

**Washington State E911 Advisory Committee
GIS Subcommittee Meeting**

July 7, 2015
10:00 am – 2:00 pm
Vancouver, WA

1. Call To Order

a. Members Attending in Person:

Craig Larsen, Chair (Lewis County)
Melissa Liebert (Wahkiakum County)
Diane Marks (Kitsap County)
Paul Newman (Clark County), host
Robert Mueller (Snohomish County)
Lynn Palmer, RiverCom (Chelan/Douglas)
Mike Shannon, Spokane County

b. Members Attending by Conference Bridge:

Chuck Buzzard (Pierce County)
Matt Hyatt (Lewis County)
Jason Guthrie, TCOM (Thurston County)
John Joseph, GeoComm
Gerrit Klein, MACC (Grant County, Host)
Mark Janowski, WHITCOM
Cori McKean, KITTCOM (Kittitas County)
Michael Morgan (Franklin County)
Milla Zinski (King County)

2. Introductions: There were seven in attendance in person and seven on the phone bridge.

3. Approval of Minutes: The meeting minutes from the May 7th meeting were approved.

4. Presentation by Intrado (?) No show!

5. Old Business:

a. RFP Template Working Group (Dan, Bob)

- It was thought that a draft was posted on the One Drive by Dan, but no one could find it. We will bring this up at the next meeting.

b. County GIS Status (Dan)

- No significant changes since last report.

c. WA State E911 Coordinating Office (SECO) Participation in OCIO NE Pilot (Dan/Ian)

- No information available since neither Dan nor Ian was on the line. Gerrit asked if there had been any movement forward on the SECO's acquisition of a server for counties to upload

their data. A good question! [NOTE: Should we establish an ArcGIS Online account with membership of only the counties involved with GIS 9-1-1 data?]

- The group agreed that there needs to be one central location for all counties to upload their data. Gerrit mentioned that he thought that Spokane (Ian) offered to host the data on his servers if he were to get compensated. [Cool elevator music chimed in.] John thought you need to have a plan before you start sharing data between. “Bad data against bad data”. How will we build our Spatial Interface (SI) statewide? Everyone should have their data assessed for its quality.
- The group thought that it would be beneficial to hear from Chuck and Lynn about their findings at the Summer Forum. They were able to access about half the counties in the state. They checked topology, attribute assessment, but did not check for edge matching. Only one county didn't have address points in their road centerline file (RCL). Most counties were in good shape and it might be only a few weeks of work to complete what's necessary, such as geocoding their RCL. No one had metadata! Chuck showed a few folks how to develop their metadata and it shouldn't be too difficult to get a statewide schema.
- Even though the NENA Data Standard has not been published, it was felt that we could take the latest draft version. Cathy said there are very few significant changes that would affect our moving forward. The bottom line is to determine which counties will need help the most. [More elevator music, somebody has us on hold]. The establishment of a “GIS Authority” for each county or at least by (HLS) regions. Edge-matching will be critical so counties can back each other up when one PSAP goes down. Each county should compare their county boundaries with that of DNR. If you feel your boundaries are “better” than DNR than it would be their responsibility to make a case with DNR. There was an extensive discussion about boundaries and how they edge-match between counties. How should we resolve any disputes? [Note: Perhaps a verbatim transcription should be made about this discussion since the group talked about many issues that could affect the way we edge-match.]
- Chuck made a motion that we accept DNR's county boundary layer as a basis for our County Boundaries. Bob recommended an amendment that there may be some adjustments due to fire district boundaries and other instances. Milla said that it would not work for King County since they have 12 PSAPs. After much discussion the motion passed.
- There was still some discussion about the establishment of Spatial Interface (SI), formerly known as the Spatial Information Function (SIF), whether there will be just one statewide SI or regional SIs. Mike thought that a primary SI with another as a failover would be the most prudent option. It was agreed that we contact the NG911 Subcommittee about what their plans are for this function. Craig also wanted to make clear that a central repository and the SI are two separate functions. A resounding, YES!
- Craig will check with the SECO to see if there is room on the OneDrive to host all the data from all of the counties. It was believed there was plenty of room on the OneDrive since the vector data doesn't really take that much room. From there, starting with the county boundaries, ensure it edge-matches and you're in agreement with your neighbors. Gerrit, “Habeus Okus”. Have Dan reach out to those counties that are not represented by the GIS Subcommittee. Gerrit recommended that we take 30 minutes (or more?) to review data.
- Once Ian joined the call he filled us in about the Northeast Counties Pilot Project and some of the boundary issues they are having between Spokane and Stevens Counties.

6. Reports:

a. **Advisory Committee** (Craig) – Nothing significant to report.

b. **Policy Subcommittee** (Craig) - Nothing to report.

c. Next Generation Subcommittee (N/A) - Nothing significant to report.

d. RFI Responder Presentations (Cathy?)

- Cathy was not available, but others chimed in about what they saw and heard during several of the online presentations and demos. Bob said he would be hard pressed to choose one over another since they all do pretty much the same tasks.

7. New Business:

a. Imagery Acquisition Work Group (Ian Von Essen)

- Ian has been reaching out to several imagery vendors with specific requirements. The requirements were that the imagery had to be 2014 or newer, it had to exist or existing soon, 12 inches or better resolution and it would be available online or as a hardcopy product by county in a compressed format. The three were Bing, Google and NAIP which will be flown this year by Hexagon (Vaultus). Pictometry was also contacted, but could not provide a hardcopy version to us. He busy getting quotes from the three.
- Google's imagery is 2014 or newer and is constantly being updated. Any government entity or business doing work for a government would have access. The Google cost would be \$960,000 statewide for 6-inch resolution. Hexagon costs were \$652,000 for statewide imagery. Stand alone products are in Web Mercator projection and standard JPEG 2000 format. Ian is now working to get price per square mile.

b. GIS/MSAG Workshop (Group Discussion)

- Chuck and Lynn reported earlier in the meeting and found it to be very fruitful. Data can now be uploaded to the One Drive in a folder called **County Data**.

c. NG911 GIS Workflow Document (Chuck)

d. GIS/MSAG Workshop (Group Discussion)

- Topics include location, the specific venue, a one day or two day? Lynn said that Chuck and she will brainstorm some ideas about hands-on classes. An advanced session would include Python, using geodatabases and more advances editing. Contractors tend to be too expensive for many smaller counties.
- In Dan's absence, Melissa said that the Sun Mountain Lodge had been contacted as a potential venue, but he did not have a specific date. Lynn asked about the possibility of renting laptops with software loaded, similar to what the Confluence Technology Center in Wenatchee.
- There was discussion about who would need what specific training, the basics and the more advanced topics under the direction of Chuck and Lynn. The specific dates still haven't been determined. Skipping the October GIS Subcommittee meeting are possibilities. Date conflicts exist because of the Spillman User Conference Sept 29 – October 2nd, the NENA Development Conference October 4-7 and the GIS Pro Conference 18-22 October.
- Craig will draft up the agenda items for the August meeting including the status of the ESInet RFP. It was motioned that Dan be "voted off the island" for lack of attendance and taking the RFP Template off the OneDrive.

7. For The Good of the Order:

- Nothing heard.

8. Action Items:

- Put together more concrete information about the GIS/MSAG workshop.(Chuck, Dan, Lynn)

- Send a County Mapping Authority List (Draft) to the GIS Subcommittee. (Dan)
- Create a map showing the imagery status of each county. (Dan)

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting in Spokane, August 13th (10:00 – 14:00).
[1620 N. Rebecca Ave, Spokane, WA].

Washington State E911 Advisory Committee

GIS Subcommittee Meeting

May 7, 2015

10:00 am – 2:00 pm

Pasco, WA

1. Call To Order

a. Members Attending in Person:

Ivar Husa, SECOMM (Benton County)
Gerrit Klein, MACC (Grant County, Host)
Craig Larsen, Chair (Lewis County)
Michael Morgan (Franklin), host
Robert Mueller (Snohomish County)
Lynn Palmer, RiverCom (Chelan/Douglas)
Mike Shannon, Spokane County

b. Members Attending by Conference Bridge:

Chuck Buzzard (Pierce County)
Jason Guthrie, TCOM (Thurston County)
Matt Hyatt (Lewis County)
Khalid Khan (King County)
Melissa Liebert (Wahkiakum County)
Andy Malchert (Grays Harbor County)
Cori McKean, KITTCOM (Kittitas County)
Cathy Udenberg (Columbia County)
Ian Von Essen, (Spokane County)
Milla Zinski, (King County)

c. State Office in Person:

Dan Miller

2. Introductions: There were eight in attendance in person and 10 on the phone bridge.

3. Approval of Minutes: The meeting minutes for the April 16th meeting were approved.

4. Old Business:

a. RFP Template Working Group (Dan, Robert)

- The working group did meet via teleconference. Bob Mueller provided some insight on the process they went through in Snohomish County for their RFQ that was published in 2009. He mentioned that it has still taken them a long time to get their data ready and the maintenance continues.
- More details on the purposes of this RFP Template were mentioned during the last GIS Subcommittee meeting. (See the minutes from the March 16th meeting)

b. County GIS Status (Dan)

- Not much change from the last status report.
- Ian suggested that the State Office needed a timeline (tied to the ESInet RFP).
- Several comments were made about data standards, edge-matching with your neighboring counties.
- A motion was made by Gerrit Klein and seconded by Lynn Palmer to have all counties/PSAPs push forward with the GIS Transition Plan to be completed no later than June 30th, 2016. It was approved with a unanimous vote. Ivar suggested a working group to come up with a standards document. Those that volunteered are Ivar Husa and Michael Morgan. Others?

c. WA State E911 Coordinating Office (SECO) Participation in OCIO NE Pilot (Dan)

- We are engaged! Involves Ferry, Lincoln, Pend Oreille, Spokane and Stevens Counties working with the state OCIO and a few other state agencies.

5. Reports:

a. Advisory Committee (Craig/Dan) – Nothing significant to report.

b. Policy Subcommittee (Craig/Dan)

- Nothing significant to report. There was a short discussion about having the other vendors be given a chance to present their RFI response for those interested. Cathy will follow up on this.

c. Next Generation Subcommittee (N/A)

- Nothing significant to report.

6. New Business:

a. Summer Forum Presentation/Workshop (Chuck & Lynn)

- Chuck and Lynn have four counties that have asked to have their data checked. Anyone else interested needs to get their data to Chuck and Lynn ASAP. [Note: as of June 18 there were ~15 counties that had uploaded their data to the One Drive.]
- Dan mentioned what has been planned related to GIS at the Washington State APCO - NENA 2015 Public Safety Communications Conference, A.K.A. Summer Forum. Kathy Liljequist from GeoComm will once again bring her PowerPoint road show to talk about NG911 and GIS.
- It was suggested we research how we would fund an event like this, especially for those that have difficulty acquiring travel funds.
- Cathy thought it would be good to have within three months a “County Mapping Authoritative” list, i.e. who will have the authority to provision county data to the SIF? On a similar note, Ivar suggested a meeting for GIS folks to discuss the end state (June 2016) of what we should expect have in place.

b. Imagery Acquisition Work Group (Khalid Khan)

- Working Group held their first meeting, including Diane, Gerrit, Ian, Khalid, Lynn, Matt and Mike. Discussed the perceived reasons for imagery acquisition. The number one purpose is

GIS data development, next data maintenance and updating, caller locations for call-takers/dispatchers. A more detailed document was uploaded to the One Drive.

- Ian mentioned that USDA will be collecting imagery as part of their NAIP Program and will have 12” resolution, but resample at one meter. If we choose to have access at 12” it would cost \$651,000. He also talked to Google and they have 6” imagery available for the entire state at about \$9 per square mile, i.e. \$645K. Kansas did this option and Google provided Mr. SID files (imagery compression) and hardcopy products for free. It is
- Several people pitched the idea of a statewide imagery consortium to coordinate with the various regional groups. Should the counties push the state (OCIO) to provide this imagery to the state? Compare what each vendor provides and for what price.

c. GIS/MSAG Workshop (Group Discussion)

- Discussed site logistics for a GIS/MSAG Workshop. This would be separate from the Coordinator Forums with GIS/MSAG personnel only, maybe this fall.
- Tie into specific needs with an agenda. Also need specifics on logistics, venue options, topics, presenters, equipment (computers) and funding options.
- Cathy, Cori and Ivan volunteered to assist Dan with doing the research.

7. For The Good of the Order:

- Mike Shannon brought up the issue of our inability to actually complete a full GIS to ALI synchronization because none of us have access to COMCAST’s (VoIP) ALI database.
- Milla says she has been in contact with TCS (they maintain the data for COMCAST). The issue of access is in the hands of TCS attorneys right now.

8. Action Items:

- Have a RFP Template draft for the working group before next meeting. (Dan, et al)
- Send a County Mapping Authority List (Draft) sent to the GIS Subcommittee. (Dan)
- Educate the County Coordinators about the importance of imagery in the GIS workflow. (All)
- Create a map showing the imagery status of each county. (Dan)

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting in Vancouver (WA), July 7th (10:00 – 14:00).
[1408 Franklin Street, Room 226, Vancouver, WA 98660].

