Downwasting of the debris-covered area of Lirung Glacier in Langtang Valley, Nepal Himalaya, from 1974 to 2010
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Abstract
Despite the widespread shrinkage of debris-covered Himalayan glaciers in recent decades, the underlying processes driving these changes are poorly understood. This study presents recent mass-balance data for the debris-covered area of Lirung Glacier in Langtang Valley, Nepal Himalaya, constrained using multi-temporal, remotely sensed digital elevation models calibrated to in situ GPS survey data, and surface-flow velocity data from phase-only correlation. The results indicate surface lowering of between \(1.3\) and \(1.8\) m a\(^{-1}\) during the study period (1974–2010), with accelerated glacier thinning after 2000. Similarly, we observed a decline in emergence velocity in the upper debris-covered area since 2000. We argue that this deceleration plays a key role in surface lowering, in contrast to declining surface mass balance, which we suggest is a residual effect of emergence velocity and surface lowering. Taken together, our findings indicate that the recent increase in surface lowering is attributable to the declining flux of ice from the upper to lower debris-covered areas of Lirung Glacier. Furthermore, this pattern suggests that downwasting of the upper debris-covered area will be augmented by a positive feedback between surface lowering and decelerated flow velocity.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd and INQUA. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Recent changes in the volume of Himalayan glaciers not only have important implications for regional hydrology but also are spatially heterogeneous (e.g. Fujita and Nuimura, 2011; Gardelle et al., 2012a; Kääb et al., 2012). Consequently, high-resolution measurements on mass changes are required to better understand the state and fate of glaciers. However, the mass balance of debris-covered glaciers, which are the dominant glacier type in the Himalayas, is complicated by variations in supraglacial debris thickness (e.g. Nakawo and Young, 1981; Mattson et al., 1993). In situ observations have demonstrated that supraglacial material generally serves to suppress surface melting (Mattson et al., 1993; Nicholson and Benn, 2006; Zhang et al., 2011). However, recent studies utilizing remotely sensed data have suggested that debris-covered and debris-free glaciers have experienced a similar magnitude of thinning in the Himalayas (Gardelle et al., 2012a; Kääb et al., 2012; Nuimura et al., 2012). This pattern is thought to result from the formation of heat-trapping supraglacial ponds and ice cliffs, which act as hotspots and enhance ice melting beneath the debris cover (Sakai et al., 1998, 2000, 2002; Brun et al., 2016; Miles et al., 2016). In contrast, the simplified model simulations of Banerjee (2017) indicate that debris-covered glaciers exhibit similar rates of surface lowering to debris-free glaciers, due to the temporal evolution of emergence velocity profiles.

Throughout the Himalayas, regional changes in debris-covered glaciers have been evaluated using differences of remote sensing-derived digital elevation models (RS-DEMs) (Berthier et al., 2007; Bolch et al., 2011; Gardelle et al., 2012a) or a combination of multiple RS-DEMs calibrated with field surveys (Nuimura et al., 2012). For instance, a number of studies of the Khumbu region of Nepal have shown that glacier thinning has accelerated since 2000 (Bolch et al., 2011; Gardelle et al., 2012a). In central Nepal, numerous glaciological studies have evaluated the recent evolution of debris-covered glaciers in the Langtang region. For instance, in the study of Lirung Glacier, which is the focus of the present paper, Naito et al. (2002) used field data to calculate a surface-lowering rate of \(1.2\) m a\(^{-1}\) during the period 1996–1999 following a period of stability in the late 1980s. Over the past decade, geodetic measurements have been performed on glaciers in the Langtang region, Pellicciotti et al. (2015), for example, employed geodetic data to estimate an average mass balance of \(0.32\) ± \(0.18\) m a\(^{-1}\).
water equivalent (w.e.) $a^{-1}$ for five debris-covered glaciers in the Langtang basin during the period 1974–2000. Furthermore, they reported surface-elevation changes of $-0.61 \pm 0.20$ m $a^{-1}$ over the debris-covered tongue of Lirung Glacier. Having extended the analysis period to 2015, Ragetti et al. (2016) reported an average geodetic mass balance for Langtang glaciers of $-0.21 \pm 0.08$ m w.e. $a^{-1}$ for the period 1974–2006 and $-0.38 \pm 0.17$ m w.e. $a^{-1}$ for 2006–2015, pointing out that considerable variability exists among individual glaciers. Focusing on the Lirung Glacier ablation zone, Ragetti et al. (2016) calculated elevation changes of $-1.03 \pm 0.05$ m $a^{-1}$ for the period 1974–2006 and $-1.67 \pm 0.59$ m $a^{-1}$ for the period 2006–2015, and also suggested that surface lowering has accelerated in recent years.

Recent refinements of survey technology have enabled high-accuracy measurements of glacier variability over relatively short time periods. For example, by deploying an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV), Immerzeel et al. (2014) created super-high resolution ortho-mosaics and DEMs of the debris-covered terminus of Lirung Glacier for May and October 2013. They then used these data to evaluate elevation changes over the lower half of the debris-covered area, which are reported as $-1.09$ m per 5 months (Immerzeel et al., 2014). The authors also documented intense backwasting of supraglacial ice cliffs, thereby confirming the findings of a previous study (Sakai et al., 2000, 2002), and calculated a surface velocity of 2.5 m per 5 months (Immerzeel et al., 2014). Kraaijenbrink et al. (2016) extended the analysis with additional UAV-derived aerial photography taken in May 2014, and evaluated seasonal changes in surface velocity as 6.0 m $a^{-1}$ in summer and 2.5 m $a^{-1}$ in winter. In this way, studies made over the past decade have revealed high-resolution changes in surface elevation and flow velocity on both long and short time scales, thanks to recent technological advances in geodetic measurements and image processing. Nonetheless, the evaluation of glacial state from the viewpoints of mass balance and ice dynamics remains poorly understood. Moreover, the remotely sensed DEMs used in geodetic measurements have room for improvement through calibration against in situ GPS surveys.

In general, variations in glacier surface elevation are a consequence of changing surface mass balance and emergence velocity, which results from differences in ice flux into and out of a specific area (Cuffey and Paterson, 2010). Conversely, average or entire surface mass balance can be estimated from difference between changes in surface elevation and in emergence velocity. This method leads to elucidate contributing factors (surface mass balance or emergence velocity) to surface elevation changes. This is also useful to evaluate representative surface mass balance of debris-covered glaciers where surface mass balance is difficult to be observed by the conventional stake method because of inaccessibility or heterogeneous surface conditions of the debris-covered area. Several previous studies have attempted this approach in the Alps (Berthier and Vincent, 2012) and the Himalaya (Nuimura et al., 2011; Vincent et al., 2016). In this study, we apply this method to a debris-covered glacier in Langtang Valley for the first time.

In the present study, we used multi-temporal DEMs (12 DEMs for the period 1974–2010) to extend the temporal coverage of surface-elevation change over the debris-covered ablation zone of Lirung Glacier in Langtang Valley, Nepal Himalaya. The advanced point of our analysis of DEMs is a calibration of remotely sensed DEMs using in situ GPS data. In addition, we explore potential factors contributing to surface lowering via a continuity equation, in which mass balance is calculated as the residual of elevation change and surface velocity, both of which are derived from satellite imagery and field surveys.

### 2. Study area

Lirung Glacier is located in Langtang Valley, ~60 km north of Kathmandu (Fig. 1). Below its accumulation zone on the south face of Mt. Langtang Lirung (7234 m a.s.l.), the glacier comprises a 4-km-long debris-covered ablation zone that passes beneath a steep bare rock slope (4400–4600 m elevation) (Naito et al., 2002). Similarly, glaciers throughout the Langtang Valley are typically mantled with debris below 5200 m a.s.l. (Ragetti et al., 2016). In addition, many of supraglacial ponds and ice cliffs are located the ablation zone (Sakai et al., 2000). Meteorological observations since the 1980s indicate that the majority of precipitation occurs during the summer months (e.g., 670 mm between June and September, corresponding to 55% of annual precipitation) (Seko, 1987); consequently, the region is characterized by “summer-accumulation-type” glaciation. Because accumulation and ablation both peak during the summer months, glaciers of this type are inherently more sensitive to changes in air temperature than winter-accumulation-type glaciers (Fujita and Ageta, 2000; Fujita, 2008). In Langtang Valley, multi-decadal mass-balance data for the neighboring Yala Glacier show accelerated glacier shrinkage since the 1980s (Fujita et al., 2006; Fujita and Nuimura, 2011; Sugiyama et al., 2013), the temporal pattern is supported by reanalysis of remotely sensed data (Ragetti et al., 2016).

### 3. Data and methods

#### 3.1. Survey data

We used single frequency, carrier-phase differential GPS...
(ProMark3, Magellan) to conduct surveys in September and October of 2008. One receiver was set at a fixed base at Kyangjin Village (3880 m a.s.l.; Fig. 1) and three additional receivers were used to survey on and around the debris-covered ablation area of Lirung Glacier. GPS data were post-processed using Global Navigation Satellite Systems Solutions software (Ashtech) and projected in the Universal Transverse Mercator projection (UTM, zone 45N, WGS-84 reference system). Measurement accuracy of a similar DGPS survey of the Bhutan Himalaya was reported as 0.11 m and 0.17 m for the horizontal and vertical axes, respectively (Fujita et al., 2008).

Measurement data for 1996 and 2008 were co-registered by referring to benchmarks located on bedrock adjacent to the glacier (Fig. 1). The benchmarks were installed in the 1980s and their relative positions surveyed using a theodolite equipped with a laser distance finder (Aoki and Asahi, 1998). Co-registered data were converted to 30-m resolution digital elevation models (DEMs), hereafter referred to as DEM96 and DEM08 for the 1996 and 2008 data respectively (Fig. 2), which in turn were used to calculate changes in glacier surface height. This conversion was carried out by regularized spline with tension, employing GRASS-GIS (Mitasova and Mitas, 1993). Grid cells with no surveyed points were excluded so as to preclude erroneous interpolation or extrapolation. We used DEM08 as a reference for calibrating multitemporal, remotely sensed DEMs (RS-DEMs).

### 3.2. Remotely sensed DEMs

We used five types of RS-DEM (12 DEMs in total) for the period 1974–2010 (Table 1). Although declassified KH-9 Hexagon satellite imagery is capable of producing high-resolution (6–10 m) stereo photogrammetry, the process is complicated by image distortion. To counter this effect, Surazakov and Aizen (2010) developed a method to correct for sensor distortion that utilizes IDL programming language implemented in ENVI software. We adopted their correction program for pre-processing of the Hexagon images acquired in 1974 and 1979, with which we generated two Hexagon DEMs (hereafter RS-DEM74 and RS-DEM79, respectively). Stereo photogrammetry processing was performed using Leica Photogrammetric Suite (LPS) 2010 from ERDAS, with 3D monitor, according to the methodology developed by Lamsal et al. (2011, 2016).

To generate a DEM for 1992 (hereafter RS-DEM92), we employed a 1: 50,000 scale topographic map based on aerial photography from that year, which was originally published by the Survey Department of Nepal. We converted the digitized 40 m-contour interval data to a 30-m-resolution DEM using a regularized spline with tension (Mitášová and Mitáš, 1993). The reported horizontal accuracy of the map-derived DEM is ~18 m (Salerno et al., 2008).

We used the Shuttle Radar Topographic Mission (SRTM) DEM, corrected in February 2000 (https://dds.cr.usgs.gov/srtm/version2-1/; last accessed on 19 October 2016), as our data set for that year (hereafter RS-DEM00). Specifically, we resampled the original SRTM3 data (3 arcsec, ~90 m) at 30 m resolution (UTM, zone 45N, WGS-84 reference system) using bilinear interpolation implemented in the GeoSpatial Data Abstraction Library (GDAL). Two previous studies used this DEM to determine ice surface elevations in 1999 due to penetration of the SRTM C-band radar into surface snow (Gardelle et al., 2012b; Kaab et al., 2012). In our study, we considered the DEM as the surface height in 2000 because of our targeted debris-covered surface.

To create DEMs for 2001, 2003, and 2004 (hereafter RS-DEM01, RS-DEM03, and RS-DEM04, respectively), we selected cloud-free scenes from Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission Reflection Radiometer (ASTER) imagery, provided by the Japanese Earth Remote Sensing Data Analysis Center (ERSDAC). Further details on the generation of these DEMs are given by Fujisada et al. (2005) and Toutin (2008), in addition to the ASTER science project website (http://www.aster.jspacesystems.or.jp/en/; last accessed on 13 October 2016). For our most recent DEMs, we used the Advanced Land Observing Satellite Panchromatic Remote-sensing Instrument for Stereo Mapping (ALOS-PRISM), provided by the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA). Specifically, we created two separate DEMs for 2008 (RS-DEM08A and RS-DEM08B) from ALOS-PRISM imagery taken in January and October of that year, respectively, in conjunction with DSM and Ortho-image Generation Software developed by JAXA for ALOS PRISM (DOCS-AP). We used the same method to create a DEM for 2010 (RS-DEM10) from the Hexagon KH-9-derived DEM with LPS with 3D monitor.

### 3.3. Bias calibration

Remotely sensed DEMs commonly include errors related to data acquisition, such that a bias calibration is required prior to DEM differencing. We used a co-registration process to improve elevation residuals among our DEMs. Specifically, we co-registered each RS-DEM against DEM08 by minimizing the standard deviation of elevation difference over the off-glacier terrain, where zero elevation change is expected (Nuimura et al., 2012). In addition, we adjusted vertically the elevation of co-registered RS-DEMs by subtracting the respective mean elevation differences from DEM08. Table 1 gives the standard deviations of elevation difference after each co-registration and vertical adjustment.

For DEMs derived from Hexagon KH-9 (RS-DEM74 and RS-DEM79), we observed a north–south bias trend that potentially results from insufficient adjustment of triangulation parameters. We calculated this bias trend by referring to the gap-filled SRTM version 4 (Rabus et al., 2003). First, we calculated differences between the two DEMs over gently sloping (<10°) off-glacier terrain. Second, having excluded outliers (elevation difference >100 m), we approximated the regression of 2nd order multi-variables (northing and easting). We also excluded outliers that exceeded the standard deviation between the original elevation and the estimated elevation on approximated regression planes. Finally, we calibrated the Hexagon KH-9-derived DEMs by subtracting the
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**Fig. 2.** Digital elevation models of the debris-covered ablation area of Lirung Glacier. DEMs were derived from field surveys in (a) 1996 and (b) 2008. Black dots indicate points measured by theodolite (a) and DGPS (b).
The elevation difference between the regression plane and the reference DEM (SRTM version 4).

### Remote sensing data list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Original $\sigma$ [m]</th>
<th>Adjusted $\sigma$ [m]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hexagon</td>
<td>Photogrammetry by LPS 3D</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexagon</td>
<td>Photogrammetry by LPS 3D</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>Contour (40 m Int.)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTM</td>
<td>SRTM v.2.1 by USGS</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTER</td>
<td>L3A01 product by ERSDAC</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTER</td>
<td>L3A01 product by ERSDAC</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTER</td>
<td>L3A01 product by ERSDAC</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOS</td>
<td>Photogrammetry by LPS 3D</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOS</td>
<td>Photogrammetry by LPS 3D</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOS</td>
<td>Photogrammetry by LPS 3D</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOS</td>
<td>Photogrammetry by LPS 3D</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALOS</td>
<td>Photogrammetry by LPS 3D</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4. Delineation of glacier area

The accumulation and ablation zones of Lirung Glacier are separated by a steep rock slope between 4400 and 4600 m a.s.l. The ablation zone, which is the focus of this study, lies entirely below 4400 m elevation and is delineated using ASTER false-color imagery from 2004. On the basis of our field observations, we excluded the lowermost part of the ablation zone from our investigation since no surface change was detected during the study period.

### 3.5. Elevation change

DEM differencing was calculated from DEM96 and DEM08 and is defined here as \( \Delta h_{96-08} \). Prior to the rasterization of point survey data, we excluded any data points from off-glacier terrain (e.g., lateral moraines). We also used glacier surface elevation change to delineate the debris-covered glacier terminus. Differences of remotely sensed DEMs is directly affected by errors in each RS-DEM. Therefore, to minimize the impact of this error, differencing is typically performed using as long a period of DEM coverage as possible (Bolch et al., 2011). The analytical correction of systematic DEM bias is also an effective means to reducing error (Nuth and Kääb, 2011; Gardelle et al., 2012a).

### 3.6. Flow velocity

Ice-stake measurements show that surface flow velocities on Lirung Glacier were 5.7–6.0 m a\(^{-1}\) in the upper debris-covered area between September 1994 and October 1996, and 0.8–2.1 m a\(^{-1}\) in the lower debris-covered area between December 1989 and October 1996 (Naito et al., 1998). More recently, surface flow velocity was calculated as subpixel displacements using a phase correlation algorithm implemented in the COSI-Corr plug-in module for ENVI (Leprince et al., 2007). In our assessment, we used 2.5-m-resolution ortho-rectified ALOS PRISM imagery, taken in October 2008 and December 2010. First, we determined the scene-wide subpixel bias by calculating displacement over the off-glacier area, where no displacement is expected, in both easterly and northerly directions. After excluding >100 grid displacements as extreme outliers, we then calculated the median displacement as 3.0 m and removed any cells that differed from the median by more than six standard deviations. We repeated the process with the remaining grids using a median of 0.0 m and excluding those that fell more than three standard deviations beyond the median. Calculated values for displacement of the glacier surface were screened using magnitude and direction filters according to Scherler et al. (2008). We then rejected any absolute displacement grid that differed from the scalar median within a moving window by more than one standard deviation. In addition, we excluded any grid that deviated by >60° from the median direction, which is calculated within a moving window of 51 x 51 grid size (corresponding to 127.5 m on the ground) by visual trial and error.

Uncertainty in surface displacement results mainly from image contrast. For example, uncertainties in snow-covered high-altitude areas differ from those in snow-free low-altitude areas. To evaluate the uncertainty in surface displacement over the debris-covered area, we calculated the alitudinal distribution of mean displacement using the digital number of satellite imagery (0–255) for the off-glacier area (Fig. 3). Fig. 3 demonstrates that large displacements occur in snow-covered (high digital number) higher-altitude (>4400 m a.s.l.) areas, and vice versa. At higher elevations, the mean displacement of on- and off-glacier grids is 7.8 and 7.4 m a\(^{-1}\), respectively, while at low (<4400 m a.s.l.) elevations the equivalent values are 2.7 and 0.8 m a\(^{-1}\), respectively. Therefore, we assume that displacement uncertainty on the debris-covered area is 0.8 m a\(^{-1}\).

### 3.7. Deriving mass balance from elevation change and emergence velocity

To evaluate factors controlling the observed changes in ice surface elevation, we calculated mass balance for the four domains in the debris-covered area of Lirung Glacier (Fig. 1) using a continuity equation (Cuffey and Paterson, 2010), in which values for elevation change and emergence velocity are required. A change in glacier thickness within a certain part of a glacier is defined as

\[
\frac{\delta H}{\delta t} = b + \frac{(Q_{in} - Q_{out})}{W \cdot dx}
\]

where \( Q \) is the ice flux entering (in) and leaving (out) the area of interest, \( H \) is ice thickness, \( t \) is a given time, \( b \) is surface mass balance (which is equivalent to ablation of debris-covered ice), \( W \) is the averaged glacier width, and \( x \) is the longitudinal length of the area of interest. The second term on the right in Eq. (1) describes the emergence velocity resulting from glacier flow convergence (Cuffey and Paterson, 2010). Ice flux at a boundary of the area of interest is described as
measurement periods are \( C_0 \) and \( D \) values for surface-flow velocity according to the manner of Sakai et al. (2010) for the continuity equation. The depth averaged velocity was set as 80\% \( v = PRISM \) image (24 October 2008), which is given as an index of surface contrast.

Fig. 3. Alitudinal distribution of displacement biases and digital numbers of an ALOS PRISM image (24 October 2008), which is given as an index of surface contrast.

\[
Q = WHv
\]

where \( v \) is the flow velocity at the upper or lower edge of the box for the continuity equation. The depth averaged velocity was set as 80\% of the mean surface velocity according to the manner of Sakai et al. (2006) and Cuffey and Paterson (2010). Because the surface velocity data for the older period (1974–2000) do not correspond to boundary of the four domains strictly, the flow velocity at the boundaries are linearly interpolated and extrapolated from the survey data by Naito et al. (1998). We obtained values for glacier width from satellite imagery. We used glacier thickness, which was determined originally via radio-echo sounding in 1999 (Gades et al., 2000), against surface-elevation changes for each period. We then applied both surveyed (Naito et al., 1998) and calculated (this study) values for surface-flow velocity. Each parameter is listed in Table 2.

4. Results

4.1. Validation of remote sensing data with field observations

Elevation changes were calculated by DEM differentiating for the period 1996–2008, based on field measurements (Fig. 4a), and by linear regression with WLS for the period 2000–2008, from multi-temporal RS-DEMs (Fig. 4b). Because access to the uppermost debris-covered ice surface is limited, the area for \( D_{h_00-08} \) is smaller than that for \( D_{h_06-08} \). By comparing common grids in two products (<4400 m a.s.l.; n = 895), the elevation changes between these two measurement periods are \(-1.13 \pm 0.82 \text{ m a}^{-1}\) for \( D_{h_06-08} \) and \(-1.62 \pm 1.04 \text{ m a}^{-1}\) for \( D_{h_00-08} \).

Extensive areas of glacier downwasting are evident in both periods, but are particularly prominent (>3 m a\(^{-1}\) surface lowering) in the uppermost debris-covered area for \( D_{h_00-08} \), for which in situ survey data are unavailable. Although the two periods are not identical, the magnitude of elevation change between the two exhibits a weakly significant correlation (\( r = 0.51, p < 0.01 \)). This similarity indicates that estimates of elevation change derived from remote sensing are reliable and comparable to field-based estimates. Similarly, the spatial distribution of uncertainties in elevation change derived from multi-temporal RS-DEMs are small over the debris-covered area, although larger uncertainties (>1 m a\(^{-1}\)) occur over the high-altitude accumulation zone (Fig. 4c). Large uncertainties have also been observed over the accumulation zones of glaciers in the Khumbu region using the same method (Nuimura et al., 2012). However, this pattern does not affect the current study, which focuses on elevation changes in the debris-covered area.

4.2. Surface elevation change

Estimates of elevation change from multi-temporal RS-DEMs were calculated for the periods 1974–2010 (\( D_{h_{1974-10}} \), 1974–2000 (\( D_{h_{1974-00}} \)), and 2000–2010 (\( D_{h_{2000-10}} \) using linear regression with WLS. Values for the debris-covered area of Lirung Glacier are \(-1.07 \pm 0.42 \text{ m a}^{-1}\) for \( D_{h_{1974-10}} \), \(-0.78 \pm 0.43 \text{ m a}^{-1}\) for \( D_{h_{1974-00}} \), and \(-1.99 \pm 1.41 \text{ m a}^{-1}\) for \( D_{h_{2000-10}} \), and together indicate a pattern of overall downwasting (Fig. 5). Significant downwasting of the upper debris-covered area is evident for both the longest and most recent periods (\( D_{h_{1974-10}} \) and \( D_{h_{2000-10}} \), respectively; Fig. 5a and c), yet is absent from the period 1974–2000 (\( D_{h_{1974-00}} \); Fig. 5b). In addition, considerable downwasting also occurred in the lowermost debris-covered area with clear margin at the lower bound suggesting the glacier terminus. A comparison of elevation-change values prior to and after 2000 (\( D_{h_{1974-10}} \) and \( D_{h_{2000-10}} \)) indicates accelerated downwasting since 2000, a pattern also supported by longitudinal profiles of elevation change (Fig. 6a). We estimate that the modern debris-covered glacier terminus is located ~800 m up-valley from its analyzed area of the \( D_{h_{06-08}} \) period. The magnitude of downwasting indicated by \( D_{h_{2000-10}} \) (1.99 m a\(^{-1}\)) is comparable to or higher than that of glaciers affected by growth of with expanding large supraglacial lakes at the terminus in the Khumbu region, which is located in a similar climatic and geographic setting to that of the present study (Bolch et al., 2011; Nuimura et al., 2012). For instance, estimates of thinning for the debris-covered Imja Glacier range from \(-1.45 \text{ m a}^{-1}\) (Bolch et al., 2011) to \(-0.93 \text{ m a}^{-1}\) (Nuimura et al., 2012) for the period 2002–2007.

4.3. Surface flow velocity

The distribution of flow velocity data suggests a gradual velocity increase in the upper-to-middle parts of the debris-covered area and a gradual decrease in the lower part (Figs. 6b and 7). In the upper part, adjacent to the bedrock slope separating the ablation and accumulation zones, we observed no apparent displacement (Fig. 7). Similarly, the vector field in this area indicates surface movement from high-angle northern and western slopes onto the glacier surface, a pattern that is suggestive of accumulation through snow avalanching rather than displacement by glacier flow. Compared with data from the 1980s and 1990s (Naito et al., 1998), our data exhibit a significant decrease in flow velocity (from 6 to 2–3 m a\(^{-1}\)) within the upper part of the debris-covered area but similar velocities (1–2 m a\(^{-1}\)) in the lower ablation area (Fig. 6b).

4.4. Continuity equation

To estimate uncertainty of mass balance and emergence
velocity, we evaluated error propagation from original errors. Original errors of the surface elevation change in four domains are calculated as average of error from linear regression with WLS. We assume reading errors of width (w) and length (x) of the glacier to be 5 m, which correspond to two cell size of ALOS PRISM. The glacier thickness errors are reported as 5 m around terminus and 10 m around upper debris-covered part (Gades et al., 2000). Therefore, we assume the thickness error of 5 m for Area 1, and that

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elevation change (m a⁻¹)</th>
<th>Emergence velocity (m a⁻¹)</th>
<th>Mass balance (m a⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1974–2000</td>
<td>−1.27 ± 0.16</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.03</td>
<td>−1.37 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1974–2000</td>
<td>−1.18 ± 0.16</td>
<td>0.26 ± 0.06</td>
<td>−1.44 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1974–2000</td>
<td>−1.14 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.22 ± 0.07</td>
<td>−1.36 ± 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1974–2000</td>
<td>−0.63 ± 0.18</td>
<td>0.35 ± 0.06</td>
<td>−0.98 ± 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2000–2010</td>
<td>−1.82 ± 0.27</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.07</td>
<td>−1.90 ± 0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000–2010</td>
<td>−1.59 ± 0.19</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.10</td>
<td>−1.75 ± 0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2000–2010</td>
<td>−1.30 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.11</td>
<td>−1.49 ± 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2000–2010</td>
<td>−1.69 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.07</td>
<td>−1.69 ± 0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 4](image_url) Distribution of elevation changes over the Lirung Glacier ablation zone for the periods (a) 1996–2008 and (b) 2000–2008. (c) Estimated error for the period 2000–2008.

![Fig. 5](image_url) Distribution of elevation changes over the Lirung Glacier ablation zone for the periods (a) 1974–2010, (b) 1974–2000, and (c) 2000–2010.
of 10 m for Areas 2–4 conservatively. Displacement error by stake measurement is assumed to be 0.02 m by referring ±0.01 m for single measurement (Vincent et al., 2016). Another displacement error by remote sensing analysis is assumed to be 0.63 m by referring 25% of pixel size (Heid and Kääb, 2012).

Surface lowering occurred throughout the debris-covered area and has accelerated since 2000. Whereas Areas 1–3 exhibit no significant change in emergence velocity for both periods (1974–2000 and 2000–2010) (Fig. 6c, Table 2), Area 4 underwent a significant decrease in emergence velocity (from $0.35 \pm 0.06$ m a$^{-1}$ to $0.00 \pm 0.04$ m a$^{-1}$). Mass balance, calculated as the residual of elevation change and emergence velocity (Eq. (1)), was generally negative throughout the debris-covered area (from $-1.37 \pm 0.18$ m a$^{-1}$ to $-1.90 \pm 0.33$ m a$^{-1}$ in Area 1; from $-1.44 \pm 0.22$ m a$^{-1}$ to $-1.75 \pm 0.30$ m a$^{-1}$ in Area 2; from $-1.36 \pm 0.24$ m a$^{-1}$ to $-1.49 \pm 0.35$ m a$^{-1}$ in Area 3; from $-0.98 \pm 0.24$ m a$^{-1}$ to $-1.69 \pm 0.32$ m a$^{-1}$ in Area 4). The decrease in mass balance corresponds to increased ablation, which in turn results from declining emergence velocities.

Accelerated surface lowering of the debris-covered area since 2000 is likely due to increased ablation, and in the upper ablation area this has been reinforced by declining emergence velocity. The longitudinal profile of flow velocity supports this interpretation (Fig. 6c, Table 2), which has also been observed at Khumbu Glacier (Nuimura et al., 2011). The reduced flux of ice into the ablation zone potentially reflects declining accumulation at higher altitudes, which is evident in regional ice-core records (Fujita et al., 2006).

5. Discussion

5.1. Accelerated surface lowering

Multi-temporal analysis of remotely sensed DEMs reveals that the debris-covered surface of Lirung Glacier has been lowering since at least 1974 and that this process accelerated after 2000. The measured change in elevation for $\Delta h_{1974-1999}$ ($-0.78 \pm 0.43$ m a$^{-1}$) is similar to that derived by Pellicciotti et al. (2015) for the period 1974–1999 ($-0.61 \pm 0.11$ m a$^{-1}$) based on differencing of a similar set of RS-DEM.
Similarly, the recent acceleration in surface lowering from \(-0.78 \text{ m a}^{-1} (1974–2000)\) to \(-1.99 \text{ m a}^{-1} (2000–2010)\) is consistent with the findings of Ragettli et al. (2016), who estimated that the rate of thinning increased from \(-1.03 \pm 0.05 \text{ m a}^{-1} (1974–2006)\) to \(-1.67 \pm 0.59 \text{ m a}^{-1} (2006–2015)\).

For the period 1974–2000, the most significant surface lowering occurred on the lower part of the ablation zone, with less extreme rates in the middle part; in contrast, the greatest rates of thinning during the period 2000–2010 occurred in the upper ablation zone (Figs. 5c and 6a). The progressive down-glacier expansion of intensified downwasting over the past decade is consistent with the flow velocity profile, which depicts flow velocities in the middle–upper areas decreasing during the 1990s (Fig. 6b) whereas the flow velocity significantly decreased around 3–4 km from terminus (Fig. 6b). Intensified surface lowering of the upper ablation zone in the past decade is further supported by the findings of Ragettli et al. (2016), who reconstructed changes in the longitudinal surface profile for the periods 1974–2009 and 2006–2015. Both profiles show the development of enhanced thinning zones around 4300 m a.s.l., which corresponds to the upper part of the debris-covered area of Lirung Glacier. The increase of flow velocity from the upper part toward down-glacier (around 3500–3600 m from the terminus) results in decreased emergence velocities, which in turn enhances surface lowering in the same area (Fig. 6c). This pattern suggests that accelerated surface lowering of the debris-covered area since 2000 is due largely to decreased flow velocity.

As we described in section 4.2, glaciers with large terminal glacial lakes have high rate of lowering in the Khumbu region (Imja and Lumding) (Rbolch et al., 2011; Nuimura et al., 2012). The formation of a terminal lake would reduce compression in the lowest part of the glacier. Therefore, the rapid surface lowering of those glaciers supporting supraglacial lakes can be attributed to decreased emergence velocity at the terminus. In contrast, we propose that the rapid surface lowering of the upper debris-covered Lirung Glacier is a consequence of declining emergence velocity due to reduced accumulation.

5.2. Fate of the debris-covered area

Past measurements have shown that the debris-covered area of Lirung Glacier was between 90 and 120 m thick in its middle and upper reaches (Gades et al., 2000). Assuming a constant rate of elevation change of \(-1.07 \pm 0.11 \text{ m a}^{-1} (\Delta h_{74-00})\), the debris-covered glacier tongue will likely persist for a further 84–112 years, or for 45–60 years according to the higher rate of \(-1.99 \pm 1.41 \text{ m a}^{-1} (\Delta h_{90-10})\). Alternatively, if the maximum thinning rate observed in the upper ablation zone during the last decade \(-4 \text{ m a}^{-1}, \Delta h_{90-10}, \text{ Fig. 6a}\) is maintained, the ice in that area will likely disappear within 23–30 years. Glacier thinning and deceleration serve as mutually positive feedback mechanisms. Two potential factors might account for the decrease in emergence velocity in the upper area (Area 4) are (1) decreased mass input due to declining accumulation in the accumulation zone and (2) a weakened flow-velocity gradient due to extreme glacier thinning in the uppermost debris-covered area (above Area 4).

6. Conclusions

We used field surveys and multi-temporal remote sensing to evaluate surface-elevation changes over the debris-covered ablation zone of Lirung Glacier. Taken together, the data suggest that estimates derived from RS-DEM s are consistent with those obtained from in situ surveyed DEMs, which show that surface lowering has continued since at least 1974 over the entire debris-covered area. Surface lowering accelerated after 2000 and has been greatest in the uppermost reaches of the ablation zone, where ice flow velocity decreased significantly between the 1990s and 2010. Using the continuity equation, we evaluated the relative contributions of changing surface mass balance and emergence velocity to the observed surface lowering. This approach demonstrates that the increasingly negative mass balance across the debris-covered area has played a significant role in surface lowering. In addition, declining flow velocity in the upper part of the ablation zone has weakened emergence velocity, further enhancing the pattern of surface lowering.
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