

## MD iMap Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Place: Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE): Terra Conference Room (Baltimore, Maryland)

Date: 09/28/09

Time: 1:00 PM – 3:08 PM

Attendees: *This information was not recorded for this meeting.*

Summary: *The following minutes cover the notes that were taken during the MD iMap Technical Committee meeting that was held at location, date and time period noted above. This document is published for reference purposes only, and any questions as to its contents must be directed to either the Maryland State Geographic Information Officer (GIO) or the co-chairs of the MD iMap Technical Committee.*

### AGENDA:

- Review of September 8, 2009 Meeting Minutes
- Discussion and Review of Draft Memo for Executive Committee Re: GIS Subject Matter Stat
- Framework Layer Prioritization
- Subcommittee and Working Groups – Reports / Discussion
  - Data
  - Application
  - Marketing / Outreach
  - Infrastructure
  - State Boundary
- Next Steps / Action Items

### MEETING NOTES:

- **TOPIC #1:** Review of September 8, 2009 Meeting Minutes
  - *No comments / updates given.*
- **TOPIC #2:** Discussion and Review of Draft Memo for Executive Committee Re: GIS Subject Matter Stat
  - The memo will go to the Executive Committee for review and comment.
    - We need to have additional supporting material within this document; i.e., where we are with things (infrastructure, data, etc.) to round out the document.
  - “Impediments for Progress”
    - Update to “Opportunities for Progress”
  - Move MOU and GIO sections above the “Impediments” section.
  - Need to update the text to be as explicit as possible in order to enable non-GIS users to understand the Memo.
    - Need to reformat the document to be more of a persuasive document; i.e., *“These are our issues and this is how we recommend we resolve them.”*
  - Disparity in Basemaps and Thematic Layers (“Current Item 1-B”)
    - *Need to add-in content to explain that 90% of the work should be in analysis and 10% should be in distributing your programs / applications.*
  - Update the following sentence to be clearer (Section 1-A):
    - *“Establishing authoritative, standardized base data layers is critical to ensure the construction of thematic spatial data occurs across one commonly accepted foundation.”*
  - Relationship Diagram
    - Possibly add-in arrows to “simply” the diagram. – Kaushik

- Brooks needs to make any updates noted here today to the Visio document provided by Doug.
      - Update formatting and structure so that the contents match the latest version of the memo.
  - Resources: Engaging Other State Agencies (Section)
    - ITEM A:
      - Need to re-word to note that we need to get State Agencies that are currently not involved with MD iMap to get involved with MD iMap.
    - ITEM B:
      - Need to have a business plan in place and note that this plan will be a two-way street for those agencies involved.
    - ITEM C:
      - Updates have been sent to Graham for incorporation in to the Memo.
    - ITEM D:
      - ...
  - Infrastructure:
    - ITEM A:
      - “These are the things that we need to address that the current infrastructure does not address.” – Doug
      - “We also need to adhere to Maryland IT securities...”
    - ITEM B:
      - The text needs to state that *the execution of an enterprise license agreement with ESRI needs to take place.*
    - ITEM C:
      - Compare to: *the State has gone to a consistent look-and-feel for websites. Even though there is some flexibility to how things work and what is shown on each site, the base template is still the same.*
        - Michael Bentivegna noted that this should only apply to applications that are “public facing”; i.e., **INTERNET**, not **INTRANET**.
  - MOU
    - *(Comments have been made and submitted to Graham for incorporation in to the latest version of the memo).*
    - Move this section to the beginning of the memo.
  - ASSEST GIO AUTHORITY
    - There currently is NOT a clear mandate of the GIO’s roles and responsibilities. The Governor needs to outline the authority of the GIO.
  - UPDATING THE DOCUMENT (REVISIONS)
    - Graham and Kevin will revise the document accordingly.
    - Brooks Weaver and CGIS want to review the document, as well.
      - CGIS will focus on adding in content for the security aspect of the document and Brooks will review the document in general.
    - The document needs to be delivered to the Governor’s Office for revision in to the “Stat” formatting two (2) weeks before the meeting; i.e., **the document needs to be delivered by 10/01/09.**
  - Attendance to 10/14/09 Meeting
    - Graham will follow-up with Lindsay in order to see who is actually invited, and he will inform the group accordingly.
- **TOPIC #3: Framework Layer Prioritization (Document)**
  - Excel spreadsheet was generate by Jeremy (CGIS)
    - Generated the list of layers at a Data Subcommittee.

- The “Red (*value=1*) – Yellow (*value=2*) – Green (*value=3*)” approach should be taken in order to show the reality of where the datasets stand in regards to accuracy. – Doug
  - We also need to document what standards are followed per dataset.



- **Need to define what each category is** and how it should be measured in order to have a consistent means of measurement per category.
- The submitting agency would be responsible for filling out the three (3) categories.
- Also, how is the agency defining the three (3) topics below?? (*These topics are defined within sections of the FGDC metadata*).
  - Accuracy
  - Completeness
  - Currency
- Data Quality
  - Data that is coming from a third-party, there are some discrepancies with the data. How are the discrepancies reported to the data owner? – Kaushik
    - Is there a feedback mechanism with MD iMap?
      - This “**feedback mechanism**” should be incorporated in to the PORTAL that is currently being developed online.
        - Brooks noted that a subscription system should be generated to keep people informed about updates with datasets.
        - Doug noted that this system, as well as, the system to report errors should already been under review / in consideration by the Application Subcommittee.
- **TOPIC #4: Subcommittee and Working Groups – Reports / Discussion**
  - Data (Kevin)
    - Metadata & Fact Sheets
      - Do we really need a “Fact Sheet” for metadata because of the FGDC metadata?
        - Erin Ross (MES) was noted as also have asked this question.
      - Fact Sheets are null and void when it comes to DATA, but not SERVICES. Fact sheets still applies to SERVICES because users will need to have that snapshot of the SERVICE(S).
    - This subcommittee has already sent out an email asking for compliant metadata from all participating agencies.
      - Jeremy (CGIS) will send out a follow-up email notifying those agencies that a FACT SHEET is NOT needed now because that information will be retrieved from the metadata.
    - This subcommittee WILL NOT go out and solicit data from agencies. – Doug
  - Application (Kaushik)
    - Met earlier this month and discussed how to update MMRG to be in ArcGIS Server (w/MD iMAP PORTAL).
      - Both of these items (below) have to be defined before a standard is defined for MD iMap.
        - Who are the users for MMRG?
        - How often is it being used?
      - What type of cost would be involved in migrating the metadata from MMRG to ArcGIS Server? – Kevin (DNR) asked this from CGIS.
  - Marketing / Outreach (Brooks)

- “Selling this to the 24+ state agencies...” (difficult to do)
      - Graham and Brooks need to follow-up with Michael E. (DOIT) on how best to proceed forward.
  - **Infrastructure**
    - Referenced the “GIS Education in the State of Maryland in 2009...” document.
      - Scott will send out an update (with John Hopkins University’s classes) to the group.
    - This document will aide in the effort to look for partners for finding secondary locations for storing GIS datasets / infrastructure.
      - “Are we going to have the high availability sites for if the primary goes down, where will that leave us?” – Doug
    - Security Infrastructure
      - Need to get the funding in place to start to implement this aspect of the infrastructure.
        - The biggest investment will be whoever handles the imagery for the State.
    - Statewide ELA
      - Counties will not be a part of the Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) because ESRI will not allow this to happen. But the University / College ELA will apply to this situation, and Counties will be able to access ArcGIS Server through the University / College ELA.
    - Interest
      - There is definite interest to pursue this issue.
  - **State Boundary**
    - *No comments given...*
- **TOPIC #5: Next Steps / Action Items**
  - MD Executive Committee Meeting (09/30/09 @ DNR)
  - MD Technical Committee Meeting (10/06/09 @ MDE)
  - Graham will update the memo based on the comments received to date:
    - Graham will pass it on to Kevin for review / comment.
    - Michael will update the Security section and forward to Graham.
    - Brooks will update the Visio document and forward to Graham.

---

**-END MEETING-**