

**From:** Nicholas Deutscher <nicholas.deutscher@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** **Re: CO from Darwin, Wolongong and Lauder**  
**Date:** November 26, 2010 9:08:44 AM MST  
**To:** "David P. Edwards" <edwards@ucar.edu>  
**Cc:** Clare Murphy <clarem@uow.edu.au>, Nicholas Jones <njones@uow.edu.au>, Rebecca Buchholz <rb864@uowmail.edu.au>, David Griffith <griffith@uow.edu.au>

---

Hi David,

Regarding the extremely high CO columns - I had a quick look, particularly at 3 days mid Nov 2005. I'd definitely throw those ones out - there is a whole bunch of rubbish there that has somehow managed to slip through. I'll take more of a look later to check everything else is okay.

Cheers,  
Nick

On 25/11/2010 10:47 PM, David P. Edwards wrote:

Hi all,

Here is an updated commentary with the plots for Darwin from the new data that Nick just sent me (thanks!). Agreement looks really good.

Please send any more ideas or thoughts on the differences. Rebecca, glad you can help out, that's great. I'll be working up a draft of the manuscript for everyone to look at before Christmas (I hope).

Cheers and happy Thanksgiving

David

---

On Nov 22, 2010, at 8:38 PM, Clare Murphy wrote:

Hi David,

Thanks for the email.

I have discussed this in detail this morning with a very resourceful student (namely Rebecca Bucholz) and we have started the hunt for plausible explanations for points where MOPITT and FTIR disagree. The very last high FTIR point in the time-series is the result of high CO on one day when we believe there may have been grass fires burning in Dapto to the south. These would be both local and low altitude plumes.

Rebecca will continue the hunt (as I am away for 2 weeks now), using our log data and some back-trajectory analysis to try to shed some light on differences.

A number of other points:

1. The significantly larger shaded envelop for the std dev. of weekly data in the FTIR data supports the idea of a variable local source – maybe Port Kembla, Wollongong itself or Sydney as you suggest.