

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team
Minnesota Counties Insurance Trust Building, St. Paul, MN
10:00-12:00, Room 306
June 17, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Pete Henschel called the meeting to order.

Present: Pete Henschel (acting chair), Carver County; Alison Slaats, 1000 Friends of MN; John Slusarczyk (SP); Anoka County; Bart Richardson, DNR; Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council; Bob Moulder, Hennepin County; Brad Roman, Hennepin County; Ben Verbick, LOGIS; Kent Tupper, Dakota County;

Support Staff: Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council).

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

The summary of the previous meeting was accepted with no changes.

4. ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION OR DISCUSSION

a) Technical Leadership Workgroup recommendations for funding

Mark Kotz explained that the Technical Leadership Workgroup would be recommending 2 new projects for funding, Best Image Service, and a combined project called "Proximity Finder" for Government Services Finder and Point in Polygon service needs. While the TLW is not recommending the Feature Services for all layers workgroup for funding, they are going to recommend that the Policy board consider the application contest idea. The TLW is also recommending \$1000 for tweaks to the existing Geocoder.

5. PROJECT AND WORKGROUP REPORTS

a) Best Image Service

McGuire described the recommendations of the Best Image Service Workgroup.

Questions

Q: Can counties contribute their high resolution imagery to the best image service?

A: Yes if they are willing to make it publicly available

Q: Where would the data come from?

A: Any freely available source.

Q: Will you be soliciting imager or looking for sources of it?

A: No. The best image service will only evaluate known, freely available sources. We expect that these will already be included in the LMIC/MGIO image service

Q: What if a county was willing to contribute older (2005) 6" resolution data. Would that be wanted?

A: It may or may not be considered "best" by the governance group. However, you can already give it to LMIC/MGIO if you are willing to make it freely available. Then they could include it in their existing image service.

Q: How is "best" defined? Currentness or resolution.

A: Both will be considered by the governance group on a case-by-case basis.

c) Feature Services Workgroup

Slaats described the Feature Services workgroup recommendation that MetroGIS sponsor a public web application contest..

The contest would solicit people to build applications using public web services. This would have many benefits including:

- Encouraging organizations to publish more data as services
- Add value to our existing investment in quality data development and publishing

The idea was taken from a similar contest held in Washington DC, which claims to have gained over a million dollars in developed applications.

Questions:

Q: Would WFS violate existing parcel license agreement?

A: Probably. The contest would not make WFS available. It would encourage data producers to make WFS available.

Q: Did DC generate any revenue?

A: Unknown

Comments –

GIS/LIS would be a good venue for something like this.

b) Proximity Finder

Kotz described the proximity finder workgroup's recommendation. It would fill two service needs:

- 1) Government Service Finder
- 2) Jurisdictions at a particular point

Proposal is to build a prototype that would allow authoritative data owners to contribute data. There might be a data mess if there are multiple contributors for the same dataset.

The recommendation consists of:

- An Application to simplify data contribution
- Registry of data
- Service that reports what's nearby
- Application to interface.

Comments: Dakota County has a service like that. It's a SOAP service that takes a location and returns the nearest place to get multiple types of services. The County has been hesitant to provide service finding for other's services due to data accuracy concerns. So far we've been pointing people to other's services finder (eg. Secretary of State where do I vote application).

6. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS & DEMONSTRATIONS

a) LOGIS gGov Application

Verbick Presented the public web map application they developed to replace their aging ArcIMS application. See attached presentation.

This app will be available to the 13 cities in the LOGIS consortium. Cities did not want to copy Google, Yahoo, etc... they want something they have control of on the back end that is specific to their needs. The application uses SQL Server 2008. There is a back end content management system that uses SQL server to change the interface. The consortium members share a single SQL Server database. The application leverages as much existing information as possible. E.g. the application links to the existing parks pages, rather than reproduce park information content in the application.

Basemap is a tiled map service covering the service area. Imagery is an ArcGIS service wrapped around the LMIC Geospatial Imagery service.

The development environment is ASP.NET using the Javascript API.

Each City determines what map layers they are showing.

Cache takes 30 hours to rebuild. Have not had success doing incremental rebuilds.

There are a total of three services. We expect it to start out at about 10,000 hits per day. For this load we have two ArcGIS Servers using a Coyote Point failover, and a separate database server.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

a) Two new state geospatial standards

Mark Kotz told the group about two new Governor's Council on GIS approved GIS standards:

- 1) CTU Codes: LMIC/MGIO put together a new web page and database with a lookup table. The standard says that State Agencies must be able to export CTU information with the GNIS code.
- 2) USNG: State standard adopts the FGDC standard and promotes and recommends formatting of maps following this standard.

See attached document.

b) Round Table Information Sharing

Roman described a bug in ArcGIS Desktop 9.3.1 Exporting data with null values through the geoprocessor is very slow.

Slusarczyk announced that Anoka County will have a web map application by the end of the year.

Bart Richardson noted that DNR is upgrading its Land Records System by replacing an AS400 database with an Oracle and Geodatabase solution.

Also the DNR is collecting county parcel datasets. Right now they have 40 counties with about 2.5 million polygons. It is being served internally via WMS and SDE.

Kotz announced that a state government ESRI enterprise license agreement has been finalized and the Metropolitan Council is included .

8. ADJOURN

Henschel adjourned the meeting at 12:00

Prepared by,
Matt McGuire

Handouts

June 17, 2009 MetroGIS TAT Meeting

MetroGIS Technical Leadership Workgroup Recommendations to the Coordinating Committee

INTRODUCTION

The Technical Leadership Workgroup is requesting Coordinating Committee approval of funding for *three* project proposals, for a total of \$35,000, to address shared application/web service needs defined in workshop last November.

BACKGROUND

1. On November 20, 2008, MetroGIS hosted a forum entitled “*Geospatial Applications and Web Services Needs Forum*”. High priority needs were:

App/Service Idea	Result
Free parcel WFS	Data need
USPS address verifier	Workgroup formed
Statewide geocoding service	Data need
Best image service	Workgroup formed
Feature services for all data	Workgroup formed
Critical infrastructure data service	Data need
Jurisdictions at a point	Workgroup formed
Government service finder	

2. The Technical Leadership Workgroup (TLW) accepted responsibility to synthesize recommendations of these workgroups into a cohesive strategy for the Coordinating Committee’s June 25, 2009 meeting.
3. MetroGIS’s approved “foster collaboration” budget for 2009 allocates \$35,000 for Regional GIS Projects. In the past, a call for project proposals has been made for these funds. For 2009, the Policy Board concurred with the Committee’s recommendation that these funds should be used to act on priorities defined at the November 20 forum. The TLW developed proposal submittal guidelines and invited each workgroup to submit a proposal.

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSALS

Proposals for four priority needs defined at the November 20 Forum were received by the TLW. The TLW met on June 2 to consider them and craft the recommendation presented here. Proposals were received from the Geocoder, Best image service, Feature services for all data, and Jurisdictions at point / Government services finder workgroups, for a total ask of \$76,500. The TLW asked for adjustments to some of the proposals (see next section) to reduce the total ask for recommended projects to the \$35,000 in available funding. A summary of the funding requested, relative to that recommended by the TLW, is presented in the table on the following page:

CANDIDATES FOR 2009 REGIONAL GIS PROJECT FUNDING

Project Description	Requested Funding	Recommended Funding
Best Image Service - single imagery web service that shows the “best” imagery available	\$20,000	\$15,250
Feature Services – Contest to promote the publishing and use of OGC compliant feature services for geospatial data	\$24,000	\$0
Proximity Finder - a prototype framework and service that would enable finding the appropriate or nearest government service or jurisdiction for a point based on available government services and jurisdiction data	\$25,000	\$18,750
Refinements to Geocoder Service	\$7,500	\$1,000
TOTALS	\$76,500	\$35,000

TECHNICAL LEADERSHIP WORKGROUP’S RATIONALE

The TLW’s rationale for the recommendation outlined in the table above is as follows.

- Given \$76,500 in proposed funding, **the TLW focused on projects that it felt would be of the highest benefit to the MetroGIS community AND would be ready to move forward as soon as funding is available. All projects were deemed to be of high value.**
- The TLW felt that the feature services contest was the most interesting project and had the potential to bring significant gains to MetroGIS. However, the group agreed that such a contest must be administered and promoted very well or not at all. The consensus view was that MetroGIS would not be ready to proceed with this project in 2009. The TLW recommends that MetroGIS pursue this project in 2010, possibly with state partners.
- The TLW asked the remaining project proposers to consider what they could do with a reduced funding amount to try to still accomplish all three with the \$35,000. All agreed that they could do significant work with less funding than requested.
- The Best Image Service project was reduced by 25%, with the difference coming in in-kind services provided by the MGIO (formerly LMIC)
- Under the TLW recommendations, the Geocoder proposal removes the \$5000 PAGC restructuring request and will receive \$1000 funding toward testing tuning parameters for MetroGIS data used in the Geocoder. The project will ask for in-kind services from the U of M.
- The Proximity Finder proposal is also reduced by 25% and would move forward with a reduced scope.
- The TLW believes this funding recommendation will provide MetroGIS with the biggest payback for its applications and services funding dollars.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Coordinating Committee:

1. Find that each project for which this funding is sought will address an application/ web service need that has value across sectors in accordance with the “shared application needs” objective set forth in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan.
2. Recommend that the Policy Board endorse the Technical Leadership Workgroup’s recommendation to fund the projects specified herein, totally up to \$35,000, and constituting the 2009 Regional GIS Projects program.
3. Understand and discuss the idea of a web feature services contest and bring the idea to the Policy Board for discussion.

Two New State Geospatial Standards

The Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information has adopted two new state geospatial standards.

Codes for the Identification of Cities, Townships and Unorganized Territories

The purpose of this standard is to provide a single, common coding scheme to identify all cities, townships and Census Bureau-defined unorganized territories in Minnesota. It is intended to be used primarily when data are being transferred between a state agency and some external customer.

This standard provides a set of codes that uniquely identify more than 2700 cities, townships and unorganized territories (CTUs) within the state of Minnesota. These codes originate from the U.S. Geographic Names Information System and are recognized as a formal federal standard. This standard is important to all developers of public databases containing information about cities, townships and unorganized territories in Minnesota.

All Minnesota CTU codes are available for searching or download from the Minnesota CTU Database page at <http://www.lmic.state.mn.us/CTU/>

U.S. National Grid

The purpose of this state standard is to encourage the use of the United States National Grid (USNG) on all appropriate map products in the state and to specify how the USNG should be presented on maps when it is used.

The USNG provides an efficient way to specify location information at different levels of detail anywhere in the United States. It is based on a universally defined geographic coordinate and grid system. It is intended to improve interoperability across all national jurisdictions especially in crisis situations. It is also intended to help people use location services such as GPS in conjunction with printed maps to find and communicate location information.

See the U.S. National Grid resources page of the GCGI Emergency Preparedness Committee at <http://www.gis.state.mn.us/committee/emprep/download/USNG/index.html>

For more information, contact Mark Kotz Co-Chair, Standards Committee, Governor's Council on Geographic Information at mark.kotz@metc.state.mn.us or 651-602-1644.