STORET User Call Minutes
July 27, 2017
12:00 Noon – 1:00 PM EST

Agenda:

1. QA workgroup questions for community
    1. Result detection condition and result value (cross with WQX 3.0)
    2. Special characters in Result value
    3. Sample collection method ID
    4. Qualifier codes
2. WQX 3.0 Round 1 & 2 highlights for discussion

Notes:

- **QA Workgroup Questions for Community:**
    - The QA Workshop group has had an ongoing discussion of reports, ensuring data reliability, and data reusability. There will be a report coming out on August.
    - There were several issues that the group wanted to open to the greater community
        - **Result detection condition and result value (cross with WQX 3.0):**
            - There are certain scenarios where data is reported above the detection limit and below the result limit. The group has discussed how to deal with these results.
            - One option suggested would be to allow a user to report a result detection condition as well as a result
            - Tracy from Maine: Our database doesn't capture this type of information and wouldn't ever have that scenario
            - Tim Bowren: Data between detection limit and reporting limit should be flagged.
            - Data can be submitted between the method detection limit and reporting limit for a result.
                - A result measure qualifier of J is often used to flag that
            - Tracy: It seems like if someone wanted to put in a number below the minimum level , this would allow them to do it.
            - There is little support for wanting to use the Result Detection Condition and Result Value together to report these scenarios (above the detection limit and below the result limit).
            - Chris Neumiller: In Washington State, we carry the detection limit, the reporting limit, and the result.
            - Jim Porter: MN flags numeric results between MDL and RL with a J qualifier. If no numeric result is provided, we use a detection condition of Below RL.
            - Decision: EPA will do research on potential quality issues with this implementation and return with information for the user community.

User community has also requested guidance on the proper way to submit data of this type.

- **Special Characters in Result Value:**
    - Group did not want to allow special characters (ex. <,>, or *). People were using these characters to get around adding a result.
        - Arnie: Agrees. These numbers should be values.
        - There are some labs that report the data as a "<" or ">"
        - Jim Porter: Agreed, no special characters should appear in result value.
        - Decision: Do not allow special characters in the result when characteristic is not a picklist.
- **Sample Collection Method ID:**
    - SCM ID is a very subjective field and is currently required. It isn't regulated in any way. The group was wondering if it should be required in WQX 3.0. If not, would have to clean up its use and make more of a standard.
        - Jolene MT: She thinks it is very important for several specific results (ex. Chlorophyll – what kind of equipment or methods)
            - You still have "Equipment Name" as a field
        - Chris Neumiller (WA Ecology): What about a list of valid values for sample collection methods?
        - Cathy A: It might be good to know if the value was collected by a continuous monitoring sonde versus a lab method or grab/sonde determined method.
        - There was some support on cleaning up the Method ID field with a standardized list.
            - It would be better to not have an "other" field to commit to cleaning up the field
        - Is there any way to have an ID that points the user to the important information they need?
            - It would be great if the ID had a link to a SOP.
            - Dwane: what if we added a linked data element that allowed you to go to the SOP.
        - There is some concern over the data file size getting too big. Can we have the methods details separately?
        - In addition to links, many people thought having referenced information would be key.
        - The group didn't want to scrap the field, but did seem keen on changing it to make it more standardized. (Possibly adding a link and a Citation)
        - Decision: Add URL link and citation information to user registered sample collection method IDs and serve that information to the data retrievers.

- **Qualifier Codes:**
  - Group was finding the qualifier code list was very exhaustive and exhausting
    - 98 of the 220 qualifier codes were commonly reported
  - The biggest challenge, on a single result, only one qualifier code is allowed. This has caused us to create a look up table with every combination of qualifier code possible.
    - This design isn't very organized
    - It would be nice to allow someone to submit up to 6 different codes.
  - Jolene: They have 7 qualifiers, but all sorts of combinations. Agrees that these qualifiers should be able to be reported separately.
  - It would be great if the combinations of qualifiers could be linked back to the single qualifiers.
  - Decision: Implement the qualifier codes the way Ryan Jorgensen has suggested. Where each individual letter is linked to one definition rather than have infinite letter combinations submitted by a user. This would make the lookup table smaller and users can provide all of their qualifiers with the data.