

UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Surface Salinity Under Transitioning Ice Cover in the Canada Basin: Climate Model Biases Linked to Vertical Distribution of Fresh Water

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1nt7k1xz>

Journal

Geophysical Research Letters, 48(21)

ISSN

0094-8276

Authors

Rosenblum, E
Fajber, R
Stroeve, JC
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2021-11-16

DOI

10.1029/2021gl094739

Peer reviewed

Surface salinity under transitioning ice cover in the Canada Basin: Climate model biases linked to vertical distribution of fresh water

E. Rosenblum¹, R. Fajber², J. C. Stroeve^{1,3,4}, S. T. Gille⁵, L. B. Tremblay⁶, E. C. Carmack⁷

¹Centre for Earth Observation Science, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

²University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA

³Centre for Polar Observation and Modelling, University College London, Earth Sciences, London, United Kingdom

⁴National Snow and Ice Data Center, Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA

⁵Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

⁶Department of Atmospheric Science, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

⁷Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Sidney, British Columbia, Canada

Key Points:

- Community Earth Systems Model versions 1.1 and 2 significantly underestimate decadal surface freshening in the Canada Basin.
- The surface freshening model bias is likely not related to seasonal freshwater input at the surface from sea ice melt or other sources.
- The models distribute fresh water over an unrealistically large depth range in recent years, which contributes to the surface salinity bias.

Corresponding author: =name=, =email address=

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1029/2021GL094739](https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL094739).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Abstract

The Canada Basin has exhibited a significant trend toward a fresher surface layer and thus a more stratified upper-ocean over the past three decades. State-of-the-art ice-ocean models, by contrast, tend to simulate a surface layer that is saltier and less stratified than observed. Here, we examine decadal changes to seasonal processes that may contribute to this wide-reaching model bias using climate model simulations from the Community Earth System Model and below-ice observations from the Arctic Ice Dynamics Joint Experiment in 1975 and Ice Tethered Profilers in 2006-2012. In contrast to the observations, the models simulate salinity profiles that show relatively little variation between 1975 and 2012. We demonstrate that this bias can be mainly attributed to unrealistically deep vertical mixing in the model, creating a surface layer that is saltier than observed. The results provide insight for climate model improvement with broad implications for Arctic sea ice and ecosystem dynamics.

Plain Language Summary

Climate models, which have been analyzed extensively to assess and predict current and future climate change and to inform policy, struggle to accurately simulate the rapid decline in Arctic sea ice. One possible source of this bias could be related to the vertical distribution of salt in the ocean, which controls the exchange of heat between the surface and deeper ocean. We compare simulations from two climate models to ocean observations collected below sea ice in the Canada Basin. In 1975, observations were collected by scientists living in ice camps, and in 2006-2012, they were obtained by automated instruments attached to sea ice. The observations indicate as much as six times greater surface freshening than the models between 1975 and 2006-2012. We show that the salt bias can be partly attributed to the models' tendency to mix fresh water from the surface deeper than in observations, resulting in a saltier ocean surface. The results may provide insight for climate model improvement that could have wide-reaching implications because the vertical distribution of salt in the ocean directly impacts the vertical transport of heat and nutrients.

1 Introduction

Rapid sea ice retreat has been extensively observed in the Canada Basin over the past several decades (F. McLaughlin et al., 2011). The increased sea ice melt and river runoff that have collected toward the center of the anticyclonic (convergent) Beaufort Gyre (Proshutinsky et al., 2009; Yamamoto-Kawai et al., 2009; F. A. McLaughlin & Carmack, 2010; E. C. Carmack et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2020) drive a 30-year 1.1-1.9 psu/yr trend toward a fresher surface layer (Peralta-Ferriz & Woodgate, 2015). The addition of this relatively light fresh water at the surface has stabilized the upper ocean, altering ice-ocean processes, including wind-driven mixing, the vertical transport of heat and nutrients, and sea ice basal melt (Toole et al., 2010; Jackson et al., 2010, 2011, 2012; Steele et al., 2011; E. Carmack et al., 2015; M. L. Timmermans, 2015; M. Timmermans & Marshall, 2020).

Historically, climate models simulate a slower sea ice retreat than observed (Stroeve et al., 2007; Winton, 2011; Stroeve et al., 2012; Rosenblum & Eisenman, 2016, 2017; Niederrenk & Notz, 2018; SIMIP, 2020). One possible source of the model bias could be related to simulated upper-ocean stratification, which tends to be less stratified in global ice-ocean models than in observations (Holloway et al., 2007; Ilicak et al., 2016). The ocean stratification bias could be related to unrealistic sea ice conditions, which could result in too little freshwater input from sea ice melt each season. Alternatively, the biases could be related to unrealistic ocean processes, such as vertical diffusion (Zhang & Steele, 2007) or brine rejection schemes (Nguyen et al., 2009). Up until now, this stratification bias has mainly been investigated with numerical experiments or by compar-




Figure 1. Observed salinity profiles from 1975 AIDJEX data (blue) and 2006-2012 ITP data (red). Solid line indicates May-December average and shading indicates one standard deviation. (b) Map showing the Canada Basin, the locations of 1975 AIDJEX data (blue) and 2006-2012 ITP data (red), and the region considered for this study (black lines). (c-d) Simulated May-December ensemble-mean basin average salinity profiles in 1970-2020 from (c) CESM1 and (d) CESM2. AIDJEX (blue) and ITP (red) observations are repeated in panels (c,d).

ing simulations to annual climatologies with little to no attention paid to their seasonality (Holloway et al., 2007; Ilicak et al., 2016; Nguyen et al., 2009; Zhang & Steele, 2007; Jin et al., 2012; Barthélemy et al., 2015; Sidorenko et al., 2018).

Here, we explore this problem by examining both sea ice conditions and ocean processes in models and observations using simulations from the two most recent generations of the Community Earth System Model (CESM1 and CESM2), both of which are extensively used in polar studies and in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fifth and Sixth Assessment Reports (AR5 and AR6), and using two sets of year-round ocean observations collected in the Canada Basin during 1975 and 2006-2012. Our main objective is to understand what governs the seasonal salinity evolution in the models and observations in the Canada Basin by examining seasonal surface processes related to sea ice conditions, freshwater input, and vertical mixing, all of which cumulatively contribute to decadal surface freshening. Distinguishing between atmospheric and oceanic processes that cause surface freshening in the models and observations is critical for determining if model freshening mechanisms are consistent with the natural world and helps to identify processes that might be missing or poorly simulated in the models.

2 Methods

We use year-round below-ice observations of ocean salinity collected in the Canada Basin, defined as the region enclosed by 72°N, 80°N, 130°W, and 155°W (Fig. 1b), from the 1975 Arctic Ice Dynamics Joint Experiment (AIDJEX) program (Maykut & McPhee,

1995; Untersteiner et al., 2007) and during 2004-present from the Ice-Tethered Profiler (ITP) instrumentation system (Krishfield et al., 2008; Toole et al., 2011, 2016). There were four occupied AIDJEX ice camps between May 1975 and April 1976 and 30 ITPs, which were available for 2004-2012 at the time of the analysis. The data in this study are identical to those employed by Rosenblum et al. (2021), who showed that June-September surface changes between the ITP and AIDJEX datasets are consistent with 30-year mixed-layer trends reported by Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate (2015) using data mainly associated with low sea ice concentration in the same region. They used only quality-controlled data (level 3) in the ITP archive, screened profiles to select those that include samples shallower than 10 m depth (as in Jackson et al., 2010), and that were collected during the period May 1 - December 31, which is common to both datasets. In total, 754 AIDJEX profiles during 1975 and 3391 ITP profiles during 2006-2012 from 12 ITPs (#1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 33, 41, and 53) satisfied these criteria, with average shallowest measurements of ~ 6 m and ~ 7 m, respectively (Fig 1b). Profiles were linearly interpolated onto a common 1 m vertical grid, and the shallowest values were extrapolated to $z = 0$, which we take as the ice-ocean interface, as in the models.

To examine sea ice conditions associated with the ITP dataset, we identify co-located daily sea ice concentrations, provided by the Passive Microwave satellite data, Version 1 (Cavalieri et al., 1996). Weekly, regional-mean sea ice concentrations associated with the AIDJEX data are provided by the Canadian Ice Service Digital Archive (CISDA) chart data for the western Arctic region (Tivy et al., 2011). We also examine estimates of the 1979-2018 effective sea ice thickness (sea ice volume per unit area) from the Pan Arctic Ice Ocean Modeling and Assimilation System (PIOMAS) (Schweiger et al., 2011). PIOMAS effective sea ice thickness was regridded to the 25-km Equal-Area Scalable Earth (EASE) grid, and data were collected from each grid cell residing in the Canada Basin. While several studies have shown that PIOMAS tends to underestimate sea ice thickness in regions of thicker ice and overestimate sea ice thickness in regions of thinner ice (Stroeve et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2018), the seasonality, spatial structure, distribution, and decadal trends of the sea ice thickness are realistically reproduced (Labe et al., 2018).

We use 30 simulations of 1970-2020 from CESM1 with historical and RCP8.5 forcing from the Large Ensemble project (Kay et al., 2015) and the first 50 CESM2 simulations from the Large Ensemble 2 project with historical and SSP 3-7.0 forcing (Rodgers et al., 2021). The CESM2 data was regridded onto a $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ grid to facilitate the analysis. CESM1 and CESM2 are run with historical forcing until 2005 and 2015, respectively. Both models use the Parallel Ocean Program Version 2 (POP2) model with a displaced pole horizontal grid, a nominal 1° resolution, 60 vertical levels, and 10 m vertical grid spacing near the surface, although some of the physical parameterizations, including the K-profile parameterization (KPP) vertical ocean mixing scheme (Large et al., 1994), differ between the two models (Danabasoglu et al., 2020). We examine the ocean salinity, the effective sea ice thickness, and the sea ice concentration in each grid box within the Canada Basin of each simulation (Table S1).

3 Results

3.1 Upper-ocean salinity

The May-December average ocean salinity over the top 300 m in the models and the observations is shown in Figure 1. The observations indicate a significantly fresher upper-ocean over the top 50 m in 2006-2012 than in 1975, with the largest differences occurring at the surface (Fig. 1a), consistent with previous studies. By contrast, the 1970-2020 ensemble mean shows only a modest freshening from the surface down to 300 m in both models (Fig. 1c-d). This results in a simulated upper-ocean stratification that is weaker than in recent observations, similar to most ice-ocean coupled models.




Figure 2. (a) Surface salinity from 1975 AIDJEX data (blue) and 2006-2012 ITP data (red). Solid line indicates May-December average and shading indicates standard deviation. Blue and red error bars indicate one standard deviation over all grid points and simulations in 1975 and 2006-2012, respectively. (b-c) Simulated 1970-2020 ensemble-mean surface salinity from (b) CESM1 and (c) CESM2. Distribution of August surface salinity in (d) 1975 and (e) 2006-2012 from each observation in 1975 (blue) and 2006-2012 (red), and from each grid point of each CESM1 (black) and CESM2 (purple) simulation of 1975 and 2006-2012 (distribution for CESM2 not shown). Solid dots and lines indicate mean and one standard deviation. AIDJEX (blue) and ITP (red) observations are repeated in panels (b,c).




Figure 3. (a) Observed sea ice concentration co-located to 1975 AIDJEX data (blue) and 2006-2012 ITP data (red). Solid line indicates monthly mean, and shading indicates standard deviation. (b-c) Simulated 1970-2020 ensemble-mean sea ice concentration from (b) CESM1 and (c) CESM2. (d-f) Effective sea ice thickness from (d) PIOMAS and (e,f) CESM1,2 ensemble mean. (g-i) Distribution of the seasonal change of the effective sea ice thickness between May and September during (g) 1979-1998, (h) 1999-2018, and (i) 2006-2012 using all grid points from PIOMAS (red), and from each CESM1 (black) and CESM2 (purple) simulation (distribution for CESM2 not shown). Solid dots and lines indicate the mean and standard deviation. AIDJEX (blue) and ITP (red) observations are repeated in panels (b,c).

To eliminate the possibility that regional or internal variability could explain the bias, we examine the surface salinity from each observation and each grid point of each simulation during each month (Figure 2). In each dataset, we find a clear seasonal cycle where the surface becomes fresher in the summer and saltier in the fall, coinciding with seasonal sea ice evolution. In each month, we find that the models systematically simulate a 1970-2020 surface layer that is more consistent with observations in 1975 than in 2006-2012 (Figs. 2b-c).

Focusing on August (the lowest monthly salinity in the models; Fig. 2d-e; Table S2), we find that CESM1 indicates a 2006-2012 August surface layer that is only 0.7 ± 1.0 g/kg fresher than in 1975, similar to CESM2 (0.7 ± 0.9 g/kg). By contrast, the observations indicate an average 3.6 ± 1.0 g/kg change toward a fresher surface layer during the same time periods. As a consequence, we find that models are consistent with observations in 1975 but not in 2006-2012. From all simulations during August 2006-2012, only 1.4% of CESM1 grid cells and only 0.9% of CESM2 grid cells have a surface salinity that is as salty as any observation. We find similar results for other months (Fig. S1-S2) and after accounting for geographical differences between ITP and AIDJEX data (not shown).

Overall, Figures 1-2 show that the models do not simulate the 1975 to 2006-2012 surface salinity change observed in the Canada Basin and that this bias cannot be explained by regional or internal variability present within the models. In the remainder of this section, we consider three factors related to seasonal surface processes to identify sources of the surface freshening model bias.




Figure 4. (a) Observed sFWC from 1975 AIDJEX data (blue) and 2006-2012 ITP data (red). Solid line indicates monthly-mean and shading indicates one standard deviation. (b-c) Simulated 1970-2020 ensemble-mean sFWC from (b) CESM1 and (c) CESM2. Blue and red error bars indicate one standard deviation over all grid points and simulations in 1975 and 2006-2012, respectively. (d-e) Distribution of August sFWC in (d) 1975 and (e) 2006-2012 from each observation in 1975 (blue) and 2006-2012 (red), and from each grid point of each CESM1 (black) and CESM2 (purple) simulation of 1975 and 2006-2012 (distribution for CESM2 not shown). Solid dots and lines indicate mean and one standard deviation. AIDJEX (blue) and ITP (red) observations are repeated in panels (b,c).

3.2 Sea ice conditions

Seasonal changes to the Arctic Ocean surface layer are primarily driven by the seasonal melting and freezing of sea ice (McPhee & Smith, 1976; Morison & Smith, 1981; Lemke & Manley, 1984; Peralta-Ferriz & Woodgate, 2015). In the models, the observations, and PIOMAS, we find a clear seasonal cycle and a considerable decline in both summer sea ice concentration (Fig. 3a-c) and effective sea ice thickness (Fig. 3d-f). To examine the decadal changes in seasonal sea ice volume evolution, which directly impacts the seasonal freshwater surface flux, we compute a seasonal change (September - May) in the effective ice thickness in each grid box in PIOMAS and in each simulation of CESM1 and CESM2 during 1979-2018 (Fig. 3g-i).

On average, PIOMAS, CESM1, and CESM2 indicate similar seasonal sea ice thickness changes during the melt season in 1979-1998 (0.9 ± 0.6 m, 0.8 ± 0.6 m, and 1.3 ± 0.6 m, respectively), in 1999-2018 (1.1 ± 0.6 m, 1.1 ± 0.6 m, and 1.5 ± 0.4 m, respectively), and in 2006-2012 (1.5 ± 0.7 m, 1.4 ± 0.6 m, and 1.5 ± 0.3 m, respectively). These results suggest that CESM1 and CESM2 are able to realistically simulate the seasonal sea ice volume evolution in the Canada Basin, consistent with previous studies (see references in Methods). This suggests that, while there are differences in sea ice concentration between the models and observations (Fig. 3a-c; Table S2), seasonal sea ice volume biases are unlikely to explain the surface freshening model bias (Fig. 1-2).

3.3 Seasonal freshwater storage

We next estimate the amount of fresh water stored seasonally in the upper ocean by examining the seasonal evolution of the observed and simulated salinity profiles, which reflects any process that drives changes to the upper-ocean salinity, including sea ice melt, river runoff, precipitation, or advection. Specifically, we use the upper-ocean seasonal freshwater content relative to May-average conditions (sFWC), given by:

$$\text{sFWC}(t) = \int_{Z_{fw}(t)}^0 \frac{S_{\text{May}} - S(t, z)}{S_{\text{May}}} \cdot dz, \quad (1)$$

where S is salinity, and Z_{fw} indicates the vertical extent of mixing defined by $S(Z_{fw}) = S_{\text{May}}$, where z and Z_{fw} are both negative. S_{May} is the May-average surface salinity, which is computed separately for each grid box of each year in each model simulation and is computed separately for each ITP or AIDJEX ice camp of each year in the observations. We compute sFWC from May-December at each grid point in each simulation of 1970-2020 from each model and for each observation in 1975 and 2006-2012 (Fig. 4). The value sFWC, therefore, represents the amount of fresh water necessary to explain the transition from a well-mixed May salinity profile (S_{May}) to any subsequent profile ($S(t, z)$) for $z \geq Z_{fw}$ at a given location in the models or observations. Figure S3 shows examples of this calculation from single profiles.

The expression for sFWC differs from the more often used expression for freshwater content in which the reference salinity is set to 34.8 g/kg. Instead, we use a reference salinity that is set to the May-average surface salinity. This difference implies that sFWC reflects the seasonal near-surface freshwater content over a well-defined volume (see SI for full derivation of sFWC), which avoids errors that can arise when using an arbitrary reference salinity (Schauer & Losch, 2019). Furthermore, we use the same criterion for S_{May} in both the models and observations, allowing for a fair comparison.

In both models and observations, we find that the average sFWC increases through the summer and into the fall, coinciding with the summer melt season, river runoff, and the intensification of the convergent Beaufort Gyre circulation. In late fall and early winter, both the models and observations indicate an average decrease of sFWC, coinciding with brine rejection from freeze-up. As in Section 3.1, we consider the distribution of the sFWC from every observation and from every grid point of every simulation in August 1975 and 2006-2012 (Fig. 4d-e). We find that, on average, the August sFWC is 0.4-0.5 m larger in the models than in the observations during both time periods (Table S2). We find similar results for other months, with the bias decreasing in fall 2006-2012 and increasing in fall 1975 (Fig. 4a-c; S4-S5). Together, this causes a smaller change in sFWC between 2006-2012 and 1975 in the models than in the observations.

We note that the simulated internal variability appears to be smaller in CESM2 than in CESM1 (compare standard deviations in Figs. 2-4). This could be related to differences in climate sensitivity, which causes a reduced sea ice volume in CESM2 than in CESM1 (DeRepentigny et al., 2020, Fig. 3b,c,e,f) and thus a reduced variability in freshwater input and surface salinity.

Overall, we find that the models appear to simulate somewhat more fresh water stored near the surface on seasonal timescales than observed. This suggests that, while there are differences in sFWC between the models and observations, insufficient seasonal freshwater input at the surface is not the likely source of the bias toward too little surface freshening in the model (Figs. 1-2).

3.4 Vertical freshwater distribution

Qualitatively, the average 2006-2012 seasonal salinity evolution indicates seasonal freshwater input is stored deeper in the models than in observations (Fig. 5i). To quan-




Figure 5. (a-f) Black solid lines separating each gray shading indicate the monthly-average depths of $Z_{10\%}$, $Z_{20\%}$, ..., Z_{May} (eq. 2) from (a,d) observations, (b,e) CESM1 ensemble-mean, and (c,f) CESM2 ensemble mean in (a-c) 1975 and (d-f) 2006-2012. Dashed lines indicate $Z_{90\%}$ in 1975 (a-c, blue) and 2006-2012 (d-f, red). Blue and red error bars indicate one standard deviation over all grid points and simulations in 1975 and 2006-2012, respectively. (g-h) Distribution of August $Z_{90\%}$ in (g) 1975 and (h) 2006-2012 from each observation 1975 (blue) and 2006-2012 (red), and from each grid point of each CESM1 (black) and CESM2 (purple) simulation of 1975 and 2006-2012 (distribution for CESM2 not shown). Solid dots and lines indicate mean and one standard deviation. (i) Simulated (dashed) and observed (solid) salinity profiles averaged over May (blue) and August (red) of 2006-2012.

230 tify this difference, we examine the the vertical distribution of seasonal freshwater stor-
 231 age in the models and observations during every month by rewriting the expression for
 232 sFWC as:

$$\text{sFWC} = \underbrace{\int_{Z_{10\%}}^0 \frac{S_{\text{May}} - S(z)}{S_{\text{May}}} \cdot dz}_{=10\% \text{ of sFWC}} + \underbrace{\int_{Z_{20\%}}^{Z_{10\%}} \frac{S_{\text{May}} - S(z)}{S_{\text{May}}} \cdot dz}_{=10\% \text{ of sFWC}} + \dots + \underbrace{\int_{Z_{fw}}^{Z_{90\%}} \frac{S_{\text{May}} - S(z)}{S_{\text{May}}} \cdot dz}_{=10\% \text{ of sFWC}}, \quad (2)$$

233 where $Z_{10\%}, Z_{20\%}, \dots, Z_{fw}$ is the lower bound of the depth range that encompasses 10%,
 234 20%,...,100% of the sFWC. These depths are computed at each grid point of each simu-
 235 lation and each observation during May-December of 1975 and 2006-2012 (Figure 5).
 236 We only include data points with positive values of sFWC, implying that some observed
 237 June profiles are not included in this portion of the analysis. As in Section 3.3, we also
 238 consider the August distribution of $Z_{90\%}$ from every observation and from every grid point
 239 of every simulation in 1975 and 2006-2012 (5g-h; Table S2). $Z_{90\%}$ is closely related to
 240 the mixed-layer depth in both the models and observations from July onward, when sFWC
 241 is large enough to form a well-defined summer mixed layer (Fig. S6). We use $Z_{90\%}$ in-
 242 stead of the more commonly used mixed-layer depth because its value can vary based
 243 on its definition (Peralta-Ferriz & Woodgate, 2015) and because the precise definition
 244 of $Z_{90\%}$ is both physically relevant and can be calculated in the same way for both mod-
 245 els and observations.

246 The vertical distribution of sFWC reveals two main discrepancies between the mod-
 247 els and observations (Fig. 5). First, we find that the fresh water is spread over a deeper
 248 range in the simulations (Aug. $Z_{90\%} = 24 \pm 2.7$ m, 26 ± 3.1 m in CESM1, CESM2) com-
 249 pared to the observations (Aug. $Z_{90\%} = 14 \pm 3.7$ m) in 2006-2012. Second, we find that
 250 the vertical distribution of sFWC remains relatively unchanged between 1975 and 2006-
 251 2012 in the simulations (less than 1 m change in Aug. $Z_{90\%}$), while the observations in-
 252 dicate that the fresh water is concentrated significantly closer to the surface in 2006-2012
 253 than in 1975 (~ 8 m change).

254 Interestingly, we also find that the models do simulate a 1975 vertical distribution
 255 of sFWC consistent with the observations during the summer (Aug. $Z_{90\%} = 23 \pm 3.5$ m,
 256 25 ± 2.8 m, and 25 ± 2.8 m in the observations, CESM1, and CESM2, respectively), simi-
 257 lar to the 1975 surface salinity (Figs. 1-2). However, an unrealistically large amount of
 258 fresh water (Fig. 4) is stored unrealistically deep in later months (Fig. 5), suggesting that
 259 this is a result of compensating errors.

260 Overall, we find that the 2006-2012 seasonal freshwater storage has an unrealistic
 261 vertical distribution in the models, and that the discrepancy between the models and
 262 observations cannot be explained by regional or internal variability present within the
 263 models (Fig. 5g-h). Together this suggests that simulated vertical mixing of fresh wa-
 264 ter is inconsistent with observations in recent years and that this is a source of the sur-
 265 face freshening model bias (Fig. 1,2).

266 4 Conclusions

267 State-of-the-art coupled ice-ocean models struggle to accurately simulate upper-
 268 ocean stratification in the Canada Basin, and instead tend to simulate a surface layer
 269 that is saltier and less stratified than observed (Holloway et al., 2007; Ilicak et al., 2016).
 270 The bias could be related to sea ice, atmospheric, or ocean processes and, until now, had
 271 only been examined using numerical experiments and annual climatologies (Holloway et
 272 al., 2007; Ilicak et al., 2016; Nguyen et al., 2009; Zhang & Steele, 2007; Jin et al., 2012;
 273 Barthélemy et al., 2015; Sidorenko et al., 2018). Here, we examine this question by fo-

274 cusing on decadal changes to seasonal surface processes using observations from below-
275 ice ocean measurements collected during May-December 1975 (AIDJEX) and 2006-2012
276 (ITPs) and in the two most recent generations of the Community Earth Systems Mod-
277 els (CESM1 and CESM2).

278 We find that CESM1 and CESM2 have an upper-ocean stratification bias in 2006-
279 2012, similar to most global ice-ocean models, but with an upper-ocean stratification that
280 is fairly consistent with observations in 1975 (Figs. 1-2). That is, the models fail to cap-
281 ture the fresh surface layer that appears in recent years. We show that this surface fresh-
282 ening model bias is likely related to the unrealistically deep mixing of fresh water in the
283 models (Fig. 5), rather than biases related to sea ice conditions (Fig. 3) or insufficient
284 seasonal freshwater input (Fig. 4). This suggests that one source of the 2006-2012 ocean
285 stratification bias is closely related to missing or unrealistic mixed-layer dynamics in re-
286 cent years, rather than unrealistic sea ice conditions or seasonal freshwater input from
287 ice melt, river-runoff, precipitation, advection, or other sources. These results are inde-
288 pendent of differences in climate sensitivity and sea ice conditions between CESM1 and
289 CESM2 (DeRepentigny et al., 2020, Fig. 3), and also do not depend on differences in sea
290 ice concentration between the models and observations (Figs. S7-8).

291 This result raises important questions as to what mechanisms must be included in
292 climate models to simulate the decadal trend toward a shallower summer mixed layer
293 in recent years. Previous studies have indicated that simulated vertical mixing is sensi-
294 tive to several inter-connected processes, including Ekman dynamics (Zhang & Steele,
295 2007), vertical mixing schemes (Liang & Losch, 2018), and ice-ocean momentum trans-
296 fer (Dewey et al., 2018; Meneghello, Marshall, Campin, et al., 2018; Meneghello, Mar-
297 shall, Timmermans, & Scott, 2018), and are directly linked to the representation of At-
298 lantic Water circulation (Zhang & Steele, 2007). Identifying the role of each mechanism
299 and improving their modelled representation will be particularly important in regions
300 such as the Canada Basin, where the summer mixed-layer depth can be smaller than the
301 vertical resolution in the models (~ 10 m). This is an interesting direction of future study.

302 Because the upper-ocean stratification directly impacts the vertical exchange of heat,
303 energy, and nutrients, these results may have important implications for Arctic ecosys-
304 tem dynamics and for sea ice cover. For example, if the unrealistically deep transport
305 of fresh water carries heat downward and traps nutrients deeper, then there could be less
306 heat available for summer sea ice melt, a weaker seasonal ice-albedo feedback, and re-
307 duced primary productivity. These results, therefore, highlight the need for improved
308 parameterizations of upper-ocean dynamics under a rapidly changing sea ice cover.

309 5 Open Research

310 The AIDJEX data used in this study can be found at
311 <http://lwbin-datahub.ad.umanitoba.ca/dataset/aidjex>. The Ice-Tethered Profiler data
312 were collected and made available by the Ice-Tethered Profiler Program based at the Woods
313 Hole Oceanographic Institution and can be found at <https://www2.whoi.edu/site/itp/data/>.
314 All sea ice concentration data created or used during this study are openly available from
315 the NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center at
316 <https://doi.org/10.5067/8GQ8LZQVL0VL>. More information on each data source is listed
317 in the methods and references. The data on which this article is based are fully described
318 in Maykut and Untersteiner (1971); Untersteiner et al. (2007); Krishfield et al. (2008);
319 Toole et al. (2011, 2016); Tivy et al. (2011); Cavalieri et al. (1996); Schweiger et al. (2011);
320 Kay et al. (2015); Danabasoglu et al. (2020).

Acknowledgments

ER was supported by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) PDF award. ER and JS were supported by the NSERC Canada-150 Chair. STG was supported by the US NSF (Awards PLR-1425989 and OPP-1936222) and by the US Department of Energy (DOE) (Award DE-SC0020073). This work is a contribution to the NSERC - Discovery Grant and the NSF Office of Polar Program grant # 1504023 awarded to LBT. RG was supported by the NSERC Canada Discovery Grant program. RF acknowledges funding from NSERC Canada through a CGS-D award and the US DOE (Grant DE-SC001940). The authors thank Benjamin Rabe and Chris Horvat for helpful comments and suggestions.

References

- Barthélemy, A., Fichefet, T., Goosse, H., & Madec, G. (2015). Modeling the interplay between sea ice formation and the oceanic mixed layer: Limitations of simple brine rejection parameterizations. *Ocean Modelling*, *86*, 141–152. doi: 10.1016/j.ocemod.2014.12.009
- Brown, K. A., Holding, J. M., & Carmack, E. C. (2020). Understanding Regional and Seasonal Variability is key to Gaining a Pan-Arctic Perspective on Arctic Ocean Freshening. *Frontiers Mar. Sci*, *7*, 606. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2020.00606
- Carmack, E., Polyakov, I., Padman, L., Fer, I., Hunke, E., Hutchings, J., . . . Winsor, P. (2015). Towards Quantifying the Increasing Role of Oceanic Heat in Sea Ice Loss in the New Arctic. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*. doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00177.1
- Carmack, E. C., Yamamoto-Kawai, M., Haine, T. W. N., Bacon, S., Bluhm, B. A., Lique, C., . . . Williams, W. J. (2016). Freshwater and its role in the Arctic Marine System: Sources, disposition, storage, export, and physical and biogeochemical consequences in the Arctic and global oceans. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, *121*, 675–717. doi: 10.1002/2015JG003140
- Cavalieri, D., Parkinson, C. L., Gloersen, P., & Zwally, H. J. (1996). Sea Ice Concentrations from SMMR and DMSP SSMI/I-SSMIS Passive Microwave Data, Version1. *Natl. Snow and Ice Data Cent., Boulder, Colo.* ((Updated 2015.) <https://nsidc.org/data/nsidc-0051>)
- Danabasoglu, G., Lamarque, J. F., Bacmeister, J., Bailey, D. A., DuVivier, A. K., Edwards, J., . . . Strand, W. G. (2020). The Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2). *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, *12*(2), 1–35. doi: 10.1029/2019MS001916
- DeRepentigny, P., Jahn, A., Holland, M. M., & Smith, A. (2020). Arctic sea ice in two configurations of the cesm2 during the 20th and 21st centuries. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *125*(9), e2020JC016133.
- Dewey, S., Morison, J., Kwok, R., Dickinson, S., Morison, D., & Andersen, R. (2018). Arctic Ice-Ocean Coupling and Gyre Equilibration Observed With Remote Sensing. *Geophysical Research Letters*. doi: 10.1002/2017GL076229
- Holloway, G., Dupont, F., Golubeva, E., Hkkinen, S., Hunke, E., Jin, M., . . . Zhang, J. (2007). Water properties and circulation in Arctic Ocean models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *112*(4), 1–18. doi: 10.1029/2006JC003642
- Ilicak, M., Drange, H., Wang, Q., Gerdes, R., Aksenov, Y., Bailey, D., . . . Yeager, S. G. (2016). An assessment of the Arctic Ocean in a suite of interannual CORE-II simulations. Part III: Hydrography and fluxes. *Ocean Modelling*, *100*, 141–161.
- Jackson, J. M., Allen, S. E., McLaughlin, F. A., Woodgate, R. A., & Carmack, E. C. (2011). Changes to the near-surface waters in the Canada Basin, Arctic Ocean from 1993-2009: A basin in transition. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *116*, 1–21. doi: 10.1029/2011JC007069
- Jackson, J. M., Carmack, E. C., McLaughlin, F. A., Allen, S. E., & Ingram, R. G.

- 374 (2010). Identification, characterization, and change of the near-surface tem-
 375 perature maximum in the Canada Basin, 1993-2008. *Journal of Geophysical*
 376 *Research: Oceans*, *115*, 1–16. doi: 10.1029/2009JC005265
- 377 Jackson, J. M., Williams, W. J., & Carmack, E. C. (2012). Winter sea-ice melt in
 378 the Canada Basin, Arctic ocean. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *39*, 2–7. doi:
 379 10.1029/2011GL050219
- 380 Jin, M., Hutchings, J., Kawaguchi, Y., & Kikuchi, T. (2012). Ocean mixing
 381 with lead-dependent subgrid scale brine rejection parameterization in a cli-
 382 mate model. *Journal of Ocean University of China*, *11*(4), 473–480. doi:
 383 10.1007/s11802-012-2094-4
- 384 Kay, J. E., Deser, C., Phillips, A., Mai, A., Hannay, C., Strand, G., . . . Vertenstein,
 385 M. (2015). The community earth system model (CESM) large ensemble
 386 project : A community resource for studying climate change in the presence of
 387 internal climate variability. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*,
 388 *96*, 1333–1349. doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00255.1
- 389 Krishfield, R., Toole, J., Proshutinsky, A., & Timmermans, M. L. (2008). Auto-
 390 mated ice-tethered profilers for seawater observations under pack ice in all
 391 seasons. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, *25*(11), 2091–2105.
 392 doi: 10.1175/2008JTECHO587.1
- 393 Labe, Z., Magnusdottir, G., & Stern, H. (2018). Variability of Arctic sea ice thick-
 394 ness using PIOMAS and the CESM large ensemble. *Journal of Climate*, *31*(8),
 395 3233–3247. doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0436.1
- 396 Large, W. G., McWilliams, J. C., & Doney, S. C. (1994). Oceanic vertical mixing: A
 397 review and a model with a nonlocal boundary layer parameterization. *Reviews*
 398 *of Geophysics*, *34*(4), 363–403. doi: 10.1029/94RG01872
- 399 Lemke, P., & Manley, T. O. (1984). The seasonal variation of the mixed layer and
 400 the pycnocline under polar sea ice. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *89*, 6494.
 401 doi: 10.1029/JC089iC04p06494
- 402 Liang, X., & Losch, M. (2018). On the effects of increased vertical mixing on the
 403 arctic ocean and sea ice. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *123*(12),
 404 9266–9282.
- 405 Maykut, G. A., & McPhee, M. G. (1995). Solar heating of the Arctic mixed layer.
 406 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *100*, 24691. doi: 10.1029/95JC02554
- 407 Maykut, G. A., & Untersteiner, N. (1971). Some results from a time-dependent ther-
 408 modynamic model of sea ice. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *76*(6), 1550–
 409 1575. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1029/JC076i006p01550>
 410 doi: 10.1029/JC076i006p01550
- 411 McLaughlin, F., Carmack, E., Proshutinsky, A., Krishfield, R., Guay, C., Yamamoto-
 412 Kawai, M., . . . Williams, B. (2011). The Rapid Response of the Canada
 413 Basin to Climate Forcing. *Oceanography*, *24*, 136–145. doi: 10.5670/
 414 oceanog.2011.66
- 415 McLaughlin, F. A., & Carmack, E. C. (2010). Deepening of the nutricline and
 416 chlorophyll maximum in the Canada Basin interior, 2003-2009. *Geophysical*
 417 *Research Letters*, *37*(24), 1–5. doi: 10.1029/2010GL045459
- 418 McPhee, M. G., & Smith, J. D. (1976). Measurements of the turbulent boundary
 419 layer under pack ice. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, *6*, 696–711. doi: 10
 420 .1175/1520-0485(1976)006(0696:MOTTBL)2.0.CO;2
- 421 Meneghello, G., Marshall, J., Campin, J. M., Doddridge, E., & Timmermans, M. L.
 422 (2018). The Ice-Ocean Governor: Ice-Ocean Stress Feedback Limits Beau-
 423 fort Gyre Spin-Up. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *45*, 11,293–11,299. doi:
 424 10.1029/2018GL080171
- 425 Meneghello, G., Marshall, J., Timmermans, M. L., & Scott, J. (2018). Obser-
 426 vations of seasonal upwelling and downwelling in the Beaufort Sea medi-
 427 ated by sea ice. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, *48*(4), 795–805. doi:
 428 10.1175/JPO-D-17-0188.1

- 429 Morison, J., & Smith, J. D. (1981). Seasonal variations in the upper Arctic Ocean
430 as observed at T3. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 8, 753–756. doi: 10.1029/
431 GL008i007p00753
- 432 Nguyen, A. T., Menemenlis, D., & Kwok, R. (2009). Improved modeling of the arctic
433 halocline with a subgrid-scale brine rejection parameterization. *Journal of*
434 *Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 114(11), 1–12. doi: 10.1029/2008JC005121
- 435 Niederdrenk, A. L., & Notz, D. (2018). Arctic Sea Ice in a 1.5C Warmer World.
436 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45(4), 1963–1971. doi: 10.1002/2017GL076159
- 437 Peralta-Ferriz, C., & Woodgate, R. A. (2015). Seasonal and interannual vari-
438 ability of pan-Arctic surface mixed layer properties from 1979 to 2012
439 from hydrographic data, and the dominance of stratification for multiyear
440 mixed layer depth shoaling. *Progress in Oceanography*, 134, 19–53. doi:
441 10.1016/j.poccean.2014.12.005
- 442 Proshutinsky, A., Krishfield, R., Timmermans, M.-L., Toole, J., Carmack, E.,
443 McLaughlin, F., ... Shimada, K. (2009). Beaufort Gyre freshwater reser-
444 voir: State and variability from observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research*,
445 114. doi: 10.1029/2008JC005104
- 446 Rodgers, K. B., Lee, S.-S., Rosenbloom, N., Timmermann, A., Danabasoglu, G.,
447 Deser, C., ... others (2021). Ubiquity of human-induced changes in climate
448 variability. *Earth System Dynamics Discussions*, 1–22.
- 449 Rosenblum, E., & Eisenman, I. (2016). Faster Arctic sea ice retreat in CMIP5 than
450 in CMIP3 due to volcanoes. *Journal of Climate*, 29(24), 9179–9188. doi: 10
451 .1175/JCLI-D-16-0391.1
- 452 Rosenblum, E., & Eisenman, I. (2017). Sea ice trends in climate models only ac-
453 curate in runs with biased global warming. *Journal of Climate*, 30(16), 6265–
454 6278. doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0455.1
- 455 Rosenblum, E., Stroeve, J. S., Gille, S., Tremblay, L., Carmack, E. C., Barber,
456 D. G., ... Fajber, R. (2021). Freshwater input and vertical distribution
457 in the Canada Basin’s seasonal halocline: 1975 versus 2006–2012. *Preprint:*
458 <https://doi.org/10.1002/essoar.10507192.1>.
- 459 Schauer, U., & Losch, M. (2019). Freshwater in the ocean is not a useful parameter
460 in climate research. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 49(9), 2309–2321. doi:
461 10.1175/JPO-D-19-0102.1
- 462 Schweiger, A., Lindsay, R., Zhang, J., Steele, M., & Stern, H. (2011). Uncertainty in
463 modeled Arctic sea ice volume. *Journal of Geophysical Research*.
- 464 Sidorenko, D., Koldunov, N. V., Wang, Q., Danilov, S., Goessling, H. F., Gurses, O.,
465 ... Jung, T. (2018). Influence of a Salt Plume Parameterization in a Cou-
466 pled Climate Model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 10(9),
467 2357–2373. doi: 10.1029/2018MS001291
- 468 SIMIP. (2020). Arctic Sea Ice in CMIP6. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(10). doi:
469 10.1029/2019gl086749
- 470 Steele, M., Ermold, W., & Zhang, J. (2011). Modeling the formation and
471 fate of the near-surface temperature maximum in the Canadian Basin of
472 the Arctic Ocean. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116, C11015. doi:
473 10.1029/2010JC006803
- 474 Stroeve, J., Barrett, A., Serreze, M., & Schweiger, A. (2014). Using records
475 from submarine, aircraft and satellites to evaluate climate model simu-
476 lations of Arctic sea ice thickness. *Cryosphere*, 8(5), 1839–1854. doi:
477 10.5194/tc-8-1839-2014
- 478 Stroeve, J., Holland, M. M., Meier, W., Scambos, T., & Serreze, M. (2007). Arctic
479 sea ice decline: Faster than forecast. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L09501.
480 doi: 10.1029/2007GL029703
- 481 Stroeve, J., Kattsov, V., Barrett, A., Serreze, M., Pavlova, T., Holland, M.,
482 & Meier, W. N. (2012). Trends in Arctic sea ice extent from CMIP5,
483 CMIP3 and observations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39, L16502. doi:

- 484 10.1029/2012GL052676
485 Timmermans, M., & Marshall, J. (2020). Understanding Arctic Ocean Circulation:
486 A Review of Ocean Dynamics in a Changing Climate. *Journal of Geophysical*
487 *Research: Oceans*, 125, 1–35. doi: 10.1029/2018jc014378
- 488 Timmermans, M. L. (2015). The impact of stored solar heat on Arctic sea
489 ice growth. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42, 6399–6406. doi: 10.1002/
490 2015GL064541
- 491 Tivy, A., Howell, S. E., Alt, B., McCourt, S., Chagnon, R., Crocker, G., ... Yackel,
492 J. J. (2011). Trends and variability in summer sea ice cover in the Cana-
493 dian Arctic based on the Canadian Ice Service Digital Archive, 1960-2008
494 and 1968-2008. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 116. doi:
495 10.1029/2009JC005855
- 496 Toole, J. M., Krishfield, R. A., Timmermans, M. L., & Proshutinsky, A. (2011). The
497 Ice-Tethered profiler: Argo of the Arctic. *Oceanography*, 24(3), 126–135. doi:
498 10.5670/oceanog.2011.64
- 499 Toole, J. M., Krishfield, R. A., & Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Ice-
500 Tethered Profiler Program. (2016). Ice-Tethered Profiler observations: Vertical
501 profiles of salinity from an Ice-Tethered Profiler buoy system. *NOAA National*
502 *Centers for Environmental Information*. Dataset accessed October 24, 2019.
503 doi: 10.7289/v5mw2f7x
- 504 Toole, J. M., Timmermans, M. L., Perovich, D. K., Krishfield, R. A., Proshutin-
505 sky, A., & Richter-Menge, J. A. (2010). Influences of the ocean surface
506 mixed layer and thermohaline stratification on Arctic Sea ice in the central
507 Canada Basin. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 115, 1–14. doi:
508 10.1029/2009JC005660
- 509 Untersteiner, N., Thorndike, A. S., Rothrock, D. A., & Hunkins, K. L. (2007). AID-
510 JEX revisited: A look back at the U.S.-Canadian Arctic Ice Dynamics Joint
511 Experiment 1970-78. *Arctic*, 60, 327–336. doi: 10.14430/arctic233
- 512 Wang, Q., Wekerle, C., Danilov, S., Koldunov, N., Sidorenko, D., Sein, D., ... Jung,
513 T. (2018). Arctic sea ice decline significantly contributed to the unprecedented
514 liquid freshwater accumulation in the Beaufort Gyre of the Arctic Ocean. *Geo-*
515 *physical Research Letters*, 45(10), 4956–4964. doi: 10.1029/2018GL077901
- 516 Winton, M. (2011). Do climate models underestimate the sensitivity of northern
517 hemisphere sea ice cover? *Journal of Climate*, 24, 3924–3934. doi: 10.1175/
518 2011JCLI4146.1
- 519 Yamamoto-Kawai, M., McLaughlin, F. A., Carmack, E. C., Nishino, S., Shimada,
520 K., & Kurita, N. (2009). Surface freshening of the Canada Basin, 2003-
521 2007: River runoff versus sea ice meltwater. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
522 *Oceans*, 114, 2003–2007. doi: 10.1029/2008JC005000
- 523 Zhang, J., & Steele, M. (2007). Effect of vertical mixing on the Atlantic Water layer
524 circulation in the Arctic Ocean. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*,
525 112(4), 1–9. doi: 10.1029/2006JC003732