

Aurora Australis **Marine Science Cruise AU0103, CLIVAR-SR3 Transect:**

Oceanographic Field Measurements and Analysis

> Mark Rosenberg *Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC*

Steve Rintoul *CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research*

> Stephen Bray *Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC*

> Clodagh Moy *Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC*

Neale Johnston *CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research*

Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems Cooperative Research Centre

Technical Report No. 4

Mark Rosenberg

Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC Private Bag 80 Hobart, Tasmania, 7005, Australia. email: mark.rosenberg@utas.edu.au

Steve Rintoul

CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research Castray Esplanade Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia. email: steve.rintoul@csiro.au

Stephen Bray

Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC Private Bag 80 Hobart, Tasmania, 7005, Australia. email: s.bray@utas.edu.au

Clodagh Moy

Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC Private Bag 80 Hobart, Tasmania, 7005, Australia. email: clodagh.moy@utas.edu.au

Neale Johnston

CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research Underwood Ave Floreat, Western Australia, 6014, Australia. email: neale.johnston@csiro.au

Cover photos courtesy of George Cresswell

© Cooperative Research Centre for Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems 2006 ISSN: 1833-2404 ISBN: 1-921197-02-1 November 2006

Published by the Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems Cooperative Research Centre, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia, 76 pp.

Established and supported under the Commonwealth Governments Cooperative Research Centres Programme.

Aurora Australis Marine Science Cruise AU0103, CLIVAR-SR3 Transect: Oceanographic Field **Measurements and Analysis**

Contents

Tables

Figures

Abstract

Oceanographic measurements were conducted along CLIVAR Southern Ocean meridional repeat transect SR3 between Tasmania and Antarctica from October to December 2001. A total of 135 CTD vertical profile stations were taken, more than half to within 20 m of the bottom. Over 2200 Niskin bottle water samples were collected for the measurement of salinity, dissolved oxygen, nutrients, CFCs, CCl4, dissolved inorganic carbon, alkalinity, DMS/DMSP/DMSO, halocarbons, barium, barite, ammonia, δ *30Si, dissolved and particulate organic carbon, particulate silica, 15N-nitrate, 18O, 234Th, 230Th, 231Pa, primary productivity and biological parameters, using a 24 bottle rosette sampler. Near surface current data were collected using a ship mounted ADCP. Two sediment trap moorings were serviced, and a third mooring was deployed at a new location. A summary of all CTD data and data quality is presented in this report.*

1 Introduction

Marine science cruise AU0103 was conducted aboard the *RSV Aurora Australis* from October to December 2001. The major constituent of the cruise was the seventh complete occupation of the CLIVAR SR3 section south of Tasmania (Figure 1a), and the first full occupation during the southern spring. Springtime measurements had previously been made during the 1991 occupation of SR3, though not to the full station density (Rintoul and Bullister, 1999). Previous completions of the transect are summarised in Rosenberg et al. (1997).

The primary scientific objectives of the CLIVAR SR3 occupation were:

- 1. to measure changes in water mass properties and inventories throughout the full ocean depth between Tasmania and Antarctica;
- 2. to estimate the transport of mass, heat and other properties south of Australia, and to compare the results to previous occupations of the WOCE SR3 line;
- 3. to identify mechanisms responsible for variability in ocean climate south of Australia;
- 4. to observe the physical and biological properties of the upper ocean during the period of the spring bloom;
- 5. to use repeat measurements to assess the skill of ocean and coupled models.

Additional CTD profiles were taken at nine 'particle station' sites to support the biogeochemical work. Three high resolution mini sections were also completed across the Antarctic Slope Front, with an additional line of CTDs taken across a bathymetric exit trough at the northwest end of the Mertz Depression (Figure 1b). Note that intensive CTD and mooring measurements in this southern shelf region were made previously during the Mertz Polynya Experiment (Rosenberg et al., 2001). Two sediment trap moorings were serviced during the cruise, and a third sediment trap mooring was deployed at a new location (Figure 1b, Table 4).

This report describes the CTD, Niskin bottle, hull mounted ADCP and underway data and data quality for this cruise. All information required for use of the data set is presented in tabular and graphical form. Publications using the cruise data set include Aoki et al.(2005a), Aoki et al. (2005b), Cardinal et al. (2005a), Cardinal et al. (2005b), Jacquet et al. (2004) and Jacquet et al. (2005).

2 Cruise itinerary and summary

The ship departed Hobart on October 29th 2001, and a test CTD was done (station 1) in 1000 m of water. The SR3 transect then commenced, and 12 CTDs were completed. Note that throughout the SR3 line, double dips were taken at approximately every second or third location, not counting particle stations (Table 2). The double dipping involved taking both a shallow cast to 350 m and a full depth cast (in either order), to gain more vertical resolution for Niskin bottle samples in the upper profile.

After CTD station 13 the ship moved to the west of the transect line and the first particle station was occupied at \sim 142°E. Four CTDs were taken, and the sediment trap mooring SAZ-B (Figure 1a) was recovered then redeployed (complete details are described in the unpublished cruise mooring report). The SR3 transect was then resumed, continuing southward towards the Antarctic shelf. En route along the transect, a further 7 particle stations were occupied (Table 2), the sediment trap mooring at SAZ-C was recovered then redeployed, a new sediment trap mooring was deployed at SAZ-F (Figure 1a), a high resolution mini transect was taken across the slope front (station 95 to 99), and a mini transect was taken across the exit trough at the northwest end of the Mertz Depression (station 101 to 104). Station 107 and 108 were taken next to the Mertz Glacier, the first in Buchanan Bay and the second to the northeast. Iceshelf water was measured, with temperatures as low as -2.04°C. Unfortunately conductivity measurements were bad for both these casts, due to instrument hardware failure. Two more mini sections were taken upstream and downstream of the exit trough (Table 2, Figure 1b), and the ninth particle station was occupied over the slope at 2500 m depth.

Conditions on the way south were remarkably ice free, and on the return northward the ship detoured specifically to seek out pack ice suitable for study. Continuing on the transit north back to Hobart, 3 of the particle stations were reoccupied (Table 2).

CTD station details are summarised in Table 2, while Table 3 summarises the major Niskin bottle sampling for each station. Mooring deployment and recovery details are summarised in Table 4. Principal investigators for CTD and water sampling measurements are listed in Table 5, while cruise participants are listed in Table 6.

Table 1: Summary of cruise itinerary

(b)

3 Problems encountered

- During the test cast at station 1, the top few metres of seacable frayed badly and a retermination was required. A further electric retermination was required after station 6 as water was entering the cable join.
- Significant data noise was observed for the first 8 casts, and the problem was eventually traced to the CTD deck unit. The unit was replaced for station 9 onwards.
- The fluorometer was powered from a separate battery pack for CTD casts up to station 108. Electrical shorts to seawater flattened the batteries during stations 6 and 8.
- Near the bottom of the cast at station 13, the CTD winch was unable to haul and the package ended up sitting on the bottom for \sim 30 minutes in 4800 m of water. When finally retrieved, there was surprisingly little damage to the instruments beyond a mudfilled conductivity cell. It was decided that the winch drum was overfilled with wire, and after station 15 1000 m of wire were removed from the drum. At station 16, trouble was again experienced below 4000 m when attempting to haul the package. After the cast the pressure in the winch hydraulics was raised from 22 to 26 bar, which appeared to fix the problem, and there were no further hauling problems for the remainder of the cruise.
- During station 30, the ship lost head repeatedly in the heavy swell, and the cast was finally abandoned at 3200 dbar, with bottles tripped on the fly during retrieval. During the cast, the CTD room shipped lots of water and a set of sample containers and filter rigs were swept out the CTD door.
- The stern gantry failed during work from the stern at the time of CTD station $38 -$ the rack and pinion drive system could not be repaired at sea. The 2 gilsson winches were rigged via a series of blocks for pulling the gantry in and out. With this configuration, the gantry was usable for trawl deck operations on the remainder of the cruise, however 4 crew were required to drive the system.
- For Niskin bottle 19, a loose lanyard prior to station 60 allowed the bottom end cap to pre-trip on many occasions. As a result, Niskin bottle samples from bottle 19 were bad for many stations prior to station 60 (details given in section 5.2).
- Near the start of the cast at station 66, a single wire strand broke on the CTD wire, bunching up and jamming in the sheaf as recovery was attempted. Retermination was required.
- The aft CTD winch drum was used for 'in situ pump' casts (P.I. Tom Trull). When at the bottom of the pump cast after CTD station 88, with 3500 m of wire out, a single strand broke on the wire. During the recovery, \sim 150 m of this broken strand had to be cut away as it bunched up at the sheaf.
- The conductivity hardware on CTD serial 1193 failed during station 107. Replacement CTD serial 1103 was installed for station 109 onwards.

4 Field data collection methods

4.1 CTD instrumentation

General Oceanics Mark IIIC CTDs including dissolved oxygen sensor were used for the entire cruise, mounted on a 24 bottle rosette frame, together with a G.O. model 1015 24-position pylon. CTD serial 1193 was used for stations 1 to 108, and CTD serial 1103 was used for remaining stations. 10-litre Niskin bottles were used for sample collection. All bottles were G.O., with the exception of 3 NOAA bottles; one of the NOAA bottles was constructed of titanium, for low CFC blank levels. All Niskins were fitted with pre-baked neoprene o-rings and stainless steel springs (no teflon coating), again to lower CFC blank levels. A Benthos altimeter serial 142 was fitted for bottom location, and digital deep sea reversing thermometers (SIS model RTM4002X) were mounted on 3 bottles for checks of CTD temperature calibration (Table 16).

A Sea Tech fluorometer, borrowed from CSIRO and rated to 6000 m, was fitted to the rosette frame for most stations up to station 108 (Table 3). This instrument was powered from a separate battery pack, also fitted to the frame. After station 108, the Antarctic Division Sea Tech fluorometer (rated to only 3000 m) was used.

A Chelsea Instruments transmissometer, borrowed from CSIRO, was fitted to the frame for most stations up to station 52. The instrument was powered from the fluorometer battery pack, and data were fed through the licor channel. No good transmittance data were obtained in this configuration. Good data were however obtained after fitting the transmissometer to the CSIRO Seacat, deployed separately from the stern (B. Griffiths, pers. comm.).

A CSIRO copper ion selective electrode was fitted to the frame for station 76, with data fed through the fluorometer channel (P.I. Denis Mackey, CSIRO).

4.2 Niskin bottle sampling

Niskin bottles were sampled for numerous chemical and biological parameters throughout the cruise. Table 3 provides a summary of the main parameters sampled at each CTD station. Repeat shallow casts were taken at every second or third location on the main SR3 transect, both to increase vertical resolution for studies focusing on the upper water column, and to provide sufficient water volume for all the samples required. Several repeat casts were taken at particle station sites, with cast depths varying according to the needs of the samples required. In general, the core CTD parameters of salinity, dissolved oxygen and nutrients (orthophosphate, total nitrate+nitrite and reactive silicate) were sampled at every SR3 location. A strict order was followed for drawing of samples from Niskin bottles, with CFC, DMS/DMSP, dissolved organic carbon, halocarbons and dissolved oxygen coming first, and biological parameters generally coming later in the order.

4.3 CTD instrument and data calibration

Pre-cruise pressure, platinum temperature and pressure temperature calibrations (October 2001) were performed at the CSIRO Division of Marine Research calibration facility (Table 7). A full multi point laboratory temperature calibration was performed for the platinum temperature sensors, with points between the triple point of water and the melting point of gallium, and also including several subzero points down to \sim -1.4 \degree C. A quadratic fit to the sensor calibration data was used for CTD1193 (stations 1-108); a linear fit was used for

CTD1103 (stations 109-135). Calibration of the fluorometer channel for CTD1193 was done on the ship (Table 7), giving data output in volts; the same calibration was applied to fluorescence data for CTD1103. Chlorophyll-a concentration data are required to scale these voltages to fluorescence units.

Complete CTD conductivity and dissolved oxygen calibration results, derived from *in situ* Niskin bottle samples, are listed later in this report. Hydrochemistry laboratory methods are discussed in Appendix 1. Full details of CTD data processing and calibration techniques can be found in Appendix 2 of Rosenberg et al. (1995), with the following update to the methodology: the 10 seconds of CTD data prior to each bottle firing are averaged to form the CTD upcast burst data for use in calibration.

4.4 ADCP

The hull mounted ADCP on the *Aurora Australis* is described in Rosenberg (unpublished report, 1999). Logging and calibration parameters are summarised as follows:

Current vectors are plotted in Figure 2; the apparent vertical current shear error for different ship speed classes, discussed in Rosenberg (unpublished report, 1999), is plotted in Figure 3.

4.5 Underway measurements

Underway data, including meteorological data, bathymetry, GPS and sea surface temperature/salinity/fluorescence, were logged to an Oracle database on the ship. All data were quality controlled by the dotzapper. For bathymetry data, a sound speed of 1463 ms⁻¹ was used for ocean depth calculation, and the ship's draught of 7.3 m was accounted for. For more information, see the AADC (Antarctic Division Data Centre) website, and the cruise dotzapper report:

Marine Science Support Data Quality Report, *RSV Aurora Australis* Season 2001-2002 Voyage 3 (CLIVAR), Ruth Lawless, Antarctic Division unpublished report (at web address http://aadc-maps.aad.gov.au/metadata/mar_sci/Dz200102030.html).

Underway data were dumped from the AADC website and are in the following files:

A correction was applied to the underway sea surface temperature and salinity data, derived by comparing the underway data with CTD temperature and salinity data at 8 dbar (Figure 4). The following corrections were applied:

$$
T = 0.9943 Tdis - 0.2361
$$
 (eqn 1)
\n
$$
S = 0.9873 Sdis + 0.4680
$$
 (eqn 2)

for corrected underway temperature and salinity T and S respectively, and uncorrected values T_{dis} and S_{dis} . Note that in the final data set, a few underway sea surface salinity values near the start and end of the cruise appear to be suspiciously low.

5 CTD and bottle data results

CTD and Niskin bottle data quality are discussed in this section. Full details of the CTD data processing and calibration techniques are described in Rosenberg et al. (1995). Data file formats are described in Appendix 2, and historical data comparisons are made in Appendix 4. When using the data, the following data quality tables are important: Table 14 (questionable CTD data) and Table 15 (questionable nutrient data).

This was the second last cruise on the *Aurora Australis* where General Oceanics CTDs were still used. In late 2002, a year after the cruise, the CTD system on the ship was switched over to SeaBird 911plus instruments, with an accompanying improvement in data quality, in particular for CTD dissolved oxygen data.

5.1 CTD data

5.1.1 Conductivity/salinity and temperature

The conductivity calibration and equivalent salinity results for the entire cruise are plotted in Figures 5 and 6, and the derived conductivity calibration coefficients are listed in Tables 9 and 10. CTD temperature and reversing thermometer data are compared in Figures 8a and b.

CTD1193 was used for stations 1 to 108. The conductivity cell used for stations 1 to 12 performed very well, with CTD salinities accurate to less than 0.002 (PSS78). The cell was damaged during station 13 when the package hit the bottom, and a different cell was fitted for stations 14 to 108. This second conductivity cell performed well for stations 14 to 29. For stations 30 to 70, a very small biasing towards a positive ΔS (where ΔS = bottle salinity – calibrated CTD salinity) is evident deeper in the water column. This biasing, mostly of the order 0.001 (PSS78), is well within the 0.002 (PSS78) salinity accuracy and therefore no correction has been made to the data.

For stations 71 to 97, the positive biasing error in ΔS becomes significant (Figure 7a). The positive group of ΔS values to the lower right of Figure 7a represents data from the bottom end of CTD profiles. The depth of these values decreases southward as the bathymetry shoals, thus the biasing is not simply a pressure dependent error. The biasing does however appear simultaneously with the appearance of a locally colder fresher 'tail' of water at the bottom of each profile. The local vertical salinity gradients are steeper in these tails, and as the centre of the Niskin bottles on the rosette frame are ~ 0.5 m above the CTD sensors, the negative sign (i.e. freshening with depth) of the gradients would be expected to cause a small positive biasing in ΔS. Closer examination reveals that the positive ΔS values do not always correspond exactly with these local fresher tails of water, and indeed the gradients

Figure 2: Hull mounted ADCP 30 minute ensemble data, for (a) all data, and (b) 'on station' (i.e. ship speed \leq 0.35 m/s) data.

Figure 3: Apparent ADCP vertical current shear, calculated from uncorrected (i.e. ship speed included) ADCP velocities. The data are divided into different speed classes, according to ship speed during the 30 minute ensembles. For each speed class, the profile is an average over the entire cruise.

Table 2: Summary of station information for cruise AU0103. All times are UTC. In the station naming, 'particle' refers to particle station, 'downstream' refers to downstream section, 'upstream' refers to upstream section, 'exit trough' is the bathymetric feature at the northwest end of the Mertz Depression, and 'large volume' is a cast specifically to collect a large volume of water from a single depth.

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), carbon tetrachloride (CCl₄), dissolved inorganic carbon (dic), alkalinity (alk), dimethyl sulphide/dimethyl sulphoniopropionate/dimethyl sulphoxide (dms), halocarbons (hal), barium (bam), barite (bat), ammonia (NH₃), δ³⁰Si, dissolved organic carbon (doc), particulate organic carbon (POC), particulate silicate (PSi), ^{15}N -nitrate, ^{18}O , ^{234}Th , $^{230}Th/^{231}Pa$, primary productivity (pp), bacterial production (bac), grazing dilution (grz), spectral absorbance (sa), HPLC pigments (pig), flow cytometry (fc) for phytoplankton and bacteria, coccolithophorid counts (coc), protist bulk fixes (pro), size-fractionated chlorophyll and primary production (frac), species ID by Dehairs group (sp.D), and bacterial groups sampled by Skerratt (baS). Note that 1=samples taken, 0=no samples taken, 2=surface sample only (i.e. from shallowest Niskin bottle), 3=one sample only from the profile. Also included are stations where trace metal casts for iron were taken from the stern (fe); stations where vertical fast repetition rate fluorometry (frrf) and transmittance (tran) were measured, using additional sensors; and stations where fluorescence was measured on the main rosette (fl) using a Sea Tech fluorometer from either CSIRO or Antarctic Division, denoted respectively by C or A in the table. Note that for stations 1 to 52 where the transmissometer was fitted to the main rosette package, no good transmittance data were obtained.

Table 4: Summary of mooring recovery and deployment information. Positions and depths are at the estimated landing sites (i.e. allowing for anchor 'dragback'). Depths are corrected for local sound velocity. For recoveries, 'release time' is the time release command was sent to acoustic release at the base of the mooring; for deployments, 'release time' is the time final component released from trawl deck. Suffixes '4' and '5' in mooring names refer respectively to the 4th and 5th deployment seasons in the SAZ program.

Table 5: Principal investigators (*=cruise participant) for CTD water sampling programs.

Table 6: Scientific personnel (cruise participants) for cruise AU0103.

Table 6: (continued)

Frank Dehairs Frank Dehairs barium, NH₃, δ³⁰Si, thorium Vrije Universiteit, Brussels
Jack Di Tullio DMS/DMSP/DMSO Grice Marine Laboratory, S Esther Fischer **DMS/DMSP** Southern Cross University Kelly Goodwin halocarbons halocarbons CIMAS, University of Miami Brian Griffiths **primary production, grazing** CSIRO Brian Hunt **CPR, zooplankton nets** Antarctic Division Neale Johnston CTD hydrochemistry CSIRO Graham Jones **DMS/DMSP** Southern Cross University Bronwyn Kimber sea ice CODES, University of Tasmania Dan King halocarbons halocarbons CIRES, University of Colorado Ruth Lawless and dotzapper and a controller and antarctic Division Sophie Le Roux organic carbon team and antarctic CRC Carsten Lemmen organic carbon team and antarctic CRC Sandric Leong light absorption of phytoplankton Soka University, Japan Harvey Marchant voyage leader, phytoplankton and antarctic Division
Richard Matear BIC, alkalinity by CSIRO DIC, alkalinity CSIRO Fred Menzia **CFC** CFC **PMEL, NOAA** Daniela Mersch organic carbon team Antarctic CRC Gordon Mor doctor Antarctic Division Angus Munro sea ice Antarctic CRC Nobuaki Ohi light absorption of phytoplankton Soka University, Japan

Naomi Petrie **CRC** organic carbon team **Antarctic CRC** Peter Pokorny **communications Communications Antarctic Division**

Mark Pretty **DIC, alkalinity** CSIRO

Malcolm Reid **phytoplankton community structure** University of Otago Steve Rintoul CTD, chief scientist CSIRO Mark Rosenberg CTD, moorings and anti-Tilla Roy **CTD** CTD **Antarctic CRC** Karl Safi bacterial production NIWA Nicolas Savoye barium, NH₃, δ^{30} Si, thorium Vrije Universiteit, Brussels Bryan Scott **computing** Computing **Antarctic Division** Jenny Skerratt microbial processes Antarctic CRC Serguei Sokolov CTD CSIRO

Paul Thomson **phytoplankton Antarctic Division** Bronte Tilbrook DIC, alkalinity CSIRO Lianos Triantafillos a squid

Tom Trull antarctic CRC corporation organic carbon team leader and Antarctic CRC organic carbon team leader

Rick Van Den Enden phytoplankton, deputy voyage leader Antarctic Division Robert Van Hale phytoplankton community structure University of Otago Tessa Vance **Southern Cross University DMS/DMSP** Southern Cross University Tony Veness electronics and the Antarctic Division Robert Walsh phytoplankton community structure DPIWE, Tasmania

Shari Yvon-Lewis halocarbons hard and AOML, NOAA

Andrew Davidson bhytoplankton and antarctic Division Grice Marine Laboratory, South Carolina Clint Hare Iron Iron Iron College of Marine Studies, University of Delaware Dave Hutchins Tron Iron Iron College of Marine Studies, University of Delaware Alex Kozyr DIC, alkalinity Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Andrew Pankowski sea ice School of Agricultural Science, University of Agricultural Science, University of Tasmania Linda Popels Iron College of Marine Studies, University of Delaware James Reid Sea ice School of Plant Science, University of Plant Science, University of Tasmania Sarah Riseman DMS/DMSP/DMSO Hollings Marine Laboratory, South Carolina Peter Sedwick iron in the station of the Bermuda Biological Station for Research Robert Strzepek phytoplankton community structure The Harrison Lab, University of British Columbia Kunio Takahashi copepods National Institute of Polar Research, Japan Ryszard Tokarczyk halocarbons Dept. of Oceanography, Dalhousie University Simon Ussher Tron Tron School of Environmental Sciences, University of Plymouth Mark Warner CFC COME COME CONSULTER School of Oceanography, University of Washington

Figure 4a and b: Comparison between (a) CTD and underway temperature data, and (b) CTD and underway salinity data, including bestfit lines. Note: dls refers to underway data.

in these tails are not strong enough to account for the magnitude of the error of up to \sim 0.004 (PSS78) – thus these local features are only considered a minor component of the error. The major cause of the error appears to be temperature related. There is a close correspondence between the salinity residuals and subzero water temperatures at depth (Figure 7b). From the figure, there is a broad scatter in ΔS values for shallow samples (≤ 250) dbar in Figure 7b), however for deeper samples ΔS values are clearly positive for temperatures below 0°C.

For stations 98 to 106, the conductivity calibration results are good, and no consistent biasing in ΔS is evident. The conductivity cell malfunctioned for stations 107 and 108, and no CTD conductivity/salinity data are available for these two stations.

CTD1103 was used for station 109 and onwards, after failure of the conductivity hardware on CTD1193. For stations 109 to 113 and stations 126 to 135 the conductivity cell calibrated well, with CTD salinities accurate to within 0.002 (PSS78). For stations 114 to 125, a CTD salinity error similar to stations 71 to 97 (CTD1193) is evident from the positive ΔS values at depth (Figures 7c and d). There appears to be a small sensor calibration error for both CTD1103 and CTD1193 in subzero water at depth. From the available evidence it is not conclusive whether the source of the error is the temperature sensor calibrations, the conductivity cell responses, or both. Both CTDs show similar behaviour, and as there is a strong possibility that the temperature calibrations are a probable source of error, the following caution is given for both the temperature and salinity data. For stations 71 to 97 and 114 to 125 in subzero waters at depth (i.e. at the bottom end of the full depth profiles), at the local salinity and pressure values there is a possible error of the order +0.003°C (i.e. temperature a little high) for CTD temperature, and a CTD salinity error of the order -0.003 (PSS78) (i.e. salinity a little low). More specifically, the salinity error is in the range -0.001 to -0.004 (PSS78), with the larger error for lower negative temperatures. No correction has been made for these errors.

For many stations the salinity data are suspect for the top 2 bins (2 and 4 dbar), due to transient errors when the instrument first enters the water. As a general caution, salinity data down to 4 dbar should be treated as suspect.

As described in section 4.3, a multi point laboratory temperature calibration was performed prior to the cruise. Both linear and quadratic fits were attempted for the temperature calibration data for both CTDs, to obtain the best fit results. For CTD1193 (stations 1 to 108), a quadratic fit to the calibration data gave the best results over the entire temperature range (Table 7). For CTD1103 (stations 109 to 135), temperatures measured during these stations were mostly below \sim 2.3°C, with higher values up to only \sim 7.5°C encountered during stations 133 to 135. For this lower end of the temperature range, the best result from the laboratory temperature calibration came from a linear fit to the calibration data (Table 7).

CTD platinum temperature data are compared with digital reversing thermometer data in Figures 8a and b. The offsets in results for the different thermometers are due to calibration offsets between the thermometers. At positive temperatures, CTD temperature sensor performance appears to be fairly stable throughout the cruise, and data for the two CTDs appear to be consistent. At temperatures below 0° C there is a clear decrease in ΔT (i.e. thermometer – CTD temperature) with decreasing temperature (Figure 8b). This same pattern is evident for both CTDs. From the comparison to the thermometer data alone, it is

not clear whether the source of the error is the CTD temperature calibrations or the thermometer calibrations. Changing response of Neil Brown platinum temperature sensors below 0°C is often reported (SCRIPPS Institution of Oceanography Calibration Facility, CSIRO Calibration Facility, pers. comms). It is therefore likely that there is at least some small calibration error in the CTD temperature data in subzero water, as discussed previously in this section.

5.1.2 Pressure

As described in previous data reports, noise in the pressure signal for CTD1193 (used for stations 1 to 108) was high, with spikes of up to 1 dbar amplitude occurring. When forming pressure monotonic data prior to 2 dbar averaging, these spikes cause low data point attendance for a significant number of 2 dbar pressure bins, resulting in missing bins in the 2 dbar averaged data. To reduce the number of missing bins, the minimum number of data points required in a 2 dbar bin to form a 2 dbar average was set to 8. To recover another \sim 20 missing bins from various stations, this minimum threshold value was reduced to 5. For most remaining missing bins, values were linearly interpolated between surrounding bins (Table 13), except where the local temperature gradient was too high. Further missing 2 dbar bins (Table 12) are due to quality control of the data.

For CTD1103 (stations 109 to 135) any noise in the pressure signal was very low, and the minimum number of data points required in a 2 dbar bin to form a 2 dbar average was set to 10.

For stations 24, 29, 62, 82 and 87, the surface pressure offset was obtained by manual inspection of the data. For stations 107 and 108, hypersaline water was placed in the sensor cover prior to commencement of logging to try to prevent sensor freezing during deployment; the surface pressure offset for these two stations was also obtained by manual inspection of the data. For station 100, logging commenced when the CTD was already in the water at \sim 4 dbar, and the surface pressure offset was estimated from values from surrounding stations. Surface pressure offset values applied to pressure data for each station are listed in Table 8.

5.1.3 Dissolved oxygen

CTD dissolved oxygen calibration results are shown in Figure 9, and the derived calibration coefficients are listed in Table 17. A new oxygen sensor was fitted to CTD1193 at the start of the cruise, and the same oxygen sensor was fitted to CTD1103 for station 109 onwards.

For the bulk of the water column the CTD dissolved oxygen data are good, and the standard deviation values for the CTD to bottle comparison are within 1% of full scale values (where full scale is approximately 380 μ mol/l for data between 35 and 1000 dbar, and \sim 270 μ mol/l for data below 1000 dbar). Much of the near surface part of the oxygen profiles is highly suspicious, in particular for the top 20 dbar, and often down to 30 dbar. In general, transient errors are common when CTD dissolved oxygen sensors (on General Oceanics CTDs) enter the water, and near surface oxygen data should be treated with caution.

5.1.4 Fluorescence and transmittance

All fluorescence data only have preliminary calibrations applied, to convert sensor output into voltages. These data should not be used quantitatively other than for linkage with

primary productivity data. Note that fluorescence data for stations 7, 8 and 9 are suspect due to a flattening battery pack.

The transmissometer was fitted to the main CTD frame for most stations up to station 52, however all data are suspect. Good transmittance data were obtained after fitting the transmissometer to the CSIRO Seacat, deployed from the stern gantry - these data are not included here.

5.1.5 Conductivity signal noise

Close examination of the conductivity cell signal from General Oceanics CTDs reveals a signal noise large enough to generate spurious small scale vertical density inversions (Rosenberg et al., 1997, Tom Whitworth, pers. comm.). From previous cruises, CTD 1103 was found to generate the noisiest conductivity data. For this cruise, a comparison of conductivity signal noise was made between the two CTDs used, 1193 and 1103. Firstly, the full 25 Hz CTD data were extracted for a series of stations from approximately equivalent latitudes for both CTD 1193 and 1103. Steep parts of the vertical profile (i.e. near the top and bottom) were excluded. Data were then smoothed using a running mean average with a window size of ± 5 data points. Lastly, variances were calculated for both the conductivity and temperature data. For the stations analysed in this way, there is no obvious difference in conductivity noise levels between the two CTDs (Figure 11) - for this cruise, evidently both CTDs are equally likely to give spurious vertical density inversions.

5.2 Niskin bottle data

A Guildline 'Autosal' salinometer serial no. 62549 was used for analysis of all salinity bottle samples. International Standard Seawater batch numbers used are detailed in Appendix 1 (Table A1.1).

For Niskin bottle 19, a loose lanyard prior to station 60 allowed the bottom end cap to pretrip on many occasions. As a result, Niskin bottle samples from bottle 19 were bad for all parameters for the following stations: 9, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, 30, 41-43, 45, 46, 48, 50-53, 56, 57, 59.

For stations 66 to 75, oxygen reagent 1 was accidentally topped up with Milli-Q instead of reagent 1, and oxygen bottle samples were pickled with this dilute reagent. These samples were analysed using a standardisation done with this same dilute reagent. Examination of the bottle oxygen concentrations and standardisation revealed no suspicious data - reagent volumes added to samples are in excess, thus the dilution of reagent 1 appears to have been within tolerance.

For station 43, faulty rosette pylon behaviour resulted in all rosette positions out of synch. by 1 position, with bottle 24 tripped at the deepest position. For station 94, the pylon was accidentally set to position 1 prior to the cast, thus bottle 2 was tripped at the deepest position, and bottle 1 at the shallowest.

Nitrate+nitrite versus phosphate nutrient data are shown in Figure 10.

Figure 5: Conductivity ratio c_{btl}/c_{cal} versus station number for cruise AU0103. The solid line follows the mean of the residuals for each station; the broken lines are \pm the standard deviation of the residuals for each station. c_{cal} = calibrated CTD conductivity from the CTD upcast burst data; c_{btl} = 'in situ' Niskin bottle conductivity, found by using CTD pressure and temperature from the CTD upcast burst data in the conversion of Niskin bottle salinity to conductivity.

Figure 6: Salinity residual (S_{btl} - S_{cal}) versus station number for cruise AU0103. The solid line is the mean of all the residuals; the broken lines are \pm the standard deviation of all the residuals. s_{cal} = calibrated CTD salinity; s_{btl} = Niskin bottle salinity value.

Figure 7a and b: Salinity residual versus (a) pressure, and (b) temperature, for stations 71 to 97. Note that only data with quality flag 1 (see Appendix 2 for definition) are plotted.

Figure 7c and d: Salinity residual versus (c) pressure, and (d) temperature, for stations 114 to 125. Note that only data with quality flag 1 (section Appendix 2 for definition) are plotted.

Figure 8a and b: Comparison between digital reversing thermometers and CTD platinum temperature for cruise AU0103: temperature difference versus (a) station number, and (b) CTD temperature.

Figure 9: Dissolved oxygen residual (O_{btl} - O_{cal}) versus station number for cruise AU0103. The solid line follows the mean residual for each station; the broken lines are \pm the standard deviation of the residuals for each station.

Figure 10: Nitrate+nitrite versus phosphate data for AU0103.

Figure 11: Conductivity and temperature signal noise for CTDs 1193 and 1103.

Table 7: Calibration coefficients and calibration dates for CTD serial numbers 1193 and 1103 (unit numbers 5 and 7 respectively) used during cruise AU0103. Note that platinum temperature calibrations are for the ITS-90 scale.

stn no.	surface p offset(dbar)	stn no.	surface p offset(dbar)	stn no.	surface p offset(dbar)	stn no.	surface p offset(dbar)	stn no.	surface p offset(dbar)
1	0.94	28	-0.01	55	-0.47	82	$0.20**$	109	0.00
$\overline{2}$	1.00	29	$-0.40**$	56	0.41	83	-0.29	110	0.79
3	0.53	30	0.19	57	-0.03	84	-0.48	111	1.00
4	0.52	31	0.22	58	0.02	85	0.74	112	0.50
5	0.39	32	0.38	59	-0.11	86	0.31	113	0.77
6	0.11	33	0.32	60	-0.11	87	$0.00**$	114	0.85
$\overline{7}$	0.21	34	0.15	61	-0.69	88	0.22	115	0.98
8	0.75	35	0.27	62	$0.30**$	89	-0.06	116	0.46
9	0.90	36	0.73	63	0.08	90	0.01	117	0.59
10	0.83	37	0.06	64	-0.17	91	0.17	118	0.99
11	0.18	38	-0.08	65	-0.67	92	0.06	119	0.91
12	0.15	39	0.09	66	-0.34	93	-0.20	120	0.40
13	0.52	40	0.25	67	-0.36	94	0.14	121	0.23
14	0.77	41	0.35	68	0.41	95	-0.16	122	0.36
15	0.03	42	0.00	69	0.42	96	-0.04	123	1.05
16	0.15	43	0.52	70	-0.17	97	0.47	124	0.65
17	0.15	44	0.21	71	-0.36	98	0.02	125	0.24
18	0.26	45	-0.33	72	-0.15	99	-0.40	126	-0.12
19	0.51	46	-0.89	73	0.15	100	$-0.20**$	127	0.93
20	-0.57	47	0.23	74	0.60	101	-0.05	128	0.55
21	0.03	48	-0.42	75	0.46	102	0.35	129	0.00
22	-0.09	49	0.46	76	-0.44	103	0.33	130	0.25
23	-0.11	50	-0.05	77	0.04	104	0.86	131	0.74
24	$-0.20**$	51	-0.22	78	-0.29	105	0.43	132	0.66
25	0.15	52	0.15	79	-0.44	106	0.36	133	-0.35
26	0.27	53	-0.56	80	0.09	107	$-0.20**$	134	-0.27
27	0.42	54	0.05	81	-0.47	108	$-0.30**$	135	0.23

Table 8: Surface pressure offsets. ** indicates value estimated from manual inspection of data.

Table 9: CTD conductivity calibration coefficients. F₁, F₂ and F₃ 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.

station $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$ number			station $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$ number	number	station $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$	station $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$ Number		
1	0.96691907E-03	35	0.94825236E-03	69	0.94784162E-03	103	0.94695816E-03	
$\overline{2}$	0.96690639E-03	36	0.94825458E-03	70	0.94784076E-03	104	0.94697172E-03	
3	0.96689371E-03	37	0.94825679E-03	71	0.94783990E-03	105	0.94698528E-03	
4	0.96688103E-03	38	0.94825901E-03	72	0.94783905E-03	106	0.94699885E-03	
5	0.96686836E-03	39	0.94826122E-03	73	0.94783819E-03	107	0.94701241E-03	
6	0.96685568E-03	40	0.94826344E-03	74	0.94783733E-03	108	0.94702597E-03	
$\overline{7}$	0.96684300E-03	41	0.94826566E-03	75	0.94783647E-03	109	0.10053662E-02	
8	0.96691750E-03	42	0.94826787E-03	76	0.94783561E-03	110	0.10053654E-02	
9	0.96692202E-03	43	0.94827009E-03	77	0.94706151E-03	111	0.10053647E-02	
10	0.96692654E-03	44	0.94827230E-03	78	0.94706155E-03	112	0.10053639E-02	
11	0.96693107E-03	45	0.94827452E-03	79	0.94706159E-03	113	0.10053631E-02	
12	0.96693559E-03	46	0.94827674E-03	80	0.94706163E-03	114	0.10053624E-02	
13	0.96694011E-03	47	0.94827895E-03	81	0.94706166E-03	115	0.10053616E-02	
14	0.94804700E-03	48	0.94788185E-03	82	0.94706170E-03	116	0.10053608E-02	
15	0.94801804E-03	49	0.94788120E-03	83	0.94706174E-03	117	0.10053600E-02	
16	0.94798908E-03	50	0.94788055E-03	84	0.94680887E-03	118	0.10053593E-02	
17	0.94796012E-03	51	0.94787989E-03	85	0.94680835E-03	119	0.10053585E-02	
18	0.94821469E-03	52	0.94787924E-03	86	0.94680782E-03	120	0.10055955E-02	
19	0.94821691E-03	53	0.94787858E-03	87	0.94680729E-03	121	0.10055963E-02	
20	0.94821913E-03	54	0.94787793E-03	88	0.94680676E-03	122	0.10055971E-02	
21	0.94822134E-03	55	0.94787727E-03	89	0.94680623E-03	123	0.10055979E-02	
22	0.94822356E-03	56	0.94787662E-03	90	0.94680570E-03	124	0.10055987E-02	
23	0.94822577E-03	57	0.94787597E-03	91	0.94680518E-03	125	0.10055995E-02	
24	0.94822799E-03	58	0.94787531E-03	92	0.94680465E-03	126	0.10056003E-02	
25	0.94823020E-03	59	0.94787466E-03	93	0.94680412E-03	127	0.10056011E-02	
26	0.94823242E-03	60	0.94787400E-03	94	0.94680359E-03	128	0.10056018E-02	
27	0.94823464E-03	61	0.94787335E-03	95	0.94680306E-03	129	0.10056026E-02	
28	0.94823685E-03	62	0.94787270E-03	96	0.94680253E-03	130	0.10067021E-02	
29	0.94823907E-03	63	0.94820530E-03	97	0.94680201E-03	131	0.10067219E-02	
30	0.94824128E-03	64	0.94820372E-03	98	0.94680148E-03	132	0.10067416E-02	
31	0.94824350E-03	65	0.94820215E-03	99	0.94680095E-03	133	0.10067614E-02	
32	0.94824571E-03	66	0.94820057E-03	100	0.94691748E-03	134	0.10067812E-02	
33	0.94824793E-03	67	0.94819899E-03	101	0.94693104E-03	135	0.10068009E-02	
34	0.94825015E-03	68	0.94819742E-03	102	0.94694460E-03			

Table 10: Station-dependent-corrected conductivity slope term $(F_2 + F_3 \cdot N)$, for station number N, and F_2 and F_3 the conductivity slope and station-dependent correction calibration terms respectively.

Table 11: CTD raw data scans deleted during data processing. For raw scan number ranges, the lowest and highest scan numbers are not included in the action (except for scan 1).

Table 12: Missing data points in 2 dbar-averaged files. '1' indicates missing data for the indicated parameters: T=temperature; S=salinity, σ_T , specific volume anomaly and geopotential anomaly; O=oxygen; F=fluorescence.

Table 14: Suspect 2 dbar averages for the indicated parameters: T=temperature; S=salinity, σ_T, specific volume anomaly and geopotential anomaly; O=oxygen. * = general caution required, due to frequent transient sensor errors when the CTD enters the water.

Table 15: Questionable nutrient sample values (not deleted from bottle data file).

Table 17: CTD dissolved oxygen calibration coefficients. K₁, K₂, K₃, K₄, K₅ and K₆ 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 as defined in Rosenberg et al., 1995); n is the number of samples retained for calibration in each station or station grouping.

67	8.866	6.50	-1.302	-0.05731	0.38414	0.98862E-04	0.16167	23
68	9.666	7.00	-1.539	-0.05715	0.70477	0.60321E-03	0.17746	12
69	6.939	5.00	-0.789	-0.10126	0.65270	0.35727E-04	0.20522	21
71	8.420	7.00	-1.220	-0.03124	0.03001	0.10541E-03	0.13972	22
72	9.122	7.00	-1.377	-0.03174	0.62800	0.11280E-03	0.18488	20
75	9.600	4.00	-1.514	-0.00501	0.86646	0.14139E-03	0.20482	23
77	8.135	4.50	-1.118	-0.05922	0.94853	0.36330E-04	0.14840	10
78	9.515	4.00	-1.497	-0.00887	0.79461	0.14148E-03	0.07669	23
79		4.50						22
	7.588		-0.996	-0.06477	0.00080	0.72885E-04	0.15632	
80	7.352	11.50	-1.035	-0.00070	0.32658	0.12954E-03	0.12665	22
81	8.085	10.00	-1.123	-0.04882	0.09085	0.74130E-04	0.09479	12
82	8.978	4.00	-1.405	-0.01642	0.69154	0.15006E-03	0.12764	18
83	9.033	7.50	-1.400	-0.00065	0.74911	0.14806E-03	0.12517	20
84	2.204	5.50	0.290	-0.19604	0.31706	0.18185E-03	0.18605	11
87	9.579	4.00	-1.516	-0.00077	0.68334	0.15170E-03	0.24743	23
89	6.396	8.00	-0.850	-0.00155	0.70775	0.13731E-03	0.23418	23
90	6.692	5.50	-0.805	-0.06733	0.17446	0.61515E-04	0.23437	22
91	8.596	10.00	-1.300	-0.00013	0.60384	0.14717E-03	0.22087	23
92	8.347	5.00	-1.146	-0.04137	0.23471	0.14593E-04	0.18880	12
93	8.785	7.00	-1.336	-0.00028	0.80655	0.14838E-03	0.09346	22
94	9.532	7.00	-1.495	-0.00075	0.70964	0.15125E-03	0.19109	20
95	11.468	6.00	-1.911	-0.01291	0.77412	0.16731E-03	0.23867	22
96	6.409	7.00	-0.729	-0.03693	0.11306	0.10841E-04	0.12173	12
97	10.893	4.00	-1.730	-0.05168	0.57916	0.11548E-03	0.31288	22
98	5.557	4.00	-0.552	-0.09634	0.21763	0.52523E-04	0.27154	22
99	4.254	4.00	-0.258	-0.11902	0.29200	0.88222E-05	0.13664	11
100	9.801	6.00	-1.498		0.61098	0.31736E-03	0.24018	11
				-0.02847				
101	2.635	4.00	0.241	-0.02757	0.75817	0.11936E-03	0.15955	8
102	3.075	6.50	0.006	-0.13997	0.25742	0.14322E-03	0.13704	8
103	3.035	6.00	-0.046	-2.01790	0.47425	0.84172E-04	0.10521	8
104	4.181	4.00	-0.099	-0.04098	0.77975	0.10948E-03	0.11980	8
106	2.907	6.50	0.054	-0.09441	0.24966	0.11797E-03	0.07823	10
109	6.697	5.50	-0.869	-0.04593	0.19676	0.33967E-03	0.20713	8
110	4.637	4.50	-0.377	-0.07659	0.22883	0.34088E-03	0.27937	10
111	4.401	5.00	-0.267	-0.06183	0.22249	0.93693E-04	0.10553	$\overline{7}$
112	12.962	5.00	-2.341	-0.01813	0.37623	0.10047E-02	0.10977	6
113	3.121	9.00	0.000	-0.11125	0.09626	0.32518E-04	0.23107	12
114	2.460	10.00	0.135	-0.19090	0.22880	0.29243E-04	0.24413	19
115	5.027	6.00	-0.416	-0.08754	0.09586	0.57401E-04	0.18011	24
116	1.771	10.00	0.319	-2.83890	0.48070	0.11283E-03	0.18744	8
117	3.608	4.00	-0.117	-0.23891	0.34958	0.56453E-04	0.17931	9
118	3.072	4.00	0.004	-0.17242	0.26132	0.31683E-04	0.18890	14
119	7.111	9.00	-0.901	-0.03454	0.08394	0.11226E-03	0.22834	23
124	4.554	10.00	-0.325	-0.07275	0.08706	0.54370E-04	0.21894	19
125	5.296	10.00	-0.580	-0.00038	0.36196	0.13564E-03	0.22973	21
		4.50						
126	7.715		-1.030	-0.00271	0.75214	0.41146E-04	0.10723	13
131	0.087	6.00	1.011	-0.31566	0.91766	0.21432E-04	0.23240	13

Table 17: (continued)

Appendix 1 Hydrochemistry cruise laboratory report

Clodagh Moy, Stephen Bray and Neale Johnston

This hydrochemistry was part of the CLIVAR program on Voyage 3 on the *Aurora Australis*. Seawater samples were analysed for salinity, nutrients (NO2+NO3, Si and P) and dissolved oxygen concentrations. Samples were collected from 135 stations in total, including 122 stations of a repeat north-south transect of the SR3 line (including 8 particle station sites) and a further 13 stations off the coast near the Mertz Glacier and across the continental shelf. Additional samples were analysed for some scientists on board, as described below. The methods used are described in the CRC hydrochemistry manual (Curran and Bray, 2003).

Number of samples analysed

Salinities: 2288 (2246 samples for SR3 and particle stations) Dissolved Oxygens: 2002 Nutrients: 2746 (2269 samples for SR3 and particle stations)

A1.1 Salinity

Clodagh Moy and Neale Johnston analysed salinities over a 24-hour period each day in the wet lab. A Guildline Autosal salinometer SN 62549 was used. Ocean Scientific IAPSO standard seawater batches used to standardise the salinometer throughout the cruise are summarised in Table A1.1. Repeat standardisations (e.g. P137 measured against P137) showed no difference (i.e. 2R of < 0.00000) over 33 repeats during the cruise. P133 standards were also measured. They showed no difference, average being 0.0000 psu. Additional standards P140 were measured. They showed no difference, average being 0.0000 psu.

There were some problems controlling the temperature of the wet lab for a number of days during the cruise. The temperature ranged between 17 and 21 degrees. A PID temperature

Table A1.1: Summary of IAPSO Standard Seawater (ISS) batches used for salinometer standardisations during cruise AU0103.

controller was used to control the temperature and an independent air-conditioner in the wet lab. Maintaining stable air temperature proved difficult with this air-conditioner, and a close eye was kept on the temperature at all times. Analysis stopped if fluctuations in ambient temperature exceeded 1 degree.

* Files updated: sal_std_check.xls sal62549.xls

A1.2 Dissolved oxygen

Dissolved oxygen analyses were performed by Stephen Bray in the wet lab. There were no major problems with the DO system. Standardisation and blank values were collated from this and previous cruises, and plotted to help identify outlying or suspicious values. The average standardisation value and average standard deviation was 4.425 +/- 0.002 ml of thiosulphate. This is 297.7 +/- 0.14 μ mol/l of oxygen, or 0.04%. The average blank value and average standard deviation were $0.006 +/- 0.001$ ml of thiosulphate.

Files:

do_std&blank.xls, a9901 do_std&blank.xls, all collation of DO standardisation values do_std&blank.xls, charts charts of standardisation values do.xls, variable summary do.xls, hydro_calc_check

A1.3 Nutrients

Clodagh Moy and Neale Johnston analysed nutrients, timing autoanalyser runs to keep the instrument running over the full 24 hours each day. Phosphate, silicate, nitrite + nitrate were analysed as per CSIRO methods (Cowley, 2001, and Cowley and Johnston, 1999). A new automatic switching valve system was used to change over from reagents to MQ and carrier etc., and included a baseline calibration. Standards were made up every couple of days in low nutrient seawater (collected from Maria Island and filtered and autoclaved, before going on the cruise). The Carrier was Artificial Seawater (or sodium chloride in MQ). New software called 'Winflow' was used, which was user friendly and flexible. A standard run included a baseline calibration using the switching valves, taking approximately 45 mins, followed by a set of standards, some SRMs (Standard Reference Material from Ocean Scientific) and QCs (LNSW spiked with nutrients), and a set of 48 samples followed by a second set of standards, SRMs and QCs. A run normally took about 3 hours to complete.

At the beginning of the cruise there were some problems with the nitrate analyses, resulting in bad peak shapes for $NO₂/NO₃$. After much experimentation to trace the problem, the batch of HCl and brij used to make up the reagents was changed - this fixed the problem. Trouble was also experienced with a bad batch of Cd coils (3 coils were used over a two week period). A separate batch brought from CSIRO was then used, with one coil lasting 2 weeks, as expected.

Near the end of the cruise the nitrite/nitrate line leaked over the nitrate detector near the exit of the flow cell. The detector began smoking and burning. The motherboard was destroyed and the detector was no longer usable, useful only for spare parts. An additional

minor problem occurred with another detector – it would not zero and kept sitting on wait. The Antarctic Division electronics engineer replaced a transistor with one from the burnt detector, fixing the problem.

Data processing was time consuming, with the procedure as follows for each run:

- first the winflow files are tidied up;
- pick peaks and check the standards, SRMs and QCs;
- check the baselines;
- data are then exported to Excel to be further processed;
- using the Fyyvvrr. xlt macro to process the data, import the n,s,p files;
- check the 3-baseline median's (green boxes) and pick the median baseline number;
- check the standards, SRM and QC values;
- check the standard curves and % recovery of the cd coil for N.

When happy with the run, a summary sheet was produced and exported to a *.xlw file for import into HYDRO (a MS-Excel based program for hydrochemistry data handling). Once imported into HYDRO, a csv file was made.

A1.4 General data handling

Plots were made of property versus station to check for suspicious data or wrongly entered data. They were based on the data in the CSV file, and were opened via the macro CSV in A0103.XLM. Data was backed up to 250MB Iomega Zip disks.

A1.5 Laboratories

The salinometer, DO system and nutrient systems were all in the wet lab. The MQ system was in the photo lab. The wet lab and the photo lab were received in clean condition. The salinometer was on the aft bench, starboard side, near the porthole. The nutrient system was on the remaining aft bench. The DO system was on the starboard sorting bench. The port side bench near the door to the trawl deck was used to prepare reagents and runs for the nutrients. The fish bowl contained the data computer, stationary and manuals.

A1.6 Temperature monitoring and control

Temperature in the wet lab was controlled by an independent air conditioner on the starboard side bulkhead and by a CAL Controls Ltd 'CAL 9900' proportional derivative plus integral (PID) temperature controller. The photo lab had no temperature controller. The ships heating inlets above the salinometer were taped closed. The temperature from the airconditioner fluctuated from 11 to 18 degrees. This caused the temperature controller to struggle when down at the lower temperatures, and resulted in one of the heaters blowing its fuse from over-heating. The air conditioner was monitored regularly to reduce large fluctuations in temperature. The photo lab was heated by the ship's air-conditioning and maintained a steady temperature.

Two Tinytalk units recorded the laboratory temperature in the wetlab. One was positioned beside the salinometer, while the other was positioned beside the DO system. The temperature was also measured by a digital thermometer above the salinometer and the temperature monitored by the PID controller in the wet lab. 'Indoor/outdoor' electronic

thermometers were used to measure the fridge and freezer. The air temperature about the salinometer was generally $20.0 +/- 1$ °C.

A1.7 Purified water

A new RO system was bought before the voyage, instead of using the MBDI tanks. The system seemed to work well. However, some air locks were experienced from time to time and the tanks in the polisher emptied. A lot of people were using our MQ system and about 280L (\sim 14 x 20L carboys) of water was produced for this cruise. Pre-filters were changed three times, and the polishers once.

A1.8 Additional samples analysed

Apart from the main CTD hydrochemistry program, a number of samples were analysed for other scientists on board, as described below:

Additional salinities were analysed for the following people: Andrew Davidson, AAD: 1 sample; Kelly Goodwin, NOAA: 6 samples; Nicolas Savoye, VUB: 11 samples; Bronte Tilbrook, CSIRO: 24 samples. Additional nutrients were analysed for the following people: Phil Boyd, Alkali: 49 samples; Pete Sedwick, BBSR: 120 samples; Malcolm Reid, Alkali: 10 samples; Karl Safi, NIWA: 41 samples; Guido Corno, IASOS: 15 samples; Frank Dehairs,VUB: 218 samples; Bronte Tilbrook, CSIRO: 24 samples.

Appendix 2 Data file types and formats

A2.1 CTD data

- CTD no.1193 was used for station 1 to 108. CTD no. 1103 was used for stations 109 to 135.
- CTD data are in text files named *.all, containing 2-dbar averaged data. An example of file naming convention:

a01035020.all a = Aurora Australis $01 =$ year 03 = cruise number 5 = CTD instrument number 020 = CTD station number

• The files consist of a 15 line header with station information (all times are UTC), followed by the data in column format, as follows:

```
column 1 - pressure (dbar)
```
- column 2 temperature (degrees C, T90 scale)
- column 3 salinity (PSS78)
- column 4 density-1000 kg/ $m³$
- column 5 specific volume anomaly
- column 6 geopotential anomaly
- column 7 dissolved oxygen (µmol/l)
- column 8 no. of data points used in the 2 dbar bin
- column 9 standard deviation of temperature data points in the bin column 10- standard deviation of conductivity data points in the bin
- columns 11,12 fluorescence ((volts) and transmittance (if present)
- All files start at 2 dbar, and there is a line for each 2 dbar value. Any missing data is filled by blank characters.
- All CTD data are downcast data.
- For station 76, the data in the 'fluorescence' column is actually from the copper ion selective electrode (in volts).

A2.2 Niskin bottle data

• The bottle data are contained in the a0103.bot text file, with the following columns:

```
column 1 - station number 
column 2 - ctd pressure (dbar) 
column 3 - ctd temperature (deg. C, T90 scale) 
column 4 - digital reversing thermometer temperature 
column 5 - ctd conductivity (mS/cm) 
column 6 - ctd salinity (PSS78) 
column 7 - bottle salinity (PSS78) 
column 8 - phosphate (µmol/l)
```
column 9 - nitrate (µmol/l) (i.e. total nitrate+nitrite)

column 10 - silicate (umol/l)

column 11 - bottle dissolved oxygen (µmol/l)

```
column 12 - bottle flag (1=good,0=suspicious,-1=bad,mainly relevant
```

```
 to bottle salinity values for CTD calibration, but not necessarily)
```
column 13 - niskin bottle number

- Columns 2, 3, 5 and 6 are all the averages of CTD upcast burst data (i.e. averages of the 10 seconds of CTD data prior to each bottle firing)
- Any missing data are filled by a decimal point '.'
- The file fluoro.lis contains the same data as a0103.bot, except that there is a line of data for all 24 rosette positions, and for all station numbers, with null values represented by -9. An additional last column contains CTD upcast burst data for fluorescence.

A2.3 Station information

A summary of the station information is contained in the a0103.sta file (this station information is also included in the matlab file a0103.mat), containing position, time, bottom depth and maximum pressure of cast for CTD stations. The CTD instrument number is specified in the file header. Position and time (UTC) are specified at the start, bottom and end of the cast, while the bottom depth is for the start of the cast.

A2.4 Matlab format

- CTD 2 dbar data and bottle data are also contained respectively in the matlab files a0103.mat and a0103bot.mat. a0103.mat includes station information.
- In the matlab files, column number for each array corresponds with CTD station number.
- In the matlab files, NaN is a null value.
- In the bottle file, the rows 1 to 24 are the shallowest to deepest Niskins respectively.
- For the file a0103.mat, the array names have the following meaning:

(all times are UTC) 'start' refers to start of cast 'bottom' refers to bottom of cast 'end' refers to end of cast 'decimal time' is decimal days from 2400 on 31st Dec. 2000 (so, for example, midday on 2nd January 2001 = decimal time 1.5). 'lat' is latitude (decimal degrees, where -ve = south) 'lon' is longitude (decimal degrees, where $+ve = east$) 'time' is hhmm time b otd = ocean depth (m) $maxp = maximum pressure of the CTD cast (dbar)$ ctdunit = instrument serial number 'ctd' is the upcast CTD burst data, for the parameters: fluoro = fluorescence ga = geopotential anomaly

```
npts = number of data points used in the 2 dbar bin 
ox=dissolved oxygen (µmol/l) 
press=pressure (dbar) 
sal=salinity (PSS78) 
sigma_t=density-1000 (kg/m^3)
sva=specific volume anomaly 
temp=temperature (deg.C T90) 
transmiss=transmissometer data, mostly suspect
```
• For the file a0103bot.mat, the array names have the following meaning:

```
'ctd' refers to upcast CTD burst data, for the parameters: 
 cond = conductivity (mS/cm) 
 fluoro = fluorescence 
 press = pressure (dbar) 
 sal = salinity (PSS78) 
 temp = temperature (deg.C T90) 
'hyd' refers to bottle data, for the parameters: 
ox = dissolved oxygen (µmol/l)
sal = salinity (PSS78) 
flag = the bottle flagged described under the bottle data section 
niskin = niskin bottle number 
nitrate, phosphate, silicate = \mumol/l
station = station number 
therm = digital reversing thermometer temperature (deg.C T90)
```
A2.5 WOCE data format

The data are also available as WOCE format files, following the standard WOCE format as described in Joyce and Corry (1994).

A2.5.1 CTD 2 dbar-averaged data files

- Data are contained in the files *.ctd
- CTD 2 dbar-averaged file format is as per Table 4.7 of Joyce and Corry (1994), 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.
- The quality flags for CTD data are defined in Table A2.1.

A2.5.2 Bottle data files

- Data are contained in the file a0103.sea, with the file a0103cfc.sea including CFC data.
- Bottle data file format is as per Table 4.5 of Joyce and Corry (1994), with quality flags defined in Tables A2.2 and A2.3.
- The total value of nitrate+nitrite only is listed.
- Silicate is 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.
- Salinity samples rejected for conductivity calibration, as per eqn A2.20 in Rosenberg et al. (1995), are not flagged in the .sea file.

A2.5.3 Conversion of units for dissolved oxygen and nutrients

A2.5.3.1 Dissolved oxygen

Niskin bottle data

For the WOCE format files, all Niskin bottle dissolved oxygen concentration values have been converted from volumetric units μ mol/l to gravimetric units μ mol/kg, as follows. Concentration C_k in μ mol/kg is given by

$$
C_k = 1000 C_l / \rho(\theta, s, 0)
$$
 (eqn A2.1)

where C_l is the concentration in µmol/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.

A2.5.3.2 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 $\rho(T_1,s,0)$ is the water density in the hydrochemistry laboratory at the laboratory temperature $T_1 = 20.5^{\circ}$ C, and at zero pressure. Upcast CTD burst data averages are used for s.

A2.5.4 Station information file

• Data are contained in the file a0103.sum, with the file format as per section 3.3 of Joyce and Corry (1994).

- All depths are calculated using a uniform speed of sound through the water column of 1463 ms^{-1} . 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 ± 3 m.
- Wire out (i.e. meter wheel readings of the CTD winch) were unavailable.

Table A2.1: Definition of quality flags for CTD data (after Table 4.10 in Joyce and Corry, 1994). 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 4.8 in Joyce and Corry, 1994).

Table A2.3: Definition of quality flags for water samples in *.sea files (after Table 4.9 in Joyce and Corry, 1994).

A2.6 ADCP data

ADCP data are available as 30 ensemble averages, contained in the following files:

```
au010301.cny - text format, all data 
au0103_slow35.cny - text format, 'on station' data 
                        (i.e. data for which ship speed \leq 0.35 ms<sup>-1</sup>)
a0103dop.mat - matlab format, all data 
a0103dop_slow35.mat - matlab format, 'on station' data 
                       (i.e. data for whichship speed \leq 0.35 ms<sup>-1</sup>)
```
Full file format description is given in the text file README_au0103_adcp, included with the data.

A2.7 Underway data

Ship's underway data (including meteorological data, bathymetry, GPS, and sea surface temperature/salinity/fluorescence), quality controlled by the dotzapper (Ruth Lawless, unpublished data quality control report), are contained in the following files:

clivar_underway.ora - text format, 1 minute instantaneous data clivar_underway.mat - matlab format, 1 minute instantaneous data

See section 4.5 above for more details. Full file format description is given in the text file README clivar underway, included with the data. Note that there are a few suspiciously low sea surface salinity values near the start and end of the time series.

Appendix 3 CFC measurements on AU0103 (CLIVAR repeat of P12) - Preliminary shipboard report

Mark J. Warner, University of Washington, School of Oceanography, Box 355351, Seattle, WA 98195-5351 USA (Telephone: 206-543-0765, FAX: 206-685-3351, E-mail: mwarner@ocean.washington.edu)

Co-investigator: John L. Bullister, NOAA-PMEL, Building 3, 7600 Sand Point Way, Seattle, WA 98115 USA (Telephone: 206-526-6741, FAX: 206-526-6744, E-mail: bullister@pmel.noaa.gov)

A3.1 CFC sampling procedures and data processing

Analysts: Mark J. Warner, University of Washington

Fred A. Menzia, Joint Institute for the Study of Atmosphere and Ocean

Concentrations of three dissolved chlorofluorocarbons (CFC-11, CFC-12, and CFC-113) were measured in approximately 1350 samples during this section. The sampling procedure and analytical techniques are based upon those described by Bullister and Weiss (1988). Samples for CFC analyses were drawn from the 10-liter Niskins into 100 cm³ ground glass syringes fitted with stainless steel syringe tips. These syringes were stored in a water bath until analyses. A portable laboratory on the heli-deck housed the analytical instrumentation. Underway measurement of atmospheric CFC concentrations was accomplished by pumping air from the bow through approximately 100 m of 3/8-in Dekaron tubing into the CFC portable laboratory. The separation of the CFCs was accomplished using a 46 cm Porasil B, 80/100 mesh precolumn followed by a 1.5 m Carbograph 1AC column in a Shimadzu Mini-2 gas chromatograph.

Shipboard electron capture gas chromatography was used to measure CFC concentrations in air, seawater, and gas standards during the expedition. In general, the precision of the measurements was outstanding during this expedition. The precisions for the response of the detector to injection of an approximately 3.7 cm³ loop of gas standard 33790 (CFC-11: 265.04 parts per trillion, CFC-12: 525.04 ppt, CFC-113: 82.84 ppt) was 1.04% for CFC-11, 0.63% for CFC-12, and 3.14% for CFC-113 over the entire cruise. Two calibration curves were used for the cruise and show relatively small differences (less than 1% difference in sensitivity over most of the range). Atmospheric concentrations for the CFCs showed very little variation, either temporally or spatially, during the cruise. The mean atmospheric mixing ratios on the SIO93 calibration scale are:

Seawater samples have been corrected for blanks introduced through the analytical system. A residual contamination existed in the valve at the top of the sparging chamber. These blanks, although relatively high, were also fairly constant and reduced during the course of the expedition. The preliminary measurements have not been corrected for any

contamination introduced from the Niskin bottles or the sampling procedure. These will be determined from a careful examination of the seawater CFC concentrations at the northern end of the section. Approximately 35 duplicate syringes were sampled and analysed to determine precision for seawater measurements. The calculated precisions are listed below; whichever is smaller, the concentration or percentage, applies to the data:

These data exceed the precision established for CFC-11 and CFC-12 as WOCE standards. (No standard was set for CFC-113.)

A3.2 Analytical problems

Prior to CTD 17, a small leak existed in the portion of the system used for analyses of standard gas and bow air samples but not in the portion of the system used for seawater samples. This resulted in apparently high seawater concentrations and surface saturations of CFCs. Shortly before finding this leak, the electrometer on the Shimadzu Mini-2 Gas Chromatograph had been replaced due to poor temperature control for the oven. This complicates the ability to correct the seawater data from CTDs 1-12, since the new electrometer also altered the amplified signal from the ECD. For this preliminary data report, the post-leak calibration curve has been applied to all this data and the seawater concentrations multiplied by the ratio of the sensitivities for 1 large gas sample volume before the leak and after the leak. Prior to fixing the leak, the precision of measured CFC-113 concentrations in the gas standards was too poor to attempt to measure seawater concentrations. CFC-113 concentrations are only reported after CTD 16.

A small amount of contamination was introduced to the analytical system through the use of a lubricating spray in the deadbolt on the van door. The baseline drifted upward and became very noisy for 1.5 days. Low-concentration samples of CFC-113 are suspect (WOCE flag $= 3$) during this period (CTD 60-2) due to baseline noise. The signal-to-noise is much greater for both CFC-11 and CFC-12, so these gases appear to be unaffected by the problem.

A few samples showed obvious signs of contamination and have been flagged as bad (WOCE flag $= 4$). There may be other suspect data which have yet to be identified and flagged.

Appendix 4 Inter-cruise comparisons

A4.1 Introduction

Inter-cruise comparisons for data collected along the SR3 transect during the 1990s are described in Rosenberg et al. (1997). Comparisons are extended here to include this latest occupation of SR3. Brief comparisons of salinity, dissolved oxygen and nutrient data are made between au0103 data and data from cruises au9601 (August-September 1996) and au9404 (January-February 1995).

Overlapping stations from the three cruises (Table A4.1) were selected with the requirement of a spacial separation less than 3 nautical miles. In most cases, spacial separation is in fact less than 1 nautical mile. Meridional sections of neutral density (McDougall, 1987) are shown in Figures A4.1a to c, including CTD station positions.

latitude	au0103	au9601	au9404	latitude	au0103	au9601	au9404
(degrees)				(degrees)			
-44.0027	2	69	106	-52.3717	45	37	
-44.0537	3	68		-52.6672	46	36	83
-44.1165	4	67	105	-53.1312	48	35	82
-44.3692	5	66		-54.0687	54	33	80
-44.7225	6	65	103	-54.5320	56	32	79
-45.2192	7	64	102	-55.0162	57	31	78
-45.7337	9	63	101	-55.4802	59	30	77
-46.1687	10	62	100	-55.9217	60	29	
-46.6432	11	61	99	-56.4260	61	28	
-47.1480	13	60	-	-56.9322	63	27	75
-47.4440	19	59	97	-57.8525	66	25	
-47.9993	20	58	-	-58.8493	67	23	
-48.3187	21	57	95	-59.3490	69	22	
-49.2715	26	55	93	-59.8367	71	21	71
-49.6083	28	54		-60.3502	72	20	
-49.8930	29	46	-	-60.8362	75	19	
-50.1620	30	45		-61.3185	78	18	69
-50.6718	33	43	89	-61.8502	79	17	68
-51.2592	39	41		-62.3497	80	16	67
-51.5380	40	40		-62.8432	82	15	66
-51.8095	41	39	85	-63.3705	83		65
-52.0853	43	38		-64.5207	90	12	

Table A4.1: Stations from each cruise used for parameter comparisons (latitudes are for au0103).

A4.2 Salinity

The meridional variation of the salinity maximum (i.e. for Lower Circumpolar Deep Water, as defined by Gordon, 1967) is compared for the three cruises. Using the 2 dbar averaged CTD salinity data, differences are formed between the deep water salinity maxima for the cases au0103-au9601, au0103-au9404, and au9601-au9404 (Figure A4.2). A mean difference value is included with each figure. (Note that temperatures at the deep salinity maximum are above zero, thus au0103 salinities here are unaffected by the conductivity error at depth for subzero waters, discussed in section 5.1.1). For each cruise pairing,

several outliers are omitted – these outliers are due either to curtailing of the vertical salinity profile by the bottom, or change in vertical profile character due to the movement of fronts (Figures A4.1a to c). Note that for au9601-au9404, a similar comparison was done in Rosenberg et al. (1997), giving a mean difference value of -0.004 (PSS78). The slightly different value here of -0.0033 (PSS78) is due to the omission of outliers.

The au0103-au9601 comparison (Figure A4.2) shows salinity correspondence between the 2 cruises within 0.001 (PSS78). For both these cruises, Guildline Autosal salinometers were used for analysis of salinity Niskin bottle samples. The au0103-au9404 and au9601-au9404 differences of approximately -0.003 (Figure A4.2) are larger. These consistently larger differences are due to the less accurate YeoKal salinometer used on au9404, as discussed in Rosenberg et al. (1997).

In an earlier comparison between cruises au9601 and me9706 (in Rosenberg et al., 1997), with Guildline salinometers used on both these cruises, a mean difference of -0.002 (PSS78) was found. The larger magnitude of this difference compared to the au0103-au9601 value is attributed to a standardisation offset on cruise me9706, possibly due to unstable laboratory temperature.

A4.3 Niskin bottle data

Dissolved oxygen and nutrient bottle data from cruises au0103, au9601 and au9404 are compared on neutral density surfaces. Neutral density values are calculated using a routine by David Jackett (CSIRO Division of Marine Research, Hobart); oxygen and nutrient bottle data are interpolated onto neutral density surfaces using a routine by Serguei Sokolov (CSIRO Division of Marine Research, Hobart) (using bilinear interpolation). Station pairings are as per Table A4.1. Note that only data below 1000 dbar are used – this excludes from the comparisons the most seasonally varying data, as well as data in the highest vertical gradients. Meridional variations of parameter differences on 10 neutral density (i.e. γ) surfaces are shown as follows:

- Figure A4.3 for dissolved oxygen,
- Figure A4.4 for phosphate,
- Figure A4.5 for nitrate+nitrite,
- Figure A4.6 for silicate.

For each parameter, differences are shown for the cases au0103-au9601, au0103-au9601, and au9601-au9404.

A4.3.1 Dissolved oxygen

For all three cruises, oxygen bottle samples were analysed using the automated titration system developed by Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (Knapp et al., 1990).

From Figures A4.3a to c, au0103 oxygen values are mostly higher than values for au9601 and au9404, while au9601 values are mostly higher than au9404. For density surfaces 27.8 to 28.3 over the latitude range 47 to 64° S, the following mean differences (with standard deviations) are found:

From Appendix 1, oxygen standardisation values for au0103 were reasonably stable (± 0.14) µmol/l). For au9601, a jump in standardisation values was noted after station 40 (Rosenberg et al., 1997), i.e. after latitude ~51.5°S. This jump, of the order 2 µmol/l, is not obvious in the comparisons shown in Figures A4.3a and c.

A4.3.2 Phosphate

From the inter-cruise comparisons in Rosenberg et al. (1997), au9601 phosphate values were found to be lower than all earlier cruises by \sim 0.1 μ mol/l, and confirmation of the assumed improvement of phosphate data for au9601 was required from a future cruise. From Figures A4.4a to c, au0103 and au9601 phosphates are both consistently lower than au9404. For density surfaces 27.8 to 28.3 over the latitude range 47 to 64°S, the following mean differences (with standard deviations) are found:

Although there is some scatter about the mean zero au0103-au9601 phosphate difference (Figure A4.4a), the standard deviation value is only \sim 1.5% of full scale (where full scale = 3.0 µmol/l), and phosphate values appear mostly consistent for au0103 and au9601 south of 48°S. This confirms the improvement in phosphate analytical methods for au9601 and au0103, compared with earlier cruises, with the error in earlier cruises due to the phosphate analysis 'carryover effect' discussed in Rosenberg et al. (1997). North of \sim 48°S, au0103 phosphate is higher than au9601 by \sim 0.06 µmol/l (Figure A4.4a).

A4.3.3 Nitrate+nitrite

Inter-cruise comparisons for nitrate+nitrite (Figures A4.5a to c) are not as simple to summarise as phosphate. The clearest trends are north of 49°S and south of 61°S, where nitrate+nitrite concentrations are (from highest to lowest): au0103, au9404, au9601. Between 49 and 61°S, differences are in general scattered about zero, except for au0103au9601 which is mostly positive between 54 and 61°S (Figure A4.5a). For all density surfaces over all latitudes, the following mean differences (±standard deviations) are found:

The largest scatter for all three cruises is between 49 and 54°S, where standard deviations in the above table are \sim 2% of full scale (where full scale = 35 µmol/l).

A4.3.4 Silicate

Silicate concentrations for au0103 are mostly higher than for au9601 and au9404 (Figures A4.6a and b), while values for au9601 and au9404 appear mostly consistent, with no significant offset (Figure A4.6c). For all density surfaces over all latitudes, the following mean differences (±standard deviations) are found:

For silicate, the standard deviation values are all higher than 2% of full scale (where full scale = 150 µmol/l). So overall the inter-cruise scatter of silicate values is higher than for the other nutrients, confirmed by close inspection of individual stations (Bronte Tilbrook, CSIRO Division of Marine Research, personal communication).

Figure A4.1a: Meridional section of neutral density for cruise au0103 along SR3 transect, including CTD station positions.

Figure A4.1b: Meridional section of neutral density for cruise au9601 along SR3 transect, including CTD station positions.

Figure A4.1c: Meridional section of neutral density for cruise au9404 along SR3 transect, including CTD station positions.

Bottle oxygen difference between au0103 and au9601 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.3a: au0103-au9601 bottle oxygen differences on neutral density surfaces.

Bottle oxygen difference between au0103 and au9404 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.3b: au0103-au9404 bottle oxygen differences on neutral density surfaces.

Bottle oxygen difference between au9601 and au9404 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.3c: au9601-au9404 bottle oxygen differences on neutral density surfaces.

Phosphate difference between au0103 and au9601 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.4a: au0103-au9601 phosphate differences on neutral density surfaces.

Phosphate difference between au0103 and au9404 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.4b: au0103-au9404 phosphate differences on neutral density surfaces.

Figure A4.4c: au9601-au9404 phosphate differences on neutral density surfaces.

Nitrate difference between au0103 and au9601 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.5a: au0103-au9601 nitrate+nitrite differences on neutral density surfaces.

Nitrate difference between au0103 and au9404 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Nitrate difference between au9601 and au9404 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.5c: au9601-au9404 nitrate+nitrite differences on neutral density surfaces.

Figure A4.6a: au0103-au9601 silicate differences on neutral density surfaces.

Silicate difference between au0103 and au9404 on neutral density (i.e.γ**) surfaces**

Figure A4.6b: au0103-au9404 silicate differences on neutral density surfaces.

Figure A4.6c: au9601-au9404 silicate differences on neutral density surfaces.

References

- Aoki, S., Rintoul, S.R. and Ushio, S., 2005a. Freshening of the Adelie Land Bottom Water along 140E. *Geophysical Research Letters* (submitted).
- Aoki, S., Rintoul, S.R., Hasumoto, H. and Kinoshita, H., 2005b. Frontal positions and mixed layer evolution in the seasonal ice zone along 140E in 2001-2. *Deep-Sea Research* (submitted).
- Bullister, J.L. and Weiss, R.F., 1988. Determination of CCl_3F and CCl_2F_2 in seawater and air. *Deep-Sea Research*, Vol. 35 (5), pp839-853.
- Cardinal, D., Alleman, L.Y., Dehairs, F., Savoye, N., Trull, T.W. and André, L., 2005a. Relevance of silicon isotopes to fingerprint Si-nutrient utilization and water masses in the Southern Ocean. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19, GB2007, doi:10.1029/2004GB002364.
- Cardinal, D., SAvoye, N., Trull, T.W., André, L., Kopczynska, E.E. and Dehairs, F., 2005b. Variations of carbon remineralisation in the Southern Ocean illustrated by the Baxs proxy. *Deep-Sea Research I* Vol. 52, pp355-370.
- Cowley, R., 2001*. A practical manual for the determination of salinity, dissolved oxygen, and nutrients in seawater.* CSIRO Division of Marine Research report, 2001.
- Cowley, R. and Johnston, N., 1999*. Investigations into the chemistry used for orthophosphate analysis in seawater.* CSIRO Division of Marine Research report, July 1999.
- Curran, C and S. Bray, 2003. *A Practical manual for the determination of Salinity, Dissolved Oxygen and Nutrients in Seawater.* Antarctic CRC Research Report, 2003.
- 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.
- Jacquet, S.H.M., Dehairs, F. and Rintoul, S., 2004. A high resolution transect of dissolved barium. *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 31 (14): Art. No. L14301.
- Jacquet, S., de Brauwere, A., Dehairs, F., Elskens, M., Jeandel, C., Metzl, N., Rintoul, S. and Trull, T., 2005. Comparison of dissolved Barium with Nutrients and Physico-chemical conditions along 30°E and 145°E across the Southern Ocean, EGU 2005, Vienna, abstract.
- Joyce, T. and Corry, C. (editors), 1994. *Requirements for WOCE Hydrographic Programme Data Reporting.* WHP Office Report WHPO 90-1, Revision 2, WOCE Report No. 67/91, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. 144 pp. (unpublished manuscript).
- Knapp, G.P., Stalcup, M.C., and Stanley, R.J., 1990. *Automated Oxygen Titration and Salinity Determination*. Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Technical Report WHOI-90-35.
- McDougall, T.J., 1987. Neutral surfaces. *Journal of Physical Oceanography* Vol. 17, pp1950- 1964.
- Rintoul, S.R. and Bullister, J.L., 1999. A late winter hydrographic section from Tasmania to Antarctica. *Deep-Sea Research I* Vol. 46, pp1417-1454.
- Rosenberg, M., Eriksen, R., Bell, S., Bindoff, N. and Rintoul, S., 1995. *Aurora Australis marine science cruise AU9407 - oceanographic field measurements and analysis*. Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre, Research Report No. 6, July 1995. 97 pp.
- Rosenberg, M., Bray, S., Bindoff, N., Rintoul, S., Johnston, N., Bell, S. and Towler, P., 1997. *Aurora Australis marine science cruises AU9501, AU9604 and AU9601 oceanographic field measurements and analysis, inter-cruise comparisons and data quality notes.* Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre, Research Report No. 12, September 1997. 150 pp.
- Rosenberg, M., unpublished. *Aurora Australis ADCP data status.* Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre, unpublished report, November 1999. 51 pp.
- Rosenberg, M., Bindoff, N., Bray, S., Curran, C., Helmond, I., Miller, K., McLaughlan, D. and Richman, J., 2001. *Mertz Polynya Experiment, marine science cruises AU9807, AU9801, AU9905, AU9901 and TA0051 - oceanographic field measurements and analysis*. Antarctic Cooperative Research Centre, Research Report No. 25, June 2001. 89 pp.

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 Australian Government's Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) Programme through the Antarctic Climate & Ecosystems CRC, the Australian Antarctic Division (ASAC Project Number 1335), and by the Australian Greenhouse Office of the Department of Environment and Heritage through the CSIRO Climate Change Science Program.

Core Participants

Australian Antarctic Division University of Tasmania CSIRO Marine & Atmospheric Research Australian Bureau of Meteorology

Supporting Participants

Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research Australian Greenhouse Office Australian National University National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Silicon Graphics International Tasmanian Department of Economic Development

Address

ACE CRC Private Bag 80 Hobart, Tasmania Australia 7001 P +61 3 6226 7888 F +61 3 6226 2440 E enquiries@acecrc.org.au www.acecrc.org.au

