

Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

Date: September 6, 2001

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Michigan Information Center, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room

I. Approval of September Meeting

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Version 1 Delivery Update

Rob Surber, Michigan Information Center (MIC), reported that the delivery of Version 1 will take many forms because there many products that agencies want out of Version 1. A significant version will have new number. A repositioned version, which will include trunkline updates, will have a Version 2 label. The statewide GIS coverage file size is 1.31 GB for all layers. It has been put together and are now doing statewide quality control on the product.

Bill Enslin, MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS, asked if county coverages will be available and what are the options.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that the shape files would be on the server. In the past, have produced CDs and will not change the policy. They can be either county or state.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if it is possible to get shape files with layers pulled out or a shape file with everything.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that most people do not know what to do with everything and they prefer separate.

Everett Root, MIC, added that they could look at putting E00 files up also.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if it would include the lake polygons

Rob Surber, MIC, added that shape files and related files by county will be available. Some non-traditional users get data out of it in a database form and to them that is framework. Therefore, had to put caveats to announcement. A generic statement that “it is coming” and is not appropriate because everybody thinks that “their” version is coming at that time.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that the framework went through a period when nobody really knew where this project was going. Framework had a nice clean path in the beginning, but it has grown and it has picked up other efforts. It is now coming to a stable point. Version 1 also includes 90% of attribution of Version 1.a data (missing two counties). As we move forward with release, it will contain extra stuff. When MIC releases Version 1 with blank fields for Wayne and Oakland Counties, SEMCOG will say that it is not Version 1 because it does not have the data they need, therefore Version 1.a.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that because referencing is stable, they can begin to do work, but they need to know that up front.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that at the same time, trying to make effort since 81 counties are complete and do not want to hold them up until the end of the year. Want to deliver things as they are complete for areas in the state so that they can be used.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that metadata is being developed for the raw original file as an all themes/all layers file as well as separate shape files by county and will be sent out with files. Feature based data is tagged where it is possible. Hopefully can give users everything that they need.

Everett Root, MIC, stated that MIC wants to do a data dictionary for shape files themes.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that this is a lot of work, but he thinks this is what most GIS users want. Framework is a living, breathing product and will modify as necessary. Versions will be critical as it goes through cycles of development and maintenance. The challenge is that until it is worked with, it is difficult to anticipate problems and needs. The plan is to continue

with quarterly releases. Updates will depend on users needs. At this point, the goal is to get a statewide product out. After repositioning there will be maintenance phase. Will try to take one pass through from feedback and updates first to the trunkline and then others.

Bill Enslin, MSU, asked how MIC would handle custom requests.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that at this time, users should contact Everett Root, MIC, if they need a special delivery. If there is an ongoing need, Rob can see a potential for a way for users to get in and get out without involving Everett.

Bill Enslin, MSU, asked if MIC when moves into SDE will they use the extract server.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that they would. MIC will initiate conversation with ESRI for onsite assistance for the process of moving into the geodata base. There are issues with the transportation model that need to be worked out yet.

B. Repositioning Update

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that repositioning work is going on in parallel with the first version, but will not be distributed at this time. Approximately half of the quarter quads are done through repositioning of the road network. From a road kilometer or mileage stand point the project is a quarter of the way done. MIC has statistics on Kent County and the rate is faster on urban areas – can view a lot of block quickly. Plan to have this done the shortly after the first of the year. Getting ortho's is a deciding factor for work being done. At this time, they have not run out of work for staff to do. May run into a critical point where it may get tight, but they are flowing in now.

C. Digital Ortho Update

Gary Bilow, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), distributed status map. They have been taking delivery of the digital ortho quarter quads (DOQQ) regularly and are reprojecting full-time. The work has been assigned and deliveries are scheduled for the rest of the year. MDNR had been waiting for USGS to do their quality control, which was taking 4-6 weeks. Now MDNR has changed the process. MDNR is taking delivery at the same time as USGS and then MDNR can begin reprojecting work. That USGS has difficulty with one block. They do not know if this is a vendor-processing problem. The MDNR money has been approved for DOQQ replacement and USGS has money to match. The plan is to replace the old 1992 DOQQs, with the 1998. MDNR is not doing national forest areas.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked how it would work with DOQQs that are “part in and part out” of the national forest areas.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, responded that the “part in and part out” would be done.

Gil Chesbro, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), commented that he downloaded MrSid compressed DOQQs. Michigan GeoRef is not coming through – it is barely in the Western Hemisphere. Asked for a contact about MDNR to get advise about how the translation is being done.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, recommended that requests go to Sherm Hollander at (517) 373-9123. On the MDNR web site is the MrSid version. There is a noticeable loss in quality going from TIFF to MrSid.

D. National Hydrologic Data (NHD) / Michigan Geographic Framework (MGF) Meeting

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that Steve Miller, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality is chairing a committee on the National Hydro Data (NHD) to conflate to larger scale map base product. There is a technical committee including state, federal, MSU, and others. The committee is focusing on which base map to use to conflate NHD data. The project with the United State Forest Service (USFS) is to conflate the NHD 1:100,000 data to the GIS data base of the Local Forest Service region. There are three areas in the state with jurisdiction and each has been doing work to create base maps. The question is how does the state partner with the

USFS and the USGS to create the best product possible. The state has an interest in making sure that its investments ((Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) and framework)) are protected without going backward and want to get any valuable information that has been created by the local Forest Service. The committee is scheduled to meet September 11 at the Kellogg Center to review where they are with the base map effort with the criteria that has been established to evaluate each base map. If not able to come up with any recommendations, they will be further along to id which base map will be used. The USFS has one year to do the work. Brian Sanborn, USFS, has indicated that the USFS is not by default choosing their base map, but they want to partner with the state and are coming to the meeting with an open mind. There will be introductory discussions regarding each product around the state and try to arrive at recommendations. A driving force is that the MDNR Institute of Fisheries Research wants to do work as part of digital atlas products along with the USFS. The Forest Service covers 1/3 of the state and the state wants data for the remaining 2/3 of the state as well. This is an argument to use framework because it is a consistent product.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that the state is going into the meeting with an open mind as well. But it would be major step backwards if we commit state resources to generate a hydro set of data that is not tied into the nearly \$14,000,000 effort to create the statewide framework. The argument of the advantages must be convincing that doing work for 1/3 of the state must be advantageous to bringing that work into the statewide consistent file. MIC has done everything since the early 1990 to look at the concept of National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) framework.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that USFS might have a variety of methods that are being used in that 1/3 of the state depending on the forest region. Is it a dump of MIRIS? That original work has gotten a lot of mileage. The commitments will have to be made by October 1 as to how much the state will do. MIC will and is committed to complete the work for the state at some point, but wants to make sure that we are not left with a mess to fix.

E. State of Michigan's Naming Authority

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that this topic was introduced at the last meeting related to another issues but since then have talked to USGS and realized that a person at MDNR has been appointed as the Name Authority for Michigan.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, added that as part of the Natural Rivers Program Steve Sutton, MDNR, was making contact with the USGS Naming Authority and during conversation agreed to be the contact for Michigan. He then got 2-3 pieces of correspondence a year from USGS. Now it sounds like a framework role and MDNR would be happy to abdicate the position.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the framework mission is to obtain as much official information as possible. The Naming Authority duty is in line with that mission.

Eric Swanson, MIC, suggested that MIC and MDNR discuss what happens currently, draft an outline of a process, and present it to the Michigan GIS Users' group. It is important to log names and document them in a timely manor.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that it might make sense to have a committee of representatives from different areas that would have input.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that he thought that the Michigan GIS Users' group would be a good place to review the process first.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, added that the naming process primarily begins at the local level and once they make approval, it is pretty much rubber-stamped unless there is a problem.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that identifying problems is an important part of the process.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that he thinks that naming is a local function. There are no laws for naming of roads, lakes, or rivers that he is aware of. He is more concerned with doing a query of legislative laws to see what is available.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU GIS Map Library, stated that there are five state governments that require that the word squaw be removed from any official names.

Bill Enslin, MSU, commented that they group might want to look at a State Cartographer who handles naming conventions. This individual would be contacted for state cartographic issues. Sherm Hollander, MDNR, has played some role in this area.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that a clearinghouse would have the official list. Rob will set up a meeting with Steve Sutton, MDNR, and Gary Bilow, MDNR, and report to the group next time.

F. NASA Northeast Affiliate Meeting

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that he attended the NASA Northeast Affiliate Meeting the Institute of Application of Geo Technology at RACNE. Many in the Michigan GIS Users' group attended a meeting on the concept of getting NASA's work and data into the hands of local, regional, and state governments for day-to-day use. The meeting agenda highlights focused on the idea of creating workshops for each of the 14 states in the northeast area. The workshops are to discuss data and of remote sensing data technology, give hands-on training, and invite interested people within each state who are interested in learning about remote sensing. They worked on workshop design and the idea is to create 1-day workshops in conjunction with existing GIS state conferences. The IMAGIN conference was Michigan's choice because it is statewide and global in its user community. The workshop would be 1 day before or after the IMAGIN conference. There is NASA money associated with development of curriculum materials, promotional, and some travel for NASA personnel. Rob commented that it would be best to have people from the state with remote sensing background do the training because these people could customize Michigan data and interests. Rob is on a committee to work on the agenda and will be making information available. The plan is to potentially tie into the next IMAGIN conference. They also worked on a mini-grant proposal. There is a BAA, which is the big NASA grant to help states initiate the remote sensing technology. Michigan is still waiting to hear why it was not chosen for a grant. Many states did not get the grant because it was not properly sponsored (no academic or commercial involvement) or did not cost share. Michigan met both criteria, so unsure of why they were not selected. More weight seemed to be given to interesting new and different applications. There were five applications from Michigan and it would be nice if can coordinate better next time. States were encouraged not to be discouraged – there will be more grants. There was a larger 5-point plan (workforce development, remote sensing, organize regional infrastructure and training, common products, and end-to-end pilot project) is being presented to the new Bush administration, but the BAA money is still there. The states asked for comments before resubmitting their proposals. NASA will do another selection round this year. RACNE has a mini-grant proposal of \$200,000 and \$250,000 that amount to \$20,000 grants to agencies. The idea that the money may jumpstart some applications.

Eric Swanson, MIC, is on this work group. There is also a data buy - RACNE will buy data from NASA and want input from affiliates. The state of Michigan will have some say as Michigan applications or commercial data can be bought. Eric Swanson, MIC, is also a part of this group to explore the opportunity for buying data for Michigan.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if Rob contacted anyone on the IMAGIN Events Committee yet.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that that he has not yet. This was only a discussion and nothing has been formalized yet.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, stated that the IMAGIN conference would be 3 days this year. Monday morning is for workshops and the NASA workshop would fit. The chair is Jennifer Miller, Tracy Breen, Justin White, or Ann.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that they would want to talk to the people at MSU, Center for Remote Sensing.

Bill Enslin, MSU, added that MSU does a national conference now. Perhaps they could incorporate.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, added that RESAC is doing data buys through MSU.

Bill Enslin, MSU, added that he heard the RESAC, which was a 3-year program, was in financial jeopardy.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that people at NASA seemed to think that the RACNE mini-grant is the boat to get on right now. NASA is up in the air because of organizational structure.

Bill Enslin, MSU, explained that LANDSAT (Land Satellite from NASA) and some other things are in place.

Eric Swanson, MIC, stated that they have been invited to meetings and they must not be interested, because they have not attended.

Bill Enslin, MSU, commented that his contact had personal problems and could not attend

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that he has a digital copy of the minutes if anybody interested.

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

Gary Bilow, MDNR, reported that with technology stuff up in air they feel fortunate that the GIS group got quarter of million dollars approved through the department budget process. This will include training for developers and a number of projects to key into the digital atlas. Met with the Corps of Engineers yesterday who are attempting to get regional Great Lakes remote sensing program in place. There may an opportunity to get money. There is a contractor looking at LIDARS (Light Detection and Ranging System) and remote sensing data for the shoreline and are limiting it to 10 kilometers inland and 8 meters of depth. They are working on the program now because they have the money. This is a hard to find product that everybody can hang hat on. The next step is a report, a Corps of Engineers document. The draft report will be out in October. Basically, there is no money for it, but plan to do the project if money becomes available.

Rob Surber, MIC, clarified that the Corps is not offering any money for this.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, commented that this was on their Wish List. Some of the details they are looking at are quarter meter 3 mile accuracy for the shoreline area from the plumbline out to 8-meter depth for the LIDAR product and 1 meter accuracy for DEM (Digital Elevation Model, typically produced by USGS) with 2-foot contours. There are 17,000 miles of shoreline in Michigan.

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

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, reported that recently the MDOT in cooperation with the County Road Association of Michigan has undertaken a pilot project to rate all federal aid roads using PASER (Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating) system. There have been six counties chosen – Genesee and Alcona Counties have been done and Chippewa, Grand Traverse, Oakland, and Kent Counties are to be done. They are taking the framework spatial data line work and linear referencing line work and brought it into a GIS and tied that into a GPS so they always knew where they were. They then click on a road segment and rate the road. Then export that data, the road attribute, and physical referencing (PR) number into DBF. Also wrote a quick routine that allows them to rate the segments and rate from the segment break.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that she was at a RoadSoft meeting. Updating procedures for collecting data on roads was on their agenda. The chair of the committee Ron Young, Alcona County, is very enthusiastic about the MDOT system. RoadSoft anticipates reflecting Act 51 for next year.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, proposed to the MIC that when MDOT does the Lower Peninsula take a MIC staff along to see the framework application and the discrepancies they see in the field.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that MDOT is waiting for quality control on Oakland and Wayne Counties. They have not done quality control for the regional product for University Region. MDOT is almost finished with Version 1. Oakland County will be tougher to check legal system, Act 51 certification.

Carol Woodman, Michigan State Industry (MSI), stated that MSI's work will take 2-3 weeks for Wayne County. It is much easier than Oakland County will be.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if Oakland County Road Commission is using framework.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, responded that he was not sure. When MDOT collects data, they will use framework. Gil asked if Oakland has an alternative.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, responded that they have their own centerline file from digital ortho photos. However, they do not have a linear referencing system.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, stated that MDOT would not use if it does not have the linear referencing system.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that this is possibly a good topic to discuss at the SEMCOG Regional meeting.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, commented that Oakland County has asked SEMCOG about using the linear referencing system. It has been explained that a system cannot be built overnight on the street centerline file.

Eric Swanson, MIC, added that the model MIC has with the Wayne County's partnership provides MIC with Wayne County's lines and MIC wants Wayne County to have MIC's attributes so both making major commitment in resources and time. This solves the whole problem.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that Wayne County is a unique situation because the Road Commission, County Engineer, is tied directly into county executive GIS office. In Oakland County, the Road Commission and county GIS office are in separate locations.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that there is a very few county road commissions that are tied into GIS. Kent and Wayne Counties may be only ones.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that fortunately Kent and Wayne Counties are partners with MIC.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that Kent County picked up the bill for major GIS work for townships and cities since they did not participate with REGIS. Most of the counties that have major GIS efforts do not coordinate with their county road commission.

Rob Surber, MIC, confirmed this. MIC will get a call from a road commission who may be unaware of what is happening in their county and MIC may have been working with their GIS departments.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that this is beginning to change in the Upper Peninsula because of RoadSoft, who is building the framework into their new products. And every Upper Peninsula County now has a copy of RoadSoft. All of the Upper Peninsula counties and about 2/3 of northern Michigan have been trained on RoadSoft.

Gary Bilow, MDNR, asked if any there is any benefit to using the Oakland County centerline file for repositioning.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded there might be – there is some history there. MIC has been using the high resolution ortho's.

Jim Living, Woolpert, stated that the centerline was not created from high resolution ortho's.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that Kent County used their photography to do their GIS work but did 'edge of roadway' and created centerlines. Found that some centerlines were missing.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that PAZER looks like it will continue, but it still is in the pilot stage.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, commented that MDOT did every road for the pilot project. They will set up procedures and train people to do Kent and Oakland Counties.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked MDOT who their contact at Oakland County is.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, responded that they do not currently have a contact.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, commented that she is going to attend an Oakland County GIS Steering Committee meeting and people from the Road Commission will be there.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, stated that MDOT is waiting for the Road Commission to start this. In addition, this seems to be politically sensitive.

Rob Surber, MIC, asked if once this is approved could it be made public.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, responded that he could not share the results until they see the results, which will be the results of a pilot project.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if the data collected includes the road type, road surface type, road condition, and number of lanes - will it change in urban areas where they might want to know the number of curbs.

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, responded the data collected would not be changed. In Alcona County, they used comments field to indicate whether seasonal roads.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that that information would be useful and MDNR may be interested in that data.

V. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Project and Activities
Nobody present.

VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

Eric Nischan, Michigan State Police (MSP), stated that MSP is wondering how the Department of Information Technology (DIT) will effect them. The MSP Communication Division will be shifting to the DIT. They do not expect the change to effect them much operationally. The web page draft for GIS MSP information will be put on the MSP Intranet first for security issues. Their consultant has collected data ready and reprojected. If statewide data was from federal agencies, it was cut down to county level. If anybody is interested in the data from the Consequences Assessment Tool set that the Defense Threat Reduction Agencies uses, MSP can provide it. MSP is about to launch their project by the end of the year. They have been working with ArcPad Version 6, which is light years beyond ArcPad Version 5. In the next month or so, they plan to have their ArcIMS services up on the Intranet.

VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Carol Woodman, Michigan State Industries (MSI), distributed a status map. MSI delivered finished MDOT attributes and mailed August 23 to MIC. MSI is more than half way through Wayne County work and anticipate completion in 2-3 weeks. The MDOT PR Finder Project has been completed – there is a small file to update. The Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) Project has 11 counties to be done - anticipate completion in a week.

VIII. MIC Projects and Activities

A. Census Zip Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) Map

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that they have created a statewide Census 2000 zip code tabulation area map, which is a custom map product, and it is on the MIC web site. There is a lot of information on one sheet. It may be downloaded as a PDF and can be printed. If there are problems, contact MIC. This is what the Census Bureau is using to tabulate data at the zip code level - there is a Census Bureau disclaimer that "this may or may not be actual zip area". The "499xx" designation is a hole where there is formal delivery area because there are no customers in that area. If cannot print large plots MIC went to PhotoShop and created 8 ½" x 11" tiles in PDF of this product. Can tape the sheets of paper together and create a map. Not everybody has the capabilities to plot a map and this is a way to print. MIC plans to do this with all Census Bureau block maps. There is block map set that MIC is going to run through program to create products. MIC just finalized the approach. These will be available with the index sheet.

Joe Kogelman, U.S. Census Bureau, stated that the Bureau received the file that showed the block and what zip code it is in. There are many approximations. Whenever there is a new postmaster, the routes and zip codes are changed especially in rural areas.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if the original of this layer is from Census Bureau.

Joe Kogelman, U.S. Census Bureau, responded that the data is based on what people said their zip codes were at time of the 2000 census.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that MIC has not tagged framework with ZCTA. It is new and they did not want to slow delivery of framework.

B. Link Michigan Projects

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the Link Michigan Project involves the state putting high-speed telecommunication trunkline around the state. MIC is involved in the planning process. They are locating concentrations of population using census data. Then can say "blank" percentage of the population is located a certain distance from a major telecommunication trunkline. The SWLD has points of all the facilities. Where the facilities are located in a high population concentration, MIC created a buffer around them on the map. Link Michigan Project is currently working a point of presence where they currently have trunklines provided by Ameritech and other companies, which will be overlaid with the SWLD to see where holes are. Then vendors will be able to bid knowing what the workload will be. This is part of Governor Engler's initiative with the Department of Information Technology and Link Michigan to be sure everybody is connected to the high speed internet.

C. Choose Your Schools

Eric Swanson, MIC, reported that MIC is working with the e-Michigan Office Center for Education Performance Information and MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS to develop web application with key characteristics by school building.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that some of the attributes are the awards that students get for excellence, tests results, teacher-pupil ratios, graduation rates, expenditures, etc. Parents want to know this information when trying to decide where to send their kids.

Eric Swanson, MIC, commented that this is an ArcIMS application that MSU is developing. It is school building-based. There are 4,200 K-12 school buildings in the state. This allows query by district, public and charter schools. This will be unveiled mid-October. It will be linked through the e-Michigan site (Michigan.gov). This project has entered MIC into the SDE, ArcIMS arena and has beefed up computing capacity and the staff's learning curve.

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

Bill Enslin, MSU, reported that the ESRI schedule has been finalized for next year. January through June there will be 15 classes. The schedule is on the web site. MDEQ scanned 700,000 water well records that are not currently in Michigan GeoRef. MDEQ has a web site for downloading the PDF files and MSU will be the point of distribution for CD products. A small

well log viewer allows selection of a county and township brings up with water well records. In February, they will provide update to health departments in the state and some communities.

X. County / Local Projects and Activities

Nobody present.

XI. Regional Projects and Activities

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, reported that they have been putting blocks on framework for their long-term project, 2000 land use update. They are still working on their tract maps. They have updated their community boundary coverage from MIC, which will help. The Regional GIS Coordination Committee is presenting a workshop on Watershed Management in GIS. This will be held at the city of Novi. They are still working on the agenda and have room for additions, if you are interested. Later they plan to present an Archive workshop.

XII. Federal Projects and Activities

Joe Kogelman, U.S. Census Bureau, reported they are gearing up for Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program. They have 65 cases that have been submitted by the three states in this region. Ken Darga, Michigan State Demographer, found quite a few in prisons and colleges. They have started 32 and have finished 20; 12 need major changes in the TIGER file in the master address file; 26 have not been started. Gordon Rector is working on Michigan. Also have been verifying boundary annexation surveys. Joe's office has been verifying the Indian reservation boundaries. There are two cases with a lot of discussion with the tribes involved. The Indians claim reservations larger than the records of the Bureau. Started production of the Census 2000 maps. Will send out maps showing the census tabulation blocks, the local boundaries, by individual jurisdictions. These will be mailed to every jurisdiction in the 3-state region (there are 4,500 jurisdictions) by November. Their office will be moving in November or December. There will also be a reduction of staff. When people get the Census 2000 maps, they are able to compare block by block to the Summary File 1 data in terms of number of housing units. The Bureau anticipates housing CQR questions from individual jurisdictions about housing units. They had a request from headquarters for two digital files for the Geography Division to review and see how to insert or replace various TIGER file information. When Joe finds out what the Geography Division wants for testing that will be sent to vendor to see if vendor can perform as promised.

XIII. Other Issues

Eric Swanson, MIC, reported that the Governor Engler, by executive order, created a new department. The Department of Information Technology takes formal effect October 14, 2001. MIC is being rolled into this new department. There are issues and questions about organizational structure. The purpose of the new department is to coordinate the information technology initiatives within state – geographic information systems (GIS) falls within that category.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if the new department is parallel to the Department of Management and Budget (DMB).

Eric Swanson, MIC, responded that it takes all information technology oversight functions out of DMB. Current chief information officers (CIO's) are being transferred into this department but will be working within their own agency. All central information technology functions are being rolled into the new department.

XIV. Next Meeting Date

October 4, 2001, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Information Center, 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