

D R A F T Meeting Minutes

Delaware Spatial Data I-Team

9:00 a.m.

March 11, 2003

**Conference Room A
State Budget Office
Thomas Collins Building
540 S. DuPont Highway
Dover, DE**

I-Team Members Present:

Connie Holland, State Planning
Sandy Schenck, DGS
Mike Ward, Kent County
Tim Westbrook, New Castle County
Matt Laick, Sussex County
Deborah Sullivan, DNREC
Chad Lauderbaugh, DeIDOT
Dick Sacher, UD/RDMS

Others Present:

Mike Mahaffie, State Planning
Phil Cabaud, Office of the Governor
McKelvin Gilbert, DeIDOT
Daniel Cox, DS&HS
Roger Barlow, USGS

Welcome and Introductions

Connie Holland started the meeting at approximately 9:00 a.m. with a welcome and introductions.

Approve Minutes of January 7, 2004 Meeting

A motion was made by Sandy Schenck, seconded by Dick Sacher, and unanimously approved by all members present to accept the minutes of the January 7, 2003 meeting.

2002 Orthophotography Acceptable Use Policy

Mike Mahaffie gave an update on the effort to craft an Acceptable Use Policy to guide distribution and use of the highest resolution version of the 2002 orthophotography in such a way as to mitigate against increased security concerns.

Phil Cabaud reported that he has discussed the draft Acceptable Use Policy with Joe Schoell, Legal Counsel to the Governor, who advised him that it appears that

the state's Freedom of Information Act does allow the I-Team to control access to the data for security reasons. Phil was asked to request an opinion on the issue in writing.

Tim Westbrook noted that it will be important for those making decisions on withholding such data to be certain that the higher resolution data is really high-resolution enough to increase risk.

Mike Mahaffie noted that the GIS community nationally is examining the issue and that there may be further guidance, nationally, in the coming months. Roger Barlow added (later in the meeting) that a study of the issue by the RAND Corporation is expected to be published this year.

Sandy Schenck said that the issue brings up a larger question for the I-Team: does the I-Team need to be more formalized. He asked whether Delaware might need a Geographic Information Office to handle these sorts of questions.

Phil Cabaud noted that there are similar questions about data access in the larger state data community and that many groups are wrestling with the issue.

Distribution by the USGS EROS Data Center

Sandy Schenck explained that he has been in contact with the USGS about the notion of having the EROS Data Center serve as a distribution point for the 1-meter version of Delaware orthophotography. Sandy noted that this would be a practical solution for ordering and distribution of the data to those wanting large amounts of data whose needs can not be met by the existing data-serving capacity of DataMIL. Roger Barlow added that that would fit in with the role of the USGS.

Sandy asked what the formal mechanism would be and Roger suggested a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the USGS and the I-Team.

A motion was made by Dick Sacher, seconded by Matt Laick, and unanimously approved by all members present to begin work on an MOU. Sandy Schenck volunteered to take the lead.

There was some discussion of what geography should be used to organize the 1-meter orthophotography data. Sandy suggested leaving that to the professionals at the EROS Data center, but agreed to work on ideas for an approach to group the existing tiles of the high-resolution data set into logical groups for other data organization.

National Hydrography Dataset (NHD)

Sandy Schenck and Roger Barlow gave an update on the effort to complete the NHD for Delaware. Sandy explained that the state's framework is complete using

the USGS digital line graph (DLG) data but that the NHD is a more accurate and more attribute-rich data set that improves on the DLG data.

Sandy explained that the NHD is being completed by USGS by cataloguing unit (CU) – akin to major watershed units – and that three of the CUs that include Delaware are complete (with some state funding) and that another is scheduled to be complete this summer. The remaining two that include Delaware will be completed as soon as funding is identified. Sandy noted that he is working with DNREC to seek the funds needed to move the project forward.

Tim Westbrook asked whether the NHD data matches the new aerial photography. Sandy said that that will be a next step, though the two data sets are very close.

DataMIL Migration

Mike Mahaffie and Sandy Schenck gave an update on the DataMIL Migration from UD RDMS to the DGS with technical assistance from DTI. Funding has been included in the proposed state budget. While that budget makes its way through the legislature, a Migration Plan will be developed.

Tim Westbrook asked whether DGS would be responsible for strategic vision for the DataMIL. Sandy noted that the I-Team will likely have to create a DataMIL steering committee. Tim suggested that it would be wise to dedicate one I-Team meeting per year to DataMIL strategy. There was general agreement with that idea.

Elevation Data Project

As called for in a motion at the January 7 meeting, Sandy Schenck presented a report on why the I-Team's 2003 RFP for elevation data failed (attached). He also gave a report on on-going data collection efforts and the potential for the I-Team to organize and expand those efforts.

He noted that the Delaware Coastal programs office still intends to use NASA to collect elevation data for parts of Sussex County, using a FEMA grant, and that the USDA's NRCS may join in with funding to expand that to the rest of Sussex County. Roger Barlow reported that the USGS is in the middle of a project to collect elevation data for portions of Kent Co.

Sandy Schenck made a motion, seconded by Tim Westbrook and unanimously approved by all members present to form a DGDC working group to examine next steps for elevation data.

Mike Mahaffie noted that early proposals from EarthData regarding the update of the orthography include creation of similar elevation data.

Presentation and Discussion: Homeland Security Issues

Dan Cox, of the Department of Safety and Homeland Security, gave a presentation about the general security situation and how the GIS community can help maintain security.

Dan noted that it is not his role to say exactly how the GIS community should maintain security, but he can help put the issue in perspective. He also noted that it will be the exercise of common sense, more than any legal opinion or legislation that will help maintain security.

Dan said there were several conceptual threads that he wanted to highlight, as a way to "connect the dots" and "learn to learn to think like a terrorist."

First, he noted, the internet is an incredible gathering of information, but is neutral. There are lots of examples of bad information on-line and that one can't control it all.

Second, Dan pointed out that we are in a long-term war -- "the forever war" and that the terrorists want to see us die. He noted that we face "asymmetrical warfare" and that we should be more worried about the education and technical level of Al Quada, and less about the "running in the dessert stuff" that we see in captured Al Quada training videos on the news.

He added that there are lots of potential terror organizations now and that many are now teaming with crime syndicates as a way to gather funding for terror activities.

Third, the web is used to coordinate funding efforts.

Fourth, we face a dilemma as a free society: the right to know vs. the need to know.

Dan added that data and GIS are important but that we have to decide and no one can decide for us, where the balance is.

Dan gave several examples of instances from history in which nations that had the apparent advantage fell because of smart "connect-the-dots" operations. These included the Spanish Armada in 1588 and the Germans in the first World War.

Dan also noted that there was a potential "tip-off" that could have signaled American troop movements that have recently been dealt with. It was that such events tended to be preceded by increases in the sale of pantyhose at military bases and in pizza deliveries to the White House.

Dan said that his function as a security expert is to listen and ask questions.

Connie Holland said that Dan's presentation was sobering, but that the GIS Community needs some guidance to help identify potential risks.

Sandy Schenck added that while this is a valid discussion, he wants to make sure that we remember that the I-Team is set up to only be responsible for Framework layers. He noted that the I-Team is not in charge of all GIS data in the state. He added that the state needs a Geographic Information Officer (GIO) to look at these sorts of issues statewide.

Phil Cabaud suggested that, while he doesn't want to change the duty of the I-Team, it is important to keep in mind the downside of making data widely available. He added that in what it does with the Framework data, the I-Team will set standards.

Connie Holland added that the governor can support increased coordination and that an entity is ready to be molded into some sort of office to get people together to work together.

Tim Westbrook said that the I-Team will need a methodology of how to deal with security issues. Mike Mahaffie responded that the FGDC's Homeland Security Working Group is crafting a process and that Delaware is, in its experience, helping to test-drive the process.

Presentation and Consideration: 2003 Delaware Spatial Data Framework Annual Report

Mike Mahaffie gave an update on the drafting of the 2003 Framework Report and the comments and corrections that had been supplied by members of the I-Team.

Mike Ward made a motion, seconded by Dick Sacher and unanimously approved by all members present to approve the Report for submission to the Governor.

Discussion: Next Round of Aerial Photography

There was a brief discussion of preparing for the next round of orthophotography. Mike Mahaffie reported that he and Vince Rucinski have received an early estimate of about \$300,000 for the next round. The I-Team agreed to have Mike and Vince continue to look into the possibility and report back. Connie Holland noted that this is another reason to call for line-item funding for GIS data. Roger Barlow noted that this is a good time of year to go to federal partners to look for funding.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

**Report to the Delaware I-Team on why the First I-Team Sponsored LIDAR
RFP was not Used
DGDC Elevation Working Group**

In January of 2003, the Delaware I-Team released a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the statewide collection of Light Detection And Ranging (LIDAR) data. These data are used to create Digital Elevation Models of the ground surface from which new elevation contours can be made. An Elevation Data Working Group drafted the RFP. It called for a final deliverable of 2-foot contours statewide and was designed to determine the likely cost of such a project would cost. If one contractor were identified, this would allow the I-Team to seek the funds to cover the cost of collection of the LIDAR data.

After the proposals were collected, the Elevation Data Working Group met several times to review the proposals and discussed the proposals with the I-team and reached the conclusion that none of the proposals would result in a satisfactory project. The reasons for this determination include the following:

1. The prices quoted for the project by the Commercial LIDAR firms that responded ranged from \$300,000 to \$1.2 million. This showed that the technical specifications for the project included in the RFP were not exacting enough.
2. The RPF did not specify a common proposal presentation that would have allowed the I-Team to compare each company's equipment, accuracy, precision, and costs, in a simple, logical way.
3. The working group became aware of new information regarding commercial LIDAR pertaining to a "dead zone" listed as inherent error in collection methods. This zone really is the area between the actual ground and the tops of vegetation such as trees and under story plants in wooded areas. The working group was not sure that the proposals, as presented, would be able to meet the specifications for adherence to FEMA accuracy specification as referenced in the RFP.
4. A potential new technological approach that that eliminated this "dead zone" error became available just as the proposals came into the working group. None of the companies had access to this technology. The Working Group felt that this new approach merits consideration as a possible solution for Delaware.

Based on these factors, the Elevation Data Working Group recommended that the I-Team not select any of the responses to the 2003 RFP.