Interannual variations in river water content and distribution over the Laptev Sea between 2007 and 2011: The Arctic Dipole connection
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Abstract Five years of oxygen isotope and hydrological surveys reveal interannual variations in the inventory and distribution of river water over the Laptev Sea. In 2007, 2009, and 2010 relatively low amounts of river water (≤1500 km³) were found and were mostly located in the southeastern Laptev Sea. In 2008 and 2011, high amounts of river water (~1600 km³ and ~2000 km³) were found, especially in the central and northern part of the shelf, suggesting a northward export of this water. This temporal pattern is coherent with the summer Arctic Dipole index that was higher in 2008 and 2011. Our results suggest that the Arctic Dipole might influence the export of river water from the Laptev Sea. Moreover, the river water inventory in the Laptev Sea seems related to the freshwater content of the Arctic Ocean with a 2 years lag.

1. Introduction

During the last decades, multiple studies highlighted decadal and annual variations in liquid freshwater storage in the Arctic Ocean [Polyakov et al., 2008; Proshutinsky et al., 2009; Morison et al., 2012; Krishfield et al., 2014; Rabe et al., 2014]. Notably, it has been estimated that the liquid freshwater content in the Beaufort Gyre increased by about 5000 km³, which represents an increase of 25% compared to the level of the 1970s [Krishfield et al., 2014]. Moreover, a time series of liquid freshwater content was computed for the whole Arctic basin and estimated a 30% increase in freshwater storage over the 1992–2012 period [Rabe et al., 2014]. However, the exact causes for this increase are still hypothetical. One explanation relies on the strengthening of the Beaufort High, which increases the anticyclonic (clockwise) wind pattern causing a convergence of fresh surface water toward the gyre’s interior [Proshutinsky, 2002]. However, increasing freshwater content under weakened Beaufort High suggests that other factors must be considered [Proshutinsky et al., 2009]. It was also suggested that runoff from Eurasian rivers could be diverted eastward to the Canadian Basin under an increasingly positive Arctic Oscillation Index (from 2005 to 2008), highlighting the importance of the pathway by which freshwater is exported from the Eurasian shelves on the global freshwater budget of the Arctic [Morison et al., 2012].

The Arctic Ocean receives 11% of the global riverine freshwater discharge [Fichot et al., 2013]. This freshwater contributes to the strong stratification that characterizes the upper layers of the Arctic Ocean and insulates the perennial sea ice cover from heat contained in the warm Atlantic-derived water [Aagaard et al., 1981]. The Lena River is one of the largest Arctic rivers, delivering around one fifth of total river water to the Arctic Ocean. The river water discharging into the Laptev Sea can be exported to the Arctic Ocean interior directly at the northward shelf break or to the Canadian part of the basin after being advected eastward [Guay et al., 2001; Dmitrenko et al., 2005, 2008]. Thus, interannual variation in the hydrology of the Laptev Sea can significantly influence the structure of the Arctic halocline and consequently the freshwater inventory of the Arctic Ocean [Johnson and Polyakov, 2001; Bauch et al., 2009; Morison et al., 2012].

It has been suggested that the Laptev Sea summer surface hydrography is mainly controlled by the dominant winds [Guay et al., 2001; Dmitrenko et al., 2005, 2008]. Two different atmospheric regimes are thought to characterize the eastern Siberian shelves: (1) an anticyclonic regime caused by a strong Siberian High and a suppressed Icelandic Low and (2) a cyclonic regime driven by a weaker sea level pressure (SLP) in the western Arctic (i.e., a reduced Siberian High) and a strong Icelandic Low that extends into the Barents and Kara Seas [Johnson and Polyakov, 2001]. During the anticyclonic phase offshore winds shift the Lena River plume northward, while during the cyclonic phase, eastward along-shore winds push the Lena River water into the
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2. Methods

Samples were collected during TRANSDRIFT expeditions in Arctic summer 2007 (29 August to 17 September), 2008 (7 August to 25 September), 2009 (9 September to 16 September), 2010 (9 September to 20 September), and 2011 (25 August to 4 September) (Figure 1). Water samples were taken with a conductivity-temperature-depth (CTD)-rosette. Individual temperature and conductivity measurements were obtained using Sea-Bird SBE-19+ with accuracy ±0.005°C and ±0.002 S/m in conductivity. In addition to CTD measurements, bottle salinity was determined directly from the same water samples taken for δ18O analysis using an AutoSal 8400A salinometer (Fa. Guildline) with a precision of ±0.003 and an accuracy of at least ±0.005. Oxygen isotopes were analyzed at the Leibniz Laboratory (Kiel, Germany) except the 2010 samples, which were analyzed at the Stable Isotope Laboratory (Oregon State University, United States). All isotope measurements were performed using the classical CO2-water equilibration method [Epstein and Mayeda, 1953]. The overall measurement precision for all δ18O analysis was ±0.04‰ or better. The 18O/16O ratio is given in respect to Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water in the δ notation [Craig, 1961].

The river water contribution can be quantified by applying a mass-balance calculation [Bauch et al., 1995] (Text S2 and Table S3). River water inventories were estimated by integrating the fractions of river water over the whole water column, which yields the averaged thickness of the water column containing pure river water. The inventory was calculated using the averaged thickness of river water extrapolated over the surface using the weighted-average tool in Ocean Data View. We strategically divided the Laptev shelf into four parts in order to track the river water inventory distribution annually (Figure 1 and Table S4). We hypothesized that during typical “offshore year” the majority of the river inventory would be located within the central, north, and/or west zone, while during “onshore year” the river water would be mostly constrained within the southeast zone. Our field measurement did not record any evidence of river water possibly originating from the Ob or Yenisey Rivers via the Vilkitsky Strait that could have penetrated the north or northwestern part of the Laptev shelf and reached our sampling sites (Figure 2). However, even if the main route for the Barents and Kara Seas shelf water into the Arctic is thought to be the recently identified Arctic Shelf Break Branch and frontal system located at the Laptev Sea slope [Aksenov et al., 2011; Bauch et al., 2014], we cannot completely rule out the possibility that some river water from the Kara Sea reached our sampling site. The Kara Sea river water carries an isotopic signature of about −17.5‰, while the Lena is about −20‰, so a significant input of Kara Sea river water would cause an underestimation of our river water inventory [Bauch et al., 1995]. If one would considers that the totality of Ob and Yenisey discharge reaches the Laptev shelf and...
mix with the Lena discharge, one would estimate a river water inventory 9% higher than ours. Since evidences suggest that the Kara Sea river water outflow is mostly constrained far from our sampling site [Aksenov et al., 2011; Bauch et al., 2014], we are confident that our river water inventory is not significantly affected by this potential influx of river water characterized by a different isotopic composition.

The fact that surface salinity pattern can be maintained from summer until the polynya events [Dmitrenko et al., 2005] suggests little variability from August to April–May; thus, we hypothesized that our data set is representative of the summer river water distribution, which is controlled by atmospheric forcing [Dmitrenko et al., 2005]. The estimated inventory is as good as possible considering the station coverage, which is limited compared to easy-reachable oceanic areas but can be considered to be extremely high for the Arctic region. So while the inventory should be considered carefully (e.g., with partly varying station coverage between years) this collection of field data provides an unparalleled insight both in space and time on the river water distribution over the Laptev Sea.

### 3. Results

The hydrography on the central Laptev Sea shelf (between 74 and 77.5°N along the 126°E meridian) is influenced by the large input of freshwater from the Lena River (Figure 2). From 2007 to 2011, the surface temperature varied from 0 to 8°C over this transect. In 2007 and 2008, high temperatures (>4°C) were measured in the southern part of the profile, while in 2009 and 2010 the whole surface layer was found to be relatively cold (<4°C). The year 2011 was exceptionally warm, with the surface layer temperature above (<4°C) for the whole transect, with maximum temperatures (>6°C) located in the northernmost part of the profile, which is a unique feature in our record. In 2007, 2009, and 2010 most of the surface layer was characterized by salinities over 25, except for the very southern part. However, in 2008 and 2011 most of the surface layer was fresher than 25, with a minimum (<10) at 75°N in 2008.
From 2007 to 2011, the fraction of river water varied from 0 to 80% along the 126°E meridian (Figure 2). The strong contribution (up to 80%) of river water in the surface layer in 2008 and 2011 results in an average thickness of pure river water of ~ 9 and 11 m, respectively (Figure S5). This amount was higher than in 2007, 2009, and 2010, which were characterized by a ~ 6–7 m thick river water layer. Similar interannual variations were found when calculating inventories over the whole central Laptev Sea (74–77°N; 120–135°E), which yielded 600–650 km³ of river water in 2007, 2009, and 2010, much lower than the 800 and >950 km³ estimated for 2008 and 2011, respectively (Table 1). We also found a high amount of river water (>450 km³) in the northern part of the Laptev Sea in 2011 (76°N–77°N), which is contrasting all other years within our data set, where the river water inventory was relatively constant and much lower (<300 km³). The Lena River directly influences the southeastern part of the Laptev Sea (Figure 1). The

Figure 2. The temperature (CTD measurement), salinity (from sampled bottle), and river water (from sampled bottle) fraction profile against depth (m) in the central Laptev Sea (74–77°N along the 126°E meridian) for 2007 to 2011. Dots represent each sample taken (exact dates of sampling are listed in the online data).
highest inventory in this sector was observed in 2010 (~500 km$^3$), while all the other years on record had similar inventory values (~400 km$^3$), which is not coherent with the discharge variation from the Lena River (Table 1). From our record, the central Laptev Sea contained 42 to 50% of the total Laptev shelf river water depending on the year. The total amount of river water over the Laptev Sea was highest in 2011 (+28% compared to the 2007–2011 average), and 2007 and 2009 were the lowest (−16% compared to the 2007–2011 average). Total shelf river water inventory constantly represented ~2.5 times the amount of river water released by the Lena during the preceding year even though both the discharge volume and river water inventory are characterized by relatively high interannual variations (Table 1).

**4. Local Forcing**

The atmospheric pressure distribution over the greater Laptev Sea region is highly variable on interannual time scales and seems to be the major factor influencing the river water distribution [Guay et al., 2001; Dmitrenko et al., 2005, 2008; Bauch et al., 2009, 2011]. Based on a simple wind-driven surface water transport model and reanalyzed SLP data, it was suggested that the third empirical orthogonal function (EOF) was the major factor to influence the export or river water from the Laptev Sea [Bauch et al., 2011]. The EOF represents the spatial pattern of variability and its variation in time and is estimated by solving the eigenvalue problem for the covariance matrix [Preisendorfer, 1988]. While the Arctic Oscillation index was described as the first EOF of the SLP, the second EOF was recently defined as the Arctic Dipole [Thompson and Wallace, 2000; Wu et al., 2006]. The third EOF of the SLP over the Laptev Sea area was linked to the variation of local low-pressure systems generated over the Siberian landmass during summer, which are thought to greatly influence the distribution of river water over the Laptev Sea [Bauch et al., 2011]. When looking at the SLP in the Laptev Sea region over the summer months (June-July-August-September; JJAS), a spread of low-pressure system over the whole Siberian coast is observed in 2007, 2008, and 2011 (Figure S6). However, in 2009 and 2010, lows were either centered over the central Kara Sea (2009) or over the Kara Sea coast (2010). On the other hand, small-scale features seem to have somehow created local SLP minimum over the Laptev Sea (or just north of it) with isobars being perpendicular to the coast from 2007 to 2010, while in 2011 the isobars are parallel to the coast. This contrast with the simple north-south SLP gradient previously highlighted for 1994 and 1999 that were respectively categorized as typical offshore and onshore years [Bauch et al., 2009]. Despite observing typical offshore and onshore river water distribution and inventory between 2007 and 2011, we did not observe the atmospheric setting that was previously thought to be typical for offshore or onshore years [Dmitrenko et al., 2005; Bauch et al., 2009, 2011].

This suggests that different forcings might have controlled the river water distribution from 2007 to 2011 compared to the last decades. This could be linked to the recent observation that the Arctic Dipole intensity has increased over the Arctic Ocean since 2007 [Overland et al., 2012]. This could also explain previous observations that highlighted a difference in the river water inventory on the continental slope north of the Laptev Sea between 1995 and 2005.
despite both years being characterized as “offshore years” based on the dominant SLP distribution [Bauch et al., 2011].

5. Pan-Arctic Atmospheric Forcing

The Arctic Oscillation (AO) and the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) are often discussed in order to explain the freshwater content of the Arctic Ocean and shelves [Steele and Ermold, 2004; Steele et al., 2004; Morison et al., 2012]. When averaging the AO index for summer months (June–September), 2009 was the year with the most negative AO, which is not coherent with low-observed freshwater storage on the central Laptev Sea shelf and neither with high amount of freshwater found in the southeast part of the shelf. Moreover, we observed an increase of 30% in the freshwater inventory from 2007 to 2008 despite an invariable AO index, a situation similar to a 47% increase in river water between 2010 and 2011 despite a similar AO index. While there is evidence that the AO influences the Arctic-wide circulation [Morison et al., 2012], our record suggests that it is not the major factor controlling the freshwater storage neither its distribution over the central Laptev Sea shelf. This is in agreement with earlier findings that the minor components of the EOF have a larger impact on the freshwater distribution north of the Laptev Sea shelf break than the first EOF that defines the AO [Bauch et al., 2011].

Nevertheless, 2010 was characterized by a low NAO, but the river water was diverted eastward as is typical for positive NAOs. Overall, our inventories seem to generally respond to the NAO index, although some additional factors might impact the distribution of river water over the Laptev Sea shelf, such as the Arctic Dipole.

The summer (JJAS) AD index is characterized by the same trend as our freshwater distribution and inventory with the highest values in 2008 and 2011 and the lowest in 2007 (Table 1 and Figure 3). Thus, our data suggest that the Arctic Dipole summarizes atmospheric conditions that dominate the distribution and fate of the Laptev Sea river runoff for the 2007–2011 period, which could imply a recent increase in the importance of the second EOF in regard to the distribution of river water over the Laptev Sea.

6. Impact of River Freshwater Export From the Laptev Sea on the Arctic

When comparing the interannual variation of river water inventory over the Laptev Sea, we found no relationship (and neither a 1 year lagged) with the Arctic-wide freshening estimated by Rabe et al. [2014]. This is not surprising since the total Laptev shelf inventory represents about ~2.5 times the amount of river water released by the Lena during 1 year; and thus, it seems unlikely that this water significantly impacts the Arctic-wide budget within only a year. The best fit was found when comparing the Laptev Sea river water inventory with the Arctic-wide liquid freshwater inventory with a 2 years lag (Figure 3), which also holds true when comparing with the liquid freshwater inventory of the Beaufort Gyre [Krishfield et al., 2014]. The fit with a 2 year lag is even better when only considering the inventory of the central Laptev Sea, which would suggest a transport time of about 2 years for the river water that is advected northward to reach the Arctic Basin and/or the Beaufort Gyre. If we consider a 2 year lag, the 200 km$^3$ increase in river water on the central Laptev Sea shelf between 2007 and 2008 would account for 50% of the increase in liquid freshwater in the Beaufort Gyre from 2009 to 2010 [Krishfield et al., 2014] and ~20% of the Arctic-wide freshening for the same period [Rabe et al., 2014]. Thus, our data suggest that the Arctic Dipole might play a significant role for the Siberian shelves river water inventory and consequently on the Arctic Ocean freshwater budget.
7. Concluding Remarks

This 5 year isotopic survey of the Laptev Sea highlights the strong link between atmospheric patterns and the Laptev Sea hydrography and suggests that, for the 2007–2011 period, the Arctic Dipole has exerted a strong influence on the distribution and export of river water from the Laptev Sea shelf. This is different than the previous decades, when the local SLP pattern (third EOF) was the main driver of the river water distribution and export.

An analysis of recent Arctic atmospheric patterns suggested a persistent change in early summer (June) SLP for 2007–2012 that was recognized as the Arctic Dipole [Overland et al., 2012]. This feature might be linked to an earlier snow or ice cover loss over high latitudes, notably over the Hudson Bay since it would allow an earlier warming of those waters and a subsequent increase in SLP [Joly et al., 2010; Overland et al., 2012]. Potential impacts of this newly persistent pattern are increased Arctic sea ice loss in summer, long-lived positive temperature anomalies and ice sheet loss in west Greenland, and increase in Arctic-subarctic weather linkages through higher-amplitude upper level flow [Overland et al., 2012]. Our results suggest that it also plays an important role on the freshwater budget of the Arctic Ocean via its influence on the freshwater export from the Siberian Seas, notably the Laptev Sea. Thus, it highlights the need of research focused on atmosphere-ocean interaction in order to understand potential impact of high-latitude warming on the global Arctic Ocean freshwater budget as well as increasing effort to understand the role of Siberian shelves on the Arctic Ocean freshening.
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