DRIVERS AND ESTIMATES OF TERRAIN SUITABILITY FOR ACTIVE LAYER DETACHMENT SLIDES AND RETROGRESSIVE THAW SLUMPSIN THE BROOKS RANGE AND FOOTHILLS OF NORTHWEST ALASKA, USA



Andrew W. Balser

Climate Change Science Inst., Oak Ridge National Laboratory

Permafrost

 $\sim 25\%$ of the global terrestrial surface

~1,700 Pg of soil carbon twice the current atmospheric load more than half the global soil carbon pool

Permafrost degradation \rightarrow CO₂, CH₄, N₂O Global warming potential (IPCC 2013) CO₂=1, CH₄=34, N₂O = 298

Arctic Landscape Change Processes

Thermokarst

Ice wedge degradation and drainage development

Thermal

Fire

Active aver detachment

Lake drainage.

Aelting ground ice River bank

Retrogressive

thaw slump

Water tracks

Thermal erosion/gullying

Active layer

Ice wedges

Figure from: Talik Permafrost Rowland, J. C., et al. (2010), Arctic landscapes in transition - Geomorphic responses to degrading permafrost., *EOS*, 91(26), 229-230.

Active Layer Detachment Slides (ALD)



Retrogressive Thaw Slumps (RTS)



Large & Deep Depth ~ 14m (@ headwall scarp) A - A' = 181mB - B' = 287m

Years to Decades

Headwall Retreat 1 to 10+ m/yr

(photo: Noatak Basin, 2011)

ALD & RTS Features in the Central and Western Brooks Range and Foothills



2,492 Active Layer Detachment Slides (ALD)805 Retrogressive Thaw Slumps (RTS)



Balser, A., M. N. Gooseff, J. Jones, and W. B. Bowden (2009), Thermokarst distribution and relationships to landscape characteristics in the Feniak Lake region, Noatak National Preserve, Alaska; Final Report to the National Park Service, Arctic Network (ARCN)*Rep.*, Fairbanks, AK.

Permafrost in Relation to Climate and Ecosystems



Shur, Y. L., and M. T. Jorgenson (2007), Patterns of Permafrost Formation and Degradation in Relation to Climate and Ecosystems, *Permafrost and Periglacial Processes*, *18*, 7 - 19.

Conceptual Model:

Factor interactions and feedbacks affecting permafrost with climate change.

Apply at a regional scale



9

Jorgenson, M. T., V. Romanovsky, J. Harden, Y. Shur, J. O'Donnell, E. A. G. Schuur, M. Kanevskiy, and S. Marchenko (2010), Resilience and vulnerability of permafrost to climate change, *Can J Forest Res*, 40(7), 1219-1236, doi:10.1139/x10-060.

'Permafrost' includes vast diversity

Properties: from complex interactions

Where might features occur?

How much terrain is that?

Terrain Suitability Estimates

Categorical factors

Integrated Terrain Unit (ITU) analysis - Lithology - Surficial Geology - Ecotype

Continuous factors

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) analysis- Vegetation- Topography- Geomorphology

Combine ITU & SEM results for final map

ALD & RTS Features in the Central and Western Brooks Range and Foothills



2,492 Active Layer Detachment Slides (ALD)805 Retrogressive Thaw Slumps (RTS)



ITU results for ALD features





2. Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)



* State Factor. Jenny (1941); van Cleve et al. (1991)



SEM results for ALD features







Final ALD and RTS Terrain Suitability Estimates

















Summary

- Up to 57% of the study region is suitable terrain
- Suitable terrain is highly diverse
- Relevant factors constrain estimates
- Interactions drive suitability, further constrain estimates

Take Home

• Forecasting future conditions in the cryosphere depends on synthesizing weather and climate patterns with spatially explicit information on terrain suitability for different modes of permafrost degradation.

Questions?














Acknowledgements

Committee:

Jay Jones, Advisor Rudi Gens, Michelle Mack, Skip Walker

Funding and other Support: Center for Global Change (CGC) NSF Arctic System Science (ARCSS) National Park Service Arctic Network (ARCN)













JUST ACROSS SMALL BIVER VALLEY FROM 101A TERMINAL MORAINE (~1 MILE FROM MORAINE CIET) TZOU-12 APPEARS TO DAVE A TUL BASE CODE UNFORM DIAMICTOUS GUEY, SILT RICH) WITH SUMP SATVRATED PORE ILE. TUP SECTION OF MALTU HAS 25-200cm OF ATAXITIC (7658) I. C. SEVERAL MORE LAYERS MAY BETTIL OR VIAN PROXIMAL GUICIDLACUSTRIAK, OR MARKS MACHPUNAL OUTWASH, PREDOMINANTLY BEDDED (111-1.7 OM LENSES) INTRESPERSED WITH 4-10 cm IN ICO BODS (GIVING THE STRIATED APPEARANCE HUDDINALL, TOP I'M DAS SOME OBVIOUS ENVINAL AND DISTAL GUCIOLACSTEINE WITH PEAT MINIAIN. SOME PLACES SHOW ~ ZUCH LUESS LIVING VEGETATION. SOME PLACES SHOW MUMACID SORTING OF ROUNDED CLASTS/SILT:





Heginbottom, J. A., J. Brown, O. Humlum, and B. H. Svensson (2012), PERMAFROST AND PERIGLACIAL ENVIRONMENTS, in *State of the Earth's cryosphere at the beginning of the 21st century–Glaciers, global snow cover, floating ice, and permafrost and periglacial environments*, edited by R. S. Williams, Jr. and J. G. Ferrigno, p. 546, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1386–A, Reston, VA.

For the central and western Brooks Range:

Where ALD and RTS features are most likely to occur.

When ALD and RTS features occur.

Median date of thawing temperatures, 1992 - 2012



'Center of Mass Timing' $C_T = \sum_i (t_i q_i) / \sum_i q_i$

where t_i is day of year (Julian date) and q_i is thawing degree days on day t_i .

Adapted from: Stewart, I.T., D. R. Cayan, and M. D. Dettinger (2005), Changes toward earlier streamflow timing across western North America, *Journal of Climate*, 18(8), 1136-1155

• Ave Temp (°C, Thawing season)

• Thawing Index (°C)

• Days $> 0^{\circ}$ C Ave. Temp.



Full Snow Season

Continuous Snow Season

• No. of Days in Snow Season



48

Trend lines are significant at p < 0.1.

Full and Continuous Snow Season End Dates

Analysis Boundary	FSS End 2001-2012 mean date (sd, days)	FSS End 2004 date (diff. from mean)	CSS End 2001-2012 mean date (sd, days)	CSS End 2004 date (diff. from mean)
Noatak & Wulik	May 23 (8)	May 8 (-15)	May 16 (8)	May 1 (-15)
Noatak	May 25 (8)	May 12 (-13)	May 18 (7)	May 6 (-12)
	•	•	•	•

Maximum temperature and number of days with temperature above freezing

	Ар	oril	Μ	lay	Ju	ne
	Max. Temp.	$Max > 0^{\circ}C$	Max. Temp.	$Max > 0^{\circ}C$	Max. Temp.	$Max > 0^{\circ}C$
Station	°C	No. of days	°C	No. of days	°C	No. of days
Kotzebue						
NOAA	5.0	20	12.7	31 +	28.9	30 +
Kelly River						
RAWS	9.4	24	22.2	31	30.6	30
Noatak						
RAWS	10.7	18	29.4 *	31 *	34.5	30
Bettles						
NOAA	10.5	26	21.6	31 +	31.1	30 +

- * includes some gap-filled values
- + includes multiple record high temperatures





Photos 2a and 2b courtesy W. B. Bowden.



E1

E2



E3

E4

Name	Block	Туре	Class
Vegetation class	Vegetative	Categorical	Active
Acidic	Vegetative	Categorical	Active
Litter Layer Thickness (O _i)	Vegetative	Quantitative	Active
Organic Layer Thickness (O _a)	Vegetative	Quantitative	Active
Buried Organics Percentage	Vegetative	Quantitative	Active
Depth of Contemporary Soil	Substrate	Quantitative	Active
Depth of Active Layer	Substrate	Quantitative	Active
Coarse Fraction Percentage (contemporary soil)	Substrate	Quantitative	Active
Microtopography	Substrate	Categorical	Active
Coarse & Fine Fraction (contemporary soil)	Substrate	Categorical	Active
Coarse & Fine Fraction (archaic soil/parent material)	Substrate	Categorical	Active
Ice percentage	Ice	Quantitative	Active
Segregation Ice Maximum LensWidth	Ice	Quantitative	Active
Wedge/Intrusive Ice Percentage	Ice	Quantitative	Active
Total Depth of Profile	Ice	Quantitative	Active
Primary Cryostructures	Ice	Categorical	Active
Secondary Cryostructures	Ice	Categorical	Active
Acidity (mean Ecotype pH)	n/a	Quantitative	Supplemental
Elevation	n/a	Quantitative	Supplemental
Aspect	n/a	Quantitative	Supplemental
Topographic Position Index	n/a	Quantitative	Supplemental
Summer Warmth Index	n/a	Quantitative	Supplemental
Slope	n/a	Quantitative	Supplemental
Surficial Geology	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental
Bedrock Geology	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental
Glacial Geology	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental
Vegetation Complex	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental
Ecotype	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental
Lithology	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental
Macrotopography	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental
Permafrost Degradation Mode	n/a	Categorical	Supplemental

Segment	Name	Туре		Source
Landscape	Physiographic position	Categorical	*	Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Landscape	Surficial Geology	Categorical	*	Hamilton, [2003 & 2010]
Landscape	Lithology	Categorical	*	Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Landscape	Bedrock Geology	Categorical	§	Beikman [1982]
Landscape	Glacial Geology	Categorical	§	Hamilton, [2003 & 2010]
Site Surface	Elevation	Quantitative	*	Garmin eTrex GPS
Landscape	Elevation	Quantitative	§	ASTER DEM
Site Surface	Slope	Quantitative	*	Brunton inclinometer
Landscape	Slope	Quantitative	§	ASTER DEM
Site Surface	Aspect	Quantitative	*	Brunton compass (declination adjusted)
Landscape	Aspect	Quantitative	§	ASTER DEM
Landscape	Topographic Position Index	Quantitative	§	ASTER DEM, Jenness [2006]
Landscape	Macrotopography	Categorical	*	Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Site Surface	Microtopography	Categorical	*	Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Landscape	Geomorphic unit	Categorical	*	Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Site Surface	Permafrost degradation mode	Categorical	*	Jorgenson et al., [2008]
Site Surface	Vegetation	Categorical	*	Viereck et al., [1992]; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Landscape	Vegetation complex	Categorical	§	Walker et al., [2002]; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Site Surface	Dominant flora [over & understory]	Species	*	Hulten [1968] & Parker [2006]
Landscape	Summer Warmth Index	Quantitative	§	Raynolds et al., [2008]
Site Surface	Ecotype	Categorical	*	Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Site Surface	Acidic (from mean pH per Ecotype)	Categorical	*	Jorgenson et al., [2010b]

Name	Segment	Туре		Integrator Variable	Units / Source
Depth of Active Layer	Profile	Quantitative			cm
Total Depth of Profile	Profile	Quantitative			cm
Wedge/Intrusive Ice Percentage	Profile	Quantitative			% of profile exposure
Litter Layer Thickness (O _i)	Soil	Quantitative			cm
Organic Layer Thickness (O _a)	Soil	Quantitative			cm
Depth of Contemporary Soil	Soil	Quantitative			cm
Coarse Fraction Percentage	Soil	Quantitative	§	Coarse & Fine Fraction	% of profile exposure
Maximum Clast Size	Soil	Quantitative	*		cm
Segregation Ice Percentage	Soil	Quantitative	*		% of profile exposure
Segregation Ice Max.Width	Soil	Quantitative	*		cm
Lithofacies	Soil	Categorical	§	Coarse & Fine Fraction	Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Coarse & Fine Fraction	Soil	Categorical			Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Coarse Fraction Shape	Soil	Ordinal	*		Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Peat Type	Soil	Categorical	*		Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Primary Cryostructures	Parent	Categorical			Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Secondary Cryostructures	Parent	Categorical	*		Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Lithofacies	Parent	Categorical	§	Coarse & Fine Fraction	Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Coarse & Fine Fraction	Parent	Categorical			Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Coarse Fraction Shape	Parent	Ordinal			Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Buried Organics Percentage	Parent	Quantitative			% of profile exposure
Primary Cryostructures	Parent	Categorical			Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Secondary Cryostructures	Parent	Categorical			Table S1; Jorgenson et al., [2010b]
Coarse Fraction Percentage	Parent	Quantitative	§	Coarse & Fine Fraction	% of profile exposure
Maximum Clast Size	Parent	Quantitative	§	Coarse & Fine Fraction	cm
Segregation Ice Percentage	Parent	Quantitative			% of profile exposure
Segregation Ice Max.Width	Parent	Quantitative			cm

Site Grouping		Permafros	t Degradati	on Mode	
	ALDS	Soil Pit	RTS	TEG	Total
E1	0	0	6	0	6
E2a	4	0	1	2	7
E2b	2	1	6	8	17
E3	7	0	2	0	9
E4a	0	0	3	0	3
E4b	0	0	9	1	10
E4c	0	0	2	0	2
Total	13	1	29	11	



Ecotype	% of Study Region	% of RTS Features	% Differential	% of ALD Features	% Differential
Alpine Dryas Dwarf Shrub	19.0	15.7	0.8	20.0	1.1
Alpine Ericaceous Dwarf Shrub	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Alpine Ericaceous Dwarf Shrub	2.0	2.8	1.4	0.0	0.0
Alpine Wet Sedge Meadow	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5
Lowland Birch-Ericaceous-Willow Low Shrub	3.0	2.4	0.8	0.0	0.0
Lowland Sedge Fen	1.0	2.8	2.8	0.0	0.0
Riverine Alder or Willow Tall Shrub	1.0	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0
Riverine Birch-Willow Low Shrub	1.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Riverine Wet Sedge Meadow	1.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0
Riverine Willow Low Shrub	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0
Upland Alder-Willow Tall Shrub	4.0	6.8	1.7	9.0	2.3
Upland Birch-Ericaceous-Willow Low Shrub	12.0	23.7	2.0	23.0	1.9
Upland Dwarf Birch-Tussock Shrub	19.0	19.2	1.0	29.0	1.5
Upland Sedge-Dryas Meadow	6.0	9.6	1.6	6.0	1.0
Upland White Spruce Forest	4.0	3.0	0.8	1.0	0.3
Upland Willow Low Shrub	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.5
Upland Willow Low Shrub	2.0	2.9	1.4	0.0	0.0
Surficial Geology	% of Study Region	% of RTS Features	% Differential	% of ALD Features	% Differential
Alluvium	6.1	7.0	1.1	1.0	0.2
Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock	53.8	26.0	0.5	54.0	1.0
Colluvium	6.9	7.0	1.0	20.0	2.9
Glacial Drift	16.4	46.0	2.8	22.0	1.3
Fan Deposits	1.8	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1
Gravel	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.0
Ice Contact	0.5	1.0	2.1	0.0	0.1
Inwash / Outwash	1.5	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1
Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine					
	9.4	11.0	1.2	2.0	0.2
Organic	9.4 0.0	11.0 0.0	1.2 0.0	2.0 0.0	0.2 0.0
Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield)	9.4 0.0 0.7	11.0 0.0 0.0	1.2 0.0 0.0	2.0 0.0 0.5	0.2 0.0 0.7
Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand	9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6	11.0 0.0 0.0 0.2	1.2 0.0 0.0 0.3	2.0 0.0 0.5 0.0	0.2 0.0 0.7 0.0
Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand Silt	9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0	11.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 0.0	1.2 0.0 0.0 0.3 0.0	2.0 0.0 0.5 0.0 0.0	0.2 0.0 0.7 0.0 0.0
Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand Silt Terrace	9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0 1.2	11.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 0.0 1.0	1.2 0.0 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.8	2.0 0.0 0.5 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.2 0.0 0.7 0.0 0.0 0.0
Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand Silt Terrace Lithology	9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0 1.2 % of Study Region	11.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 0.0 1.0 % of RTS Features	1.2 0.0 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.8 % Differential	2.0 0.0 0.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 % of ALD Features	0.2 0.0 0.7 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 % Differential
Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand Silt Terrace Lithology Noncarbonate	9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0 1.2 % of Study Region 89.8	11.0 0.0 0.0 0.2 0.0 1.0 % of RTS Features 99.2	1.2 0.0 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.8 % Differential 1.1	2.0 0.0 0.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 % of ALD Features 98.3	0.2 0.0 0.7 0.0 0.0 0.0 % Differential 1.1



























Ecotype	% of Study Region	% of RTS Features	% Differential	% of ALD Features	% Differential
Alpine Dryas Dwarf Shrub	19.0	15.7	0.8	20.0	1.1
Alpine Ericaceous Dwarf Shrub	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Alpine Ericaceous Dwarf Shrub	2.0	2.8	1.4	0.0	0.0
Alpine Wet Sedge Meadow	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5
Lowland Birch-Ericaceous-Willow Low Shrub	3.0	2.4	0.8	0.0	0.0
Lowland Sedge Fen	1.0	2.8	2.8	0.0	0.0
Riverine Alder or Willow Tall Shrub	1.0	1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0
Riverine Birch-Willow Low Shrub	1.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Riverine Wet Sedge Meadow	1.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0
Riverine Willow Low Shrub	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0
Upland Alder-Willow Tall Shrub	4.0	6.8	1.7	9.0	2.3
Upland Birch-Ericaceous-Willow Low Shrub	12.0	23.7	2.0	23.0	1.9
Upland Dwarf Birch-Tussock Shrub	19.0	19.2	1.0	29.0	1.5
Upland Sedge-Dryas Meadow	6.0	9.6	1.6	6.0	1.0
Upland White Spruce Forest	4.0	3.0	0.8	1.0	0.3
Upland Willow Low Shrub	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.5
Upland Willow Low Shrub	2.0	2.9	1.4	0.0	0.0
Surficial Geology	% of Study Region	% of RTS Features	% Differential	% of ALD Features	% Differential
Surficial Geology Alluvium	% of Study Region 6.1	% of RTS Features 7.0	% Differential	% of ALD Features 1.0	% Differential 0.2
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.1	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.1 2.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine Organic	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4 0.0	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2 0.0	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield)	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4 0.0 0.7	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2 0.0 0.0	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0 0.2	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2 0.0 0.0 0.3	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand Silt	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.0	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.7 0.0 0.0
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand Silt Terrace	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0 1.2	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 0.1	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.5	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
Surficial GeologyAlluviumThin Soil over Near-surface BedrockColluviumGlacial DriftFan DepositsGravelIce ContactInwash / OutwashLacustrine / GlaciolacustrineOrganicOther (Active Glacier / Snowfield)SandSiltTerraceLithology	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0 1.2	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 % of RTS Features	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
Surficial Geology Alluvium Thin Soil over Near-surface Bedrock Colluvium Glacial Drift Fan Deposits Gravel Ice Contact Inwash / Outwash Lacustrine / Glaciolacustrine Organic Other (Active Glacier / Snowfield) Sand Silt Terrace Lithology Noncarbonate	% of Study Region 6.1 53.8 6.9 16.4 1.8 0.1 0.5 1.5 9.4 0.0 0.7 0.6 1.0 1.2 % of Study Region 89.8	% of RTS Features 7.0 26.0 7.0 46.0 0.3 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 1.0 0.4 11.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.0 1.0 % of RTS Features 99.2	% Differential 1.1 0.5 1.0 2.8 0.2 0.7 2.1 0.3 1.2 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.0 1.1	% of ALD Features 1.0 54.0 20.0 22.0 0.2 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.1 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 98.3	% Differential 0.2 1.0 2.9 1.3 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
Approach

Determine year of initiation for active RTS features archive of SAR imagery

(ERS 1&2, 1997-2010, ~bi-weekly)

Examine initiation timing against: weather patterns and events seasonal snowpack coverage and duration wildfire occurrence



b)

C)

21 features chosen for study:

a) Actively degrading

Big enough for reliable detection in imagery

Not along river bank cuts

74







- A) 2008 hi-res image
- B) 2002 Landsat ETM
- C) 2005 Landsat ETM+
- D L) SAR Imagery 1997-2009

RTS 10 initiated in 1998 RTS 9 initiated in 2004



Retrogressive Thaw Slump Initial Detection Dates



Median date of thawing index, 1992 - 2012





May 2004 precipitation at the NOAA and RAWS stations + includes record rainfall

May 2004

	5/6 to 5/11 cm	5/22 to 5/24 cm	total cm
Kotzebue NOAA	2.2	0.58	3.5 +
Kelly River RAWS	3.9	2.8	8.1
Noatak Village NOAA	3.5	1.8	6.9
Noatak RAWS	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bettles NOAA	1.2	0.2	4.2

Continuous Snow Season in the Noatak Basin

(from MODIS Snow Metrics 2001-2012)







http://nsidc.org/data/seaice_index/

Anomalous weather early in the thaw season:

- Sun angles are highest
- Duration of daylight is longest
- Cloud cover is minimal (typically)
- Before bud burst (mostly)
- Increased incident solar radiation to the surface
- Accelerated thaw front advance with the rest of the thaw season still to come

Summary

- RTS features initiate in clusters (temporally)
- Timing of weather may be critical
- Early exposure likely accelerates thaw front advance

Take Home

- Response trajectories may critically depend on the timing of weather patterns and events.
- Correctly forecasting future impacts and feedbacks hinges on matching responses with future change scenarios.

Approach

Examine terrain and upper permafrost properties (field)CryostructuresVegetation ClassGround Ice %Parent MaterialContemporary SoilOrganic LayerActive Layer DepthMicrotopography

Examine (dis)similarity among sites using: Multiple Factor Analysis (MFA) ordination Hierarchical Clustering





Methods

MFA Ordination:

Organize variables into logical blocks: Vegetative Substrate Ground Ice

Each block is weighted evenly – no block dominates the ordination.



MFA: Hierarchical Clustering

MFA: Factor Overlays



Dim 1 (16.81 %)

Dim 1 (16.81 %)

Dim 1 (16.81 %)

MFA: Influence of Blocks by Axis







Summary

- Terrain and permafrost properties are correlated across diverse landscapes in the study region
- Sites fall into consistent groupings
- Groupings correlate with permafrost degradation mode

Take Home

- Relationships among terrain and permafrost properties may be used to estimate ALD and RTS terrain suitability at a regional scale.
- Regional estimates of ground ice properties may also be attainable, but the data aren't there yet for this region.

TIMING OF RETROGRESSIVE THAW SLUMP INITIATION IN THE NOATAK BASIN, NORTHWEST ALASKA



Balser, A. W., J. B. Jones, and R. Gens (2014), Timing of Retrogressive Thaw Slump Initiation in the Noatak Basin, Northwest Alaska, USA, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 2013JF002889, doi:* 10.1002/2013JF002889

RELATIONSHIP OF TERRAIN AND PERMAFROST PROPERTIES IN THE BROOKS RANGE AND FOOTHILLS OF NORTHERN ALASKA



Balser, A. W., J. B. Jones, and M.T. Jorgenson. Prepared for submission to *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*.

TERRAIN SUITABILITY FOR ALD AND RTS IN THE BROOKS RANGE AND FOOTHILLS OF NORTHWEST ALASKA



Balser, A. W., J. B. Jones, and M.T. Jorgenson. Prepared for submission to *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*.