CIWQS External Users Group: Reports
November 13th 2007

Generally the group wanted available reports to be more user-friendly, display "middle level information," and present high quality data.

Recognizing that some of the needed items would take a long time to accomplish, Ann Heil suggested that the group focus on some quick accomplishments and the group generally agreed with this approach. The suggested items were posting a definition of terms, removing displays of potential violations, and adding a column for violation type or some other type of violation categorization to give it more meaning. The group agreed with the first item but needed more discussion on the other two.

The group agreed to a conference call on December 7th, from 10 am – 12 pm.

Linda Sheehan and Ann Heil agreed to represent the Reports User Group on the CIWQS Steering Committee.

Specific thoughts captured during the meeting are listed below.

****

- Report as stand alone document shouldn't be cross-referenced to glossary.
- If its necessary to toggle between reports/pages navigation should be easy (bread crumbs)
- Pop up definitions
- One place for short definitions and a link to more robust definitions
- Definitions on home page and on each report. Should have a way to change in all places.
- A procedure for resolving data problems should be developed and posted
- Create reports that are positive
  Compliance rate report
- Split out reporting violations
- Eliminate potential violations
- Sunset data after five years
- Inaccuracy of data concern to our public, if data is good may not need to sunset.
- More data may be needed to highlight trends
- Hesitant to enter data electronically to avoid generating erroneous data (false positives)
- Create reports in chart form to help the user understand the relationship between macros and micro data with out a lot of drilling
- Create the in between, so people don't navigate to micro if it's not what they want.
- Enhancing eSMR to handle all permits

- System-generated "potential" violations can be hidden, but then there is the perception that we are hiding data.
- Willingness to enter eSMR data but not have the system generate violations
- Be more explicit in what public is looking at. For example: what is a "dismissed violation."
- Metrics as intermediate step, such as pie charts
- More descriptive when drill down
- Self-reported violations vs. system-generated
- The current public report interface is alienating to the general public
- Cater to audience internal (expert), external (general)
- Hold off on rolling out to general public (watershed and community groups)
- Highlight the big water quality violations
- Report idea: Influent concentrations vs. effluent concentrations
- What resources are available for use?
- Come up with a list of quick fixes
- Come up with a long-term vision

PRIORITIES

- Remove "potentials"?

- Glossary—ASAP more important than use and substance

- Add more columns for violations?