

Maine Library of Geographic Information Board Meeting

Date: Wednesday May 20th, 2009

Time: 10:00 AM to 12:30 PM

Place: Burton M. Cross Building, Conference Room 105.

AGENDA

1. Approval of the April 15th meeting minutes – Chair
2. CAT 3 Project – Project Team
3. LIDAR Regional Project – Mike Smith
4. Subcommittee Reports
 - Financial – Larry Harwood
 - Policy & Marketing
GeoPortal System Management
 - Technical
Status of the GeoPortal – Mike Smith, Christopher Kroot

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: Wednesday June 17th, 2009, 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., Burton M. Cross Building, Conference Room 105.

Meeting Minutes

Present

Nancy Armentrout
Michael Smith
Greg Copeland
Gretchen Heldmann
Ken Murchison (by phone)
Paul Hoffman
Dan Coker, Co-Chair
Stu Rich (by phone)
Jon Giles (by phone)
Aimee Dubois
Christopher Kroot

Staff

Larry Harwood

Visitors

Vinton Valentine, University Southern Maine (USM), Maine GIS Users Group (MEGUG)
Rich Sutton, James W. Sewall Project Team (by phone)
Dan Walters, US Geological Survey (USGS) (by phone)

The meeting was called to order at 10:04. Dan Coker, Co-Chair presiding.

1. Approval of the April 15th meeting minutes

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Greg Copeland moved to approve the minutes as written. Gretchen Heldmann seconded. The Board voted 8¹ in favor, none opposed, the Chair abstaining. The motion carried.

The Chair moved item # 2 on the agenda, the CAT 3 Project, to last place on the agenda to accommodate schedules.

3. LiDAR Regional Project

Mike Smith reported that he, Joe Young, a Senior Planner for the State Planning Office's Floodplain Management Program, and Dan Walters, USGS Maine Liaison, attended a meeting in Woods Hole, MA hosted by the Northeast Oceans Regional Council (NROC) to document LiDAR uses and requirements from regional stakeholders. NROC has identified needs specific to their programs in the coastal zone. There was considerable interest in and support of the proposed regional coastal LiDAR collection project.

Mike and Dan also attended the National Digital Orthoimagery Program (NDOP) committee meeting in Concord NH. The NDOP committee consists of representatives from federal agencies who use digital orthoimagery. They are responsible for establishing federal standards and overseeing NDOP activities.

Partnering with states for orthoimagery is an important component of the program, so the committee holds their meetings at varying locations so that state officials can attend and present their needs to the committee.

Sometime in June the USGS will be issuing an RFP for LIDAR collection or orthoimagery based on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act stimulus funding. The requirements are not clear, but the program may require a 50% match and be capped at \$500,000

Federal funds notwithstanding, Mike and his New England colleagues have been drawing up contingency plans. First is the 'Coastal Plan' which is as has been proposed so far. This would be flying all the coastal areas of the New England states and producing 1, 2 or 4 foot contours. Second is the "Complete Plan" to do the same for the entire area of all the states. Third is the "Bare Bones Plan" under which the entire states would be flown but contours and other products would not be produced.

Dan Walters reported that there is \$11M available with \$1M earmarked for Alaska primarily because it has not been mapped since statehood in 1959. An additional \$1.2M has been set aside for nationwide science projects. The rest will be available through the Cooperative Agreements Program (CAP) grants.

Q: The Bare Bones proposal would cover all the states?

A: Yes, all the area in ME, NH, VT, MA, RI and CT.

Q: What sorts of costs are involved in your plans?

A: It is very preliminary but we are figuring about \$3M for the Coastal Plan and \$22M for the Complete Plan. The thinking is to go ahead with the Coastal Plan if at all possible, even if we do not get any 'stimulus' money.

Q: Is the "LiDAR bond" still a possibility?

A: Yes it is and that is an excellent point. According to Joe Young at the State Planning Office the bond is still being considered. It is being actively supported by two legislators, representatives Dawn Hill, District 19 and Edward Legg, District 141.

¹ Due to Board members arriving at or departing from the meeting, the total number of votes will vary.

4. Subcommittee Reports

Financial

Larry Harwood presented the month's financial spreadsheet. There were no changes from the last report; the Board has \$42,370.50 remaining un-appropriated.

At the last meeting there had been a question on the amount appropriated for ESRI work on the GeoPortal. Larry reported that he had gone thru the meeting minutes from the beginning of the ESRI involvement in the GeoPortal and could find no mention of increasing the ESRI contract to \$14,000. There was a brief period in which some Board members reviewed together whatever relevant documents had been brought to the meeting. The additional \$4,000 expenditure could not be identified.

Mike Smith moved to allocate an additional \$4,000 to the GeoPortal project contingent upon research into the records to determine if the original ESRI contract for portal customization was funded at only \$10,000. Aimee Dubois seconded. The Board voted 8 in favor, none opposed, the Chair abstaining. The motion carried.

Policy and Marketing

Marilyn Lutz was not present and none were prepared to discuss the *GeoPortal System Management* policy. The Chair tabled this to the next meeting.

Technical

Mike Smith and Christopher Kroot reported on the status of the GeoPortal. Since the last meeting, they have been to USM to view the work to date and talk with those involved. Compared to the "functional Specifications" list – the Scope of Work - it could be said that all the Priority One functions are working. The functions can be divided into three categories.

1. Currently working functions
2. Functions not yet available, but which **can** be created with the existing funding.
3. Functions not yet available, which **cannot** be created with the existing funding

They specifically listed these functions as existing or obtainable.

- an encrypted login page for security
- the ability to set up groups with varying levels of access (administrators, publishers, etc.)
- a map viewer
- searching by metadata
- the so called "clip, zip and ship" of data in a selected rectangular area
- the loading of shape files and a means to view them

Q: Will the new orthoimagery display show the tiles as does the current viewer?

A: Yes, it will be similar to the Aerial Photography Viewer

Q: Will the date of photography be on the tiles?

A: No, because there is no sure way to know the exact date of any given orthoimagery tile. The tiles are made up of parts of the scanned aerial negatives called chips. The image chips are selected, put together in a mosaic, orthorectified and color balanced. One tile may be made up from air photos taken on different days, months or possibly even years in some cases. That being said we can state that a given tile probably was flown in a certain year and a range of months.

Mike also reported that he has made progress with the Web Mapping Service for the Geolibrary orthoimagery. This will eventually replace the Aerial Photography Viewer. The problem was with the Maine State Plane projection measurement units. There was a short technical discussion of the state plane projection in Maine, the units used, the zones used and some of the common misconceptions on these topics.

Q: What is the status of the contract with USM?

A: Nothing has been signed yet. The paperwork is getting done. We have, as already noted, been working with USM on the “functional specifications” spreadsheet so we are ahead of the paperwork so to speak.

Q: Was anything ever done with the parcel viewer?

A: No, the Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC) found some funding to make their own.

Q: Could the LURC parcel viewer be generalized to work with Geolibrary parcels.

A: Almost certainly, there is nothing in the unorganized parcel data greatly different from the Geolibrary parcels, or any others.

There was more discussion on the portal Scope of Work and how that will be used to judge the success of the portal. Some were of the opinion that the entire Board was too unwieldy to judge and vote on the portal’s functionality. Others, especially some technical committee members, were concerned about bringing a “done deal” on the portal to the board without a vote.

Greg Copeland moved to send the Scope of Work to the Technical Committee and give them the authority to execute the same with USM without having to return to the Board for a vote. Mike Smith seconded. The Board voted 9 in favor, none opposed, the Chair abstaining. The motion carried.

Christopher Kroot, Chair of the Technical Committee asked for an explanation of exactly what the committee was being asked to do. In particular how was the committee to make decisions, by voting for example? After some discussion it was decided that specific language be included in the minutes to make this point clear as follows:

“The Chair of the Technical Committee will send out the Scope of Services matrix via E-mail to the members of the Technical Committee. Members will be asked to comment and respond with a yea or nay vote via E-mail. Members will be given at least 5 business days to review the matrix and respond. A non-response will be counted as a yea and will be so noted in the E-mail from the Chair of the Technical Committee.”

There was further discussion of the portal in particular the timing of its release to the public. Some Board members wanted to see the portal made public as soon as possible because of the long delay. Others felt that the portal should be ready in all respects before its debut to the public. It was explained that the portal was still running on development hardware and that an encrypted login was needed before any public reveal.

Gretchen Heldmann moved to have the Technical Committee develop a time line for the deployment of the GeoPortal and report back at the next Board meeting. Greg Copeland seconded. The Board voted 9 in favor, none opposed, the Chair abstaining. The motion carried.

2. CAT 3 Project

Nancy Armentrout wished to discuss three Integrated Land Records Information System (ILRIS) documents. The first was the *Conceptual Framework* which had been discussed at the last meeting and was an attachment to

the April minutes. It was hoped that this could be approved at today's meeting. The other two, available as copies in the meeting packet. Were the *Functional Specifications* and the *Promotion Plan*. After today's discussion and subsequent changes if needed it was hoped these could be approved in the June meeting.

There was a short discussion of the Conceptual Framework. Since last reviewed there have not been many comments and the changes have been few and incremental. Rich Sutton described some of the obstacles, the lack of funding at the registries and differences in registry procedures. Also the different registries have different vendors and the vendors have different software, procedures, etc. It is however important to maintain 'forward motion', keep up Geolibary support and start making municipal/registry data – at whatever level - available on the GeoPortal.

Christopher Kroot moved to accept the Conceptual Framework and to empower the CAT 3 Project Team to make additional changes as needed. Ken Murchison seconded. The Board voted 10 in favor, none opposed, the Chair abstaining. The motion carried.

The ensuing discussion focused mostly the Functional Specification and the Promotion Plan but also branched into their connections to the GeoPortal and future Board actions. The main points are summarized as follows.

- Uniform services provided by the registries would be ideal but the idea cannot get past the problems of funding and local customs.
- What is needed is both *system* and a *process*. A system that would provide the functionality we are looking for and then a process to move the towns and registries into that system.
- Non-GIS people need to be involved. A good example working with the Property Tax School. (Rich will be at the next Property Tax School at Colby College this August).
- What the non-GIS people really need is a very simple map browser not a full blown web mapping service.
- The GeoPortal can function as a parcel viewer, displaying the parcels and information about the parcels right on a web browser. It can be part of the Promotion Plan.

Q: Wouldn't people be posting non-standard data? Is that a problem?

A: Not if they have metadata, which they need to have in order to load their data. We can also set up sub-groups who can see only certain kinds of data.

- Town line locations are always an issue. If those could be addressed somehow, that would be a way to get funding.
- The state legislature has not been mentioned yet. If there a role for them in these issues we should address that.
- It will be important to have these plans and systems in place in the event that money actually does become available.
- There are maybe 150 towns that will probably never have a digital parcel system of their own. If we could offer them a free, web based storage, display and editing they might participate.
- Rich will provide the Board with a link to the most up to date versions of the ILRIS documents.

Discussion concluded, the Chair asked if there were any further business. There was none.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:14.