Hedges, Kate (Defra)

Subject: FW: Walpole Bay

From: [redacted]
Sent: 20 March 2014 09:26
To: Connolly, Elaine (Defra)
Cc: [redacted]; Hedges, Kate (Defra); Beard, Edmund (Defra)
Subject: RE: Walpole Bay

I'm happy with that Elaine – we need to keep everything transparent.

[redacted]
Senior Advisor - Tidal Waters Team Leader
Environment and Business
Environment Agency
[redacted]

From: Connolly, Elaine (Defra) [mailto:elaine.connolly@DEFRA.GSI.GOV.UK]
Sent: 20 March 2014 09:24
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Hedges, Kate (Defra); Beard, Edmund (Defra)
Subject: RE: Walpole Bay

Hi [redacted]

We will work that into our response. When assessing these we only use a count of the raw data, so if the data is manipulated in any way in the summaries we need to be made aware.

We gave MCS the data, and it was also released as part of the local consultation. It is also FOI'able and we have an FOI request for it in already. We are going to put it on our website for the national consultation today which will continue to run til the end of April. We will also be updating our summary to include the full count of all users, as I cannot see how using a lower number than MCS (and I) counted from the raw data would be defensible.

We will inform Thanet Council before this goes live.

Elaine

From: [redacted]
Sent: 19 March 2014 17:10
To: Connolly, Elaine (Defra)
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Walpole Bay

Hi Elaine

We normalised all the survey zones to 100m, re-calculated the results as if they had been done for 100m proportionally.
We should have stated this in the 4 page summary to save confusion.

Where is the raw data available? Did MCS look at that data and raise the issue?

I think a response to MCS would be fine as this is not an error, though we could have explained it more transparently.

Apologies

[redacted]
Senior Advisor - Tidal Waters Team Leader
Environment and Business
Environment Agency
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 19 March 2014 13:46
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Walpole Bay

Hi [redacted]

I have re-checked the raw survey data, and the reason for the difference is because I used values per 100 metres to compare the surveys zones in the summary. This reason for this is because the survey zones were not all 100 metres exactly.

Therefore, using normalised values (per 100m) gives total number of people in the sea as 633.

Using the raw survey data, without normalisation gives total number of people in the as 866.

Please let me know if you require any further information.

Many thanks
[redacted]

[redacted]
Environment Monitoring officer (marine)
South East Region
Portfield Depot, Oving Road, Chichester
West Sussex, PO20 2AG

[redacted]
www.environment-agency.gov.uk
external [redacted]
internal [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 19 March 2014 13:02
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Walpole Bay
Importance: High

[redacted]

Could you check this urgently please the number look to be wrong.

Regards
[redacted]

From: Connolly, Elaine (Defra) [mailto:elaine.connolly@DEFRA.GSI.GOV.UK]
Sent: 19 March 2014 12:55
To: [redacted]
Cc: Hedges, Kate (Defra); Beard, Edmund (Defra)
Subject: Walpole Bay
Importance: High

Hi

I've left you a message. MCS have pointed out that the raw data from the survey doesn't match the summary information we gave out in the consultation.

We took the data from the EA's summary (pdf attached), which reports **633** people in the sea. I've since re-counted this (spreadsheet attached with my workings) and got **859** people in the water.

<<Walpole Bay beach surveys 2013.pdf>> <<Copy of Walpole Bay 2013 Survey.xlsx>>

Kate is re-checking everything again now and going to come up with some way of explaining it. I have to leave at 2pm today, but will catch up with you all again on this in the morning.

Elaine

Elaine Connolly | Policy Advisor | Bathing & Shellfish Water Quality | **Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs**
Direct line: 020 7238 4451 | Mobile: 077686 88098| Email: elaine.connolly@defra.gsi.gov.uk |
Address: 3D, Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P 3JR

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)

This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose,
store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender.
Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within Defra systems we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems.
Communications on Defra's computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

This message has been scanned and no issues discovered.

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.
We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

This message has been scanned and no issues discovered.

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.
We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.