



**Federal Geographic Data Committee
Coordination Group Meeting
Tuesday, August 13, 2013
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Eastern
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. **FED ONLY****

Location: National Capital
Planning Commission
(NCPC)
401 9th Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC

AGENDA

9:00 – 9:10	Welcome and Introductions	<i>Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS</i>
9:10 – 9:20	Previous Meeting Action Item Review	<i>Arista Maher, FGDC OS</i>
9:20 – 10:00	FGDC Business Report	<i>Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS</i>
10:00 – 10:30	HIFLD Proposal (FGDC Alignment/Infrastructure Data)	<i>David Alexander, DHS</i>
10:30 – 10:55	Geologic Subcommittee Report	<i>Dave Soller, USGS</i>
10:55 – 11:20	Cadastral Subcommittee Report	<i>Don Buhler, BLM</i>
11:20 – 11:45	National Digital Orthoimagery Program (NDOP) Subcommittee Report	<i>Anne O'Connor, Census Bureau</i>
11:45 – 12:00	NSDI Strategic Plan Update	<i>John Mahoney, FGDC OS</i>

12:00– 1:00 **LUNCH**

***** FED ONLY SESSION BEGINS *****

1:00 – 2:15 **Data Sets/Data Themes** *Wendy Blake-Coleman,
EPA*

2:15 – 2:45 **Geospatial Platform** *Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS*

2:45 – 3:00 **Action Item Review & Next Meeting Agenda** *Arista Maher, FGDC
OS*

3:00 *Adjourn*

*Read-ahead Documents	1.
Other Relevant documents	

* Read-ahead documents are located at the my.usgs.gov site for member access.

CG Meeting Planning

<p>Coordination Group Meetings Topics (in addition to the following standing items)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome and Introductions; - Previous Meeting Action Item Review; - FGDC Business Update; - FGDC Secretariat Report; - Summary of Action Items / Next Meeting Agenda; - Adjourn - All meetings are scheduled from 9am to 3pm EST at NCPC in D.C., unless otherwise noted
<p>September 10, 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Tentative: FGDC Chair Visit</i> • Report from: Vegetation SC (Marianne Burke); Users/Historical Data WG (Colleen Cahill); Marine and Coastal Spatial Data SC (Tony LaVoi).
<p>October 8, 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report from: Metadata SC (Jennifer Carlino); Geodetic Control SC (Juliana Blackwell); Transportation SC (Mark Bradford).
<p>November 19, 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report from: Standards WG (Julie Maitra); Wetlands SC (Bill Wilen).
<p>December 10, 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report from: Geologic SC (Dave Soller); Spatial Water Data SC (Steve Aichele).



Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting ACTION ITEMS Through August 13, 2013

Closed		
Lead:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC OS	Action#: 20130219-01
Action:	At the next meeting with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Ivan DeLoatch will share further information with the CFPB on OGC's work on parcels, as well as NextGen 911.	
Contact:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC OS, ideloatch@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	FGDC has contacted CFPB, but there was no response on scheduling the next meeting.	
Complete		
Lead:	Colleen Cahill, Library of Congress	Action#: 20130409-01
Action:	Colleen Cahill will share the Users/Historical Data Work Group appraisal process document with the FGDC Secretariat, so that the Secretariat can provide the document to the Coordination Group, NGDA theme leads, and dataset managers to review and provide comments.	
Contact:	Colleen Cahill, Library of Congress, cstu@loc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	The document was sent out on August 14, 2013.	
Closed		
Lead:	Dick Vraga, USGS	Action#: 20130514-01
Action:	Dick Vraga will follow up with Karl Brown (NPS) on issues related to The National Map and A-16 Supplemental Guidance dataset activities.	
Contact:	Dick Vraga, USGS, rsvraga@usgs.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	USGS and NPS will be following up via internal conversations.	
Complete		
Lead:	Shawn Gravatt, FGDC OS/COMSO	Action#: 20130514-03
Action:	Shawn Gravatt is developing the NGDA data theme community management protocols and practices. When they are ready, they will be sent to the Theme Leads for their review and comment.	
Contact:	Shawn Gravatt, FGDC OS/COMSO, sgravatt@usgs.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	The COMSO team has held discussions with Jerry Johnston, Theme Leads, and other relevant parties to ensure they are headed in the same direction and not duplicating effort. They are now working to implement initial roles and responsibilities into the "UAT" (testing) environment where they will be tested in a variety of ways. Testing will include the basic permissions of each role, as well as more in depth testing on various workflow procedures within the site.	
Complete		
Lead:	Bill Burgess, NSGIC	Action#: 20130618-01
Action:	Bill Burgess will provide the FGDC Secretariat with additional information—including the identification of key contacts-- on the states' efforts regarding emergency response, in relation to	

	the Steering Committee action for the meeting that is to occur between Ivan DeLoatch, Jerry Johnston, Scott Bernard, Dan Cotter, and Bob Austin.	
Contact:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC OS, ideloatch@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/Response:	Bill provided the POC for FirstNet to Ivan on June 18.	
Complete		
Lead:	Jen Carlino, FGDC OS	Action#: 20130618-02
Action:	Jen Carlino will finalize the Metadata Work Group Charter by incorporating the suggestions discussed at the June 18 CG meeting, and will post the finalized Charter to the FGDC website.	
Contact:	Jen Carlino, FGDC OS, jcarlino@usgs.gov	
Resolution/Response:	The charter has been finalized and has been posted to the FGDC website.	
Complete		
Lead:	CG Members	Action#: 20130618-03
Action:	CG members are asked to engage with their SAOGIs to identify executive champions, data theme leads, SAOGIs, and respond to other requests outlined in the memorandum from Anne Castle and Scott Bernard via the President's Management Council on the A-16 Implementation Plan and portfolio management no later than June 20. SAOGI identifications should be provided to Anne Castle and Scott Bernard.	
Contact:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC OS, ideloatch@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/Response:	Including responses to the PMC memo, 20 of 22 Theme Leads and 5 of 16 Theme Executive Champions have been identified.	
Complete		
Lead:	CG Members	Action#: 20130618-04
Action:	CG members asked to provide their comments on the NSDI Strategic Plan Version 1 draft to the FGDC Secretariat by June 24, 2013.	
Contact:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC OS, ideloatch@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/Response:	Comments received were included in the 1 st adjudication process. The next iteration of the plan has been reviewed by an editor and suggested changes incorporated. The next plan version scheduled to go out for public comment on July 31, 2013.	
Complete		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action#: 20130618-05
Action:	The FGDC Secretariat will post the June 13 Steering Committee meeting presentations to the FGDC website.	
Contact:	Vaishal Sheth, FGDC OS, vsheth@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/Response:	The presentations were posted on June 20.	
Due Date: ASAP		
Lead:	CG Members	Action#: 20130618-06
Action:	Coordination Group members are asked to work with their dataset managers on completing NGDA actions items and on returning the NGDA crosswalk spreadsheets to Sean Zintel as soon as possible; or, alternatively, by coordinating with Wendy Blake-Coleman on a completion schedule.	
Contact:	Sean Zintel, FGDC OS/COMSO, szintel@usgs.gov ; Wendy Blake-Coleman, EPA, blake-coleman.wendy@epa.gov	

Resolution/ Response:	Crosswalk spreadsheets have been received from only 5 of the 16 themes. CG members should continue to work with their dataset managers to ensure that the spreadsheets are sent to Sean ASAP.	
Complete		
Lead:	CG Members	Action#: 20130618-07
Action:	CG members with questions on obtaining log-in information for accessing the SharePoint site should contact Roxanne Lamb.	
Contact:	Roxanne Lamb, FGDC OS, rh Lamb@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	This was an information action.	
Complete		
Lead:	CG Members	Action#: 20130618-08
Action:	Coordination Group members planning on attending the Esri International Users' Conference should contact both Wendy Blake-Coleman and Ivan DeLoatch.	
Contact:	Wendy Blake-Coleman, EPA, blake-coleman.wendy@epa.gov ; Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC OS, ideloatch@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	Esri conference occurred the week of July 8 th .	
Due Date: ASAP		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action#: 20130813-01
Action:	The FGDC Secretariat will work with Dave Soller and Wendy Blake-Coleman to schedule a Geologic Subcommittee discussion on how to categorize the Geologic Subcommittee's datasets and themes.	
Contact:	Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS, kmshaffer@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Due Date: ASAP		
Lead:	Coordination Group Members	Action#: 20130813-02
Action:	Any Coordination Group members with further questions on the HIFLD/FGDC alignment should contact either David Alexander or the FGDC Secretariat.	
Contact:	David Alexander, DHS, david.alexander1@hq.dhs.gov ; Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS, kmshaffer@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Due Date: 9/13/13		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action#: 20130813-03
Action:	The FGDC Secretariat will work with Wendy Blake-Coleman, Adrian Gardner, and Lori Peltz-Lewis to schedule a Theme Lead meeting for late September.	
Contact:	Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS, kmshaffer@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Due Date: ASAP		

Lead:	CG Members/NGDA Theme Leads	Action#: 20130813-04
Action:	CG Members and NGDA Theme Leads are asked to take a look at the A-16 Theme Lead Collaboration Community and provide feedback on the site to ServiceDesk@geoplatform.us .	
Contact:	ServiceDesk@geoplatform.us or Sean Zintel, COMSO, szintel@usgs.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Due Date: ASAP		
Lead:	NGDA Theme Leads	Action#: 20130813-05
Action:	Theme Leads interested in participating in functionality testing (UAT) for the A-16 Theme Lead Collaboration Community should contact Sean Zintel.	
Contact:	Sean Zintel, COMSO, szintel@usgs.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Due Date: ASAP		
Lead:	Sean Zintel, Doug Nebert, and Wendy Blake-Coleman	Action#: 20130813-06
Action:	Sean Zintel, Doug Nebert, and Wendy Blake-Coleman will coordinate a meeting to discuss the next steps on the NGDA crosswalk results/registration.	
Contact:	Sean Zintel, COMSO, szintel@usgs.gov ; Doug Nebert, FGDC OS, ddnebert@usgs.gov ; Wendy Blake-Coleman, EPA, blake-coleman.wendy@epa.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Due Date: ASAP		
Lead:	NGDA Theme Leads	Action#: 20130813-07
Action:	Theme Leads are asked to review the current versions of the Themes-At-A-Glance documents and provide updates to Wendy Blake-Coleman.	
Contact:	Wendy Blake-Coleman, EPA, blake-coleman.wendy@epa.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		



Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting MEETING MINUTES August 13, 2013

(Note: Primary CG members are indicated in **blue text**; alternate CG members are indicated in **red text**.)

√	Coordination Group Attendees	Organization	√	Attendee	Organization
x	Shirley Hall	USDA- Farm Service Agency		Robert Welsh	DOI – Office of Surface Mining
x	Marisa Capriotti	USDA – Natural Resources Conservation Service		Christina Lett	DOI – US Fish & Wildlife Service
	Betsy Kanalley	USDA – US Forest Service		Bill Wilen	DOI – US Fish & Wildlife Service
x	Marianne Burke	USDA – US Forest Service		Ivan DeLoatch	DOI – USGS/FGDC; Chair, CG
	Juliana Blackwell	DOC – National Geodetic Survey	x	Dick Vraga	DOI – USGS
	Tony LaVoi	DOC - NOAA		Stephen Aichele	DOI – USGS
x	Lynda Liptrap	DOC – Census Bureau		Edward Hugler	Dept of Labor – OASAM
x	Anne O'Connor	DOC – Census Bureau		Cecelia Henderson	Dept of State
	Jim Bjostad	DOD - NGA	x	Mark Bradford	DOT - Research & Innovative Technology Admin
x	David LaBranche	DOD - DISDI	x	Raquel Hunt	DOT – Federal Railroad Admin
	Mitchell Fiedler	DOD - DISDI		Jimmy Amoaka-Atta	Dept of Treasury
	Nancy Blyler	DOD – US Army Corps of Engineers		Pheakdey Lim	Dept of Veterans' Affairs
	Tai Phan	Dept. of Education – Institute of Ed Statistics		Tom Garin	Dept of Veterans' Affairs
x	Teddy Dyer	Dept. of Energy	x	Wendy Blake-Coleman	EPA
	Stephanie Foster	DHHS – CDC		Dave Catlin	EPA
	Lew Summers	DHS – Office of the CIO	x	John Sullivan	GSA
	Dennis Hardy	DHS		Autumn Wallin	GSA
x	Jon Sperling	HUD – Policy Development & Research	x	Colleen Cahill	Library of Congress
	Salvatore Sclafani	HUD - Office of Community Planning & Development		Jacqueline Nolan	Library of Congress
	David Chase	HUD – Policy Development & Research		Gregory Mann	NASA

	Antoinette Sebastian	HUD – Office of Environment & Energy	x	Brett Abrams	NARA
	Don Buhler	DOI - BLM		Pamela Stephens	National Science Foundation
	Doug Vandegraft	DOI – Bureau of Ocean Energy Mgmt, Regulation & Enforcement		Asghar Noor	Small Business Administration
	Steven Schwartz	DOI - BOEMRE		David Timmons	Social Security Administration
	David Duran	DOI – Nat’l Park Service		Ray Mitchell	Tennessee Valley Authority
	Tim Smith	DOI – Nat’l Park Service			
	Other Attendees	Organization		Attendee	Organization
x	David Alexander	DHS	x	Kristie McLeroy	USDA
x	Anne Ball	NOAA	x	Marcia McNiff	USGS
x	Roger Barlow	USGS	x	Terry Rhea	FAA
x	Jennifer Carlino	FGDC OS	x	Ken Shaffer	FGDC OS
x	Rich Grady	Applied Geographics	x	Vaishal Sheth	FGDC OS
x	Shawn Gravatt	FGDC OS/COMSO	x	Gita Urban-Mathieux	FGDC OS
x	Arista Maher	FGDC OS	x	Lucie Vogel	IHS
x	Julie Maitra	FGDC OS	x	Linda Zellmer	WIU
x	Butch Lazorchak	LoC	x	Sean Zintel	FGDC OS/COMSO
x	Lorri Peltz-Lewis	USGS	x	Ken Shaffer	FGDC OS

Welcome and Introductions – Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS

Ken Shaffer welcomed participants to the meeting, and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

Previous Meeting Action Item Review - Arista Maher, FGDC OS

Arista Maher reviewed the action items, noting resolutions and responses.

FGDC Business Report - Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS

[[Presentation](#), PPT]

Ken Shaffer reported out on recent meetings and other developments in the FGDC. The meeting’s agenda was reviewed. The Executive Committee met on August 1, where they decided to task David Alexander (DHS), Dan Cotter (DHS), Adrian Gardner (NASA), and Jerry Johnston (DOI) with developing a draft charter for the FGDC/HIFLD alignment, which will be discussed further in this meeting. ExCom members Dan Cotter and Jim Bjostad (NGA) will also bring recommendations on the next steps for ExCom regarding the FirstNet proposal back to that group. Additionally, Adrian Gardner (NASA) will share the proposed A-16 implementation plan outline with ExCom, and following that, when it is ready, with the National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC).

The FGDC Steering Committee met on June 13. At that meeting, members were asked for their feedback on the NSDI Strategic Plan, and to ensure that their agencies responded to the request for information via the FGDC memo sent through the Presidential Management Council to agency Deputy Secretaries. Two new Senior Agency Officials for Geospatial Information (SAOGIs) were designated since the June Steering Committee meeting: Jean Lin Pao (HUD) and Holly Donnelly (DOL). Other FGDC membership changes included two new CG members: CG primary designee Marianne Burke, U.S. Forest

Service, replacing Ralph Crawford as Chair of the Vegetation Subcommittee; and Stephen Aichele, U.S. Geological Survey, replacing Bob Pierce and Tod Dabolt as Chair of the Spatial Water Data Subcommittee.

The next FGDC Steering Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, September 12, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. EDT at the South Interior Auditorium. Attendance is by registration only. The next NGAC meeting will be held on Wednesday and Thursday, September 4 and 5, at the National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) in Shepherdstown, WV. The new NGAC appointees are being reviewed; nominations were due August 12. The final decisions will be made by the Secretary of the Interior by the end of calendar year 2013. The next FGDC Coordination Group meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 10. It was noted that this will be an abbreviated meeting, taking place from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. EDT at the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC). There will be no Fed Only session at this meeting. FGDC Chair Anne Castle is currently scheduled to attend this meeting in order to participate in a dialogue with FGDC CG members.

An update on the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) actions, stemming from their 2012 evaluation, was given. The status of the portfolio management action is that the A-16 Implementation Plan will be a topic at the upcoming NGAC, Steering Committee, and ExCom meetings, and that the FGDC Secretariat continues to follow up on agency responses to the call for Executive Champions and Theme Leads. The initial draft outline for the Implementation Plan has been developed, but the content will need to be developed by Theme Lead representatives. On the Geospatial Platform action, it was noted that the technical capability for the “marketplace” community is in development, following the July 2013 release of the new prototype GeoPlatform 2.0 functionality. The status of the NSDI Strategic Plan will be discussed in detail later in this meeting, but overall, it is progressing well. The input on the draft document that was released for public comment will be on the agenda at all upcoming FGDC meetings (Steering Committee, NGAC, and ExCom).

The recent developments related to the Geospatial Platform and Geospatial Line of Business were reviewed. There are still several FY 13 interagency agreements that need to be signed and members should work with their agencies to complete them.. The COMSO team has continued to support the Theme Leads and Dataset Managers in preparing NGDA metadata for harvesting in the new Catalog.Data.gov. COMSO has also developed a draft NGDA Lifecycle Baseline Maturity Questionnaire. Version 2.0 of the Geospatial Platform was released in July, along with a draft capabilities development release schedule. Feedback was collected regarding Version 2.0 at the Esri International Users’ Conference and other venues.

The FGDC Annual Report is being compiled. Contributions (text and graphics) are due to Gita Urban-Mathieux by August 16. FGDC Coordination Group members, including subcommittee and work group leads, are asked to make contributions to the report on their activities.

As a result of a reduction in funding, it was noted that the NSDI Cooperative Agreements Program (CAP) will be discontinued for FY 2013 and FY 2014. The FGDC will not be soliciting projects during those years. A formal announcement will be released soon.

An update on standards activities was given. The FGDC Steering Committee endorsed the Time-Space-Position Information (TSPI) Standard, version 2.0, as well as the Wetlands Classification Standard revision. The next Standards Working Group meeting has been scheduled for September 10. The various CAP Standards projects and their statuses were reviewed. The upcoming INCITS-L1 and GWG meeting dates were shown. OGC standards activities include a request for comment on OGC WaterML 2.0- Part 2, as well as several other comment requests.

Geologic Subcommittee Report – Dave Soller, USGS

[[Presentation](#), PPT]

Dave Soller gave an update on the Geologic Subcommittee. The purpose and membership of the subcommittee was reviewed. It was noted that BOEM and USACE have vacancies on the subcommittee, so there has been a call for members. Much of geological data gathering is done by state and Federal geological surveys. Geological agencies (including the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Park Service, and state surveys) continue to bring issues to the subcommittee for discussion. The subcommittee is not very active, as much of the work tends to be done within USGS, other Federal agencies, and state agencies. The principal focus this year has been converging on a standard database design for the production of geologic maps. The leading candidate is the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program 2009 (NCGMP09). After slow consideration by a number of agencies, a meeting was held in June 2013 deciding that the consensus was to support this standard database design. Since then, about 20 agencies have engaged in implementing this design. The next steps are to continue to improve the design, to produce maps in this format, and then reconvene when products have been released to review the lessons learned and changes needed. This standard is intended for publishing individual maps; they hope to tackle enterprise-level mapping later on.

Monthly teleconferences are held to discuss technical issues related to the implementation of geologic map design. A progress report on implementation is to be released this fall. This report is a snapshot to supersede a poll done last year. It raises issues related to implementing such a database, including that given the 100-plus years of data gathering in geologic mapping, it is necessary to determine the best methods to bring data into the database when little is known about the interpretive methods by which data was gathered in the first place. The report allows for migration of legacy paper maps into the design.

USGS provides the user support for the FGDC Geologic Map Symbolization Standard. This includes addressing technical questions, requests for paper copies, and suggestions for additions or corrections to the standard. An update is anticipated.

Dave also stated that the subcommittee is “not sure how to participate in NGDA.” He noted that they are not able to proceed until they know how information such as geologic mapping fits into the National Geospatial Data Assets (NGDA) plan (i.e., are they categories, data sets, or data themes?) He stated that they are looking to the FGDC for assistance on this. They are aware of the outstanding action item for the Geologic Subcommittee to respond to the request for a theme crosswalk, but have been unable to provide such information because it is not clear to them “where [they] fit.” When the call for NGDA Data Themes/Data Sets was first submitted, the Geologic Subcommittee volunteered 14 different sub-disciplines for data sets/data themes under the purview of Geologic Data Subcommittees. However, they are still unsure of the next course of action.

Ken Shaffer asked whether they have suggestions on what could be provided to the Geologic Subcommittee to move forward on data themes/data sets. Dave responded that they have offered Geologic Mapping as a theme, but it may not fit under what the FGDC has in mind for NGDA. Wendy Blake-Coleman explained that what is listed in Data.gov are considered datasets, and that some of the elements listed as datasets in geology are not considered national datasets by the definition of a dataset. Dave stated that he thinks they have differing definitions for terms, and that he needs guidance on what is considered a dataset vs. a theme. Wendy suggested putting together a discussion with members of the Geologic Subcommittee and other stakeholders to lay out understanding on definitions.

ACTION: The FGDC Secretariat will work with Dave Soller and Wendy Blake-Coleman to schedule a Geologic Subcommittee discussion on how to categorize the Geologic Subcommittee's datasets and themes.

HIFLD Proposal – David Alexander, DHS

[[Presentation](#), PPT]

David Alexander presented on a potential alignment to the FGDC with the Homeland Infrastructure Foundation-Level Data (HIFLD) Working Group. The objective of HIFLD is to: “support domestic infrastructure data gathering, sharing and protection, visualization, and spatial knowledge management for homeland defense, homeland security and national preparedness – prevention, protection, mitigation, response and recovery communities.” HIFLD builds partnerships and obtains the best available data, which is useful, usable, and used. HIFLD came about as a result of 9/11, to help address access of data assets. It was later transitioned to a Homeland Security Working Group under the FGDC structure. In the past, the community has collaborated with FGDC and others in order to compile data that is more useful to front-line data needs.

There are over 5,860 mission partners for HIFLD, representing the 14 executive departments, 98 agencies, 53 states and territories, and more than 700 private sector entities. The evolution of HIFLD with regard to participation was described. As more Homeland Security Infrastructure Program (HSIP) Gold data layers were released, the number of participants in HIFLD, as well as the number of HSIP Gold data requests, increased. The various HSIP product lines were described, including vector, elevation, and imagery products. HIFLD data support a variety of missions from flood plain management, to national disasters, to drug interdiction activities. Not all of HSIP is controlled-access data; some public domain and limited-access data does exist.

It was noted that HIFLD supports national directives for both operations and critical infrastructure, using the best available data. It is not necessarily mandated data; there has been a focus on best-available data. There are advantages and disadvantages to this. These priorities are informed by Presidential Policy Directives 8 and 21, the NSDI, and other policies such as digital government and information strategies. The strategic framework and policy landscape were described in detail.

There is opportunity for collaboration between HIFLD and FGDC, as Federal partners for HIFLD are OMB Circular A-16 contributors. HIFLD can serve to complement these efforts by including data that is currently not covered in A-16. Furthermore, HIFLD promotes data standards, best practices, and technical capabilities. HIFLD can be beneficial because it can facilitate the distribution of shared data to advance national strategies.

A conceptual diagram of how HIFLD would fit into the FGDC structure was presented. It was noted that HIFLD would fill the gap that was created when the Homeland Security Work Group was dissolved. HIFLD's recommendation is to charter a relationship with the FGDC in order to strengthen coordination between data providers and operators, and to formalize HIFLD governance and foster strategic-level coordination. It complements and enhances FGDC contributions to NSDI by including data requirements that are not covered under A-16.

Raquel Hunt (DOT) stated that in the past, DOT was not invited to participate in the HIFLD transportation work group. She asked whether they would be able to participate in the future. David responded that he does believe there is an opportunity for collaboration, which HIFLD hopes to strengthen.

Bill Burgess (NSGIC) pointed out that one strength of HIFLD is that it operates outside of formal structure and includes a lot of participation from members in the private sector and other fields. However, this can be a disadvantage, because as a more formal process for subcommittees is adopted, we may start to run into problems with Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) compliance. Bill mentioned that he was active in the Homeland Security Subcommittee, and at one point, there was pressure put on the Chair of that subcommittee regarding FACA violations. David responded that this issue was discussed with the ExCom at their last meeting, and it was decided that since we are just chartering a relationship initially, this should not conflict with FACA. He stated that they do not want to harm what HIFLD accomplished to date and they still want HIFLD to function largely informally. Ken commented that it does not seem like the proposal would significantly change operations of the FGDC or HIFLD, and if concerns about potential FACA issues are being raised now, why isn't it currently a concern with HIFLD in how it currently operates? David responded that HIFLD is financed through the Department of Defense and national technical means, which provides some coverage. Wendy commented that it sounds like an issue the FGDC and HIFLD should both take a look at, as it may impact how the charter is drawn up. David stated that he expects to create a charter formalizing a relationship between the two entities. HIFLD will focus on issues that the Homeland Security Work Group used to do for FGDC, and the relationship will allow for more FGDC representation on HIFLD leadership.

Wendy asked whether there will now be a formalized process for feedback from users to producers. David acknowledged that feedback was being collected, but it wasn't being distributed to data providers. They hope to improve this. He stated that they continue to be mindful of concerns, but ultimately, they believe this is a "win-win" relationship.

ACTION: Any Coordination Group members with further questions on the HIFLD/FGDC alignment should contact either David Alexander or the FGDC Secretariat.

Cadastral Subcommittee Report – Don Buhler, BLM

[[Presentation](#), PPT]

Don Buhler reported out on the recent activities of the Cadastral Subcommittee, on behalf of himself and Bob Ader, Chairs of the Cadastral Subcommittee. The Subcommittee continues to establish leadership and direction for Federal agencies with regards to Cadastral data. They are trying to get agencies to follow a national standard to support individual agency efforts. They have also been working with FGDC Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP) award recipients, states, and local agencies in the deployment and sustained delivery of standardized data. Presentations were made to Appalachian Development Council, the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) and many state-based GIS organizations.

Some of the publications in IAAO's magazine were outlined. First, they discussed an article by Jon Sperling (HUD), which focused on HUD's parcel activities. Additionally, a New Mexico Statewide parcel data article was released in June. Nancy Von Meyer stated that the state of New Mexico has standardized parcel data available to version 2 of the standard. Parcel ID has been tied to the PLSS system, which was then used to establish a point for each location. For the first time, New Mexico has statewide cadastral coverage. They have successfully merged PLSS and parcel information to produce a meaningful product for the state Department of Revenue and the Department of Emergency Management. The subcommittee also continues to support parcel data for wildland fire management activities. Another article in the July IAAO magazine looked at how to make parcel data available throughout the US. Nancy von Meyer stated that they took HUD's, the National Research Council's, and the Cadastral Subcommittee's recommendation that talked about using the state as a harvester of local information and

trusted source of parcel information and looked at what capabilities this could provide. However, some of the challenges for statewide programs include coordination, education, and sustainable funding.

The Cadastral Subcommittee has also discussed the Surface Management Agency (SMA) dataset. They have made a great deal of progress on depicting Federal agencies based on who is managing the land. Jurisdiction over the land is defined when the land is either: withdrawn, exchanged, or acquired. Withdrawals are the highest profile of these actions (National Parks, Indian reservations, national monuments, wilderness areas, etc.) “Land status” refers to all the actions affecting the disposition of federal lands. The SMA dataset only depicts the surface boundaries (not mineral boundaries). BLM has jurisdiction over a particular category of Federal land known as “public land”: any land or interest in land owned by the US and administered by the Secretary of Interior through the BLM. Public lands include public domain lands and acquired lands. The technical process they are using for SMA development was described. They are leveraging existing state-maintained SMA data, and also building SMA from land records themselves. They will publish everything they have later this month, and will continue to work with other Federal agencies.

National Digital Orthoimagery Program (NDOP) Subcommittee Report – Shirley Hall, USDA

[\[Presentation, PPT\]](#)

Shirley Hall gave a report on the recent activities of the NDOP Subcommittee. The NDOP Subcommittee is responsible for “developing, promoting and executing the national strategy for the acquisition or development of orthoimagery data for Federal agencies while creating and utilizing partnerships with State, local, tribal, and private organizations.” Chairs of the subcommittee rotate on an annual basis. The most recent meeting of the Subcommittee was May 14-16, 2013 in Washington, DC. The topics included the NAIP 2013 contract; the FAA presentation on the Airports GIS program; Landsat 8, the AFD8/100 Quality Assessment Plan; the Alaska Mapping Initiative; the 3D Elevation Program; an A-16 theme discussion; and agency and subgroup reports.

One recent project of the NDOP Subcommittee is the NAIP 2012-14 Acquisition Plan. The funding agreement was signed last year by FSA and their partners (NRCS, USFS, and DOI). Changes to the new three-year plan were described. With additional funding redirected, they were able to purchase additional states. In 2013, prices also became more reasonable, so they were able to collect more states than expected. What was initially a three-year acquisition plan is now moving to a two-year plan based on good prices and more funding. Idaho 0.5 meter imagery is the pilot project this year – they are looking to see how this turns out. As part of the early access program, vendors are putting the data up on their site as soon as it is collected. FSA uses this for compliance, as it helps monitor imagery data collection. Ken asked, what brought down vendor costs? Shirley responded that processing costs have reduced for vendors. Another project they are working on is the Urban Areas Program (1-ft resolution, leaf-off imagery). They hope to continue to maintain a three-year refresh cycle on this program.

Additionally, the NDOP website has been updated. In the coming months, the NDOP Subcommittee hopes to discuss how to better align imagery and elevation data acquisition investments in Alaska, and establish a new 3-year multi-agency agreement (2015-17) for cooperative funding of NAIP. The NDOP Subcommittee’s next meeting will be in November 2013 in Salt Lake City, UT. Some of the topics to be discussed at the next meeting include the NAIP update, high resolution program update, and agency updates/subcommittee reports.

NSDI Strategic Plan Update – Ken Shaffer, FGDC OS

[[Presentation](#), PPT]

Ken Shaffer gave an update on the progress regarding the NSDI Strategic Plan. The team would like to validate consensus around a shared vision of the NSDI, and the role the Federal government plays in moving forward. While it does collaboratively define strategic relationships, the goals are focused on what federal agencies can achieve in the next three years.

The timeline for the development of the NSDI Strategic Plan, as well as the project teams and partners were reviewed. Ken noted that the “core team” has been meeting weekly and has provided key input. The FGDC held a Strategic Visioning Workshop in March 2013 for key Federal leaders to provide input on the Plan. Similarly, the NSDI Leaders Forum in March also set the stage for the initial draft and content through discussions with non-Federal partners. The National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) provided their input on the Plan during the April/May time frame. The first draft of the Plan was released in early June 2013, and distributed to FGDC agencies and the NGAC for their review and comment by June 24, 2013. Since that time, 220 comments were received from 12 agencies and 11 partner organizations. There was extensive discussion on the first iteration of the Plan at the June NGAC meetings.

Between Version 1 and 2 of the NSDI Strategic Plan, several important changes were made, including that the team: added an Executive Summary; refined the vision and guiding principles; streamlined the introductory section; revised the Roles and Responsibilities and Challenges and Opportunities sections; refined goals/objectives/actions; identified outcomes for each objective; and added an Appendix section. Version 2 was released for public comment on July 31, 2013, with comments due back by August 21, 2013. Following this, there is an NSDI Leaders’ Forum webinar scheduled for August 26, and scheduled discussions on the comments at both the September NGAC and Steering Committee meetings. The NSDI Core Team will review comments and feedback following these meetings and prepare the final draft (Version 3), which will later be submitted to the NGAC and Steering Committee for approval and adoption. Subsequently, the ExCom will oversee development of project plans for goals and objectives in the Plan.

***** FED ONLY SESSION BEGINS *****