**Response to Comments from Draft Report Version (as Received July, 2016)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment No.** | **Page** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| 1 | 9 | And the final set is reported on? Or an average of the field parameters are reported on? | Text has been updated and clarified |
| 2 | 14 | Should this have a *“2”* notation? | Correct, this has been added in the table.  |
| 3 | 14 | There is no *“4”* notation in the legend below. | The “4” notation has been changed to “2”. |
| 4 | 14 | There is no *“4”* notation in the legend below – should this be *“2”*? | Correct, the “4” notation has been changed to “2”. |
| 5 | 14 | There is no *“4”* notation in the legend below. | The “4” notation has been changed to “2”. |
| 6 | 14 | This note doesn’t seem applicable here. | This note has been removed, no alternate note was considered necessary.  |
| 7 | 15 | Should attempts be made to remove the object (from what I understand from the field notes – maybe a rock?) from the well? Or perhaps it doesn’t matter if it didn’t prevent sampling or didn’t influence results? I’m just wondering if this could prove to be a problem during later sampling events. | It may be advisable to investigate and remove the blockage as long as there is no risk to making the blockage worse (e.g., shifting the blockage). We will add a recommendation to investigate using a downhole camera, and to remove if it is believed to be possible to do so safely.  |