

National Standard

A memorandum from Dennis Lytle to the SBAAG, dated November 4, 1994, asked that we provide more information on why the National Standard is so far down on the priority list. Chronologically and logically it is prioritized as such to follow the complete conversion to NASIS.

We have been discussing the National Standard since the inception of SBAAG. The National Standard will serve a particular function in NASIS, and we conclude this function has not been fully defined in previous analysis. This document will address the process of insuring that the National Standard is consistent with NASIS concepts.

Since 1988 there has been discussion about changing the Official Series Descriptions from a text file to a database. This database has been referred to as the "National Standard." The National Standard for Soil Classification and Interpretations Team suggested the name of the database be changed from National Standard to "National Standard for Soil Classification and Interpretations" (NSSCI). SBAAG believes the name NSSCI does not accurately reflect what the proposed database contains. SBAAG suggests the name National Standard be replaced with "Component and Pedon Standard". This could be shortened by using "CAP Standard " or "CAPS."

The NSSCI DRS was distributed to SBAAG after the Steering Team approved the DRS. In reviewing the DRS, we have noted statements that agree with NASIS concepts and statements that conflict with NASIS concepts. The DRS does not fully address the charges and does not show a logical path for development and implementation of the National Standard. We have several concerns with the NSSCI DRS. They include:

- The greatest concern is the inclusion of interpretations and soil performance information in the National Standard. One of the NASIS concepts is that interpretations will be generated using interpretation criteria and data. The data would generally be from the MUR but for some interpretations it would be pedon data. If the interpretation criteria is correct, and if the data is correct, then the interpretation will be correct. We will obtain correct interpretations if the national interpretation criteria is part of the NSSH, and if data used for generating interpretations is checked by a process using the National Standard. Using this NASIS concept, there is no need to store interpretations, or any part of interpretations, in the National Standard.

- The DRS suggests sectioning the current OSED into 15 text tables as outlined on page 29 of the DRS. This is an inappropriate use of time and resources that must be used to develop and populate the National Standard.
- Another concern is how the National Standard will be populated, and the time frame for population.

Please refer to attachment one for a markup version of the DRS which reflects NASIS consistent material appropriate for inclusion in a DRS.

In the earliest concepts of NASIS, the National Standard was perceived as a replacement for OSED. It was also to be a database that would contain information for soils classified at a higher category than the series, and information about non-soils. The National Standard was to be used for classification and correlation purposes. It would only contain data elements needed for classification, correlation and to define the series. It is hoped that during development of the OPD and TRS, the OSED, SIR, and SOI-6 concept would not be adopted and a new concept and database be developed which would fulfill the role of the National Standard within NASIS.