

Record of activities completed for the Mississippi-Rideau Potential Threats Database:

Importing of core database data into the master database:

- Completed inventory of databases to be included in the master database (Mississippi-Rideau Potential Threats Database). This included field names and field types for the following databases:
 - Dillon_200001107001_Final.mdb (9 tables)
 - Renfrew...Watershed.mdb (11 tables)
 - MOESite_MississippiValley_EFX_2000.mdb (4 tables)
 - ContaminantSourceInventory-Golder2000.mbd (2 tables)
 - Scotts1.mdb (1 table)
- Determined which fields from tables in the above five databases were to be included in the master database, and determined which fields they were to be mapped to (this information can be found in the excel spreadsheet threats_fieldmapping.xls).
- Imported tables from the above five databases into the master database.
- Mapped the relevant fields to the master database.
- Updated the DataSupplier field to the proper values for each of the above five databases.

Formatting of core database data:

- Added new fields for Comments and Old_township.
- Mapped city names for all records to Municipal_detail.
- Mapped any old township names that were available to Old_township.
- Grouped all common city names together and determined which municipalities they belong to (using in-house maps as well as Google maps).
- Updated the Municipality field to the proper values for entire set of records.
- Deleted any records from the master database which were not part of the study area.

Formatting of database data for connection to look-up-tables:

- Grouped together descriptions of land uses (Land_use_activity_name) and NAICS codes (NAICS_code) for eventual formatting to look-up-table values.
- Mapped Land_use_activity_name to look-up-table values for the following tables:
 - Renfrew-ANDR
 - Renfrew-COAL
 - Renfrew-NPCB (Partially complete)
 - Renfrew-PAP (Partially complete)
 - Renfrew-SRDS
 - Mississippi-Rideau-NPCB (Partially complete)
 - MOE Mississippi-TD_FS_DETAIL (Partially complete)
- Mapped NAICS_code values to look-up-table values for records with available land use activity names.
- Mapped Land_use_activity_name values to look-up-table values for records with available NAICS codes.

Address data mapping, information gathering:

- The master database had two main fields which were to be used for the address data mapping. They are:
 - *Street_name*: this field contained, in most cases, the full address of the site in question. Typically, data was in the format of “354 Perrin Dr” and could include the street name, street number, type (ex. drive, road), suffix (ex. east, west), and prefix (ex. Route, east). Some entries contain a full address, along with other information describing the site location (ex. North Augusta; 537 Green St.)
 - *Address_detail*: this field contained additional address data for the site in question.

An inventory of the data in these fields was made and can be found in the Address Mapping tab of the *threats_mapping (LUTs and addresses).xls* Excel spreadsheet. It is suggested that address mapping be done one data source at a time. Each data source tends to have a unique format for the address fields, so this might be the easiest way to handle the mapping.

Address data cleaning:

- *Street_name* field was separated, as much as possible, into its various components (street type, street name, street number, street direction) by using a Visual Basic program (called *address_clean* under “modules” in the master database)
- Entries in *Street_name* which were not able to be cleaned using the Visual Basic program were looked at, for most records, on a case-by-case basis, using various queries to search for anomalies. For many of the entries it was necessary to use a street map to determine the approximate street address.
- Where the lot and concession information was available, it was placed into two new fields (called lot and concession)
- A new field was added called *address_complete*, and all records which had complete addresses available (street number, street name, street type) were added to this field. Addresses which already had UTM coordinates available were not added to this new field.

Threats database geocoding:

- Records which had UTM coordinates available were placed into a GIS map (*Threats_geocode_Nov1.mxd*). This included 2807 records.
- Records which did not have UTM coordinates available, but which had complete addresses available, were geocoded using an address locator which was created using the US One Range (GDB) service. This included 2754 records.
- After geocoding the addressed records, there were approximately 600 records which the address locator was unable to match. These were reviewed using an

interactive review. Many of the problems were due to spelling errors or misinterpretations by the address locator.

- After reviewing all unmatched records, another 426 records were able to be geocoded. The remaining records were unmatched mainly because they were not a part of the SWP area.
- Another approximately 120 records in the master database were geocoded using lot and concession information.

Other data sources:

- Data from the federal contaminated sites inventory was added to the threats map (data to be mapped to master database in the future).
- Data from the Regional Groundwater Study (RGWS) were checked against threats data to see if there were any records missing from the threats database. There were 159 RGWS entries which did not match up against the threats data.
- Data from the Waste Disposal Site Inventory (June 1991) was entered and added to the threats map. It was determined that these data were in the wrong datum, and therefore needed to be checked against existing landfills data to see if the original set were in the wrong datum. After checking against existing landfills data, the additional (new) landfills from the WDSI were added to the threats map.