**Meeting Description:** Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting
**Date:** September 2, 2004                    **Time:** 10:00 a.m.
**Location:** Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room


I.        Approval of Meeting Minutes

II.       Geographic Framework Program
      A. Version 5
   Everett Root, Center for Geographic Information (CGI), reported last month CGI spent time updating roads in the Upper Peninsula (UP) using centerlines derived from 9-1-1 applications - new roads, names, and addresses.
      B.  Act 51 Process
   Everett Root, CGI, reported the Act 51 process has started.  CGI has received all the additions, deletions, jurisdictional transfers, and classification changes for all 83 counties.  CGI will begin updating.
   Jeroen Wagendorp, Grand Valley State University (GVSU), asked how is it comparing to the line work that came off the 1-meter imagery.
   Everett Root, CGI, responded that it is very close.  All CGI does is transfer over their names, if there is no name for the road, and do small adjustments.  It works well.  Woolpert
   Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, stated Barry County got 6-inch stuff from and put on top of the 1-meter stuff and it is amazingly close.
   Everett Root, CGI, added that it is starting out to be a conformation of what they have.
   Rob Surber, CGI, commented this has always been a weak point of the products because of the nature of the roads.  The companies that are working with the counties are also working with CGI.
   Everett Root, CGI, added that CGI gets the geography straight from the consultant or CUPPAD.  A couple counties are done with the addressing part.  Have to get the roads in line and then go back and pick up the rest of the roads.  Have to get Act 51 process done for January 1, 2005 delivery.  Addresses take longer to transfer over.
   Rob Surber, CGI, said if there is an interest in knowing which vendors CGI is working with, CGI can give out the information.
      C. Digital Ortho
   Sherm Hollander, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), reported the digital ortho quad (DOQ) project is wrapping up.  They got the imagery for the last two areas done by federal government and they are being reprojected.  The whole state will be up in a month or so.
   Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the plan is to replace a portion of the statewide Spatial Database Engine (SDE) layer with the updates in SDE 9.  Staff is working on the migration issues.
      D.  Partnership Update
   Everett Root, CGI, reported CGI is rolling along.  Have not solicited any formal partnerships.  CGI continues to receive updates and work out details of transfer of information.  CGI will present idea at the MiCAMP and follow-up on contacts later.
      E.  Regional Maintenance Concept
   Everett Root, CGI, reported in the past, since creation of framework in the 1990's, there was an attribute, feature, or geographic priority that would be distributed among the staff to work on and then move onto the next priority.  Now it is in a maintenance mode, CGI has established regional responsibility for staff.  There are 7 framework editors who are lead workers.  The state has been broken into 7 regions.  They will have the lead in any editing for the counties in their

regions. They will be responsible for updates, maintenance, quality control programs, and eventually outreach and making contacts with counties and regions. It will add a better level of organization to the process. They will take ownership of their areas. They have started meeting weekly. Have not established the communication part yet. The regional leads will eventually work with the federal contacts also.

Rob Surber, CGI, added the CGI contacts will have up-to-date information. CGI is working on an intranet site – as information becomes available it may be posted there. It is not just editing or managing data – it is managing relationships. The goal is to prop up the local GIS offices that might end up being a key contributor. Eventually CGI would like being a synchronizer or integrator of work. There will be just as much work but it will be a different type of work. That will be a paradigm shift for the CGI staff. Also thought about trying to minimize breaking regional planning commission.

Everett Root, CGI, added that they use planning regions. For example, the 3 in the Upper Peninsula are kept together; the 2 in the northern Lower Peninsulas are together, 2 in southwest Michigan, Tri-County Planning. If there were an active region group there would be less contacts. SEMCOG would have 3 contacts. It is still the largest region feature-wise.

Everett Root, CGI, commented that considered in the decision-making process were total features, physical reference (PR) roads, county, city, village, and township counts. Everybody has 2-300 units of government in their region and 100,000 road features. In the UP there are not as many roads but if get involved in hydro project then the person will have more to deal with.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that internally CGI needed to be onto something. CGI hope it is not just an internal benefit. CGI believes that it is a together effort to serve effectively. It is a combination of technical and relationships.

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, commented that she thinks this is a good approach. If there were things she wants to discuss that she thinks are wrong in the framework, would she work with contact.

Rob Surber, CGI, affirmed that was correct. CGI is not ready to give out the contact names yet.

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, stated that SEMCOG has 12 roads that have PRs that equal zero but they have address ranges still. SEMCOG has the OID number of the arc, but does not know the county they are in.

Everett Root, CGI, answered that she can still give it to him and he will pass it on to the contact.

III.     Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities
        A. Boundary Review Phase II

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that CGI is partnering with the MDNR on the boundary review process. Phase1 of the boundary review, MDNR is dong a review of external perimeter of all of their land holdings. Phase 2 is looking at parcel-by-parcel properties that they acquired through a number of state business processes. There is a tax reversion process where folks don't pay their taxes and the property comes back to the state. MDNR has been the holder of that process. Thousands of properties, parcel-based, are sitting in the system and are not all mapped. Now they are reviewing all of these over next 2-3 years. There is a pilot for Berrien and Dickinson Counties to review the land holdings. CGI helped develop an application to visualize the seamed parcels. There is a check-off system that goes to each division. A division, in the process of review, may be interested in the piece of land because it supports their mission. If nobody shows an interest, it may go for an executive review. This is just kicking off. MDNR is not trying to dump land but trying to be better stewards of what they have and this process will make them more aware of their properties. Other state agencies may be interested in them as well. CGI is

spatially enabling the parcels. A state agency or local may be interested if the property comes back on tax roles. Ten counties will be done at a time on a flow basis. MDNR is not necessarily selling but may swap properties. The plan is that there will be better parcel information of state properties and land holdings that can be useful to others as well. State parcels will be a state custodial role and relationship to any framework player – certainly the Public Land Survey System (PLSS) as a background too is an important layer within the framework, but not local parcel information. There are mutually beneficial roles; if you have the state parcels and have the locals working together there can be synergy. The information is not completely organized to facilitate that.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, commented that county treasury relationship with the townships as the tax reversion process comes to an end where property is sold off for back taxes. These are properties that the market has no interest in, so these are the worse of worse. That process from state to county to township or from township to county to state could be streamlined.

Chuck Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI), asked Sherm Hollander, MDNR, if MDNR has available through their sites regarding underwater preserves.

Sherm Hollander, MDNR, responded that boundaries were mapped quite a long time ago, but he has not kept up-to-date on it.

Chuck Bender, MSI, showed a little book available in dive shops. There are 11 preserves in the 2,300 square miles of the Great Lakes and there are 200 wrecks listed. There are maps that are basic drawings that identify the location of the wrecks, the depth, what type of diving certificate is needed, has latitude/longitude, date sank and depth. MDNR is referenced in booklet as a contact if people are found removing artifacts from the dive sites.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the governor's office contacted him because they had an inquiry from a remote sensing company that was promoting the idea that they could help do exploration for possibly more and they wanted permits. There seem to be three groups involved in the underwater preserve program and they share responsibility - MNDR, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) submerged lands group, and the History Arts and Library (HAL). Never concluded permitting comes from HAL.

IV. Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Projects and Activities

Everett Root, CGI, reported CGI received geographic information system (GIS) centerlines from all 3 of the federal forest's most recent files. They identify the road ownership and road names that CGI is comparing to framework. CGI is tagging in framework for all federal forest-owned roads. If CGI doesn't have them they are pulling them in, if they do have them they are transferring them over to get the coding right and flagging roads that federal and county unit of government are claiming ownership. CGI has Ottawa in the UP done. CGI worked with all 3 forests individually and got the geography.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated the hope is that framework and federal forest work together and maintain a relationship.

Everett Root, CGI, added the federal forest people gave CGI the outline of boundaries too.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that MDOT had to report federal roads in Michigan by way of spreadsheet to Washington. The original file shows an overlap of parties who claim them.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if the management of the boundary layer for forest roads has been developed and has the custodial relationship been developed. CGI has relationships with the local forest areas and unsure what that pipeline is on up to the federal level for management of data at the National Map level.

Charley Hickman, United States Geological Survey (USGS), responded that in terms of roads for national consistency they were going to use TIGER. But a lot of forest service roads that are

not in TIGER.  So they were going to take the best combination of TIGER and forest service roads for the National Map.

Rob Surber, CGI, clarified that he is asking about boundaries.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, added that the other layer the Census Bureau is going to give the National Map is the municipal and township boundaries.  Maybe the Department of Interior may be providing those for the National Map.  If land is added to a national forest, they are unsure how it gets into TIGER.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the Census Bureau is probably not the pipeline, even though they might be for the roads and boundaries.

Charley Hickman, USGS, stated that they probably get information from the Federal Forest Service headquarters.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that it is worth exploring - so there is not duplication of efforts.  What is the relation between the coding on the roads in the boundary and is that important for mileage?

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that it is hard to know for MDOT's benefit because they get the spreadsheet from the federal government with no miles on it.  Ottawa, Manistee, and Huron forest people were not aware of the spreadsheet either.  There are 150-220 miles of road on the spreadsheet that belong to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Fisheries and Wildlife are interested in them.  There is a handful in Michigan that is unknown.

Charley Hickman, USGS, mentioned that the National Park is one of them.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if anybody was involved with the Sleeping Bear dunes.  There is an activity underway to do management up there.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that for some of the miles they get very detailed information as to exactly where it is.  The Indian Affairs roads just get a summary of miles by county.  Not sure who to contact to find out where the roads are.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, stated that the Census Bureau collects the 11 Indian areas' roads information in Michigan.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI should look at the pipeline of data maintenance, because CGI would like to get it back into the framework, at least from the Census Bureau definition and CGI would put a disclaimer on it.  There are times when folks would like to know something about Indian lands.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, added they take the boundary that is recognized by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  There are tribes that claim a third of the State of Michigan.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated there is a lawsuit on the hunting rights issues.

Charley Hickman, USGS, commented that the Michigan framework can be efficient as far as roads and hydrography and boundaries.  It seems there are similarities in all on them.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported the PR Finder has been on the web for close to a month and is getting good reviews.  They can bring up photos and topography behind it.  It is public but has not been advertised outside MDOT very much.  The link is
http://mcgiweb1.mcgi.state.mi.us/prfinder/home.asp.  It is very much like Map Michigan but it has data regarding road numbers.  It also brings up imagery.  MDOT will be pushing the Transportation Asset Mapping System (TRAMS), which is web mapping of their data.  They are interested in getting average annual daily traffic (AADT) maps.  They currently have a PDF map on their web site and a paper map and now want to go to a live GIS map.

V.	Michigan Department of Environmental (MDEQ) Projects and Activities

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, reported that MDEQ formed MDEQ GIS committee to start trying to pull together what MDEQ is doing in their area.  The committee is similar to Michigan Department of Natural Resources' VIGIL.  John Esch is the chairman of the group.  Dave sees a

lot of replication of efforts – for example digital ortho photos.  NAIP is going to be flying, counties are flying at better resolution, and MDEQ is flying stuff with USGS.  Looking for ways to maximize what they get and are able to use.  It is nice to hear what is going on.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI is excited to see this.  MDEQ is a valuable part of this discussion.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, commented that there are data layers that MDEQ can offer down the road – for example historical land fills, deed restrictions, resource and land use restrictions.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated one thing that will be beneficial from the business side is that MDEQ is communicating and prioritizing.  There is more potential here than what is behind, for a number of reasons.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, added there are a variety of issues that he eventually wants to bring up – for example historic air photographs.  MDOT, Michigan State University, and Department of Agriculture have them and they are always doing paper searches and it would be great to have this data digitized.  MDEQ needs them for site clean-ups.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, added that various counties have taken the 1938 stuff and subsequent years and digitized, scanned, and georeferenced so they are ready to go seamless layers.

Dave Slayton, MDEQ, asked if the state could get access to county level effort.  How do we get everybody to use the same base map and the same digital ortho?

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that each community has a business model and everybody will not want to converge on one data model.  It may not be the right question or the right answer.  But there will be a convergence of inner operability.  Counties will want to maintain information to protect their interests.  Some have a model where they have to pay for their staff through data sales.

Bill Enslin, MSU, added that in the future there will be more web services and eventually counties will get involved with that.  There is a state contract for plat books information and you can envision that in the future there will be many contracts with different entities in the state to provide on-demand imagery.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that it will vary depending on the need.  CGI has taken the approach of should be safety net of minimum standards that would be available to anyone at any time.  The web service context is something that the state is interested in.  CGI will have presentations of new developments in future.  A lot of GIS will not be traditional GIS - it will be embedded in applications.  MDOT is now looking at a standard accounting process for projects that gets an invented map service in their application.  A purpose of this group is to kick issues around and push the envelope as to what is real and what is possible.

VI.     Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities
Jaclyn Burke, MSP Emergency Management Division, reported they are busy with E-team.
        A.  Michigan Homeland Security GIS Advisory Committee
Rob Surber, CGI, mentioned the Homeland Security GIS Advisory Group has been meeting and will report to the governor's Homeland Security Council.  The group conducted an assessment and received back 1/3-1/2 of the surveys that were mailed to 111 Emergency Operations Centers (EOC) in the state.  They have been keying information in.  The group is trying to come up with a plan to synchronize efforts of the EOCs and the GIS offices.  To date the EOCs have a big job on their hands and a lot of processes in place and E-team factors into that.  They could use GIS services beyond graphical reporting of an incident.  Through the assessment they have confirmed that GIS professional staff that the EOC could take advantage of but don't know anything about, don't know what data is available, and therefore being under-utilized in the case of emergencies.  The assessment is looking at GIS readiness of these

communities. The assessment was sent to EOC managers, GIS officials, and regional and state level. Hope to get a state-of-the-state of GIS readiness – tools, data, and human resources. What is a minimum GIS readiness standard for consistency standpoint, attribute standpoint, and a geographic layer standpoint, how current by layer and what are the risks, how complete is information, what are the exchange mechanisms, can bring up Intergraph files or does it have to be residing in native format because the speed is too slow. The group will mesh minimum readiness standard with current GIS assessment and will find the gaps. They have gone after grant money to plug those holes. One important component is sustainability. The group is committed to the long-term sustainability not just plugging holes. It is important that the locals and regions commit to make something happen. E-team is a tracking mechanism for instant management. The group is hopeful that this will be a companion product for E-team.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, commented that Rob mentioned the important stuff, but the intangible benefits will be forcing folks to work together and this would not have happened otherwise.

Rob Surber, CGI, added along with the sustainability issues, roads issues, and elections issues, Homeland Security issues do not go away in tight budget times. It is important for CGI to promote the GIS offices as much as possible. Hope some solid pipelines of value that the GIS agencies provide. The value is there but need to constantly remind folks of it being seen under these conditions.

## VII.    Department of Community Health (MDCH) Projects and Activities

Mike Hass, MDCH, reported they are mapping local/regional Strategic National Stockpile (SNS) planners. SNS is how drugs will be dispensed in an emergency – from the federal level down to the local level. Mike's most recent project is assisting regional SNS planners to figure out where the facilities should be. There is a multitude of criteria that needs to be met - loading dock, building size, population size, etc.

## VIII.    Michigan State Industry (MSI) Projects and Activities

Chuck Bender, MSI, reported they delivered a number of counties to MDOT for Right-of-Way project – they are working closure of that project. They are plugging away at 'As Built'. It is an on-going project. Fisheries of 60 lakes MSI has - 10 are completed and have to run them through an AML for metadata. They are also trying to get a drainage proposal status from MDOT.

Everett Root, CGI, stated there was on MDOT meeting and a discussion National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) from the Department of Agriculture (DOA) perspective of cross-county drains.

Chuck Bender, MSI, added that MSI presented the information to them and waiting for review.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that if they want information from CGI, Brett Nelson is the NHD representative.

Everett Root, CGI, added that Brett is soliciting drain information from counties and hope to do so at MiCAMP. The stuff they are working on now was stuff that Steve Miller had given them last year. Have Oakland, Wayne, Lapeer, and Gratiot counties' drain data.

Rob Surber, CGI, mentioned that for MDEQ drains are important activity. The drain commissioner as an elected office concept is unique around the country. The NHD folks are interested in this Michigan because of this component.

Everett Root, CGI, added that from the files CGI has gotten, there is work going on at the county level.

IX. CGI Projects and Activities

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that CGI finally got financial information worked out for the NHD. Brett Nelson, CGI, is the project manager. Call Brett if you have questions about the work that is being done or if you have information to share call Brett. The model that CGI is working with is a continuation of the MDNR, Institute of Fisheries Research (IFR) model that has been done with Forest Service for a third of the state. CGI is working with those standards. Don't know the connection between this and Macatawa work.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, remember there was a 2-day workshop a couple of ears ago and this would tie into that. There were fundamental arguments – for example when do you start mapping both sides of a stream. It would be nice to put some closure to it.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented there are standards are set and there was work done in Macatawa with United States Geological Survey (USGS) but he is not aware of the consistency. He is aware of what the group came up with and that is what should be followed. But unsure of what USGS did. There have been a lot of changes. Lidar was done by MDEQ but it may have been used. CGI has followed those standards and used that project to refine that and come up with a plan.

MRBIS II (boating recreation system) is up and live off Michigan.gov.

The Michigan Natural Features Inventory, nature conservancy process of reviewing the mapping part for endangered species will be up later this month. If you have an application that is near an endangered species, this will send an automatic response if it is not close to endangered species. This will keep things flowing.

Everett Root, CGI, reported that CGI did a school district boundary review for the Census Bureau back in March and April. Put the present school district boundaries on a web site, contacted all the school districts in the state and asked them to review and make changes. About 500 of 550 participated. Part of the process was that they would get a hard-copy map. The boundaries have been updated and are sitting in a statewide geodatabase base. CGI will generate maps with new boundaries over framework. PDFs will be on the CGI web site for viewing, downloading, and purchase if additional copies are requested.

Rob Surber, CGI, gave background of National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) sponsored workshop for a group of 14 northeast states. The goal is to do outreach to key elected officials at various levels of government and various sizes of government within each level as high a level of position as possible. Michigan gets 4 representatives (county, regional, city, and state representatives) and CGI is the lead. GIS information is being used at various levels of government but raster data is the weaker of the datasets. NASA wants to reach out to local and county governments and make use of this. What they want is to hear honest discussion about the impediments from elected officials. They will do some educating of folks and how they may not be aware of what's out there. They want a frank workshop about how to move forward. There are three business areas - water resources, economic development and planning, and homeland security. Michigan will have representatives from various levels that will plug into each one of the three areas. Will present the Allegan County project looking at road assessing to look at the drain field issue. That may plug into the business model at the local level. It is scheduled for October 26-28. The goal is to come up with a plan. Hope to come back with action items. NASA is working the channels to get influential people there.

X.     MSU Remote Sensing and GIS Research and Outreach Services Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU, reported that he retired July 1,2004 and was rehired at ¾ time with a soft money contracts and grants. He started his own company, Geopathways. It has obtained a distribution and development license from MSU for the Map Image Viewer (MIV). The sales to other entities will go through Pathways. There is a separate licensing agreement for MDEQ. The licenses provide latitude for support for help for the product and to develop spin-offs and look at future developments of the product external to research efforts that go on at MSU. There is a license agreement with MSU/MDEQ. Bill will continue working there ¾ time on the Well Head protection, Ground Water mapping, and they are wrapping up a project with Critical Sand Dune Management, which has lead to a new tool to work with the digital elevation module (DEM) and lidar data for constructing 3D elevation models. Bill will continue to attend meetings to represent MSU. Another project underway is the Health Impact Assessment Project. They are developing a checklist, protocol, and some software tools within the MIV but may also be used within ArcView and other GIS products to help guide a planner that is getting land development plans as to what the health issues and considerations should be considered when developing sites. This involves urban planning and landscape architects from MSU, Tri-County Regional Planning, Ingham Public Health Department, and MSU Extension. The pilot area is the tri-county area of Eaton, Clinton, and Ingham Counties. It will be 3-6 months out - in the data gathering phase now and traffic volumes are one thing interested in, which is not a standard framework file.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if this is a local health department driven or is it driven by some other group.

Bill Enslin, MSU, responded it is going to be a training workshop at some point where township planners in the Tri-County area will be invited. Ingham County Health piloted a non-GIS version.

Rob Surber, CGI, wondered if this is a part of a larger project or did Bill see the need and is now developing it and they will pay for it as a proceed license in the development of this tool or is there a program area that is going statewide.

Bill Enslin, MSU, stated the initiation force was Bob Gaato at Ingham County Public Health because he had done this work in the past and he could see health becoming a bigger issue. He said that important in some of the land use decisions being made in the state and the planners should be aware of the impact to health issues as to how the use assisted living facilities, how close to convenient stores, and traffic volumes through at different locations relative to that. It is not like a product development – it is a pilot project to get the check list, get data, get links, get protocol, identify what pool will be there to help a planner to extract important things to apply to their assessment.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, commented some of the township planners do not have the resources to use this.

Bill Enslin, MSU, responded that part of the interest in the MIV is that there will be individuals who will be part of the process who would have exposure to some of the health issues. +


XI.     County/Local Projects and Activities

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, reported that he left the employ of Allegan County on August 5. He accepted job as chair of geography planning at Grand Valley State University and is also teaching at Western Michigan University. Jeroen shared county activity with group because he is a conduit for county activity. Ottawa, Barry, and Allegan counties received 6-inch pixel material that will be forced down to the township level along with the MIV. Ottawa is still waiting for their products because there is lidar attached to it. Next week is the MiCAMP conference.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI is exploring video conferencing for the monthly meeting but it is only available at another location. It would make some sense, but right now the set up is not right.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, stated GVSU is the only public university in greater Grand Rapids metropolitan area. The university is not active as they could be in the GIS realm. All the public universities have ESRI licenses. There is a use charge even with discounts that all universities pay. There is a discussion how statewide licensing for non-profits and government alike that can be bundled. Currently Central Michigan University (CMU) holds the key to ESRI licensing for most universities. CMU plays that role for 15 state universities. Why not collapse the agreement that CMU has with the state and see if they can get better efficiencies.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the federal government is working on enterprise ESRI for state government and beyond.

Chuck Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI), added that if you haven't kept up your maintenance for a couple of years, ESRI will not allow you to buy a current one – have to pay for all previous maintenance to date. It is cheaper to buy new version than to get an upgrade. MSI had to buy a new version of 9 because for 3 years back it was going to cost them more to get up-to-date than to buy a new version. Then they were given the update for free. If you wait at least 3 years, it is cheaper to buy new. Version 8 did not have a problem but you could not spatially reference anything.

XII.     Regional Projects and Activities

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, reported they are finished processing Version 4b of the framework and they are going to update their server with the new files that they cannot extract out of it. SEMCOG is still using coverages, shape files, and AMLS. When they finish updating file on the server, they will streamline the process and they are considering using the Model Builder in ArcGIS 9. She will share with the group when she gets things documented. September 16 is the next regional GIS meeting. Took a survey of the Regional GIS group and based on the results, will make changes to the committee. They will take away the formality, parliamentary procedure; nameplates, chairperson and the group will become a technical GIS user group. They will meet once a year and put on workshop a couple times a year. Also considered doing an online newsletter twice a year. The annual meeting would be at the end of the year and maybe try to get ESRI more involved. SEMCOG will provide administration role and communication. The workshops would probably move around the region. They are still working on the geodatabase migration – cleaning up and organizing data. They need to wrap up the 2004 ortho flight in the next couple months. They are still going through the SEMCOG approval process – Friday it was approved by the Finance and Budget Committee and later in the month it will go before the Executive Committee. They will meet with the partners in October. The selection committee chose Earthdata to do the flight.

Rob Surber, CGI, added this is one model where the state has contributed money to a regional flight for a product that all agreed on. It is not a statewide model, but they are looking for opportunities around the state.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, commented that the same cost sharing approach was offered to the 3 counties.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated the federal government could be a potential partner.

Ann Burns, SEMCOG, reported that the partners for their spring 2005 flight are, the 7 counties, SEMCOG, Detroit Water and Sewer, and the State of Michigan and possible the federal government (who may come in late) depending on their budget.

Rob Surber, CGI, added the state agencies have access to the seamless regional 2-foot, 1-foot and 6-inch file.

David Slayton, MDEQ, said he would talk to Rob after the meeting about questions about other things in the pipeline.

XIII.    Federal Projects and Activities

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, reported the Census Bureau is planning to release the next public version of TIGER this month.  This will be the first release of TIGER that will have some of the Michigan counties that have gone through the road realigning process.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented CGI is going to start linking the Census Bureau additional data right into framework automatically because of the spatial relationship.

Everett Root, CGI, asked if the TIGER release will have the 2000 voter precincts.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, responded that when they get closer to the release, they will put out the metadata and it will state what it included.  When it is released, he will advise Everett Root, CGI.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that CGI will keep the group posted on the developments because CGI would like to start working with the IDs and do transactional work.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, asked if there was potential for the uninformed people who will expect TIGER to mesh seamlessly.  For the counties up north in search for free data is there potential for confusion.  For the uninformed individual it is a bunch of line work so it must be okay.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded it is something to explore as it becomes more out there, as to this is TIGER and this is framework.  There will be a big union of the two and there will be areas that will be unique to census and areas unique to framework.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, stated if you go back to 10 years ago, when the big conflation thing was happening – have we come full circle.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded he thinks we are closer than ever.  But have not seen any yet.  It will be a good presentation at a conference.  That was the goal that there would be a pipeline across the nation.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, commented he thinks there is confusion about what the Census Bureau takes from local and state government files.  TIGER is what it is and they want to reposition roads but there is other information coming from local files and they have to make a decision whether to use or not.  Some decisions are made by taking all the attributes and putting them aside and down the road they will decide whether to use them or not.

Rob Surber, CGI, volunteered if appropriate, CGI can sit on a group to explore those issues.  The minute you say that you need it to be certified a certain way, CGI would like to work it from their end to met the criteria.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, asked if framework has become the basis for TIGER at least for the line work.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, responded for alignment of the line work it has but attribution-wise they are still working on.

Jeroen Wagendorp, GVSU, commented that you could download the new TIGER and it should plop on top.  It is a benefit and a liability.  On top to the untrained eyes it may look close enough.  Now there are two sets of attributions and people won't understand it.


Charley Hickman, United States Geological Survey (USGS), reported they reorganized and hope to put a person in Lansing to be the liaison to work with Michigan.  Now it will be delayed about 90 days because of the reorganization.  The USGS mapping component, the national map, will be in same group that had the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FDGC) and the geo-spatial one-stop.  This will make it easier to understand what is going on at the federal level.  There is a new FDGC newsletter online at www.fdgc.gov.  One thing about Michigan it shows

where grants were awarded for framework programs and CGI applied and did not get the award. The City Connect Detroit group won an award. The category was Institute Building and Organization. There is an opportunity to review the FDGC framework standards now through October 30. It is on the website and the 7 framework categories are elevation, ortho imagery, geodetic control, hydrography, transportation, cadastral, and governmental unit boundaries. There is a meeting for the Great Lakes Regional Data Exchange meeting sponsored by the Great Lakes Commission October 26-28. The first day is workshops and you do not need to sign up for the conference to attend. Their photo lab in Sioux Falls is closing and that had some impact on the last bit of imagery for Michigan for the MDNR. The USGS is trying to find ways to get the order in earlier. They are backed up on federal requirements coming from the Department of Defense and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for more data from Grand Rapids and Flint. Charley was not able to attend the National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) but thinks that Steve Aichele attended. There is interested in scanned digital versions of historical maps that USGS and others have.

   David Slayton, MDEQ, stated that various agencies were involved in trying to get money to help fund the NAIP flight for next summer. Where should the state spend their money to get the base map?

   Rob Surber, CGI, responded that all the principal stakeholders are meeting this afternoon to try to come up with some funds. NAIP is interested in half the state. The goal is to put together enough money to fly the whole state. It would be leaf-on at 1-2 meter resolution. There are a lot of good opportunities available and trying to make sense of them all. One of the key things is to make sure the information is available to all.

XIV.      Other Issues
   Nothing

XV.  Next Meeting Date
   October 7, 2004, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48933