Lucas Haffner

458 Web Mapping

558 Tech Report Review

Kwasi Abebrese

Interests –

* This information is easy to gravitate to, it is logical that the demand for this technology would be high. Strict coordinate systems are difficult to adjust to when dealing with elevation and rough terrain.
* Individual participation in the mapping process is increasing with geolocating of many attractions and land features that humans want other humans to know about but may have little capital interest to supply that demand.
* Astounding that so many people, currently, live without addresses. Highlights the necessity even more.
* Good visual break-down of the area/region/local code.
* The lack of political boundaries is an integral feature and very forward thinking.
* An evolution of technology is still very possible in the areas of usability and technical high-altitude improvements

Improvements –

* Consider a logo or some type of example image near the intro to give a visualization for the reader to gain some perspective what makes Open Codes unique.
* In section 1.3, addition of an example JSON code could be useful.
* In section 1.3.1, consider revising the b. section for better clarity.
* The map example is a nice graphic but underexplained. Adding a description could be useful.
* Further explanation of how this system can operate without an internet connection is possible.

Yu Tian

Interests –

* Nice choice of topic. Understanding this basemap layering better is in the interest of all who work in GIS.
* The location feature is unique and leads to interesting abilities to locate other features near the chosen location.
* The ability to transfer maps is promotable, combined with the ability to draw new features on existing maps make the future implications vast.
* Sounds like an interesting final project idea.

Improvements –

* A more in-depth intro that divulges into the ability and construction of this layer pack with a visual representation that shows an example map would be useful.
* The third slide could use some more detail. How does it locate self? Key factors?
* Better slide layout could help convey the message in a more efficient way.
* Be sure to proofread and to check semantics on verbiage.
* Is the membership free? More information on this area of OSM could be useful.
* Be sure to arrange the slides in sections to keep them from looking cluttered that leads to confusion.

Breanne Marmur –

Interests –

* Nice lead slide structured well and presents effectively.
* The second slide reminds me of that if we have thought of it or created something, it can be digitized in one form or another. It’s nice JS has taken on this tool in this way.
* Chart representation on slide three is helpful to visualize the options available.
* Amazing amount of options to customize for individuality and creative design.
* The configuration options make this tool very versatile among the varied platforms everyone uses which is essential for success in today’s multi-varied device world.
* Speed and efficiency is amazing and a sellable quality.

Improvements –

* It is nearly self-explanatory but labeling of some sort on slide three could be helpful.
* Consider the revision and segregation of slide five for easier readability as the script is very small and there is a lot of white space.
* Further explanation of the Leaflet similarities could help.
* The chart is created after the <canvas id=”myChart”><//canvas> tag? Better explanation on slide seven regarding how to create the actual chart would assist.

Tim Kerkhove

Interests –

* 1969 is a long time, no wonder they have a majority of the market share.
* Unfortunate that the subscriptions are so steep, hinders participation by the less financially able but is necessary to make top notch programing available.
* The vast array of thematic mapping is one amazing ability of ArcMap online. The layers that have been made available is fascinating and fun to explore.
* I’ve utilized the importing tool to make layers in many classes. That’s really handy to liven up projects.
* I would like to know more about the tools referenced as we are attempting to clip online, and it is proving to be difficult with out using ArcMap desktop.
* Nice link embedding on slide eight that takes you to a well-developed Arcmap site.
* I have found the online version to be much more limited than the desktop but that only means there’s room for improvement.

Improvements –

* Check for spelling and semantics (slide three)
* Consider multiple examples on slide three.
* Reflect on upping the font size in areas, maybe consider shadowing for readability.
* Consider utilizing the classify feature on slide six It will make that representation pop a lot more and improve effectiveness.
* Deliberate visual representation on slide seven and eight.

Krithika Mohan

Interests –

* The most in-depth topic choice of the five reports. Very interesting information about a very complex API.
* The inter-program tools look like they would be utilized by many types of planners and other professionals. Somewhat like Geoplanner?
* The customization/compatibility abilities really shine with this unique API.
* Slide eight has nice map graphics that explain what the API is doing with inputted code.
* Slide ten is good information but could be decluttered a bit by deciphering which info is most important and highlighting that data.

Improvements –

* The chalkboard basemap is a neat look but it leaves me wondering if other basemaps are available or if this format enables the tools ability?
* Contemplate enlarging the features and explanations on slide three for better readability.
* Slide six could be expanded to two slides adding a visual tool for the second half expressing similarities.
* Consider a visual representation for slide seven, a lot of white space that could use a filler.
* For slide nine, ponder making the code thinner and filling more of the space with the map.