Michael F. Goodchild [1]

The Application of Advanced Information Technology in Assessing Environmental Impacts

REFERENCE: Goodchild, M. F., "The Application of Advanced Information Technology in Assessing Environmental Impacts," Applications of GIS to the Modeling of Non-Point Source Pollutants in the Vadose Zone, ASA-CSSA-SSSA Bouyoucos Conference, Mission Inn, Riverside, CA, May 1-3, 1995.

ABSTRACT: Although many advanced information technologies are potentially of value to environmental impact assessment, this paper focuses on those generally included under the term geographic information technologies, including geographic information systems (GIS), remote sensing, and the global positioning system (GPS). The paper begins with a brief description of each of these, and a more detailed review of the state of development of GIS, its current capabilities, and impediments to greater use. Problems having to do with the integration of the geographic information technologies, and the raster and vector approaches to GIS, are discussed in the context of environmental impact assessment, and attention is drawn to current research on advanced geographic data models, which may hold the key to further progress in integration.

Keywords: GIS, geographic data model, raster, vector, field, entity

INTRODUCTION

Modern assessment of environmental impacts makes use of a wide range of information technologies, from word processing and spreadsheets to geographic information systems. Some of these are by now so widely applied in all aspects of human activity that they scarcely bear mention in a conference of this nature. Others, however, are still at the lower end of the growth curve both in terms of applications, and also in terms of their influence as tools on the way science and assessment are conducted. The geographic information technologies seem to fall in this latter category, which is one reason for raising them to prominence in this conference.

This singling out of geographic information technologies may seem odd to someone not already familiar with them. We do not, for example, commonly organize conferences on textual information in environmental science, or on the use of photographic images. Geographic information can be defined as facts that are tied to specific locations on the Earth's surface, but the presence of geographic coordinates in data hardly seems to justify special attention. But there are several strong arguments for special treatment for spatial data. First, the real world is infinitely complex, so any digital representation must be an approximation. Moreover, in general an infinite number of alternative representations exist for any

---

[1] Director, National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, and Professor of Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4060

real geographic phenomenon. Second, geographic data tend to be particularly voluminous, and for a variety of practical reasons generally incompatible with other information types. Finally, there appears to be a very strong distinction between conventional digital structures of geographic data and the ways people actually think and reason about space (Mark and Frank 1991).

A variety of technologies for collecting, handling, and analyzing spatial data have emerged in the past three decades. If attention is limited to those that deal strictly with geographical data, rather than the more generally defined spatial data, then the list would have to include GPS, the global positioning system based on analysis of signals from a constellation of orbiting satellites; electronic surveying technology as typified by the modern "total station"; remote sensing; and geographic information systems (GIS). Of the four, the second seems least appropriate in the context of environmental impact assessment. GPS is perhaps the most straightforward, if viewed as a technology for providing measurements of the geographic positions of points, although a range of approaches exist with associated accuracies, and there are many challenging technical issues in the system's design.

Although remote sensing can be broadly defined as measurement at a distance, for most purposes it implies the imaging of the surface of the Earth from an airborne or space-borne sensor, using some appropriate part of the electromagnetic spectrum. The technical issues of sensor design, orbital corrections, cloud, and noise reduction are not of concern here. Remote sensing software is designed to process this raw data into forms that are useful for a range of purposes, from simple mapping and monitoring to management and modeling.

A geographic information system is a much broader and more nebulous concept--a system for the input, storage, manipulation, and output of geographically referenced data. Although there is wide acceptance of this general definition (for a review of GIS definitions see Maguire 1991), the actual specification of a GIS can vary widely depending on the assumptions that its designers are willing to make about its uses. For example, a GIS designed to process only data derived by remote sensing would be very different from one designed to process only data derived from maps. This paper will not attempt to provide a general introduction to GIS, since the topic is already addressed comprehensively in many texts (for general overviews see Burrough 1986; Maguire, Goodchild, and Rhind 1991; Star and Estes 1991). Goodchild, Parks, and Steyaert (1993) include several chapters on the use of GIS in hydrology.

The value of the geographic information technologies in a field like environmental impact assessment will ultimately depend on whether the technology can find useful application. The functions performed by the technology must match those needed by the application, and in this sense technologies like GIS, which have been designed for very general purpose manipulation of geographic data, are likely to be successful. However, given the fundamental diversity inherent in the representation of geographic phenomena noted earlier, it is important also that the representations adopted within GIS also match those used by the application. The next section reviews the state of the art and recent research on issues of representation in the geographic information technologies, or what is more appropriately defined as geographic data modeling.

GEOGRAPHIC DATA MODELING

In recent years, the field of geographic data modeling has emerged as a distinct and important subspecialty of geographic information science, and is now recognized as one of, if not the most fundamental of the research issues raised by the development and exploitation of geographic information systems. Geographic data modeling can be seen as a subfield of data modeling in general, and also as a subset of the broader issues of geographic representation--the systematic study of the methods people use to create representations and understandings of the world around them.

At this point, it is perhaps worth stressing the distinction being made here between geographic data modeling, and the modeling of processes operating on or under the geographic landscape. In the first case the emphasis is on representation, and the choices that must be made to create a discrete digital version of some real geographic form or pattern. Process modeling, on the other hand, is concerned with the mathematical or numerical representation of processes rather than forms, and with prediction and understanding rather than with representation per se. Thus data modeling is a preliminary to science, although the representational choices made will undoubtedly influence the way scientific investigation is ultimately carried out.

Peuquet published a comparatively early and much cited review of geographic data modeling (Peuquet, 1984). Goodchild (1992) provides a more recent review, and the increasing importance of the field is reflected in the chapters devoted to this topic in the review of GIS by Maguire, Goodchild, and Rhind (1991). Notable among more specialized reviews are the discussions of modeling the temporal component in spatial databases by Langran (1992) and Peuquet (1994), and of three dimensional spatial information by Raper (1989) and Turner (1992). Smith et al. (1994) demonstrate the importance of geographic data modeling in environmental science, giving examples of the role data models can play in the formulation and use of mathematical models of environmental systems and processes.

Data modeling is a complex and often subtle process that extends from the design of surveys and instruments for capturing raw data through the various manipulations that occur before the data are finally ready to be analyzed or displayed. For example,we have traditionally monitored the Earth's spatio-temporal precipitation field by continuous sampling at an international network of weather stations. Each station reports its time series using a variety of aggregation intervals. A variety of techniques are commonly used to interpolate the field spatially between sample points. Each of these sampling and processing decisions ultimately affect how the world is represented in the digital database, and constrain the kinds of analysis that can be performed, but they are made at different times, by different people, and perhaps with different objectives in mind.

The purpose of this paper is to address the geographic data modeling issue in the context of this conference, with particular emphasis on environmental impact assessment and vadose-zone modeling of non-point source pollutants. After a review of the use of traditional geographic data models, the paper outlines the principal findings of recent research on advanced data modeling, and their potential applications in this area. While many of these have yet to appear across the full range of available software products, their eventual availability is likely to have a substantial impact, in changing the ways in which hydrologists and others collect and represent geographic data, and structure models of processes.

TRADITIONAL GIS DATA MODELS

Traditionally, GIS data models have been divided into two major classes: *raster* data models, which represent two-dimensional spatial variation by assigning values to cells in a fixed rectangular array; and *vector* data models, which represent spatial variation through irregularly distributed points, lines, and areas. Lines and area boundaries are often conceived as smoothly varying, but the vector data models represent both as connected sequences of straight segments (*polylines* and *polygons* respectively), although some systems also support smooth representations known as *splines*, and also connected arcs of circles. In a raster model, each cell in an array is normally restricted to a single value, so multiple *layers* of coincident cells must be used to represent the spatial variation of many variables. For example, a layer might represent the spatial variation of depth to groundwater in a layer constructed by *interpolating* between a number of measurement locations.

The meaning of *layer* for vector systems is more complex. For some systems, a layer is simply a convenient grouping of one or more classes of points, lines, or areas; a layer might include all roads, for example, or all county boundaries. In such systems organization of the data into layers facilitates display, allowing the user to turn layers on or off, and assign them different colors or other types of symbolization. In other systems, the points, lines, or areas forming a layer must be *planar enforced*. In the case of a layer of areas, this means that areas cannot overlap and must fill the project area, so that every location within the project area lies in exactly one area. This is true in general of many classes of statistical reporting zones, such as counties, and also of land ownership.

Because of this confusion, there have been several attempts to provide an overarching conceptual framework that can accommodate the various implementations found among available GIS and spatial database products. Goodchild (1992) argues that two views of spatial variation underlie the various options. One is a *field*, defined as the view that a variable can be given a single, well-defined value at every location within the project area. An example of a field variable is *elevation*. Many systems of statistical reporting are defined as assigning every location to a single zone--for example, every point in the US lies in exactly one county (if we ignore the possibility of lying exactly on a boundary). Counties thus satisfy the definition of a field, since they assign every location to a single value, measured in this case on a nominal scale as an identifying name.

While elevation and county satisfy the definition of fields, other spatial variables raise problems. It is not immediately obvious that point sources of pollutants, for example, can be conceived as fields. Pollutant density can be defined for a county by dividing total pollutant load by area, but this definition breaks down as the area of the reporting zone shrinks, and becomes meaningless for areas below perhaps 1km in diameter, depending on the context. But this problem can be avoided in two readily available ways. First, we could define pollutant density as a field by specifying an explicit search radius--for example, value at a point could be defined as the ratio of the total pollutant load found within 1km of the point divided by the area of a circle of radius 1km. Second, we could make use of techniques of density estimation, which replace discrete point locations with a spatially continuous *kernel function* (Silverman, 1986. Within the geographical literature density estimation is analogous to the calculation of potential; see for example Stewart, 1947).

For spatial variation conceived or characterized as a collection of fields, spatial databases currently provide six distinct methods of discrete, digital representation. The six field data models are:

- a regular rectangular array of cells, with the average value of the field recorded in each (*raster* model);
- a regular rectangular array of sample points (*grid* model);
- an irregularly spaced set of sample points (*point* model);
- a polyline representation of a set of isolines (*contour* model;

- a set of planar enforced irregular polygons, with associated average values for each (*polygon* model);
- a set of planar enforced irregular triangles, variation within each triangle being assumed to be planar (*triangulated irregular network* or *TIN* model).

Since the average or mean value cannot be defined for nominal-scaled data, it is normally replaced with the modal or commonest value, although in many cases the nominal value will be true for the entire cell or polygon (e.g., county name). The names suggested above are conventional, although many equivalent terms exist.

Not all geographic phenomena are conveniently represented as fields, and the requirement that a field have a single value everywhere in the plane is often overly restrictive. Thus in addition to fields, GIS support the representation of phenomena as discrete objects--points, lines, or areas--which may overlap, and need not fill the plane. These *entity* models reflect an entirely different view of the world as composed of discrete objects with internally homogeneous characteristics, and one that is perhaps much closer to the ways people learn about the world and navigate within it (Mark and Frank, 1991). The concept of *neighborhood*, for example, is much better accommodated within the entity view of the world, since boundaries of neighborhoods may overlap, and are almost certainly specific to context. One can always create fields from such entities--for example, a single neighborhood can be represented as a field variable with two values, inside and outside, and many people's views of a given neighborhood can be represented as a variable equal to the proportion of respondents who indicated that a given location was inside. But while such representations may be worth creating within the constraints of any one spatial database architecture, they are generally inefficient because of the high level of redundant information.

Entity models are common among GIS architectures that have been designed for facilities management applications, such as are found in highway departments, city engineering departments, or utility companies, where there are many examples of discrete entities, and almost none of spatially continuous fields. Some commercial GIS offer no capabilities at all for storing or manipulating fields.

THE GEORELATIONAL MODEL

The basis for any digital representation of geographic phenomena is a collection of points, lines, and areas, though the rules governing collections of these primitive objects depend on whether the entity or field view is being implemented, and whether objects are planar enforced. In addition to primitive objects, any successful approach to geographic data modeling must allow for the representation of relationships between objects. Such relationships fall conveniently into three categories: those necessary to the successful representation of the objects themselves; those describing relationships evident from the objects' geometry; and those describing relationships of a more functional nature. The first category will not always be apparent to the user, because its examples may have been hidden by the system designer, but it includes the relationships between adjacent areas in a planar enforced layer of such areas, and the relationships between shared vertex points that define a TIN. The second includes the *lies in* relationship that assigns a point to its containing reporting zone, and the *overlaps* relationship that indicates whether the areas of two reporting zones intersect. Functions exist in most GIS to compute such relationships from the geometry of the primitive objects: The *lies in* relationship is computed with the *point-in-polygon* function, and *overlaps* with *polygon overlay*.

The *georelational model* emerged in the late 1970s as a specific implementation of the more general relational database model that offered specific advantages for storing and manipulating spatial relationships. It is now the dominant architecture for GIS, though its dominance may be threatened in the next few years by more recent alternatives. Spatial objects are organized into classes sharing common characteristics, such as a class of county polygons, or a class of point occurrences of disease. Each class is conceptualized as a table, with the member objects forming the rows and the various attributes of each object as the columns. This tabular model of data should be familiar from its use in the statistical packages and spreadsheets. In the georelational model, a relationship between two objects is represented as an additional attribute of one or sometimes both of them. For example, the *lies in* relationship would be represented as an additional column in the table of points, containing the identification number of the containing polygon, and thus *pointing* to its record in the relevant reporting zone table. There will be exactly one pointer because a point must lie in exactly one polygon, whereas the reverse, of pointing from polygons to points, would not be as simple. Simple operations on tables, such as counting points by polygon, are now easily carried out.

Besides relationships that can be determined from geometry, the georelational model also provides support for other kinds of relationships, such as those having to do with the processes occurring on the landscape and responsible for the patterns we see. One commonly implemented relationship in surficial hydrology applications of spatial databases is connectivity, allowing one link in the network to *point to* another link. Although connection can often be inferred from geometry, it is much more difficult to infer direction of flow, forcing the builders of such applications to treat each possible connection explicitly, or to make use of other information such as elevation.

INTERACTIONS

Although pointers allow relationships to be defined between different types of objects, or between objects belonging to a single class, they provide no support for the qualification of relationships. For example, one might want to store the fact that a particular hydrologic connection between a sink and a spring was characterized by a certain flow-through time, or had a certain volume/head relationship. The georelational model allows us to do this by establishing a new table, or *relation*, with one entry per interaction. The columns of the table would include a pointer to the origin object, a pointer to the destination object, and various measures of interaction.

Unfortunately, at this point in time no available GIS provides comprehensive support for the representation of interaction. While relations such as that defined above exist in isolated instances, the necessary functions for basic manipulation of interaction data, such as display, or modeling of flows using standard spatial interaction models, are not provided by the majority of GIS vendors, and interaction modeling is only just beginning to appear as a supported function. Hopefully such functions will be much more common in the future.

The next section of the paper reviews recent work in advanced data modeling, and its potential applications to subsurface modeling.

ADVANCED GEOGRAPHIC DATA MODELING

Recent research has yielded a rich set of advanced techniques for geographic data modeling, particularly in areas such as time, linear networks, and hierarchies. The subsections of this part of the paper review each of the major contributions, and outline ways in which they can be useful to applications in the areas of concern to this conference.

Hierarchical Structures

The traditional emphasis in geographic data modeling has been on the representation of a single level of generalization. Tools for automatic generalization, or the automatic production of one scale or spatial resolution of mapping from another, larger scale, have proven highly elusive (Buttenfield and McMaster, 1991), because of the difficulty of emulating in a machine the complex and sophisticated process used by the cartographer. Recently, however, significant advances have been made in the digital representation of hierarchy, or the logical linkage between data at different levels of spatial resolution.

One of the best known of these is the concept of the quadtree (Samet, 1990). Rather than model a single level of spatial resolution, a quadtree systematically decomposes a map into scales of variation, starting with the coarsest and proceeding to the most detailed. The basic quadtree concept has been implemented both as a method for representing fields, and as an index to the spatial objects in an entity database. In the latter case, the largest objects are associated with the coarsest spatial resolution. Advanced versions of this concept include more adaptable tree structures (von Oosterom, 1993) and wavelet decompositions (Chui, 1992).

Complex objects are another mechanism for modeling relationships between information at different spatial scales that is now widely supported among available GIS, particularly for facility management applications. Here, a feature represented by a single spatial object at one level of resolution may be linked to a set of more primitive features at another, more detailed level. This situation is commonly found in the systems of reporting zones used in hydrology, where detailed subwatersheds nest within coarse watersheds at several levels. Nested hierarchies such as this are common in geographical data, so it is surprising perhaps that so little support has been provided for them in traditional GIS designs. Support should include the ability to define relationships between objects at different scales, and simple functions such as aggregation and disaggregation. Recently, new techniques of exploratory spatial data analysis have allowed more than one level in a hierarchy to be viewed and analyzed simultaneously (Fotheringham and Rogerson, 1994), leading to useful insights into the effects of scale on the analysis of geographic data.

Although it is possible to model hierarchical relationships within a relational database, lack of supporting methods of manipulation and explicit techniques for representation have created the sense of a conflict between the georelational model as normally implemented in GIS, and the need to model hierarchical relationships. In the case of GDS, a GIS widely adopted within the facilities management industry, the central database architecture is hierarchical rather than georelational, indicating the importance attached to hierarchical spatial relationships in this application area, although links also exist to standard relational databases. Hopefully, new GIS products appearing on the market in the next few years will make the modeling of hierarchical relationships much easier.

Dynamic Segmentation

Road and river networks have provided a rich set of applications for GIS. In traditional geographic data modeling, networks are represented as connected sets of lines. Each line object points to other connected line objects, or to the nodes (a special class of points) at each end; in the latter case, the nodes in turn point to links. Link/node modeling of transport networks began in the 1960s with the Census Bureau's DIME project, and is currently generating widespread interest in the context of

Intelligent Vehicle-Highway Systems (IVHS). Information about the distribution of phenomena along a network can be represented in the form of link and node attributes.

Although successful, the link/node model suffers from one major disadvantage: in reality, attributes are often not constant along links, and change in attributes is not confined to nodes. In principle, the network should be seen as a one-dimensional manifold embedded in a two-dimensional space; methods are needed for the systematic description of variation on this one-dimensional continuum that are analogous to the two-dimensional field and entity data models of GIS. On the one-dimensional manifold there are two entity models (line and point) and five field models (regularly and irregularly spaced sample points, planar enforced regular and irregular line segments, and segments characterized by linear change, the equivalent of a TIN; one could even imagine a one-dimensional equivalent of the isoline). Rather than introducing false nodes at every change of attributes, the *dynamic segmentation* model allows attributes to be assigned to points anywhere on the network, or to sections of links between points that can span intervening nodes. Although it does not implement all of the possible data models listed earlier, this advance on the traditional GIS data model has proven very useful in network applications wherever it is necessary to describe complex geographical variation over the geometry of a network. But as is often the case in GIS, its status as a workaround solution to a practical problem works against its recognition as a theoretically distinct data type.

Fuzzy Representations

In the traditional GIS data model all variation must be expressed through some combination of discrete, well-defined objects with precise *footprints* on the surface of the Earth. In a vector system, precision is determined by the arithmetic precision of the computer and its programming language, and can often be as high as one part in 10^{14}. In raster-based systems positional precision is determined by cell size and is thus likely to be much coarser.

Despite the precision of vector-based systems, the positional accuracy of spatial objects is likely to be much less. Even the best surveying instruments achieve accuracies of only 1 part in 10^6, and map digitizing can rarely exceed 1 part in 10^4. Moreover, the definitions of many spatial objects fail to support even these levels of accuracy. A map of soils or land cover, for example, may include boundary lines between classes whose positions are definable to no better than 1 part in 100 (such as a boundary positioned to the nearest 100m on a map covering an area 10km wide). For this reason, there has been much interest recently in the modeling of uncertainty in spatial databases, and in studies of error and accuracy (Goodchild and Gopal, 1989). Fuzzy logic has been widely suggested as a framework for such models.

Many applications may require the merger of data sets with widely differing lineages and thus positional accuracies. To take one example, many boundaries of reporting zones run along rivers. To assign a point location to the correct reporting zone can require a high level of positional accuracy in both the data set containing the digitized river boundaries, and the data set containing the point locations.

Although traditional GIS data models made no accommodation for uncertainty, requiring the assumption that all object footprints were *crisp*, there has been much recent interest in explicit support for uncertainty, documentation of information on accuracy, and programs of accuracy assessment. Fear of legal liability is one of the major motivations behind this new interest. The recently adopted Federal spatial data format (Federal Information Processing Standard 173; Morrison, 1992) and metadata (data documentation) standards both contain guidelines for reporting and accessing information on quality. Other recent research has focused on techniques for communicating quality information to the user, through novel methods of visual display (Beard, Buttenfield, and Clapham, 1991).

Other recent research effort has gone into methods of *error propagation*, which allow the effects of uncertainty in input data to be carried automatically into estimates of the uncertainty of the products of analysis. Such methods may be useful in estimating the uncertainties associated with spatially-based policies in the area of environmental health, and in dealing effectively with risk. Epidemiologists are likely to have their own approaches to uncertainty, based on statistical models, and it may be useful to explore their incorporation as GIS functions.

Temporal Change

Raw data collection in the field is costly, and traditional systems of data collection thus tend to emphasize those aspects of real systems that remain relatively constant through time, and to characterize change through the use of periodic *time slices*. This approach is reflected in the organization of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resource Inventory (NRI), which samples the U.S. every five years, and also in such systems as Landsat, which takes a view of the surface of the Earth from space every 19 days. Maps also emphasize the comparatively static aspects of the Earth's surface, and these traditions have been preserved in the conventional GIS data models.

More recently, there has been substantial interest in introducing the temporal dimension to spatial databases, and in investigating whether traditional methods of data collection might not be usefully modified in response to the widespread use of digital data processing. Is it possible to rethink the timeslice approach to data collection in the age of GIS?

Langran (1992) and Peuquet (1994) provide recent reviews of the state of temporal data modeling in GIS. One commonly encountered problem is the instability of reporting zone boundaries through time, which creates problems for any kind of longitudinal data analysis. Even though longitudinal stability is a stated objective of many systems of reporting zones, changes nevertheless occur in boundaries. One possibility is to maintain a master file of all boundary segments that ever existed, and to incorporate a GIS function that can rebuild from them the exact geometry of reporting zones that was valid at any specific time. This approach could be used, for example, to build the county boundary network of the U.S. at any time since Independence.

Another approach to spatiotemporal data modeling is illustrated by the work of Goodchild, Klinkenberg, and Janelle (1993) in representing the daily behavior patterns of a sample of urban residents. Rather than time slices, the raw data consisted of the known locations of each individual in the sample; during periods of movement only the endpoints are known. This data model can be visualized as a three-dimensional space, with the two spatial dimensions horizontal and time vertical. In this space, each individual's trajectory forms a line having a single spatial location at any point in time. Simple processing functions can be used to interpolate a map of individuals at any time, or to aggregate individuals by spatial reporting zones for analysis.

In other applications, it may be necessary to represent the space-time continuum as a three-dimensional or even four-dimensional raster, in order to support models of space-time processes. Such approaches are likely to be expensive both in data acquisition and in processing.

Three Dimensions

Systematic modeling of the vadose zone requires a three-dimensional approach. Just as in two dimensions, representation of three-dimensional phenomena can make use of field and entity representations, but the set of primitive objects must be extended to include volumes, whether as polyhedra (the equivalent of polygons) or as voxels (three-dimensional pixels). The quadtree has also been extended to three dimensions as the *octree*.

Several issues arise in handling volumetric data. First, the structure of GIS is two-dimensional, and volumetric data must be integrated through linkages to specifically volumetric databases. Several GIS vendors offer linkages to volumetric packages. Second, three-dimensional data is voluminous, requiring attention to problems of database partitioning, access speed, and indexing in order to produce reasonably acceptable performance. Third, raw three-dimensional data is often expensive to collect, and there is no tradition of data publication comparable to the tradition of two-dimensional mapping. Finally, it is not clear that the functionality of two-dimensional GIS translates to a simple three-dimensional equivalent--if one had a three-dimensional GIS, what would one want to do with it?

Summary

The focus of this section has been on the nature of geographic data modeling in two contexts. Traditional GIS data models have emphasized the representation of the contents of maps, and thus have modeled real geographic phenomena as layers of fixed, crisply defined points, lines, and areas. The advanced data models that have emerged in the past decade, largely in response to the inadequacies of the earlier generation, have dealt explicitly with time, fuzziness, hierarchical relationships across scales, interactions, and complex patterns on networks. These new ideas have only just begun to influence practice, and their full influence is yet to be seen. The GIS field is conservative in such matters, and it can be difficult for products offering new ideas in data modeling to break into a market dominated by a few large vendors. The paper has also made suggestions about areas where the newer more advanced data models are likely to influence practice in environmental health and epidemiology.

There has not been space in this paper to discuss several important trends in advanced data modeling. The paper has followed traditional practice in separating the issues of representation from the functions to be performed on the data, and this tradition is now under regular and strong attack from supporters of *object orientation*, who argue that by *encapsulating* functions with data it will be possible to escape many of the limitations currently imposed by choice of data model. For example, if a set of irregularly spaced point observations of depth to water table could be packaged with a function for spatial interpolation, then it would be possible for the user to ignore the particular representation, and to think of the data simply as a field. This kind of approach holds the promise of much greater ease in transferring data from one system to another, and of *interoperability* between systems.

With a steadily increasing number of options for geographic data modeling available, it seems likely that *niche* implementations of GIS will appear, offering the subset of data modeling options found to be most useful in some specific application area. Dynamic segmentation is more likely to be supported by vendors competing in the market for hydrologic applications, while clearly of less interest for other areas of resource management. At this stage it is not clear whether the needs of vadose zone modeling are sufficiently well defined to provide a niche, or whether the broader needs of hydrology are sufficient to justify a GIS for hydrologists.

FUNCTIONALITY

While thinking about data modeling has progressed markedly in the past few years, much available GIS software remains structured along the lines established by the raster/vector cleavage. Although raster/vector conversion is supported, processing is structured around functions that expect and produce regular arrays, and functions that expect and produce combinations of discrete points, lines, and areas.

Two advances on this situation can be expected in the future. First, the raster/vector cleavage is inappropriate to a conceptual framework that distinguishes between field and entity models, since a field can be represented in six ways, two of which are raster-like and four vector-like. Kemp (1993) has discussed the design of a level of user interaction that would focus on the user's concept of field, and hide lower level issues of field representation as far as possible. For example, the user need not be aware of the details of the representation of what is conceived as a continuous surface of terrain elevation, and can compute such properties as slope without interacting at a lower level with the primitive objects used to create the slope representation. Of course interaction is necessary for some functions, particularly those having to do with accuracy of representation.

Second, if the level of user interaction can be raised to the level of the entity/field cleavage, then integration of the respective functions becomes much easier. It should be possible, for example, to query a field representation for the average value within an area entity. In current architectures, the user would need to know the representation details in order to select the appropriate series of commands.

In hydrologic applications, it may be useful to make a formal distinction between three classes of information, specifically entities (points, lines, areas), two-dimensional fields, and fields on networks (one-dimensional fields embedded in a two-dimensional space). The benefits of this conceptual reorganization become especially apparent in relation to the functions that link data of the three types. Consider, for example, the task of modeling overland sheet flow as a two-dimensional field, and accumulating it as a one-dimensional field over a surface network. In a three-dimensional extension, consider the functions needed to handle surface entity representations of underground planes of discontinuity and their interaction with three-dimensional field representations of fluid flow.

CONCLUSIONS

Geographic data models provide the underlying architectural structure of GIS, and of its interaction with data generated by other geographic information techologies, such as remote sensing. The specific problems of integrating GIS and remote sensing from the perspective of geographic data models are discussed by Goodchild (1994). This paper has presented a brief review of the current state of geographic data modeling, and of recent research that has attempted to go beyond conventional data models. This research promises specific benefits to environmental impact assessment, and vadose zone modeling in particular, because of its emphasis on time and three dimensions, hierarchical relationships, and the modeling of variation over linear networks.

Because of its reliance on the raster/vector cleavage, the current range of GIS products handles these more advanced concepts of geographic data modeling through a variety of workarounds, rather than by implementation within the architecture. With a stronger theoretical base and a better series of linkages to the ways scientists think about spatial variation, much of the technical complexity of GIS might be shown to be unnecessary.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis is supported by the National Science Foundation, grant SBR-8810917.

REFERENCES

Beard, M. K., Buttenfield, B. P., and Clapham, S. B., 1991, NCGIA Research Initiative 7: Scientific Report for the Specialist Meeting, National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, Santa Barbara, CA.

Burrough, P. A., 1986, Principles of Geographical Information Systems for Land Resources Assessment, Clarendon, Oxford.

Buttenfield, B. P., and McMaster, R. B., editors, 1991, Map Generalization: Making Rules for Knowledge Representation, Longman Scientific and Technical, London.

Chui, C. K., 1992, An Introduction to Wavelets, Academic Press, Boston.

Fotheringham, A. S., and Rogerson, P. A., 1994, Spatial Analysis and GIS, Taylor and Francis, London.

Goodchild, M. F., 1992, "Geographical data modeling," Computers and Geosciences, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 401-408.

Goodchild, M. F., 1994, "Integrating GIS and remote sensing for vegetation analysis and modeling: methodological issues," Journal of Vegetation Science, Vol. 5, pp. 615-626.

Goodchild, M. F., and Gopal, S., 1989, Accuracy of Spatial Databases, Taylor and Francis, London.

Goodchild, M. F., Klinkenberg, B., and Janelle, D. J., 1993, "A factorial model of aggregate spatio-temporal behavior - application to the diurnal cycle," Geographical Analysis, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 277-294.

Goodchild, M. F., Parks, B. O., and Steyaert, L. T., 1993, Environmental Modeling with GIS, Oxford University Press, New York.

Kemp, K. K., 1993, "Environmental modeling with GIS: a strategy for dealing with spatial continuity," Technical Report 93-3, National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, Santa Barbara, CA.

Langran, G., 1992, Time in Geographic Information Systems, Taylor and Francis, London.

Maguire, D. J., 1991, "An overview and definition of GIS," in D. J. Maguire, M. F. Goodchild, and D. W. Rhind, editors, Geographical Information Systems: Principles and Applications, Longman Scientific and Technical, London, pp. 9-20.

Maguire, D. J., Goodchild, M. F., and Rhind, D. W., editors, 1991, Geographical Information Systems: Principles and Applications, Longman Scientific and Technical, London.

Mark, D. M., and Frank, A. U., editors, 1991, Cognitive and Linguistic Aspects of Geographic Space, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Morrison, J. L., 1992, "Implementing the spatial data transfer standard -

introduction," Cartography and Geographic Information Systems, Vol. 19, No. 5, p. 277.

Peuquet, D. J., 1984, "A conceptual framework and comparison of spatial data models," Cartographica, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 66-113.

Peuquet, D. J., 1994, "It's about time - a conceptual framework for the representation of temporal dynamics in geographic information systems," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 84, No. 3, pp: 441-461.

Raper, J. R., 1989, Three Dimensional Applications of Geographical Information Systems, Taylor and Francis, London.

Samet, H., 1990, The Design and Analysis of Spatial Data Structures, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Silverman, B. W., 1986, Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis, Chapman and Hall, London.

Smith, T. R., Su, J., El Abbadi, A., Agrawal, D., Alonso, G., and Saran, A., 1994, "Computational modeling systems," Information Systems, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp: 1-54.

Star, J. L., and Estes, J.E., 1990, Geographic Information Systems: An Introduction, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Stewart, J. Q., 1947, Macrogeography and Income Fronts, Monograph Series No. 3, Regional Science Research Institute, Philadelphia.

Turner, A. K., editor, 1992, Three-Dimensional Modeling with Geoscientific Information Systems, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

von Oosterom, P. J. M., 1993, Reactive Data Structures for Geographic Information Systems, Oxford University Press, New York.