Minutes
Committee on State Cartography (CSC)
December 10, 2012
(Union South, UW-Madison)

Present: Rob Roth (chair), Geography/UW-Madison; Mutlu Ozdogan, Forest Ecology & Environmental Studies/UW-Madison; Ian Muehlenhaus, Geography/UW-LaCrosse; Curt Pulford, GIO/DOA; Tony Van Der Wielen, Legislative Technology Service Bureau; Fred Iausley, Dane County LIO/LION; Kent Pena, National SSURGO Coordinator/USDA; Nancy von Meyer, Fairview Industries; John Ellingson, NGS/WisDOT

SCO Staff: Howard Veregin, State Cartographer; Jim Lacy, Associate State Cartographer; AJ Wortley, Senior Outreach Specialist; Brenda Hemstead, IS-Data Services; and Tim Kennedy, Administrative Program Specialist

Absent: Adam Derringer, Mapping Specialists

Meeting was called to order at 9:15am by Rob Roth, Chair.

Meeting kickoff
Roth introduced himself as chair and explained the role of the Geography Department and background on the Committee on State Cartography (CSC) itself. He referenced the agenda stating the first half of the meeting will be background/informational and the second half for discussion and feedback. Roth proceeded by providing background on himself and asked members to introduce themselves.

Roth explained the compilation of the Committee relating to “spheres of influence” and the expectations of the Committee. He indicated members serve a 2-year term with an option of reappointment and stated meetings will be held twice a year. Roth expressed desire for: feedback on SCO activities, making connections for the SCO and sponsoring those connections, being stewards for the office by reaching out to constituents, assist in distributing product information, i.e., pubs, meetings/conferences, correspondence, etc.

Presentation/Powerpoint
Veregin provided an overview of key SCO activities and projects delivered through a PowerPoint presentation. Veregin started by briefly describing the role of the CSC, office personnel and their 2010-2013 Strategic Plan including priorities, initiatives and annual progress reports. He then provided an overview of major projects such as: Migration of Finder Applications, WHAIFinder Development, Web Site, Publications, Orthophoto Business Plan, PLSS Pilot Project, and GIS Catalog. Veregin then provided a brief overview of other projects aligned with the office’s strategic plan such as: Virtual Data Integration, GIS Inventory Update, Midscale Project “Pronounce Wisconsin”, Outreach Effectiveness through Web site usage, Geospatial Alliance, Higher Ed Initiatives, Land Cover, and the Kroll Report.

Break (10:10-10:25)
Von Meyer and Muehlenhaus temporarily left the conference call

Discussion & Feedback (group)
Pulford: How are members selected by SAGIC and LION?
Roth: Provided further clarification of the committee representation and asked reps for SAGIC and LION to discuss with their groups and report back to the Committee, he also suggested at the next meeting the members could provide “key concerns” to the Committee.
Iausly: What is the SCO’s role related to the Kroll report and are they a production shop for GIS data?
Veregin: It was a surprise to the SCO being mentioned in the Kroll report and it would be a challenge for the office with and/or without funding and asked “where’s the data going to come from”?
Ozdogan: related comments towards land cover/WISCLAND pointing out the value SCO brought to the WISCLAND project.
Iausly: I’m talking more specifically about statewide data layers and everybody’s role; where is the state going to put this?
Veregin: SCO could clearly be a coordinator/disseminator.
Iausly: Explained past perception of it being in the GIO’s office; no governmental entity has stepped up and LIO’s were caught off guard by Kroll report.
Pulford: Having this in statutory language would be good and if it were at the SCO, I’d be fine with that.
Von Meyer: A clearer understanding is needed of who to talk to in Wisconsin, i.e., authoritative source, a trusted data source and a data disseminating source. A trusted data source could be multiple sources however roles need to be clearly described.
Pena: Roles need to be clearer for WIGICC, SCO, WLIA, etc.
Von Meyer: Described working with BLM involving SCO indicating they (BLM) designated the SCO as their Wisconsin point of contact.
Roth: It might be useful to have one-on-one discussion to understand who’s confused or marginalized.
Iausly: Expressed frustration in receiving multiple data requests from same agency.
Von Meyer: Stated SCO should be the data disseminator for Wisconsin.
Van Der Wielen: Expressed frustration with local governments in receiving data.
Iausly: Stated too many groups “coordinating” need someone to “just do it”.
Van Der Wielen: Referenced MCD’s being duplicated.
Veregin: Geospatial data is a problem, maybe now is the time to draft out “who” or the “plan”.
Iausly: Regarding the Kroll report, has the SCO informed the Dean, Chancellor, etc.?
Veregin: Has had UW’s lawyer involved and the lawyer says this is a good thing for potential funding and support.
**Roth:** Should form an ad-hoc committee to lay out a secondary report to include target and results for a full Committee review. The ad-hoc committee consists of Veregin as lead with Pena, Iausly, and Van Der Wielen as members. Roth targeted six weeks for the draft completion date.
Von Meyer: Emphasized the need to clarify authorization for trusted aggregation and dissemination in the form of a concept paper reflecting roles and opinions.

Roth switched the conversation due to limited time remaining towards discussing projects.

Pena: Mentioned Ag statistics collaboration/partnerships doing land cover.
Ozdogan: Indicated he was aware of this group and pointed out the “labels” are different. He also indicated he would be the liaison for this project and offered to reach out to forestry as well.
Pulford: Briefly discussed updates to the clearinghouse saying they could be expanded with standards and utilities.
Wortley: Referenced the office working with the Map Library for campus wide data as a combination delivery mechanism including requirements and how to preserve archived data as well as bringing it forward to today’s software. He mentioned there isn’t a clear trend in campus data collection versus public data collection.
Pena: Might be worthwhile to provide educational outreach pertaining to metadata?
Van Der Wielen: Suggested creating “a who to contact metadata cheat sheet”.
Iausly: Agreed metadata is important but keeping it up-to-date would be a problem since people don’t really read metadata but educating the user community about it would be worthwhile.

Roth suggested goals for the Committee such as do current SCO products work and how are these working as well as new initiatives/emerging products/ideas. He also asked members to think about the upcoming strategic planning process such as broad themes and specifics in relation with each agency. Roth mentioned the SCO’s strategic plan is due June 30, 2013.

Roth also mentioned most committee members will be at the WLIA conference in Lake Geneva in February and suggested CSC members could meet there for a face-to-face meeting during that week to flesh out the Concept Paper submitted by the ad-hoc subcommittee and how it might align with the SCO’s upcoming strategic plan.

**Action Item(s):**
1) Ad hoc committee, led by Veregin with committee members Pena, Iausly, and Van Der Wielen, to produce a “concept paper” on updated roles for data production versus coordination (include target and results) for a full committee review in six weeks.
2) Members are to report on: do current products work; new initiatives from committee suggestions, i.e., metadata; other emerging hot topics.

Meeting adjourned at 11:33am.

Minutes prepared by Brenda Hemstead.