

Idaho Geospatial Committee: October 7, 2004, Meeting Minutes

Basement Conference Room, LBJ Building, Boise

Call to Order

Committee Chairman Jonathan Perry, Bureau of Homeland Security, called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

Attendance:

Members/Designates Present:

Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff; Lanie Paquin Boler, USDI Bureau of Reclamation (designate); Janet Cheney, Bonneville County (designate); Linda Davis, Department of Water Resources; Tracy Fuller, U.S. Geological Survey; Nancy Glenn, Idaho State University; Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello; Mike McDowell, Kootenai County; Jonathan Perry, Bureau of Homeland Security; Frank Roberts, Coeur d'Alene Tribe (*via phone*)

Members Absent:

Mike Beaty, USDI Bureau of Reclamation; Dr. Charles Bolles, Idaho State Library; Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho State Senate; Bart Butterfield, Department of Fish and Game; Sean Harwood, USDA Forest Service; Craig Rindlisbacher, Madison County/City of Rexburg; *Two open positions (public utilities/private business representatives)*

Others Present:

Sheldon Bluestein, Ada County; Stephen Cox, Department of Lands; Gene Dana, U.S. Geological Survey; Bruce Godfrey, University of Idaho Library; Dan P. Jensen, City of Idaho Falls; Bridgette Krawczak, U.S. Geological Survey; Jeff Servatius, State Tax Commission; Bruce Tuttle, Department of Water Resources

Approval of Minutes

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the June 10, 2004, Idaho Geospatial Committee meeting minutes.

County Mapping Survey

Per Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff, the State Tax Commission (STC) performed a survey of what was being done digitally across the state. He highlighted a few changes that had occurred since the previous survey was performed. Per Mike McDowell, Kootenai County and chair of the Idaho Association of County Assessors Mapping Committee, a survey needed to be done for a number of reasons. The primary push of the mapping committee was going to be to update and publish the assessor's mapping manual in an up-to-date environment, and to identify the resources and processes needed to conduct the work the assessor's were required to do. The goal was publish the manual in three different formats (paper, compact disc, STC website). Sheldon Bluestein, Ada County, and others discussed the manual further. In response to a question from Nathan, Mike advised outreach to/solicitation of input from other organizations was not currently a part of the plan, but was not unreasonable. Nathan requested the manual be presented to the IGC when complete. It was expected a final draft would be introduced to the Association of County Assessors (Assessor's Association) for consideration in February 2005. Attendees then recognized Mike for his leadership on the effort. There was brief discussion regarding accessibility of the information contained in the manual to non-assessors. Sheldon gave a brief overview of how some counties were handling cadastral data, as well as Oregon's model. Jonathan announced two Oregon representatives would be at the Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) seminar entitled "Working with Labels and Annotation Using ArcGIS 9" on October 26, and offered to stay thru the 27th

to meet with anyone interested in discussing cadastral land records-related data models, geodatabase migration, etc. This was discussed further, as well as additional conversation regarding geodatabases.

Privacy from Cadastral TWG – follow-up to “Mike Ciscell Paper”

Michael Ciscell, Department of Water Resources, presented to the Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC) at its August meeting on draft recommendations concerning personal information and parcel data prepared by members of the IGC Cadastral and Geodetic Control Technical Working Group. There was concern that the information had not been presented to the IGC; and it was suggested geographic information systems (GIS) issues should be brought before the IGC for review prior to being introduced to ITRMC. Mike advised the recommendations had been presented to and adopted (as written) by the Assessor’s Association. He mentioned that about a month ago, Kootenai County received a request for an interpretation of the section of Idaho Code that limited the ability of counties to use their databases for mailing or solicitation lists outside of government. Mike talked about the law further, advising some of the wording could be interpreted differently today than it was when the code was originally written. He strongly suspected *various parties* interpreted it differently, also. There was additional discussion on the issue.

AmericaView

Bruce Godfrey, ISU, provided some background information on AmericaView (AV) (refer to handouts: idaho.gov/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m041007/av-overview.pdf and idaho.gov/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m041007/av-bylaws.pdf). He then solicited feedback on whether the state should pursue an affiliate membership with the organization (refer to handout: idaho.gov/itrmc/committees/igc/minutes/m041007/av-affiliatememberapp.pdf). Bruce continued with a brief explanation of AV’s membership levels. He asked that committee members consider how to proceed and respond at the next IGC meeting. Nancy Glenn, ISU, added that a strong consortium (of universities; local, state, and federal governments; and private organizations), effort, and leadership were needed in order to be successful at becoming an AV affiliate member. She also provided more information about AV memberships. Responding to a question from Nathan, Nancy assured the group that Idaho Space Grant Consortium was not in competition with AV. There was more discussion on the overall issue of future possibilities with respect to remote sensing. Nancy urged the committee members to e-mail her and/or Bruce if their organization was interested in participating in the long-term effort. Additionally, Terry Crooks of AV was available via phone or e-mail. Nancy then spoke a bit on some possible benefits of an AV membership. Then, the group talked about possible state participants and ‘member of record.’

IGC Executive Order set to expire on April 13, 2005

Following introductions, Jonathan reviewed the charge of the IGC as outlined in Executive Order 2001-07 (idaho.gov/gov/mediacenter/execorders/eo01/eo_2001_07.htm). He asked the group how the committee was doing in fulfilling that charge. It was pointed out that each member participated for his or her own particular reasons, and were more active when issues affected them. Also, the committee was the only avenue the GIS community had for input to the Legislature. Critical issues to be brought before the Legislature or ITRMC, said Tracy Fuller of the U.S. Geological Survey, could be funneled through IGC member Senator Hal Bunderson. One attendee stated IGC provided structure for the state’s GIS community, but was concerned with the disproportionate number of non-state agency representatives. Jonathan called attention to the fact that state agencies had not been very aggressive in following through with any of the issues raised by the IGC. Someone commented that there was really no other forum for bringing together Idaho local, state, and federal government GIS representatives. Further, it was critical to keep the communication and discussion open; and having an outlet through ITRMC and Senator Bunderson was a good tool. He continued by suggesting there should be greater focus on channeling appropriate communications through the IGC.

Jonathan invited the group to offer ways in which the executive order could be improved. Nathan suggested a small working group be formed to solicit input from the GIS community and review the document. Other members supported this idea, and there was some discussion regarding outreach and awareness. He advised the U.S. Census Bureau had requested a position on the IGC, and other federal groups expressed interest in participating, as well. The revised order, advised Nathan, should be complete by the end of January 2005. The Idaho State Library's participation and interest was talked about briefly. Potential work group members were considered, and Nathan advised he would send an e-mail out that evening about holding a meeting the following week. A draft or recommendations would be submitted at the next IGC meeting.

The amount of recent technical working group activity was talked about shortly.

Homeland Security

Jonathan reviewed some information he, Nathan, and Tracy had received at the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) 2004 Annual Conference in mid-September. The meeting focused a great deal on homeland security. In fact, a lot of states were designating homeland security as their primary GIS agency. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was pushing its flood map modernization, and local governments would probably be hearing more about it. In Idaho, there was only one fully digital flood map – Ada County, Boise River. The others (digital) were scanned. Jonathan explained FEMA was hoping to get at least one more level of sophistication in its digital maps (flood areas only, for the entire country) by 2007. There was more discussion on this. Jonathan continued, advising FEMA had developed a new modeling program, HAZUS-MH (hazards U.S. - multi-hazard), which contained models for estimating potential losses from earthquakes, floods, and hurricane winds. (HAZUS-MH was modeled after HAZUS, which only dealt with earthquakes.) State and especially local governments were encouraged to participate. More discussion followed.

FEMA also had two online hazards mapping websites (hazards.fema.gov and hazardmaps.gov).

Michigan was synchronizing all state GIS data through its county emergency operations centers, and developing a cadre of GIS professionals. Jonathan continued with some logistics.

Indiana was likely the most advanced state Jonathan had seen, he said. Its number-one homeland security goal was to build an integrated complimentary interoperable statewide GIS for prevention of terrorist-type events. This was very important from a homeland security perspective. He continued with some details.

Minnesota, Utah, and Massachusetts had all been developing GIS in their K-12 classrooms. Additionally, Utah and Minnesota were making it a part of the statewide curriculum.

Jonathan mentioned 80% of homeland security funding received from the federal government had to be distributed to local governments. The other 20% was for state government. He believed the Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security director actually gave 90% to local communities. A conversation on obtaining grants occurred. The importance of recovery measures, specifically cataloging, was pointed out. Per Jonathan, local GIS representatives needed to contact their first responders (fire) and 911 committee regarding the benefits of GIS. Also, county commissioners needed to be convinced before the state was approached. These steps could help in obtaining a good deal of funding. He indicated the Indiana GIS Initiative website, in.gov/ingisi, had some good wording about supporting homeland security at the local level. Added Nathan, GIS was included as a fundable line item in the approved

homeland security funding section of the 2004 state budget. Jonathan advised he was working on obtaining funding at the state level. There was more discussion. Jonathan mentioned the U.S. Department of Homeland Security was also reaching out to tribal governments. There was some discussion on how tribes could obtain homeland security funding.

NAIP Update

Nathan provided an update on the status of the U.S. Farm Service Agency's National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) in Idaho. The flights were complete. He had 20 compressed county mosaics (CCMs) including areas in eastern, southern, and northern Idaho. The CCMs were preliminary data to be used at the state's own discretion. Though, NAIP representatives recommended the state only use the CCMs for light review, as they were subject to change. Copies were available from Nathan. He provided more details about the imagery. CCMs for the entire state should be available by the middle of November. It was anticipated the Digital Orthophoto Quarter-Quadrangles (DOQQs) would be received by the end of December.

NDOP Overview

Nathan advised this was the first opportunity the state had to host the bi-annual meeting of the National Digital Orthophoto Program (NDOP) Steering Committee. He reviewed meeting topics and participants. Nathan represented the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) at the meeting, which was held October 5-7.

Single-edition Quads Twin Falls Forest service area Nov 29 – Dec 1

Per Nathan, the USDA Forest Service district was holding a three-day meeting in Twin Falls to review the single-edition quadrangles (SEQ) process and to review what data would be updated. Local governments were being invited to attend. Nathan talked more on the Forest Service's plans with SEQs in Idaho.

USGS Projects – New/Proposed projects

Tracy advised state agency proposals were submitted to plan what the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) National Mapping Division would do over the coming year. Idaho favored fairly well in the initial cut.

Do we need to have IGUM?

One attendee suggested perhaps the Idaho Geospatial Users' Meeting (IGUM) could be held at the end of the 2005 Intermountain GIS Users' Conference (sponsored by the Northern Rockies Chapter of the Urban-Regional Information Systems Association, URISA) to be held in April 2005, if time permitted. Said Nathan, offline comments received supported this suggestion, and indicated that state agency resources were drained in years when Idaho was host to the Intermountain GIS Users' Conference and an Arc users conference. Further, he did not have time to produce an IGUM comparable to those in past years. He then solicited input from other attendees, and there was some discussion. As a side note, he mentioned there was ITRMC interest in the development of a GIS portal linked from the state homepage. There seemed to be consensus regarding holding IGUM in conjunction with the April conference. Agencies involved in GIS were encouraged to submit an end-of-year report to Jonathan for inclusion in the IGC's annual report to ITRMC.

Next Meeting

It was decided the next meeting would be held on December 2, 2004.

Adjourn

Jonathan adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.