Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting
Date: December 14, 2000 **Time:** 10:00 a.m.
Location: Romney Building, 10th Floor, Michigan Information Center Conference Room

I. Approval of November Meeting Minutes

There were two corrections to the October meeting minutes. Steve Miller, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), clarified that MDEQ does not have grant monies available. Terry McNich, Michigan Technological University (MTU), stated that MTU is not a go-between for the Michigan Department of Transportation and the counties. They serve the role of developing the software only.

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Phase 2 Status

Rob Surber, Michigan Information Center (MIC), reported that 81 counties are complete. Oakland County reached identity point. This is a major milestone with reconciliation with transportation network and attributes. Anticipate completion of Wayne and Oakland Counties for an end December or mid-January timeframe. Oakland County will probably finish after Wayne County. Allen Park is the only community left to do in Wayne County. MIC is waiting for Livingston and Macomb Counties to be completed by Michigan State Industry (MSI).

Joyce Newell, Michigan Department of Transportation, commented that their department has Livingston and Macomb Counties is editing the work.

B. Polygon Build / Act 51 / Seaming Update

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that Phase 3 work includes polygon building, current ACT 51 update, and reconciliation of geography data at county lines is all complete except for the SEMCOG area and Jackson County. Seaming is being focused in southeast Michigan. Counties like Saginaw, Midland, Newaygo, and Montcalm will be done quickly because most of the work around them has been done. MIC anticipates completion of SEMCOG area in the spring. MIC is now distributing files for other parts of the state.

C. Repositioning Update

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that MIC has 2 counties currently being repositioned and will be going throughout the entire state to correcting position of lines to a consistent scale of 1:24,000 with digital ortho photography products. Some counties will be better depending on the sources being used. All features are being done – hydro, rail, transportation base, and political boundaries.

Everett Root, MIC, added that a framework classification code that identifies different types of features because repositioning has given the opportunity to check more closely. Lisa Dygert, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, reported today that they are moving every arc that has a visible feature on the photo to move it to. When there is something on framework that is not on the photos, it will be flagged. MIC brought over the 40-acre grid, which is a nice area for viewing.

Bill Enslin, Michigan State University Remote Sensing and GIS, asked if there have been any additions or deletions.

Everett Root, MIC, responded that are islands that don't show up. 2-tracks that cannot be seen on the photos will be flagged. The photos that the MIC has now are older and they will be apprehensive about making additions or deletions from those. When they get to the 1998-99 photos they may move forward with additions and deletions. If 2-tracks are seen on the photos that are not in framework, they will not added at this time.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that the MIC would try to come up with documentation that identify decisions made and will be made available so that an opportunity for feedback will be

given. MIC met with Land and Water Management and they agreed to review questionable shoreline issues. If 2-tracks are an issue, would like to hear from people.

Eric Swanson, MIC, asked why we are doing 2-tracks.

Everett Root, MIC, added that MIC is repositioning 2-tracks where they can be seen on the photo – if cannot be seen, they will be given a special classification to flag them because they are probably a Level 2 from Michigan Resource Inventory System (MIRIS). The area MIC is currently working has 1992-93 era, which is 10-year old data.

Mike Donovan, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), commented that the issue that MDNR has is that many of the state lands are that the old base has an under representation of 2-tracks. This is a major piece of data if collected.

Everett Root, MIC, responded that MIC could do a number system to indicate number of 2-tracks found in photos that are not in framework.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that he thinks the MIC should do that and after they finish the 2 counties being worked on, they will have a better sense of what falls out and can go back and add them.

Mike Donovan, MDNR, commented that it also brings up another question – for example, in Cheboygan County a lot of 2-tracks have been named as county roads, have they been incorporated into the framework?

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that they have been claimed as county roads.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that prior roads that have been named are in there. So the issue is about roads that are unnamed.

Everett Root, MIC, clarified that MIC has no source for data that is not in framework but does appear in the photo. Anything in framework has been researched as much as possible, but may be left nameless. MIC has U.S. Forest Service maps that have been put on - anything that they can find at this point.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that if MIC see a 2-track on a photo that it should be taken into consideration as we are moving through this. Doesn't want MIC to go back and redo the whole thing, but need to consider the consequences.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that referencing changes need to be considered and whether they intersect with existing roads. This will have to be addressed with current workflow.

Everett Root, MIC, stated that the problem is trying to find names.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that lots of the 2-tracks do not have names, but are major 2-tracks.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if it is on the map already.

Dave Tijerina, Lansing City Assessor, asked what major cause of repositioning is – does new information come in?

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that that is part of it. Original digitized line work from the graphic maps from the MIRIS program was brought in. Some features came from TIGER files which is a Census product and had positional problems. There were also other varying sources. MIC is going through to check there is consistent accuracy.

Dave Tijernia, Lansing City Assessor, asked if repositioning as a project compares in scope to Y2K?

Rob Surber, MIC, stated this is a 1-year project to complete. Estimate one county per month with 9 people, but don't have a final figure yet. There are other benefits to the project. It is part of the framework program and will be a benefit to all state agencies, cities, and counties.

Dave Tijerina, Lansing City Assessor, stated that he has been trying the convince city council to establish a survey grade grid with global position system (GPS) points for the city so they don't have to reposition in 3 or 4 years.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that other cities and counties have done that and suggested that Dave look at their business cases to see how they progressed.

Dave Tijerina, Lansing City Assessor, commented that the latest issue of IMAGIN news highlighted Macomb County and they were asked what they would do differently if they were to start over. They said they would build a grid to start with. Does MIC have a lot of resources and manpower to assign to repositioning.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that MIC would have 10 or more people on it over the course of the next year. It is a big job, but it is one where the benefits will be realized immediately. With GPS technology will get more reliable locations.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that she has been asked if MIC would have use of data from GPS driven roads. Gary Baker, U.S. Department of Transportation, is planning to send people out in cars to check driving speeds and would like to use GPS data on a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) product. Joyce gave Gary Eric's name and phone number to contact. MDOT has been driving roads and will continue and wondered if MIC is interested in the data.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that the biggest area of need is new construction that comes in after the photos. For example, it would be nice to have drive lines for the by-pass around Cadillac. MIC was able to get the 27 by-pass in sooner because of people drove it. Part of it may be MDOT's business decision. There may be use for the measurement data but not the line work. Some of the mileage distances on the trunkline are arrived from actual drive miles and this might be an added benefit.

D. Digital Ortho Order

Everett Root, MIC, reported that MIC has received the 350 quarter quads that were ordered. They were mostly for the Upper Peninsula and down around the state line. They have all been reprojected into Michigan GeoRef and put onto CD. MIC did set of Dickinson County in state plane for CUPPAD and are in the process of doing Schoolcraft County and the eastern two-thirds of Alger County. These are color infrared photos in state plane. The state plane copies were sent off, but it is on tape and it can be copied off. MIC will keep set of Michigan GeoRef on CD.

E. Ottawa County Partnership

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that MIC went to Ottawa County who is starting a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) program for parcel mapping and will be developing a centerline base map using framework as starting point. Ottawa County will add Metadata, attributes, addressing, road names, reposition, etc. MIC met with them to discuss standards that have been used. MIC is excited because this represents another way to update framework.

Everett Root, MIC, added that the county is getting a digital parcel layer created by a vendor that will flow to them one township at a time. The county will use that as a reference as well as the photos. The county will start with two staffers who will learn it and then they will add more.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that there will be challenges, but all will learn lessons from it.

F. Council of State Governments Meeting Recap

Eric Swanson, MIC, reported that the Council of State Governments met in Dearborn, MI. Nine state departments including MSU were represented and showed their GIS applications. The applications were well received. The highlight of the meetings was that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court looked at the demos and requested a map, which Mary Lannoye, State Budget Director, will present to her. The Secretary of State, Candice Miller, spent time at the display. The work of 9 agencies was displayed and it was impressive because of the diversity. Legislative staffs from other states were impressed by the unity of state government.

G. Sufficiency Control Section Reconciliation and Posting

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that MDOT collects information on roadways. A major input mechanism is actual driving of roads to rate the roads. Data is posted into control sections, but this is a different set of control sections than those that have been posted in the current framework. This is important data input for integrating information about roads, MIC is reconciling MDOT's control sections with current set that is in framework to create one set to

map sufficiency and the other applications that framework is currently supporting. MIC is also adding a rating sections, which is an attribute applied to sub-sections, on roadways will be posted directly in framework. This is more information that can be used for mapping and analysis. It will take few weeks for the work to be completed for the Upper Peninsula and a few weeks for the northern area. This is not a major effort, but it is an important one. There is staff assigned to this task only.

H. Framework Map Mailing to RoadSoft Users

Rob Surber. MIC, reported that MIC did large mailing of framework maps to a lot of Roadsoft users, which included county and city engineers.

Everett Root, MIC, stated that 60 county road commissions received maps and 15 of them have returned their maps and also 7 cities requested and received maps. There are more requests to be filled. The recipients are given a set of instructions and asked to look at names and topology. The engineers are familiar with the legal system and functional class and also looking at that. They then write changes on the maps before returning and several have included small maps to indicate new and/or private roads.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the data is incorporated into framework. MIC is trying to get in before official release.

Everett Root, MIC, commented that if a county is in the seaming process, MIC can get changes added during workflow. Can add changes to some of the superior region, but it will not be reflected in Version 1.

I. Framework Versions

Rob Surber, MIC, distributed a copy of the Michigan Geographic Framework (MGF) Version Proposal proposing how framework versions will be identified. It is something that MIC will continue to work on. This is the first time documentation has been distributed outside of MIC and Rob would appreciate comments and suggestions. There is a 3 level version identification number being worked on. This does not replace Metadata. Most people will look at what version is being worked with.

- Level 1 - annual complete re-issue of the physical referencing and all other MGF edits.
- Level 2 – delivered for the purpose of reciprocal data exchange. This level involved a physical referencing update
- Level 3 – delivered for the purpose of reciprocal data exchange. This level involves attribute splits (new nodes) on existing roads (represented by the number) and/or off-road topological changes or attribute-only changes (represented by the small alpha).

Regarding Level 1 - some agencies want an annual release. Some agencies don't want a lot of intermediate releases because it is more work and they will resynchronize annually. Regarding Level 2 – involves where MIC touched the physical referencing of the road or hydro networks and it has been altered or edited in some way. There are specific change transaction policies and keep track of every edit made to the file. If agencies want to do data processing changes integration work, they will have to step through all of this and the version will be very important. This will be available on demand. Regarding Level 3 – if MIC has not updated referencing, but has done work. A version number will only be reissued when a partner authorizes official release of the information. Unsigned versions may be distributed if there is a request for a current copy of a file. This will be big job but MIC is committed to.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if this would be done on a county basis.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that even though this is a statewide product, most people will work at the county level, even state government. If an agency wants an official release of a specific area, they would be given the most recent versions available for that area. But if they request a statewide official release, they would receive the same version number across the state in order to get a seamed product. The year is purposely not added to the version because may be

interpreted differently. The file Metadata would show which attributes have been touched. MIC is still finishing release 1 and are trying to get all of the state to 1.1.a.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that there would be an official statewide Version 1 when work is complete on Wayne and Oakland Counties.

Bill Enslin, MSU, asked if there is any new information about plans to move to geo database.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that there are over the course of the next year. SDE is up and running and MIC is developing a couple different test environments. Will also be testing Windows 2000 and a number of different things in parallel. They are looking at mid-summer to make firm commitment to a new development environment. By then MIC will have tested the functions and capabilities needed, that will include testing of the geo database. Will be using the geo database with SDE and editing tools in small sections of the state, then bring it together to see how fast it is and other issues (check in check out). The goal is to continue developing, editing and repositioning in the current environment for the next year. But hope to move everything into SDE and new geo database model by the end of 2001. Shouldn't be any down time to edit and release data. If anybody has experience in this, Rob would appreciate any advice.

Mike Donovan, MDNR, asked if MIC had considered an unversion release.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that he is not a fan of that idea, but anticipates pressure. But MIC will be firm and will not be able to accept information back easily unless agency pays for redevelopment of product. There may be pressure to provide something even though it is not an official release, and MIC cannot guarantee any use of it at the state level.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that if MIC can't provide an official version a new set of data, a county may start doing things on their own. It will defeat the purpose of trying to keep coordination. MIC cannot keep up with everything. If MIC has a version and has not had time to make it official, but others add to it because of project deadlines. They may need to progress and will make changes, but need to be made aware that MIC may not be able to take the file back

Rob Surber, MIC, added that MIC could get Freedom of Information Act (FIOA).

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that this could introduce an element of sloppiness. MIC is committed to doing versioning and to help agencies reconcile their data and move back and forth. With most agencies, the commitment is there on both sides.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the MIC is not able to cut new versions every week. There will be limits, but MIC is committed to trying to meet agencies half way.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that a year from now if the MIC is truly in the versioning mode, things could change as things evolve.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the purpose in support of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) concept of working together and keep track and area integration is the spirit of the whole initiative.

III. Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities

Mike Donovan, MDNR, reported that after the first of the year, they are expecting digital ortho quarter quad (DOQQ) product from the joint purchase from the innovative partnership (IP). This would fill in the holes in the Upper Peninsula, Cheboygan and Emmet Counties. National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps have finished initial digitizing of the Upper Peninsula would be available in spatial data library soon. Then there will be complete coverage except for a couple quads were not done in west end of Upper Peninsula and there are pieces missing - land in Menominee County and an island that are Michigan property but they fall on a Wisconsin quad. The GIS Coordinating Committee funded the MSU Regional Earth Science Application Center (RESAC) Program, which is a National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) funded program to develop a web based air photo viewing and ordering system. The technology is

demonstration on the MSU RESAC site on the web. MDNR is piloting the development in Otsego County. It would take MDNR's archives that have been scanned by a contractor, into an ArcIMS SDE viewing system into the web. Will be able to view in real time with a MrSID image viewing technology. A photo could be selected and be able to print out an order form. Initially it would be a manual order process, but would become an e-commerce activity. MDNR is now spending a lot of time in their aerial photo area giving high quality service to a small number of people. This may increase their market.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that there have been discussions with NASA, MDNR, and MSU about building a statewide inventory archive. Mike discusses a piece of that archive, but Eric has a bigger concept. There is an opportunity with the satellite imagery and soon will have a digital ortho archive started. Bill Enslin, MSU, has historical air photo archive at MSU and local governments are developing imaging archives and down the road where the state fills in the balance of state, local governments that have already done their own work, will want to be repaid, which cannot be done. But there is a real opportunity that if there is an imagery program established for the state with significant state funding there may be potential for local matches. At the NASA conference, the draft solicitation was out for state and local governments. There is an operational interest to get NASA funding for a project, which is almost duplicate to what MDNR is doing.

Mike Donovan, MDNR, commented that it is the same technology. MDNR went to RESAC, which is a 3-state effort, because MSU has proven the technology application. MDNR is putting their data behind it and customizing the interface. MDNR is acquiring satellite imagery for the redevelopment of the forest landscape inventory system. There is a lot of potential for a cooperative effort.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that MIC had staff do initial investigation on server technology to house ortho photos. It would be a big expenditure ($1 quarter million) to do correctly. It is important to get primary players together.

Mike Donovan, MDNR, reported that MDNR released a satellite derived land cover for northern Lower Peninsula on their state data library. This done as part of the GAP Program, which is a United States Geological Survey USGS) program that the MDNR has been participating in. It is based on 1993 satellite imagery. MDNR has developed a projector extension, an easy to use tool, which combines the ArcView projector with the add-on extension to give an easy-to-use pick list to work with Michigan GeoRef. This is downloadable under the software area of the spatial library.

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

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that MDOT looked at the Highway Pavement Management System (HPMS) identification program that Alden Leatherman, MIC, is working on to code in segments to rate roadways. Expect to have final changes on that soon. They have had inquiries from their finance department. HPMS is a federal program and MDOT is required to submit data about highways that influences funding that the state receives. The finance department must report how spend the money. Effective October 1 of next year will begin referencing projects to route numbers. In the past 94 Michigan Accident Location Inventory (MALI) were used. Will be changing the linear referencing system that is sent to Washington to correspond to framework, finance will need to begin using those PR numbers and will have to start reporting each project by physical reference (PR) numbers. The map database will then have to relate to reference number. A 3-step process has been proposed. (1) Web-based state map is needed that people can go to, point to where the roadway project is, and it will provide PR numbers and mile points related to their project. (2) The data must relate back to the map base. (3) Must be able to

process and plot all projects for management. They may be looking for additional help on step 1 of the process.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked who MDOT expected to be the users of the web base.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded users are accountings, regions, MTOs, local agencies and anyone who submits projects. Ron Vibbert, MDOT, is reviewing. Current map database is not set up to accept PR numbers and mile points. Every project has a job number and that could be used as a referencing number to get to the area on the map. Joyce check on the 'As Built Plans' to be scanned and attached to framework. More projects have been added to the scan contract and the contract has not been signed yet. Should start getting CDs the beginning of the year. MDOT has also been charged with reproducing control section atlas. The last control section atlas was produced in 1993 and the last PR atlas was produced in 1995-96.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that the purpose is that the users are contractors and people who work on projects with MDOT. The engineering firms would need to know how to refer to it in their proposal. External customers use this atlas a lot. It is a great way to show that framework can produce maps. A lot of work up to this point has been data base integration and this is a nice by-product. The atlas is trunkline for state highway activity.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that when this was originally looked, MIC got involved with labeling in ArcView. It was estimated that it would take 18 months. John Clark, MDEQ, had written scripts to do auto labeling. Now it looks like 1 person can do labeling in 3 months to do statewide county-by-county maps.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that there would not only be a book but also get a PDF files for the web.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that for future project modifications, it would be more efficient because labeling would have been done.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that before it was done by MDOT mapping and drafting area on a cad type system, which is no longer available.

Dave Tijerina, Lansing City Assessor, asked if there is technology to look at the 496 closure to see how to reroute traffic and how it will impact other streets.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, suggested that Dave start with Tri-County or Jim Brush, MDOT.

V. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Project and Activities

Steve Miller, MDEQ, reported that ArcIMS SDE has been converted to Windows 2000 without problems. One interface program that doesn't work on Windows 2000 but there are other options.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked if it works more efficiently on a multi-processor.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, responded that they do not have a performance test before and after to document. It was not an issue to them, this was the direction that the department was taking. They are working on 1-Stop Grant that MDEQ has for trying to consolidate permit efforts. Address ranges and important and there are funds in the 1-Stop Grant for MIC to clean up address ranges to help MDEQ with address matching in consolidation coordination.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that MIC has shared data with GDT and had been looking at Ottawa County where there is a pilot with Hudsonville and Port Sheldon to reconcile Qualified Voter Files (QVF) address ranges with framework. This was completed. Then reconcile GDT work to that work. There are pros and cons.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that MDEQ relies more and more heavily on address ranges. It is an issue. There are funds and MDEQ needs to start looking at it. John Clark, MDEQ, is very interested in purchase for Spot imagery and MDNR is also interested. This was discussed at a previous meeting and it is very reasonably prices for 10-meter statewide.

Eric Swanson, MIC, responded that Spot has put out 10-meter statewide imagery is approximately $60 thousand. Licensing agreement can be shared across governmental agencies - federal through local. If we buy in now, in 4 years can buy for twice the cost for 5-meter imagery. It looks very reasonable. Eric wants to evaluate with the potential of the NASA grant. There are some utilities at the state level that don't have this as a backdrop. Eric would like to have statewide imagery if MIC were to use combined funds that are already available.

Mike Donovan, MDNR, commented that from the MDNR perspective is not a fit for anything that they can think of right now, but might in the future. The price is good. In terms of processing classification, they don't see an enhancement. In terms of a visual display, hand sharpening could be done. For state lands, they are already looking for a much finer resolution imagery now.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, commented that Land and Water would use Land Satellite (LANDSAT) '98 data and combine with Spot Imagery and do a classification statewide. It is not the level of detail, but it is statewide coverage.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that John Wesa, MDOT, is going to continue to talk to Spot about a proposal to keep this as a raw data file versus a processed data file. Eric would like discussion about this. Close to being able to do this as a backdrop. It is 1999-2000 imagery. MIC, through combined funds, can do this to benefit all.

Dave Tijerina, Lansing City Assessor, questioned the resolution. Did not realize that the Upper Peninsula has a need for high resolution. But it is needed to find 2-tracks in Upper Peninsula and in the city it is needed to distinguish one property from the next.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that everybody is moving toward better resolution. This gives consistent statewide coverage now, but doesn't replace detailed needs at this time.

VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

Eric Nischan, MSP, reported that the Emergency Management Division has their servers. Now they are educating people that this is not a 'plug and play' process. Also looking at SDE and are testing the implementations. They are working with SAIC to get implemented, Eric will be doing testing alone. They are estimating being operational next year. There are in a holding partner until their system is running. Criminal Justice Information Center is restructuring and have a new person, Amy Alderman. Their mapping project is also on hold.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that they are working on crash Internet mapping and that is going out for bid.

Eric Nischan, MSP, added that they had state emergency because of the snow. Maps were developed on data from county emergency managers. Some sent in wrong forms and Department of Management and Budget decided to close state offices that should not have been closed.

VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Rob Surber, MIC, reported to Carol Woodman, MSI, who could not make it because of the weather. MSI has received the two counties and are waiting for Wayne and Oakland Counties.

VIII. MIC Projects and Activities

A. Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Initiative

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) tried to operationalize the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) at the federal level. One initiative that Wayne County has been lead in is to look at the relationship between county, state, federal governments in support of the modernization of TIGER and how the framework project could help with that. MIC met with leaders of the Census Bureau, OMB, Wayne County, and

SEMCOG. They discussed where direction and how to interface to develop a better TIGER product for enumerating data on an on-going with global position system (GPS) receivers in the hands of data collectors in the field. This falls in line with the Census Bureau's goals for the next decade. The challenge is to come up with a community survey, which is an ongoing census to provide on-going adjustments every 10 years. To do that they need better addressing map data. The Census Bureau has copies of the Wayne County framework and centerline, and a standards documents. The Census Bureau will review and then after the first of the year will discuss model differences and standards and how to work together. Part of the goal is to develop tools and techniques. The state is doing this now and there might be benefits to develop tools and techniques that are web enabled that other counties can tie into for a method of updating, flagging and posting information. Then send the data through the state and then to the federal government. Rob brought up the importance of 'sign off' and the officialness of things. The Census Bureau gets beat up because they have to get 'sign offs' by local units of governments. Certification is an important part of the process. The OMB initiative is to fund several demonstrations around the country. Rob is hopeful that Michigan will be chosen. OMB will send forms to be filled out stating what Michigan plans to do. After submission of completed forms, the plan will be evaluated. Whether this is funded by OMB or not, MIC feels that there may be benefit to the exposure possibly nationally and helping others.

B. Redistricting Project

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC has been working with democrats and republicans from the House, Senate, and the governor's office to pull together data from the census TIGER files and public law data, which is the demographic data used for reapportionment. MIC wants to integrate framework with the new census. MIC has evaluated redistricting software, and has selected a common software, Autobound, for all parties to use. These people are used to working with census CDs and not their own data. Michigan also developed historical data sets of election voting data.

IX. Regional Projects and Activities

Nobody present.

X. MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU, reported that MSU is building Metadata for digital rastor graphics (DRG) quads. That work is complete. Bill offered to bring next time. It is an ESRI shape file that has date that has the date DRGs were scanned, the date of the MDNR topographic quad that was used for the land cover mapping, scale of the quad, contour interval, and the quad name. It is complete and can be FTPd. They are working on a map image viewer. MDEQ has meeting mid-February to roll out the viewer with data sets. MSU is working on adding Metadata for layers to go with it and documentation. They re-worked the backdrop imagery so that it now has a pick list. If they have multiple thematic mapper images, they can automatically select within the application to change the backdrop image and edit the MrSID support as well. MSU spent a lot of time on MDNR's spatial data library, which is a great resource, downloading most layers to test to see if they can be added very easily within the viewer. Instructions will be included on how to add own data sets to the viewer. This worked out fine and is a great resource to have in the state. Have been successful in getting Oracle 8I, the spatial data engine, and ArcIMS up and running.

Mike Donovan, MDNR, asked if there is information on the coordination of the processing of non-certified soil status.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that Dave Lusch is working on a county source water project and cleaning up non-certified soils. Unsure of the status, but when finished with them, the intent is to

get them back to MDNR. MDEQ has been struggling with the attributes and found that even when using the certified attributes in GIS environment there are problems. It has been a good test, because they have been exercising the data, finding errors, and cleaning them up. The goal is have done by February. Steve complimented MDNR on their spatial data library - it is great for the state.

XI. County / Local Projects and Activities

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, commented that he has been contacted by GDT once every month for the last two years. Wonders why they are working the state and the counties at same time.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that it is a competitive business. They are feeling each other out to see where both fall. MIC wants to see something good for the state.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated there may be opportunity for some exchange. Eric's primary interests with GDT or another private sector vendor are that the state won't get tied up in proprietary restrictions.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, added that he would like to stay abreast on this. If Jeroen creates a point file for every structure in Allegan County with an address, it would be worth a lot of money. Jeroen is responsible to the board who would want to see some sort of return on it. Address ranges don't work in real context unless you readdress the entire county, which is not feasible.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that a MIC staffer is talking at SEMCOG GIS Advisory Committee today about the addressing draft legislation to get their feedback.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, asked when MIC takes the drivers license file and bounce it off geocoding what is the hit rate.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that is 90% statewide.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that a lot of the data is based on address file that goes in. The Health Department file is real good. Statewide address files are 86-90% and when we get to Wayne County, which is a stable urban area, it is 95-96%.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that MIC checks the accuracy location. The more rural areas are less precise. More work needs to be done. It will vary. MIC tried to put Metadata on for clients who care about it to give a measure of competency.

Dave Tijerina, Lansing City Assessor, reported that the City of Lansing Assessor's Office is interested in all these matters. They are in the middle of coordinating address ranges and comparing data bases with utility companies and post offices. They are hiring a new computer person and will bring him to the meeting next month. They just purchased ArcInfo 8 and are interested training.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that there are several opportunities at MSU for training. It is great that MSU and Eastern Michigan University provide that service. It is a nice alternative to out-of-state travel.

XIII. ESRI

Pat Cummens, ESRI, reported that they are planning to do a seminar in the spring to help with Arc 8.1 rollout. It will be an informational all-day seminar to go into detail on how it all components (ArcInfo, ArcView, ArcIMS, and SDE) fit together. Some may be a repeat of what was covered in August, but there will be new stuff. They are looking at a March time frame. They are open and interested in scheduling more half-day seminars on focus topics that may be of interest to Michigan. Send requests to Pat. There seems to be questions on SDE and

implementation, which is tougher to do in a global sense. It lends itself better when tailored to individual agencies and their needs. But can explore possibilities.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that some sort of combined effort with individuals from group discussing through the problems with ESRI present, could be very useful.

Pat Cummens, ESRI, added that there is a great working test case with MDEQ and can give some though on how to structure walking through a demonstration. May need more of an issues discussion. What makes it more difficult for the traditional GIS shop is that this moves them into the database world and they don't have a strong background in that. Sometimes there is not a good relationship between the GIS shop and the IS shop. Perhaps ESRI could bring a technical person for a half-day seminar and help to understand that benefits are and what the price is to pay.

Rob Surber, MIC, agreed that Pat made a valid point and that that is what the issues are.

Pat Cummens, ESRI, suggested that it works well when set up as the 'buddy system' and bring in the GIS person, Oracle database administrator, or SQL server database administrator. Then there is a higher chance of success. May have had false starts at MDEQ but it is now up and functioning and is stable.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that their SQL person responsible for administering SDE is spending maybe 2 hours per month. So it does not demand continual maintenance. A strength is that they had a SQL database up and operational.

Pat Cummens, ESRI, added it works well if people go to the SDE training and know what to expect. Often follow that with onsite custom training, installation, and then do fine tuning which seems to be the most difficult part for the GIS person or a database person not familiar with GIS.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, commented that tuning that was done to the framework can be shared.

Pat Cummens, ESRI, stated that she will discuss this with the SDE person to determine a useful structure. Then will talk to a few users in the group and send out a draft outline of a proposal. A pre-released version of Arc GIS 8.1 is now available, but doesn't know official final cut date is. Then manufacturing time is about a month for production and packaging. Shipping is probably going to be February. Do not what to get into releasing something before it is ready and cause more frustrations than what is caused by not meeting a deadline.

XIV. Other Issues

None.

XIV. Next Meeting Date

January 11, 2001, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48933

** If any changes or corrections are to be made to these minutes, please contact the Michigan Information Center at (517) 373-7910