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Abstract

The distribution of rock glaciers is often used to investigate the occurrence of permafrost in mountain areas and to understand their climate and paleoclimate evolution. This requires the creation of regional and global inventories capable of discriminating active and relict landforms in order to forecast the presence or absence of ice in the ground. In this paper, geomorphological, geophysical and microclimatic surveys are
performed on a rock glacier of the Carnic Alps (Eastern European Alps). In the classification currently used for implementing regional inventories of permafrost evidence in the Alps, this rock glacier would be defined as relict. However the geophysical, climatological and geomorphological results indicate that internal ice is widespread in large portions of the rock glacier. These are generally interpreted as ice in pore spaces and local ice lenses, probably without layers of massive ice. Moreover the occurrence of ice during the maximum thawing season at depths < 15 m, assumed here as the depth of zero annual amplitude, suggests that the ice occurring within the rock glacier is related to current cryotic conditions due to density driven air flow (i.e. the chimney effect). This research demonstrates that the current altitudinal limit of alpine permafrost can be locally several hundreds of meters lower than forecasted by empirical modeling based only on the rock glacier distribution and classification. Therefore, rock glacier classifications based only on remote sensing and geomorphological evidence as the main sources for extracting regional climate and paleoclimate signals should be treated with caution.

1. Introduction

The term rock glacier defines a thick lobate or tongue-shaped mass of debris moving downslope through the deformation of subsurface ice and/or ice-rich sediments (Ballantyne, 2018). Generally, the downslope movement is indicated geomorphologically by a system of transverse surface ridges and furrows (Capps, 1910; Wahrhaftig and Cox, 1959). Although they are commonly present in many poorly-glacierized mountain regions around the world, rock glaciers represent key features for the understanding of high altitude cryosphere under climate change conditions (Haeberli et al., 2006). A long-running discussion exists around the origin of rock glaciers (Anderson et al., 2018). The ice within a rock glacier might come from ice-supersaturated mountain permafrost (e.g., Haeberli, 1985; Barsch, 1996), from glacier ice (e.g., Whalley and Martin, 1992, Guglielmin et al., 2018) or represents a continuum between glacial and non-glacial origin (e.g., Giardino et al., 1987; Clark et al., 1998; Humlum, 1998, 2000; Berthling, 2011;)

A common characteristic of rock glaciers is the presence of old buried ice, often (but not exclusively) of glacial origin (e.g., Guglielmin et al., 2004; Stenni et al., 2007; Ribolini et al., 2010;) and of different ages
It has been recently shown that presently active rock glaciers probably underwent long periods of inactivity in response to climate variability (i.e. warming) during the Holocene, although warmer periods produced only limited ice melt (Krainer et al., 2015). Thus, while glaciers are considered excellent climate indicators and their evolution is recognized as some of the best evidence for climate change (e.g., Haeberli et al., 2007), rock glaciers are generally more resilient to atmospheric changes due to their thick debris cover (Jones et al., 2018). In this context, it is important to discriminate between different rock glacier’s evolutionary stages, and classify them accordingly. The rock glacier classification is generally performed by looking at their degree of activity, defining them as intact (active and inactive) and relict, and following different classifications proposed by Haeberli (1985), Barsch (1996) and Cremonese et al. (2011), all based on their dynamics. Active rock glaciers are characterized by widespread presence of buried ice, sufficient to induce internal deformation, creep and movement. Inactive rock glaciers also contain ice, but are no longer mobile either due to the melting of most of the upper ice layers within the terminus slope (climatically inactive), or because of topographic obstacles (dynamically inactive). Relict rock glaciers do not flow and internal ice is assumed to be completely absent. Moreover, an additional type of rock glaciers, called pseudo-relict, has also been recognized and defined as an intermediate type between relict and inactive rock glacier, having locally isolated patches of permafrost (Barsch, 1996; Kellerer-Pirklbauer, 2008; Kellerer-Pirklbauer et al., 2012) with negligible climatic significance.

Ice distribution within rock glaciers varies considerably. Volumetric ice content within rock glaciers normally ranges between 40% and 60% (Barsch, 1996; Haeberli et al., 1998; Hausmann et al., 2007) although estimates of up to 70% have also been reported (Barsch et al., 1979; Arenson, 2002). Considerable uncertainties remain regarding the ice content and subsequent water equivalent of inactive and pseudo-relict rock glaciers. One of the peculiar characteristics of a rock glacier is to retain much of its original morphology, even after it has ceased moving and the internal ice has completely melted. Rock glaciers at this stage display less pronounced furrows and gentler front slopes compared to the same landform that was once active (Hughes et al., 2003). For this reason, rock glaciers can be mapped relatively easily from aerial photographs, and
further geometrically constrained and classified with more sophisticated digital elevation models (DEM), obtained from high resolution aerial laser scanning or photogrammetric techniques. These methods are widely used in compiling regional inventories, which often discriminate between intact and relict forms, although generally without any geophysical or direct investigation. Such classifications are further used to make estimations of permafrost presence (e.g., Scotti et al., 2013) and water volume equivalent (Jones et al., 2018). One of the main indicators used in remote sensing to classify a rock glacier as relict, thus excluding the occurrence of ice and movement, is considered to be the presence of (widespread) vegetation cover (e.g., Seppi et al., 2005; Scapozza and Mari, 2010; Lilleøren and Etzelmüller, 2011; Scotti et al., 2013; http://www.permanetalpinespace.eu/archive/pdf/WP5_3_final_report.pdf; last accessed 4 July 2018) although it is well known that alpine vegetation can cover surfaces with displacement up to 35 cm/year (i.e. Cannone and Gerdol, 2003). Once classified, the altitudinal distribution of rock glaciers is often used as a proxy for inferring permafrost occurrence and to extract climate and paleoclimate signals. A correct interpretation of all these aspects is particularly important in areas of sporadic permafrost, as, e.g., the case of the Mediterranean mountains (Oliva et al., 2018). Here, it is still not clear which landforms flow and/or contain ice, and what is the timing of their formation and stabilization (e.g., Hughes, 2018; Oliva et al., 2018).

Geophysical techniques have been extensively used to investigate the internal structure of rock glaciers. These include seismic (e.g., Musil et al., 2002), ground penetrating radar (GPR) (e.g., Arcone et al., 1998; Musil et al., 2006; Monnier et al., 2008; Merz et al., 2015; Guglielmin et al., 2018) and electrical (e.g., Kneisel and Hauck, 2008) methods. Such techniques are often integrated (Hausmann et al., 2007; Leopold et al., 2011) and calibrated with boreholes and temperature measurements. As far as electrical methods are concerned, the technical improvements of the last decades have provided increasingly accurate results. Vertical resistivity soundings (VES) have been extensively used since the 1970’s to investigate the internal structure of rock glaciers (King et al., 1987; Guglielmin et al., 1994, 1997). More recently, the development of modern multichannel systems that can be connected to several tens of electrodes has allowed the successful application of 2D electrical resistivity tomography (ERT) (e.g., Hauck et al., 2003; Hauck and
as well as pseudo-3D ERT surveys (Rödder and Kneisel, 2012; Emmert and Kneisel, 2017). The most significant problem in geoelectrical surveying on rock glaciers is the weak galvanic coupling associated with the generally high contact resistances between electrodes and ground (Maurer and Hauck, 2007), and the usually very rough topography, characterized by different size sediments and blocks. However, ERT investigations remain the most accurate geophysical techniques to distinguish between frozen and unfrozen areas (e.g., Hausmann et al., 2007; Hauck et al., 2011), even if there are uncertainties related to the resistivity range superposition between different geological and glaciological conditions (Reynolds, 2011). A comprehensive review of the pros and cons of geophysical techniques for rock glaciers imaging is provided by Maurer and Hauck (2007).

Rock glaciers on the southern side of the European Alps have been thoroughly studied using different approaches (Oliva et al., 2018) and the distribution of rock glaciers in the southeastern Alps has been recently updated by Colucci et al. (2016). Here, the altitudinal range of rock glaciers was found to be the lowest for the southern Alps, while the majority of rock glaciers were classified as relict. The Razzo rock glacier (RRG) in the Italian Carnic Alps is an example of a rock glacier that shows characteristics of a relict landform based only on its geomorphic properties, elevation range and vegetation cover. This work aims to: 1) describe the internal characteristics of a geomorphologically relict rock glacier through ERT investigations, repeated high resolution LiDAR surveys, and a three-year-long period of ground temperature monitoring; 2) discuss, with evidence from the RRG case study, the limitations of the present classifications when taking into account only geomorphic characteristics and vegetation cover in the implementation of regional inventories.

1. Study area

The RRG (Lat. 46°28′16.19″ N; Long. 12°36′34.61″ E) is located in the Italian Carnic Alps (Fig. 1). The highest peak of the study area is Mt. Tiarfin (2,413 m asl; Fig. 3), while the highest peak in the Carnic Alps is Mt. Coglians (2,782 m asl; Fig. 1b). The Tiarfin group is characterized by Triassic dolomitic limestone (i.e. calcari dolomitici of Tiarfin) in the highest parts, overlaying Permian Bellerophon, Val Gardena Sandstone and
Sesto Conglomerate towards the North (Carulli, 2006). Several rock glaciers and other landforms of periglacial origin have been described in inventories of the surrounding mountains (Colucci et al., 2016), while glaciers and ice patches are scattered and have only been reported from the Dolomites to the west (Baroni et al., 2017), in the area of Mt. Coglians (Carnic Alps) to the northeast (Colucci and Guglielmin, 2015) and in the Julian Alps to the east (Colucci and Žebre, 2016).

A useful source of climate information for the study area is the meteorological station of Mt. Zoncolan (1750 m) located 25 km east and at the same elevation as RRG. Here, the 1993-2017 Mean Annual Air Temperature (MAAT) was 4.2°C (σ=0.7) with February being the coldest month (-3.5°C, σ=2.5) and August being the warmest month (12.6°C, σ=1.8) (www.meteo.fvg.it; last accessed on 4 July 2018). 1993-2013 Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP) was 1,795 mm water equivalent (w.e.) with February being the driest month (36 mm w.e.) and November being the wettest month (255 mm w.e.).
(a) Permafrost distribution in the Alps according to the Alpine permafrost index map (Boeckli et al., 2012).

(b) Rock glacier distribution in the southeastern Alps, including Central and Eastern Austria (after Lieb et al., 2012), Slovenia (after Colucci et al., 2016) and Italian regions of Friuli Venezia Giulia (after Colucci et al., 2016) and Veneto (after PermaNet; http://www.permanetalpinespace.eu/archive/pdf/WP5_3_final_report.pdf; last accessed on 4 July 2018).

The latter inventory was performed using lower resolution DEM with respect to Lieb et al. (2012) and Colucci et al. (2016) and therefore probably underestimates the real number of landforms. The Razzo study area is located within the marked black square and reported in detail in Fig. 3.
2. Methods

3.1 LiDAR data acquisition and processing

Two airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) surveys were carried out over the study area on August 2009 and September 2016, with an average point density of 4 and 8 points per square meter, respectively. Technical specifications of both surveys are reported in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 survey</th>
<th>2016 survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average flight height</td>
<td>800 m a.g.l.</td>
<td>1000 m a.g.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiDAR system</td>
<td>Optech ALTM Gemini</td>
<td>Riegl LMS-Q780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser frequency</td>
<td>33 – 167 kHz</td>
<td>0 – 400 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition mode</td>
<td>Up to 4 range measurements</td>
<td>Full-waveform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scan angle</td>
<td>50°</td>
<td>60°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average point density</td>
<td>4 points m(^2)</td>
<td>8 points m(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical accuracy</td>
<td>0.05 m at 250 m range</td>
<td>0.02 m at 250 m range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal accuracy</td>
<td>0.05 m at 250 m range</td>
<td>0.02 m at 250 m range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Technical specifications of the two LiDAR surveys performed in the study area in 2009 and 2016.

A visual inspection of the two datasets showed a residual shift between them, which could affect subsequent analyses and generate misleading results in terms of surface changes. For this reason, the Iterative Closest Point (ICP) algorithm (Zhang, 1994) of the CloudCompare software was used to automatically co-register the two point clouds, adopting as a reference the point cloud from 2016. In particular, the ICP algorithm was applied on a subset of the point clouds, corresponding to stable (i.e. no surface change) areas, and the obtained rigid transformation was then applied to the whole original point cloud surveyed in 2009.
In order to create a representative model of the actual terrain surface excluding vegetation, a classification of both point clouds was carried out. First, the routines provided by TerraScan software package were used to generate an automatic classification. This classification was subsequently manually edited to accurately rearrange the datasets into two classes, namely ground points, i.e. points belonging to the terrain surface, and overground points, i.e. points backscattered by trees, shrubs, buildings and any other element above the terrain. Ground points were then exploited to create Digital Terrain Models (DTMs) with a resolution of 1 m. TerraScan software uses LiDAR points to derive a Triangulated Irregular Network (TIN) through Delaunay triangulation that is subsequently resampled onto a grid of specified resolution.

Finally, to highlight vertical elevation differences and the horizontal shifts of the study area, a DEM of Difference (DoD) was computed by subtracting the 2009 surface from the 2016 surface using the ESRI ArcGIS® raster calculator tool. The elevation difference error, computed on stable areas, is on average -0.06 m, with a standard deviation of 0.28 m.

### 3.2 Geomorphic Changes and Analysis

In order to identify and investigate possible geomorphic changes in the study area, vertical elevation differences between the DTMs derived from the 2009 and 2016 LiDAR point clouds were analyzed. To produce reliable results, uncertainties affecting DTMs and the obtained DoD were first taken into account. Several factors can indeed introduce errors in DTMs, including survey point quality, surface characteristics, sampling strategy, interpolation methods and classification errors (Milan et al., 2011).

In this study, we assumed spatially uniform uncertainties affecting the DoD and specified a threshold for the minimum level of detection to distinguish between actual surface changes and inherent noise. A threshold of 0.56 m was chosen, which corresponds to twice the standard deviation of the elevation difference error computed on stable areas, as described in section 3.1. In this way, predicted elevation changes beneath this detection limit were discarded. The thresholded DoD was generated using the ESRI ArcGIS Geomorphic Change Detection (GCD) tool (Wheaton et al., 2010).
Further statistical analysis was then performed with the GCD tool on the thresholded DoD and the results are reported in Table 2.

3.3 Geomorphological setting, rock glacier volume and water volume equivalent

Although the focus of this research is the study of one particular rock glacier, we mapped the geomorphology of a wider area, approximately equal to 6 km². Moraine and rock glacier ridges were mapped using orthophotos and digital elevation models (DEM) derived from 2009 and 2016 LiDAR data (Table 1), as well as field surveying. A detailed geomorphological analysis, including the calculation of some typical rock glacier morphometric parameters (maximum, minimum and mean altitude, width, length, area, mean slope of the front), was performed by applying different ESRI ArcGIS® tools.

The maximum volume of ice during full rock glacier activity in the past of the RRG was estimated on the basis of assumed volumetric ice content (40-60 %) within intact rock glaciers and rock glaciers volume. Volume of the RRG was estimated by multiplying rock glacier surface area (A) and thickness (H). The first parameter was extracted from a 1 m DEM, using the previously defined rock glacier polygon. The second parameter was estimated using an empirical rule established by Brenning (2005), which is based on several field observations of rock glacier geometry. According to this power-law relationship (Equation 1) the mean rock glacier thickness (H; in meters) is calculated as a function of surface area (A; in square kilometres) and two scaling parameters (c and β)

\[ H = cA^\beta \]  

where c is 50 and β is 0.2.

The estimated ice volume was subsequently used for the calculation of the water volume equivalent (w.v.e.) (Brenning, 2005; Jones et al., 2018) by assuming an ice density conversion factor of 900 kg m⁻³ (Paterson, 1994).

3.4 Ground temperature monitoring
Ground temperature is measured at 2 different locations at the rock glacier’s front by using Tynitag-plus-2® dataloggers, equipped with a built-in sensor and with thermistor probes with an accuracy of 0.35°C and a resolution of 0.01°C. The probes are located at the entrance of two decimetric-in-size natural cavities near the foot of the rock glacier’s front, through which evident cold-air flow is detected in summer. Ground surface temperature (GST) at location 1 (Fig. 2a) is recorded by the built-in sensor at the ground surface and the datalogger is inserted into the ground with its top part at ground level, whilst ground temperature (GT-1) is recorded by a thermistor probe inserted 20 cm in the soil at the bottom of the small cavity, overall at 100 cm depth. Ground temperature (GT-2) at location 2 (Fig. 2b) is recorded in the same way as at location 1, whilst air flow temperature (ATH) is recorded by a thermistor probe vertically fixed in the small cavity. At both locations, the dataloggers are set to record the minimum and maximum temperature on a hourly basis.
Location of the ground temperature probes at the rock glacier front: a) details of the location 2 as highlighted in Fig. 4a; b) details of the location 1 as highlighted in Fig. 4; c) photograph of the location 2 highlighting the GST monitoring site, i.e. the built-in sensor (not visible here) and the GT-2 located in the small cavity at the rock glacier’s front (Photo by R.R. Colucci). The sketches in a and b are intended to clarify how the probes are inserted in the ground and the drawing is not correctly scaled both in terms of lengths and steepness of the slope.
Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT)

Two longitudinal ERT profiles were acquired on the rock glacier (Fig. 4); one in 2015 (October 30th) and the other in 2016 (September 7th). The 2015 ERT survey was performed with a Syscal Pro georesistivimeter (IRIS International) connected to 72 electrodes with a 2 m spacing. We used both standard Wenner (W) and Wenner-Schlumberger (WS) electrode configurations, obtaining 828 and 1221 measures, respectively. After the preliminary analysis on 2015 ERT data we decided to enlarge the electrode spacing to 5 m for the 2016 survey. In 2016, we used a Pasi 16GL-N instrument with a standard Wenner configuration to collect two partially overlapping profiles, each of them with 32 electrodes. During the processing we concatenated such profiles obtaining a 48 electrodes (235 m long) profile with 289 resistivity values. Each measure was repeated from three to six times, depending on the standard deviation of the collected values, then stacking the data, to minimize random noises. The overall high data quality is confirmed by the very low standard deviation between reciprocal measurements: 8 values from 2015 W profile, 7 values from 2015 WS profile and only 4 values from 2016 W profile have RMS error above 0.5%.

After careful data editing by checking the effective electric currents, self potentials, difference of potential, and apparent resistivities, we used Res2Dinv software (Loke and Dahlin, 2002) to invert the data and set a RMS convergence limit equal to 5%. Due to the high quality of the data neither interpolation nor resistivity constrains have been applied. On the other hand, it was almost impossible to follow a straight line on the field, especially for the 2016 profile. Therefore, we recalculated all the geometrical factors by using the actual electrodes locations measured by an RTK GPS device, which allowed a centimetric accuracy. The RMS mean error obtained after data inversion is always lower than 10% after maximum 5 iterations, despite the very rough topography and the logistical problems, related to the connection of some of the electrodes into the ground.
Fig. 3

Geomorphological map of the broader study area, characterized by high density of rock glaciers and moraines. The RRG is marked with a black square shown in detail in Fig. 4. The base map and contours are realized from a high resolution (2x2 m cell) DEM kindly made available by the Geological Service of the Veneto Region.
3. Results

4.1 Geomorphology of the study area

The landscape of the study area (Fig. 3) is largely characterized by typical alpine glacial and periglacial landforms. The carbonate slopes below the highest mountain crests are mainly covered by non-vegetated talus deposits, generally directly linked to the rock glaciers located downwards. Lateral, frontal and hummocky moraine ridges cover less steep slopes immediately below the rock glaciers and are stratigraphically older than the rock glaciers. Till cover is are occasionally dissected by permanent or intermittent streams flowing from the rock glaciers terminus over moraines and towards north. The area to the north forms a badland-like landscape, which is extensively eroded by water. Moraine ridges are a few meters high and likely designate several glacier stabilizations (stadials) during the Late glacial and/or early Holocene periods. As recently shown by Colucci et al. (2014), the LGM ELA in the southeastern Alps was much lower than the LGM ELA in the Casera Razzo area, which likely acted as an area of accumulation for larger glaciers. Ten rock glaciers (6 of them shown in Fig. 3) with a total area of 0.7 km² were mapped in the Tiarfin group (Fig. 3). They extend between 2,280 and 1,680 m asl. Seven of them are tongue-shaped, while the rest have a lobate geometry. Their areas vary between 5,410 and 189,429 m². The RRG is located SE of the Col Marende peak (Fig. 3) and its rooting zone is located on the NE slopes of the Tiarfin group. It has all the characteristics of a tongue-shaped rock glacier with a length/width ratio of 1.9. The altitudinal difference between the maximum (1,981 m asl) and minimum (1,831 m asl) point is 150 m, while the median elevation is 1,909 m. The area covered by this landform is ca. 173,000 m². The height of the frontal slope is ca. 30 m and the mean and maximum slope angles of the front are 30° and 43°, respectively. The RRG surface is characterized by ridges composed of angular metric Triassic dolostone and limestone boulders, originating from the local slopes. The orientation of the ridges is related to the N-NE downward direction of the rock glacier movement. Between the ridges, thermokarst depressions are formed mainly on the main body and towards the front, but not over it. The RRG is entirely and extensively covered by vegetation, with prevailing Pinus mugo and Larix decidua, while the vegetation at the front is much different from the surroundings and appears to be related to locally colder thermal regime with species
typical of higher altitudes as the Cladonia macrophyllodes Nyl. (Tretiach, 1992; Nimis et al., 2018). At the contact between the rock glacier front and the bedrock a spring emerges, from which an intermittent stream, active mainly in spring and early summer, flows towards a depression behind a frontal moraine. There, a pond forms and usually persists until the early summer. Other springs, which are not located immediately below the RRG front, but clearly feed from the rock glacier area, are present NW of the front, in the area of moraine deposits.

According to Equation 1, the mean thickness of the RRG (debris and ice) in its active state would be 35.2 m. This results in a total rock glacier volume of 6.08*10^6 m^3 and volumetric ice content between 2.43*10^6 and 3.65*10^6 m^3 if considering a range of 40–60% for the ice content. Thus, the water volume equivalent was calculated to be between 2.19*10^6 m^3 and 3.28*10^6 m^3.
(a) The extent of the RRG with the location of ERT profiles performed in 2015 and 2016, and ground temperature monitoring locations 1 and 2 (details in Fig. 2). (b) Orthophoto of the RRG area. Note the dense vegetation cover over the entire surface of the rock glacier. (c) Aspect map and (d) slope map of the area covered by the RRG. Base layer for (a), (c) and (d) is a shaded relief extracted from the 2016 1-m DTM.
4.2 Climatology of the area

The 1981–2010 climatology of MAAT at 2,200 m asl in the south eastern Alps, recently reconstructed by Colucci and Guglielmin (2015), is in very good agreement with the data record of 2004-2017 monthly mean temperature in Sella di Razzo (R=0.95; Fig. 5a), as well as with the data record of Mt. Zoncolan (Fig. 1b) meteorological station (R=0.95). Therefore, it was possible to reconstruct the 1981-2010 MAAT for Sella di Razzo when data was missing. A 37-year-long record of MAAT is presented in Fig. 5b. MAAT in Sella di Razzo, which is located very close to the front of the rock glacier (Fig. 3), is 3.7°C (σ=0.7). Indeed, this 30-year-long period has been characterized by a steep and accelerated warming during which MAAT increased by about 1.0°C. Temperature data from Sella di Razzo shows a steep rising trend with three of the warmest year recorded in the last five years of observation, which is in accordance with observations in the southeastern Alps. The year 2015 is the warmest of the Sella di Razzo record and likely the warmest of the last (at least) 150 years.

Mean annual precipitation (MAP) over the period 1961-2000 recorded at the meteorological station of Sauris at 1,212 m asl was 1543 mm water equivalent (w.e.). February is the driest month (74 mm w.e.) and October is the wettest (175 mm w.e.). More recent observations (2005-2017) performed in Forni di Sopra (Fig. 1b) at 922 m asl point to similar data with MAP of 1548 mm w.e. (January 84 mm w.e.; November 176 mm w.e.).
Fig. 5

In a) scatter plot of temperature reconstruction from Julian Alps (Colucci and Guglielmin, 2015) and Sella Razzo dataset. In b) 1901-2017 climatology of: (1) MAAT Canin (2,200 m asl); (2) MAAT Sella Razzo (1,839 m asl); (3) 5-year centered running mean for Canin; (4) 5-year centered running mean for Sella Razzo.
4.3 Geomorphic Changes and Analysis

By analysing the LiDAR point cloud data from 2009 and 2016, some small changes in the area of interest (AOI; corresponding to the rock glacier extent) were detected (Table 2). A net volume change of -1803 m$^3$ and the average net thickness (computed as the total net volume difference divided by the AOI) of 1 cm for the period 2009-2016 was found. The percentage of the AOI with detectable changes (i.e. exceeding the minimum level of detection) equals 2%. All these values clearly show that geomorphic changes in the area of interest are negligible along all (x,y,z) directions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thresholded DoD Estimate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative volume change (m$^3$)</td>
<td>2065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive volume change (m$^3$)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net volume change (m$^3$)</td>
<td>-1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average depth of negative change (m)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average depth of positive change (m)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of AOI with detectable change</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average net thickness difference for AOI (m)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

Statistics related to changes in the area of interest (AOI), computed on the thresholded DoD.

4.4 Results from temperature monitoring

A 36-month-long record of continuous semi-hourly ground (GT-1 and GT-2), soil (GST) and air-flow (AT-H) temperatures were recorded from August 2015 to July 2017 at the front of the RRG (Fig.s 2 and 4). GST shows a marked daily variability in summer with diurnal excursions often greater than 25 °C. Daily maximums exceeded 30°C in several occasions during the summers of 2016 and 2017 with a peak of 35.4°C.
in 2017. GT-1 and GT-2 show a similar pattern in all the seasons with a fast decreasing trend from early autumn to mid winter and a slow and long rising trend from mid winter to the end of the summer. AT-H is in phase with GT-2, but shows warmer temperature during the winter/early spring phase. At the onset of the snowmelt season in March, temperature at all the locations rapidly rise to 0°C and a long zero curtain effect is recorded. In autumn a less pronounced zero curtain phase is also observed in 2016 and 2017, especially at locations GT-2 and AT-H. The coldest temperature generally occurs on early-to-mid winter, when minimum peaks between -15°C and -20°C have been recorded and associated with low snow cover (Fig. 5). In winter 2018, early snow cover dumped the cooling of the ground, which only occasionally reached minimum values around -5°C (“S” in Fig. 5). Only the GST location shows a positive mean annual temperature (MAT; Fig. 6), whilst at location GT-1 MAT is the lowest (Fig. 6).

The temperature of the spring immediately below the rock glacier front (S1 in Fig. 3;) was measured to 1.3°C on the 19th of June 2016, when the air temperature was 9.0°C and winter snow cover was completely absent in the area and over the rock glacier. The spring S2 (Fig. 3;) ~300 m far from the rock glacier front and 40 m lower in elevation from the S1 had a temperature of 2.7°C on the same day.
Daily ground temperature data at the rock glacier front and snow thickness at the Sella Razzo meteorological station (see Fig. 3 for location): with “z” the “zero curtain” phases are highlighted; with “s” the thick snow cover of the winter season 2017-18, which has inhibited the ingress of cold air into the ground, is also highlighted. First data refers to 8th August, 2015 while last data belongs to 15th August, 2018. See Fig. 2 for the location of the probes. GT represents the ground surface temperature, AT-H the temperature of the air flowing in the small cavities and GST is the ground surface temperature.
Monthly and annual (MAT) ground and air temperature data at the RRG front. Grey boxes highlight locations with “just” 2 continuous years of data recorded.

### 4.5 ERT results

Inverted 2015 ERT profiles show a resistivity range between about 0.3 and 40 kOhm·m (Fig. 7) with only minor differences between WS (Fig. 8a) and W (Fig. 8b) configurations. In fact, for increasing depths a low resistivity layer with variable thickness from about 2 up to 10 m is followed by a quite laterally continuous zone with resistivity always above 10 kOhm·m and a maximum thickness of about 15 m. In the central part of the 2015 profile (Fig. 8) there is a remarkable resistivity decreasing down to values of few hundreds Ohm·m. Such results are similar to the ones obtained in the 2016 survey (Fig. 9), where, despite higher overall resistivities, the above described trend is similar.

The higher resolution provided by the WS profile with respect to the W one (Figs. 8a and 8b, respectively) shows very shallow and small high-resistivity-zones, shown by the black arrows in Fig. 8a. These zones which might be related to local air filled fissures and small cavities just below the largest boulders are especially obvious in the lower ridge (R1).
Inverted ERT Wenner-Schlumberger (A) and Wenner (B) 2015 profiles. Black arrows mark surficial relatively high resistivity zones, interpreted as air filled voids between rock blocks, the white-dotted line highlights the approximate base of the active layer, and R1 and R2 highlight the two main ridges intersected by the profile. Percentual RMS errors are equal to 9.9 and 6.9 for A) and B), respectively. Vertical to horizontal ratio is equal to 1.
Inverted ERT Wenner 2016 profile plotted with the same resistivity scale as in Fig. 5. White dotted line highlights the approximated base of the active layer, while R3 and R4 labels highlight the two main ridges intersected by the profile. Percentual RMS error is equal to 4.6. Vertical to horizontal ratio is equal to 1. The exact location of this profile within the rock glacier indicated in Fig. 4a as ERT 2016.

5. Discussion

The RRG, which on the basis of our results is classified as inactive, would have been certainly classified as a relict rock glacier according to the criteria presented in Table 4 and by using only remote sensing techniques (aerial photographs, analysis of a more geometrically consistent DEM obtained from TLS, LiDAR or photogrammetric surveys). Much of the RRG geomorphic characteristics, such as a concave median longitudinal profile, a generally depressed body, no ice exposures, the presence of some collapsed features (conical depressions) and a gentle transition to upper surface, would exclude the presence of ground buried ice or interstitial ice. Additionally, when considering the MAAT of the last 37 years (3.7°C), we can infer that the rock glacier is climatically located out of the range of a periglacial environment. The steepness of the front of the RRG indeed might point to an active landform, but recent studies show possible higher external angle of repose for limestone scree, generally in the range 35 - 45 ° with variability affected by factors, such as the size distribution of clasts, cleanliness and moisture content (Oates, 1998; Rackl and Grötsch, 2018).
Several authors would consider this rock glacier as a relict one also on the basis of the present vegetation cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>RSD</th>
<th>RSD</th>
<th>RSD</th>
<th>RSD</th>
<th>RSD</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td>Steep front (&gt;$35^\circ$) and side slopes $^{1,2}$</td>
<td>Surface with well defined furrows and ridges $^{1,3}$</td>
<td>Median longitudinal profile is convex $^{4}$</td>
<td>Swollen body $^{5}$</td>
<td>eventual ice exposures $^{6}$</td>
<td>Sharp crested frontal slope $^{7}$</td>
<td>MAAT $&lt; -2^\circ\text{C}$ $^{8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relict</strong></td>
<td>Gently sloping (&lt;$30^\circ$) $^{1,2}$</td>
<td>(Naturally subdued) surface relief of ridges and furrows is still visible $^{1,3}$</td>
<td>Median longitudinal profile is concave $^{4}$</td>
<td>Depressed or flattened body $^{5}$</td>
<td>No ice exposures and surface collapsed features $^{6}$</td>
<td>Gentle transition (rounded crest) to upper surface $^{7}$</td>
<td>MAAT $&gt;3^\circ\text{C}$ $^{8}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.

Remote Sensing Derived (RSD) and Climatically Derived (CD) classification for active and relict rock glaciers.

1) Barsch (1988); 2) Jones et al. (2018); 3) Kääb and Weber (2004); 4) Colucci et al. (2016); 5) Seppi et al. (2004); 6) Janke (2013); 7) Wahrhaftig and Cox (1959); 8) French (2018). The characteristics of the RRG are shown in bold.

On the other hand, the findings from this case study point to a widespread and abundant presence of buried ice in the RRG, therefore indicating it should be classified as an inactive rock glacier. Specifically, ERT inversions show resistivity values typically encountered in active rock glaciers. It is worth noting that for both ERT profiles the resistivity exhibits thicker low sub-surficial zones below the ridges (labels R1-R4 on
Fig. 8 and 9), while some high resistivities are also close to the topographic surface (up to about 2-2.5 m) in correspondence with the furrows. A similar distribution pattern, which should be related to colder temperatures in the furrows due to topographic or microclimatic effects, is reported by Harris and Pedersen (1998) and Hoelzle et al. (1999). An opposite behavior, likely caused by local compression phenomena in the ridge zones, is described by Hauck and Kneisel (2008) and Emmert and Kneisel (2017).

The active layer thickness (ALT) varies between about 2 and 8 m (white dotted lines in Fig.s 8 and 9) showing a correspondence with the main ridges (R1, R2, R3, R4). The longitudinal lateral variability, shown by the electrical resistivity data along an almost continuous, more than 500 m long longitudinal profile (see Fig. 4) on the rock glacier, is overall small, demonstrating a generally increasing trend towards higher elevations. A relevant exception is represented by the well-defined shallow high resistivity zone at the rock glacier’s front (Fig. 8), ending at its limit. The resistivity values exceeding 30 KOhm·m and the mean slope of the rock glacier’s front along this profile is >35° (Fig. 4d), indicate the probable presence of ice-rich materials and permafrost conditions even at that location.

Additional ERT data, acquired from the plain just to the north of the rock glacier and not reported in this paper, show a maximum resistivity of 2.5 KOhm·m, indirectly demonstrating that the ice-rich materials lie only within the rock glacier.

The cryological interpretation of the resistivity values in the absence of boreholes or other geophysical investigations is not easy to interpret, but according to Haeberli and VonDer Mühll (1996) values above 10-15 KOhm·m can be referred to rock glacier permafrost, whereas sedimentary ice has values close to or higher than 100 KOhm·m, showing high variability for low temperature conditions.

In more recent papers, Ribolini et al. (2010) studied the Foscagno rock glacier (Central Alps) and interpreted zones with resistivity exceeding 20 kOhm·m as *ice-rich permafrost*, while Emmert and Kneisel (2017) analyzed two rock glaciers in the Swiss Alps and fixed a resistivity threshold of 8 kOhm·m as the lower limit for the frozen state. Similar results are provided by Ikeda and Matsuoka (2006) by validating ERT data with direct observations in a trench and considering the differences between boulder and pebble sized rock glaciers. However, we have to consider that the presence of liquid water can strongly influence the
resistivity values (Hauck and Kneisel, 2008) and the grain size vertical and lateral variability also plays a role (Kneisel et al., 2008), making it difficult to extrapolate a single resistivity threshold to infer the ice presence. Summarizing and integrating the geophysical and geomorphological results from RRG, large portions of the rock glacier contain ice, without relevant layers composed of massive ice, but rather with ice in pore spaces and local, but continuous ice lenses. Although massive ice cannot be inferred by the resistivity values never exceeding some tens of KOhm·m, the ice is widespread and continuous enough to generate an essentially uninterrupted high resistivity level. The active layer consists of boulders (up to several meters wide) as well as fine-grained sandy-silty materials as typically found in the Alps (Isaksen et al., 2000). Geophysical investigations in the RRG also show the occurrence of frozen material during the summer and autumn above the depth of zero annual amplitude (ZAA). In this type of deposit it is reasonable to hypothesize that the ZAA, which represents the soil-and-climate-dependent depth where the annual variation is less than 0.1°C, at depth ≥ 15 m (Harris et al., 2009). Therefore, we infer the presence of frozen material in the RRG related to current ground cryotic conditions. Observations of both ground and spring water temperatures, and of air flows also support the hypothesis that ice exists within this rock glacier. Recorded Mean Annual Ground Temperature (MAGT) points to the presence of permafrost (Cremonese et al., 2011). Short periods of strong ground overcooling are detectable from October-November up to the second half of January, generally with low snow cover on the ground (Fig. 6). This is probably due to the warmer and less dense air than the external, flowing away from the upper part of the rock glacier due to its buoyancy through voids between blocks and the debris (i.e. chimney effect; (Thury, 1861; Balch, 1900)). This produces a negative low (lower air pressure) inside the rock glacier, which triggers a forced aspiration of atmospheric air in the lower part of the rock glacier as already highlighted by several authors (e.g., Morard et al., 2008; Popescu et al., 2017). This is clearly detectable at the RRG from the AT-H probe, which shows the lowest mean monthly values in December and January (Table 3). On the other hand, during summer months, colder and denser air flows out from the rock glacier front, keeping cooler conditions at the rock glacier terminus and just in front of it. Mean and absolute temperature observed at the RRG’s front (Figs. 6 and 7) are largely consistent with previous
studies in the Alps on talus slopes (e.g., Delaloye and Lambiel, 2005; Popescu et al., 2017) and rock glaciers (e.g., Delaloye and Lambiel, 2005; Morard et al., 2008), as well as in talus-and-gorge ice caves in North America (Holmgren et al., 2017).

With such evidence, cryotic conditions in the ground are still currently occurring here. This means that the forced lowering of the mean annual ground temperature in turns allows permafrost conditions to reach much lower elevations compared to the regional climate limits. Similar cases exist in the Mediterranean areas and in North Africa, where the presence of permafrost is marginal. This is for instance the case of Morocco, where ground temperature measurements imply that permafrost may still be present (Vieira et al., 2017).

By overlying the Alpine-wide Permafrost Model (APMOD, Boeckli et al., 2012) on the geomorphological map of the area of Casera Razzo (Fig. 10), we observed that the area of possible presence of permafrost is 900 m lower than that modeled in the area around the RRG. Considering the cooling effect cause by coarse-blocky rock glaciers in the Alps, the offset found in the RRG area is actually greater than that reported in Boeckli et al. (2012) In their “debris model”, a maximum altitudinal variation offset from APMOD between -153 m to +770 m is assumed. However, the same authors warn about possible larger differences related to local permafrost patches in densely vegetated areas or below the tree line (as the present case), which are not considered in the model.
6. Conclusions

This work shows that rock glaciers considered relict on the basis of remote sensing and geomorphological evidence can still contain residual ice at elevations much lower than the modelled permafrost limit. Indeed rock glaciers can exist at altitudes several hundred meters lower than forecasted by modeling techniques or taking into account the -2°C isotherm. This aspect is of particular interest because it shows how models can be inaccurate when dealing with sporadic permafrost areas. Several examples exist from the
Mediterranean mountains, where under thick debris cover (rock glaciers) and in caves (permanent ice deposits in caves) no model or index is currently able to predict the presence of ice. This is particularly true for high altitude karstic terrains, where the occurrence of ground ice in caves is common. Several ice caves exist in the area of the RRG (Colucci et al., 2016b, 2017), in the southern Alps, in the Apennines and Sicily in Italy (Maggi et al., 2018) and in other Mediterranean areas such as Greece (e.g., Pennos et al., 2018). As a result, caution should be applied when calculating physical parameters such as the minimum altitudinal limit for the occurrence of permafrost at regional scales, the volume of water equivalent in a geographic area affected by possible permafrost conditions, as well as paleoclimatic reconstruction of permafrost occurrence and predictions of future scenarios.
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