

Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)  
**Idaho Geospatial Committee (IGC)**  
**September 18, 2002, Meeting Minutes**  
*(Approved by Committee May 8, 2003)*

The September 18, 2002, Idaho Geospatial Committee meeting was held from 11:35 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., East Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building, Boise, Idaho.

**CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS**

**Liza Fox**, Chair, welcomed members and others in attendance, and called the meeting to order.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members Present:**

Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff  
Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho Senate  
Gail Ewart, Maxim Technologies, Inc.  
Liza Fox, Idaho Transportation Department  
Tracy Fuller, USGS National Mapping Division  
Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello  
Roger Hirschman, USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service  
Tony Morse, Idaho Department of Water Resources  
Frank Mynar, Idaho Power  
Craig Rindlisbacher, Madison County and City of Rexburg  
Frank Roberts, Coeur d'Alene Tribe  
Carol Silvers, Idaho State Library  
\*Sheldon Bluestein, Ada County  
\*Danielle Bruno, Idaho Department of Agriculture  
\*Donna Fornshell, USDI Bureau of Reclamation  
\*Nancy Glenn, Idaho State University

\*Designate

**Others Present:**

Jason Carr, IDWR Research Institute (IWRI)  
Janet Cheney, Bonneville County  
Rich Elwood, ITRMC Staff  
Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff

**Members Absent:**

Mike Beaty, USDI Bureau of Reclamation  
Dr. Piotr Jankowski, University of Idaho  
Mike McDowell, Kootenai County  
Jonathan Perry, Bureau of Disaster Services

**NEW MEMBER INTRODUCTION**

Liza introduced **Gail Ewart** (Maxim Technologies, Inc.) and **Roger Hirschman** (U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service [USDA NRCS]) as new members of the Committee. Also introduced was **Nancy Glenn** of Idaho State University – representing Dr. Piotr Jankowski at today's meeting – as new member-elect, replacing Jankowski as the Committee's State university system representative.

**MOTION:** Nathan Bentley moved a motion to approve the April 4, 2002, Idaho Geospatial Committee Meeting Minutes.

Carol Silvers, Idaho State Library, suggested one minor change: page four, 'GEOSPATIAL DATA CLEARINGHOUSE DISCUSSION, State,' "After hearing the comments...on February 7th to be fairly decent." This sentence should be changed to read, "After hearing the comments...on February 7th to be *valid*."

**AMENDED MOTION:** Tony Morse moved and Craig Rindlisbacher seconded a motion to approve the April 4, 2002, Idaho Geospatial Committee Meeting Minutes as revised by Carol Silvers, and the motion passed unanimously.

## **GUEST INTRODUCTION**

Liza introduced **Curtis (Curt) Smith**, National Geodetic Survey (NGS) (U.S. Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA]), as Idaho's NGS geodetic adviser. Curt (also the NGS geodetic representative for Montana) explained what kinds of activities were performed by the NGS, and advised he acted as a local point of contact. He also explained how his position was funded. Per Liza, it was hoped that Curt would take a lead in the IGC Cadastral and Geodetic Control Technical Working Group (TWG).

### *Discussion:*

At Nathan's request, Curt explained what the **NOAA's Continuously Operating Reference Stations (CORS) system** was. In the future, it was hoped there would be a densified CORS network in Idaho. More information on this can be found at <http://www.ngs.noaa.gov/CORS/cors-data.html>.

In answer to questions from **Senator Hal Bunderson**, Curt advised the following:

- The NGS owned five of the more than three hundred CORS nation-wide (two were in Idaho), the majority being operated and maintained by the U.S. Coast Guard.
- A consortium of universities, as well as state and local entities, installed the systems.
- At this time, typical time-level CORS receiver antenna set-up and software cost about \$20,000 for each unit. Every one was funded separately by private industry, as well as state and local entities.
- Once operational, the units required very little hands-on maintenance.

---

There was some discussion on the use of **global positioning systems (GPS)**.

Bunderson noted that, the State ought to know how many CORS Idaho should have. Then, details could be worked out as to how partnerships could be developed to fund the installation of the systems. He also pointed out that Michigan had produced a report on what had been done there. Said Curt, the State of Michigan was very proactive in visiting states that were interested in developing a similar set-up. There was more discussion on Idaho's needs with regard to CORS, and Nathan advised he and Curt would soon meet to discuss this issue. ***Liza recommended Nathan and Curt work with the Cadastral and Geodetic Control TWG on the development of a plan for Idaho CORS.***

## **GEOSPATIAL DATA CLEARINGHOUSE – FOLLOW-UP**

Liza provided some background. (For detailed information, see: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/Minutes/m011019.htm#clearinghouse>; <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m020207.htm#clearinghouse>; and <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m020404.htm#clearinghouse>.)

## **MOU**

In April 2002, the IGC endorsed the draft MOU (in concept, with revisions).

*Discussion:*

- Section IV, 1, second bullet, “The participating agencies will provide digital data in agreed formats...” Roger wondered if the data formats referred to needed to be clarified. Per Liza, there was a bulleted item in earlier versions of this document that specified formats. At the February 2002, IGC meeting, “*It was decided such limitations would be removed from the MOU pending further discussion.*” Therefore, **the item in question could be removed.**
  - o Liza advised Senator Bunderson that the purpose of the MOU was to provide seamless sharing of information. By striking the item pertaining to format, agencies would not be limited or forced to confine data to specific formats. This would provide more interoperability between systems. Further, all the softwares could read the different formats, leaving no reason to identify one vendor-specific format.
- Section IV, 2, second bullet, last sentence, “Larger agencies are encouraged to maintain their data on their own servers...” **Dennis Hill** (City of Pocatello) was concerned that the term ‘larger’ was not defined. **Tracy Fuller**, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), mentioned Dennis’ comment was also relevant in the previous sentence (“INSIDE Idaho will develop a strategy for assisting smaller organizations...”), and suggested both sentences dealt with operational issues that should be taken care of by the designated clearinghouse steering committee (upon approval of the MOU).
  - o As these sentences were added at Nathan’s request, Liza asked him to address them. Nathan could not recall the reason(s) for the additions at that time.
  - o Senator Bunderson believed the fourth sentence, “INSIDE Idaho will develop a strategy for assisting smaller organizations...,” read such that INSIDE Idaho would determine which agencies were small. He added that, since the sentence was permissive, the word ‘larger’ could be removed from the last sentence. **Nathan advised he would not have a problem with removing the words ‘smaller’ and ‘larger’ (when referring to agencies) from the document.**
  - o Tony (Idaho Department of Water Resources, IDWR) questioned whether encouraging each agency to maintain its own data on its own servers was not, consequently, encouraging redundancy. He added that a recurring theme in the MOU was to reduce cost by reducing redundancy. In contrast to Tony’s first statement, **Danielle Bruno** (Idaho Department of Agriculture) compared INSIDE Idaho to the federal metadata server concept (Geospatial One-Stop Portal, <http://gai.fgdc.gov/portal/concept.doc>), citing that the data would only actually be stored on the agencies’ servers. Other Committee members concurred with Danielle’s statement.
    - **Frank Mynar**, Idaho Power, wondered who would make the determination as to which agency’s data would be available on insideidaho.org if the same dataset were stored on more than one agency’s server. Per Bunderson, a qualifying phrase could be added to discourage redundancy. Liza noted the last sentence did specify “their data,” implying that *agency-specific* data was to be included. Also, responsibility was not defined, especially for the framework data sets, as well as other shared data.
  - o Gail suggested that, perhaps “...agencies are encouraged to maintain...” (last sentence) could be changed to “...agencies *may* maintain...” Nathan expressed a contrary view, stating that insideidaho.org should not become a data warehouse. This revised language would suggest that an agency could send all its data to INSIDE Idaho to be maintained by University of Idaho staff.
- Section IV, 3, sixth bullet, “The participating agencies will provide updates to their data...” Dennis expressed confusion with this item, in that data updates were required, but there was no timeframe established to do so. Liza mentioned the IGC’s federal representative addressed this at the February 2002, IGC meeting. She explained there were no timeframes set for updating data sets – the idea being that if an agency was responsible for its data, it needed to be kept as current as possible. Also, the MOU, by its very nature, was completely voluntary. **It was decided the item would be changed to read: “The participating agencies will provide updates to their data maintained on their own servers or on INSIDE Idaho. In order to keep that data and information at its most current level, participating agencies will provide updates to INSIDE Idaho when appropriate.”**

- Section IV, 3, third bullet, “Agencies may participate by storing their data locally or....” Frank M. noted this might be redundant, given earlier discussion. He recommended either this bullet or the last sentence of section IV, 2, second bullet, be stricken.
- Section IV, 2, second bullet, “INSIDE Idaho will serve as the statewide....” **Sheldon Bluestein**, Ada County, suggested the last two sentences be replaced with the sentence “INSIDE Idaho will develop a strategy for assisting organizations to make their data available through INSIDE Idaho.” ***There was consensus on this point.***
  - o Carol later stated that the document should be permissive, rather than prescriptive. She liked Sheldon’s suggested language, which allowed negotiation between the clearinghouse and the agency as to how best to deliver the data. She added that this did not need to be spelled out in the MOU itself. Danielle also liked Sheldon’s language, and agreed that it should be left to INSIDE Idaho to negotiate with specific agencies.

Liza stated the MOU had been before the IGC for several meetings, and that it had been voted on. Though the discussion was extremely important, she decided to put the issue to rest for the moment, as there were many other agenda items yet to be covered. There were, however, three areas of concern that were still unresolved from today’s MOU discussion.

**MOU** (continued)

- Craig (Madison County and City of Rexburg) wondered whether or not the clearinghouse was encouraged to follow the **Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) model of distributed servers**, and if the IGC supported this model.
  - o Danielle later observed that the group might be looking at the INSIDE Idaho site as both following the FGDC’s distributed server model, but sometimes just acting as an individual bulk distributor.
- Per **Frank Roberts** (Coeur d’Alene Tribe), there were two issues on the table: the idea of the metadata record being stored, and the idea of the data itself being stored. He mentioned that having the data stored at insideidaho.org had many benefits to end users, one of which was that the Web site had much more bandwidth than any of the State organizations. Encouraging some base layers/framework data to be stored at insideidaho.org was of value to him, though it may have meant duplication of data.
  - o Dennis expressed concerns about storing working data at INSIDE Idaho. Liza advised there was no language in the MOU requesting working data.
- Liza called on **Jason Talbot** (Idaho State Tax Commission, STC), to respond to Tony’s reluctance to serve certain data from the IDWR. Jason advised the STC served-up all its tax code maps on INSIDE Idaho. The benefit to doing this, said Liza, was that it was not necessary to involve STC staff in responding to requests for the information. Jason added that this also saved the STC from sending out a lot of paper maps.
- Section IV, 2, first bullet, “Statewide Geospatial Steering Committee:”
  - o For clarification, Carol advised that members of the Steering Committee would be made up of signatories of the MOU. Liza noted that, at the April 2002, IGC meeting, it was discussed that the INSIDE Idaho staff would be asked by the IGC for recommendations on the initial signatories/steering committee members. After some discussion, **it was decided the second sentence (“Signatories of the MOU will form the committee.”) would be stricken.**
  - o In response to a question from Nathan, Liza advised that the clearinghouse steering committee would not be a subcommittee of the IGC, and that the IGC would make recommendations with regard to this steering committee to the ITRMC for approval (rather than not). **Rich Elwood**, Statewide IT Coordinator and ITRMC Staff, added that, given the statutory authority given to the group, it was always appropriate to go forward to the ITRMC for approval. Senator Bunderson echoed this remark.
- Page one, fourth paragraph. **Donna Fornshell**, USDI Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), advised Mike Beaty (also of the USDI BOR) thought that the participant domain was limited to only government agencies. There were other, non-governmental organizations, such as the Nature Conservancy and Albertson’s College, that might want to contribute data to the clearinghouse, as well. Also, Donna

was not clear as to whether or not non-signatories could contribute data. She suggested language be included to remedy this concern. Roger later suggested “WHEREAS, state agencies...” (page one, fourth paragraph) be changed to “WHEREAS, governmental and other entities...” Alternatively, Gail later suggested this be changed to “WHEREAS, organizations in Idaho...” Carol suggested an additional bullet be added under section IV, 1, indicating the inclusiveness of participating groups. Per Tracy, the actual title of the MOU limited who would be involved.

Once more, Liza informed the group that the MOU had been before the IGC for several meetings, and reminded them of other agenda items to be covered. She did not feel the document could be approved until members discussed it further with their respective stakeholder groups. ***She recommended a small group look at the MOU in light of the comments made today, and to re-present the document at the next IGC meeting.***

**MOTION: Dennis Hill moved a motion to form a small group to consider the comments brought up regarding the clearinghouse memorandum of understanding (MOU), and to bring the revised document before the Committee at its next meeting.**

**AMENDED MOTION: Senator Hal Bunderson moved and Sheldon Bluestein seconded a motion to form a small group to consider the comments brought up today regarding the clearinghouse memorandum of understanding (MOU); to bring the revised document before the Committee at its next meeting; and to require anyone with additional comments or criticism to submit them in writing before the next meeting – including any recommended solution, and after some discussion, the motion was not passed.**

#### **MOU** (continued)

- Tony suggested a sentence be added to the document that stated that nothing in the MOU should be interpreted to restrict access and participation with INSIDE Idaho to any entity.
- Danielle wondered if: it was necessary for the MOU to cover everyone; this document could be geared only toward local, state, and tribal governments; and a separate MOU could be drafted to cover private entities and other organizations. Donna stated that, with minor modifications, the current MOU could cover everyone. Dennis agreed.
- Senator Bunderson advised it was possible this MOU could be developed into rules at some point. Given this, it should include both the public and private sectors.
- Roger suggested the alternate title “MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING among *GOVERNMENTAL AND OTHER ENTITIES IN IDAHO...*” Alternatively, Gail suggested this be changed to “MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING among *ORGANIZATIONS IN IDAHO...*”
- Page one, fifth paragraph. Nathan pointed out that INSIDE Idaho was not “...the only NSDI-compliant clearinghouse in Idaho,” and suggested this sentence be changed to read: “WHEREAS, Interactive Numeric...and INSIDE Idaho is *an* NSDI-compliant clearinghouse...” (NSDI stands for National Spatial Data Infrastructure.)
- Section III, Participants. Frank M. noted that if the document were revised to broaden participation, this definition would need to be modified.
- Sheldon later pointed out that, often times, there were no .prf files available for download on insideidaho.org, and requested INSIDE Idaho have metadata, as well as .prj files. Liza suggested Sheldon participate in meetings of the IGC Geospatial Applications Subcommittee to make his comments known.

Liza again reiterated her desire to table discussion of the MOU until the next IGC meeting, reminding members to submit additional comments and recommended changes in writing to her.

#### **ITRMC POLICIES AND STANDARDS**

Liza welcomed Rich to speak to the group. Discussion highlights included:

- Some background on the ITRMC, formed by statute in 1996 (Idaho Code § 67-5745A, B, and C)

- ITRMC Staff duties
- Committees and work groups assisting the ITRMC in carrying out its responsibilities
- Ways in which policies, standards, and guidelines were developed and brought to the Council for adoption
  - o Thus far, fifteen information technology policies, twelve enterprise standards, and six enterprise guidelines had been adopted. (All approved ITRMC policies, standards, and guidelines are accessible through the ITRMC Web site: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/>.)
- The IGC's role in development of policies and standards. This was outlined in Executive Order 2001-07 ([http://www2.state.id.us/gov/mediacenter/execorders/eo01/eo\\_2001\\_07.htm](http://www2.state.id.us/gov/mediacenter/execorders/eo01/eo_2001_07.htm)).
- New ITRMC requirements adopted at the August 21, 2002, Council meeting (see Policies 1010, 2010, and 2030).
- ITRMC was taking an enterprise view of the IT infrastructure across State agencies. The Staff was looking for ways State government could be more efficient, finding areas of duplication in the IT infrastructure layer.

*Discussion:* Danielle asked how a **major IT project** was defined. Rich advised this had been a difficult issue, as no dollar amounts could be assigned. The most recent change made in ITRMC IT Policy 2030, IT Major Project Review, required State agencies covered by the ITRMC to submit to the ITRMC Staff a list of all projects for which funding was requested. The Staff would present this list to the Council for review. Council members would then select projects they considered to be major for further review in accordance with Policy 2030. Those not selected would be approved by default, as long as they had met the specifications of Policy 2030.

### **Draft ITRMC Policy 1070**

Nathan described what was outlined in draft ITRMC IT Policy 1070, Geographic Information Systems (GIS). Among other things, it defined GIS, and recognized it as an essential part of information technology. Additionally, this policy would build upon the executive order that established the IGC. Upon expiration of Executive Order 2001-07, it was anticipated that elements of the document would be transferred to Policy 1070, if adopted.

*Discussion:*

- The group was directed to the 'Role of the IGC' section of the draft document. Nathan inquired about the IGC members' interest in hosting the annual Idaho Geospatial Users Meeting (IGUM) (second bullet), and **sponsoring educational workshops** (fourth bullet).
  - o Dennis wondered if the IGC-sponsored educational workshops would be in tandem with, or in addition to, the annual Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA) conference. Nathan advised the workshops would be in conjunction with the annual URISA conference, offering supplemental information to that already provided by URISA.
  - o Craig was concerned that having the IGC involved in the level of activity needed to organize events would pull focus away from the collaboration that really needed to be done. He also expressed frustration with holding an annual conference separate from URISA's annual conference, and recommended the IGC be involved in only one. Accordingly, Craig recommended the second and fourth bullets under 'Role of the IGC' be removed from draft ITRMC Policy 1070.
  - o Danielle agreed with Dennis and Craig, and requested 'educational workshop' be further defined. Nathan advised an IGC-sponsored educational workshop may or may not be technically oriented, such as URISA workshops, but more of an outreach opportunity.
  - o Tony was concerned that the activities described in the draft policy veered from the IGC's role as outlined in Executive Order 2001-07, which did not define the IGC in terms of specific tasks associated with conferences, training, etc. Further, the role of the IGC, as described in a policy, should be consistent with the executive order. Nathan advised the requirements outlined in the executive order were incorporated in this policy, but were also expanded upon. Per Senator Bunderson (ITRMC member), the IGC was subject to the direction of the ITRMC. Furthermore, the executive order merely provided general direction for the Committee.

- In answer to a question from Dennis, Nathan advised he envisioned the establishment of a State GIS service center/training facility in the future.
- Danielle was concerned that items listed under the fifteenth paragraph in Executive Order 2001-07 (number two, “The purpose of the Idaho Geospatial Committee is to...”) were not portrayed in draft Policy 1070.
- Liza suggested the role of the State GIS coordinator be defined in the policy.

Nathan advised draft ITRMC IT Policy 1070 would be presented for adoption at the December 2002, meeting of the ITRMC, and ***requested any comments be submitted in writing to him for consideration before the next IGC meeting.***

At Liza’s request, draft ITRMC IT Policy 1070 was available on the IGC Web site for review and comment: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/1070.pdf>.

### **Draft ITRMC IT Enterprise Standard 4210**

Nathan advised this document was provided for the members’ information only. A **working group** had drafted this standard as a result of IGC discussions on migration of IDTM (Idaho Transverse Mercator) to NAD83 (North American Datum of 1983). Nathan then discussed the results of a related survey that was posted to the geotech listserv.

Liza pointed out that, at the first meeting of the IGC, the **IGC Geospatial Applications Subcommittee** was established to assist in the development of GIS standards. She wondered how the aforementioned Standard 4210 working group was related to that subcommittee. Nathan explained that he (Subcommittee co-chair) called on a group of interested people to participate in the development of draft Standard 4210. (There were no formal members of the IGC Geospatial Applications Subcommittee.) He also mentioned that Tony (Subcommittee co-chair) was in attendance. ***Per Nathan, the final draft of the standard would be shown to the working group for review prior to presentation to the ITRMC.***

Said Nathan, the State Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors was interested in commenting on a finalized draft of the standard.

Per Sheldon, from a **local government standpoint**, this document was of little importance (though, local government agencies did occasionally gather data from the State). He said, as long as the projection (.prj file) accompanied the data, he was not concerned with what software was used to create the data – he could move it to his own projection.

Gail wondered why there was a perimeter on **projection** identified in Standard 4210; she did not feel this was a necessary inclusion. Per Nathan, this was identified for the benefit of anyone who did not have a background in GIS. There was more discussion on projection.

Donna suggested that, looking ahead, the Committee consider whether or not there was **something beyond IDTM** that could be used, such as a spherical coordinate system.

As with draft ITRMC IT Policy 1070, Nathan advised Standard 4210 would be presented for adoption at the December 2002, meeting of the ITRMC, if possible.

### **I-PLAN STATEWIDE VISION**

(Refer to slide presentation: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m020918/i-plan.pdf>)

Liza reminded Committee members of previous IGC meeting discussions of how the federal **Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB’s) I-Team (geospatial implementation plan) initiative** would be addressed.

Senator Bunderson commented on the **efforts of the Legislative Interim Committee on Electronic Commerce**, and of the ITRMC. He expressed the need for a statewide vision of handling GIS, including a timeline of when key stages would be achieved, recognizing financial constraints. Bunderson went on to discuss the possibility of establishing a State GIS center, and the elimination of redundancy. He also mentioned the importance of the availability of demographic and geographic data to businesses. Per Bunderson, the IGC was critical to help craft this vision, with the ITRMC-adopted concept of central coordination and local control in mind.

---

Craig led discussion of Idaho's I-plan statewide vision. He began by reviewing the **OMB's I-Team initiative**, and Idaho's movement in this direction, with the group. He then presented a draft objective and goals for Idaho's I-Plan, and went on to explain a proposed iterative Idaho I-Team process.

*Discussion:* There was some discussion about **federal financial incentive** to complete the process.

---

Craig presented recommendations for IGC action with regard to development of Idaho's I-Plan.

**MOTION: Senator Hal Bunderson moved and Danielle Bruno seconded a motion to accept Craig Rindlisbacher's "Recommended IGC Action."**

*Discussion:* There was some discussion on the following: abstract request from IGC TWG's; development of FGDC geospatial data standards; State agency budget predicament; establishment of the IGC, or subcommittee thereof, as Idaho's I-Team; and definition of "I-Team."

**After much discussion, there was Committee consensus to 1) accept Craig Rindlisbacher's "Recommended IGC Action;" and 2) identify an IGC oversight subcommittee, made up of all stakeholder groups of the IGC, to draft Idaho's I-Plan for IGC review.**

*Discussion:*

Craig requested more of an idea of who would compose **oversight subcommittee membership**. It was suggested the IGC TWG chairs gather the information for presentation to the Committee. There was more discussion on this issue. Liza asked that Craig coordinate the oversight subcommittee, and e-mail recommendations to IGC members. Per Liza, oversight subcommittee participation would be solicited directly. Craig requested from Liza, recommended names for oversight subcommittee participation, within one week.

---

This complex undertaking was discussed further, including: the timing involved with the approval of it, when complete; gaining consensus; what type of information could and could not be released according to the Idaho Open Records Law; and the possibility of reworking the Idaho Open Records Law.

Liza requested the IGC identify, over the next two weeks, a small subcommittee to consider the issue of the IGC's position on the threshold of releasable information to the Internet. Based on the subcommittee's findings, the IGC would ask to make a brief presentation to the Legislative Interim Committee on E-Commerce. Liza suggested, perhaps, a discussion board could be set up to focus on the issue. She also requested Jason Talbot's assistance on the subcommittee. Nathan stated he would take the lead in keeping together everyone involved. Donna requested the slide pertaining to the release of data be e-mailed to the group. She added that the U.S. Department of Interior was very interested in this issue and in participating in the subcommittee, when formed.

## REPORTS AND UPDATES

### Research – GIS Technical Services and Support – GIS Service Center

Background: At the February 2002, ITRMC meeting, Nathan “proposed research be performed (by himself) on the concept to gather information on: need/want for a state GIS center; scope of responsibilities; location; funding; staffing; best practices; etc...Chairman [Pam] Ahrens noted this could be an opportunity to follow a longstanding ITRMC philosophy to explore/maximize the use of shared resources/funding already available.”

Per Nathan, of the six states surrounding Idaho, five had technical service centers of some type. He went on to describe these facilities, along with the State of Maryland’s model, and then presented recommended functions of a GIS service center for the State of Idaho.

Nathan advised he had been encouraged by ITRMC Chairman Pam Ahrens to consider **staffing** for a *virtual* entity, using existing resources. He had also investigated the possibility of outsourcing the center, such as to Idaho’s colleges and universities.

Another issue related to the establishment of an Idaho GIS service center was **funding**. Nathan mentioned support could be competitively sought from the General Fund. There were also grant opportunities if the center was located at a college or university.

The final issue covered by Nathan was the **location** of a GIS service center for Idaho.

Nathan advised he would spend the next couple of months doing solid research on this issue. The next step would be to survey State and local government agencies to determine needs.

#### *Discussion:*

There was some discussion on: staffing possibilities; Idaho’s unique situation regarding the use of GIS; the functions of an Idaho GIS service center (as presented by Nathan); and the feasibility of establishing such a center in Idaho.

---

The State of Utah’s Automated Geographic Reference Center (AGRC) model was discussed.

---

Gail suggested there be put into place a mechanism for combining transportation data in which different entities were responsible for generating/gathering. This would allow for composition of a framework data set – one not based on any particular set of boundaries – to be offered to other users. This need alone, said Nancy, did not justify the establishment of a physical State GIS service center.

---

Nancy suggested a thorough review be performed of what technical expertise/services Idaho’s universities could provide.

---

Craig recommended the **Oregon model** be looked at more closely, and that Idaho’s focus should be on the coordination of services, rather than technical support.

---

Liza proposed that, perhaps draft ITRMC IT Policy 1070 would be a good place to address the issue of coordination of GIS activities, using the ITRMC as the coordinating body.

---

The role of the State GIS coordinator, with regard to a State GIS service center, was talked about.

---

Liza asked Nathan to use the information he had received from Committee members at today’s meeting to develop next steps to be taken, and to present them at the next IGC meeting.

## **Geospatial Applications Subcommittee**

Tony advised the Subcommittee would be focusing on the **projection** issue.

## **National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) 2002 Annual Conference – Update**

(Refer to handouts: [http://www.nsgic.org/hot\\_topics/security/NSDI\\_public\\_safety.pdf](http://www.nsgic.org/hot_topics/security/NSDI_public_safety.pdf) and <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m020918/blm.pdf>)

Nathan presented two handouts: “*Saving Lives and Saving Money, An Urgent Call to Build the National Spatial Data Infrastructure in Support of Public Safety – A Declaration of Interdependence*,” and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) draft “*Strategy for Cadastral Information in Western States*.” He encouraged Committee members to read the BLM document on their own time. If there were concerns, Nathan would contact those who presented the document. ***Liza recommended Nathan solicit comments from the IGC Cadastral and Geodetic Control TWG. He would e-mail the document to members.***

Said Nathan, the **NSGIC document** was approved by a unanimous passing vote of NSGIC 2002 Annual Conference attendees. It was forwarded to the states for ratification and signature. Nathan then proposed Committee members review the document with their respective stakeholder groups and endorse it at the next IGC meeting or via e-mail. Details of the “*Declaration of Interdependence*” were discussed briefly. ***Liza strongly recommended Nathan copy IGC members on e-mail comments received pertaining to this document.***

## **Technical Working Group Reports**

Liza welcomed TWG representatives to e-mail Committee members with reports, as time was limited.

## **SET NEXT MEETING DATE**

As per today’s discussions concerning the IGC hosting the **annual Idaho Geospatial Users Meeting**, Liza advised that, unless an organization took the lead in coordinating the meeting, it would probably not be held. ***Per Liza, Committee members should take comments from their respective stakeholder communities, and forward recommendations on how to address this issue to the IGC.*** She recommended the **next meeting** be set for about one week preceding to the next ITRMC meeting (December 11, 2002).

## **ADJOURNMENT**

As time did not allow for any further discussion, Liza thanked those in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Gales  
ITRMC Assistant