## **Cruise Summary**

FGB Rapid Response 2016 (FGB-RR16) 30 July – 2 August 2016

Vessel: R/V Manta Cruise duration: 3 days

Mobilization: Galveston Texas At sea: Demobilization: Galveston Texas 30 July 2016 30 July – 2 August 2016 2 August 2016

## **Cruise Summary:**

A research cruise was conducted to obtain oceanographic observations in the northwestern Gulf of Mexico, 28 July – 2 August 2016,. The primary objective was to estimate oceanographic properties in the vicinity of Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary. This was a Rapid Response Cruise to investigate the environmental conditions associated with a massive die off event in the sanctuary. The cruise designator for this cruise is FGB-RR16.

## **Measurement Objectives:**

1. Perform 25 CTD stations in the vicinity of FGBNMS;

2. Collect hydrographic profiles of temperature/salinity/dissolved oxygen/fluorometer/turbidity using a Seabird SBE25 CTD;

3. Collect underway surface properties using the ship's flowthrough system;

4. Collect dissolved nutrients, bottle oxygen, and salinity samples for chemical analysis;

5. Collect samples for phytoplankton classification;

6. Collect samples for post-cruise 16S rRNA analysis;

7. Collect samples for CO2 system analysis.

## Cruise Synopsis:

The cruise transited from Galveston, Texas, to the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary on 30 July 2016. A total of 39 CTD stations were performed in a 5x5 grid that encompassed the East and West FGB. CTD Station locations are given in the following table (Table 1). Stations are listed in order of preferred sequence. Naming convention is FGB-RRXX, where XX is column-row of station. Same stations were repeated to collect sufficient water samples for analysis. Three stations were performed near the coral head (20 m depth) of East Bank. The ship returned to Galveston early on 2 August 2016.



Figure 1. Planned location of 25 CTD stations near FGBNMS.



Figure 2. Detail of planned FGB-RR16 cruise CTS locations.



Figure 3. GoogleEarth map of planned FGB-RR16 CTD stations and station names.

Lat (N)	Lon (W)	Station						
28.0340	93.9300	FGRR-11						
27.9670	93.9300	FGRR-12						
27.9000	93.9300	FGRR-13						
27.8330	93.9300	FGRR-14						
27.7660	93.9300	FGRR-15						
28.0340	93.8300	FGRR-21						
27.9670	93.8300	FGRR-22						
27.9000	93.8300	FGRR-23						
27.8330	93.8300	FGRR-24						
27.7660	93.8300	FGRR-25						
28.0340	93.7300	FGRR-31						
27.9670	93.7300	FGRR-32						
27.9000	93.7300	FGRR-33						
27.8330	93.7300	FGRR-34						
27.7660	93.7300	FGRR-35						
28.0340	93.6300	FGRR-41						
27.9670	93.6300	FGRR-42						
27.9000	93.6300	FGRR-43						
27.8330	93.6300	FGRR-44						
27.7660	93.6300	FGRR-45						
28.0340	93.5300	FGRR-51						
27.9670	93.5300	FGRR-52						
27.9000	93.5300	FGRR-53						
27.8330	93.5300	FGRR-54						
27.7660	93.5300	FGRR-55						

Table 1. Planned Position and Station names.

# Point of CONTACT INFORMATION

Steven F. DiMarco, Professor Department of Oceanography Texas A&M University College Station, TX 77845 Office: 979-862-4168 Cell: 979-324-5336 FAX: 979-847-8879 Email: sdimarco@tamu.edu

### **SCIENCE PARTY**

LIST of PARTICIPANTS AND AFFILIATIONS **Chief Scientist** Dr. Matthew Howard, Texas A&M University Senior Scientists Dr. Jamie Steichen, Texas A&M University at Galveston Dr. Laura Bretherton, Texas A&M University at Galveston Ms. Heather Zimmerle, Data Cop, Texas A&M University Research Assistant Mr. Tyler Byrne, CTD Operator, Texas A&M University Graduate Students McKenzie Daugherty (Phytoplankton) Texas A&M University Emily Whitaker (Microbial Processes) Texas A&M University John Schiff (CO2 System) Texas A&M University Undergraduate Students Brian Buckingham (Water Sampling) Texas A&M University **Instrumentation** CTD/rosette system: SBE-25 Six Niskin Rosette (4-L) Seabird CTD: SBE-25 Wetlabs Fluorometer/Turbidity/PAR Deckbox Computer Sample bottles/plastic syringes SBE-43 Oxygen sensor on package DID NOT WORK Winkler Titration system Titrator

Computer Flasks/tubing Chemicals

Flow-through system: thermosalinograph, Chelsea fluorometer

The following series of images were taken from the OOF numerical model: <u>http://pong.tamu.edu/oof\_v2/main/forecast.php</u>

The OOF model is a real-time nowcast/forecasr numerical modeling system run by R. Hetland at TAMU. The model is funded in part by NOAA and Texas GLO.





Figure O1. Sea surface salinity 29 July 2016 from OOF model system. Image courtesy R. Hetland TAMU.



Figure O2. Near bottom dissolved oxygen concentration 29 July 2016 from OOF model system. Image courtesy R. Hetland TAMU.



TABS Buoys locations.



Figure O3. Observations at TABS Buoy V. (West side of sanctuary).



GERG Flower Gardens Buoy N - 27 53.418N 94 02.202W

Figure 04. Observations at TABS Buoy N. East side of sanctuary.

#### RESULTS

The locations, depth and sequence number for the 39 CTD casts are given in the following table. This information is in the accompanying 'ACTUALS' file.

# Flower Garden Banks Rapid Response 2016 (FGBRR16) # R/V Manta # CTD Data # Bottom depth (m) is the bottom of the CTD cast from the pressure sensor # Bottom Depth can be revised from the CTD operator's log # Last Revision of this file 03-Aug-2016 # Matthew Howard mkhoward@tamu.edu # Point of Contact Dr. Steven DiMarco sdimarco@tamu.edu # END Station Date-Time (UTC) Seq Bottom Lat Lon FGRR-11 2016-07-31T11:45:31Z 28.0346 93.9292 001 67.5 FGRR-11a 2016-07-31T14:03:35Z 28.0350 93.9287 002 65.5 93.9296 003 82.0 FGRR-12 2016-07-31T15:11:13Z 27.9667 93.9295 004 FGRR-13 2016-07-31T16:23:48Z 27.9000 105.5 93.9302 005 FGRR-13a 2016-07-31T16:57:17Z 27.9002 106.5 2016-07-31T17:36:59Z 27.9000 93.9295 004 105.5 FGRR-14 FGRR-14a 2016-07-31T18:10:31Z 27.8316 93.9267 007 148.5 2016-07-31T19:03:53Z 27.7654 93.9276 008 FGRR-15 233.5 FGRR-15a 2016-07-31T19:51:59Z 27.7658 93.9280 009 237.5 93.8292 010 FGRR-25 2016-07-31T20:49:03Z 27.7657 230.0 FGRR-25a 2016-07-31T21:16:10Z 27.7640 93.8271 011 232.0 2016-07-31T21:59:27Z 27.7656 93.8299 012 FGRR-25b 233.5 FGRR-24 2016-08-01T00:23:28Z 27.8325 93.8279 013 116.0 FGRR-24a 2016-08-01T01:08:32Z 27.8312 93.8299 014 112.0 93.8335 015 FGRR-24b 2016-08-01T01:47:26Z 27.8331 113.0 FGRR-23 2016-08-01T02:39:37Z 27.8999 93.8280 016 89.0 FGRR-22 2016-08-01T03:36:33Z 27.9682 93.8326 017 92.5 FGRR-21 2016-08-01T04:35:18Z 28.0345 93.8302 018 73.5 FGRR-31 2016-08-01T05:35:31Z 28.0345 93.7313 019 86.5 96.5 FGRR-32 2016-08-01T06:35:44Z 27.9678 93.7290 020 FGRR-33 2016-08-01T07:40:16Z 27.9006 93.7305 021 102.5 FGRR-34 2016-08-01T08:47:01Z 27.8344 93.7319 022 145.0 2016-08-01T09:54:22Z 27.7675 FGRR-35 93.7311 023 207.0 FGRR-45 2016-08-01T10:55:34Z 27.7674 93.6315 024 191.0 2016-08-01T11:46:42Z 27.8338 93.6298 025 126.0 FGRR-44 2016-08-01T12:07:26Z 27.8346 93.6290 026 125.0 FGRR-44a FGRR-43 2016-08-01T12:57:17Z 27.9005 93.6300 027 99.0 2016-08-01T13:20:32Z 27.8997 93.6300 028 98.0 FGRR-43a 93.6300 029 FGRR-43b 2016-08-01T14:46:26Z 27.9001 60.5 FGRR-43BC1 2016-08-01T15:56:58Z 27.9092 93.5998 030 20.0 FGRR-43BC2 2016-08-01T16:48:35Z 27.9102 93.5982 031 20.0 17.5 FGRR-43BC3 2016-08-01T17:37:36Z 27.9072 93.5989 032 FGRR-42 2016-08-01T18:19:54Z 27.9666 93.6306 033 93.0 FGRR-41 2016-08-01T19:09:08Z 28.0327 93.6294 034 88.5 FGRR-51 2016-08-01T20:06:51Z 28.0331 93.5298 035 87.0 FGRR-52 2016-08-01T20:49:55Z 27.9663 93.5317 036 101.5 FGRR-53 2016-08-01T21:38:43Z 27.8996 93.5300 037 140.5 FGRR-54 2016-08-01T22:31:36Z 27.8294 93.5326 038 189.5 FGRR-55 2016-08-01T23:21:07Z 27.7661 93.5228 039 241.5



Table of Niskin water sample collection. See accompanying xls spreadsheet for details.



	3								51.18		16	147		90	x		X	1	
	2								86.63				<u> </u>	89	x	<u> </u>		6-32	
	1								86.63		127	148	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	X	0.02	
36	SB	52	27.57.977	93.51.900	8/1/16	20:51	102	100.9	Surface	6	111/	149	614			×			
	6				-, -,				1 21	-	30	150		96	×			6-21	
	5								25.63		45	151		95	×				
	4								57.68		8	152		94	x	×	x		
	3								76.3		132	153		93	x				
	2								100.9		151	155		92	x		x	G-28	
	1								100.9		142	154				×			
37	SB	53	27.53.989	93.31.802	8/1/16	21:41	146	140.6	Surface	6		155				X			
	6								1.11		131	156		99	X	<u> </u>		G-34	
	5								25.22		147	157			X	i		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	4								49.81		149	158		98	X		X	<u> </u>	
	3								102		137	159			X	<u> </u>			
	2								140.6					i	X	i	X	G-25	<u> </u>
	1								140.6		74	160		97		X		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
38	SB	54	27.49.727	93.32.000	8/1/16	22:35	190	189.6	Surface	6		161				×		<u> </u>	
	6								0.9		327	162		261	х			G-36	
	5								25.22		1	163		262					
	4								57.37		304	164		263	х	х	х		
	3								101.3		180	165		264	х				
	2								189.6					FGB2 265			х	G-35	
	1								189.6		159	166			х	х			
39	SB	55	27.45.943	93.31.384	8/1/16	23:23	244	241.2	Surface	6		167				Х			
	6								1.42		119	168		266				G-20	
	5								25.63		353	169		267					
	4								61.08		21	170		268		X	Х		
	3								126.1		103	171		269					
	2								241.2					220		X		G-23	
	1								241.2		128	172					Х		

Figure R1. Spatial distribution of near-bottom observations of dissolved oxygen concentration (ml/L). Data obtained from Winkler titration of water samples from Niskin bottles. Triangles are planned station locations; red circles are actual station locations. Bathymetry lines are indicated on isopleths.



Figure R2. Spatial distribution of near-bottom observations of density (kg/m3). Data obtained from deepest CTD bin. Triangles are planned station locations; red circles are actual station locations. Bathymetry lines are indicated on isopleths.



Figure R3. Detail of spatial distribution of near-bottom observations of dissolved oxygen concentration (ml/L). Data obtained from Winkler titration of water samples from Niskin bottles. Black dots are actual station locations.



Figure R4. Spatial distribution of near-bottom observations of chlorophyll fluorescence (mg/L). Data obtained from deepest CTD bin. Triangles are planned station locations; red circles are actual station locations. Bathymetry lines are indicated on isopleths.



Figure R5. Spatial distribution of near-bottom observations of turbidity (NTU). Data obtained from deepest CTD bin. Triangles are planned station locations; red circles are actual station locations. Bathymetry lines are indicated on isopleths.





Figure R6. Spatial distribution of near-surface observations of salinity (PSS78). Data obtained from 5-m CTD bin. Triangles are planned station locations; red circles are actual station locations. Bathymetry lines are indicated on isopleths



Figure R7. Profiles of potential temperature from 5x5 grid of CTDs at FGBNMS FG-RR16 cruise. Top to bottom are lines 1 thru 5, left to right are columns 1 thru 5.



Figure R8. Profiles of chlorophyll fluorescence from 5x5 grid of CTDs at FGBNMS FG-RR16 cruise. Top to bottom are lines 1 thru 5, left to right are columns 1 thru 5.



Figure R9. Profiles of practical salinity from 5x5 grid of CTDs at FGBNMS FG-RR16 cruise. Top to bottom are lines 1 thru 5, left to right are columns 1 thru 5.



Figure R10. Profiles of turbidity from 5x5 grid of CTDs at FGBNMS FG-RR16 cruise. Top to bottom are lines 1 thru 5, left to right are columns 1 thru 5.



Figure R11. T-S relationship for all CTD profiles taken on FG-RR16 cruise. Color bar is turbidity data. Dashed lines are isopleths of sigma-theta.



Figure R12. Temperature profiles for all CTD stations on FG-RR16 cruise. Color bar is turbidity data from CTD.



Figure R13. Temperature profiles for all CTD stations on FG-RR16 cruise. Color bar is chlorophyll fluorescence data from CTD.





Figure S2, S3. Time series of temperature and salinity at TABS Buoys N and V during June and July 2016.



# Impressions

- Unfortunately, the SBE-43 oxygen sensor on the CTD did not work during this cruise. However, the T-S relationship shown in Figure S1 shows that the top of the Oxygen Minimum Zone (OMZ) in the Gulf of Mexico is near the 20°C isotherm (~100-150 m depth, Figure R12, see Spencer et al. 2016, JGR-Oceans).
- The spatial distribution of near-surface salinity shows clear differences between the east and west banks (Figure R6). A fresh water mass is clearly present on the east side of the study area.
- The spatial distribution of near-bottom oxygen shows low concentrations on the seaward eastern stations (Figure R1).
- The spatial distribution of near-bottom density shows evidence of upwelling of offshore waters on the eastern side of the study area (Figure R2).
- The profiles of temperature and salinity of the western stations show less stratification than the eastern stations.

Two factors have led to increased stratification on the eastern side of the study region. 1) The presence of a surface freshwater plume, which advected southward from the inner Texas-Louisiana shelf. 2) The upwelling of cool dense water from offshore. The upwelling was manifest as shoreward movement of the cooler benthic waters into the FGBNMS. There is no apparent surface expression of this water in the CTD data. The stratification of the eastern water column would have inhibited the ventilation of the sub-pycnocline waters and contributed to the observation of depleted near-bottom oxygen concentration on the east side.

Because the upwelled waters are consistent (density/depth/temperature) with waters at the top of the OMZ, the waters were presumably already somewhat oxygen depleted, local respiration of organic material would presumably lead to further oxygen depletion. This point is admittedly speculative and needs further refinement based on analysis results from phytoplankton, inorganic, and microbial water samples.

The surface salinity and temperature observations from TABS buoys N and V (Figures S2, S3) show the surface waters were significantly fresh (S < 35) for nearly 8 weeks. Comparison to previous years indicates the persistence and magnitude of the freshwater plume is unusual for this offshore location. The surface temperature time series shows temperatures exceeded 30°C since mid-June. At times, temperature approached 32°C. Future analysis will include surface velocity observations from the TABS buoys.

Stable isotopes of oxygen will be run on surface samples to determine whether the freshwater is from Texas or Louisiana terrestrial/river sources (DiMarco et al 2012, Aquatic-Geochemistry).

My impression of these data is that it is unlikely that a benthic hypoxic water mass advected southward from the inner shelf. The densities of the waters affected are of deepwater origin (not from lighter inshore water) and reflect the presence of the vertical process of oxygen depletion rather than a horizontal advective process (Hetland and DiMarco 2008, JMS). Nutrient analysis is pending and will help clarify this point.

There are many questions that remain to be addressed; however the investigation of upwelling dynamics on the northern slope/shelf should be investigated. We are actively analyzing the TAMU coupled physical-biogeochemical numerical model (PI's: R. Hetland, TAMU and K. Fennel, Dalhousie) for indications of the upwelling mechanism.

A glider is currently deployed in the vicinity of the FGBNMS to help monitor water quality conditions in and around the sanctuary perimeter.