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Charge 1 - What new interpretations are needed?

• Jane Anklam surveyed users
  – suggestions about display of related resource data
    • should only point to related data
  – Suggestion to redesign interps for septics
    • are Soil Potentials a better approach?
    • Draft loading rate guide developed by Louis Boekman
    • a report in NASIS is similar
Charge 1 - What new interpretations are needed? (cont.)

• Some fixes are needed with existing interps
  • suitability as source of sand and gravel

• Users want data that they can use for applications
  • something similar to single phase SIR
  • Component data record report in NASIS is similar

• Want to know restrictive features rather than interpretive rating
  • use access template fed with data from NASIS report?
Charge 1-What new interpretations are needed? (cont.)

- Requests for storm water infiltration in urbanizing areas
  - developed GIS application showing substratum permeability
  - infiltration influenced by other parameters also (e.g. structure)

- Discussion about description of bedrock
  - how do we describe what is actually on the ground
Charge 1 - What new interpretations are needed? (cont.)

• Use soil parameters for compaction susceptibility interp

• Other issues
  – Need to improve our index maps so users can find themselves
  – For charge 3
    • Need to document interpretations and logic behind them
    • Need to establish standards for documentation of NASIS interpretations
Charge 2 - How should interpretations be presented

- Revamp properties table to meet customers’ needs
- Consider standards for export into other formats (including metadata)
  - let user select data to be extracted
  - we need to be able to service different levels of sophistication
How should interpretations be presented (cont.)

• we need to consider other ways of viewing or displaying data including graphical display and animation
Charge 3 - Interpretation standards

• We need to establish standards for documenting standards in NASIS

• We need to review our interpretive criteria to see if they are still valid
  – our criteria were established 25 years ago
  – we need to evaluate whether newer science or current performance data warrant changes in criteria
Interpretation standards (cont.)

• We need a clearinghouse where sample interps are stored
• We need to document the logic behind interpretations being developed in NASIS
• Do we need a regional committee for interpretations
  – National or regional discipline workshops might be a better method for disseminating current technology
Interpretation standards (cont.)

• We should consider support at a regional level for developing interpretations
  – groups of MO’s might be best
• We need better communication about what interpretations have already been developed
Interpretation standards (cont.)

• A national set of interpretations will likely be needed
  – we may not need as large a set as we currently have
  – national set should be based on which interps could be applied on a national scale

• Discussion about NASIS including both spatial and attribute data
  – should they be in different data sets?
Charge 4 - Interpretations Object

• Should NASIS structure accommodate an interpretations object
  – current definitions and concepts of perfect joins are a problem the way NASIS data are currently structured
  – we need interpretations object or redefinition of perfect joins or both