Melting of Surface Ice Deposits on Mars by Hot Impact Ejecta. D. K. Weiss and J. W. Head, Department of Earth, Environmental, and Planetary Science, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912, U.S.A. (david_weiss@brown.edu)

features are present on the surface of Mars. Of which it is excavated, and shock heating during these features, fluvial features associated with the impact. When the ejecta is emplaced on the impact craters and impact ejecta [e.g., 1, 2] are surface snow and ice deposits (Fig. 1B), the hot of particular interest because they may offer ejecta radiates heat outwards and conducts heat insight into the ancient martian climate and its downwards into the icy deposits, thereby genrelationship to the impact cratering process. erating meltwater which may lead to fluvial The high spatial and temporal frequency of erosion (Fig. 1C). both impact events and surface ice [e.g., 3, 4] on Mars raises the possibility that an impact of regional surface snow and ice deposits inhibcratering event into regional surface ice depos- its geothermal heat diffusion through the ice its could have been a relatively common oc- (Fig. 1C and E). As a result, following the imcurance throughout martian geologic history, pact event the 273 K ice melting isotherm with-We examine two mechanisms by which impact in the shallow crust is predicted to rise to the ejecta may cause melting of surface ice depos- base of the ice sheet given sufficient ejecta its in this scenario, wherein an impact occurs thicknesses (Fig. 1E). This causes the ice sheet into regional surface snow and ice deposits to melt from the bottom-up, supplying a poten-(Fig. 1A):

temperatures due to a combination of pre-

Introduction: A wide variety of fluvial impact geothermal heating at the depth from

Basal melting [5]: Ejecta deposition on top tial source of liquid water for fluvial erosion Contact melting [1]: Ejecta is at elevated proximal to the impact crater (Fig. 1F).



Figure 1. Post-impact melting configuration used in our models. A) The pre-impact target is composed of a surface ice layer overlying ice-cemented regolith/rock. The pre-impact ice-melting isotherm (273 K) (dashed red line) defines the base of the cryosphere (the zone cold enough for pore-ice stability). B) The impact occurs, and hot ejecta is deposited on top of the surface ice; contact melting of the surface ice begins. C) Contact melting continues and meltwater drains out of the ejecta; meltwater derived from near the topographically high rim-crest may form chan-

nels within the ejecta facies if the meltwater encounters an impermeable layer (e.g., a spring). D) The surface ice sheet may flow, enhanced by the weight of the overlying ejecta. E) The thermally insulating ejecta layer inhibits heat conduction, which raises the melting isotherm (273 K) (dashed red line) up through the cryosphere; the melted pore-ice then drains downward and is a source for groundwater recharge. The 273 K isotherm is raised up to the base of the ice sheet near the rim, where the ejecta is thickest. This allows for basal melting of the ice sheet; the meltwater is predicted to be transported up the crater rim (blue arrows) and towards the crater interior due to the pressurization from the overlying ejecta and ice. F) The meltwater transported into the crater interior could form fluvial channels on the crater walls.

Methods: We implement thermal models to test whether the presence of ejecta on top of surface ice can produce substantial contact melting at the ice sheet surface, or raise the geotherm sufficiently to induce melting at the base of an ice sheet (Fig. 1) [6]. We model the cooling of ejecta and melting of surface ice using the one-dimensional heat equation [6], where the initial ejecta temperature (Fig. 2) is found as the combined effects from pre-impact geothermal heating and post-impact shock heating [7].

Results: We find that the heat flux and surface temperature conditions required to produce contact melting are met throughout martian history for craters larger than ~40 km in diameter (Fig. 2), whereas the heat flux and surface temperature conditions to produce basal melting are met only under currently understood ancient martian thermal conditions. For an impact into a regional ice sheet, the contact and basal melting mechanisms are predicted to generate melt volumes between $\sim 10^{-1}$ and 10^{5} km³, depending on crater diameter, ice thickness, surface temperature, and geothermal heat flux. Contact melting is predicted to occur immediately following ejecta emplacement over the course of hundreds of years to tens of kyrs. Basal melting initiates when the 273 K isotherm rises through the crust and reaches the base of the ice sheet ~0.1 to ~1 Myrs following the impact.

Fate of meltwater: We find that contact melting is predicted to produce fluvial features on the surface of ejecta and the interior crater walls, whereas basal melting is predicted to produce fluvial features only on the interior crater walls (Fig. 1C and F). Before basal melting initiates, the ice-cemented cryosphere underlying the crater ejecta is predicted to melt



Figure 2. Volumetric average ejecta temperature (T_E) as a function of crater diameter for surface temperatures (T_S) of 215, 235, and 255 K, and surface heat fluxes of 20 mW/m², 40 (black lines), 60 (blue lines), and 100 mW/m² (red lines). Color bar indicates volumetric average peak shock pressures corresponding to each crater diameter (shown on the 20 mW/m² line).

and drain downwards through the substratum (Fig. 1C-E), generating a source of water for chemical alteration and possibly subsurface clay formation.

The contact and basal melting mechanisms appear attractive within the constraints of the current 3D climate models for the Late Noachian [e.g., 4] because they do not require warm atmospheric temperatures (e.g., the rainfall hypothesis for Late Noachian craters [8]). For example, contact and basal melting could operate as a background landscape/crater degradation processes in a cold and icy early Mars [5] even in the absence of punctuated warming events [e.g., 9, 10].

- References: [1] Mangold, PSS 62(1), 69-85 (2012)
- [2] Hobbs et al., Geomorph. 261, 244-272 (2016)
- [3] Head et al., Nature 426(6968), 797-802 (2003)
- [4] Wordsworth et al., Icarus 222(1), 1-19 (2013)
- [5] Weiss and Head, PSS 117, 401-420 (2015)
- [6] Weiss and Head, PSS in press (2016)
- [7] Fritz et al., MAPS 40, 1391-1411 (2005)
- [8] Craddock and Howard, JGR 107(E11), 511 (2002)
- [9] Halevy and Head, *Nature* 7, 865-868 (2014) [10] Wordsworth et al., *JGR* 120, 1201-1219 (2015)