

# Thin sea ice, thick snow and widespread negative freeboard observed during N-ICE2015 north of Svalbard

Anja Rösel,<sup>1</sup> Polona Itkin,<sup>1</sup> Jennifer King,<sup>1</sup> Dmitry Divine,<sup>1</sup> Caixin Wang,<sup>1</sup>

Mats A. Granskog,<sup>1</sup> Thomas Krumpen,<sup>2</sup> Sebastian Gerland<sup>1</sup>

Corresponding author: A. Rösel, Norwegian Polar Institute, Tromsø, Norway.

(anja.rosel@npolar.no)

<sup>1</sup>Norwegian Polar Institute, Tromsø,  
Norway.

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Wegener Institute, Bremerhaven,  
Germany.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/2017JC012865

© 2018 American Geophysical Union

Received: Mar 08, 2017; Revised: Dec 08, 2017; Accepted: Jan 10, 2018

**Key Points.**

- During N-ICE2015 the snow to ice thickness ratio was exceptionally high due to thick snow on thin ice.
- Modal sea ice thickness was below historical observations in the area north of Svalbard confirms the general trend of continued thinning.
- Thick snow limited ice growth in winter, resulting in flooding and widespread negative freeboard.

**Abstract.** In recent years sea-ice conditions in the Arctic Ocean changed substantially towards a younger and thinner sea-ice cover. To capture the scope of these changes and identify the differences between individual regions, in situ observations from expeditions are a valuable data source. We present a continuous time series of in situ measurements from the N-ICE2015 expedition from January to June 2015 in the Arctic Basin north of Svalbard, comprising snow buoy and ice mass balance buoy data and local and regional data gained from electromagnetic induction (EM) surveys and snow probe measurements from four distinct drifts.

The observed mean snow depth of 0.53 m for April to early June is 73% above the average value of 0.30 m from historical and recent observations in this region, covering the years 1955-2017. The modal total ice and snow thicknesses, of 1.6 m and 1.7 m measured with ground-based EM and airborne EM measurements in April, May and June 2015, respectively, lie below the values ranging from 1.8 m to 2.7 m, reported in historical observations from the same region and time of year.

The thick snow cover slows thermodynamic growth of the underlying sea ice. In combination with a thin sea-ice cover this leads to an imbalance between snow and ice thickness, which causes widespread negative freeboard with subsequent flooding and a potential for snow-ice formation. With certainty, 29% of randomly located drill holes on level ice had negative freeboard.

## 1. Introduction

Sea-ice conditions in the Arctic have undergone substantial change in recent years, transitioning from a multi-year ice dominated, to a younger and thinner ice cover [e.g., *Kwok and Rothrock*, 2009; *Maslanik et al.*, 2011; *Hansen et al.*, 2013]. A decline in sea-ice extent is well documented, since 1979, through the use of satellite observations [*Comiso et al.*, 2008; *Meier et al.*, 2014] and in modeling studies [e.g. *Stroeve et al.*, 2007; *Hunke et al.*, 2010]. A corresponding decline in sea-ice thickness has been shown from direct observations [e.g. *Haas et al.*, 2011; *Lindsay and Schweiger*, 2015], from satellite altimetry data [e.g. *Laxon et al.*, 2013; *Kwok and Cunningham*, 2015], from radiometric data [*Kaleschke et al.*, 2015], and also from altimetry data in combination with radiometric data [*Ricker et al.*, 2017].

Field studies and direct observations allow the investigation of the composition of ice types [*Hansen et al.*, 2014], the amount and structure of the snow cover [*Haapala et al.*, 2013; *Webster et al.*, 2014], and the seasonal changes in ice and snow thickness [*Perovich et al.*, 2014; *Wang et al.*, 2016]. Regional [e.g. *Renner et al.*, 2013, 2014; *Hansen et al.*, 2013; *King et al.*, 2017] and local studies [*Gerland et al.*, 2008] in the European sector of the Arctic Ocean have shown a thinning of sea ice coherent with that documented on a pan-Arctic scale.

Regional Arctic sea-ice studies in early winter are few; i.e. Nansen's Fram drift at the end of the 19th century, the Surface Heat Budget of the Arctic Ocean study (SHEBA), from October 1997 to October 1998 in the Beaufort Sea [e.g. *Perovich*, 2003], and the transpolar drift of the schooner *Tara* in 2007-2008 [*Gascard et al.*, 2008; *Haas et al.*,

2011]. Another valuable data source are observations made at Soviet drifting stations and aircraft landings on Arctic sea ice, compiled by *Radionov et al.* [1997] and *Romanov* [1996] and published by *Warren et al.* [1999] (hereafter *W99*). In the past decade, intensive measurements of snow and ice thickness mainly over the western and central Arctic are performed by NASA's Operation Ice Bridge's aircraft overflights [e.g. *Richter-Menge and Farrell*, 2013].

The Norwegian young sea ICE expedition (N-ICE2015), led by the Norwegian Polar Institute in the region north of Svalbard, from January to June 2015 therefore represents a unique opportunity to study the conditions found for a changing Arctic sea-ice regime. The multidisciplinary expedition documented the conditions in a younger and thinner ice pack, with a special focus on the transition from polar night to spring [*Granskog et al.*, 2016].

Snow is a key component of the ocean-ice-atmosphere system. Sea-ice and snow thickness control heat fluxes and radiative transfer that are key parameters for describing and quantifying ice-ocean-atmosphere interactions. Additionally, snow has a large impact on sea-ice thermodynamics: In winter, the low density snow pack is an insulator from a cold atmosphere and at the same time it prevents a warming of the atmosphere by a comparably warm Arctic Ocean [*Sturm*, 2002; *Gallet et al.*, 2017]. These characteristics control the wintertime growth rate of the underlying sea ice [*Perovich*, 2003]. A thicker snow pack on relatively thin ice can become a positive contribution to the sea ice mass balance through snow-ice formation [*Haas et al.*, 2001; *Granskog et al.*, 2017; *Provost et al.*, 2017].

The most widely used snow depth data remains the pan-Arctic snow climatology from observations made during Soviet drifting stations on multi-year Arctic sea ice from W99,

while other snow on sea-ice data products from airborne data [e.g. *Kurtz et al.*, 2013; *Newman et al.*, 2014] and remote sensing data [*Maaß et al.*, 2013] are still under development.

*Bintanja and Selten* [2014]; *Park et al.* [2015]; *Woods and Caballero* [2016]; *Graham et al.* [2017a]; *Rinke et al.* [2017] suggest that there is strong evidence of a change of the Arctic climate regime, especially for the Atlantic sector towards a higher storm frequency and more precipitation events. An increase in frequency and duration of winter warming events in the North Pole region, from the Atlantic sector is shown by *Graham et al.* [2017b]. Assuming the precipitation falls as snow and with thinning ice this may cause the sea-ice regime in this region to shift towards conditions more commonly associated with Antarctic sea ice; thin ice with a deep snow cover, which promotes negative freeboard.

In the context of sea-ice and snow observations as well as heat fluxes during N-ICE2015, some relevant studies have been already published: *Merkouriadi et al.* [2017a] and *Gallet et al.* [2017] describe snow pack properties and its transition from winter to summer. They describe a unique snow stratigraphy with a distinct depth hoar layer in the bottom that impacts the thermal conductivity of the snow. *Granskog et al.* [2017] and *Provost et al.* [2017] report a significant snow-ice formation from ice core analyses and buoy observations, caused by an increased snow-to-ice thickness ratio. *Provost et al.* [2017] also calculates the heat fluxes between ocean, ice and atmosphere. *Peterson et al.* [2017] and *Meyer et al.* [2017a] observed the heat fluxes from the ocean to the ice. They find that storms significantly control heat fluxes and particularly above Atlantic Water they are inducing rapid basal melt events. With reference to a thinner, and therefore more fragile sea-ice

cover *Itkin et al.* [2017] report strong deformation rates during the expedition and state that storm events can irreversibly damage the sea-ice cover.

This paper presents a comprehensive compilation and analysis of sea-ice and snow mass balance observations, consisting of in-situ measurements of sea-ice, snow thickness, and freeboard collected in the vicinity of the vessel, *RV Lance*, and regional scale airborne survey data.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 and 3, the expedition and the methods are described, followed by the presentation of the results (Section 4). Thereafter, in Section 5 we discuss the results and demonstrate the important role of snow in the sea-ice mass balance in a changing Arctic sea-ice regime. When set in the context of historical observations in the same region (Section 5.2), the data indicate a decrease in sea-ice thickness, and a deeper than expected snow pack. Finally, we summarize the findings in Section 6.

## 2. The N-ICE2015 expedition

The N-ICE2015 drift experiment started north of Svalbard at  $83^{\circ}15'N$ ,  $21^{\circ}32'E$  on 15 January 2015. The Norwegian research vessel *RV Lance* was used as a drifting base and logistic platform, moored to and drifting with a sea-ice floe. Once the ship drifted out of the consolidated ice pack or the ice floe broke up it was relocated towards the original starting area and a new drift started. As a result, the ship drifted four times within a region that extended between  $80^{\circ} - 83^{\circ}N$  and  $3^{\circ} - 28^{\circ}E$  [*Granskog et al.*, 2016], which we refer hereafter as the area north of Svalbard. On each of the drifts an ice camp was established, these are referred to hereafter as *Floe 1*, *Floe 2*, *Floe 3*, and *Floe 4* (Figure 1). The ice floes were selected based on the following criteria: location within helicopter range

from Svalbard for search and rescue operations, accessibility and mooring possibilities for the vessel, sufficient floe diameter and thickness to support the science program, proximity to level first-year ice (FYI), and representativeness of the surrounding sea ice. The layout of the ice camps varied depending on the surface topography and dimensions of each floe and covered a range of different ice types. Schematics for the survey setups, ice type composition, and the snow and ice thickness sampling sites for each drift station are presented in Figure 2.

Calculated back-trajectories for the four drift stations, based on drift-vectors extracted from passive microwave sea-ice drift product [*Girard-Ardhuin and Ezraty, 2012*] show that the oldest sea ice in the investigated area originates from the northern Laptev Sea, and initially formed in September 2013 [*Itkin et al., 2017*]. In addition to this second-year ice (SYI), the region contained both, FYI floes and young ice (YI) produced in refrozen leads during the time period of the drift.

### 3. Data and Methods

The ground-based surveys during N-ICE2015 consists of stationary time series and measurements with spatial coverage. In the first category autonomous buoys provide time series of snow accumulation and snow depth and ice thickness. In the second category snow and ice thickness surveys were performed along transects with a snow probe and electromagnetic soundings. We describe first the methods that generate a stationary time series (Section 3.1 and 3.2) and then the surveys with spatial coverage (Section 3.3).

#### 3.1. Autonomous buoys

Buoys are used as autonomous platforms that record a variety of data and transmit these regularly via the Iridium satellite network. For this paper we analyzed the snow and sea-ice mass balance data recorded by three types of buoys: snow buoys, thermistor ice mass balance buoys (IMB), and seasonal IMBs.

Snow buoys (developed by MetOcean Data Systems, Dartmouth, Canada) measure the distance to the snow surface with four sonic sensors. The snow buoys cannot provide any information on the internal structure of the snow or detect subsurface changes e.g. snow-ice or superimposed ice formation. At deployment, the initial snow depth was measured and afterwards used to calibrate the values measured by the buoy. Thermistor IMBs are designed to measure temperatures along a cable deployed through a profile of air, snow, ice and surface ocean. During N-ICE2015 two types of thermistor IMBs were deployed: SAMS (Scottish Association for Marine Science) Ice Mass Balance for the Arctic (SIMBA) buoys, produced by SAMS Research Services Ltd (SRSL) [Jackson *et al.*, 2013] and IMB-Bs, produced by British Antarctic Survey (Cambridge, UK) and Bruncin (Zagreb, Croatia). Both are equipped with a 5-m long thermistor chain cable hanging from a tripod through air, snow, and a 2“ drill hole through the sea ice into the ocean.

The buoy measures temperature with 20 mm vertical resolution at approximately 0.1°C accuracy. They also feature a heating mode that provides a proxy for thermal resistivity (the proxy is calculated from temperature differences after a heating cycle) which can be used to discriminate between different media, especially between air, snow, and ice. The interfaces were defined using the method described in Provost *et al.* [2017] and an example is shown in Figure 3.

The seasonal IMB (IMB-S) developed by the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (CRREL) is an instrument that combines the measuring principles of a sonic snow buoy and a thermistor IMB [Polashenski *et al.*, 2011]. Additionally to the thermistor string (50 mm vertical resolution), it also has an underwater sonic sensor that provides the sea-ice thickness measurements by measuring the distance from the sensor to the bottom ice surface. All sensors are sheltered in a floating elongated tube that should potentially survive summer melt and fall freeze-up processes. During N-ICE2015, in total four snow buoys, seven SIMBAs, one IMB-B, and one IMB-S provided reliable data (Table 1, *Itkin et al.* [2015]). On *Floes 1-3* the four snow buoys were always deployed with a co-located thermistor IMB. Additionally, on *Floe 1* and *Floe 3* the buoys were part of a larger buoy array surrounding the main ice camp that had several other IMBs deployed in remote locations 5–20 km away from the ice camp [Itkin *et al.*, 2017]. IMB-S-2015a was deployed approximately 100 km NW of *Floe 3* from where it drifted to the Fram Strait. Due to the predefined time frame for the N-ICE2015 expedition, the duration of *Floe 4* was expected to be short and since buoys would not freeze into the ice after the onset of melt, none were deployed.

### 3.2. Hot-wires and snow-stakes

Snow-stakes and hot-wire fields are commonly used and considered as low cost methods for continuous ice and snow thickness observations and used during, e.g., the SHEBA drift [Perovich, 2003; Mahoney *et al.*, 2009]. Compared with autonomous buoys they provide snow depth and sea-ice thickness at reduced temporal resolution. On the four N-ICE2015 *Floes* we installed in total seven hot-wire fields and seven snow-stake fields following the routine outlined in Perovich [2003]. A rectangular hot-wire field with a side length of

approximately 10 m was designed in a way that in each corner a wire was installed close to an ablation stake, and in the middle of the hot-wire field nine snow-stakes with even spacing were set up (Figure 4). Snow depth and ice thickness changes were recorded on a regular basis, and the readings were averaged in space to cover small scale spatial variability [Rösel *et al.*, 2016a, b].

### 3.3. Spatial surveys of snow and ice thickness

#### 3.3.1. Ground-based electromagnetic surveys

Total ice and snow thickness was measured with portable electromagnetic instruments (EM31 and EM31SH, Geonics Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada) mounted on a sledge. The EM31s measure the received secondary electromagnetic field, induced by highly conductive seawater [Kovacs and Morey, 1991]. Conductivity values are calibrated with drill hole measurements and post processed according to Haas *et al.* [1997]. In total 101 and 145 calibration drillings were made for EM31SH and EM31, respectively, covering a thickness range from 0.15 m to 4.50 m. Analysis of the calibration measurements did not reveal any drift in the fitting curve parameters on the temporal or spatial scales (see Figure S1).

The footprint size of the EM31 ranges from 3 m to 5 m [e.g. Haas *et al.*, 1997; Renner *et al.*, 2014], depending on the ice and snow thickness. Accuracy of EM31 measurements is in the range of  $\pm 0.1$  m [Haas *et al.*, 2009] for level ice, becoming higher for rough and deformed ice.

On all *Floes*, independent (i) and repeated (r) transects with combined EM31 and snow depth measurements were performed. Repeated transects are considered as repetitions of marked tracks on a weekly basis to observe temporal change, while independent transects are long surveys in different directions from the main ice camp are to cover the spatial

variability of the surrounding area. One repeated transect line measurement, typically the first survey, is included in the independent data set.

### 3.3.2. Airborne surveys

Helicopter-borne EM instruments (HEM) (Ferra Dynamics Inc, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada), were used to measure ice thickness in helicopter range around *RV Lance* between 15 April and 8 June 2015. Altogether, seventeen HEM surveys were undertaken. The first, on 15 April, occurred while *RV Lance* was traveling into the ice to begin the drift of *Floe 3*. Sixteen surveys were carried out between 19 April and 18 May while *RV Lance* was moored to *Floe 3*. The last survey on 8 June 2015 was an overflight of *Floe 4*, operated from the *FS Polarstern's* expedition “PS92” (ARK-XXIX/1, Alfred-Wegener Institute (AWI), Bremerhaven, Germany, *Peeken* [2015]).

HEM measurements use the same principle as the EM31 ground surveys: They both measure the distance from the instrument to the ice bottom. The HEM uses additionally a laser altimeter to measure the height above the snow surface. The laser footprint has a diameter of about 3 cm.

The height above the bottom of the ice is derived from the strength of electromagnetic induction in the conductive water under the ice, and the height of the instrument above the surface of the ice or snow is determined with a laser altimeter [*Haas et al.*, 2009, 2010]. The difference between the two height measurements corresponds to the total thickness of ice and snow. The HEM instruments used in this study have horizontal co-planer transmitting and receiving coils spaced 2.7 m apart. They operate at a signal frequency of 4 kHz, with a 10 Hz sampling rate, corresponding to measurement point spacing of 3–5 m [*Haas et al.*, 2009; *Pfaffhuber et al.*, 2012]. The HEM instrument is flown at a

height of 15–20 m above the surface and has a footprint of approx. 40–50 m [Haas *et al.*, 2009]. The system is calibrated by measuring at high elevations and over open water. The nominal total thickness uncertainty for a single HEM measurement is 0.1 m over level ice, with significantly larger errors and an underestimation of maximum thickness occurring in heavily ridged areas due to footprint smoothing [Haas *et al.*, 2009; Mahoney *et al.*, 2015].

### 3.4. Snow depth surveys

Snow depth surveys were made with a GPS snow probe, henceforth referred to as Magnaprobe (Snow-Hydro, Fairbanks, AK, USA). The Magnaprobe is a thin pole with a sliding disk of 0.2 m in diameter around it. The pole penetrates the snow pack to the sea-ice surface while the disk rests on the snow surface. Inside the pole a magnetic device measures the distance between the disk and the lower tip of the pole providing the snow depth [Sturm and Holmgren, 1999]. Each depth is time- and position-tagged and recorded on a data logger. The Magnaprobe enables snow depth surveys with several thousand snow depth measurements in a few hours. The accuracy of the measurement is  $\pm 3$  mm [Marshall *et al.*, 2006] and the footprint is the size of the disk.

### 3.5. Merging of electromagnetic soundings and Magnaprobe measurements

For direct comparison of the values, and to subtract the snow depth from the EM31 data, we re-sampled the EM31 data onto the coordinates of the Magnaprobe track, and we applied a Gaussian filter to the EM31 data. The EM31 and Magnaprobe data sets [Rösel *et al.*, 2016c, d] were median-sampled on a 5 meter regular grid, following the approach by Geiger *et al.* [2015]. Snow depth was subtracted from the EM31 values to

derive sea-ice thickness. To facilitate this re-gridding, both the Magnaprobe and EM31 data were corrected for sea-ice drift. The drift correction routine is based on subtraction of the floe track over the period preceding the exact timing the measurement was carried out. Starting from the second position of the instrument in the particular measurement sequence, the Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) station coordinates were used to calculate the back-trajectories of the measurement points with respect to initial time of the series.

The floe track itself is computed using the data from one of two GNSS base stations (called hereafter GPS1 and GPS2) that were installed on the ice stations, or the Lance position when the base stations were not in operation. Note the approach we use implicitly assumes that rotation of the floe over the measurement period was negligible. This is reasonable since EM31 and Magnaprobe measurements were always carried out at the same time with a maximal time lag of 30 seconds. The single point horizontal accuracy for such floe position measurements varies in time being of the order of 1-4 meters. For those measurements where single point accuracy was critical, such as e.g. validation fields for airborne campaigns, the data was post-processed using Precise Point Positioning (PPP) processed reference tracks of GPS1 and GPS2. This increases the track accuracy to 0.2-0.3 m and takes the rotation of the floes into account. The PPP processing was performed by using the open source RTKLIB software package (<http://www.rtklib.com>).

In order to avoid oversampling for the survey periods when the instrument was stationary relative to the ice, we estimated the instrument velocity from the drift corrected measurement positions and eliminated the values corresponding to instrument speeds below  $0.2 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ .

### 3.6. Drill hole measurements and freeboard calculations

#### 3.6.1. Drill hole measurements

During the N-ICE2015 expedition we obtained more than 400 direct measurements from drill holes or holes from ice coring on different types of level ice. They are arbitrarily located in the vicinity of the snow and ice thickness transects, within a 5 km radius around the ship. For measuring freeboard at the drill holes, first snow thickness is measured above the drill hole, afterwards snow is removed and the hole is directly drilled or cored into the sea ice. The thickness is measured with a flexible thickness gauge with a foldable metal piece at the bottom as weight. The distances from the ocean–ice interface to both, the water surface and the ice surface are noted. We estimate the uncertainty of these measurements to be less than  $\pm 0.02$  m, resulting from the sampling uncertainties like i.e., different observers, differences in reading of the tape, different strength of pulling the tape, or uneven bottom of the sea ice. More than half of the thickness drillings are used for the calibration of electromagnetic measurements (see Section 3.3.1). Drill hole measurements provide spatial ice and snow thickness as well as freeboard and draft information at point scale, but without temporal component [Rösel and King, 2017].

#### 3.6.2. Freeboard calculations

Freeboard values  $h_{fb}$  can either be read directly from tape measurements at drill holes, or they can be calculated based on the principle of an isostatic equilibrium [Forsström *et al.*, 2011]:

$$h_i = \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_w - \rho_i} h_{fb} + \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_w - \rho_i} h_s \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho_w$  is  $1027 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$  [Meyer *et al.*, 2017b]. For winter conditions (*Floe 1* and *2*), the bulk density of the snow pack is  $\rho_s = 345 \pm 39 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ , bulk density for FYI is  $\rho_i = 910 \pm 18 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ . For spring conditions (*Floe 3* and *4*) we define  $\rho_s = 313 \pm 50 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$  and  $\rho_i = 901 \pm 18 \text{ kgm}^{-3}$ ; density values are extracted from snow pits [Merkouriadi *et al.*, 2017b; Gallet *et al.*, 2017] and ice core analysis [Gerland *et al.*, 2017]. For snow depth  $h_s$  we used Magnaprobe measurements and for ice thickness  $h_i$  we used the values obtained from the combination of EM31 and Magnaprobe data. In this study we analyze calculated freeboard from long independent walks. By using equation (1) we have to take into account that we might get results with an offset towards higher freeboard values in case of flooding, because  $\rho_s$  of a flooded snow pack will be substantially higher.

#### 4. Results

The combined sea ice and snow thickness data from all different sources is summarized in Table 1, providing an overview about the temporal and spatial variability of snow and ice thickness during the entire N-ICE2015 expedition.

Independent snow and ice thickness transects from combined EM31/Magnaprobe measurements give average values, including standard deviations, in the range from  $1.19 \pm 0.52 \text{ m}$  to  $1.47 \pm 0.63 \text{ m}$  for ice and  $0.29 \pm 0.18 \text{ m}$  to  $0.56 \pm 0.17 \text{ m}$  for snow, for all the floes (Table 1). Average values of ice and snow thickness from point measurements and their evolution throughout the entire N-ICE2015 expedition from January to June 2015 are shown in Figure 5.

#### 4.1. Floe 1: 15 January – 21 February 2015

The data acquired by five IMBs, a snow buoy, hot-wire and snow-stake fields associated with *Floe 1* and its surrounding represent different snow and ice conditions observed during the drift. All buoys show a weak increase in ice thickness during a period of low air temperatures in the last week of January, followed by an increase of snow depth from 0.59 m to 0.66 m for SIMBA\_2015a and a decrease from 0.45 m to 0.35 m for SIMBA\_2015b [Itkin *et al.*, 2015]. During a major storm event lasting from 3 to 8 February (M2) [Cohen *et al.*, 2017], snow depth at SIMBA\_2015b and SIMBA\_2015g decreased, while it increased at SIMBA\_2015e. SIMBA\_2015a, SIMBA\_2015f, and SIMBA\_2015g show both: first an increase and later a decrease of snow depth (Figure 5). The decrease in snow depth can be explained by blowing snow and its redistribution. It should be noted that these are point measurements and they do not capture the spatial variability of the snow.

While drifting over Atlantic Water in mid-February [Meyer *et al.*, 2017b] the southernmost buoy SIMBA\_2015a (20 km distant from *Floe 1*) indicates bottom melt starting on 16 February, followed by a similar signal from SIMBA\_2015e and SIMBA\_2015g starting on 19 February (Figure 5). Initial flooding with a gradual snow-ice formation on the snow/ice interface was observed at SIMBA\_2015a (Figure 5 and Provost *et al.* [2017]). Due to ice temperatures of  $-4.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  we surmise that the ice was permeable [Weeks and Ackley, 1986], and negative freeboard promoted snow-ice formation on SIMBA\_2015a. During the last week of February and the first week of March, ice break-up events, flooding and subsequent snow-ice formation led to a rapid decrease of snow depth and an increase of ice thickness. On 18 February a deformation event led to lateral flooding of *Floe 1*, and

subsequent snow-ice formation was observed in the SIMBA\_2015f record [*Provost et al.*, 2017].

From the hot-wire and snow-stake fields HW1&SS1 (FYI) and HW4&SS4 (SYI) initial ice thicknesses with standard deviations were  $0.94\pm 0.1$  m, and  $1.29\pm 0.05$  m, respectively (Table 1). The last readings four weeks later showed values of  $0.98\pm 0.06$  m, and  $1.30\pm 0.05$  m, respectively. Only hot-wire field HW3, deployed in a refrozen lead with an initial snow cover of 0.02 m showed a significant increase from  $0.41\pm 0.14$  to  $0.64\pm 0.09$  m (Table 1, Figure 5). The initial snow depth with standard deviation at the SYI field was  $0.55\pm 0.13$  m, and about 0.16 m higher than at the FYI field with an initial observed snow depth of  $0.39\pm 0.11$  m. On both ice types the snow depth showed a net increase of about 0.1 m within one month.

Figure 6a presents *Floe 1* ice and snow thickness probability density functions (PDF) derived from independent measurements with EM31 and Magnaprobe. Please note, that in Figure 6 all distributions represent both, spatial and temporal variability since spatial data from a longer period are included. The PDF of the ice thickness features a trimodal distribution with a first peak at 0.3 m corresponding to thin ice, a second peak at 0.9 m, and a third major peak, which represents the primary mode at 1.5 m. Mean ice thickness was 1.47 m with a standard deviation of 0.63 m. The tail of the PDF above 1.8 m represents deformed ice.

The modal ice thickness for all repeated FYI transects was 0.80 m (Figure 6b). The modal thickness for all repeated SYI transects was 1.40 m. On FYI the average snow depth with standard deviation was  $0.33\pm 0.14$  m, whereas on SYI it was  $0.52\pm 0.14$  m (Figure 6b). The distributions of both snow depth and ice thickness do not differ greatly over either

type between the first and last transect lines. We notice a shift from the FYI mode from 0.8 m to 0.9 m and for the SYI mode from 1.5 m to 1.6 m, but the averages for both ice types for the first and the last transect stayed in the same order of 1 m for FYI and 1.8 m for SYI. The mode for snow thickness on FYI increased by 0.05 m from 0.20 m to 0.25 m on FYI while it decreased by the same amount from 0.60 m to 0.55 m on SYI.

#### 4.2. Floe 2: 24 February – 19 March 2015

On *Floe 2* snow buoy SNOW\_2015d, SIMBA\_2015d, and snow-stake field SS5 were deployed together on SYI at the main ice camp. Initial snow depth for SNOW\_2015d was 0.34 m (Table 1). The buoy showed an increase of 0.15 m in snow depth after deployment, caused by two major storm events (M4 and M5) with precipitation [Cohen *et al.*, 2017]. SIMBA\_2015d was deployed one week later, after the storm, with initial snow and ice thicknesses of 0.42 m and 1.30 m, respectively. During the drift, we registered only slight variations in the range of a few centimeters in snow depth and ice thickness (Figure 5). The snow-stake field on FYI (SS6) showed an increase from 0.33 m to 0.41 m while the snow-stakes on SYI (SS5) showed a decrease from 0.36 m to 0.32 m (Figure 5).

The thickness distributions for the independent measurements and the repeated transect lines (Figure 6d, 6e) on *Floe 2* show similarities: the thin ice class with ice thickness values in the range from 0.0 m – 0.3 m is present in both histograms. The main modal peak is around 1.0 m, representing the fraction of dominating FYI. For the transect lines a third mode can be identified at 1.3 m, whereas in the independent measurements a third mode is at 1.8 m. The snow depth with standard deviation on *Floe 2* from independent measurement is comparable to the measurements on the transect line and the mean is  $0.55 \pm 0.18$  m (Figure 6d). On *Floe 2* the conditions were quite stable; the average thickness

of ice and snow did not change within three weeks of the drift on this floe (Table 1). Snow depth on FYI and SYI were in the range of 0.33 – 0.56 m (Table 1), but it is not distinct that the values in the higher range always correspond with SYI.

### 4.3. Floe 3: 18 April – 05 June 2015

The IMBs, snow-stake and hot-wire fields on *Floe 3* show coinciding results throughout the drift. During the first four weeks after the installation of the snow-stake and hot-wire sea-ice and snow conditions remained stable around 1.08 m and on 1.47 m on SYI with 0.70 m and 0.55 m of snow. This is confirmed by the data from SIMBA\_2015c, which had an initial ice thickness of 1.79 m with 0.61 m snow. Starting at the beginning of June, rapid bottom melt with a rate of about  $0.10 \text{ m day}^{-1}$  commenced on both ice types, while the snow depth remained unchanged. SIMBA\_2015c shows an indication of a weak basal melt already after 25 May followed by a steep increase of the basal melt rate on 5 June (Figure 3). Subsequent freeboard adjustment and flooding of the floe caused the formation of a slush layer with a thickness of up to 0.30 m (Figure 3). Due to the high density and the salinity of the slush layer and its potential to refreeze, we will here consider the slush-layer as sea ice. Observed 2-meter air temperatures well below  $0^\circ\text{C}$  until 1 June [Hudson *et al.*, 2015] and also cold sea-ice temperatures may allow the slush layer to refreeze subsequently to a snow-ice layer. Consequently, snow depth measured by SIMBA\_2015c gradually decreased, starting at the end of May. The next significant decrease in snow depth registered in early June by the three snow buoys is connected to storm events (Figure 5: M8 on 2 – 6 June and m9 on 8 June, Cohen *et al.* [2017]), and might be caused by lateral flooding induced by break up events of *Floe 3*. Note, that snow buoys can only measure the change of the distance from the snow surface to the sensor,

which was in this case an increase and might be a sign of compacting snow. Flooding or snow-ice formation cannot be detected by snow buoys. IMB-B\_2015b was deployed on 8 May in a refrozen lead about 20 km NW of *RV Lance* with initial ice thickness of 0.62 m and 0.02 m of snow. This is below the detection limit of the thermistor chain, so no snow depth can be shown on Figure 5. A gentle decrease of ice thickness from the bottom can be observed already after 16 May, followed by a sharp increase of the basal melt rate on 5 June that continued until complete disintegration of the level ice on 12 June, 20 km from the open water (Figure 5). IMB-S\_2015a was deployed on 19 May on level FYI with initial thicknesses of 1.05 m for ice and 0.28 m for snow, respectively. IMB-S\_2015a showed no sign of snow-ice formation. Ice and snow thickness both decrease gradually in June, caused by bottom melting and snow melt or compaction.

The repeated measurements on *Floe 3* also showed stable conditions in terms of snow and ice thickness until the onset of gradual melt in the second half of May. Then both, snow and ice thickness show a decrease in thickness (see Table 1). The comparison of the first and the last repeated transect line results in an average decrease of 0.16 m in ice thickness and 0.02 m in snow thickness. The sea-ice thickness distribution of *Floe 3* is bimodal, with a first mode at 1.2 m and a second mode at 0.2 m, which represents a large refrozen lead in the vicinity of the ship (Figure 6g). Connected to these two distinct sea-ice modes, the observed snow depth distribution shows a peak at 0.03 m representing the snow cover of the refrozen lead. The second mode is at 0.45 m associated with the snow cover on FYI and SYI. Figures 6g, h demonstrate that the distributions from the independent measurements and the repeated transect lines are comparable, except for the mode corresponding to the snow on thin ice only present in the independent measurements.

#### 4.4. Floe 4: 07 – 22 June 2015

*Floe 4* was established on FYI within the marginal ice zone. At the hot-wire field HW9, an intense bottom melting event was observed, which started between 10 and 13 June, with melt rates up to  $0.25 \text{ m day}^{-1}$  (Figure 5). This hot-wire field was in a deformed area of the floe, therefore may not be fully representative of processes on level ice. We assume the ocean induced melting of deformed ice could lead to disintegration of previously consolidated ice blocks efficiently accelerating the melt process.

The snow and ice distributions for *Floe 4* both show a unimodal distribution, where the mode for snow is located at 0.20 m and for ice at 1.25 m (Figure 6j, k). The comparison of independent measurements with repeated transects shows that the transect lines represent well the overall surrounding (Table 1). On *Floe 4* the established survey line could not be followed due to strong bottom melt and a rapid transition from solid into rotten ice, making a quantitative inter-comparison of the entire surveys difficult. However, we found a decrease of the average sea-ice thickness of 0.5 m within ten days when we compare the first and the last transect line. This might also explain the wider thickness distributions for *Floe 4*. The snow thickness decreased by 0.05 m. In general, a flooding of vast parts of *Floe 4* was registered after 14 June, along with formation of a snow-ice crust in wet snow (see Figure 7) above the flooded snow pack. This ice layer grew over several days towards the former snow/ice interface. The formation of this crust resulted in a sudden decrease of snow depth and the same amount of increase in ice thickness; we noted that in many areas the Magnaprobe pole could not penetrate through the crust to the original snow/ice interface and might bias the observations.

#### 4.5. Regional HEM surveys over *Floe 3* and *Floe 4* surroundings

Figure 8 presents all HEM surveys including date and time [King *et al.*, 2016]; basic statistics for each survey are summarized in Table 2. The total snow and ice thickness distribution for all HEM surveys combined has mode 1.7 m and mean 1.8 m. There is a second mode at between 0.1 m and 0.3 m in almost all the surveys that is representative of the thin ice class found in refrozen leads.

Long HEM surveys towards the east on 6 and 12 May show a distribution dominated by the thin ice class, while flights along the main drift direction show very little variation between the surveys.

Four local area surveys with a radius of 10 km around the ice station were carried out on a repeated pattern over *RV Lance*'s position on 24 and 28 April and on 5 and 11 May. Between the 28 April and 5 May an increase of the second mode from 0.1 m to 0.2 m can be observed, indicating a thickening of the YI. The primary mode ranges between 1.7 and 1.8 m. The local survey on 11 May did not follow exactly the pattern of the previous three surveys due to bad weather. The ice thickness distribution of this flight has a primary mode at 1.5 m and a weak second mode at 0.3 m.

The HEM flight on 8 June over *Floe 4* shows a slightly thinner sea ice cover with a mode at 1.4 m and a mean thickness of 1.5 m.

#### 4.6. Comparing airborne with ground-based EM data

The independent EM31 data set agrees well with HEM measurements in the vicinity of *Floe 3* made from mid-April until mid-May (Figure 9a). Both PDFs show a bimodal distribution with the major peak in the thicker level ice, and a second mode, representing the thin ice. The thin ice mode is less pronounced in the EM31 data, because for safety

reasons it was difficult to collect data of ice thickness in newly refrozen leads. This under-representation of very thin ice also explains the slightly higher mean values of ice thickness derived from the EM31 data.

As strong bottom melting resulted in a remarkable thinning on *Floe 4* only two EM31 surveys on 10 and 11 June can be compared with the HEM survey from 8 June. The modes for both distributions are at 1.3 m, the mean for EM31 is 1.7 m, and for HEM 1.5 m (Figure 9b). On *Floe 4* no thin ice or refrozen lead was present in the area of the ice station, but in the larger vicinity, which was covered by the HEM survey on 8 June (Figure 9b).

#### 4.7. Freeboard during N-ICE2015

On all four floes widespread negative freeboard along with flooded areas was observed from the drilling records: 32% (*Floe 1*), 37% (*Floe 2*), 61% (*Floe 3*), and 48% (*Floe 4*) of the readings show negative freeboard, considering an uncertainty of  $\pm 0.02$  m for the measured freeboard. All values within this range (in total 31%) were discarded. We consider the drill holes to be representative for the area, because they are numerous ( $N=475$ ) and arbitrarily located. In addition, we have calculated freeboard from snow and ice thickness measurements of the long independent walks referring to the method in Section 3.6.2 (Figure 6c,f,i,l). Considering an uncertainty of  $\pm 0.06$  m, the calculated negative fraction of freeboard on all four floes is 5% on *Floe 1*, 62% on *Floe 2*, 18% on *Floe 3*, and 11% on *Floe 4* (Figure 6).

We estimate the uncertainty of the calculated freeboard resulting from the propagation of uncertainties in the snow and ice densities and the sampling uncertainty (represented by the spatial variability) to be on average  $\pm 0.06$  m. For calculated freeboard considered

as a function of  $h_i$ ,  $h_s$ ,  $\rho_i$ , and  $\rho_s$ , at every analyzed location, the freeboard absolute uncertainty is calculated as a square root of the sum of squared partial increments of this function due to errors in the input variables. We used as measurement error the standard deviations of  $\rho_i$ , and  $\rho_s$ , and for  $h_i$  and  $h_s$  we used their observed standard deviations, since the sampling uncertainty, represented here by the standard deviation of snow and ice measurements, is a better approximation of the large areal impact on freeboard than the measurement error of each individual point. We consider the errors in the four measured variables of the error propagation method to be independent, because they were derived by different methods. The comparison of observed freeboard to calculated freeboard from drill hole measurements (Figure 10) gives an overall agreement with a correlation of  $r^2=0.49$ , but it also shows significant scatter. With regard of the uncertainty of  $\pm 0.02$  m for the measured freeboard, 40% of the drill hole values lie above the uncertainty, 29% lie below and 31% of the values fall within the range of uncertainty. For the calculated freeboard, a 73% of the values from the independent long walks lie within the uncertainty range of  $\pm 0.06$  m, while only 5% lie below and 22% lie above.

It is also noticeable that the correlation is higher for a positive freeboard than for negative freeboard. The scatter might be caused by the fact that individual locations for the drill holes are not always at isostatic equilibrium since internal pressure in the ice might cause a certain disturbance. In addition, the calculations appear to underestimate negative freeboard, where the snow load can cause flooding of the snow layer which results in a higher density of the snow pack. Additionally, the measurement error for negative freeboard values might be higher because the interfaces, especially for water and snow are difficult to distinguish after flooding.

#### 4.8. Snow melt on *Floe 3* and *Floe 4*

Events of snow melt were observed on both *Floe 3* and *Floe 4*. Temperatures rose to 0°C twice in May, but we observed no change in the snow depth in connection with these events. The onset of intense snow melt on *Floe 3* was registered on 4 June when the 2 m air temperature exceeded 0°C and stayed around the freezing point with slight variations due to the diurnal cycle [Hudson *et al.*, 2015; Cohen *et al.*, 2017].

On *Floe 4* we observed a darkening of the snow cover in depressions in the vicinity of pressure ridges on 8 June, which was an indication of a continuous wetting of the snow pack. Air temperature remained above freezing between 8 and 9 June promoting melt pond formation in these dark spots. Air temperature dropped again below 0°C on 10 June. Distinct signs of snow surface melting due to radiative forcing with a rapid transformation of the crystal structure of the snow pack on a large scale was observed on 14 June, when the 2 m air temperature increased again to 0°C [Gallet *et al.*, 2017]. Additionally, snow pit and ice core temperature data gave evidence of an isothermal temperature profile through the entire snow and ice pack, along with increasing bulk snow densities [Gallet *et al.*, 2017; Merkouriadi *et al.*, 2017b; Gerland *et al.*, 2017].

### 5. Discussion

This compilation of the N-ICE2015 snow and sea-ice thickness data sets [Rösel *et al.*, 2016a, b, c, d] represents a unique opportunity to study and understand processes in the winter-to-spring evolution of a thinner sea ice cover with a thick snow cover from the Atlantic sector of the Arctic from winter conditions to melt onset.

#### 5.1. Sea ice during N-ICE2015

The N-ICE2015 expedition took place over the Nansen Basin and the Yermak Plateau, in an area where the Arctic Ocean is connected to the Atlantic Ocean via the deep Fram Strait and the shallow Barents Sea [*Meyer et al.*, 2017b]. The exchange of northwards flowing warm and saline Atlantic Water and southward cold Arctic water near the surface gives in combination with the bathymetry makes this region special in terms of heat exchange. The shallow Yermak Plateau is a local hot-spot for vertical mixing and cooling of Atlantic Water, while in the deep Nansen Basin the cold Polar Water dominates [*Meyer et al.*, 2017b]. Also, the Atlantic Ocean and the Fram Strait is a prominent pathway for low pressure systems which penetrate across the North Pole and cause winter warming events in the Central Arctic [*Graham et al.*, 2017b; *Rinke et al.*, 2017].

Our observations show that during N-ICE2015, interaction at the ocean-sea ice-interface was determined to be the most significant factor driving the ice thickness changes, because thick snow moderated the influence from the atmosphere. During winter negative heat fluxes [*Meyer et al.*, 2017a] caused a slight increase of sea-ice thickness. This increase in thickness was especially pronounced in areas with thin snow cover e.g. refrozen leads or new ice (Table 1). However, the sea-ice growth is moderated by the insulating effect of the snow cover. The thick snow pack of on average  $0.52 \pm 0.18$  m on SYI on Floe 1 in January and February, during the coldest period of the experiment, limited thermodynamic ice growth [*Provost et al.*, 2017]. When the station drifted over warm Atlantic Water a significant reduction of ice thickness due to bottom melt was observed. In particular, we registered such events once in winter on *Floe 1*, starting on 17 February at  $82^{\circ}\text{N}$ , and twice in spring: on *Floe 3*, 4 – 5 June at  $80^{\circ}\text{N}$ , and on *Floe 4*, 12 – 18 June at  $80^{\circ}40'\text{N}$  [*Meyer et al.*, 2017a]. Both bottom melting events during *Floe 3* and *Floe 4*

were associated with a strong positive ocean heat flux up to  $400 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  in the mixed layer at the ocean-ice interface, driven by a combination of shallow Atlantic Water and storm events [Meyer *et al.*, 2017a; Peterson *et al.*, 2017]. The combination of positive ocean heat fluxes with storm events or strong swell induced by storm events caused the break up of the aforementioned floes [Itkin *et al.*, 2017].

From the analysis of multi-modal total thickness distributions from EM31 transects on *Floe 1* and *Floe 2* we can clearly differentiate between level YI, FYI, SYI and deformed thick ice. This is, however, not the case on *Floe 3*, where the modes associated with FYI and SYI are no longer distinct. A similarity in total ice thickness distributions for both ice types is also confirmed by the drill hole and ice core measurements. From *Floe 3* onwards the analysis of total thickness distributions alone is not sufficient for a robust classification of sea-ice types, which then requires e.g. ice core analysis [Granskog *et al.*, 2017].

## 5.2. N-ICE2015 in the context of other studies in the region

In line with pan-Arctic trends, a shift to a thinner Arctic sea ice during the transition from winter to summer in the last decade in the study region has been already shown in Renner *et al.* [2013]. The comparison of the N-ICE2015 HEM surveys with HEM surveys in the same region from April 2009 and April-May 2011 [Haas *et al.*, 2010; Renner *et al.*, 2013] revealed a decrease of the mode of total thickness from 2.4 m in 2009 over 1.8 m in 2011, down to 1.7 m in 2015. It should be mentioned that most of the N-ICE2015 surveys were further north than the flights in the previous years at the same time of the year.

Between  $83^\circ\text{N}$  and  $81^\circ\text{N}$  no gradient was observed in ice thickness. A gradient towards a thinning of the sea-ice cover occurred from  $81^\circ\text{N}$  southwards. This expected gradient is

associated with warm Atlantic Water influence on the ice pack which consequently results in a breakup of floes and rapid melting. According to historical observations in the region [e.g. *Renner et al.*, 2013], this process is generally limited to the area within a distance of 50 km to open water, which is also shown by the two southernmost HEM flights from 12 May and 8 June 2015 having with 1.5 and 1.4 m, respectively, the lowest modal thickness.

Inter-annual variability of snow and ice thickness is significant on a range of spatial and temporal scales (Figure 11). During N-ICE2015 the observed regional ice thickness was reduced and the snow depth was higher compared to studies from historical observations (Table 3, Figure 11). For example, the January-February mean snow depth of  $0.33\pm 0.14$  m on FYI was higher than the observations during a short test cruise prior to N-ICE2015 in February 2014: here the average snow depth on FYI was  $0.20\pm 0.08$  on 0.80 m thick sea ice (modal value). It is to be noted that the sea ice in this case was most likely younger and had thus less snow on top.

The April-May mean snow depth for the same region in 2011, reported in local scale studies of *Haapala et al.* [2013] and *Renner et al.* [2013] were  $0.36\pm 0.26$  and 0.32 m, respectively. A 200 m long snow depth profile from 1 April 2003 on 80.427 N, 12.817 E during Polarstern Cruise ARKTIS IXI/1 resulted in a mean snow depth of  $0.17\pm 0.08$  m [*Haas*, 2018]. From the same cruise, average snow and ice thicknesses from ice stations were noted with  $0.18\pm 0.14$  m and  $1.96\pm 0.43$  m, respectively [*Schünemann and Werner*, 2005]. During a drifting station with Polarstern on Expedition ARKTIS-IX/1 in March 1993 in the same area a 200 m snow and ice thickness profile on 2.56±0.53 m thick MYI indicated an average snow cover of  $0.25\pm 0.27$  m (Table 3, Figure 11).

While observations from the recent INTPART Field School 2017 cruise in May to the marginal ice zone north of Svalbard showed a significant number of floes with snow depths larger than 0.4 m (A. Doulgeris, S. Gerland, M. Granskog, pers. communication, 2017), alongside FYI floes with much less snow. These observations resemble the conditions during N-ICE2015 and give an indication that the situation of thick snow on thin ice could occur more regularly in this region and might favor an increase in the occurrence of negative freeboard.

In summary, the April to early June mean snow depth of  $0.50 \pm 0.12$  m averaged over all measurements on *Floe 3* (Table 1) was significantly higher than the averaged observations of  $0.30 \pm 0.14$  m from historical observations, including the recent observations from 2017 (Table 3).

Compared to the W99 climatology with values of 0.37 m for snow depth in April in the area north of Svalbard, our observations show thicker snow. It needs to be noted, however, that the use of W99 in the Atlantic Sector of the Arctic should be treated carefully, since observational data is sparse in this region. In fact, only 41 average snow thickness values from the 'Sever' Aircraft Landing Observations from the Former Soviet Union from the years 1955 and 1975-1979 [Romanov, 2004] are included in W99 for the area north of Svalbard. W99 describes a general decadal scale decreasing trend in snow depth between 1954 and 1991, but explained by a decrease mainly in May. In addition, a later onset of ice formation [Stroeve et al., 2014; Johnson and Eicken, 2016] and an associated delay in snow accumulation on sea ice, or liquid precipitation instead of snowfall in the autumn, could lead to a general thinning of the snow cover. Nevertheless, inter-annual and spatial variability of snow thickness is high (Table 3): Forsström et al. [2011] present values

in the range of  $0.30\pm 0.19$  m for Fram Strait in April-May 2005, 2007, and 2008, while [Renner *et al.*, 2014] measure  $0.32\pm 0.22$  m,  $0.47\pm 0.24$  m, and  $0.39\pm 0.22$  m for the same years, respectively. It is to be noted that the corresponding sea-ice thicknesses are also showing high variability in Forsström *et al.* [2011] and Renner *et al.* [2014]. Fram Strait is considered a region with high drift speeds and the origin of the sea ice might be different than in the area north of Svalbard [Spreen *et al.*, 2009].

However, exceptional atmospheric circulation events in autumn 2014 and winter 2015 could have caused the observed increased snow depth in 2015 in the study area [Merkouriadi *et al.*, 2017a]. Studies suggest that there is evidence, especially for the climate of the Atlantic sector of the Arctic, to shift towards a different regime with a higher storm frequency and more precipitation events, particularly during the winter season. This can result in an increased snow thickness [Bintanja and Selten, 2014; Park *et al.*, 2015; Graham *et al.*, 2017a; Merkouriadi *et al.*, 2017a].

Based on ERA-Interim reanalysis data along the back trajectories of the four floes for the months September to March over the period 1979-2015, we see that the winter precipitation has increased. The precipitation experienced by our four floes in winter 2014/2015 lies 50% above the long-term average in our study area [Merkouriadi *et al.*, 2017a]. To summarize: in combination with a thinner sea-ice cover [e.g., Kwok and Rothrock, 2009; Hansen *et al.*, 2013] the recently observed amount of snow causes an increase in the snow-ice ratio (this will be even the case if the snow depth is not increasing), which favors negative freeboard and subsequent flooding of the snow pack in the Atlantic sector of the Arctic.

### 5.3. Thick snow on thin ice promotes negative freeboard

On all four floes widespread negative freeboard along with flooded areas was observed from the drilling records (32% – 61% of the drill holes show negative freeboard). Also the calculated freeboard indicate widespread negative freeboard, from 5% (*Floe 1*) to 62% (*Floe 2*) of the individual points with snow and ice thickness, when an uncertainty of  $\pm 0.06$  m is accounted for (Figure 6). Of course, part of the negative freeboard values can result from deformation events like ridging, but from the drill hole dataset we have evidence that negative freeboard was common on level ice. Considering the specific densities of snow and ice, the hydrostatic balance is of snow-covered sea ice with a freeboard of 0 cm is given when the ratio of snow depth to ice thickness is approximately 1:3 [Sturm and Massom, 2009]. Once this ratio is exceeded – either by accumulating snow on the sea ice or bottom melt of sea ice – and the freeboard becomes negative, lateral flooding or permeation of water through the porous ice with subsequent snow-ice formation can occur. Snow-ice formation is a positive contribution to the sea-ice mass balance and has to be considered in sea ice models, as snow-ice was found to be widespread during N-ICE2015 [Granskog et al., 2017].

A substantial fraction of areas with negative freeboard can affect regional ice thickness retrievals from satellite altimetry data like CryoSat-2 in two ways: i) a flooded and saline snow pack will raise the main radar scattering horizon, therefore the sea-ice freeboard might be misinterpreted, which results in erroneously high sea-ice thickness values [Nandan et al., 2017]. Further, ii) areas of negative freeboard might have a disproportionately thick snow cover. For CryoSat-2 ice thickness retrieval algorithms, snow depth values from W99 are widely used, and for FYI dominated regions it is suggested for calculation

of sea ice thickness to use only half of the snow depth given in W99 [e.g. *Laxon et al.*, 2013]. For the conditions during N-ICE2015, where the observed snow depth in the area north of Svalbard region was 73% higher than the climatological value of W99 for the months April and May, this results in an underestimation of the CryoSat-2 sea-ice thickness product compared to the ground truth data. As an example, with a freeboard of 0.05 m, the calculated sea ice thickness for  $h_s = 0.185$  m (which represents the value of W99/2 which is typically applied for this region), the calculated sea-ice thickness results in 0.87 m for spring conditions (using equation (1)), while with an observed snow thickness of 0.53 m results in an ice thickness of 1.72 m. Another important point to mention in this context is that the presence of thick snow cover might be biased towards higher values in ice thickness [e.g. *Kwok*, 2014; *Ricker et al.*, 2015]. Again, we advise a closer look into the regional characteristics when data are used in a pan-Arctic context, since the observations from the Atlantic sector differ substantially from those of the western Arctic.

## 6. Conclusion

We have presented a comprehensive data set in which ground-based point measurements from buoys, snow-stakes, or drill holes, are complemented by local scale surveys of ice and snow thickness with EM31 and Magnaprobe, and more regional observations with airborne instruments. The N-ICE2015 expedition took place an ice pack composed of SYI, originating from the Laptev Sea in fall 2013 [*Itkin et al.*, 2017], and FYI formed during the drift of the floes with the Transpolar Drift, with some YI formed in leads. From all observations on the individual floes, we find that the average snow depth from January to March 2015 on *Floes 1* and *2* is  $0.44 \pm 0.14$  m, it shows an increase in April and May 2015 on *Floe 3* to  $0.50 \pm 0.12$  m and a substantial decrease in June 2015 to

$0.31\pm 0.02$  m on *Floe 4*. On the other hand, the average sea ice thickness remained fairly constant (Figure 3), ranging from 1.2-1.3 m (Table 1), until the floes reached the marginal ice zone with strong Atlantic Water influence, where bottom melting occurred (Figure 3).

Irrespective of ice type the modal total snow and ice thickness of 1.6 m and 1.7 m inferred from ground-based EM and airborne EM measurements in April, May, and early June 2015, respectively, lie below the values ranging from 1.8 m to 2.7 m, reported in historical observations from the same region and time of year. Due to exceptional atmospheric circulation events in autumn 2014 and winter 2015 [Cohen *et al.*, 2017], the observed mean snow depth of  $0.53\pm 0.17$  m for April – early June in this region is 73% higher than the average of 0.30 m, ranging from 0.16 to 0.47 m from historical and recent observations (see Table 3).

The thick snow cover affects the sea-ice mass balance on one hand by insulation and slows thermodynamic growth. On the other hand, it leads to negative freeboard of level ice with subsequent flooding and a potential for snow-ice formation. This is exemplified with a positive contribution of snow-ice to the total sea-ice mass balance as found in sea-ice cores collected during N-ICE2015 [Granskog *et al.*, 2017].

Further, snow depth is considered a factor of a high uncertainty in a number of remote sensing and climate modeling applications. Deriving a new pan-Arctic sea-ice snow cover climatology is crucial for further improvement of the satellite based ice thickness products.

The comparison to earlier years suggests that there might be evidence for a regional negative trend in ice thickness and a positive trend for snow depth, while recent observations, i.e. on the INTPART Field School 2017 cruise support that thick snow was not a unique observation. We accept that to some extent we see effects from regional and tem-

poral variability, and to assess this variability, continuous observations of different regions should be performed in the coming years.

The good agreement of measurements on point, local, and regional scales will allow us to take the next step towards upscaling ice classification using satellite images, and make an assessment of the homogeneity of sea-ice cover in the region. This will provide valuable information for sea-ice model parameterizations as well as for sea-ice forecasts, e.g. for navigation and ship route planning in ice.

A repetition of an N-ICE2015-like drift experiment, especially over a longer time period to cover a full cycle of ice growth and ice melt, can be helpful to set our findings on snow and ice thickness in a temporal and spatial context. Prospective expeditions like the planned Multidisciplinary drifting Observatory for the Study of Arctic Climate (MOSAiC) (see science plan at <http://www.mosaic-expedition.org/>) are highly needed and will give additional value to the previous efforts made in Arctic research.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors want to thank Andy Mahoney, the two anonymous reviewers and the editor for their valuable comments which clearly helped to improve the manuscript. We thank the many scientists who collected an incredible amount of observational data. Special thanks to Glen Liston, Jari Haapala, Gunnar Spreen, Jean-Charles Gallet, Nina Maaß, Martine Espeseth, Andrea Gierisch, Annu Oikkonen, Markus Frey, Åse Ervik, Marcel Nicolaus, Chris Polashenski, Anaïs Orsi, and Alexey Shestov. The IMBs and snow buoys were deployed with assistance of Bengt Rotmo, Ottar Skog, Steinar Aksnes, Alf Arne Pettersen, Stephen Hudson, Audun Gjerland, Nina Maaß, Aleksey Pavlov, Gunnar Spreen, Torbjørn Taskjelle, Lana Cohen and Chris Polashenski. We thank Marius Bratrein for his contribution to the HEM surveys and the design of the

hot-wire installations. We also thank the crew and scientists on board *R/V Lance*, as well as the helicopter pilots from Airlift AS, and the crew on *KV Svalbard*. Back-trajectories of floe drifts were calculated by Gunnar Spreen. The authors thank Glen Liston for his valuable comments on the manuscript and Christian Haas, Donald Perovich, and Stefan Kern for digging in their data archives and helping to find unpublished snow and ice data from previous expeditions. This work has been supported by the Norwegian Polar Institute's Centre for Ice, Climate and Ecosystems (ICE) through the project N-ICE. Additional support and some of the buoys were provided through the projects SMOSice (University Hamburg, ESA, project DFG EXC177), ID Arctic (Norw. Ministries of Foreign Affairs), NFR project STASIS (221961/F20), ICE-ARC (FMI, EU, 7th Framework Programme, grant number 603887, Paper-number ICE-ARC-061), and AWI (Helmholtz infrastructure program FRAM). The AWI HEM survey was conducted within the framework of the 'Transitions in the Arctic Seasonal Sea Ice Zone' (TRANSSIZ) project. The INTPART Field School 2017 cruise was funded by the INTPART Arctic Field Summer Schools: Norway-Canada-USA collaboration (NFR project 261786/H30). JK was supported by the Norwegian Research Council project 'CORESAT' (NFR project number 222681). N-ICE acknowledges the in-kind contributions provided by other national and international projects and participating institutions, through personnel, equipment and other support. N-ICE2015 data are available through the Norwegian Polar Data Centre (<https://data.npolar.no>).

## References

- Bintanja, R., and F. M. Selten (2014), Future increases in Arctic precipitation linked to local evaporation and sea-ice retreat, *Nature*, *509*(7501), 479–482, doi:10.1038/nature13259.
- Cohen, L., S. R. Hudson, V. P. Walden, and M. A. Granskog (2017), Meteorological conditions in a thinner Arctic sea ice regime from winter through spring during the Norwegian young sea ICE expedition (N-ICE2015), *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *122*, 7235–7259, doi:10.1002/2016JD026034.
- Comiso, J. C., C. L. Parkinson, R. Gersten, and L. Stock (2008), Accelerated decline in the Arctic sea ice cover, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *35*(1), doi:10.1029/2007gl031972.
- Eicken, H., and J. Meincke (1994), The expedition ARKTIS-IX/1 of RV "Polarstern" in 1993. Reports on Polar Research, Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research, Bremerhaven, 134 .
- Forsström, S., S. Gerland, and C. A. Pedersen (2011), Thickness and density of snow-covered sea ice and hydrostatic equilibrium assumption from in situ measurements in Fram Strait, the Barents Sea and the {Svalbard} coast, *Annals of Glaciology*, *52*(57), 261–270, doi:10.3189/172756411795931598.
- Gallet, J.-C., I. Merkouriadi, G. E. Liston, C. Polashenski, S. R. Hudson, A. Rösel, and S. Gerland (2017), Spring snow conditions on Arctic sea ice north of Svalbard, during the Norwegian young sea ICE (N-ICE2015) expedition, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *122*, doi:10.1002/2016JD026035.
- Gascard, J.-C., J. Festy, H. le Goff, M. Weber, B. Bruemmer, M. Offermann, M. Doble, P. Wadhams, R. Forsberg, S. Hanson, and et al. (2008), Exploring Arctic Transpolar Drift During Dramatic Sea Ice Retreat, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, *89*(3), 21, doi:

10.1029/2008eo030001.

Geiger, C., H.-R. Müller, J. P. Samluk, E. R. Bernstein, and J. Richter-Menge (2015), Impact of spatial aliasing on sea-ice thickness measurements, *Annals of Glaciology*, *56*(69), 53–362, doi:10.3189/2015AoG69A644.

Gerland, S., A. H. H. Renner, F. Godtliobsen, D. Divine, and T. B. Løyning (2008), Decrease of sea ice thickness at Hopen, Barents Sea, during 1966-2007, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *35*(6), doi:10.1029/2007gl032716.

Gerland, S., M. A. Granskog, J. King, and A. Rösel (2017), [data set] N-ICE2015 ice core physics: temperature, salinity and density, doi:10.21334/npolar.2017.c3db82e3.

Girard-Ardhuin, F., and R. Ezraty (2012), Enhanced Arctic sea ice drift estimation merging radiometer and scatterometer data, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, *50*(7), 2639–2648.

Graham, R. M., A. Rinke, L. Cohen, S. R. Hudson, V. P. Walden, M. A. Granskog, W. Dorn, M. Kayser, and M. Maturilli (2017a), A comparison of the two Arctic atmospheric winter states observed during N-ICE2015 and SHEBA, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *122*, 5716–5737, doi:10.1002/2016JD025475.

Graham, R. M., L. Cohen, A. A. Petty, L. N. Boisvert, A. Rinke, S. R. Hudson, M. Nicolaus, and M. A. Granskog (2017b), Increasing frequency and duration of Arctic winter warming events, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *44*, 6974–6983, doi:10.1002/2017GL073395.

Granskog, M., P. Assmy, S. Gerland, G. Spreen, H. Steen, and L. Smedsrud (2016), Arctic Research on Thin Ice: Consequences of Arctic Sea Ice Loss, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, *97*, doi:10.1029/2016eo044097.

- Granskog, M. A., A. Rösel, P. A. Dodd, D. Divine, S. Gerland, T. Martma, and M. J. Leng (2017), Snow contribution to first-year and second-year Arctic sea ice mass balance north of Svalbard, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *122*, 2539–2549, doi:10.1002/2016jc012398.
- Haapala, J., M. Lensu, M. Dumont, A. H. Renner, M. A. Granskog, and S. Gerland (2013), Small-scale horizontal variability of snow, sea-ice thickness and freeboard in the first-year ice region north of Svalbard, *Annals of Glaciology*, *54*(62), 261–266, doi:10.3189/2013aog62a157.
- Haas, C. (2018), Snow thickness transect north of Svalbard, on 2003-04-01, during POLARSTERN cruise ARK-XIX/1 (PS64). Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Center for Polar and Marine Research, Bremerhaven, PANGAEA, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.885359>.
- Haas, C., S. Gerland, H. Eicken, and H. Miller (1997), Comparison of sea-ice thickness measurements under summer and winter conditions in the Arctic using a small electromagnetic induction device, *GEOPHYSICS*, *62*(3), 749–757, doi:10.1190/1.1444184.
- Haas, C., D. Thomas, and J. Bareiss (2001), Surface properties and processes of perennial Antarctic sea ice in summer, *Journal of Glaciology*, *47*(159), 613–625.
- Haas, C., J. Lobach, S. Hendricks, L. Rabenstein, and A. Pfaffling (2009), Helicopter-borne measurements of sea ice thickness, using a small and lightweight, digital EM system, *Journal of Applied Geophysics*, *67*(3), 234–241, doi:10.1016/j.jappgeo.2008.05.005.
- Haas, C., S. Hendricks, H. Eicken, and A. Herber (2010), Synoptic airborne thickness surveys reveal state of Arctic sea ice cover, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *37*(9), doi:10.1029/2010gl042652.
- Haas, C., H. L. Goff, S. Audurain, D. Perovich, and J. Haapala (2011), Comparison of seasonal sea-ice thickness change in the Transpolar Drift observed by local ice mass-balance observations and floe-scale EM surveys, *Annals of Glaciology*, *52*(57), 97–102.

- Hansen, E., S. Gerland, M. A. Granskog, O. Pavlova, A. H. H. Renner, J. Haapala, T. B. Løyning, and M. Tschudi (2013), Thinning of Arctic sea ice observed in Fram Strait: 1990-2011, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *118*(10), 5202–5221, doi:10.1002/jgrc.20393.
- Hansen, E., O.-C. Ekeberg, S. Gerland, O. Pavlova, G. Spreen, and M. Tschudi (2014), Variability in categories of Arctic sea ice in Fram Strait, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *119*(10), 7175–7189, doi:10.1002/2014jc010048.
- Hudson, S. R., L. Cohen, and V. P. Walden (2015), [data set] N-ICE2015 surface meteorology v2, doi:10.21334/npolar.2015.056a61d1.
- Hunke, E. C., W. H. Lipscomb, and A. K. Turner (2010), Sea-ice models for climate study: retrospective and new directions, *Journal of Glaciology*, *56*(200), 1162–1172, doi:10.3189/002214311796406095.
- Itkin, P., G. Spreen, S. R. Hudson, M. A. Granskog, S. Gerland, A. Pavlov, B. Cheng, J. Haapala, M. Doble, M. Nicolaus, L. Kaleschke, J. Wilkinson, and H. Steen (2015), [data set] N-ICE2015 buoy data, doi:10.21334/npolar.2015.6ed9a8ca.
- Itkin, P., G. Spreen, B. Cheng, M. Doble, F. Girard-Ardhuin, J. Haapala, S. Hudson, N. Hughes, L. Kaleschke, M. Nicolaus, and J. Wilkinson (2017), Thin ice and storms: Sea ice deformation from buoy arrays deployed during N-ICE2015, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *122*, 4661–4674, doi:10.1002/2016JC012403.
- Jackson, K., J. Wilkinson, T. Maksym, D. Meldrum, J. Beckers, C. Haas, and D. Mackenzie (2013), A Novel and Low-Cost Sea Ice Mass Balance Buoy, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, *30*(11), 2676–2688, doi:10.1175/jtech-d-13-00058.1.
- Johnson, M., and H. Eicken (2016), Estimating Arctic sea-ice freeze-up and break-up from the satellite record: A comparison of different approaches in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, *Elem*

- Sci Anth.*, 4, 124, doi:10.12952/journal.elementa.000124.
- Kaleschke, L., X. Tian-Kunze, N. Maas, R. Ricker, S. Hendricks, and M. Drusch (2015), Improved retrieval of sea ice thickness from SMOS and CryoSat-2, *IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, doi:10.1109/igarss.2015.7327014.
- King, J., S. Gerland, G. Spreen, and M. Bratrein (2016), [data set] N-ICE2015 sea-ice thickness measurements from helicopter-borne electromagnetic induction sounding, doi:10.21334/npolar.2016.aa3a5232.
- King, J., G. Spreen, S. Gerland, C. Haas, S. Hendricks, L. Kaleschke, and C. Wang (2017), Sea-ice thickness from field measurements in the northwestern Barents Sea, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, doi:10.1002/2016JC012199.
- Kovacs, A., and R. M. Morey (1991), Sounding sea ice thickness using a portable electromagnetic induction instrument, *GEOPHYSICS*, 56(12), 1992–1998, doi:10.1190/1.1443011.
- Kurtz, N. T., S. L. Farrell, M. Studinger, N. Galin, J. P. Harbeck, R. Lindsay, V. D. Onana, B. Panzer, and J. G. Sonntag (2013), Sea ice thickness, freeboard, and snow depth products from Operation IceBridge airborne data, *The Cryosphere*, 7(4), 1035–1056, doi:10.5194/tc-7-1035-2013.
- Kwok, R. (2014), Simulated effects of a snow layer on retrieval of CryoSat-2 sea ice freeboard, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41(14), 5014–5020, doi:10.1002/2014GL060993.
- Kwok, R., and G. F. Cunningham (2015), Variability of Arctic sea ice thickness and volume from CryoSat-2, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 373, doi:10.1098/rsta.2014.0157.
- Kwok, R., and D. A. Rothrock (2009), Decline in Arctic sea ice thickness from submarine and ICESat records: 1958-2008, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36(15), doi:10.1029/2009gl039035.

- Laxon, S. W., K. A. Giles, A. L. Ridout, D. J. Wingham, R. Willatt, R. Cullen, R. Kwok, A. Schweiger, J. Zhang, and C. Haas (2013), CryoSat-2 estimates of Arctic sea ice thickness and volume, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *40*(4), 732–737, doi:10.1002/grl.50193.
- Lindsay, R., and A. Schweiger (2015), Arctic sea ice thickness loss determined using subsurface, aircraft, and satellite observations, *The Cryosphere*, *9*(1), 269–283, doi:10.5194/tc-9-269-2015.
- Maaß, N., L. Kaleschke, X. Tian-Kunze, and M. Drusch (2013), Snow thickness retrieval over thick Arctic sea ice using SMOS satellite data, *The Cryosphere*, *7*(6), 1971–1989, doi:10.5194/tc-7-1971-2013.
- Mahoney, A., S. Gearheard, T. Oshima, and T. Qillaq (2009), Sea Ice Thickness Measurements from a Community-Based Observing Network, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *90*(3), 370–377, doi:10.1175/2008bams2696.1.
- Mahoney, A. R., H. Eicken, Y. Fukamachi, K. I. Ohshima, D. Simizu, C. Kambhamettu, M. V. Rohith, S. Hendricks, and J. Jones (2015), Taking a look at both sides of the ice: comparison of ice thickness and drift speed as observed from moored, airborne and shore-based instruments near Barrow, Alaska, *Annals of Glaciology*, *56*(69), 363–372, doi:10.3189/2015aog69a565.
- Marshall, H. P., G. Koh, M. Sturm, J. Johnson, M. Demuth, C. Landry, J. Deems, and A. Gleason (2006), Spatial variability of the snowpack: Experiences with measurements at a wide range of length scales with several different high precision instruments, *Proc. ISSW 2006*, pp. 359–364.
- Maslanik, J., J. Stroeve, C. Fowler, and W. Emery (2011), Distribution and trends in Arctic sea ice age through spring 2011, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *38*(13), doi:10.1029/2011gl047735.
- Meier, W. N., G. K. Hovelsrud, B. E. H. van Oort, J. R. Key, K. M. Kovacs, C. Michel, C. Haas, M. A. Granskog, S. Gerland, and D. K. Perovich (2014), Arctic sea ice in transformation: A review of recent observed changes and impacts on biology and human activity, *Reviews of*

- Geophysics*, 52(3), 185–217, doi:10.1002/2013rg000431.
- Merkouriadi, I., J.-C. Gallet, G. E. Liston, C. Polashenski, A. Rösel, and S. Gerland (2017a), Winter snow conditions over the Arctic Ocean north of Svalbard during the Norwegian young sea ICE (N-ICE2015) expedition, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122, in press, doi:10.1002/2017JD026753.
- Merkouriadi, I., J.-C. Gallet, G. Liston, C. Polashenski, P. Itkin, J. King, M. Espeseth, A. Gierisch, A. Oikkonen, A. Orsi, and S. Gerland (2017b), [data set] N-ICE2015 snow pit data, doi:10.21334/npolar.2017.d2be5f05.
- Meyer, A., I. Fer, A. Sundfjord, and A. K. Peterson (2017a), Mixing rates and vertical heat fluxes north of Svalbard from Arctic winter to spring, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 122, 4569–4586, doi:10.1002/2016JC012441.
- Meyer, A., A. Sundfjord, I. Fer, C. Provost, N. V. Robineau, Z. Koenig, I. H. Onarheim, L. H. Smedsrud, P. Duarte, P. A. Dodd, R. M. Graham, and H. Kauko (2017b), Winter to summer hydrographic and current observations in the Arctic Ocean north of Svalbard, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 122, in press, doi:10.1002/2016JC012391.
- Nandan, V., T. Geldsetzer, J. Yackel, M. Mahmud, R. Scharien, S. Howell, J. King, R. Ricker, and B. Else (2017), Effect of Snow Salinity on CryoSat-2 Arctic First-Year Sea Ice Freeboard Measurements, *Geophysical Research Letters*, doi:10.1002/2017GL074506, 2017GL074506.
- Newman, T., S. L. Farrell, J. Richter-Menge, L. N. Connor, N. T. Kurtz, B. C. Elder, and D. McAdoo (2014), Assessment of radar-derived snow depth over Arctic sea ice, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119(12), 8578–8602, doi:10.1002/2014JC010284.
- Park, D.-S. R., S. Lee, and S. B. Feldstein (2015), Attribution of the Recent Winter Sea Ice Decline over the Atlantic Sector of the Arctic Ocean, *Journal of Climate*, 28(10), 4027–4033,

doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0042.1.

- Peeken, I. (2015), Station list and links to master tracks in different resolutions of POLARSTERN cruise PS92 (ARK-XXIX/1 TRANSSIZ), Bremerhaven - Longyearbyen, 2015-05-19 - 2015-06-28, doi:10.1594/PANGAEA.848841.
- Perovich, D., J. Richter-Menge, C. Polashenski, B. Elder, T. Arbetter, and O. Brennick (2014), Sea ice mass balance observations from the North Pole Environmental Observatory, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*(6), 2019–2025, doi:10.1002/2014gl059356.
- Perovich, D. K. (2003), Thin and thinner: Sea ice mass balance measurements during SHEBA, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *108*(C3), doi:10.1029/2001jc001079.
- Peterson, A. K., I. Fer, M. G. McPhee, and A. Randelhoff (2017), Turbulent Heat and Momentum Fluxes in the Upper Ocean Under Arctic Sea Ice, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *122*, 1439–1456, doi:10.1002/2016JC012283.
- Pfaffhuber, A. A., S. Hendricks, and Y. A. Kvistedal (2012), Progressing from 1D to 2D and 3D near-surface airborne electromagnetic mapping with a multisensor, airborne sea-ice explorer, *GEOPHYSICS*, *77*(4), WB109–WB117, doi:10.1190/geo2011-0375.1.
- Polashenski, C., D. Perovich, J. Richter-Menge, and B. Elder (2011), Seasonal Ice Mass-Balance Buoys: Adapting tools to the changing Arctic, *Annals of Glaciology*, *52*(57), 9.
- Provost, C., N. Sennéchaël, J. Miguet, P. Itkin, A. Rösel, Z. Koenig, N. Villacieros, and M. A. Granskog (2017), Observations of flooding and snow-ice formation in a thinner Arctic sea ice regime during the N-ICE2015 campaign: Influence of basal ice melt and storms, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, doi:10.1002/2016JC012011.
- Radionov, V. F., N. N. Bryazgin, and E. I. Alexandrov (1997), The Snow cover of the Arctic Basin, *Tech. Rep. Tech. Rep. APL-UW-TR 9701*, Appl. Phys. Lab., Univ. of Wash., Seattle,

Wash.

- Renner, A. H. H., S. Hendricks, S. Gerland, J. Beckers, C. Haas, and T. Krumpfen (2013), Large-scale ice thickness distribution of first-year sea ice in spring and summer north of Svalbard, *Annals of Glaciology*, *54*(62), 13–18, doi:10.3189/2013aog62a146.
- Renner, A. H. H., S. Gerland, C. Haas, G. Spreen, J. F. Beckers, E. Hansen, M. Nicolaus, and H. Goodwin (2014), Evidence of Arctic sea ice thinning from direct observations, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*(14), 5029–5036, doi:10.1002/2014gl060369.
- Richter-Menge, J. A., and S. L. Farrell (2013), Arctic sea ice conditions in spring 2009–2013 prior to melt, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *40*(22), 5888–5893, doi:10.1002/2013GL058011, 2013GL058011.
- Ricker, R., S. Hendricks, D. K. Perovich, V. Helm, and R. Gerdes (2015), Impact of snow accumulation on CryoSat-2 range retrievals over Arctic sea ice: An observational approach with buoy data, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *42*(11), 4447–4455, doi:10.1002/2015GL064081, 2015GL064081.
- Ricker, R., S. Hendricks, L. Kaleschke, X. Tian-Kunze, J. King, and C. Haas (2017), A weekly Arctic sea-ice thickness data record from merged CryoSat-2 and SMOS satellite data, *The Cryosphere*, *11*(4), 1607–1623, doi:10.5194/tc-11-1607-2017.
- Rinke, A., M. Maturilli, R. M. Graham, M. H., D. Handorf, L. Cohen, S. R. Hudson, and J. C. Moore (2017), Extreme cyclone events in the Arctic: Wintertime variability and trends, *Environmental Research Letters*, *12*(9), doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa7def.
- Romanov, I. P. (1996), *Atlas of Ice and Snow of the Arctic Basin and Siberian Shelf Seas*, vol. 211 pp. and 250 charts, Backbone Publishing.

- Romanov, I. P. (2004), Morphometric Characteristics of Ice and Snow in the Arctic Basin: Aircraft Landing Observations from the Former Soviet Union, 1928-1989, Version 1., doi:10.7265/N5B8562T, [Accessed July, 2017].
- Rösel, A., and J. King (2017), [data set] N-ICE2015 ice thickness, snow thickness, and freeboard from thickness drillings, doi:10.21334/npolar.2017.25f70db1.
- Rösel, A., P. Itkin, D. Divine, J. A. King, M. Nicolaus, C. M. Polashenski, G. E. Liston, S. Gerland, M. A. Granskog, A. Ervik, J.-C. Gallet, A. Gierisch, J. Haapala, A. Oikkonen, and G. Spreen (2016a), [data set] N-ICE2015 snow thickness from snow stakes, doi:10.21334/npolar.2016.3099ea95.
- Rösel, A., M. Bratrein, J. A. King, P. Itkin, D. Divine, A. Ervik, J.-C. Gallet, A. Gierisch, J. Haapala, A. Oikkonen, G. E. Liston, M. Nicolaus, C. M. Polashenski, G. Spreen, S. Gerland, M. A. Granskog, and D. Perovich (2016b), [data set] N-ICE2015 ice thickness from hot wires, doi:10.21334/npolar.2016.263a317f.
- Rösel, A., D. Divine, J. A. King, M. Nicolaus, G. Spreen, P. Itkin, C. M. Polashenski, G. E. Liston, A. Ervik, M. Espeseth, A. Gierisch, J. Haapala, N. Maas, A. Oikkonen, A. Orsi, A. Shestov, C. Wang, S. Gerland, and M. A. Granskog (2016c), [data set] N-ICE2015 total (snow and ice) thickness data from EM31, doi:10.21334/npolar.2016.70352512.
- Rösel, A., C. M. Polashenski, G. E. Liston, J. A. King, M. Nicolaus, J.-C. Gallet, D. Divine, P. Itkin, G. Spreen, A. Ervik, M. Espeseth, A. Gierisch, J. Haapala, N. Maas, A. Oikkonen, A. Orsi, A. Shestov, C. Wang, S. Gerland, and M. A. Granskog (2016d), [data set] N-ICE2015 snow depth data with Magna Probe, doi:10.21334/npolar.2016.3d72756d.
- Schünemann, H., and I. Werner (2005), Ice station data during POLARSTERN expeditions ARK-XVIII/2 and ARK-XIX/1 to Fram Strait, the western Barents Sea and north of Svalbard,

- doi:10.1594/PANGAEA.855170, supplement to: Schünemann, H; Werner, I (2004): Seasonal variations in distribution patterns of sympagic meiofauna in Arctic pack ice. *Marine Biology*, 146(6), 1091-1102, doi:10.1007/s00227-004-1511-7.
- Spreen, G., S. Kern, D. Stammer, and E. Hansen (2009), Fram Strait sea ice volume export estimated between 2003 and 2008 from satellite data, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36(19), L19,502, doi:10.1029/2009gl039591.
- Stroeve, J., M. M. Holland, W. Meier, T. Scambos, and M. Serreze (2007), Arctic sea ice decline: Faster than forecast, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34(9), L09,501, doi:10.1029/2007gl029703.
- Stroeve, J. C., T. Markus, L. Boisvert, J. Miller, and A. Barrett (2014), Changes in Arctic melt season and implications for sea ice loss, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41(4), 1216–1225, doi:10.1002/2013GL058951, 2013GL058951.
- Sturm, M. (2002), Winter snow cover on the sea ice of the Arctic Ocean at the Surface Heat Budget of the Arctic Ocean (SHEBA): Temporal evolution and spatial variability, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 107(C10), doi:10.1029/2000jc000400.
- Sturm, M., and J. Holmgren (1999), Self-recording snow depth probe, *Tech. rep.*, US patent number: 5,864,059.
- Sturm, M., and R. A. Massom (2009), *Snow and Sea Ice, in Sea Ice, Second Edition* (eds D. N. Thomas and G. S. Dieckmann), Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, UK, doi:10.1002/9781444317145.ch5.
- Wang, C., M. A. Granskog, S. R. Hudson, S. Gerland, A. K. Pavlov, D. K. Perovich, and M. Nicolaus (2016), Atmospheric conditions in the central Arctic Ocean through the melt seasons of 2012 and 2013: Impact on surface conditions and solar energy deposition into the ice-ocean system, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121(3), 1043–1058, doi:

10.1002/2015jd023712.

Warren, S. G., I. G. Rigor, N. Untersteiner, V. F. Radionov, N. N. Bryazgin, Y. I. Aleksandrov, and R. Colony (1999), Snow Depth on Arctic Sea Ice, *Journal of Climate*, *12*(6), 1814–1829, doi:10.1175/1520-0442.

Webster, M. A., I. G. Rigor, S. V. Nghiem, N. T. Kurtz, S. L. Farrell, D. K. Perovich, and M. Sturm (2014), Interdecadal changes in snow depth on Arctic sea ice, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *119*(8), 5395–5406, doi:10.1002/2014jc009985.

Weeks, W., and S. Ackley (1986), *The growth, structure and properties of sea ice*, vol. The geophysics of sea ice, Plenum Press, New York (Nato ASI B146).

Woods, C., and R. Caballero (2016), The Role of Moist Intrusions in Winter Arctic Warming and Sea Ice Decline, *Journal of Climate*, *29*(12), 4473–4485, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-15-0773.1.

**Figure 1.** Trajectories of the four N-ICE2015 drifts in the area north of Svalbard. The background is sea-ice concentration (black is 0%; white is 100% sea-ice concentration) from 15 May 2015 based on SSM/I data, calculated with ASI algorithm, provided by ICDC, University Hamburg.

**Table 1.** Temporal coverage and initial conditions (measured at time of deployment) of IMBs, snow buoys, snow stakes, and hotwire fields deployed during N-ICE2015 on all floes. For sampling with EM31/Magnaprobe (MP), mean thickness is

calculated from EM31 measurements, subtracted by snow depth (description in the text) and shown with standard deviation over the given period. Please note that standard deviations for point measurements are temporal while they are spatial for line measurements. Line i stands for independent measurements, line r stand for repeated transect lines. The difference ( $\Delta$ ) is calculated from the first and the last transect on a floe and normalized to a 30 day period to make numbers inter-comparable.

\* Ice type is an estimation, derived from initial snow and ice thicknesses, \*\*likely deformed ice, \*\*\* last date where snow and ice data was transmitted, the buoy drifted into Fram Strait until 12.09.2015

Floe	Instrument	Type	start date dd.mm.	end date dd.mm.	days	ice type	initial snow depth (m)	initial ice thickness (m)	mean snow depth (m)	mean ice thickness (m)	$\Delta$ snow (m) per 30 days	$\Delta$ ice (m) per 30 days
Floe 1	WAVE-2015b	point	16.01.	23.02.	39	FYI*	0.15±0.05	0.82±0.09	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	SIMBA-2015a	point	15.01.	12.03.	57	SYI*	0.59±0.09	1.33	0.53±0.08	1.26±0.12	-0.15	-0.13
	SIMBA-2015b	point	15.01.	13.03.	58	SYI*	0.44±0.08	1.28±0.01	0.39±0.04	1.35±0.02	0.00	0.00
	SIMBA-2015c	point	26.01.	23.02.	29	SYI*	0.21±0.06	1.49	n/a	1.53±0.04	n/a	-0.11
	SIMBA-2015f	point	24.01.	17.02.	25	FYI	0.35±0.14	1.08	0.51±0.07	0.95±0.02	0.10	0.13
	SIMBA-2015g	point	31.01.	28.02.	29	n/a	0.41±0.03	1.08	0.43±0.04	1.14±0.05	0.02	-0.04
	SNOW-2015a	point	23.01.	21.02.	25	FYI	0.32±0.02	0.90	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	HW1/SS1	point	23.01.	16.02.	25	FYI	0.55±0.13	0.94±0.10	0.57±0.15	0.95±0.09	0.13	0.05
	HW2/SS2	point	27.01.	16.02.	21	FYI	0.22±0.04	0.94±0.04	0.28±0.10	0.56±0.10	0.20	0.23
	HW4/SS4	point	27.01.	16.02.	21	SYI	0.02	1.29±0.05	0.43±0.04	1.29±0.01	0.10	0.00
Floe 2	EM31/MP	line i	15.01.	17.02.	34	mixed	0.36±0.11	1.41±0.14	0.41±0.19	1.47±0.63	n/a	n/a
	EM31/MP	line r	24.01.	15.02.	23	SYI	0.30	1.17	0.35±0.14	0.98±0.29	0.08	0.08
	EM31/MP	line i	24.01.	15.02.	23	SYI	0.49	1.08±0.33	0.52±0.12	1.75±0.57	0.04	0.11
	Average Floe 1						0.34±0.16	1.08±0.33	0.44±0.10	1.20±0.33	-0.02	0.02
	SIMBA-2015d	point	07.03.	25.04.	49	SYI	0.42	1.30	0.43±0.03	1.26±0.02	0.04	n/a
Floe 3	SNOW-2015b	point	01.03.	25.04.	55	SYI	0.34	1.34	0.41±0.03	1.21±0.87	n/a	n/a
	IMB-B-2015b	point	24.02.	19.03.	24	mixed	n/a	n/a	0.56±0.17	1.21±0.87	0.04	n/a
	EM31/MP	line i	26.02.	09.03.	14	mixed	0.52	1.44	0.54±0.19	1.23±0.79	0.03	-0.08
	SS5	point	02.03.	19.03.	18	SYI	0.36±0.04	n/a	0.33±0.02	n/a	-0.07	n/a
	SS6	point	27.02.	17.03.	22	FYI	0.33±0.04	n/a	0.37±0.03	n/a	0.10	n/a
	Average Floe 2						0.40±0.08	1.36±0.07	0.44±0.09	1.23±0.03	-0.23	-0.38
	SIMBA-2015c	point	24.04.	07.06.	45	SYI	0.61	1.79	0.60±0.08	1.77±0.11	n/a	n/a
Floe 4	SNOW-2015b	point	23.04.	07.06.	45	SYI	0.42	n/a	0.47±0.02	0.50±0.10	n/a	-0.47
	IMB-B-2015b	point	08.05.	11.06.	36	FYI	0.02	0.62	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	EM31/MP	line i	19.05.	06.07.***	53	FYI	0.28	1.05	0.35±0.03	1.45±0.82	-0.01	n/a
	SNOW-2015c	point	20.04.	11.06.	53	n/a	0.33	1.25	0.39±0.02	n/a	0.04	n/a
	SNOW-2015e	point	21.04.	11.06.	54	n/a	0.32	1.34	0.43±0.24	1.45±0.82	n/a	n/a
	EM31/MP	line i	18.04.	05.06.	49	mixed	n/a	n/a	0.53±0.17	1.56±0.51	-0.03	-0.06
	EM31/MP	line r	27.04.	04.06.	42	mixed	0.57	1.43	0.55±0.01	1.45±0.05	0.02	-0.10
	HW7/SS7	point	29.04.	31.05.	37	SYI*	0.55±0.17	1.47±0.11	0.70±0.01	1.45±0.03	-0.01	-0.08
	HW8/SS8	point	04.05.	04.06.	28	SYI*	0.70±0.10	1.08±0.17	0.50±0.12	1.30±0.4	n/a	n/a
	Average Floe 3						0.42±0.21	1.27±0.33	0.29±0.18	1.36±0.76	n/a	n/a
EM31/MP	line i	10.06.	18.06.	9	mixed	n/a	n/a	0.32±0.20	1.36±0.76	n/a	n/a	
EM31/MP	line r	11.06.	16.06.	6	mixed	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.33±0.41	n/a	-2.37	
HW9	point	08.06.	18.06.	11	FYI**	n/a	1.74±0.04	0.31±0.02	1.29±0.09	n/a	n/a	
Average Floe 4							1.74±0.04	0.31±0.02	1.29±0.09	n/a	n/a	

**Table 2.** Total snow and ice thickness from HEM surveys. Times are UTC. Second mode in brackets is included where one exists. Mode and mean thickness with standard deviation for all surveys from *Floe 3* and *4* are calculated from all of the data points.

Date	Start lon/lat	Thickness mode (m)	Thickness mean (m)	Notes
15.04.2015	19.81/81.95	1.9 (0.1)	1.8±0.9	Reconnaissance flight
19.04.2015	14.26/83.15	1.8	2.1±0.8	
24.04.2015	15.37/82.75	1.7 (0.1)	1.7±0.8	Local area survey
24.04.2015	15.30/82.73	1.7 (0.3)	1.8±1.0	
28.04.2015	13.96/82.18	1.8 (0.1)	1.8±0.9	Local area survey
29.04.2015	13.57/82.07	1.5	1.9±1.0	
30.04.2015	13.30/82.00	1.9 (0.2)	2.1±1.1	
05.05.2015	13.20/81.80	1.7 (0.2)	1.6±0.9	Local area survey
05.05.2015	13.43/81.79	1.7 (0.3)	1.9±0.9	
05.05.2015	13.23/81.77	1.8 (0.2)	1.9±1.0	
06.05.2015	13.32/81.76	1.8 (0.1)	1.9±1.0	
06.05.2015	13.13/81.79	0.1 (1.8)	1.4±1.0	Long track east
08.05.2015	12.03/81.63	1.7 (0.1)	1.7±1.1	
11.05.2015	9.85/81.40	1.5 (0.3)	1.8±0.8	
12.05.2015	9.53/81.36	0.3 (1.3)	1.4±1.0	Local area survey/buoy overflight
18.05.2015	9.61/81.28	2.0 (0.1)	1.6±1.1	Long track south-east
08.06.2015	19.30/81.10	1.4 (0.1)	1.5±0.9	
All Flights		1.7 (0.1)	1.8±0.9	

**Table 3.** Snow and Ice thickness from historical and recent observations in the area north of Svalbard during April to early June.

Date	Expedition	Mean snow depth (m)	Mean sea ice thickness (m)	Modal total thickness (m)	Reference
April 1955	“Sever” Aircraft landings	0.16±0.16	0.94±0.42	n/a	Romanov [1996]
April 1974	“Sever” Aircraft landings	0.38±0.12	2.92±0.11	n/a	Romanov [1996]
April 1975	“Sever” Aircraft landings	0.29±0.13	2.28±0.49	n/a	Romanov [1996]
April 1976	“Sever” Aircraft landings	0.46±0.08	2.33±0.10	n/a	Romanov [1996]
April 1977	“Sever” Aircraft landings	0.45±0.16	2.6	n/a	Romanov [1996]
April 1978	“Sever” Aircraft landings	0.16±0.01	2.75±0.35	n/a	Romanov [1996]
April/May 1979	“Sever” Aircraft landings	0.2±0.09	1.93±0.65	n/a	Romanov [1996]
April/May 1954-91	Climatology	0.37	n/a	n/a	Warren et al. [1999], N-ICE2015 area
March 1993	PS ARKTIS IX/1	0.25±0.27	2.56±0.43	n/a	Eicken and Meincke [1994]
1 April 2003	PS ARKTIS IXI/1	0.17±0.08	n/a	n/a	Haas [2018]
April 2003	PS ARKTIS IXI/1	0.18±0.14	1.96±0.43	n/a	Schünemann and Werner [2005]
18 May - 4 June 2005	Fram Strait	0.32±0.22	2.5±1.1 (total ice and snow)	2.6±1.7	Renner et al. [2014]
10 - 30 April 2007	Fram Strait	0.47±0.24	2.5±0.9 (total ice and snow)	n/a	Renner et al. [2014]
April/May 2005/7/8	Fram Strait	0.30±0.19	1.88±0.83	n/a	Forsström et al. [2014]
16 April - 1 June 2008	Fram Strait	0.39±0.22	3.2±1.1 (total ice and snow)	2.7±1.6	Renner et al. [2014]
April 2009	Polar 5 flight	n/a	n/a	2.4	Haas et al. [2010]
April/May 2011	ICE2011	0.36±0.26	n/a	1.8	Haapala et al. [2013]
April/May 2011	KVS2011/ICE2011	0.32	n/a	1.8	Renner et al. [2013]
February 2014	N-ICE Testcruise	0.20±0.08	0.80 (mode, FYI)	n/a	unpublished data, NPI
April-June 2015	N-ICE2015	0.53±0.17	1.56±0.51	1.7	this paper, <i>Floe 3</i> , EM31/MP(i)
May 2017	INTPART Cruise	0.41±0.23	1.65±0.50	n/a	unpublished data, NPI

**Figure 2.** Sketches of the four N-ICE2015 ice stations (*Floes 1-4*) with their sea-ice mass balance related installations and tracks.

Accepted Article

**Figure 3.** Temperature profile (a) and thermal resistivity proxy profile (b) for SIMBA\_2015c, deployed on 24 April 2015 on *Floe 3*. The black dashed lines show initial values at deployment, the white lines overlaid are the calculated interfaces (as in [Provost et al., 2017]). The dashed white line shows the surface of the slush layer, which may be transformed into an snow-ice layer. The slush layer is defined by the thermal resistivity proxy (b). The distance on the y-axis is the distance on the thermistor chain. Towards the end of the time series bottom melt and flooding is observed. Missing or noisy data are masked as gray.

**Figure 4.** a) and b) Photo and schematic of a combined hot-wire and snow-stake field: red squares are the positions of hot-wires, blue circle is the grounding wire. Black squares show the 9 snow-stakes. c) Schematic of a hot-wire and the grounding wire, connected prior to the measurement to a generator.

**Figure 5.** a) Snow depth and b) sea-ice thickness, extracted from IMBs, snow buoys, snow-stake fields (SS), and hot-wire fields (HW) during N-ICE2015. The error-bars represent the standard deviations. The purple shading in the background indicates storm events, labeled as M (major) and m (minor) storms according to *Cohen et al.* [2017]. The stars show major snow fall events [*Cohen et al.*, 2017]. Note that before 2 February 2015 no precipitation data, and between 18 March and 18 April 2015 no wind speed and no precipitation data are available.

Accepted Article

**Figure 6.** Snow and ice thickness distributions from independent measurements (left) and repeated measurements (middle) for all *Floes*. SYI and FYI is only distinguished for *Floe 1* on all repeated transects, for *Floe 2, 3, and 4* the distributions contain a mixture of SYI and FYI. The right column displays calculated freeboard from the independent measurements of each floe. The gray shaded areas indicate the values that fall in the uncertainty range of  $\pm 0.06$  m based on  $\pm 1$  STD. The bins in the pdfs are centered and bin size for ice thickness is 0.10 m, for snow depth 0.05 m, for freeboard 0.01 m. All distributions represent both, spatial and temporal variability.

**Figure 7.** Snow pits with flooded snow pack on *Floe 4* on 14 June 2015 on three different sites. a) Close to the ship, water level at 0.075 m, wet snow until 0.14 m, total snow depth 0.30 m. b) Water level at 0.13 m, wet snow until 0.19 m, total snow depth 0.53 m. c) Water level at 0.06 m, wet snow until 0.09 m, total snow depth 0.34 m.




figs/8\_hemmap.png

**Figure 8.** HEM surveys carried out in the N-ICE region between 15 April and 08 June 2015. The flight at 82°N/20°E was a reconnaissance flight on the way the start position of the 3rd drift. The background is sea-ice concentration (black is 0%; white is 100% sea-ice concentration) from 15 May 2015 based on SSM/I data, calculated with ASI algorithm, provided by ICDC, University Hamburg.


**Figure 9.** a) Probability density functions of all independent EM31 and HEM ice and snow thickness measurements during *Floe 3* (April – early June 2015). Average ice thickness from buoys SIMBA\_2015c and IMB-B\_2015b are marked by a black line. b) Probability density functions of independent EM31 and HEM ice and snow thickness measurements from AWI flight on 8 June 2015 over *Floe 4*.

**Figure 10.** Scatter-plot of freeboard measured in situ at drill holes [Rösel and King, 2017] versus the calculated freeboard using equation (1) for all 4 floes. The uncertainties based on  $\pm 1$  STD of  $\pm 0.02$  m for measured freeboard and  $\pm 0.06$  m for calculated freeboard around 0.0 m are shaded light gray.


**Figure 11.** a) Mean snow thickness, b) mean sea-ice thickness, and c) mean and modal total thickness values from historical and recent observations in the area north of Svalbard, as listed in Table 3. The error-bars present the standard deviation.




Floe 1




Floe 2







Floe 3



Floe 4 – FYI/SYI patchwork







This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

