Modeling the seasonal variability of hydrography and circulation in the Kara Sea
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Abstract. In the frame of a project on transport of contaminants in the Arctic, the Hamburg shelf ocean model (HAMSOM) is applied to the Kara Sea. The HAMSOM system consists of a threedimensional, baroclinic circulation model coupled to a thermodynamic and dynamic sea ice model. The Kara Sea model is forced with climatological winds, atmospheric heat fluxes, river runoff, and tides. The obtained results reveal no typical Kara Sea circulation that prevails throughout the year. Instead, the model showed a strong seasonal variability in circulation and hydrography due to winds, freshwater runoff, and ice formation. The circulation is weakest in spring when the wind speeds are low and horizontal density gradients are small. Fresh water from the rivers spreads toward the north and northwest rather than forming a coastaly trapped current that flows to the east. In autumn, the circulation is significantly enhanced because of increasing wind speeds and strong horizontal density gradients. Good agreement was found between model results and recent observations. The "classical" cyclonic current pattern in the southern Kara Sea, however, was not reproduced by the model.

1. Motivation
Over the past 5 years, several publications reported on increasing environmental problems in the Arctic Ocean and the Kara Sea (overview is given by Nilsson [1997]). One prominent example of Arctic pollution is the dumping of radioactive waste by the former Soviet Union [Yablokow et al., 1993] which provided the motivation for intense experimental fieldwork [Joint Russian-Norwegian Expert Group, 1996] and model studies on radionuclide transport in Arctic Shelf seas [Scott et al., 1997; Harms, 1997b]. The great Siberian rivers that drain huge land areas and industrial zones may also contribute to the input of pollutants into the Arctic environment. In addition, intense oil and gas exploitation which is planned for the Kara Sea and finally the operation of the Northern Sea Route may cause environmental problems [Moe et al., 1997].

In 1994, a joint project was initiated by the German Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency and the University of Hamburg (Institute for Marine Research) to investigate transport and dispersion of contaminants in the Arctic Ocean. The major goal of this work was to improve the oceanographic knowledge of the Arctic and the Kara Sea with respect to pathways and transit times of possible contaminants. Several numerical models were used in this project to evaluate present and future environmental problems of that region.

The present model study is part of this project and investigates circulation and hydrography of the Kara Sea with special emphasis on the seasonal variability. Section 2 describes the model used and section 3 presents the results. A summary and discussion are given in section 4.

2. Kara Sea Model
The Kara Sea model is based on the coding of the Hamburg shelf ocean model (HAMSOM) which is briefly described in section 2.1 and 2.2. A more detailed description of HAMSOM with applications to coastal waters and Arctic Shelf seas is given by Stronach et al. [1993], Harms [1994], and Harms [1997a]. Special emphasis is given to the application of the forcing data which is described in section 2.3.

2.1. HAMSOM System
HAMSOM is a three-dimensional, baroclinic circulation model, developed at the Institute of Marine Research (University Hamburg) for investigations of shelf sea processes [Backhaus, 1985]. The level type model is based on nonlinear primitive equations of motion, invoking the hydrostatic approximation and the equation of continuity which serves to predict the elevation of the free surface from the divergence of the depth mean transport. The numerical scheme of the circulation model is semi-implicit, and the equations are discretized as finite differences on an Arakawa C-grid.

Vertical sub-grid scale turbulence is parameterized by means of a turbulent closure approach, proposed by Kochergin [1987] and later modified by Pohlmann [1996]. The scheme is closely related to a Mellor and Yamada [1974] level-2 model where vertical eddy viscosity coefficients depend on stratification and vertical current shear. Convective overturning is parameterized by vertical mixing; an unstable stratification is turned into a neutral state through artificial enlargement of the vertical eddy
viscosity coefficient. The horizontal diffusion of momentum is calculated using a constant, isotropic eddy viscosity coefficient.

The circulation model includes an Eulerian transport algorithm for temperature, salinity, and passive tracers based on the advection-diffusion equation and an upstream scheme. Vertical eddy diffusivity coefficients are calculated in the same way as vertical eddy viscosity coefficients, depending on stratification and vertical current shear. Horizontal eddy diffusion is neglected because of numerical diffusion stemming from the advection scheme. This artificial horizontal diffusion is related to the advection velocity, the average grid size, and the time step. For small and moderate velocities (< 0.3 m/s), which are typical for the simulated Kara Sea circulation, the artificial diffusion remains below 10^{-4} m^2/s.

The circulation model is coupled to a thermodynamic and dynamic sea ice model which calculates space and time dependent variations of ice thickness and ice concentration. The basic configuration follows Hibler's [1979] one-layer sea ice model. The classification constant for thin and thick ice is set in our case to 0.2 m. Ice thinner than this value is treated thermodynamically as open water. Thermodynamic changes in ice thickness and concentration depend principally on the sum of the involved heat fluxes. Latent and sensible heat fluxes at the ocean- or ice-atmosphere interfaces are calculated with standard bulk formulae [Maykut, 1986] on the basis of air temperatures, humidity, and cloud cover. Additional heat fluxes encompass the conductive heat flux through the ice, the turbulent heat flux under the ice, the long-wave radiation, and the incoming short-wave radiation. Salt fluxes due to brine release and ice melting are proportional to thermodynamic ice growth [Iemke et al. 1990]. A constant and isotropic ice salinity of 10 practical salinity units (psu) is used which is related mainly to thin ice and new ice formation.

The dynamic part of the ice model is kept simple and does not include an ice rheology. Instead, a "free drift" algorithm accounts for advection of ice thickness and ice concentration due to wind and water stress at the surface or the bottom of the ice [Bruno and Madsen, 1989]. This approach was chosen in order to reduce the computer time for tracer simulations over long time spans. The calculation of the wind stress at the ice or water surface follows a second-order approach with individual wind drag coefficients for water and ice [McPhee, 1979]. In order to account for fast ice, the ice drift in winter should be suppressed in very shallow regions with depth < 20 m. However, a "numerical switch" between normal ice movement (depth > 20 m) and no ice movement (depth < 20 m) caused rather unrealistic discontinuities not only in the ice velocities but also in ice thickness and concentration. In order to smooth this effect, we decided to define a "transition zone" between regions with more than 50 m depth, where the ice drift is free and regions with less than 20 m depth, where the ice drift is set to zero. This interpolation algorithm is applied only in winter (i.e., January, February, and March). It will be shown in section 3.1.1. that this rather simple dynamic approach reproduces observed ice thickness and concentrations in the Kara Sea remarkably well.

2.2. Model Configuration

The HAMSO-System is applied with high spatial resolution to the central Kara Sea (Figure 1). The domain includes very shallow areas (< 50 m) along the Siberian coast, the river estuaries of Ob and Yenisei as well as the deep Novaya Semlya Trough (> 400 m). The topography is based mainly on the ETOPO 5 data set [Hirt, 1985]. Some smaller corrections were made according to sea charts of that region [Perry and Fleming, 1986; Cherkis et al., 1990] and topographic data sets from other model applications [Kowalik and Proshutinsky, 1993]. The Kara Strait (to the Barents Sea) and the Vilkitsky Strait (to the Laptev Sea) represent open boundaries to the model. The northern parts of the Kara Sea, namely, the Svyataya Anna Trough, were excluded since these areas are strongly influenced by the Barents Sea outflow toward the Arctic. The grid of the model is equidistant with a mesh size of 9.4 km. The vertical scale is resolved with 12 layers having boundaries in 5, 10, 15, 25, 50, 75, 100, 150, 200, 300, 400, and 500 m depths.

![Figure 1. Domain and topography of the Kara Sea model.](image-url)
The size of the matrix is 85 by 170, resulting in 50,051 wet grid points.

If not mentioned otherwise, a zero-gradient condition is applied at all open boundaries to (1) the horizontal velocity components for ice and water movement, to (2) temperature and salinity, and also to (3) ice concentration and ice thickness. The sea surface elevation at open boundaries is prescribed. The calculation of boundary values encompasses the inverse barometric effect coming from the air pressure, the geostrophic adjustment of the baroclinic field, and the tides (see section 2.3).

2.3. Applied Forcing Data

The application of numerical models to Arctic Shelf seas is very different from applications to well-known areas such as the North Sea or the Baltic Sea. The quality and quantity of forcing data is usually critical in Arctic Shelf regions, and a validation of model results is a difficult task. The intention of the paper is therefore also to describe the forcing data in order to evaluate their role in affecting the seasonal variability of circulation and hydrography. The Kara Sea model is forced with (1) M2-tides, (2) monthly mean climatological data for wind speed and direction, (3) monthly mean climatological data for air temperature, cloud cover, and humidity, (4) 10 day mean river runoff data, (5) 10-day mean Kara Strait throughflow data, and (6) initial temperature and salinity fields.

The following five paragraphs describe the main characteristics of the applied forcing in more detail. Section 2.3.1. summarizes briefly the results from tidal simulations which were achieved using a previous barotropic/no-ice version of the Kara Sea model.

2.3.1. Tides. The Kara Sea Model accounts for the dominant M2 tidal constituent. Amplitudes and phases were taken from a tidal model of the Arctic Ocean [Kowalik and Proshutinsky, 1994] and applied to the open boundaries. A comparison with observations and other model results [Kowalik and Proshutinsky, 1994; Gjevik and Straume, 1989] showed that the agreement is very good in the deeper central and southwestern parts of the Kara Sea, where the tidal influence is strong (see below). In very shallow northeastern parts, however, the comparison revealed some smaller differences (20 - 30%) between computed and observed amplitudes or phases (Table 1).

In two cases, the differences were higher than 40%. This can be attributed to the northeastern open boundary of the model which unfortunately cuts through an amphidromic point west of Severniy Semlya. The tidal solution proved to be sensitive to prescribed amplitudes and phases there. Another reason for differences might be the model topography which may reproduce the very shallow, complex bottom relief insufficiently.

Simulated M2 tidal elevations are dominated by an amphidromic point in the western Kara Sea which is forced by a 180° phase lag of the incoming tidal wave between the Kara Strait and the open boundary to the Arctic Ocean. Simulated amplitudes (Figure 2a) usually remain below 20 cm except in two areas: the southern "Baydaratskaya" Bay area, where tidal resonance causes amplitudes of more than 70 cm, and the area north of Yamal peninsula around Belyy Island (30 - 35 cm).

Simulated maximum tidal currents (Figure 2b) are strongest in the Baydaratskaya Bay and near the river estuary of the Ob (30 cm/s). In the small strait between Yamal and Belyy Island, tidal currents may exceed 50 cm/s due to considerable horizontal gradients in tidal elevation. Preliminary tracer simulations [Karcher et al., 1997] showed that these areas are significantly influenced by tidal mixing. Other regions, in particular those to the east of Novaya Semlya and in the eastern Kara Sea (along the Siberian coast) are only weakly influenced by the M2 tides.

Residual currents can usually be found in shallow areas where tidal currents are strong. Again, this holds true for the Ob estuary, the area north of Yamal peninsula (around Belyy Island), and the Baydaratskaya Bay. However, the velocities are generally small and remain below 2 cm/s. Around Belyy Island, residual currents form a weak anticyclonic circulation.

Table 1. Comparison Between Observed and Simulated Amplitudes and Phases of the M2 tide in the Kara Sea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Simulated</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amplitude cm</td>
<td>Phase deg</td>
<td>Amplitude cm</td>
<td>Phase deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Yugorskiy Shar</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Ysi Kara</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Maaresaale</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Harasavey</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Belyi</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Zjelania</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Uedininia Island</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Izvestiy Chik Island</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Isachenko Island</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Pravdy Island</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Taymir Island</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Russkiy Island</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Krasnoflotskie Island</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Djkson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Leskin Island</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Obskaya Guba</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The station numbers refer to locations in Figure 2.
2.3.2. Atmospheric forcing. The Kara Sea model is forced with monthly mean climatological wind stress values, deduced by Trenberth et al. [1989] from European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast data [1988] for the period 1980-1989. The obtained wind fields (Figure 3) show strong, monsoon-like variability due to the seasonal air pressure distribution over the Arctic.

In winter, the Kara Sea is in a transition zone between a large and stable high-pressure cell over central Siberia and low-pressure ridges over the Barents and Norwegian Seas. Monthly mean wind speeds are high and very stable then, with maximum velocities of 8.5 m/s in February. From October to March, a cyclonic curl prevails with main wind directions from south to southwest for the central Kara Sea.

In summer, the air pressure distribution is reversed. The Siberian high-pressure cell decreases, and a high-pressure cell develops over the central Arctic. Horizontal air pressure gradients are much weaker, and the wind speeds are lower (2-4 m/s). The wind directions are more changeable, but north or northeast winds dominate.

Monthly mean climatological air temperature, humidity and cloud cover data were deduced by Aukrust and Oberhuber [1995] from ECMWF data for the period 1985-1990. The seasonal air temperature variance over Kara Sea waters is considerable and ranges from +5°C over the southwestern parts in August to -33°C over eastern parts in January. Compared to these strong variances, the relative humidity and the cloud cover remain quite stable during the whole year. The humidity is usually >80%, and the cloud cover is between 60% and 80% in summer and >80% in winter.

2.3.3. River runoff. The Kara Sea is dominated by large freshwater runoff in spring [Pavlov et al., 1993]. The freshwater supply to the Kara Sea is mainly through the Ob and Yenisei rivers which drain a catchment area in Siberia and Russia of more than 5 million km². The total annual amount of freshwater input into the Kara Sea equals roughly 1200 km³/yr, of which 80% is discharged in spring (May - June) [Pavlov and Pfarman, 1995].

Information on the river runoff to the Kara Sea was taken from an unpublished data review on the hydrology of Arctic rivers (O.F. Vasilyev et al., "Estimate of river water inflow to the Karsk Sea", Institute for Water and Environmental Problems, Siberian Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, 1995). This review includes data of observed freshwater runoff rates from Siberian rivers for certain years. Apart from strong seasonal variations, the runoff values also showed interannual variations between "wet" and "dry" years. Tables 2 and 3 give yearly mean runoff rates in m³/s for dry, wet and average years.
for the Ob and Yenisei rivers, respectively. In order to be consistent with the climatological atmospheric forcing, it was decided to use a realistic year with an average runoff for both rivers. This was found to be 1980, when the Ob and Yenisei rivers had yearly mean freshwater discharges of 12,700 m³/s and 17,300 m³/s, respectively.

In the Kara Sea model, the river runoff rates from the Ob, Yenisei and Pyasina are prescribed as 10-day mean volume fluxes in m³/s (Figure 1). The Ob tributaries, Taz and Pur, are included in the Ob runoff. The salinity of the rivers at the point where they enter the model domain was set to 5 psu, whereas the temperature was prescribed depending on the season. Highest river temperature in August was set to 3.8°C; the lowest was during winter at the freezing point (-0.3°C).

2.3.4. Kara Strait throughflow. The Barents Sea inflow through the Kara Strait is of major importance because it brings heat and salt into the Kara Sea. To account for these effects, the net inflow or outflow is prescribed as 10-day mean volume fluxes (Figure 5). These data were deduced from a coupled ice-ocean isopycnic general circulation model for the Arctic and sub-Arctic domains [Karcher and Oberhuber, 1997]. Temperature and salinity in the Kara Strait were prescribed according to the Gorshkov [1980] data atlas.

The simulated time series in Figure 5 suggests that the variability of the flow through the Kara Strait is mainly wind driven. Inflow from the Barents Sea is most enhanced during winter, when strong south to southwesterly winds prevail.

Table 2. Selected yearly mean discharge rates of the Ob river.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Discharge rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>most dry</td>
<td>8,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>most wet</td>
<td>18,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are given in m³/s. Source is an unpublished report "Estimate of river water inflow to the Karas Sea", by O.F. Vasiliev et al., Institute for Water and Environmental Problems, Siberian Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, 1995.

Table 3. Selected yearly mean discharge rates of the Yenisei river.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Discharge rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>most dry</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>17,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>most wet</td>
<td>20,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are given in m³/s. Source is an unpublished report "Estimate of river water inflow to the Karas Sea", by O.F. Vasiliev et al., Institute for Water and Environmental Problems, Siberian Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, 1995.
maximum transport rate into the Kara Sea is 0.65 Sv during the first half of January. In summer, when northerly winds prevail, the inflow is reduced, showing a slight net outflow (-0.07 Sv) toward the Barents Sea in July and August. The mean inflow averaged over 1 year is 0.3 Sv.

The computed time series of volume flux through the Kara Strait is in good agreement with observations of Pavlov and Pfirman [1995]. They estimated the yearly averaged inflow toward the Kara Sea to be in the range of 0.04 Sv up to 0.6 Sv. However, the seasonal variability of the throughflow is almost unknown, except for some single observations: "Historic" circulation patterns, deduced from hydrographic observations and direct current measurements, suggest a water exchange through the strait in both directions [Pfirman et al., 1997]. According to these surface flow charts, the northern part of the strait is dominated by an outflow from the Kara Sea (the "Litke Current") whereas the southern part is dominated by an inflow from the Barents Sea. This bidirectional flow, which also appears in laboratory simulations (T.A. McClimans, personal communication, 1997), has been recently supported by satellite images from the Kara Strait, but only for the summer season. Advanced very high resolution radiometer (AVHRR) data from August 1988 and 1994 reveal considerable horizontal temperature gradients across the strait which might be due to horizontal current shear [Pfirman et al., 1997]. Since there is no information on the winter situation, it remains unclear if this is a permanent or a seasonal feature.

The observed bidirectional flow in the Kara Strait is thought to be forced by northerly winds driving surface waters to the west and by the Pechora runoff which results in a density driven coastal current, flowing to the east. Both features do not appear in winter; the runoff is absent and the winds are from south to southwest. It is therefore unlikely that the observed bidirectional flow is also present during winter. Looking at the wind direction and speed over the Kara Strait, it is more reasonable to assume that the Barents Sea inflow is much stronger from October to March than during the remaining part of the year. The computed time series of volume fluxes in Figure 5 supports these assumptions.

2.3.5. Temperature and salinity data. Because of severe climate conditions but also because of political reasons, the Kara Sea was relatively inaccessible during the last decades. This still seems to be the case, and results in a general lack of data for validation and forcing of numerical models. With respect to the high resolution of the applied model grid and in order to avoid the application of insufficiently resolved temperature and salinity data sets, the model is not constrained to any climatological data. Instead, it was decided to use reasonable initial fields for the start and to run the model in a full prognostic mode. Several test runs showed that the small grid size allows for a very detailed space resolution of, for example, frontal structures in the vicinity of the river plume which are found to be poorly resolved in available climatological data sets.

The model is started at rest in late winter, April 1. There is no ice at the sea surface. The initial temperature is set to the freezing point in the whole model domain following the description of Pavlov et al. [1993]. The initial salinity distribution is prescribed according to the spring data of Levitus [1982]. Applying these start conditions, the model needs a spin-up of at least one summer and one winter season to achieve reasonable results for circulation and hydrography.

3. Results

The Kara Sea model was run with the complete set of forcing functions in a prognostic mode for several years. After 3 years, the model reached an almost cyclic stationary state. This holds true, in particular, for the circulation, the sea surface elevations, and the temperatures which behave quite robustly. A more sensitive variable is the surface salinity. Simulations for time spans longer than 3 years revealed a small drift for the average surface salinity which is due an imbalance between freshwater runoff, ice formation, and ice export.

The following model results are taken from the third year of simulation. We first describe the results concerning the

Figure 5. Proscribed Kara Strait throughflow, deduced from an Arctic isopycnal general circulation model [Karcher and Oberhuber, 1997]. The total river runoff is shown for comparison.
3.1. Hydrography

The following Section describes the simulated seasonal variability of the hydrography, focusing on sea surface temperatures (3.1.1), sea ice (3.1.2), sea surface salinity (3.1.3), and vertical stratification (3.2.4).

3.1.1. Sea surface temperature (SST). Because of a closed ice cover, the SST in the Kara Sea (Figure 6) is at the freezing point until April. In spring, the incoming short wave radiation is mainly used for ice melting which starts in May in the river estuaries and along the Siberian coast. In these ice-free areas, the inflowing river water mixes with melt water creating, together with atmospheric warming, a thin but very pronounced, warm and low saline surface layer. The spring ice melting is also strong along the east coast of Novaya Semlya where prevailing northerly winds drive the ice cover offshore. This allows the short wave radiation to penetrate into surface waters and to heat them. In July, August, and September, the southern Kara Sea is ice free. The highest surface temperatures occur in August near the Kara Strait and in the Baydaratskaya Bay (6°- 7°C). These values agree well with observed average summer temperatures in the southern Kara Sea given by Pavlov et al. [1993] and Burenkov and Vasilkov [1995]. Because of a small remaining ice shield between Novaya Semlya and Severnaya Semlya, the SST does not rise significantly above the freezing points there.

Freezing starts already in September in the eastern parts and the surface temperatures drop rapidly during October and November in the whole Kara Sea. In the eastern parts of the Kara Sea, the ice cover establishes quite fast because of a pronounced haline stratification (river and melt water) which inhibits vertical mixing and heat transfer from below. In the western parts, however, where the Barents Sea inflow is dominating, the haline stratification is much weaker. Here vertical mixing and upward heat transfer are more intense, which hampers a rapid closing of the ice cover and keeps the autumn SST significantly higher than in the eastern parts. Until December, an almost closed ice cover is established also in the southern parts, and the SST is at (or close to) the freezing point.

![Figure 6. Simulated sea surface temperatures from May to October.](image)

![Figure 7. Simulated seasonal cycle of the ice volume in the Kara Sea model domain.](image)
3.1.2. Sea ice. The model reproduces a strong seasonal variance of the ice cover. In January, February, and March, the Kara Sea is completely covered by ice with a maximum (average) ice thickness of 1.7 m. In August-September, however, the Kara Sea is almost totally ice free. Only a small ice shield remains between Novaya Semlya and Severnaya Semlya with an average ice thickness of 0.5 m. The seasonal variance of ice volume in the model domain is depicted in Figure 7; the ice volume decreases from almost 500 km$^3$ in April down to less than 50 km$^3$ in September.

Simulated ice thickness and concentrations are compared to climatological data (Figures 8 and 9) in order to evaluate the model results. For this purpose, mean ice thickness distributions in Siberian Shelf seas [Romanov, 1995] during minimum and maximum ice seasons (August-September and March-April, respectively) were averaged over the years 1972-1981. The comparison with model results (Figure 8) reveals a slight overestimation of the simulated ice thickness in winter, whereas the simulated summer ice thickness is somewhat underestimated along the Siberian coast. Instead, the model shows larger summer ice thickness between Novaya Semlya and Severnaya Semlya. It has to be mentioned, however, that the interannual variance of the original data (1972-1981) is considerable.

Mean ice concentrations for similar (minimum and
maximum) seasons are taken from satellite passive-microwave observations during the years 1978–1987 [Gloersen et al., 1997] We additionally compare the ice concentrations in November which is the main freezing month (Figure 9). Bearing in mind the rather simple "free drift" ice dynamics of the model, the comparison shows a remarkably good agreement. As with the ice thickness, a small disagreement can be seen in summer, when the simulated ice concentration in the northeastern parts is underestimated.

The rather good agreement between winter observations and simulations can be attributed to the fact that the Kara Sea is an ice export region, where thermodynamic ice formation and divergent (offshore) ice movement dominates. A prevailing convergent ice movement (onshore), which can be assumed in summer in the eastern parts, leads to specific dynamic processes such as pressuring and ridging. Since these processes are not considered in our model, the comparison for these cases is not as good. We would like to stress that the ice model is not totally mass conserving. However, the ice results show that our simplified approach (no rheology, free drift, and land-fast ice) offers, at least for ice export regions like the Eurasian Arctic shelves, a reasonable and less expensive alternative to complex ice models.

### 3.1.3. Sea surface salinity (SSS)

The seasonal evolution of the SSS is depicted in Figure 10. The river runoff starts in May and June when the fresh water flows mainly to the east. However, in July and August, the freshwater signal from the Ob and Yenisei also propagates northwestward into the central Kara Sea (see detailed discussion in section 3.2.3). Together with the ice melting, the river water also causes a considerable freshening of the surface layers in the central Kara Sea.

The increase of SSS in autumn and winter is most pronounced east of Novaya Semlya and in the Baydaratskaya Bay where thermodynamic ice formation provides a strong salt input through brine release. By the end of March, the fresh surface layer has almost vanished except in the river estuaries and along the Siberian coast.

The general spatial structure of the SSS is well reproduced by the model. Simulated regional differences concerning the seasonal increase and decrease of the SSS are largely supported by descriptions of Pavlov et al. [1993]. However, comparisons with almost synoptic observations are difficult. The observed summer SSS in the Kara Sea such as that given by Milligan [1969] or Burenkov and Vasill'kov [1995] is partly different from the simulated summer climatic mean. This holds true, in particular, for regions north of the estuaries where the observed SSS is lower and frontal structures are more pronounced than in our simulations. This difference can be attributed first of all to the fact that the model uses climatological forcing, whereas the data from Burenkov and Vasill'kov [1995], for example, were taken in a year with rather anomalous winds. A second reason might be an insufficient space resolution of the river plume which prejudices the reproduction of frontal structures.

The salt budget for Kara Sea surface waters depends mainly on the ice formation and the river runoff. Previous studies have shown [Harms, 1997c] that the yearly averaged, simulated thermodynamic ice production is largely dominated by high net freezing rates along the Siberian coast, with maximum values of
the order of 4 - 6 m/yr. Because of a significant ice export of roughly 150 km$^3$/yr [Pavlov et al., 1993], the salt input through thermodynamic ice growth in winter is much larger than the corresponding freshwater release through ice melting in spring and summer. This considerable imbalance is largely compensated by the freshwater runoff from the rivers. In this respect, the model underlines the important roles that river runoff, thermodynamic ice growth, and resulting ice export have for the hydrography of the Kara Sea.

However, all these factors are subject to interannual variability. The question to what extent the salt input through ice formation is balanced by the river runoff or by fluxes through open boundaries cannot be answered using climatological forcing fields. Future model studies on the freshwater balance of the Kara Sea should use realistic forcing fields in order to include interannual variations in river runoff and atmospheric forcing.

3.1.4. Stratification. Simulated temperature and salinity profiles for summer and winter are compared to observations in the Novaya Semlya Trough [Pavlov and Pfirman, 1995] (Figure 11). Whereas in winter the stratification is generally weak, the summer situation (September) is characterized by a thermohaline stratification, caused by freshwater runoff, ice melting and atmospheric warming. It can be seen from Figure 11 that the model reveals a slight deficiency in maintaining strong vertical gradients from spring until September. However, this is typical for three-dimensional level models with rather simple turbulence closure schemes. More detailed studies on the Kara Sea stratification should probably involve a submodel with a more sophisticated turbulence closure, as suggested for example by Burchard and Baumbier [1995].

A very strong haline stratification can be observed in late summer/autumn at the Siberian shore when the freshwater plume is established. Vertical density gradients in this area (Figure 12a) are most pronounced in the upper 50 m causing rather strong baroclinic pressure gradients (see also section 3.2.4.). Other typical features of the observed Kara Sea stratification are temperature maxima in 50-100 m depth in autumn, caused by vertical mixing and convection due to atmospheric cooling and ice formation. The model produces a
3.2. Circulation

An overview of the circulation is given by averaged yearly mean fields in section 3.2.1. This gives an impression of the prevailing current systems. The seasonal variance is depicted by surface means of the winter (JFM), spring (AMJ), summer (JAS) and autumn (OND) circulation in section 3.2.2. Special emphasis is given to the surface circulation in regions of freshwater influence (section 3.2.3) and to the sub-surface and near bottom flows (section 3.2.4).

3.2.1. Yearly mean circulation. The model circulation of the upper layers is partly in disagreement with "classical" pictures of the southern Kara Sea circulation. According to Pavlov et al. [1993] and Pavlov and Pfirrmann [1995], the general surface circulation should be dominated by a southward going coastal current at the east coast of Novaya Semlya (i.e., the "Fast Novaya Semlya Current") and a northward going current at the west coast of the Yamal peninsula (i.e., the "Yamal Current"). These two flows should result in a cyclonic circulation pattern in the southern Kara Sea. Unfortunately, no information is given on the seasonal variability of the circulation.

Simulated, yearly averaged flow fields of the upper five layers (0-50 m) do not show this cyclonic circulation (Figure 13). A southward flow along the east coast of Novaya Semlya is completely absent, and the northward flowing Yamal Current is a seasonal feature that appears only in autumn (see section 3.2.2). Instead, the simulated flow field is dominated by topographically guided, northeastward currents that extend from the Kara Strait to Severnaya Semlya and Vilkitsky Strait. Northeastward currents prevail throughout the year along the southeast coast of Novaya Semlya.

The yearly mean surface circulation along the Siberian coast to the east of the Yenisei is dominated by a strong, northeastward flowing coastal current. The flow originates in the river estuaries and leaves through Vilkitsky Strait and west of Severnaya Semlya. In spite of northerly currents at the surface, the near-bottom flow (25-50 m) reveals an undercurrent, flowing at southward directions toward the estuaries.

3.2.2. Seasonal variability of the surface circulation. The simulated sea surface elevation (SSE) in the Kara Sea (Figure 14) is characterized throughout the year by higher levels along the Siberian coast and lower levels along the east coast of Novaya Semlya. This underlines the general northeastward flow which dominates throughout the year in the Kara Sea. However, the SSE gradient varies seasonally, being most pronounced in autumn and winter and weakest in spring and summer. The enhancement in autumn and winter is caused by cyclonic wind fields and the river plume that moves along the Siberian shore. The opposite situation occurs in spring and autumn, when weaker northerly winds prevail and the amount of fresh river water is much smaller.

Despite this dominating SSE gradient, which suggests a more or less prevailing northeastward flow in the Kara Sea, the model reveals a considerable seasonal variability of the surface circulation (Figure 15). The main features can be summarised as follows.

3.2.2.1. Autumn and winter: Current speeds are strongest in autumn during October, November, and December. The general surface flow is from southwest to northeast, caused by strong cyclonic wind fields, pronounced horizontal density and SSE gradients and a maximum inflow from the Barents Sea through the Kara Strait. Because of these factors, the Siberian Coastal Current as well as the Yamal Current are enhanced. At the northern open boundary, outflow from the Kara Sea toward
the Arctic Ocean dominates. The flow at the southeast coast of Novaya Semlya is to the north.

These circulation patterns are visible also in September, although this month actually belongs to the summer. However, concerning the wind forcing, the September situation is ambiguous. The applied ECMWF climatology, for example, shows a cyclonic autumn wind field already for September. This might explain why observations which were actually made in late summer (September 1994) show good agreement with the simulated autumn circulation. The broad northeastward flow in
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**Figure 13.** Simulated yearly averaged currents at the surface and in the fifth layer.

**Figure 14.** Simulated seasonal mean surface elevations for spring, summer, autumn, and winter.
the southern Kara Sea was also found in acoustic Doppler current profiler (ADCP) data [Johnson et al., 1997].

The winter situation in January, February, and March is very similar to autumn, however, current speeds are somewhat weaker in midwinter. This is mostly due to the breakdown of the river runoff and the retreat of the river plume which results in decreasing horizontal density and SSE gradients. A secondary effect is the reduced transfer of momentum from the atmosphere to the ocean because less mobile ice (landfast ice) covers the shallow parts of the sea.

3.2.2.2. Spring and summer: The spring (April, May, and June) and summer (July, August, and September) situation is very different from autumn and winter. It is characterized by weak anticyclonic wind fields and strong river runoff but very weak horizontal density and SSE gradients. The prevailing wind direction is from north to northeast. The Barents Sea inflow through the Kara Strait is small, with slightly negative values in July and August. However, a significant inflow from the Arctic or the Barents Sea around the northern tip of Novaya Semya can be observed. There is also some inflow from the Laptev Sea through Vilkitsky Strait. This inflow occurs only during spring and summer, when winds are favorable. Westerly currents in Vilkitsky Strait were also observed in 24-hour current meter mooring data recorded during the Northwind expedition [Milligan, 1969, Johnson et al., 1997]. The general surface circulation pattern in spring tends to be anticyclonic, at least in the southwestern Kara Sea. Apart from enhanced velocities close to the river estuaries, the current speeds in spring and summer are generally much weaker than in autumn.

3.2.3. Region of freshwater influence (ROFI). Although the whole Kara Sea has to be regarded as a ROFI, the freshwater influence is strongest in the estuaries. The seasonal variance of the currents in the Ob and Yenisei estuaries is very pronounced (Figure 16). The currents are strongest during spring and summer when the runoff is large. In spring (May and June), when most parts of the Kara Sea are still covered by ice, the estuarine currents turn sharply to the east. The landfast ice inhibits momentum transfer from the atmosphere, and the flow is mostly density driven. As a result, topographically guided meanders form during May or June, and the horizontal current (and density) shear is considerable. The further retreat of the ice cover in July and August allows the wind to act on the sea surface and to drive the fresh water from the estuaries to the north and northwest. This is reflected in northward currents in the estuaries during July and August. However, the flow at the northern Yamal coast is in the south.

Simulated SSS and also SSE confirm that the summer freshwater signal from the Ob and Yenisei propagates into the central Kara Sea, instead of going mainly eastward as one would expect. A northwestern flow close to the river estuaries was also observed in laboratory simulations by McClimens [1997]. Since these simulations were run without any wind forcing, McClimens attributed the northward flow of river plumes to tidal rectification. However, in our numerical simulations, the main driving force for the northwestward spreading is the wind. A wind-induced dispersion of river water to the northwest has also been suggested by Nansen [1902]. It was later confirmed by Milligan [1969] and was recently found by Johnson et al. [1997].

From September on, when the freshwater plume has its largest extent, the winds change to the cycloonic winter situation. Large amounts of freshwater are pushed back to the Siberian shore, and a pronounced coastal current develops that prevails throughout the autumn and early winter. At the same time, "high" saline water from the southwestern Kara Sea flushes the west coast of the Yamal peninsula. It penetrates into the freshwater plume north of Yamal and cuts it off from the coast (see Figure 10, X, XI, XII). As a result, isolated lenses of low-saline river water remain in the southern Kara Sea. Very similar observations were made by Burenkov and Vasil’kov [1995], who
found exceptionally low-salinity values in freshwater lenses east of Novaya Semya. The high silicate content of this water showed that the observed lens was related to river discharge. Burenkov and Vasil'kov suggest that these lenses are formed through detachment of the Ob and Yenisei river plume from the coast.

In preliminary dispersion studies [Karcher et al., 1997], tracers were released in the Ob and Yenisei estuaries during the peak runoff. These simulations showed that the spreading and the transit times depend very much on the tracer depth (see also section 3.2.4). Whereas surface river tracers usually need less than 2 years to leave the model domain, near-bottom tracers might circulate for several years in the central Kara Sea. This holds in particular for "deep" Ob tracers that spread to a large extent in the southwestern Kara Sea.

3.2.4. Sub-surface and near bottom flows. The seasonal variance in the deeper layers is much weaker than at the surface. Examples are given for the fifth model layer, between 25 and 50 m (Figure 17), which usually coincides with the lower boundary of the upper thermo-haline stratification (see section 3.1.4). The seasonal variance in these depths is confined to two circulation types for either spring/summer or autumn/winter. However, the differences between summer and autumn circulation concerns mainly the flow intensities. Because of a permanent SSE gradient (c.f. Figure 14), a northeastward flow dominates in both seasons the circulation along the southeast coast of Novaya Semya and in the central Kara Sea.

In both seasons, summer and autumn, a southwestward upcurrent flows at 5-10 cm/s along the Siberian shores in the opposite direction to the surface flow. In our model simulations, the main driving force for this flow is a strong baroclinic pressure gradient (see also section 3.1.4, and Figure 12a) that opposes the barotropic one, stemming from the SSE field. The most favorable season for this case is late summer, when the river plume is fully established and the wind and SSE fields still reflect the summer situation. The Siberian upcurrent is therefore strongest in late summer and weakest or absent in late winter or spring. Recent observations and modeling efforts support our findings: vertical current shear was also found at current meter moorings deployed close to the Ob and Yenisei estuaries in autumn [Johnson et al., 1997] and also in laboratory model studies by McClain [1997]. However, in both cases the observed upcurrent was slightly weaker as in our simulations.

The strongest seasonal variability in depths between 25 and 50 m can be found at the Yamal coast. Northward currents prevail only during autumn and winter, whereas in spring and
summer the flow is southward. This is very similar to the surface circulation, suggesting a barotropic current profile. The wind fields and the related SSE are the main driving forces for this flow.

The deep flows in the seventh layer, between 75 and 100 m (Figure 18), are mainly driven by barotropic pressure gradients originating from the Kara Strait inflow and the wind fields. A strong topographic steering can be observed, which results in two recirculation cells just to the east of the Kara Strait. The inflow from the Barents Sea first moves in a southern loop into Baydaratskaya Bay before returning to the Kara Strait again. There the broad northward flow partly recirculates in a northern loop that also returns to the Kara Strait, this time by flowing southward along the coast of Novaya Semlya. Very similar recirculation cells were reported from laboratory tracer experiments by McClimans [1997]. These recirculation patterns suggest that (1) the inflowing water masses from the Barents Sea may return with a westward flow to the Kara Strait and (2) the residence times for inflowing Barents Sea water masses or contaminants in the southern Kara Sea may be prolonged.

After passing the recirculation cells to the east of the Kara Strait, the northeastward flow continues through the central Kara Sea toward Severnaya Semlya and the Vilkitsky Strait. The seasonal variance in these depths is small and mostly confined to the flow intensity. The described flow field with maximum current speeds of more than 10 cm/s close to the Kara Strait dominates from November to March. In summer, the flow is significantly weaker, but there is no reverse in the current direction.

4. Summary and Final Remarks

Summarizing the main results of the present model study, it can be said that the yearly averaged flow field is dominated by the autumn situation, because this season shows the strongest circulation. However, there is no typical "Kara Sea circulation" that prevails throughout the year. The model results revealed a pronounced seasonal variability that is caused by the wind field, the freshwater runoff, and the ice formation. This variability concerns not only the circulation but also the hydrography.

An evaluation of the Kara Sea model is difficult, first of all because direct observations are scarce or unpublished and second because the application of climatological forcing fields in prognostic model simulations leads to "artificial" results that do not reflect a real or observed situation. This allows only for a qualitative comparison between climatological model results and direct measurements. Another problem arises from the fact that most of the available observations were made during summer.
There is almost no information on the remaining time of the year, which makes a validation of our winter and spring results difficult.

The simulated hydrography is found to be in good agreement with available observations. In particular, the general spatial structure of the SST and SSS is well reproduced by the model. Some differences were found in the comparison with measurements; the observed summer SSS in the Kara Sea ROI is somewhat lower than in the simulations. This can be attributed to the climatic forcing but also to an insufficient horizontal resolution by the model. Similar problems occurred in the vertical, where the model showed some deficiencies in maintaining the strong summer stratification for 2 or 3 months. Future model studies should consider these points by using a higher spatial resolution, sophisticated turbulence closure schemes, and realistic forcing fields on the basis of, for example, daily means.

Concerning the simulated circulation, we found a very good agreement between our model results and the available observations in several areas. Laboratory modeling results seem to support the numerical model results on several points. Some discrepancies appeared when we compare the model simulations with the oceanographic descriptions of the Kara Sea given by Pavlov et al. [1993] and Pavlov and Pjirmann [1995]. The described hydrography agrees well with our model results, but there were some differences concerning the circulation. The frequently cited cyclonic current pattern which should dominate the circulation in the central and southern Kara Sea is not (or only partly) present in our model simulations. The main reasons for this are (1) the absence of the Eastern Novaya Semlya Current and (2) the strong seasonality of the Yamal Current that appears only in autumn in our simulations.

As mentioned previously, the simulated flow along the east coast of Novaya Semlya is generally weak and mostly to the north. This agrees with a drifter trajectory [Feyn and Nikitin, 1994] from August to September 1994. Although this is a very weak and maybe also an incidental support, we found no published observations that indicated a flow to the south. If the Eastern Novaya Semlya Current really exists, it might be a very narrow coastal current, driven by freshwater runoff from Novaya Semlya. It may be a seasonal signal that is only observed in summer, very close to the coast. This would also explain why the Eastern Novaya Semlya Current did not appear in the model: the grid resolution is too coarse and the freshwater runoff from Novaya Semlya is not included.

The discrepancy concerning the simulated and observed Yamal Current can probably be explained in the same way. The northward flowing Yamal current was mainly observed in autumn when climate and weather are favorable. This leads to the "traditional" but probably wrong impression that northward currents prevail throughout the year at the Yamal coast.

These are only two attempts to explain the differences between the model results and the traditional picture of the Kara Sea circulation. The authors do not claim that the model is right and the traditional view is wrong. However, without detailed observations, it cannot be definitely concluded whether the Kara Sea circulation really behaves according to the traditional view or not.

Two more simulated features seem to be important not only for the Kara Sea circulation but also for contaminant transport: the southward, near-bottom flow below the Siberian Coastal Current and two recirculation cells that appear in the deeper layers east of the Kara Strait. For both features, we found some agreement with recent observations and laboratory modeling. However, the present model results underline the urgent need for more information on the Kara Sea circulation and hydrography.

5. Outlook

The achieved circulation results will be used for tracer dispersion simulations in order to study the major pathways for contaminants in the Kara Sea [Nies et al., 1997; Karcher et al., 1997]. This also concerns terrigenous substances in ice and
water, its accumulation on the shelf, and its transport from the shelf into the open ocean environment. The sediment supply to the Kara Sea and the deep Arctic basins is mainly controlled by river discharges. From more than 30 million tons of suspended material that is discharged annually into the Kara Sea, only 0.47 million tons (1.5%) are believed to leave the shelf. In contrast, 80% of the dissolved matter discharged by rivers is expected to enter the Arctic Ocean [Schlosser et al., 1995]. As the model results have shown previously, the inflowing fresh water causes a strong seasonality in hydrography and circulation on the shelf. The same strong seasonality can be assumed for the input of dissolved and particulate matter from the rivers. The peak release of suspended matter by the rivers might be even more pronounced than the freshwater signal itself. With respect to sediment transport in water and sea ice, it is interesting to mention that simulated ice velocities, surface currents, and near-bottom flows in the river estuaries might have considerable differences in direction. However, this is a subject for ongoing investigations and will be discussed in a future publication.
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