

INCIDENT DATA ANALYSIS USING DATA MINING TECHNIQUES

A Thesis

by

LISA M. VELTMAN

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

August 2008

Major Subject: Safety Engineering

INCIDENT DATA ANALYSIS USING DATA MINING TECHNIQUES

A Thesis

by

LISA M. VELTMAN

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	M. Sam Mannan
Committee Members,	Marietta J. Tretter
	Mahmoud El-Halwagi
Head of Department,	Michael Pishko

August 2008

Major Subject: Safety Engineering

ABSTRACT

Incident Data Analysis Using Data Mining Techniques. (August 2008)

Lisa M. Veltman, B.S., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. M. Sam Mannan

There are several databases collecting information on various types of incidents, and most analyses performed on these databases usually do not expand past basic trend analysis or counting occurrences. This research uses the more robust methods of data mining and text mining to analyze the Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance (HSEES) system data by identifying relationships among variables, predicting the occurrence of injuries, and assessing the value added by the text data. The benefits of performing a thorough analysis of past incidents include better understanding of safety performance, better understanding of how to focus efforts to reduce incidents, and a better understanding of how people are affected by these incidents.

The results of this research showed that visually exploring the data via bar graphs did not yield any noticeable patterns. Clustering the data identified groupings of categories across the variable inputs such as manufacturing events resulting from intentional acts like system startup and shutdown, performing maintenance, and improper dumping. Text mining the data allowed for clustering the events and further description of the data, however, these events were not noticeably distinct and drawing conclusions based on these clusters was limited. Inclusion of the text comments to the overall analysis of HSEES data greatly improved the predictive power of the models. Interpretation of the textual data's contribution was limited, however, the qualitative conclusions drawn were similar to the model without textual data input. Although HSEES data is collected to *describe* the effects hazardous substance releases/threatened releases have on people, a fairly good predictive model was still obtained from the few variables identified as cause related.

DEDICATION

To Mom and Dad

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor Dr. M. Sam Mannan for his guidance and support in my research and academic developments as well as allowing me the opportunity to be a part of the Mary Kay O'Connor Process Safety Center. Thanks to my committee member Dr. Marietta J. Tretter for all of her help and advice about both my research and challenges life may bring. Thanks to my other committee member Dr. Mahmoud El-Halwagi for his support in my research endeavors. Also, many thanks to Mr. T. Michael O'Connor for the thought provoking discussions, advice on my research, and for allowing me the privilege to participate in projects the Center is involved in.

I would also like to thank Donna Startz, Mary Cass, and Valerie Green for all of the assistance they have provided me over the course of my graduate studies at Texas A&M University. Thanks to Dr. William J. Rogers for the long discussions about my research, safety in general, and all of the other interesting adjacent topics that came up.

I would like to thank my friends and fellow students in the Center for their support, encouragement, camaraderie, and for making my experience in our research group an enjoyable one.

Finally, thanks to Mom and Dad for their everlasting love, support, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. BACKGROUND.....	3
3. HSEES DATA.....	7
4. DATA MINING.....	9
4.1 Describing the Data.....	9
4.1.1 Variables.....	9
4.1.2 Visualization and Summaries.....	10
4.1.3 Clustering	10
4.1.4 Text Mining.....	10
4.2 Building Predictive Models.....	12
4.2.1 Decision Trees.....	12
4.2.2 Logistic Regression	13
4.3 Measuring Model Performance	13
4.3.1 Lift and Gain	13
4.3.2 Maximum Likelihood Estimates	17
5. METHODS.....	18
5.1 Define Data Mining Goal.....	18
5.2 Data Cleaning and Preparation.....	19
5.3 Data Analysis	21

6. RESULTS.....	22
6.1 Sample.....	22
6.2 Explore and Modify	22
6.2.1 MultiPlot.....	24
6.2.2 Clustering	29
6.2.3 Text Mining.....	32
6.3 Model	37
6.3.1 Decision Tree without Text Input	37
6.3.2 Decision Tree with Text Input	40
6.3.3 Logistic Regression Node without Text Input	44
6.3.4 Logistic Regression Node with Text Input	50
6.4 Assess	53
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	56
7.1 Conclusions	56
7.2 Recommendations	57
REFERENCES	58
VITA	60

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1	Example of Cumulative Gain Chart..... 15
Figure 2	Example of Lift Chart 16
Figure 3	Primary Factor by Injury Occurrence 26
Figure 4	Secondary Factor by Injury Occurrence 27
Figure 5	Industry Code by Injury Occurrence 28
Figure 6	Spills by Injury Occurrence 29
Figure 7	Air Emissions by Injury Occurrence 29
Figure 8	Clustered Data..... 30
Figure 9	Cluster Rings..... 35
Figure 10	Cumulative Lift Comparison for Train Dataset..... 54
Figure 11	Cumulative Lift Comparison for Validate Dataset 54
Figure 12	Cumulative Lift Comparison for Test Dataset..... 55

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1	Term Frequency Matrix 11
Table 2	Example of Calculated Lift Values 15
Table 3	Categorical Variables 23
Table 4	Continuous Variables 24
Table 5	Events per Hazardous Substance Subcategory..... 25
Table 6	Clustered Terms per Segment 33
Table 7	Cluster Descriptions 34
Table 8	Classifications for Decision Tree with No Text Input 37
Table 9	Variable Importance for Decision Tree with No Text Input..... 38
Table 10	Classifications for Decision Tree with Text Input 41
Table 11	Variable Importance for Decision Tree with Text Input..... 42
Table 12	Cluster Weights for SVD_1 and SVD_4 43
Table 13	Classifications for Logistic Regression with No Text Input 45
Table 14	Maximum Likelihood Estimates for Logistic Regression without Text. 46
Table 15	Reduced Variable List for Logistic Regression with No Text Input 48
Table 16	Classifications for Logistic Regression with Text Input..... 50
Table 17	Maximum Likelihood Estimates for Logistic Regression with Text 51
Table 18	Reduced Variable List for Logistic Regression with Text Input 52

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a need to understand how industry as a whole is performing from a safety standpoint. To date, no one can really answer this question with certainty. People do a decent job collecting data on incidents, but few take the analyses of the data past basic trending. Having the capability to collect enormous amounts of data is a feat in and of itself; however, it begs the question, “So what?” With the amount of resources spent to collect data, it seems logical to look at the data under extreme scrutiny to obtain as much knowledge about the data as possible. Data in a database is just that, data. By analyzing and understanding what is in the database yields knowledge. Passing this knowledge on to others can improve the understanding of what went wrong with incidents from the past thereby greatly enabling the prevention of future incidents.

Trending analyses do provide useful comparisons in the data, however, going beyond comparisons by using data mining techniques can enable one to build predictive models, unveil relationships within the data that are not necessarily intuitive, and perhaps answer the question, “How is industry’s safety performance doing?” Marketers have successfully harnessed the power of data mining to build predictive models to increase profit by, for example, determining customer buying habits based on advertisement campaigns. The advantage of using data mining is its ability to analyze an enormous set of data [1]. Using the data mining as an analysis tool applied to incident databases can make a huge, positive impact on industry and the public at large.

The benefits of performing a thorough analysis of incident databases include better understanding of safety performance, better understanding of how to focus efforts to

This thesis follows the style of Journal of Hazardous Materials.

reduce incidents, and a better understanding of how people are affected by these incidents. The data chosen for this research comes from the Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance (HSEES) system for the years 2002 to 2004. This system collects data on incidents where there was a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance that resulted in some public health action [2]. It is unique in that it collects data for the purpose of analyzing the effects these incidents have on the health of the public as opposed to other databases that focus on environmental impact.

The objective of this research is to use data mining and text mining to analyze the HSEES system data by identifying relationships among the variables, predicting variable(s) of interest, and assessing the value added by the text data. Furthermore, the results of this research will define what can be done with this type of data in terms of analyses and what types of questions more thorough analyses may answer.

2. BACKGROUND

Analyses of the information in databases help connect the dots between what went wrong and what people can do to prevent it—the relationship between the cause of an incident and its consequences. Trevor Kletz time and time again reminds us that an essential part of not repeating mistakes from history is to make sure that lessons are learned, and to make sure these lessons are shared as new generations join in. Several people have put their mark on assessing what knowledge is available from incident databases and some of these are discussed in the following.

Eboni Trevette McCray compared several incident databases in an effort to formulate improvements for these databases as well as determine national safety goals to be implemented given these improvements. It was argued that comparing and trending data from the databases is impossible due to the overall discrepancy in data collection agendas, methods, and definitions from year to year. As a result, it was proposed to create a single database with a thorough amount of information on incident details including the causes and effects of the incidents. This proposed database will originate from the existing Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS) database and is expanded upon with questions from an Accidental Release Information Program (ARIP) survey [3]. Although it is agreed that there are errors and discrepancies in data collection, it is disagreed that ascertaining any useful analysis from these databases is impossible. It is implicit through modeling these data that there is some level of variability and uncertainty, yet the overall trend and relationships will be foretelling enough to draw conclusions and make recommendations for safer practices regarding chemicals. In the case of my research, the data used from 2002 to 2004 have common definitions and the inherent nature of HSEES being an active system means the data are more reliable.

Others have made strides to analyze databases such as Fahad Al-Qurashi's work where the combined effects of accidental, failure rate, and reactive chemical databases were considered. Specifically, the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Risk Management Program (RMP) database was used to decipher the most significant chemicals released and ultimately it was concluded that there is a need for more data with regard to failure rates and reactive chemicals. It was stressed that with the appropriate understanding of equipment reliability and the inherent hazards of chemicals used, the number of incidents can be reduced [4]. Although the focus of this research is to link different data sources together to find new learnings, it still identified the most frequently occurring offenders and basic trends with the analysis, but did not incorporate predictive modeling.

Looking at the benefits of using data mining, one can consider Sumit Anand's work where data mining techniques were applied to the National Response Center's database to uncover interesting patterns in data pertaining to fixed facilities in Harris County, Texas from 1990-2002. Example techniques applied to these data are decision trees where consequences of an incident are compared to the type of equipment failure and incident cause, and association analysis used to compare the type of equipment failure and the chemical involved. Using the data mining results, Anand updated equipment failure probabilities and built a decision support system [5]. Finding associative behaviors between variables, like type of injury and chemical released, might be a viable option for the HSEES dataset. It could show how likely the presence of some chemical X will result in some injury y. An alternative option is clustering events.

Terry L. Bunn et al analyzed tractor fatality data for the state of Kentucky focusing on the added benefits of analyzing the text given by way of incident investigation reports. They showed that analyzing text entries in addition to coded data provides far more information than looking at coded data alone [6]. The advantage with the tractor fatality dataset is that the text entries are detailed incident investigation reports, not short

comments on the nature of the event like what is contained in the HSEES dataset. Relationships in the tractor data were extracted about pre-event, event, and post-event conditions, namely the initiating event, the actual injury or outcome, and the response to the event. The consequence of “Dead at the scene” events were linked with the causes “operation of a tractor with a bucket, muddy terrain, and being thrown from the tractor” [6]. Causes of dying from being “crushed” were identified as “the lack of tractor maintenance, the lack of brakes, or a clutch as well as the lack of a seat belt on the tractor, the lack of an attached [rollover protective structure], the lack of tractor counterweights for tractor balance, overturning the tractor, and operating the tractor on an embankment or a slope” [6]. Using logistic regression analysis, it was found that an individual is 8.8 times more likely to die of being crushed where the tractor is overturned or rolled over, and that a driver is more likely to be crushed when operating on a slope than on level ground [6]. This example goes to show the benefits for including the analysis of text data in finding patterns and building models. A similar approach is used to combine the HSEES text comments with the other structured data to build a predictive model.

Already the HSEES data is benefitting the public at large. The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) produces annual reports from the HSEES data. These reports include things such as the number of victims and types of injuries, the types of substances released, the number of evacuations, and information on the most commonly reported category of substances [7]. In addition to the ATSDR report, participating states are required to analyze the data and use their findings for outreach programs [2]. Doing so ensures that the data collected is used to benefit the public. States like New York have done an excellent job with their analysis to accomplish things such as removal of mercury from schools and identifying sources of carbon monoxide poisoning in buildings [8].

ASM Obidullah analyzed the HSEES data by considering the relationship between the causes and consequences of the recorded incidents for Texas manufacturing facilities as well as proposed a national estimate. In this research, trend, cause, and consequence analysis were used to conclude and recommend further study and integration of equipment failure data, the need for more training on safe practices when conducting maintenance and further study of the environmental impact chemical releases are having since many of the releases in the HSEES database did not have recorded injuries. Some of the findings were that equipment failure was a major cause for process interruption, process upset is the most frequent type of process interruption in the industries analyzed, and respiratory irritation was the type of injury that frequently occurred among workers [9]. Obidullah made good progress in the effort to learn from past manufacturing incidents from the HSEES database, however, more learning can be wrought from this database by using the predictive power that data mining can provide.

The commonality between all of these works is that society as a whole can learn from past incidents through data analysis in order to prevent future incidents from occurring. There is an enormous potential to learn from the information housed in today's databases with the wide availability of various approaches. Analyses that are done on data such as HSEES are just scratching the surface. Ramping up these analyses with analyses that data mining can help produce will further help meet the overall goal with any type of analyses—taking data and gaining knowledge from it. In the case of analyses on the HSEES data, the idea is to gain knowledge and understandings of incidents such that one can identify what areas need to be focused on to reduce the occurrences of harm to the public. Adding predictive power to the reports and findings that are currently available will greatly aid in this effort.

3. HSEES DATA

The Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance (HSEES) data includes information on events where:

- There was an uncontrolled/illegal release or threatened release of at least one hazardous substance NOT including petroleum (due to the Petroleum Exclusion clause of CERCLA) and the release of the hazardous substance(s) requires removal, clean up, or neutralization, or
- There was a threatened release of a hazardous substance that would have needed to be removed, cleaned up, or neutralized AND the threatened release resulted in a public health action.

Although CERCLA has a Petroleum Exclusion, events where petroleum is released along with other hazardous substances are included in HSEES and petroleum is reported along with the other substances [2].

HSEES is unique compared to other databases since its focus is on public health whereas other databases focus on environmental impact. This focus on public health is aligned with ATSDR's mission "to serve the public by using the best science, taking responsive public health actions, and providing trusted health information to prevent harmful exposures and disease related to toxic substances" [2]. The purpose for collecting the data is to assess the acute effects hazardous substance emergencies have on the morbidity and mortality of the first responders, general public, and employees, and thereby reduce these occurrences [2].

The data for 2002 to 2004 were obtained in an excel spreadsheet format. There are four different worksheets: event data, chemical data, victim data, and text comments. The event data includes information on unique record number for each incident, the type of event (fixed facility or transportation), whether there was an actual release or a threatened release, location, the type of area, time, date, and day of the week the event

occurred, type of industry, and contributing factors to the incident. The latter is not to be confused with root causes as a more thorough investigation is required to find this type of information. These data are formatted such that each row represents a single event.

The chemical data contain information such as the unique record number, type of chemical released, the chemical category, and the quantity of the chemical released. Each row in the chemical dataset represents a single chemical involved in the incident. Incidents with several chemicals involved will have several rows of data in the chemical file.

The victim data contain the unique record number, specific information on the types of injuries incurred, the type of personal protective equipment (PPE) used if at all, decontaminations, whether or not an evacuation or shelter-in-place was ordered, age and gender of the victim, victims distance from the event, and type of victim (first responder, general public, employee, or student). Each row of data in this dataset represents a single victim. Consequently, the victim data will have multiple rows for a single incident if there are multiple victims.

The text worksheet contains the record number and the text comment inputted for the incident. The formatting of this file is inconsistent. Text comments for a single incident were in most cases split into different cells on different rows and columns within the spreadsheet. Heavy cleaning was necessary to get the comments rejoined into a single cell for each subsequent event. Once cleaned, these data will have a single row per incident.

4. DATA MINING

The capabilities of generating and collecting data has rapidly grown in the last couple of decades and as such there is a need for technology that can assist a user by transforming large amounts of data into useful information [10]. Cue data mining. Data mining can be defined as “the process of discovering interesting knowledge from large amounts of data stored either in databases, data warehouses, and other information repositories” [10]. The process can be described in three steps—describe the data, build a predictive model, and verify the model. Data are described by its statistical attributes such as means and standard deviations, by visually reviewing charts and graphs, and looking for relationships among variables. Predictive models are built based on patterns found in known results. The model must be tested with a separate data sample that was not used to build the model and contains known results. Finally, the model should be verified with new data without known results [11].

4.1 Describing the Data

Visualization, summaries, and cluster analysis are used to describe the structured HSEES data. Text mining is used to describe the unstructured data in HSEES. These methods are described in the following sections.

4.1.1 Variables

Structured data consist of three main types of variables—nominal, ordinal, and continuous. Nominal variables are unordered categorical variables, ordinal variables are ordered categorical variables, and continuous variables are numeric [11]. Examples of nominal variables are names or type of event (fixed facility versus transportation event). Examples of ordinal variables include class ranks and letter grades. Continuous

variables are attributes such as age or temperature. Data such as text comments are considered unstructured data.

4.1.2 Visualization and Summaries

Plots and graphs are used to visually compare different groups of variables. Visualizing the data in this way is helpful particularly because patterns and relationships are easier to perceive graphically than they are when looking at text or numerical values. Visualizing the data and looking at the statistical summaries is extremely beneficial with promoting understanding of the data, because it helps the modeler easily recognize patterns or relationships that might otherwise go unnoticed [11].

4.1.3 Clustering

The intention of clustering a database is to divide data into groups that are distinct from one another, but whose elements are similar. Furthermore, the idea is to segment the data into groups that are not previously defined so that the clusters can be used to classify new data. This might require excluding variables that are not meaningful or otherwise insignificant until reasonable clusters are formed [11]. SAS displays attributes in each cluster using bar graphs that the modeler can use to ascertain the distinctness of the clusters.

4.1.4 Text Mining

Text mining is used to find patterns in unstructured data. Common problems with analyzing textual data are misspellings, synonymy, and polysemy (same word can have different meanings in different contexts) [10]. The text mining node in SAS creates a term frequency matrix and displays a term table that shows the total number of times each term appears and the number of documents the term appears in. Synonym lists,

stop lists, and start lists can be created and implemented to guide what terms the text mining node groups together (synonym list), what terms to omit because they are deemed irrelevant (stop list), and what terms to keep (start list). Furthermore, the text mining node may be set up to automatically cluster, allowing for closer inspection of the documents that contain similar sets of words.

One method of structuring text data to incorporate into models is to use latent semantic indexing (LSI). The LSI method uses the technique of singular value decomposition (SVD) to reduce the size of the term frequency matrix [10]. As depicted in Table 1 below, the $n \times m$ term frequency matrix shows the frequency ($a_{i,j}$) of terms (t_i) per document (d_j).

Table 1 Term Frequency Matrix

<i>Frequencies</i>	d_1	d_2	d_3	d_4	d_5	...	d_m
t_1	$a_{1,1}$	$a_{1,2}$	$a_{1,3}$	$a_{1,4}$	$a_{1,5}$...	$a_{1,m}$
t_2	$a_{2,1}$	$a_{2,2}$	$a_{2,3}$	$a_{2,4}$	$a_{2,5}$...	$a_{2,m}$
t_3	$a_{3,1}$	$a_{3,2}$	$a_{3,3}$	$a_{3,4}$	$a_{3,5}$...	$a_{3,m}$
t_4	$a_{4,1}$	$a_{4,2}$	$a_{4,3}$	$a_{4,4}$	$a_{4,5}$...	$a_{4,m}$
t_5	$a_{5,1}$	$a_{5,2}$	$a_{5,3}$	$a_{5,4}$	$a_{5,5}$...	$a_{5,m}$
...
t_n	$a_{n,1}$	$a_{n,2}$	$a_{n,3}$	$a_{n,4}$	$a_{n,5}$...	$a_{n,m}$

For example, there are $a_{1,1}$ occurrences of the term t_1 in document d_1 . The SVD method takes this $n \times m$ matrix and reduces it to a $K \times K$ matrix by removing rows and columns with the least significant information. The latent semantic indexing method can be generalized to the following steps:

1. Create a term frequency matrix.
2. Compute SVD of the term frequency matrix by splitting the matrix into three matrices, U, S, and V. U and V are orthogonal matrices ($U^T U = 1$ and $V^T V = 1$), and S is the reduced $K \times K$ matrix.

3. Replace each document d 's vector by a new one that excludes the terms eliminated during SVD.
4. Store the set of all vectors and index them using advanced multi-dimensional indexing techniques [10].

SAS Text Miner node performs these functions and the new SVD variables can be used as input in subsequent nodes that build the predictive models.

4.2 Building Predictive Models

Logistic regression and decision trees are two methods of building predictive models.

4.2.1 Decision Trees

Decision trees can predict categorical or continuous variables. The decision trees represent a series of rules that lead to some class or value. The top node is the decision node, which specifies the test to be carried out. Each branch off of the top node leads to either another decision node or to the leaf node (at the end of a branch). The trees are grown with an iterative process that splits the data into discrete groups with the “goal to maximize ‘distance’ between groups at each split” [11].

To control the size of the tree, stopping rules may be implemented such as limiting the depth the tree may grow to. The tree may also be pruned—the modeler or the built-in heuristics can prune the tree to the smallest size that still maintains its accuracy [11].

A drawback of using decision trees are that they do not consider the effects splits might have on future splits. Furthermore, the tree makes splits sequentially resulting in each split being dependent on its predecessor. Thus, changing a split somewhere in the tree can greatly impact the resulting splits after it. Although the model builds quickly since it considers a single predictor variable at a time, this limits the number of splitting rules to

test as well as increases the difficulty of detecting relationships among predictor variables [11].

4.2.2 Logistic Regression

Logistic regression is used to predict binary variables with values yes/no or 1/0. Because the target variable is not continuous, it cannot be predicted with linear regression. Instead, logistic regression predicts the logarithm of the odds of the event occurring as opposed to predicting if the event will occur. The logarithm is referred to as the log odds or logit transformation and is expressed as the following ratio of probabilities:

$$\text{odds ratio} = \frac{\text{Pr}(\text{event occurs})}{\text{Pr}(\text{event does not occur})}$$

For example, if the odds ratio is 3, then the probability of the event occurring is three times as much as the probability of the event not occurring. In other words, the odds are 3 to 1 that the event will occur, or there is a 75% chance the event will occur and 25% chance it will not [11].

4.3 Measuring Model Performance

This section discusses the metrics used to decipher how well a predictive model has performed.

4.3.1 Lift and Gain

Lift is the ratio of the target response to the average response of the population. It can be expressed as lift per decile or as the cumulative lift across the population. Gain

describes the ratio of the target response to the total number of positive responses.

These are defined in the following equations:

$$Lift = \frac{a_i}{\bar{b}}$$

$$Cumulative Lift = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\bar{b} * n}$$

$$Cumulative Gain = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{A}$$

where a_i = number of predicted positive responses in decile i

$$\bar{b} = \frac{A}{T}, \text{ the total number of positive responses } A \text{ per total events } T$$

n = is the decile being considered.

Typically lift is illustrated using cumulative gains and lift charts. To demonstrate these calculations and the resulting charts, consider Table 2, which is populated with fictitious data. Consider decile 3 in Table 2. The lift is $240/160 = 1.5$, the cumulative lift is $1,040/480 = 2.2$, and the cumulative gain is $1,040/1,600 = 65\%$.

Table 2 Example of Calculated Lift Values

Decile	Total Number of Events	Cumulative by Decile				By Decile		
		Predicted Positive Responses	Average Positive Response	Cumulative Gains	Cumulative Lift	Predicted Positive Responses	Average Positive Response	Lift
1	2,000	480	160	30%	3.0	480	160	3.0
2	4,000	800	320	50%	2.5	320	160	2.0
3	6,000	1,040	480	65%	2.2	240	160	1.5
4	8,000	1,264	640	79%	2.0	224	160	1.4
5	10,000	1,360	800	85%	1.7	96	160	0.6
6	12,000	1,440	960	90%	1.5	80	160	0.5
7	14,000	1,504	1,120	94%	1.3	64	160	0.4
8	16,000	1,552	1,280	97%	1.2	48	160	0.3
9	18,000	1,584	1,440	99%	1.1	32	160	0.2
10	20,000	1,600	1,600	100%	1.0	16	160	0.1

The data in the table for all 10 deciles yield the cumulative gain chart found in Figure 1 and the lift chart in Figure 2.




Figure 1 Example of Cumulative Gain Chart

The cumulative gains chart in Figure 1 shows that by taking 10% of the total events, the predictive model has successfully predicted positive responses for 30% of the total possible positive responses.




Figure 2 Example of Lift Chart

The lift chart in Figure 2 shows that by taking 10% of the total events, the model predicts 3 times more positive responses than the average number of responses.

In general, the larger the lift, the more effective the model is predicting the target compared to not using the model at all. There is no definite rule on what level of lift indicates a good model as this depends on the application. The goal is to get the best lift possible for the model under consideration. After doing this for several models, the lift for each model can be used to compare, on a relative basis, which model performs the best i.e. has the higher lift [12].

4.3.2 Maximum Likelihood Estimates

Maximum likelihood estimates are convenient for determining whether the predictor variables in the model are statistically significant. These estimates are provided in the output for the logistic regressions. To check for statistical significance, the modeler can review the p-values for each predictor variable used in the model. A value less than 0.05 means the variable is statistically significant. The odds ratio is given for each variable, and this number indicates the relative importance of each variable's contribution to the overall response prediction. Ideally, the modeler will want several variables to contribute importantly to the overall model. The other measurements used to assess the model's predictive ability are found in the association of the predicted probabilities and actual responses statistics, which can show what percent of the predicted probabilities matched the actual responses [13].

5. METHODS

Data mining is a method to find patterns in data and build predictions using these patterns. The general steps are first to describe the data in terms of its statistical attributes, visually look at charts and graphs to identify meaningful relationships among the variables, build predictive models based on the patterns found, test if the model appropriately predicts variables using known data separate from the data used to build the model, and finally verify the model with real data [11].

For this project, a similar approach is used and it is summarized in the following steps:

1. Define a data mining goal.
2. Clean the data and prepare it for analysis.
3. Choose samples to analyze.
4. Look for patterns and relationships.
5. Modify dataset as necessary.
6. Apply models to the dataset.
7. Assess how well these models fit the data.
8. Compare the data mining results to previous work.

Steps 2 through 6 can be repeated as necessary to develop a reasonable model and details of the steps are provided later.

5.1 Define Data Mining Goal

Before beginning the data mining process, a clear, well-defined objective must be established. The objective for the data and text mining is to build a model that predicts whether an event will result in injured or killed victims. More specifically, the goal is to build a model that relates whether victims are injured or killed, a consequence, to event characteristics that logically can be considered causal information. Three variables that could be used as targets for such an assessment are the total victims (a number), whether

there was an injury (yes/no), and whether there was a fatality (yes/no). Closer inspection of the data revealed that only 49 events out of 19,165 resulted in at least one fatality (0.3% of the total events) and 1,592 events out of 19,165 resulted in an injury (8% of the total events). Because of the small number of fatalities, the occurrence of fatalities was omitted as a possible target leaving the number of victims and occurrence of an injury. The decision was made to predict the occurrence of an injury since it is binary and will result in a simpler model.

5.2 Data Cleaning and Preparation

Data cleaning and preparation is the second step in the data mining process. Relative to this research, step 1 entails consolidating the data into a single flat file with each row of data representing a single event. Since the event file is already set up this way, the summarized chemical and victim data as well as the text data were imported into the event file by matching the unique identification number for each incident. The following are a list of summarized data added to the event file:

- Day of the year the event occurred with values ranging from 1 to 366.
- Number of substances released in 4 subcategories—chemical, radiological, medical, and biological.
- Number of chemicals released in each of 15 subcategories that include Acids, Ammonia, Bases, Chlorine, Other Inorganic Substances, Paints and Dyes, Pesticides/Agricultural, Polychlorinated Biphenyls, Volatile Organic Compounds, Other, Mixture Across Chemical Categories, Formulations, Hetero-Organics, Hydrocarbons, and Oxy-Organics.
- Number of each type of release—air emission, spill, fire, explosion, threatened or other.
- Number of each type of injury—trauma, respiratory system irritation, eye irritation, gastrointestinal problems, heat stress, burn injuries, skin irritation,

dizziness or other central nervous system symptom, headaches, heart trouble, shortness of breath, and other.

- Number of victims with each type of severity, which covers treatment needs as well as fatalities.
- Number of each type of victim such as student, firefighter, employee, general public, and police officer.
- Number of people using each type of personal protective equipment (PPE) ranging from Level A to level D as well as those using firefighter turnout gear, gloves, hardhats, and steel toed boots.
- Number of victims in each of 8 age categories—employee, responder, general public, career firefighter, volunteer firefighter, firefighter (not specified), police officer, EMT personnel, hospital personnel, company response team employee, and student.

Some other tasks performed to prepare the data for analysis were:

- Concatenate the text comments into a single cell per event before importing into the event dataset.
- Delete events that do not fit ATSDR's definition of a surveillance event, which reduces the dataset from 36,218 events to 26,211 events.
- Filter the "Fixed Facility" events and save these events as a separate dataset. This dataset consists of 19,165 events.
- Retained states that collected data for each year from 2002-2004. These states include Alabama, Colorado, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin.
- Deleted variables with 60% or more missing values.
- Save the fixed facility data in a SAS compatible format.

5.3 Data Analysis

The data analysis steps 3 to 7 in this research's procedure are adapted from a process of logical steps SAS developed. This iterative process of logical steps is designed to help the user apply the data mining tools in the SAS software. These steps are Sample, Explore, Modify, Model, and Assess, and these steps are commonly referred to with the acronym SEMMA.

- Sample entails choosing a subset of data that is large enough to contain all pertinent information, but small enough to process quickly. This subset is then divided into three subsets—training, validation, and test sets. The training set of data is used to fit the model, the validation set of data is used to prevent over fitting a model, and the test set is used to evaluate how well the model fits the data.
- Explore is the step to gain a better understanding of the data by identifying trends or anomalies in the data either visually or using statistical methods like cluster analysis.
- Modify entails changing the dataset by performing tasks such as creating new variables, eliminating other variables, and eliminating anomalies. The changes made in this phase are based on the discoveries made in the explore phase.
- Modeling the data is the step where different types of models are chosen for the software to fit to the data automatically.
- Assessing the data is the final step in the iterative process where one checks the validity of the results. This assessment is done by taking a test dataset and applying the model to these data to test if the model predicts the correct result.

This process continues until the data miner is satisfied with the results [14].

Because decisions on what to do from step to step are dependent on the results of the former step, the specifics of what data mining tools were used for each stage of this SEMMA process are given in the results section.

6. RESULTS

The results in the section are summarized in the order of the steps taken for the analysis.

6.1 Sample

To develop a meaningful model, the dataset was simplified by considering only data pertaining to fixed facility events. Consequently, transportation events and events with no classification type were omitted. The events where an injury did occur only comprise 8% of the total dataset. Because the desired model needs to predict the positive outcome of an injury (injury = yes), weights were set such that positive injury occurrences are treated as 1.5 times more important than the negative injury occurrences.

6.2 Explore and Modify

The tasks for these steps are to identify potential relationships in the data, identify ways to edit the list of predictor variables, and make data modifications as deemed necessary.

Keeping in mind that injury occurrence is the target variable, definitions were closely inspected to identify desirable predictor variables that describe the cause of an event to allow for a model that relates causes to the consequence of an injury occurrence. The following observations were made:

1. Many variables describe event consequences such as who was notified because of the event, who responded to the event, and number of people decontaminated.
2. Many variables provide redundant information about injury occurrences including variables that describe the types of injuries, severity of injuries, victim category, and victim age. These variables are redundant because these data are only given for victims in the event, not for all people involved in the incident.

3. Many variables described event characteristics that are not considered a cause or consequence such as the number of people at home or number of people that live within various distances from the event, the existence of different establishments within a quarter mile of the event (school, nursing home, recreational facility, etc.), and the number of people visiting or working at a facility.
4. Variables considered as cause related include number of hazardous substances released or threatened to be released in their respective subcategories, the type of release, primary and secondary contributing factors, and industry type. The latter is more subtle and is better described as an opportunistic variable. Industry type is included because the existence of hazardous substances might be more prevalent in some industries than it is in other industries.

Table 3 provides the list of nominal cause related variables that will be used in the predictive modeling.

Table 3 Categorical Variables

Variable Name	Description	Categories
INJ_YorN	Injury, yes or no	Y = Yes, N = No
PRIM_FACT	Primary factor contributing to cause of incident	2 = Equipment failure, 3 = Operator Error, 8 = Other, G = Intentional, H = Bad weather condition, S = Illegal act
SEC_FACT	Secondary factor contributing to incident	1=Improper mixing, 2=Equipment failure, 3=Human error, 4=Improper filling, loading, or packing, 8=Other, A=Performing maintenance, B=System/process upset, C=System start up and shutdown, E=Power failure/electrical problems, F=Unauthorized/improper dumping, I=Vehicle or vessel collision, P=Vehicle or vessel derailment/rollover/capsizing; J=Fire, K=Explosion, L=Overspray/misapplication, Q=Illicit drug production related, N=No secondary factor, O=Loadshift, R=Forklift puncture
NIND_CODE	General Industry categories	1 = Agriculture, 2 = Mining, 3 = Construction, 4 = Manufacturing, 5 = Transportation, 6 = Communications, 7 = Utilities, 8 = Wholesale trade, 9 = Retail trade, 10 = Finance and real estate, 11 = Business and repair services, 12 = Personal services, 13 = Entertainment, 14 = Professional services, 15 = Public administration, 16 = Abandoned facilities, 17 = Private vehicle or property, 18 = Illegal activity (non-illicit drug related), 19 = Illegal activity (illicit drug related), 20 = Unspecified and unknown

Table 4 provides the list of interval cause related variables that will also be used in the predictive modeling.

Table 4 Continuous Variables

Variable Name	Description
REL_AIREMIS	Number of Air Emission type releases
REL_EXPLOS	Number of Explosion type releases
REL_FIRE	Number of Fire type releases
REL_OTHER	Number of Other type releases
REL_SPILL	Number of Spill type releases
REL_THREAT	Number of Threatened type releases
SC_ACID	Number of chemicals released in the Acid subcategory
SC_AMMONIA	Number of chemicals released in the Ammonia subcategory
SC_BASES	Number of chemicals released in the Bases subcategory
SC_CHORLINE	Number of chemicals released in the Chlorine subcategory
SC_FORM	Number of chemicals released in the Formulations subcategory
SC_HETEROORG	Number of chemicals released in the Hetero-Organics subcategory
SC_HYDROCARB	Number of chemicals released in the Hydrocarbons subcategory
SC_MIX	Number of chemicals released in the Mixture Across Chemical Categories subcategory
SC_OISC	Number of chemicals released in the Other Inorganice Substances subcategory
SC_OTHER	Number of chemicals released in the Other subcategory
SC_OXYORG	Number of chemicals released in the Oxy-Organic subcategory
SC_PANDD	Number of chemicals released in the Paints and Dyes subcategory
SC_PESTAG	Number of chemicals released in the Pesticides/Agricultural subcategory
SC_POLYCHLBPH	Number of chemicals released in the Polychlorinated Biphenyls subcategory
SC_VOC	Number of chemicals released in the Volatile Organic Compounds subcategory
TOT_CHEM	Total number of chemicals spilled

6.2.1 MultiPlot

The MultiPlot node was used to compare each input variable to the target variable via bar charts that illustrate distributions across the entire population of data. Visual inspection of these charts aided in describing the HSEES data.

The hazardous substances subcategories did not reveal any interesting patterns within each subcategory. However, comparing all of the subcategories to one another showed

the subcategory groups other inorganic substances, mixtures, oxy-organic, other, acids, and ammonia were present in a larger number of events compared to pesticides, bases, chlorine, paints and dyes, hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls, hetero-organics, and formulations. Table 5 shows the number of events each subcategory was present in.

Table 5 Events per Hazardous Substance Subcategory

Hazardous Substance Subcategories	# Events
SC_OISC	5,119
SC_MIX	4,128
SC_VOC	3,743
SC_OXYORG	1,906
SC_OTHER	1,536
SC_ACID	1,512
SC_AMMONIA	1,404
SC_PESTAG	740
SC_BASES	627
SC_CHORLINE	576
SC_PANDD	429
SC_HYDROCARB	316
SC_POLYCHLBPHNL	245
SC_HETEROORG	162
SC_FORM	36

Primary and secondary contributing factors are nominal variables with categorical inputs. Bar charts with distributions related to these contributing factors show the number of events each classification type. In Figure 3, primary contributing factor equipment failure (2) has the largest number of events. Operator error (3) has less than half the number of events as equipment failure, but contains more injury related events. Intentional act (G) is similar in magnitude to operator error, but has fewer injuries.




Figure 3 Primary Factor by Injury Occurrence

Referring to the secondary contributing factor bar chart in Figure 4, it is evident that the majority of the events did not have a secondary contributing factor (N) and that there were more injuries in events without a secondary contributing factor than the other events. The top three secondary contributing factors are system process upset (B), system startup/shutdown (C), and performing maintenance (A). Note that illicit drug production (Q) has a smaller amount of events than system process upset (B), system startup/shutdown (C), and performing maintenance (A), however, it also has more injury related events.




Figure 4 Secondary Factor by Injury Occurrence

The industry type is another nominal variable with categorical information. In Figure 5, the leading industry involved in fixed facility HSEES events is manufacturing (4). The next highest number of events are from utilities (7), wholesale trade (8), transportation (5), personal services (12), professional services (14), and illegal activity (19), but these trail much further behind.




Figure 5 Industry Code by Injury Occurrence

Reviewing release types showed spills and air emissions as the types of releases that dominated the fixed facility HSEES events. These are shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7 below. All other release types had hardly enough events to make note.




Figure 6 Spills by Injury Occurrence




Figure 7 Air Emissions by Injury Occurrence

6.2.2 Clustering

To cluster the data, the cause related variables were selected as input initially and the remaining variables were added and taken away in various arrangements throughout

several iterations. The best discernable clusters obtained came from using primary and secondary contributing factors, type of area the event occurred in, the industry type, and the state. The clustering produced segments with 49.7%, 32.9%, and 17.4% of the total events for segments 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Because the hazardous substances subcategory variables showed no distinctness, they were replaced with the total number of chemicals variable to summarize this finding strictly for illustration purposes. The resulting clusters are shown in Figure 8.




Figure 8 Clustered Data

Close inspection of these segments revealed the following:

- Segment 1 shows a large number of manufacturing type events, industrial area type events, equipment failure as the leading primary contributing factor,

equipment failure as the second largest contributor, and Texas as the primary state captured in this cluster.

- Segment 2 shows about 55% of events are in a commercial area type, the industries are fairly spread out with utilities, transportation, manufacturing, and wholesale trade representing about half of the events, almost an equal contribution between equipment failure and operator error as the primary factor, and presence of a secondary factor contributing to half of segment 2 as well.
- Segment 3 has more contribution from residential area types than it does from industrial and commercial, a little over half of the events are related to manufacturing and illegal activities as the industry type, illegal acts are about 98.5% of the events with respect to primary contributing factors, and illicit drug production is the leading secondary contributing factor with performing maintenance, system startup and shutdown, and unauthorized/improper dumping trailing behind.
- There is no difference between segments with respect to the number of chemicals involved.
- Texas, New York, and Utah's percent varies the most between segments. The other states maintain a fairly even contribution across the segments.

Given the previously listed findings, one might expect the following scenarios:

- Many of the events in segment 1 occurred in Texas with the manufacturing industry as a result of equipment failure and system/process upset.
- Many of the events in segment 2 are in a commercial with almost an equal chance of being the result of equipment failure or operator error.
- Just less than half of the events in segment 3 are in residential areas as a result of illegal acts, predominately illicit drug production. The methamphetamine events are probably most prominent in this segment. The remaining half of the events are commercial or industrial area types dealing with mostly the manufacturing industry as a result of intentional acts. These intentional acts are related to

performing maintenance, system startup and shutdown, and unauthorized/improper dumping.

Note that the clustering method does not consider the target variable. Instead, the clustering helps describe the nature of the data content completely independent from what is going to be predicted later in the data mining process.

6.2.3 Text Mining

Before connecting the text mining node, the data were partitioned into the following sets: 40% training set, 30% validation set, and 30% test set. The text mining node was set to ignore punctuation, different parts of speech, terms that appear only in a single document, determiners (a, an, the), conjugations (and, but, or), auxiliary verbs (may, can, should), prepositions (of, for, from), pronouns (he, it, them), participles (not, to, be), interjections (yes, thank you, hello), and finally numbers. This greatly reduces the number of terms to decipher, which include nouns, verbs, proper nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and abbreviations. Finally, the text mining node was set to automatically cluster terms and to transform the data using SVD.

After running the text miner, the interactive capability of this node allowed for a close inspection of identified terms and their links as well as clustered terms. At this point, a synonym list, start list, and stop list can be created. A term frequency table can be sorted in various arrangements; a subset of documents that contain selected terms can be filtered. This is helpful for reading groups of text descriptions with similar terms to better understand the significance and relationship of the selected terms. Also, concept links can be used to illustrate the links between terms.

To clean the text data, misspelled words were grouped with their correctly spelt alternatives, abbreviations were combined with their definitions when available, and

other obvious synonyms were grouped together like “PRV”, “pressure relief valve”, and “relief valve”. After all of these changes were made, the synonym list was saved.

Next, the words that appeared fewer than 3 times in total were eliminated. Any words that describe the type of injury or the consequence of being injured or killed were also eliminated. Eliminating these words is essential, since the end goal is to build a model that links causes to the consequence of being injured. Other erroneous terms were eliminated as well such as “on” and “when”. After eliminating these irrelevant terms, a stop list was saved. The text miner was run again with the updated synonym and stop lists.

Table 6 shows the clustered terms per segment.

Table 6 Clustered Terms per Segment

Cluster	Percent	Terms
1	33%	
2	17%	+ result, + release, + response, + shut, + shutdown, + pressure, + fail, + company, + failure, + unit, + line, + gas, equipment, + flare, + secure
3	8%	+ chemical, + mix, + police department, + laboratory, + methamphetamine, + spray, + treat, + explode, + home, + find, + fire department, + respond, + methamphetamine lab, + fire, + area
4	4%	additional, + worker, + fume, + on-site, + expose, + area, + clean, + report, + fire department, + evacuate, + work, + out, + contain, ammonia, + time
5	29%	+ break, + receive, + clean up, + drum, + spill, + fire, up, into, + water, + fire department, + leak, + out, + contain, + occur, + tank
6	3%	+ evacuate, + build, + people working, + unknown, visiting unknown, + work, people, + measure, + visit, + decontamination, + read, emergency, + result, scene, + time
7	3%	additional, + school, anhydrous ammonia, anhydrous, ammonia, + student, + fume, + eye, + valve, + respond, + expose, + police department, + laboratory, + evacuate, + tank
8	3%	+ expose, + wear, ppe, enforcement, + residence, + length, special agents, toxic, + affect, + action, + perform, + child, + wearing ppe, + respiratory protection, + methamphetamine lab

Table 7 provides a brief description of the events found in each clustered segment.

Table 7 Cluster Descriptions

Cluster	Percent	Description
1	33%	No text entries available.
2	17%	Contains many of equipment failure events and flare stack events
3	8%	Large portion of the events are related to methamphetamine labs and the remainder dealt with general chemical releases that required the police or fire department to respond.
4	4%	Contains mostly operator error events.
5	29%	Varying types events that do not have any obvious connections to one another.
6	3%	Events are mostly associated with each other by the word evacuate. However, there are a large number of events that stated "no evacuation".
7	3%	Mostly ammonia and school related events.
8	3%	Events are mostly associated with methamphetamine events and the use of PPE.

A Segment Profile node illustrates the clustered terms distributions as they relate to input variables. Events within each segment are depicted by either concentric rings for categorical input variables or bar charts for interval variables. The outer circle of the concentric ring shows the distribution of the attributes within each segment, and the inner ring shows the distribution of the same attributes within the entire population of data. In the bar charts, the solid bars represent the events in the segment and the hollow outlined bars represent the population. Although we want segments distinct from one another, the distribution of the attributes within each segment should be similar to the distribution of the attributes within the population.

Figure 9 is a snapshot of the cluster results for each segment.




Figure 9 Cluster Rings

The segments are listed by the number of events they contain in decreasing order. The input variables are depicted in decreasing order of their worth. The following observations were made based on the concentric ring illustration:

- Segment 1 events represent the industry types similarly to the entire population of events, but the segment events lack 5 industries. The secondary factors are also fairly well represented in the segment with some variations. Air emission and spill releases as well as the mixture substance subcategory are similar between the population (hollow outlined bars) and the segment (solid bars). Finally, the primary factor is similar in distribution between the population and

segment events. This segment contains the events with no text entries, so there is no text-based theme for this segment to compare to the population.

- Segment 5 represents the secondary factor distribution almost exactly like the population. The industry codes are also well represented in this segment, but the air emission and spill releases do not perform as well. This segment is an assortment of different types of events, so it is difficult to compare the text-based theme of the segment with the population.
- Segment 2 represents the industry type distribution similarly to the population, but the larger amount of wholesale trade industry represented in the segment. The other inorganic substances subcategory representation in the segment compared to the population is acceptable, and so are the secondary and primary contributing factors, the air emission releases, and the volatile organic compound subcategory. The text comments described equipment failure and flare stack release events and this is consistent with the concentric rings showing a large proportion of manufacturing events with equipment failure as the primary factor. The similarities between the segment and population with regard to air emission releases can be attributed to the large number of flare stack events contained in this segment.
- Segments 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 all do poorly with representation of the population. This is expected because these segments have a small number of events. Recall that segment 3 contains events that describe methamphetamine labs and other types of labs where chemicals were released. Reviewing the concentric rings for secondary contributing factors shows a larger portion of illicit drug production than any of the other segments as well as a larger portion of illegal activity as the industry type.

The results of the text mining node that is passed on to the modeling nodes are 36 SVD vector inputs.

6.3 Model

To model the HSEES data, two different types of models were applied—the decision tree and the logistic regression. These models were run with various arrangements of the cause related variable inputs to maximize its predicting power, and then a separate set of decision tree and logistic regression models were run that included both the cause related variables and the text SVD inputs. The comparison of both sets of models will help delineate the value added by the text data.

6.3.1 Decision Tree without Text Input

The decision tree node was connected directly to the partition node and the cause related variables were set to input, occurrence of injuries set to target, and all other variables set to reject. The decision tree node was adjusted multiple times to optimize the accuracy of the model. Table 8 contains the event classification table.

Table 8 Classifications for Decision Tree with No Text Input

Data Role	Target	FALSE Negative	TRUE Negative	FALSE Positive	TRUE Positive
Frequencies					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	534	6,994	34	103
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	409	5,225	47	68
Percent of Total					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	6.97%	91.25%	0.44%	1.34%
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	7.11%	90.89%	0.82%	1.18%

In the event classification table, “FALSE Negative” refers to the predicted outcome of injuries = no when it should have been injuries = yes. Similarly, “TRUE Negative” is the number of events the model correctly predicts as injuries = no, “FALSE Positive” is the number of events the model predicts as injuries = yes when it should have been

injuries = no, and finally “TRUE Positive” is the number of events correctly predicted as injury = yes. For this decision tree, it correctly predicted 1.34% injuries, but incorrectly predicted no injuries for the other 6.97% of events that had injuries. In other words, it correctly predicted 16% of the injury events.

Table 9 contains the variable importance table. NRULES is the number of times the variable appears in a node, IMPORTANCE shows the level of importance for the variable in the training dataset, and VIMPORTANCE shows the level of importance for the variable in the validation dataset. RATIO is the IMPORTANCE divided by the VIMPORTANCE. In this table, it is clear that the industry code has equal importance across the two sets, air emission releases have absolutely no importance with relation to the validation set, and the remaining release types and chemical subcategories do not have much importance in either dataset.

Table 9 Variable Importance for Decision Tree with No Text Input

Obs	NAME	NRULES	IMPORTANCE	VIMPORTANCE	RATIO
1	NIND_CODE	1	1.000	1.000	1.000
2	SEC_FACT	3	0.693	0.662	0.955
3	REL_AIREMIS	1	0.404	0.000	0.000
4	PRIM_FACT	3	0.372	0.400	1.073
5	SC_OISC	2	0.269	0.310	1.153
6	SC_AMMONIA	3	0.235	0.214	0.911
7	SC_ACID	3	0.222	0.250	1.127
8	SC_OXYORG	1	0.220	0.160	0.730
9	REL_SPILL	2	0.183	0.081	0.443
10	SC_MIX	1	0.180	0.159	0.882
11	SC_OTHER	1	0.114	0.084	0.738
12	SC_CHORLINE	2	0.107	0.111	1.037
13	REL_FIRE	1	0.107	0.070	0.659

An example rule produced by this decision tree is:

- If the primary factor is something other than Human Error,
 - AND the secondary contributing factors are system/process upset or power failure/electrical problems
 - AND industry type is manufacturing or mining, then
 - Occurrence of injuries is estimated to be 0.1% for 1,902 events.

Take this same set of rules except consider the scenario where there is at least one acid present, then the occurrence of injuries jumps to 5.9% for 17 events. This percentage increase makes sense because the presence of an acid is adding a hazard to the scenario.

Looking at the leaf nodes with large percent estimations for injuries = yes can help identify the main scenarios that cause injuries. Branches with higher percent predictions for injuries also contain few events, which is intuitive since only a small percentage of the total events result in injury. In addition, the predicted percentages for injuries between the training and validation set differ significantly more for smaller groupings of events. Thus, a more qualitative approach was taken to identify key components for these high injury yielding events.

- Explosions in the utilities or transportation industries is expected to have 53.8% occurrence of injuries in 13 events for the training set and 35.3% occurrence of injuries in 17 events for the validation set.
- Illicit drug production or improper mixing in the utilities or transportation industries is predicted to have 22.5% occurrence of injuries in 111 events and 13.8% occurrence of injuries in 87 events in the training and validation datasets, respectively.
- The presence of at least one hazardous substance mixture in an event that involves improper mixing or performing maintenance and is in the professional services or illegal activity industries is expected to have 75.6% occurrence of injuries in 41 events and 65.1% occurrence of injuries in 43 events for the

training and validation datasets, respectively. These events account for many methamphetamine related events.

- The presence of at least 1 ammonia substance, released via air emission due to operator error in the utilities or transportation industries is expected to have 100% occurrence of injuries in 13 events and 88.9% occurrence of injuries in 9 events for the training and validation datasets, respectively. Events where a tank of ammonia is accidentally spilled fits this scenario description well.
- The presence of at least 1 acid, released via air emission due to operator error in the utilities or transportation industries is expected to have 82.6% occurrence of injuries in 23 events and 73.7% occurrence of injuries in 19 events for the training and validation datasets, respectively.

6.3.2 Decision Tree with Text Input

A second decision tree node was connected to the text miner node and the settings were set identically to the decision tree discussed in section 6.3.1. The cause related variables and the SVD variables from the text mining node were set as input, occurrence of injuries was set as the target, and all other variables were set to reject.

Table 10 on the following page contains the event classification table.

Table 10 Classifications for Decision Tree with Text Input

Data Role	Target	FALSE Negative	TRUE Negative	FALSE Positive	TRUE Positive
Frequencies					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	271	6,918	110	366
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	264	5,117	155	213
Percent of Total					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	3.54%	90.25%	1.44%	4.77%
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	4.59%	89.01%	2.70%	3.70%

The decision tree with the incorporated SVD vectors from the text node classified the events much better than the decision tree without the SVD vectors. Table 10 shows the decision tree with SVD input correctly predicted 4.79% injuries, but incorrectly predicted no injuries for the other 3.52% of events that had injuries. This translates to correct predictions for 57% of the injury events, a sizeable improvement from the decision tree model without the text input.

Table 11 contains the variable importance table. In this table, it is clear that the `_SVD_4` vector has equal importance across the training and validation datasets, the secondary contributing factors have about 0.6 importance, and the industry type and `_SVD_1` vector have about 0.5 importance across the training and validation datasets.

Table 11 Variable Importance for Decision Tree with Text Input

Obs	NAME	NRULES	IMPORTANCE	VIMPORTANCE	RATIO
1	_SVD_4	1	1.000	1.000	1.000
2	SEC_FACT	1	0.688	0.595	0.865
3	NIND_CODE	3	0.577	0.471	0.816
4	_SVD_1	2	0.523	0.461	0.881
5	_SVD_3	3	0.449	0.448	0.999
6	_SVD_8	2	0.325	0.261	0.801
7	_SVD_6	2	0.304	0.260	0.854
8	_SVD_11	3	0.261	0.142	0.543
9	_SVD_21	3	0.252	0.000	0.000
10	_SVD_10	1	0.248	0.000	0.000
11	_SVD_23	2	0.239	0.160	0.671
12	_SVD_27	1	0.211	0.000	0.000
13	_SVD_26	3	0.211	0.152	0.722
14	_SVD_25	1	0.201	0.000	0.000
15	_SVD_7	1	0.184	0.114	0.621
16	_SVD_32	1	0.182	0.000	0.000
17	PRIM_FACT	1	0.181	0.266	1.472
18	_SVD_2	1	0.164	0.106	0.646
19	REL_SPILL	1	0.158	0.000	0.000
20	SC_ACID	1	0.149	0.000	0.000
21	_SVD_18	1	0.145	0.000	0.000
22	SC_OISC	1	0.145	0.122	0.846
23	SC_OXYORG	1	0.142	0.000	0.000
24	_SVD_17	1	0.139	0.000	0.000
25	_SVD_28	1	0.132	0.000	0.000
26	_SVD_5	1	0.122	0.000	0.000
27	_SVD_20	1	0.089	0.142	1.600

The weights per cluster segment for SVD_1 and SVD_4 are provided in Table 12 below. The percents are the portion of events per cluster.

Table 12 Cluster Weights for SVD_1 and SVD_4

Cluster	Percent	_SVD_1	_SVD_4
1	33%	0.000	0.000
2	17%	0.187	-0.077
3	8%	0.241	-0.063
4	4%	0.645	-0.091
5	29%	0.235	-0.096
6	3%	0.216	-0.107
7	3%	0.182	0.082
8	3%	0.184	-0.096

Compared to the other SVD vectors (not shown), SVD_1 has the highest weights across the largest number of clusters. This is a result of SVD_1 accounting for most of the variability in the model. Clusters 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are all weighted about 0.2 and the clusters include various types of events that are not generally related to operator error. Cluster 4 has the largest weight of 0.65 and only accounts for 4% of the events; cluster 4 contains mainly operator error events. The weight for cluster 1 is 0 since this cluster represents the set of events with no text entries. The vector SVD_4 has equal weights of about -0.1 for clusters 2-6 and 8. Cluster 7 is weighted as 0.1 and contains ammonia and school related events. Because the clusters are not very distinct from one another, interpretation of the scenarios in the decision tree is limited, and drawing meaningful conclusions from these events is limited as well.

The low event number and high percent predicted injury occurrence scenarios were reviewed and the following are some of the findings:

- Events where the primary contributing factor is operator error and the secondary factor is either improper mixing or performing maintenance with events weighted

< 0.00413 in SVD_4 are predicted to result in 57.6% occurrence of injuries in 110 events and 51.8% occurrence of injuries in 85 events for the training and validation datasets, respectively.

- This scenario is describing events where the operator erred via improper mixing or performing maintenance and events that are not grouped in cluster 7.
- Events where fire or illicit drug production were the secondary contributing factors with weights < 0.00413 in SVD_4 are predicted to result in 17.7% occurrence of injuries in 844 events and 15.8% occurrence of injuries in 659 events for the training and validation sets, respectively.
 - This scenario is describing events that are most likely coming from cluster 3, 4, or 5 which contain the clustered word “fire”. Cluster 3 contains events with explosions from methamphetamine labs.
- Events in the wholesale trade or professional services industry with weights between 0.00413 and 0.10328 for SVD_4 are predicted to have 52.0% occurrence of injuries in 102 events and 58.5% occurrence of injuries in 65 events for the training and validation sets, respectively.
 - The events in this scenario are singled out to cluster 7 which is described as mostly ammonia and school-related events. The wholesale trade industry has a large number of events with ammonia releases and the professional services industry has a large number of school services (elementary school, colleges and universities, etc.) grouped with it.

6.3.3 Logistic Regression Node without Text Input

A few iterations were required to build the best possible logistic regression model with the cause related predictor variables. The final setup for this model includes industry type, release types, primary and secondary contributing factors set to input, occurrence

of injuries set to target, and all other variables set to reject. The model selection of choice is stepwise regression.

Table 13 shows the event classification table. The logistic regression model correctly predicted 1.72% injuries, but incorrectly predicted no injuries for the other 6.59% of events that had injuries. Similarly stated, this decision tree model correctly predicted 21% of the injury events.

Table 13 Classifications for Logistic Regression with No Text Input

Data Role	Target	FALSE Negative	TRUE Negative	FALSE Positive	TRUE Positive
Frequencies					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	505	6,939	89	132
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	368	5,174	98	109
Percent of Total					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	6.59%	90.53%	1.16%	1.72%
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	6.40%	90.00%	1.70%	1.90%

Table 14 on the following page lists the parameter estimate results for the selected variables.

Table 14 Maximum Likelihood Estimates for Logistic Regression without Text

Parameter	INJ YorN	Category	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi- Square	Pr > ChiSq	Standardized Estimate	Exp(Est)
Intercept	Y		1	-3.1579	2.5627	1.52	0.2178		0.043
NIND_CODE	Y	1	1	-0.2421	0.3355	0.52	0.4704		0.785
NIND_CODE	Y	2	1	-2.3574	0.9511	6.14	0.0132		0.095
NIND_CODE	Y	3	1	-0.0246	0.2863	0.01	0.9314		0.976
NIND_CODE	Y	4	1	-1.0436	0.1513	47.56	<.0001		0.352
NIND_CODE	Y	5	1	-1.073	0.2803	14.65	0.0001		0.342
NIND_CODE	Y	6	1	0.4252	1.033	0.17	0.6807		1.53
NIND_CODE	Y	7	1	-0.7176	0.2238	10.28	0.0013		0.488
NIND_CODE	Y	8	1	-0.6896	0.2755	6.26	0.0123		0.502
NIND_CODE	Y	9	1	1.0625	0.2327	20.85	<.0001		2.894
NIND_CODE	Y	10	1	0.5574	0.3805	2.15	0.143		1.746
NIND_CODE	Y	11	1	0.3295	0.3662	0.81	0.3682		1.39
NIND_CODE	Y	12	1	0.6858	0.1683	16.61	<.0001		1.985
NIND_CODE	Y	13	1	0.3664	0.4045	0.82	0.365		1.443
NIND_CODE	Y	14	1	1.0046	0.1842	29.75	<.0001		2.731
NIND_CODE	Y	15	1	-0.0418	0.3574	0.01	0.907		0.959
NIND_CODE	Y	16	1	-0.3209	0.5403	0.35	0.5525		0.725
NIND_CODE	Y	17	1	1.3005	0.3566	13.3	0.0003		3.671
NIND_CODE	Y	18	1	1.0943	0.4605	5.65	0.0175		2.987
NIND_CODE	Y	19	1	-0.1151	0.2544	0.2	0.651		0.891
PRIM_FACT	Y	2	1	-0.4992	0.1645	9.21	0.0024		0.607
PRIM_FACT	Y	3	1	0.7239	0.1591	20.7	<.0001		2.062
PRIM_FACT	Y	8	1	0.5335	0.4222	1.6	0.2064		1.705
PRIM_FACT	Y	G	1	-0.6747	0.2107	10.25	0.0014		0.509
REL_AIREMIS	Y		1	0.3838	0.0735	27.28	<.0001	0.1524	1.468
SC_ACID	Y		1	0.6764	0.1281	27.87	<.0001	0.1226	1.967
SC_AMMONIA	Y		1	0.6665	0.1625	16.83	<.0001	0.0963	1.947
SC_BASES	Y		1	0.5161	0.2107	6	0.0143	0.0533	1.676
SC_CHORLINE	Y		1	0.8852	0.2134	17.21	<.0001	0.0841	2.424
SC_OISC	Y		1	-0.6551	0.0976	45.05	<.0001	-0.2708	0.519
SC_OTHER	Y		1	0.385	0.1368	7.92	0.0049	0.0642	1.47
SC_OXYORG	Y		1	0.3609	0.1071	11.35	0.0008	0.0873	1.435
SEC_FACT	Y	1	1	2.3502	2.5676	0.84	0.36		10.488
SEC_FACT	Y	2	1	0.0123	2.5727	0	0.9962		1.012
SEC_FACT	Y	3	1	1.9573	2.575	0.58	0.4472		7.08
SEC_FACT	Y	4	1	0.1735	2.5675	0	0.9461		1.189
SEC_FACT	Y	8	1	1.3584	2.5712	0.28	0.5973		3.89
SEC_FACT	Y	A	1	0.7002	2.5668	0.07	0.785		2.014
SEC_FACT	Y	B	1	-0.8022	2.5887	0.1	0.7567		0.448
SEC_FACT	Y	C	1	-0.5688	2.5951	0.05	0.8265		0.566
SEC_FACT	Y	E	1	-5.4724	7.9975	0.47	0.4938		0.004
SEC_FACT	Y	F	1	-0.2557	2.577	0.01	0.9209		0.774
SEC_FACT	Y	I	1	0.00208	2.74	0	0.9994		1.002
SEC_FACT	Y	J	1	1.4371	2.5666	0.31	0.5755		4.209
SEC_FACT	Y	K	1	3.3018	2.5814	1.64	0.2009		27.163
SEC_FACT	Y	L	1	1.5423	2.5739	0.36	0.549		4.675
SEC_FACT	Y	N	1	0.8416	2.5592	0.11	0.7423		2.32
SEC_FACT	Y	O	1	-7.2505	45.3653	0.03	0.873		0.001
SEC_FACT	Y	P	1	0.1933	2.7746	0	0.9445		1.213
SEC_FACT	Y	Q	1	1.7903	2.5715	0.48	0.4863		5.991

Recall that logistic regression builds a model that predicts the likelihood of some response via odds ratio. The “Estimate” column gives the estimated coefficient for each variable. For interval variables such as air emission release type, the coefficient will be multiplied by the number of air emission releases. For categorical variables such as industry type, the model splits these into binary variables of industry code 17, industry code 18, and so on such that if NIND_CODE 17 = Yes, the value 1 will be multiplied by the coefficient.

Using the coefficient estimates from Table 14, the equation for this model is:

$$\ln[\text{OddsRatio}(\text{Injury} = \text{Yes})] = \ln[\text{Pr}(\text{Injury} = \text{Yes}) / \text{Pr}(\text{Injury} = \text{No})] = \\ -3.2 * \text{NIND_CODE17} + 1.3 * \text{NIND_CODE18} + \dots + 0.4 * \text{REL_AIREMIS} + \dots$$

If there is an event involving illegal activity (industry type 18), then NIND_CODE 18 = 1 else it is 0. The other categorical variables are treated the same way. If there are 3 substances that were released via air emission, then REL_AIREMIS = 3. The other interval variables are treated similarly. The final results gives the odds ratio, which describes how much more likely it is for an injury to occur then for an injury not to occur. The equation can be manipulated to solve for $\text{Pr}(\text{Injury}=\text{Yes})$.

Note that the statistical significance of the variables should be considered in terms of identifying the more important factors. Looking at the coefficients alone does not give an adequate assessment of the variable significance since the order of magnitude among the variables is different. Reviewing the odds ratio in the column “Exp(est)” can give a good indication of what variables have a larger effect on the occurrence of injury. Considering both the odds ratio and the p-values found in column “Pr > ChiSq” helps discern which variables affect the occurrence of an injury and are still statistically significant. The variables with p-values less than 0.05 were filtered out and ranked in decreasing order by their odds ratio estimate. The results are given in Table 15.

Table 15 Reduced Variable List for Logistic Regression with No Text Input

Parameter	Category	Category Description	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq	Standardized Estimate	Exp(Est)
NIND_CODE	17	Private vehicle or property	1.3005	0.3566	13.3	0.0003		3.671
NIND_CODE	18	Illegal activity (non-drug related)	1.0943	0.4605	5.65	0.0175		2.987
NIND_CODE	9	Retail trade	1.0625	0.2327	20.85	<.0001		2.894
NIND_CODE	14	Professional services	1.0046	0.1842	29.75	<.0001		2.731
SC_CHORLINE			0.8852	0.2134	17.21	<.0001	0.0841	2.424
PRIM_FACT	3	Operator error	0.7239	0.1591	20.7	<.0001		2.062
NIND_CODE	12	Personal services	0.6858	0.1683	16.61	<.0001		1.985
SC_ACID			0.6764	0.1281	27.87	<.0001	0.1226	1.967
SC_AMMONIA			0.6665	0.1625	16.83	<.0001	0.0963	1.947
SC_BASES			0.5161	0.2107	6	0.0143	0.0533	1.676
SC_OTHER			0.385	0.1368	7.92	0.0049	0.0642	1.47
REL_AIREMIS			0.3838	0.0735	27.28	<.0001	0.1524	1.468
SC_OXYORG			0.3609	0.1071	11.35	0.0008	0.0873	1.435
PRIM_FACT	2	Equipment failure	-0.4992	0.1645	9.21	0.0024		0.607
SC_OISC			-0.6551	0.0976	45.05	<.0001	-0.2708	0.519
PRIM_FACT	G	Intentional act	-0.6747	0.2107	10.25	0.0014		0.509
NIND_CODE	8	Wholesale trade	-0.6896	0.2755	6.26	0.0123		0.502
NIND_CODE	7	Utilities	-0.7176	0.2238	10.28	0.0013		0.488
NIND_CODE	4	Manufacturing	-1.0436	0.1513	47.56	<.0001		0.352
NIND_CODE	5	Transportation	-1.073	0.2803	14.65	0.0001		0.342
NIND_CODE	2	Mining	-2.3574	0.9511	6.14	0.0132		0.095

The following observations are made based on these results:

- None of the secondary contributing factors were considered statistically significant.
- A private vehicle or property related event is 3.7 times more likely to result in an injury.
- Events related to illegal activity that is non-drug related, retail trade, and professional service industries all are roughly 3 times more likely to have an injury.
- Chlorine events are 2.5 times more likely to result in an injury whereas acid, ammonia, and base events are only 2 times more likely to result in an injury. Substances in the oxy-organic and other substances categories are only about 1.5 times more likely to result in an injury. Interestingly enough, the presence of

substances in the other inorganic substances category are 2 times more likely to *NOT* result in an injury.

- The only statistically significant release type is air emissions, which has the odds of 3 to 1 that a person will be injured.
- Events caused by operator error have 2 to 1 odds that someone will be injured, but events caused by equipment failure and intentional act are respectively 1.6 and 2.0 times more likely *NOT* to result in an injury.
- Events in the wholesale trade and utilities industries are 2.0 times more likely to *NOT* result in injury and events in the manufacturing and transportation industries are showing respectively 2.8 and 2.9 times the likelihood of resulting in an injury. Mining industry events are showing the occurrence of an injury is 10 times less likely.

Based on this logistic regression model, efforts to decrease the occurrence of injuries can be focused on the private frontier, illegal activities, retail trades, and professional services. Data inspection of these industry types revealed the following:

- Illegal activities as events dealing with disgruntled employees, vandalism, and domestic disputes.
- Retail trade events dealt primarily with ammonia releases/leaks, improper mixing of chemicals, use of pesticides without proper ventilation, or other substance leaks. Many of the events with ammonia leaks were related to someone stealing the ammonia to make methamphetamines and not completely shutting the valves.
- Professional services events typically dealt with broken thermometers or accidentally spilling materials.
- Personal services industry included many meth lab related events where surrounding households had to be evacuated.

An effective way to reduce injuries is something ATSDR and participating states are already doing—focusing on outreach programs to educate people about hazards associated with substances such as mercury, chlorine, and pesticides. Another

suggestion to reduce the opportunity for injuries with respect to thieves stealing ammonia is to collaborate with retail trades to identify and implement ways of storing their chemicals in a more secure location.

6.3.4 Logistic Regression Node with Text Input

A few iterations were required to build the best possible logistic regression model with the cause related predictor variables and SVD variables. The final setup for this model includes industry type, release types, primary and secondary contributing factors set to input, occurrence of injuries set to target, and all other variables set to reject. The model selection of choice is stepwise regression.

Table 16 shows the event classifications and Table 17 lists the parameter estimate results. The logistic regression with SVD input correctly predicted 3.65% injuries, but incorrectly predicted no injuries for the other 4.66% of events that had injuries.

Table 16 Classifications for Logistic Regression with Text Input

Data Role	Target	FALSE Negative	TRUE Negative	FALSE Positive	TRUE Positive
Frequencies					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	357	6,935	93	280
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	239	5,186	86	238
Percent of Total					
TRAIN	INJ_YorN	4.66%	90.48%	1.21%	3.65%
VALIDATE	INJ_YorN	4.16%	90.21%	1.50%	4.14%

Table 17 Maximum Likelihood Estimates for Logistic Regression with Text

Parameter	INJ YorN	Category	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi- Square	Pr > ChiSq	Standardized Estimate	Exp(Est)
Intercept	Y		1	-3.1579	2.5627	1.52	0.2178		0.043
NIND_CODE	Y	1	1	-0.2421	0.3355	0.52	0.4704		0.785
NIND_CODE	Y	2	1	-2.3574	0.9511	6.14	0.0132		0.095
NIND_CODE	Y	3	1	-0.0246	0.2863	0.01	0.9314		0.976
NIND_CODE	Y	4	1	-1.0436	0.1513	47.56	<.0001		0.352
NIND_CODE	Y	5	1	-1.073	0.2803	14.65	0.0001		0.342
NIND_CODE	Y	6	1	0.4252	1.033	0.17	0.6807		1.53
NIND_CODE	Y	7	1	-0.7176	0.2238	10.28	0.0013		0.488
NIND_CODE	Y	8	1	-0.6896	0.2755	6.26	0.0123		0.502
NIND_CODE	Y	9	1	1.0625	0.2327	20.85	<.0001		2.894
NIND_CODE	Y	10	1	0.5574	0.3805	2.15	0.143		1.746
NIND_CODE	Y	11	1	0.3295	0.3662	0.81	0.3682		1.39
NIND_CODE	Y	12	1	0.6858	0.1683	16.61	<.0001		1.985
NIND_CODE	Y	13	1	0.3664	0.4045	0.82	0.365		1.443
NIND_CODE	Y	14	1	1.0046	0.1842	29.75	<.0001		2.731
NIND_CODE	Y	15	1	-0.0418	0.3574	0.01	0.907		0.959
NIND_CODE	Y	16	1	-0.3209	0.5403	0.35	0.5525		0.725
NIND_CODE	Y	17	1	1.3005	0.3566	13.3	0.0003		3.671
NIND_CODE	Y	18	1	1.0943	0.4605	5.65	0.0175		2.987
NIND_CODE	Y	19	1	-0.1151	0.2544	0.2	0.651		0.891
PRIM_FACT	Y	2	1	-0.4992	0.1645	9.21	0.0024		0.607
PRIM_FACT	Y	3	1	0.7239	0.1591	20.7	<.0001		2.062
PRIM_FACT	Y	8	1	0.5335	0.4222	1.6	0.2064		1.705
PRIM_FACT	Y	G	1	-0.6747	0.2107	10.25	0.0014		0.509
REL_AIREMIS	Y		1	0.3838	0.0735	27.28	<.0001	0.1524	1.468
SC_ACID	Y		1	0.6764	0.1281	27.87	<.0001	0.1226	1.967
SC_AMMONIA	Y		1	0.6665	0.1625	16.83	<.0001	0.0963	1.947
SC_BASES	Y		1	0.5161	0.2107	6	0.0143	0.0533	1.676
SC_CHORLINE	Y		1	0.8852	0.2134	17.21	<.0001	0.0841	2.424
SC_OISC	Y		1	-0.6551	0.0976	45.05	<.0001	-0.2708	0.519
SC_OTHER	Y		1	0.385	0.1368	7.92	0.0049	0.0642	1.47
SC_OXYORG	Y		1	0.3609	0.1071	11.35	0.0008	0.0873	1.435
SEC_FACT	Y	1	1	2.3502	2.5676	0.84	0.36		10.488
SEC_FACT	Y	2	1	0.0123	2.5727	0	0.9962		1.012
SEC_FACT	Y	3	1	1.9573	2.575	0.58	0.4472		7.08
SEC_FACT	Y	4	1	0.1735	2.5675	0	0.9461		1.189
SEC_FACT	Y	8	1	1.3584	2.5712	0.28	0.5973		3.89
SEC_FACT	Y	A	1	0.7002	2.5668	0.07	0.785		2.014
SEC_FACT	Y	B	1	-0.8022	2.5887	0.1	0.7567		0.448
SEC_FACT	Y	C	1	-0.5688	2.5951	0.05	0.8265		0.566
SEC_FACT	Y	E	1	-5.4724	7.9975	0.47	0.4938		0.004
SEC_FACT	Y	F	1	-0.2557	2.577	0.01	0.9209		0.774
SEC_FACT	Y	I	1	0.00208	2.74	0	0.9994		1.002
SEC_FACT	Y	J	1	1.4371	2.5666	0.31	0.5755		4.209
SEC_FACT	Y	K	1	3.3018	2.5814	1.64	0.2009		27.163
SEC_FACT	Y	L	1	1.5423	2.5739	0.36	0.549		4.675
SEC_FACT	Y	N	1	0.8416	2.5592	0.11	0.7423		2.32
SEC_FACT	Y	O	1	-7.2505	45.3653	0.03	0.873		0.001
SEC_FACT	Y	P	1	0.1933	2.7746	0	0.9445		1.213
SEC_FACT	Y	Q	1	1.7903	2.5715	0.48	0.4863		5.991

Both the odds ratio and the p-values found in column “Pr > ChiSq” were used to discern which variables affect the occurrence of an injury and are still statistically significant. The variables with p-values less than 0.05 were filtered out and ranked in decreasing order by their odds ratio estimate. The results are given in Table 18.

Table 18 Reduced Variable List for Logistic Regression with Text Input

Parameter	Category	Category Description	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq	Standardized Estimate	Exp(Est)
_SVD_4			5.9036	0.4387	181.09	<.0001	0.3314	366.372
_SVD_1			5.6878	0.378	226.45	<.0001	0.486	295.234
_SVD_11			2.3812	0.4042	34.7	<.0001	0.1506	10.818
SEC_FACT	K	Explosion	2.2691	1.112	4.16	0.0413		9.671
_SVD_25			2.1992	0.5262	17.47	<.0001	0.1398	9.018
_SVD_24			2.0997	0.4458	22.19	<.0001	0.1593	8.164
_SVD_20			1.8752	0.4127	20.65	<.0001	0.1507	6.522
_SVD_23			1.6062	0.4209	14.56	0.0001	0.1774	4.984
NIND_CODE	17	Private vehicle or property	1.5191	0.3991	14.49	0.0001		4.568
_SVD_6			1.3335	0.4397	9.2	0.0024	0.0645	3.794
_SVD_29			1.0776	0.4578	5.54	0.0186	0.0643	2.938
SC_CHORLINE			1.0645	0.2409	19.53	<.0001	0.1011	2.9
_SVD_10			1.0116	0.3533	8.2	0.0042	0.0963	2.75
NIND_CODE	14	Professional services	0.877	0.2237	15.36	<.0001		2.404
_SVD_9			0.8092	0.3817	4.5	0.034	0.055	2.246
SC_AMMONIA			0.8093	0.1849	19.15	<.0001	0.117	2.246
NIND_CODE	9	Retail trade	0.7375	0.284	6.75	0.0094		2.091
PRIM_FACT	3	Operator error	0.5119	0.1868	7.51	0.0061		1.668
NIND_CODE	12	Personal services	0.5085	0.201	6.4	0.0114		1.663
REL_FIRE			0.4024	0.1546	6.77	0.0093	0.0453	1.495
REL_AIREMIS			0.3282	0.0884	13.78	0.0002	0.1304	1.388
PRIM_FACT	2	Equipment failure	-0.4227	0.1931	4.79	0.0286		0.655
PRIM_FACT	G	Intentional act	-0.5836	0.2345	6.19	0.0128		0.558
NIND_CODE	5	Transportation	-0.6431	0.3235	3.95	0.0468		0.526
NIND_CODE	4	Manufacturing	-0.6691	0.1776	14.2	0.0002		0.512
_SVD_31			-1.2139	0.5183	5.48	0.0192	-0.072	0.297
_SVD_17			-1.2473	0.4199	8.82	0.003	-0.1072	0.287
_SVD_15			-1.7313	0.4306	16.17	<.0001	-0.0975	0.177
_SVD_2			-2.5201	0.3756	45.01	<.0001	-0.1857	0.08
NIND_CODE	2	Mining	-2.7277	1.2407	4.83	0.0279		0.065
Intercept			-3.6029	1.057	11.62	0.0007		0.027

There are 15 SVD vectors that show statistical significance, 11 of which have odds ratios larger than 2.2 with a maximum of 366. The weights were reviewed for each of the 15

SVD vectors and no discernable conclusions could be drawn because clustered events and terms are not distinct enough.

The following observations are made based on these results:

- Only one secondary contributing factor (Explosion) was determined statistically significant.
- A private vehicle or property related event is 4.6 times more likely to result in an injury.
- Professional service events are 2.4 times more likely to result in injuries.
- Events related to retail trade, operator error, and personal services industries all are roughly 2 times more likely to have an injury.
- Chlorine events are 2.9 times more likely to result in an injury whereas ammonia events are only 2.2 times more likely to result in an injury.
- The only statistically significant release types are air emissions and fire, which are 1.5 and 1.4 times more likely to result in injury, respectively.
- Events caused by equipment failure and intentional act are respectively 1.6 and 2.0 times more likely NOT to result in an injury.
- Events in the transportation and manufacturing industries are 2.0 times more likely to NOT result in injury. Mining industry events are showing the occurrence of an injury is 37 times less likely.

Based on the listed findings, similar conclusions to the non-text logistic regression model results can be drawn. Note that the logistic regression model with text input did identify explosions as a statistically significant event.

6.4 Assess

Finally, the model comparison node was connected to the two regression nodes. The accuracy of the regression models were compared by applying the models to all data subsets (train, validate, and test). The logistic regression model with the text input was

determined to predict injury occurrences the best as can be seen by the higher lift in each dataset. Cumulative lift charts for the train, validate, and test sets are provided in Figure 10, Figure 11, and Figure 12, respectively. The lift in all three datasets is similar showing the models performed consistently.




Figure 10 Cumulative Lift Comparison for Train Dataset




Figure 11 Cumulative Lift Comparison for Validate Dataset




Figure 12 Cumulative Lift Comparison for Test Dataset

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations for this research are presented in this section.

7.1 Conclusions

Data mining proved to be beneficial in both describing the HSEES events and building a fairly good model to predict the occurrence of injuries. The following are some conclusions drawn based on the analysis:

- Although HSEES data is collected to *describe* the effects hazardous substance releases/threatened releases have on people, a fairly good predictive model was still obtained from the few variables identified as cause related.
- Visually exploring the data via bar graphs did not yield any noticeable patterns.
- Clustering the data identified groupings of categories across the variable inputs such as manufacturing events resulting from intentional acts such as system startup and shutdown, performing maintenance, and improper dumping.
- Text mining the data allowed for clustering the events and further description of the data, however, these events were not noticeably distinct and drawing conclusions based on these clusters was limited.
- Inclusion of the text comments to the overall analysis of HSEES data greatly improved the predictive power of the models. Interpretation of the textual data's contribution was limited, however, the qualitative conclusions drawn were similar to the model without textual data input.

Probably the most beneficial part of performing a data mining analysis on the HSEES data is having the capability to relate characteristics across several variable types to one another. Annual reports provided by ATSDR do not go into such detail—the annual reports describe the number of occurrences and percent distributions of event characteristics with some associations made to other variable types. For example, in the

2004 report, the percent of events with victims with respect to the number of substances present from a single category or more than one category was determined [7]. The data mining analysis was able to address questions with regard to types of events that occur without having to read individual data entries.

7.2 Recommendations

This study focused on identifying causal factors that result in injury, however, there are other potential studies that would be beneficial to explore such as:

- Use data mining techniques to *describe* the victim data.
- Translate the chemical quantities into a common unit, compare the quantities of each substance type to their corresponding permissible exposure limits (PEL) defined by OSHA, and incorporate these data into an analysis such that the consequence severity can be assessed.
- Use link analysis to build association rules for text comment entries and determine if there are any strong cause-consequence associations.
- Try different approaches to build more distinct clusters within the textual data such that more interpretable conclusions may be drawn.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Anand, N. Keren, M.J. Tretter, Y. Wang, T.M. O'Connor, M.S. Mannan, Harnessing data mining to explore incident databases, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 130 (2006) 33-41.
- [2] Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry, Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance (HSEES) Protocol, <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HS/HSEES/protocol030804.html> (last visited on 2008).
- [3] E.T. McCray, Chemical accident databases: What they tell us and how they can be improved to establish national safety goals, MS Thesis, Chemical Engineering Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 2000.
- [4] F. Al-Qurashi, Development of a relational chemical process safety database and applications to safety improvements, MS Thesis, Chemical Engineering Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 2000.
- [5] S. Anand, Novel applications of data mining methodologies to incident databases, MS Thesis, Chemical Engineering Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 2005.
- [6] T. L. Bunn, S. Slavova, L. Hall, Narrative text analysis of Kentucky tractor fatality reports, *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 40 (2008) 419-425.
- [7] Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry, Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance (HSEES): Annual Reports, <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HS/HSEES/> (last visited on 2008).
- [8] New York State Department of Health, New York State Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance Project, <http://www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/chemicals/hsees/> (last visited on 2007).
- [9] A.S.M. Obidullah, Use of incident databases for cause and consequence analysis and national estimates, MS Thesis, Chemical Engineering Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 2006.
- [10] J. Han, M. Kamber, *Data Mining: Concepts and Techniques*, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2001, pp. 1-7, 429-433.
- [11] *Introduction to Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, Two Crows Corporation, third ed., 1999, <http://www.twocrows.com/intro-dm.pdf> (last visited on 2008).
- [12] D.S. Coppock, Why Lift? Data Modeling and Mining, *DM Review Magazine*, June 2002, <http://www.dmreview.com/news/5329-1.html> (last visited on 2008).

- [13] R. Bibb, How to Interpret Modeling Results: Basics for the End User, DM Review Magazine, June 2001, <http://www.dmreview.com/issues/20010601/3479-1.html> (last visited on 2008).
- [14] SAS, SAS Enterprise Miner, <http://www.sas.com/technologies/analytics/datamining/miner/semma.html> (last visited on 2007).

VITA

Lisa M. Veltman received her Bachelor of Science degree in applied mathematical sciences from Texas A&M University at College Station in 2005. In August 2006, she entered the Safety Engineering program at Texas A&M University and received her master's degree in August 2008.

Ms. Veltman may be reached at Mary Kay O'Connor Process Safety Center, Texas A&M University, 3122 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843-3122. Her e-mail is veltlm@yahoo.com.