

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

**Date:** August 7, 2003

**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 3

Everett Root, Center for Geographic Information (CGI), reported that Version 3a was created and a variety of geography and table products were delivered to Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), Michigan Technological University, and a couple of counties. Version 3a had all the linear referencing so that they could get some projects started. Version 3a did not have the attributes for 2002 legislative districts (Senate, Congress, House), 2000 census tracts or 2000 census block groups. Those are now all filled in statewide and updated the school districts. Had to split one physical referenced (PR) road and then created Version 3b. The shape file is processing as we speak and will go into the Geographic Data Library. Version 3b will be the available version for the time being. That will include the Map Image Viewer files. CGI does quality control during the creation of shape files. Lake and river polygons can be generated and CGI can show people how to do that. Version 1 lake and river polygons got a lot of attention by Michigan State University (MSU). Not all of the changes could be brought into Version 2. Out of the 11,000 named lakes in the state; about 900 of them were lost. CGI fixed most of those in Version 3. Not all the arcs associated with the lakes and polygons have a name, so naming may still be an issue. CGI wants to work on getting lake names this next year up-to-date.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS stated that he is trying to make an assessment at what point it is safe to use framework and will see where all the right roads need to be added. And not get caught in another major revision.

B. Next Steps

Everett Root, CGI, reported that it is going to quiet down considerably. CGI is receiving the 2002 Act 51 maps and will incorporate the new certified roads from those maps into framework, make the deletions indicated, and make jurisdictional transfers indicated. The number of features that that effects within a county is minimal. That covers the county-owned roads, which are the township jurisdictions. City and village maps have not been received yet, but they will be incorporated within the next few months. What will be seen in the road layer are Act 51 changes and trunk line changes that MDOT makes. Federal Aid Urban Boundaries (FAUB) have been mapped using framework Features and under review and then left and right Federal Urban Boundary codes will go on all framework Features, then polygons can be created and National Functional Class will be reviewed and updated based on these boundaries.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, asked for an explanation of FAUB are different from Urban Boundaries.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that the Census Bureau defines the Urban Boundaries strictly on population density. FAUB highways are enlarged for areas where it makes sense for transportation uses. Have to include Census Bureau boundaries but can enlarge for growing areas or where transportation facilities don't make sense. FAUBs would be a little smoother – they won't be as jaggy as the Census Bureau boundaries because they are still based on population. They pay no attention as to whether there is a road there or not or whether they are connected properly.

Everett Root, CGI, added that this is under review because the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approves them.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that they have all been approved at this point. Last year they went to the urban areas and asked for revisions to the boundaries and they got all those back. MDOT asked FHWA to hold approval until January so that it would not have to be reported in 2002 on the federal

reporting because they would not have time to get them all in. All the changes are in effect January to date. The roadway Functional Classification within a boundary becomes urban versus rural outside the boundary and effects funding.

Everett Root, CGI, asked if this would change the Functional Classification attribute based on inside/outside on the roads.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, commented that over the next ten years how many times would this be used?

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that the road agencies will use this to determine whether they qualify for federal funding and how much they qualify for. Between Version 2 and Version 3 there were a lot of roads added because of Act 51.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, said he is trying to decide when to jump in to have things relatively stable.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that positionally for roads and for cities and township boundaries things are relatively stable.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, asked for clarification that nodes and arcs are pretty stable. CGI is just attributing more information per segments?

Everett Root, CGI, confirmed that and added attributing will be the majority of CGI's work now will be attributing and updating.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, asked if it can be done at any time but the topology can be the same.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that CGI is going to minimize the topology changes now.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if CGI had an idea how soon FAUBs will be available.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that Susan Berquist is responsible for this and he believes that they are looking at October. And it will line up with Version 3b.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) needs to reflect the new Functional Classes that are in the new FAUBs.

Gordon Rector, United States Census Bureau, asked about the private roads that are not in framework now, would they only be added routinely if a county updated them and sent them to CGI because private roads do not come in on the Act 51 data.

Everett Root, CGI, commented that the Qualified Voter File (QVF) is going to help with that. Also a county or community who takes time to review framework or 9-1-1 application that uses framework may provide information.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that there were a couple of counties that included their private roads on their Act 51.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, stated that the road commission is working on adding private roads.

Charles Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI), asked about the DNR trail system.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that CGI will work on this as well. The indication is that a lot of work has been done in the Upper Peninsula with the snowmobile trails. CGI provided the Dispatch Center in Negaunee with framework for their 9-1-1 dispatch system. They are very interested in information on trails for 9-1-1 cell phone calls that come in off the trails. CGI will be looking at trying to incorporate those and get them identified uniquely – possibly PRs and mile points. Then if somebody calls in not knowing where they are, they can try to find xy cell phone position and dispatch vehicles based on common name using mile points. That is going to be part of the CGI system. CGI is also going to do voter precincts. They have put precincts on two counties as part of a pilot project and from that will come the county commissioner districts.

### C. Digital Ortho Update

Sherm Hollander, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), reported that they have the remainder of the state under contract for production of the color imagery. There are two groups of contracts – the United States Forest Service (USFS) is doing Huron Manistee National Forest areas in the upper northern Lower Peninsula; the DNR is contracted to do the remaining counties – there is a group above the Huron Manistee National Forest that includes: Alpena,

Kalkaska, Otsego, Grand Traverse, Benzie, Leelenau and a scattering of counties the southern Lower Peninsula: Clinton, Montmorency will be finished up. This will be 1:40,000 scale color infrared 1998 Series National Aerial Photography Program (NAPP) imagery flown by United State Geological Survey (USGS).

Everett Root, CGI, added that they are still working to get statewide 1998 coverage. That's what we will have as a result of this. These will go on the Geographic Data Library as they are delivered in normal progression.

Sherm Hollander, DNR, stated that they are expecting completion of the National Forest by the end of the calendar year and the MDNR's will begin coming in by the end of the year and finished up the first part of next year.

#### D. Framework Network Pilot Partnerships Update

Everett Root, CGI, reported that this is a pilot program underway with some of the county Geographic Information System (GIS) agencies who submitted information in partnership with their county clerk in GIS formatted information to go into the Qualified Voter File (QVF) for that process and the geographic features are available to update the framework. The pilot is underway with 5-6 counties. Have not had the opportunity to review and put the geography into the framework. But the data does go into the QVF street index on a regular basis. Another opportunity was presented with the 9-1-1 Dispatch Center in the Upper Peninsula – the communication director at the Negaunee Post is organizing a better feedback mechanism of road information of the Upper Peninsula counties into the framework that then can be uploaded into their system. CGI has received centerline files with address information for Keweenaw and Luce Counties. The 9-1-1 Dispatch Center not only dispatches the Upper Peninsula but a few other counties. So because of these opportunities in the Upper Peninsula now the driving force was the 9-1-1 Dispatch Center doing a good job of communicating and bringing some of these agencies together. They did not know that CGI existed. They were getting ready to go online with a 9-1-1 computer aided dispatch and they started looking for mapping information at the local level. What was available was varying format and qualities and they were running into problems. They were ready to go live and they had no map and CGI sent them a file and it uploaded well and they were up and running. CGI is going to look at getting software here that they use. The company's name is Plan Equipment out of Texas. If CGI gets it they may be able to upload into their system.

#### E. Rail Update

Everett Root, CGI, reported that with the completion of Version 2, the timing was right and there was real interest from MDOT with the agencies involved with rail: freight, passenger, and non-motorized. Their were meetings and input from agencies. CGI started repositioning all the rail features in framework and coding them with active/inactive, and features that need to be reviewed because they may not be seen on photos. When the MDOT rail staff first looked at framework rail, they indicated that it is probably 1960 vintage. Michigan's rail mileage peaked at about 11,000 miles and is now down to 4,000. So there is a lot of rail that can be removed or change classification of. Some rails have gone over to trails and they are important. CGI will identify trails and put coding on them and eventually maybe enable linear referencing using the PR mile point system. There will be data that agencies keep in regards to these trails. As of right now it is just centerline. There are right-of-way issues and land transfers issues that CGI will not get into. They want to identify the active rail and identify if it is a main line or a siding or a yard. Then CGI will look at the inactive rail and then have decisions made about what can be deleted or if it is important to one of the trail organizations. Also will be able to tag all of the grade crossings. Everywhere a railroad track crosses a road there is a national inventory (NI) number which will be assigned to the node in framework so that the NI number can be used to tie data to. CGI should have the repositioning done statewide in early September. CGI received a file from SEMCOG that was early 2000 vintage that will be used as the source for active/inactive there. SEMCOG did a lot of work with the rail companies to find out current information. Everett attended a rail meeting at the Michigan Rail Association office in Lansing. There were

representatives from the three largest companies in Michigan: Canadian National, Norfolk Southern, and CSX. CGI explained what they are doing and they indicated that they had staff who could provide active/inactive information. This will be used as a source as CGI continues to refine the information on the rail. The goal is a statewide active rail map sometime in September, which will be put out for review. CGI will then talk with the non-motorized, Rails-to-Trails, non-profit groups, and non-state agencies that were involved in this meeting. CGI will get them to start looking at some things CGI finds as inactive and they can let us know what is important and CGI can begin to code those.

III. Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities  
Sherm Hollander, MDNR, nothing to report.

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

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that MDOT made contact a year ago with each of the federal forests asking for GIS for the forest roads. Joyce just followed up again and plans to add to framework when they are available. There are about 1,000 miles of roadway that MDOT has to report on the HPMS to Washington each year. MDOT only knows what county they are in, but not where they are. MDOT is still looking at the right-of-way scans that they got from Michigan State Industries (MSI). MDOT is trying to get them into their software package, Caliper, Maptitude, and Transcad. Their staff person who will do this is in the Upper Peninsula collecting data. MDOT has 4 teams out now working with the regions and the county agencies collecting data for Asset Management for all federal aid roads across the state. They are starting in the northern counties and working their way south. The goal for collection completion is November for the entire state. The data being collected is type of lanes, type of roadway and condition. MDOT is looking for a couple of counties for doing a drain pilot. Looking at the possibility of coding the drainage district boundaries, attributing drains into framework with drain names, and creating a layer in framework for drains that are not in framework. For the pilots they will use all the data they have for those counties to see how long it would take to do everything. MDOT only needs what interacts with the roads, but it would nice for framework to have a full set of data. Given that federal funding is available for the federal aid roads as well, most drains interact with some of those roads. It can be justified for the pilot counties to see how long it will take to do. If it doesn't take too long, they may do it for as many counties as they can get the data for.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, stated that MDOT may want to first find out how many drains there are per county. Some counties have many.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that there are 53 counties that assess MDOT for drains. So they don't have data on the other counties. As complete a job as they can do is beneficial for more people. The Drain Association is quite interested in having this looked at in more detail also.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, asked if this ties into the state initiative to acquire 2-foot contour statewide.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, answer that it does not at this point.

Everett Root, CGI, added that MDOT is looking at working from the source materials that are sent in for assessment purposes.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that some counties have digital and for those there probably is not as much work to do. MDOT is trying to get a county that has only paper maps and one that has only digital to compare the difference. Some of the maps are pretty old and some are not the greatest quality.

Everett Root, CGI, reported that a few counties have shared their drain layers with CGI. The collector of paper maps has been MDOT through the assessment process.

Charles Bender, MSI, added that he understood that MDOT has between 3,000-5,000 maps that need to be scanned or digitized.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that MDOT's next effort will be reporting back to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) where they report mileage and road conditions. Currently they take their base data for the universe off of the Needs Assessment from 1983. Asset Management wants to retire the Needs Assessment gracefully, but will still need the same segmentation because that is what is used for HPMS. MDOT will be working this summer and fall on how to save the information from the Needs which is Average Daily Traffic (ADT) until they are replaced with better ADTs and get segment information from framework. That requires the FAUB, Functional Class changes, etc. must be discussed to decide the best game plan to make things work on schedule.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU, asked if there was anything new regarding the traffic survey.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that MDOT is still planning on doing it, but she doesn't know any more than that this fall.

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

Nobody in attendance.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU Map Library, stated that she has been trying to get in touch with John Esch. Is there anybody else in MDEQ that know about GIS?

Everett Root, CGI, stated that John Clark is in CGI and he might be able to recommend someone.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU Map Library, asked about Rick Sorrell.

Charles Bender, MSI, added that it depends on the data that is needed.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU Map Library, responded that they are looking for wastewater data.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, stated that Rick is involved in their partnership attempting to work with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to develop wetlands delineations.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, asked if they are redoing the inventory or fine tuning it?

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, responded that they have got funding from FEMA to do a countywide redelineation of the floodways and are doing a pilot with them.

#### VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

Eric Nischan, MSP, reported that they continue to work on the integration for ETeam emergency management software with MSP GIS layers to be sure that it all works. So far it is going along smoothly. They are laying the ground for transition to SDE. Would welcome any experience migrating to SDE.

#### VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Charles Bender, MSI, reported that MSI have finished 25 lakes for Fisheries. They have sent MSI 10, more which should consume their budget at this time. They have made a pitch for additional funding and have to wait for next meeting this month. They are asking for funding for 100-300 lakes and get more funding so they can to finish up the balance of the 2,600. They are sending MSI digital ortho maps as well as regular paper map from a TIFF. MSI is georeferencing it and snapping it to framework. Identifying bottom types, vegetation, and inlets/outlets. MSI has it down to 20-30 minutes per lake. MSI is providing Fisheries free quality control work because it is only taking about 5-7 minutes per lake. The metadata is also free because MSI wrote an AML file that plugs everything in except for a couple of entries that need to be changed. MSI has trimmed down the cost considerably. Because of the way that MSI is able to do the work, Fisheries is more than happy to try to get as much work as they are able to. MSI has sent it as shape files and rectified/unrectified TIFFs – to see if they need to backwards research anything, can pull the TIFF file into anything that they need to pull it into. MSI is working with MDOT and just finished inputting, except for Kent County, the last data for the As Built project that identifies all road segments that were 1959 and older or 1960

and newer. MSI ran across a dozen or so files from the CD that were completely unreadable. There may be issues when they get to those particular files as far as trying to do framework against them. MSI is working with MDOT's new tech and understands that he was able to pull up some of the files that MSI sent in ArcMAP and does some tweaking in order to bring them into the Caliper software they use. When he did that, he said that the data was poor quality, which doesn't make much sense because the TIFF file wouldn't have changed. They are trying to identify where the problem in the resolution might be. One option being considered is if they can get a copy of Caliper or Maptitude. Then MSI might be able to identify some other way to bring the data into the program.

Sherm Hollander, MDNR, asked about the lake maps for the Fisheries Division, of 2,600 total approximately how many were finished.

Charles Bender, MSI, responded that there are close to 100 completed between the MSI GIS Department and various MSU projects that were done. Fisheries is leaning more toward having MSI do the balance because of standardization. For each project that MSU does and then provides them with data it is all for whatever that particular project requires and nothing is consistent. This data has not been made available. MSI is going to scan in and make a cross-reference for the metadata for the lakes that MSI is creating into a separate data base file through Microsoft Access and then creating hyperlinks to the individual TIFF files. Then can pull up a page by county that will identify each of the lakes within that county. Can also hyperlink to metadata for that lake or to the TIFF file? It is a pet project of MSI that may be made available to MDNR once far enough into it to present it to see if they would be interested in it.

## VIII. CGI Projects and Activities

### A. Qualified Voter File (QVF) to the Map Pilots

Everett Root, CGI, reported that CGI is working on several pilots for the QVF to the framework map. There is a strong desire by the Department of State (DOS) to have the QVF Street Index sit on the framework. GIS has become part of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) in Michigan. It is a federal act, but they are looking at using the funding that Michigan is going to get to use GIS to help improve the entire voting system. They have other things that they are going to do with the equipment, ballots, etc. But they are looking at GIS to help with the system. It is going to be a multi-year process. CGI is going to put all of the election geography on the framework. That includes the legislative districts, minor civil divisions (MCDs), cities and villages, voter precincts, county commissioner districts and school districts as accurate as possible. That is the information that is in the QVF Street Index. Precinct is the smallest common denominator for every record. So every time that a precinct changes a new record is generated for the Street Index and with that record comes the address information and other associated election geography. CGI is looking at how to get the records in their present format on to the framework. They are finding that there is one record that makes up 10-12 segments in framework. CGI is looking at the process of getting the information on the framework and interpolate the address ranges. There are areas where CGI has one framework segment and they have two records because there is a precinct or school district break there that should be on that segment in framework. CGI will have to manipulate some of the framework geography to match these records. There are three general areas that are being piloted. 1. There is a web application that CGI is looking at to do a variety of things. A) They are allowing the clerks or local units of government access to look at framework and election geography with the possibly of input of new information – new streets or precinct changes. B) Allowing for review of CGI's work. C) A possible scenario building tool where a clerk could select polygons to determine voter population within a precinct. If they have a precinct where the lines are too long every election day, this tool would allow them to click an area within their community and assign it to an adjoining precinct and it will redo the numbers. CGI is going to propose a web application within those three areas as part of their proposal to DOS. The pilots are to determine what it would take to do this in reality. All the work at the present time is going into a proposal, which is due in September. One thing that the web application will do is to help with communication between DOS and the important input of the local officials whose input CGI needs. The Street Index has its uses in the format that it is. CGI is not going to put

all the data on the map and then have the map in its present format become the Street Index. There is still a need to have it in a certain format. 2. CGI is looking at the idea of having a master address file that will come out of framework and match the Street Index. The Street Index would sit on one side and have its uses and be updated nightly through the address file that gets updated from the geography. It is a concept that CGI will put into the proposal as a method to continue the Street Index, as it is yet not able to be updated by updating the geography. 3. A jurisdiction will get the framework and the Street Index will get reconciled. Everything is agreed upon – all the street names, address ranges, and the election geography matches. From then on any change for the jurisdiction will go into geography first, then the master address file, and then into the Street Index. There will be a list of jurisdictions that will update the Street Index and continue to use that. As they become reconciled MGF that list will be smaller and CGI will use geographic methodology for the jurisdictions they can. There will be a better framework product and hopefully a much cleaner Street Index for DOS to match the voters to. That is the intermediate step – the web application might allow a change to come in, the change goes into the geography, then out of the geography into the Street Index. To get the present QVF Street Index information into framework is another pilot. There are jurisdictions where a staff member has an Access table and Alden Leatherman wrote a program that allows selection of a record in the Access table and the address range information then can go onto selected set of framework arcs. This is streamlining the process of getting data from this table into framework provided all the election geography matches. In the first jurisdiction completed, there were 200 street index records and 65 matched on the first attempt where they interpolated the address ranges normally across a series of segments in framework. The biggest problem is the lack of good zip codes on framework. The Street Index zip codes need to be on framework and they are looking at ways to do that. Trying to work with the United States Postal Service (USPS). CGI has had a meeting in Grand Rapids and they have been promised another meeting. CGI proposed going there and look at their resources that would help verify where these zip code locations are. CGI may be looking at taking the clerks' word for it for the time being. CGI got 65 out of 200 to match and they don't know how many of the remaining are a result of bad zip codes. Staff states that this is a significant problem.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, said that if CGI figures out the source for the zip code boundaries, please let her know.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that there are number of things that the USPS is working on. One is a local addressing authority, which the USPS rules states they are supposed to work with. They are supposed to be compiling a list that they will share with CGI. CGI has already started a list like that. And CGI wants to establish that list of who is the authority on names and addresses. Then they are supposed to work with the local postmasters on the zip code information. CGI offered to print maps for them. CGI did print maps for Royal Oak and have never gotten anything back yet. CGI has lots of ideas – taking staff over there to look at the resources, print maps, send problem areas to them. The upper management involved in the first meeting was positive that they wanted this State/USPS relationship to happen. If they can make it work, they would like to take it to Memphis office of the USPS.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, stated that eventually if there is a semi-decent cadastral layout and populates parcels with the appropriate zip codes and you can go backwards.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that he has not had a chance to see what their resources are. As soon as they see what USPS has, they will have a better chance of streamlining a process to figure out where the zip code breaks are. But you can't build zip code polygons.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, commented that they just resorted to using the process Jeroen Wagendorp just described of using parcels as a reference theme and infers where some of the boundaries are. They did receive some legal descriptions from the Royal Oak office and they calculated that they have a document to support about 50% of them. Then if the parcels show that boundary built based on the legal description doesn't work, and then they will edit the boundary based on parcels. They know that the tax bills are getting there and that is a pretty good sign that the zip code is pretty good.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, stated that in 1992 Allegan County had a lot of floating polygons with different zip codes with a lot of jumping back and forth.

Everett Root, CGI, added that the ability to change that is at the local level, but doesn't know if it then comes up to the region. It was encouraging from the start and CGI is hoping that something will happen to help with the zip code issue. One of the other big things are the school districts. They are an important component of election geography for school district elections. Getting school district boundary updates are difficult because they can change yearly and often change on parcels. So CGI has talked about getting parcels with the school district codes. Some communities have that. That could be another resource CGI would like to look at. Ultimately the source for all this will be the clerk for the time being – will try to get them to work with the GIS Office when available. There will be a lot more to report on this. Anything done with these web applications will be useful in other areas. The programming, reporting of information back and forth, and capture of local information - it will all be very useful.

#### B. Act 51 Mapping

Everett Root, CGI, reported that CGI has reconciled 2001 Act 51 maps to framework. That was a big component in Version 3. They created city and village Act 51 maps earlier this year and are in the process now of creating township maps for the county road commissions. Twenty-two counties have been completed. CGI makes the maps, make the PDF, and have them sitting and waiting for review. Technically they don't go out until January, but CGI wants to get as much done now possible. CGI is looking at new software to help with the labeling. Now everything is done in ArcMAP. It is a good way to get framework out there and get the road commissions to look at that.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, asked if Oakland County is one of the 22 and who the contact person at the road commission.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that CGI doesn't have a contact person because CGI makes the maps and then they go to Dick Turcott, MDOT. They go through the flow there. CGI did all the cities and villages and they were mailed out during the winter and spring months. CGI has not had a chance to see a return on those yet. They are still being processed at MDOT.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if the ones being created now are from the changes that were sent back.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that the 2002 changes are incorporated. Almost all of the county changes are in. CGI has counties A through N in the office and the rest are about ready.

#### IX. Michigan State University (MSU) Center for Remote Sensing (CRS) and GIS Project and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU CRS GIS, reported that the Center for Remote Sensing had reorganization and an administrative name change, which took effect July 1. The new name is Remote Sensing and GIS Research and Outreach Services. Their new web address is [www.rsgis.msu.edu](http://www.rsgis.msu.edu), but the old one will work. They have been sending out cards notifying people of the change. Function hasn't really changed. Staff has been cut back from 15 staff to about 11. Had a list of 5 classes that ESRI is scheduled to teach in the January to March period. They are mainly all building Arc GIS or Arc Geodatabase. MSU will have a fall Tech Week, September 29 through October 3. This is one week of 3-hour mini-sessions. Four sessions deal with ArcGIS (primer – migrating data into it and editing parcels in ArcGIS); ArcSDE; basic HTML; spatial concepts; public data; Map Image Viewer; and land cover/use. The workshops cost about \$50 in the spring and Bill doesn't think that the cost has been increased. In the November 3-7 period there are several 1-2 day classes at MSU: Fundamentals of GIS, Map Image Viewer, 2-day Intro to ArcGIS, Image Rectification, and Photo Interpretation. MSU is also finalizing negotiations with LEICA to become a LEICA Global Position System (GPS) Training Center. There will be additional equipment that will be available and training classes in GPS. MSU has been land use/cover mapping in the state. The latest has been with a Kellogg Grant that has provided matching funds for townships. Under the first round of the grant, 50 townships are underway for land cover mapping. This is typically using 1998 color infrared images unless the township or the county has more recent photography. Displayed a map showing which townships are involved. About

20 of those 50 have opted for having analysis done to do change detection between the 1978 Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) land use mapping and the more recent mapping. MSU has secured more funding from Kellogg that will allow 25 more townships to be done. The match on the new 25 is \$1,500 for the township and the grant matches \$1,000. As the townships are completed, they are being put on the Center's server and are available through the Map Image Viewer, which installs by county. There will probably be discussion about other routes for distribution.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU Map Library, asked if the future 25 townships are already lined up or do they want to get the word out.

Bill Enslin, MSU CRS GIS, responded that they want to get the word out. They don't suspect there will be any problem filling them. The first 50 went quickly and should be done by October this year. Currently they will be on the Center's server and they are available through the distribution of the Map Image Viewer product.

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

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, reported that their biggest initiatives now are participating in couple regional partnerships through SEMCOG. One is the acquisition of the SEMCOG regional ortho imagery. They are currently seeking partners for the partnership and expecting to collect the letter of intent from those persons next month. Another partnership with SEMCOG is in support of Homeland Security through a coordination group for GIS Emergency Management. Tammi Shepherd, Oakland County, will be heading up the public safety interface. The purpose of the coordination group is to integrate GIS into emergency management practices. They started initially by identifying what data layer that should go into that, the Critical Locations: schools, public facilities, municipal buildings, hospitals, etc. Now that they have begun the data layers that are useful for Homeland Security issues, they need to talk about protecting the sensitive data. Data access and sharing will be a topic that will be addressed. They are publishing all of their data in SDE even the TIFFs, which are awesome in SDE.

Susan Moore, Oakland County GIS, reported that they have all their data in SDE and they are developing some data models: critical locations, drain commission, administrative areas, and land management. There will be parcels and roads all in one data model and hopefully will take advantage of all the geo database capabilities. Within the next year they plan to launch the land management data model. They are developing some ArcIMS services – some internal and some external. Hopefully by Labor Day they will have a metadata service available on their internet server – then can come to their website and search all their metadata. That means that they need to get their metadata written and that means communicating with their different departments to get help writing the metadata.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, reported that he has a meeting with Ottawa, Barry, and Kalamazoo Counties to see if they can fly next year using one vendor. Based on what Oakland learned, Image America's 6-inch black and white you can get 2,500 square miles on one contract.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, stated that Image America came by yesterday to give a demonstration because Oakland pressed them on the 2002 flight and shortcomings on method of collection. They are finding way to improve those shortcomings.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County GIS, commented that he talked to Ken Parks and explained that Image America had given them a price for 6-inch stuff and Jeroen asked Ken for a price for 12-inch color that would be cheaper.

#### XI. Regional Projects and Activities

Nobody present.

#### XII. Federal Project and Activities

Gordon Rector, United States Census Bureau, reported that they have downloaded the remaining Michigan Geographic Framework (MGF) files to evaluate for the TIGER

repositioning program. About 10 counties from Michigan had gone to their contractor earlier this year and the Census Bureau is still waiting to hear if they have come back and look good. There have been some formatting issues. The contractor in Florida is still working on those. The Census Bureau is hoping that it all works out because there are 600 more counties throughout the country that are coming this fiscal year. The Census Bureau is hoping that they can do what they did this past fiscal year.

Everett Root, CGI, said that it is his understanding that Monroe County made it all the way through.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, stated that he had not officially heard that and he has been asking that in the weekly conference calls with headquarters and they are not sure that they can say officially that it has gone through. When it does, that is the one that will be called "The Pathfinder" for the whole country. If Monroe County works, then we know that the contractor has the ability to do it everywhere else.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, asked if this is the local data that they are talking about.

Everett Root, CGI, responded it is framework data.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, added that they have served up their local roads.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, responded that the Census Bureau has taken framework for most of the state, but a few like Oakland is being taken. This is an initial program to realign the line work in TIGER. The goal is to get every county in the country to get the roads to line up within 7.6 meter or better accuracy. Later in the decade they will go back to the counties and get updates. Then when they go into the 2010 census, they will have the best they can have.

Anita Campbell, Oakland County GIS, asked if there are any other local units of government that they Census Bureau has collected their road data?

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, responded that he thinks Macomb County submitted theirs. There are not a lot of counties that have gone through this process yet. The Census Bureau is trying to load up the queue so that 600 can go through next year and a lot of Michigan counties will go through the whole process next year. The Census Bureau has another contractor that collects 110 GPS points in each county and then they evaluate the files up front to see if these files at least are 7.6 meter of accuracy. Then they send them off to the contractor and they use the same 110 points when they come back from the contractor to see if they have repositioned it correctly. Anything that they can do will make TIGER better than it is now.

### XIII. Other Issues

Kathleen Weessies, MSU Map Library, reported that she is responsible for the IMAGIN newsletter's feature article for November and December. She is looking for ideas. This is a great opportunity. If you want the word to go out statewide about one of the projects or want people to learn about the QVF or the concept of locals feeding information to the state. The articles are not long. If you have an idea, it is easy to work up a couple pages on a topic. Needs a good solid rough draft by the end of September.

### XIV. Next Meeting Date

September 4, 2003 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, Lansing, MI 48913