Unique Well Numbers can be **Easier!**

> William Olsen Dakota County Environmental Resources Department

A great idea: Assign Unique identifiers to Wells

1 Well <==> **1** Unique Number

We want <u>Reliable</u> Identifiers for:

- Public Health
- Geologic Studies
- Environmental Protection
- Well Management & Well Owners too

A great idea: Assign Unique identifiers to Wells

1 Well <==> **1** Unique Number

We use Unique Numbers to:

- Preserve information
- Share information
- Associate and Leverage Information

A great idea: with a great problem!

	1 \	Nell -	<==> many	y Unique Numbers
R • •	CORD 19	4078	Monitoring We	MINNESOTA UNIQUE WELL NO. 194078
·	Phoenix Inc. 240193 CENTX INC.			
1	# 1	12495 E I. G. H	ING SEALING RECORD	Minnesota Well and Boring Sealing No. Minnesota Unique Well No.
ľ	P+0++++0	235	Statutes. Chapter 1031 Date Sealed	Or W-series No. (Leave blank if not known) Date Well or Boring Constructed
			10-17-02	ft Ormos Depth
	140'		AQUIFER(S) Single Aquifer	STATIC WATER LEVEL
	() () *** **** () *****:-* **** () *****:-*		WELL/BORING	Measured Estimated 125.5 ft Measure above land surface
•	USC			

Not a great idea: Force the data into the wrong model



A BETTER idea: Use a model that fits the data

1 Well <==>manyUnique Numbers

- Guarantee all Unique Numbers
- No demotion, no orphans
- Preserve information better
- Share well data more easily

Time for one illustration:

A recent study* collected 274 water samples from wells in Dakota County.

Unique Numbers were discovered for 217 wells. New Unique Numbers were created for 57 wells.

Because <u>every</u> well got a Unique Number, <u>all</u> of the data can be effectively tracked through time, and shared reliably.

Did we make errors assigning Unique Numbers?

* WIISE Study. A cooperative study between MDH and Dakota County.

- 1. Fail to recognize well A and guess it is well B
- 2. Fail to recognize well A and make up well C
- 3. Fail to recognize well A and do nothing

- 1. Fail to recognize well A and guess it is well B
- 2. Fail to recognize well A and make up well C
- 3. Fail to recognize well A and do nothing

Information from well A is merged with well B, and can be very difficult to disentangle.

This is really the worst mistake to make.

- 1. Fail to recognize well A and guess it is well B
- 2. Fail to recognize well A and make up well C
- 3. Fail to recognize well A and do nothing

When the error is discovered, identifier C will be <u>demoted</u>, and information using identifier "C" will be <u>orphaned</u>.

- 1. Fail to recognize well A and guess it is well B
- 2. Fail to recognize well A and make up well C
- 3. Fail to recognize well A and do nothing

Fearful of type 1 or 2 error, do nothing.

Information gathered for the well will not persist, cannot be shared, and cannot be leveraged.

- Fail to recognize well A and guess it is well B
 Fail to recognize WEIR and make up new C
- 3. Fail to recognize well A and do nothing

The proposed definition recognizes multiple identifiers, so the cost of error 2 is minimized.

Errors 1 and 3 can be less frequent.

Unique Well Numbers really can be **Easier**

- if we build our systems to **Embrace** the fact that:

1 Well <==> many Unique Numbers