

Information Management Technical Working Group, IJC LOSLR Study
CAP LOSLR Framework Data Project
Final Review Meeting

Time: Thursday, April 24th 8am – 5pm
 Friday, April 25th 8am – noon

Location: CCIW Boardroom, Room L205
 Burlington, Ontario

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Participants - 24-Apr-03

Present at Meeting

Ian Gillespie – EC
Amy Daaca – EC
Roger Gauthier – GLC
Kevin Yam – GLC
Lengelle Fabien – IJC
Michelle Tracey – IJC
Frank Kenny – OMNR
Mike Robertson – OMNR
Charles Burg – ACE
Pete Zuzek – Baird
Steve Langendyk – Baird
Chris Stewart – CJSC
Jeff Ehman – Pangaea
Jerry Johnston – Pangaea

Connected by Teleconference

Shon Doseck – Pangaea
André Plante – EC
Arleen Kreusch – ETE

Presentations & Discussion

Introductions

Led by Gillespie and Gauthier.

Brief Overview & Review of Project Status

Ehman presented preliminary version of “Brief Overview & Review of Project Status” document.
[A revised version of this table, based on Mtg. discussion, is attached as **Appendix 1**]

Gauthier described Great Lakes Commission’s resolution entitled “Data Exchange Partnerships and Standardization of Decision Support Tools” adopted on April 17, 2003, and considerations

for selection of participants for (and timing of) the Great Lakes Framework Meeting to be held in Ann Arbor.

Framework Data Integration Status

Zuzek presented status of framework data integration, by layer.

[A revised version of the tables used in Zuzek's presentation is attached as **Appendix 2**. Most of the germane points from the discussion are contained in the *Issues/Questions* and *Action Items* sections of those tables. Those that are not are listed below]

Planté: Asked for confirmation of his understanding of use of metadata standards: "FGDC-1998 compliant metadata will accompany all geospatial data distributed by the IMTWG, but this could change when a new data owner (non-IJC or non-Project Participant) adopts a particular dataset." The group agrees with this position.

Gauthier: Questioned consistency between our integrated shoreline data product and the toe-of-bluff features generated by Coastal TWG, and expressed concern about probable positional discrepancies during simultaneous display of these features.

Gauthier: The IMTWG should use the term "Hydrography" (not "Tributaries") to refer to the framework layer comprising the drainage network and the polyline features (e.g., lakes and large rivers).

Tracey: Suggested that "user profiling" might be useful prior to determining data dissemination policies and approaches. [During discussion of Elevation data products.]

Gauthier: Further discussion regarding the shoreline layer should take place with USGS (Roger B.), EC (Ian G.), Steve (Baird) and Pangaea; need resolution on how to package the shoreline layer [as noted in Appendix 2].

Ehman: A common classification scheme will need to be developed for viewing the 3 or 4 road levels from the transportation layers, as different data sources are being used for the 3 main Study sub-regions. Attribute values from each of the data sets will need to be related to this classification. The same may be true for the hydrography layer.

Gauthier, Burg, et al.: Several lessons were learned from Study orthophoto acquisition. Context was lost in cropping photos on lakeside and in upland areas adjacent to rivers and embayments. Potentially useful information about jetties, break waters, and the near shore environment is absent with the cropping approach. The issue with image registration (fewer or no control points) in those areas is acknowledged. Need to explicitly request details and ask for raw imagery and process files for future contracts.

Project Website and Dissemination

Fabien: Asked if there are any issues with translation.

Gillespie: Getting TWGs to recognize and plan for their responsibility for translating metadata for non-framework data is an on-going issue.

Fabien: Stated two general translation rules used by Canada government [paraphrased]:

- 1) Government should communicate with the public in the public's language, which is dependent on the target audience and is related to regional geography and demographics.
 - a) Any Canada-wide dissemination needs to be binlingual.
 - b) Smaller units of government must consider presence of Francophones and Anglophones.
- 2) Intra-governmental communications (internal products) do not need to be translated; all civil servants are able to work in language of choice.

[?]: The FTP site is for internal use; therefore, the rule does not apply and it can be remain in English.

Gauthier: At one time the Study Board stated that “anything on the web needs to be translated.”

Fabien: IJC “is exempt from these rules, but will translate as a moral obligation.”

Gillespie[?]: Interface to web-mapping should be bilingual, and linkages from the IJC site to the GLC site and associated web-pages should be bilingual.

Fabien: “Final” reports from IMTWG, or any other TWG, will need to be translated, but not necessarily drafts or preliminary versions. The IJC considers at least three factors regarding translation of reports: 1) usefulness, 2) importance, and 3) geography. The IJC is currently struggling with this issue.

Gauthier: The Framework Project and the IMTWG should translate framework metadata, web-mapping interfaces, final reports, posters, and brochures.

Fabien: The CAP and IMTWG budget and time/effort involved in any translation should be considered. He will be available to give the IMTWG guidance on specific translation decisions during the next three years.

Gauthier: Asked Planté to think about whether or not translation [to French] of particular CAP products would be necessary.

Stewart: Presented CAP website, mock-up of IJC website and linkages to document clearinghouse and geospatial clearinghouse.

Yam: Presents GLC web-mapping site.

Tracey: Suggests usability testing of web-mapping site.

Arlene: Suggests testing on PIAG at the end of May.

Roger: There should be a “feedback button”, or automated mechanism for users to transmit feedback about the web-mapping site.

Fabien: The IJC wants to support the IMTWG, and help direct traffic to the “atlas” in an efficient manner. The project is in an “informative phase”- years 1-3 of project. The “Sunset phase” is after year 5.

Kreusch: Year 4-5 will be an “interactive phase”.

The group agrees that outreach products will include the following: Ripple Effects - feature article, a one-page or tri-fold brochure, and a poster.

Meeting Participants - 25-Apr-03

Present at Meeting

Charles Burg – ACE
Ian Gillespie – EC
Roger Gauthier – GLC
Kevin Yam – GLC
Mike Robertson – OMNR
Pete Zuzek – Baird
Steve Langendyk – Baird
Chris Stewart – CJSC
Jeff Ehman – Pangaea
Jerry Johnston – Pangaea

Connected by Teleconference

Arlene Kreusch – ACE
André Plante – EC
Stuart Eddy - GLC
Greg Bay – OMNR
Shon Doseck – Pangaea

Great Lakes Framework Meeting

Gauthier leads discussion. Group agrees on meeting in Ann Arbor on July 8th with simultaneous webcast for morning. Beta testing on the system and data integration, preparation for presentation on June 27. GLC will explore ways to set up video conferencing facilities for meeting, including contacting Pranas Pranckevicius (USEPA).

Gauthier: Electronic copies of a “Background for the Great Lakes Commission Resolution on Data Exchange Partnerships and Standardization of Decision Support Tools” will be sent out.

Gauthier: Describes GLC Resolution -- GLC staff will implement regional data exchange agreement within 12 months and work on standardization, adopted by GLC Commissioners on April 17. Commission also has a position on requesting funds on congress to fund programs.

Various members of the group suggest that the background paper should be amended so as to include federal agencies as it demonstrates and showcases federal projects. The list of federal agencies will be expanded for the Canadian section. The document should try to include other initiatives and not to be restricted to a small number of provincial/state agencies. These additions

should include NRCAN, and other federal agencies in the Canada (national scale/local level for detail dataset), interdepartmental web mapping initiatives, National Map representatives – USGS. Other initiatives should be considered for the document and directions for data exchange agreement. There should be standardization at the local level. The National States Geographic Information Council provides an excellent network for contacting the appropriate State GIS Coordinators who have connections with their respective counties and other relevant groups in the Great Lakes region.

CAP Poster

Stewart presents the draft poster and asks for comments. The following comments were offered:

- Upload best available logos onto the FTP site
- Highlight and add graphics for Ontario, Quebec and New York
- Use minimum of 18 pt font
- Reduce amount of text and enlarge photos/graphics
- Add IJC Study Board title banner
- Revise and shorten title
- Add backdrop of lake Ontario and possibly Study portion of St. Lawrence River
- Reduce logos in size
- Add IJC, CAP, Study website URLs

System Development

Planté indicates that he will coordinate with other technical leads and other participants during bi-weekly conference calls. Technical lead for LIO system is Greg Bay (OMNR). Technical lead for GLC is Stuart Eddy.

Planté provided status report for Quebec: Server/hardware have been purchased and it is set up inside firewall. Oracle 9i has been installed. ArcIMS can be connected to the server. SDE will not be used. Images from Coastal of IKONOS to be loaded onto the server.

Considerations for storing and serving raster data using SDE v. not using SDE are discussed. Burg notes that the rate-limiting factor for serving raster data will likely be bandwidth; others agree.

Bay recalls that version 1.0 of the OpenGIS® Web Map Service Interfaces Implementation Specification (WMS) does not support the use of the OpenGIS® Styled Layer Descriptor Implementation Specification (SLD). Bay will look into this and into OMNR upgrading to version 1.1 of the WMS spec.

Eddy reports that the GLC is in the process of acquiring their new server, and may have to use older server for the public outreach meeting and webcast.

Baird will be taking the lead on standardization of display among the disparate datasets, symbology to be used, and implementation and use of the SLD spec.

Use of Web Coverage Services (WCS) was briefly discussed and considered a future endeavor for the IMTWG.

The group agreed that the use of the CGDI Reusable Components (e.g., Gazetteer) was in our best interest.

ESRI Canada has information on how to connect ArcIMS 4 to WMS.

Conference call between the system development group will be held on April 29th, 9am, and every two weeks thereafter until further notice.

A Project-wide conference call will take place on May 13th, 10am, and every two weeks thereafter until further notice.

Non-Framework Data and other TWGs

PFEG is concerned with availability and access to non-framework data.

Gillespie and Gauthier will engage TWGs on roles and responsibilities. Providing information to TWGs is crucial in the project, including non-framework data (i.e., levels and flows information from H&HTWG). Ehman suggests preparing and distributing a document that outlines the data and metadata management procedures for the TWGs.

Date for WMS system in place: mid-June, June 17

Shared Vision Model and PFEG Integration

The group briefly discussed the Planté et al. Technical Report (RT-XXX). Planté will provide the most recent version of this report to Pangaea and other participants. Group agrees that the IMTWG should participate in the SWM conference calls.

Budget

Planté asked for confirmation that funding for the purchase of Oracle license for Quebec will be provided next week.

Gauthier provides the following summary of the annual IMTWG budgets for Y2-Y5:

Year 2, information management
\$310,000 (U.S.) for both sides
\$130,000 (U.S.) of that was provided by FDGC/Geoconnections

Year 3,
\$186,000 (U.S.)

Year 4
\$143,000 (U.S.)

Year 5
\$110,000 (U.S.)

Yearly budgets are separated into Data Discovery components and Data Storage, Maintenance, Access component.

Data Discovery – to continue metadata coordination, online metadata compilation and web query development

Data Storage, Maintenance, Access – funds set aside for system operations of GLC, funds for MOE, EC, and OMNR.

Other IM support:

- FTP and IM
- Document Management
- French Translation - \$15,000 (US)
- Web Mapping Improvement
- Shared Vision Support

Gauthier and Gillespie will discuss funding distribution immediately after meeting.

Final Discussion on Schedule

Integration Guidelines from Baird

- Awaiting decision on Quebec data, which is dependent on Gillespie/Fabien effort to contact the Quebec government. Alternative to 1:10,000-scale data is use of NTDB Service through CTI Sherbrooke.
- Ontario will provide updated data dictionary documentation to Pangaea by May 2nd
- Pangaea will upload OMNR data dictionary and schema documentation to FTP site for Baird to access to develop the integration guidelines.
- Baird – May 16th complete final drafts of all integration guidelines, with most completed prior to that date.

Gillespie confirms his key role in the production of CAP Project final report and the report to the IJC.

Ehman will update table and distribute “Brief Overview & Review of Project Status” document to all Project participants.

APPENDIX 1: LOSLR Framework Data Project: Status Overview

Milestone	Name	Deliverables	Input /From	Responsible Party	Deliver To:	Status / Deadline
1	Strategy Development & Integration Guidelines	Strategy Plan	All	Pangaea	Website/CJSC	Complete
		Integration Guidelines	Pangaea/Data Providers	Baird	All	In Progress/ 16 May
		Review of Guidelines		All	Baird	21 May
		Data Dictionary & Data Schema	Integrated Feature and Attribute Table Descriptions	EC-Planté	Website/CJSC	Draft/ 6 June
2	Implement Data Integration Guidelines	Integrated Data Sets	Guidelines/Baird	Pangaea	Baird	In Progress/ 30 May
		Data Quality Audit & Report	Final Data Sets/Pangaea	Baird	Website/CJSC	6 June
		Data Integration Procedures	Data Quality Audit & Report /Baird	Pangaea	Website/CJSC	13 June
3	Metadata & Data Discovery	Metadata Workshop		Pangaea	All	Complete
		Metadata SOPs	All	EC-Gillespie Pangaea	Website/CJSC	Complete
		Framework Metadata	Quebec, Ontario, and US framework metadata files	Pangaea	Translators at IJC; then GLC-Yam	In progress/ 13 June
		Metadata in registered Clearinghouse	Pangaea	GLC-Yam	GLINDD	20 June

Milestone	Name	Deliverables	Input /From	Responsible Party	Deliver To:	Status / Deadline
4	Data Storage, Maintenance, and Distribution	Data stored on regional host sites.	Pangaea	EC-Planté, GLC-Yam, OMNR-Bay		6 June
		OGC-compliant WMS capabilities at each node. Future flexibility for WFS and WCS.		Planté, Yam, Bay (Baird/Pangaea)		6 June
		Develop Data Maintenance Mechanisms, Processes, and Schedules	Planté, Yam, Bay	Planté, Yam, Bay		20 June
		Document System Architecture, Policies and Procedures		Pangaea		Website/CJSC
5	Data Dissemination & Public Outreach	Develop Public Outreach Strategy	PIAG	Stewart (Many)	Ftp site?	6 June
		Design and Implement Framework Data Project Website		Stewart		Draft Complete/ 30 June
		Design and Implement WMS-compliant web-mapping service with Framework Data.		Baird (Planté, GLC, Bay, & many others)		In Progress/ 20 June
		Develop Public Outreach Documentation		Stewart		Website

Milestone	Name	Deliverables	Input /From	Responsible Party	Deliver To:	Status / Deadline
5 (con't.)	Data Dissemination & Public Outreach	Develop and Deliver Framework Data Project Presentation	All	Gauthier Ehman Gillespie	GeoTools ASPRS IAGLR	7 January 9 May 26 June
6	Project Conclusion	Workshop on improving geospatial data resource preservation and accessibility. Spatial Data Framework Report for IJC: formal recommendations for future framework development, and general experiences with geospatial information mgt. Final Project Report Update <i>Glossary</i> for final report		Pangaea GLC - Gauthier USACE - Hoff EC – Gillespie (All) EC – Gillespie GLC - Gauthier Pangaea EC – Gillespie Pangaea GLC - Gauthier Pangaea		8 July Ann Arbor mtg. and Webcast (27 June – Webcast dry run) 30 June 30 June 23 June

APPENDIX 2: Framework Layer Summary

Framework Data Layer: IJC Shore Units

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layer	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	From the IJC Coastal TWG	Shore Unit Polygons (30 polygons)	N/A	Existing metadata failed syntactic compliance	Not Required	Complete
Quebec						
New York						

Issues/Questions: 1) Some minor problems with metadata

Action Items: 1) Shon to lead upgrades, with a review from Pete and Ian

Framework Data Layer: Shoreline

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	MNR	1:10,000 NRVIS	MNR will evaluate revised shoreline for Mississauga from Coastal TWG	Will be complete for NRVIS data by May 17, 2003	Draft Complete	Ongoing
Quebec	EC Quebec	1:10,000 MSC Modeleur	polyline based on 2 year return period for river level (stage) from DEM	Completed in French and presently being translated into English in XML format		
New York	Pangaea	1:12,000	Missing some orthos for security purposes. Pangaea has requested photos from NY State and will obtain to finish digitizing	Draft metadata complete		

- Issues/Questions:**
- 1) Has the Mississauga problem been fixed in the NRVIS 1:10,000 (identified by CJSC)? NO
 - 2) Presently, only non-compliant metadata available for NRVIS shoreline
 - 3) Do the three geographic shorelines remain discrete files
 - 4) Missing Islands for parts of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River (identified by CJSC)

- Action Items:**
- 1) Chris send revised CND shoreline to Mike with ortho backdrop for Mississauga and missing islands on St. Lawrence. MNR will evaluate (and possibly update and re-disseminate)
 - 2) Mike and Frank (MNR) will provide metadata (as complete as possible) for NRVIS shoreline by May 17, 2003
 - 3) Fabien will contact Intergovernmental affairs in Quebec about obtaining layers equivalent to NRVIS. Fabien will contact study participants by 30 April, 2003 with results
 - 4) Limitations with 2002 orthos in US2, 4 and 7 will be documented in the data quality audit by Baird (i.e. clipped to 77m contour)
 - 5) Jeff will contact New York State about digitizing and serving shoreline polyline for sensitive areas (homeland security issues)
 - 6) Integration Definition: refers to resolving a common vertical projection and datum for framework layers
 - 7) Roger to lead further discussion with NY State on whether to geo-divide the new 1:12,000 NY shoreline in counties

Framework Data Layer: Political Units, Provincial Boundaries

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	MNR	1:10,000 NRVIS	Mike in the process of obtaining this dataset and will forward to Ian	Will be complete by May 17, 2003	Under development	Under development
Quebec	N/A	N/A	Not required, will use the Ontario boundary	N/A		
New York	International Boundary Commission	Point data	Generated from surveyors' points	Under development		

Issues/Questions 1) Ontario - Quebec boundary missing. Mike will provide through NRVIS

Action Items:

- 1) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide data in the near future
- 2) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide metadata (as complete as possible) for Political Boundaries by May 17, 2003

Framework Data Layer: Political Units, Municipal Boundaries

(Counties and Townships)

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	MNR	1:10,000 NRVIS	LIO will provide ASAP (May 2, 2003)	Will be complete by May 17, 2003	Under development	Discussed
Quebec	NTDB (likely)	1:50,000	Ian and Fabien will address based on feedback from Quebec	N/A		
New York	2000 Census	1:24,000 Counties (USGS National Map) and 1:100,000 TIGER	County Boundaries, minor civil divisions and urbanized areas	Exists		

Issues/Questions: 1) Options for Quebec data will be evaluated by the end of the month

Action Items:

- 1) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide data by May 2, 2003
- 2) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide metadata (as complete as possible) for Political Boundaries by May 17, 2003
- 3) Ian and Fabien will be contacting Quebec

Framework Data Layer: Cadastral Data

(Lots and Concessions in Ontario and Townships in NY)

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	MNR, LIO	1:10,000	LIO will provide ASAP (May 2, 2003)	Will be complete by May 17, 2003	Under development	Discussed
Quebec	Not available from NTDB. Ian and Fabien will pursue other Quebec data	N/A	N/A	N/A		
New York	DLG	1:24,000	N/A	Exists		

Issues/Questions:

- 1) No individual property parcel data on the US and CND side
- 2) Ian and Fabien pursuing the Quebec data (if possible), otherwise nothing is available
- 3) US Township layer available, but dataset on FTP site was clipped to 5 km buffer. Require initial raw dataset

Action Items:

- 1) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide data by May 2, 2003
- 2) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide metadata (as complete as possible) for Political Boundaries by May 17, 2003
- 3) Detroit District USACE to re-send original NY Townships to Pangaea. Jeff and Charles to coordinate

Framework Data Layer: Transportation Features

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	LIO / MTO	1:10,000 NRVIS and MTO	LIO will provide ASAP (May 2, 2003)	Will be complete by May 17, 2003	Under development	Discuss
Quebec	Ian and Fabien will pursue Quebec data or default to NTDB	Quebec or 1:50,000 NTDB	N/A	N/A		
New York	DLG or TIGER	1:24,000 or 1:100,000	Original dataset was clipped. Detroit District USACE to re-send original file	Exists		

Issues/Questions: 1) Quebec was clipped to 5 km buffer. Require original file
2) Is 1:24,000 DLG acceptable for NY?

Action Items:

- 1) Mike and Frank (LIO / MTO) will provide data by May 2, 2003
- 2) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide metadata (as complete as possible) for Transportation Features by May 17, 2003
- 3) Charles to re-send the original (complete) Transportation file to Pangaea to clip with 10 km buffer
- 4) Fabien / Ian will contact Intergovernmental affairs in Quebec about obtaining layers equivalent to NRVIS.
Fabien will contact study participants by 30 April, 2003 with results

Framework Data Layer: Watersheds

(all watersheds connected to the Study Area)

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	NRCAN / LIO	1:1,000,000 (Ontario and Quebec) and 1:10,000 for Ontario only	N/A	Compliant metadata is forthcoming	Finished	Near completion
Quebec						
New York	NRCS	1:250,000 and 1:24,000	N/A	Exists		

Issues/Questions: 1) NRVIS and NRCAN data forwarded to Pangaea

2) CND: for web mapping application, will use NRCAN data (1:1,000,000).

Also indicate that higher resolution data is available (1:10,000)

3) US: NRCS and 3rd order HUC are matching resolution to CND NRCAN data

Action Items: 1) Ian Gillespie to forward NRCAN metadata (from Water Survey of Canada) to Pangaea once it is available, unknown completion

2) Bryce Matthews will provide metadata file for 1:10,000 watersheds

Framework Data Layer: Hydrology

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	LIO, NRVIS	1:10,000	In preparation by MNR	Will be complete by May 17, 2003	Under development	N/A
Quebec	Ian and Fabien will pursue Quebec data, otherwise default to NTDB	Quebec or 1:50,000 NTDB	N/A	Unknown		
New York	NHD	1:24,000 and 1:100,000	N/A	Exists		

Issues/Questions:

- 1) New MNR data will be delivered soon
- 2) Quebec decision to be made by April 30, 2003
- 3) 1:24,000 NHD for 10 km buffer and 1:100,000 for complete view. Both available and complete.

Action Items:

- 1) Mike and Frank (LIO / MNR) will provide data by May 2, 2003
- 2) Mike and Frank (LIO) will provide metadata (as complete as possible) by May 17, 2003

Framework Data Layer: Elevation

(raw hydrographic/elevation soundings and contours)

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers /Database	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	MNR and SHOALS	N/A	Need raw points from MNR grid. Is contour data available?	Unknown	N/A	Discuss
Quebec	EC Quebec	N/A	Combined bathymetry and topographic grid in development	Exists and being translated		
New York	LIDAR and SHOALS for US2, 4 and 7	Points, Contours (0.5 m) and Mr. SID file for US2, 4, and 7.	Combined bathymetry and topographic grid in development. Will points or grids be served?	Exists		

- Issues/Questions:**
- 1) Size of datasets. Are we serving raw LIDAR/SHOALS soundings, grids or contours? NO grids
 - 2) Future life of the IM TWG FTP Site?
 - 3) Missing bathymetry coverage for US shoreline of the lake (US1, 3, 5, 6)
 - 4) For display/visualization, could create a Mr. SID file of grid (shaded relief model).
If raw data is desired, then point file can be downloaded
 - 5) For discovery, distribute raw point file (X,Y,Z) and ESRI shape file (points) will be available with metadata
 - 6) For Quebec server, 5 Meg and smaller data requests will be e-mailed.
MNR sends 10 Meg and smaller requests by e-mail (larger requests sent on 80GIG HD)

- Action Items:**
- 1) Charles to discuss with DD the potential of using Mr. SID file for visualizing SHOALS/LIDAR data (first priority) and existing 10m USGS topographic data (potentially). Report to Roger
 - 2) Charles, Frank, and Andre will coordinate production of Mr. SID shaded relief coverages (10 km buffer, origin, elevation contours and colors)
 - 3) National Geophysical Data Center bathymetry for Lake Ontario (combined bathymetry from multiple temporal periods)?
MNR will create Mr. SID for this file?
 - 4) MNR has prepared topo for all of Ontario for separate study and will provide points files for this dataset (plus shaded Mr. SID file)
 - 5) EC Quebec has agreement with CHS for raw bathymetry on the river.
Andre exploring the opportunity of sharing this data, presently not possible due to contract language
 - 6) Roger, Ian, Charles and Frank to determine who will create Mr. SID files after the meeting.
May be more efficient to have one department lead this task

Framework Data Layer: Imagery

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	IJC and Private	Many	Imagery owned by private entities may have limitations for distribution	Unknown	N/A	Discuss
Quebec	IJC	Many	Unknown	Unknown		
New York	IJC	US2, 4 and 7	N/A	Exists?		

- Issues/Questions:**
- 1) Copyright issues for the Ontario and Quebec data? Can not be disseminated at existing resolution
 - 2) Must discuss the use of the Ontario 2000 orthos with Ralph M. and Rob R. (maybe view online but not disseminate?)
 - 3) Ontario 2002 orthos collected and processed for multiple partners by MNR. IJC and MNR working on an agreement
 - 4) Quebec, existing B/W orthos at 200 dpi purchased for the IJC study
 - 5) 4m multispectral IKONOS, Andre is contacting supplier about distribution

- Action Items:**
- 1) Pete and Steve to contact Ralph and Rob about the Ontario imagery
 - 2) Mike and Ralph Moulton will continue their dialog regarding the new 2002 orthophotographs for the Golden Horseshoe

Non-Framework Data Layer: Conservation Management Boundaries

Geographic Region	Source Agency	Layers	Layer Status / Comments	Metadata Status	Integration Guidelines	Layer Integration
Ontario	MNR	Conservation Authority Boundaries	Received (no distinction between public and private)	Unknown	N/A	Discussed
Quebec	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
New York	NY GAP, FWS and USGS	Land Stewardship Layer	Cadastral Layer (makes distinction between public and private lands)	Unknown		

- Issues/Questions:**
- 1) US dataset distinguishes between land stewards (owners/managers). For example, Nature Conservancy, State, Private, etc.
 - 2) No compatible layer for Quebec?
 - 3) Can't integrate b/c compatible layer doesn't exist between Ontario, Quebec and New York
 - 4) Since compatible data is not available, it was dropped as a Framework Layer and shifted to a Non-framework Layer

- Action Items:**
- 1) CA boundaries and stewardship layers become non-framework layers and therefore no integration guidelines required