

**Meeting Description:** Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

**Date:** December 10, 1998 **Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Lewis Cass Bldg., 6th Floor, North Wing, Dept. of Management and Budget, Director's Conference Room

Scheduled Time			Actual Time		
Start	Stop	Total Hours	Start	Stop	Total Hours
10:00 a.m.	12:00 p.m.	2	10:00 a.m.	12:00 a.m.	2

Rob Surber, MIC, distributed corrections to the November 12, 1998 meeting minutes under section **XIII. Other Issues** regarding comments made by Cary Adranga, MSI. Rob then asked if there were any other updates to last month's meeting minutes. There was no response.

## I. Geographic Framework Progress

### A. MIC Project Update

#### 1. MALI to GIS Conflation (Phase2) Status

Rob Surber, MIC, distributed a current status map. Phase 1 includes SEMCOG even though they have a different definition of Phase 1. MIC has not received Macomb, Oakland, and Monroe counties from SEMCOG. Phase 2 has fourteen counties currently in progress, which have not reached identity point (when all of the linear referencing system of the current MALI is equal to the GIS.) There are eight counties that have reached the identity point. Twelve counties are complete in Phase 2 with Grand Traverse and Allegan counties to be done next. The MIC is waiting for information from MDOT on Grand Traverse. The 127 bypass is in and has been referenced in Clinton County in the framework. Now the MIC is going back and updating MALI with all of the changes to the road system. GPS (global positioning system) drive lines from MDOT's van were used to put in the line work. The MIC was not able obtain digital ortho photography or aerial photography since Clinton County is still waiting for delivery. In the framework it will be noted that they are GPS lines and did not come from aerial photography base.

Rob Surber, MIC, also commented that there would be ongoing coordination with MDOT as they get new design plans. He asked if it's standard business process for MDOT to drive the roads and get the GPS location of highways prior to any aerial photography.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that GPS is new to them too and she assumes that for their compliance they will want to do that. MDOT will need to continue to send trunkline transfers to the MIC. The mileage is about 100 miles so far but more will be coming throughout the state. Joyce spoke to Connie Houk, MDOT, about getting pavement condition data and was told that they did drive all of the roads this year. Joyce is unsure whether they collected geographic reference data at that time.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the GPS lines are not as good cartographically as digital ortho reference lines. However, they are decent and are usable.

#### 2. County Seaming

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC is continuing work on county seaming. Hillsdale and Lenawee counties are done through Phase 2. The MIC is working on the boundary between the two counties to develop validation procedures. It is very

complex and requires a lot of programming to make sure that it is done correctly. The first time through involves more time to do all quality controls necessary to make sure that the applications and datum are not being lost. The last Rob heard, the programs are numerous and counting. It can be done but there will be issues with Oakland and Wayne counties that the MIC will have to discuss with SEMCOG. Hillsdale and Lenawee counties are not very populated areas and there are a lot of issues even with them. Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham counties are scheduled to be the first region worked on at the county seaming level.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked how far away from completion the work is on Clinton and Ingham counties.

Everett Root, MIC, responded that the introduction of the new drive lines changed all the point ids. All those transactions have to be pulled out and redone, plus any additional work. The work is now almost back to the identity point because of all the new MALI. Roads got cut off and rerouted. Once that is back together, then everything else in the county is done.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the MIC is monitoring the work closely and plans to have the work done this month. In January they will have each of the counties in the Tri-county area done.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, asked if in the future when updating files will there be seaming updates to the surrounding counties and does the MIC plan to tie this to the state file. Can you extract by tri-county?

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that you would be able to extract tri-county. Initially there will be common geography representing county lines and their attributes. As it is loaded into the enterprise dataset, that will manage how edits are made, it won't be represented twice. But there will be a transition period (over several months) for a while where county line data will be represented twice in case you only want one county or the other. This is not a robust database management system and they don't want to develop a lot of programs around this information. If you select tri-county, you will get three counties and can eliminate common lines if you don't need it for your application. The main concern, as the data model is developed, is to have the business practices to edit it so they don't blow point ids apart and all the hooks that people know and use for their applications. The program has to be migrated into an Oracle database.

Eric Swanson, MIC, reported that he spoke to Jim Lively, Northwest Council of Governments, and they will begin to work on a corridor study with MDOT. It will include Emmet, Charlevoix, Antrim and a touch of Kalkaska counties. Jim asked if Charlevoix could be introduced into Phase 2.

## B. Framework Update and Maintenance

### 1. U.S.P.S. Update Maps

Rob Surber, MIC, showed examples of updates the MIC is receiving in an ongoing basis from the U.S.P.S. The updates come in a variety of qualities from the local postmasters and are collected at the district office. The MIC feels that this is key for users of framework to see that we are in sync with the postal office. Some updates are survey maps while others are on the backs of napkins or placemats. U.S.P.S. validates and works out quality control. The MIC will use digital ortho photography to get the actual location down. This will work in tandem with ZIP+4 data base comparison program where they take last month's file for Michigan and compare it against this month's to keep track of updates.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, asked if when the MDNR does work in the ARCInfo environment, is there a process now to get that back into framework.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that there is not a formal process. Rob and Sherm Hollander, MDNR, have discussed how to handle this. They agreed that Sherm could send over the sheets of paper where he notes changes. Integration of parallel work is an issue if both agencies are doing digital work on the file. The MIC and MDNR will have to consider what makes sense from an ongoing perspective and might want to think it in terms of themes.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, stated that they would like to sit down and talk about it before they actually do the work. They want to be sure that they are doing the work correctly.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that they would not know all the issues and all the answers until they start doing the work. They probably would be able to initially establish some basic do's and don'ts that might help the process, but would probably have to go through it and test their hypotheses.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, commented that he had talked to Everett Root, MIC, and has a better understanding of formats in the framework. There are certain levels of information that the MDNR is in a rush to get out to the field offices.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that another issue is timing. Everything isn't worked out, it may not make sense to delay what MDNR needs to do. If this occurs, MDNR and MIC will have to stay in close communication as they encounter some growing pains.

Eric Swanson, MIC, asked if Gary Bilow was referring to actual feature work.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, responded that there are a number of MIRIS layers that their field people will want in order to do their analysis. The MDNR wants to follow framework standards.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that the important aspects, as they look at these exercises, is the creation of Metadata. Documentation will be helpful as we evaluate how information gets reintegrated. In general, as parallel work for a given geographic area needs to be integrated, Metadata becomes more and more important. There will need to be general Metadata for the data set and specific Metadata for each feature in the data set. Bill Enslin, MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS, is working on a program that builds lakes and river boundaries. It has been done for a few counties on framework. They are working on shape file coverage. Bill Enslin did ask Rob how to get back to information back to the MIC. Any discussions should also include Bill.

### C. SEMCOG Project Update

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, distributed a Current Status of the Michigan Geographic Framework in Southeast Michigan. SEMCOG processes in a different order from MIC. SEMCOG built the LRS (Linear Referencing System) first on the MIRIS coverage, updated TIGER through spring 1995, and then conflate to the files. The conflation cleanup process simply cleans up some errors that occurred (such as MCD boundaries) but does not make additional enhancements to the product. SEMCOG has delivered Livingston, St. Clair, and Washtenaw counties. Washtenaw County is going through the Phase 2 process at MIC. SEMCOG will be doing Oakland and Macomb next. Conflation is done for southeast Michigan. They just finished conflation cleanup for Wayne County and are currently working on cleanup in Monroe and Wayne counties.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the MIC is processing Washtenaw County in Phase 2. The

work that SEMCOG has done is saving time as the MIC concentrates on additional things. The MIC is taking PRs (physical reference numbers) off the driveways.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, commented that if a road was not named SEMCOG didn't give the linear reference, but if it was named with the word 'driveway' they did.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that way they knew they were attributing driveways as a part of the '95 aerial review.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, stated that when doing TIGER update, they couldn't always tell if something was a driveway, so they would add the driveway to the base map. They could remove the LRS and look for the word driveway to try to be consistent.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked for clarification – are you saying that you don't know if you have all of them labeled as driveways, but everything that is labeled as driveway would have come from the '95 aerials.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, added that the CFCC (Census Federal Classification Codes) identifies roads which don't have address ranges (for example a park or cemetery,) but the CFCC equals A74. Freeways have different CFCC code. Delores stated that she should talk with Catina Wesseler, MIC, to see if there are any comments. SEMCOG staff attended a meeting at MIC to discuss the change transaction files. It was a very informative presentation and it will be helpful in the future. They have given the file to MIC, to reconcile difference and changes that MIC makes to SEMCOG attributes. SEMCOG's transportation network is on that file.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that she just came from meeting with SEMCOG discussing attributes of bridges on framework. She explained to SEMCOG how MDOT attributes bridges at the node layer for trunk route map. They will be in touch with MIC to discuss how to coordinate.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, commented that they are interested in bridges.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that they would do a last minute check to make sure that all of the bridges are there. MSI could code bridges, especially Wayne and Oakland Counties.

#### D. Other Framework Initiatives

##### 1. Hydrography / Reach

Rob Surber, MIC, commented there have been informal meetings including Gary Bilow, MDNR, and Steve Miller.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, stated that the concept they have been talking about for some time is looking at the Reach network of the hydrography of the streams in the state and trying to get a consistent network. There is an effort at the national level to bring the U.S.G.S. hydrological unit codes and the EPA Reach files together. Michigan is interested in looking at the 1:100,000 scale product and then also starting a pilot that will conflate the national product to 1:24,000 (the scale that MDEQ would like to bring the Reach network to.) There is interest within MDNR, (particularly Fisheries Division) to get this resolved. MDEQ met with U.S. Army Corp of Engineers and Mark Coppersmith of the U.S.G.S., who is interested in looking at Michigan as a demo state. The idea is to have a constant Reach number representing a particular segment on a particular stream between nodes (like where streams cross bridges.) John Clark, Hydrologic Studies, stated he has seen a study where they took older 1:100,000 and brought into a new updated version and they retained 81% of the data, but they lost 19% in the process. John is concern with any type of automated type of

process. There is an agreement for John to do some work on the Macatawa in the Holland area.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that maybe she could go into more detail on how MDOT is doing bridges. They just put bridge structure numbers on node files referencing back to the structure inventory, which tells clearance, length of grids, ADT and other information about the bridge. If it is a one-bank river, there will only be one node. Two-bank rivers have bridges coded to both banks. Stack bridges on freeways have ground level and upper level roads coded. Bridge structure includes road over railroad, but not railroad over water. MDOT is doing attribution as quickly as they can. They have 6-7 counties done. Hillsdale, Lenawee, Barry, Eaton, counties are almost done and they are working on Dickinson; Otsego, Emmet, Manistee, Gratiot.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the U.S.G.S. is interested.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers is also interested. If the group can come up with an approach to get it moving, a lot of are people going to sign on. Steve asked Eric Swanson if he found out more information about who is the lead agency – U.S.G.S. or EPA.

Eric Swanson, MIC, responded Eric still doesn't have a clear understanding of who is in charge at the federal level. He had a conference call with U.S.G.S. two weeks ago. The call was to discuss the innovative partnership on framework in general. The U.S.G.S. has three areas of interest – DEMs, DOQs, and hydro. Framework is composed of seven themes.

Eric Swanson added that the U.S.G.S has refused the framework innovative partnership and countered with the introduction of hydro work. The MIC cannot introduce a significant amount of 'new work' (hydro) until Phase 2 of framework is done. Eric was extremely disappointed with U.S.G.S.'S approach, since they are the lead agency on framework and they are stepping back to their business practices versus the integrative approach the MIC has taken. Eric hasn't totally ruled out the idea of dealing within their parameters. He left the U.S.G.S. with the idea that the state will look to them on a project basis versus a programmatic basis if that is their position.

Eric Swanson also stated that he is disappointed because there are seven themes that make up framework and there is no lead organization at the federal level trying to integrate it. Who is looking at this data? Should he talk to the transportation folks, should he talk to U.S.G.S. about the Reach data or should he talk to EPA for Reach. U.S.G.S. couldn't give him an answer.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that they are concerned about making sure bridges are over rivers, etc., is one of reasons why MDOT decided to go with annotating at the points. That means no matter how the roads might be shifted to correct the positional attributes on the nodes, they will be at the same point.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that then the attribution would always be in sync.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if anyone had seen the FGDC (Federal Geographic Data Committee) 'Draft Road Standards.'

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that he had and that copies were passed around for comment. It is his understanding that there is a meeting this month, pulling together experts to comment on it, but as far as he knows, nobody from Michigan was invited.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that there are similar but different concepts to try to put together.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that it is important that MDOT has a chance to look at that.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, noted that U.S.G.S. simplifies their network by using FRSEP (framework segment end points.) They have less than what MDOT would have.

Rob Surber, MIC, agreed and stated that is because they are not thinking of an integrated product. They are thinking only of roads crossing other roads, not bridge structures, etc.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that MDOT has more features than U.S.G.S. does, but to reduce it to what U.S.G.S. has would take a lot of work. For example, if there is a roadway crossing a freeway, U.S.G.S. doesn't want a node at both of the junctional freeway points, they want a FRSEPs at only one.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that U.S.G.S. would have to identify the critical points. If anybody is interested in seeing the road data model, it is on FGDC (Federal Geographic Data Committee) web site. If MDOT had to produce something in that format, they would probably have to go through and identify the common points between the agencies.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that he is not sure who is interested in the transportation network at the federal level.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that she thinks that there is a question between U.S. DOT and Bureau of Transportation Statistics about who is in charge of developing the roadway network. She is not sure anyone from Michigan is going to be involved in upcoming meetings and believes that someone should be there.

## 2. DOQs (Digital Ortho Quads)

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC is using DOQs and has estimated that it is saving about a week or more time on Phase 2 as oppose to scanning in available source maps. They are keeping updated on new U.S.G.S. quads that are being created for the state and trying to coordinate with the MDNR. The MIC is attempting to create a polygon coverage of the quad boundaries. MDEQ has one with quad name linked to the quad boundary so that MIC can then do an automatic download of the names that are being updated on their web site, link it into the map, and keep a time series of which quads are now being made available. Then they will be able to do summaries by county or whatever. They have been coordinating with Sherm Hollander, MDNR, on what both offices have and will look at ways to speed up that process of the delivery and look into getting some other DOQs for areas we don't have. U.S.G.S is selling large chunks of DOQ coverage by quarter quad for the Upper Peninsula for \$7.50 per quarter quad plus processing fees. U.S.G.S. does not have any indication whether they will group them into county CDs for a cheaper price at a later date. Currently one will only deal with quad or quarter quad basis, which is a lot more expensive.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, stated that they have quad coverage with names attached much like the build up for the DEMs.

Everett Root, MIC, stated that U.S.G.S. has a map on their web site showing the status of the DOQs, but lags by couple of months. It will show things in progress but the list shows it is available to purchase. So we would have to make our own map.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that what they have used, John Clark got that map and then added things. John found errors. There were no quads along Indiana and Ohio

boundaries. They want to use this file to work with the DRGs because when it is composited into county coverages, all U.S.G.S. topo margin information has been removed. They will set up a related database so it that can be pulled up to see: quadrangle name, whether it has metric or English contours, contour interval, etc. Steve stated they would share this with other interested parties.

Eric Swanson, MIC, asked if Mike Beaulac set up time with MDNR to talk about VARGIS.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, responded that he had not – he only dropped a CD off.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, commented that Mike Beaulac has scheduled a half-day session at SEMCOG to talk about digital ortho in their region.

Eric Swanson, MIC, asked if SEMCOG meeting was with Greg Tilly, VARGIS president. VARGIS has digital orthos for Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, and the rights to Washtenaw digital ortho that they want us to lease.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that he thought these orthos were from spring '98.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that he suggested that Mike Beaulac get rid of the proprietary restrictions.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, commented that their bids are out for the innovative partnership and should be in this week. When they get the prices they will be talking to U.S.G.S. about how to market to the counties.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that U.S.G.S. did mention in the conference call that it looks like the digital ortho innovative partnership will go through.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, stated that there are concerns about cost sharing to work through.

## II. Michigan State Government Geographic Information Policy Council

### A. State Agency Survey Development

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that a subcommittee (represented by MDEQ, State Police, DMB, and MDNR) is working on a state agency survey development that should work in tandem with the clearinghouse support. It is looking at key agencies that are creating geographic information at the state government level and the key information about the quality of their data. They are trying to identify information by themes. They had an incredible list. In fact, the people in the subcommittee said they had never seen the magnitude of things that are going on in state government. Rob thinks this will be useful. They are trying to get draft to the subcommittee by Christmas. They will make sure the information goes to all state agencies and all departments. There are a lot of departments that are not data developers so the subcommittee will try to collect a list of their needs. They then hope to match needs to developers. One of the goals of the council is to look at prioritization of geographic activities and geo spatial activities for the state based on the current picture of where we are. At this time it is not looking at outside of state government, need to get handle on where state government is before moving on. This information is intended to tie into the clearinghouse.

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that there was a framework demonstration program put on at the Library of Michigan. Overall it was well received. All state departments were invited. There were many different representatives from different state agencies that don't normally come to these meetings or think about the mapping of Geospatial data. There were a lot of good comments. The demonstration gave state departments, that don't think in terms of GIS or

mapping, an idea of how GIS relates to them. They need to be shown potential applications that they might need and to be shown the relationship as to how this could be beneficial to them.

### III. MDNR Projects and Activities

Gary Bilow, MDNR, reported that they are working on a quarter quarter grid. It is more of a project than they had expected. They have about two-thirds of the Lower Peninsula done. That's a coverage of 40 acre parcels based on MIRIS section lines. There is a section coverage out there that is based on MRIIS section quarters which connects straight lines to the corners – this is available if people want it. But the straight line between the corners doesn't always follow the section lines. That is why they are creating the 40 acre grid to match the section lines.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that as a group, we talked about updating repositioning with the new digital orthos. When U.S.G.S. topographic maps were digitized, section lines often fell on the roads, etc. Is there any thought as to what will happen to section boundaries (that may be cartographically represented on the roads) when roads are repositioned.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, stated that at this point they are mostly concerned about getting quarter quarter grid done. It is just a repositioning problem. They don't know right now where the quarter section line is in the road. With the statewide Remonumentation Program, at some point they will have stateplane coordinates on all the section corners in the state and then will have all the section lines. They feel the MIRIS base is +/- 100 feet and figure the section corners and starting lines are a good representation for that accuracy. They will be using that as a link into their real estate information system. What they are doing is similar to EIS – find out information about property based on 40 acres level.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, also stated that they have about 4 million acres of state-owned land. The records are on a huge computer database. They also have another 4 million acres of land that they have an interest in through the Farmland and Open Space Preservation Act. They want to be able link into the real estate information system. The MDNR has opened the center in Roscommon. They have three analysts doing geographic information in the field - shortly they will have a fourth employee and will be fully staffed. It is their task to get the data sets ready to go out to field managers which creates a concern about updating framework.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that MIC and MDNR now have three shared staff working on framework – three days at MIC and two days at MDNR.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the work relationship is somewhat similar to the relationship the

MIC has with MDOT where we have staff on sight making sure that the department's interests are considered as we work on the common base.

### IV. MDOT Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that the upcoming infrastructure has been pretty quiet for the last month – nothing new to report. It is Joyce's understanding that they still have not appointed a committee from elected officials. Half the committee is to be elected representative or senators and the other half will be from MDOT. They are to do a study of infrastructure of roadway needs in Michigan to determine how to rewrite Act 51 that determines how money is distributed between local areas and the state.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, also reported that they have had discussions with the MIC regarding how to incorporate the rail sooner than was originally intended. They don't want to delay getting the roads in, but their UPTRAN people are in the process of trying to get their software compliant with Y2K and keep track of the grade crossings. They are trying to come up with proposals on how to provide UPTRAN with a way of mapping roads without having to develop a new geographic map. They are

looking at the possibility of coding rail crossings as much as they are doing the bridge crossings, because basically they don't have data collected for anything but the grade crossings. That might be one way they can get that data entered in time for their project and still come onboard for framework. They will be discussing more in this near future.

## V. MIC Projects and Activities

### A. NSDI (National Spatial Data Infrastructure) Clearinghouse

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that they continue to work on the NSDI clearinghouse by getting framework information in compliance.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that he had a conversation with IMAGIN. MIC is considering a contract with IMAGIN to assist in survey development and distribution to the non-state government GIS community. He thinks a proposal will be finalized next week. The approach to the clearinghouse is not a one-time deal. It will be a web-based application where agencies can enter and can fill out a survey anytime and can update and maintain it. It will be a single place via the web that people can come into and know who is in the Michigan GIS community.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that this will be not just data but also resources.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that there were a couple ways of looking at this – common organizational structure, county, region, road commission, etc. Then you can organize it in a core business arena, environmental, transportation, etc. It can evolve easily.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that it will be both public and private. He thinks the private sector will be real interested in being a part of it and possibly being a part of keeping it current and helping support it.

### B. Statewide Land Database-EIS ( Executive Information System )

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC is currently doing informal surveys of key contacts in every department to collect information where managers are responsible for information on buildings, facilities' structures, institutions, land, and roads. This is a big job. They are looking to not replace the core business of managing these lands and facilities but bringing together key attributes that a planning level may want to know. They are looking for duplication, different definitions, business processes and volatility of that information. A prototype of the state will be prepared bringing together the information into an Internet application. The stakeholders will be asked to comment and provide feedback. To date they have met with the MDNR, State Police, FIA.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that they would meet with will all the departments. They are discovering that real estate management in state government is dynamic. This is a statewide application that could not be officially done without the framework product. This will be the first time to officially have these three things (40 acre grid, physical reference numbers, and addresses) in the same base. It is exciting. MIC will be meeting with most of the agencies before Christmas and expect to get prototype development on it the first of the year

## VI. MDEQ Projects and Activities

Steve Miller, MDEQ, reported that they are working on the Source Water Assessment Program for drinking water supplies. It has pushed them forward in terms of the need to disseminate information, particularly the updated framework information, digital raster graphics, and other information. MDEQ has cooperative programs with county health departments and locals. MDEQ has a contract with M.S.U. Center for Remotes Sensing and GIS to help with the program. Bill

Enslin has developed a themer program that allows to people to build a coverage recognizing that the framework has a lot of things that the locals don't need or aren't interested in. The themer program will enable users to choose from the old MIRIS information that might not have been imported in the framework. It takes a while to run, but you can create coverages that make sense for the user. The program will be available and distributed. Right now it is in MapObjects, an ESRI product, and they are looking at dissemination of information to their field staff and others and are also looking into using ArcExplorer as a client browser. MDEQ is talking to Bill Enslin about using a viewer that has more application than the ArcExplorer. They are considering purchasing what Bill has built as front end to LandScan. They have also purchased SDE and are waiting for implementation – they are sending people to training in February.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, added that they have used the Ultramap browser that came free with 1:100,000 data set that they prepared. MDNR is considering distributing it.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that it might be useful if Bill Enslin were to demonstrate the LandScan viewer to the group. Steve will contact Bill to see if he is available to do a demonstration for the January meeting.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that MDEQ is continuing to work with MIC on getting some data sources geo referenced and looking at the possibility of extending that effort with some EPA money, but hasn't heard back from EPA.

## VII. SEMCOG Projects and Activities

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, reported that Steve Perry is putting together an RFP (request for purchase) for 2000 aerial photography that will probably be flown at 1:24000 in year 2000. He has signed up vendors to compare prices. He is still looking at the possibility of creating DOQs from the aerial photography. He has spoke to the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, also stated that SEMCOG is working on some of the conflation cleanup to deliver the files to MIC. They will not be updating attributes (LRS, address ranges, street names) while the file is at MIC. In the meantime, SEMCOG has thought about cleaning up some of the census tracts, much like they have cleaned the MCD information (having that as a separate layer using framework as a base) using a program that has been written already to help clean up the MCD and polygons. They will start with census tracts and then will look at block groups. They think this work will be very useful.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that there would be some minor changes to intersections, but for the most part things will be in place.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, stated that they are extremely interested in is geocoding to the track/block for forecast modeling. They will be communicating with the counties to see how they think they would be using MGF (Michigan Geographic Framework) in their county GIS. In southeast Michigan there are some counties, such as Oakland and Wayne, that have their own street centerline files that are more precise than the MGF and these counties are interested in conflating the MGF to their street centerlines. SEMCOG will be finding out what base these counties will be using for their county GIS and how they plan to update the address ranges. For other counties, for example Livingston and St. Clair, Delores is sure that the MGF will be the base.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked if it is a requirement of the counties to provide information for the model as a part of their relationship with SEMCOG.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, responded that it is not a requirement because many of the counties don't have staffing to be able to do that, but it is something SEMCOG tries to encourage. For the larger counties it is a built in partnership, because they are actually using SEMCOG's data for their applications. Eventually the applications, for example in Macomb County 911, will become very dependent on the MGF information

Rob Surber, MIC, added that one of the problems with Oakland and some other counties is that they are struggling with 'dirtiness' of their own addresses (lack of consistent naming/numbering standards.) The whole local addressing authority issue may come up again at some point – which might help this whole process.

Joyce Newell, MIC, asked if SEMCOG had been in discussion with Washtenaw County about their updating of roads and street names on the framework.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, stated that Steve Perry did meet with Washtenaw County Road Commission yesterday. One of the projects that they are using MGF for is creating a road map using street names. The Road Commission mentioned that the MGF is helping out quite a bit. There are new subdivisions that they are adding into that file. They may not be putting address ranges on, but they are adding the line work

Joyce Newell, MDNOT, stated that she just heard about this last week but they indicated that they are correcting street names for their map purposes. MDOT is concerned about coordination.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that now is the time while we are working in it. Someone is supposed to get in touch with the MIC about this. Rob will have Catina Wesseler, MIC, call the Road Commission.

Delores Muller, SEMCOG, asked if that is information that they should give to the MIC.

Eric Swanson, MIC, responded that since the MIC has a person working with Washtenaw, we should have that person work with Washtenaw direct.

#### VIII. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission Projects and Activities

Melissa Scott, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, stated that they are trying to rally support for the Future Trends Project. One of the aspects is land use. They have decided to splurge for the land use update of the 1978 MIRIS. Paul Hamilton has put together a draft RFP. He asked for Rob Surber's and Sherm Hollander's comments. Melissa brought copies for the group to review. They are planning to use the '95 aerial photos – not sure if everyone agrees that this is the best method.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that CATA is interested getting Phase 2 framework for their routings.

Melissa Scott, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, stated that the route files of Wayne State University are finished. CATA and MDOT have received copies, but Tri-County hasn't.

#### IX. MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Nothing to report.

#### X. County / Local Projects and Activities

Jim Myers, City of Lansing, stated that they have nothing to report.

#### XI. U.S. Census Bureau Regional Office TIGER Update

Nothing to report.

#### XII. Federal Projects and Activities

Nothing to report.

### XIII. Other Issues

Jim Best, MSI, reported that they have three county files from MDOT for digitizing. Jim explained that he is not a GIS person and he asked the group for their advice. Hamburg Township, Livingston County, wants MSI to add 500 parcels to already existing files (that are being worked on by a consultant.) Jim's feeling is that perhaps Hamburg Township should wait for MIC to finish Livingston County first. The township will be giving MSI township information only and they will have a lot of additions. Jim's contacts at the township didn't seem to know about framework - Jim explained it to them. Hamburg stated they couldn't wait for the county to be complete. Jim wondered if he is doing an injustice by not waiting.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented there are significant advantages that local government could achieve via the coordinated approach.

Jim Best, MSI, responded that he was contacted by Mr. Dillman, supervisor, and he turned Jim over to Jim Stover.

Jim Best, MSI, commented that he was told that Hamburg Township is the fastest growing township in the United States. If that is the case, MSI could be creating data that may not be useless, but it may have to be done again.

Rob Surber, MIC, mentioned that the intent of framework is not to replace the local governments' GIS. They are organized and have a mapping program to support their day-to-day business and framework was never intended to replace that. Not to say that there are not things on framework that might not be useable by them. Some agencies want to start with framework. They must look at their own needs. We are not necessarily creating this with everybody's needs in mind, but trying to create something that is covering many of the state's and other agencies' needs. But it is probably not going to hit the target for a day-to-day parcel mapping standpoint. It is a centerline model serving as a crossroads of mapping activities.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, suggested that Jim Best ask if there is a countywide effort for 9-1-1.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that Aaron Burke is working on the 9-1-1 program for Livingston County.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that it would be helpful if the township would be in contact with Livingston County, but it doesn't always happen that way.

Jim Best, MSI, stated that Hamburg Township is the customer and is telling MSI what they want.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that all you can do is tell your customers what all the options are and then they can pick and choose.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that the MIC has given Livingston County everything that is available in framework as well as source materials. The MIC can't keep up with the county's schedule either.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that Hamburg Township might want to check with the county to see if they can save the township some work.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, asked if the group would like to see the Ultramap browsers. They will also do a demonstration at the January meeting.

### XIV. Next Meeting Date

Thursday, January 14, 1999, 10 a.m. until noon, Lewis Cass Building, 320 S. Walnut, Lansing, MI 48933 - 6th Floor, North Wing, Dept. of Community Health, Director's Conference Room

\*\* If any changes or corrections are to be made to these minutes, please contact the Michigan

Information Center at (517) 373-7910