



Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting

May 5, 2009

Time: 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 a.m. EST

Location: National Capitol Planning Commission
401 9th Street NW – North Lobby
Washington D.C. 20576

Room: Commission Chambers, Suite 500

Agenda

9:00 – 9:05	Welcome and Introductions	<i>Ken Shaffer, FGDC</i>
9:05 – 9:10	Previous Meeting Action Item Review	<i>Pat Phillips, FGDC</i>
9:10 – 9:45	ExCom Offsite Update • FGDC Governance • Joint CG and ExCom meeting	<i>Karen Siderelis, DOI, John Mahoney, FGDC</i>
9:45 – 10:00	Coordination Group Charter	<i>John Mahoney, FGDC</i>
10:00 – 10:15	FGDC Business Update	<i>Ken Shaffer, FGDC</i>
10:15 – 10:30	Coordination Group 2-Day Offsite Planning	<i>Milo Robinson, FGDC Bonnie Gallahan, FGDC</i>
10:30 – 10:50	GeoLob Update • Monthly Reporting • Work Plans	<i>Roxanne Lamb, FGDC</i>
10:50 -11:00	Break	
11:00 – 11:15	Administration Transition Work Group - (bumped)	<i>Randy Fusaro, Census</i>
11:15 – 11:30	50 States Update - (bumped)	<i>Milo Robinson, FGDC</i>
11:30 – 11:45	Georgia 50 States Initiative	<i>Danielle Ayan, Georgia Institute of Technology</i>
11:45 – 11:50	Summary of Action Items / Next Meeting Agenda	<i>Pat Phillips, FGDC</i>
11:50 – 12:00	Announcements / Discussion Wrap-up	<i>Ken Shaffer, FGDC</i>
12:00	Adjourn	

Future meetings:	NGAC	- May 12 and 13, 2009-GWU
	Executive Committee	- May TBD
	Coordination Group Offsite	- June 2-3, 2009
	Steering Committee	- June 11, 2009, 1-3 AIA
	IFTN Champion and Chairs meeting	- June TBD



Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting May 5, 2009

ACTION ITEMS

Lead:	Coordination Group Members	Action #: 20090505-1
Action:	The Coordination Group Members are to provide comments on the draft Coordination Group Charter by May 19. Discussion about the Charter will be included in the agenda for the June 2-3 Coordination Group off site meeting.	
Contact:	FGDC, John Mahoney, jmahoney@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090505-2
Action:	The FGDC Secretariat will send a data call out for input to the Annual Report by June 1. Suggestions for a major theme and all submission go to Milo Robinson. The report will be completed by November 1, 2009.	
Contact:	FGDC, Milo Robinson, mrobinson@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Lead:	Coordination Group Members	Action #: 20090505-3
Action:	By May 22, 2009 provide a synopsis of Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP) funding category and suggested deliverables, budget, and number of awards to Gita Urban-Mathieux. Pat sent background information via email 5/7/09.	
Contact:	FGDC, Gita Urban-Mathieux, burbanma@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090505-4
Action:	Gita will clarify the wording on the U.S. Geological Survey's grant authority and the way to determine if other agencies can send money to support the NSDI CAP program.	
Contact:	FGDC, Gita Urban-Mathieux, burbanma@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090505-5
Action:	The Coordination Group requests to include a briefing on the FortiausOne grant efforts at the July 7 Coordination Group meeting. Pat will coordinate through Doug Nebert the FGDC technical contact.	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		

Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090505-6
Action:	The Coordination Group requests a briefing on the work being done by the Executive Committee on the National Geospatial Policy. Possibly include in the agenda for the Coordination Group offsite.	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/Response:		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090505-7
Action:	Milo Robinson will set up a small team to perfect the Coordination Group offsite agenda. Members may send suggestions to the agenda to Milo.	
Contact:	FGDC, Milo Robinson, mrobinson@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/Response:		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090505-8
Action:	The Coordination Group requests to include a SmartBuy status update at the July 7 Coordination Group meeting.	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/Response:		
Lead:	Census	Action #: 20090505-9
Action:	Randy will send additional information on the Cultural Resource Standard Work Group standards review efforts.	
Contact:	Census, Randy Fusaro, randy.j.fusaro@census.gov	
Resolution/Response:		



Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting May 5, 2009 MEETING MINUTES

Next Meeting Agenda Items:

The next meeting is an offsite to be held on June 2-3 at the U.S. Geological Survey, 12201 Sunrise Valley Dr., Reston VA

Suggested agenda items for the July 7 meeting at AIA are Geocoding, and update on National Geospatial Policy, and SmartBuy.

General/Intros/Upcoming Meetings/Summary of Action Items:

Ken Shaffer welcomed the Coordination Group participants to the May 5 meeting, roll call was taken and the agenda was summarized.

Pat Phillips summarized the April 14, 2009 Coordination Group action items.

Coordination Group Charter - John Mahoney, FGDC

[Draft CG Charter]

John Mahoney provided an overview of the draft Coordination Group Charter. A small work group had convened and formulated several iterations of the Charter. The group was made up of Sandra Downie, GSA; Wendy Blake- Coleman, EPA; Lew Sanford, FGDC; Tony LaVoi, NOAA; Randy Fusaro, Census; Dave Morehouse, DOE; and John Mahoney, FGDC. The last revision of the charter was completed and approved by the Steering Committee in 2006. Several documents were used as reference, the OMB Memorandum M-06-07, "Designation of a Senior Agency for Geospatial Information" and the Draft OMB Supplemental A-16 Guidance.

The Coordination Group Members are to provide comments on the draft Coordination Group Charter to John Mahoney at jmahoney@fgdc.gov by May 19. Further discussion about the Charter will take place at the June 2-3 Coordination Group off site meeting.

Comment: Wendy Blake-Coleman

This Charter is critical; I suggest that we have a dialog with the Executive Committee, possibly a facilitated time to discuss this at the offsite. Will agencies be able to support the changes that are proposed especially the additional amount of work?

Comment: Nancy Byler

What this needs is a dialog not just word –smithing.

There are a couple of options for Chairing the Coordination Group. After the dialog with the Executive Committee, the Charter will then be put before the Steering Committee for approval.

FGDC Business update – Ken Shaffer, FGDC

[presentation]

Ken Shaffer asks the Coordination Group whether any new SAOGI's have been nominated in their agencies. There were none.

Geo Lob Lifecycle Work Group meeting

Wendy Blake- Coleman summarized the Geo LoB Lifecycle Work Group meeting that was a day long meeting, held on May 4 at Grant Thornton. This meeting focused on building consensus for a single conceptual categorization of geospatial data themes of national significance. It used the categories of 8 efforts, including the A-16 appendix E to map common data themes. Last Fall the Work Group sent out 35 data themes to see in which agency the authority falls and which themes were thought to be nationally significant. This was all part of portfolio management, to develop tools and to consolidate themes.

Q. Nancy Byler

Nancy questions the term “nationally significant” and asks whether or not agency legislation was looked at. Agencies have certain authority for certain layers. There is no legislative authority for an agency to provide the transportation layer.

A. Wendy Blake-Coleman

Yes we will take a look at legislative authority. Agencies have certain legislative authorities and there are also mission related themes that are critical but maybe not authorized legislatively. This is a next step in the process.

Comment: Dennis Crow

The phrase “nationally significant” is written in the A-16 guidance but it is not defined. There are two kinds of geospatial data; one is required to be produced and one to be consumed.

Georecovery.gov meeting

Ken summarized the on- going Georecovery. gov activities. Two use cases were provided to the development team on 4/30/09. Case 1 is visualizing state-level AARA spending by program area. Case 2 is visualizing AARA spending with user defined layers. The team is developing guidance but will not attempt to address broader recovery financial reporting issues. Next steps for the team are to continue discussion with developers and to formalize the documentation.

Q. Nancy Byler

Are you making recommendations for the types of maps that agencies use? The USACE just received our recovery money and have put our maps up on the web. Should we contact Doug Nebert with what we have done?

A. Ken Shaffer

Our team requirements are to map the spatial elements needed with the report information. We are trying to provide the geospatial enabling information that the developers need to know up front to help guide their development. Yes, please contact Doug.

FGDC 2009 Annual Report

The 2009 Annual Report will follow the 2008 outline; however, one thing added this year is Challenges. One example of a challenge is the mapping of Alaska and lack of sustainable funds. If challenges are included, recommended solutions should be included as well. The FGDC Secretariat will send out a data call for input to the Annual Report by June 1. Suggestions for a main theme and all submissions go to Milo Robinson. The report will be completed by

November 1, 2009.

Comment: Jeff Booth

This seems old school to print out an Annual Report. This could be a digital product or a succinct factsheet of main take- away issues.

Comment: The Annual Report has been produced in a variety of ways, digitally, paper copy and on thumb drives. Only a limited number are printed.

One suggested topic is “Partnering to Reduce Cost”

2010 NSDI Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP)

The CAP has the overall same budget as last year. The Economic stimulus grants could offset the CAP schedule this year.

By May 22, 2009 the Coordination Group is to provide a synopsis of the CAP funding categories and suggested deliverables, budget, and number of awards to Gita Urban-Mathieux.

Comment: Jeff Booth

Jeff proposes two new categories; the National Grid being one.

Gita will clarify the wording on the U.S. Geological Survey’s grant authority.

Standards Update

Comment: Randy Fusaro

The Cultural Resource Standard Work Group has done a lot of work recently at an offsite meeting. Randy will send additional information on this. They want additional reviewers and military/DoD participation is encouraged.

FGDC Collaboration Site

The collaboration site for FGDC Committees, Subcommittee, Works Groups and Initiatives is currently being set up and will be available at <https://my.usgs.gov> . This site uses Alfresco software. Additional information on how to access this site is forthcoming. The FGDC is replacing the discussion forum page on the website and replacing it with a Community of Interest (COI) page.

Comment: Jeff Booth

Jeff requested a briefing on the FortiousOne grant capabilities at the July 7 Coordination Group meeting.

Comment: Jon Sperling

HUD has a geocoding center and we accept work from other agencies. This issue should be brought up with the Coordination Group and the Steering Committee or possibly at the Coordination Group offsite.

Comment: Wendy Blake Coleman

The EPA uses Dunn and Bradstreet or our Google license for geocoding.

Comment: Jon Sperling

HUD can provide best practices since we have been providing this service for awhile.

Comment: Jeff Booth

DHS would like to put in a huge buy but wanted to hold out for the SmartBuy. When will SmartBuy be on the street? There is another large grant that USGS is doing. Can we find out more on this?

FGDC Server Upgrades

The FGDC Secretariat is upgrading the infrastructure that is hosting the FGDC website and this means there is significant changes to the hardware and software infrastructure that should improve performance. Look and feel with stay the same.

Executive Committee Offsite Update – John Mahoney, FGDC

[presentation]

John provided an overview of the April 15-16 Executive Committee offsite. The topics that were identified during the April 14 Coordination Group meeting were discussed at the offsite.

- National Geospatial Policy
- Governance
- Transportation data
- Communication

The Executive Committee agreed that the National Geospatial Policy is timely and they would like to see the new Administration on board with this. They envision creating a one pager and to identify strategies and to use social media approaches to inform constituent on the development. The initial concepts will be developed for a shared infrastructure.

Q. Randy Fusaro

Dan Cotter had asked for participation so is this now a done deal?

A. John Mahoney

There will still be a working group starting up soon.

Comment: Jeff Booth

The Coordination Group should have a briefing on the geospatial policy work being conducted. I find it odd that we are reaching out to the National Geospatial Advisory Group, the private sector on their thoughts about a National Geospatial Policy before the Coordination Group has had a chance to weigh in.

Comment: Wendy Blake-Coleman

The Executive Committee meets in May; we should sit down with them as a precursor.

Economic Recovery

The Executive Committee endorsed in concept a set of criteria for assessing future proposals. Future stimulus priorities were identified: Imagery for the Nation, Elevation Data, Parcel data, Infrastructure.

Data Issues related to IFTN and Alaska were discussed. An integrated approach is needed.

The Parcel meeting is scheduled for Thursday May 7 at the American Institute of Architects. Everyone must register ahead of time to attend.

Coordination Group 2- day offsite Planning: Milo Robinson

[Draft CG agenda]

The suggestions heard at this meeting today for the offsite planning are:

- Expand upon the Nation Geospatial Policy
- Annual Report should have a regular reporting cycle- for instance a dashboard approach
- less presentations, more read aheads
- facilitated session on 50 States – the project plans and report templates are fabulous documents
- Outcomes focused on implementation for 2010
- Coordination Group Charter
- Set up an operational framework
- Solidify our relationship with the Steering Committee and the Executive Committee
- Spell out our relationship with the Steering Committee in the Coordination Group Charter
- Our relationship with the NGAC is not a priority

Ken suggests setting up a small team to discuss planning the Coordination Group off-site and the monthly meetings. What is it that we want to achieve at these meetings. Should there be discussion on topical issues like IFTN or should we focus on the analysis of the operation? We need to hear from the membership of this group on what we want to focus on.

Comment : Lee Fahrner

Why are we rewriting the charter in advance of the National Policy?

Response from group: We can not wait that long.

Comment: Ken Shaffer

The time to look at the operations is now at the offsite.

Comment: Jeff Booth

We should have a template like the one that Milo has put together for the 50 States initiative. All of us should be that accountable and have that framework. Let's look at milestones and deliverables.

Milo Robinson will set up a small team to perfect the Coordination Group offsite agenda.

Members may send suggestions to the agenda to Milo at mrobinson@fgdc.gov.

Jeff Booth, Wendy Blake-Coleman, Randy Fusaro and Doug Vandegraff will work on the offsite agenda.

GeoLob Update: Roxanne Lamb

[presentation]

Roxanne thanked the Geo Lob Work Group leads for getting their work plans in.

The work plans report on activities accomplished, project deliverable milestone summaries and resource usage. These reports are placed monthly on the shared site.

Page 6 shows how the FTE's are reported.

Comment: Wendy Blake- Coleman

The amount of FTE should be put into some type of context. Why do some groups get access to 1 FTE and another group will have access to more?

A. Roxanne Lamb

This has to do with shifting priorities over time.

Comment: Jeff Booth

Let's look at the work plans and map what we have received to date and what was originally in the work plans.

Georgia - 50 States Initiative: Danielle Ayan , Georgia Institute of Technology

[presentation]

Danielle provided an overview presentation on what the State of Georgia was able to do with the category 3 CAP grant funding from FGDC. There is no full time geospatial point of contact in the state. With the funds they were able to revamp the website and provide an enterprise license agreement strategy.

Georgia is in need of additional grant dollars to help fund their federal portfolio. The state has been very successful but needs additional support.

Q. What is the funding requirement for NSDI

A. The funding in 1996-1999 was \$425. Last years budget was \$225. and this year it is 0. We can sustain a program at the \$225. level.

Q. Jeff Booth

Did you use a template and a facilitator to help you get through your budget year or do it on your own?

A. We did hire a facilitator to target the appropriate state leadership. The template came from FGDC and Applied Geographic's. The software used for this presentation is Mindmapper and requires a \$300 license fee.

Q. Jeff Booth

What would you do differently if you could start again?

A. We would articulate the need for a State GIS program and the reasoning why the work can't just get farmed out. We need a state program because we are behind as a state. Our data is not catalogued and we don't have a GIS coordinator.

Adjourn