

# **COOPERATIVE RESEARCH CENTRE FOR THE ANTARCTIC AND SOUTHERN OCEAN ENVIRONMENT (ANTARCTIC CRC)**

# Aurora Australis Marine Science Cruise AU9404 - Oceanographic Field Measurements and Analysis

MARK ROSENBERG *Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia* 

RUTH ERIKSEN *Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia*

STEVE BELL *Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia* 

STEVE RINTOUL *Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia CSIRO Division of Marine Research, Hobart, Australia* 

Antarctic CRC Research Report No. 8 ISBN: 0 642 25469 9 ISSN: 1320-730X July 1996 Hobart, Australia

# **LIST OF CONTENTS**



# **LIST OF CONTENTS (continued)**



**APPENDIX 3 CFC-11 and CFC-12 Measurements on AU9404 (WOCE SR3 and S4) 55 (provided by John Bullister, 27 April 1997)** 

# **LIST OF FIGURES**



# **LIST OF TABLES**



# **LIST OF TABLES (continued)**



# **Aurora Australis Marine Science Cruise AU9404 - Oceanographic Field Measurements and Analysis**

MARK ROSENBERG

*Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia* 

RUTH ERIKSEN

*Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia* 

STEVE BELL

*Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia* 

STEVE RINTOUL

*Antarctic CRC, GPO Box 252-80, Hobart, Australia*; *CSIRO Division of Marine Research, Hobart, Australia* 

## **ABSTRACT**

Oceanographic measurements were conducted along WOCE Southern Ocean meridional section SR3 between Tasmania and Antarctica, and along the part of WOCE Southern Ocean zonal section S4 lying between approximately 110 and 16 $2^{\circ}$ E, from December 1994 to February 1995. An array of 4 current meter moorings at approximately  $51^{\circ}$ S in the vicinity of the SR3 line was successfully recovered. A total of 107 CTD vertical profile stations were taken, most to near bottom. Over 2380 Niskin bottle water samples were collected for the measurement of salinity, dissolved oxygen, nutrients, chlorofluorocarbons, helium, tritium, dissolved inorganic carbon, alkalinity, carbon isotopes, dissolved organic carbon, dimethyl sulphide/dimethyl sulphoniopropionate, iodate/iodide, oxygen 18, primary productivity, and biological parameters, using a 24 bottle rosette sampler. Near surface current data were collected using a ship mounted ADCP. Measurement and data processing techniques are summarised, and a summary of the data is presented in graphical and tabular form.

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

Marine science cruise AU9404, the third oceanographic cruise of the Cooperative Research Centre for the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Environment (Antarctic CRC), was conducted aboard the Australian Antarctic Division vessel RSV Aurora Australis from December 1994 to February 1995. The major constituent of the cruise was the collection of oceanographic data relevant to the Australian Southern Ocean WOCE Hydrographic Program, along WOCE sections S4 (traversed west to east) and SR3 (traversed south to north) (Figure 1). The primary scientific objectives of this program are summarised in Rosenberg et al. (1995a). Section SR3 was occupied three times previously, in the spring of 1991 (Rintoul and Bullister, submitted), in the autumn of 1993 (Rosenberg et al., 1995a), and in the summer of 1993/94 (Rosenberg et al., 1995b). Zonal section S4 represents a circumnavigation of the globe in the Southern Ocean, with the various parts to be completed by different WOCE participants. The part of S4 completed on this cruise (Figure 1) was a first time occupation. At the western end of the S4 transect, seven of the stations were occupied by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute ship R.V. Knorr (M. McCartney, pers. comm.) several days prior to occupation by the Aurora Australis. These stations are intended to provide cross-calibrations for the tracer samples and CTD measurements collected by both vessels.

An array of four full depth current meter moorings, in the vicinity of the SR3 line at the latitude of the Subantarctic Front, was successfully recovered. The moorings had been deployed in the autumn of 1993 by the Aurora Australis, and at the time of writing, have since been redeployed in the same region by the SCRIPPS ship R.V. Melville as part of a larger mooring array (principal investigators Luther, D., Chave, A., Richman, J., Filloux, J., Rintoul, S. and Church, J.). Additional CTD measurements were made at the four mooring locations.

This report describes the collection of oceanographic data from the SR3 and S4 transects, and summarises the chemical analysis and data processing methods employed. Brief comparisons are also made with existing historical data. All information required for use of the data set is presented in tabular and graphical form.

# **2 CRUISE ITINERARY**

The cruise commenced with recovery of one of the current meter moorings at  $\sim$ 50 $^{\circ}$  25'S (Table 4). Increasing winds prevented further recoveries, so it was decided to continue south leaving retrieval of the remaining moorings for the return leg to Hobart. En route to the Australian Antarctic base Casey, a deep water test CTD cast was conducted, and three CTD stations were occupied along the S4 transect. An upward looking sonar mooring (Bush, 1994) (Table 5) was recovered in the vicinity of Casey; an unsuccessful attempt was made to recover an additional upward looking sonar mooring. Following approximately a week of cargo operations at Casey, the S4 transect proper commenced at ~110°E. Due to time constraints, the originally planned station spacing of 30 nautical miles was increased to 45 nautical miles for most of the S4 transect. Included in the section were stations coinciding with the 7 stations occupied by the Knorr (stations 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 in Table 2 correspond respectively with Knorr stations 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91 and 92). Also included were stations coinciding with locations sampled on the meridional sections SR3 and P11 (see Rosenberg et al., 1995a, for description of the P11 transect). Favourable sea ice and weather conditions permitted conclusion of S4 in 560 m of water just off Young Island in the Balleny Island group (Figure 1).

On the return west to the start of the SR3 section, a shallow test cast was conducted to test the Niskin bottles for CFC blank levels. The SR3 section commenced with 4 CTD stations at various locations on the shelf in the d'Urville Sea, beginning near Commonwealth Bay. Further north, between 61.3°S and 55.5°S, the station spacing was again increased from 30 to 45 nautical miles, due to further time constraints. Following recovery of the remaining 3 current meter moorings (Table 4) around the Subantarctic Front and additional CTD casts at these sites, the SR3 section was completed. A final CTD cast was conducted to test a suspect instrument before returning to Hobart.

#### **Table 1: Summary of cruise itinerary.**

*Expedition Designation* Cruise AU9404 (cruise acronym WOCET), encompassing WOCE sections S4 and SR3

*Chief Scientist* Steve Rintoul, CSIRO

*Ship* RSV Aurora Australis

*Ports of Call*

**Casev** 

*Cruise Dates* December 13 1994 to February 2 1995

# **3 CRUISE SUMMARY**

#### **3.1 CTD casts and water samples**

In the course of the cruise, 107 CTD casts were completed along the S4 and SR3 sections (Figure 1) (Table 2), plus additional locations, with most casts reaching to within 15 m of the sea floor (Table 2). Over 2380 Niskin bottle water samples were collected for the measurement of salinity, dissolved oxygen, nutrients (orthophosphate, nitrate plus nitrite, and reactive silicate), chlorofluorocarbons, helium, tritium, dissolved inorganic carbon, alkalinity, carbon isotopes ( ${}^{14}$ C and  ${}^{13}$ C), dissolved organic carbon, dimethyl sulphide/dimethyl sulphoniopropionate, iodate/iodide, <sup>18</sup>O, primary productivity, and biological parameters, using a 24 bottle rosette sampler. Table 3 provides a summary of samples drawn at each station. Principal investigators for the various water sampling programmes are listed in Table 6a. For all stations, the different samples were drawn in a fixed sequence, as discussed in section 4.1.3. The methods for drawing samples are discussed in section 4.1.4.



**Figure 1: CTD station positions for RSV Aurora Australis cruise AU9404 along WOCE transects S4 and SR3, and current meter mooring locations.** 

**Table 2 (following 3 pages): Summary of station information for RSV Aurora Australis cruise AU9404. The information shown includes time, date, position and ocean depth for the start of the cast, at the bottom of the cast, and for the end of the cast. The maximum pressure reached for each cast, and the altimeter reading at the bottom of each cast (i.e. elevation above the sea bed) are also included. Missing ocean depth values are due to noise from the ship's bow thrusters interfering with the echo sounder. For casts which do not reach to within 100 m of the bed (i.e. the altimeter range), or for which the altimeter was not functioning, there is no altimeter value. For station names, TEST is a test cast. Note that all times are UTC (i.e. GMT). CTD unit 7 (serial no. 1103) was used for stations 1 to 18; CTD unit 5 (serial no. 1193) was used for stations 19 to 106; CTD unit 6 (serial no. 2568) was used for station 107.**

# **Table 2: (continued)**



# **Table 2: (continued)**



# **Table 2: (continued)**



**Table 3: Summary of samples drawn from Niskin bottles at each station, including salinity (sal), dissolved oxygen (do), nutrients (nut), chlorofluorocarbons (CFC), helium/tritium (He/Tr), dissolved inorganic carbon (dic), alkalinity (alk), carbon isotopes (Ctope), dissolved organic carbon (doc), dimethyl sulphide/dimethyl sulphoniopropionate (dms), iodate/iodide (i), 18O, primary productivity (pp), "Seacat" casts (cat), and the following biological samples: pigments (pig), lugols iodine fixed plankton counts (lug), Coulter counter for particle sizing (cc), bacteria counts (bac), samples to determine presence of viruses inside algae (vir), flow cytometry (fc), video recording (vid), samples for culturing (cul), and transmission electron microscopy (te). Note that 1=samples taken, 0=no samples taken, 2=surface sample only (i.e. from shallowest Niskin bottle); and some biology samples taken from a surface bucket only. Also note that at stations 33, 50, 58, 67, 81 and 94, primary productivity samples were additionally filtered to measure d.o.c. content.** 



# **Table 3: (continued)**



# **Table 3: (continued)**



**Table 4: Current meter moorings recovered along SR3 transect (positions given are at times of deployment). Recovery times are for last mooring component.** 



**Table 5: Upward looking sonar (ULS) mooring recovered (including current meter [CM]) (positions given are at times of deployment). Recovery time is for last mooring component.** 



# **3.2 Moorings recovered**

An array of four current meter moorings was recovered (Table 4) along the SR3 transect line. A single upward looking sonar mooring was recovered near Casey; an unsuccessful attempt was made to locate a second upward looking sonar mooring (Table 5).

## **3.3 XBT/XCTD deployments**

A total of 43 XBT and 26 XCTD deployments were made along the SR3 transect. The data were processed further by CSIRO Division of Oceanography (R. Bailey, pers. comm.). Results are not reported here.

### **3.4 Principal investigators**

The principal investigators for the CTD and water sample measurements are listed in Table 6a. Cruise participants are listed in Table 6b.

## **Table 6a: Principal investigators (\*=cruise participant) for water sampling programmes.**



# **Table 6b: Scientific personnel (cruise participants).**



# **4 FIELD DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

#### **4.1 CTD and hydrology measurements**

In this section, CTD, hydrology, and ADCP data collection and processing methods are discussed. Preliminary results of the CTD data calibration, along with data quality information, are presented in Section 6.

#### **4.1.1 CTD Instrumentation**

The CTD instrumentation is described in Rosenberg et al. (1995b). Briefly, General Oceanics Mark IIIC (i.e. WOCE upgraded) CTD units were used. A 24 position rosette package, including a General Oceanics model 1015 pylon, and 10 litre General Oceanics Niskin bottles, was deployed for all casts. Deep sea reversing thermometers (Gohla-Precision) were mounted at rosette positions 2, 12 and 24. A Sea-Tech fluorometer and Li-Cor photosynthetically active radiation sensor were also attached to the package for some casts (Table 22).

#### **4.1.2 CTD instrument and data calibration**

Complete calibration information for the CTD pressure, platinum temperature and pressure temperature sensors are presented in Appendix 1. Pre cruise pressure and platinum temperature calibrations were available for all three CTD units, performed at the CSIRO Division of Oceanography Calibration Facility, with the exception of CTD unit 6, where manufacturer supplied platinum temperature calibration coefficients were used for the single test cast where this instrument was used. Pre cruise manufacturer supplied calibrations of the pressure temperature sensors were used for the cruise data. Note that readings from this sensor are applied in a correction formula for pressure data. The complete CTD conductivity and dissolved oxygen calibrations, derived respectively from the in situ Niskin bottle salinity and dissolved oxygen samples, are presented in a later section.

Manufacturer supplied calibrations were applied to the fluorescence and p.a.r. data (Appendix 1). These calibrations are not expected to be correct - correct scaling of fluorescence and p.a.r. data awaits linkage with primary productivity and Seacat (section 3.2) data.

The CTD and hydrology data processing and calibration techniques are described in detail in Appendix 2 of Rosenberg et al. (1995b) (referred to as "CTD methodology" for the remainder of the report). Note however the following updates to the methodology:

(i) the 10 seconds of CTD data prior to each bottle firing are averaged to form the CTD upcast for use in calibration (5 seconds was used previously);

(ii) the minimum number of data points required in a 2 dbar bin to form an average was set to 6 (i.e. jmin=6; for previous cruises, jmin=10);

(iii) in the conductivity calibration for some stations, an additional term was applied to remove the pressure dependent conductivity residual;

(iv) CTD raw data obtained from the CTD logging PC's no longer contain end of record characters after every 128 bytes.

#### **4.1.3 CTD and hydrology data collection techniques**

Data collection techniques are described in Rosenberg et al. (1995b). A fixed sequence was followed for the drawing of water samples on deck, as follows:

first sample: CFC

 D.O.C dissolved oxygen DMS/DMSP helium D.I.C. alkalinity carbon isotopes primary productivity salinity nutrients iodate/iodide  $18<sub>O</sub>$ tritium

last sample: biology

(see Table 3 for a summary of which samples were drawn at each station).

## **4.1.4 Water sampling methods**

The methods used for drawing the various water samples from the Niskin bottles are described here.

*Chlorofluorocarbons:* 100 ml samples are taken using precision ground glass syringes, following a series of rinses; care is taken to ensure bubble free samples.

Dissolved organic carbon: Sample jar volume =  $250$  ml (jars baked for 12 hours at  $550^{\circ}$ C) During d.o.c. sampling, polyethylene gloves were worn by the sampler. The gloves were changed every second sample.

\* rinse spiggot copiously with sample water

\* rinse sample jar twice

\* fill jar with ~200 ml and screw cap on tightly

After sampling, the jars are stored in the dark in a freezer at -18 $^{\circ}$ C.

*Dissolved oxygen:* sample bottle volume = 150 ml

Bottles are washed and left partially filled with fresh water before use. Tight fitting silicon tubing is attached to the Niskin spiggot for sample drawing. Pickling reagent 1 is  $3 \text{ M } MnCl<sub>2</sub>$  (1.0 ml used); reagent 2 is 8 N NaOH/4 M NaI (1.0 ml used); reagent 3 is 10 N  $H_2SO_4$  (1.0 ml used).

\* start water flow through tube for several seconds, making sure no bubbles remain in tube

\* pinch off flow in tube, and insert into bottom of sample bottle

\* let flow commence slowly into bottle, gradually increasing by releasing tubing, at all times ensuring no bubbles enter the sample and that turbulence is kept to a minimum

\* fill bottle, overflow by at least one full volume

\* pinch off tube and slowly remove so that bottle remains full to the brim, then rinse glass stopper

\* immediately pickle with reagents 1 then 2, inserting reagent dispenser at least 1 cm below water surface

\* insert glass stopper, ensuring no bubbles are trapped in sample

\* thoroughly shake sample (at least 30 vigorous inversions)

\* store samples in the dark until analysis

\* acidify samples with reagent 3 immediately prior to analysis

*DMS and DMSP:* Sample containers are quickly rinsed, then filled. For shallow samples only, a 750 ml amber glass bottle is used. For full profile sampling, samples for filtering are collected in 250 ml polyethylene screwcap jars; unfiltered samples are collected in 140 ml amber glass bottles.

*Helium:* Plastic tubing is attached to both ends of a 2 foot length of copper tubing, with one of the plastic tubes attached to the Niskin spiggot. The copper tube is self flushed as air bubbles work out of the intake tube; the copper and plastic tube are struck to ensure no bubbles are trapped during filling. The plastic hoses are clamped, and the assembly removed to a hydraulic press where the copper tube is cut and crimped at either end, and in the middle.

#### *Dissolved inorganic carbon:* sample bottle volume = 250 ml

Tight fitting silicon tubing is attached to the Niskin spiggot for sample drawing. Samples are poisoned with 100  $\mu$  of a saturated solution of HgCl<sub>2</sub>.

\* drain remaining old sample from the bottle

\* start water flow through tube for several seconds, making sure no bubbles remain in tube

\* insert tube into bottom of inverted sample bottle, allowing water to flush bottle for several seconds

\* pinch off flow in tube, and invert sample bottle to upright position, keeping tube in bottom of bottle

\* let flow commence slowly into bottle, gradually increasing, at all times ensuring no bubbles enter the sample

\* fill bottle, overflow by one full volume, and rinse cap

\* shake a small amount of water from top, so that water level is between threads and bottle shoulder

\* insert tip of poison dispenser just into sample, and poison

\* screw on cap, and invert bottle several times to allow poison to disperse through sample

*Alkalinity:* These are sampled and poisoned in the same fashion as dissolved inorganic carbon, except that 500 ml bottles are used.

*Carbon Isotopes:* These are sampled and poisoned in the same fashion as dissolved inorganic carbon, except that 500 ml glass stoppered vacuum flasks are used, and vacuum grease is placed around the stopper before inserting.

*Primary productivity:* Sampled from casts taken during daylight hours; samples were drawn for analysis of primary productivity and suspended particle size (taken from the shallowest four Niskin bottles). At most primary productivity sites, a Seabird "Seacat" CTD was deployed to obtain vertical profiles of photosynthetically active radiation (p.a.r.) and fluorescence from the top part of the water column. For primary productivity samples, 500 ml blacked out plastic jars are quickly rinsed then gently filled with ~400 ml of water through a length of tubing attached to the Niskin spiggot. Samples for particle size analysis are collected in 250 ml plastic bottles (with a single quick rinse prior to filling).

#### *Salinity:* sample bottle volume = 300 ml

\* drain remaining old sample from the bottle (bottles are always stored approximately 1/3 full with water between stations)

\* rinse bottle and cap 3 times with 100 ml of sample (shaking thoroughly each time); on each rinse, contents of sample bottle are poured over the Niskin bottle spiggot

\* fill bottle with sample, to bottle shoulder, and screw cap on firmly

At all filling stages, care is taken not to let the Niskin bottle spiggot touch the sample bottle.

#### *Nutrients:* sample tube volume = 12 ml

Two nutrient sample tubes are filled simultaneously at each Niskin bottle.

\* rinse tubes and caps 3 times

\* fill tubes

\* shake out water from tubes so that water level is at or below marking line 2 cm below top of tubes (10 ml mark), and screw on caps firmly

After sampling, one set of tubes are refrigerated for analysis within 12 hours; the duplicate set of tubes are placed in a freezer until required.

*Iodate:* same as for nutrients

*Iodide:* same as for nutrients, except 100 ml plastic bottle used.

*18O:* Sample bottle volume = 20 ml Sample bottles given 3 quick rinses, then filled. *Tritium:* 1 litre argon-filled bottles are filled to the top, minus headspace.

*Biological sampling:* Several different analyses were performed on the biological water samples, as listed in Table 3. Biological samples were usually drawn from the shallowest four or five Niskin bottles, with additional samples collected from a surface bucket.

#### **4.1.5 Hydrology analytical methods**

The analytical techniques and data processing routines employed in the Hydrographic Laboratory onboard the ship are discussed in Appendix 3 of Rosenberg et al. (1995b). Note the following changes to the methodology:

(i) 150 ml sample bottles were used (300 ml bottles had been used previously), and 1.0 ml of reagents 1, 2 and 3 were used (2.0 ml used previously); the corresponding calculation value for the total amount of oxygen added with the reagents =  $0.017$  ml (0.034 ml previously);

(ii) exact oxygen sample bottle volumes were individually measured, and applied for each individual bottle in the calculation of dissolved oxygen concentration.

#### **4.2 Underway measurements**

Throughout the cruise, the ship's data logging system continuously recorded bottom depth, ship's position and motion, surface water properties and meteorological information. All measurements were quality controlled during the cruise, to remove bad data (Ryan, 1995).

After quality controlling of the automatically logged GPS data set, gaps (due to missing data and data flagged as bad) are automatically filled by dead-reckoned positions (using the ship's speed and heading). Positions used for CTD stations are derived from this final GPS data set. Bottom depth is measured by a Simrad EA200 12 kHz echo sounder. A sound speed of 1498 ms<sup>-1</sup> is used for all depth calculations, and the ship's draught of 7.3 m has been accounted for in final depth values (i.e. depths are values from the surface).

Seawater is pumped on board via an inlet at 7 m below the surface. A portion of this water is diverted to the thermosalinograph (Aplied Microsystems Ltd, model STD-12), and to the fluorometer (Turner Design, peak sensitivity for chlorophyll-a). Sea surface temperatures are measured by a sensor next to the seawater inlet at 7 m depth.

The underway measurements for the cruise are contained in column formatted ascii files. The two file types are as follows (see Appendix 4 in Rosenberg et al., 1995b, for a complete description):

(i) 10 second digitised underway measurement data, including time, latitude, longitude, depth and sea surface temperature;

(ii) 15 minute averaged data, including time, latitude and longitude, air pressure, wind speed and direction, air temperature, humidity, quantum radiation, ship speed and heading, roll and pitch, sea surface salinity and temperature, average fluorescence, and seawater flow.

#### **4.3 ADCP**

A vessel mounted acoustic Doppler current profiler (ADCP) was installed in the hull during drydocking of the ship in mid 1994. The unit is a high power 150 kHz narrow band ADCP produced by RD Instruments. The four transducer heads are mounted in a concave Janus configuration, with the beams 30 degrees off vertical, and with the transducers aligned at  $45^{\circ}$  to fore and aft. The transducers are mounted in a seachest ~7 m below the water surface, behind a 81 mm thick low density polyethylene window, with the window flush to the ship's hull. The inside of the seachest is

lined with acoustic tiles (polyurethane with barytes and air microsphere fillers), and filled with hypersaline water.

ADCP data were logged on a Sparc 5 Sun workstation. Logging parameters are listed in Table 7. An array of sounders is mounted on the ship for use in hydroacoustic biology surveys (T. Pauly, pers. comm.). When these sounders are in operation, firing of the ADCP is synchronised with the sounder trigger pulses, to avoid interference between the two systems. When this synchronisation is active, the ADCP ping rate is lowered by ~35%. When the ADCP system bottom tracking is active, the ping rate is decreased by ~50 %. Gyrocompass heading data were logged on the Sun through a synchro to digital converter, at a one second sampling frequency. GPS data collected by a Lowrance receiver were also logged by the Sun; the Lowrance unit received GPS positions every 2 seconds, and GPS velocities every 2 seconds, with positions and velocities received on alternate seconds. ADCP data processing is discussed in more detail in Dunn (a and b, unpublished reports).

#### **Table 7: ADCP logging parameters.**



ensemble averageing duration: 3 min.

# **5 MAJOR PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED**

#### **5.1 Logistics**

The only significant logistic problem was shortage of time, due in part to delayed cargo operations at Casey. For part of the transects, as mentioned above, station spacing was increased to 45 nautical miles, to ensure completion of the oceanographic work in the available time.

#### **5.2 CTD sensors**

Various problems occurred with the CTD sensors over the course of the cruise. For CTD 1103 (used for the first 18 stations), the conductivity output became increasingly noisy after station 10, resulting in random salinity noise with an amplitude up to ~0.01 psu. The CTD was finally changed to CTD 1193 following station 18. After the cruise, the noise problem in CTD 1103 was traced to loosely mounted cards inside the housing.

Conductivity noise was minimal for CTD 1193, however the conductivity cell response showed a strong pressure dependence. In addition, the same conductivity cell displayed significant hysteresis between the down and upcasts. These problems are discussed in more detail in section 6. Following station 56, the conductivity cell on CTD 1193 was changed for a spare. The spare cell functioned well, except for a transient error when first entering the water - the cell appeared to need soaking near the surface for up to 2 minutes, before a stable conductivity reading was reached.

Prior to station 95, moisture was discovered entering the CTD 1193 housing, causing corrosion of the fast temperature sensor connector. The fault was traced to pits in the o-ring seats of the metal

mounting plate on which the conductivity and fast temperature sensors are mounted. As a temporary fix, the connectors were sprayed with a water displacing agent, and the space behind the sensors in the housing was filled with grease. No leakage occurred for the remaining stations, however one or more of these substances caused slight contamination of the conductivity cell, resulting in a small amount of signal noise over the next few stations.

For both CTD 1103 and 1193, the oxygen sensor oil reservoir housing could not be screwed tightly onto the mounting connector threads. As a result, any impact, such as caused by the instrument breaking through the water surface on deployment, caused the housing to move sufficiently for the silicon oil to drain past the o-ring, and resulting in loss of data (see section 6). This occurred several times early in the cruise. Following station 28, 2 adjacent o-rings (instead of the usual 1) were installed in the oxygen oil reservoir housing, solving the oil drainage problem.

Following station 76, a crack was discovered in the housing window for the photosynthetically active radiation sensor. The sensor was not used for the remainder of the cruise.

The altimeter did not function for the first 4 stations, thus these CTD casts were only taken to within ~100 to 200 m of the bottom. Following station 4, the problem was traced to a burnt out chip in CTD 1103. The altimeter performed well for the remainder of the cruise, allowing close CTD approaches to the bottom (Table 2).

#### **5.3 Other equipment**

The first few days of bathymetry data were lost due to problems with the 12 kHz echo sounder transducer. Good bathymetry data was obtained starting from 19/12/94 UTC.

Routing of the aft CTD winch wire resulted in serious kinking of the wire on several occasions - the wire required retermination each time. Following station 33, operations were changed to the forward CTD winch wire, and no more serious problems occurred for the remainder of the cruise.

One of the upward looking sonar moorings (Table 5) could not be located with the acoustic release surface transducer. No attempt was made to send the release command, owing to the significant sea ice coverage. At the time of writing, further recovery attempts indicated the mooring was no longer present at the deployment site.

## **6 RESULTS**

This section details information relevant to the creation and the quality of the final CTD and hydrology data set. For actual use of the data, the following is important:

 CTD data - Tables 14 and 15, and section 6.1.2; hydrology data - Tables 18 and 19.

Historical data comparisons are made in section 7. Data file formats are described in Appendix 4 of Rosenberg et al. (1995b).

#### **6.1 CTD measurements**

#### **6.1.1 Creation of CTD 2 dbar-averaged and upcast burst data**

#### *Conductivity*

Four different conductivity cells were used during the cruise, as follows:

conductivity cell 1, stations 1-18 (using CTD 1103); conductivity cell 2, stations 19-56 (using CTD 1193); conductivity cell 3, stations 57-106 (using CTD 1193); conductivity cell 4, station 107 (using CTD 2568).

With the exception of cell 4, all the conductivity cells displayed large transient errors when entering the water. In addition, cell 3 displayed significant hysteresis between downcast and upcast conductivity data. As a result, for stations 1 to 106, upcast CTD data was used for all the 2 dbaraveraged pressure, temperature and conductivity data. Note that station 107 data were not used.

The response of conductivity cells 1 and 2 showed a pressure dependence, much stronger in the case of cell 2. For both these cells (i.e. stations 1 to 56), the pressure dependent conductivity residual was removed by the following steps:

(a) CTD conductivity was initially calibrated to derive conductivity residuals ( $c_{\text{bit}}$  -  $c_{\text{cal}}$ ), where  $c_{\text{bit}}$  and  $c_{\text{cal}}$  are as defined in the CTD methodology, noting that  $c_{\text{cal}}$  is the conductivity value after the initial calibration only i.e. prior to any pressure dependent correction.

(b) Next, for each station grouping (Table 11), a linear pressure dependent fit was found for the conductivity residuals i.e. for station grouping i, fit parameters  $\alpha_i$  (Table 11) and  $\beta_i$  were found from

 $(c_{\text{btl}} - c_{\text{cal}})_n = \alpha_i p_n + \beta_i$ 

(eqn 1)

where the residuals  $(c_{\text{btl}} - c_{\text{cal}})_n$  and corresponding pressures  $p_n$  (i.e. pressures where Niskin bottles fired) are all the values accepted for conductivity calibration in the station grouping.

(c) Lastly, the conductivity calibration was repeated, this time fitting ( $c_{\text{ctd}} + \alpha_i$  p) to the bottle values  $c_{\text{bit}}$ in order to remove the linear pressure dependence for each station grouping i (for uncalibrated conductivity c<sub>ctd</sub> as defined in the CTD methodology; and note that the offsets  $\beta_i$  were not applied).

#### *Dissolved oxygen*

For stations 19 to 106, downcast oxygen temperature and oxygen current data were merged with the upcast pressure, temperature and conductivity data (upcast dissolved oxygen data is in general not reliable). With this data set, calibration of the dissolved oxygen data then followed the usual methodology. No CTD oxygen data was obtained for stations 1 to 18, due to a hardware fault in CTD 1103.

A small additional error in CTD dissolved oxygen data is expected to occur from the merging of downcast oxygen data with upcast pressure, temperature and conductivity data - where horizontal gradients occur, there will be some mismatch of downcast and upcast data as the ship drifts during a CTD cast. At most, this error is not expected to exceed ~3%.

#### *Summary*

stations 1-18: all CTD data from upcast; weak pressure dependent conductivity residual removed; no CTD dissolved oxygen data;

stations 19-56: CTD data from upcast, except for dissolved oxygen data (downcast); strong pressure dependent conductivity residual removed.

stations 57-106: CTD data from upcast, except for dissolved oxygen data (downcast).

Further information relevant to the creation of the calibrated CTD data is tabulated, as follows:

\* Surface pressure offsets calculated for each station are listed in Table 10.

\* Missing 2 dbar data averages are listed in the files avmiss.out and avoxmiss.out (the latter for CTD dissolved oxygen).

\* CTD conductivity calibration coefficients, including the station groupings used for the conductivity calibration, are listed in Tables 11 and 12.

\* CTD raw data scans flagged for special treatment are listed in Table 13.

\* Suspect 2 dbar averages are listed in Tables 14 and 15. The file avinterp.out lists 2 dbar averages which are linear interpolations of the surrounding 2 dbar averages.

\* CTD dissolved oxygen calibration coefficients are listed in Table 16. The starting values used for the coefficients prior to iteration, and the coefficients varied during the iteration, are listed in Table 17.

- \* Stations containing fluorescence and photosynthetically active radiation data are listed in Table 22.
- \* The different protected and unprotected thermometers used for the stations are listed in Table 23.

#### **6.1.2 CTD data quality**

The final calibration results for conductivity/salinity and dissolved oxygen, along with the performance check for temperature, are plotted in Figures 2 to 5. For temperature, salinity and dissolved oxygen, the respective residuals  $(T_{therm} - T_{cal})$ ,  $(S_{\text{btl}} - S_{\text{cal}})$  and  $(O_{\text{btl}} - O_{\text{cal}})$  are plotted. For conductivity, the ratio  $c_{\text{bit}}/c_{\text{cal}}$  is plotted. Note that for stations where a correction was made for the pressure dependent conductivity error,  $c_{\text{cal}}$  here refers to the final calibrated value after the correction.  $T_{therm}$  and  $T_{cal}$  are respectively the protected thermometer and calibrated upcast CTD burst temperature values;  $S_{\text{btl}}$ ,  $S_{\text{cal}}$ ,  $O_{\text{btl}}$ ,  $O_{\text{cal}}$ ,  $C_{\text{btl}}$  and  $C_{\text{cal}}$ , and the mean and standard deviation values in Figures 2 to 5, are as defined in the CTD methodology.

CTD data quality cautions for the various parameters are discussed below. Table 8 contains a summary of these cautions.

#### *Pressure*

The titanium strain gauge pressure sensors used in the Mark IIIC CTD's display a higher noise level than the older stainless steel strain gauge models, with a typical rms of  $\sim\pm 0.2$  dbar (Millard et al., 1993). Noise in the pressure signal for CTD 1193 (used for stations 19 to 106) was found to be higher than this, with spikes of up to 1 dbar amplitude occurring. In the creation of CTD raw data files monotonically increasing with pressure (see CTD methodology), pressure spikes with a width exceeding 3 data points are retained as real values. Thus as a result of the high noise levels for CTD 1193, a large number of 2 dbar bins were missing, as not enough data points were present in these bins to form a bin average. The number of missing bins was reduced by setting to 6 the minimum number of data points required in a 2 dbar bin to form an average (i.e. imin=6; for previous cruises,  $j$ min=10). Note that  $j$ min=6 was used for the entire cruise. For remaining missing bins, values were linearly interpolated between surrounding bins, except where the local temperature gradient exceeded  $0.005^{\circ}$ C between the surrounding bins i.e. temperature gradient > 0.00125 degrees/dbar.

For stations 48, 54 and 72, surface pressure offset values fell on small pressure spikes, thus the final surface pressure offsets were estimated from a manual inspection of the pressure data. A manual estimate was also required for station 55. The surface pressure offset values for stations 66 and 76 were estimated from the surrounding stations (Table 10). Any resulting additional error in the CTD pressure data is judged to be small (no more than 0.2 dbar).

For stations 7, 11, 16, 28, 65 and 66, flooding of the dissolved oxygen sensor with seawater resulted in bad pressure temperature data (as discussed in Rosenberg et al., 1995b). To allow accurate calculation of pressure in dbar, the following pressure temperature data were used in pressure calculations for these stations:



Note that the pressure temperature profiles chosen above provide the closest match to the assumed pressure temperature profiles for stations 7, 11, 16, 28, 65 and 66, and any errors are judged to be small  $( $0.3$  dbar).$ 

#### *Salinity*

The conductivity ratios for all bottle samples are plotted in Figure 3, while the salinity residuals are plotted in Figure 4. The final standard deviation values for the salinity residuals (Figure 4) indicate the CTD salinity data over the whole cruise is accurate to within  $\pm 0.002$  psu.

No conductivity residual correction was made for stations 1 and 54: all bottles were fired at the same depth for these stations (test casts), so that any pressure dependent conductivity residual (section 6.1.1) could not be quantified. Note that as a result, the salinities for these stations can only be considered as accurate to ~0.01 psu.

Bottle salinity data was lost for station 24, due to malfunction of the salinometer. The station was grouped with surrounding stations for conductivity calibration (Table 11).

No conductivity residual correction (section 6.1.1) was made for stations 3 to 10 and 52 to 53, as no pressure dependent conductivity residual was found for these stations.

#### *Temperature*

The temperature residuals are shown in Figure 2, along with the mean offset and standard deviation of the residuals. The thermometer value used in each case is the mean of the two protected thermometer readings (protected thermometers used are listed in Table 23). Note that in the figures, the "dubious" and "rejected" categories refer to corresponding bottle samples and upcast CTD bursts in the conductivity calibration, rather than to CTD/thermometer temperature values.

For CTD 1193 (stations 19 to 106), there was a problem with the laboratory calibration of the platinum temperature sensor. With the original pre-cruise calibration coefficients, an offset of 0.007 $\mathrm{^{\circ}C}$ was found between CTD and reversing thermometer temperature values. As a consequence, an additional offset value of -0.007°C (Appendix 1) was applied to all CTD temperature values for stations 19 to 106.

#### **Table 8: Summary of cautions to CTD data quality.**



#### *Dissolved Oxygen*

After the cruise, the CTD dissolved oxygen data for CTD 1103 (stations 1 to 18) was found to be unusable. The fault was traced to incorrect wiring in the factory-provided oxygen sensor mounting.

The dissolved oxygen residuals are plotted in Figure 5. The final standard deviation values are within 1% of full scale values (where full scale is approximately equal to 250 μmol/l for pressure > 750 dbar, and 350  $\mu$ mol/l for pressure < 750 dbar).

In general, good calibrations of the CTD dissolved oxygen data were obtained using the in situ bottle data, however some atypical values were found for the calibration coefficients (Tables 16 and 17) (see the CTD methodology for full details of calibration formulae). For most stations, the best calibration was achieved using large values of the order 10.0 for the coefficient  $K_1$  (i.e. oxygen current slope), and large negative values of the order -1.5 for the coefficient  $K_3$  (i.e. oxygen current bias). This, however, is not considered relevant to actual data quality.

In addition, the following unusual coefficient values were found (for typical values, see Millard and Yang, 1993, and Millard, 1991):



Despite some atypical calibration coefficient values, all dissolved oxygen calibrations are considered valid.

Oil drainage from the oxygen sensor mounting resulted in unusable dissolved oxygen data for stations 28, 65 and 66.

No oxygen bottle samples were collected for station 54. No attempt was made to calibrate the dissolved oxygen data for this station.

Dissolved oxygen data were not processed for station 107 (a working sensor was not fitted).

### *Fluorescence and P.A.R. Data*

As discussed in section 4 above, fluorescence and p.a.r. are effectively uncalibrated. These data should not be used quantitatively other than for linkage with primary productivity data.

## **6.2 Hydrology data**

## **6.2.1 Hydrology data quality**

Quality control information relevant to the hydrology data is tabulated, as follows:

\* Questionable dissolved oxygen and nutrient Niskin bottle sample values are listed in Tables 18 and 19 respectively. Note that questionable values are included in the hydrology data file, whereas bad values have been removed.

\* Laboratory temperatures at the times of nutrient analyses are listed in Table 20.

Dissolved oxygen Niskin bottle samples flagged with the code -9 (rejected for CTD dissolved oxygen calibration) are listed in Table 21.

For station 47, the cast was abandoned at ~1000 on the downcast, due to ice floes around the CTD wire. During retrieval, bottles at rosette positions 1 to 18 were tripped on the fly. For station 48, 8 bottles did not trip, due to malfunction of the rosette pylon.

#### *Nutrients*

For the phosphate analyses, it was found that the autoanalyser peak height of a sample which was run immediately after a series of wash solution vials (low nutrient sea water) was suppressed by, on average, 2%, as discussed in section 6.2.1 of Rosenberg et al. (1995b). For stations 1 to 34, samples thus affected (typically from rosette positions 12 and 24) were treated as bad data. Following station 34, additional "dummy" samples drawn from the Niskin bottles were inserted in autoanalyser runs immediately following wash solution vials to artificially mask the suppression effect on subsequent samples.

Surface phosphate values for many of the remaining stations still remain artificially suppressed - in Figure 9 the low phosphate values, in the vicinity of the nitrate+nitrite concentration of ~25 umol/l, are all near surface samples. Moreover, these samples all occur in regions where the steepest vertical gradients in nutrient concentrations are found. As a result of the steep vertical gradients, near surface phosphate concentrations are much lower than for the remainder of the water column, and any suppression of the phosphate autoanalyser peaks for the near surface samples will become amplified when data are viewed as ratios (Figure 9). These questionable near surface phosphate samples are listed in Table 19.

For surface silicate samples at stations 71 to 104, the autoanalyser silicate peaks were spiked, causing problems in the automatic peak integration performed by the software DAPA (see Appendix 3 in Rosenberg et al., 1995b). The replicate surface sample (one of the dummy samples for the phosphate analysis) did not show the same response, so the replicate was used for measuring the peak height.

The following notes also apply to the nutrient data:

\* For station 107, no nutrient samples were collected.

\* For the station 62, all nutrient concentrations were derived from manual measurements of autoanalyser peak heights, using the strip chart recordings.

## **6.2.2 Hydrology sample replicates**

The accuracy and precision of bottle data are considered relative to the full scale deflection of measurement for nutrients



and relative to the maximum data value for dissolved oxygen

dissolved oxygen: ~350 μmol/l for pressure < 750 dbar  $\sim$ 250  $\mu$ mol/l for pressure > 750 dbar.

In general, no organised sample replication was carried out, thus the replicate data set discussed here is small. Most replicate data were obtained opportunistically, from multiple fired Niskin bottles taken during bottle test casts, or from depths sampled in both casts of shallow/deep cast pairs. Two types of replicate data were obtained from the hydrology data set, as follows.

#### *Replicate samples drawn from the same Niskin bottle*

A series of repeat nutrient samples were drawn from 2 different Niskin bottles at station 32. At each of the Niskins, the absolute value of the differences about the mean value were formed (Figure 6a). Precision values for phosphate, nitrate+nitrite and silicate are respectively 0.16%, 0.22% and 0.35% of the full scale deflection (Table 9a).





#### *Replicate samples drawn from different Niskin bottles tripped at same depth*

At several stations, multiple Niskin bottles were fired at a single depth. For each set of Niskin bottles tripped at a single depth, a mean value  $m<sub>x</sub>$  was calculated for the sample set and the differences  $x-m<sub>x</sub>$  formed, where x is the phosphate, nitrate+nitrite, silicate, salinity or dissolved oxygen bottle value; the standard deviation of all x-m<sub>x</sub> values for the replicate data was calculated. Absolute values of the differences x-m<sub>x</sub> are shown in Figure 6b, and the results are summarised in Table 9b. It is assumed that these precision values would be further reduced if sample groups were drawn from the same Niskin bottle.



#### **Table 9b: Precision data for replicates drawn from Niskin bottles tripped at the same depth.**

# **7 HISTORICAL DATA COMPARISONS**

In this section, a brief comparison is made between the au9404 cruise data, and data from the previous cruise au9407 (Rosenberg et al., 1995b).

# **7.1 Dissolved oxygen**

Vertical profiles of CTD dissolved oxygen concentrations for cruises au9404 and au9407 are compared in Figure 7. Note that dissolved oxygen concentrations of bottle samples for both cruises were measured using the WHOI automated method (see Appendix 3, Rosenberg et al., 1995b). Concentration values for the two cruises are in general consistent.

# **7.2 Salinity**

The meridional variation of the salinity maximum for the two cruises i.e. for Lower Circumpolar Deep Water (as defined by Gordon, 1967) is compared in Figure 8. For the comparison, CTD 2 dbar data were used i.e. CTD salinity, temperature and pressure values at the nearest 2 dbar bin to the salinity maximum for each station. Note that in the figure, property differences are only formed between station pairs (i.e. corresponding au9404 and au9407 stations) which are separated by less than 1.5 nautical miles of latitude.

There appears to be a mean offset of  $\sim 0.003$  psu between the two cruises (Figure 8), smaller than the large salinity offset of ~0.007 psu found between cruises au9309 and au9407 (Appendix 6 in Rosenberg et al., 1995b). Note that there is no consistent biasing of the temperature or pressure data (Figure 8), suggesting that the difference is due to salinity alone, the same result as found for the comparison between earlier cruises. In summary, the following approximate mean salinity differences are evident for the successive occupations of the SR3 transect:

cruise comparison mean salinity difference



As discussed in Rosenberg et al. 1995b, the most likely source of any systematic salinity error is the salinometers (YeoKal Mk IV) used for the analysis of salinity samples from the Niskin bottles. However, the exact cause of the error remains inconclusive. At the time of writing, two more recent occupations of SR3 stations await processing, while a further transect of SR3 is planned using more accurate salinometers (Guildline Autosals). These later data sets may clarify any instrument errors.

#### **7.3 Nutrients**

Phosphate and nitrate+nitrite concentrations are in general consistent for the au9404 and au9407 data, revealed by comparison of the nitrate+nitrite to phosphate ratio (Figure 9). Note that for au9404, the depressed phosphate values at the approximate nitrate+nitrite level of 25 μmol/l are all near surface values, and are to be regarded as questionable data (see section 6.2.1 for more details).

There is a small non-linearity in the nitrate+nitrite to phosphate ratio for both cruises, with low nutrient values lying below the best fit linear relationship (Figure 9). A similar trend is evident in data from cruise au9309 (Figure A6.4 in Rosenberg et al., 1995b), and data along the P11 transect from cruise au9391 (Figure A6.10 in Rosenberg et al., 1995a) (although there is more scatter in the au9391 data). For cruise au9404, these low values correspond with near surface samples north of the Subantarctic Front (Figure 10) i.e. north of  $~50^{\circ}$ S. Note that at both the Subantarctic and Subtropical Fronts (at  $\sim$  50°S and  $\sim$  45.5°S respectively from inspection of surface temperatures in Figure 10), there is a sharp horizontal gradient in surface nutrient values, with concentrations decreasing to the north across the fronts. A corresponding northward decrease in the nitrate+nitrite to phosphate ratio is also evident (Figure 10), accounting for the non-linearity in the ratio at low nutrient concentrations (Figure 9). This effect, also observed in the earlier cruises, appears to be a real feature.



Figure 2: Temperature residual (T<sub>therm</sub> - T<sub>cal</sub>) versus station number for cruise au9404. The **solid line is the mean of all the residuals; the broken lines are** ± **the standard deviation of all the residuals (as defined in the CTD methodology). Note that the "dubious" and "rejected" categories refer to the conductivity calibration.** 



Figure 3: Conductivity ratio c<sub>bti</sub>/c<sub>cal</sub> versus station number for cruise au9404. The solid line **follows the mean of the residuals for each station; the broken lines are** ± **the standard deviation of the residuals for each station (as defined in the CTD methodology).**


Figure 4: Salinity residual (S<sub>btl</sub> - S<sub>cal</sub>) versus station number for cruise au9404. The solid line is **the mean of all the residuals; the broken lines are** ± **the standard deviation of all the residuals (as defined in the CTD methodology).**







Figure 5: Dissolved oxygen residual (O<sub>btl</sub> - O<sub>cal</sub>) versus station number for cruise au9404. The **solid line follows the mean residual for each station; the broken lines are** ± **the standard deviation of the residuals for each station (as defined in the CTD methodology).** 



**Figure 6: Absolute value of parameter differences for replicate samples, for replicates drawn from (a) the same Niskin bottle, and (b) different Niskins tripped at the same depth. Note that differences are between parameter values and depth mean.** 



**Figure 7: CTD dissolved oxygen vertical profile data for comparison of au9404 and au9407 data.** 



**Figure 8: Variation with latitude south along the SR3 transect of properties at the deep salinity maximum (marking the Lower Circumpolar Deep Water): property differences are between cruise au9404 and cruise au9407 i.e. au9404 value minus au9407 value. Note that differences are formed only between stations from the two cruises which are separated by no more than 1.5 nautical miles of latitude.** 



**Figure 9: Bulk plot of nitrate+nitrite versus phosphate for all au9404 and au9407 data along the SR3 transect, together with linear best fit lines.** 



**Figure 10: Meridional variation along the SR3 transect of CTD temperature, phosphate concentration, and nitrate+nitrite to phosphate ratio, all at the near surface Niskin bottle.** 

#### **Table 10: Surface pressure offsets (as defined in the CTD methodology). \*\* indicates that value is estimated from surrounding stations, or else determined from manual inspection of pressure data.**



**Table 11:** CTD conductivity calibration coefficients.  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  are respectively conductivity **bias, slope and station-dependent correction calibration terms. n is the number of samples retained for calibration in each station grouping;** σ **is the standard deviation of the conductivity residual for the n samples in the station grouping (eqn A2.19 in the CTD methodology);** α **is the correction applied to CTD conductivities due to pressure dependence of the conductivity residuals (eqn 1).**



Table 12: Station-dependent-corrected conductivity slope term (F<sub>2</sub> + F<sub>3</sub> . N), for station number **N**, and  $F_2$  and  $F_3$  the conductivity slope and station-dependent correction calibration terms **respectively.**

| station<br>number | $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$ | station<br>number | $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$  | station<br>number | $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$ |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
|                   | 1 TEST 0.98742342E-03 | 37 S4             | 0.95658030E-03         | 73 SR3            | 0.95827468E-03        |
| 2 S <sub>4</sub>  | 0.98716526E-03        | 38 S4             | 0.95660218E-03         | 74 SR3            | 0.95823538E-03        |
| 3 S4              | 0.98725884E-03        | 39 S4             | 0.95504184E-03         | 75 SR3            | 0.95786211E-03        |
| 4 S4              | 0.98724844E-03        | 40 S4             | 0.95511904E-03         | 76 SR3            | 0.95788886E-03        |
| 5 S4              | 0.10322266E-02        | 41 S4             | 0.95703805E-03         | 77 SR3            | 0.95842332E-03        |
| 6 S4              | 0.10322266E-02        | 42 S4             | 0.95703008E-03         | 78 SR3            | 0.95843131E-03        |
| 7 S <sub>4</sub>  | 0.98690369E-03        | 43 S4             | 0.95702211E-03         | 79 SR3            | 0.95843929E-03        |
| 8 S4              | 0.98693532E-03        | 44 S4             | 0.95668522E-03         | 80 SR3            | 0.95732310E-03        |
| 9 S <sub>4</sub>  | 0.98789931E-03        | 45 S4             | 0.95668249E-03         | 81 SR3            | 0.95730813E-03        |
| 10 S4             | 0.98778553E-03        | 46 S4             | 0.95667976E-03         | 82 SR3            | 0.95817735E-03        |
| 11 S4             | 0.98768450E-03        | 47 S4             | 0.95605761E-03         | 83 SR3            | 0.95812420E-03        |
| 12 S4             | 0.98766663E-03        | 48 S4             | 0.95576899E-03         | 84 SR3            | 0.95780889E-03        |
| 13 S4             | 0.98670749E-03        | 49 S4             | 0.95636344E-03         | 85 SR3            | 0.95784717E-03        |
| 14 S4             | 0.98672818E-03        | 50 S4             | 0.95638381E-03         | 86 SR3            | 0.95725530E-03        |
| 15 S4             | 0.98805001E-03        | 51 S4             | 0.95640419E-03         | 87 SR3            | 0.95725958E-03        |
| 16 S4             | 0.98810230E-03        | 52 S4             | 0.95542546E-03         | 88 SR3            | 0.95726386E-03        |
| 17 S4             | 0.98815459E-03        | 53 S4             | 0.95567894E-03         | 89 SR3            | 0.95726814E-03        |
| 18 S4             | 0.98820687E-03        |                   | 54 TEST 0.95835512E-03 | 90 SR3            | 0.95727242E-03        |
| 19 S4             | 0.95733896E-03        | 55 SR3            | 0.95853942E-03         | 91 SR3            | 0.95727670E-03        |
| 20 S4             | 0.95746798E-03        | 56 SR3            | 0.95872372E-03         | 92 SR3            | 0.95728098E-03        |
| 21 S4             | 0.95741133E-03        | 57 SR3            | 0.95490015E-03         | 93 SR3            | 0.95681457E-03        |
| 22 S4             | 0.95729571E-03        | 58 SR3            | 0.95453358E-03         | 94 SR3            | 0.95681472E-03        |
| 23 S4             | 0.95832904E-03        | 59 SR3            | 0.95592085E-03         | 95 SR3            | 0.95681487E-03        |
| 24 S4             | 0.95832197E-03        | 60 SR3            | 0.95599808E-03         | 96 SR3            | 0.95662950E-03        |
| 25 S4             | 0.95831489E-03        | 61 SR3            | 0.95682575E-03         | 97 SR3            | 0.95662105E-03        |
| 26 S4             | 0.95830781E-03        | 62 SR3            | 0.95677297E-03         | 98 SR3            | 0.95534341E-03        |
| 27 S4             | 0.95830074E-03        | 63 SR3            | 0.95695933E-03         | 99 SR3            | 0.95501771E-03        |
| 28 S4             | 0.95795483E-03        | 64 SR3            | 0.95690192E-03         | 100 SR3           | 0.95531241E-03        |
| 29 S4             | 0.95804456E-03        | 65 SR3            | 0.95684452E-03         | 101 SR3           | 0.95531831E-03        |
| 30 S4             | 0.95800507E-03        | 66 SR3            | 0.95733220E-03         | 102 SR3           | 0.95529443E-03        |
| 31 S4             | 0.95805553E-03        | 67 SR3            | 0.95733546E-03         | 103 SR3           | 0.95525249E-03        |
| 32 S4             | 0.95757736E-03        | 68 SR3            | 0.95616942E-03         | 104 SR3           | 0.95521055E-03        |
| 33 S4             | 0.95749279E-03        | 69 SR3            | 0.95618640E-03         | 105 SR3           | 0.95543257E-03        |
| 34 S4             | 0.97676403E-03        | 70 SR3            | 0.95620339E-03         | 106 SR3           | 0.95534163E-03        |
| 35 S4             | 0.97657712E-03        | 71 SR3            | 0.95622037E-03         |                   |                       |
| 36 S4             | 0.95655843E-03        | 72 SR3            | 0.95831399E-03         |                   |                       |

**Table 13: CTD raw data scans, mostly in the vicinity of artificial density inversions, flagged for special treatment. Note that the pressure listed is approximate only; possible actions taken are either to ignore the raw data scans for all further calculations, or to apply a linear interpolation over the region of the bad data scans. Causes of bad data, listed in the last column, are detailed in the CTD methodology. For the raw scan number ranges, the lowest and highest scans numbers are not included in the ignore or interpolate actions.** 





**Table 14: Suspect 2 dbar averages. Note: for suspect salinity values, the following are also suspect: sigma-T, specific volume anomaly, and geopotential anomaly.** 

**Table 15a: Suspect 2 dbar-averaged data from near the surface (applies to all parameters other than dissolved oxygen, except where noted).** 



#### **Table 15b: Suspect 2 dbar-averaged dissolved oxygen data from near the surface.**



**Table 16:** CTD dissolved oxygen calibration coefficients.  $K_1$ ,  $K_2$ ,  $K_3$ ,  $K_4$ ,  $K_5$  and  $K_6$  are **respectively oxygen current slope, oxygen sensor time constant, oxygen current bias, temperature correction term, weighting factor, and pressure correction term. dox is equal to 2.8**σ **(for** σ **defined as in eqn A2.24 in the CTD methodology); n is the number of samples retained for calibration in each station or station grouping.** 



# **Table 16: (continued)**



**Table 17: Starting values for CTD dissolved oxygen calibration coefficients prior to iteration, and coefficients varied during iteration (see CTD methodology). Note that coefficients not varied during iteration are held constant at the starting value.** 



# **Table 17: (continued)**







#### **Table 19: Questionable nutrient sample values (not deleted from hydrology data file).**



| stn            | $T_{\rm L}$   | stn | $\mathsf{T}_1$ | stn | $\langle T_1 \rangle$                                | stn | $T_1$                            | stn | $T_1$                               | stn | $T_1$         |
|----------------|---------------|-----|----------------|-----|--|-----|----------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|---------------|
| no.            | $(^{\circ}C)$ | no. |                |     | $(^{\circ}C)$ no. $(^{\circ}C)$<br>----------------- | no. | $(^{\circ}C)$                    | no. | $(^{\circ}C)$<br>------------------ | no. | $(^{\circ}C)$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$   | 22            | 21  | 21.7           | 41  | 21   |     | ------------------<br>61  22  81 |     | 21.5                                | 101 | 21.5          |
| $\overline{2}$ | 22            | 22  | 22             | 42  | 21   | 62  | 21                               | 82  | 21.5                                | 102 | 21.5          |
| 3              | 22            | 23  | 21.5           | 43  | 21.5   | 63  | 21.5                             | 83  | 22                                  | 103 | 21            |
| $\overline{4}$ | 23            | 24  | 22             | 44  | 21   | 64  | 21                               | 84  | 22                                  | 104 | 21.5          |
| 5              | $\sim$        | 25  | 20.5           | 45  | 22   | 65  | 22                               | 85  | 22                                  | 105 | 21.5          |
| 6              | 21            | 26  | 21             | 46  | 21   | 66  | 22                               | 86  | 22                                  | 106 | 21.5          |
| $\overline{7}$ | 22            | 27  | 21             | 47  | 21   | 67  | 22                               | 87  | 23                                  |     |               |
| 8              | 20.5          | 28  | 21             | 48  | 21   | 68  | 21.5                             | 88  | 22.5                                |     |               |
| 9              | 21            | 29  | 21             | 49  | 21   | 69  | 22                               | 89  | 22.5                                |     |               |
| 10             | 22.5          | 30  | 21             | 50  | 20.5   | 70  | 22                               | 90  | 23.5                                |     |               |
| 11             | 21.5          | 31  | 21.5           | 51  | 21.5   | 71  | 22                               | 91  | 22.5                                |     |               |
| 12             | 21.5          | 32  | 21             | 52  | 22   | 72  | 21.5                             | 92  | 21.5                                |     |               |
| 13             | 21.5          | 33  | 20.5           | 53  | 21   | 73  | 21.5                             | 93  | 22                                  |     |               |
| 14             | 22            | 34  | 22             | 54  | 19.5   | 74  | 22                               | 94  | 22                                  |     |               |
| 15             | 22            | 35  | 21             | 55  | 20   | 75  | 22                               | 95  | 21                                  |     |               |
| 16             | 21.5          | 36  | 21             | 56  | 19.5   | 76  | 21.5                             | 96  | 21.5                                |     |               |
| 17             | 21            | 37  | 21.5           | 57  | 21   | 77  | 21.5                             | 97  | 21.5                                |     |               |
| 18             | 22.5          | 38  | 21.5           | 58  | 21   | 78  | 21.5                             | 98  | 21.5                                |     |               |
| 19             | 21            | 39  | 21             | 59  | 21   | 79  | 22                               | 99  | 22                                  |     |               |
| 20             | 22            | 40  | 21             | 60  | 22   | 80  | 21.5                             | 100 | 22                                  |     |               |

Table 20: Laboratory temperatures T<sub>I</sub> at the times of nutrient analyses. Note that a mean value **of 21.5<sup>o</sup> C was used for conversion to gravimetric units for WOCE format data (Appendix 2).**

**Table 21: Dissolved oxygen Niskin bottle samples flagged as -9 for dissolved oxygen calibration. Note that this does not necessarily indicate a bad bottle sample - in many cases, flagging is due to bad CTD dissolved oxygen data.** 



#### **Table 22: Stations containing fluorescence (fl) and photosynthetically active radiation (par) 2 dbar-averaged data.**



#### **Table 23: Protected and unprotected reversing thermometers used for cruise AU9404 (serial numbers are listed).**



#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Thanks to all scientific personnel who participated in the cruise, and to the crew of the RSV Aurora Australis. The work was supported by the Department of Environment, Sport and Territories through the CSIRO Climate Change Research Program, the Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre, and the Australian Antarctic Division.

### **REFERENCES**

- Bush, G., 1994. *Deployment of upward looking sonar buoys.* Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin University of Technology, Western Australia, Report No. C94-4 (unpublished).
- Dunn, J., 1995a. *ADCP processing system.* CSIRO Division of Oceanography (unpublished report).
- Dunn, J., 1995b. *Processing of ADCP data at CSIRO Marine Laboratories.* CSIRO Division of Oceanography (unpublished report).
- Gordon, A.L., 1967. Structure of Antarctic waters between 20°W and 170°W. Antarctic Map Folio Series, Folio 6, Bushnell, V. (ed.). American Geophysical Society, New York.
- Millard, R.C., 1991. *CTD Oxygen Calibration Procedure* in WOCE Operations Manual, 1991. WHP Office Report WHPO 91-1, WOCE Report No. 68/91, Woods Hole, Mass., USA.
- Millard, R.C. and Yang, K., 1993. *CTD calibration and processing methods used at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.* Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Technical Report No. 93- 44. 96 pp.
- Millard, R., Bond, G. and Toole, J., 1993. Implementation of a titanium strain gauge pressure transducer for CTD applications. *Deep-Sea Research I*, Vol. 40, No. 5, pp1009-1021.
- Rintoul, S.R. and Bullister, J.L. (submitted). A late winter section between Tasmania and Antarctica: Circulation, transport and water mass formation.
- Rosenberg, M., Eriksen, R. and Rintoul, S., 1995a. *Aurora Australis marine science cruise AU9309/AU9391 - oceanographic field measurements and analysis*. Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre, Research Report No. 2, March 1995. 103 pp.
- Rosenberg, M., Eriksen, R., Bell, S., Bindoff, N. and Rintoul, S., 1995b. *Aurora Australis marine science cruise AU9407 - oceanographic field measurements and analysis*. Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre, Research Report No. 6, July 1995. 97 pp.
- Ryan, T., 1995. *Data Quality Manual for the data logged instrumentation aboard the RSV Aurora Australis..* Australian Antarctic Division, unpublished manuscript, second edition, April 1995.

## **APPENDIX 1 CTD Instrument Calibrations**

**Table A1.1: Calibration coefficients and calibration dates for CTD serial numbers 1103 and 1193 (unit nos 7 and 5 respectively) used during RSV Aurora Australis cruise AU9404. Note that an additional pressure bias term due to the station dependent surface pressure offset exists for each station (eqn A2.1 in the CTD methodology). Also note that platinum temperature calibrations are for the ITS-90 scale.** 



*preliminary polynomial coefficients applied to fluorescence (fl) and photosynthetically active radiation (par) raw digitiser counts (supplied by manufacturer)* 



## **APPENDIX 2: WOCE Data Format Addendum**

#### **A2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This Appendix is relevant only to data submitted to the WHP Office. For WOCE format data, file format descriptions as detailed earlier in this report should be ignored. Data files submitted to the WHP Office are in the standard WOCE format as specified in Joyce et al. (1991).

### **A2.2 CTD 2 DBAR-AVERAGED DATA FILES**

\* CTD 2 dbar-averaged file format is as per Table 3.12 of Joyce et al. (1991), except that measurements are centered on even pressure bins (with first value at 2 dbar).

\* CTD temperature and salinity are reported to the third decimal place only.

\* Files are named as in the CTD methodology, except that for WOCE format data the suffix ".all" is replaced with ".ctd".

\* The quality flags for CTD data are defined in Table A2.1. Data quality information is detailed in earlier sections of this report.

### **A2.3 HYDROLOGY DATA FILES**

\* Hydrology data file format is as per Table 3.7 of Joyce et al. (1991), with quality flags defined in Tables A2.2 and A2.3.

\* Files are named as in the CTD methodology, except that for WOCE format data the suffix ".bot" is replaced by ".sea".

\* The total value of nitrate+nitrite only is listed.

\* Silicate and nitrate+nitrite are reported to the first decimal place only.

\* CTD temperature (including theta), CTD salinity and bottle salinity are all reported to the third decimal place only.

\* CTD temperature (including theta), CTD pressure and CTD salinity are all derived from upcast CTD burst data; CTD dissolved oxygen is derived from downcast 2 dbar-averaged data.

\* Raw CTD pressure values are not reported.

\* SAMPNO is equal to the rosette position of the Niskin bottle.

### **A2.4 CONVERSION OF UNITS FOR DISSOLVED OXYGEN AND NUTRIENTS**

#### **A2.4.1 Dissolved oxygen**

#### *Niskin bottle data*

For the WOCE format files, all Niskin bottle dissolved oxygen concentration values have been converted from volumetric units  $\mu$ mol/l to gravimetric units  $\mu$ mol/kg, as follows. Concentration C<sub>k</sub> in μmol/kg is given by

$$
C_k = 1000 \, C_1 / \rho(\theta, s, 0) \tag{eqn A2.1}
$$

where C<sub>l</sub> is the concentration in  $\mu$ mol/l, 1000 is a conversion factor, and  $\rho(\theta,s,0)$  is the potential density at zero pressure and at the potential temperature θ, where potential temperature is given by

 $\theta = \theta(T, s, p)$  (eqn A2.2)

for the *in situ* temperature T, salinity s and pressure p values at which the Niskin bottle was fired. Note that T, s and p are upcast CTD burst data averages.

#### *CTD data*

In the WOCE format files, CTD dissolved oxygen data are converted to μmol/kg by the same method as above, except that T, s and p in eqns A2.1 and A2.2 are CTD 2 dbar-averaged data.

#### **A2.4.2 Nutrients**

For the WOCE format files, all Niskin bottle nutrient concentration values have been converted from volumetric units μmol/l to gravimetric units μmol/kg using

$$
C_k = 1000 C_1 / \rho(T_1, s, 0)
$$
 (eqn A2.3)

where 1000 is a conversion factor, and  $p(T_i,s,0)$  is the water density in the hydrology laboratory at the laboratory temperature T<sub>i</sub> and at zero pressure. Note that T<sub>i</sub> = 21.5<sup>o</sup>C was used for all stations. Upcast CTD burst data averages are used for s.

**Table A2.1: Definition of quality flags for CTD data (after Table 3.11 in Joyce et al., 1991). These flags apply both to CTD data in the 2 dbar-averaged \*.ctd files, and to upcast CTD burst data in the \*.sea files.**



#### **Table A2.2: Definition of quality flags for Niskin bottles (i.e. parameter BTLNBR in \*.sea files) (after Table 3.8 in Joyce et al., 1991).**



**Table A2.3: Definition of quality flags for water samples in \*.sea files (after Table 3.9 in Joyce et al., 1991).**



### **A2.5 STATION INFORMATION FILES**

\* File format is as per section 2.2.2 of Joyce et al. (1991), and files are named as in the CTD methodology, except that for WOCE format data the suffix ".sta" is replaced by ".sum".

 $*$  All depths are calculated using a uniform speed of sound through the water column of 1498 ms<sup>-1</sup>. Reported depths are as measured from the water surface. Missing depths are due to interference of the ship's bow thrusters with the echo sounder signal.

\* An altimeter attached to the base of the rosette frame (approximately at the same vertical position as the CTD sensors) measures the elevation (or height above the bottom) in metres. The elevation value at each station is recorded manually from the CTD data stream display at the bottom of each CTD downcast. Motion of the ship due to waves can cause an error in these manually recorded values of up to  $\pm 3$  m.

\* Lineout (i.e. meter wheel readings of the CTD winch) were unavailable.

### **REFERENCES**

Joyce, T., Corry, C. and Stalcup, M., 1991. *Requirements for WOCE Hydrographic Programme Data Reporting.* WHP Office Report WHPO 90-1, Revision 1, WOCE Report No. 67/91, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. 71 pp.

## **APPENDIX 3 : CFC-11 and CFC-12 Measurements on AU9404 (WOCE SR3 and S4)**

(Following discussion provided by John Bullister, 27 April 1997)

John Bullister NOAA-PMEL Building #3 7600 Sand Point Way, NE Seattle, WA 98115 USA Telephone: 206-526-6741<br>FAX : 206-526-6744  $: 206 - 526 - 6744$ Internet : bullister@pmel.noaa.gov

### **CFC Sampling Procedures and Data Processing**

CFC water samples were usually the first samples collected from the 10 liter bottles. Care was taken to co-ordinate the sampling of CFCs with other gas samples to minimize the time between the inital opening of each bottle and the completion of sample drawing. In most cases, all dissolved gas samples were collected within several minutes of the initial opening of each bottle. CFC samples were collected in 100 ml precision glass syringes and held immersed in a water bath until processing. For air sampling, a ~100 meter length of 3/8" OD Dekaron tubing was run from the CFC lab van to the bow of the ship. Air was sucked through this line into the CFC van using an Air Cadet pump. The air was compressed in the pump, and the downstream pressure held at about 1.5 atm using a back pressure regulator. A tee allowed a flow (~100 cc/min) of the compressed air to be directed to the gas sample valves, while the bulk of the air (>7 liter/minute) was vented through the back pressure regulator.

Concentrations of CFC-11 and CFC-12 in air samples, seawater and gas standards on the cruise were measured by shipboard electron capture gas chromatography, using techniques similiar to those described by Bullister and Weiss (1988). The CFC analytical system functioned well during this expedition.

Analytical blanks for the water stripping process were determined and subtracted from the measured water sample concentrations. Both gas and water sample analytical blanks were very low for most of the expedition. In a few cases, for very low concentration water samples and a higher than average water sample analytical blank, subtraction of the water sample CFC analytical blank from the measured CFC water sample concentration yielded negative reported concentration values.

Concentrations of CFC-11 and CFC-12 in air, seawater samples and gas standards are reported relative to the SIO93 calibration scale (Cunnold, et. al., 1994). CFC concentrations in air and standard gas are reported in units of mole fraction CFC in dry gas, and are typically in the parts-pertrillion (ppt) range. Dissolved CFC concentrations are given in units of picomoles of CFC per kg seawater (pmol/kg). CFC concentrations in air and seawater samples were determined by fitting their chromatographic peak areas to multi-point calibration curves, generated by pressurizing sample loops and injecting known volumes of gas from a CFC working standard (PMEL cylinder 33790) into the analytical instrument. The concentrations of CFC-11 and CFC-12 in this working standard were calibrated versus a primary CFC standard (36743) (Bullister, 1984) before the cruise and a secondary standard (32386) before and after the cruise. No measurable drift between the working standards could be detected during this interval. Full range calibration curves were run 11 times during the cruise. Single injections of a fixed volume of standard gas at one atmosphere were run much more frequently (at intervals of 1 to 2 hours) to monitor short term changes in detector sensitivity. We estimate a precision (1 standard deviation) for dissolved CFC measurements on this cruise of about 1%, or 0.005 pmol/kg, whichever is greater (see listing of replicate samples given at the end of this report).

As expected, low (~0.01 pmol/kg) but non-zero CFC concentrations were measured in deep samples along the northern ends of the SR3 section. Deep and bottom CFC concentrations increased significantly southward along the section. It is likely that most of the deep CFC signals observed on SR3, which are strongly correlated with elevated dissolved oxygen and cold temperatures, are due to deep ventilation processes in this high latitude region, and not simply blanks due of the sampling and analytical procedures. The measured levels of CFC in deep water samples on the northern end of SR3 are considerable higher than those found on WOCE sections in the low latitude Pacific and Indian Oceans. For example, typical measured deep water CFC measurements along WOCE section I2 (at about 8S) were ~0.003 pmol/kg for CFC-11 and <0.001 for CFC-12. Since no "zero" concentration CFC water was present anywhere along SR3 or SR4, and an earlier occupation of SR3 in 1991 showed similar low levels of CFCs along the northern end of this section, no corrections for 'sampling blanks' have been applied to the reported CFC signals for SR3 or S4.

A number of CFC samples (from a total of ~1500) had clearly anomolous CFC-11 and/or CFC-12 concentrations relative to adjacent samples. These appeared to occur more or less randomly, and were not clearly associated with other features in the water column (eg. elevated oxygen concentrations, salinity or temperature features, etc.). This suggests that the high values were due to isolated low-level CFC contamination events. These samples are included in this report and are flagged as either 3 (questionable) or 4 (bad) measurements. 34 analyses of CFC-11 were assigned a flag of 3 and 49 analyses of CFC-12 were assigned a flag of 3. 82 analyses of CFC-11 were assigned a flag of 4 and 70 CFC-12 samples assigned a flag of 4.

In addition to the file of mean CFC concentrations reported for each water sample (keyed to the unique station:sample ID), tables of the following are included in this report:

Table 2a. AU9404 Replicate dissolved CFC-11 analyses Table 2b. AU9404 Replicate dissolved CFC-12 analyses Table 3. AU9404 CFC air measurements Table 4. AU9404 CFC air measurements interpolated to station locations

A value of -9.0 is used for missing values in the listings.

### **References**

- Bullister, J.L., 1984. *Anthropogenic Chlorofluoromethanes as Tracers of Ocean Circulation and Mixing Processes: Measurement and Calibration Techniques and Studies in the Greenland and Norwegian Seas.* Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. Calif. San Diego, 172 pp.
- Bullister, J.L. and R.F. Weiss, 1988. Determination of CCl3F and CCl2F2 in seawater and air*. Deep-Sea Research*, 35 (5), 839-853.
- Cunnold, D.M., P.J. Fraser, R.F. Weiss, R.G. Prinn, P.G. Simmonds, B.R. Miller, F.N. Alyea, and A.J.Crawford, 1994. Global trends and annual releases of CCl3F and CCl2F2 estimated from ALE/GAGE and other measurements from July 1978 to June 1991*. J. Geophys. Res*., 99, 1107-1126.

## **Table 2a: AU9404 Replicate dissolved CFC-11 analyses**



## **Table 2a: (continued)**



## **Table 2a: (continued)**



## **Table 2b: AU9404 Replicate dissolved CFC-12 analyses**



## **Table 2b: (continued)**



## **Table 2b: (continued)**



# **Table 2b: (continued)**



### **Table 3: AU9404 CFC Air Measurements**



**Table 4: AU9404 CFC Air values (interpolated to station locations)**

| Stn |           |            |           | F <sub>11</sub> | F12   |
|-----|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------------|-------|
| No. | Latitude  | Longitude  | Date      | <b>PPT</b>      | PPT   |
| 1   | 57 32.1 S | 127 49.5 E | 20 Dec 94 | 257.5           | 510.2 |
| 2   | 61 59.1 S | 120 01.7 E | 21 Dec 94 | 257.6           | 510.2 |
| 3   | 62 00.7 S | 119 02.1 E | 21 Dec 94 | 257.6           | 510.2 |
| 4   | 62 00.3 S | 118 01.6 E | 22 Dec 94 | 257.6           | 510.2 |
| 6   | 65 59.3 S | 109 55.0 E | 2 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 7   | 65 23.1 S | 112 33.2 E | 3 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 8   | 65 18.5 S | 112 32.2 E | 3 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 9   | 64 57.7 S | 112 09.6 E | 4 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 10  | 64 44.9 S | 111 55.1 E | 4 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 11  | 64 30.9 S | 111 25.8 E | 4 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 12  | 64 06.1 S | 112 05.9 E | 4 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 13  | 63 40.8 S | 112 36.5 E | 4 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 14  | 63 16.5 S | 113 13.0 E | 5 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 15  | 62 50.8 S | 113 49.1 E | 5 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 16  | 62 25.3 S | 114 25.7 E | 5 Jan 95  | 258.3           | 506.6 |
| 17  | 62 00.0 S | 115 01.0 E | 6 Jan 95  | 258.0           | 510.1 |
| 18  | 61 59.7 S | 116 30.5 E | 6 Jan 95  | 258.0           | 510.1 |
| 19  | 62 00.3 S | 120 01.4 E | 6 Jan 95  | 258.0           | 510.1 |
| 20  | 61 59.8 S | 121 26.9 E | 7 Jan 95  | 258.0           | 510.1 |
| 21  | 62 00.2 S | 122 50.4 E | 7 Jan 95  | 258.0           | 510.1 |
| 22  | 62 00.1 S | 124 15.4 E | 7 Jan 95  | 258.0           | 510.1 |
| 23  | 62 00.2 S | 125 39.6 E | 7 Jan 95  | 258.0           | 510.1 |
| 24  | 62 00.4 S | 127 05.5 E | 8 Jan 95  | 258.4           | 509.9 |
| 25  | 62 00.7 S | 128 31.6 E | 8 Jan 95  | 258.4           | 509.9 |
| 26  | 62 00.2 S | 129 56.7 E | 8 Jan 95  | 258.4           | 509.9 |
| 27  | 62 00.6 S | 131 20.0 E | 9 Jan 95  | 258.4           | 509.9 |
| 28  | 61 59.9 S | 132 45.6 E | 9 Jan 95  | 258.4           | 509.9 |
| 29  | 62 01.4 S | 134 11.1 E | 9 Jan 95  | 258.4           | 509.9 |
| 30  | 62 00.3 S | 135 35.1 E | 9 Jan 95  | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 31  | 61 59.9 S | 137 01.3 E | 10 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 32  | 62 09.5 S | 138 27.2 E | 10 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 33  | 62 21.5 S | 139 53.4 E | 10 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 34  | 62 28.1 S | 141 03.3 E | 11 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 35  | 62 35.9 S | 142 12.4 E | 11 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 36  | 62 45.8 S | 143 36.2 E | 11 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 37  | 62 54.2 S | 145 03.3 E | 12 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 38  | 63 03.1 S | 146 28.0 E | 12 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 39  | 63 10.7 S | 147 50.9 E | 12 Jan 95 | 258.7           | 510.9 |
| 40  | 63 18.6 S | 149 12.6 E | 13 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 41  | 63 25.9 S | 150 39.8 E | 13 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 42  | 63 25.6 S | 152 10.8 E | 13 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 43  | 63 26.2 S | 153 41.4 E | 13 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 44  | 63 26.1 S | 155 10.9 E | 14 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 45  | 63 25.8 S | 156 39.1 E | 14 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 46  | 63 26.0 S | 158 09.9 E | 14 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 47  | 63 25.6 S | 159 26.4 E | 14 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 48  | 64 00.9 S | 160 10.7 E | 15 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 49  | 64 37.3 S | 160 44.3 E | 15 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 50  | 65 18.0 S | 161 23.8 E | 15 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 51  | 65 56.0 S | 162 03.3 E | 16 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 52  | 66 06.7 S | 162 14.2 E | 16 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 53  | 66 09.1 S | 162 15.3 E | 16 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 54  | 64 13.9 S | 155 19.7 E | 18 Jan 95 | 258.2           | 511.3 |
| 55  | 66 36.3 S | 144 09.6 E | 19 Jan 95 | 259.3 509.5     |       |
## **Table 4: (continued)**

