

## Maine Library of Geographic Information Board Meeting

Date: Wednesday, 16 February 2011

Time: 10:00 AM to 12:30 PM

Place: 19 Union St., room 110, State Planning Office, Augusta

### AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Approval of the 19 January 2011 meeting minutes – Chair
3. Format of minutes – detailed vs. limited to record of votes, with notes as supplemental reference document
4. ESRI Book Update – Chair
5. Strategic Plan Implementation Groups
  - Coordination & Communication – Mike Smith, Dan Walters
  - GeoParcels – Nancy Armentrout
  - Education & Training – Tora Johnson (or designated Board member)
  - Geospatial Data – Joseph Young (or designated Board member)  
*Change in Chair from Joe to having Co-chairs Dan & Nancy*
6. Committee Reports
  - Financial Committee – Chair
  - Policy & Marketing Committee – Vinton Valentine
  - Technical Committee – Christopher Kroot  
*Status of GeoPortal*  
*GeoPortal Hosting Solutions*  
*Where to go from here?*  
*Who will host? Univ. Lib.? Regional/Planning Commission? MMA?*  
*How much is MEGIS currently spending? (time/money)*  
*Who to call for tech support?*
7. Guest Comments
8. Recommendations for Next Agenda

**NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING:** Wednesday, 16 March 2011, 10:00 AM – 12:30 PM, 19 Union St.,  
Augusta

**MINUTES**  
**Maine GeoLibrary Board Meeting**  
**02/16/2011**

- Call to Order - 10:00 AM
- Attendance:
  - Present in Person
    - Gretchen Heldmann - Chair
    - Dan Cocker
    - Judy Colby George
    - Steve Weed
    - Nancy Armentrout
    - Mike Smith
    - Christopher Kroot (arrived 11:40 a.m.)
    - Jon Giles
    - Vinton Valentine
    - Aimee Dubois
    -
  - By Phone
    - Bill Hanson – Co - Chair
    - Ken Murchison
    - Greg Davis
    - Dan Walters
  - Guests:
    - Brian Stearns
    - Joe Young – Maine State Planning Office

**Minutes from meeting of January 19, 2011**

- Spelling error corrected PostGRIS to 'PostGRES'
- Motion to approve as amended Dan Coker
  - Motion to second the approval, Bill Hanson

**Vote Unanimous in Favor of Approval of the Minutes as drafted.**

**Discussion on format of minutes – detailed vs. limited to record of votes, with notes as supplemental reference document**

Nancy would like to see any decisions recorded, whether it was a vote or not, and capture action items as well. Context of decisions is very important Mike pointed out. Bill has concern about other folks reading minutes from the website. Aimee made a motion to

keep to action items, votes, decisions, July 2<sup>nd</sup>. Bill questioned if we have to box ourselves in with such a rule, if we want to change decisions we would have to formally move second and have a vote. Steve suggested maybe making that motion a minimum? The general consensus was to go with minimum and play it out the next few months and see how it goes. Aimee withdrew the motion with permission from Judy. Steve pointed out that our minimum is what's required anyway, so if we want to do more, then we can do that.

### **ESRI Book**

No new information was available, still waiting for response from the author Cory Fleming. A rough outline has been drafted. (Cory is a Senior Project Manager at International City/County Management Association.)

 **NO ACTION on this matter consensus was to table until further notice.**

### **Strategic Plan Implementation Workgroups**

- **Coordination and Communication – Dan Walters and Michael Smith’s report is summarized below:**
  - MMA Technical Conference - March 3, 2011–
    - Presentations Scheduled:
      - Joe Young – Floodplain Mapping and LiDAR,
      - Dan – Statewide Ortho Imagery Proposal,
      - Nancy Armentrout participating on GeoParcels panel
  - Maine County Commissioners Association Meeting – March 9, 2011
    - Dan and Joe going to discuss Statewide Ortho Imagery Program
  - Cumberland County Town Managers – March 10, 2011
    - Dan and Joe going to discuss Statewide Ortho Imagery Program
  - USGS ARRA LiDAR Acquisition Update
    - Mike notes some communication about LiDAR project, specifically how to deal with water bodies, how to deliver that, discussed among all states that are participating. We don't have a tidal coordinated LiDAR collect, so whenever they fly, that's the tide cycle we get. For island processing, we provided them a shape file of islands which is just USGS topo, and not all those are islands – they are low tide islands b/c they didn't show up on LiDAR at high tide. There were some islands that showed up that were not on footprint. Any island 1ac or larger was going to be mapped with LiDAR, anything smaller than 1ac not part of DEM but will be part of LAS files. Any island in footprint but found underwater is not an island. How to deal with water surface? Original spec said to flatten out surface, but oddities occur in tidal collection, so some are mid tide, high tide, low tide, etc, so it's hard to flatten. The contractor will do a bare water collect, so DEM will show waves in it. Break lines can be used to flatten after the fact. Any salt water return categorized class 19 saltwater and kept in elevation model. Freshwater

returns flattened and categorized class 9 DEM. How were breaklines developed? They are manually digitized using aerial photos and intensity data from LiDAR. Did they take photos while collecting? No, using NAIP and GeoLib photos.

- **ACTION ITEMS**

- None

- **GeoParcels** – Nancy Armentrout

Still working on putting MMA panel session together, asked 6 more to participate, 3 have agreed so far. Jon Giles suggested Sarah Tucker of Town of Bethel, can speak to parcel mapping in small town. Aimee had a couple decline, and was surprised.

Nancy thought the final CAT grant report was due by 3/15. Michael offered a slight correction, grant application has due date of 3/7 in the award letter even though we put 3/15 in grant app. However, they build in a 90 day grace period, so we have until 6/7 in all reality. Working out some roughness in draft, particularly in maintenance process, all will be discussed at GeoParcels meeting after this mtg.

The project has three deliverables:

- Final Report,
- Hancock Cty parcels, and
- A GeoParcels viewer.

They are about 6 weeks behind on parcels. Mike made exec decision to make viewer later after learning of June deadline, so viewer will be April or May, and it will be a better application at that point. Tora needs to submit report as well as parcels, so it can be incorporated into final report. Mike isn't concerned about it but Nancy is – a rough outline would work. Final vision of viewer is what? Mike says a couple different visions – yes, in Hancock, would link to deeds b/c they are online, but otherwise may not be that ideal due to problems with linking deeds. Mike is confident the project will be complete by June 7<sup>th</sup> as he sees no reason to request an extension beyond that date. An extension would give us license to procrastinate.

**Education & Training** – Tora Johnson (or designated Board member)

- Vinton Valentine reported for Tora.
  - Maine laptop program – the image is being created and it was decided that given QGIS quirks still out there and with fixes forthcoming in July that the program should be delayed until later this year. Tora's class exercises currently focus on Google Earth and MEGIS site working with a few teachers already using the laptop program.
  - Due to low participation in past years, the student poster competition is not being held.
  - Municipal Applications of GIS class is currently ongoing, 15 people in class, and is going well.
  - ATE Grant - using the remaining money, planning has begun for a 4th Annual Conference for GIS Educators in Maine to be held Friday, 18 November 2011

- EMCC is offering its first GIS course this fall, KVCC, SMCC, and WCCC will be or are currently offering courses.
- Some reorganization at USM regarding a master's program in GIS.
- National GeoTech Center for Excellence, in concert with US Dept of Labor, came up with new job categories and competency model for geospatial skills for Analysts, Specialists, etc and salary ranges throughout the US.
- **GeoSpatial Workgroup-** Joseph Young (or designated Board member)
  - The Chair announced that Joe has to step down as chair, he will be serving on Mapping and Standards Policy Committee of the National Association of Floodplain Managers, cannot keep up as Chair of GeoSpatial Data. It was suggested that Dan and Nancy share leadership as co-chairs. Nancy declined the appointment as co-chair but will continue with parcel and roads committee work she is presently engaged with. Dan agreed to take the Chair position, his work on land use code committee is winding down so he can replace that responsibility with this. Mike will help as much as he can. Vinton asked about others on committee that might step up? Maybe email members of committee and see if anyone is interested. Nancy agreed that was a good idea, try to broaden participation. Joe noted it would be nice if one of the private sector people stepped up.
    - Lidar acquisition? See Joe's handout (attached), he is not married to \$15K suggested amount. Mike noted we have about \$33,000 with some other encumbered by contract not yet spent. Mike suggested we have three big spending priorities for remaining bond funds:
      - lidar project                   \$10,000
        - For Data Acquisition projects in the past, small amounts of seed money, has worked out and turned into a big project (current lidar project is example). The proposed allocations above would encumber all of bond funds. Aimee pointed out that this may help the Board get more money. Potential partners for LiDAR acquisition could be FEMA, USGS, or the counties. If we put money on the table, it's more appealing to other groups to match the amount. Dan Coker asked if there is a specific LiDAR acquisition proposal. Joe responded, not a specific one yet, but he is working on one. USGS Partnership Grant applications need minimal detail, but sufficient to provide basic proposal and allows for working with whoever shows up as a partner. For FEMA coastal area watersheds are first priority to fill out what's currently being collected; could also do county-based fill-out. Going to continue York and Cumberland County mapping, and apply Bob Gerber methodology. Questions about quality of data and how it was applied in

that scenario. Judy has towns calling her asking if they are supposed to use those data or not? Proposal could be based on 8-digit HUC or county, needs to be large enough scale to make sense economically in order to get \$275/sq. mi price.

- ortho program, \$10,000
- Portal \$ remainder of Board Bond Funds
  - Michael believes about \$12,000 is needed to continue support of portal for three more years. Judy questions not leaving enough money for portal, and we've spent so much on it, do we have enough? What if something breaks and we don't have money to fix it? Mike states he needs Christopher here to speak to that, but something like that would be specified in contract. He doesn't think any upgrades would happen if everything is working. Mike suggested we agree informally to wait for Christopher to hear about portal first before deciding anything.
- ARRA Northeast Lidar Update and Usage questions: Aimee/Scarborough would like to create 2ft contours for town from the lidar data, asked Jon Giles for ballpark budget number. What are deliverables? How far is classification going to be taken? How many tiles, tile size? It's 1500sq m, based on National Grid, some portion of those grid cells. Can't give details of classification details, but can tease out first and last returns, ground and water separate, anything big enough to be flattened would show up (rivers, not necessarily smaller streams). Majority of users relate to 2ft contours than DEMs. What would cost be per sq mi or whatever, to get the 2ft contours created? Pool resources to get 2ft contours similar to orthos or lidar. Present the info in a way towns would understand so they can decide to budget or not – no, not necessarily to work with adjacent towns. Info sheet would have a range of the price to get the lidar converted to 2ft contours. Would need to be smooth, not choppy lines. Gretchen pointed out storm water implications and could get sub, sub, sub, watershed for impaired streams. Jon stated could also do four or five ft contours and still gets good results. Maybe do session at fall MMA conference? Mike suggested it's a great opportunity for local Maine geospatial companies to do their own marketing and advertising about what they offer to convert these data. Joe suggested a fact sheet about what was created as deliverables through the lidar project be put together. Mike didn't think the GeoLib should put together a price sheet, that's not their place. Joe asked if ARRA and FEMA datasets would be combined – no. Would cost more to try and mesh the two and make them match. Comes down to a town's RFP spec. Judy stated it is an opportunity for the GeoLib to promote itself to the towns and give them stuff instead of asking them to submit data to us. Jon stated it's

important to keep our name/brand with the lidar data so the towns understand it's a good project from state-leveraged monies and regional/fed coordination. Mike suggested technical session at summer MEGUG meeting. Judy stated the title needs to be catchy! One-pager is needed about this lidar project and what can be done with the products. Mike volunteers to the one-pager, and will work with the vendors on the board to put together some rough concepts for the one-pager. Mike suggested some money be set aside for doing mailers to towns.

- It was suggested that information on progress of the ARRA LiDAR project should be posted on the website. Michael announced that InforME has given the go ahead, and it's up at [maine.gov/megis](http://maine.gov/megis) ---- Mike needs to write Lidar update though and will do so by end of week. The Chair noted that the links still point to the old map server test site, so he needs to fix all links also.
- Steve said Maine Revenue starting May 1<sup>st</sup> is launching online RETT site, he has been asked to beta test it starting May 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Gretchen mentioned surveying day, doing another MEGUG/MSLS joint meeting, etc. On a related note, Aimee has done maps before for law enforcement purposes, and recently got one that asked for a letter accompanying it to certify the accuracy level. Found a sample letter from another town claiming that the parcels were accurate to within two feet – she was astounded. She wrote something totally different that didn't actually speak to the accuracy because neither she nor Sewall (that does their parcel updates) was comfortable speaking to that. She felt there needed to be more discussion with surveying community about how to answer something like that. Jon asked if a GIS person could certify something like according to law or not – he thinks only surveyors or engineers could do that by law. There is no clear line, so this would be a good topic to discuss at a joint MEGUG/MSLS meeting. All present thought a joint meeting was a good idea.
- Dan Walter's counterpart in Mass/RI/CT retired, and positions will not be filled, Dan has been assigned to work with Mass and RI. The person that covers VT/NH is taking CT.
- Judy questioned if GeoLib should have some comment on Gov's suggestion to not collect data on private landowner land without their consent? How does this relate to remote sensing, or was the intent for identifying vernal pools, deer yards, etc.? Wording was broad – can't collect any data on private land that would lead to zoning or regulation. Mike stated that CA wealthy residents sued to have their properties cut out and they lost, Sioux Nation in SD did same thing and lost. There are questions surrounding what it is applied to.

- **NO ACTION**

## Committee Reports

### Financial

- See above discussion – Mike had recent spreadsheet.

### Technical Committee

- Mike briefed Christopher on what we had previously discussed regarding the portal, lidar, ortho, money, etc. Is the \$12K and remaining change enough for the portal for three years? What do they need to “do” to meet their mission statement? Mike stated the last contract was three years of hosting and the hardware for \$12K. Christopher suggested adding in rest of GeoNode part of suite of software. World Bank funded a project last year that integrated open source products, which provides functionality where you don’t have to do any custom programming. Look at existing functionality that is somewhere else that we could add in without having to program it. After that, look at what to custom-build for things that don’t exist. Or build in custom tools for little cost. Dan Walter’s take on partnership funds as it relates to what to spend on portal? Mike responded that portal needs to be a priority because the Board has already committed to it. Christopher thinks GeoNode would be of great interest to University, thinks he can get answer fairly quick regarding costs, estimates, etc for coming few years. There are valid research projects that meet their criteria and he will find an answer ASAP.

Gretchen asked when all the updates would be done to the test server and be moved to the production. Christopher wasn’t sure, didn’t have a date. Estimate right now is one month and then we can go into our testing mode, so probably another month after that to accommodate testing.

#### *GeoPortal Hosting Solutions*

*Where to go from here?*

*Who will host? Univ. Lib.? Regional/Planning Commission? MMA?*

*How much is MEGIS currently spending? (time/money)*

*Who to call for tech support?*

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

-  Monday 2/28 1pm conf call to vote on how to spend the money. Info will be emailed ASAP.
  -  Christopher will talk discuss portal development progress with USM staff that are doing the development and the folks doing the hosting (separate) to see what the costs would be.
- **POLICY COMMITTEE**
    - Vinton has no policy updates. Judy is on Policy Committee, with Nancy, Bill, Vinton.

Adjourned 12:15 AM

I encourage the Board to consider setting aside \$15,000 to provide matching funds for a LiDAR acquisition project that would achieve the full acquisition and basic processing of data for to meet USGS standards for inclusion in its CLICK data center. These funds would be used to submit an application to the USGS for partnership funding of \$150,000 for LiDAR data acquisition and processing for a \$325,000 project @ \$275/mile for a total data acquisition area of about 1,200 square miles. The specific project would be determined through the solicitation of contributing partners.

The table below shows potential projects based on watersheds, which in many cases conform loosely to county lines. From a floodplain mapping perspective watersheds are good projects in that they encourage FEMA to do a complete remapping process based on new topographic data. We have informal word that we will begin “discovery” for the rest of Maine’s coastline this summer. This is the first step towards remapping the rest of Maine’s coastline. The amount of new mapping inland will be dependent upon availability of high resolution topographic data.

**Potential LiDAR Acquisition Projects**

<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Square Miles Needed (est)</b>	<b>LiDAR Estimate</b>	<b>Primary Counties Involved</b>
Piscataqua/Salmon Falls - Maine Portion	426	\$ 117,260	York
Presumpscot	1,201	\$ 330,150	Cumberland, Oxford
Saco	1,051	\$ 289,120	York
St Croix*	612	\$ 168,216	Washington
St George Sheepscot (Midcoastal)	982	\$ 270,173	Sagadahoc, Lincoln, Knox
Maine Coastal(Downeast)*	1,278	\$ 351,425	Waldo, Hancock, Washington

\* Doesn't include unorganized territories

Author: Joe Young, MSPO Floodplain Program-February 16, 2011