Evaluation of MLRA Projects - Meeting in Fairfield, IA November 7, 2007

==========

Priority Criteria to Evaluate Projects (Relative Ranking)

Purpose-Establish project priorities as part of a workload analysis

First 6 Priority Items below score 0 to 10 points each (0 = Non-Issue)
Next 8 Priority Items below score 0 to 5 points each (0 = Non-Issue)

Score	Priority	Item
	1	Program Relevance (Subjective based on programmatic needs, rank as [1] = low importance to [10] = high importance) - Prime Farmland, FRPP, Hydric, HEL, CSP, Slope length, Yields, K, T, CRP, LESA - Information does not meet user needs [10]
	2	Interpretative Issues (Differences in layer depths, restrictive features, Depth to saturated zone, Map unit composition, flooding frequency of components) - Inconsistencies between survey areas are rare [1] - Inconsistencies between survey areas are common [5] - Inconsistencies between survey areas are frequent [10]
	3	Acres affected (MLRA basis) - <10,000 [2] - 10,000-30,000 [5] - 30,000-50,000 [7] - >50,000 [10]
	4	Data errors/Frequency of Complaints or Appeals/Feedback - Complaints/Comments occur rarely (1 or 2 times annually) [1] - Complaints/Comments occur occasionally (2 to 5 times annually) [5] - Complaints/Comments occur frequently (>5 times annually) [10]
	5	Joins/Legend Issues - Differences between states - Historical Bias - Phases (surface texture, slope, erosion, flooding, depositional, etc.)
	6	Map unit kind (Phases/Variants/taxadjuncts, misc. units) - Could be classified to the series level
	7	Data consistency/ NASIS data validation (Regional Consistency - i.e. Flooding Frequency) - Passes Soil Datamart Export validation [1] - Does not pass Soil Datamart Export validation [5]
	8	Series Age Concept/Classification Issues - Series Control Section change - Classification/Concept change - Inactive series - Property overlap
	9	Line Placement/Landscape Model Issues (Subjective) - Identifying landforms (Stream terraces) - Mixing Biomes
	10	Lab data availability/voids (Full characterization to depth of at least 150 cm) - No data available [5] - Data available from 1 or 2 pedons, with limited spatial extent [4] - Data available from 3 to 9 pedons, with moderate spatial extent [3]

		- Data available from 10 to 19 pedons, with wide spatial extent [2] - Data available from more than 20 pedons, with wide spatial extent [1]
	11	Stakeholder Contribution/Cost Share - No interest (0) [1] - Moderate interest ($) [3] -Intense interest ($$$) [5]
	12	Benchmark Status - Soil is benchmark [5] - Soil is not a benchmark [1]
	13	Age of survey - More than 40 years old [5] - 30 to 39 years old [4] - 20 to 29 years old [3] - 5 to 19 years old [2] - 0 to 4 years old [1]
	14	Whodunit & How (Subjective, rank as 5 = very poor quality, 4 = poor quality, 3 = somewhat okay, 2 = moderately good quality, 1 = good quality) - Project took 10 or more years to complete - Project was compilation of different age and quality of maps - Extensive use of detailees and trainees - Idiot factor
0		

Sample Evaluation of FY 2008 Projects
==========

Tama, sandy substratum Analysis Project

Score	Priority	Item
4	1	Program Relevance (Subjective based on programmatic needs, rank as [1] = low importance to [10] = high importance) - Prime Farmland, FRPP, Hydric, HEL, CSP, Slope length, Yields, K, T, CRP, LESA - Information does not meet user needs **Affects crop rental rates, yield estimates for RUSLE 2**
7	2	Interpretative Issues (Differences in layer depths, restrictive features, Depth to saturated zone, Map unit composition, flooding frequency of components) - Inconsistencies between survey areas are rare [1] **- Inconsistencies between survey areas are common [5]** - Inconsistencies between survey areas are frequent [10]
5	3	Acres affected (MLRA base) - <10,000 [2] **- 10,000-30,000 [5] (15,000)** - 30,000-50,000 [7] - >50,000 [10]
1	4	Data errors/Frequency of Complaints or Appeals/Feedback **- Complaints/Comments occur rarely (1 or 2 times annually) [1]** - Complaints/Comments occur occasionally (2 to 5 times annually) [5] - Complaints/Comments occur frequently (>5 times annually) [10]
7	5	Joins/Legend Issues **- Differences between states** **- Historical Bias** **- Phases (surface texture, slope, erosion, flooding, depositional, etc.)**
10	6	Map unit kind (Phases/Variants/taxadjuncts, misc. units) - Could be classified to the series level **Purpose of project**
1	7	Data consistency/ NASIS data validation (Regional Consistency - Flooding Frequency) **- Passes Soil Datamart Export validation [1]** - Does not pass Soil Datamart Export validation [5]
0	8	Series Age Concept/Classification Issues - Series Control Section change - Classification/Concept change - Inactive series - Property overlap **Non-issue**
1	9	Line Placement/Landscape Model Issues - Identifying landforms (Stream terraces) - Mixing Biomes **Spatial editing will be needed, position on landform is basically correct**
3	10	Lab data availability/voids (Full characterization to depth of at least 150 cm) - No data available [5] - Data available from 1 or 2 pedons, with limited spatial extent [4] **- Data available from 3 to 9 pedons, with moderate spatial extent [3]** - Data available from 10 to 19 pedons, with wide spatial extent [2]

		- Data available from more than 20 pedons, with wide spatial extent [1]
1	11	Stakeholder Contribution/Cost Share - **No interest (0) [1]** - Moderate interest ($) [3] -Intense interest ($$$) [5]
5	12	Benchmark Status **- Soil is benchmark [5]** - Soil is not a benchmark [1]
3	13	Age of survey - More than 40 years old [5] - 30 to 39 years old [4] **- 20 to 29 years old [3]** - 5 to 19 years old [2] - 0 to 4 years old [1]
4	14	Whodunit & How (Subjective, rank as 5 = very poor quality, 4 = poor quality, 3 = somewhat okay, 2 = moderately good quality, 1 = good quality) - Project took 10 or more years to complete - Project was compilation of different age and quality of maps - Extensive use of detailees and trainees - Idiot factor
52		

Adco-Kniffin Analysis Project

Score	Priority	Item
5	1	Program Relevance (Subjective based on programmatic needs, rank as [1] = low importance to [10] = high importance) - Prime Farmland, FRPP, Hydric, HEL, CSP, Slope length, Yields, K, T, CRP, LESA - Information does not meet user needs **AWC differences, RUSLE2**
7	2	Interpretative Issues (Differences in layer depths, restrictive features, Depth to saturated zone, Map unit composition, flooding frequency of components) - Inconsistencies between survey areas are rare [1] **- Inconsistencies between survey areas are common [5]** **- Inconsistencies between survey areas are frequent [10]**
10	3	Acres affected (MLRA base) - <10,000 [2] - 10,000-30,000 [5] - 30,000-50,000 [7] **- >50,000 [10] (65,000 acres in Iowa)**
1	4	Data errors/Frequency of Complaints or Appeals/Feedback - Complaints/Comments occur rarely (1 or 2 times annually) [1] - Complaints/Comments occur occasionally (2 to 5 times annually) [5] - Complaints/Comments occur frequently (>5 times annually) [10]
10	5	Joins/Legend Issues **- Differences between states** **- Historical Bias** - Phases (surface texture, slope, erosion, flooding, depositional, etc.) **Primary purpose of project**.
0	6	Map unit kind (Phases/Variants/taxadjuncts, misc. units) - Could be classified to the series level
1	7	Data consistency/ NASIS data validation (Regional Consistency - Flooding Frequency) - Passes Soil Datamart Export validation [1] - Does not pass Soil Datamart Export validation [5]
2	8	Series Age Concept/Classification Issues - Series Control Section change **- Classification/Concept change** - Inactive series - Property overlap
4	9	Line Placement/Landscape Model Issues - Identifying landforms (Stream terraces) - Mixing Biomes **Some spatial editing will be needed, position on landform is basically correct**
1	10	Lab data availability/voids (Full characterization to depth of at least 150 cm) - No data available [5] - Data available from 1 or 2 pedons, with limited spatial extent [4] - Data available from 3 to 9 pedons, with moderate spatial extent [3] - Data available from 10 to 19 pedons, with wide spatial extent [2] **- Data available from more than 20 pedons, with wide spatial extent [1]**
1	11	Stakeholder Contribution/Cost Share - No interest (0) [1] - Moderate interest ($) [3]

		-Intense interest ($$$) [5]
1	12	Benchmark Status - Soil is benchmark [5] - Soil is not a benchmark [1]
3	13	Age of survey - More than 40 years old [5] - 30 to 39 years old [4] **- 20 to 29 years old [3]** - 5 to 19 years old [2] - 0 to 4 years old [1]
2	14	Whodunit & How (Subjective, rank as 5 = very poor quality, 4 = poor quality, 3 = somewhat okay, 2 = moderately good quality, 1 = good quality) - Project took 10 or more years to complete - Project was compilation of different age and quality of maps - Extensive use of detailees and trainees - Idiot factor
48		

Re-evaluation of the Gosport series concept

Score	Priority	Item
5	1	Program Relevance (Subjective based on programmatic needs, rank as [1] = low importance to [10] = high importance) - Prime Farmland, FRPP, Hydric, HEL, CSP, Slope length, Yields, K, T, CRP, LESA - Information does not meet user needs **Affects program eligibility, yield estimates for RUSLE 2**
8	2	Interpretative Issues (Differences in layer depths, restrictive features, Depth to saturated zone, Map unit composition, flooding frequency of components) - Inconsistencies between survey areas are rare [1] - Inconsistencies between survey areas are common [5] - Inconsistencies between survey areas are frequent [10] **Most survey areas are consistently wrong**
10	3	Acres affected (MLRA base) - <10,000 [2] - 10,000-30,000 [5] - 30,000-50,000 [7] **- >50,000 [10]**
1	4	Data errors/Frequency of Complaints or Appeals/Feedback **- Complaints/Comments occur rarely (1 or 2 times annually) [1]** - Complaints/Comments occur occasionally (2 to 5 times annually) [5] - Complaints/Comments occur frequently (>5 times annually) [10]
0	5	Joins/Legend Issues - Differences between states - Historical Bias - Phases (surface texture, slope, erosion, flooding, depositional, etc.) **Non-issue**
1	6	Map unit kind (Phases/Variants/taxadjuncts, misc. units) - Could be classified to the series level
5	7	Data consistency/ NASIS data validation (Regional Consistency - Flooding Frequency) - Passes Soil Datamart Export validation [1] **- Does not pass Soil Datamart Export validation [5]**
5	8	Series Age Concept/Classification Issues - Series Control Section change - Classification/Concept change - Inactive series - Property overlap **Primary purpose of project. Series concept change.**
0	9	Line Placement/Landscape Model Issues - Identifying landforms (Stream terraces) - Mixing Biomes
2	10	Lab data availability/voids (Full characterization to depth of at least 150 cm) - No data available [5] - Data available from 1 or 2 pedons, with limited spatial extent [4] - Data available from 3 to 9 pedons, with moderate spatial extent [3] **- Data available from 10 to 19 pedons, with wide spatial extent [2]** - Data available from more than 20 pedons, with wide spatial extent [1]
0	11	Stakeholder Contribution/Cost Share - No interest (0) [1]

		- Moderate interest ($) [3] -Intense interest ($$$) [5]
1	12	Benchmark Status - Soil is benchmark [5] - Soil is not a benchmark [1]
3	13	Age of survey - More than 40 years old [5] - 30 to 39 years old [4] **- 20 to 29 years old [3]** - 5 to 19 years old [2] - 0 to 4 years old [1]
3	14	Whodunit & How (Subjective, rank as 5 = very poor quality, 4 = poor quality, 3 = somewhat okay, 2 = moderately good quality, 1 = good quality) - Project took 10 or more years to complete - Project was compilation of different age and quality of maps - Extensive use of detailees and trainees - Idiot factor
44		