

Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

Date: October 2, 2003

Time: 10:00 a.m.

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

I. Approval of September Meeting Minutes

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Version 3 Update

Rob Surber, Michigan Center for Geographic Information (CGI), reported that the county files are now available on the CGI web site (michigan.gov/cgi) and can be downloaded. The statewide file will be ready in a few days. CGI is working on developing generalization techniques for faster map display at various scales for use with framework. The performance in Map Michigan is reasonable but plan to increase it not only from a hardware standpoint with server upgrades but also from a data standpoint. For example, the two-barrel highways have a centerline version and have single points for interchanges and ramps. There are a number of things being done at various scales.

Everett Root, CGI, added that CGI wants to generalize layers for different scales and see if they will display faster. They plan to look at the routing application to see if adjustments need to be made. The geocoding or the addressing matching part will not change – they seem to be pretty efficient. CGI is in a research stage. Then will load into routing application and put it out there.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that this going to be done in a matter of weeks. CGI will make an announcement. There are problems keeping track of Map Michigan load statistics. Staff is talking about getting software to do a better job of tracking. Some of the seasonal programs are have spikes at certain times of the year – for example the Boating Application had major hits over the summer. Now with the MEAP data coming out, the Michigan School Info Online Application will probably take off. CGI hopes to have better statistics in the future.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County Geographic Information Systems (GIS), stated that he has downloaded Version 3. There has been a lot of clean up and it looks good.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, commented that she sent 640 new segments and 165 pages of changes to private road segments to Rayan Ray, CGI, this week. The stuff covered by Act 51 is clean as can be, but the private roads need work.

Trevor Floyd, St. Clair County Metropolitan Planning Commission (SCCMPC), added that they have a lot of private roads. A couple of section lines popped up as roads this time.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, said that some of it is Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (TIGER) artifacts, Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) artifacts. They are not there.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that CGI is just now entering into the local certification phase. Do not feel comfortable at the state level of dropping them off without local level of review.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, commented that she had a clerk sign off on anything higher than an A44 framework classification code (FCC).

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that this is in the area of the pilot partnerships. CGI is hoping that folks look at and get a chance to provide feedback. In the future, if a new version comes out it should be minimal in terms of changes or updates.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, asked Everett Root if CGI is going to update framework with QVF changes.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that they will be reflected in Version 4 as far as private roads. CGI can do a cartographic version or a GIS version.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, stated that once everybody is on the same page, they want to go over to framework operator id so they can start looking at information for their road commission. The road commission is not interested in the county GIS's product unless they can link to RoadSoft.

Trevor Floyd, SCCMPC, added that it is huge with RoadSoft. Their road commission put a lot of data in there.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, asked if they can keep downloading framework on a regular basis and input that for AVL and computer dispatch or do they have to keep their own version to use and then submit it to framework. How will the cycle work?

Everett Root, CGI, responded that it will depend on whether the physical reference (PR) and mile points for referencing have been assigned because at present time those have to be assigned at CGI.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, added that the 9-1-1 System is not dependent on the unique identification system.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, stated that none of them are except for the Road Commission.

Everett Root, CGI, commented that there needs to be a system whereby if the framework user wants to put it in so that it is in their system, give CGI the geography and the attributes and CGI will add a PR.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that for the partners in the program this is one advantage, CGI can cut pre-releases.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, added that 9-1-1 does not care if it is an Act 51 road – that characteristic can be added later. But it has to be in there at least as a residential dispatchable road.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that is something that CGI wants to work with users on and try a few different methods. That is the point of the pilot. CGI has to see how it fits in their workflow as well. At a minimum, there will be some reconciliation points. Hopefully that will be less and less of a job.

B. Next Steps

- Act 51 Mapping

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that progress is coming well with this process of doing all the township, cities, and villages mapping. CGI is on track to have maps ready to go for next Act 51 release of January 1, 2004. All of the county's products are in and CGI is about a quarter of the way with the cities.

Everett Root, CGI, added this is 2002 Act 51 changes that have been received from the counties have been incorporated and are about a quarter of the way through the cities and villages – not all cities and villages have changes.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the cycle of Act 51 is 1-½ years, which is a long time for certification. There is talk of shrinking that down. Some counties want PDFs sent out as a digital copy.

Everett Root, CGI, added that the ultimate goal is for a web application that will allow change and digital signatures eventually.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that changes are being put in and will be in Version 4. The major releases will be annually – May/June of each year.

Everett Root, CGI, added that it has been put on the Data Library the first week of September. Hope to shorten the gap.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the data is locked down May/June and there are initial products that go out right away.

C. Digital Ortho Update

Nothing to report.

D. Framework Network Pilot Partnerships Update

- Qualified Voter File (QVF) Street Index to the Map Project

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that conversation has covered this topic and asked if there were any comments or questions.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, commented that after looking at Version 3, she thinks things will be a lot harder. Barry County has been feeding the state information for 5-7 years. The clerks were in charge of reporting new road segments and their road segment geography into the QVF. They are doing the data entry regarding the information about the road segment but they were not sending the map. She doesn't mind if she has to write a letter stating that the road segment is a quarter mile off and needs to be shifted over. At least something was submitted, but having nothing at all appear and knowing that they have the QVF and wondering why it is not in framework if it is supposed to have line geography with it. It implies that there are township clerks that do not know where it is.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that Rayan Ray, CGI, said there are a number of clerks who have not been sending in the map products.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, commented that it is easy for her to send a digital shape file completely attributed with precincts. The clerk doesn't require a signoff on the new segments – only on the change segments. She still does pen and paper for the change segments – operator id number, actual name, actual address range and have the clerk sign off. Just send the new segments.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if the clerk just gets the cc and they have no real say in the new segments.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, responded that they get the gold copy. She sets up the new segments as her function for the 9-1-1 maps.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that she is really the key, so it doesn't matter. They will have to have a precinct code or something. That is the best of all scenarios if it is just done. CGI knows there will be some work and have added that into the work plan. CGI has begun some work on a technical proposal. Working on documentation. A letter will go to all the elected officials and GIS offices introducing this concept of the framework network and the QVF address mapping program and support. It will go out in November with endorsement by as many groups as possible (MICAMP, Michigan Association of Counties, Township Association, Clerks Associations, United States Postal Service (USPS), United States Bureau of the Census, state 9-1-1 group, possibly a phone company, state departments). This is a high profile letter giving a business case stating the program name and what they plan to do and preview of coming attractions. The GIS office will get the letter and be able to reference it and set up discussions with the county people. A lot of it is going to be public relations up front and getting momentum. Hopefully it will focus things they are already trying to do but will give a little more leverage in local jurisdictions. It is sort of behind the scenes but everybody knows its value. One of CGI's goals are to raise the awareness of the value of the GIS offices in communities. Hopefully this will create opportunities for GIS offices.

Everett Root, CGI, reported that he had a discussion with Kalamazoo County yesterday. They are looking at an ArcIMS application to get mapping on some of the county agencies' desktops so they can review maps. They plan to hire a GIS coordinator in 2005. Western Michigan University (WMU) is going to provide support to Kalamazoo County to help cleanup their framework to go into their base map. The interest is coming. The road commission has already come to Planning asking for help. The clerk is providing a lot of information to the state. It was a positive meeting. The county asked about crime mapping. Everett explained that was

their data but there is a base map they can map it on. They have things that they would like to map but don't know how to do it.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, added that at MICAMP they have discussed doing a 'road show' and go to administrators conferences etc.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the public relations side of GIS is something that always needs to be worked on. So much of what they do is behind the scenes but the value needs to be spelled out.

- United States Postal Services (USPS) Partnership Update

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that CGI met with management at the Greater Michigan District at Grand Rapids about this concept. They are working on the letter with CGI. An action item from the meeting is that USPS will set up a presentation for other district managers and Memphis about the benefits of this program for them and hopefully get buy-in from other district managers in the state. Problem areas were discussed. USPS is willing to come to the table, get down and dirty with their data problems and work with the state to start resolving them. If the districts get involved, then the local post offices will too. The plan is to have a presentation by the end of this month with all districts including Green Bay. Hopefully this will have implications in the GIS community from the data standpoint for the road system. A key concept talked about was making sure the business-owner of data is at the table and information is coming from them in a consistent way. USPS is a business-owner of their 5-digit and ZIP code information. Once they identify where their new routes are and new ZIP code areas are it is cycled to CGI and then back to local communities in the process. The USPS database is not in sync with their map products. CGI sent them changes. Hopefully with framework as a focal point, they are starting to do updates on framework. Their new directives are not to do haphazard ZIP code boundaries but more consistent ZIP code boundaries. One of the benefits of this process is giving them the tools to be able to do that. Another benefit is that they will have maps at their fingertips that their locals and regions can use.

Michael Hass, Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH), asked where the information comes from.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that they learn about it from ZIP+4 when a new zip code shows up.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that it is not geographic. They want USPS to use GIS as a tool to make the modifications. CGI does have some work with Royal Oak on a hardcopy map product. They are drawing on framework some of their changes and their routes and will send it back to CGI. Royal Oak is a start, but it hasn't happened in the rest of the state.

Everett Root, CGI, commented that the geocoders just get addresses with zip codes that CGI doesn't have and then have to be researched.

Michael Hass, MDCH, asked if there was any thought to when a zip code boundary changes to work with the Census Bureau to update the population data before the 10 year mark.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that is Census Bureau's integration issue. CGI has talked to the USPS about important role with the Census Bureau. There are too many questions to know how that will work. That is the goal – to have a nice flow.

Trevor Floyd, SCCMPC, asked if there has been verification with USPS for a list of addresses for delivery routes.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that there are delivery points in a file that supposedly is confidential. That is an area that CGI is interested in. Maybe under this program, CGI will be able to enter into confidentiality sharing of some of that for purposes for data synchronization or clean up. Much like Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) was. If this works Memphis has talked about taking this nationally. Michigan is going to be in a much better position if we enter into this partnership.

E. Rail Update

Everett Root, CGI, reported that MDOT asked CGI to recreate the active rail map for the state of Michigan from framework. CGI students are going through and tagging active and inactive based on source materials. One task has been completed and MDOT has reviewed. The attributes are now being refined. As a result of that, some of the inactive rails have become Rails to Trails. The staff at the Rails-to-Trails program has requested tagging of Rails-to-Trails trails. There will be a specific Framework Classification Code (FCC) code for the trails.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that some of the maps have air photos to help lock down the start and stop points.

Everett Root, CGI, added that some time in October CGI will do another statewide active rail map. Will continue to make the county maps for the Rails-to-Trails for review and continue to refine features. There is also interest in the inactive rail and its potential to become a trail.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that at some point this might become a distributed MDOT map product.

Everett Root, CGI, added that PR numbers will be added and beginning and ending mile points and will be able to have mile points at intersections. Would like to get an official name and it could go into a 9-1-1 system. The Upper Peninsula is very interested in that.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, stated that they have a lot of two-tracks or foot paths that people live on and they walk to their house from a common parking lot.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, asked if the updated rails will be part of Version 4.

Everett Root, CGI, responded that not officially, but CGI will probably make a GIS layer sooner.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, asked if there was a utilities layer.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded there is not anything that is clean. There is old TIGER features.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, added that there is cell tower info available from the Federal Communication Commission (FCC). E-mail FCC and they will send a current copy. If you ask for the geography (x-y), you will get everything. They have anything that was built after FCC regulations were started. Could not find TV towers that have been up since 1950s and water towers that don't have radio hookup to them.

F. Federal Aid Urban Boundaries (FAUB) Update

Everett Root, CGI, reported that the FAUB boundaries have been mapped to Version 3 of framework. The National Functional Class Codes (NFCC) have been updated based on these new boundaries and are under review. Fifty-two counties were touched by the FAUB.

Joyce Newell, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), explained that federal urban areas are any area over 5,000 population.

Everett Root, CGI, added that once these have been approved, map will be made and then sent to federal government and local government for review. This data will be in Version 4. There will be a FAUB left and right and the functional class will be updated.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that then the maps are sent to regions and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) for functional class review. That should not appear on framework until Version 5. For Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) submittal, do not want to deal with things changing beyond FAUB. Will have Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) not approve any functional class changes that are not related to the boundary changes until January 1. So MDOT can legitimately say that HPMS is now reflecting 2003 data when submitted in 2004 to June.

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

Nobody in attendance.

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

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that they are looking at their federal forest layers for forest roads that are open to the public. FHWA indicates an overlap of miles where feds are claiming forest roads and counties are claiming county roads. FHWA feels that if it is happening in Michigan it is happening in other places too. This is a potential public data layer eventually. Now it is being compared to framework. When layers are cleaned up, will produce working maps. Hiawatha and Ottawa forests have been done and now are working on Huron Manistee. Then will meet with HWA to decide how they want to deal with it and then will work with CGI to get the roads into the system. The asset management data collection is going on. This involves each of the county road commissions going out with an MDOT employee and someone from the region to look at all the federal aid roads. This is 43,000 miles of roadway statewide. They have concentrated on upper Michigan to finish before snow. They are checking the condition of roadways and using RoadSoft, which uses framework, and bring the map up in the car and they attach the data.

Cory Johnson, MDOT, added that it is surprising that with a county rep, region rep, and MDOT rep as a team agree upon what a rating is. They use the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) System to rate surface types 1-10. It is rated based on physical reference (PR) numbers and as each section comes up it is rated. If the condition varies within a segment and it is over a quarter mile long, it is considered a significant change and the length is split. It is identified by mile point at that point. This system is working.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the Procedure Manual is on the web site under About MDOT, under the Transportation Commission, then Asset Management Council.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that the county road commissions have been slow to catch on to GIS. At least one person in each county is now seeing it in action and they will get a copy of the results. They can use RoadSoft (a free software) and they can use it to display data. The data does not belong to MDOT, but to the Asset Management Council and they will decide what to do to finalize the data.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the idea is that they are going to go beyond federal aid over the next few years and do all roads. Some are collecting culverts and other types of information. RoadSoft allows for that and this is revolutionizing how road commissions view their information.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that it will be interesting to see how much the road commissions want to build off of it when then see that tool.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, stated that their road commission is very excited. They want the private drive in there for reference. They want the GIS office to migrate to something that RoadSoft can take.

Michael Hass, Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH), commented that in Branch County they figured the only way they could update RoadSoft data was to send it to CGI and wait for framework to come down. It might be a good thing that it is that hard to get stuff in.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that part of the issue is data migration and consistency on the referencing. It is one thing to have a GIS picture and another to be able to do something with the data. Data migration is no small task.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added the RoadSoft has made some big strides too. They originally started out as PR system as a database, and then they mapped it in a strip map showing intersections according to the Michigan Accident Location Inventory (MALI) index, which was frequently incorrect. Macomb County said that they could not use it because they had so many roads missing. There was no way to update the MALI index. That was one thing that started the work toward framework and getting the index in there so that it could be updated easily for crash location and RoadSoft and others users. Michigan Tech is still learning about GIS as well. It is

built into RoadSoft so they can make it free. If counties don't have RoadSoft, it would benefit them to get it, since it is free, and see what it can do.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, anticipates that they will talk with the road commission more – initially it will come in through addressing. They don't have the resources to jump on the bandwagon and keep it going.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, stated that they are waiting for a framework version that the road commission will be able to accept and then migrate their operator ids.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, commented that if it was on a monthly cycle where they could submit updates and once a month get an updated framework GIS version to support 9-1-1 applications, transportation routing, etc.

Cory Johnson, MDOT, reported that they are working on drain information. They have shared paper maps for Eaton County with MSI.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, commented that within the next couple of weeks they will be putting their hydrology and drains up. It will include storm water sewers that are county drains and tile. They are collecting the name of the drain and if it is classified flow through (FT) and it is consistent with what the drain commission uses. This may actually result in the drain commission dropping certain drains that are being maintained.

Cory Johnson, MDOT, reported that Right-of-Way effort, they just discussed going to a browser-based solution related to Map Michigan as opposed to a GIS platform. This is a preliminary discussion as a result of Caliper issues. The way that they tag the coordinate system is a mystery.

Charles Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI) GIS, stated that industry standards are used. The way the files are generated by one program, it is an issue when tries to be referenced by another program.

Cory Johnson, MDOT, commented that if they wanted to make a map, they could use Arc Explorer.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, added that book product is invaluable. The biggest users of that are title companies trying to figure where the easements are.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated the CGI is working with MDOT on developing an Internet service map service. It is a pilot project to look at dynamic segmentation and use of framework tying into the transportation management system using browser technology to allow people to query and get results.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that part of the pilot was the PR finder and people are asking when it will be available.

Michael Hass, MDCH, asked if you could use dynamic seg with ArcIMS.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded no but that it can be used with Arc Map Services that can be displayed through IMS. Arc9 is going to have an ArcGIS servlet that will allow it to be done. There are a number of ways to solve the problem and they are looking for the most efficient way to do it. The goal is to open up a world of information for MDOT some of which will be public. From the CGI standpoint, this makes framework more visible and from the MDOT standpoint they can start seeing the results of it.

V. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Projects and Activities
Nobody in attendance.

VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities
Nobody in attendance.

VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Charles Bender, MSI, reported that MSI will be digitizing Eaton County for the drainage. They will identify drain names, types, whether tile or open. There will be separate layer so that it will not actually be on framework. Eaton County will be the low end but it is a higher tech low end for referencing. Will try to work with another county that has digitized data available. Then by averaging the two they will have an idea how long it will take if they go statewide. MSI finished going through the 'As Built' CDs that MDOT provided. The data was correlated, put into a data base so they could do sorts and finds identifying the road segments that are 1960 and newer and 1959 and older. They predominately worked with the newer segments when they worked with the 'As Built'. There have been problems with data assessment between the two programs. The first application was only one to be opened by Caliper correctly. The issue is when the files are open and there two roads listed and when the TIF fell behind it and the files seemed like they were being stretched in the process of opening, when a road came through it may be slightly off and skewed from its original location. Both are supposed to be registered to Michigan Georef.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that Caliper doesn't support Michigan Georef.

Charles Bender, MSI, stated that they are getting mixed signals and are only trying to identify what the problem might be and work out a solution. They are snapping it against framework and going from there.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, commented that the road is relatively linear and if you are snapping it on the road, you will need some control outside of that road segment for it to come out right. Arc might be a little friendlier to that amount of linear control. In MIPS if you something that is too much in line, it will distort. Need more distributed points.

Charles Bender, MSI, added that they are referencing to Arc 8.2.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, asked when they image in arc, is it resampling the image to that projection.

Charles Bender, MSI, responded that they haven't seen what Caliper does, they don't have a copy of it.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, added that what happens in ArcInfo and may happen in Caliper as well is that image even though it is registered, when you bring up two, it works the Vectors to the raster image. Even though the image may come up referentially, but if the image has not been resampled to the same projection it will warp the vectors.

Charles Bender, MSI, stated that they have fixed lines before doing any work to it and it didn't seem to make a difference. Couldn't open it at all.

Trevor Floyd, SCCMPC, stated that there are two different places that Arc looks when it finds the coordinates of that image. If it is not in one of two places depending on the version you are looking at, it will have a complete fit.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, said that if MSI is getting a blank screen, it might be a unit conversion problem and it is zooming in too far.

Charles Bender, MSI, added that they will be finishing off the lakes that MDNR does not have funding for yet. They will release them as MDNR gets additional funds. MSI has a copy of the database that they will send to MDNR and there are a lot of nice handy dandy check box features MDNR can use as well – whether there is hunting, fishing, boating, rest rooms. If a county does a search for all the lakes in a county, it gives area, location, and special notes. MSI is tagging rectified and unrectified TIF files in the database for hypertext linking to it which will show the differences and how it relates. Also adding metadata so that it is viewable for hyperlink text. Presenting that to MDNR as something that they may wish MSI to continue to do later.

VIII. CGI Projects and Activities

A. Map Michigan Update

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that the Map Michigan was given at the beginning of the meeting.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, asked how often the Map Michigan is updated. If he sends in a new subdivision in QVF, how long will it be before that shows up in Map Michigan?

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that if you are partnering with CGI under this program, those are the things that you can help steer for your area. CGI wants to set up a decent amount of incentives so that people can get some return that is more tangible. CGI doesn't know yet.

Everett Root, CGI, added that they did it once and a lot of the layers were built and that did not work.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, stated that they are still waiting for a photo product. It will not come up – it junks out every time.

Rob Surber, CGI, suggested that she try it at CGI before she leave and see what the issues might be.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that they showed it live at MICAMP. It takes 37 hours to build pyramids and if you add one new photo, you have to rebuild the whole thing.

B. Michigan Department of Management and Budget (MDMB) Business Continuity Plan – GIS Integration

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that this is a component of statewide land database (SWLDB) but MDMB wants to as a part of any emergency plan there must be business continuity in case of disaster. MDMB is responsible for facilities and parking structures. The issue is much of the need in the case of the emergency is related around GIS data. There have been a number of drills with the Emergency Operations Center, MSP, to say “what if”. Now they are looking at GIS integration and what are the pieces of data that are out there as simple as in the case of a blackout how many people in wheelchairs will need assistance out of the Mason Building. This type of information has not been put together, but if they can work on standards from the GIS perspective it can be tagged for facilities to know floor plans. Working on standards related to facility id and are tying into federal facilities id standards. Relating that to work site information are sub-facilities showing numbers of employees and where they are. MDMB is involving people from the Parking Office, information technology computer systems, and HRMN system (resource management system that tracks state employees). There is discussion about how to tie it together and put it into a map base to do business continuity planning. Some of the other departments are not a part of this right now. The MDMB director wanted to get a feel without getting it too complex.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if they were going to put servers on generators. If there is a blackout there has to be a way to retrieve the information.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that they have not gotten that far yet. Each agency will have their own databases with the information with GIS standards. In case of emergency, it can be pulled in and used. The focus is on MDMB-owned facilities and rented facilities. The groups that manage their own facilities and land are MDOT, MDNR, Veterans Affairs and MDMB.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, asked if this will be in real time in terms of ID tags.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that they are working on the content and standards. The operational will come later.

IX. Michigan State University (MSU) Remote Sensing and GIS Research and Outreach Services Projects and Activities

Nobody in attendance from MSU.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, stated that they ordered a Map Image Viewer for their locals.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that Bill Enslin and staff at MSU have made a lot of additions to the Viewer in the past year.

X. County / Local Projects and Activities

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, reported that their Emergency Management Director position is open.

Trevor Floyd, SCCMPC, reported that their emergency management program has taken off with GIS. They had a mock plane disaster. They had a state police officer light ranging system and the global positioning system (GPS) units that runs off the towers and they GPS'd the items in the field. The accident happened at 6 a.m. and they played after the sun came up at about 8:30, were back in the office by 10:30 and the maps were done and linked by 11:30.

XI. Regional Projects and Activities

Nobody in attendance.

XII. Federal Projects and Activities

Nobody in attendance.

XIII. Other Issues

XIV. Next Meeting

November 20, 2003 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48913