Passive reclamation of soft-sediment ecosystems on the North Coast of British Columbia, Canada

Article

Accepted Version

Campbell, L., Sizmur, T. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9835-7195, Juanes, F. and Gerwing, T. G. (2019) Passive reclamation of soft-sediment ecosystems on the North Coast of British Columbia, Canada. Journal of Sea Research, 155. 101796. ISSN 1385-1101 doi: 10.1016/j.seares.2019.101796 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/88167/

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2019.101796

Publisher: Elsevier

Passive Reclamation of Soft-Sediment Ecosystems on the North Coast of British Columbia, Canada

Lily Campbell[1]*, Tom Sizmur[2], Francis Juanes[1], Travis G Gerwing[1,3]

[1]Department of Biology, University of Victoria. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
[2]Department of Geography and Environmental Science, University of Reading. Reading, UK.
[3] Ecosystem Science and Management Program, University of Northern British Columbia. Prince George, British Columbia, Canada.

*Corresponding Author: Lily Campbell. Email: lilyncampbell@gmail.com

Abstract

Estuarine ecosystems are degraded through anthropogenic development, leading to reduced habitat suitability for biological communities. The Skeena River estuary (British Columbia, Canada) is undergoing passive reclamation from historical salmon canneries and pulp mills, while localized disturbances continue at present. To reveal both current impacts and the trajectory of passive reclamation from historical activities, the intertidal mudflat surrounding the longest operating salmon cannery, Cassiar Cannery, within the Skeena estuary was surveyed. Nutrient availability (chlorophyll *a* concentration/organic matter content), sediment variables (particle size, water content, penetrability, woody debris/macroalgae cover, apparent redox potential discontinuity depth), and infaunal community composition varied spatiotemporally, and suggest that an old dock may be influencing the infaunal community given the abundance of disturbance indicating taxa below the dock. However, with populations of amphipods, mobile polychaetes, and a complex community structure, the mudflat as a whole appears to be relatively healthy. Therefore, cessation of historic activities has allowed for passive reclamation to a reasonably unstressed state, though a threshold of recovery may exist for intertidal mudflats beyond which passive reclamation will not be effective.

Key Words: Infauna, Intertidal, Habitat Disturbance, Passive Restoration, Salmon Cannery, Soft-Sediment

1. Introduction

Soft-sediment ecosystems represent over 70% of coastal ecosystems, and are important components of estuarine habitats (Constable and Fairweather 1999; Schlacher and Thompson 2013). Estuaries are productive regions with importance for commercial fisheries, providing habitat for sensitive species (especially migratory shorebirds), as well as recreational uses for human populations (Carr-Harris et al. 2015; Constable and Fairweather 1999; Dissanayake et al. 2018; Kennish 2002). However, urbanization and industrial development have resulted in the degradation of soft-sediment ecosystems and estuaries (Constable and Fairweather 1999; Crain et al. 2008; Kennish 2002; Schlacher et al. 2016). Coastal developments will increase as human populations grow, with the associated habitat degradation leading to substantial ecological consequences (Dissanayake et al. 2018; Kritzer et al. 2016). As such, understanding human impacts and subsequent management is now a fundamental component of research into coastal and estuarine ecology (Gonzalez et al. 2016; Vackar et al. 2012).

Within estuarine soft-sediments, detrimental effects can occur through physical damage to the substrate surface, organic enrichment, oxygen depletion, and accumulation of contaminants (Dernie et al. 2003; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). Physical disturbance results in the creation of surface features such as pits and troughs, thus allowing water accumulation, disturbing biological communities and structures, and possibly disrupting the redox potential discontinuity (RPD; transition from oxidizing to reducing sediment conditions) layer (Dernie et al. 2003; Fonseca et al. 1982; Hansen and Skilleter 1994). Organic enrichment, such as from human sewage or effluent from pulp mills, can substantially alter infaunal biodiversity and community composition (Ahn et al. 1995; Buttermore 1977; Caswell et al. 2018; Heilskov and Holmer 2001; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978) and potentially lead to oxygen depletion and anoxia (Buttermore 1977; Kristensen 2000; Levin et al. 2009; Waldichuk 1979). Such enrichment can also lead to sulphide accumulation, altering infaunal communities through toxicological effects and exacerbation of hypoxia (Heilskov and Holmer 2001; Wu 1995). Furthermore, sediment contamination is not restricted to organic enrichment and occurs through pollution and industrial effluents containing polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, sulfides, coppers and other chemicals (Hoos 1975; Turner 2019; Yunker et al. 2002), with negative impacts on infaunal communities (Pires et al. 2017; Pocklington and Wells 1992; Waldichuk 1966).

Due to their well-understood responses to disturbance, invertebrates are invaluable for evaluating ecosystem health and identifying disturbed habitats (Gesteira and Dauvin 2000; Guerra-Garcia and Garcia-Gomez 2004; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). Invertebrates have been used to develop ecological theories on organismal responses to disturbance (Cowie et al. 2000; Gerwing et al. 2017a; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978), and are employed in both monitoring and assessing human impacts on natural ecosystems (Borja and Muxika 2005; Gerwing et al. 2018a; Hereward et al. 2017; Muxika et al. 2005; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). In addition to monitoring applications, marine benthic invertebrates support commercial fisheries, both by serving as dietary sources for fish and as industrial bait (Davis et al. 2014; Kritzer et al. 2016; Pires et al. 2017). Therefore, studying invertebrates is a pro-active strategy to detect disturbances before productivity of commercial fisheries is impaired (Ozdemir et al. 2011; Pinto et al. 2009). In soft-sediment ecosystems, infaunal invertebrates have been employed as successful indicators for multiple disturbance mechanisms including organic enrichment, hypoxia, and pollution (Bett 1988; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978; Thrush et al. 2003).

Although disturbance can have detrimental effects, soft-sediment ecosystems and infaunal communities are resilient to disturbance as the fauna are exposed to extreme variability on a daily basis (Altieri 2006; Cowie et al. 2000; Gerwing et al. 2018a; Valdivia et al. 2011), and are responsive to passive reclamation through both physical and biological processes such as wave action, sediment deposition, and bioturbation (Dernie et al. 2003; Gerwing et al. 2018a; Skilleter 1996). Passive reclamation is the cessation of activities causing ecosystem degradation, thus allowing for unassisted recovery (Benayas et al. 2009; Holl and Aide 2011). Considered to be the first and most crucial step in ecological reclamation, passive reclamation can be highly effective in coastal and estuarine ecosystems without the associated cost of active reclamation; however, not all reclamation efforts track progress against recovery targets, or consider infaunal communities (Bayraktarov et al. 2016; Holl and Aide 2011; Kauffman et al. 1997; Marquiegui and Aguirrezabalaga 2009; McCrackin et al. 2017).

Along the North Coast of British Columbia (BC) Canada, the Skeena River estuary has experienced a variety of disturbances, including physical disruption of soft-sediment, organic enrichment, and accumulation of toxins (Carr-Harris et al. 2015; Gerwing et al. 2018c). Near the mouth of the Skeena River, the mudflat surrounding Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage (Figure 1) experiences physical disturbance to the sediment from logs that are transported down the Skeena River, flow through Inverness Passage, and accumulate on the mudflat, while an old dock structure may deposit woody debris into the sediment, potentially resulting in organic enrichment. However, in addition to these current impacts, this mudflat has also been undergoing passive reclamation from historical activities. Established in 1889, Cassiar Cannery was the longest consecutively operating salmon cannery on BC's coast before closing in 1983, with associated disturbances including toxic inputs like copper and creosote, and organic enrichment from discarded salmon carcasses (Beyer et al. 1975; Faggetter 2008; Stone et al. 1981). Furthermore, through the 1900s, 12 salmon canneries operated near the mouth of the Skeena River, with the last cannery ceasing operation in 1989, while pulp mill operations commenced in the 1970s and continued through 2001(Akenhead 1992; Faggetter 2008; Yunker et al. 2002). Unfortunately, estuarine and coastal ecosystems may require at least 15-25 years to recover from degradation spanning a century, or alternatively may never recover and instead exist in a perpetual alternate state (Borja et al. 2010; McCrackin et al. 2017; Simenstad et al. 2006). Therefore, considering historical impacts is crucial when assessing estuary health and ecosystem functioning (Szabo 2010).

At the Cassiar Cannery mudflat, the sediment is predominantly fine silt (< 63 μm) and fine-grained sand (125-250 μm) with coarser grain sand and pebbles present within small patches. A 1-3mm layer of oxic mud occurs at the sediment surface (Gerwing et al. 2017a; McLaren 2016). The mudflat was sampled at four distinct locations (Figure 1), with two locations considered impacted (hereafter referred to as Resort and Dock locations) and two chosen as reference stations. As both the Resort Location and Dock Location are within the historical footprint of the salmon cannery, they were thus historically impacted via chemicals such as creosote, copper and copper soldering products, pyrogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, grease and other chemicals (Faggetter 2008; Page et al. 1999). Substantial nutrient inputs also occurred due to salmon carcass discards (Beyer et al. 1975; Stone et al. 1981). The Dock Location (DL) is situated below the historical wooden dock and is hypothesized to be currently impacted by the dock depositing woody debris on the mudflat surface. Additionally, the benthos below the dock has not seen direct sunlight for ~130 years, and sedimentation and hydrology are likely affected by the physical structure of the dock. The Resort Location (RL) is in front of former homes of cannery managers that have been restored to heritage houses, allowing Cassiar Cannery to continue operating as an ecotourism resort. This study does not examine impacts of the resort itself, but instead looks at the current physical disturbance to the sediment surface that occurs at the Resort Location from accumulated logs that flow from the Skeena River through Inverness Passage and scour the sediment surface (Gerwing et al. 2015a; Herbert et al. 2009).

The majority of mudflats in the region had salmon canneries operating on them, greatly decreasing the availability of reference locations within the immediate region that reflect unimpacted soft-sediment ecosystems. The reference locations employed (North Reference (NR) and South Reference (SR)) are both outside the area of current impacts of physical disturbance from logs and the dock structure, and are also outside the historical footprint of the salmon cannery. Due to high tidal flushing, as well as water and sediment input from the Skeena and Nass Rivers (McLaren 2016) any organic matter or chemicals present would likely have been diluted and had minor impacts upon the reference locations (Beyer et al. 1975). Therefore, these locations are adequate reference locations (Underwood 1994; 1997; 2009).

By employing these four study locations, this study attempts to reveal current impacts regarding organic enrichment and physical disturbance from potential woody debris deposition and log scour at the intertidal mudflat surrounding Cassiar Cannery, while also considering historical impacts and the trajectory of passive reclamation. To accomplish these goals, the infaunal community, sediment parameters and nutrient availability were examined at reference and potentially impacted locations. Within the infaunal community, high abundances of indicator taxa including oligochaetes, nematodes, and polychaetes from the families Spionidae and Capitellidae may indicate impacted habitat, as these taxa are often found in higher abundances in disturbed habitats (Chollett and Bone 2007; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978), and these were thus hypothesized to be present at higher abundances at the Dock and Resort Locations. Conversely, taxa indicating healthy habitats such as amphipods and mobile, errant polychaetes were expected to be absent from disturbed locations (Cardoso et al. 2007; Gesteira and Dauvin 2000). The dock was also expected to decrease the depth to the apparent redox potential discontinuity depth (aRPD), due to increased oxygen consumption during decomposition of woody debris, with a subsequent increase in organic matter content at the Dock Location (Kristensen 2000; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). Impacted locations were also expected to have reduced primary productivity due to disruption to biotic structures and the dock reducing light availability. A greater understanding of passive reclamation and its efficacy would help to inform cost-benefit decisions of coastal management and reclamation activities, given the high costs associated with active reclamation.

2. Methods

2.1 Sampling Scheme and Field Methods

At each location three transects were established, stretching from the start of the mudflat to the low tide waterline (Cox et al. 2017; Gerwing et al. 2015b). Transects were 60m long, placed 10m apart, and stratified into three equal zones based upon distance from shore (near, middle, far). Within each zone, a 1m^2 quadrat was randomly selected and established (n = 3 per transect, 9 per location). All 4 locations were sampled in a day, 3 times throughout the summer of 2017 (May 30, June 21, and July 20) at the lowest low tides (Cox et al. 2017; Gerwing et al. 2017a) for a total of 27 sampling events per location.

At each $1m^2$ quadrat, infauna was collected with a core of 10cm in length and a diameter of 7cm. Following collection, the sediment was passed through a 250µm sieve and stored in vials of 95% ethanol (Bringloe et al. 2013; Gerwing et al. 2017a; Hamilton et al. 2003; Sizmur et al. 2013). Forty infaunal taxa have previously been identified at the Cassiar Cannery (Gerwing et al. 2017a; Gerwing et al. 2018c), and specimens were identified to the lowest possible taxonomic unit (Gerwing et al. 2017a; Thrush et al. 2003) as follows: cumaceans, amphipods, polychaetes, nemerteans and bivalves were identified to species; chironomids (larvae) to family; copepods to order; ostracods to class; and nematodes to phylum.

For sediment parameters, surface wood cover (%) and macrophyte cover (%) of the quadrat were visually estimated, and sediment penetrability was assessed by dropping a metal weight (15cm long, 1.9cm diameter, 330g) from a height of 0.75m above the sediment (Gerwing et al. 2015b). The depth the weight penetrated the sediment was measured as an indication of how easily water and animals can penetrate the sediment, therefore generating an index that can be compared between quadrats and locations. Additionally, water content, and volume weighted mean particle size in the upper 1cm of sediment were quantified as outlined in Gerwing et al. (2015b) by collecting a sediment core (4.5cm diameter, 5cm length) from each quadrat. The top 1cm of each core was weighed, placed in a drying oven at 110^0C for 12 hours, and re-weighed. Percent water-content was calculated as:

$$(\text{mass wet sediment} - \text{mass dry sediment})/(\text{mass wet sediment}) \times 100$$

Volume-weighted mean particle-size of the sediment for each sample was determined using a Malvern Mastersizer 2000 (www.malvern.com). Particle size was measured in triplicate and a mean value per sample calculated (Gerwing et al. 2015b).

Depth of the apparent redox potential discontinuity (aRPD) was measured to the nearest 1mm as an index of sediment dissolved oxygen content (Gerwing et al. 2017b; Gerwing et al. 2015c). aRPD depth gives a relative measure of sediment dissolved oxygen content and redox conditions. The aRPD was measured in the sediment void left by the removal of the 7cm diameter infauna core (Gerwing et al. 2013).

Organic matter content was quantified from the sediment core as outlined by Gerwing et al. (2015b). Briefly, dried sediment samples were ashed in a muffle furnace at 550_{0}C for four hours and re-weighed. Percent organic-content was calculated as:

(mass dry sediment – mass of ashed sediment)/(mass of dry sediment) x 100

Chlorophyll *a* concentration was used as a proxy for the abundance of benthic diatoms (Coulthard and Hamilton 2011; Hargrave et al. 1983; Trites et al. 2005). A 2cm diameter core was taken to determine the concentration of chlorophyll *a* in the top 2-3mm of sediment as outlined by Coulthard and Hamilton (2011). Briefly, chlorophyll pigments were extracted from sediment samples via buffered acetone (90%) and processed through a spectrophotometer to assess reflectance of chlorophyll pigments (664 and 750nm)

2.2 Statistical Analysis

The Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA) package in the statistical program PRIMER 7 (McArdle and Anderson 2001; Clarke and Gorley 2015) was used to elucidate how biotic and abiotic parameters varied between reference and impacted locations. These parameters were divided into infaunal community (species composition and abundance), sediment parameters (depth to the aRPD, sediment water content, volume weighted mean particle size, penetrability, % macroalgae coverage, and % wood coverage), and nutrient variables (chlorophyll *a* concentration and sediment organic matter). Groups of variables were then analyzed separately, to elucidate any differences between reference and potentially impacted areas.

Infaunal abundances were fourth root ($x^{1/4}$) transformed to decrease the importance of very abundant species on the outcome of analyses and improve the assessment of less common species. Subsequently, Bray-Curtis distances were used to create a resemblance matrix (Clarke et al. 2006) for the PERMANOVA. Within this PERMANOVA, Location (4 levels), and Sampling Date (3 levels) were fixed factors, while Transect nested within Location (Transect(Location); 3 levels) was a random factor. Four *a priori* planned contrasts examined how locations varied from each other as follows: 1) Dock Location (DL) vs. reference locations (NR + SR); 2) Resort Location (RL) vs. reference locations (NR + SR); 3) DL vs. RL; and 4) NR vs. SR. An α of 0.05 denotes statistical significance for all analyses. A PERMANOVA was also run to determine if taxonomic richness varied between impacted and reference locations, by summing the number of taxa observed at each quadrat, with Bray-Curtis distances for the resemblance matrix. Taxonomic richness was used as not all specimen could be identified to species, therefore richness is not a true measure of species richness, instead it measures the number of observed taxa (Gerwing et al. 2016; Gerwing et al. 2015b).

For the sediment PERMANOVA, depth to the aRPD, volume-weighted mean sediment size, % macroalgae cover and % wood cover were square root ($\sqrt{x}$) transformed to correct for skewed distributions. For the nutrient matrix, all variables were square root ($\sqrt{x}$) transformed. All variables were normalized, and Euclidean distances were used to calculate a resemblance matrix. Factors and planned contrasts for both the sediment and nutrient PERMANOVA were as described above in the infauna PERMANOVA. Sediment variables also had an *a priori* analysis conducted for Date X Location comparisons.

Similarity Percentages analyses (SIMPER; Clarke 1993) were used to examine the contribution of each variable (infaunal, sediment or nutrient) to the observed differences between locations or sampling dates. Increased percent dissimilarity indicates increased dissimilarity between locations. The ratio of each variable's average dissimilarity to the standard deviation of dissimilarities (Diss/SD) for infauna, or average squared Euclidean distance to the standard deviation of squared distances (Sq.Dist/SD) for sediment and nutrient variables were calculated. These values represent how consistently each variable contributed to the observed difference; variables with a ratio greater than 1 consistently contributed whereas those with a value below 1 did not (Gerwing et al. 2015b). Finally, non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS, 100 restarts) plots were used to visualize variation in infauna, sediment conditions, and nutrient availability between locations. All nMDS graphs had a stress of ~ 0.2, and were considered to be good two-dimensional representations (Clarke 1993).

3. Results

Analysis of the invertebrate community and sediment variables through PERMANOVAs showed statistically significant spatiotemporal variation, while nutrient availability varied significantly through time (Figures 2-3; Tables 1-2; Supplemental Material Tables 1-3). Both the infauna community and sediment parameters varied significantly between impacted locations (Dock and Resort Locations) and reference locations (North and South Reference; Table 1). Percent dissimilarity of the infaunal community between locations varied between 44 and 52% (Table 3). A large proportion of the variation in dissimilarity of location comparisons was driven by four taxa: Oligochaeta, *Pygospio elegans*, *Capitella* Species Complex and Nematoda (40-45%; Table 3). However, taxa contributing to observed differences between locations varied. Nematoda, Oligochaeta, and *P. elegans* were consistently more abundant at DL (7.00, 5.55 and 6.08 individuals/m_2 respectively) compared to reference locations (6.10, 3.23 and 4.71 individuals/m^2), but these taxa were consistently higher at reference locations compared to RL (4.74, 1.07 and 4.57 individuals/m^2). Furthermore, *Capitella* Species Complex was consistently higher at reference locations (5.49 individuals/m^2) than either disturbed location (3.71 and 3.70 individuals/m^2) (Table 3). The amphipod *Americorophium salmonis* was present at higher abundances in reference locations compared to the Dock Location (4.76 Vs 2.66), but at lower abundances compared to the Resort Location (4.82) (Table 3). The errant polychaete *Eteone californica* was also present in high abundances at each location with average abundances at DL, RL, and the reference locations being 2.49, 2.90 and 4.07 respectively. Taxonomic richness did not vary significantly with either location or date (p = 0.5298 and 0.0950 respectively; Table 1).

A significant interaction was found for Date and Location factors of sediment parameters, therefore *a priori* contrasts were conducted for each location and sampling date comparison. Sediment properties varied significantly for all location comparisons, except between reference locations (NR vs SR; Table 2). Wood cover contributed the most to location comparisons including DL; however it only consistently contributed for the June 21 sampling date as shown by the Sq.Dist/SD ratio greater than 1 (Table 4). No other trend was observed, and average squared distance for location comparisons ranged from 12.29-14.42.

Nutrient availability had significant differences between sampling dates (p = 0.0002), but with no observed effect of location on availability (Table 1). Neither chlorophyll *a* concentration nor organic matter content consistently contributed to the differences between sampling dates (Table 5). Average squared distance between sampling dates was between 2.28 and 5.18.

4. Discussion

Along the North Coast of British Columbia, Canada, the intertidal mudflat surrounding Cassiar Cannery may be impacted from current disturbances including physical disruption of the sediment from logs and a dock structure depositing woody debris on the substrate. Simultaneously, this mudflat is also undergoing passive reclamation from historical impacts associated with salmon canneries and a pulp mill. Therefore, the objective of this study was to examine current impacts while considering historical impacts in the region with regards to the infaunal community, sediment conditions, and nutrient availability.

4.1 Infaunal Community

With regards to community composition, there was conflicting evidence of disturbance and of overall health at different spatial scales. The infaunal community exhibited significant spatiotemporal variation, with the presence of oligochaetes, nematodes, and polychaetes from the families Spionidae and Capitellidae, as well as low abundances of amphipods indicative of current or historic disturbances (Chollett and Bone 2007; Keats et al. 2004; Kesaniemi et al. 2012; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). The infaunal community under the dock (DL) was characterized by higher abundances of oligochaetes, nematodes, and Spionidae polychaetes when compared to the reference locations, as well as by smaller populations of amphipods. Furthermore, DL had an increased abundance of *Nippoleucon hinumensis* than reference areas which could be indicative of disturbance, as *N. hinumensis* is an invasive cumacean from Asia (Light and Smith 2007) and disturbance can facilitate biological invasions (Burke and Grime 1996; Smith and Knapp 1999). These community characteristics are all representative of a disturbed habitat, and it is unsurprising that the dock is altering the infaunal community composition beneath it. Conversely, the mudflat in front of the ecotourism resort (RL) had smaller populations of oligochaetes, nematodes, and Spionidae and Capitellidae polychaetes, as well as higher populations of amphipods when compared to reference locations. As such, there is no evidence that the mudflat in front of the ecotourism lodge (RL) is negatively impacted by log scour or by the activities of the lodge itself. Moreover, no differences in taxonomic richness were revealed between impacted or reference locations, further suggesting that the potentially disturbing agents occurring at the Cassiar Cannery are not impacting the mudflat.

Interestingly, reference locations had higher average abundances of Capitellidae polychaetes when compared to the dock (DL) and resort (RL) locations. This was unexpected, as Capitellidae polychaetes can be indicative of disturbance, particularly of organic enrichment that was expected to occur under the dock structure (Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). However, and as discussed in detail below, no organic enrichment under the dock was observed. Further, Capitellidae polychaete abundance in all locations on the Cassiar Cannery mudflat were similar to those observed on non-organically enriched mudflats in the region (Campbell, Unpublished Data) as well as on mudflats on the Atlantic coast (Gerwing et al. 2015b). Therefore, Capitellidae polychaetes were within normal abundances when considering the scale of the entire mudflat.

Beyond contrasting different locations within the Cassiar Cannery mudflat, some inferences can be made regarding the overall health of this mudflat. First, all locations had high populations of mobile errant polychaetes and amphipods. Amphipods and mobile errant polychaetes are powerful indicator species (Cardoso et al. 2007; Conlan 1994; Gerwing et al. 2018a; Gerwing et al. 2018b; Gesteira and Dauvin 2000; Thomas 1993), whose high densities throughout this mudflat suggest that the Cassiar Cannery mudflat is relatively healthy. Additionally, complex community structure with multiple species present at all levels of the food web, coupled with high biodiversity is also often representative of relatively undisturbed and/or functional habitats (Pearson and Rosenberg 1976; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). With high biodiversity, and a complex community across trophic levels, the Cassiar Cannery mudflat has a diverse and functioning food web and as such the community structure is similar to undisturbed mudflats (Cardoso et al. 2007; Gerwing et al. 2015b; Gesteira and Dauvin 2000; Hooper et al. 2005).

While at the scale of the mudflat, Cassiar Cannery may be relatively healthy and functional, community composition at the spatial scale of the $1m^2$ quadrat offers a slightly contradictory perspective. Invasive Cumacea, Capitellidae and Spionidae polychaetes, oligochaetes, and nematodes were observed in some quadrats in all locations at densities indicative of disturbance (Chollett and

Bone 2007; Keats et al. 2004; Kesaniemi et al. 2012; Pearson and Rosenberg 1978). While this could be the result of natural variability, previous investigations of infaunal community composition along BC's north coast have detected remnant signals of historical disturbances within relatively healthy mudflats decades after disturbance (e.g. logging practices (Gerwing et al. 2018b)). It is hypothesized that a similar phenomenon may have been observed here. Within Inverness Passage, 3 salmon canneries besides Cassiar were operating, and another 8 operated around the mouth of the Skeena River (Hoos 1975). Furthermore, a pulp mill in the region discharged highly toxic effluents and spent sulfite liquid (500 tons/day) into the nearshore environment commencing in the 1970s (Hoos 1975; Waldichuk 1966; Wilkes and Dwernychuk 1991). The decomposition of the spent sulfite liquid led to greatly reduced biological oxygen demand, and the effluent accumulated in a three-meter thick layer of toxic sludge on the littoral zone near the discharge pipe. Although the discharge pipe was moved in the early 1990s before the mill ceased operations in 2001, much of the invertebrate community was defaunated by effluents (Akenhead 1992; Hoos 1975; Waldichuk 1966). Therefore, while the Cassiar Cannery mudflat is now overall relatively healthy, biological signals of disturbance at the scale of the 1m^2 quadrat may be remnants of the historical disturbances this mudflat has experienced. Cessation of disturbances associated with the pulp mill and canneries would have allowed for the process of passive reclamation, which appears to have been relatively successful for this infaunal community.

4.2 Sediment Parameters

Sediment parameters varied significantly through time and space, including in comparisons between impacted and reference locations, but no variable consistently contributed to location differences. Wood cover had the largest percent contribution for all comparisons including the Dock Location (18.9 - 27.0%), but only consistently contributed for one sampling date (June 21). It was hypothesized that the accumulation of woody debris at DL would decrease the depth to the aRPD as oxygen is consumed during the degradation of woody debris. However, this was not observed and may be due to tidal flushing either replenishing oxygen consumed in decomposition or removing woody debris before it has sufficient time to decompose (Kristensen 2000). Evidence suggests the latter, as organic matter content was not significantly higher at DL compared to the other locations. Interestingly, DL was the only location that had no macroalgae cover for any quadrat on any sampling date (Supplemental Material Table 2), which may indicate that the dock structure is affecting the hydrology and light availability at the Dock Location.

As physical disturbance can disrupt the redox potential discontinuity and result in water accumulation in associated pits and furrows (Dernie et al. 2003), changes to the aRPD depth and water content were potential indicators of physical disturbance at the Resort Location due to scour by logs. However, this was not observed in this location, as neither the aRPD depth nor water content consistently contributed to differences in sediment variables between RL and other location comparisons. Additionally, mudflats show high spatiotemporal variation in their sediment parameters (Gerwing et al. 2015b), suggesting that the variability present on this mudflat may not be a result of current or historical impacts.

4.3 Nutrient Availability

Although the biological community and sediment conditions showed significant spatiotemporal variation, nutrient availability (chlorophyll *a* concentration and percent organic matter) only showed temporal variation. Both chlorophyll *a* and organic matter content are known to vary through time, so temporal differences were not surprising (Gerwing et al. 2015b; Hargrave et al. 1983; Trites et al. 2005). However, a lack of spatial variation was unexpected. As the Dock Location receives no direct sunlight, it was hypothesized to have the lowest chlorophyll *a* concentration, yet this was not observed. Some species of microalgae can acclimatize to shade (Katayama et al. 2018), and cyanobacteria can produce more chlorophyll *a* at low light intensities compared to high light intensities (Muller et al. 1993; Raps et al. 1983). It is possible that these shade-acclimatized primary producers may be driving chlorophyll *a* productivity at DL, or tidal transport of diatoms to the substrate surface may be occurring under the dock. Regardless, future work should address how disturbance can influence species composition of photosynthetic organisms on intertidal mudflats. Additionally, as physical disruption to sediment can be detrimental to a variety of biotic parameters besides infaunal community composition (Dernie et al. 2003; Fonseca et al. 1982; Hansen and Skilleter 1994) it was expected that the Resort Location would have reduced chlorophyll *a* concentration compared to the reference locations; however, this was not supported by the data.

While the physical disturbance at RL was not expected to alter organic matter content (Dernie et al. 2003), the dock and potential accumulation of wood fibres was expected to result in organic matter enrichment at DL, and the historic cannery may have led to organic matter enrichment compared to the reference locations. This was not observed, suggesting that if organic enrichment occurred, it has decreased over the past 25 years. Additionally, the average organic content in any location was not higher than non-organically enriched mudflats on the east coast of Canada (~2.2-4.5%; (Gerwing et al. 2015b) it was marginally higher than at other mudflats nearby, as well as within the disturbed Kitimat Estuary (1.81-3.97%; Campbell, Unpublished Data; Gerwing et al. 2018a). Future research should determine natural ranges of organic matter content at Northeast Pacific mudflats not experiencing anthropogenic nutrient inputs.

4.4 Passive Reclamation

Passive reclamation can be highly effective in coastal and estuarine systems (Bayraktarov et al. 2016; Holl and Aide 2011; Marquiegui and Aguirrezabalaga 2009), while the associated costs of active reclamation can be extremely high (Bayraktarov et al. 2016; Holl and Aide 2011). Additionally, there is no clear relationship between the cost of reclamation and the success of marine coastal reclamation efforts (Bayraktarov et al. 2016). At the Cassiar Cannery mudflat, quantifiable comparisons were not possible due to a lack of pre-disturbance data, but the cessation of historical activities would have allowed for passive reclamation. These findings suggest that passive reclamation was sufficient to return this intertidal mudflat to a relatively productive, functional and diverse ecosystem, therefore in some scenarios passive reclamation may be an effective reclamation tool without the burden of high operating costs (Holl and Aide 2011). However, in this study passive reclamation did not restore the community to an entirely unstressed state, as evidenced by locally abundant populations of Capitellidae/Spionidae polychaetes and invasive cumaceans. Therefore, more time may be necessary for further progression towards an unstressed state, or a threshold may exist beyond which intertidal mudflats cannot be reclaimed through passive means. For instance, it is unlikely that an invasive species will passively die off once established.

The Cassiar Cannery mudflat would also have been impacted by chemical contaminants during its operation, and while this study did not quantify residual contaminants (e.g. copper or polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from the historical pulp mill and salmon cannery,) Sizmur et al. (In Press) showed no evidence of sediment contamination by potentially toxic elements (a naturally occurring element that can be toxic in high concentrations, e.g, arsenic, cadmium, cobalt, chromium, nickel, lead, and zinc) in the top 20 cm of the Cassiar Cannery mudflat. All potentially toxic elements studied at the Cassiar Cannery mudflat can be classified as unpolluted due to their low concentration (Muller 1969). This result indicates that if contaminants were present, sediment inputs from the Skeena and Nass River have buried contaminated sediment as part of the passive reclamation process.

Passive reclamation therefore is an effective tool for intertidal mudflats; however, more research is required to see if thresholds exist to the efficacy of passive reclamation and whether these thresholds shift based on the level of disturbance to an estuarine system. Regardless, if thresholds do exist for passive reclamation but the goal is full reclamation, allowing for passive reclamation to the existing threshold before commencing active reclamation may be more cost-effective than a complete active reclamation scheme.

5. Conclusions

Overall the Cassiar Cannery mudflat appears to be relatively healthy and reasonably unstressed, and it appears that passive reclamation from historical disturbances has occurred at these locations. Therefore, passive restoration may be an appropriate reclamation technique in other soft-sediment or estuarine ecosystems degraded by industrial activities. However, within the mudflat, some patches ($1m^2$ quadrat) reveal the legacy of past disturbances in the form of patchy distributions of taxa which are known indicators of disturbance. Therefore, thresholds may exist to the efficacy of passive reclamation, and future research should address potential thresholds of reclamation. Regardless, allowing for passive reclamation of the soft-sediment ecosystem to a relatively unstressed state before commencing active reclamation may be successful without the high cost associated with a full active reclamation scheme.

Acknowledgments

This project was funded by an NSERC CGS M to LC, an NSERC Discovery award and Liber Ero funds to FJ, a Mitacs Elevate postdoctoral fellowship to TGG, and support to TS from the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG) in the form of an Environment and Sustainability Research Grant. Without the support of Justine and Mark Crawford of Cassiar Cannery this project would have been impossible, and much gratitude is owed to them. Finally, Aleia Wylie’s support was crucial to see this project to completion.

References

Ahn IY, Kang YC, Choi JW. 1995. The influence of industrial effluents on intertidal benthic communities in Panweol, Kyeonggi Bay (Yellow Sea) on the west-coast of Korea. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 30(3):200-206.

Akenhead S. 1992. A review of the oceanography and marine ecology of Prince Rupert Harbour a propos sewage outfalls. Prepared for the Institute of Ocean Sciences, Sidney BC.

Altieri AH. 2006. Inducible variation in hypoxia tolerance across the intertidal-subtidal distribution of the blue mussel *Mytilus edulis*. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 325:295-300.

Bett B. 1988. Monitoring with meiofauna. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 19(6):293-294.

Bayraktarov E, Saunders MI, Abdullah S, Mills M, Beher J, Possingham HP, Mumby PJ, Lovelock CE. 2016. The cost and feasibility of marine coastal restoration. Ecological Applications. 26(4):1055-1074.

Benayas JMR, Newton AC, Diaz A, Bullock JM. 2009. Enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystem services by ecological restoration: A meta-analysis. Science. 325(5944):1121-1124.

Beyer DL, Nakatani RE, Staude CP. 1975. Effects of salmon cannery wastes on water-quality and marine organisms. Journal Water Pollution Control Federation. 47(7):1857-1869.

Borja A, Dauer DM, Elliott M, Simenstad CA. 2010. Medium- and long-term recovery of estuarine and coastal ecosystems: Patterns, rates and restoration effectiveness. Estuaries and Coasts. 33(6):1249-1260.

Borja A, Muxika H. 2005. Guidelines for the use of AMBI (AZTI's marine biotic index) in the assessment of the benthic ecological quality. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 50(7):787-789.

Burke MJW, Grime JP. 1996. An experimental study of plant community invasibility. Ecology. 77(3):776-790.

Buttermore RE. 1977. Eutrophication of an impounded estuarine lagoon. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 8(1):13-15.

Cardoso PG, Bankovic M, Raffaelli D, Pardal MA. 2007. Polychaete assemblages as indicators of habitat recovery in a temperate estuary under eutrophication. Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science. 71(1-2):301-308.

Campbell L, Wood L, Allen Gerwing AM, Allen S, Sizmur T, Rogers M, Gray O, Drewes M, Juanes F. 2019. A rapid, non-invasive population assessment technique for marine burrowing macrofauna inhabiting soft sediments. In Press at Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science.

Carr-Harris C, Gottesfeld AS, Moore JW. 2015. Juvenile salmon usage of the Skeena River Estuary. Plos One. 10(3): e0118988.

Chollett I, Bone D. 2007. Efffiects of heavy rainfall on polychaetes: Differential spatial patterns generated by a large-scale disturbance. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 340(2):113-125.

Conlan KE. 1994. Amphipod crustaceans and environmental disturbance - a review. Journal of Natural History. 28(3):519-554.

Constable AJ, Fairweather PG. 1999. Ecology of estuaries and soft-sediment habitats: Symposium introduction. Australian Journal of Ecology. 24(4):289-290.

Coulthard ME, Hamilton DJ. 2011. Effects of *Ilyanassa obsoleta* (Say) on the abundance and vertical distribution of *Corophium volutator* (Pallas) on mudflats of the Upper Bay of Fundy. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 397(2):161-172.

Cowie PR, Widdicombe S, Austen MC. 2000. Effects of physical disturbance on an estuarine intertidal community: Field and mesocosm results compared. Marine Biology. 136(3):485-495.

Cox KD, Black MJ, Filip N, Miller MR, Mohns K, Mortimor J, Freitas TR, Greiter Loerzer R, Gerwing TG, Juanes F et al. 2017. Community assessment techniques and the implications for rarefaction and extrapolation with Hill numbers. Ecology and Evolution. 7(24):11213-11226.

Crain CM, Kroeker K, Halpern BS. 2008. Interactive and cumulative effects of multiple human stressors in marine systems. Ecology Letters. 11(12):1304-1315.

Davis B, Mattone C, Sheaves M. 2014. Bottom-up control regulates patterns of fish connectivity and assemblage structure in coastal wetlands. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 500:175-186.

Dernie KM, Kaiser MJ, Richardson EA, Warwick RM. 2003. Recovery of soft sediment communities and habitats following physical disturbance. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 285:415-434.

Dissanayake NG, Frid CLJ, Drylie TP, Caswell BA. 2018. Ecological functioning of mudflats: Global analysis reveals both regional differences and widespread conservation of functioning. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 604:1-20.

Faggetter BA. 2008. Review of the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of marine pollution in the north and central coast regions of British Columbia. Prepared for North Coast-Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society.

Fauchald K, Jumars P. 1979. The diet of worms: A study of polychaete feeding guilds. Oceanography and Marine Biology Annual Review. 17:193-284.

Fonseca MS, Fisher JS, Zieman JC, Thayer GW. 1982. Influence of the seagrass, *Zostera marina*, on current flow. Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science. 15(4):351-358.

Gerwing TG, Allen Gerwing AM, Macdonald T, Cox K, Juanes F, Dudas SE. 2017a. Intertidal soft-sediment community does not respond to disturbance as postulated by the intermediate disturbance hypothesis. Journal of Sea Research. 129:22-28.

Gerwing T, Campbell L, Allen Gerwing A, Allen S, Cox K, Rogers M, Gray O, Drewes M, Juanes F. 2018a. Potential impacts of logging on intertidal infaunal communities within the Kitimat River Estuary. Journal of Natural History. 52:2833-2855.

Gerwing TG, Cox K, Allen Gerwing AM, Carr-Harris CN, Dudas SE, Juanes F. 2017b. Depth to the apparent redox potential discontinuity (aRPD) as a parameter of interest in marine benthic habitat models. International Journal of Sediment Research. 33:472-480.

Gerwing TG, Drolet D, Barbeau MA, Hamilton DJ, Allen Gerwing AM. 2015a. Resilience of an intertidal infaunal community to winter stressors. Journal of Sea Research. 97:40-49.

Gerwing TG, Allen Gerwing AM, Drolet D, Barbeau MA, Hamilton DJ. 2015b. Spatiotemporal variation in biotic and abiotic features of eight intertidal mudflats in the Upper Bay of Fundy, Canada. Northeastern Naturalist. 22:1-44.

Gerwing TG, Allen Gerwing AM, Drolet D, Hamilton DJ, Barbeau MA. 2013. Comparison of two methods of measuring the depth of the redox potential discontinuity in intertidal mudflat sediments. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 487:7-13.

Gerwing TG, Allen Gerwing AM, Hamilton DJ, Barbeau MA. 2015c. Apparent redox potential discontinuity (aRPD) depth as a relative measure of sediment oxygen content and habitat quality. International Journal of Sediment Research. 30(1):74-80.

Gerwing TG, Allen Gerwing AM, Macdonald T, Cox K, Juanes F, Dudas SE. 2018b. Assessing the relationship between community dispersion and disturbance in a soft-sediment ecosystem. Marine Ecology-an Evolutionary Perspective. 39(4):9.

Gesteira JLG, Dauvin JC. 2000. Amphipods are good bioindicators of the impact of oil spills on soft-bottom macrobenthic communities. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 40(11):1017-1027.

Gonzalez A, Cardinale BJ, Allington GRH, Byrnes J, Endsley KA, Brown DG, Hooper DU, Isbell F, O'Connor MI, Loreau M. 2016. Estimating local biodiversity change: A critique of papers claiming no net loss of local diversity. Ecology. 97(8):1949-1960.

Guerra-Garcia J, Garcia-Gomez J. 2004. Polychaete assemblages and sediment pollution in a harbour with two opposing entrances. Helgoland Marine Research. 58(3):183-191.

Hansen JA, Skilleter GA. 1994. Effects of the gastropod *Rhinoclavis aspera* (Linnaeus, 1758) on microbial biomass and productivity in coral-reef-flat sediments. Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research. 45(4):569-584.

Hargrave BT, Prouse NJ, Phillips GA, Neame PA. 1983. Primary production and respiration in pelagic and benthic communities at 2 intertidal sites in the Upper Bay of Fundy. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences. 40:229-243.

Heilskov AC, Holmer M. 2001. Effects of benthic fauna on organic matter mineralization in fish-farm sediments: Importance of size and abundance. ICES Journal of Marine Science. 58(2):427-434.

Herbert RJH, Crowe TP, Bray S, Sheader M. 2009. Disturbance of intertidal soft sediment assemblages caused by swinging boat moorings. Hydrobiologia. 625:105-116.

Holl KD, Aide TM. 2011. When and where to actively restore ecosystems? Forest Ecology and Management. 261(10):1558-1563.

Hooper DU, Chapin FS, Ewel JJ, Hector A, Inchausti P, Lavorel S, Lawton JH, Lodge DM, Loreau M, Naeem S et al. 2005. Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: A consensus of current knowledge. Ecological Monographs. 75(1):3-35.

Hoos LM. 1975. The Skeena River Estuary: Status of environmental knowledge to 1975: Report of the Estuary Working Group, Dept. of the Environment, Regional Board Pacific Region. Environment Canada.

Katayama T, Nagao N, Goto M, Yusoff FM, Banerjee S, Sato M, Takahashi K, Furuya K. 2018. Growth characteristics of shade-acclimated marine *Chlorella vulgaris* under high-cell-density conditions. Journal of Environmental Biology. 39(5):747-753.

Kauffman JB, Beschta RL, Otting N, Lytjen D. 1997. An ecological perspective of riparian and stream restoration in the western united states. Fisheries. 22(5):12-24.

Keats RA, Osher LJ, Neckers HA. 2004. The effect of nitrogen loading on a brackish estuarine faunal community: A stable isotope approach. Estuaries. 27(3):460-471.

Kennish MJ. 2002. Environmental threats and environmental future of estuaries. Environmental Conservation. 29(1):78-107.

Kesaniemi JE, Bostrom C, Knott KE. 2012. New genetic markers reveal population genetic structure at different spatial scales in the opportunistic polychaete *Pygospio elegans*. Hydrobiologia. 691(1):213-223.

Kristensen E. 2000. Organic matter diagenesis at the oxic/anoxic interface in coastal marine sediments, with emphasis on the role of burrowing animals. Hydrobiologia. 426(1-3):1-24.

Kritzer JP, DeLucia M, Greene E, Shumway C, Topolski MF, Thomas-Blate J, Chiarella LA, Davy KB, Smith K. 2016. The importance of benthic habitats for coastal fisheries. BioScience. 66(4):274-284.

Light SF, Smith RI. 2007. The Light and Smith manual: Intertidal invertebrates from Central California to Oregon. Carlton JT, editor. Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, USA: University of California Press.

Marquiegui MA, Aguirrezabalaga F. 2009. Colonization process by macrobenthic infauna after a managed coastal realignment in the Bidasoa Estuary (Bay of Biscay, NE Atlantic). Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science. 84(4):598-604.

McCrackin ML, Jones HP, Jones PC, Moreno-Mateos D. 2017. Recovery of lakes and coastal marine ecosystems from eutrophication: A global meta-analysis. Limnology and Oceanography. 62(2):507-518.

McLaren P. 2016. The environmental implications of sediment transport in the waters of Prince Rupert, British Columbia, Canada: A comparison between kinematic and dynamic approaches. Journal of Coastal Research. 32(3):465-482.

Muller G. 1969. Index of geoaccumulation in sediments of the Rhine River. Geojournal. 2:108-118.

Muller C, Reuter W, Wehrmeyer W, Dau H, Senger H. 1993. Adaptation of the photosynthetic apparatus of *Anacystis nidulans* to irradiance and CO_2-concentration. Botanica Acta. 106(6):480-487.

Ozdemir A, Duran M, Sen A. 2011. Potential use of the oligochaete *Limnodrilus profundicola* v., as a bioindicator of contaminant exposure. Environmental Toxicology. 26(1):37-44.

Page DS, Boehm PD, Douglas GS, Bence AE, Burns WA, Mankiewicz PJ. 1999. Pyrogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in sediments record past human activity: A case study in Prince William Sound, Alaska. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 38(4):247-260.

Pearson T, Rosenberg R. 1976. A comparative study of the effects on the marine environment of wastes from cellulose. Ambio. 5(2):77-79.

Pearson TH, Rosenberg R. 1978. Macrobenthic succession in relation to organic enrichment and pollution of the marine environment. Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review. 16:229-331.

Pearson TH, Stanley SO. 1979. Comparative measurement of the redox potential of marine-sediments as a rapid means of assessing the effect of organic pollution. Marine Biology. 53(4):371-379.

Pinto R, Patrício J, Baeta A, Fath BD, Neto JM, Marques JC. 2009. Review and evaluation of estuarine biotic indices to assess benthic condition. Ecological Indicators. 9(1):1-25.

Pires A, Velez C, Figueira E, Soares A, Freitas R. 2017. Effects of sediment contamination on physiological and biochemical responses of the polychaete *Diopatra neapolitana*, an exploited natural resource. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 119(1):119-131.

Pocklington P, Wells PG. 1992. Polychaetes - key taxa for marine environmental-quality monitoring. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 24(12):593-598.

Raps S, Wyman K, Siegelman HW, Falkowski PG. 1983. Adaptation of the cyanobacterium *Microcystis aeruginosa* to light-intensity. Plant Physiology. 72(3):829-832.

Schlacher TA, Lucrezi S, Peterson CH, Connolly RM, Olds AD, Althaus F, Hyndes GA, Maslo B, Gilby BL, Leon JX et al. 2016. Estimating animal populations and body sizes from burrows: Marine ecologists have their heads buried in the sand. Journal of Sea Research. 112:55-64.

Schlacher TA, Thompson L. 2013. Spatial structure on ocean-exposed sandy beaches: Faunal zonation metrics and their variability. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 478:43-55.

Skilleter GA. 1996. An experimental test of artifacts from repeated sampling in soft-sediments. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 205(1-2):137-148.

Simenstad C, Reed D, Ford C. 2006. When is restoration not? Incorporating landscape-scale processes to restore self-sustaining ecosystems in coastal wetland restoration. Ecological Engineering. 26:27-39.

Sizmur T, Campbell L, Dracott K, Jones M, O'Driscoll NJ, Gerwing T. 2019. Survey of intertidal ecosystem reveals a lecacy of potentially toxic elements from industrial activity in the Skeena Estuary, British Columbia, Canada. In Press at Estuaries and Coasts.

Smith MD, Knapp AK. 1999. Exotic plant species in a C-4-dominated grassland: Invasibility, disturbance, and community structure. Oecologia. 120(4):605-612.

Stone FE, Barnett HJ, Hunter PJ, Roberts GC, Nelson RW. 1981. Processing waste-water from 2 mechanized salmon canneries. Marine Fisheries Review. 43(1):21-25.

Szabo P. 2010. Why history matters in ecology: An interdisciplinary perspective. Environmental Conservation. 37(4):380-387.

Thomas JD. 1993. Biological monitoring and tropical biodiversity in marine environments - a critique with recommendations, and comments on the use of amphipods as bioindicators. Journal of Natural History. 27(4):795-806.

Thrush SF, Hewitt JE, Norkko A, Cummings VJ, Funnell GA. 2003. Macrobenthic recovery processes following catastrophic sedimentation on estuarine sandflats. Ecological Applications. 13(5):1433-1455.

Trites M, Kaczmarska I, Ehrman JM, Hicklin PW, Ollerhead J. 2005. Diatoms from two macro-tidal mudflats in Chignecto Bay, Upper Bay of Fundy, New Brunswick, Canada. Hydrobiologia. 544:299-319.

Turner A. 2019. Lead pollution of coastal sediments by ceramic waste. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 138:171-176.

Underwood AJ. 1997. Experiments in ecology: Their logical design and interpretation using analysis of variance. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Underwood AJ. 1994. On beyond BACI - sampling designs that might reliably detect environmental disturbances. Ecological Applications. 4(1):3-15.

Underwood AJ. 2009. Components of design in ecological field experiments. Annales Zoologici Fennici. 46(2):93-111.

Vackar D, ten Brink B, Loh J, Baillie JEM, Reyers B. 2012. Review of multispecies indices for monitoring human impacts on biodiversity. Ecological Indicators. 17:58-67.

Valdivia N, Scrosati RA, Molis M, Knox AS. 2011. Variation in community structure across vertical intertidal stress gradients: How does it compare with horizontal variation at different scales? Plos One. 6(8):8.

Veloso VG, Neves G, Lozano M, Perez-Hurtado A, Gago CG, Hortas F, Garcia FG. 2008. Responses of Talitrid amphipods to a gradient of recreational pressure caused by beach urbanization. Marine Ecology-an Evolutionary Perspective. 29:126-133.

Waldichuk M. 1966. Effects of sulfite wastes in a partially enclosed marine system in British Columbia. Journal Water Pollution Control Federation. 38(9):1484-1505.

Waldichuk M. 1979. Ecological impact of logs. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 10(2):33-34.

Wilkes B, Dwernychuk L. 1991. Environment studies in the marine receiving environment at the Skeena cellulose pulp mill, Watson Island, BC. Pulp & Paper Canada. 92(10):20-27.

Wu RSS. 1995. The environmental impact of marine fish culture: Towards a sustainable future. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 31(4-12):159-166.

Yunker MB, Cretney WJ, Ikonomou MG. 2002. Assessment of chlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxin and dibenzofuran trends in sediment and crab hepatopancreas from pulp mill and harbor sites using multivariate and index-based approaches. Environmental Science & Technology. 36(9):1869-1878.

Tables and Figures



Figure 1. Location of the Cassiar Cannery mudflat (54.178092°, -130.176924°) sampled during summer 2017, in Inverness Passage, British Columbia, Canada. A) shows the location of the Cassiar Cannery mudflat within Inverness Passage relative to the Skeena River and Prince Rupert. B) shows the 4 locations sampled on the Cassiar Cannery mudflat. DL: Dock Location (benthos underneath the dock denoted by DK), RL: Resort Location (in front of guest houses denoted by GH), NR: North Reference, SR: South Reference.



Figure 2. Non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) graphs showing infaunal invertebrate community at four locations on the intertidal mudflat at Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage, British Columbia, during the summer of 2017. A) the infaunal community by location and B) the vector overlay indicates the direction of increased density, with correlations > 0.3 shown. DL: Dock Location. RL: Resort Location. NR: North Reference. SR: South Reference.



Figure 3. Non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) graphs of A) sediment parameters (depth to the aRPD, water content, particle size, penetrability, % macroalgae coverage, and % wood cover) by time and location and B) the nutrient availability (chlorophyll *a* and organic matter content) at four locations on the intertidal mudflat at Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage, British Columbia, during the summer of 2017. Vector overlays for sediment and nutrient variables show the correlation between variables and nMDS axes, with each vector showing the direction of increased value. DL: Dock Location. RL: Resort Location. NR: North Reference. SR: South Reference.

Table 1. Permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) quantifying the spatiotemporal variation in A) infaunal invertebrate community, and B) taxonomic richness, and C) sediment parameters, and D) the nutrient parameters at four locations at the intertidal mudflat at Cassiar Cannery during the summer of 2017. DL: Dock Location. RL: Resort Location. NR: North Reference. SR: South Reference. Significant p values (α < 0.05) are denoted in bold.

A)

Source	df	MS	Pseudo-F	Unique Permutations	p
Date	**2**	**6939.90**	**6.93**	**4982**	**0.0002**
Location	**3**	**6316.20**	**3.38**	**4237**	**0.0002**
DL vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**6973.10**	**6.95**	**4986**	**0.0002**
RL vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**5798.70**	**4.69**	**4992**	**0.0008**
DL vs RL	**1**	**7738.00**	**5.97**	**4990**	**0.0002**
NR vs SR	**1**	**5500.80**	**5.81**	**4986**	**0.0002**
Transect(Location)	**8**	**1869.20**	**2.11**	**4971**	**0.0002**
Date X Location	6	1345.20	1.34	4978	0.1550
Date X Transect(Location)	16	1001.50	1.13	4958	0.2372
Residual	72	885.96			
Total	107				

B)

Source	df	MS	Pseudo-F	Unique Permutations	p
Date	2	435.28	2.13	4990	0.0950
Location	3	1004.20	0.90	4225	0.5298
Transect(Location)	**8**	**1121.80**	**4.57**	**4975**	**0.0002**
Date X Location	6	244.31	1.19	4988	0.3290
Date X Transect(Location)	16	204.67	0.83	4978	0.6982
Residual	72	245.43			
Total	107				

C)

Source	df	MS	Pseudo-F	Unique Permutations	p
Date	2	4.58	1.29	4974	0.2670
Location	**3**	**35.72**	**5.48**	**4248**	**0.0004**
Transect(Location)	8	6.52	1.25	4977	0.1486
Date X Location	**6**	**6.96**	**1.96**	**4982**	**0.0278**
Date X Transect(Location)	16	3.55	0.68	4961	0.9826
Residual	72	5.21			
Total	107				

D)

Source	df	MS	Pseudo-F	Unique permutations	p
Date	**2**	**9.76**	**11.49**	**4989**	**0.0002**
May 30 vs June 21	**1**	**7.74**	**8.79**	**4987**	**0.0002**
May 30 vs July 20	**1**	**6.77**	**3.50**	**4987**	**0.0306**
June 21 vs July 20	**1**	**15.85**	**8.79**	**4987**	**0.0002**
Location	3	2.35	1.12	4258	0.4162
Transect(Location)	8	2.10	0.99	4983	0.4696
Date X Location	6	0.69	0.81	4980	0.6526
Date X Transect(Location)	16	0.85	0.40	4967	0.9976
Residual	72	2.12			
Total	107				

Table 2. Permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) quantifying the spatiotemporal variation in sediment variables on three sampling dates at the Cassiar Cannery intertidal mudflat during the summer of 2017. Date was run as separate PERMANOVAs due to the significant interaction term between Date X Location in Table 1. DL: Dock Location. RL: Resort Location. NR: North Reference. SR: South Reference. Significant p values (α < 0.05) are denoted in bold.

May 30					
Source	df	MS	Pseudo-F	Unique Permutations	*p*
Location	**3**	**14.32**	**3.37**	**4269**	**0.0008**
DL Vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**16.48**	**2.95**	**4989**	**0.0128**
RL Vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**15.11**	**2.68**	**4985**	**0.0214**
DL Vs RL	**1**	**12.56**	**2.25**	**4516**	**0.0328**
NR Vs SR	1	13.13	2.36	4483	0.0800
Transect(Location)	8	4.25	0.77	4969	0.8500
Residual	24	5.54			
Total	35				
June 21					
Source	df	MS	Pseudo-F	Unique Permutations	*p*
Location	**3**	**18.83**	**4.06**	**4238**	**0.0008**
DL Vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**26.10**	**5.02**	**4983**	**0.0002**
RL Vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**17.50**	**3.16**	**4986**	**0.0084**
DL Vs RL	**1**	**27.39**	**5.87**	**4468**	**0.0002**
NR Vs SR	1	5.69	0.94	4503	0.4700
Transect(Location)	8	4.64	0.96	4967	0.5600
Residual	24	4.85			
Total	35				
July 20					
Source	df	MS	Pseudo-F	Unique Permutations	*p*
Location	**3**	**14.68**	**2.75**	**4245**	**0.0032**
DL Vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**23.23**	**4.37**	**4979**	**0.0020**
RL Vs (NR + SR)	**1**	**12.20**	**2.12**	**4978**	**0.0438**
DL Vs RL	**1**	**15.49**	**2.87**	**4533**	**0.0058**
NR Vs SR	1	8.63	1.48	4517	0.1700
Transect(Location)	8	5.33	1.04	4958	0.4200
Residual	24	5.14			
Total	35				

Table 3. SIMPER (Similarity Percentages) determining the contribution of each taxonomic grouping to the observed differences between intertidal locations at Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage during summer of 2017. Diss/SD represents the ratio of the dissimilarity to the standard deviation. Values >1, denoted in bold, represent groups that consistently contribute to the observed differences between location types. Taxa with Diss/SD <1 did not consistently contribute to the observed differences between location types. Only groups that contributed ≥ 1% to the observed differences between locations are shown. DL: Dock Location. RL: Resort Location. NR: North Reference. SR: South Reference.

DL vs (NR+SR) — Average Dissimilarity = 45.90%

Species	DL Abundance	(NR + SR) Abundance	Av.Diss	Diss/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Oligochaeta	**5.55**	**3.23**	**5.01**	**1.23**	**10.91**	**10.91**
Pygospio elegans	**6.08**	**4.71**	**4.85**	**1.19**	**10.56**	**21.47**
Nematoda	**7.00**	**6.10**	**4.55**	**1.13**	**9.91**	**31.38**
Harpacticoida	**1.06**	**4.03**	**4.38**	**1.24**	**9.54**	**40.93**
Americorophium salmonis	**2.66**	**4.76**	**4.23**	**1.27**	**9.22**	**50.15**
***Capitella* Species Complex**	**3.70**	**5.49**	**4.15**	**1.20**	**9.05**	**59.19**
Nippoleucon hinumensis	**2.79**	**2.27**	**3.61**	**1.05**	**7.86**	**67.05**
Eteone californica	**2.49**	**4.07**	**3.35**	**1.12**	**7.30**	**74.35**
Aricidea hartleyi	2.29	0.07	2.55	0.79	5.56	79.91
Macoma balthica	4.99	4.68	2.45	0.94	5.34	85.26
Cumella vulgaris	1.67	0.45	2.13	0.78	4.64	89.90
Paranemertes peregrina	0.66	0.81	1.38	0.61	3.00	92.90
Abarenicola pacifica	0.18	0.85	1.06	0.48	2.31	95.21
Ostracoda	0.30	0.32	0.76	0.39	1.66	96.87
Fabricia stellaris	0.41	0.13	0.51	0.31	1.10	97.97

RL vs (NR+SR) — Average Dissimilarity = 50.09%

Species	RL Abundance	(NR + SR) Abundance	Av.Diss	Diss/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
***Capitella* Species Complex**	**3.71**	**5.49**	**5.95**	**1.18**	**11.88**	**11.88**
Nematoda	**4.74**	**6.10**	**5.87**	**1.18**	**11.72**	**23.59**
Pygospio elegans	**4.57**	**4.71**	**5.41**	**1.20**	**10.80**	**34.39**
Americorophium salmonis	**4.82**	**4.76**	**5.00**	**1.14**	**9.98**	**44.37**
Macoma balthica	**3.60**	**4.68**	**4.54**	**0.98**	**9.06**	**53.43**
Eteone californica	**2.90**	**4.07**	**4.21**	**1.09**	**8.40**	**61.82**
Oligochaeta	**1.07**	**3.23**	**4.16**	**1.08**	**8.30**	**70.13**
Harpacticoida	3.37	4.03	4.12	0.96	8.22	78.35
Nippoleucon hinumensis	1.76	2.27	3.56	0.94	7.11	85.45
Cumella vulgaris	1.13	0.45	1.90	0.62	3.79	89.25
Chironomidae Larvae	0.99	0.00	1.34	0.49	2.68	91.93
Paranemertes peregrina	0.18	0.81	1.12	0.49	2.24	94.17
Abarenicola pacifica	0.00	0.85	1.07	0.43	2.14	96.31
Ostracoda	0.15	0.32	0.67	0.32	1.35	97.65

DL vs RL — Average Dissimilarity = 52.98%

Species	DL Abundance	RL Abundance	Av.Diss	Diss/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Oligochaeta	**5.55**	**1.07**	**6.81**	**1.37**	**12.86**	**12.86**
Pygospio elegans	**6.08**	**4.57**	**5.42**	**1.14**	**10.22**	**23.08**
***Capitella* Species Complex**	**3.70**	**3.71**	**4.93**	**1.21**	**9.30**	**32.39**
Americorophium salmonis	**2.66**	**4.82**	**4.82**	**1.24**	**9.10**	**41.48**
Nematoda	**7.00**	**4.74**	**4.80**	**1.26**	**9.06**	**50.54**
Macoma balthica	**4.99**	**3.60**	**4.40**	**1.01**	**8.31**	**58.85**
Harpacticoida	**1.06**	**3.37**	**4.16**	**1.23**	**7.84**	**66.69**
Nippoleucon hinumensis	2.79	1.76	4.02	0.95	7.59	74.28
Eteone californica	**2.49**	**2.90**	**3.75**	**1.08**	**7.08**	**81.36**
Aricidea hartleyi	2.29	0.00	2.85	0.77	5.39	86.75
Cumella vulgaris	1.67	1.13	2.69	0.86	5.08	91.83
Chironomidae Larvae	0.33	0.99	1.66	0.55	3.14	94.97
Paranemertes peregrina	0.66	0.18	0.94	0.45	1.77	96.74
Ostracoda	0.30	0.15	0.66	0.33	1.24	97.98

NR vs SR — Average Dissimilarity = 44.17%

Species	NR Abundance	SR Abundance	Av.Diss	Diss/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Nematoda	**5.11**	**7.09**	**5.81**	**1.14**	**13.15**	**13.15**
Pygospio elegans	**6.29**	**3.13**	**5.62**	**1.40**	**12.72**	**25.86**
***Capitella* Species Complex**	**6.82**	**4.15**	**4.65**	**1.33**	**10.53**	**36.39**
Americorophium salmonis	**5.92**	**3.60**	**4.57**	**1.26**	**10.35**	**46.74**
Harpacticoida	**3.81**	**4.24**	**3.89**	**1.00**	**8.81**	**55.56**
Oligochaeta	**3.56**	**2.90**	**3.82**	**1.19**	**8.64**	**64.20**
Nippoleucon hinumensis	**1.81**	**2.74**	**3.54**	**1.02**	**8.01**	**72.21**
Eteone californica	3.75	4.40	2.98	0.95	6.75	78.96
Macoma balthica	**5.33**	**4.03**	**2.76**	**1.06**	**6.24**	**85.20**
Abarenicola pacifica	1.15	0.55	1.68	0.63	3.81	89.02
Paranemertes peregrina	1.27	0.34	1.62	0.68	3.68	92.69
Cumella vulgaris	0.15	0.76	1.03	0.43	2.32	95.02
Ostracoda	0.00	0.64	0.82	0.39	1.85	96.87
Eogammarus confervicolus	0.49	0.00	0.58	0.34	1.31	98.18

Table 4. SIMPER (Similarity Percentages) showing percent contribution (%) of each sediment variable collected at each quadrat (normalized) to the dissimilarity in sediment environment at Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage, during 2017. Particle size, aRPD, wood cover, and macrophyte cover were SQRT(X) transformed. Av. Sq. Dist: Average squared distance. Sq Dis/SD: Ratio of the average squared distance to the standard deviation. Values >1, denoted in bold, represent variables that consistently contribute to the observed differences between location types. DL: Dock Location. RL: Resort Location. NR: North Reference. SR: South Reference.

May 30; DL vs (NR + SR)
Average Squared Distance = 12.92

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Wood Cover (%)	3.48	0.74	26.94	26.94
Penetrability (mm)	2.34	0.81	18.08	45.02
aRPD (mm)	1.98	0.53	15.30	60.32
Water Content (%)	1.86	0.63	14.42	74.73
Macrophyte Cover (%)	1.73	0.53	13.43	88.16
Particle Size	1.53	0.77	11.84	100

May 30; RL vs (NR + SR)
Average Squared Distance = 12.29

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Wood Cover (%)	2.74	0.57	22.28	22.28
Penetrability (mm)	2.17	0.79	17.67	39.94
Water Content (%)	2.06	0.60	16.73	56.68
aRPD (mm)	1.97	0.46	16.04	72.71
Particle Size	1.70	0.70	13.81	86.53
Macrophyte Cover (%)	1.66	0.58	13.47	100

May 30; DL vs RL
Average Squared Distance = 12.73

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Wood Cover (%)	2.40	0.71	18.87	18.87
Penetrability (mm)	2.25	0.74	17.69	36.56
Macrophyte Cover (%)	2.15	0.43	16.93	53.48
Water Content (%)	2.07	0.72	16.24	69.72
aRPD (mm)	1.95	0.77	15.31	85.03
Particle Size	1.91	0.71	14.97	100

June 21; DL vs (NR + SR)
Average Squared Distance = 13.95

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Wood Cover (%)	**3.78**	**1.18**	**27.09**	**27.09**
Penetrability (mm)	2.53	0.80	18.12	45.21
Water Content (%)	2.08	0.87	14.92	60.13
aRPD (mm)	2.03	0.77	14.56	74.69
Particle Size	1.81	0.49	12.94	87.63
Macrophyte Cover (%)	1.73	0.44	12.37	100

June 21; RL vs (NR + SR)
Average Squared Distance = 12.82

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
aRPD (mm)	2.61	0.79	20.35	20.35
Penetrability (mm)	2.34	0.76	18.28	38.62
Wood Cover (%)	2.27	0.76	17.71	56.33
Particle Size	2.06	0.63	16.05	72.39
Water Content (%)	1.87	0.70	14.59	86.97
Macrophyte Cover (%)	1.67	0.53	13.03	100

June 21; DL vs RL
Average Squared Distance = 14.38

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Wood Cover (%)	**2.92**	**1.09**	**20.28**	**20.28**
Penetrability (mm)	2.72	0.9	18.92	39.2
aRPD (mm)	2.32	0.59	16.11	55.31
Water Content (%)	2.27	0.87	15.76	71.07
Macrophyte Cover (%)	2.24	0.63	15.61	86.67
Particle Size	1.92	0.68	13.33	100

July 20; DL vs (NR + SR)
Average Squared Distance = 14.12

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Wood Cover (%)	3.62	0.90	25.65	25.65
Penetrability (mm)	2.36	0.97	16.68	42.34
Particle Size	2.28	0.57	16.14	58.48
Water Content (%)	2.18	0.73	15.42	73.9
aRPD (mm)	2.04	0.49	14.43	88.33
Macrophyte Cover (%)	1.65	0.37	11.67	100

July 20; RL vs (NR + SR)
Average Squared Distance = 14.42

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Particle Size	3.12	0.62	21.65	21.65
Macrophyte Cover (%)	2.61	0.45	18.11	39.76
Water Content (%)	2.30	0.78	15.98	55.74
Wood Cover (%)	2.17	0.43	15.02	70.76
Penetrability (mm)	2.17	0.59	15.02	85.78
aRPD (mm)	2.05	0.56	14.22	100

July 20; DL vs RL
Average Squared Distance = 13.05

Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Wood Cover (%)	2.71	0.89	20.76	20.76
aRPD (mm)	2.28	0.53	17.48	38.24
Particle Size	2.15	0.62	16.49	54.73
Macrophyte Cover (%)	2.13	0.41	16.30	71.03
Water Content (%)	1.89	0.79	14.49	85.52
Penetrability (mm)	1.89	0.78	14.48	100

Table 5. SIMPER (Similarity Percentages) showing percent contribution (%) of each nutrient variable (normalized) collected at each quadrat to the dissimilarity in nutrient availability between each location at Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage, during 2017. All variables were SQRT(X) transformed. Av. Sq. Dist: Average squared distance. Sq Dis/SD: Ratio of the average squared distance to the standard deviation.

May 30 vs June 21				
Average Squared Distance = 4.96				
Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Chlorophyll *a* Concentration (mg/m^2)	3.13	0.56	63.1	63.10
Organic Matter Content (%)	1.83	0.76	36.9	100
May 30 vs July 20				
Average Squared Distance = 5.18				
Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Chlorophyll *a* Concentration (mg/m^2)	2.89	0.57	55.7	55.70
Organic Matter Content (%)	2.30	0.79	44.3	100
June 21 vs July 20				
Average Squared Distance = 2.28				
Variable	Av.Sq.Dist	Sq.Dist/SD	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Organic Matter Content (%)	2.10	0.81	91.74	91.74
Chlorophyll *a* Concentration (mg/m^2)	0.19	0.89	8.26	100

Supplemental Material

Table A.1. Mean abundance (individuals /m^2) and standard error (n = 27) of the infaunal invertebrate community at four locations at the intertidal Cassiar Cannery mudflat in Inverness Passage during the summer of 2017.

Species	Location	May 30	June 21	July 20
Eogammarus confervicolus	Dock Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	Resort Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88
	North Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88	115.53 ± 87.84
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Americorophium salmonis	Dock Location	346.59 ± 178.63	173.30 ± 96.87	462.12 ± 104.14
	Resort Location	404.36 ± 115.53	3,465.90 ± 1,554.23	2,368.37 ± 945.65
	North Reference	548.77 ± 222.79	3,985.79 ± 1,361.77	3,292.61 ± 832.22
	South Reference	173.30 ± 114.62	1,704.07 ± 960.10	982.01 ± 437.07
Oligochaeta	Dock Location	1,646.30 ± 702.59	3,841.38 ± 1,170.37	3,379.26 ± 1,703.46
	Resort Location	144.41 ± 87.84	404.36 ± 341.44	0.00 ± 0.00
	North Reference	548.77 ± 152.83	1,299.71 ± 462.57	231.06 ± 133.14
	South Reference	837.59 ± 372.13	1,126.42 ± 354.62	28.88 ± 28.88
Nippoleucon hinumensis	Dock Location	86.65 ± 43.32	346.59 ± 137.00	1,299.71 ± 794.14
	Resort Location	28.88 ± 28.88	346.59 ± 178.63	259.94 ± 86.65
	North Reference	57.77 ± 57.77	664.30 ± 474.81	202.18 ± 84.21
	South Reference	144.41 ± 76.42	635.42 ± 256.71	722.06 ± 305.66
Cumella vulgaris	Dock Location	404.36 ± 130.77	86.65 ± 43.32	28.88 ± 28.88
	Resort Location	57.77 ± 57.77	28.88 ± 28.88	202.18 ± 72.21
	North Reference	28.88 ± 28.88	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88	375.47 ± 241.65
Abarenicola pacifica	Dock Location	0.00 ± 0.00	57.77 ± 57.77	0.00 ± 0.00
	Resort Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	North Reference	231.06 ± 133.14	115.53 ± 45.67	0.00 ± 0.00
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	231.06 ± 146.56	0.00 ± 0.00
Capitella Species Complex	Dock Location	982.01 ± 266.28	693.18 ± 252.62	231.06 ± 91.33
	Resort Location	1,906.25 ± 872.95	1,617.42 ± 838.71	1,155.30 ± 586.25
	North Reference	3,956.91 ± 1,042.28	3,668.08 ± 1,412.81	3,725.85 ± 1,670.64
	South Reference	1,068.65 ± 491.00	2,310.60 ± 1,120.94	404.36 ± 130.77
Pygospio elegans	Dock Location	1,559.66 ± 312.41	5,516.56 ± 2,409.75	2,974.90 ± 1,324.12
	Resort Location	1,906.25 ± 671.17	2,686.08 ± 1,271.98	808.71 ± 339.60
	North Reference	2,888.25 ± 852.77	3,090.43 ± 845.03	2,195.07 ± 464.82
	South Reference	1,357.48 ± 902.32	2,512.78 ± 1,280.80	375.47 ± 290.98
Aricidea hartleyi	Dock Location	866.48 ± 528.83	750.95 ± 507.91	202.18 ± 112.79
	Resort Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	North Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Fabricia stellaris	Dock Location	0.00 ± 0.00	317.71 ± 286.65	0.00 ± 0.00
	Resort Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	North Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	259.94 ± 259.94	0.00 ± 0.00
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Eteone californica	Dock Location	231.06 ± 101.09	346.59 ± 86.65	144.41 ± 62.95
	Resort Location	346.59 ± 167.79	635.42 ± 256.71	433.24 ± 137.00
	North Reference	259.94 ± 106.12	779.83 ± 324.21	577.65 ± 166.54

	South Reference	375.47 ± 130.77	1,444.13 ± 284.46	433.24 ± 96.87
Paranemertes peregrina	Dock Location	115.53 ± 115.53	57.77 ± 38.21	28.88 ± 28.88
	Resort Location	0.00 ± 0.00	57.77 ± 57.77	0.00 ± 0.00
	North Reference	86.65 ± 43.32	28.88 ± 28.88	202.18 ± 84.21
	South Reference	86.65 ± 86.65	28.88 ± 28.88	0.00 ± 0.00
Macoma balthica	Dock Location	866.48 ± 259.94	808.71 ± 133.14	1,126.42 ± 327.09
	Resort Location	1,357.48 ± 417.30	433.24 ± 203.21	577.65 ± 160.81
	North Reference	1,530.77 ± 388.57	1,473.01 ± 375.20	837.59 ± 317.71
	South Reference	693.18 ± 225.12	375.47 ± 194.29	664.30 ± 107.10
Nematoda	Dock Location	2,426.13 ± 556.50	3,783.61 ± 753.03	4,505.68 ± 2,086.75
	Resort Location	2,888.25 ± 859.35	2,426.13 ± 1,118.06	115.53 ± 45.67
	North Reference	2,974.90 ± 1,749.18	3,437.02 ± 1,541.97	2,657.19 ± 1,265.90
	South Reference	3,552.55 ± 707.92	16,636.34 ± 4,725.87	1,097.54 ± 904.40
Harpacticoida	Dock Location	57.77 ± 38.21	288.83 ± 257.93	115.53 ± 76.42
	Resort Location	404.36 ± 123.39	317.71 ± 94.70	519.89 ± 173.30
	North Reference	982.01 ± 493.54	462.12 ± 104.14	577.65 ± 219.96
	South Reference	779.83 ± 293.84	895.36 ± 372.97	3,696.96 ± 2,962.78
Ostracoda	Dock Location	28.88 ± 28.88	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88
	Resort Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88
	North Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88	144.41 ± 87.84
Chironomidae Larvae	Dock Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	86.65 ± 61.27
	Resort Location	57.77 ± 38.21	144.41 ± 144.41	115.53 ± 62.95
	North Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Isotomidae sp.	Dock Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	Resort Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	28.88 ± 28.88
	North Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	South Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00

Table A.2. Mean and standard error (n = 27) of sediment variables collected at each quadrat at four locations at the intertidal mudflat at Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage during the summer of 2017.

Variable	Location	May 30	June 21	July 20
aRPD (mm)	Dock Location	1.89 ± 0.63	2.78 ± 1.28	0.89 ± 0.39
	Resort Location	1.00 ± 0.17	0.78 ± 0.32	4.89 ± 2.81
	North Reference	3.56 ± 0.99	4.56 ± 1.26	1.22 ± 0.15
	South Reference	3.44 ± 2.08	2.78 ± 0.97	6.00 ± 2.95
Macro (%)	Dock Location	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
	Resort Location	2.67 ± 2.19	3.89 ± 2.17	7.67 ± 6.59
	North Reference	30.11 ± 12.24	20.33 ± 11.47	2.56 ± 1.62
	South Reference	0.22 ± 0.22	1.78 ± 1.66	0.00 ± 0.00
Particle Size	Dock Location	49.44 ± 1.82	41.83 ± 4.20	40.98 ± 3.56
	Resort Location	48.33 ± 3.92	46.43 ± 6.97	59.94 ± 11.16
	North Reference	46.30 ± 5.37	40.54 ± 2.96	37.88 ± 2.75
	South Reference	49.44 ± 7.63	50.39 ± 7.51	34.71 ± 1.86
Penetrability (mm)	Dock Location	41.44 ± 6.74	47.33 ± 5.07	38.11 ± 7.06
	Resort Location	27.33 ± 2.65	26.67 ± 2.88	37.22 ± 5.09
	North Reference	43.11 ± 2.28	37.89 ± 2.91	39.67 ± 4.00
	South Reference	31.44 ± 4.21	35.67 ± 3.90	44.67 ± 3.82
Water Content (%)	Dock Location	34.87 ± 1.12	35.98 ± 1.17	34.56 ± 1.38
	Resort Location	32.97 ± 0.95	33.12 ± 0.82	34.23 ± 1.62
	North Reference	35.80 ± 1.47	34.81 ± 1.18	36.84 ± 1.58
	South Reference	35.33 ± 1.08	34.04 ± 1.06	37.06 ± 0.87
Wood Cover (%)	Dock Location	22.33 ± 10.41	33.89 ± 9.64	23.89 ± 9.27
	Resort Location	1.78 ± 1.16	1.33 ± 0.60	0.11 ± 0.11
	North Reference	0.00 ± 0.00	0.22 ± 0.15	0.11 ± 0.11
	South Reference	0.44 ± 0.24	0.89 ± 0.89	0.00 ± 0.00

Table A. 3. Mean and standard error (n = 27) of nutrient variables measured at each quadrat at four locations at the intertidal mudflat at Cassiar Cannery in Inverness Passage during the summer of 2017.

Variable	Location	May 30	June 21	July 20
Chlorophyll *a* Concentration (mg/m_2)	Dock Location	14.37 ± 9.16	0.59 ± 0.44	0.75 ± 0.18
	Resort Location	7.31 ± 6.82	0.85 ± 0.50	1.05 ± 0.48
	North Reference	20.66 ± 10.33	0.79 ± 0.43	1.15 ± 0.25
	South Reference	13.84 ± 8.99	0.53 ± 0.23	0.63 ± 0.17
Organic Matter Content (%)	Dock Location	4.07 ± 0.22	4.05 ± 0.13	4.20 ± 0.18
	Resort Location	3.95 ± 0.14	3.78 ± 0.12	4.11 ± 0.16
	North Reference	3.76 ± 0.19	3.66 ± 0.13	4.01 ± 0.19
	South Reference	4.07 ± 0.17	3.73 ± 0.11	4.38 ± 0.15