

**State Agency GIS (SAG) Meeting  
March 17, 2011**

ITEM	DISCUSSION	STATUS/ACTION
<b>Attendance</b>	Attendees: Colin Duewell, Tracy Schloss, Kirk Webb, Debbie Briedwell, Renee Robinson, Paul Wright, Arnold Williams, Mark Duewell, Beth Streumpf, Craig Scroggins, Michael Hill	Call to order at 1:05 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Truman Bldg. Rm 280 Conf Rm. B	
<b>Identify someone to take minutes</b>		Tracy Schloss
<b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b>		
<b>Review and approve minutes from previous meeting</b>	Minutes for February 17, 2011, were approved.	Ready for Colin to post to the web. <i>Still waiting for January minutes from Tim.</i>
<b>Review action items from previous meeting</b>  <i>Carried forward from past meetings. We didn't discuss, but needs to be addressed:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zip Code Tabulation Areas (ZCTA) – MSDIS has posted new ZCTA boundaries based on the 2010 census. Any feedback on these should go to Mark Duewell.</li> <li>• ESRI Enterprise Advantage Program (EEAP) with ESRI – The contract is still under negotiation. There was some 'boiler plate' language that was added on the OA side that ESRI didn't accept. The original 65K cost is still the rate being discussed.</li> <li>• Acknowledgement of Contract (AOC) – has been approved by purchasing and Doug Young. This went out to 10 universities on 3/16. There are still a few remaining to send it to. This will allow internships to be paid out of either E &amp; E or PS dollars. This was written for GIS internships specifically (not IT). <i>October 2010: Discussion on MODOT roads being conflated with TIGER data for addressing – Jason Hinson MCDC has more information</i></li> </ul>	<p>Question: Could this be used for internships at the high school level. Answer: The agreement is not set up that way for liability reasons. Paul doesn't think you could pay a HS student through this agreement.</p> <p><i>Tim Haithcoat to ask Jason to provide report.</i></p>
<b>CIO REPORT</b>		
<b>CIO report</b>	None	
<b>GIO REPORT</b>		
<b>GIS Director</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paul finally has a job description.</li> <li>• Strategic Plan – Paul still has not met with Doug about this. Hopefully this will be a topic at their next meeting. He intends to send this out to the group afterwards for discussion.</li> </ul>	Paul Wright
<b>AGENCY REPORTS</b>		
<b>MSDIS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Image Server – Both North node and main servers are set up at MSDIS and mostly they mirror each other. Wenbo is spending a lot of time trying to build the imagery caches. Mark is hoping that Michael can come up at some point to help.</li> </ul>	

	<p>Benchmarking – There will be 5 entities participating. Mark still needs specific contact names and he’s not sure what tests to have. Mark asked what needs to be in the test. Suggests using NAIP2010 imagery, pan, zoom etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GeoPortal – This should be able to ‘clip, zip and ship’. Right now this is working internally, but doesn’t work to email to any external addresses.</li> </ul> <p>All of this looked just great in demonstration. It turns out many other states have had to use alternative configurations/software for the email part.</p> <p>It is not set up correctly for the extents of Missouri.</p> <p>Current timeline includes the setup of a development server. Mark is not sure this will be done before the go/no go decision date.</p>	<p>DNR and SEMA both have applications that could be used to test SDC image server.</p> <p>Debbie would like to test services both on the desktop and within applications. Michael pointed out that we might not be able to do a direct connect to the desktop, you might always have to connect via a web service (9.3 had a way to direct connect that is not available in the new version).</p> <p>DNR is also going to need to connect to a NED 10 meter flow direction service and perform a surface flow trace.</p> <p>Debbie will send the ones she’s been using.</p>
<b>OPEN DISCUSSION</b>		
	<p>General discussion on upgrades to version 10. Agencies that have a few desktops have successfully upgraded. Agencies that have many ArcView users are having problems with many machines not meeting the new minimum specifications.</p>	
<b>REVIEW OF NEW ACTION ITEMS</b>		
<b>NEXT MEETING</b>		
<b>Next Meeting</b>	<p>April 21, 2011, from 1 p.m. - 3 p.m. Truman Bldg. Room 280 Conf Rm. B</p>	<p>Meeting concluded at 2:10 pm</p>