PRESIDENT’S COLUMN

by Lisa Dunn

It’s August, and thoughts (at least my thoughts) turn to the end of summer. We’ve had the summer festivals, the street markets, the fairs, the open air concerts. We’ve been to ball games, and hiked and taken road trips.

My thoughts also turn to the upcoming Society meeting —being an officer does strange things to you. We have a strong program and I’m looking forward to a visit to Seattle.

**Business Meeting:** The following issues are potential agenda items. Feedback, even if you aren’t going to be attending the Business Meeting, would be helpful.

**Important:** To allow more time for discussion of Society business, this year the agenda will not include committees and representative reports. Annual reports will be published in the Newsletter in October. Chairs and representatives with action items for the Business Meeting should contact me in advance to be put on the agenda. “New Business” is available for news items and meeting announcements as well.

**GSIS meeting schedule:** Conflicts with the schedule arise each year. The traditional schedule matches our activities with the official GSA meeting calendar (5 days) and coordinates our scheduling with GSA events. Another option is to hold our meeting with GSA but sponsor fewer sessions, ignore conflicting GSA events, etc. with the goal of shortening the entire GSIS schedule. Which direction does the Society want to go?

**Budget:** In addition to an overview of the budget, the Society should address the status of contributed funds that need to be spent out.

**Distinguished Service Award:** A proposal was made last year to establish a Distinguished Service Award to be given at the discretion of the Executive Board, and accompanied by a certificate and a gift such as a one-day registration to GSA. Issues include how candidates would be identified and evaluated; how supporting funds would be raised.

**Web (digitized) GSIS proceedings:** Is it a good idea? Issues include file locations; who would digitize past proceedings; copyright status; financial impact on the Society.

**List of core undergraduate geoscience books:** Is there an interest in forming a working group to compile such a list?

**Student outreach:** We’d like to get students involved in the Society. Issues include incentives; costs; targeting the right audiences; involving members in recruitment.

**Annual Reports**

To all committee chairs, representatives and officers —the annual report deadline is September 19. Please submit your report to the GSIS Newsletter, with a copy to me. See you in Seattle!

VICE PRESIDENT’S COLUMN

by Lura Joseph

Greetings! Plans for the GSIS/GSA Seattle 2003 meeting are progressing well. Thanks to our members, we will have an extremely interesting topical session. We have a total of 14 talks. *(Editor’s note: The tentative schedule is given on page 3 and the Abstracts start on page 4.)*

I will post a message to GeoNet as soon as the schedule has been locked-in by GSA, and another right before the meeting. I will also post meeting information on the GSIS Web site.

I’m really excited about the Seattle 2003 meeting, and I hope you are also. I hope you all plan to attend!
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GSIS members are encouraged to contribute materials for publication. Material for the October, 2003 issue should be
received no later than September 26, 2003. If possible, please send materials by e-mail.
Sunday, November 2
Note: The Geoscience/Communications discipline oral session is being managed by Monica Easton, Association of Earth Science Editors (AESE). This session will include talks of interest to both AESE and GSIS. At this point it is uncertain whether it will meet in morning or afternoon, November 2. The discipline poster session is also currently scheduled for Sunday, but it is also uncertain whether it will be in the morning or afternoon. There are presently only 4 posters, so the poster session could be cancelled.

12:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m. GSIS Board Meeting  
4:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m. GSA Presidential Address & Awards Ceremony  
6:00 p.m.-8:30 p.m. GSA Welcoming Party & Exhibit Hall Opening

Monday, November 3
8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. GSIS Topical Session T48  
2:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m. Collection Development Forum  
5:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m. GSA Alumni Night

Tuesday, November 4
8:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m. Digital/GeoRef Forum  
12:00 p.m.-1:30 p.m. GSIS Luncheon & Awards  
1:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m. GSIS Business Meeting  
7:00 p.m.-9:30 p.m. GSIS Reception

Wednesday, November 5
8:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. Preservation Forum  
1:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m. Professional Issues Forum & Wrap-up

Thursday, November 6
GSIS Field Trip (Plan to attend! Don’t miss the fun and companionship!)

Other meetings of interest  (I made a valiant attempt to avoid scheduling over other sessions of interest, but that turned out to be impossible with our packed schedule and GSA scheduling constraints): [Remember that these dates and times could also change]

T33 Beyond Google: Strategies for Developing Information-Literate Geoscience Students (Posters) (Geoscience Educators) Tuesday, 11/4, 8-12.
T45I Geological and Geophysical Databases: What We Have and What We Need I. Tuesday, 11/4, 8-12.
T45II Geological and Geophysical Databases: What We Have and What We Need II. Tuesday, 11/4, 1:30-5:30.
T47 Design & Development of XML-based, Discipline-Specific, Geological Markup Languages, and Development of Applications, Tuesday, 11/4, 8-12.
T49 The National Geologic Map Database (Posters), Monday, 11/3, 1:30-5:30.

GSIS Exhibit Committee Report
The GSIS booth at GSA in Seattle this year will be #736. Our theme is Digitization in GeoScience Libraries. If you have a project on digitization, please write a short paragraph and include a photograph and/or a web site and we will use these in the booth. We also welcome recommendations of other projects you know about. We again need volunteers willing to staff the booth. Please send ideas and resources to Dona Dirlam at ddirlam@gia.edu
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Saving the Geology Library--A Civics Lesson. C. J. Manson

The Washington state geological survey library was formally established in 1935. Due to severe budget shortfalls, that library was threatened with permanent closure in 2003. That it survived shows that 'the system works'. How it survived may be a useful example to other organizations facing similar problems. Preliminary projections, released in December 2002, indicated that Washington state government faced a $2.4 billion revenue shortfall. The legislature would meet in January 2003, primarily to work on the budget for all state programs. In advance of that, the Governor's proposed budget was released in mid-December 2002. That budget opted to make up the shortfall by cutting all but the most necessary state programs. Those cuts included the Washington state geological survey library and all our state survey public information functions. Both librarians would lose their jobs, but what would become of the collection? Would the materials be given to other libraries? Would they be boxed and stored indefinitely? Would they simply be tossed? No one knew. We immediately fought back. We contacted our external users in industry, academia, and the public about our plight. We could not lobby the legislature ourselves nor could we tell our supporters what to say. However, we could and did provide our supporters with the information they requested about our situation. We prepared and distributed fact sheets and surveys. We encouraged our supporters to express their opinions to their legislators and to spread the word. Their letters came in a torrent. We heard that the letters were articulate, factual, intelligent, and much appreciated. The cynics are wrong: the system does work. Legislators do read their mail and they do take it to heart. The legislature did not fund raises for teachers and they cut many other programs. But they restored $100,000 to our budget, specifically for the library. That $100,000 restored only partial funding for us, so we scrambled to find the rest through various federal grants and other funds and are confident we will succeed. The library lives for at least two more years, when we'll probably go through this all over again.


Conference proceedings serve a role in communicating current ideas, interim results, and completed studies to a broader audience than just the conference registrants. They are published as single volumes, parts of monographic series, on CD-ROMs, or on the Web. In some cases, they are published within journals. The value of these journal-published conference papers has been questioned, because 1) they may be considered less valuable than regular journal papers and 2) they increase the size of the journals and perhaps contribute to cost increases. These proceedings get distributed to a wide audience, but subscribers usually do not have a choice on whether they will receive and thereby pay for them. This issue still has relevance with the rise of electronic journal packages, because the price of the packages is often dependent on the price of the constituent journals. If conference proceedings are inflating journal prices, then they are probably inflating journal package prices too.

If conference papers have less long-term value than journal articles, then there should be a difference in their citation patterns. Eight years ago a preliminary study found no significant difference between the citation frequencies of conference papers and research articles that were published during the same year in the same geoscience journals. The study was limited because the data were slowly gathered through CD-ROM searches. The current study examined a larger set of geoscience journals and longer citation periods through searches of the Web of Science. Citation frequencies of conference papers in monographic proceedings were also collected. The results show whether conference papers in journals are used to the same extent as research journal articles or whether they fit expectations of lower use of proceedings papers.

Geoscience Monograph Series -- Are They Worth the Cost or Are They a Great Value For Libraries? C. R. M. Derksen, M. M. Noga

Earth Sciences Libraries abound with monograph series published by societies, research institutes, universities, and government agencies. Some of those published by the societies, for example, the Geological Society of America's Special Paper series, the Mineralogical Society of America's Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry series, or the American Association of Petroleum Geologists' AAPG Memoir series, may take up a lot of shelf space and are unpredictable in publication schedule and/or cost per volume.

This study focused on a selected number of series, all of which were non-commercially published, broad in geographic scope, and established monographic series. Several of the university-published series are actually publishing venues for theses. Some, published by government agencies, are acquired on deposit, as gifts, or at very low cost. Others, such as the Geological Society's Special Publication series, have a more expensive price tag. Cost per year, use of the volumes (as determined by circulation and in-house use records) and citation rates were examined. Stanford University Libraries figures were supplemented by data from MIT Libraries. The information collected for the selected series was also contrasted with comparable data for commercially published books purchased individually.

This examination of the cost and use data for the society monographic series volumes and the other selected series
indicates that, by and large, they are well used, and worth the shelf space and purchase price. Purchase of the same volumes on an as needed basis could be more expensive.


Many bibliographic databases such as GeoRef are available through several commercial vendors. Quite often academic libraries form consortia agreements to obtain the best price and licensing options on database purchases. This in turn creates a “one package fits all” purchasing environment with cost becoming the controlling factor. However, pedagogical aspects, functionality, currency and most importantly primary audience also need to be considered. This presentation will establish a check list of criteria for database vendor selection and using GeoRef as an example, compare some of the major bibliographic vendors.

**Book Reviews in the Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Journal Literature. C. Laffoon, M. Fosmire**

As library budgets continue to lag behind increases in the cost of scholarly information in the geosciences, it becomes increasingly important for librarians to make good choices in collection development. One way to get more information about books to make an informed acquisition decision, is through reading substantial, timely reviews. Whereas the major book review indexes only cover geoscience titles sporadically, the authors decided to undertake a full study of the literature in earth and atmospheric sciences to find out which journals contain book reviews, and how old the books are that are reviewed. This study is modeled after the article, “Locating Book Reviews in Agriculture and the Life Sciences,” by Kathleen Clark and Brent Mai, and incorporates Lura Joseph’s, “Sources of Book Reviews in the Geosciences” (http://door.library.uiuc.edu/gex/bookreviews.html), as well as several other resources. This study examines 263 earth and atmospheric sciences journal titles which include book reviews. Of these, 247 are primarily in earth sciences, with the remaining 16 in atmospheric sciences. For this study, journal issues published in 2002 are examined. The reviews average one page in length and are all signed by the reviewer.

**Publishing Patterns in the Earth System Science Department, a Non-Traditional Geoscience Program at the University of California, Irvine. A. M. Love**

Analysis of the publication patterns of the UCI Earth System Science faculty researchers will compare publications and research between UCI and more traditional geology departments. Additionally, this analysis will provide insights into the research habits and publication patterns of the Earth System Science (ESS) faculty. The information presented will exemplify specialized collection development experiences in a university library setting as well as highlight current changes in information usage in the geosciences. These changes not only have an impact on library users, but also those responsible for collection development in support of research. The ESS instruction and departmental research emphasis changes are a dynamic reflection of interests in current issues and global environmental concerns—not static reflections of standard physical science programs.

The University of California, Irvine (UCI) was founded in 1965. In 1989-90, the School of Physical Sciences examined the possibility of establishing a geosciences program where, up until this time, there had been no geology program included in the UCI campus science curriculum. The Earth System Science Department has its roots in the atmospheric chemistry research of F. Sherwood Rowland’s laboratory group in the Department of Chemistry. The focus of the proposed geosciences program was nontraditional and did not emphasize the usual “rock” geology. In 1990 Ralph Cicerone, a specialist in atmospheric chemistry and former director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research’s Atmospheric Chemistry Division, joined the UCI faculty. With Dr. Cicerone came a change in the focus for the departmental curriculum; it took on the “global change agenda,” and the founding faculty members were hired in the atmospheric sciences, geochemistry and oceanography.

**Information Labs: A New Approach to Geoscience Information Literacy Instruction. M. Fosmire**

As higher education undergoes a transformation from a lecture-dominated enterprise to one that encourages active engagement by the students with the curriculum, librarians have a new avenue for inserting themselves into the educational mission of the university. At Purdue University, the libraries have been successful integrating problem-based learning activities into curricula in several departments. One of the most successful ventures at Purdue has been in the Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, where, in addition to our regular instructional presence, we have created ‘information labs’ in two courses so far, including the first year survey course taken by all EAS majors. The information lab takes the place of a regular lab in those classes, and involves the students tackling a research project, solving it, and writing up the results in some format and presenting those results to the rest of the class. The lab uses a problem-based learning methodology, where students take ownership of a problem or situation, determine what their learning issues are, and then go about resolving those learning issues to solve their problem. The instructor acts as a guide, answering questions and guiding students through the process of problem solving, rather than standing up front and demonstrating databases for the students. The students work in small groups to facilitate peer learning as well, which has been shown to be a preferred method for students to learn. Since the information lab takes the students through all the steps in the problem-solving process, it naturally addresses each of the
ACRL information literacy competencies, providing a well-rounded introduction to information literacy to the students. This paper describes the two information labs that have been created for the geosciences, one in the survey course, and one in mineralogy. From the creation of subject-faculty/librarian partnerships, to the actual content of the labs, to an evaluation of the effectiveness of the instruction, the process of implementing the information labs will be discussed. Tips for creating these types of information instruction experiences will also be given.


GeoScienceWorld is a multi-society aggregation of geoscience electronic journals currently under development by seven societies: AAPG, AGI, GSA, GSL, MSA, SEG, SEPM. The purpose is to continue the collective mission of disseminating scientific research and information as well as to preserve past scientific literature. The aggregation will consist of peer-reviewed, high quality, regularly appearing, internationally based, earth and space science journals that are published by non-profit professional societies and university presses. Initially GeoScienceWorld will focus on journals published in English, but will later incorporate other languages for worldwide coverage. The goal is to have the aggregation ready to launch during 2004.

The initial launch will feature a Millennium Collection, which will consist of a full-text, online-accessible aggregation of geoscience journals issued from January 2000 forward. Features will include searching of full-text and figure captions for all journals in the aggregation, and of all geoscience literature through GeoRef, with linking between reference and cited articles through CrossRef. Other expected features include HTML and PDF (searchable) full text, searches using a controlled vocabulary, the ability to limit searches to subsets, clear identification of journals and societies, public access to all abstracts, and links to enhanced data sets. The intent is to develop a literature access service that links the Millennium Collection to searchable electronic back issues (pre-2000) of as many society journals as possible. Although the initial focus is on journals, the goal is to include or be linked to non-journal material such as digital datasets, books, maps, and other geoscience literature in the future.

An electronic journal aggregation should result in a greater integration and exposure of earth science disciplines and an increase in the value and accessibility of scientific society journals to the greater geoscience community, including developing countries. GeoScienceWorld may have the most powerful impact on geosciences in many decades.


The library and information environments have changed substantially during the past ten years. The development of the World Wide Web and subsequent rapid growth of scholarly information and other data, available anytime or anyplace through the internet, have exerted a profound impact on the way geoscientists find and use the information resources needed for research and teaching. This presentation draws upon the extensive survey and user assessment data accumulated at the University of Washington since 1992. Large scale survey information provides sufficient granularity to compare how geoscientists and scientists in other areas find information and use libraries.

Linking to Full Text (and Beyond) With SFX. A. B. Twiss-Brooks

The University of Chicago Library is committed to providing its academic research and education community with a diverse collection of print and, increasingly, electronic resources. The electronic collections are remarkable not only for the amount of information available (more than 4,000 electronic journals in the sciences alone), but also for the astounding (and confusing) variety of publisher search interfaces, schemes for content organization, and navigational routes to the content. In an effort to provide users with a more intuitive and consistent way to identify means to retrieve content, regardless of format or source, the Library implemented an SFX server solution.

SFX (from ExLibris) is a linking technology based on the OpenURL protocol (currently under development as a NISO standard) for creating customized links among diverse information products. The University of Chicago Library implementation of SFX to provide better management of electronic resources and improved service to the scholarly community is described.

The Library defined its electronic collection, and constructed rules to guide SFX in creating context-sensitive links. These customized, context-sensitive links use web-transportable packages of metadata to connect users to resources and services. Links to resources are dynamically generated to provide information about all available online copies. In addition, SFX services have been configured to include links to online full text, as well as searches of the University of Chicago Library’s rich print collections and additional services, including automated interlibrary loan request generation.

Recent and future developments described include an OpenURL generator/DOI resolver tool, a dynamically generated comprehensive online journal A to Z list, and additional SFX services.

Implementing the Open Archival Information System (OAIS) Reference Model: NSIDC, A Case Study. T. L. Mullins, R. Duerr

Geoscience data sets are the foundation of education and basic and applied research in the geosciences. Their long-term continuity and viability are of great importance to all aspects of society. Open access to data allows research-
ers to replicate research results and provides greater understanding of the Earth system. With the advent of new sources of remote sensing data and the technical capability of processing large volumes of data, new models for data management, access and archival are needed for archives, libraries and cultural heritage institutions to properly manage geoscience data sets. The Open Archival Information System (OAIS) Reference Model, a recommendation by the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems, was developed in part to define an ISO standard for the long-term preservation of digital information. The National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC), a national data archive with expertise in cryospheric research, is adopting the OAIS reference model because it meets the goals we have set out in our mission statement “to excel in managing data and disseminating information in order to advance understanding of the Earth system”.

NSIDC started the process of adopting this model for data stewardship in 2002. At that time a Data Management Policies document was drafted and a Metadata Database project was initiated to unite guardianship efforts across programs and with NSIDC data providers and users. This paper will briefly examine the OAIS model and then discuss the work that NSIDC is doing to implement it. Specific data sets in different stages of acceptance, ingest and archival will be used to illustrate fundamental concepts. Metadata and data format standards, system architecture and documentation will be reviewed.

USGS Water Resources Investigation Reports: A Case Study for Improving Access. P. B. Yocum

Since 1973 the USGS has published over 4,000 reports in the series, Water Resources Investigation Reports. Copies of the studies, dealing with water in localities throughout the United States, have been deposited in libraries for use by academic researchers and the general public. From the outset the University of Michigan Library sought to collect the reports comprehensively. Prior to the digital era limited resources caused the library to catalog only the series name and to record holdings only by the piece number. With rare exceptions, catalog entries were not made for author, title, or subject for individual pieces. As more reports arrived, management of the collection became more difficult and access to the individual pieces became more problematic. By the late 1990’s attempts by patrons to consult items in the series often required extensive staff help for what should have been a straightforward, self-service function.

In late Spring 2000 the Shapiro Science Library embarked on a project to improve the situation. The project proceeded in several phases and with multiple goals. The most important of these were achieved by Spring 2003. Among them was providing a separate catalog record for each WRIR number in the U of M collection, thus making each searchable by author, title, subject and keyword from anywhere in the world. Improved bibliographic access also makes items more available for use via interlibrary loan. This paper discusses the need for the project, the challenges encountered, and the solutions adopted. It will be of special interest to institutions considering improvements to their collections of WRIR or other government publications in series.

Status of Bibliographic Control of Pre-1900 Geoscience Literature. M. W. Scott

There are several print bibliographies that cover the literature before 1900. The Bibliography of North American Geology (1785-1948) was incorporated into GeoRef as a special project. But other non North American bibliographies, for example, Repertorium commentationum a societatis litterarum editarum, 1665-1800; The Royal Society (Great Britain), Catalogue of scientific papers 1800-1900; Agassiz, Louis, Bibliographia zoologiae et geologiae, 1848; Taschenbuch für die gesammte Mineralogie, 1807-1829; Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geologie and Palaeontologie, 1830-1900; Bibliographia geologica: 1896-1906; and Annuaire geologique universel: revue de geologie & palaeontologie, 1885-1896 were not entered into GeoRef. Should they be included? Is coverage of major geological topics and/or journals missing from GeoRef? How accessible is the literature from this time period? As libraries move older material to remote storage, do we have the tools to find and recall this material, particularly the journal literature?

The mathematicians are creating Electronic Research Archive for Mathematics, ERAM, a digital archive of the most important mathematical publications of the period 1868-1942 and a database based on the "Jahrbuch über die Fortschritte der Mathematik." Is a similar project feasible for the geosciences?


Among the great challenges of current geoscience information are the questions of deciding what information will be digitally preserved, in what format, and what types of access can be made available.

In 1999, the Geology Library at Michigan State University received a collection of letters and reports written by Frank Leverett and Frank Taylor. Dating between 1890 and 1937, the collection includes correspondence between Leverett and Taylor, as well as letters written by other glaciologists. The collection also includes many of Taylor’s handwritten reports. In addition to this very unique resource, the Geology Library has discovered a small group of detailed field maps for various quadrangles in Michigan that relate directly to some of the areas mapped by Leverett. Since 2000, the Geology Library has also acquired copies of Leverett’s field notebooks for Michigan and a series of paintings that show the recession of the glaciers across Michigan.
In addition to preserving this unique but disparate group of collections, it is the objective of the Geology Library to explore ways to make these collections accessible to researchers. The ultimate goal would be a database that would allow glaciologists and geomorphologists access to the information collected by Leverett & Taylor in the production of Monograph 53. Ideally the theoretical design of such a database would be more than archival in nature. It should permit correlated access to all parts of the information base by location (a multi-tier field location structure), by date, and by name of glacial feature.

**GEO SCIENCE INFORMATION SOCIETY**

**2003 Field Trip--Thursday, November 6, 2003**

*Seismic In Seattle!*

The trip is in three parts so folks can participate in any part(s) they’d like and leave when they need to.

**Part 1:** "The Glacial Geology and Seismic Hazards of the Puget Lowland," led by geologist Tim Walsh (head of the Environmental Geology section of the Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources). Take the Seattle to Bremerton ferry, over the Seattle fault, past Restoration Pt. (site of uplift from the 1100 ybp earthquake on the Seattle fault), past the glacially-deposited, landslide-prone shores of Puget Sound. 8:30 to 11:30; fee $15.

**Part 2:** Lunch in historic Pioneer Square (on your own)

**Part 3:** The Seattle Underground Tour-Visit the spooky city that lies beneath Seattle’s present street level. The subterranean walkways are dry, but the history is not. Learn about Seattle's colorful past; how the Founding Fathers’ squabbling led to Seattle’s complicated street system, and how the solutions to our unique plumbing problems affected the town’s elevation. (This is one of Seattle’s most popular attractions-- and A Real Hoot!) 1:30 to 3:30; fee $10.

There is no limit to the number who can attend: the ferry holds quite a few people, there are plenty of restaurants in Pioneer Square, and the Underground Tour can accommodate just about any number. If we have at least 10 people, we can get a private tour and pick our own hour.

**Sign Up Now!**

Name: _________________________________________
e-mail address: __________________________________
Ferry tour only: $15; Underground tour only: $10; Both:$25

Please mail this form and your check to: Connie Manson, 2525 Sleater Kinney Road N.E., Olympia, WA 98506
Regarding the 2003 GSIS budget which appeared in the April newsletter, the Executive Board approved changing [bank] interest from $500 expense to $300 income. The change is reflected in the midyear budget report printed in the current newsletter issue. Interest on CD’s will be posted in December.  Patricia Yocum, Treasurer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Budgeted</th>
<th>Income Actual</th>
<th>Expense Budgeted</th>
<th>Expense Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE BOARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$9.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past-President</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$58.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleconferences</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$925.00</td>
<td>$67.56</td>
<td>$67.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Meeting</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$552.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Exhibit</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Meeting Fieldtrip</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Meeting</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Meeting: fieldtrip</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Reception (Elsevier)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$904.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td>$904.68</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>$4,960.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Sponsorship</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Sponsorship</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$358.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$8,660.00</td>
<td>$7,503.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory of Geoscience Libraries</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing labels</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership directory</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter: printing</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$911.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter: mailing</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$437.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter: subscriptions</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter: back issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter: cancellation refunds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, v.33 (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>$1,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, v.32 (2001)</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>$1,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, v.31 (2000)</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, v.30 (1999)</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, v.29 (1998)</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings, prior volumes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings standing order refunds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOINFO V Proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOINFO VI Proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Editing &amp; Information Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$4,615.00</td>
<td>$1,635.00</td>
<td>$9,130.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPRESENTATIVES/APPOINTEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGI Member Council rep</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGI Gov’t Affairs Program rep</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUAC (2 reps @ $200 each)</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity Officer</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$525.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMITTEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Paper</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Reference Work</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Guidebook</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Development</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Data</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeoRef Users Group</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidebook Standards</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Initiatives</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership brochure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union List of Field Trip Guidebooks</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Advisory</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$825.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISCELLANEOUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGI member society dues</td>
<td>$425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP contribution</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSIS International Fellow</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount 1/1/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansari Award</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts (unrestricted)</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts- Professional Develop Fund</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debit for deposit of insufficient funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenirs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$16,825.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checking 1/1/03
Union Bank of California $3,847.10

Savings 1/1/03
Union Bank of California $2,599.45

Bank of America: Ansari Savings $785.84

National City Bank: Ansari CD $2,523.16

National City Bank: Ansari CD $4,104.80

National City Bank: CD $3,020.29

National City Bank: CD $8,081.28

TOTAL balance 1/1/03 $24,961.92

TOTAL Balance 6/30/03 $29,221.77

ANNUAL REPORT - REPRESENTATIVE


This year’s conference was jointly held with Canadian Library Association. MAGERT produced two programs plus a contributed papers session this year. Parts of the two programs, on cartographic materials cataloging and on access to geospatial data, have html or powerpoint documents located at http://magert.whoi.edu:8000/conf/2003/details03.html

Sponsored by the GeoTech Committee of MAGERT, speakers for the geospatial data program were Dave McIlhagga of DM Solutions Group, Jason Cupp and Angela Lee of ESRI, and Marcel Fortin of the University of Toronto. Open source technologies are impacting the geomatics industry, exemplified by the software and standards for data sharing from the University of Minnesota MapServer. The Canadian Geospatial Data Infrastructure and its American counterpart (National Geospatial Data Infrastructure) are developing so that spatial data can be imported into applications from open source (non-commercial) servers. Open source and open standards technologies are cost effective and simplify integration into other web content.

Respectfully submitted, Thomas R. Zogg
CUAC Representatives
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Daniel T. Seldin, Indiana University, NACIS
Wangyal Shawa, Princeton University, ALA/MAGERT
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Linda Zellmer, Indiana University, GSIS
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May 1, 2003
CUAC Co-chairs Dan Seldin and Mike Furlough called the meeting to order and welcomed the attendees.

Government Printing Office: Gil Baldwin, Director, Library Programs Service
Mr. Baldwin welcomed CUAC to GPO and assured us that he had a terrific staff that would be available for our two days of meetings to help make our meeting comfortable and productive.

In December 2002, the Bush Administration appointed a new Public Printer, who was confirmed by the Senate. He is Bruce James; originally from Nevada, Mr. James has an industry background. He brings an entrepreneurial spirit and a business approach. His staff is working on a two-year cycle of change. There are three phases to this and to some extent all three phases are ongoing, but in most aspects they are in the fact-finding phase with lots of pilot projects, discussions with different communities and exploring various products and services. The next phase is developing consensus on what the future will look like and getting input from all communities on a strategic plan. The final phase will be implementation.

Judith Russell has been appointed Superintendent of Documents. Judith spent several years at GPO before her years at NCLIS and has now returned as the first woman Superintendent of Documents.

Mr. James is very business oriented and is focused on the future and is externally directed. It is clear that the future is not going to be printing. The future is information dissemination. In the beginning, GPO Access was very much driven by paper products that were available digitally. They are now focused on born digital information and have become an information dissemination agency.

Mr. James has appointed William H. Turri Deputy Public Printer and Chief Operating Officer who is in charge of Innovations and Partnerships. This is a broader program than the traditional partnership initiative that LPS has had going for several years.

GPO currently employs about 3,100 people. Library Program Service has a staff of 108. Most of these are librarians, many are catalogers, but there are also librarians who are managers and program analysts. There are many more professionals than there used to be with only about 35 blue-collar workers in LPS.

They are in the process of selecting an integrated library system, and have been in the evaluation phase for the past 6 months. This phase is being directed by professional consultants who have been extremely helpful. They are currently in the contract development phase, working with Ex Libris and PTFS in partnership. They have not yet awarded a contract, but they hope to do so by the end of May.

The new Recommended Specifications for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries have been developed based on what LPS sees coming out from federal publishers. It represents middle-of-the-road technology rather than bleeding edge. He is asking CUAC for input on these recommendations. Cindy Etkin, who is responsible for the development of the specifications, will
come to the meeting later.

Bonnie Trivizas, Chief of the Library Division has retired and Sheila McGarr is returning from the Department of Education Library to fill Ms. Trivizas’s position.

The transition from paper and fiche to electronic has been progressing for many years. Today, two-thirds of the distribution is online electronic format. One-fourth of the remaining tangible products are maps.

OMB issued a directive to executive agencies allowing them to solicit bids from commercial printers rather than printing documents through GPO. This has reduced GPO’s sources of information, even though Congress opposed the directive. This was one of Mr. James first orders of business when he started. When he first took over, he spoke with Mitch Daniels of OMB about the issue. The public who loses when printing does not come through GPO, because then information does not get sent out to libraries. Fully 85% of the printing done through GPO is done by outside contractors.

Cataloging staff has been increased by six. They are trying to determine what data and information products will be coming through the program so they will know whether staffing is appropriate. There is a lot of training going on now, both for the new electronic medium and for the new integrated library system.

Two new formats that came through the program in the past year: the audio E book and the mini CD-ROM. This may not be any indication of a trend, but they were something different that required cataloging.

Several new communication channels are now available for communicating with GPO. There is the GPO FDLP-L. To sign on, go to the GPO homepage. Click on list serve. Click on list serve archive. Register at this point. Instructions are also in Administrative Notes. Also available are AskLPS, AskLPS@GPO.gov, and lostdocs@gpo.gov. All of these sources of assistance from GPO are available to all of us and we are encouraged to use them. LPS is also in the process of acquiring help desk software. It will be available in the next few months.

The Interagency Depository Seminar will be held later this month at GPO. This is especially geared towards new government document librarians. In October the Federal Depository conference will be held in D.C. There will be informational and instructional programs as well as a continuation of the discussion on the future direction of the FDLP.

There is a new program at NARA that assures Access to Archival Databases (AAD). This program will assure the digital archiving of all congressional and regulatory publications.

GPO’s digital archive harvests digital-only data. This is done through their own archives server, as well as through partnerships, the digital archiving project with OCLC and they are investigating the possibility of including digital management on their ILS contract.

A couple of their partnerships are one with Department of Energy, Office of Science and Technology Information for permanent public access for all fiche and online data, and one with the University of Illinois at Chicago for the Foreign Affairs Network of the Department of State.

In response to a question about archiving of publications that are sent out electronically directly from an agency and not through the FDLP, Mr. Baldwin asked that we let LPS know about these cases so that the information can be captured and access can be provided through FDLP.

It was pointed out that CD-ROM products were being cataloged from the cover information instead of from the metadata contained on the CD-ROM. This was noted by the GPO catalogers in attendance.

A question was asked about how broken links on the Web are dealt with. Mr. Baldwin explained the PURL system. Broken links are discovered by an automated system, but the investigation that needs to be done to repair the link has to be done by a person. Broken links should be reported to askLPS@GPO.gov.

Council had several cataloging questions. The backlog will be resolved with the increase in the number of catalogers, and the assignment of an assistant to help Vi Morehouse with map cataloging. It has been about 18 months since they lost 4 catalogers, and it has taken this long to bring everyone up to speed. There was some discussion about Antarctica maps and how they should be classified, but that was also resolved and should be completed shortly. It was agreed that subject headings could be added for the counties for the Forest Service topos.

In response to questions about CRADAs (Cooperative Research and Development Agreement), Mr. Baldwin explained that when GPO finds out an agency has established a CRADA with a company, GPO contacts the agency and either makes a competing offer or merely explains that the agency is still responsible for getting data to the public. Agencies now are under much pressure to get their information out and still remain solvent.

(Minutes submitted by Donna Koepp)

Library of Congress: John Hebert, Chief, Geography and Map Division

John Hebert began with a brief update of recent activities in the Division.

The Library has entered into its final year of its agreement with the German Prince Johannes Waldburg-Wolfgieg regarding the Waldseemüller Map. The map is a one-of-a-kind from 1507; it is the first published map to use the word “America.” The Library of Congress has given $6.5 million of the $10 million owed to the Prince. The Library is in negotiation with the Discovery Channel for the remaining $3.5 million. The Channel is also considering making a 30-hour program using many of the maps from the Division.

G&M added 3 new catalogers; 2 filled vacant positions. Two new cartographers will be hired soon; their job will be to use GIS to create maps for Congress. These maps will...
not be available to the public because they are specifically produced for Congress. The Division has put out notices for participants for their Summer Program. It is unknown how many people will attend. Last summer, 2 people from Native American colleges worked in the Division. Also, a Chinese professor helped analyze the division’s pre-1900 Chinese maps. Currently, G&M is working with a group from Japan who is interested in scanning a set of older Japanese maps. 160 of the maps in this set are found nowhere in the world other than the Division.

The Division’s website has recently added images of maps from WWII and the Lewis and Clark Expedition. The Library will soon be opening an exhibit on the latter topic; a third of the items in the exhibit will be maps. On September 18, 2003, LC will host a conference on Lewis and Clark.

The Phillip Lee Phillips Society recently met in Texas. There are several large scanning projects going on or planned within the Division. The Chief noted that when items are scanned by the Division, the items are also cataloged. The first project will scan the Vietnam and India 1:50,000 maps. Second, the Division has entered into a contract with Readex where they will scan older maps in the Serial Set; Readex will use Donna Koepp’s index as a reference when selecting the materials. The scans will be made available on LC’s website and will be in the public domain. Readex will sell access to the scanned accompanying materials in the Serial Set.

The move to LC’s new Integrated Library System (ILS) has caused problems with the scanned image display software. Owing to changes in the MrSID licensing structure that may cost LC more money, LC is considering translating its files to JPEG2000 format.

The project to scan the Division’s collection of Sanborn maps has fallen apart because Sanborn (who were to pay to have the maps scanned) wanted to re-copyright the maps, even if they were in the public domain. Because of this G&M is examining some other ways to scan their 250,000 Sanborn sheets that are in the public domain.

The Chief informed CUAC that items from the former Soviet Union and Soviet Bloc which were thought to be in the public domain, might not be.

G&M continues to talk with NIMA about co-operative cataloging. G&M catalogs more items, but NIMA catalogs to sheet level of sets.

The Division is going to buy some new scanners; they will be able to scan items 2 feet by 5 feet. They are attempting to purchase top-mounted scanner, which would be used for atlases. G&M wants to hire a scanning technician — someone who is responsible for the scanners, but not the cataloging. Congress has given LC $5.5 million to work with NARA on digital preservation.

(Minutes submitted by Christopher J. J. Thiry)

U.S. Bureau of the Census: Connie Beard, Cartographic Operations Branch

Connie Beard of the Census provided an update on recent map products and the progress of the MAF/TIGER modernization activities at the U.S. Census Bureau.

The recent Census products include maps, data and LandView.

Maps Products:

The map products include digital maps on the web, DVD/CD-ROM, printed report maps, and printed wall maps.

Digital Maps:

All the large-format digital maps of Census 2000 are available on the web, and some of them are available on DVD/CD-ROM, as listed below:

--Census Tract Outline Maps (Census 2000)...1 DVD – Available Now
--Entity Based Census 2000 Block Maps…6 DVDs – 1 Available Now, 5 Coming Soon
-- American Indian/Alaska Native/Hawaiian Home Lands (Block Maps, Tract Maps & AIANA Wall Map)...1 DVD – Coming Soon
--Recreated 1990 Block and Census Track/BNA outline maps to fit with 2000 Block and Census Track/BNA boundaries. These maps were created using the same software as Census 2000 mapping software. The outline maps were saved as PDF files. They are available on the Internet now and later will be made available on DVD.

Printed Report Maps:

The printed report includes the Summary Population and Housing Characteristic Reports (PHC-1 and PHC-2). All the printed report maps are accessible on the Internet http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/index.html. These printed report maps consist of maps such as state and county outline maps, county subdivision maps, and tribal subdivision maps. The PHC-3 report will be coming out late in the summer and it will include state-based Metropolitan Area maps, showing the 1999 OMB definition of Metropolitan Areas that were in effect for Census 2000 and state-based urban areas maps that shows the location and name of the urbanized area and urban clusters for that state. The large-format maps of urbanized areas and urban cluster outline maps are available on the Internet in PDF file format. The Census is planning to put these maps on DVD later.

The Census Bureau is currently making the 1% sample or Super-PUMA maps available on their web page and later on DVD/CD-ROM. The end of the summer 5% sample data maps will be made available on the web. The Census has also made individual state profile maps and information available on their web page.

Printed Wall Maps

The following printed wall maps are available on the Census web page:

--The 108th Congressional District maps.

(Minutes submitted by Christopher J. J. Thiry)
Census is in the process of making wall maps of individual Congressional Districts and State-based Congressional Districts outline maps.

**Cartographic Boundary Files:**

The generalized boundary files of all levels of Census Geography from Block Groups and above are available on the Census web page (http://www.census.gov/geo/www/cob/index.html). These files have been recently re-generated so that they will integrate vertically in a GIS. The boundary files are available in the following file formats:

--ArcView Shapefile
--Arc/Info Coverage Export (.e00)
--Arc/Info Ungenerate (ASCII)

What’s New (http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/index.html) is a good place to check these products that are available on the web.

**LandView:**

The Census is developing LandView version 5, which integrates EPA, Census data, and USGS Geographic Names Information System. This version of Landview will be a depository item. For more information on the LandView 5 product contact 301-763-4636.

*The MAF/TIGER modernization:*

The main goals of MAF (Master Address File)/TIGER modernization activities are to replace the old TIGER database system with an open commercial database system such as Oracle, and implement a more flexible, object-oriented development environment. Another objective is to merge the exiting separate databases such as MAF, TIGER, and GEOCAT into a single integrated database system so that it will improve the functionality of the MAF/TIGER system. In addition, the Census is working on improving address and map accuracy by enhancing coordinate systems.

This MAF/TIGER modernization program will improve the effectiveness and lower the cost of 2010 Census, ACS, and many other Census products.

*(Minutes submitted by Wangyal Shawa)*

**National Imagery & Mapping Agency: Jim Lusby, Disclosure and Release Division**

Jim Lusby began by reporting that policies regarding public release of NIMA products had not changed in the past year. In the wake of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and ongoing security fears, there are still questions and concerns in the federal government about the types of data that can be released to the public. However, Mr. Lusby noted that NIMA has not withdrawn anything from circulation, except during an initial review period following September 11, 2001.

As an organization, NIMA is in a period of uncertainty, especially with regard to its role since the formation of the Department of Homeland Security. As a matter of federal law, the Defense Department cannot operate inside the United States, but NIMA assists other agencies that take the lead in protecting the United States. Many of these agencies that have cartographic products and needs have been absorbed into Homeland Security. Mr. Lusby acknowledged a name change for the agency is in the works: the National Imagery and Mapping Agency will become the National Geographic-Intelligence Agency, or NGA.

Although Mr. Lusby announced last year that he was no longer responsible for customer operations, it has taken some time to find another person in NIMA who can serve as a liaison to the map user community. Mary Ford will take on the role that Mr. Lusby previously held prior to September 11, including interaction with GPO. Ford was unable to attend this year’s CUAC meeting owing to prior commitments, but she will attend future meetings. Mr. Lusby promised to train her in the needs of the map user community.

Mr. Lusby commented on some upcoming releases, including some international series of maps, notably covering Peru, Central America, and parts of Africa. The recent release of maps covering Iraq prior to the war was an effort by NIMA to get a common base of information distributed to the media, the public, and internal customers before the war began. He also referred to a series of posters re-printing historical maps from the 19th and 20th centuries. Both these maps and the maps of Iraq are available for public sale through the USGS websites. The NIMA homepage has a list of large-scale products for sale (http://www.nima.mil).

Shuttle Radar Topography Data (SRTM) is currently under release and will be completely distributed soon. The US Public has access to DTED-1 and DTED-2 level data (3-arc second and 30-arc second), and can obtain the data through the USGS Earth Data Center web sites. Most of the United States has been processed. Free downloads up to a file size limit are available, with purchase options for large quantities of data.

Mr. Lusby clarified that public sale maps could be made available through the FDLP program, but understood that participating libraries had not yet been surveyed regarding which of these series they wished to collect. Mr. Lusby suggested pursuing the matter with the GPO representatives to get the maps into the distribution channels.

*(Minutes submitted by Mike Furlough)*

Dan Seldin adjourned the meeting until Friday morning, May 2, at 9:00 am.

**May 2, 2003**

Dan Seldin brought the meeting to order.

**Bureau of Transportation Statistics: Carol Brandt, GIS Program Manager**

Carol Brandt has been at BTS since 1995 and previously worked at Census Bureau and Defense Mapping Agency.

Bureau of Transportation Statistics is one of ten operating “administrations” within the USDOT (Coast Guard and the Transportation Security Administration were recently moved to the Department of Homeland Security). The US...
DOT creates and maintains transportation specific spatial data for: highways, railroads, transit systems, airport facilities and air space, and intermodal facilities. USDOT spatial applications take the form of Internet mapping applications, transportation modeling, remote sensing and imagery, and various spatial and cartographic products and data in both hard copy and digital formats.

Non-BTS spatial data efforts of the other administrations within USDOT and mentioned by Ms. Brandt were:

-- FHWA – Federal Highway Administration maintains National Highway Planning Network (NHPN), spatial data depicting the National Highway System. The FHWA collects Highway Performance Monitoring System Information from the States and uses spatial modeling to create representations of flow of traffic over the highway system.

-- NHTSA – National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is currently developing better means, including geocoding, for identifying accident locations for the Fatal Accident and Reporting System (FARS).

-- FAA – Federal Aviation Administration creates and maintains aeronautical charts for navigation. FAA is moving to more digital information with increased focus on 3-D modeling.

-- FTA – Federal Transit Administration is beginning to use GIS technology to model passenger flow through transit system(s) and encourage greater use of transit. FTA recently completed a data collection effort to acquire spatial data representing transit infrastructure.

-- FRA – Federal Railroad Administration maintains rail network spatial data to model commodity flow and is collecting geographic locations using GPS to improve safety.

-- Office of Pipeline Safety collects spatial data representing pipelines and facilities. Data from the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) is not available to the public post-September 11. The data will be made available on a case-by-case basis if request is cleared by agency (Office needs information on the requester and the planned use of the data). Data is collected and sold by vendors (Pennwell and Tobin) and is accurate to within plus or minus 500 feet.

-- MARAD – Maritime Administration is using spatial data to model commodity flow through ports and is responsible for developing plans to improve security at ports throughout the US.

Ms. Brandt also drew attention to the “virtual” National Transportation Library (http://ntl.bts.gov), which offers quick links to spatial and other types of transportation data.

Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS)

Within the USDOT, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS):

-- Fills gaps, creating spatial data where no data steward exists.

-- Distributes spatial data through the National Transportation Atlas Data Program;

-- Provides cartographic and spatial analysis support for the Department;

-- Develops internet mapping applications to provide easier access to transportation data;

-- Works to coordinate geographic efforts in the USDOT.

The Geographic Information Program within BTS is the lead administration for geographic information within USDOT. It represents USDOT in the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC), hosts the NSDI clearinghouse node for transportation data, and is coordinating standards development for the transportation portion of the Geospatial One-Stop Initiative.

BTS distributes national level transportation-specific spatial data, such as the national Transportation Atlas Databases (NTAD). NTAD contains the majority of the databases owned and maintained by various USDOT modes and includes transportation networks, transportation facilities and geographic reference data. All NTAD databases are available for download via the BTS web site (http://www.bts.gov/gis/ntatlas/index.html), and a data CD-ROM is released annually.

BTS purchased a “vintage road network” from GDT (Geographic Data Technologies, Inc.). This data set is available via download (network area by area) on their website. Contact Ms. Brandt to get the whole network at once on a 4 CD set. Some examples of BTS filling in gaps in data sets include the data on intermodal terminals, metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) boundaries, and working with the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) to geo-locate bridges. The NBI without geocoding is currently available on CD -- contact Ms. Ann Shemaka / FHWA Office of Bridge Technology / HIBT-30 400 7th St. SW / Washington, D.C. 20590 /202-366-1575 / ann.shemaka@fhwa.dot.gov

BTS also produces some paper maps (“Annual Major Transportation Facilities,” “Transportation in North America,”) to support BTS publications and the Crisis Management Center, and maps on request, as indicated on the BTS website. Their Internet mapping applications include the National Highway System, tracking Airline Market Share, Airport Congestion, and the North American Transportation Atlas Databases (NORTAD). Via NORTAD, BTS distributes tri-national transportation specific spatial data equivalent to the NTAD for the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. There are plans for developing relationships to allow for regular release of NORTAD.

Security

After September 11, all geospatial data was removed from the BTS website for approximately two months, and there is continued focus in BTS on what data should be available. Most security concerns center on data showing the geographic locations of possible transportation “choke points,” e.g. tunnels and bridges. For example, the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) is basically a tabular dataset that
BTS is working to geocode, but it is undecided at this point whether this data will be made available to the public.

**Geospatial One-Stop**

BTS is participating in Geospatial One-Stop, an OMB E-government initiative to create a comprehensive web portal to provide easier—and timelier—access to geospatial data. The lead agency for GeoSpatial One-Stop is the Department of the Interior, USDOT is the lead agency for the transportation area, and BTS is handling the core data content standards development activities for USDOT. Successful implementation of this initiative will require participation from all levels and types of government (perhaps 2/3 of the participation from non-federal sources) plus academic and private sectors. At the time of the CUAC meeting, draft content standards existed for road and rails, standards for air and transit were coming soon, and those for waterways would follow. Other geospatial data themes are scheduled to be available in September. The comprehensive web portal is scheduled for preview in early June. Check the BTS web site for Geospatial One-Stop at http://www.bts.gov/gis/geospatial_onestop/index.html.  

(Minutes submitted by Mary McInroy)

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Doug Vandegraft, Chief Cartographer, Division of Realty**

Mr. Vandegraft reported on collaboration between USGS and FWS to produce a new map of the National Wildlife Refuge System for the National Atlas of the United States. The map is unique because it presents the refuge boundaries derived from an entirely digital format. There are now 541 national wildlife refuges and there will soon be 542. There are now more than 100 million acres in the system. Mr. Vandegraft explained that as a result of the digitization process, FWS was able to identify an additional 6 million square miles of refuge area. The scale of the map is 1:7,500,000; both Hawaii and Alaska are depicted at this constant scale.

In the future look for all FWS maps to be produced in a new format. The goal is to have all maps produced by the agency look alike. Digital orthophotoquads will be used as the base map. There will not be a consistent scale due to the relative sizes of the geography being represented. New maps will begin to appear on the Division of Realty website (http://realty.fws.gov/carto-resources.html). Not all regions will set distributing maps on the web as a priority goal, and data availability will vary by region.

Digital land status maps are being produced. These maps will show the lands already owned by the FWS as well as lands that the service would like to acquire. Approved acquisition boundaries identify lands that are viable for habitat, but not necessarily owned by the FWS.

Within the FWS both AutoDesk and an array of ESRI products are being utilized.

Mr. Vandegraft reported that he has not attended any Department of Homeland Security meetings.

The Service still has plans to connect its Real Property Database with its digital boundary files. Presently the Real Property Database is being converted into an Oracle Database.

GIS layers can be downloaded from the FWS website (http://fwsgis.fws.gov/website/nwrbnd/run.htm). These are boundary files. For the lower 48 states the scale is 1:24,000. For Alaska the scale varies from 1:250,000 to 1:63,360. The files for Alaska do contain some attribute data not available for the other states.

Mr. Vandegraft responded to a question about including trails on maps that are available to the public. He said that some maps do indicate where trails are, but it is not a responsibility or priority for the agency.

(Minutes submitted by David Deckelbaum)

**U.S. Geological Survey: Frank Beck, National Mapping Division**

Frank Beck, USGS National Mapping Division, gave the USGS report, substituting for Dan Cavanaugh, who had a conflict that prevented him from attending the meeting. Mr. Beck reported on several projects, including the National Map, which will revolutionize the National Mapping Discipline, the National Atlas, and some discussion on the Global GIS Dataset, DDS-62, a concern of CUAC.

The National Map is a major redirection for the National Mapping Division. Most people are familiar with the USGS’ basic product, the 7.5’ Quadrangle. The USGS completed once-over coverage at 1:24,000 in the late 1990s. To replicate that effort, it would cost $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000. There is a tremendous amount of information on the 1:24,000 topographic maps. However, USGS has realized in the past few years, based on comments from users, that the maps are definitely out of date. Despite our best efforts, and pleas for funding to keep them up to date, there is a strong realization that USGS is fighting a losing battle trying to maintain the maps on their own. Budgets have been decreasing, although everyone is familiar with that problem. The revision program, which has existed for a number of years in an attempt to keep the maps up to date, at best is able to revise 1200 to 1500 maps a year.

**The National Map**

The National Map was a study that was done a few years ago to address the problem of salvaging the fundamental base-mapping program. The edict USGS received from Barbara Ryan, the USGS’ Associate Director of Geography, stated “I am committed to a dramatic improvement in our revision program as one of the major components of a healthy and scientifically sound geographic discipline.” The key characteristics of the National Map are that it be current, continuously revised, seamless, with no arbitrary edges, complete and consistently classified, built on the best available data, have varying resolution to reflect geographic reality, integrated within and between themes of data (positional and logical consistency), geographic (no
cartographic offsets), that it should be a temporal record, which means that there will be versioning and transactional updates, and that there will be metadata for the data set and at the feature level. USGS has come to the realization that they cannot do it ourselves, so the National Map will rely heavily on partnerships, with federal agencies, state, regional and local governments, private industry, universities and libraries, and the public. Everyone is aware of data in various organizations that could help USGS maintain their maps. The National Map will be a system of related databases that will be combined to build and maintain a map that will cover the United States from coast to coast, and border to border. The National Map will show the information that USGS used to collect on their own to produce their topographic maps. The USGS role in the National Map will be to organize the information, be responsible for awareness, availability, and utility, serve as a catalyst and collaborator for creating and stimulating data partnerships, partner in standards development, integrate data from other participants, and finally produce and own data when no other source exists.

Most recently, the big emphasis in the National Mapping Division, for better or worse, are the 133 Urban Areas. A tremendous percentage of the population dwells in the major metropolitan areas of our country. Those are the areas that are extremely important for reasons of security and natural disaster recovery. A good percentage of the USGS efforts this past year have been placed on these 133 urban areas.

A sample of the National Map Viewer for Mecklenburg County, NC was shown. It has undergone several changes, based on tests over the past year. This does not show the ultimate appearance of the National Map, but it is an example of the ultimate goal. At present there are no agreements between USGS and Mecklenburg County to maintain these data sets, but it is an example of the direction for the National Map. The National Map will offer a wide range of viewing options. Hopefully, users will be able to drill down from a small-scale depiction, such as the National Atlas, to a large-scale view, such as the Digital Orthophotoquads. Users will be able to pick and choose the layers they want and produce a graphic. Some information on the viewer may be owned and maintained by other organizations, per-haps even served by local government agencies. Users will be able to drill down to local data, such as information about local hospitals (services, number of beds, etc.), which will be maintained by local government agencies and/or organizations outside of the USGS. Ideally, local government agencies will take responsibility for maintaining their data, and provide access to USGS and, ultimately, the public.

A question was asked about who would take responsibility for archiving older data, USGS or local agencies. USGS hopes that localities will archive their data, in an appropriate, agreed-upon archival format and mechanism, frequency, etc. The primary concern is that digital information, which will not be printed regularly as has been done for the USGS topographic maps, will not be available for future use in temporal studies. There isn’t a clear understanding on what data needs to be archived, especially if only a small fraction of the features have changed. Perhaps only the information on the transaction will be archived.

Another question was asked about the rural areas, which may not be using GIS. The USGS will continue to be the data gatherer and provider for rural areas that are not currently using GIS or producing digital spatial data. Several approaches could be used. The National Map could simply show the existing topographic map, in the form of a digital raster graphic (a scanned topographic map). Another alternative would be to scan the map separates (roads, contours, vegetation cover, etc.) and allow that information to be accessed separately. That would represent the best available data for those areas, but would take more time and effort. Both options have been examined, but no decision has been made concerning how to show those rural areas.

Congress is enthusiastic about the National Map in some areas, such as the 133 urban areas. NIMA is the driver behind this part of the project. Getting funding for those areas, because of the Homeland Security needs, has been easy. Getting funding work elsewhere is more difficult. Even getting data from local partners, much less getting funding from those organizations to do work is difficult. The biggest incentive for local agencies is that by cooperating with the USGS, their data and that of their neighbors will be much more likely to be seamless and user friendly. USGS is also working on efforts to make local data more accessible. They are working on software packages that will make the data more interchangeable.

The latest fact sheet on the National Map is titled Hazards, Disasters and the National Map. It is USGS Fact Sheet 027-03, available on the web at: http://erg.usgs.gov/ish/pubs/factsheets/fs02703.html. Several printed byproducts of the National Map, mock-ups of topographic maps, were shown as examples of future print output that can be produced quickly and cheaply. With this type of product, it is difficult to determine what to put in the collar. Especially given that the data came from multiple sources, and that the date may not be very meaningful, as the data could change daily, and the layers may have been updated at different times. In addition, the new National Wildlife Map from the National Atlas was shown. Another North American map is in process. There is a new area on the National Atlas site on Printable maps, maps that can be printed at page-size for the common users. The site for this is at: http://nationalatlas.gov/printable.html.

Other Questions:

A question was asked about the source information on some of the maps from the old printed National Atlas maps, which give brief bibliographic information, with the statement “and other sources.” That request will be forwarded to the National Map office. A question was asked about fund-
ing for the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping program. No information on their funding was available.

The Middle East and Iraq maps produced by NIMA were also mentioned. Three additional maps will be available soon. GPO is trying to get copies for distribution to Depository Libraries.

**Digital Data Set 62:**

Four parts of DDS-62 (Central & South America, Africa, South Asia and South Pacific) were issued through the Depository Library Program. After those first four were issued, the Geologic Division ran into funding problems and could not issue the remaining sets (North America, Europe and North Eurasia). Somehow, a CRADA (Cooperative Research and Development Agreement) was established with the American Geological Institute. They are producing and issuing the remaining parts of DDS-62, and copyrighting them. The CRADA was announced in late September. What is copyrighted is the package that AGI has put together and issued, such as the ESRI software. What is not copyrighted is the raw data. That has not been a product provided by the U.S. Geological Survey. If there is enough interest in the raw data for the three remaining areas, GPO needs to be petitioned to ask for the data from USGS. The Survey could then provide the data to GPO, who could then provide it to Depository Libraries. GIS-literate librarians and library users would find the data useful.

A question was asked about whether we might be informed about potential CRADAs before they are finalized so that we could comment on them. Mr. Beck had no information on how to comment on them, but suggested two people who might be contacted about commenting on future CRADAs. Other agencies (such as the U.S. Department of Education) could and should have been contacted about providing funding support.

(Minutes submitted by Linda Zellmer)

**William Effland: Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture**

William (Bill) Effland’s presentation discussed the background, uses and selected examples of various digital soil survey products produced by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service.

He stated that he would speak about (1) some digital soil survey information; (2) several sources of digital soil information that are available or are being developed; (3) advantages of that information; and (4) how the Agency is working to deliver that information to customers. Additionally, he mentioned future research and application directions of the Soil Survey Division by discussing some landscape analysis projects that he has worked on since transferring to the Division in January, 2003.

Dr. Effland explained that the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) was formerly known as the Soil Conservation Service until about 1994. He noted that he works in the Soil Survey Division, with background and training as a soil scientist. Dr. Effland remarked that he is currently employed as a landscape analyst in the Agency’s 10,000 employees. About 900 of those employed are in the Soil Survey Division, where 45-50% of the workforce is expected to retire in the next five years. He stated that digital soil resource information provided one of the foundation layers for modern natural resource appraisal, analysis and interpretation.

**National Cooperative Soil Survey (NCSS)**

Dr. Effland stated that the National Cooperative Soil Survey is the key to the soil survey programs that exist throughout the United States. However, there are at least three components of cooperative soil surveys: the state, the county, and the federal government. These partners should be kept clearly in one’s mind when discussing soil survey information. The NCSS has many partners (e.g., federal agencies, state agencies, county agencies, land grant universities and private entities), with USDA/NRCS designated by Congress as the lead federal agency for soil survey programs. Some federal agency partners include the US Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service, including work on mapping soil resources for the national parks. There are also numerous NCSS partners with State Agencies. Dr. Effland stated that funding for the soil survey program varies from state to state. Each state has its own structure with respect to funding soil survey and how specific information is collected even though there is the broad umbrella of the NCSS, which provides a standardized format. Funding for the soil survey program is obtained through the various NCSS partners. In some states, historically soil survey work was 1/3 funded by the federal government, 1/3 by the states and 1/3 by the counties; in other states, it was primarily funded by the county government, with smaller contributions from the federal and state agencies. He continued his discussion of NCSS partners by stating that the Land Grant Universities are also collaborators who conduct soil science research and participate in field reviews. University cooperators help with the quality assurance of soil survey information. These universities are also an important component as far as research and development of technology for improving soil survey. In some areas, they helped develop the various soil landscape models that are applied as conceptual tools to identify and delineate different soils in the real world.

Another NCSS partner is groups such as the soil conservation and water conservation districts, which are legislative bodies formed at the county level. Typically, a single county will have a soil conservation district. These distinct groups were formed to give local advice on how to help direct the soil survey program. The last group he mentioned was various private entities, noting that some industry groups also serve as partners.

Dr. Effland concluded this section by reminding the group that the National Cooperative Soil Survey is a long-standing collaborative partnership and that “this collabor-
Distribute generalized natural resource information that is culturally relevant to produce and use the National Resources Inventory (NRI) - a statistical database - as an example of global scale soil information. This group works collaboratively with the US State Department, the US Agency for International Development and UN/FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations) to produce and distribute generalized natural resource information that is available on a national to regional basis.

Digital Soil Survey Products

Dr. Effland then discussed digital soil survey products in general, stating that these data are inherently multi-scaled in nature. He said that the data can be displayed and studied on a world basis (global scale) down to something that is essentially within a field or sub-field level (e.g., county to field scale). He mentioned data from the World Soil Resources group led by Dr. Hari Eswaran as an example of global scale soil information. This group works collaboratively with the US State Department, the US Agency for International Development and UN/FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations) to produce and distribute generalized natural resource information that is available on a global to regional basis. He continued by citing the following two principle databases as examples of information or data available on a national to regional scale:

- The National Resources Inventory (NRI) - a statistically designed database of over 800,000 sampling points across the U.S. with over 1.2 million records for approximately 200 different attributes. These data were collected every 5 years (1982-1997) and now a sub-sample is collected on a yearly basis (starting in 2000). The NRI is a multi-million dollar effort. It includes spatial and temporal information and allows researchers and policy-makers to look at the status, conditions and trends of natural resources. The NRI does not inventory federal lands.

- State Soil Geographic Database (STATSGO). This data was originally released on CD in 1994 (available at 1:250,000 scale). It utilizes polygon/base mapping of large areas for regional to national scales of analysis and interpretation. The spatial data includes up to 21 different soil components for each polygon, giving the percentage of those different components within the polygon. Physical location for each individual soil component is not given but there are approximately 20,000 polygons for the U.S. STATSGO data was utilized in a GIS decision support system project completed under the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada. Here, STATSGO data was joined across the U.S. and Canadian borders with the Soil Landscapes of Canada data, which is at a mapping scale of 1:1,000,000. In another project, STATSGO data was applied in conjunction with the Soil Landscapes of Canada for estimating soil carbon levels across North America.

Dr. Effland concluded this section by discussing an example of data available on a county to field scale: the Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO). SSURGO data is county level data that is publicly available via the Internet for application in geographic information systems. The NRCS is also developing a Soil Data Viewer in ArcView 3.3, which will be incorporated into the customer toolkit at USDA field offices throughout the U.S. SSURGO data scales vary with typical values ranging from 1:12,000 to 1:24,000.

He stated that these digital soils data are soil reports with county level soil data that have been used for years. He reminded the group of the wealth of information available in these products saying that, “the widely varying resource questions ranging from global to field level areas resulted in five orders, or mapping levels, of detail for soil survey data”. Traditionally, the county soil surveys were published in hard-copy paper format and some users still tend to like this format.

Uses of Digital Soil Products

His talk then focused on the uses of digital soil survey products. Areas mentioned were GIS visualization of soil properties or characteristics; soil interpretations; resource conservation planning; land use management; environmental assessment; and computer simulation modeling. He stated that the GIS visualization, analysis and interpretation of soil properties are a valuable use of the data. In fact, a multi-million dollar yearly effort is currently underway to update and digitize all modern soil surveys. He emphasized that there is also a wealth of soil interpretations available that allow us to look at potentials and limitations for using soils. For example, soils interpretation data allows one to look at engineering properties and limitations. He also stated that resource conservation planning was still a primary focus for using soil survey information, originating in the 1930’s with the early work of the Soil Erosion Service. A current example in this area is nutrient management and environmental quality with respect to air and water quality. Examples of land use planning, environmental assessment and computer simulation modeling were given. He talked about a program called BASINS that uses a model called SWAT (Soil Water Assessment Tool) which is a GIS linked computer simulation modeling tool that allows one to make estimates of the total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) of various watersheds. It is still in development. He also mentioned a water erosion prediction project that uses a tool called GeoWEPP. This model uses digital soil survey information in conjunction with the water erosion prediction model, WEPP.

Dr. Effland discussed the advantages of using digital soil information. One advantage was that the digital data can be accessed very quickly and provide data rapidly. Another was that the digital soil data allows one to think about new relationships and to develop new interpretations that were not considered in the past because that data were not easily accessible. There is now and will be increased data availability for integrated resource and management tools. In fact, SSURGO data are becoming available as a part of a common computing environment where data from different agencies are stored on a central server and can be
shared throughout the more than 2,000 USDA field offices across the country. Access to this data by a county planner or conservation planner technicians will be available through a GIS tool, the Soil Data Viewer. The last advantage of using digital data that he discussed was its ability to increase the capacity to develop some new soil information, e.g. creating soil information on some of the National Parks or BLM lands, and quickly updating and maintaining the soil information. Such updates would include drawing new soil lines or looking within the soil polygons and trying to understand the relationships of the soils to other factors or environmental variables. He then showed several maps produced from digital soil data to illustrate various uses. Most of these maps can be found on the Internet at: http://soils.usda.gov/soil_survey/main.htm; accessed July 1, 2003.

In this section, Dr. Effland also talked about a map for the National Soil Characterization Database, which showed the location of more than 27,000 soil profiles sampled for the soil survey program. This database "provides detailed morphological, chemical and physical property data which can be linked for analysis and interpretation to spatial data such as STATSGO or the NRI". Another map showed the status of soil survey digitizing work for the county-level soil surveys. He mentioned that currently, more than 1,450 county soil surveys can be downloaded from the Internet.

He commented about the digitization of the SSURGO data, stating that it has a total of 2,200 counties or area for soils throughout the US. Currently, about 1,450 of these are archived SSURGO. Of the counties remaining, some are just being started, some have map compilation completed, and some are working on digitization. There are several digitizing centers throughout the country and this work is being done in cooperation with some universities.

In discussing tools that are being used to display and query SSURGO data, he named the Soil Data Viewer as the current GIS tool. The earlier Soil Explorer did not allow one to do a "true" GIS analysis. The current Soil Data Viewer uses ESRI's ArcView GIS software and provides rapid access to numerous soil characteristics and interpretations. It thus allows one to rapidly create many interpretive thematic maps, e.g., on agriculture, building site development, sanitary facilities, and water tables. Reports - tabular or cartographic - can also be generated using this viewer. With SSURGO data, however, one may have up to three soil components because of the detailed level of soil information. There is also a web-based Soil Data Viewer that is being developed to view SSURGO data. (http://www.itc.nrcs.usda.gov/soildataviewer; accessed July 1, 2003).

Lastly there was a discussion about a research tool currently under development at the University of Wisconsin-Madison called the 3dMapper. It was originally funded by NRCS as a tool for soil map visualization. He stated that it has now been commercialized and can be used to update the soil maps. It will allow draping digital orthophotographs over a DEM. (http://www.TerrainAnalytics.com; accessed July 1, 2003).

At the end of the discussion, the following questions were asked:
1. Have you considered printing the soil surveys? For example, doing print on demand, similar to what some small publishers are doing?

Dr. Effland stated that there has been some talk of print on demand with some of the publications. He said that they previously had a small publisher near Blacksburg, VA that would print on demand once there was enough interest in the publications. For example, they would print a thousand copies of a specific publication such as “Keys to Soil Taxonomy.” He stated that in many areas the soil resource survey information is underutilized but that it is very valuable to some people in other areas. Dr. Effland mentioned the program at the University of Maryland where they are scanning their old surveys and are making them available through a web site. This allows users to print only one map sheet, for example. He stated that NRCS is exploring various printing options such as the program at the University of Maryland. It was noted that Pennsylvania, Oregon and Missouri are doing similar work.

2. Terrain Analytics is the distributor for the 3dMapper and it’s for a fee. Is it freeware?

Dr. Effland stated that there is a free version that was developed a few years back but that it is not enhanced with additional functionality and is more of a visualization tool. He stated that the current 3dMapper is more of a functional mapping tool and is fairly inexpensive.

3. One of the examples you showed from STATSGO data was the distribution of soil water tables and is it available for the public to use?

Dr. Effland stated that the data are available on the web but that the particular graphic for water table distributions is not on the web. He said that the data can be downloaded from STATSGO and are free through the website at Fort Worth. Dr. Effland was unsure if the BASINS data are still available to the general public due to Homeland Security issues. One member stated that the BASINS data are freely available by request through the EPA.

4. What is the minimum scale which determines an arbitrary boundary? For example, what is the minimum factor that you define when you try and determine an arbitrary boundary between Soil A and Soil B? Is there a specific standard or does the person viewing the boundary make the decision?

Dr. Effland stated that each of the soil surveys is mapped at one or two levels or orders. For example, an Order 1 survey would be at a research farm level with most county soil surveys at Order 2. He said that the polygon boundary determinations are standardized based on the soil landscape model and survey order but there is some subjectivity from the individual soil mappers. Dr. Effland said that one reason they are moving into using DEMs, DOQs and raster-based GIS is an effort to remove some of that subjec-
tivity. He stated that if you look in the National Soil Survey Handbook or Soil Survey Manual, there is a table for each mapping scale indicating the minimum size delineation.

5. You talked about the sampling of soils at various locations, the Pedon Database. Is this data accessible to the public?

Dr. Effland stated that the Pedon database is going into transition and it will be one of the Internet map server type projects but that currently the CD is available. He said that previously, you could buy the data for $50 but now it is in transition where it will be updated more frequently as more soil pedon data becomes available. There are a lot of Land Grant Universities cooperators with the soil pedon data. He also said that, in some cases, the data may be incomplete so it was not used in the NCSS but now they are trying to complete, update and expand the database. Dr. Effland noted several places where they are working to do this, including the University of Arkansas, Pennsylvania State University and a project at the USGS related to information on soil carbon sequestration.

6. Will the CD ROM version of the soil surveys be available for all areas of the U.S.? Will including the shape files of raw data become the standard for CD distribution?

Dr. Effland said that the CDROM data will be available on a state-by-state basis. He said that some states have more resources as far as presenting that kind of information but in the long run the hardcopy soil survey report is transitioning into CD or Web-based server. Dr. Effland also noted that some of the electronic versions of the soil survey reports are technically equivalent to the hard copy report but also contain spatial data such as shape files.

(Minutes submitted by Clara McLeod)

Adjournment

Mike Furlough thanked Betty Jones for her work in helping CUAC to hold its annual meeting in the Government Printing Offices. Dan Seldin adjourned the meeting.

AGENCY REPORTS SUBMITTED VIA PROXY

U.S. Board on Geographic Names: Roger Payne, Executive Secretary (via email)

The Secretary reported that the Board of Geographic Names (BGN) is in the process of beta testing a new version of their Geographic Names Information Service (GNIS) website. Two states are testing the changes—Delaware and Florida. After the website’s redesign, among the new features will be a spatially enabled component. In the next year, the Board will release and activate the redesigned database, and release a new, enhanced user Internet webpage and interface for GNIS. The Board’s new disc product includes GNIS’ data almost in its entirety, and can be displayed using LANDVIEW V (a product produced by a Federal consortium); the disc is presently marketed by the Bureau of the Census. It is $99, and is in DVD format.

Although there was some mention of blocking certain categories names in GNIS due to 9/11, an analysis later determined that would not be necessary.

The upgrading of the names in GNIS (Phase II) is complete or in progress for all but four States—New York, Kentucky, Alaska, and Michigan. Phase III will likely be scrapped because it has been overtaken by events: namely support for the local and State vertical data integration in support of The National Map and homeland security. Phase II will be completed.

There have been no major changes in procedure or policy regarding how the Board decides on name changes.

Report taken and submitted by Christopher J.J. Thiry

U.S. Forest Service: Betsy Banas, Staff Cartographer, Geospatial Services Group

I. The Forest Service recently held its second Geospatial Conference in Colorado Springs, Co. There were over 250 attendees from the Federal Government, State and County representatives, State Foresters, and many others. The event was co-sponsored by Colorado State University and The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The conference program and presentations are available by contacting David George, the Forest Service Geospatial Conference Program Chair, at dgeorge@fs.fed.us.

II. The Forest Service continues to collaborate with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) in its National Map Initiative. We are pleased to report that the Forest Service is participating in building the National Map, using Forest Service data for two focus areas: Colorado Springs/San Isabel National Forest and Albuquerque/Cibola National Forest.

III. Last year the Forest Service reported on the focused effort Forest Service has placed on our participation in the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC). We are continuing to be engaged in the varied, fast paced efforts of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) through the FGDC, to coordinate mapping and geospatial data collection and related activities among Federal Agencies. There has been a lot of effort this year, by the FGDC to engage participation among States, local governments, Tribes, academia and other entities. OMB and FGDC are developing a means to measure and monitor our adherence to standards in order to hold us accountable for compliance.

IV. The President’s Council on Excellence in Government has keyed in on Electronic Government (e-Gov/ the Internet) as the way to improve efficiency in doing business. 24 e-government initiatives were identified, including Geospatial One-Stop. On December 17, 2002, the President signed the E-Government Act. President Bush states that this legislation “builds upon my Administration’s expanding E-Government initiative by ensuring strong leadership of the information technology activities of Federal agencies, a comprehensive framework for information security standards and programs, and uniform safeguards to protect the
confidentiality of information provided by the public for statistical purposes. The Act will also assist in expanding the use of the Internet and computer resources in order to deliver Government services, consistent with the reform principles I outlined on July 10, 2002, for a citizen-centered, results-oriented, and market-based Government.”

The Forest Service has been very involved in Geospatial One-Stop, as we continue our efforts to provide standard geospatial data, which is documented with FGDC compliant metadata. We now have our Forest Service Geo-data Clearinghouse up and on-line. The Geo-data Clearinghouse can be viewed at http://fsgeodata.fs.fed.us/. It is currently being upgraded to provide ESRI ArcIMS data with FGDC compliant metadata. The upgrade should be complete by October 2003.

To learn more about Electronic Government and Geospatial One Stop, see http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/ and http://www.geo-one-stop.gov/.

The Forest Service is also involved with Recreation One Stop another of the 24 Presidential e-Gov initiatives. The effort will provide the public with a one stop ‘portal’ to recreational opportunities and will be supported with Internet mapping services.

V. The Forest Service continues to collaborate with the USGS in the sale of our Forest Visitor Maps and other specialty products through their on-line services and vendor network. This enables us to provide better public service. The program has been operational for 2 years and we have seen our map sales increase as a result.

VI. Since September 11, the Forest Service has focused efforts on Homeland Security.

A. The Deputy Manager from our Geospatial Service and Technology Center, Barry Napier, has accepted a 15-month detail to the Interagency Geospatial Preparedness Team, located at the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Other members of the team are from USGS and the National Imagery and Mapping Agency. We also have a representative (Susan DeLost from our Washington Office, Engineering Staff) to the FGDC Homeland Security Working Group.

B. Efforts are focused on defining geospatial data that is critical for disaster preparedness and for first response in the event of a crisis. A Standard and Agreed Upon Critical Infrastructure Layer for Homeland Security is being developed.

C. Forest Service experience with fire-related disaster response has been valuable.

D. Forest Service and other USDA Agencies were involved in the efforts to recover debris from the Columbia Shuttle. Remote Sensing and Global Positioning System data and technology were utilized.

VII. The Forest Service suffered an extremely severe fire season in 2002. Congress did not allocate additional funds to cover the excessive costs of fighting fires last year. Money was ‘borrowed’ from other program areas to cover costs. Our Geospatial Service and Technology Center suffered from this ‘Fire Borrowing.’ The Single Edition Quadrangle Mapping Program, in which we produce 1/24,000 topographic quadrangle maps over National Forest System Lands, has suffered. We were unable to meet our production goal of 600 maps. We are trying to make up the shortfall this year, but it is not certain if we will meet this goal. If we have another bad fire season, we may go through another round of borrowing.

VIII. Our budgets have not been increased, and all of the geospatial initiatives have increases, so our dollars are spread very thin. This has also affected our production schedule.

IX. Another OMB initiative, “Competitive Sourcing” which involves efforts to streamline and improve efficiency has also had an impact. Various program areas are being studied to determine the best way to improve efficiency. Unfortunately, the task of studying programs is costly and takes time from other work. To learn more about competitive sourcing see http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a076/a076sa1.html

X. Chris Thiry asked for a Point of Contact at the map printer who does the beautiful work on our Forest Visitor Maps and other maps. The Printer is Williams and Heinz Map Corporation, 8119 Central Avenue, Capitol Heights, MD 20743. The Point of Contact is Mr. Mark Budd, at 1-800-338-6228.

Report taken and submitted by Christopher J.J. Thiry
2003 minutes compiled by Mike Furlough

JOB ANNOUNCEMENT

Librarian, Robinson Map Library, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Position Vacancy Listing PVL# 45214

Working title: Librarian, Robinson Map Library; Official title: Assoc Spec Librarian (T23FN)

Degree and area of specialization: Graduate degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association or an equivalent graduate library science/information studies degree.

Minimum number of years and type of relevant work experience: The Department of Geography seeks a dynamic and energetic librarian to manage all operations of the Robinson Map Library. Candidates should have demonstrated knowledge of maps, analog and digital geodata resources, a working knowledge of Geographic Information Systems (GIS), experience providing public service in a library setting, excellent written and oral communication skills, and the ability to interact positively and productively with library and department colleagues. Preference will be given to individuals with experience (or coursework) in cartography,
Principal duties: The Robinson Map Library is located administratively in the Department of Geography. Its patrons are approximately equally divided between campus scholars and off-campus users from government agencies and commercial firms. The library collection contains about 500,000 items, including a large air photo collection. (See www.geography.wisc.edu/map_lib.htm for more information on holdings.) Staff consists of the Librarian (this appointment), a part-time library services assistant, and student assistants. The Librarian will:

1. Provide reference and consultation assistance to users with cartographic materials and geospatial data.
2. Work closely with primary users in a wide variety of academic areas including geography, forest resources, earth and spatial sciences, and urban planning.
3. Oversee the collection, including ongoing evaluation, analysis, and management of the collection and development of same. Locate, select and make purchases of cartographic materials, both analog and digital. Weed and maintain the collection.
4. Collaborate with the General Library System, including possible sub-contracting for cataloging and other services.
5. Integrate Map Library catalog into campus-wide systems and practices.
6. Work with an Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from all user groups to maintain the Library’s vision and mission, and the delivery of services that are responsive to changing needs and technologies.
7. Manage Map Library staff.

How to apply: Send letter of application, resume, and the names, addresses and phone numbers of three professional references to Professor James Burt.

A period of evaluation will be required.
Appointment type: Academic Staff
Department(s): L&S / GEOGRAPHY
Full time salary rate: Minimum $36,475 ANNUAL (12 months) Depending on Qualifications
Term: This is a renewable appointment.
Appointment percent: 100%
Anticipated begin date: OCTOBER 01, 2003
Number of positions: 1
To insure consideration, application must be received by: JULY 31, 2003
How to apply: Send resume and cover letter referring to Position Vacancy Listing #45214 to JAMES BURT
Phone: 608-262-4438
384 SCIENCE HALL TTY: N/A
550 N PARK STREET Fax: N/A
MADISON WI 53706-1491 Email: jburt@geography.wisc.edu

Note: Unless confidentiality is requested in writing, information regarding the names of applicants must be released upon request. Finalists cannot be guaranteed confidentiality.

UW-Madison is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. We promote excellence through diversity and encourage all qualified individuals to apply.

For more academic job opportunities at the University of Wisconsin-Madison please click on PVL Home. For more information on the University of Wisconsin-Madison Office of Human Resources please click on http://www.ohr.wisc.edu
For more information on the University of Wisconsin-Madison see our home page at http://www.wisc.edu For UW Madison Campus Safety Information see http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/ Employment/Safetyinformation.htm

Connie J. Manson, GSIS Newsletter Editor
2525 Sleater Kinney Road N.E.
Olympia, WA 98506 USA