FACTORS AFFECTING THE HORIZONTAL
DISTRIBUTION OF VERTICAL WORM TUBES
IN THE THOROLD SANDSTONE

FACTORS AFFECTING THE HORIZONTAL
DISTRIBUTION OF VERTICAL WORM TUBES
IN THE THOROLD SANDSTONE

By

COLIN JAMES YEO

A Thesis
Submitted to the Department of Geology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Bachelor of Science

McMaster University
April 1974

Title: Factors Affecting the Horizontal
                 Distribution of Vertical Worm Tubes
                 in the Thorold Sandstone

Author: Colin James Yeo

Supervisor: Dr. M.J. Risk

Number of Pages: viii, 95

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF PLATES

ABSTRACT

101 samples of Thorold sandstone were collected from
12 geographically distinct regions along the Niagara
Escarpment. The average number of vertical worm tubes in
each region was determined as was clay content, organic
matter, burrow diameter, interburrow distance, mean grain
size, sorting, quartz proportion, distance from shore,
porosity, and the sandstone/shale ratio. Stepwise linear
regression and principal component analysis were used to
investigate relationships between the variables. The
number of worm tubes can be predicted by clay content,
organic matter, distance from the shore, and porosity, a
model which explains 62% of the observed variation. All
11 variables accounted for 99.9% of the variation. Distance
from shore can be predicted by organic matter, burrow diam-
eter, mean grain size, and the sandstone/shale ratio, a
model which explains 94% of the variation. All 11 variables
accounted for 99.9% of the variation. Organisms living in
the Thorold evidently reacted to environmental parameters
in a similar fashion to modern tidal flat organisms.

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Numerous workers have shown that a relationship
exists in the marine habitat between diversities and
densities of organisms and environmental parameters.
The bulk of the evidence comes from studies on recent
marine communities in shallow lagoons or on recent
mud flats. The purpose of this investigation is to
determine if recent models of environmental control
of animal populations can be used to deduce the
factors which correlate with the horizontal distri-
bution of vertical worm tubes in a Silurian sandstone
from southern Ontario and northern New York State.
If these factors can be isolated, then this study
will demonstrate that methods currently used in marine
biological studies can be applied to the ancient.

Schafer (1972), Eltringham (1971), Newell (1970),
and Hughes et al. (1972) have shown how environmental
parameters affect the zonation of organisms in inter-
tidal regions. Hughes identified the fauna and sieved
the sediment as well as measured the distance from the
shore in St. Margaret's Bay, Nova Scotia. The sediment
and distance measurements were correlated with the
various species of polychaetes and echinoderms by
applying both principal component and Q mode factor
analysis. He found that five components explained 70%
of the total variance.

Statistical analysis of variance has been used by
many workers in various studies. Griffiths (1958)
used multiple stepwise regression techniques to evalu-
ate the relationship between petrology and porosity;

Field (1971) used factor analysis to produce species groups of Australian benthic invertebrates which can be correlated with environment parameters. Roback et al. (1969) studied the fauna of a large river on the eastern United States coast and observed changes in the type and diversity of fauna, as well as changes in the environment due to increased urbanization, and attempted to relate the two. Stephenson et al. (1970) used statistical analysis to reduce their data, to arrange sample sites into groups with similar characteristics, to assign specific species to certain groups, and to establish a site-group, species-group correlation. Stephenson (1971) grouped fauna according to environmental factors using principal component analysis. Rhoads et al. (1972) grouped sampled fauna into sediment-related fossil assembleges, but used no statistical or numerical methods to group the fauna.

The principles of interpretation and analysis enumerated by the above studies will be incorporated in the present study, which attempts to determine the relationship between organisms inhabiting vertical tubes and the paleoenvironmental parameters (presumably reflected in substrate lithology).

Study Area

The Thorold sandstone, considered to be a Silurian intertidal mud flat (Martini, 1971), is a good parallel with the present environment because of the availability of information on research into animal-environment relationships on modern intertidal mud flats.

The Thorold sandstone has been assigned to the Medina Formation of the Lower Silurian Clinton Group. It

conformably grades into the Grimsby sandstone below,
marked by a colour change from green to red; the Thorold
is unconformably overlain by the Reynales limestone. It
ranges in thickness from approximately 4.9 m. around
Hamilton, Ontario, to about .3 m. just east of the Lock-
port area, but can be traced a total of 203.2 km. from
Clappison's Corners, Ontario, in the west to Fulton,
New York, in the east, with no lateral breaks. The
Thorold is exposed all along the Niagara Escarpment and
is easily accessible in several areas. However, in
some areas it is covered, especially to the southwest.
The Thorold is exposed in the Niagara Gorge following
a north-south line perpendicular to the trend east-west
along the escarpment face. All sample sites used were
those selected by Martini (1966) for his sedimentological
study of the Medina Formation.

FIG. 1

N

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF SAMPLE POINTS

• SAMPLE POINT

SCALE 1" = 50 mi.

5.

STATISTICAL APPROACH

Sample Design

The sampling procedure used in this study was deter-
mined by two factors: the type of analysis to be
performed and the cost-efficiency [1] in terms of data
collection. The analysis used here requires that
systematic samples be taken along a line or grid when
using stepwise regression and principal component
analysis (Kummel and Raup, 1965). These two types of
variance analysis explain variation as distributions
and occurrences of organisms. The author adopted a
stratified systematic sampling strategy with starting
points randomly determined, necessarily modified by the
occurrence of covered intervals.

The above sampling procedure was carried out on
both a regional and local scale. The entire extent of
the exposed Thorold along the transect was divided into
ten eastwardly increasing strata [2] with one sample point
in each stratum. The Niagara Gorge permitted sampling
both north and south of the Niagara Escarpment, giving
some indication of variation perpendicular to the
transect. On a regional scale, the Thorold was sampled
at twelve exposures (sample points). At each of the
twelve locations (sample points) the site was divided

---

1. Cost-efficiency is a sampling term which indicates
   how many samples must be taken in order to approx-
   imate the mean of the population at a given
   probability level. It also indicates how much it
   will cost in time and money to collect these samples.

2. Strata is used here in a statistical rather than a
   geological sense.

Plate 1: A typical sample slab of Thorold sandstone
          showing vertical worm tubes. If this
          specimen was larger, the number of strata
          that the outcrop would be divided into would
          be reduced.

into a specific number of equal strata. The number of
strata used was inversely related to the surface area
of the sample slabs (see Plate 1.); a large number of
strata was used when the slab surface area was small
and a smaller number was used when the slabs were large
in area. In all cases, an attempt was made to sample a
total of 0.2 sq. m. slab area. After the number of
strata at each sample point was decided upon, a point
in the first stratum was randomly selected; the relative
position of the sample point within each succeeding
stratum was the same as the first. The samples were
taken along a diagonal line stretching from the base of
the first incremental column to the top of the last.
This monitored changes in tube population densities
during the deposition of the Thorold at each sample
point. The final average value for each of the vari-
ables using this scheme should be representative of
the entire Thorold at each location.

A result of the stratified systematic sampling
design used in this study is an increase in the effi-
ciency of obtaining an estimate of the mean of the
particular population under investigation. Snedecor
and Cochran (1967) show that in a case such as this
study, stratified systematic sampling allows an accu-
rate estimate of the mean to be produced with fewer
samples.

Statistical Procedure

The variables to be used in this analysis fall into
three groups: the distribution and occurrence of
vertical worm tubes, lithology and mineralogy of the
containing rock, and a geographic measure of position

on the presumed Silurian mud flat. Once these variables
have been established and measured, their variance will
be compared by means of linear regression, stepwise
regression and principal component analysis, using the
UCLA Biomedical Computer program package.

For examination of the behavior of a dependent
variable and one independent variable, a computer pro-
gramme for simple linear regression was employed. This
programme determines the standard deviation of both the
dependent and independent variables, the correlation
coefficient, the Y intercept of the regression line,
the slope of the line, and the standard error of estimate.

The stepwise regression programme (BMD02R) calculates
linear regression equations in a sequential method. The
variable which has the highest simple correlation
coefficient with the dependent variable is the variable
used in the first equation. In each succeeding step,
all the variables which have not been added to the
equation are partialled on those that have been added.
The next variable entered into the equation is the
variable with the highest partial correlation coefficient,
thus the variable which most greatly reduces the chi-
square goodness of fit value, and if added would produce
the highest F value. When the F value falls below a
specific minimum value, the variable is rejected since
it does not contribute to the explanation of the
variance of the dependent variable. The programme also
allows variables to be forced into the equation (assum-
ing that the F value is too low for further computation)
and also allows the regression line to be forced through
the origin. As a final result, one is able to determine
how much of the observed variation in the dependent

variable is explained by the variation among the
independent variables. This will provide some idea of
how important each variable is in explaining variation
of the dependent variable.

Many of the independent variables which are selected
as being valid controlling influences on the dependent
variable are in fact not independent but are auto-
correlated. The principal component analysis programme
(BMD01M) is designed to recoordinate interdependent
variables (x1, x2, x3 ... xn) so that within the context
of the new coordinate system, they become independent
components (y1, y2, y3 ... yn). The total number of
variables equals the total number of new components and
the total variance is preserved in the transformation.
The resulting components comprise all the original
variables, each variable having a certain importance or
factor loading. In many studies, (King, 1966; Moser &
Scott, 1961), the number of original variables could be
reduced by 80% to a few components. This programme
derives the principal components of standardized data
and rank orders in each case. Principal component
analysis is used when the variables used in stepwise
regression are not independent.

These three computer programmes should be competent
to isolate those variables or factors which explain the
bulk of the variation in worm distribution in the
Thorold sandstone.

PETROGRAPHY AND DIAGENESIS

The Thorold sandstone is a white to light green, fine grained, dense orthoquartzite. It consists of interbedded sands and shales with the sandstone/shale ratio increasing in an eastward direction (Bolton, 1957). In thin section the grains are subrounded to subangular; the sediment becomes dominently subangular closer to the sediment source. Quartz overgrowths are common throughout the Thorold. The grain surface below the overgrowths is frequently marked by a dusty iron oxide coat, the overgrowth often showing signs of being reworked. The presence of sericite indicates alteration of potassium feldspars; this is reinforced by cases in which feldspar is in transition to sericite. The sericite appears to be "squeezed" around quartz grains often appearing as if the quartz and sericite were reacting. Rims of goethite surround quartz grains and are found in the surrounding matrix as small spherules. Some calcite cement was also found in the sandstone. Accessory minerals included biotite, chlorite, zircon, tourmaline, magnetite and plagioclase feldspars. X-ray diffraction analysis showed that montmorillonite, chlorite, illite, goethite, quartz and calcite are very common in the Thorold, with rare dolomite. Quartz makes up 60% – 70% of the sandstone by visual estimate, with an error of $\pm$ 5% as indicated by Dennison and Shea (1966). Goethite and clays each make up approximately 15%.

Martini (1971) concluded that the Thorold is a second cycle sediment on the basis of abundant quartz, chert grains, submaturity of the sandstone, the presence of only the most stable heavy minerals, and reworked quartz overgrowths. He believes the Thorold is the reworked top of the subsiding Grimsby delta.

The usual sorting, compaction and reworking processes took place, as can be seen in thin section. Quartz grains were cemented by secondary silica and calcite, which reduced permeability and total porosity. Dolomite occasionally replaces the calcite cement. Post-depositional diagenetic changes occurred, but do not appear to have significantly altered the texture or mineralogy of the sediment. Tectonic processes were not of major significance in the geologic history of the region and the Thorold in particular, but did cause a regional 5° dip of the beds to the south west.

Most thin sections from the study area show aligned quartz extinction, suggesting a regional stress, such as a tilting of the beds after lithification. Such a force would also tend to explain any preferred pressure solution direction.

VARIABLES

Introduction

Eleven variables were chosen as possibly related to environmental conditions necessary for the organisms to survive (Storer et al., 1968; MacGinitie and MacGinitie, 1968; Ager, 1963). Each variable is indicative of some environmental process or condition. As any one variable (environmental condition) changes, worm burrow population should also change. The eleven variables are listed below, and the method used to quantify each is also described.

Worm Burrow Population Density

Each sample slab was thoroughly washed to ensure that no mudballs were mistaken for burrows. The number of vertical tubes was counted on each slab and the area of the slab was measured. The sum of the burrows and the sum of the area were calculated. The total number of burrows within the sampled area was readjusted to a square meter so that all population densities were based on one square meter.

Clay Fraction

X-ray diffraction analysis identified at least three clay minerals and sometimes four. The area under the curve of each clay mineral primary peak was measured using a planimeter; the areas for each clay mineral were summed and the area was expressed as a percent of the total summed area for all minerals.

Organic Fraction

One sample from each of the twelve sample points was crushed to a fine powder ($< 50 \mu$). A weighed quantity of sandstone powder was placed in a beaker to which was added a volume of 15% H_2O_2. The hydrogen peroxide oxidized any organic residue present. After the reaction had gone to completion, the sample was filtered using the finest filter paper available, and the sample was dried. The sample was weighed and the difference in weight expressed as a percent of the original sample. There does exist the possibility that the sample was contaminated by foreign organic matter or that organic acids have entered the rock from external vegetation.

Burrow Diameter

The outside diameter of each burrow was measured using a pair of caliphers and a steel rule divided into mm. units. Where the number of burrows of each sample exceeded thirty, a grid pattern was superimposed on the slab and a sample of 30 burrows was counted using a systematic design.

Interburrow Distance

The distance between the centre of one burrow and its nearest neighbour was measured using caliphers and a rule. When the number of burrows exceeded thirty, only those burrows included in the sample measured were used to determine the nearest neighbour distance. If the edge of the sample was closer to a given burrow than another burrow, that burrow was ignored.

Mean Grain Size

A petrographic microscope was used to measure thirty quartz grains excluding any overgrowths from one thin section from each sample point. Again, a grid pattern was employed to select the grains.

Sorting

The standard deviation of the mean grain size was used as an expression of the degree of sorting of the sediment in the thin section.

Quartz Fraction

X-ray diffraction analysis was used to determine the percent quartz at each sample point.

Distance from the Shore

Using the isopach maps from Martini (1966 and 1971), the suspected shore line was sketched onto large scale maps. The shortest distance from each sample point to the shore was measured in miles using the appropriate scale.

Porosity

The porosity and permeability of a specimen from each sample point was determined using standard industrial techniques. These measurements were made in the laboratories of Amoco Canada Ltd., Calgary, Alberta. The value for each specimen is expressed in percent terms.

Sandstone/Shale Ratio

The thickness of the sandstone beds and the shale beds were measured in the field. The ratio of the total thickness of each was taken. These sample points which had no shale beds were assigned a ratio of 9999.99, which is the largest number that can be entered into the programme.

Environmental Significance of the Variables

There are at least four major factors which affect worms: food, community interaction, substrate type and the condition of the water. The worms under investigation are either filter feeders (probably) or deposit feeders. If they are deposit feeders then they should be most abundant where the organic content of the sediment is high, relatively speaking. The organic residue within the sandstone would give a direct measure of the available food. However, because of the reactive nature of organics, this measure may not be valid due to processes of decomposition and diffusion (Berner, 1971). Clays which have a reactive surface often bind organics to the grain surface. Deposit feeding organisms ingest the clays to remove the organics for nutrition. If these organisms are filter feeders, then there should be little or no correlation with either the organic content or the clay content of the sediment.

The second factor is community interaction. The organisms, for unknown reasons, may need to live in clusters or be separated by some distance. This spacing may be a function of competition for food. The diameter of the burrow is a function of the size of the animal,

or a function of the species of worm which constructs
the burrow.

The nature of the substrate is reflected by the mean
grain size, sorting, quartz fraction, porosity, and
sandstone/shale ratio. The degree of compaction of
the surface sediment is to some extent reflected by the
grain size; that is, small grains form a harder substrate
than large grains. Sorting is indicative of the porosity
of the sediment, a well sorted sediment being more porous
than one which is poorly sorted. It has been shown that
particular combinations of mean grain size and sorting
are suggestive of particular environments (Blatt et al.
1972). The quartz fraction reflects the amount of non-
argillaceous, particulate matter in the substrate.
Porosity indicates the degree of compaction that has
occurred and measures the degree of secondary cementation
in the sandstone. This measure may not be valid since
the primary cementation cannot be accurately estimated,
and thus the extent of diagenesis before cementation
cannot be determined. The sandstone/shale ratio is an
indication of the rate of sedimentation and also the
substrate type.

The distance from the shore reflects such conditions
as current velocity, wave energy, salinity, and turbidity.
This measure is a "catch all" term for many environmental
conditions.

TABLE 1

X_1 number of worm burrows per meter

X_2 clay content

X_3 organic content

X_4 burrow diameter

X_5 mean grain size

X_6 sorting

X_7 quartz fraction

X_8 distance from shore

X_9 porosity

X_{10} sandstone/shale ratio

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F RATIO
REGRESSION	9	1926918.073	214102.008	36.092
RESIDUAL	1	5932.056	5932.056	

VARIABLES IN EQUATION

VARIABLE	COEFFECIENT	STD. ERROR	F TO REMOVE
(CONSTANT	-7025.16717)		
2	-91.21529	11.44885	63.4763 (2)
3	-931.23507	83.72833	133.0659 (2)
4	1276.52456	155.21317	67.6396 (2)
5	-11043.71655	1153.41399	91.6769 (2)
6	602.11304	130.79811	21.1911 (2)
7	-16.42405	6.07490	7.3094 (2)
8	68.02949	5.01266	184.1866 (2)
9	-87.51133	8.91237	96.4143 (2)
10	.09172	.01718	28.5102 (2)

VARIABLES NOT IN EQUATION

VARIABLE	PARTIAL CORR.	TOLERANCE	F TO ENTER

F-LEVEL OR TOLERANCE INSUFFICIENT FOR FURTHER COMPUTATION

SUMMARY TABLE

STEP NUMBER	VARIABLE ENTERED	VARIABLE REMOVED	MULTIPLE R	RSQ	INCREASE IN RSQ	F VALUE TO ENTER OR REMOVE	NUMBER OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES INCLUDED
1	8		.4194	.1759	.1759	1.9212	1
2	9		.5725	.3277	.1518	1.8065	2
3	2		.6956	.4838	.1561	2.1165	3
4	3		.7987	.6378	.1540	2.5522	4
5	4		.8410	.7074	.0695	1.1878	5
6	5		.8822	.7783	.0709	1.2792	6
7	10		.9650	.9313	.1530	6.6791	7
8	6		.9872	.9745	.0432	3.3896	8
9	7		.9985	.9969	.0224	7.3094	9

LIST OF RESIDUALS

CASE NUMBER	Y X(1)	Y COMPUTED	RESIDUAL	X(8)	X(9)	X(2)	X(3)	X(4)
1	448.4000	427.4842	20.9158	156.0000	12.7000	27.0000	2.1400	4.1000
2	434.2000	434.0408	.1592	155.0000	10.5000	19.0000	3.4500	2.9000
3	1659.5000	1646.1928	13.3072	150.0000	7.6000	16.0000	1.3300	3.6000
4	668.2000	665.4299	2.7701	149.0000	6.1000	19.0000	2.9000	3.3000
5	128.3000	113.6987	14.6013	148.0000	15.8000	15.0000	2.5000	3.6000
6	650.4000	690.1119	-39.7119	138.0000	11.5000	21.0000	2.5100	4.1000
7	210.2000	258.1165	-47.9165	125.0000	9.4000	21.0000	.7400	3.6000
8	115.5000	104.7940	10.7060	111.0000	7.3000	20.0000	2.3300	4.6000
9	284.2000	299.5625	-15.3625	112.0000	5.3000	24.0000	2.1000	5.8000
10	190.7000	165.3573	25.3427	115.0000	6.4000	27.0000	.8500	4.2000
11	320.9000	305.7113	15.1887	81.0000	8.7000	17.0000	.8800	4.8000

FINISH CARD ENCOUNTERED
PROGRAM TERMINATED

19.

TABLE 2

```
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE       DF     SUM OF SQUARES    MEAN SQUARE     F RATIO
          REGRESSION        9        5775.634         641.737      503.382
          RESIDUAL          1           1.275           1.275
```

| | VARIABLES IN EQJATION | | | | VARIABLES NOT IN EQUATION | | |
VARIABLE	COEFFECIENT	STD. ERROR	F TO REMOVE .	VARIABLE	PARTIAL CORR.	TOLERANCE	F TO ENTER
(CONSTANT	103.43175)						
1	.01462	.00108	184.1866 (2)				
2	1.33822	.15942	70.4604 (2)				
3	13.69191	.54846	623.2155 (2)				
4	-18.79403	1.46929	163.6151 (2)				
5	162.58926	7.85457	428.4883 (2)				
6	-8.87585	1.67599	28.0465 (2)				
7	.24243	.08443	8.2442 (2)				
9	1.28142	.14443	78.7142 (2)				
10	-.00135	.00023	35.3046 (2)				

F-LEVEL OR TOLERANCE INSUFFICIENT FOR FURTHER COMPUTATION

SUMMARY TABLE

STEP NUMBER	VARIABLE ENTERED	REMOVED	MULTIPLE R	RSQ	INCREASE IN RSQ	F VALUE TO ENTER OR REMOVE	NUMBER OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES INCLUDED
1	4		.7106	.5050	.5050	9.1818	1
2	5		.8173	.6680	.1630	3.9288	2
3	3		.9205	.8473	.1793	8.2228	3
4	10		.9699	.9407	.0934	9.4475	4
5	1		.9838	.9678	.0271	4.2152	5
6	9		.9912	.9824	.0146	3.3092	6
7	2		.9968	.9935	.0112	5.1827	7
8	6		.9990	.9980	.0044	4.3280	8
9	7		.9999	.9998	.0018	8.2442	9

LIST OF RESIDUALS

CASE NUMBER	X(Y8)	Y COMPUTED	RESIDUAL	X(4)	X(5)	X(3)	X(10)	X(1)
1	156.0000	156.2908	-.2908	4.1000	.1700	2.1400	1.0260	448.4000
2	155.0000	155.0008	-.0008	2.9000	.0700	3.4500	1.1000	434.2000
3	150.0000	150.1494	-.1494	3.6000	.1600	1.3300	1.0900	1659.5000
4	149.0000	149.0549	-.0549	3.3000	.0800	2.9000	1.9300	668.2000
5	148.0000	148.2446	-.2446	3.6000	.1400	2.5000	1.8400	128.3000
6	138.0000	137.3760	.6240	4.1000	.0700	2.5100	7.3300	650.4000
7	125.0000	124.3306	.6694	3.6000	.1300	.7400	7.9300	210.2000
8	111.0000	111.1771	-.1771	4.6000	.0500	2.3300	10.3300	115.5000
9	112.0000	111.7827	.2173	5.8000	.2800	2.1000	9999.9900	284.2000
10	115.0000	115.3782	-.3782	4.2000	.1300	.8500	88.0000	190.7000
11	81.0000	81.2147	-.2147	4.8000	.1000	.8800	9999.9900	320.9000

FINISH CARD ENCOUNTERED
PROGRAM TERMINATED

20.

TABLE 3

BMD01M - COMPONENT ANALYSIS - REVISED SEPTEMBER 12, 1969
HEALTH SCIENCES COMPUTING FACILITY.UCLA

PROBLEM CODE BMD01M
NUMBER OF VARIABLES 10
NUMBER OF CASES   11
NUMBER OF VARIABLES ADDED   0
NUMBER OF TRANSGENERATION CARD(S)   -0
NUMBER OF VARIABLE FORMAT CARD(S)   1

VARIABLE FORMAT IS
(4F6.2,6X,6F6.2)

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT MATRIX

1.0000	-.3173	-.0186	-.2940	.0616	-.0290	.0508	.4194
-.3173	1.0000	-.1658	.3582	.3340	-.1169	-.3406	-.0661
-.0186	-.1658	1.0000	-.3199	-.2584	.5271	.0467	.5859
-.2940	.3582	-.3199	1.0000	.5461	-.4665	-.1144	-.7106
.0616	.3340	-.2584	.5461	1.0000	-.2502	-.0771	-.0498
-.0290	-.1169	.5271	-.4665	-.2502	1.0000	.2339	.3289
.0508	-.3406	.0467	-.1144	-.0771	.2339	1.0000	-.1403
.4194	-.0661	.5859	-.7106	-.0498	.3289	-.1403	1.0000
-.1622	-.2435	.2649	-.3857	-.1552	-.1241	.0685	.4451
-.1840	-.0022	-.2686	.7682	.4935	-.1348	.1352	-.7102

-.1622	-.1840
-.2435	-.0022
.2649	-.2686
-.3857	.7682
-.1552	.4935
.1241	-.1348
.0685	.1352
.4451	-.7102
1.0000	-.3444
-.3444	1.0000

EIGENVALUES
3.582424	1.5577291	1.3369052	1.1435364	.9558874	.6493582
.5078754	.2140699	.0522760	.0001059		

CUMULATIVE PROPORTION OF TOTAL VARIANCE
.36	.51	.65	.76	.86	.92	.97	.99
1.00	1.00					

TABLE 4

EIGENVECTORS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	.1497	.0542	.7546	.2667	.1149	.0139	.0410	.5215
	-.1933	.5189	-.3718	.1546	.2017	.4895	.0677	.3969
	.3281	-.1060	-.3238	.4056	.07A3	-.3801	.5768	.0062
	-.4809	-.0705	-.1069	.1720	-.1152	-.0208	.3799	.2409
	.2876	.2272	-.1072	.5952	-.3665	.0526	-.2440	-.4392
	.2801	-.2833	-.3131	.3710	-.3719	.0843	-.5581	-.1363
	.0085	-.6351	.0703	.1440	-.1386	.6676	-.2393	-.0909
	.4384	.2904	.0867	.3378	-.1611	.0708	.0994	-.1272
	.2756	-.0300	-.2303	-.1187	-.7791	-.0025	-.1771	.442A
	-.4146	-.3018	-.0319	.2646	-.0440	-.3936	-.2172	.283A

	1	2
	.1130	.1852
	.2535	.1568
	-.0326	.3568
	.5632	-.4355
	.1354	-.3033
	.3438	-.1094
	-.1961	.0421
	-.2550	-.6928
	.0863	.1179
	-.5977	-.1567

EIGEN VALUE CHECK MATRIX

3.5823	.0016	-.0002	.0000	.0006	.0001	.0002	-.0000
-.0016	1.5577	-.0000	.0000	-.0001	-.0003	-.0001	-.0000
-.0002	.0000	1.3369	-.0000	-.0001	-.0003	-.0001	-.0000
.0000	.0000	-.0001	1.1435	.0000	-.0000	-.0000	-.0000
.0006	-.0003	-.0003	.0000	.9559	-.0000	.0000	-.0000
.0002	-.0001	.0001	-.0000	-.0000	.6494	.5079	.0000
-.0000	.0000	-.0000	-.0000	.0000	-.0000	.0000	.2141
-.0000	.0000	-.0000	-.0000	-.0000	-.0000	-.0000	-.0000
.0000	.0000	-.0000	-.0000	.0000	-.0000	-.0000	.0000

-.0000	.0000
-.0000	.0000
.0000	-.0000
.0000	-.0000
.0000	-.0000
-.0000	-.0000
-.0000	.0000
.0523	.0000
.0000	.0001

RANK ORDER OF EACH STANDARDIZED CASE ORDERED BY
SIZE OF EACH PRINCIPAL COMPONENT SEPARATELY

TABLE 5

RESULTS

All variables were entered into the BMD02R programme.
It was apparent that interburrow distance was the dominant
variable, accounting for 62% of the variation in burrow
density. However, it is intuitively obvious that a large
number of burrows within a given area tend to be closer
than a few scattered over the same area. It was decided
to remove the variable to see how important it is to the
regression model. It was also noted that the standard
error of estimate was very large because of the data from
Webster's Falls. Webster's Falls was the most poorly
sampled point (one biased sample of a small area). It
was decided to remove the Webster's Falls data from the
matrix. After these modifications, the data matrix
contains 10 variables and 11 cases.

The BMD02R programme was run again using the new data
matrix. The 10 variables explained 99.69% of the variance.
Thus, interburrow distance is inessential to the model.
However, the standard error of estimate was too large for
many variables to contribute significantly to the explained
variation. Distance from the shore, porosity, clay fraction,
and organic fraction explain 62% of the variation with
distance from the shore having $p > .05$ and the clay fraction
$p > .10$. All the variables entered after this point are
not significant because their standard error of estimate
is too large. It should be noted that the lack of signifi-
cance may not be a function of a wide scatter of points
about the model line but may be a result of the small
number of sample points. The regression equation which
describes the variation of the dependent variable, the
population density of worm burrows, with the variation in
the independent variables are:

$$X_1 = -7025.16 - 91.22 \, X_2 - 931.24 \, X_3 + 68.03 \, X_8 - 87.51 \, X_9$$

where X_2 = clay content

X_3 = organic fraction

X_8 = distance from the shore

X_9 = porosity

X_2 confidence level 10%

X_8 confidence level 5%

The same data matrix was run using BMDO2R but designating distance from the shore as the dependent variable. Four variables: burrow diameter, mean grain size, organic fraction, and sandstone/shale ratio, explain 94% of the variation in distance, multiple R = .9985 (p > .05). These four variables are all significant above the 5% level (t test). The remaining five variables explain another 5% of the variation, but the regression coefficients are not significant. Total explained variance is 99.98%. The regression equation which describes the variation of the dependent variable, the distance from the shore, with the variation in the independent variables are:

$$X_8 = 103.43 + 13.69 \, X_3 - 18.79 \, X_4 + 162.59 \, X_5 + .001 \, X_{10}$$

where X_3 = organic fraction

X_4 = burrow diameter

X_5 = mean grain size

X_{10} = sandstone/shale ratio

X_3, X_4, X_5, X_{10}, confidence level 5%

In order to determine which variables are contributing to explained variance through correlation with another independent variable, BMDO1M was run using 10 variables and 11 cases.

Principal component analysis showed that 86% of the total variance could be explained using only 5 components. Component one explained 36% of the variation, with all variables except the quartz fraction equally contributing

to the component. An additional 15% was accounted for by
component two, dominated by the quartz and clay fraction
variables; to a lesser extent the organic fraction, mean
grain size, sorting, distance from the shore, and the
sandstone/shale ratio contributed to the component. Com-
ponent three explained another 14% of the variation. It
consisted of a heavy factor loading on burrow density
with all other variables except quartz fraction, distance
from the shore, and the sandstone/shale ratio equally
important to the component. Component four explains an
additional 11% with equal loadings on all variables
except mean grain size, which is more heavily loaded.
Component five accounts for another 10%, which is dominated
by porosity with equal contributions from all other
variables except the organic fraction and the sandstone/
shale ratio.

Examining all the components, it is apparent that all
variables contribute equally to the explanation of variance
with one different variable in components two to five being
only slightly more dominant than the rest.

Interpretation of Results

Stepwise regression analysis shows that only two of the
variables are significant above the 10% level of con-
fidence in the worm burrow model: distance from the shore
and the clay fraction. The correlation matrix indicates
that these two variables are not autocorrelated. There
are many ecological implications of the distance variable.
As distance increases so does the population of worm
burrows. It would appear that the organisms inhabiting
the tubes prefer quiet waters with slow sedimentation
rates. Eltringham (1971) notes that polychaetes on modern

tidal flats are scarce on the high energy zone close to
the shore but increase as one moves away from shore.
This observation is consistent with the model established
for the Thorold. Kellerhals and Murray (1969) have also
found the same relationship on the Fraser River delta.
The sediment type reflects quiet water. As distance
increases, the amount of argillaceous material also
increases. Eltringham (1971) noticed that certain species
of worms prefer a particular substrate. In Kames Bay, he
found that changes in the fauna could be related to changes
in the substrate. Newell (1970) shows that some poly-
chaetes seek a sediment type containing a certain quantity
or species of bacteria. He concludes that on the modern
flats substrate surface texture, surface contours, surface
angle, surface albedo, grain size and porosity, and
current strength are important considerations in analysing
polychaete population densities. The first four factors
are relatively constant throughout the Thorold, but grain
size and porosity and current strength vary. Grain size
and porosity show no correlation with distance and there
is no accurate means of measuring paleocurrent velocity.
Grain size and porosity have been altered by diagenesis;
they may have once been highly correlated with distance
as modern sediments are today. The ease with which an
organism can burrow is related to the grain size and the
porosity of the sediment. The largest densities occur
far from shore in the Thorold where grain size was probably
originally small and compaction loose. The same situation
occurs in the Bay of Fundy (D. Craig, personal communica-
tion.

Current strength varies with distance from the shore
but does not do so directly. Offshore and longshore
currents combine to produce complex water current systems.

These currents act as importers of fresh organic material.
The morphology of the tubes indicates that the organisms
were probably filter feeders or surface feeders scraping
organic material from the sediment surface. In such a case,
currents would be extremely important in food supply. If
current and wave energy were high, sediment as well as
organic matter would be in suspension resulting in a clog-
ged feeding apparatus and removing organic films from the
sand grains (Newell, 1970). The maximum densities occur
where these conditions are most beneficial to the animal.
Some animals have a wide tolerance level explaining the
gradation from near shore to far shore environments
(Schafer, 1972). The same relation was found by Sanders
(Purdy, 1964). He found that the relative abundance of
filter feeders and suspension feeders varied with the
sediment texture; deposit feeders were found associated
with the finest grain size, while filter feeders were
associated with the coarsest. The association of filter
feeders and coarse grain size is through current velocity.
Filter feeders require microorganisms and organic material
to be suspended in order to be consumed and high current
velocities (relative to clay and silt settling velocities)
suspend the organic material.

Salinity changes slightly, decreasing in the near shore
environment. Eltringham (1971) shows that the most normal
marine conditions are far from shore. These organisms
found in the Thorold apparently preferred the normal
salinity offshore.

In summary, distance from the shore as it applies to
population densities includes considerations of energy
zonation, substrate zonation, grain size and porosity,
current strength, and salinity. These conditions apply to
modern marine intertidal areas and these same conditions

adequately explain the distribution of organisms on the Thorold.

The second significant variable in this model is the clay content. Population density is inversely related to the clay content of the substrate.

The distance from shore model contains four variables with a confidence level above 5%: burrow diameter, mean grain size, organic fraction, and sandstone/shale ratio. Distance and burrow diameter are inversely related. The smaller burrows far from shore may be a function of the compaction of the sediment; the walls of the vertical burrows do not slump inward. Also there is the possibility that another species inhabits distal regions.

Mean grain size is directly related to distance from the shore. This same relationship was found by Purdy (1964). Stronger tidal and offshore currents rework the sediment and deposit sediment with grain sizes larger than near shore sediment.

The residual organic fraction is inversely related to distance from the shore. This is expected since most organic material is supplied from the land and would decrease away from the shore as currents dwindled. The amount of organic material is related to the amount of clay; the surface of the clay is chemically reactive and readily binds organic material to its surface.

The sandstone/shale ratio is inversely related to distance: the farther offshore, the more argillaceous material present. The sandstone/shale ratio is highly autocorrelated with burrow diameter suggesting that different species are associated with different types of substrates.

A final note: the population density of <u>Arthrophycus</u> <u>alleghenesis</u>, a deposit feeder, varies inversely with

the density of vertical burrows. This relation may be
due to competition but is more likely related to food
supply, the deposit feeders requiring high organic content
in the sediment and filter feeders not needing this organic
content.

Sources of Error

Sampling errors are always inherent in any statistical
analysis. A modified systematic design was used; any
regularly occurring population changes would not have
been included in the sample. Measurements from X-ray
diffraction analysis may depend upon the correct position-
ing of the base line. The figures given for the clay
fraction represent the upper limit of clay content within
the sample, and is probably less than 10%. Determination
of the organic fraction involved many reactions, each of
which would add to the measurement error. Purdy (1964)
points out that organic matter in the sediment is modified
by post depositional processes. All size measurements
were subject to the usual operator error of one half of
the distance of the smallest scale division.

The entire study used 101 samples from 12 geographical-
ly distinct areas. The final result was 11 cases or
sample points which is too small.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be made:

1. Burrow population density may be predicted by 4
   variables:

   X_8 distance from the shore   exceeds the 5% confidence
                                            level.

   X_2 clay fraction   exceeds the 10% confidence
                                            level.

   X_3 organic fraction

   X_9 porosity

The model is:

$$X_1 = -7025.16 + 68.03\ X_8 - 87.51\ X_9 - 91.22\ X_2 - 931.24\ X_3$$

2. Distance from the shore can be predicted by 4
   variables:

   X_4 burrow diameter

   X_5 mean grain size   all variables exceed the

   X_3 organic fraction   5% confidence level.

   X_{10} sandstone/shale ratio

The model is:

$$X_8 = 103.43 - 18.79\ X_4 + 162.59\ X_5 + 13.69\ X_3 - .001\ X_{10}$$

3. Principal component analysis shows that there is no
   one dominating variable; most variables are equally
   loaded in the first five components. However, many
   variables are not significant due to a wide scatter
   of points and a small size.

4. Although the sample size is small, the variables

chosen for the model are capable of accounting for
99.98% of the variation in the distance from shore
and 99.69% of the variation in burrow population
density. In each case, only four easily obtained
measurements are needed to determine the distance
from shore or the number of burrows per square meter.

Economic Significance

The distance from shore model is a very useful predic-
tive tool. By using standard laboratory techniques the
closest distance from any point in the surface of an
intertidal mudflat or delta to the shore can be calcu-
lated. This is extremely useful in determining the
position of ancient shore lines and hence possible hydro-
carbon reservoirs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ager, D.V. 1963. Principles of Paleoecology. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Berner, R.A. 1971. Principles of Chemical Sedimentology. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Blatt, H., Middleton, G. and Murray, R. 1972. Origin of Sedimentary Rocks. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Bolton, T.E. 1957. Silurian Stratigraphy and Paleontology of the Niagara Escarpment in Ontario. GSC Memoir 289. Ottawa.

Dennison, J.M. and Shea, H. 1966. Reliability of Visual Estimates of Grain Abundance. Journal of Sedimentary Petrology. 36: No. 1.

Dixon, W.J. ed. 1971. Biomedical Computer Programs. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Eltringham, S.K. 1971. Life in Mud and Sand. New York: Crane, Russak and Company Inc.

Field, J.G. 1971. A Numerical Analysis of Changes in the Soft Bottom Fauna along a Transect across False Bay, South Africa. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 7: 215 - 233.

Griffiths, J.C. 1958. Petrography and Porosity of the Cow Run Sand, St. Marys, West Virginia. Journal of Sedimentary Petrology. 28: No. 1.

Hughes, R.N., Peer, D.L., and Mann, K.H. 1972. Use of
    Multivariate Analysis to Identify Functional Components
    of the Benthos in St. Margaret's Bay, Nova Scotia.
    Limnology and Oceanography. 17: 111 - 121.

Kellerhals, P. and Murray, J.W. 1969. Tidal Flats at
    Boundary Bay, Fraser River Delta, British Columbia.
    Bulletin of Canadian Petroleum Geology. 17: 67 - 91.

King, L.J. 1966. Cross Sectional Analysis of Canadian
    Urban Dimensions: 1951 and 1961. Canadian Geographer.
    Vol. 10.

Kummel, B. and Raup D. 1965. Handbook of Paleontological
    Techniques. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

MacGinitie, G.E. and MacGinitie, N. 1968. Natural History
    of Marine Organisms. Toronto: McGraw Hill Book
    Company.

Martini, I.P. 1966. The Sedimentology of the Medina
    Formation Outcropping along the Niagara Escarpment
    (Ontario and New York State). Unpublished Ph.D.
    Thesis, McMaster University.

——————. 1971. Regional Analysis of Sedimentology
    of the Medina Formation (Silurian), Ontario and
    New York. American Association of Petroleum Geologists
    Bulletin. 55: No. 8.

Moser, C.A. and Scott, W. 1961. British Towns: A Study
    of Their Social and Economic Differences. London:
    Oliver and Boyd Ltd.

Newell, R.C. 1970. _Biology of Intertidal Animals_. New
York: American Elsevier Publishing Company Inc.

Purdy, E.G. 1964. Sediments as Substrates. _Approaches_
to Paleoecology. ed. J. Imbrie and N.D. Newell.
New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc. pp. 238 - 271.

Rhoads, D.C., Speden, I.G. and Waagé, K.M. 1972. Trophic
Group Analysis of Upper Cretaceous (Maestrichtian)
Bivalve Assembleges from South Dakota. _American_
Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin. 56:
No. 6.

Roback, S.S. Carins, J. and Kaesler, R.L. 1969. Cluster
Analysis of Occurrence and Distribution of Insect
Species in a Portion of the Potomac River. _Hydro-_
biologia. 39: 484 - 502.

Schafer, W. 1972. _Ecology and Paleoecology of Marine_
Environments. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

Snedecor, G.W. and Cochran, W.G. 1967. _Statistical_
Methods. Ames: The Iowa State University Press.

Stephenson, W., Williams, W.T. and Lance, G.N. 1970.
The Macrobenthos of Moreton Bay. _Ecological_
Monographs. 40: 459 - 494.

Stephenson, W. and Williams, W.T. 1971. A Study of the
Benthos of Soft Bottoms, Sek Harbour, New Guinea,
Using Numerical Analysis. _Australian Journal of_
Marine and Freshwater Research. 22: 11 - 34.

Storer, T.I., Usinger, R.L. and Nybakken, J.W. 1968.
    Elements of Zoology. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book
    Company.

Appendices

Key

Station 1	Rock Chapel, Ontario
Station 2	Sydenham Road, Dundas, Ontario
Station 3	Webster's Falls, Dundas, Ontario
Station 4	Jolly Cut, Hamilton, Ontario
Station 4A	Sherman Access, Hamilton, Ontario
Station 4B	Kenilworth Access, Hamilton, Ontario
Station 5	Bruce Trail, Grimsby, Ontario
Station 6	Ball's Falls, Vineland, Ontario
Station 7	Niagara Gorge, Niagara Falls, Ontario
Station 8	Niagara Glen, Niagara Falls, New York
Station 9	Lewiston, New York
Station 10	Rochester, New York

Appendix I

Population Characteristics

Station 1

Sample No.	Area (cm^2)	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	29.25	16	0.40	0.90
			0.30	1.00
			0.40	0.70
			0.30	0.80
			0.40	1.00
			0.35	1.20
			0.30	0.60
			0.30	1.50
			0.30	
			0.45	
			0.25	
			0.35	
			0.40	
			0.35	
			0.40	
			0.40	
2.	108.00	5	0.60	5.20
			0.30	3.55
			0.45	4.30
			0.60	5.20
			0.30	5.30
3.	56.00	0	----	----
4.	49.00	15	0.40	0.40
			0.35	0.90

			0.35	1.50
			0.40	0.90
			0.40	0.90
			0.40	1.00
			0.40	1.20
			0.20	1.20
			0.20	
			0.35	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.35	
			0.30	
			0.40	
5.	109.25	0	-----	-----
6.	69.38	3	0.30	1.00
			0.30	0.90
			0.30	0.90
7.	92.50	3	0.40	4.30
			0.55	3.40
			0.40	3.40
8.	180.00	6	0.45	2.95
			0.40	2.95
			0.40	4.15
			0.55	3.60
			0.35	5.60
			0.45	7.10
9.	30.00	2	0.45	2.75
			0.40	2.75

10.	22.75	0	----	----
11.	30.00	1	0.45	----
12.	19.13	0	----	----
13.	15.00	0	----	----
14.	27.00	2	0.50	2.05
			0.40	2.05
15.	52.25	0	----	----
16.	27.00	3	0.60	0.90
			0.30	0.90
			0.60	0.90
17.	128.25	6	0.80	0.80
			0.45	0.80
			0.45	1.10
			0.60	
			0.40	
			0.40	
18.	360.00	1	0.50	----

$\leq$ = .1405 sq. m. 63 $\bar{X}$ = 0.41 $\bar{X}$ = 2.17

σ^2 = 0.01 σ^2 = 2.77

σ = 0.11 σ = 1.66

Population Density = 448.4

Station 2

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	152.75	6	0.45	0.90
			0.25	2.35
			0.25	
			0.35	
			0.30	
			0.40	
2.	112.50	0	----	----
3.	45.00	5	0.40	2.15
			0.55	
			0.40	
			0.40	
			0.40	
4.	56.00	32	0.20	0.75
			0.20	0.75
			0.20	0.70
			0.20	0.70
			0.20	0.50
			0.20	
			0.20	
			0.20	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	

			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.15	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
			0.10	
5.	42.25	1	0.30	----
6.	63.00	1	0.25	----
7.	118.75	2	0.40	6.10
			0.45	
8.	112.50	1	0.35	----
9.	286.00	14	0.80	2.15
			0.60	1.90
			0.45	1.45

			0.45	2.60
			0.55	2.20
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.20	
			0.20	
			0.30	
			0.30	
10.	324.00	13	0.45	2.15
			0.40	1.70
			0.55	2.15
			0.35	1.70
			0.35	0.90
			0.40	0.90
			0.30	0.90
			0.30	0.90
			0.20	
			0.60	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.30	
11.	337.50	12	0.40	0.70
			0.30	0.70
			0.40	1.65
			0.45	1.20
			0.40	1.70
			0.30	1.20
			0.50	1.35

			0.35	1.65
			0.40	
			0.70	
			0.45	
			0.40	
12.	288.75	.2	0.40	----
			0.25	----
13.	157.50	2	0.70	----
			0.70	----

$$\leqq = .2097 \text{ sq. m. } 91 \quad \bar{x} = 0.29 \qquad \bar{x} = 1.56$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.03 \qquad \sigma^2 = 1.07$$
$$\sigma = 0.16 \qquad \sigma = 1.04$$

Population Density = 434.2

Station 3

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	157.50	3	0.25	0.60
			0.45	
			0.35	
	$\lessgtr$ = .0016 sq.m.	3	$\bar{x}$ = 0.35	$\bar{x}$ = 0.60
			σ^2 = 0.01	
			σ = 0.08	

Population Density = 1875.0

Station 4

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	442.00	7	0.15	1.75
			0.25	1.75
			0.10	1.75
			0.80	1.75
			0.30	
			0.35	
			0.25	
2.	340.00	2	0.50	4.80
			0.40	4.80
3.	130.00	0	----	----
4.	510.00	0	----	----
5.	154.00	6	0.30	1.30
			0.60	1.30
			0.50	1.60
			0.40	1.60
			0.30	3.10
			0.20	
6.	160.00	8	0.60	2.15
			0.35	1.90
			0.40	1.90
			0.40	
			0.30	

			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.20	
8.	132.00	0	-----	-----
9.	150.00	3	0.40	3.40
			0.40	3.40
			0.40	
10.	754.00	440	$\hat{\bar{\bar{X}}}$	$\hat{\bar{\bar{X}}}$
			0.60	0.90
			0.40	0.65
			0.35	0.50
			0.50	0.50
			0.40	0.80
			0.40	0.60
			0.40	0.75
			0.30	0.35
			0.40	0.50
			0.40	0.50
			0.30	0.45
			0.30	0.95
			0.40	0.45
			0.30	0.55
			0.40	0.50
			0.45	0.80
			0.30	1.20
			0.40	0.60
			0.25	0.50
			0.30	0.95
			0.40	0.85
			0.35	0.60

0.45	0.80
0.35	0.85
0.35	0.95
0.30	1.70
0.40	0.65
0.35	0.40
0.35	0.70
0.35	0.40
0.25	1.60
0.40	0.30
0.30	0.60
0.35	0.60
0.40	0.80
0.35	0.60
0.30	0.40
0.25	0.60
0.30	0.70
0.30	
0.35	
0.25	
0.40	

$\leqslant$ = .2772 sq.m. 460 $\bar{x}$ = 0.36 $\bar{x}$ = 1.19

σ^2 = 0.01 σ^2 = 1.03

σ = 0.11 σ = 1.01

Population Density = 1659.5

Station 4A

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	319.00	0	----	----
2.	155.00	3	0.50	----
			0.30	----
			0.30	----
3.	48.00	1	0.20	----
4.	30.00	1	0.35	----
5.	55.00	0	----	----
6.	28.00	15	0.40	0.85
			0.40	0.40
			0.35	0.55
			0.30	0.60
			0.25	0.90
			0.20	0.55
			0.25	0.50
			0.45	
			0.35	
			0.35	
			0.35	
			0.25	
			0.30	
			0.50	
			0.40	

			$\bar{\bar{x}}$	$\bar{\bar{x}}$
7.	350.00	4	0.45	----
			0.30	----
			0.40	----
			0.40	----
8.	432.00	0	----	----
9.	121.00	82	$\bar{\bar{x}}$	$\bar{\bar{x}}$
			0.40	0.65
			0.40	1.15
			0.45	0.50
			0.40	0.70
			0.25	0.70
			0.55	0.60
			0.30	0.60
			0.20	0.90
			0.30	0.70
			0.20	1.15
			0.40	0.60
			0.45	0.50
			0.20	0.50
			0.30	0.70
			0.25	0.80
			0.40	0.90
			0.35	
10.	115.50	1	0.40	----
11.	25.00	0	----	----
12.	30.00	2	0.30	0.50
			0.50	0.50
13.	27.00	0	----	----

14.	21.00	0	----	----
15.	24.00	10	0.15	0.80
			0.35	0.70
			0.30	0.30
			0.40	0.30
			0.15	
			0.30	
			0.20	
			0.20	
			0.30	
			0.30	

$\leq$ = .1781 sq.m. 119 $\bar{x}$ = 0.33 $\bar{x}$ = 0.65

σ^2 = 0.01 σ^2 = 0.05

σ = 0.10 σ = 0.21

Population Density = 668.2

Station 4B

Sample No.	Area (cm²)	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	418.00	0	----	----
2.	374.00	3	0.40	----
			0.25	----
			0.35	----
3.	135.00	6	0.30	3.40
			0.30	
			0.25	
			0.45	
			0.40	
			0.50	
4.	170.00	0	----	----
5.	72.50	1	0.80	----
6.	120.00	1	0.45	----
7.	145.00	4	0.40	----
			0.40	----
			0.30	----
			0.40	----
8.	225.00	0	----	----
9.	56.00	9	0.40	0.60

			0.25	0.60
			0.30	1.10
			0.30	0.90
			0.25	
			0.20	
			0.30	
			0.25	
			0.50	
10.	504.00	10	0.40	1.70
			0.20	1.70
			0.30	2.05
			0.50	2.05
			0.50	0.60
			0.30	0.60
			0.20	
			0.40	
			0.40	
			0.40	
11.	585.00	2	0.30	-----
			0.40	-----

$$\Sigma = .2805 \text{ sq.m.} \quad 36 \quad \bar{x} = 0.36 \quad \bar{x} = 1.39$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.01 \quad \sigma^2 = 0.79$$
$$\sigma = 0.12 \quad \sigma = 0.89$$

Population Density = 128.3

Station 5

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
			$\hat{\bar{X}}$	$\hat{\bar{X}}$
1.	1968.00	128	0.55	0.60
			0.40	1.50
			0.50	0.50
			0.40	0.70
			0.40	0.80
			0.30	1.20
			0.40	0.35
			0.30	0.55
			0.35	1.60
			0.40	0.95
			0.35	0.50
			0.30	1.30
			0.20	1.40
			0.50	0.60
			0.70	0.60
			0.40	0.55
			0.40	0.50
			0.35	
			0.65	

$\leqslant = .1968$ sq.m. 128 $\bar{x} = 0.41$ $\bar{x} = 0.85$

$\sigma^2 = 0.02$ $s^2 = 0.17$

$\sigma = 0.12$ $\sigma = 0.41$

Population Density = 650.4

Station 6

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	1530.00	20	0.40	4.70
			0.40	3.70
			0.30	1.30
			0.30	1.30
			0.40	2.70
			0.20	2.70
			0.40	3.30
			0.25	5.40
			0.30	1.30
			0.25	1.30
			0.30	5.30
			0.40	5.30
			0.35	
			0.35	
			0.45	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.40	
2.	420.00	19	0.30	3.50
			0.40	1.90
			0.50	1.65
			0.40	1.65
			0.25	1.65
			0.40	1.50

			0.30	1.50
			0.30	1.70
			0.30	1.70
			0.30	0.75
			0.30	0.85
			0.20	
			0.40	
			0.30	
			0.40	
			0.30	
			0.35	
			0.50	
			0.60	
3.	475.00	13	0.30	2.30
			0.40	2.90
			0.30	2.70
			0.35	1.60
			0.45	2.80
			0.25	1.60
			0.65	3.00
			0.60	
			0.30	
			0.45	
			0.40	
			0.50	
			0.45	
4.	60.00	2	0.40	————
			0.30	————
6.	132.00	1	0.40	————

$\lessgtr = .2617$ sq.m.   55 $\bar{x} = 0.36$ $\bar{x} = 2.45$

$\sigma^2 = 0.01$

$\sigma = 0.10$

Population Density $= 210.2$

Station 7

Sample No.	Area ($cm.^2$)	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	323.00	5	0.40	1.80
			0.40	
			0.50	
			0.40	
			0.40	
2.	120.00	0	----	----
3.	32.00	0	----	----
4.	84.00	0	----	----
5.	102.00	0	----	----
6.	170.00	8	0.50	1.40
			0.40	3.20
			0.40	3.50
			0.60	3.10
			0.50	
			0.50	
			0.50	
			0.50	
7.	180.00	0	----	----
8.	67.50	0	----	----
9.	70.00	1	0.40	----

10.   28.00   0   ----   ----

11.   36.00   0   ----   ----

$$\text{≶} = .1212 \text{ sq.m. } 14 \quad \bar{x} = 0.46 \quad \bar{x} = 2.60$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.00 \quad \sigma^2 = 0.88$$
$$\sigma = 0.07 \quad \sigma = 0.94$$

Population Density = 115.5

Station 8

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	4164.00	0	----	----
2.	931.00	0	----	----
3.	1306.00	6	0.70	----
			0.50	----
			0.90	----
			0.50	----
			0.50	----
			0.50	----
4.	1241.00	267	$\hat{\bar{X}}$	$\hat{\bar{X}}$
			0.45	1.30
			0.30	1.30
			0.60	1.30
			0.40	0.70
			0.60	1.10
			0.70	1.70
			0.35	1.70
			0.40	0.90
			0.50	1.40
			0.70	1.30
			0.80	1.30
			0.45	1.70
			0.70	1.70
			0.60	0.60
			1.00	0.60

			0.50	2.20
			0.90	2.20
			0.60	1.50
			0.90	1.50
			0.50	1.70
			0.40	1.10
			0.40	1.10
			0.40	1.20
			0.40	0.90
			0.30	0.90
			0.30	2.40
			0.40	0.70
			0.50	0.70
			0.40	0.80
			0.40	1.10
5.	1016.00	14	0.90	3.00
			1.00	3.00
			0.70	7.90
			0.90	2.60
			0.70	2.60
			0.40	2.50
			0.40	2.50
			0.70	3.00
			0.50	3.00
			0.70	
			0.60	
			0.90	
			0.70	
			0.70	
6.	1306.00	14	0.80	9.20
			0.70	9.20

			0.80	7.20
			0.90	1.60
			0.90	1.60
			0.70	2.70
			0.70	5.00
			0.80	
			0.70	
			0.50	
			0.70	
			0.50	
			0.40	
			0.50	
7.	909.00	8	0.40	2.20
			0.60	2.20
			0.30	2.20
			0.40	1.30
			0.40	1.30
			0.30	
			0.30	
			0.40	

$\lessgtr = 1.0873$ sq.m.   309 $\bar{x} = 0.58$ $\bar{x} = 2.24$

$\sigma^2 = 0.04$ $\sigma^2 = 4.01$

$\sigma = 0.19$ $\sigma = 2.00$

Population Density = 284.2

Station 9

Sample No.	Area (cm.²)	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm)
1.	785.00	2	0.50	----
			0.30	----
2.	168.00	3	0.30	2.20
			0.40	
			0.40	
3.	124.00	2	0.40	----
			0.40	----
4.	352.00	6	0.60	5.10
			0.50	
			0.40	
			0.50	
			0.40	
			0.50	
5.	398.00	13	0.40	0.90
			0.40	0.90
			0.40	4.00
			0.40	1.50
			0.40	1.50
			0.60	1.50
			0.60	1.50
			0.35	
			0.50	
			0.50	

			0.40	
			0.50	
			0.35	
6.	88.00	4	0.60	1.10
			0.50	1.10
			0.30	
			0.30	
7.	150.00	0	----	----
8.	66.00	0	----	----
9.	176.00	14	0.60	0.50
			0.40	0.50
			0.40	1.10
			0.40	1.10
			0.50	2.40
			0.40	2.40
			0.40	0.40
			0.35	0.40
			0.40	1.20
			0.40	
			0.40	
			0.40	
			0.30	
			0.30	

$\angle = .2307$ sq.m.　44　$\overline{x} = 0.42$　$\overline{x} = 1.57$

$\sigma^2 = 0.01$　$\sigma^2 = 1.43$

$\sigma = 0.09$　$\sigma = 1.19$

Population Density = 190.7

Station 10

Sample No.	Area (cm.^{2})	No. of Burrows	Diameter (cm.)	Nearest Neighbour Distance (cm.)
1.	187.00	6	0.60	1.50
			0.60	1.30
			0.40	1.30
			0.40	
			0.50	
			0.40	
	$\leqslant$ = .0187 sq.m.	6	$\bar{x}$ = 0.48	$\bar{x}$ = 1.37
			σ^2 = 0.01	σ^2 = 0.01
			σ = 0.01	σ = 0.12

Population Density = 320.9

Appendix II

Grain Size Analysis

Station 1

0.20	0.12	0.23
0.13	0.17	0.12
0.20	0.10	0.10
0.20	0.20	0.17
0.15	0.17	0.20
0.25	0.15	0.10
0.10	0.30	0.10
0.20	0.10	0.05
0.20	0.20	0.15
0.10	0.25	0.25

$$\bar{x} = 0.165$$
$$\sigma = 0.059$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.0035$$

Station 2

0.10	0.06	0.12
0.10	0.06	0.04
0.10	0.10	0.04
0.06	0.08	0.03
0.08	0.07	0.05
0.07	0.08	0.09
0.10	0.09	0.06
0.15	0.06	0.07
0.05	0.04	0.03
0.04	0.09	0.06

$$\bar{x} = 0.072$$
$$\sigma = 1.47$$
$$\sigma^2 = 2.17$$

Station 3

0.08	0.06	0.05
0.06	0.08	0.03
0.05	0.08	0.09
0.05	0.12	0.09
0.07	0.10	0.04
0.15	0.09	0.06
0.06	0.17	0.04
0.05	0.08	0.04
0.04	0.06	0.09
0.05	0.05	0.04

$$\bar{x} = 0.071$$
$$\sigma = 0.033$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.001$$

Station 4

0.15	0.20	0.17
0.12	0.25	0.20
0.20	0.23	0.25
0.12	0.09	0.05
0.15	0.12	0.15
0.12	0.23	0.15
0.20	0.23	0.06
0.23	0.22	0.20
0.09	0.17	0.15
0.12	0.10	0.15

$$\bar{x} = 0.162$$
$$\sigma = 0.056$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.003$$

Station 4A

0.09	0.08	0.05
0.15	0.10	0.03
0.20	0.03	0.06
0.03	0.02	0.15
0.04	0.12	0.03
0.04	0.09	0.01
0.02	0.06	0.22
0.04	0.13	0.06
0.12	0.05	0.06
0.06	0.06	0.05

$$\bar{x} = 0.075$$
$$\sigma = 0.053$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.003$$

Station 4B

0.15	0.14	0.15
0.25	0.10	0.23
0.17	0.12	0.09
0.10	0.13	0.06
0.17	0.25	0.10
0.12	0.15	0.14
0.06	0.14	0.25
0.14	0.20	0.12
0.20	0.13	0.04
0.09	0.18	0.10

$$\bar{x} = 0.142$$
$$\sigma = 0.056$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.003$$

Station 5

0.12	0.07	0.08
0.06	0.06	0.06
0.09	0.09	0.06
0.09	0.12	0.05
0.06	0.05	0.04
0.06	0.05	0.05
0.06	0.06	0.04
0.06	0.10	0.08
0.05	0.11	0.08
0.05	0.09	0.04

$$\bar{X} = 0.069$$
$$\sigma = 0.023$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.001$$

Station 6

0.06	0.11	0.05
0.11	0.25	0.12
0.18	0.10	0.15
0.25	0.06	0.20
0.06	0.08	0.12
0.25	0.08	0.33
0.08	0.06	0.20
0.12	0.07	0.08
0.20	0.05	0.17
0.25	0.04	0.15

$$\bar{X} = 0.134$$
$$\sigma = 0.077$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.006$$

Station 7

0.05	0.08	0.03
0.03	0.10	0.03
0.04	0.09	0.05
0.04	0.06	0.02
0.06	0.04	0.02
0.08	0.08	0.15
0.02	0.03	0.02
0.03	0.06	0.02
0.03	0.02	0.15
0.02	0.01	0.05

$$\bar{x} = 0.050$$
$$\sigma = 0.036$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.001$$

Station 8

0.25	0.23	0.40
0.22	0.35	0.20
0.23	0.15	0.30
0.35	0.32	0.25
0.40	0.30	0.35
0.50	0.15	0.30
0.25	0.35	0.20
0.30	0.25	0.27
0.30	0.25	0.10
0.25	0.50	0.20

$$\bar{x} = 0.282$$
$$\sigma = 0.092$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.009$$

Station 9

0.10	0.20	0.12
0.11	0.12	0.15
0.17	0.05	0.25
0.15	0.08	0.10
0.10	0.12	0.15
0.15	0.06	0.15
0.15	0.17	0.23
0.25	0.25	0.10
0.05	0.10	0.10
0.12	0.10	0.05

$$\bar{X} = 0.133$$
$$\sigma = 0.058$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.003$$

Station 10

0.10	0.05	0.15
0.17	0.08	0.17
0.09	0.05	0.10
0.05	0.20	0.06
0.10	0.05	0.06
0.10	0.04	0.10
0.09	0.10	0.10
0.12	0.12	0.15
0.15	0.10	0.04
0.06	0.17	0.20

$$\bar{x} = 0.104$$
$$\sigma = 0.047$$
$$\sigma^2 = 0.002$$

Appendix III

Sandstone/Shale Ratio
Distance From Shore
Organic Fraction
Quartz Fraction
Clay Fraction

Sandstone/Shale Ratio

Station	Ratio
1	1.02
2	1.10
3	1.20
4	1.09
4A	1.93
4B	1.84
5	7.33
6	7.93
7	10.33
8	999.99
9	88.00
10	999.99

Distance from Shore Line

Station	Miles
1	156.0
2	155.0
3	156.0
4	150.0
4A	149.0
4B	148.0
5	138.0
6	125.0
7	111.0
8	112.0
9	115.0
10	81.0

Organic Content

Station	Percent
1	2.14
2	3.45
3	3.15
4	1.33
4A	2.90
4B	2.50
5	2.51
6	0.74
7	2.33
8	2.10
9	0.85
10	0.88

Quartz Fraction

Station	Percent
1	60.0
2	63.0
3	64.0
4	63.0
4A	51.0
4B	57.0
5	54.0
6	61.0
7	69.0
8	59.0
9	48.0
10	62.0

Porosity

Station	Percent
1	12.7
2	10.5
3	14.3
4	7.6
4A	6.1
4B	15.8
5	11.5
6	9.4
7	7.3
8	5.3
9	6.4
10	8.7

Appendix IV

Mineral Content
From X-Ray Analysis

Station 1

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	0.90	
illite	0.48	
chlorite	0.08	
unknown clay	0.12	
total clay	1.58	0.27
goethite	0.71	0.12
quartz	3.53	0.60
dolomite	0.07	0.01
Total Minerals	5.89	

Station 2

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	0.43	
illite	0.08	
chlorite	0.06	
unknown clay	0.07	
total clay	0.64	0.19
goethite	0.50	0.15
quartz	2.15	0.63
calcite	0.08	0.02
dolomite	0.03	0.01
Total Minerals	3.40	

STATION 3

Station 3

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	0.73	
illite	0.18	
chlorite	0.08	
unknown clay	0.20	
total clay	1.19	0.14
goethite	1.20	0.14
quartz	5.37	0.64
calcite	0.56	0.07
dolomite	0.12	0.01
Total Minerals	8.44	

Station 4

montmorillonite	0.22	
illite	0.24	
chlorite	0.08	
total clay	0.54	0.16
goethite	0.46	0.14
quartz	2.13	0.63
calcite	0.17	0.05
dolomite	0.07	0.02
Total Minerals	3.37	

STATION 4A

83.

STATION 4B

84.

Station 4A

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	0.61	
illite	0.20	
chlorite	0.11	
unknown clay	0.15	
total clay	1.07	0.19
goethite	1.15	0.21
quartz	2.81	0.51
calcite	0.42	0.08
dolomite	0.06	0.01
Total Minerals	5.51	

Station 4B

montmorillonite	0.65	
illite	0.12	
chlorite	0.21	
total clay	0.98	0.15
goethite	1.33	0.21
quartz	3.60	0.57
calcite	0.32	0.05
dolomite	0.10	0.02
Total Minerals	6.33	

STATION 5

87.°

Station 5

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	0.65	
illite	0.33	
chlorite	0.17	
unknown clay	0.13	
total clay	1.28	0.21
goethite	0.99	0.16
quartz	3.29	0.54
calcite	0.40	0.07
dolomite	0.15	0.02
Total Minerals	6.11	

Station 6

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	0.39	
illite	0.08	
chlorite	0.02	
total clay	0.49	0.21
goethite	0.31	0.14
quartz	1.39	0.61
calcite	0.08	0.04
dolomite	0.01	0.00
Total Minerals	2.28	

Station 7

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	1.07	
illite	0.12	
chlorite	0.13	
total clay	1.32	0.20
goethite	0.48	0.08
quartz	4.35	0.69
dolomite	0.19	0.03
Total Minerals	6.34	

Station 8

montmorillonite	0.99	
illite	0.06	
chlorite	0.05	
unknown clay	0.07	
total clay	1.17	0.24
goethite	0.75	0.15
quartz	2.87	0.59
calcite	0.06	0.02
Total Minerals	4.85	

Station 9

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	1.30	
illite	0.07	
chlorite	0.03	
unknown clay	0.04	
total clay	1.44	0.27
goethite	1.12	0.21
quartz	2.60	0.48
calcite	0.11	0.02
dolomite	0.14	0.02
Total Minerals	5.41	

Station 10

	Absolute Amount	Proportion
montmorillonite	0.49	
illite	0.12	
chlorite	0.05	
total clay	0.66	0.17
goethite	0.60	0.16
quartz	2.37	0.62
dolomite	0.18	0.05
Total Minerals	3.81	

Modified Data Matrix

Station	Worm Burrows	Clay Fraction	Organic Fraction	Burrow Diameter	Mean Grain Size	Sorting	Quartz Fraction Grains	Distance From Shore	Porosity	Ss/Sh Ratio
1	448.4	27.0	2.14	4.10	.17	.06	60.0	156.0	12.7	1.02
2	434.2	19.0	3.45	2.90	.07	1.47	63.0	155.0	10.5	1.10
4	1659.5	16.0	1.33	3.60	.16	.06	63.0	150.0	7.6	1.09
4A	668.2	19.0	2.90	3.30	.08	.05	51.0	149.0	6.1	1.93
4B	128.3	15.0	2.50	3.60	.14	.06	57.0	148.0	15.8	1.84
5	650.4	21.0	2.51	4.10	.07	.02	54.0	138.0	11.5	7.33
6	210.2	21.0	.74	3.60	.13	.08	61.0	125.0	9.4	7.93
7	115.5	20.0	2.33	4.60	.05	.04	69.0	111.0	7.3	10.33
8	284.2	24.0	2.10	5.80	.28	.09	59.0	112.0	5.3	9999.99
9	190.7	27.0	.85	4.20	.13	.06	48.0	115.0	6.4	88.00
10	320.9	17.0	.88	4.80	.10	.05	62.0	81.0	8.7	9999.99