

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team
Minnesota Counties Insurance Trust Building, St. Paul, MN
1:00-3:00, Room 205
October 27, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Chair David Brandt called the meeting to order.

Present:

David Brandt, Washington, County – TAT Chair
Chris Cialek, MnGeo
Jessica Fendos, DEED
Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council
Josh Gumm, Scott County
Jim Maxwell, NCompass Technologies
Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council
Curt Peterson, Ramsey County
Charlie Teff, Anoka County
Ron Wencil, USGS

Support Staff: Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

2. APPROVE AGENDA

The agenda was approved .

3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY

The summary of the previous meeting was not distributed. It will be sent by email for e-approval.

4. MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2011

The concensus was that Kotz should schedule 3 meetings similar to this year and they can be cancelled as needed.

5. PROJECT AND WORKGROUP REPORTS

a) Geocoder

No update. It was asked that Nancy submit a written update to be included with meeting notes

From: Nancy Read [mailto:nancread@mmcd.org]
Subject: Geocoder Update for TAT

We have two contractors, one is Steve Woodbridge who will be working on a "universal one-line parser" to allow requests to the service to come in as one line instead of already split into micro (house# + street) and macro (city, state, zip) parts, and the other is again Walter Sinclair who will be restructuring the underlying PAGC geocoder code so that it can use other kinds of databases for its internal storage in addition to the current choice, Berkeley DB level 4.1-4.4 (a relatively old version in this business). Not much else to report yet.

b) Address Workgroup

Kotz reported that the MetroGIS Address Points Dataset is now live on DataFinder with one city. Contributions by more cities would be welcome. He also reported that the Web Editing Application project is under with Applied Geographics. Must be done by the end of the year. The national address data standard is expected to be approved by mid January. They seem to be incorporating the changes suggested by the Address Workgroup.

Maxwell asked how cities are being pursued to contribute. Kotz said their has been very little promotion of the project so far.

c) Geospatial Commons

Kotz gave a presentation about the Commons. It will have 4 functional areas, Find, Evaluate, Share and Administer. MnGeo is hosting a test implementation using the ArcGIS 9.3 Geoportal Extension. The project is being worked on by MnGeo, Met Council, DNR, MnDOT, DEED and Scott County. Phase 1 is wrapping up and a test version is expected to be available in November or December. Then a project plan will be proposed for a production version.

Kotz also reported that the funding for the clip, zip and shop project will not be used. The workgroup was not ready for this project and there was no one available to be the project manager.

d) Best Image Service

McGuire reported that workgroup has come up with a proposed definition of what “best” means. It will be a service hosted by MnGeo. The contract for the project was just signed and MnGeo expects to have something up by the end of the year. At small scales it will be Landsat imagery and at larger scales it will switch to aerial photography. At 1:10,000 it will switch to metro area 1 foot resolution.

Moving forward, a workgroup will meet annually to determine changes to the best image service.

Can counties contribute their imagery to the service?

The process is that any imagery available in the MnGeo imager server will be considered. To get imagery in the Best Image Service, first submit it to MnGeo to make it a publicly available web service.

e) Proximity Finder

Jessica Fendos provided a handout giving highlights of the Proximity Finder project’s second demo. She then gave a presentation on the project status. She said the project is close to completion. The project is to support two use cases:

- What’s near me?
- What city am I in?

Jessica gave history of the project and said that most information is available on the project web site through SharedGeo and Houston Engineering.

<http://proximity.houstoneng.net/webpage/proxfinder.html>

There is a proximity finder service for the application and another for the data uploader.

Interaction with the Finder service is in LAT/LON - LL84 - EPSG:4326, but the Loader service can use others and tries to detect the coordinate system of the uploaded file by looking in the *.prj SHP file and will re-project to WGS84 (EPSG:4326) while it is loading if necessary.

Jessica demoed the What’s Near Me and What City Am I In functions of the project.

This is the phase 1 deliverable.

The project will be presented to the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee on December 16th.

The project will then need a permanent host and will need to define what layers it should have.

Wencl asked how this project relates to the structures data work being done through MnGeo? Some of the "starter" datasets from the MN Structures Collaborative were used as sample data sets in this project. The service could be used in conjunction with those data sets or potentially with the application developed by SharedGeo for MnGeo to allow users to edit that data.

It was clarified that the project deliverable is the software to create these services and not a hosted service itself. There currently is no defined host for the proximity finder service. The software will be freely available to anyone that wants to host it.

f) Other Technical Items from coordinating Committee Meeting

None

6. TECHNICAL DISCUSSIONS

a) OpenStreetMap – How can we engage?

Matt came up with three ways in which we could engage the OSM community

1. Experiment technically with OSM moving OSM data to traditional GIS datasets.
Matt has a plan to pull OSM data into a geodatabase, but has not found any type of easy conversion tool yet.
2. Experiment thematically with different datasets in OSM
Post a small area of data or a specific theme for the metro area (e.g. pharmacies) in OSM and see what happens to the data. Could download it and see what has changed and what has not and evaluate changes to the data.
3. Have a MetroGIS OSM mapping party
These parties generally involve having people getting together on a weekend and people go out and map a small area. MetroGIS might want to instead to work on a theme instead of all themes for a small area.
There are one to two dozen open street map editors in the twin cities area. Thus, MetroGIS could be a majority input into OSM.

Discussion:

How much is the OSM data used? This is important for deciding how much effort should be put into putting data into OSM.

It might be a good way to get data updated. It would be a good experiment.

What imagery does OSM use? They have an agreement to use Yahoo imagery for viewing.

To have a party, it would be important to first have the theme specified. Different folks would have different opinions about what would be most valuable.

It is wise to be mindful of what theme might be tested in OSM so we don't duplicate data in OSM and so we don't duplicate data development efforts going on now.

b) Pictometry and Aerial Photos Discussion

Brandt led a discussion on this topic. In Washington County there is an interest in getting aerials and Pictometry updated annually, though it may be unrealistic in terms of cost. But they are looking at options for updated such data more frequently, for example doing oblique imagery one year and vertical imagery the next. He noted that there is a discount for Pictometry if 5 counties order at the same time. Brandt wondered if other counties are interested in pursuing Pictometry next year.

Peterson said they are considering if Pictometry high resolution data might allow them to develop planimetric data and rely less on traditional aerial imagery.

Wencl said that from the national perspective there has not been much luck getting Pictometry data, due to positional accuracy concerns. At the national level there has been much less interest in the oblique data. The feds are mainly interested in the vertical data. NGA has just recently given a green light to the quality of a new Pictometry product. Apparently they have improved positional accuracy.

MnGeo said that they have been contacted by Pictometry recently and have scheduled an informational meeting for November. MnGeo has no defined need for Pictometry data.

Brandt said that GIS managers from several metro counties plan to get together to discuss opportunities for coordinating the acquisition of imagery.

7. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS

None

8. INFORMATION SHARING Round Table

Bart R. from DNR reports that the DNR has adopted the MetroGIS 65 parcel attributes as the standard for stitching together a statewide parcel datasets.

Wencl reports that LiDAR will be flown in the spring for part of east central MN and the arrowhead.

Cialek: The ortho imagery project will expand to 36 counties in southern MN for this spring photography.

Maxwell asked about lakes data and who has what data within the Met. Council and DNR. Kotz said that the Met. Council maintains a dataset of open water features which is posted on DataFinder. It uses open water boundaries as viewed from aerial photography and not the hydrologic boundary. Thus marsh lands are often not included in the polygon. DNR distributes several different lake boundary datasets and has an internal dataset that attempts to track the ordinary high water mark, though this dataset is not available on the Data Deli. Kotz has requested it several times but has yet to receive it.

9. ADJOURN

Brandt adjourned the meeting at 3:00

Prepared by,
Mark Kotz