

Subject: RE: Count data question
From: "Milner, Richard" <Richard.Milner@act.gov.au>
Date: 18/8/20, 8:10 am
To: Emily Hedger <e.hedger@uq.net.au>
CC: Annabel Smith <annabel.smith@uq.edu.au>

UNOFFICIAL

Hi Emily,

All native forbs should have an exact count rather than a count estimate. If necessary they can be categorised into the same count ranges as grasses etc but given they were the most likely group to be impacted by the herbicide we thought it was important to collect as accurate data as possible for this group. Maybe native forb response could be looked at separately?

Hope this helps.

Thanks,

Richard

From: Emily Hedger <e.hedger@uq.net.au>
Sent: Monday, 17 August 2020 5:42 PM
To: Milner, Richard <Richard.Milner@act.gov.au>
Cc: Annabel Smith <annabel.smith@uq.edu.au>
Subject: Count data question

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Richard,

I have been looking at the count data and am wanting to know why exact counts are included when a letter has been assigned for that count. For example in the 2017 survey for *Aira* sp. a W (count of 16-50) has been recorded whereas for *Chrysocephalum apiculatum* exact numbers are recorded and no letters used. This is something I have found throughout the data. Why have some species have been recorded with exact count data whereas others have not?

Kind regards,

Emily Hedger

This email, and any attachments, may be confidential and also privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies of this transmission along with any attachments immediately. You should not copy or use it for any purpose, nor disclose its contents to any other person.
