

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team**  
**January 17, 2001**

**1. Call to Order**

Co-Chair Maxwell called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m., at the City of Lakes Building in Minneapolis.

Members present: Bob Basques (City of St. Paul); Sherry Coatney (Intergraph); Will Craig (UM CURA); Dan Falbo (ESRI); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Jane Harper (Washington County); Jay Krafthefer (Mn/DOT); Susanne Maeder (LMIC); Jim Maxwell (The Lawrence Group); Bob Moulder (Hennepin County); Rick Person (City of St. Paul); Bart Richardson (DNR IS); Scott Simmer (Hennepin County); Ronald Wencil (USGS); Tim Zimmerman (Hennepin County)

Members absent: Roger Carlson (City of Minneapolis); David Claypool (Ramsey County); John Connelly (St. Paul & Ramsey County Charter Commissions); Bob Diedrich (SRF Consulting); Elliott Graham (Ramsey County); Blaine Hackett (PlanSight, LLC); Michael Munson (Metropolitan Council); Donna Roper (Minneapolis Public School District); Ben Verbick (LOGIS)

Visitors: Pam Siminitz (Intergraph); Roger Harwell (Intergraph); Mark O'Connor (Intergraph); Damon Dougherty (Intergraph); Brett Budrow (Ramsey County); Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Dan Bartholic (City of St. Paul); Scott Merkley (City of St. Louis Park); Alison Slaats (Metropolitan Council); John Lunde (MnDOT); Pat Cummins (ESRI); Don Elwood (City of Minneapolis); Gary Criter (City of Minneapolis); William Gooding (ORACLE Corp.)

Staff: Theresa Foster (MetroGIS Technical Coordinator); Randy Johnson (MetroGIS Staff Coordinator)

**2. Accept Agenda**

Member Maxwell motioned to accept the agenda as submitted, with the following agenda item change, agenda item 4b will follow agenda item 4d and agenda item 6a will not be discussed but is for reference only, Member Craig seconded.

*Motion carried.*

**3. Introduction of Team Members**

Co-Chair Maxwell welcomed team members, guests and the presentation team from Intergraph, then asked them to introduce themselves.

**4. Accept Meeting Minutes**

Member Craig motioned to accept the meeting minutes from November 2, 2000, Member Person seconded.

*Motion carried.*

**5a. Technical Team Assignments**

Member Maxwell gave a brief overview of the 2001 work plan activities for the team to focus on. Members were asked to commit to a least one activity during the year to provide organizational support from within MetroGIS stakeholders, members were asked to only volunteer for activities that either they have an in-depth knowledge of or are interested in participating from a pilot project standpoint. Member Maeder agreed to participate on the metadata workshop activity, LMIC will be doing future workshops in Minnesota and would like to coordinate activities with MetroGIS. Foster said she will be available to members before the next Technical Advisory Team to solidify the activities and answer any questions.

*No Motion Needed.*

**5c. Enhanced DataFinder Demonstration/Evaluation**

Date Approved:  
*March 29, 2001*

Alison Slaats, DataFinder Web Developer, gave a demonstration of the enhanced DataFinder site. Slaats stated that the changes that were made to DataFinder will reduce redundancy of metadata with other agencies. The development of DataFinder to become an FGDC NSDI clearinghouse node will greatly improve a better mechanism to search metadata; which was recently registered with the FGDC. The search interface is based upon the LMIC GeoGateway; it was agreed upon by the evaluation team (Wencl, Meader, Gelbmann and MetroGIS staff) that the continuity between the two organization interfaces will make it easier for users to eventually navigate. The last change that was significant is the improvement of the theme catalog for browsing of metadata records (which is generated nightly so changes in metadata and/or data are promptly updated). Also, tag lines were included to indicate which metadata sets are new or recently updated and MetroGIS endorsed. Data distribution from the metadata record is still by FTP, but this is now housed at Met Council, which eliminates the need to provide data sets to LMIC for posting on their FTP server, which are also updated nightly. A section on reference maps was changed from providing static maps to helping users orient themselves and allow them to browse the data and its contents. A resource section was added to clearly provide links to other agencies in Minnesota that provide GIS data and links to online mapping resources available. The help section was simplified to provide a single contact with a generic email that is forwarded to several people so that someone can provide information more readily. Also, the frequently asked questions underwent editing to make the content easier to understand. The enhanced MetroGIS DataFinder web site ([www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org)) should be up and running by the end of January, there will be a feedback form implemented on the site that gives stakeholders the opportunity to evaluate the new site. We will be taking feedback for a period of 30 days and then the evaluation team and MetroGIS staff will compile feedback information and make changes based upon the provided information. Only data issues not consistent with the approved site will be brought back to the Technical Advisory Team for further direction. Slaats formally thanked LMIC staff (Pete Olsen and Susanne Maeder) for the successful implementation and assistance in gearing up and implementing the DataFinder FGDC Node, they were a valuable resource.

Member Basques suggested that a symbol/color ramping be added to clearly distinguish between dates of data (age). Visitor Lunde suggested that along with the tag line UPDATED a month/year be added (i.e. UPDATED 03/01). Member Craig asked Slaats to summarize the effort it took to implement the FGDC Node in order to be NSDI Compliant. Slaats stated that you must first install the indexing software ISITE, second index all metadata records, then last but not least develop an interface mechanism to successfully search for metadata, which LMIC previously did on their new GeoGateway site.

#### **5d. Data Distribution Demonstration - Intergraph**

Member Maxwell reminded members that MetroGIS will be looking at different data distribution mechanisms for larger data sets based upon future needs of MetroGIS users. The basis for each demonstration will be on the capabilities of accessing and distributing large data sets, architecture of their system, technical tools, benefits, data security and access, and any data standards that are in place and/or required to support each system.

Sherry Coatney, Damon Dougherty, Pam Siminitz, Roger Harwell and Mark O'Connor demonstrated the WebMap and WebEnterprise Products as well as the future of Intergraph's Web/Wireless Technology.

Intergraphs' demonstration focused on the following agenda items:

- GeoMedia Technology Overview
- Web Map Demonstration
- MetroGIS Parcel Dataset Demonstration
- Other Web Map Sites
- Standards
- Future of Mobile Workforce Management

#### **Questions and Answers (During Meeting):**

Q: What types of extraction file formats can WebMap/WebEnterprise distribute data in?

A: Microsoft Access, MicroStation, Oracle Spatial, shapefile, SQL Server, MapInfo, AutoCAD, and raster image. Attribute data may be exported via cut-and-paste to Windows products such as Word, Excel, etc.

Q: What types of input data file formats can map server read?

A: MGE, FRAMME, Arc/Info, ArcView, MicroStation, Field View, MapInfo, AutoCAD, Oracle Spatial, Microsoft Access, SQL Server, MGD, InRoads, many raster file formats, and tabular data from any ODBC-compliant data store. Other formats are supported through services and special arrangements, including Smallworld, Genamap, VPF, etc.

Q: Can you extract data by Polygon; ad-hoc Polygon?

A: Yes.

Q: What controls on the datasets do you have to provide users/dev. Access and editing features? Are there any limits on the details to limit access?

A: Dependent on business rules which trigger operations in an application. For example record editing done in GeoMedia will trigger update information in the data store. WebMap does have enabling tools; WebMap does not override Oracle Business Rules (SC can you elaborate this better?)

Q: Can you provide users with write only access?

A: Look into example provided with GeoMedia Transaction Tools, due out this year.

Q: Does your export extraction tool deliver data in single layer or in multiple layers?

A: Dependent on output format. You can control the output format and data translation definition.

Q: Is one of your choices a shapefile for single and multiple layers?

A: Dependent on coding and access capabilities.

Q: What are the differences between WebMap and WebEnterprise?

A: WebMap lets you communicate through maps, make simple queries, and browse GIS information (i.e. buffers). WebEnterprise is the method for distributing data, allows network analysis, routing capabilities and read/write with data services (spatial query, buffer zoning, geocoding, network analysis and coordinate transformation).

Q: What are your licensing arrangements?

A: Map server packaging in the following increments, 2, 12, 96. Two Map Server Executables can handle up to 20 users comfortably (ie. 20 map requests per instance).

Q: What is the initial price of WebMap?

A: List Price \$10,000 for the 2 Map Server version, maintenance usually runs 20% of list per year but is optional (covers unlimited software problem resolution, operating system upgrades and product upgrades).

Q: What operating system does your web product run on?

A: Designed for Windows 95, 98, Windows NT Workstation and Server, Windows 2000. Standards based upon OLE/COM. While this is the preferred platform now a few years ago this was UNIX. Microsoft claims that in Windows 2000 99.9% uptime has been demonstrated.

Q: Do you handle SmallWorld extractions and input?

A: This is covered by project ware; complex transactions for SmallWorld products, Intergraph does support but it is not plug 'n' play.

Q: How do handle projections on the fly? Particularly county coordinate systems?

A: WebMap handles over 40 standard coordinate systems on the fly, without altering the original data sets' coordinates. County coordinate systems are supported, including custom datum transformations. This has been tested on a number of Minnesota County Coordinate System definitions. Some data formats expose coordinate systems definitions for WebMap to use, for others there is a one time definition of the data set coordinate system when you set up the data for use in WebMap. Can use a drop down list to alter user's preferred viewing coordinate system (regardless of the data's original coordinate system) once the data's coordinate system is defined.

Q: How does the Oracle license treat WebMap Server? I have heard this is by user, which is costly.  
A: Oracle defines user, Intergraph goes along with definition.

**Questions and Answers (Post-Its):**

Q: Does GeoMedia support Small World formatted data?

A: Through projectware and services. Intergraph has written a Smallworld data server that is available with services.

Q: What kind of controls are available for datasets being edited on the web?

A: The security of the data is controlled by the processes that are enabled by the WebMap implementation. In addition, WebMap can never override the security that is set up by the data store itself. For example, if the data to be altered is in Oracle, the person changing the data via WebMap must have the required username/password and privileges to change the data that any normal Oracle user would have.

**Overall Evaluation:**

Question:	Ability to access and distribute large data sets	Architecture of the system	Technical tools of the system	Benefits of the system	Information about data security and access	Data Standards required to support system	
<b>Participant</b>							
<b>1</b>	4	4	4	4	4	4	<b>4.00</b>
<b>2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	<b>2.00</b>
<b>3</b>	3	2	3	2	1	2	<b>2.17</b>
<b>4</b>	2	3	2	3	2	3	<b>2.50</b>
<b>5</b>	2	2	2	3	3	3	<b>2.50</b>
<b>6</b>	3	3	3	*	2	4	<b>3.00</b>
<b>7</b>	2	3	2	4	3	2	<b>2.67</b>
<b>8</b>	3	3	3	3	2	3	<b>2.83</b>
<b>9</b>	3	4	2	3	2	4	<b>3.00</b>
<b>10</b>	*	3	*	3	3	4	<b>3.25</b>
<b>11</b>	4	3	3	3	3	4	<b>3.33</b>
<b>Avg</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>2.82</b>

Score based upon 4 pt scale (Needs Improvement = 1.0, Average = 2.0, Good = 3.0, Excellent =4.0)

**Would you like to see more demonstrations on data distribution? 4(Y) 5(N) 2(No Answers)**

**Comments on Evaluation Forms:**

Presentation included broad overview of multiple Intergraph products and issues (i.e. OGC & Wireless).  
Interesting session (not too much of a sales pitch, but not too heavy on pure technical items either).

Date Approved:  
March 29, 2001

Appears to be very flexible across data sets in various native formats, for display as well as windowing and downloading.

### **5b. School District Boundaries Recommendations**

Member Harper updated the team on the progress of the Washington County School District Boundary Pilot Project and on the recommendation by the Peer Review participants on November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2000, on the data specifications, roles and responsibilities for primary and regional custodians. At this time all seven counties maintain a school district boundary, it is not know at what accuracy, data attributes or completeness the files are in, staff will be making an attempt to do a data comparison assessment by the end of January. Harper briefed the team on the primary custodian roles which clearly state that the current process of creating/updating school district boundary information lies within the jurisdiction of the county board in Minnesota ((Minn. Stat. § 123A.45, Minn. Stat. § 123A.46, Minn. Stat. § 123A.48). Also the pilot study concluded that the Land Management Information Council should be the regional custodian because in the past LMIC has contracted with CFL and the Office of Legislation to update/maintain the school district boundaries by census block. Member Harper noted that under the responsibilities of the counties, the notification to the regional custodian is provided for when the regional custodian annually contacts the primary custodian for an update. Please change addendum with this update. Member Maeder noted that in the case of number 1, under Regional Custodian identification, she would like the statement to read, In 1990, LMIC was contracted by CFL to produce a state-wide jurisdictional map of school district boundaries by census boundary, it does not currently maintain this data set. Under number 2, it should read change standards of mapping to entail providing a regional school district boundary set at parcel level in the metro area, in the past it was maintained at the census block level. Add Number 4 that states, the regional custodian is the compiler of county data sets, no jurisdictional changes in boundaries will be performed by the regional custodian. The MetroGIS Policy Advisory Team, CFL and LMIC well need to negotiate the duties performed and finalize responsibilities as stated.

Member Craig motioned to accept the agenda item with the aforementioned changes, Member Gelbmann seconded.

*Motion carried.*

### **6a. Information Items**

Member Maxwell stated previously during the acceptance of the agenda, that the following information items are for your information only and will not be discussed today.

### **7. Next Meeting**

Next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 14<sup>th</sup> (time/location - TBD)

*Member Craig noted to staff this is the same date as the Governors Council meeting.*

*Meeting rescheduled to March 29, 2001, City of St. Paul (1-4 p.m.)*

### **8. Adjourn**

Maxwell moved and Moulder seconded to adjourn at 11:45 a.m.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

Prepared by,

Theresa K. Foster  
MetroGIS Technical Coordinator