

Summary of Test Statistics with One-tailed T-test Adjustment

Test	Endpoint	Treatment	Comparison	Probability Normal	Probability Homogeneous	Test Type	Test Probability	Significant?	One-Tail Comparison
Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	Control	0.873	0.072	T-test Unequal Var	0.001	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	Control	0.555	0.058	T-test Unequal Var	0.000	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	Control	0.726	0.014	T-test Unequal Var	0.000	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	Control	0.109	0.004	T-test Unequal Var	0.000	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Lower Comp 100%	Control	0.878	0.077	T-test Unequal Var	0.463		Treatment >= Comparison
Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	Control	0.000	0.029	Rankit Unequal Var	0.813		Treatment >= Comparison
Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	Control	0.000	0.029	Rankit Unequal Var	0.813		Treatment >= Comparison
Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	Control	0.000	0.029	Rankit Unequal Var	0.813		Treatment >= Comparison
Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	Control	0.000	1.000	Rankit Equal Var	0.500		Treatment >= Comparison
Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	Control	0.000	0.029	Rankit Unequal Var	0.813		Treatment >= Comparison
Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	Control	0.000	1.000	Rankit Equal Var	0.500		Treatment >= Comparison
Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	Control	0.000	1.000	Rankit Equal Var	0.500		Treatment >= Comparison
Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	Control	0.000	0.029	Rankit Unequal Var	0.813		Treatment >= Comparison
Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	Control	0.000	0.029	Rankit Unequal Var	0.813		Treatment >= Comparison
Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	Control	0.000	0.029	Rankit Unequal Var	0.813		Treatment >= Comparison

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 Results of Test of Normality

Obs	Test	Endpoint	Treatment	compare	normal	prob_ normal
1	Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	Control	0.96816	0.87328
2	Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	Control	0.94021	0.55534
3	Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	Control	0.95483	0.72567
4	Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	Control	0.87329	0.10916
5	Larval Water Column	Percent Normal Survival	Lower Comp 100%	Control	0.96866	0.87813
6	Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	Control	0.62470	0.00011
7	Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	Control	0.62470	0.00011
8	Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	Control	0.62470	0.00011
9	Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	Control	0.50927	0.00000
10	Menidia Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	Control	0.62470	0.00011
11	Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	Control	0.50927	0.00000
12	Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	Control	0.50927	0.00000
13	Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	Control	0.62470	0.00011
14	Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	Control	0.62470	0.00011
15	Mysid Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	Control	0.62470	0.00011

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
Results of Levene's Test for Equal Variance

O e b s s t	T	E n d p o i n t	E	n	d	p	o	i	n	t	T r e a t m e n t	N A M E	S O U R C E	T Y P E	D F	S S	F	P R O B
1	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	1	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.030196	.	.	
2	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	1	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.016181	4.2871	0.07217	
3	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	1	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.016181	4.2871	0.07217	
4	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	2	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.028936	.	.	
5	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	2	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.017718	4.8986	0.05778	
6	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	2	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.017718	4.8986	0.05778	
7	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	4a	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.023058	.	.	
8	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	4a	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.027836	9.6574	0.01450	
9	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	4a	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.027836	9.6574	0.01450	
10	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	4b	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.021406	.	.	
11	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	4b	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.042284	15.8030	0.00409	
12	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Area	4b	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.042284	15.8030	0.00409	
13	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Lower	Comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.026404	.	.		
14	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Lower	Comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.013631	4.1300	0.07659		
15	Larval	Water	Column	Percent	Normal	Survival	Lower	Comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.013631	4.1300	0.07659		
16	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	1	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.029815	.	.		
17	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	1	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.026502	7.1111	0.02851		
18	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	1	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.026502	7.1111	0.02851		
19	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	2	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.029815	.	.		
20	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	2	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.026502	7.1111	0.02851		
21	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	2	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.026502	7.1111	0.02851		
22	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	4a	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.029815	.	.		
23	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	4a	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.026502	7.1111	0.02851		
24	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	4a	comp	100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.026502	7.1111	0.02851		
25	Menidia	Water	Column	Percent	Survival	Area	4b	comp	100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.059629	.	.		

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 Results of Levene's Test for Equal Variance

T O e b s s t	E n d p o i n t	T r e a t m e n t	N A M E	S O U R C E	T Y P E	D F	S S	F	P R O B		
										absdelta	group
26	Menidia	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.000000	0.000000	1.00000
27	Menidia	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.000000	0.000000	1.00000
28	Menidia	Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.029815	.	.
29	Menidia	Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851
30	Menidia	Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851
31	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.059629	.	.
32	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.000000	0.000000	1.00000
33	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 1 comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.000000	0.000000	1.00000
34	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.059629	.	.
35	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.000000	0.000000	1.00000
36	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 2 comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.000000	0.000000	1.00000
37	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.029815	.	.
38	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851
39	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4a comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851
40	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.029815	.	.
41	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851
42	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Area 4b comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851
43	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	absdelta	ERROR	ERROR	8	0.029815	.	.
44	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS1	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851
45	Mysid	Water Column	Percent Survival	Lower Comp 100%	absdelta	group	SS3	1	0.026502	7.111111	0.02851

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Larval Water Column Endpoint=Percent Normal Survival Treatment=Area 1 comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2840	0.1628	0.0728	1.0803	1.4566
Test	5	0.8776	0.0726	0.0325	0.7580	0.9461
Diff (1-2)		0.4064	0.1260	0.0797		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		1.2840	1.0819 1.4861	0.1628	0.0975 0.4677
Test		0.8776	0.7875 0.9678	0.0726	0.0435 0.2087
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.4064	0.2226 0.5902	0.1260	0.0851 0.2414
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.4064	0.2073 0.6055		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	5.10	0.0009
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.5315	5.10	0.0028

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	5.02	0.1470

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Larval Water Column Endpoint=Percent Normal Survival Treatment=Area 2 comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2840	0.1628	0.0728	1.0803	1.4566
Test	5	0.6511	0.0672	0.0300	0.5913	0.7658
Diff (1-2)		0.6329	0.1245	0.0787		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean		Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev	
Control		1.2840	1.0819	1.4861	0.1628	0.0975	0.4677
Test		0.6511	0.5677	0.7346	0.0672	0.0402	0.1930
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.6329	0.4513	0.8145	0.1245	0.0841	0.2385
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.6329	0.4341	0.8317			

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	8.04	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.3241	8.04	0.0004

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	5.87	0.1147

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Larval Water Column Endpoint=Percent Normal Survival Treatment=Area 4a comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2840	0.1628	0.0728	1.0803	1.4566
Test	5	0.3981	0.0341	0.0153	0.3499	0.4417
Diff (1-2)		0.8860	0.1176	0.0744		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean		Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev	
Control		1.2840	1.0819	1.4861	0.1628	0.0975	0.4677
Test		0.3981	0.3557	0.4405	0.0341	0.0205	0.0981
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.8860	0.7145	1.0575	0.1176	0.0794	0.2253
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.8860	0.6859	1.0861			

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	11.91	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.3513	11.91	0.0002

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	22.73	0.0104

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Larval Water Column Endpoint=Percent Normal Survival Treatment=Area 4b comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2840	0.1628	0.0728	1.0803	1.4566
Test	5	0	0	0	0	0
Diff (1-2)		1.2840	0.1151	0.0728		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		1.2840	1.0819 1.4861	0.1628	0.0975 0.4677
Test		0	0 0	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	1.2840	1.1162 1.4519	0.1151	0.0777 0.2205
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	1.2840	1.0819 1.4861		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	17.64	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	17.64	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Larval Water Column Endpoint=Percent Normal Survival Treatment=Lower Comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2840	0.1628	0.0728	1.0803	1.4566
Test	5	1.2762	0.0721	0.0322	1.1784	1.3585
Diff (1-2)		0.00780	0.1259	0.0796		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		1.2840	1.0819 1.4861	0.1628	0.0975 0.4677
Test		1.2762	1.1867 1.3658	0.0721	0.0432 0.2072
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.00780	-0.1758 0.1914	0.1259	0.0850 0.2412
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.00780	-0.1913 0.2069		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.10	0.9243
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.5118	0.10	0.9254

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	5.10	0.1438

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Menidia Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 1 comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-0.1718	0.7685	0.3437	-1.5466	0.1718
Test	5	0.1718	0	0	0.1718	0.1718
Diff (1-2)		-0.3437	0.5434	0.3437		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-0.1718	-1.1261 0.7824	0.7685	0.4605 2.2084
Test		0.1718	0.1718 0.1718	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3437	-1.1363 0.4489	0.5434	0.3671 1.0411
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3437	-1.2980 0.6106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Menidia Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 2 comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-0.1718	0.7685	0.3437	-1.5466	0.1718
Test	5	0.1718	0	0	0.1718	0.1718
Diff (1-2)		-0.3437	0.5434	0.3437		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-0.1718	-1.1261 0.7824	0.7685	0.4605 2.2084
Test		0.1718	0.1718 0.1718	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3437	-1.1363 0.4489	0.5434	0.3671 1.0411
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3437	-1.2980 0.6106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Menidia Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 4a comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-0.1718	0.7685	0.3437	-1.5466	0.1718
Test	5	0.1718	0	0	0.1718	0.1718
Diff (1-2)		-0.3437	0.5434	0.3437		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-0.1718	-1.1261 0.7824	0.7685	0.4605 2.2084
Test		0.1718	0.1718 0.1718	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3437	-1.1363 0.4489	0.5434	0.3671 1.0411
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3437	-1.2980 0.6106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Menidia Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 4b comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-333E-19	0.7119	0.3184	-1.2736	0.3184
Test	5	-333E-19	0.7119	0.3184	-1.2736	0.3184
Diff (1-2)		0	0.7119	0.4503		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-333E-19	-0.8840 0.8840	0.7119	0.4265 2.0458
Test		-333E-19	-0.8840 0.8840	0.7119	0.4265 2.0458
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0	-1.0383 1.0383	0.7119	0.4809 1.3639
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0	-1.0383 1.0383		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.00	1.0000
Satterthwaite	Unequal	8	0.00	1.0000

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.00	1.0000

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Menidia Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Lower Comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-0.1718	0.7685	0.3437	-1.5466	0.1718
Test	5	0.1718	0	0	0.1718	0.1718
Diff (1-2)		-0.3437	0.5434	0.3437		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-0.1718	-1.1261 0.7824	0.7685	0.4605 2.2084
Test		0.1718	0.1718 0.1718	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3437	-1.1363 0.4489	0.5434	0.3671 1.0411
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3437	-1.2980 0.6106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Mysid Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 1 comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-333E-19	0.7119	0.3184	-1.2736	0.3184
Test	5	-333E-19	0.7119	0.3184	-1.2736	0.3184
Diff (1-2)		0	0.7119	0.4503		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-333E-19	-0.8840 0.8840	0.7119	0.4265 2.0458
Test		-333E-19	-0.8840 0.8840	0.7119	0.4265 2.0458
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0	-1.0383 1.0383	0.7119	0.4809 1.3639
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0	-1.0383 1.0383		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.00	1.0000
Satterthwaite	Unequal	8	0.00	1.0000

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.00	1.0000

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Mysid Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 2 comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-333E-19	0.7119	0.3184	-1.2736	0.3184
Test	5	-333E-19	0.7119	0.3184	-1.2736	0.3184
Diff (1-2)		0	0.7119	0.4503		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-333E-19	-0.8840 0.8840	0.7119	0.4265 2.0458
Test		-333E-19	-0.8840 0.8840	0.7119	0.4265 2.0458
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0	-1.0383 1.0383	0.7119	0.4809 1.3639
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0	-1.0383 1.0383		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.00	1.0000
Satterthwaite	Unequal	8	0.00	1.0000

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.00	1.0000

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Mysid Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 4a comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-0.1718	0.7685	0.3437	-1.5466	0.1718
Test	5	0.1718	0	0	0.1718	0.1718
Diff (1-2)		-0.3437	0.5434	0.3437		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-0.1718	-1.1261 0.7824	0.7685	0.4605 2.2084
Test		0.1718	0.1718 0.1718	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3437	-1.1363 0.4489	0.5434	0.3671 1.0411
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3437	-1.2980 0.6106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
 T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Mysid Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area 4b comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-0.1718	0.7685	0.3437	-1.5466	0.1718
Test	5	0.1718	0	0	0.1718	0.1718
Diff (1-2)		-0.3437	0.5434	0.3437		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-0.1718	-1.1261 0.7824	0.7685	0.4605 2.2084
Test		0.1718	0.1718 0.1718	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3437	-1.1363 0.4489	0.5434	0.3671 1.0411
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3437	-1.2980 0.6106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Juneau Douglas Harbor Statistical Comparison
T-test Results on Rankits, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Mysid Water Column Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Lower Comp 100% -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rankit (Rank for Variable Result)

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	-0.1718	0.7685	0.3437	-1.5466	0.1718
Test	5	0.1718	0	0	0.1718	0.1718
Diff (1-2)		-0.3437	0.5434	0.3437		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		-0.1718	-1.1261 0.7824	0.7685	0.4605 2.2084
Test		0.1718	0.1718 0.1718	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3437	-1.1363 0.4489	0.5434	0.3671 1.0411
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3437	-1.2980 0.6106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
Means and Standard Errors

----- Test=Neanthes -----

Treatment	No. Reps	Mean Survival	SE Survival	Standard Deviation	CV
AREA1	5	0.96	0.040000	0.08944	9.3169
AREA2	5	0.88	0.080000	0.17889	20.3279
AREA4A	5	0.92	0.048990	0.10954	11.9070
AREA4B	5	1.00	0.000000	0.00000	0.0000
LOWERCOMP	5	0.84	0.074833	0.16733	19.9205
REFCOMP	5	0.96	0.040000	0.08944	9.3169

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Test=Neanthes -----

Obs	S-W Arcsine W	Prob <W for Arcsine
1	0.91564	0.020703

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Arcsine Transformed Survival

Obs	Test	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Neanthes	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	24	0.22084	.	.
2	Neanthes	absasrv	Treatment	SS1	5	0.25651	5.57516	.001514085
3	Neanthes	absasrv	Treatment	SS3	5	0.25651	5.57516	.001514085

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neanthes -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Treatment	6	AREA1 AREA2 AREA4A AREA4B LOWERCOMP REFCOMP
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
 ANOVA and Comparison of Means
 Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neanthes -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: arcsurv

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.33149818	0.06629964	1.14	0.3687
Error	24	1.40103422	0.05837643		
Corrected Total	29	1.73253239			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	arcsurv Mean
0.191337	17.05140	0.241612	1.416964

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	5	0.33149818	0.06629964	1.14	0.3687

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	5	0.33149818	0.06629964	1.14	0.3687

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neanthes -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.058376
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.2614

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits	
AREA4B - AREA1	0.0927	-0.1687 0.3542	
AREA4B - REFCOMP	0.0927	-0.1687 0.3542	
AREA4B - AREA4A	0.1855	-0.0760 0.4469	
AREA4B - AREA2	0.2297	-0.0318 0.4911	
AREA4B - LOWERCOMP	0.3224	0.0610 0.5838	***
AREA1 - AREA4B	-0.0927	-0.3542 0.1687	
AREA1 - REFCOMP	0.0000	-0.2614 0.2614	
AREA1 - AREA4A	0.0927	-0.1687 0.3542	
AREA1 - AREA2	0.1369	-0.1245 0.3984	
AREA1 - LOWERCOMP	0.2297	-0.0318 0.4911	
REFCOMP - AREA4B	-0.0927	-0.3542 0.1687	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neanthes -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits	
REFCOMP - AREA1	0.0000	-0.2614 0.2614	
REFCOMP - AREA4A	0.0927	-0.1687 0.3542	
REFCOMP - AREA2	0.1369	-0.1245 0.3984	
REFCOMP - LOWERCOMP	0.2297	-0.0318 0.4911	
AREA4A - AREA4B	-0.1855	-0.4469 0.0760	
AREA4A - AREA1	-0.0927	-0.3542 0.1687	
AREA4A - REFCOMP	-0.0927	-0.3542 0.1687	
AREA4A - AREA2	0.0442	-0.2172 0.3057	
AREA4A - LOWERCOMP	0.1369	-0.1245 0.3984	
AREA2 - AREA4B	-0.2297	-0.4911 0.0318	
AREA2 - AREA1	-0.1369	-0.3984 0.1245	
AREA2 - REFCOMP	-0.1369	-0.3984 0.1245	
AREA2 - AREA4A	-0.0442	-0.3057 0.2172	
AREA2 - LOWERCOMP	0.0927	-0.1687 0.3542	
LOWERCOMP - AREA4B	-0.3224	-0.5838 -0.0610	***
LOWERCOMP - AREA1	-0.2297	-0.4911 0.0318	
LOWERCOMP - REFCOMP	-0.2297	-0.4911 0.0318	
LOWERCOMP - AREA4A	-0.1369	-0.3984 0.1245	
LOWERCOMP - AREA2	-0.0927	-0.3542 0.1687	

Test	Endpoint	Treatment	Compare	Test Type	Test Probability	Significant?
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA1	REF-Comp	Unequal	0.5	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA2	REF-Comp	Unequal	0.226	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA4A	REF-Comp	Unequal	0.273	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA4B	REF-Comp	Unequal	0.813	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	LOWERCO	REF-Comp	Unequal	0.104	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA1	REF-X	Unequal	0.727	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA2	REF-X	Unequal	0.408	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA4A	REF-X	Unequal	0.500	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	AREA4B	REF-X	Unequal	0.911	
Neanthes	SURVIVAL	LOWERCO	REF-X	Unequal	0.233	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neanthes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREAL -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.4781	0.2073	0.0927	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.4781	0.2073	0.0927	1.1071	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0	0.2073	0.1311		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.4781	1.2206 1.7355	0.2073	0.1242 0.5958
Treatment		1.4781	1.2206 1.7355	0.2073	0.1242 0.5958
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0	-0.3024 0.3024	0.2073	0.1401 0.3972
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0	-0.3024 0.3024		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.00	1.0000
Satterthwaite	Unequal	8	0.00	1.0000

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.00	1.0000

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neantes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREA2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.4781	0.2073	0.0927	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.3411	0.3241	0.1449	0.8861	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.1369	0.2720	0.1721		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.4781	1.2206 1.7355	0.2073	0.1242 0.5958
Treatment		1.3411	0.9387 1.7435	0.3241	0.1942 0.9312
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.1369	-0.2598 0.5337	0.2720	0.1837 0.5212
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.1369	-0.2723 0.5462		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.80	0.4490
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.8051	0.80	0.4529

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.44	0.4082

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neanthes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREA4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.4781	0.2073	0.0927	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.3853	0.2540	0.1136	1.1071	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0927	0.2318	0.1466		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.4781	1.2206 1.7355	0.2073	0.1242 0.5958
Treatment		1.3853	1.0700 1.7007	0.2540	0.1522 0.7297
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0927	-0.2454 0.4308	0.2318	0.1566 0.4441
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0927	-0.2477 0.4332		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.63	0.5447
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.6923	0.63	0.5454

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.50	0.7040

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neanthes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREA4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.4781	0.2073	0.0927	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.5708	0	0	1.5708	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0927	0.1466	0.0927		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.4781	1.2206 1.7355	0.2073	0.1242 0.5958
Treatment		1.5708	1.5708 1.5708	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0927	-0.3066 0.1211	0.1466	0.0990 0.2809
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0927	-0.3502 0.1647		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.00	0.3466
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.00	0.3739

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neantes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=LOWERCOMP -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.4781	0.2073	0.0927	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.2484	0.3078	0.1377	0.8861	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.2297	0.2624	0.1660		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.4781	1.2206 1.7355	0.2073	0.1242 0.5958
Treatment		1.2484	0.8662 1.6306	0.3078	0.1844 0.8846
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.2297	-0.1531 0.6124	0.2624	0.1773 0.5028
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.2297	-0.1627 0.6221		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	1.38	0.2038
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.01	1.38	0.2089

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.20	0.4628

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
Means and Standard Errors

----- Test=Neanthes -----

Treatment	No. Reps	Mean Survival	SE Survival	Standard Deviation	CV
AREA1	5	0.96	0.040000	0.08944	9.3169
AREA2	5	0.88	0.080000	0.17889	20.3279
AREA4A	5	0.92	0.048990	0.10954	11.9070
AREA4B	5	1.00	0.000000	0.00000	0.0000
LOWERCMP	5	0.84	0.074833	0.16733	19.9205
REFX	5	0.92	0.048990	0.10954	11.9070

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Test=Neantes -----

Obs	S-W Arcsine W	Prob <W for Arcsine
1	0.91627	0.021486

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Arcsine Transformed Survival

Obs	Test	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Neanthes	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	24	0.16925	.	.
2	Neanthes	absasrv	Treatment	SS1	5	0.25933	7.35475	.000264481
3	Neanthes	absasrv	Treatment	SS3	5	0.25933	7.35475	.000264481

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neanthes -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Treatment	6	AREA1 AREA2 AREA4A AREA4B LOWERCOMP REFX
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neantes -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: arcsurv

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.31066596	0.06213319	1.00	0.4374
Error	24	1.48702186	0.06195924		
Corrected Total	29	1.79768782			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	arcsurv Mean
0.172814	17.76058	0.248916	1.401509

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	5	0.31066596	0.06213319	1.00	0.4374

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	5	0.31066596	0.06213319	1.00	0.4374

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neanthes -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.061959
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.2693

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits	
AREA4B - AREA1	0.0927	-0.1766 0.3621	
AREA4B - AREA4A	0.1855	-0.0839 0.4548	
AREA4B - REF	0.1855	-0.0839 0.4548	
AREA4B - AREA2	0.2297	-0.0397 0.4990	
AREA4B - LOWERCOMP	0.3224	0.0531 0.5917	***
AREA1 - AREA4B	-0.0927	-0.3621 0.1766	
AREA1 - AREA4A	0.0927	-0.1766 0.3621	
AREA1 - REF	0.0927	-0.1766 0.3621	
AREA1 - AREA2	0.1369	-0.1324 0.4063	
AREA1 - LOWERCOMP	0.2297	-0.0397 0.4990	
AREA4A - AREA4B	-0.1855	-0.4548 0.0839	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Neanthes -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits	
AREA4A - AREA1	-0.0927	-0.3621 0.1766	
AREA4A - REFX	0.0000	-0.2693 0.2693	
AREA4A - AREA2	0.0442	-0.2251 0.3136	
AREA4A - LOWERCOMP	0.1369	-0.1324 0.4063	
REFX - AREA4B	-0.1855	-0.4548 0.0839	
REFX - AREA1	-0.0927	-0.3621 0.1766	
REFX - AREA4A	0.0000	-0.2693 0.2693	
REFX - AREA2	0.0442	-0.2251 0.3136	
REFX - LOWERCOMP	0.1369	-0.1324 0.4063	
AREA2 - AREA4B	-0.2297	-0.4990 0.0397	
AREA2 - AREA1	-0.1369	-0.4063 0.1324	
AREA2 - AREA4A	-0.0442	-0.3136 0.2251	
AREA2 - REFX	-0.0442	-0.3136 0.2251	
AREA2 - LOWERCOMP	0.0927	-0.1766 0.3621	
LOWERCOMP - AREA4B	-0.3224	-0.5917 -0.0531	***
LOWERCOMP - AREA1	-0.2297	-0.4990 0.0397	
LOWERCOMP - AREA4A	-0.1369	-0.4063 0.1324	
LOWERCOMP - REFX	-0.1369	-0.4063 0.1324	
LOWERCOMP - AREA2	-0.0927	-0.3621 0.1766	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neantes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREAL -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.3853	0.2540	0.1136	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.4781	0.2073	0.0927	1.1071	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0927	0.2318	0.1466		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.3853	1.0700 1.7007	0.2540	0.1522 0.7297
Treatment		1.4781	1.2206 1.7355	0.2073	0.1242 0.5958
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0927	-0.4308 0.2454	0.2318	0.1566 0.4441
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0927	-0.4332 0.2477		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.63	0.5447
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.6923	-0.63	0.5454

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.50	0.7040

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neantes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREA2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.3853	0.2540	0.1136	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.3411	0.3241	0.1449	0.8861	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0442	0.2911	0.1841		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.3853	1.0700 1.7007	0.2540	0.1522 0.7297
Treatment		1.3411	0.9387 1.7435	0.3241	0.1942 0.9312
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0442	-0.3804 0.4688	0.2911	0.1966 0.5577
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0442	-0.3846 0.4731		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.24	0.8163
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.5675	0.24	0.8166

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.63	0.6482

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neantes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREA4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.3853	0.2540	0.1136	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.3853	0.2540	0.1136	1.1071	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0	0.2540	0.1606		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.3853	1.0700 1.7007	0.2540	0.1522 0.7297
Treatment		1.3853	1.0700 1.7007	0.2540	0.1522 0.7297
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0	-0.3704 0.3704	0.2540	0.1715 0.4865
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0	-0.3704 0.3704		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.00	1.0000
Satterthwaite	Unequal	8	0.00	1.0000

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.00	1.0000

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neantes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=AREA4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.3853	0.2540	0.1136	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.5708	0	0	1.5708	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.1855	0.1796	0.1136		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.3853	1.0700 1.7007	0.2540	0.1522 0.7297
Treatment		1.5708	1.5708 1.5708	0	. .
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.1855	-0.4474 0.0764	0.1796	0.1213 0.3440
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.1855	-0.5008 0.1299		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.63	0.1411
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4	-1.63	0.1778

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	Infty	<.0001

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Test=Neantes Endpoint=SURVIVAL Treatment=LOWERCOMP -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: arcsurv

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Reference	5	1.3853	0.2540	0.1136	1.1071	1.5708
Treatment	5	1.2484	0.3078	0.1377	0.8861	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.1369	0.2822	0.1785		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Reference		1.3853	1.0700 1.7007	0.2540	0.1522 0.7297
Treatment		1.2484	0.8662 1.6306	0.3078	0.1844 0.8846
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.1369	-0.2746 0.5485	0.2822	0.1906 0.5406
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.1369	-0.2772 0.5511		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.77	0.4649
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.721	0.77	0.4657

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.47	0.7183

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
Means and Standard Errors

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Treatment	No. Reps	Mean Survival	SE Survival	Standard Deviation	CV
AREA1	5	0.92	0.030000	0.06708	7.2915
AREA2	5	0.92	0.025495	0.05701	6.1966
AREA4A	5	0.90	0.044721	0.10000	11.1111
AREA4B	5	0.87	0.025495	0.05701	6.5527
AREA4BACC	5	0.94	0.029155	0.06519	6.9353
LOWERACC	5	0.94	0.024495	0.05477	5.8268
LOWERCOMP	5	0.76	0.050990	0.11402	15.0023
REFCOMP	5	0.93	0.012247	0.02739	2.9447

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Obs	S-W Arcsine W	Prob <W for Arcsine
1	0.93510	0.023698

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Arcsine Transformed Survival

Obs	Test	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Ampelisca	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	32	0.19028	.	.
2	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS1	7	0.05409	1.29947	0.28230
3	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS3	7	0.05409	1.29947	0.28230

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Treatment	8	AREA1 AREA2 AREA4A AREA4B AREA4BACC LOWERACC LOWERCOMP REFCOMP
		Number of Observations Read 40
		Number of Observations Used 40

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: arcsurv

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	7	0.35647644	0.05092521	2.14	0.0679
Error	32	0.76274167	0.02383568		
Corrected Total	39	1.11921811			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	arcsurv Mean
0.318505	12.00893	0.154388	1.285610

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.35647644	0.05092521	2.14	0.0679

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.35647644	0.05092521	2.14	0.0679

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	32
Error Mean Square	0.023836
Critical Value of t	1.69389
Least Significant Difference	0.1654

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits		
AREA4BACC - LOWERACC	0.00406	-0.16134	0.16946	
AREA4BACC - AREA1	0.06029	-0.10510	0.22569	
AREA4BACC - AREA2	0.06435	-0.10105	0.22975	
AREA4BACC - REFCOMP	0.07502	-0.09038	0.24041	
AREA4BACC - AREA4A	0.08547	-0.07993	0.25087	
AREA4BACC - AREA4B	0.17227	0.00687	0.33767	***
AREA4BACC - LOWERCOMP	0.30809	0.14269	0.47349	***
LOWERACC - AREA4BACC	-0.00406	-0.16946	0.16134	
LOWERACC - AREA1	0.05623	-0.10916	0.22163	
LOWERACC - AREA2	0.06029	-0.10510	0.22569	
LOWERACC - REFCOMP	0.07096	-0.09444	0.23636	
LOWERACC - AREA4A	0.08141	-0.08398	0.24681	
LOWERACC - AREA4B	0.16821	0.00281	0.33361	***
LOWERACC - LOWERCOMP	0.30403	0.13863	0.46943	***
AREA1 - AREA4BACC	-0.06029	-0.22569	0.10510	
AREA1 - LOWERACC	-0.05623	-0.22163	0.10916	
AREA1 - AREA2	0.00406	-0.16134	0.16946	
AREA1 - REFCOMP	0.01472	-0.15067	0.18012	
AREA1 - AREA4A	0.02518	-0.14022	0.19058	
AREA1 - AREA4B	0.11198	-0.05342	0.27737	
AREA1 - LOWERCOMP	0.24780	0.08240	0.41319	***
AREA2 - AREA4BACC	-0.06435	-0.22975	0.10105	
AREA2 - LOWERACC	-0.06029	-0.22569	0.10510	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits		
AREA2 - AREA1	-0.00406	-0.16946	0.16134	
AREA2 - REFCOMP	0.01067	-0.15473	0.17606	
AREA2 - AREA4A	0.02112	-0.14428	0.18652	
AREA2 - AREA4B	0.10792	-0.05748	0.27332	
AREA2 - LOWERCOMP	0.24374	0.07834	0.40914	***
REFCOMP - AREA4BACC	-0.07502	-0.24041	0.09038	
REFCOMP - LOWERACC	-0.07096	-0.23636	0.09444	
REFCOMP - AREA1	-0.01472	-0.18012	0.15067	
REFCOMP - AREA2	-0.01067	-0.17606	0.15473	
REFCOMP - AREA4A	0.01046	-0.15494	0.17585	
REFCOMP - AREA4B	0.09725	-0.06814	0.26265	
REFCOMP - LOWERCOMP	0.23307	0.06767	0.39847	***
AREA4A - AREA4BACC	-0.08547	-0.25087	0.07993	
AREA4A - LOWERACC	-0.08141	-0.24681	0.08398	
AREA4A - AREA1	-0.02518	-0.19058	0.14022	
AREA4A - AREA2	-0.02112	-0.18652	0.14428	
AREA4A - REFCOMP	-0.01046	-0.17585	0.15494	
AREA4A - AREA4B	0.08680	-0.07860	0.25219	
AREA4A - LOWERCOMP	0.22262	0.05722	0.38801	***
AREA4B - AREA4BACC	-0.17227	-0.33767	-0.00687	***
AREA4B - LOWERACC	-0.16821	-0.33361	-0.00281	***
AREA4B - AREA1	-0.11198	-0.27737	0.05342	
AREA4B - AREA2	-0.10792	-0.27332	0.05748	
AREA4B - REFCOMP	-0.09725	-0.26265	0.06814	
AREA4B - AREA4A	-0.08680	-0.25219	0.07860	
AREA4B - LOWERCOMP	0.13582	-0.02958	0.30122	
LOWERCOMP - AREA4BACC	-0.30809	-0.47349	-0.14269	***
LOWERCOMP - LOWERACC	-0.30403	-0.46943	-0.13863	***
LOWERCOMP - AREA1	-0.24780	-0.41319	-0.08240	***
LOWERCOMP - AREA2	-0.24374	-0.40914	-0.07834	***
LOWERCOMP - REFCOMP	-0.23307	-0.39847	-0.06767	***
LOWERCOMP - AREA4A	-0.22262	-0.38801	-0.05722	***
LOWERCOMP - AREA4B	-0.13582	-0.30122	0.02958	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Means and Standard Errors

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Treatment	No. Reps	Mean Survival	SE Survival	Standard Deviation	CV
AREA1	5	0.92	0.030000	0.06708	7.2915
AREA2	5	0.92	0.025495	0.05701	6.1966
AREA4A	5	0.90	0.044721	0.10000	11.1111
AREA4B	5	0.87	0.025495	0.05701	6.5527
AREA4BACC	5	0.94	0.029155	0.06519	6.9353
LOWERACC	5	0.94	0.024495	0.05477	5.8268
LOWERCOMP	5	0.76	0.050990	0.11402	15.0023
REFX	5	0.95	0.027386	0.06124	6.4460

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Obs	S-W Arcsine W	Prob <W for Arcsine
1	0.93330	0.020674

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Arcsine Transformed Survival

Obs	Test	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Ampelisca	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	32	0.21345	.	.
2	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS1	7	0.02860	0.61262	0.74125
3	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS3	7	0.02860	0.61262	0.74125

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Treatment	8	AREA1 AREA2 AREA4A AREA4B AREA4BACC LOWERACC LOWERCOMP REF
		Number of Observations Read 40
		Number of Observations Used 40

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: arcsurv

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	7	0.41531320	0.05933046	2.19	0.0620
Error	32	0.86743794	0.02710744		
Corrected Total	39	1.28275114			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	arcsurv Mean
0.323768	12.69032	0.164643	1.297393

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.41531320	0.05933046	2.19	0.0620

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.41531320	0.05933046	2.19	0.0620

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	32
Error Mean Square	0.027107
Critical Value of t	1.69389
Least Significant Difference	0.1764

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits	
REFX - AREA4BACC	0.0192	-0.1571 0.1956	
REFX - LOWERACC	0.0233	-0.1531 0.1997	
REFX - AREA1	0.0795	-0.0968 0.2559	
REFX - AREA2	0.0836	-0.0928 0.2600	
REFX - AREA4A	0.1047	-0.0717 0.2811	
REFX - AREA4B	0.1915	0.0151 0.3679	***
REFX - LOWERCOMP	0.3273	0.1510 0.5037	***
AREA4BACC - REFX	-0.0192	-0.1956 0.1571	
AREA4BACC - LOWERACC	0.0041	-0.1723 0.1804	
AREA4BACC - AREA1	0.0603	-0.1161 0.2367	
AREA4BACC - AREA2	0.0644	-0.1120 0.2407	
AREA4BACC - AREA4A	0.0855	-0.0909 0.2619	
AREA4BACC - AREA4B	0.1723	-0.0041 0.3487	
AREA4BACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3081	0.1317 0.4845	***
LOWERACC - REFX	-0.0233	-0.1997 0.1531	
LOWERACC - AREA4BACC	-0.0041	-0.1804 0.1723	
LOWERACC - AREA1	0.0562	-0.1201 0.2326	
LOWERACC - AREA2	0.0603	-0.1161 0.2367	
LOWERACC - AREA4A	0.0814	-0.0950 0.2578	
LOWERACC - AREA4B	0.1682	-0.0082 0.3446	
LOWERACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3040	0.1276 0.4804	***
AREA1 - REFX	-0.0795	-0.2559 0.0968	
AREA1 - AREA4BACC	-0.0603	-0.2367 0.1161	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFX
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison		Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits		
AREA1	- LOWERACC	-0.0562	-0.2326	0.1201	
AREA1	- AREA2	0.0041	-0.1723	0.1804	
AREA1	- AREA4A	0.0252	-0.1512	0.2016	
AREA1	- AREA4B	0.1120	-0.0644	0.2884	
AREA1	- LOWERCOMP	0.2478	0.0714	0.4242	***
AREA2	- REFX	-0.0836	-0.2600	0.0928	
AREA2	- AREA4BACC	-0.0644	-0.2407	0.1120	
AREA2	- LOWERACC	-0.0603	-0.2367	0.1161	
AREA2	- AREA1	-0.0041	-0.1804	0.1723	
AREA2	- AREA4A	0.0211	-0.1553	0.1975	
AREA2	- AREA4B	0.1079	-0.0685	0.2843	
AREA2	- LOWERCOMP	0.2437	0.0674	0.4201	***
AREA4A	- REFX	-0.1047	-0.2811	0.0717	
AREA4A	- AREA4BACC	-0.0855	-0.2619	0.0909	
AREA4A	- LOWERACC	-0.0814	-0.2578	0.0950	
AREA4A	- AREA1	-0.0252	-0.2016	0.1512	
AREA4A	- AREA2	-0.0211	-0.1975	0.1553	
AREA4A	- AREA4B	0.0868	-0.0896	0.2632	
AREA4A	- LOWERCOMP	0.2226	0.0462	0.3990	***
AREA4B	- REFX	-0.1915	-0.3679	-0.0151	***
AREA4B	- AREA4BACC	-0.1723	-0.3487	0.0041	
AREA4B	- LOWERACC	-0.1682	-0.3446	0.0082	
AREA4B	- AREA1	-0.1120	-0.2884	0.0644	
AREA4B	- AREA2	-0.1079	-0.2843	0.0685	
AREA4B	- AREA4A	-0.0868	-0.2632	0.0896	
AREA4B	- LOWERCOMP	0.1358	-0.0406	0.3122	
LOWERCOMP	- REFX	-0.3273	-0.5037	-0.1510	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4BACC	-0.3081	-0.4845	-0.1317	***
LOWERCOMP	- LOWERACC	-0.3040	-0.4804	-0.1276	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA1	-0.2478	-0.4242	-0.0714	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA2	-0.2437	-0.4201	-0.0674	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4A	-0.2226	-0.3990	-0.0462	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4B	-0.1358	-0.3122	0.0406	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMPACC
Means and Standard Errors

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Treatment	No. Reps	Mean Survival	SE Survival	Standard Deviation	CV
AREA1	5	0.92	0.030000	0.06708	7.2915
AREA2	5	0.92	0.025495	0.05701	6.1966
AREA4A	5	0.90	0.044721	0.10000	11.1111
AREA4B	5	0.87	0.025495	0.05701	6.5527
AREA4BACC	5	0.94	0.029155	0.06519	6.9353
LOWERACC	5	0.94	0.024495	0.05477	5.8268
LOWERCOMP	5	0.76	0.050990	0.11402	15.0023
REFXACC	5	0.96	0.018708	0.04183	4.3576

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMP
Means and Standard Errors

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Treatment	No. Reps	Mean Survival	SE Survival	Standard Deviation	CV
AREA1	5	0.92	0.030000	0.06708	7.2915
AREA2	5	0.92	0.025495	0.05701	6.1966
AREA4A	5	0.90	0.044721	0.10000	11.1111
AREA4B	5	0.87	0.025495	0.05701	6.5527
AREA4BACC	5	0.94	0.029155	0.06519	6.9353
LOWERACC	5	0.94	0.024495	0.05477	5.8268
LOWERCOMP	5	0.76	0.050990	0.11402	15.0023
REFCOMP	5	0.93	0.012247	0.02739	2.9447

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMPACC
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Obs	S-W Arcsine W	Prob <W for Arcsine
1	0.92841	0.014295

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMPACC
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Arcsine Transformed Survival

Obs	Test	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Ampelisca	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	32	0.19920	.	.
2	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS1	7	0.02794	0.64126	0.71854
3	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS3	7	0.02794	0.64126	0.71854

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMPACC
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Treatment	8	AREA1 AREA2 AREA4A AREA4B AREA4BACC LOWERACC LOWERCOMP REFVACC
		Number of Observations Read 40
		Number of Observations Used 40

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMPACC
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: arcsurv

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	7	0.43206802	0.06172400	2.36	0.0462
Error	32	0.83742680	0.02616959		
Corrected Total	39	1.26949482			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	arcsurv Mean
0.340346	12.45064	0.161770	1.299292

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.43206802	0.06172400	2.36	0.0462

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.43206802	0.06172400	2.36	0.0462

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMPACC
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	32
Error Mean Square	0.02617
Critical Value of t	1.69389
Least Significant Difference	0.1733

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits	
REFXACC - AREA4BACC	0.0344	-0.1389 0.2077	
REFXACC - LOWERACC	0.0385	-0.1348 0.2118	
REFXACC - AREA1	0.0947	-0.0786 0.2680	
REFXACC - AREA2	0.0988	-0.0745 0.2721	
REFXACC - AREA4A	0.1199	-0.0534 0.2932	
REFXACC - AREA4B	0.2067	0.0334 0.3800	***
REFXACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3425	0.1692 0.5158	***
AREA4BACC - REFXACC	-0.0344	-0.2077 0.1389	
AREA4BACC - LOWERACC	0.0041	-0.1692 0.1774	
AREA4BACC - AREA1	0.0603	-0.1130 0.2336	
AREA4BACC - AREA2	0.0644	-0.1090 0.2377	
AREA4BACC - AREA4A	0.0855	-0.0878 0.2588	
AREA4BACC - AREA4B	0.1723	-0.0010 0.3456	
AREA4BACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3081	0.1348 0.4814	***
LOWERACC - REFXACC	-0.0385	-0.2118 0.1348	
LOWERACC - AREA4BACC	-0.0041	-0.1774 0.1692	
LOWERACC - AREA1	0.0562	-0.1171 0.2295	
LOWERACC - AREA2	0.0603	-0.1130 0.2336	
LOWERACC - AREA4A	0.0814	-0.0919 0.2547	
LOWERACC - AREA4B	0.1682	-0.0051 0.3415	
LOWERACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3040	0.1307 0.4773	***
AREA1 - REFXACC	-0.0947	-0.2680 0.0786	
AREA1 - AREA4BACC	-0.0603	-0.2336 0.1130	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFCOMPACC
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison		Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits		
AREA1	- LOWERACC	-0.0562	-0.2295	0.1171	
AREA1	- AREA2	0.0041	-0.1692	0.1774	
AREA1	- AREA4A	0.0252	-0.1481	0.1985	
AREA1	- AREA4B	0.1120	-0.0613	0.2853	
AREA1	- LOWERCOMP	0.2478	0.0745	0.4211	***
AREA2	- REFXACC	-0.0988	-0.2721	0.0745	
AREA2	- AREA4BACC	-0.0644	-0.2377	0.1090	
AREA2	- LOWERACC	-0.0603	-0.2336	0.1130	
AREA2	- AREA1	-0.0041	-0.1774	0.1692	
AREA2	- AREA4A	0.0211	-0.1522	0.1944	
AREA2	- AREA4B	0.1079	-0.0654	0.2812	
AREA2	- LOWERCOMP	0.2437	0.0704	0.4170	***
AREA4A	- REFXACC	-0.1199	-0.2932	0.0534	
AREA4A	- AREA4BACC	-0.0855	-0.2588	0.0878	
AREA4A	- LOWERACC	-0.0814	-0.2547	0.0919	
AREA4A	- AREA1	-0.0252	-0.1985	0.1481	
AREA4A	- AREA2	-0.0211	-0.1944	0.1522	
AREA4A	- AREA4B	0.0868	-0.0865	0.2601	
AREA4A	- LOWERCOMP	0.2226	0.0493	0.3959	***
AREA4B	- REFXACC	-0.2067	-0.3800	-0.0334	***
AREA4B	- AREA4BACC	-0.1723	-0.3456	0.0010	
AREA4B	- LOWERACC	-0.1682	-0.3415	0.0051	
AREA4B	- AREA1	-0.1120	-0.2853	0.0613	
AREA4B	- AREA2	-0.1079	-0.2812	0.0654	
AREA4B	- AREA4A	-0.0868	-0.2601	0.0865	
AREA4B	- LOWERCOMP	0.1358	-0.0375	0.3091	
LOWERCOMP	- REFXACC	-0.3425	-0.5158	-0.1692	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4BACC	-0.3081	-0.4814	-0.1348	***
LOWERCOMP	- LOWERACC	-0.3040	-0.4773	-0.1307	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA1	-0.2478	-0.4211	-0.0745	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA2	-0.2437	-0.4170	-0.0704	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4A	-0.2226	-0.3959	-0.0493	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4B	-0.1358	-0.3091	0.0375	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFACC
Means and Standard Errors

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Treatment	No. Reps	Mean Survival	SE Survival	Standard Deviation	CV
AREA1	5	0.92	0.030000	0.06708	7.2915
AREA2	5	0.92	0.025495	0.05701	6.1966
AREA4A	5	0.90	0.044721	0.10000	11.1111
AREA4B	5	0.87	0.025495	0.05701	6.5527
AREA4BACC	5	0.94	0.029155	0.06519	6.9353
LOWERACC	5	0.94	0.024495	0.05477	5.8268
LOWERCOMP	5	0.76	0.050990	0.11402	15.0023
REFXACC	5	0.96	0.018708	0.04183	4.3576

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFACC
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

Obs	S-W Arcsine W	Prob <W for Arcsine
1	0.92841	0.014295

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFACC
 Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
 Arcsine Transformed Survival

Obs	Test	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Ampelisca	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	32	0.19920	.	.
2	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS1	7	0.02794	0.64126	0.71854
3	Ampelisca	absasrv	Treatment	SS3	7	0.02794	0.64126	0.71854

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFACC
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Treatment	8	AREA1 AREA2 AREA4A AREA4B AREA4BACC LOWERACC LOWERCOMP REFACC
		Number of Observations Read 40
		Number of Observations Used 40

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFACC
 ANOVA and Comparison of Means
 Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: arcsurv

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	7	0.43206802	0.06172400	2.36	0.0462
Error	32	0.83742680	0.02616959		
Corrected Total	39	1.26949482			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	arcsurv Mean
0.340346	12.45064	0.161770	1.299292

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.43206802	0.06172400	2.36	0.0462

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Treatment	7	0.43206802	0.06172400	2.36	0.0462

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFXACC
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	32
Error Mean Square	0.02617
Critical Value of t	1.69389
Least Significant Difference	0.1733

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison	Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits	
REFXACC - AREA4BACC	0.0344	-0.1389 0.2077	
REFXACC - LOWERACC	0.0385	-0.1348 0.2118	
REFXACC - AREA1	0.0947	-0.0786 0.2680	
REFXACC - AREA2	0.0988	-0.0745 0.2721	
REFXACC - AREA4A	0.1199	-0.0534 0.2932	
REFXACC - AREA4B	0.2067	0.0334 0.3800	***
REFXACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3425	0.1692 0.5158	***
AREA4BACC - REFXACC	-0.0344	-0.2077 0.1389	
AREA4BACC - LOWERACC	0.0041	-0.1692 0.1774	
AREA4BACC - AREA1	0.0603	-0.1130 0.2336	
AREA4BACC - AREA2	0.0644	-0.1090 0.2377	
AREA4BACC - AREA4A	0.0855	-0.0878 0.2588	
AREA4BACC - AREA4B	0.1723	-0.0010 0.3456	
AREA4BACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3081	0.1348 0.4814	***
LOWERACC - REFXACC	-0.0385	-0.2118 0.1348	
LOWERACC - AREA4BACC	-0.0041	-0.1774 0.1692	
LOWERACC - AREA1	0.0562	-0.1171 0.2295	
LOWERACC - AREA2	0.0603	-0.1130 0.2336	
LOWERACC - AREA4A	0.0814	-0.0919 0.2547	
LOWERACC - AREA4B	0.1682	-0.0051 0.3415	
LOWERACC - LOWERCOMP	0.3040	0.1307 0.4773	***
AREA1 - REFXACC	-0.0947	-0.2680 0.0786	
AREA1 - AREA4BACC	-0.0603	-0.2336 0.1130	

Analysis of Survival Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REFXACC
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Arcsine Transformed Survival

----- Test=Ampelisca -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for arcsurv

Comparisons significant at the 0.1 level are indicated by ***.

Treatment Comparison		Difference Between Means	90% Confidence Limits		
AREA1	- LOWERACC	-0.0562	-0.2295	0.1171	
AREA1	- AREA2	0.0041	-0.1692	0.1774	
AREA1	- AREA4A	0.0252	-0.1481	0.1985	
AREA1	- AREA4B	0.1120	-0.0613	0.2853	
AREA1	- LOWERCOMP	0.2478	0.0745	0.4211	***
AREA2	- REFXACC	-0.0988	-0.2721	0.0745	
AREA2	- AREA4BACC	-0.0644	-0.2377	0.1090	
AREA2	- LOWERACC	-0.0603	-0.2336	0.1130	
AREA2	- AREA1	-0.0041	-0.1774	0.1692	
AREA2	- AREA4A	0.0211	-0.1522	0.1944	
AREA2	- AREA4B	0.1079	-0.0654	0.2812	
AREA2	- LOWERCOMP	0.2437	0.0704	0.4170	***
AREA4A	- REFXACC	-0.1199	-0.2932	0.0534	
AREA4A	- AREA4BACC	-0.0855	-0.2588	0.0878	
AREA4A	- LOWERACC	-0.0814	-0.2547	0.0919	
AREA4A	- AREA1	-0.0252	-0.1985	0.1481	
AREA4A	- AREA2	-0.0211	-0.1944	0.1522	
AREA4A	- AREA4B	0.0868	-0.0865	0.2601	
AREA4A	- LOWERCOMP	0.2226	0.0493	0.3959	***
AREA4B	- REFXACC	-0.2067	-0.3800	-0.0334	***
AREA4B	- AREA4BACC	-0.1723	-0.3456	0.0010	
AREA4B	- LOWERACC	-0.1682	-0.3415	0.0051	
AREA4B	- AREA1	-0.1120	-0.2853	0.0613	
AREA4B	- AREA2	-0.1079	-0.2812	0.0654	
AREA4B	- AREA4A	-0.0868	-0.2601	0.0865	
AREA4B	- LOWERCOMP	0.1358	-0.0375	0.3091	
LOWERCOMP	- REFXACC	-0.3425	-0.5158	-0.1692	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4BACC	-0.3081	-0.4814	-0.1348	***
LOWERCOMP	- LOWERACC	-0.3040	-0.4773	-0.1307	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA1	-0.2478	-0.4211	-0.0745	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA2	-0.2437	-0.4170	-0.0704	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4A	-0.2226	-0.3959	-0.0493	***
LOWERCOMP	- AREA4B	-0.1358	-0.3091	0.0375	

Test	Endpoint	Treatment	Comparison	Probability Normal	Probability Homogeneous	Test Type	Test Probability	Significant?	One-Tail Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	RefComp	Control	0.280	0.464	T-test Equal Var	0.790		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	RefCompAcc	Control	0.108	0.323	T-test Equal Var	0.559		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	RefX	Control	0.594	0.073	T-test Unequal Var	0.912		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	RefXAcc	Control	0.483	0.038	T-test Unequal Var	0.951		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area1	RefComp	0.117	0.131	T-test Equal Var	0.573		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area2	RefComp	0.067	0.138	T-test Equal Var	0.556		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4A	RefComp	0.286	0.067	T-test Unequal Var	0.457		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4B	RefComp	0.335	0.292	T-test Equal Var	0.036	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4BAcc	RefComp	0.564	0.011	T-test Unequal Var	0.789		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerAcc	RefComp	0.085	0.000	T-test Unequal Var	0.785		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerComp	RefComp	0.044	0.210	Mann-Whitney	0.049	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area1	RefCompAcc	0.091	0.949	T-test Equal Var	0.630		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area2	RefCompAcc	0.040	0.978	Mann-Whitney	0.627		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4A	RefCompAcc	0.370	0.635	T-test Equal Var	0.537		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4B	RefCompAcc	0.088	0.444	T-test Equal Var	0.205		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4BAcc	RefCompAcc	0.180	0.554	T-test Equal Var	0.794		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerAcc	RefCompAcc	0.054	0.473	T-test Equal Var	0.788		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerComp	RefCompAcc	0.009	0.936	Mann-Whitney	0.062		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area1	RefX	0.630	0.764	T-test Equal Var	0.237		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area2	RefX	0.423	0.670	T-test Equal Var	0.220		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4A	RefX	0.741	0.830	T-test Equal Var	0.198		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4B	RefX	0.368	0.140	T-test Equal Var	0.029	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4BAcc	RefX	0.075	0.749	T-test Equal Var	0.434		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerAcc	RefX	0.040	0.635	Mann-Whitney	0.416		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerComp	RefX	0.355	0.647	T-test Equal Var	0.007	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area1	RefXAcc	0.274	0.921	T-test Equal Var	0.182		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area2	RefXAcc	0.147	0.812	T-test Equal Var	0.165		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4A	RefXAcc	0.877	0.645	T-test Equal Var	0.154		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4B	RefXAcc	0.214	0.111	T-test Equal Var	0.014	Yes	Treatment < Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	Area4BAcc	RefXAcc	0.087	0.490	T-test Equal Var	0.375		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerAcc	RefXAcc	0.012	0.283	Mann-Whitney	0.295		Treatment >= Comparison
Ampelisca	Percent Survival	LowerComp	RefXAcc	0.138	0.773	T-test Equal Var	0.004	Yes	Treatment < Comparison

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=RefComp -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2724	0.0734	0.0328	1.1731	1.3453
Reference	5	1.3068	0.0527	0.0236	1.2490	1.3453
Diff (1-2)		-0.0344	0.0639	0.0404		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		1.2724	1.1812 1.3635	0.0734	0.0440 0.2110
Reference		1.3068	1.2413 1.3722	0.0527	0.0316 0.1515
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0344	-0.1277 0.0588	0.0639	0.0432 0.1225
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0344	-0.1294 0.0605		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.85	0.4191
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.2567	-0.85	0.4215

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.94	0.5363

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=RefCompAcc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2724	0.0734	0.0328	1.1731	1.3453
Reference	5	1.2850	0.1712	0.0765	1.1071	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0127	0.1317	0.0833		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		1.2724	1.1812 1.3635	0.0734	0.0440 0.2110
Reference		1.2850	1.0725 1.4975	0.1712	0.1026 0.4918
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0127	-0.2047 0.1794	0.1317	0.0890 0.2523
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0127	-0.2218 0.1965		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.15	0.8829
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.4246	-0.15	0.8846

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	5.43	0.1300

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=RefX -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2724	0.0734	0.0328	1.1731	1.3453
Reference	5	1.4011	0.1702	0.0761	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.1287	0.1310	0.0829		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		1.2724	1.1812 1.3635	0.0734	0.0440 0.2110
Reference		1.4011	1.1898 1.6123	0.1702	0.1019 0.4889
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.1287	-0.3198 0.0624	0.1310	0.0885 0.2511
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.1287	-0.3367 0.0793		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.55	0.1591
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.4404	-1.55	0.1765

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	5.37	0.1325

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=RefXAcc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
Control	5	1.2724	0.0734	0.0328	1.1731	1.3453
Reference	5	1.4162	0.1465	0.0655	1.2490	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.1439	0.1159	0.0733		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
Control		1.2724	1.1812 1.3635	0.0734	0.0440 0.2110
Reference		1.4162	1.2344 1.5981	0.1465	0.0877 0.4209
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.1439	-0.3129 0.0251	0.1159	0.0783 0.2219
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.1439	-0.3240 0.0362		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.96	0.0852
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.8921	-1.96	0.0981

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	3.98	0.2098

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Areal -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefComp	5	1.3068	0.0527	0.0236	1.2490	1.3453
Test	5	1.3215	0.1638	0.0733	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0147	0.1217	0.0770		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefComp		1.3068	1.2413 1.3722	0.0527	0.0316 0.1515
Test		1.3215	1.1181 1.5249	0.1638	0.0981 0.4707
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0147	-0.1922 0.1627	0.1217	0.0822 0.2331
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0147	-0.2148 0.1853		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.19	0.8530
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.8196	-0.19	0.8561

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	9.66	0.0495

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefComp	5	1.3068	0.0527	0.0236	1.2490	1.3453
Test	5	1.3175	0.1542	0.0690	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0107	0.1153	0.0729		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefComp		1.3068	1.2413 1.3722	0.0527	0.0316 0.1515
Test		1.3175	1.1259 1.5090	0.1542	0.0924 0.4432
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0107	-0.1788 0.1574	0.1153	0.0778 0.2208
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0107	-0.1989 0.1776		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.15	0.8873
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.9218	-0.15	0.8895

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	8.56	0.0610

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefComp	5	1.3068	0.0527	0.0236	1.2490	1.3453
Test	5	1.2963	0.1984	0.0887	1.0472	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0105	0.1451	0.0918		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefComp		1.3068	1.2413 1.3722	0.0527	0.0316 0.1515
Test		1.2963	1.0500 1.5426	0.1984	0.1188 0.5700
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0105	-0.2012 0.2221	0.1451	0.0980 0.2780
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0105	-0.2325 0.2534		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.11	0.9121
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.5622	0.11	0.9141

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	14.16	0.0250

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefComp	5	1.3068	0.0527	0.0236	1.2490	1.3453
Test	5	1.2095	0.0910	0.0407	1.1071	1.3453
Diff (1-2)		0.0973	0.0744	0.0470		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefComp		1.3068	1.2413 1.3722	0.0527	0.0316 0.1515
Test		1.2095	1.0965 1.3225	0.0910	0.0545 0.2615
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0973	-0.0112 0.2057	0.0744	0.0502 0.1425
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0973	-0.0161 0.2106		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	2.07	0.0725
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.4124	2.07	0.0811

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.98	0.3152

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4Bacc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefComp	5	1.3068	0.0527	0.0236	1.2490	1.3453
Test	5	1.3818	0.1830	0.0818	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0750	0.1347	0.0852		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefComp		1.3068	1.2413 1.3722	0.0527	0.0316 0.1515
Test		1.3818	1.1546 1.6090	0.1830	0.1096 0.5259
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0750	-0.2714 0.1214	0.1347	0.0910 0.2580
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0750	-0.2988 0.1488		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.88	0.4041
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.6592	-0.88	0.4215

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	12.05	0.0334

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerAcc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefComp	5	1.3068	0.0527	0.0236	1.2490	1.3453
Test	5	1.3777	0.1762	0.0788	1.2490	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0710	0.1301	0.0823		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefComp		1.3068	1.2413 1.3722	0.0527	0.0316 0.1515
Test		1.3777	1.1589 1.5966	0.1762	0.1056 0.5064
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0710	-0.2607 0.1187	0.1301	0.0879 0.2492
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0710	-0.2864 0.1445		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.86	0.4135
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.71	-0.86	0.4301

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	11.18	0.0382

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerComp -----

The NPAR1WAY Procedure

Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable Result
Classified by Variable group

group	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std Dev Under H0	Mean Score
RefComp	5	36.50	27.50	4.609772	7.30
Test	5	18.50	27.50	4.609772	3.70

Average scores were used for ties.

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test

Statistic 36.5000

Normal Approximation

Z 1.8439

One-Sided Pr > Z 0.0326

Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.0652

t Approximation

One-Sided Pr > Z 0.0491

Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.0983

Z includes a continuity correction of 0.5.

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Chi-Square 3.8118

DF 1

Pr > Chi-Square 0.0509

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Areal -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefCompAcc	5	1.2850	0.1712	0.0765	1.1071	1.5708
Test	5	1.3215	0.1638	0.0733	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0365	0.1675	0.1060		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefCompAcc		1.2850	1.0725 1.4975	0.1712	0.1026 0.4918
Test		1.3215	1.1181 1.5249	0.1638	0.0981 0.4707
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0365	-0.2808 0.2078	0.1675	0.1132 0.3209
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0365	-0.2809 0.2079		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.34	0.7394
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9846	-0.34	0.7394

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.09	0.9342

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefCompAcc	5	1.2850	0.1712	0.0765	1.1071	1.5708
Test	5	1.2963	0.1984	0.0887	1.0472	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0113	0.1853	0.1172		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefCompAcc		1.2850	1.0725 1.4975	0.1712	0.1026 0.4918
Test		1.2963	1.0500 1.5426	0.1984	0.1188 0.5700
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0113	-0.2815 0.2589	0.1853	0.1251 0.3549
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0113	-0.2825 0.2599		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.10	0.9254
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.8322	-0.10	0.9255

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.34	0.7820

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefCompAcc	5	1.2850	0.1712	0.0765	1.1071	1.5708
Test	5	1.2095	0.0910	0.0407	1.1071	1.3453
Diff (1-2)		0.0755	0.1371	0.0867		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefCompAcc		1.2850	1.0725 1.4975	0.1712	0.1026 0.4918
Test		1.2095	1.0965 1.3225	0.0910	0.0545 0.2615
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0755	-0.1244 0.2754	0.1371	0.0926 0.2626
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0755	-0.1359 0.2868		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.87	0.4093
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.0941	0.87	0.4169

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	3.54	0.2486

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4Bacc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefCompAcc	5	1.2850	0.1712	0.0765	1.1071	1.5708
Test	5	1.3818	0.1830	0.0818	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0968	0.1772	0.1121		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefCompAcc		1.2850	1.0725 1.4975	0.1712	0.1026 0.4918
Test		1.3818	1.1546 1.6090	0.1830	0.1096 0.5259
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0968	-0.3552 0.1616	0.1772	0.1197 0.3394
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0968	-0.3554 0.1618		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.86	0.4129
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9645	-0.86	0.4130

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.14	0.9000

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerAcc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefCompAcc	5	1.2850	0.1712	0.0765	1.1071	1.5708
Test	5	1.3777	0.1762	0.0788	1.2490	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		-0.0927	0.1737	0.1099		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefCompAcc		1.2850	1.0725 1.4975	0.1712	0.1026 0.4918
Test		1.3777	1.1589 1.5966	0.1762	0.1056 0.5064
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0927	-0.3461 0.1606	0.1737	0.1173 0.3328
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0927	-0.3461 0.1607		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.84	0.4232
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9932	-0.84	0.4232

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.06	0.9563

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area2 -----

The NPAR1WAY Procedure

Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable Result
Classified by Variable group

group	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std Dev Under H0	Mean Score
RefCompAcc	5	25.50	27.50	4.472136	5.10
Test	5	29.50	27.50	4.472136	5.90

Average scores were used for ties.

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test

Statistic 25.5000

Normal Approximation

Z -0.3354
One-Sided Pr < Z 0.3687
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.7373

t Approximation

One-Sided Pr < Z 0.3725
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.7450

Z includes a continuity correction of 0.5.

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Chi-Square 0.2000
DF 1
Pr > Chi-Square 0.6547

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerComp -----

The NPAR1WAY Procedure

Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable Result
Classified by Variable group

group	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std Dev Under H0	Mean Score
RefCompAcc	5	36.0	27.50	4.714045	7.20
Test	5	19.0	27.50	4.714045	3.80

Average scores were used for ties.

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test

Statistic 36.0000

Normal Approximation

Z 1.6971
One-Sided Pr > Z 0.0448
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.0897

t Approximation

One-Sided Pr > Z 0.0620
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.1239

Z includes a continuity correction of 0.5.

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Chi-Square 3.2512
DF 1
Pr > Chi-Square 0.0714

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Areal -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefX	5	1.4011	0.1702	0.0761	1.1731	1.5708
Test	5	1.3215	0.1638	0.0733	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0795	0.1670	0.1056		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefX		1.4011	1.1898 1.6123	0.1702	0.1019 0.4889
Test		1.3215	1.1181 1.5249	0.1638	0.0981 0.4707
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0795	-0.1640 0.3231	0.1670	0.1128 0.3200
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0795	-0.1641 0.3232		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.75	0.4730
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9885	0.75	0.4730

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.08	0.9430

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefX	5	1.4011	0.1702	0.0761	1.1731	1.5708
Test	5	1.3175	0.1542	0.0690	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0836	0.1624	0.1027		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefX		1.4011	1.1898 1.6123	0.1702	0.1019 0.4889
Test		1.3175	1.1259 1.5090	0.1542	0.0924 0.4432
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0836	-0.1532 0.3204	0.1624	0.1097 0.3111
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0836	-0.1536 0.3208		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.81	0.4392
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.924	0.81	0.4394

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.22	0.8536

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefX	5	1.4011	0.1702	0.0761	1.1731	1.5708
Test	5	1.2963	0.1984	0.0887	1.0472	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.1047	0.1848	0.1169		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefX		1.4011	1.1898 1.6123	0.1702	0.1019 0.4889
Test		1.2963	1.0500 1.5426	0.1984	0.1188 0.5700
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.1047	-0.1648 0.3742	0.1848	0.1248 0.3540
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.1047	-0.1659 0.3753		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.90	0.3964
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.819	0.90	0.3970

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.36	0.7735

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefX	5	1.4011	0.1702	0.0761	1.1731	1.5708
Test	5	1.2095	0.0910	0.0407	1.1071	1.3453
Diff (1-2)		0.1915	0.1364	0.0863		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefX		1.4011	1.1898 1.6123	0.1702	0.1019 0.4889
Test		1.2095	1.0965 1.3225	0.0910	0.0545 0.2615
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.1915	-0.00748 0.3905	0.1364	0.0922 0.2614
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.1915	-0.0187 0.4017		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	2.22	0.0572
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.1153	2.22	0.0674

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	3.50	0.2528

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4Bacc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefX	5	1.4011	0.1702	0.0761	1.1731	1.5708
Test	5	1.3818	0.1830	0.0818	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0192	0.1767	0.1118		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefX		1.4011	1.1898 1.6123	0.1702	0.1019 0.4889
Test		1.3818	1.1546 1.6090	0.1830	0.1096 0.5259
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0192	-0.2384 0.2769	0.1767	0.1193 0.3385
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0192	-0.2387 0.2772		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.17	0.8675
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.958	0.17	0.8676

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.16	0.8912

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerComp -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefX	5	1.4011	0.1702	0.0761	1.1731	1.5708
Test	5	1.0737	0.1585	0.0709	0.9377	1.3453
Diff (1-2)		0.3273	0.1644	0.1040		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefX		1.4011	1.1898 1.6123	0.1702	0.1019 0.4889
Test		1.0737	0.8769 1.2705	0.1585	0.0949 0.4554
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.3273	0.0875 0.5671	0.1644	0.1111 0.3150
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.3273	0.0873 0.5673		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	3.15	0.0136
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9599	3.15	0.0137

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.15	0.8937

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerAcc -----

The NPAR1WAY Procedure

Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable Result
Classified by Variable group

group	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std Dev Under H0	Mean Score
RefX	5	29.0	27.50	4.564355	5.80
Test	5	26.0	27.50	4.564355	5.20

Average scores were used for ties.

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test

Statistic 29.0000

Normal Approximation

Z 0.2191
One-Sided Pr > Z 0.4133
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.8266

t Approximation

One-Sided Pr > Z 0.4157
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.8315

Z includes a continuity correction of 0.5.

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Chi-Square 0.1080
DF 1
Pr > Chi-Square 0.7424

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Areal -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefXAcc	5	1.4162	0.1465	0.0655	1.2490	1.5708
Test	5	1.3215	0.1638	0.0733	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0947	0.1554	0.0983		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefXAcc		1.4162	1.2344 1.5981	0.1465	0.0877 0.4209
Test		1.3215	1.1181 1.5249	0.1638	0.0981 0.4707
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0947	-0.1319 0.3213	0.1554	0.1049 0.2977
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0947	-0.1324 0.3218		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.96	0.3633
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9018	0.96	0.3636

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.25	0.8335

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefXAcc	5	1.4162	0.1465	0.0655	1.2490	1.5708
Test	5	1.3175	0.1542	0.0690	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0988	0.1504	0.0951		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefXAcc		1.4162	1.2344 1.5981	0.1465	0.0877 0.4209
Test		1.3175	1.1259 1.5090	0.1542	0.0924 0.4432
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0988	-0.1206 0.3181	0.1504	0.1016 0.2881
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0988	-0.1207 0.3182		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	1.04	0.3294
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9787	1.04	0.3295

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.11	0.9225

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefXAcc	5	1.4162	0.1465	0.0655	1.2490	1.5708
Test	5	1.2963	0.1984	0.0887	1.0472	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.1199	0.1743	0.1103		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefXAcc		1.4162	1.2344 1.5981	0.1465	0.0877 0.4209
Test		1.2963	1.0500 1.5426	0.1984	0.1188 0.5700
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.1199	-0.1344 0.3742	0.1743	0.1178 0.3340
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.1199	-0.1383 0.3781		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	1.09	0.3085
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.3621	1.09	0.3112

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.83	0.5712

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefXAcc	5	1.4162	0.1465	0.0655	1.2490	1.5708
Test	5	1.2095	0.0910	0.0407	1.1071	1.3453
Diff (1-2)		0.2067	0.1219	0.0771		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefXAcc		1.4162	1.2344 1.5981	0.1465	0.0877 0.4209
Test		1.2095	1.0965 1.3225	0.0910	0.0545 0.2615
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.2067	0.0289 0.3845	0.1219	0.0824 0.2336
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.2067	0.0226 0.3908		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	2.68	0.0279
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.6881	2.68	0.0329

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.59	0.3791

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=Area4Bacc -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefXAcc	5	1.4162	0.1465	0.0655	1.2490	1.5708
Test	5	1.3818	0.1830	0.0818	1.1731	1.5708
Diff (1-2)		0.0344	0.1657	0.1048		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
RefXAcc		1.4162	1.2344 1.5981	0.1465	0.0877 0.4209
Test		1.3818	1.1546 1.6090	0.1830	0.1096 0.5259
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.0344	-0.2073 0.2762	0.1657	0.1119 0.3175
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.0344	-0.2093 0.2782		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	0.33	0.7509
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.6335	0.33	0.7513

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.56	0.6766

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerComp -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: Result

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
RefXAcc	5	1.4162	0.1465	0.0655	1.2490	1.5708
Test	5	1.0737	0.1585	0.0709	0.9377	1.3453
Diff (1-2)		0.3425	0.1526	0.0965		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean		Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev	
RefXAcc		1.4162	1.2344	1.5981	0.1465	0.0877	0.4209
Test		1.0737	0.8769	1.2705	0.1585	0.0949	0.4554
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.3425	0.1200	0.5651	0.1526	0.1031	0.2923
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.3425	0.1197	0.5653			

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	3.55	0.0075
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9507	3.55	0.0076

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.17	0.8822

----- Test=Ampelisca Endpoint=Percent Survival Treatment=LowerAcc -----

The NPAR1WAY Procedure

Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Variable Result
Classified by Variable group

group	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Under H0	Std Dev Under H0	Mean Score
RefXAcc	5	30.50	27.50	4.472136	6.10
Test	5	24.50	27.50	4.472136	4.90

Average scores were used for ties.

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test

Statistic 30.5000

Normal Approximation

Z 0.5590
One-Sided Pr > Z 0.2881
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.5762

t Approximation

One-Sided Pr > Z 0.2949
Two-Sided Pr > |Z| 0.5898

Z includes a continuity correction of 0.5.

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Chi-Square 0.4500
DF 1
Pr > Chi-Square 0.5023

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Means and Statistics

----- Species=Macoma -----

treatment	No. Reps	Mean Result	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Variance
AREA 1	5	0.0275	0.0015	0.0034	.000011488
AREA 2	5	0.0529	0.0042	0.0093	.000086508
AREA 4A	5	0.0391	0.0025	0.0056	.000031207
AREA 4B	5	0.0418	0.0033	0.0074	.000054245
LOWER	5	0.2136	0.0107	0.0240	.000574300
REF	5	0.0158	0.0008	0.0017	.000002957

----- Species=Nephtys -----

treatment	No. Reps	Mean Result	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Variance
AREA 1	5	0.0085	0.0005	0.0012	.000001421
AREA 2	5	0.0118	0.0011	0.0024	.000005646
AREA 4A	5	0.0097	0.0004	0.0008	.000000639
AREA 4B	5	0.0095	0.0003	0.0007	.000000448
LOWER	5	0.0273	0.0014	0.0031	.000009345
REF	5	0.0079	0.0002	0.0003	.000000121

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Species=Macoma -----

Obs	S-W Untrnsformed W	Prob <W for Untransformed	S-W Transformed W	Prob <W for Transformed
1	0.91945	0.025955	0.97394	0.65154

----- Species=Nephtys -----

Obs	S-W Untrnsformed W	Prob <W for Untransformed	S-W Transformed W	Prob <W for Transformed
2	0.92915	0.046607	0.96122	0.33279

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Untransformed Data

Obs	Species	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Macoma	absmercury	ERROR	ERROR	24	.000598551	.	.
2	Macoma	absmercury	treatment	SS1	5	.001151161	9.23158	.000052737
3	Macoma	absmercury	treatment	SS3	5	.001151161	9.23158	.000052737
4	Nephtys	absmercury	ERROR	ERROR	24	.000017280	.	.
5	Nephtys	absmercury	treatment	SS1	5	.000015606	4.33488	.005949246
6	Nephtys	absmercury	treatment	SS3	5	.000015606	4.33488	.005949246

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Transformed Data

Obs	Species	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Macoma	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	24	0.16918	.	.
2	Macoma	absasrv	treatment	SS1	5	0.01209	0.34289	0.88170
3	Macoma	absasrv	treatment	SS3	5	0.01209	0.34289	0.88170
4	Nephtys	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	24	0.04253	.	.
5	Nephtys	absasrv	treatment	SS1	5	0.07187	8.11166	0.00013
6	Nephtys	absasrv	treatment	SS3	5	0.07187	8.11166	0.00013

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: Mercury

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.13632607	0.02726521	215.05	<.0001
Error	24	0.00304282	0.00012678		
Corrected Total	29	0.13936889			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	Mercury Mean
0.978167	17.29358	0.011260	0.065110

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.13632607	0.02726521	215.05	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.13632607	0.02726521	215.05	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for Mercury

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.000127
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.0122

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	0.213600	5	LOWER
B	0.052860	5	AREA 2
B			
C	0.041800	5	AREA 4B
C			
C	0.039080	5	AREA 4A
D			
E	0.027540	5	AREA 1
E			
E	0.015780	5	REF

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: Mercury

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.00136623	0.00027325	93.04	<.0001
Error	24	0.00007048	0.00000294		
Corrected Total	29	0.00143671			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	Mercury Mean
0.950942	13.76099	0.001714	0.012453

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.00136623	0.00027325	93.04	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.00136623	0.00027325	93.04	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for Mercury

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	2.937E-6
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.0019

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	0.027300	5	LOWER
B	0.011778	5	AREA 2
C	0.009732	5	AREA 4A
C	0.009486	5	AREA 4B
C	0.008510	5	AREA 1
C	0.007914	5	REF

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: logresult

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	19.07618656	3.81523731	186.98	<.0001
Error	24	0.48970552	0.02040440		
Corrected Total	29	19.56589208			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	logresult Mean
0.974971	-4.585496	0.142844	-3.115126

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	19.07618656	3.81523731	186.98	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	19.07618656	3.81523731	186.98	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for logresult

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.020404
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.1546

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	-1.54867	5	LOWER
B	-2.95258	5	AREA 2
C	-3.18736	5	AREA 4B
C	-3.25065	5	AREA 4A
D	-3.59798	5	AREA 1
E	-4.15353	5	REF

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: logresult

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	5.17960633	1.03592127	69.68	<.0001
Error	24	0.35679879	0.01486662		
Corrected Total	29	5.53640513			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	logresult Mean
0.935554	-2.712177	0.121929	-4.495604

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	5.17960633	1.03592127	69.68	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	5.17960633	1.03592127	69.68	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for logresult

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.014867
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.1319

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	-3.60563	5	LOWER
B	-4.45909	5	AREA 2
C	-4.63497	5	AREA 4A
C			
D	-4.65991	5	AREA 4B
D			
D	-4.77413	5	AREA 1
E			
E	-4.83990	5	REF

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 1 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.1535	0.1050	0.0470	-4.2616	-3.9846
Test	5	-3.5980	0.1201	0.0537	-3.7132	-3.4234
Diff (1-2)		-0.5556	0.1128	0.0713		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.1535	-4.2839 -4.0232	0.1050	0.0629 0.3017
Test		-3.5980	-3.7471 -3.4489	0.1201	0.0720 0.3451
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.5556	-0.7201 -0.3910	0.1128	0.0762 0.2161
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.5556	-0.7206 -0.3905		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-7.79	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.8597	-7.79	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.31	0.8007

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.1535	0.1050	0.0470	-4.2616	-3.9846
Test	5	-2.9526	0.1772	0.0792	-3.2089	-2.7091
Diff (1-2)		-1.2010	0.1456	0.0921		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.1535	-4.2839 -4.0232	0.1050	0.0629 0.3017
Test		-2.9526	-3.1726 -2.7326	0.1772	0.1062 0.5092
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-1.2010	-1.4134 -0.9885	0.1456	0.0984 0.2790
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-1.2010	-1.4222 -0.9797		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-13.04	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.5003	-13.04	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.85	0.3349

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.1535	0.1050	0.0470	-4.2616	-3.9846
Test	5	-3.2506	0.1473	0.0659	-3.4705	-3.0813
Diff (1-2)		-0.9029	0.1279	0.0809		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.1535	-4.2839 -4.0232	0.1050	0.0629 0.3017
Test		-3.2506	-3.4336 -3.0677	0.1473	0.0883 0.4233
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.9029	-1.0894 -0.7163	0.1279	0.0864 0.2451
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.9029	-1.0930 -0.7128		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-11.16	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.23	-11.16	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.97	0.5279

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.1535	0.1050	0.0470	-4.2616	-3.9846
Test	5	-3.1874	0.1771	0.0792	-3.4143	-2.9720
Diff (1-2)		-0.9662	0.1456	0.0921		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.1535	-4.2839 -4.0232	0.1050	0.0629 0.3017
Test		-3.1874	-3.4073 -2.9674	0.1771	0.1061 0.5089
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.9662	-1.1785 -0.7538	0.1456	0.0983 0.2789
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.9662	-1.1873 -0.7450		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-10.49	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.5023	-10.49	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.85	0.3354

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=LOWER -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.1535	0.1050	0.0470	-4.2616	-3.9846
Test	5	-1.5487	0.1119	0.0500	-1.6820	-1.4188
Diff (1-2)		-2.6049	0.1085	0.0686		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.1535	-4.2839 -4.0232	0.1050	0.0629 0.3017
Test		-1.5487	-1.6875 -1.4098	0.1119	0.0670 0.3214
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-2.6049	-2.7631 -2.4467	0.1085	0.0733 0.2078
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-2.6049	-2.7632 -2.4466		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-37.97	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9682	-37.97	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.13	0.9053

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 1 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.8399	0.0440	0.0197	-4.8902	-4.7939
Test	5	-4.7741	0.1369	0.0612	-4.8982	-4.5952
Diff (1-2)		-0.0658	0.1017	0.0643		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.8399	-4.8946 -4.7852	0.0440	0.0264 0.1265
Test		-4.7741	-4.9441 -4.6041	0.1369	0.0820 0.3934
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0658	-0.2141 0.0825	0.1017	0.0687 0.1948
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0658	-0.2330 0.1014		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-1.02	0.3364
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.8185	-1.02	0.3551

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	9.67	0.0494

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.8399	0.0440	0.0197	-4.8902	-4.7939
Test	5	-4.4591	0.2133	0.0954	-4.7353	-4.3051
Diff (1-2)		-0.3808	0.1540	0.0974		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.8399	-4.8946 -4.7852	0.0440	0.0264 0.1265
Test		-4.4591	-4.7239 -4.1942	0.2133	0.1278 0.6129
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3808	-0.6054 -0.1562	0.1540	0.1040 0.2950
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3808	-0.6431 -0.1185		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-3.91	0.0045
Satterthwaite	Unequal	4.3402	-3.91	0.0149

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	23.48	0.0097

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.8399	0.0440	0.0197	-4.8902	-4.7939
Test	5	-4.6350	0.0806	0.0361	-4.7083	-4.5190
Diff (1-2)		-0.2049	0.0650	0.0411		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.8399	-4.8946 -4.7852	0.0440	0.0264 0.1265
Test		-4.6350	-4.7351 -4.5349	0.0806	0.0483 0.2317
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.2049	-0.2997 -0.1102	0.0650	0.0439 0.1244
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.2049	-0.3047 -0.1052		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-4.99	0.0011
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.1906	-4.99	0.0023

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	3.35	0.2681

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.8399	0.0440	0.0197	-4.8902	-4.7939
Test	5	-4.6599	0.0701	0.0314	-4.7341	-4.5854
Diff (1-2)		-0.1800	0.0585	0.0370		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.8399	-4.8946 -4.7852	0.0440	0.0264 0.1265
Test		-4.6599	-4.7470 -4.5728	0.0701	0.0420 0.2015
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.1800	-0.2654 -0.0946	0.0585	0.0395 0.1122
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.1800	-0.2683 -0.0917		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-4.86	0.0013
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.7294	-4.86	0.0020

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.54	0.3892

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=LOWER -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF	5	-4.8399	0.0440	0.0197	-4.8902	-4.7939
Test	5	-3.6056	0.1077	0.0482	-3.7050	-3.4327
Diff (1-2)		-1.2343	0.0823	0.0520		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF		-4.8399	-4.8946 -4.7852	0.0440	0.0264 0.1265
Test		-3.6056	-3.7394 -3.4719	0.1077	0.0645 0.3095
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-1.2343	-1.3543 -1.1143	0.0823	0.0556 0.1576
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-1.2343	-1.3658 -1.1027		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-23.72	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.3	-23.72	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	5.99	0.1112

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
One-tail T-test Summary

Obs	Species	treatment	Variances	probt1	sig	onetail
1	Macoma	AREA 1	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
2	Macoma	AREA 2	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
3	Macoma	AREA 4A	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
4	Macoma	AREA 4B	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
5	Macoma	LOWER	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
6	Nephtys	AREA 1	Unequal	0.178		Treatment <= Comparison
7	Nephtys	AREA 2	Unequal	0.007	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
8	Nephtys	AREA 4A	Equal	0.001	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
9	Nephtys	AREA 4B	Equal	0.001	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
10	Nephtys	LOWER	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF
Upper Confidence Limit Calculations

Species	Treatment	Mean	Variance	Upper		Upper		Difference		Difference		Upper	Upper
				Limit 1	Limit 2	Limit 1	Limit 2	Mean 1	Mean 2	Limit 1	Limit 2		
1 Macoma	AREA 1	-3.59798	0.014423	1.71088	2.13185	-3.48732	-3.48348	0.11066	0.11450	0.02738	0.03058	0.03070	
2 Macoma	AREA 2	-2.95258	0.031399	1.71088	2.13185	-2.84192	-2.78364	0.11066	0.16894	0.05221	0.05831	0.06181	
3 Macoma	AREA 4A	-3.25065	0.021703	1.71088	2.13185	-3.13999	-3.11019	0.11066	0.14045	0.03875	0.04328	0.04459	
4 Macoma	AREA 4B	-3.18736	0.031368	1.71088	2.13185	-3.07670	-3.01850	0.11066	0.16885	0.04128	0.04611	0.04887	
5 Macoma	LOWER	-1.54867	0.012511	1.71088	2.13185	-1.43801	-1.44203	0.11066	0.10664	0.21253	0.23740	0.23645	
6 Macoma	REF X	-4.23653	0.014098	1.71088	2.13185	-4.12587	-4.12333	0.11066	0.11320	0.01446	0.01615	0.01619	
7 Nephtys	AREA 1	-4.77413	0.018743	1.71088	2.13185	-4.67740	-4.64361	0.09673	0.13052	0.00845	0.00930	0.00962	
8 Nephtys	AREA 2	-4.45909	0.045499	1.71088	2.13185	-4.36235	-4.25572	0.09673	0.20336	0.01157	0.01275	0.01418	
9 Nephtys	AREA 4A	-4.63497	0.006500	1.71088	2.13185	-4.53823	-4.55810	0.09673	0.07686	0.00971	0.01069	0.01048	
10 Nephtys	AREA 4B	-4.65991	0.004917	1.71088	2.13185	-4.56318	-4.59306	0.09673	0.06685	0.00947	0.01043	0.01012	
11 Nephtys	LOWER	-3.60563	0.011603	1.71088	2.13185	-3.50890	-3.50293	0.09673	0.10270	0.02717	0.02993	0.03011	
12 Nephtys	REF X	-4.84454	0.008644	1.71088	2.13185	-4.74781	-4.75590	0.09673	0.08864	0.00787	0.00867	0.00860	

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
Means and Statistics

----- Species=Macoma -----

treatment	No. Reps	Mean Result	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Variance
AREA 1	5	0.0275	0.0015	0.0034	.000011488
AREA 2	5	0.0529	0.0042	0.0093	.000086508
AREA 4A	5	0.0391	0.0025	0.0056	.000031207
AREA 4B	5	0.0418	0.0033	0.0074	.000054245
LOWER	5	0.2136	0.0107	0.0240	.000574300
REF X	5	0.0145	0.0008	0.0017	.000003043

----- Species=Nephtys -----

treatment	No. Reps	Mean Result	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Variance
AREA 1	5	0.0085	0.0005	0.0012	.000001421
AREA 2	5	0.0118	0.0011	0.0024	.000005646
AREA 4A	5	0.0097	0.0004	0.0008	.000000639
AREA 4B	5	0.0095	0.0003	0.0007	.000000448
LOWER	5	0.0273	0.0014	0.0031	.000009345
REF X	5	0.0079	0.0003	0.0007	.000000511

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
Shapiro-Wilks Test for Normality

----- Species=Macoma -----

Obs	S-W Untrnsformed W	Prob <W for Untransformed	S-W Transformed W	Prob <W for Transformed
1	0.92060	0.027793	0.97654	0.72816

----- Species=Nephtys -----

Obs	S-W Untrnsformed W	Prob <W for Untransformed	S-W Transformed W	Prob <W for Transformed
2	0.93939	0.087585	0.96551	0.42469

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
 Untransformed Data

Obs	Species	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Macoma	absmercury	ERROR	ERROR	24	.000595327	.	.
2	Macoma	absmercury	treatment	SS1	5	.001136810	9.16587	0.000056
3	Macoma	absmercury	treatment	SS3	5	.001136810	9.16587	0.000056
4	Nephtys	absmercury	ERROR	ERROR	24	.000018262	.	.
5	Nephtys	absmercury	treatment	SS1	5	.000014388	3.78177	0.011466
6	Nephtys	absmercury	treatment	SS3	5	.000014388	3.78177	0.011466

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
Levene's Test for Equality of Variance
Transformed Data

Obs	Species	_NAME_	_SOURCE_	_TYPE_	DF	SS	F	PROB
1	Macoma	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	24	0.15958	.	.
2	Macoma	absasrv	treatment	SS1	5	0.00739	0.22228	0.94935
3	Macoma	absasrv	treatment	SS3	5	0.00739	0.22228	0.94935
4	Nephtys	absasrv	ERROR	ERROR	24	0.05830	.	.
5	Nephtys	absasrv	treatment	SS1	5	0.06154	5.06673	0.00261
6	Nephtys	absasrv	treatment	SS3	5	0.06154	5.06673	0.00261

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF X
		Number of Observations Read 30
		Number of Observations Used 30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: Mercury

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.13694417	0.02738883	216.00	<.0001
Error	24	0.00304316	0.00012680		
Corrected Total	29	0.13998733			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	Mercury Mean
0.978261	17.34962	0.011260	0.064903

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.13694417	0.02738883	216.00	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.13694417	0.02738883	216.00	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for Mercury

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.000127
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.0122

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	0.213600	5	LOWER
B	0.052860	5	AREA 2
B			
C	0.041800	5	AREA 4B
C			
C	0.039080	5	AREA 4A
D			
D	0.027540	5	AREA 1
E	0.014540	5	REF X

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF X
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: Mercury

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	0.00136696	0.00027339	91.08	<.0001
Error	24	0.00007204	0.00000300		
Corrected Total	29	0.00143900			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	Mercury Mean
0.949937	13.91529	0.001733	0.012451

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.00136696	0.00027339	91.08	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	0.00136696	0.00027339	91.08	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Untransformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for Mercury

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	3.002E-6
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.0019

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	0.027300	5	LOWER
B	0.011778	5	AREA 2
C	0.009732	5	AREA 4A
C	0.009486	5	AREA 4B
C	0.008510	5	AREA 1
C	0.007898	5	REF X

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF X
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: logresult

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	19.96676992	3.99335398	190.92	<.0001
Error	24	0.50200548	0.02091689		
Corrected Total	29	20.46877539			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	logresult Mean
0.975475	-4.622200	0.144627	-3.128959

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	19.96676992	3.99335398	190.92	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	19.96676992	3.99335398	190.92	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Macoma -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for logresult

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.020917
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.1565

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	-1.54867	5	LOWER
B	-2.95258	5	AREA 2
C	-3.18736	5	AREA 4B
C	-3.25065	5	AREA 4A
D	-3.59798	5	AREA 1
E	-4.23653	5	REF X

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
treatment	6	AREA 1 AREA 2 AREA 4A AREA 4B LOWER REF X
	Number of Observations Read	30
	Number of Observations Used	30

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: logresult

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	5	5.19568127	1.03913625	65.01	<.0001
Error	24	0.38362242	0.01598427		
Corrected Total	29	5.57930369			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	logresult Mean
0.931242	-2.811794	0.126429	-4.496378

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	5.19568127	1.03913625	65.01	<.0001

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
treatment	5	5.19568127	1.03913625	65.01	<.0001

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
ANOVA and Comparison of Means
Transformed Data

----- Species=Nephtys -----

The GLM Procedure

t Tests (LSD) for logresult

NOTE: This test controls the Type I comparisonwise error rate, not the experimentwise error rate.

Alpha	0.1
Error Degrees of Freedom	24
Error Mean Square	0.015984
Critical Value of t	1.71088
Least Significant Difference	0.1368

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

t Grouping	Mean	N	treatment
A	-3.60563	5	LOWER
B	-4.45909	5	AREA 2
C	-4.63497	5	AREA 4A
C			
D	-4.65991	5	AREA 4B
D			
D	-4.77413	5	AREA 1
E			
E	-4.84454	5	REF X

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 1 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.2365	0.1187	0.0531	-4.3662	-4.0864
Test	5	-3.5980	0.1201	0.0537	-3.7132	-3.4234
Diff (1-2)		-0.6386	0.1194	0.0755		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean		Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev	
REF X		-4.2365	-4.3840	-4.0891	0.1187	0.0711	0.3412
Test		-3.5980	-3.7471	-3.4489	0.1201	0.0720	0.3451
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.6386	-0.8127	-0.4644	0.1194	0.0807	0.2288
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.6386	-0.8127	-0.4644			

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-8.45	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.999	-8.45	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.02	0.9829

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.2365	0.1187	0.0531	-4.3662	-4.0864
Test	5	-2.9526	0.1772	0.0792	-3.2089	-2.7091
Diff (1-2)		-1.2840	0.1508	0.0954		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.2365	-4.3840 -4.0891	0.1187	0.0711 0.3412
Test		-2.9526	-3.1726 -2.7326	0.1772	0.1062 0.5092
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-1.2840	-1.5039 -1.0640	0.1508	0.1019 0.2889
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-1.2840	-1.5096 -1.0583		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-13.46	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.9893	-13.46	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.23	0.4571

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.2365	0.1187	0.0531	-4.3662	-4.0864
Test	5	-3.2506	0.1473	0.0659	-3.4705	-3.0813
Diff (1-2)		-0.9859	0.1338	0.0846		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.2365	-4.3840 -4.0891	0.1187	0.0711 0.3412
Test		-3.2506	-3.4336 -3.0677	0.1473	0.0883 0.4233
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.9859	-1.1810 -0.7908	0.1338	0.0904 0.2563
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.9859	-1.1826 -0.7892		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-11.65	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.6546	-11.65	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.54	0.6862

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=AREA 4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.2365	0.1187	0.0531	-4.3662	-4.0864
Test	5	-3.1874	0.1771	0.0792	-3.4143	-2.9720
Diff (1-2)		-1.0492	0.1508	0.0954		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.2365	-4.3840 -4.0891	0.1187	0.0711 0.3412
Test		-3.1874	-3.4073 -2.9674	0.1771	0.1061 0.5089
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-1.0492	-1.2691 -0.8293	0.1508	0.1018 0.2888
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-1.0492	-1.2747 -0.8236		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-11.00	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	6.9913	-11.00	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.22	0.4576

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Macoma treatment=LOWER -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.2365	0.1187	0.0531	-4.3662	-4.0864
Test	5	-1.5487	0.1119	0.0500	-1.6820	-1.4188
Diff (1-2)		-2.6879	0.1153	0.0729		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.2365	-4.3840 -4.0891	0.1187	0.0711 0.3412
Test		-1.5487	-1.6875 -1.4098	0.1119	0.0670 0.3214
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-2.6879	-2.8561 -2.5196	0.1153	0.0779 0.2210
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-2.6879	-2.8562 -2.5195		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-36.85	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.9716	-36.85	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.13	0.9106

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 1 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.8445	0.0930	0.0416	-4.9923	-4.7341
Test	5	-4.7741	0.1369	0.0612	-4.8982	-4.5952
Diff (1-2)		-0.0704	0.1170	0.0740		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.8445	-4.9600 -4.7291	0.0930	0.0557 0.2672
Test		-4.7741	-4.9441 -4.6041	0.1369	0.0820 0.3934
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.0704	-0.2411 0.1003	0.1170	0.0790 0.2242
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.0704	-0.2452 0.1044		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-0.95	0.3693
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.0424	-0.95	0.3729

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	2.17	0.4719

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 2 -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.8445	0.0930	0.0416	-4.9923	-4.7341
Test	5	-4.4591	0.2133	0.0954	-4.7353	-4.3051
Diff (1-2)		-0.3855	0.1645	0.1041		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.8445	-4.9600 -4.7291	0.0930	0.0557 0.2672
Test		-4.4591	-4.7239 -4.1942	0.2133	0.1278 0.6129
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.3855	-0.6254 -0.1455	0.1645	0.1111 0.3152
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.3855	-0.6462 -0.1247		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-3.70	0.0060
Satterthwaite	Unequal	5.4669	-3.70	0.0119

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	5.26	0.1367

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 4A -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.8445	0.0930	0.0416	-4.9923	-4.7341
Test	5	-4.6350	0.0806	0.0361	-4.7083	-4.5190
Diff (1-2)		-0.2096	0.0870	0.0550		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.8445	-4.9600 -4.7291	0.0930	0.0557 0.2672
Test		-4.6350	-4.7351 -4.5349	0.0806	0.0483 0.2317
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.2096	-0.3365 -0.0827	0.0870	0.0588 0.1667
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.2096	-0.3369 -0.0822		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-3.81	0.0052
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.8428	-3.81	0.0054

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.33	0.7890

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=AREA 4B -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.8445	0.0930	0.0416	-4.9923	-4.7341
Test	5	-4.6599	0.0701	0.0314	-4.7341	-4.5854
Diff (1-2)		-0.1846	0.0823	0.0521		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.8445	-4.9600 -4.7291	0.0930	0.0557 0.2672
Test		-4.6599	-4.7470 -4.5728	0.0701	0.0420 0.2015
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-0.1846	-0.3047 -0.0645	0.0823	0.0556 0.1578
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-0.1846	-0.3063 -0.0629		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-3.55	0.0076
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.438	-3.55	0.0085

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.76	0.5981

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
 T-test Results, This is a 2-tailed result
 See Summary Page for 1-tail Result

----- Species=Nephtys treatment=LOWER -----

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: logresult

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
REF X	5	-4.8445	0.0930	0.0416	-4.9923	-4.7341
Test	5	-3.6056	0.1077	0.0482	-3.7050	-3.4327
Diff (1-2)		-1.2389	0.1006	0.0636		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean	Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev
REF X		-4.8445	-4.9600 -4.7291	0.0930	0.0557 0.2672
Test		-3.6056	-3.7394 -3.4719	0.1077	0.0645 0.3095
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	-1.2389	-1.3857 -1.0922	0.1006	0.0680 0.1928
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	-1.2389	-1.3862 -1.0916		

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > t
Pooled	Equal	8	-19.47	<.0001
Satterthwaite	Unequal	7.8327	-19.47	<.0001

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	4	4	1.34	0.7823

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
One-tail T-test Summary

Obs	Species	treatment	Variances	probt1	sig	onetail
1	Macoma	AREA 1	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
2	Macoma	AREA 2	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
3	Macoma	AREA 4A	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
4	Macoma	AREA 4B	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
5	Macoma	LOWER	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
6	Nephtys	AREA 1	Equal	0.185		Treatment <= Comparison
7	Nephtys	AREA 2	Equal	0.003	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
8	Nephtys	AREA 4A	Equal	0.003	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
9	Nephtys	AREA 4B	Equal	0.004	Yes	Treatment > Comparison
10	Nephtys	LOWER	Equal	0.000	Yes	Treatment > Comparison

Analysis of Tissue Data for Douglas Harbor vs. REF X
Upper Confidence Limit Calculations

Species	Treatment	Mean	Variance	Upper		Upper		Difference		Difference		Upper	
				Limit 1	Limit 2	Limit 1	Limit 2	Mean 1	Mean 2	Upper 1	Upper 2		
1 Macoma	AREA 1	-3.59798	0.014423	1.71088	2.13185	-3.48732	-3.48348	0.11066	0.11450	0.02738	0.03058	0.03070	
2 Macoma	AREA 2	-2.95258	0.031399	1.71088	2.13185	-2.84192	-2.78364	0.11066	0.16894	0.05221	0.05831	0.06181	
3 Macoma	AREA 4A	-3.25065	0.021703	1.71088	2.13185	-3.13999	-3.11019	0.11066	0.14045	0.03875	0.04328	0.04459	
4 Macoma	AREA 4B	-3.18736	0.031368	1.71088	2.13185	-3.07670	-3.01850	0.11066	0.16885	0.04128	0.04611	0.04887	
5 Macoma	LOWER	-1.54867	0.012511	1.71088	2.13185	-1.43801	-1.44203	0.11066	0.10664	0.21253	0.23740	0.23645	
6 Macoma	REF X	-4.23653	0.014098	1.71088	2.13185	-4.12587	-4.12333	0.11066	0.11320	0.01446	0.01615	0.01619	
7 Nephtys	AREA 1	-4.77413	0.018743	1.71088	2.13185	-4.67740	-4.64361	0.09673	0.13052	0.00845	0.00930	0.00962	
8 Nephtys	AREA 2	-4.45909	0.045499	1.71088	2.13185	-4.36235	-4.25572	0.09673	0.20336	0.01157	0.01275	0.01418	
9 Nephtys	AREA 4A	-4.63497	0.006500	1.71088	2.13185	-4.53823	-4.55810	0.09673	0.07686	0.00971	0.01069	0.01048	
10 Nephtys	AREA 4B	-4.65991	0.004917	1.71088	2.13185	-4.56318	-4.59306	0.09673	0.06685	0.00947	0.01043	0.01012	
11 Nephtys	LOWER	-3.60563	0.011603	1.71088	2.13185	-3.50890	-3.50293	0.09673	0.10270	0.02717	0.02993	0.03011	
12 Nephtys	REF X	-4.84454	0.008644	1.71088	2.13185	-4.74781	-4.75590	0.09673	0.08864	0.00787	0.00867	0.00860	