

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team**  
**Minnesota Counties Insurance Trust Building, St. Paul, MN**  
**1:00-3:00, Room 205**  
**June 23, 2010**

**1. CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS**

Chair David Brandt called the meeting to order.

Present:

David Brandt, Washington, County – TAT Chair  
Bob Basques, City of St. Paul  
Chris Cialek, MnGeo  
Jessica Deegan, Metropolitan Council  
Dan Falbo, ESRI  
Jessica Fendos, DEED  
Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council  
Randy Knippel, Dakota County  
Matt Koukal, Ramsey County  
Jim Maxwell, NCompass Technologies  
Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council  
Jeremy Moore, Houston Engineering  
Curt Peterson, Ramsey County  
Chad Riley, Carver County  
Alison Slaats, 1000 Friends of Minnesota  
Charlie Teff, Anoka County

Support Staff: Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

**2. APPROVE AGENDA**

The agenda was approved adding one more project report for the metro orthoimagery.

**3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY**

The summary of the previous meeting was approved with one little change.

**4. PROJECT AND WORKGROUP REPORTS**

**a) 2010 Metro Orthoimagery**

Chris Cialek passed out a handout showing the status of the Metro Orthoimagery project. The project extends somewhat beyond the 7 county area. There are 3 different resolutions being collected. Brandt asked if there was a plan to fly the metro again on a regular cycle. Cialek replied that it would be a great idea, but nothing yet has been set. A discussion followed related to coordinating future flights, costs, etc.

**b) Address Workgroup**

Kotz reported that the MetroGIS Address Points Dataset is now live on DataFinder with one city. A few other cities and counties are working toward contributing data to the dataset. He also reported that the Web Editing Application project is under way with a kickoff meeting scheduled for next week. Finally, the workgroup worked jointly with the MnGeo Standards Committee to submit comments to the draft national address data standard.

**c) Proximity Finder**

Jessica Fendos provided a handout giving highlights of the Proximity Finder project. See handout.

**d) Best Image Service**

Kotz reported that there is nothing new to report except that the Met. Council is now working on creating a contract with MnGeo to start the project.

**e) Geospatial Commons**

Kotz reported that the Commons workgroup was formed jointly by MetroGIS and the MnGeo Standards Committee Deegan reported that the ESRI Geoportal Extension is installed and the implementation team is working on configuring and customizing the test Commons.

**f) Other Technical Items from coordinating Committee Meeting**

Brandt mentioned the Quantifying Public Value grant project. He also mentioned an idea from the Coordinating Committee meeting to create a metro wide stormwater system dataset. Kotz mentioned that this idea come partially out of an effort lead by MNPCA and others to create a stormwater data exchange standard.

**5. TECHNICAL DISCUSSIONS**

**a) OpenStreetMap as a Potential Landmarks Data Source**

The Met Council has a need for landmarks data as do many organizations. The Council has several different landmarks datasets that are not coordinated. Several other sources of landmarks data exist, including NCompass, Cyclopath, OpenStreetMap and other sources. See presentation.

Discussion:

McGuire: Is this a valuable data source for MetroGIS?

Maxwell: Is this the best option you have seen?

McGuire: It could allow us to get a lot of information without doing a lot of work. But there may be drawbacks.

Maxwell: Are there some really good owners of thematic data e.g. restaurants? Libraries?

McGuire: Probably. How do we get all of that in one place and updated?

Brandt: In our county we track some kinds of landmarks closely and others not at all. Eg. County inspects restaurants and we have those, as well as schools, but not other things.

McGuire: How can we get benefit from all of the people who are editing OSM.

Peterson: How do you get a consistent set of attributes behind the landmarks. E.g. what kind of restaurant? What level of ball field? This seems to be a drawback of OSM.

Kotz: It is possible that we could agree on a set of attributes (“tags” in OSM) for landmarks and agree to use them. Under that scenario we could all contribute and have more detailed attributes.

Knippel: I think it is not a matter of if we use OSM but when we use OSM. Could the MetroGIS community come together and be active contributors?

Slaats: This is a big opportunity and an elegant way to proceed. Many doubted Wikipedia, but now it is a main stream site. The same could be true for OSM.

More discussion followed.

Action Item: Have an update at the next TAT – 1 to 3 ways we as a community could begin to engage with OSM.

**b) Home Grown Street Centerlines: Does it make sense to have a standard?**

Washington County uses NCompass street centerline data, but it doesn't meet all needs. They already create their own centerlines with names, but don't have the attributes to do geocoding or networking. They are considering doing more to maintain their own local data. Most counties seem to use the data for geocoding and routing. In particular there is a need for next generation E911, pavement management, etc.

Koukal: At Mn/DOT we did everything for dynamic segmentation, but now realize that isn't necessarily a big focus for others like counties.

Maxwell: We do make changes you ask for quickly (e.g. 3 days) but it may take a quarter to get posted on the MetroGIS FTP site.

Gelbmann: Is there a reason to have a regional dataset?

Brandt: Yes, we use the NCompass data outside our county all the time, for mapping/geocoding and for even responding to emergencies beyond the county.

Gelbmann: Met Council is in the process of contracting for regional street centerlines again. The previous contract expires at the end of the year. The Council is really interested in getting feedback from others on ways we can make a regional dataset that meets the most needs.

Brandt: There is no action item here, but wanted to make sure others were aware of the topic and thought a discussion would be important.

**6. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS**

**a) Anoka county's Public Property Information Map Application**

Jeremy Moore and Charlie Teff gave a presentation on the application developed for Anoka County's parcel viewer application. See presentation.

Demonstration provided of the application, built using GeoPRIME ([www.geodecisions.com/geoprime](http://www.geodecisions.com/geoprime)). The application includes five services, aeriels, general base map, buildings, parcels, roads and labels. The application also includes benchmarks and section corners for the surveyors. Simple tools, identify parcels, links (will link) to property tax file, also links to half sections and plats as well as schools (websites) and pictometry. Mailing label functionality embedded, with a variety of selection tools to generate list of parcels.

Riley asked if the mailing label feature limited returns, Yes, 500 limited parcel returns for labels.

Jeremy Moore demonstrated GeoPRIME, which is a developer interface that sits on top of ArcGIS Server, offering basic configuration tools. Configuring an application via user interface creates a FLEX application for ArcGIS Server.

Alison Slaats asked about costs for GeoPRIME. Jeremy noted that the price can vary for each application depending on customization needs.

Maxwell: are tools standardized? Jeremy noted that some customized tools get added via JavaScript. Wizard interface gives initial basic tools.

Application will be live at end of month.

### **b) US National Grid Mapping in Minnesota**

Randy Knippel presented on the USNG, GIS for Emergency Management, and also had several handouts. See presentation. More US National Grid info can be found here <http://gis.co.dakota.mn.us/content/dakco/usng/er/maps.htm>

Fire Map Books in County drove need for USNG mapping. These books contain line and ortho maps (one sample provided – for City of Burnsville). Randy noted that USNG is really just an abbreviation of UTM.

Currently there is an effort through MnGEO to create state-wide series of 22x24” 10K using USNG. The maps are meant to be easily tiled together for first responders and in emergency situations. Can use the basic map series (orthos and grid lines) and overlay emergency specific data, which then can be merged via pdf. Merging can be scripted using Python (pyPDF used to script pdf merging).

Knippel demonstrated a basic html image map that was generated through python to provide spatial index, having all on a jump drives offers a mobile GIS for the field.

Maxwell: How is this coming along in the Metro? Does each city’s fire department have book of maps?

Knippel: Up to them to decide when they transition to USNG. Those that don’t use it are transitioning at some point. Thinks the GIS community can be more proactive. Giving presentations to several organizations.

**7. INFORMATION SHARING**

Maxwell: (to Brandt) are you looking for input on how to resolve the street centerline issues from the MetroGIS TAT?

Brandt: If there is enough broad interest, yes.

Peterson: is interested in a sub group

Maxwell: also interested in being part of a sub group

Gelbmann: would like to have a Metro Council representative on the group as well.

Brandt: will get something going and invite all county folks.

**a) Round Table Information Sharing**

No round table due to over time

**8. ADJOURN**

Brandt adjourned the meeting at 3:20

Prepared by,  
Mark Kotz and Jessica Deegan