

From: Nigel Keeley
Sent: 7 Apr 2014 14:26:36 +1200
To: Steve Urlich-8309
Subject: RE: Otanerau monitoring report #2465

Hi Steve,

My apologies, we probably should have picked up on that detail in the results. From memory, that infauna single sample was poorly preserved for some reason and could not be enumerated properly by the taxonomists, so was discounted. So the score for that replicate was based only on the information from the organic content and the sediment chemistry – the table in the back of the report shows all of the data.

I made the pragmatic decision to not go back to resample because of the costs and delays involved weighed up against the importance of the single sample - it was an additional 3rd Pen site (one more than normal), we still had the standard two fully sampled Pen sites, and the third had two full sets of replicate variables with only the infauna missing from the third set. It would cost about \$8K to go back and get this single sample and then the taxonomic results (and reports) would also be delayed accordingly. The value indicated by the redox and sulphides was also fairly consistent with the overall value – you will note that the infauna in replicate A indicated a nearly azoic infauna.

I know it's not ideal, but the logistics of this are fairly involved and we have to get close to 200 full sets of replicates within a relatively short timeframe and on a fairly tight budget.

Regards
Nigel

From: Steve Urlich-8309 [mailto:Steve.Urlich@marlborough.govt.nz]
Sent: Monday, 7 April 2014 1:28 p.m.
To: Nigel Keeley
Cc: 'Mark Gillard (Mark.Gillard@kingsalmon.co.nz)'
Subject: RE: Otanerau monitoring report #2465

Hi Nigel

It appears from Appendix 3 that the ES score for this replicate (C) has been calculated without the infauna score. The replicate had 28% AFDW; redox $-38 E_{h_{NHE}}$ mV; and sulphides ($\sim 7400 \mu M$) possibly indicating that this sampling site was extremely enriched to the point of being azoic.

I am about to send material off the Kenny Black for review, could you please let me know what the data showed.

Regards
Steve

From: Steve Urlich-8309

Sent: Wednesday, 2 April 2014 2:32 p.m.
To: nigel.keeley@cawthron.org.nz
Cc: Mark Gillard (Mark.Gillard@kingsalmon.co.nz)
Subject: TRIM: Otanerau monitoring report #2465

Hi Nigel

There appears to be a value missing in Appendix 3 of the report. In the section shaded yellow, under Pen 3- the third replicate under Macrofauna is blank. Could you please provide the ES score for that. I think it might be the core where there were only a handful of *C. capitata*.

Regards
Steve

Steve Ulrich Ph.D

Environmental Scientist | **Marlborough District Council**
15 Seymour Street | PO Box 443 | Blenheim 7240 | New Zealand
P: 03 520 7400 | M: 027 837 7644 | www.marlborough.govt.nz

This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may contain legally privileged material and is only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient then any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately and delete the original message. This email does not necessarily represent the views of the Marlborough District Council. Thank you.

Attention:

This message is for the named person's use only. It may contain confidential, proprietary or legally privileged information. If you receive this message in error, please immediately delete it and all copies of it from your system, destroy any hard copies of it and notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, distribute, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient. Cawthron reserves the right to monitor all e-mail communications through its networks. Any opinions expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the message states otherwise and the sender is authorised to make that statement.

This e-mail message has been scanned and cleared by **MailMarshal**
