

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team**  
**Minnesota Counties Insurance Trust Building, St. Paul, MN**  
**1:00-3:00 PM, Room 205**  
**November 8, 2007**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Bob Basques called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Present: Bob Basques (City of St. Paul), Dave Brandt (Washington County), Zach Christoff (Hennepin County), Chris Cialek (MN LMIC), Dan Falbo (ESRI), Jim Fritz (Xcel Energy), Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), Joshua Gumm (Scott County), Matt McGuire (Metropolitan Council), Jim Maxwell (The Lawrence Group), Curt Peterson (Ramsey County), Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District), Brad Rupert (Carver County), Alison Slaats (Metropolitan Council), Ron Wencil (USGS).

Support Staff: Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council)

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted.

**3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY**

The summary of the August 2, 2007 meeting was accepted, as submitted.

**4. ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION OR DISCUSSION**

**a) Elect a Chair**

Dave Brandt was unanimously elected chair for 2008

**b) Meeting Schedule in 2008**

The group agreed to a schedule of 3 meeting approximately every 4 months as has been done in the last few years. Kotz will setup the meetings and notify the group.

**c) Implications of the Approved MetroGIS Business Plan**

Nancy Read gave an overview of the approved MetroGIS business plan, including major milestones, mission statement, expanded scope, and 8 major activity areas. For details please see [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07\\_1017/07\\_1008\\_businessplan\\_final.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07_1017/07_1008_businessplan_final.pdf).

Read also mentioned that MetroGIS has launched a Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup that will focus on defining future direction for MetroGIS with respect to shared application needs. The group will select a consultant to conduct a forum to help MetroGIS understand and plan for this opportunity area. The forum will likely be held in January 2008, and TAT members are encouraged to attend. Read said that the Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup differs from the TAT in that it has a fairly focused mission and will end as soon as that mission is completed in 2008. It remains to be seen what work might be assigned to the TAT stemming from this effort.

**d) Options & Considerations for Using and Protecting TLG Data on the Web**

Jim Maxwell describe that TLG data has been available to MetroGIS participants for many years. As online applications have continually increased in importance, TLG has been asked to allow the use of their data in web applications. TLG has been in discussion with the Metropolitan Council about doing this and testing a web use licensing process. TLG will be proceeding on a case by case basis for applications. It is important for TLG to know who the users will be, what the functionality of the applications will be, and what spatial extent will be involved. TLG will need to evaluate if a potential

application would conflict with it's own business practices. Maxwell didn't think would be a common problem with government web applications.

McGuire asked how one would begin this conversation with TLG. Maxwell responded that a license agreement for web use has been created which includes an attachment that requests pertinent information about the web application. Once that is completed and submitted to TLG, the conversation begins. This is still in draft form now as the process is being tested with Metropolitan Council.

Much discussion ensued about what is currently permitted on the web. Maxwell noted that some organizations have TLG data on the web for viewing only and have discussed this with TLG. Maxwell said that TLG has found instances in the past where their data was in a web application and they were able to download it, which was not an intended purpose of the application. Kotz noted that the idea of the license is to clearly define in a technical sense what is permissible and what is not. With so many different web technologies and environments, it is not practical to make one set of specific technical rules, thus the idea to view them on a case by case basis.

## **5. PROJECT AND WORKGROUP REPORTS**

### **a) Address Workgroup Update**

Kotz explained that the workgroup had met twice since the last TAT meeting. The group has made significant progress on defining the draft database specification. The big focus of the group was to propose a full "regional solution" to the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board, but this cannot be done until an organization is willing to accept the role of regional custodian. And the responsibilities of the regional custodian are still unclear. The biggest issue surrounds the need for the proposed address points dataset to be updated on a daily basis. To this end the Workgroup has received funding from MetroGIS to support a project by Carver County to create a working address point data synchronization mechanism. The \$20,000 project will be funded half by MetroGIS and half by Carver Co. It is expected to be completed in early 2008 and provide the methodology and a working example for synchronizing such data on a daily basis between individual address authorities and county and regional aggregators.

Roman mentioned that Hennepin County has stepped away from creating a web application for collecting address point data and instead is working directly with some cities that are actively maintaining this data.

Kotz reported that the draft National Street Address Standard is expected to be submitted to the Federal Geographic Data Committee in the next few months, at which time it will be made available for a public review. The Address Workgroup will coordinate a review of this standard through MetroGIS.

### **b) MetroGIS Geocoder Update**

Read described that the geocoder project is in full swing. A consultant has been hired to create the geocoder. The consultant previously worked on the PAGC geocoder engine ([www.pagcgeo.org](http://www.pagcgeo.org)) and is very experienced. The geocoder will use fairly sophisticated algorithms and applicable standards. Once completed the geocoder will accept an address or intersection, desired street offset (if needed) and max number of matches, and return the following:

- The original input
- Number of candidate matches
- Array, including for each candidate match:
  - A standardized output address
  - A point location in decimal degrees
  - Match score
  - Dataset that was used for the match (e.g. address points, parcels or streets for a cascading geocoder)

The geocoder will not include reverse geocoding or landmarks at this time. It is expected to be available in April. LMIC has agreed to use the geocoding engine to host a geocoding service on the web that will allow single but not batch geocoding. The geocoding engine will be made freely available, so

organizations could implement it in-house to do batch geocoding. If you are interested in participating or observing the development, sign up for the PAGC developers list at “e-mail lists” link on pagcgeo home page, or browse the list archive at [https://sourceforge.net/mail/?group\\_id=66325](https://sourceforge.net/mail/?group_id=66325).

**c) Geospatial Services Catalog Update**

Cialek explained that the geospatial services catalog project is at the point of defining a standard for documenting (metadata) such services. They are creating a documentation scheme based on the ISO 19115 metadata standard, which includes metadata for geospatial services. The workgroup expects to have a draft catalog up and running to show the steering committee next week. The idea is to have an online application in which one could login and create documentation for geospatial services and applications. The documentation would then be reviewed by an expert acting as a sort of broker. It would be posted if completed OK, or possibly sent back for clarification. The group is also on it's second draft of a project report.

**6. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS & DEMONSTRATIONS**

**a) Centralized GIS Applications – Washington County Show and Tell**

Dave Brandt gave a demonstration of several centralized applications that Washington County field staff use. Brandt had a notebook computer with a wireless card to connect back to the server in Stillwater through Citrix. Brandt said that these applications were necessitated by the fact that so many staff were previously using ArcView 3x and had the data loaded on each computer. It was both a licensing constraint and a data update constraint to have so many computers to keep running those applications. So Washington Co. created internal web applications to provide this functionality, using ArcIMS and the Geocortex client. Brandt reported that the performance is generally good with some rare exceptions (e.g. an appraiser is in a basement).

Brandt demoed one of the most used applications by field staff, which a parcel search that appraisers use frequently. 20 staff members are now using this implementation and the county just bought 50 more notebooks to deploy. Brandt showed some of the tools developed for the appraisers, for example a COGO drawing tool. Squad cars are also using similar technology but without the wireless connection to the data and application on the server. For the squad cars, the applications are on each computer and the data is updated automatically when they park in a hotspot at the office at night. The coordinates of the squad care are sent wirelessly to the dispatch.

**7. INFORMATION SHARING**

**a) Round Table Information Sharing**

Wencl reported that Homeland Security is close to contracting for aerial photography and LIDAR data to support the 2008 Republican National Convention.

**8. ADJOURN**

Basques adjourned the meeting at 3:12 p.m.

Prepared by,  
Mark Kotz