From WCCS (Wisconsin County **Coordinate System**) To WISCRS (Wisconsin County **Reference** Systems)

Alan Vonderohe

SIAC Seminar – February 15, 2006

#### **Fundamental Descriptors of Position**



Ellipsoid Meridian of Longitude Prime Meridian Parallel of Latitude

Latitude ( $\phi_P$ ) and Longitude ( $\lambda_P$ ) of point P

### **Elements of an Ellipse**



a = Semi-Major Axis b = Semi-Minor Axis Rotate about minor axis to generate oblate spheroid.

Spheroid used for current national geodetic datum (NAD83) is named "GRS 80": - a = 6378137.0 m - b = 6356752.3141403 m Computational and Visualization Problem

- Latitude / Longitude are angular, not rectangular coordinates.
- Ellipsoid surface cannot be cut and laid flat.
- Latitude / Longitude must be projected to a "developable" surface to obtain rectangular coordinates.

#### **Developable Surfaces**



#### **One Way to Conceptualize "Projection"**



Points on the ellipsoid are projected to the projection surface by straight lines from the center of the ellipsoid.

Note scale factor and how it varies across the projection surface.

Note: Some map projections are purely mathematical and have no graphical counterpart.

## **Ground-to-Grid**

Problem: Length distortion occurs when projecting from:

- Ground (Earth) to ellipsoid
- Ellipsoid to projection surface



# Ground-to-Grid Two step process to obtain grid (map projection) distances from ground distances:

$$D_{ellipsoid} = (D_{ground})(EllipsoidFactor)$$

$$D_{grid} = (D_{ellipsoid})(ScaleFactor)$$

 $D_{grid} = (D_{ground})(EllipsoidFactor)(ScaleFactor)$ 

## **Ellipsoid Factor**



R / (R + N + H) is called the "ellipsoid factor". R is computed from a, b, and  $\phi$ .

Ellipsoid factor varies with position.

Center of Earth

## Wisconsin County Coordinates

#### Original WCCS Objective:

1. Make differences between ground distances and grid distances negligible for most applications.

#### Original Design Strategy:

- 1. Restrict extent of each projection so scale factor is approximately equal to one everywhere.
- For each projection, enlarge the ellipsoid by adding N+H to R. This causes the ellipsoid factor to be approximately equal to one everywhere.

## Wisconsin County Coordinates



72 Counties 59 Coordinate Systems 24 Lambert 35 Transverse Mercator

#### Lambert Conformal Conical Projection



#### Scale variation is greater north-south than east-west.

#### Lambert Conformal Conical Projection



Alternative to  $\phi_1$ ,  $\phi_2$  is  $\phi_0$ ,  $k_0$  (latitude and scale factor at central parallel).

**Projection Parameters:**  $\lambda_0$  (longitude of central meridian)  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  (latitudes of standard parallels)  $\phi_0, X_0, Y_0$  (latitude, false easting, false northing of the coordinate origin)

## **Transverse Mercator Projection**



Scale Groater Frue Scale Less Than True Scale Less Than True Than True

C

٨

Scale variation is greater east-west than north-south.

## **Transverse Mercator Projection**



**Projection Parameters:** 

 $\lambda_0$  (longitude of central meridian)

k<sub>0</sub> (scale factor along central meridian)

 $\phi_0$ ,  $X_0$ ,  $Y_0$  (latitude, false easting, false northing of the coordinate origin)

## Wisconsin County Coordinates

#### Problem:

- Each projection has its own ellipsoid.
- This makes it seem like each projection has its own datum.
- Confusion abounds.

## WLIA Task Force

In 2004, WLIA formed the Wisconsin Coordinate Systems Task Force to address this and other spatial referencing issues.

Ultimately, the Task Force recommended redesign of the system, established criteria, and obtained funding.

## **Redesign** Objectives

 Redesign the coordinate systems so there is no need to enlarge the ellipsoid.

- There will be only one ellipsoid (GRS80) for everyone.
- Redesigned coordinates should not differ by more than 5mm from the originals anywhere on any projection.
  - Legacy data will be preserved.
  - Existing and new data can be combined without transforming either.

## **Redesign Strategy**

- Multiply scale factor on Central Meridian (Transverse Mercator) or Central Parallel (Lambert) by (R + N + H) / R to obtain provisional scale factor.
  - Causes ellipsoid factor and scale factor to be approximate reciprocals of one another, so when they are multiplied together the result is approximately equal to one.
- 2. Adjust false northing, false easting, and provisional scale factor to account for effects of difference in eccentricities of the two ellipsoids (GRS80 and enlarged).

#### Methodology:

- 1. Use DNR statewide map to obtain boundaries for each projection.
- Generate a 0.5-mile grid of test points within a 2-mile buffer for each projection.



#### Methodology:

- 3. Compute provisional scale factor for each projection.
- Using provisional scale factor, compute provisional county coordinates for each grid point.
- 5. Compute original county coordinates for each grid point.
- 6. Develop observation equations for each grid point:

$$(E_{original} - E_{o}) + v_{Eoriginal} = S(E_{provisional} - E_{o}) + \Delta E_{o}$$
$$(N_{original} - N_{o}) + v_{Noriginal} = S(N_{provisional} - N_{o}) + \Delta N_{o}$$

#### Methodology:

 Compute least squares solution of about 10,000 equations for each projection to obtain shifts in false northing and false easting, and multiplier for provisional scale factor.

8. Final Transverse Mercator parameters are:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{o(redesigned)} &= \lambda_{o(original)}; \phi_{o(redesigned)} = \phi_{o(original)}; k_{o(redesigned)} = k_{o(provisional)} * S; \\ E_{o(redesigned)} &= E_{o(original)} + \Delta E_{o}; N_{o(redesigned)} = N_{o(original)} + \Delta N_{o} \end{aligned}$$

## Number of Transverse Mercator parameters is reduced from 7 to 5.

## Redesign Methodology Methodology: Final Lambert parameters are:

$$\lambda_{o(redesigned)} = \lambda_{o(original)}; \phi_{o(redesigned)} = \phi_{o(original)}; k_{o(redesigned)} = k_{o(provisional)} * S = E_{o(redesigned)} = E_{o(original)} + \Delta E_{o}; N_{o(redesigned)} = N_{o(original)} + \Delta N_{o}$$

- Number of Lambert parameters is reduced from 8 to 5.
- $\phi_{o(\text{original})}$  is computed from  $\phi_{1(\text{original})}$  and  $\phi_{2(\text{original})}$ .
- Coordinate origin is shifted to  $\phi_0$ ,  $\lambda_0$ .
- N<sub>o(original)</sub> at new coordinate origin is computed, not given.

#### Methodology:

- 10. Compute differences between redesigned and original coordinates at each grid point.
- 11. Find maximum shifts in northings and eastings to check against 5mm tolerance.
- 12. Prepare isoline (contour) maps of coordinate shifts.

## **Redesign Results**

#### Results:

- All coordinate systems meet the redesign criterion:
  - All coordinate shifts are less than 5mm.
- Typical coordinate shifts range from -3mm to +3mm.
- Some counties have maximum shifts of less than 1mm.
- Maximum shifts are in Oneida and Vilas (Lambert) and Ashland and Forest (Transverse Mercator).

#### Coordinate Shifts Buffalo County (Typical Transverse Mercator)





#### Shift in Easting (mm)

#### Ashland County (Worst-Case Transverse Mercator)





Shift in Easting (mm)

#### Forest County (Worst-Case Transverse Mercator)





#### Shift in Easting (mm)

#### **Burnett County (Typical Lambert)**





#### Shift in Northing (mm)

#### Shift in Easting (mm)

#### **Oneida County (Worst-Case Lambert)**





#### Shift in Northing (mm)

#### Shift in Easting (mm)

#### Vilas County (Worst-Case Lambert)





#### Shift in Easting (mm)



#### Validation:

- Independent testing by four individuals using various software packages and programming techniques.
- All have concluded that the redesign meets the 5mm criterion.
- Draft final report under review.
   Final submittal during March.

WISCRS (Wisconsin County Reference Systems)

Two days ago, the Task Force decided:

- To retain the name "WCCS (Wisconsin County Coordinate System)" for the original.
- To name the redesigned "WISCRS (Wisconsin County Reference Systems).
  - Individual county systems are suggested to be referred to as "WISCRS, Dane County", for example.

## WISCRS (Wisconsin County Reference Systems)

- It is expected that WISCRS will
  - Be more easily understood by the user community.
  - Be easily adoptable by vendors.
  - Allow integration with legacy data without the need for transformation.
  - Be placed in at least one "official" registry.