell Sea, contributes to Antarctic Bottom Water (AABW).

AASW is formed from WDW that is modified by interactions with the atmosphere, meteoric water, and a seasonal air temperature minimum [Jacobs and Fairbanks, 1984]. Consequently, it is a mixing product of meteoric water (precipitation and glacial ice, including icebergs) and WDW. These two sources, meteoric water from a calved piece of C18A ice and WDW, are used as end-members in the estimation of meteoric water fraction in section 2.1.

Sea ice concentrates brine in the surface water when it freezes and freshens it when it melts. This tends to enrich the sea ice in $^{18}\text{O}$ while depleting the seawater. If sea ice is advected into or out of a sample area, it can violate the conservation of $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ in a manner similar to the evaporation and precipitation processes at the surface (cf. section 1.1). Below the surface $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ is a conservative tracer.

2. Methods

Sixty-five hydrocasts were performed in the Powell Basin of the northwest Weddell Sea on-board the RVIB Nathaniel B. Palmer (Cruise NBP0902) east of the Antarctic Peninsula during March and April 2009 in order to study the effects of iceberg C18A on the ecosystem. C18A formed from iceberg C18 (76×7 km) originating from the Ross Ice Shelf in May, 2002. C18A was lunate in shape with longest dimensions of 31 km×7 km×184 m. Figure 1 depicts our study site in this region bounded by (W52°, S61°) and (W47°, S63°) with the ship track showing circumnavigations of C18A, surface mapping of the wake field and surface...
C18A, and the Iceberg Alley site which was 175 km southeast of C18A and contained many small icebergs and bergy bits. The Control site was without iceberg traffic for at least 2 weeks prior to sampling based on direct observations by microwave satellite imagery resolving icebergs >4 km in longest dimension. A set of 107 discrete water samples was collected by hydrocast across the sites. A few of these samples were collected from the surface using a towfish [Lin et al., 2011] but most were collected by Niskin bottles at discrete depths. Of 65 CTD casts performed during the cruise, 56 were deeper than 250 m, with most of these profiles going deeper than 500 to ~600 m [Stephenson et al., 2011]. Samples (80 mL) were sealed and transported back to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, stored at ambient temperature, and subsequently sent to the USGS Reston Stable Isotope Laboratory for isotopic analysis. Water samples were analyzed for δ18O (equation (1) [Coplen, 1994]) using the CO2 equilibration technique of Epstein and Mayeda [1953] and automated by Révész and Coplen [2008]. The error in these measurements is ±0.03%.

A dense, blue C18A ice fragment was collected from an observed sidewall calving event. Thus it was well below the unconsolidated surface (firn) of recently accumulated meteoric water and not from the bottom of the iceberg. This fragment was also measured for δ18O using the method described above but the salinity was measured by a hand-held refractometer with a precision of 0.014 on the practical salinity scale (PSS). The salinity of the fragment was 5 PSS (Table 2). The salinity of meteoric water is theoretically zero and this is the value used by Meredith et al. [2008] in a similar type of study. The ice-fragment may have been infiltrated by seawater after the calving event we observed before it was recovered from the sea.

### 2.1. Estimation of Meteoric Water Fraction

To analyze the component sources of each of the water samples, we applied the method of Jenkins [1999] and Jenkins and Jacobs [2008]. (The nomenclature used here is that of Jenkins [1999]. The superscripts are to be read as labels rather than as exponents.) For seawater that is a homogeneous mixture of two known end-members, a composite property, ψ, can be defined using any two jointly conserved properties of the seawater (ψ1, χ1) so that composite property ψ2.1 is identically zero; zero everywhere along the line defined by equation (2).

$$\psi^{2.1} = (\chi^2 - \chi_0^2) - (\chi^1 - \chi_0^1) \left(\frac{\chi^2 - \chi_0^2}{\chi^1 - \chi_0^1}\right)$$

(2)

Nonzero values of ψ2.1 represent nonconservative mixing processes or an input from outside the system, such as meltwater from sea ice or an iceberg. This study uses salinity and δ18O as conservative tracers used to define the composite property ψ2.1. This model provides a convenient two-dimensional way to visualize the parameter space of mixing and establishes a range of values to use for the end-members used in the calculation of meteoric water fraction. In this study, we are using δ18O as the one-dimensional domain to estimate the meteoric water fraction.

We define ambient seawater along the line-of-conservation as a mixture of Warm Deep Water (WDW) and glacial ice using characteristic values of salinity and δ18O for these end-members (Table 2). Given equation (1), by defining WDW as one end-member and glacial ice as the other we can then use equation (3) to estimate the fraction (Q) of meteoric water in each sample.

$$Q = \frac{(\delta^{18}O_i - \delta^{18}O_{WDW})}{(\delta^{18}O_{Ice} - \delta^{18}O_{WDW})}$$

(3)

Uncertainty in Q is a function of uncertainty in the δ18O measurement (±0.001‰), the magnitude of the measured sample (numerator) plus the uncertainty in the measurement of the reference ice (denominator).
and its magnitude (Table 2). So, assuming independence of measurements such that the covariance is zero between the numerator and the denominator, the uncertainty in \(Q\) varies over \([0.0002, 0.0025]\) for the \(Q\) values ranging over \([0.0022, 0.0262]\) in a data-dependent way over the range of values of \(\delta^{18}O\) \([-0.4700, -0.0400]\).

Error propagation in the meteoric water fraction calculation followed standard methods [NIST, 2012]. The RMSE (square-root of the sum of mean squared deviations) values were computed using standard deviations obtained by the SAS/STAT software, Version 9.3 of the SAS system [copyright] for Linux. Plotting and curve-fitting were done with R [R Development Core Team, 2008] using the ggplot2 library. The LOESS smoothing option was chosen to provide a locally fitted polynomial with a 95% confidence interval using methods first described by Cleveland [1979]. The difference in meteoric water fraction between Near-field and Far-field sites was tested using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Note that salinity is not used in the calculation of the meteoric water fraction. Therefore, the fact that the salinity of the iceberg-fragment end-member is nonzero has no effect on any of the subsequent analysis although it would slightly lessen the slope of the line-of-conservation (equation (2)) as discussed in section 3. The slope does not enter into any calculation. Furthermore, we assume a negligible amount of local precipitation such that ambient conditions were identical across sites including sea ice transport; no net import or export during the time of the study. A model of the Near-field meltwater volume, based on the meteoric water fraction, will be developed in section 3.

3. Results

Salinity values for all sites have fully overlapping ranges \([33.65–34.50]\) from the surface to about 50 m indicating similar amounts of freshening in the mixed layer (Figure 2a). However, the corresponding \(\delta^{18}O\) measurements only partially overlap \([-0.42 to -0.3]\) and reveal distinctly different sources for the freshening (Figure 2b). At C18A, from the surface to 600 m, the \(\delta^{18}O\) values are clearly more negative and distinct from the non-C18A sites.

Figures 2c and 2d show the same data reclassified into the C18A (Near-field) and Far-field sites to better illustrate the trends (Figures 2c and 2d). The sites have been fitted with LOESS regression lines depicting the 95% confidence interval around the fits. Figures 2c and 2d show mixed layer features in salinity and \(Q\), that mix back to deep water, ambient values of salinity \([34.5–34.75]\) and \(\delta^{18}O\) \([-0.2 to -0.05]\) with inflection points in the fitted lines above 100 m but with significant differences that persist to about 500 m; considerably below the keel-depth of C18A.

We estimated the (1) meteoric water fraction (\(Q\)) for Near-field and Far-field sites, (2) difference between the sites by 100 m depth bin, (3) difference in the height of meteoric water equivalent, and (4) difference in the concentration of meteoric water as a percentage. The largest percentage difference in meteoric water concentration (Table 3) is in the surface to 100 m bin \([0.52%]\) although this difference is relatively constant in the 100–200 m \([0.49%]\) and 200–300 m \([0.43%]\) bins after which the difference is reduced by \(~50%\) yet persists to 600 m \([0.25–0.28%]\).

The fractions of meteoric water were significantly different between the Near-field and Far-field sites (ANOVA, \(P < 0.0001\)). Further, and not as surprising, significant differences (ANOVA, \(P < 0.0001\)) were observed between the surface depth bin values and all deeper water depth bins to 600 m at both site locations. From this, we conclude there is a similar depth-gradient of meteoric water at Near and Far-field locations, but the iceberg increased the meteoric water fraction by 0.37% over the integrated depth to 600 m in the Near-field.

In summary, the results show the meltwater from C18A to be a source of meteoric water input into an ambient ocean (Figures 2e and 2f) above and below the WW and the permanent pycnocline. Consequently, there is a quasi-static Near-field source of meteoric water attached to a moving iceberg. While the iceberg ablates, this provides input into a depth-stratified, ambient background (AASW, WW, WDW) that gradually mixes back, through a Far-field trace, to the ambient condition.

3.1. Geometric Model and Near-Field Volume Estimate

Meltwater fraction estimates were combined with a daily ablation rate estimate for C18A to construct a geometric model of the Near-field source attached to C18A as it ablates over its lifetime. C18A was imaged by
the Quikscat scatterometer sensor for 257 days after the initial date we visited it to the time it disappeared from view (<4km in longest dimension) based on the database described by Long et al. [2002]. This interval was then used to estimate a fractional ablation rate of $\frac{1}{257}$ per day or $3.9 \times 10^{-3}\, \text{day}^{-1}$ (Table 4). From this,
We calculated a mean daily mass loss from C18A and the volume for the meltwater Near-field using the total meteoric water fraction from Table 3. These values were used to define a preliminary model of the geometry of the iceberg. The meltwater field, with stationary volume \( V_q \), is assumed to be solely a function of iceberg size, neglecting weather, tides, and currents, extending astern away from the mean direction of iceberg motion.

\( V_q \) was modeled as a set of \( n \) vertically stacked ellipses with shape parameters \((\alpha, \beta)\) varying by depth bins of arbitrary thickness \( (z_i) \) each with a corresponding meteoric water fraction \( (\delta_i) \). The shape parameters define the length of the major and minor axes of each ellipse.

Consequently, we estimated the quasi-static Near-field volume to be:

\[
V_q = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i \pi \alpha_i \beta_i
\]

(4)

where \( V_q \) is the displacement volume of the iceberg contained within the elliptical volume. This expression was simplified by integrating across the water column and centering the ellipse on the end of the iceberg. This results in:

\[
V_q = \frac{\Delta Q}{2} \left( \pi \delta / \beta \right)
\]

(5)

Here \( \Delta Q \) is the meteoric water fraction \( (Q) \) integrated over the 0–200 m depth range from Table 3, 0.0051 ± 0.0028. We know that the speed of C18A was 8.8 km \( d^{-1} \) [Helly et al., 2011a] so we use this distance to estimate \( \beta \). The water depth \( (z) \) is set at 200 m since this is approximately the keel-depth of C18A and just above the transition to the lower concentration bin (Table 3).

Then, \( V_q \) is computed from the daily mass ablated from C18A, converted to a volume \( V_q = Ma / \rho_{meltwater} \). This leaves the only unknown, \( \alpha \), to be estimated at 11.5 km. These calculations are summarized in Table 4. The result is a half-ellipsoidal volume \( (V_q) \) centered on the end of C18A that is 23 km wide (i.e., 11.5 km on each side) and extending 8.8 km behind C18A from the surface to a depth of 200 m with a 0.51% mean concentration of meltwater due to the presence of C18A.

4. Discussion

The use of \( ^{18}O \) as a tracer of iceberg-derived meteoric meltwater built upon previous efforts to delineate the spatial and temporal extent of the C18A meltwater field and to assess it as a source of disturbance to the ambient marine environment [Helly et al., 2011a, 2011b]. Previously, the temporal and spatial scales, both horizontal and vertical, of C18A’s effects were defined based on temperature and salinity parameters. Those characteristics provided a framework to quantify the meteoric water injection by C18A ablation in this study allowing us to develop an improved model of how the meteoric meltwater affected water.
column structure. This provided a means to derive a volumetric estimate of the distribution and differential concentration of the meteoric water from C18A relative to the ambient environment.

4.1. Comparison With Prior Meltwater Concentration Estimates

These results are similar to results from our earlier studies, using different methods, and support these estimates as realistic values for meteoric water concentrations in the Near-field of an iceberg such as C18A. Stephenson et al. [2011] developed estimates of C18A basal meltwater production also using a mixing model approach but based on temperature and salinity using a different method. The result from that approach, 0.2 m of water column height within 100–200 m depth bin, is within the confidence interval of our estimate (0.49±0.36 m, Table 3). Some assumptions of that study may be violated in our analysis due to ablation of the subaerial portions of C18A through wave action and sun-induced melting. Similar end-member limits were defined for WDW, AASW, and WW using temperature and salinity but the meteoric water fraction was estimated by constraining the fine-structure mixing revealed in CTD profiles along an isopycnal so that the point of intersection with a limit lines could be determined.

4.2. Choice of $\delta^{18}O$ Glacial End-Member

The choice of the $\delta^{18}O$ end-members for the meteoric water fraction ($Q$) estimates is an important determinant of our results since they determine the value of the denominator in equation (3). The dense, blue C18A ice fragment we chose came from an observed sidewall calving event. Thus it was well below the unconsolidated ice associated with the iceberg. The other end-member, for WDW, comes from the literature as indicated in Table 2 and is well established.

The iceberg ice $\delta^{18}O$ values ($−18\%_{oo}$) are slightly enriched relative to some ice-shelf values and similar to values for glacial meltwater. Groote and Stuiver [1983] found values on the Ross Ice Shelf to range from about $−34\%_{oo}$ to $−27\%_{oo}$ from approximately 40 to 200 m in the ice-shelf. These results are similar to those reported by Oerter et al. [1992] ($−33.5\%_{oo}$ to $−26\%_{oo}$) for the Filchner-Ronne ice shelf raising the question as to whether our value is representative of the overall meteoric water composition of C18A. Interestingly, the keel-depth of C18A (184 m) is within what Oerter et al. [1992] identified as a marine shelf ice that is formed from seawater with $\delta^{18}O > 0$. Such a shelf could be exposed to higher $\delta^{18}O$ values from seawater that may melt, mix, and refreeze onto the glacier resulting in intermediate values within the glacial ice. Our values are consistent with the values measured in Marguerite Bay, Antarctic Peninsula by Meredith et al. [2008] for precipitation ($−13\%_{oo}$) and glacial meltwater ($−20\%_{oo}$). Although we do not have a control for this uncertainty, based on what is known about iceberg formation, we argue that the measured $\delta^{18}O$ of the C18A fragment is a reasonable value to use in this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (L)</td>
<td>Helly et al. [2011a]</td>
<td>$3.11 \times 10^{4}$ m (31.1 km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (W)</td>
<td>Helly et al. [2011a]</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^{3}$ m (7.0 km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard elevation ($h_f$)</td>
<td>Helly et al. [2011a]</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^{3}$ (28 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel depth (Z)</td>
<td>Helly et al. [2011a]</td>
<td>$1.84 \times 10^{3}$ m (184 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total height (H)</td>
<td>$h_f + Z$</td>
<td>$2.12 \times 10^{3}$ m (212 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total volume ($V_f$)</td>
<td>$V_f = HLW$</td>
<td>$4.6 \times 10^{5}$ m$^3$ (46 km$^3$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mass ($MC_{18A}$)</td>
<td>$\rho_m$ (LWZ)</td>
<td>$4.11 \times 10^{5}$ kg (41.1 Gt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firn depth (F)</td>
<td>$H_{\text{f,interp}}$</td>
<td>5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice density ($\rho_{\text{ice}}$)</td>
<td>Wadhams [2000]</td>
<td>917 kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater density ($\rho_{\text{sw}}$)</td>
<td>Interpolated from Wadhams [2000]</td>
<td>$1030$ kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meltwater field density ($\rho_{\text{melt}}$)</td>
<td>Interpolated from Wadhams [2000]</td>
<td>$1015$ kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meltwater density ($\rho_{\text{water}}$)</td>
<td>Interpolated from Wadhams [2000]</td>
<td>$1005$ kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily ablation rate from scatterometer ($k_a$)</td>
<td>$k_a = 100 \times 10^3$ days calculated from tracking data [Long et al., 2002]</td>
<td>0.4 % d$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily ablation mass ($M_a$)</td>
<td>$M_a = k_a MC_{18A}$</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^{11}$ kg d$^{-1}$ (0.16 Gt d$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily quasi-static meltwater volume ($V_q$)</td>
<td>Equation (5)</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^3$ m$^3$ d$^{-1}$ (0.16 km$^3$ d$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard units are provided for ease-of-calculation. Scaled values are provided in parentheses for convenient intercomparison with other studies (Gigaton (Gt) = $10^{12}$ kg).
For example, the more positive (heavier) values of δ¹⁸O are found closer to the coasts in Antarctic ice-sheets and ice-shelves at the surface [Morgan, 1982]. Presumably, this reflects the earlier rain-out of heavier water before the drier, lighter air reaches the interior of the content. Further, ice-shelf thinning by basal melting may remove the more continental ice (more depleted) from the bottom of the ice-shelf before calving occurs [Rignot, 2008]. Thus the relatively enriched ice formed from near-coastal precipitation would be what is released as icebergs. Additionally, C18A likely spent at least some decades at the coast before calving and, from satellite observations, we know that C18A spent at least 7 years drifting in the circumpolar countercurrent before we sampled it.

4.3. Implications of Meltwater Field Production

It appears that there are three distinct geophysical processes at work as a result of iceberg transit in this setting: (1) subaerial ablation, (2) sidewall and basal melting, and (3) deep, turbulent mixing, and advection (Figure 3). We hypothesize that there are two densification mechanisms, one dominated by surface cooling and another dominated by mixing the cooled water with high-salinity WDW, induced by mechanical turbulence. This would create upwelling due to mass conservation [Neshyba, 1977] resulting in convection carrying AASW and WW down and WDW upward. The deep penetration of the meteoric water signal to 600 m is an effect of these mixing processes. This is consistent with the XBT and ADCP observations that the pycnocline was disrupted to 1500 m [Helly et al., 2011a]. We theorize that the mechanism for this is the differential distribution of heat and salt combined with the mechanical disturbance of the iceberg moving through the pycnocline by freshening, cooling, and turbulence resulting in mixing to a surprising depth.

A related implication of the geophysical processes is that iceberg ablation releases and distributes iceberg-derived inorganic terrestrial debris [Smith, 2011b] that is mixed as a consequence of the hypothesized densification mechanisms. This results in modified surface water that is relatively rich in inorganic nutrients and has a higher transmissivity in the euphotic zone [Vernet et al., 2011]. Importantly, these conditions can set up a transient environment for enhanced phytoplankton growth [Schwarz and Schodlok, 2009; Vernet et al., 2011], until the disturbed waters reequilibrate to ambient conditions.

4.4. Comparison to Other Iceberg Ablation Rate Estimates

Based on satellite observations, Scambos et al. [2008] found that large, tabular icebergs in the open ocean experience a steady loss of area ranging from (1–2) to (3–10) × 10⁴ m²km⁻¹d⁻¹. Applying this to C18A calculation results in an ablation rate of 1.2%day⁻¹ at the high-end; assuming that this mass loss is converted to meltwater as opposed to additional icebergs. While this is the same order of magnitude as our estimate, 0.4% day⁻¹, it may reflect a focus on actively calving icebergs rather than a more continuous ablation dominated by melting. Additionally, variations in ablation rates can occur as a function of how much of its lifetime an iceberg spends in sea ice; constraining the AASW to the freezing point and slowing the ablation rate.
5. Conclusion

Our results support the hypothesis that the ablation of icebergs establishes a transiently stable lens of an ambient seawater and fresh meltwater mixture astern of an iceberg, in the euphotic zone, that gradually mixes away in the wake of a period of days to weeks at a spatial scale of tens of kilometers. These effects suggest an important role for icebergs in determining the structure of the water column and provides a picture of the spatial and temporal scales of the dynamic processes around icebergs and their potential interaction with the local biogeochemistry. This is a new view of the dynamics of the iceberg ecosystem described in Vernet et al. [2012]. Our conceptual model provides the basis for future estimates of (i) the coupling between iceberg geophysics and the biogeochemistry of carbon-cycling related to iron-production and phytoplankton growth and (ii) the scaling of the geophysical and biogeochemical effects to regional and global domains.
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