

### **(1) Comments from Referee 1**

Comment by D. R. Eriksen (Referee) [ruth.eriksen@csiro.au](mailto:ruth.eriksen@csiro.au)

Received and published: 3 September 2018

5

General comments: Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The current state of research and new approaches described are an important contribution to improving high frequency time-series in locations that are traditionally hard to access for year-round observations. The observatory described, located in a region of dynamic change, is impressive, and although this paper presents preliminary analysis of results, the compilation of information on how the observatory was designed and factors that resulted in the final design are incredibly important for other research programs that use complex moorings arrays in harsh environments. The value of communicating “lessons learned” cannot be understated. I look forward to the following series of papers that provide in depth analysis of these high frequency observations and improved understanding of ecosystem dynamics in this region.

10

15 Minor comments:

P 2, l 42. Figure 4. Because this is such a great illustration of a time-series of change in a complex environment, I immediately went looking for the artists name, it took me a little while to find it. I wonder if you can highlight this more in the caption. Or provide a download link to a high -quality version that can be used with appropriate citation and acknowledgement.

20

P3, l 10 Do you have continuous data for estimates of MLD at the mooring location? Even a simple summary of how this changes relative to water column depth over the seasonal cycle would be useful for those of us more familiar with Antarctic cycles than Arctic cycles and ocean dynamics.

25

P 3, l 13- can you provide a citation for the “relatively low grazing activity”? This is an interesting point for understanding modes of carbon export compared to other polar systems. Also, any linkages to zooplankton phenology associated with both the summer and fall phytoplankton blooms.

P 3, l39 this freeze-up mooring and associated data set is fantastic. I can see wide applications.

30

P 4 l 12 Can you comment on how many times during a typical mooring deployment cycle you were able to obtain samples for sensor calibration purposes? The option of profiling winches is certainly attractive option, with the potential for “event based “sampling if real-time communications limitations can be overcome

P 6 l 45 SOTS observatory is described by “Eriksen et al” (not “Erikson”)

## **(2) Author's response**

Dear Dr. Eriksen,

Thank you very much for taking the time to review our manuscript. We are currently working on a series of papers  
5 describing our data in more detail and are hoping to be able to submit these papers soon.

We really appreciate your comments about the art and are hoping that it will be used widely. Besides highlighting  
Klara Maisch's name in the caption, we will also provide a link to a high-resolution version of her art that will be hosted on  
her private website, including an appropriate citation.

10 We unfortunately do not have seasonal data for the mixed layer depth at the mooring location. The ice detection buoy  
is a first try to get a better understanding of the mixed layer depth from the time it is deployed (late July or August) until freeze  
up. Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015 (Progress in Oceanography) compiled available salinity and temperature profiles from  
1979-2012 and estimated a mixed layer depth minimum of 12 m in July/August and maximum of 36 m in March. Current  
methods to collect seasonal mixed layer depth data are too costly for our project (e.g. WHOI's bottom lander), but we are  
15 looking into other options.

There are several studies that suggest a relatively low grazing rate for the Chukchi Sea. For  
example, Campbell et al 2009 (Campbell, R.G., E.B. Sherr, C.J. Ashjian, S. Plourde, B.F. Sherr, V. Hill,  
and D.A. Stockwell. 2009. Mesozooplankton prey preference and grazing impact in the western Arctic  
Ocean. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography* 56 (17): 1274-1289) and Kitamura  
20 M, Amakasu K, Kikuchi T, Nishino S (2017) Seasonal dynamics of zooplankton in the southern Chukchi  
Sea revealed from acoustic backscattering strength. *Continental Shelf Research* 133:47-58  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2016.12.009>.

However, co-author Catherine Lalande has been working up data from CEO's sediment trap, which contain a lot of  
fecal pellets, pointing towards high grazing pressure during spring. Her hypothesis is that even if there is a productive  
25 zooplankton community, primary production is so extremely high and the shelf so shallow that carbon export is considerable.  
These results and zooplankton phenology associated with the summer and fall blooms, including a discussion of papers  
reporting low grazing pressure will be presented in a manuscript that is currently in preparation.

We always take calibration samples at deployment and recovery of the observatory. Unfortunately, since the HydroC  
30 pCO<sub>2</sub> and SeapHOx sensors need some acclimatization time (~ 2 weeks for SeapHOx), samples taken right after their  
deployment cannot be used for calibration. However, we are usually able to get 1 to 3 additional calibration samples in fall,  
depending on cruises of opportunity and the willingness of the PIs to make the effort of collecting water samples.

All comments are directly addressed in the manuscript and described in section (3) “Authors changes in manuscript.”

Thank you again for reviewing our manuscript and for your productive comments.

Best regards,  
Claudine Hauri and co-authors

(3) Author's changes in manuscript

P 2, l 42. Figure 4. Because this is such a great illustration of a time-series of change in a complex environment, I immediately went looking for the artists name, it took me a little while to find it. I wonder if you can highlight this more in the caption. Or provide a download link to a high -quality version that can be used with appropriate citation and acknowledgement.

We added the following sentences to the caption of figure 3: The illustration was painted by Klara Maisch. A high-resolution version can be downloaded from her personal website at: <https://klaramaisch.com/chukchi-sea-mooring-illustration>.

P 3, l 10 Do you have continuous data for estimates of MLD at the mooring location? Even a simple summary of how this changes relative to water column depth over the seasonal cycle would be useful for those of us more familiar with Antarctic cycles than Arctic cycles and ocean dynamics.

We added available information about the mixed layer depth to the text. These estimates are based on available data from the entire Chukchi Sea. We changed the text accordingly:

p. 3 L.1: Through heat loss, sea ice formation, and brine rejection (Fig. 3B) in late fall and winter, the water column over the Chukchi shelf becomes more saline and vertically homogenized (Weingartner et al., 2005), deepening the mixed layer depth to a maximum of ~36 m in March (Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015).

P. 3 L. 9: During this time, the water column stratifies with inputs of fresh meltwater and heat at the surface (Fig. 3G), leading to a shoaling of the mixed layer depth to a minimum of ~12 m (Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015). This is the time when extraordinary phytoplankton blooms occur in the nutrient rich surface waters (Fig. 3F; Hill et al., 2018).

P 3, l 13- can you provide a citation for the “relatively low grazing activity”? This is an interesting point for understanding modes of carbon export compared to other polar systems. Also, any linkages to zooplankton phenology associated with both the summer and fall phytoplankton blooms.

We modified the text to: P.3 L 12: These high rates of primary production support large fluxes of sinking particulate organic matter to the seafloor (Fig. 3I, Lalande et al., 2007), thereby sustaining a rich benthic ecosystem (Fig. 3J; Grebmeier et al., 2006, Grebmeier et al., 2015), which attracts large numbers of marine mammals that forage on the benthos (Fig. 3K; Jay et al., 2012; Hannay et al., 2013) or Arctic cod (Fig. 3L).

P 3, 139 this freeze-up mooring and associated data set is fantastic. I can see wide applications. Thank you!

P 4 l 12 Can you comment on how many times during a typical mooring deployment cycle you were able to obtain samples for sensor calibration purposes? The option of profiling winches is certainly attractive option, with the potential for “event based “sampling if real-time communications limitations can be overcome

Please see the comment above. To calibrate the 2015-2016 NO<sub>3</sub> data record, we used two calibration samples as described in the figure 6 caption, p16, L5-8: “*In-situ* NO<sub>3</sub> water samples were collected at times of the CEO deployment and recovery, and were analysed with standard wet chemical determinations of nitrate + nitrite of frozen samples at the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory. Using the calibration samples as anchor points, a drift of 12  $\mu\text{mol l}^{-1}$  throughout the deployment was found and corrected by linearly detrending the data.”

P 6 l 45 SOTS observatory is described by “Eriksen et al” (not “Erikson”)

We corrected the typo.

#### (1) Comments from Referee 1

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 October 2018

The authors present a blueprint for a complete observing system, capable of capturing relevant physical, chemical and biological parameters for monitoring and understanding the progress of change in a vulnerable Arctic system. While the paper doesn't really focus on new scientific results, the manuscript is a useful way to share the challenges and early successes of working with an automated observing platform in a remote region. I hope that papers with a deeper focus on the science are forthcoming. The description of the physical environment and the well-studied physical seasonality provides a nice background for the description of the observing platform and the presentation of preliminary results.

The freeze up detection method sounds great – was the ‘expendable float’ recovered? Would be a tough sell to leave gear like that behind by design in the Antarctic.



Minor Comments: It would have been nice to see the CO<sub>2</sub> system data that was collected once the SeapHOx sensor was added since these provide the data required to address questions relevant to the progress of acidification which the authors outline as a key research goal. It was reassuring to see the correspondence in temperature at 34 and 43 meters depth since measurements are restricted to the subsurface – any ideas about seasonality of mixed layer depth? The pCO<sub>2</sub> supersaturations observed In Canadian waters in winter were more shallow than 34 meters (see also Shadwick et al., 2011 L&O).

(2) Author's response

Dear Referee,

We are grateful to you for taking the time to review our manuscript, thank you. We are currently working on a series of papers describing our data in more detail and are hoping to be able to submit these papers soon. The reason we did not include pH and pCO<sub>2</sub> data in this current paper is that the timeseries of pH and pCO<sub>2</sub> only starts in the summer of 2016. We chose to show the data return of our 2015/2016 deployment because it contained the most complete record of post-processed data to date.

Similar to drifting buoys, the top float of our ice freeze up buoy is left behind. It contains the satellite communications modem, and some very basic electronics to trigger the release and a battery, which make up about 1/3 of the price. The vast majority of the cost of the mooring is recovered, including all scientific sensors and acoustic releases. We have put effort into trying to make them more biodegradable by using fewer plastics and this is an ongoing process.

We unfortunately do not have seasonal data for the mixed layer depth at the mooring location. The ice detection buoy is a first try to get a better understanding of the mixed layer depth from the time it is deployed (late July or August) until freeze up. Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015 (Progress in Oceanography) compiled available salinity and temperature profiles from 1979-2012 and estimated a mixed layer depth minimum of 12 m in July/August and maximum of 36 m in March. Please keep in mind that these estimates are based on available data from the entire Chukchi Sea, and may not precisely reflect the seasonality of the mixed layer depth at the observatory location. Current methods, such as using benthic landers to collect seasonal mixed layer depth data are outside the scope of our project, but we are looking into other options. While analyzing our biogeochemical data, we will keep in mind that the mixed layer depth may at times be deeper than the location of our sensors.

(3) Author's changes in manuscript

Any ideas about seasonality of mixed layer depth?

We added available information about the mixed layer depth to the text. These estimates are based on available data from the entire Chukchi Sea. We changed the text accordingly:

p. 3 L.1: Through heat loss, sea ice formation, and brine rejection (Fig. 3B) in late fall and winter, the water column over the Chukchi shelf becomes more saline and vertically homogenized (Weingartner et al., 2005), deepening the mixed layer depth to a maximum of ~36 m in March (Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015).

- 5 P. 3 L. 9: During this time, the water column stratifies with inputs of fresh meltwater and heat at the surface (Fig. 3G), leading to a shoaling of the mixed layer depth to a minimum of ~12 m (Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015). This is the time when extraordinary phytoplankton blooms occur in the nutrient rich surface waters (Fig. 3F; Hill et al., 2018).

## From sea ice to seals: A moored marine ecosystem observatory in the Arctic

Claudine Hauri<sup>1</sup>, Seth Danielson<sup>2</sup>, Andrew M. P. McDonnell<sup>2</sup>, Russell R. Hopcroft<sup>2</sup>, Peter Winsor<sup>2</sup>, Peter Shipton<sup>2</sup>, Catherine Lalonde<sup>3</sup>, Kathleen M. Stafford<sup>4</sup>, John K. Horne<sup>5</sup>, Lee W. Cooper<sup>6</sup>, Jacqueline M. Grebmeier<sup>6</sup>, Andrew Mahoney<sup>7</sup>, Klara Maisch<sup>8</sup>, Molly McCammon<sup>9</sup>, Hank Statscewich<sup>2</sup>, Andy Sybrandy<sup>10</sup>, Thomas Weingartner<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>International Arctic Research Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK, 99775, USA

- 15 <sup>2</sup>College of Fisheries and Ocean Science, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK, 99775, USA

<sup>3</sup>Département de Biologie, Université Laval, Québec, QC, G1V 0A6, Canada

<sup>4</sup>Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98195, USA

<sup>5</sup>School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98195, USA

<sup>6</sup>Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Solomons, MD, 20688, USA

- 20 <sup>7</sup>Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK, 99775, USA

<sup>8</sup>Klara Maisch Art and Design, Fairbanks, AK, 99775, USA

<sup>9</sup>Alaska Ocean Observing System, Anchorage, AK, 99501, USA

<sup>10</sup>Pacific Gyre Inc., Oceanside, CA, 92056, USA

- 25 *Correspondence to:* Claudine Hauri (chauri@alaska.edu)

**Abstract.** Although Arctic marine ecosystems are changing rapidly, year-round monitoring is currently very limited and presents multiple challenges unique to this region. The Chukchi Ecosystem Observatory (CEO) described here uses new sensor technologies to meet needs for continuous, high resolution, and year-round observations across all levels of the ecosystem in the biologically productive and seasonally ice-covered Chukchi Sea off the northwest coast of Alaska. This mooring array records a broad suite of parameters that facilitate observations, yielding better understanding of physical, chemical and biological couplings, phenologies, and the overall state of this Arctic shelf marine ecosystem. While cold temperatures and eight months of sea ice cover present challenging conditions for the operation of the CEO, this extreme environment also serves as a rigorous test bed for innovative ecosystem monitoring strategies. Here, we present data from the 2015-16 CEO deployments that provide new perspectives on the seasonal evolution of sea ice, water column structure and physical properties, annual cycles in nitrate, dissolved oxygen, phytoplankton blooms and export, zooplankton abundance and vertical migration, the occurrence of Arctic cod, and vocalizations of marine mammals such as bearded seals. These integrated ecosystem observations are being combined with ship-based observations and modeling to produce a time-series that documents biological community responses to changing seasonal sea ice and water temperatures while establishing a scientific basis for ecosystem management.

## 1 The Gateway to the Arctic Ocean

The Chukchi continental shelf is the seasonally ice-covered entryway of Pacific-origin waters flowing northward into the Arctic Ocean. An oceanic pressure and elevation differential between the Pacific and the Arctic Oceans is the driving force for this transport (Stigebrandt, 1984), moving water, heat, nutrients, organic carbon, and organisms northward, leading to transformations on the shelf en route to the deep Arctic Ocean. Large late spring and summertime phytoplankton blooms (Sambrotto et al., 1984; Springer et al., 1996; Arrigo et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2018) make the Chukchi continental shelf an extremely productive marine ecosystem that supports a thriving benthos (Grebmeier et al., 2006), zooplankton (Ershova et al., 2015), seabirds (Kuletz et al., 2015) and marine mammals (Hannay et al., 2013).

The Chukchi Sea shelf is part of a broader Arctic system undergoing rapid change. The Arctic near surface air temperature is increasing almost twice as fast as the global average (Serreze and Francis, 2006; Stocker et al., 2013). On the Chukchi shelf, annual average temperatures have been as much as 0.8 °C warmer during the last two decades compared to the average of the 1900-2016 period of record (Smith et al., 2008, Fig. 1). Warming has led to a > 40% Arctic-wide decrease of summertime sea ice extent over the last 4 decades (Serreze and Stroeve, 2015). In the Chukchi and Beaufort seas, ice cover has decreased by 1.24 days/year since 1979, a trend that accelerated to a decrease of 12.84 days/year in the 2000-2012 period (Frey et al., 2015). The freshwater content of the Arctic Ocean has also increased profoundly since the 1990's, with potentially large effects on the global thermohaline circulation (McPhee et al., 2009; Proshutinsky et al., 2009). Anti-cyclonic winds, sea ice melt, increased precipitation and run-off are suggested to be the contributing factors to the widespread freshening of the Arctic Ocean (McPhee et al., 2009; Morison et al., 2012; Bintanja and Selten, 2014). Pacific Arctic storm frequency and intensity has also increased over the last 25 years (Pickart et al., 2013). This increased storm activity corresponds with wintertime Northern hemisphere temperature increases, which has likely led to a northward shift of Northern Hemisphere storm tracks (McCabe et al., 2001; Hakkinen et al., 2008). High latitude marine ecosystems are also particularly vulnerable to ocean acidification (Orr, 2011). Due to naturally lower carbonate ion concentrations  $[CO_3^{2-}]$  and accelerated decrease of  $[CO_3^{2-}]$  as a result of sea ice and glacial melt (Yamamoto-Kawai et al., 2009; Evans et al., 2014), these regions are quickly being pushed closer or past biologically important thresholds. Already today, the consequences of these anthropogenic changes are visible in the marine ecosystem and manifest themselves as species range shifts, changes in abundance, growth, condition, behaviour and phenology, and community and regime shifts (Wassmann et al., 2011).

These anthropogenic changes have large implications for the ecosystem, and the global carbon cycle and climate. To monitor these changes, disentangle their effects from those caused by natural variability, and improve our mechanistic understanding of the ecosystem dynamics, we designed an observatory capable of continuously recording a broad suite of ecosystem parameters in the northeastern Chukchi Sea (Fig. 2-4).

## 2 The Chukchi Ecosystem Observatory

The CEO is an array of closely co-located subsurface moorings in the Northeast Chukchi Sea (71° 35.976' N 161° 31.621' W, Fig. 2-4, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yvmzTuAQ98k&feature=youtu.be>). The CEO is situated in 45 m of water on the southeastern flank of Hanna Shoal within a productive biological "hotspot" (Grebmeier et al., 2015). The shoal's shallow depths result in deep ice keel groundings (Barrett and Stringer, 1978), and accumulation of thick ice, which serves as important habitat for walrus and other animals (Jay et al., 2012). The exact observatory siting and our ecological understanding of the greater region is based on many years of multi-disciplinary sampling on the NE Chukchi shelf, including those of the Chukchi Sea Environmental Studies Program (Day et al., 2013), the Chukchi Offshore Monitoring in Drilling Area (Dunton et al. 2014), and the Distributed Biological Observatory (DBO; Moore and Grebmeier, 2018).

The CEO moorings carry sensors that collectively measure an extensive suite of physical, biogeochemical, and biological parameters (Fig. 4). These sensors allow us to observe and understand the phenology and connections within this Arctic marine ecosystem. The sensors capture temporal variations in sea ice cover and thickness, light, currents, waves, water column structure, and concentrations of dissolved oxygen, nitrate, inorganic carbon species, and particulate matter. They document the presence of phytoplankton blooms and export, zooplankton abundance and vertical migration, the presence of Arctic cod and other fishes, and the vocalizations of marine mammals. The CEO is designed to monitor the ecosystem year-round, making it well-suited for studying interactions among ecosystem components, especially during the

Deleted: in press

poorly documented winter months. Although to our knowledge, no other single Arctic monitoring site measures the full suite of parameters collected by the CEO, of course many of the individual measurements are also made elsewhere across the Arctic. With time, we expect that insights derived from the CEO observations will be extended to other Arctic shelf ecosystems and trigger new comparative studies.

### 5 3 The Chukchi Seascape

The artist's depiction of the Hanna Shoal ecosystem (Fig. 3) illustrates the seasonal cycle at the CEO site (Fig. 3A). Moving from left to right, Fig. 3 captures seasonal shifts from the ice-covered winter, into the productive summer, and finally into the stormy and biologically senescent autumn.

Through heat loss, sea ice formation, and brine rejection (Fig. 3B) in late fall and winter, the water column over the Chukchi shelf becomes more saline and vertically homogenized (Weingartner et al., 2005), deepening the mixed layer depth to a maximum of ~36 m in March (Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015). Although nutrients are in abundant supply from the incoming Anadyr-origin waters, planktonic production remains limited due to the scarcity of light (Fig. 3C). Over the course of winter, continued heat loss to the atmosphere leads to thermodynamic thickening of the sea ice, while convergence of the ice pack leads to mechanical thickening in the form of pressure ridges. Divergence of the ice pack creates open water in the form of leads and polynyas, which during winter will freeze and thicken through the same processes. As the light begins to return in the spring, diatoms and other algae begin to bloom within the ice matrix and at the ice-water interface (Fig. 3D; Ambrose et al., 2005; Gradinger, 2009).

It is not until late May or June, when the days are long, insolation is strong, and warm water moves in from the south that sea ice begins to melt, thin, and recede northwards (Fig. 3E). During this time, the water column stratifies with inputs of fresh meltwater and heat at the surface (Fig. 3G), leading to a shoaling of the mixed layer depth to a minimum of ~12 m (Peralta-Ferriz and Woodgate, 2015). This is the time when extraordinary phytoplankton blooms occur in the nutrient rich surface waters (Fig. 3F; Hill et al., 2018). These processes set up strong vertical gradients of inorganic carbon and nutrients across the shallow water column (Fig. 3H; Bates, 2006). These high rates of primary production support large fluxes of sinking particulate organic matter to the seafloor (Fig. 3I, Lalande et al., 2007), thereby sustaining a rich benthic ecosystem (Fig. 3J; Grebmeier et al., 2006, Grebmeier et al., 2015), which attracts large numbers of marine mammals that forage on the benthos (Fig. 3K; Jay et al., 2012; Hannay et al., 2013) or Arctic cod (Fig. 3L).

Fall is characterized by surface cooling and more frequent and intense storm systems with strong winds (Fig. 3M) that erode the highly stratified water column. This process brings remineralized nutrients and inorganic carbon from bottom waters into the surface layer, supporting fall phytoplankton blooms and the outgassing of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere (Else et al., 2012; Hauri et al., 2013). Later, as sunlight fades into the darkness of winter, primary production further slows, the planktonic ecosystem becomes senescent (Fig. 3N), and the benthos continues to thrive off of organic matter stored in the sediments (Pirtle-Levy et al., 2009).

Due to the logistical complexities of operating in the region, most of the observational work done in the Pacific sector of the Arctic Ocean takes place during the sea ice-free summer and early autumn via research vessels (Fig. 3O).

Autonomous vehicles such as gliders have also found increasing use in recent years (Fig. 3P; Baumgartner et al., 2014; Martini et al., 2016; Danielson et al., 2017).

### 4 Arctic Observing Challenges

A starting premise of our effort to improve understanding of this complex ecosystem and monitor ongoing changes, is that it is necessary to extend observations of the ecosystem into the ice-covered winter and employ new observational approaches that are appropriate for this challenging environment.

Given the presence of deep ice keels that regularly exceed 20 m depth - and may occasionally extend as deep as 30 m - we restrict the uppermost sensor package of our observatory to 33 m below the surface, leaving only 12 m of the water column safe for mooring instrumentation and hardware. Although we cannot deploy instruments in the upper 30 m of the water column when sea ice is present, upward looking acoustic instruments in the array provide observations above the top-

Deleted: and

Deleted: in press

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 10 pt

Deleted: Combined with relatively low grazing activity, the high rates of primary production support large fluxes of sinking particulate organic matter to the sea floor (Fig. 3I, Lalande et al., 2007), thereby sustaining a rich benthic ecosystem (Fig. 3J; Grebmeier et al., 2015)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri, 11 pt, Font color: Dark Red

Deleted: modest

Deleted: 8

mooring package. An Acoustic Zooplankton Fish Profiler (AZFP, manufactured by ASL Environmental Sciences) measures the presence and abundance of zooplankton and fish and ice draft, while a TeledyneRDI Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler (ADCP) records current velocity and direction. During sea ice free conditions, the ADCP instrument also quantifies the height, period and direction of surface waves.

One example of a purpose-built technology for the CEO is a novel “freeze-up detection mooring” that was first deployed in fall 2015 (Fig. 4c). Oceanographers have long struggled with finding a way to measure upper water column stratification and heat content through the fall up to the time of freeze-up in ice-covered seas. The freeze-up detection mooring was outfitted with an expendable surface float that housed a satellite communications package, a tether release, an inductive modem, and a sea surface temperature sensor. The surface float was connected to four Sea-Bird SBE 37 inductive modern CTDs that transmitted hourly temperature, salinity and pressure to the surface float from four subsurface depths (8, 20, 30, and 40 m), along with a sub-surface camera that records and sends digital images of the upper water column. The advance of the fall ice pack was closely monitored with satellite imagery and the surface float provided simultaneous real-time monitoring of the temperature and salinity throughout the water column leading up to ice formation. When the ice edge was within one day of over-running the mooring and sparse ice chunks were already floating by, the surface float was remotely released from the mooring, leaving a mid-depth subsurface float to provide floatation for the portion left behind. The data from this mooring are presented and discussed below (Fig. 5).

Cold seawater (temperatures below 0 °C for most of the year) decreases the capacity of all batteries. Some instruments are powered with lithium batteries that provide a higher power density. Engineering constraints dictate the trade-offs between the various sensor battery packs and the desired sampling rates. For example, due to the large power demand of the Kongsberg Contros HydroC pCO<sub>2</sub> sensor, its sampling rate had to be decreased to once every 24 hours but the AZFP instrument has sufficient power and memory to sample every 15 seconds for the entire year.

A dedicated vessel charter for servicing the remote CEO is also not cost-effective given the 2000 km distance to the nearest deep water, year-round ice-free port Dutch Harbor in Unalaska, Alaska. We thereby rely on vessels of opportunity during the summer months to deploy and recover the CEO as part of other funded shipboard research. By partnering with other oceanographic research teams that are operating in the region, we are also able to collect water samples from the CEO site to provide for in situ calibration of sensors throughout the deployment. Furthermore, ship-based observational efforts such as the Arctic Marine Biodiversity Observatory Network and the DBO programs add spatial context to the CEO data. Conversely, the CEO can help place research cruise data into a fuller temporal context, including variability on scales ranging from the synoptic to the inter-annual (Danielson et al., 2017).

Despite design advances and features, limitations and challenges still remain to be overcome. For example, without real-time data communications capabilities, instrument function and data returns can only be assessed annually following the CEO turn-around. This delays data availability and makes the approach poorly suited for adaptive sampling efforts after deployment. Furthermore, throughout the winter, there are currently no ship-based efforts or autonomous vehicles operating in the region. The result is limited spatial context during winter and early spring, and an inability to collect samples for frequent calibrations of the CEO’s deployed sensors. Many of the measurements made from the CEO are collected at a single depth within the water column, thus limiting interpretation of upper water column parameters, especially over the winter months. Future innovations and investments in technologies such as profiling winches, direct-to-shore submarine cable communications, or under-ice autonomous assets are a few possibilities that could mitigate some of these challenges.

## 5 First Scientific Results

The 2015-16 data returns from the CEO provide a unique window into the year-round Arctic marine ecosystem (Fig. 6). We also present new data showing water column turnover and cooling processes during the freeze up period (Fig. 5 and 6).

The physical conditions measured at the CEO include currents, waves, temperature, salinity, ice draft and light (Photosynthetic Active Radiation, PAR) (Fig. 5 and 6a-d). The temperature and salinity cycles are tied to lateral advection, surface heat fluxes, ice cover and winds. Sensors on the freeze-up detection buoy show that the upper 20 m of the water column was well mixed and steadily lost heat from around 4 °C at the beginning of September to -1.5 °C shortly before sea ice formed at the beginning of November (Fig. 5). Water temperature at 30 m depth largely followed bottom water (40 m)

temperature during September and early October. However, several large departures when 20 and 30 m temperatures briefly warmed and even exceeded those at the surface could indicate the effects of lateral advection and/or the passing influence of intrapycnal eddies (Lu et al., 2015). The bottom water temperature steadily increased from -1.5 °C at the end of September to 1 °C during freeze up at the beginning of November, reversing the vertical temperature gradient in mid October. Between

September and November wind speeds in excess of 10 m s<sup>-1</sup> were observed during the passage of several low-pressure systems (Fig. 5a). At peak intensity, these storm events did not appear to erode stratification at the CEO site. However wind direction reversals, from predominantly upwelling-favorable directions (northeasterly) to downwelling-favorable directions (southwesterly), were associated with periodic depressions of the pycnocline. After freeze-up, water temperatures at the 34 and 43 m depths remained near the freezing point (-1.6 to -1.8 °C) through the end of the record in August.

Salinity followed a more cyclical progression of freshening between June and November and salinization in the other half of the year. Ice cover persisted for nearly nine months (November through August) and the thermodynamic thickening and thinning of the ice can be seen in the overall shape of the ice draft time-series (Fig. 6a). Some ice keels extended to deeper than 10 m below the surface, although an ice draft of 1-3 meters was more typical. The absence of deeper keels may be due to the upwind proximity of Hanna Shoal, which would likely block or deflect deep-keeled ridges from the Northeast. At the same time, the absence of extended mid-winter periods of open water demonstrates that the CEO lies outside any polynya formation zone due to the proximity of the shallow Hanna Shoal.

Nitrate is the limiting nutrient in the Chukchi Sea (Walsh et al., 1989) and therefore is an important bottom-up control for the ecosystem. We deployed a SUNA V2 nitrate sensor (Sea-Bird Scientific) on the upper instrument package (34 m below the surface, Fig. 6e). Over 26-28 August 2015, shortly after deployment, nitrate values dropped from above 15 µM down to between 5 and 7.5 µM during a strong and prolonged storm. Nearby shipboard wind measurements exceeded 10 m s<sup>-1</sup> for part of each day from August 25-29, 2015. The drop in nitrate concentrations was simultaneous with a sharp increase in bottom water temperatures (Fig. 6c) and an increase in dissolved oxygen (Fig. 6f), likely indicating that strong mixing of surface waters with warm, nutrient-depleted and oxygen-rich waters down to the depth of the sensors. Nitrate and temperature remained relatively constant for a couple of weeks before returning to higher and lower values, respectively, in the middle of September. While dissolved oxygen concentrations increased slowly from mid-September until freeze up, nitrate concentrations declined as water column stratification weakened and overturning was initiated (Fig. 5) due to the strong heat and buoyancy losses from the surface ocean. These coincident changes indicate that the decline in nitrate during this time period was driven in part by the dilution of bottom water nitrate with low-nitrate surface waters, although some fall production also occurred at this time: chlorophyll *a* fluorescence at the CEO was measurable through at least early November (Fig. 6g). Following freeze-up, nitrate concentrations slowly increased from a low of approximately 5 µM in early November to 12 µM in early May. These increases and the anti-correlated decrease in dissolved oxygen reflect the ongoing remineralization of organic matter in sediments and the water column throughout the winter.

Chlorophyll *a* fluorescence and sediment trap collections reveal a seasonal cycle of phytoplankton and ice algae export from surface waters. Large chlorophyll *a* peaks were observed in August and September. In June, chlorophyll *a* fluorescence increased from a low wintertime background level and remained elevated with intermittent peaks throughout the summer. Because the sensor is located below the summer mixed layer, it is not well situated to record the phytoplankton that reside within the upper water column or within/under the ice. However, the identification of sediment trap contents indicates that *Nitzschia frigida*, an ice-obligate pennate diatom, began sinking from the ice as early as April, with large pulses in May and June (Fig. 6h). During these times, sea ice and surface snowmelt would have begun, a process that would flush diatoms out of the ice matrix. Large quantities of phytoplankton were also collected in the traps in September/October and June/July, correlating with the chlorophyll *a* peaks, suggesting blooms in spring and fall.

Wavelet analysis of the AZFP acoustic backscatter at 125 kHz indicated a strong diurnal (1 day period) signal (Fig. 6j). This diurnal signal was found in open water conditions in fall when the zooplankton undergo daily migrations up and down in the water column. More surprisingly, there were also strong indications of diurnal migrations in mid-winter (January to March) under ice-cover. In the spring, backscatter at 125 kHz was present but not strongly associated with diurnal migration.

The 38 kHz active acoustic data suggests a strong diurnal migration of fish with swim bladders from August into October, diminished backscatter from December to February, and then higher background levels with intermittently strong returns in April through July (Fig. 6k).

The passive acoustic spectra reveal the timing and source of underwater sounds, notably bearded seal vocalizations in spring and early summer (Fig. 6I).

## 6 Importance of the Observatory

Over the past several decades, moorings have been deployed at select sites across the Arctic as tools for providing insights into the year-round functioning of this system (e.g. Woodgate et al., 2012; Nishino et al., 2016; Polyakov et al., 2017; de Jong et al., 2018). These moorings are usually outfitted with sensors to measure physical properties and, less frequently, biological and geochemical samplers, such as nitrate sensors and sediment traps. To obtain a better understanding of polar ecosystems, ship-based biological and geochemical sampling often complement moored observatories (e.g. Southern Ocean Observing System, Fram Strait Arctic Outflow Observatory). Much has been learned from these endeavours, especially with regard to water mass circulation and the functioning of the ecosystem and biological pump (e.g. Forest et al., 2013, Kenitz et al., 2017; Eriksen et al., 2018). The CEO adds a highly outfitted complement of acoustic, optical, electrochemical, and gas membrane sensors as well as direct sample collection devices. In doing so, the CEO dataset illuminates multiple linkages of the physical, chemical, and biological environment. This broad suite of observations represents a necessary but mostly untapped approach to integrated ecosystem research and monitoring in the Arctic. To our knowledge, the CEO is the most extensive moored observatory for continuous recording of ecosystem parameters in an ice-covered sea.

The Arctic has already, and will continue to undergo transformative physical and chemical changes. Such changes may trigger a cascade of consequences that propagate into the regional ecosystem and may test its resiliency and vulnerability. The extensive year-round dataset derived from the CEO is providing insights into how the ecosystem operates from physics to biology. These baseline data also offer quantitative comparisons in future years for assessing ecosystem responses to an altered climate. Even though distinction of secular trends from natural interannual, decadal, and seasonal variability will require a time-series of around 40 years in high latitude regions (Henson et al., 2010), gaining a better understanding of the system's current state and mechanisms that govern its variability are necessary first steps towards that goal. The data and improved mechanistic understanding of the shelf ecosystem are available to improve biogeochemical and ecological models that allow us to test, analyze, and prepare for the future. The status and trends in the marine ecosystem of the northeastern Chukchi Sea, observed through seasonal ship field programs, moorings such as the CEO, and satellite observations will provide critical information on the status of the ecosystem and associated ecosystem services it can provide. For example, local subsistence users are interested in a healthy foodweb that supports traditional food sources. Reduced sea ice may increase the potential of northward migration of subarctic species, including commercial fish species that will alter those foodwebs. The CEO will allow year-round tracking of the marine ecosystem in the northeastern Chukchi Sea, and thus can provide data valuable to an ecosystem-based approach to resource management.

## 7 Concluding Thoughts

Arctic changes, including human induced influences on climate, can be expected to affect high latitude food webs. A better understanding of the driving factors of potential ecosystem shifts can only be gained through coordinated and simultaneous measurements such as these that span a wide range of physical, chemical and biological indicators. Ocean acidification, warming, freshening, and de-oxygenation are large-scale issues that require interdisciplinary efforts. While ship based multidisciplinary efforts remain valuable components of observing efforts, these only provide episodic data coverage. On the other hand, continuous time-series moorings generally do not include such a large array of disciplines (Newton et al., 2015). The model of extensive ecosystem observation capabilities that the CEO provides can be used in other ecosystems beyond the challenging Arctic environment. For example, an ecosystem observatory for the Gulf of Alaska in the subarctic Pacific is currently being developed and is using some of the lessons learned here.

## Author contribution

Deleted: o

SD developed and designed the CEO. CH, SD, AMPM, RRR, PW, PS, CL, KMS, HS, and JKH maintain instrumentation on the observatory. PS built and deployed the observatory. KM created the artwork in collaboration with CH, SD and AMPM. CH prepared the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors.

## 5 Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Acknowledgements

- A broad consortium of academic, agency, and industry partners are contributing to the success of the CEO program.
- 10 Major financial support comes from the National Pacific Research Board Long-term Monitoring (NPRB LTM) program (project #1426), the Alaska Ocean Observing System (award #NA11NOS0120020), and the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Additional partners include the University of Washington, Université Laval, Olgoonik-Fairweather, LLC. Claudine Hauri acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation Office of Polar Programs (OPP-1603116). Projects that serviced the CEO and/or collected water column calibration data were funded by the National Science Foundation, Bureau of
  - 15 Ocean Energy Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Oceanographic Partnership Program, and Shell Exploration and Production Company, Inc. The primary goal of the NPRB LTM is to support time-series research and thereby improve the predictability of ecosystem responses to changing ocean conditions. Maintenance and calibration of our remote observatory is only possible due to numerous collaborators within the Arctic research community who helped with CEO deployment and recovery or collected sensor calibration samples. We would therefore like to thank
  - 20 Carin Ashjian, Jessica Cross, Miguel Goñi, Burke Hales, Katrin Iken, Laurie Juranek, Calvin Mordy, and Robert Pickart. Post-processed data are available through <http://www.chukchiecosystemobservatory.org/> and <http://www.aaos.org>. Data from the ice detection buoy is available at: <https://portal.aaos.org/arctic#metadata/75373/station>. This is NPRB publication #XXXX (to be added)

## References

- 25 Ambrose, W. G., Von Quillfeldt, C., Clough, L. M., Tilney, P. V. R., and Tucker, T.: The sub-ice algal community in the Chukchi sea: Large- and small-scale patterns of abundance based on images from a remotely operated vehicle, *Polar Biol.*, 28(10), 784–795, doi:10.1007/s00300-005-0002-8, 2005.
- Arrigo, K. R., Perovich, D. K., Pickart, R. S., Brown, van Dijken, G. L., Lowry, K. E., Mills, M. M., Palmer, M. A. William, Balch, M., Bates, N. R., Benitez-Nelson, C. R., Brownlee, E., Frey, K. E., Laney, S. R., Mathis, J., Matsuoka, A., Mitchell,
- 30 B., Moore, G. W. K., Reynolds, R. A., Sosik, H. M., and Swift, J. H.: Phytoplankton blooms beneath the sea ice in the Chukchi Sea, Deep Sea Research II, 105, 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2014.03.018>, 2014.
- Barrett, S. A. and Stringer, W. J.: Growth Mechanisms of “Katie’s Floeberg,” *Arct. Alp. Res.*, 10(4), 775, doi:10.2307/1550744, 1978.
- Bates, N.: Air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes and the continental shelf pump of carbon in the Chukchi Sea adjacent to the Arctic Ocean,
- 35 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111, C10013, doi:10.1029/2005JC003083, 2006.
- Baumgartner, M. F., Stafford, K. M., Winsor, P., Statscewich, H., and Fratantoni, D. M.: Glider-Based Passive Acoustic Monitoring in the Arctic, *Mar. Technol. Soc. J.*, 48(40), 40–51, doi:10.4031/MTSJ.48.5.2, 2014.
- Bintanja, R. and Selten, F. M.: Future increases in Arctic precipitation linked to local evaporation and sea-ice retreat, *Nature*, doi:10.1038/nature13259, 2014.
- 40 Corlett, W. B. and Pickart, R. S.: The Chukchi Slope Current, *Progress in Oceanography*, 153, 50–65, doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2017.04.005, 2017.
- Day, R. H., Weingartner, T. J., Hopcroft, R. R., Aerts, L. A. M., Blanchard, A. L., Gall, A. E., Gallaway, B. J., Hannay, D. E., Holladay, B. A., Mathis, J. T., Norcross, B. L., Questel, J. M., and Wisdom, S. S.: The offshore northeastern Chukchi Sea, Alaska: A complex high-latitude ecosystem, *Continental Shelf Research*, 67, 147–165, doi: 10.1016/j.csr.2013.02.002,
- 45 2013.



- Danielson, S. L., Cooper, L. W., Grebmeier, J. M., Hauri, C., Iken, K., Hopcroft, R. R., Horne, J. H., Lalande, C., McDonnell, A. M. P., Stafford, K. M., and Winsor, P.: Collaborative approaches to multi-disciplinary monitoring of the Chukchi shelf marine ecosystem, *MTS/IEEE Oceans17 conference proceedings*, Anchorage, AK, pp. 1-7, 2017.
- De Jong, M.F., Oltmanns, M., Karstensen, J., de Steur, L.: Deep Convection in the Irminger Sea observed with a dense mooring array, *Oceanography* 31: 50–59, doi: 10.5670/oceanog.2018.109, 2018.
- De Robertis, A., Taylor, K., Wilson, C.D., and Farley, E.V.: Abundance and distribution of Arctic cod (*Boreogadus saida*) and other pelagic fishes over the U.S. Continental Shelf of the Northern Bering and Chukchi Seas, *Deep-Sea Research II*, 135, 51-65, doi: 10.1016/j.dsr2.2016.03.002, 2017.
- Dunton, K. H., Grebmeier, J. M., and Trefry, J. H.: The benthic ecosystem of the northeastern Chukchi Sea: An overview of its unique biogeochemistry and biological characteristics, *Deep Sea Research Part II*, 102, 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2014.01.001>, 2014.
- Else, B. G. T., Papakyriakou, T. N., Galley, R. J., Mucci, A., Gosselin, M., Miller, L. A., Shadwick, E. H., and Thomas, H.: Annual cycles of pCO<sub>2</sub>sw in the southeastern Beaufort Sea: New understandings of air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> exchange in arctic polynya regions, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, C00G13, doi:10.1029/2011JC007346, 2012.
- Eriksen R., Trull, T. W., Davies, D., Jansen, P., Davidson, A.T., Westwood, K., and van den Enden, R.: Seasonal succession of phytoplankton community structure from autonomous sampling at the Australian Southern Ocean Time Series (SOTS) observatory. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 589:13-31, doi.org/10.3354/meps12420, 2018.
- Ershova, A.E., Hopcroft, R.R., and Kosobokova, K.N.: Inter-annual variability of summer mesozooplankton communities of the western Chukchi Sea: 2004-2012, 38(9), 1461-1481, doi:10.1007/s00300-015-1709-9, 2015.
- Evans, W., Mathis, J. T., and Cross, J. N.: Calcium carbonate corrosivity in an Alaskan inland sea, *Biogeosciences*, 11(2), 365–379, doi:10.5194/bg-11-365-2014, 2014.
- Forest, A., Joint, T., Lalande, C., Hwang, J., Korea, S., and Sampei, M.: Bio-mooring arrays and long-term sediment traps: Key tools to detect change in the biogeochemical and ecological functioning of Arctic marine ecosystems, *Arct. Obs. Summit 2013*, (Figure 1), 1–20, 2013.
- Frey, K. E., Moore, G. W. K., Cooper, L. W., and Grebmeier, J. M.: Divergent patterns of recent sea ice cover across the Bering, Chukchi, and Beaufort seas of the Pacific Arctic Region, *Prog. Oceanogr.*, 136, 32–49, doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2015.05.009, 2015.
- Gattuso, J.-P. and Hansson, L.: Ocean acidification: background and history, in *Ocean Acidification*, edited by J.-P. Gattuso and L. Hansson, pp. 1–18, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.
- Gradinger, R.: Sea-ice algae: Major contributors to primary production and algal biomass in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas during May/June 2002, *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.*, 56(17), 1201–1212, doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.10.016, 2009.
- Grebmeier, J. M., Cooper, L. W., Feder, H. M., and Sirenko, B. I.: Ecosystem dynamics of the Pacific-influenced Northern Bering and Chukchi Seas in the Amerasian Arctic, *Prog. Oceanogr.*, 71(2-4), 331–361, doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2006.10.001, 2006.
- Grebmeier, J. M., Bluhm, B. A., Cooper, L. W., Danielson, S. L., Arrigo, K. R., Blanchard, A. L., Clarke, J. T., Day, R. H., Frey, K. E., Gradinger, R. R., Kędra, M., Konar, B., Kuletz, K. J., Lee, S. H., Lovvorn, J. R., Norcross, B. L., and Okkonen, S. R.: Ecosystem characteristics and processes facilitating persistent macrobenthic biomass hotspots and associated benthivory in the Pacific Arctic, *Prog. Oceanogr.*, 136, 92-114, doi: 10.1016/j.pocean.2015.05.006, 2015.
- Hakkinen, S., Proshutinsky, A., and Ashik, I.: Sea ice drift in the Arctic since the 1950s, 35, 1–5, doi:10.1029/2008GL034791, 2008.
- Hannay, D. E., Delarue, J., Mouy, X., Martin, B. S., Leary, D., Oswald, J. N., and Vallarta, J.: Marine mammal acoustic detections in the northeastern Chukchi Sea, September 2007-July 2011, *Cont. Shelf Res.*, 67, 127–146, doi:10.1016/j.csr.2013.07.009, 2013.
- Hauri, C., Winsor, P., Juranek, L. W., McDonnell, A. M. P., Takahashi, T., and Mathis, J. T.: Wind-driven mixing causes a reduction in the strength of the continental shelf carbon pump in the Chukchi Sea, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, doi:10.1002/2013GL058267, 2013.
- Henson, S. A., Sarmiento, J. L., Dunne, J. P., Bopp, L., Lima, I., Doney, S. C., John, J., and Beaulieu, C.: Detection of anthropogenic climate change in satellite records of ocean chlorophyll and productivity, *Biogeosciences*, 7(2), 621–640, doi:10.5194/bg-7-621-2010, 2010.

- Hill, V., Ardyna, M., Lee, S.H., and Varela, D.E.: Decadal trends in phytoplankton production in the Pacific Arctic Region from 1950 to 2012. *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.*, 152, 82–94, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2016.12.015>
- Jay, C. V., Fischbach, A. S., and Kochnev, A. A.: Walrus areas of use in the Chukchi Sea during sparse sea ice cover, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 468, 1–13, doi:10.3354/meps10057, 2012.
- 5 Kenitz K. M., Visser A.W., Mariani P., Andersen K.H.: Seasonal succession in zooplankton feeding traits reveals trophic trait coupling. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 62(3). 10.1002/lno.10494, 2017.
- Kroeker, K. J., Kordas, R. L., Crim, R. N., and Singh, G. G.: Meta-analysis reveals negative yet variable effects of ocean acidification on marine organisms., *Ecol. Lett.*, 13(11), 1419–34, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01518.x, 2010.
- Kroeker, K. J., Micheli, F., and Gambi, M. C.: Ocean acidification causes ecosystem shifts via altered competitive interactions, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, 2(10), 1–4, doi:10.1038/nclimate1680, 2012
- 10 Kuletz, K. J., Ferguson, M. C., Hurley, B., Gall, A. E., Labunski, E. A., and Morgan, T. C.: Seasonal spatial patterns in seabird and marine mammal distribution in the eastern Chukchi and western Beaufort seas: Identifying biologically important pelagic areas, *Prog. Oceanogr.*, 136, 175–200, doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2015.05.012, 2015.
- Lalande, C., Grebmeier, J.M., Wassmann, P., Cooper, L.W., Flint, M.V., and Sergeeva, V.M.: Export fluxes of biogenic matter in the presence and absence of seasonal sea ice cover in the Chukchi Sea. *Continental Shelf Research* 27, 2051–2065, 2007.
- 15 Lu, K., T. Weingartner, D. Danielson, P. Winsor, E. Dobbins, K. Martini, and H. Statscewich: Lateral mixing across meltwater fronts of the Chukchi Sea shelf, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42, 6754–6761, doi:10.1002/2015GL064967, 2015.
- 20 Martini, K. I., P. J. Stabenro, C. Ladd, P. Winsor, T. J. Weingartner, C. W. Mordy, and L. B. Eisner.: Dependence of subsurface chlorophyll on seasonal water masses in the Chukchi Sea, *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.*, 121(3), 1755–1770, doi:10.1002/2015JC011359, 2016.
- McCabe, G. J., Clark, M. P., and Serreze, M. C.: Trends in Northern Hemisphere Surface Cyclone Frequency and Intensity, *Journal of Climate*, 14(12), 2763–2768, doi: 10.1175/1520-0442(2001)014<2763:TINHSC>2.0.CO;2, 2010.
- 25 McPhee, M. G., Proshutinsky, A., Morison, J. H., Steele, M., and Alkire, M. B.: Rapid change in freshwater content of the Arctic Ocean, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36(10), 1–6, doi:10.1029/2009GL037525, 2009.
- Moore, S. E. and Grebmeier, J. M.: The Distributed Biological Observatory: Linking Physics to Biology in the Pacific Arctic Region, *Arctic*, 71(5), 1–7, doi:<https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic4606>, 2018.
- Morison, J., Kwok, R., Peralta-Ferriz, C., Alkire, M., Rigor, I., Andersen, R., and Steele, M.: Changing Arctic Ocean freshwater pathways, *Nature*, 481(7379), 66–70, doi:10.1038/nature10705, 2012.
- 30 Newton, J. A., Feely, R. A., Jewett, E. B., Williamson, P., and Mathis J.: Global Ocean Acidification Observing Network: Requirements and Governance Plan. Second Edition, GOA-ON, [http://www.goa-on.org/docs/GOA-ON\\_plan\\_print.pdf](http://www.goa-on.org/docs/GOA-ON_plan_print.pdf), 2015.
- Nishino, S., Takashi, K., Fujiwara, A., Hirawake, T., and Aoyama, M.: Water mass characteristics and their temporal changes in a biological hotspot in the southern Chukchi Sea, *Biogeosciences*, 13, 2563–2578, doi:10.5194/bg-13- 2563-2016, 2016.
- Norcross, B. L., Raborn, S.W., Holladay, B.A., Gallaway, B.J., Crawford, S. T., Priest, J.T., Edenfield, L.E., and Meyer, R.: Northeastern Chukchi Sea demersal fishes and associated environmental characteristics, 2009 – 2010, *Continental Shelf Research*, 67, 77–95, doi: 10.1016/j.csr.2013.05.010, 2013.
- 40 Orr, J. C.: Recent and future changes in ocean carbonate chemistry, in *Ocean Acidification*, vol. 2, edited by J.-P. Gattuso and L. Hansson, pp. 41–66, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.
- Pickart, R. S., Schulze, L. M., Moore, G. W. K., Charette, M. A., Arrigo, K. R., van Dijken, G., and Danielson, S. L.: Long-term trends of upwelling and impacts on primary productivity in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, *Deep. Res. Part I Oceanogr. Res. Pap.*, 79, 106–121, doi:10.1016/j.dsr.2013.05.003, 2013.
- 45 Pirtle-Levy, R., Grebmeier, J.M., Cooper, L.W., and Larsen, I.L.: Chlorophyll a in Arctic sediments implies long persistence of algal pigments, *Deep Sea Research II*, 56(17), 1326–1338, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.10.022>, 2009.
- Polyakov, I. V., Pnyushkov, A. V., Alkire, M. B., Ashik, I. M., Baumann, T. M., Carmack, E. C., Goszczko, I., Guthrie, J., Ivanov, V. V., Kanzow, T., Krishfield, T., Kwok, R., Sundfjord, A., Morison, J., Rember, R., and Yulin, A.: Greater role for Atlantic inflows on sea-ice loss in the Eurasian Basin of the Arctic Ocean, *Science*, 356(6335), 285–291, DOI: 10.1126/science.aai8204, 2017.
- 50

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.13", Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Font: Italic


**Deleted:** Research

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

**Deleted:**

**Deleted:** SOAR Special Issue, in-press.

- Proshutinsky, A., Krishfield, R., Timmermans, M.-L., Toole, J., Carmack, E., McLaughlin, F., Williams, W. J., Zimmermann, S., Itoh, M., and Shimada, K.: Beaufort Gyre freshwater reservoir: State and variability from observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *114*, C00A10, doi:10.1029/2008JC005104, 2009.
- 5 Sambrotto, R. N., Goering, J. J., and McRoy, C. P.: Large yearly production of phytoplankton in the Western Bering Strait, *Science*, *225*(4667), 1147–1150, DOI: 10.1126/science.225.4667.1147, 1984.
- Serreze, M. C. and Francis, J. A.: The Arctic amplification debate, *Clim. Change*, *76*(3–4), 241–264, doi:10.1007/s10584-005-9017-y, 2006.
- Serreze, M. C. and Stroeve, J. C.: Arctic sea ice trends, variability and implications for seasonal ice forecasting, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, *373*(2045), 20140159, doi:10.1098/rsta.2014.0159, 2015.
- 10 Smith, T.M., Reynolds, R.W., Peterson, T.C., and Lawrimore, J.: Improvements NOAAs Historical Merged Land–Ocean Temp Analysis (1880–2006). *Journal of Climate*, *21*, 2283–2296, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JCLI2100.1>, 2008.
- Springer, A. M., McRoy, C. P. and Flint, M. V.: The Bering Sea Green Belt: shelf-edge processes and ecosystem production, *Fisheries Oceanography*, *5*, 205–223, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2419.1996.tb00118.x, 1996.
- Stigebrandt, A.: The North Pacific: A Global-Scale Estuary, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, *14*(2), 464–470, doi:10.1175/1520-0485(1984)014<0464:TNPAGS>2.0.CO;2, 1984.
- 15 Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S. K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P. M.: IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, p. 1535 pp., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013.
- 20 Walsh J.J., McRoy C.P., Coachman L.K., Goering J.J., Nihoul J.J., Whitley T.E., Blackburn T.H., Parker P.L., Wirick C.D., Shuert P.G., Grebmeier J.M., Springer A.M., Tripp R.D., Hansell D., Djenidi S., Deleersnijder E., Henriksen K., Lund B.A., Andersen P., Müller-Karger F.E., and Dean K.: Carbon and nitrogen cycling within the Bering/Chukchi Seas: source regions for organic matter affecting AOU demands of the Arctic Ocean, *Progress in Oceanography*, *22*, 279–361, DOI: 10.1016/0079-6611(89)90006-2, 1989.
- 25 Wassmann, P.: Arctic marine ecosystems in an era of rapid climate change, *Prog. Oceanogr.*, *90*(1–4), 1–17, doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2011.02.002, 2011.
- Weingartner, T., Aagaard, K., Woodgate, R., Danielson, S., Sasaki, Y., and Cavalieri, D.: Circulation on the north central Chukchi Sea shelf, *Deep Sea Research II*, *52*, 3150–3174, doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2005.10.015, 2005.
- 30 Woodgate, R. A., Weingartner, T., and Lindsay, 2012: Observed increases in Bering Strait oceanic fluxes from the Pacific to the Arctic from 2001 to 2011 and their impacts on the Arctic Ocean water column, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *39*, L24603, doi:10.1029/2012GL054092, 2012.
- Yamamoto-Kawai, M., McLaughlin, F. A., Carmack, E. C., Nishino, S., and Shimada, K.: Aragonite undersaturation in the Arctic Ocean: effects of ocean acidification and sea ice melt., *Science*, *326*(5956), 1098–100, doi:10.1126/science.1174190, 2009.



5 **Figure 1: Chukchi Sea continental shelf (64°N to 74°N and 180 to 157°W) annual sea surface temperature anomaly over the 1900-2016 period of record from the extended reconstructed SST dataset (Smith et al, 2008). The data is publicly available here <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/data-access/marineocean-data/extended-reconstructed-sea-surface-temperature-ersst-v5>. Blue bars indicate colder than average temperature for the given year, whereas red bars indicate warmer than average temperatures respectively. The annual anomalies were computed by subtracting 0.114 °C.**

10





Figure 2: Bathymetry of the Chukchi, northern Bering, East Siberian and eastern Beaufort seas. The Chukchi Ecosystem Observatory (CEO) near Hanna Shoal is marked with a yellow star. General circulation patterns are shown with arrows: Black: Alaskan Coastal Water and Alaskan Coastal Current, dividing into the Shelfbreak Jet (right) and Chukchi Slope Current (left, Corlett and Pickart, 2017); Orange: Anadyr, Bering Sea, and Chukchi Sea Water; Purple: Siberian Coastal Current; Yellow: Beaufort Gyre boundary current.



5 Figure 3: Illustration of the mooring array and the ecosystem at the observatory site. A) Mooring array, B) brine rejection, C) dark winter, D) sea ice algae bloom, E) receding sea ice, F) phytoplankton bloom, G) stratification, H) vertical gradient of nutrients and inorganic carbon, I) sinking particulate organic matter, J) rich benthic ecosystem, K) foraging walrus, L) Arctic cod, M) storm-induced mixing, N) senescent planktonic ecosystem, O) Research Vessel Sikuliaq, and P) glider. The illustration was painted by Klara Maisch. A high-resolution version can be downloaded from her personal website at: <https://klaramaisch.com/chukchi-sea-mooring-illustration>. Examples of walrus and bearded seal sounds are available at: <http://mather.sfos.uaf.edu/~seth/CEO/Sounds.html>. A movie describing the observatory in more detail is available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ypmzTuAQ98k&feature=youtu.be>.

10

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman




Figure 4: Illustration of the Chukchi Ecosystem Observatory (CEO), including the a) biophysical, b) biogeochemical, and c) freeze-up moorings. Note that the freeze up mooring includes a surface package, whereas the other two moorings only reach up to 33 m depth. Sensors are calibrated with as many *in-situ* samples as possible. Calibration samples are always collected upon deployment and recovery of the moorings, and depending on other research activity nearby our site, also at other times of the year. pCO<sub>2</sub> and pH sensors were added in summer 2016.




Figure 5: Time series from the NOAA operated Barrow Airport weather station and the Chukchi Ecosystem Observatory freeze-up detection mooring deployment in 2015. Shown are a) wind speed and direction (arrows pointing downwind), b) temperature (°C), and c) salinity. Conductivity and temperature sensors were moored at 8 m, 20 m, 30 m, and 40 m (dashed lines) from early September until close to freeze up at the beginning of November.






Figure 6: Data from the 2015/2016 deployment. Shown are a) ice draft (m), b) salinity, c) temperature (°C), d) photosynthetically active radiation (PAR,  $\mu\text{E cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ), e) nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3$ ,  $\mu\text{mol l}^{-1}$ ), f) oxygen ( $\text{O}_2$ ,  $\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ ), g) fluorescence ( $\text{mg m}^{-3}$ ), *Nitzschia frigida* flux (million cells  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ ), i) Diatoms (million cells  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ ) j) acoustic zooplankton fish profiler (AZFP, days) 125 KHz, k) AZFP 38 KHz (days), and l) acoustic spectra (Hz). *In-situ*  $\text{NO}_3$  water samples were collected at times of the CEO deployment and recovery, and were analysed with standard wet chemical determinations of nitrate + nitrite of frozen samples at the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory. Using the calibration samples as anchor points, a drift of  $12 \mu\text{mol l}^{-1}$  throughout the deployment was found and corrected by linearly detrending the data.