

**DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
INFORMATION RESOURCE EXCHANGE GROUP
Minutes of March 6, 2002**

Location: DVRPC, Bourse Building, 111 S. Independence Mall East, 8th Floor

Attendance:

Name:	Organization	E-mail Address
Bob Parfet	Archdiocese of Philadelphia	rparfet@adphila.org
Bob Gittler	Ben Franklin Technology Partners	robert@sep.benfranklin.org
Bob Keough	Bucks Co. Planning	rhkeough@co.bucks.pa.us
Bob Walker	Chester Co. Planning	rwalker@chesco.org
Bob Bielski	Chester Co. Planning	rbielski@chesco.org
Curt Noe	Camden County	curtnoe@camdencounty.com
Brian Sweeney	Chester Co. Planning Commission	bsweeney@chesco.org
Susan Hauser	Delaware Co. Planning	hausers@co.delaware.pa.us
Eileen Gallagher	DVRPC	egallagher@dvrpc.org
Taghi Ozbeki	DVRPC	tozbeki@dvrpc.org
Will Stevens	DVRPC	wstevens@dvrpc.org
Mary Bell	DVRPC	mbell@dvrpc.org
Joe Fazekas	DVRPC	jfazekas@dvrpc.org
Glenn McNichol	DVRPC	gmcnichol@dvrpc.org
Michael Ontko	DVRPC	montko@dvrpc.org
Kevin Adams	DVRPC	kadams@dvrpc.org
Katy Kalata	DVRPC	kkalata@dvrpc.org
Mark H. Gatti	DVRPC	mhgatti@dvrpc.org
Ken Rimer	DVRPC	krimer@dvrpc.org
Bill Mead	Gloucester County Planning	bmead@co.gloucester.nj.us
Steve Beck	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson	
Tom Girdle	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson	
Bob Wendt	LVRDC	wendt@fast.net
Maureen Sharkey	PECO Energy	maureen.sharkey@exeloncorp.com
JoAnn Finley	PGW	joann.finley@pgworks.com
Jametta Johnson	Phila. City Planning Com. (PCPC)	
Ken Sipos	Phila. Dept. of Public Properties	kenneth.sipos@phila.gov
Maryann McCann	Phila. Ind. Devlpmt. Corp. (PIDC)	mmccann@pidc-pa.org
Brian Ivey	Phila. MOIS	brian.ivey@phila.gov
Dennis Mahoney	Phila. Suburban Water Co.	mahoneyd@suburbanwater.com
Katrina Flagel	Mercer County Planning	kflagel@mercercounty.org
Fred Goodrich	Montgomery Co. Planning	fgoodrich@mail.montcopa.org
Lauris Olson	U of PA Library	olson@pobox.upenn.edu
Greg Brivic	US Census Bureau	gregory.brivic@census.gov
Montez Dickerson	SJTPO	mdickerson@sjtpo.org

The meeting was called to order at 10:15.

1. Minutes of the meeting of December 12, 2001

The minutes were approved.

2. Presentation: Regional Transportation GIS Project Design & File Architecture

Mr. Ontko introduced the history of this project and why DVRPC chose to embark on this endeavor. Through a selection process by project committee, Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson (JMT) and their consultant team were chosen for this project. After completion of this phase of the project, discussion will continue through a project steering committee and a larger GIS committee.

Mr. Steve Beck from JMT and Tom Gergel of TransDecisions made the presentation. Mr. Beck began the presentation by identifying the four primary goals defined in the RFP, which included looking at GIS use in the region, documentation and analysis to determine assistance for common level of data quality and data sharing. First steps involved interviews to collect intelligence on what we were doing with GIS. A pre-interview survey was distributed via email. Phone calls were made explaining what to expect. Results were collected from the DOTs, transportation and transit authorities, and all member counties and the cities of Camden, Trenton and Philadelphia. Twenty-Three separate interview sessions were conducted (most multi-agency) and 40 agencies were ultimately interviewed in this process.

Information collected included how GIS data was being used (and with what other technologies), the type of data developed and maintained (self-generated vs. purchased commercially), how transportation-related data was being stored, and the current levels of cooperation between agencies.

The results of this interview process showed that there was widespread GIS usage at various levels, including planning, zoning, 911 and applications such as trash truck routing. The responsibility for GIS varied by department. Some were managed in a professional planning environment while others were maintained as a technical IT function. The software predominantly used for GIS was the ESRI suite of products, with the exception of the DOTs, NJT and Burlington County who use Intergraph. Most were on a Microsoft Windows based platform (with some on UNIX and mainframe). Metadata collection and usage was sketchy and not often collected.

As for scales, most agencies are using files based on USGS quadrangles. Some are based on digital imagery. Some agencies did a one-time purchase of a commercially available linework with no plans for maintaining it, while others like Chester County update their linework as part of the business process.

A seamless centralized GIS-T for the entire DVRPC region is unlikely. GIS will continue to be maintained and developed by separate participating agencies. Most agencies are willing to share their data, but the difficulty is in properly designing a master database that is independent of line work data and supports multiple LRS and broad based planning efforts.

A wall-sized graph was displayed showing the initial five stages of a technology ramp. The technology ramp is a summary blueprint for participants to migrate to higher levels of information sharing.

The challenge is finding the 'sweet spot', staying within an envelope which provides steps in information development and a program for more sophisticated information sharing. The study's recommendation is to relate available systems where possible.

Tom Gergel, a subcontractor to JMT added that NJ uses State Route Identification (SRI) mileposts while PA uses segment offset in their GIS. Using a common LRS/Street address geocoding system allows the sharing of data regardless of graphical depiction. In other words, counties can have more detailed information and state agencies more general, but using the same LRS allows the data to be transformed from network to network.

An Adobe Acrobat file (.pdf) of each volume of the study will be distributed with internal hyperlinks to the contents of each report. CD-ROMs will be delivered to DVRPC as the final product and files will possibly be posted on the DVRPC website. Mr. Mead asked about the availability of results to the IREG committee. Mr. Ontko said that the final results would be made available.

3. Census Update

Greg Brivic from the Census Bureau, gave an update on various Census-related products.

- a. SPS, SPSS, SDIDC website has sample SAS code for NY, NYC and PA, which was produced by the Mississippi State Data Center (SDC) and the PA SDC in partnership with Census 2000. Code is available from (www.sdcbidc.iupdi.edu/), including SAS templates for Census 2000 and PL 94 data. Contact John Blodgett at the MS SDC for more information (573/884.2727)
- b. The Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) website is archiving 2000 Census files (www.icpsr.umich.edu/)
- c. **Urbanized Areas (UAs).** UA definitions will be published in two weeks with addendum updates to the finalized criteria version released sometime later. UAs will now be split within a Metropolitan Area, but previously it was between Metro Areas. Final UA delineations will be available between late March early April 2002.
- d. **TIGER/Line®.** New TIGER file will be released by the end of April 2002. Urban Area TIGER/Line file will be released with new delineations. This latest release is radically more complex; however, urban/rural aggregation will be more or less similar to previous product.
- e. **Metropolitan Area Definitions.** Metro Areas were last updated in June 1999, but usually it is updated every year. The delay is due to conducting the 2000 Census. Commuting data waiting until 2003. (www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/metroarea.html).
- f. **Micropolitan Area.** This is a new delineation, with a core population of 10,000 verses 50,000 for the Metropolitan Area requirements. The new standards for defining Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas are outlined in the Office of Management and Budget's Federal Register / Vol. 65, No. 249 / (Wednesday, December 27, 2000) (www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/notice001227.pdf)

- g. **American Community Survey (ACS).** Not listed on the agenda. A recent alert stated that Transportation Analyzsis Zone (TAZ) data aggregation will be available in 2008 based on 5 years of the ACS, assuming the 2003 budget for it is passed. Mr. Olson asked to receive a forward of that email alert.
- h. **Congressional Districts.** The 108th Congress will be the first to reflect reapportionment and redistricting based on Census 2000 data. 108th Congress TIGER/Line file will be released by end of 2002. States have until November 2002 to submit changes. Wall maps for the 108th congressional districts will be available in January 2003. (www.census.gov/geo/www/cob/cd_metadata.html)
- i. **Adjusted 2000 Census Counts.** Count Question Resolution (CQR) results are available through the American FactFinder, under items of interest, CQR, State then MCD (place-level changes are deeper within which can be a bit misleading). Multi-county governments will be included in each separate county. (www.census.gov/dmd/www/CQR.htm)
- j. **TIGER/Line UA Delineations.** The late April release will include PUMAS (old 1990 data reference). The Fall 2002 release will have the new format and will no longer contain 1990 data references. Of the three upcoming TIGER files being released, only one will have new geography.
- k. **TIGER Modernization (Enhancement).** Also not on the agenda was TIGER Modernization (Enhancement), which is still in its pilot phases, including the State of Delaware. No decisions have been made regarding the future of this project.

4. FY 2002 Work Program Updates

- a. **Year 2000 Aerial Imagery Acquisition.** Mr. Keough brought up a concern that the MrSID and .tiff files for certain areas in Bucks County did not match up in pixel size. DVRPC said they would look into it and get back to him. Mr. Olson inquired if there were any restrictions on 2000 Orthophotography over Fort Dix and the Limerick Nuclear Power Plant. Mr. Ontko said that no restrictions have been imposed.
- b. **Year 2000 Land Use.** DVRPC has abandoned the idea of devloping 2000 Land Use from the 1990/95 Land Use files. The increased accuracy of the imagery make it impossible to adjust the 90/95 polygons. Instead, we will be redoing it from scratch. This will be a two year project to digitize information, check and release to counties for QA/QC. Mr. Keough inquired if DVRPC was going to use Land Use or Land Cover. Mr. Ontko stated that we would use the same categories as before with a few additional categories.
- c. **Census 2000 Data Bulletins.** Ms. Bell spoke about the 4 recently released data bulletins on 2000 Census Profile data. There were four changes in municipal numbers, due to CQR. Original numbers appear in the table with askterisks to the footnotes at the bottom of each table, which had the revised numbers.

5. Information Items

- a. **New Jersey Imagery Acquisition.** The southern parts of the state will be flown first. With the mild winter we had, there will be early leafout and a shorter leafoff season.
- b. **Pennsylvania Imagery Acquisition.** Responsibility for this project is shared between Counties and the State. There are numerous issues to deal with/ such as scale, where a more accurate scale is desired in urban areas, but not needed across vast state forests and parkland upstate.
- c. **GASB 34/35.** DVRPC has been unsuccessful in obtaining a speaker on this topic. Mr. Mead volunteered to look for a speaker.

6. Old Business

There was no old presented at this time.

7. New Business

- a. Bob **Walker** was nominated as the new Vice-Chair of IREG for 2002. Curt Noe, the former Vice-Chair, became the new IREG Chair and officiated this meeting.
- b. Mr. Mead added that the NJSDC Advisory Council decided to amend its bylaws to include regional agencies like DVRPC as an MPO to join the discussion on implementing a process for developing a comprehensive municipal forecasting model in New Jersey.

8. Next meeting dates

June 5th 2002 and September 4th 2002 were confirmed as the next meeting dates.

9. Meeting Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 pm.