



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Agenda Minutes (Draft)

Thursday, March 27, 2014, 1 PM - 3:30 PM

Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

Members Attending:

Matt Baker, Metropolitan Airports Commission
William Brown, Hennepin County
Ben Butzow, MnDOT
Erik Dahl, EQB (Chair-Elect)
Francis Harvey, U of M (alternate)
Brad Henry, University of Minnesota
Randy Knippel, Dakota County
Matt Koukol, Ramsey County
Dan Ross, MnGeo
Ron Wencl, USGS

David Brandt, Washington County (Vice Chair)
Nancy Read, Metro Mosquito Control
Gordon Chinander, MESB
Jim Fritz, Xcel Energy
Eric Haugen, Resource Data, Inc.
Peter Henschel, Carver County
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Hal Watson, MnDNR
Donovan Koxvold, Hennepin County (alternate)

Members Absent:

John Slusarczyk, Anoka County
James Bunning, Scott County
Hal Busch, City of Bloomington/Metro Cities
Len Kne, University of Minnesota (sent alternate)
Gary Swenson, Hennepin County (sent alternate)

Ben Verbick, LOGIS
Mark Maloney, City of Shoreview/Metro Cities
David Bitner, db Spatial LLC
Jeff Matson, CURA/University of Minnesota
Sally Wakefield, Non-Profit Representative

Guests:

Carrie Magnuson, Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District
Curtis Carlson, North Star MLS
Will Craig, University of Minnesota
Joe Sapletal, Dakota County

Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council
Chris Mavis, Hennepin County Survey Department

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

Paul Peterson, MetroGIS Project Manager

1) Call to Order

Chair Dahl called the meeting to order at 3:08 pm

2) Approval of Meeting Agenda

Motion: Kotz, Second: Read, motion carried, agenda approved.

3) Approve Meeting Minutes from January 9, 2014

Motion: Brandt, Second: Butzow, motion carried, agenda approved.

4) Acknowledgement of William (Bill) Brown's contributions to MetroGIS

Coordinator Maas provided a brief overview of Bill's career with Hennepin County and his contributions to the collaborative and presented him with the first-ever MetroGIS 'Benchmark Award' for his decade-plus of work with the group. Bill addressed the group, acknowledging the successes made possible by having been afforded the opportunity to collaborate with partners outside of Hennepin County through MetroGIS.

5) Erik Dahl Committee Eligibility Discussion

Erik Dahl was elected to the chair of the Committee at this meeting on January 9, 2014. Subsequent to his election, he moved from his position with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District to one with the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board. The Coordinating Committee needed to deliberate and vote on his eligibility to (a) remain an eligible member of the Coordinating Committee and (b) if so, serve in the capacity of Chair, as per his prior election.

Erik presented a brief overview of the function and purpose of the Environmental Quality Board, restated his interest in the collaborative and his desire to continue to serve as Chair should the Committee determine him eligible.

A motion to retain Erik Dahl as a member of the Coordinating Committee in the 'Special Expertise' category was offered by Mark Kotz, seconded by Brady Henry, with unanimous approval.

6) Election of Coordinating Committee Chair:

Vice Chair Brandt asked if any other members were interested in serving as Chair of the Committee. Hearing no other members expressing interest, Mark Kotz motioned to re-elect Erik Dahl to the Chair, seconded by Brad Henry, voting: unanimous approval.

7) Lightning Round Updates

Maas (MetroGIS): Maas thanked the group for their attendance and offered a welcome to the guests visiting the meeting. He indicated that the new MetroGIS website was viewable (in draft form) on the vendor's development site and that a more formal use-experience outreach would be offered in the coming weeks. Launch of the new site is presently planned for April 28. Maas indicated that a 3-page brief of 12 months (November 2012-November 2013) worth of download activity summary was available from the MetroGIS website homepage. Maas and Metropolitan Council GIS Manager Mark Kotz also indicated that the Metropolitan Council is allowing MetroGIS to carry over \$45,000 in unspent funds into 2014.

Dahl (Environmental Quality Board): Dahl thanked the group for re-instating him as a member and re-electing him as Chair. He indicated that his most significant present work assignment with the EQB is review and development of regulations on silica sand extraction and that the EQB will be offering a GIS-based environmental projects 'tracker' on line soon. This 'tracker' would enable viewers to see where and what kind of environmental projects are being assessed around the state.

Brandt (Washington County): Brandt indicated there were no major updates from Washington County.

Chinander: Chinander discussed the work progress being made with local addressing and tracking the development and refinement of national standards for Next Gen 9-1-1 such as the forthcoming NENA address standard. He re-iterated the combined focus on a single centerline solution as being a desirable goal, and that the work of the various groups serves that larger goal.

Knippel (Dakota County): Knippel described that Dakota, along with other metro counties are changing their data availability and distribution policies. On March 25, 2014, Dakota County adopted a 'free and open public geospatial data' resolution similar to that of Ramsey and Hennepin counties. He indicated that Dakota County would be addressing the revenue differential (lost revenue from data sales) in its budget cycle for 2015. Dakota County will be making its data available from its own website, and will coordinate with MetroGIS/DataFinder (provide a metadata link) and the Geospatial Commons when it comes on line as appropriate. Dakota County is also working with ArcGIS On Line, however has identified that the cost, with over 200 users anticipated, each requiring a named account would translate into an expense of over \$35,000/year. Knippel indicated that there is a strong case for collaborative development of applications in JavaScript for producing similar desirable results. Knippel also introduced Dakota County Senior GIS Specialist Joe Sapletal, the key presenter later in the meeting)

Henschel (Carver County): Henschel indicated that a free and open public geospatial data resolution, similar to that of Dakota, Hennepin and Ramsey, would be voted on before the County on Tuesday, April 1, 2014 and that Carver County has approved and adopted geospatial data disclaimer language that is essentially the same as that developed and adopted by Anoka County.

Harvey (University of Minnesota): Pass; he indicated that he would have more detailed and relevant updates at our next meeting.

Kotz (Metropolitan Council): Kotz indicated that the Metropolitan Council intends to collect imagery for the metropolitan region in 2016 and is looking to coordinate with interested partners. The Council needs a minimum of 2-foot resolution, leaf off and only for the region of the seven metropolitan counties. Additionally, Kotz described a recent request of a Council web services user inquiring about dynamic services, which enable the end user to modify the default symbology. He asked the group if they have been receiving similar requests or if this option is something they'd like to see. Donovan Koxvold (Hennepin County) indicated that they have received similar requests as well.

Watson (Department of Natural Resources): Hal Watson introduced himself as the new representative to MetroGIS from the DNR, replacing Tim Loesch as the former representative to the Committee. Watson indicated that he is the new GIS Section manager for DNR and has been deeply involved in the Geospatial Commons project, with the backend programming and development. He stated he is also finishing up work on the MnTopo application, which is presently available through the MnGeo site and will offer enhanced tools to view and download LIDAR data and related datasets.

Watson described another initiative which is receiving significant support in DNR leadership: a pilot project for developing a parcel fabric integration solution in Minnesota's Arrowhead Region. Partners in the initiative include the Superior National Forest, Lake County, Cook County and St Louis County. Watson stressed that while this is not a 'metro' effort, it is a significant opportunity to observe and learn from and to eventually develop a state-wide parcel fabric solutions. This type of work is receiving much higher priority from the DNR than in the past and is a good indicated of where things are headed. He closed by stating that the DNR is also focused on increasing its development of mobile data applications. Finally, we are spending a lot of energy on mobile data applications; large initiative.

Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control Board): Read stated that the Metro-Area geocode is 'not dead; that Pete Olson is keeping it alive and that it still maintains an average of about 1000 hits a week, with occasional larger hits. We may need to develop a maintenance plan on that so that updated parcel and streets data still enter that system for those that continue to use the tool.

Butzow (Minnesota Department of Transportation): Butzow indicated that there was to be some follow-up on the proposed Traffic Impact Data Project that was presented at the last MetroGIS Coordinating Committee meeting (January 9, 2014). MnDOT's Mike Reynolds is developing a proposal outline that will be delivered to county and city contacts for review, refinement and further discussion. Brad Henry asked if this initiative would integrate with the existing 511 system or utilize Google Map technology, Butzow replied that he was not sure but can carry that question back to Reynolds and the team at MnDOT.

Haugen (Research Data, Inc.): Haugen reminded the Committee that the Minnesota High Tech Association (MHTA) spring conference is coming up on May 6, 2014 (<http://www.mhta.org/>). He indicated the MHTA is not-limited to just private sector interests and that government input and participation are welcome. Also indicated that the conference is a good one, worthy of consideration by members of the group, and it has been 'eerily silent' from the GIS sector of late and a stronger GIS presence would be most welcome.

Fritz (Xcel Energy): No major updates from the utilities sector; Fritz indicated he is interested in the possible public/private data sharing discussion and would reserve his comments for that agenda item.

Wencl (U.S. Geological Survey): Wencl indicated that spring is 'flood season' and that stream gauge monitoring application and data would be receiving attention; he made note of the new national web map application for hazards mapping, a link to which was on the MnGeo EPC website; Wencl also took the opportunity to thank Bill Brown for his service and contributions to the GIS community and that working with Bill provided the USGS with the ability to work effectively with Hennepin County.

Baker (Metropolitan Airports Commissioner): Baker indicated that the MAC is looking for a paid undergraduate GIS student to fill an upcoming project position.

Koxvold (Hennepin County GIS): Koxvold reminded the group that on February 11, 2014, Hennepin County adopted a free and open geospatial data policy resolution and his department has been working with others in the county on a task force to evaluate which data are public and effective methods of distribution. Data will be available through an FTP site off of the county's website, with several datasets being the 'first wave' to be released these include: address points, county centerlines, municipal boundaries, the county boundary, commissioner boundaries, 2-foot contours and the 2012 county aerials images as a WMS service. Hennepin is working to pro-actively meet the public demand for the data. In Hennepin County's GIS office they are upgrading to Arc 10.2 Server and on task by June 2014 to have this completed and then upgrading all desktops to 10.2 as well. Koxvold also stressed there is a 'big push' to deploy ArcGIS online, and GIS is working with Survey and Public Works to handle the administration of it.

Mavis (Hennepin County Survey Department): Mavis indicated that the survey department is still working with the city of Minneapolis to complete its corrections and monuments. Survey is adopting ArcGIS as a method for not only distribution of its information but also for collection of information and streamlining its workflow including implementation of corner monument maintenance, inspection of monuments, changes in attribution, inclusion of photos as well as mobile and external work.

Brown (Hennepin County Survey Department): Brown reported that he is pretty much here just to "fill in if either Chris (Mavis) or Donovan (Koxvold) ran out of things to say" and did not provide further updates.

Craig (University of Minnesota): Craig indicated that at the most-recent NSGIC conference in Washington DC, the federal General Accounting Office has been approaching the FGDC and are interested in the better integration of address data, reduction of redundancy on that issue and a smarter move toward better coordination at all levels to perform that work more

suitably. Craig mentioned that the Census Bureau is will to host a collaborative site to post and share outside of their Title XIII (non-sharable) data resources. Craig mentioned that moving forward in a coordinated way from local, county, state and federal levels on the address issue is rising in importance.

Henry (University of Minnesota, Special Expertise): Henry indicated his mind disappointment that the members of the Committee did not respond to his request from the last meeting about how their agencies are integrating infrastructure asset management or who to contact about the topic. He stressed that many agencies and jurisdictions have little idea about the full investment that have and maintain in infrastructure and that awareness, inventory, tracking, maintenance and reporting through GIS of these assets is essential.

Henry stressed the presence of MN2050, an initiative to increase the awareness of our infrastructure, it condition and its value to the function of our economy and institutions. An important component of MN2050 will be to get policy makers better aware of this investment and how it needs to be better understood and funded. Henry indicated there will be an education and outreach component of MN 2050, as well as an assessment management survey of which agencies are engaged in digital asset management. He stressed his desire to link this effort back to MetroGIS so we can avoid 're-inventing the wheel', he will reach out again to this group to help determine 'who is doing what' in your various agencies. In response Randy Knippel indicated that Dakota County was in process to acquire an asset management system, that there are multiple off-the-shelf systems to choose from and that, unfortunately, GIS was not a major consideration as these are primarily work order tracking and management systems for specific purposes needed by public works and related departments. Matt Koukol volunteered that Ramsey County is also early in its RFP development process and is currently determining 'who is doing what' and confirmed that there may not be sufficient overlap and communication between the GIS and engineering professionals to ensure the full set of questions are being asked; the two fields have different values and approaches to the issue which poses a challenge.

Koukol (Ramsey County): Koukol reminded the group that on February 11, 2014 (just hours before Hennepin County) the Ramsey County Board of Directors adopted a resolution in support of free and open geospatial data. He indicated that some data is already available from Ramsey County's website. Koukol indicated that there is a technical governance group at work in Ramsey County that has assembled a 'skeleton' plan where almost all FOIA-able (Freedom Of Information Act) data could be released, they are working on resources for the sheriffs' office to lay some ground work on what to do and how to do it. Additionally, Koukol indicated that he remains engaged with the Statewide Centerlines Initiative and a conflation project to share data more effectively with MnDOT. Finally he mentioned a joint project with Washington County using ArcGIS to track recycling in the eastern metro region is underway.

8) Policy Board Update

Maas reminded the group that no meeting was convened of the Policy Board on January 22, and asked the members if there were significant fiscal or policy issues that they were facing that could appropriately be brought before the policy body. N. Read suggested that the Policy Board be convened as a 'check in' and given an update on the progress being made on the free and open data initiative around the metro. A brief discussion took place where it was decided that waiting until the majority of the county GIS data was actually available and downloadable with some indication of impact to county operations would be more appropriate. Coordinator Maas was directed by the Committee to not convene the Policy Board for its next meeting date of April 23, 2014, providing an email update in lieu of that meeting.

(The Committee recessed for a 10 minute break)

9) Address Points Development

9a) Revisiting the Original Vision for a Regional Address Point Solution

Mark Kotz gave a brief presentation on the shared and approved original vision, mission and need for a shared address point solution. He stressed the goal of having and maintaining one authoritative source, the efficiency gained and benefit of having a single place to validate the data and the many needs that can be met by this resource.

MetroGIS' vision for address points is for the recording and availability of each point location of every official address as defined by the appropriate address authority, updated daily or weekly, in a standard format for the entire region updated in a way that is both long-term and sustainable, with the data originating from the authoritative source.

Out of scope issues: Kotz indicated that there are some issues that were deemed 'out-of-scope' for the project. Primary among these included the 'how' of address creation; so long as the authoritative source creates the address, 'how' they determine the address (i.e. which city department makes the determination, their process working with developers, their unique naming conventions, etc.) is not within the ambit of the project.

Kotz summarized the overall address point process through the roles of the participants.

- An official address authority: creates and assigns the address to its location point;
- Counties can partner with cities to aggregate these points to a county level;
- Regional and state agencies can provide further aggregation and distribution of the data, contribute support through funding for the process and refinement of the editing and aggregation applications.

Chinander: We have talked about the city being a single source as the authoritative source, but *which* department within each city?

Kotz: While important, this consideration is out of scope for us, the city needs to determine that on its own. We can look to the Dakota County Joint Powers Agreement model for some guidance. It states that each city task a specific staff for the county to work with.

Harvey: Does the model deal with unofficial/inofficial addresses? Examples might include an intersection description or landmark.

Kotz: These are also considered out of scope for the project. The data standard and the editor tool give the authoritative source the ability to load in what they want.

Fritz: How far along is this process?

Kotz: Officially, there are none presently ready (0 of 7 counties, 0 of 150+ address authorities) however, we will be hearing from each of the county managers in the next agenda item on their current status.

9b) County Address Point Status

Knippel: Dakota County is between 95-99% finished, we will have our data up on our site shortly.

Koxvold: Hennepin County will be putting up what they have once their data assessment team clears it. Hennepin County began its own address project over a year and a half ago, defined its own standard that meets a broad number of needs. We will be assessing the MetroGIS tool to determine if it meets our needs or can be enhanced as a 'Version 3.0' to do so.

Koukol: In Ramsey County, we have four municipalities actively using the tool and the rest is augmented with parcel (centroid) points, so we have a county-wide coverage but as per the quality of the suggestion solution.

Henschel: In Carver, we are presently testing the tool; the point development process is in the works.

Brandt: At present, we have none available in Washington County. We will be working with our cities to get them together.

Chinander: How difficult is it to add and modify the attributes?

Kotz: That is a data standard/specification question. We may want to revise our specifications once the NENA standard is finalized.

Sapletal: The tool itself is dependent only on a few attributes: PIN, latitude and longitude, the user/address authority then adds the rest in; simple interface as Joe (Sapletal) is about to show us, to add more attributes as they see fit.

Chinander: We should contemplate checking the address points as they are developed against the centerlines so we can assure that they are working together. We will be getting a mix of actual and interpolated locations, want to be able to get one definitive 'hit' if we can and have higher confidence in the data.

9c) Address Editor Tool 2.0 Presentation: Joe Sapletal, Dakota county

Sapletal provided an overview of the address point process, touching on many of the same key overall points as Mark Kotz' presentation: cities/address authorities create the data and pour it into the 'funnel' of the county where it gets aggregated at the regional and state level.

Sapletal touched on the following specifics of the tool in his presentation, these included:

- Overall technical function of the tool
- Upgrades available in Version 2.0 of the tool: Copy and paste, multi-point editor, default attributes
- Basemap options and settings
- Control of points in the area of one's authority/jurisdiction (can't edit outside your jurisdiction)
- Unique IDs ticking back to the user table
- Find tool, layering tool, ID tool (finding info about underlying parcel)
- Search features
- Log In Table
- Core tool functions: fence selection, exporting options and print out options
- Geo-referencing tool (ability to overlay plats and other documents for reference)

Sapletal ran through an example of creating a point, demonstrated the general function of many of the tools in the Address Point Editor and offered to answer questions.

(Sapletal's PowerPoint presentation is available as an appendix to these minutes)

Carlson: Is there a formal validation process with this tool?

Sapletal: We have several verification scripts, but there is at this time no built-in verification routine.

Chinander: Is a (globally) unique ID a possibility? Does the MetroGIS data standard cover the regional, city or county 'code'?

Sapletal/Kotz: Code is unique to the address authority; it is possible that there could be duplicates when aggregate. By adding the GNIS ID on the front of the number generated by the authority effectively removes this issue.

Knippel: Originally, the city and county processes for approval of the plat and assigning an address were not totally synced up in terms of their work flow, such as approval of an address prior to the approval of a plat. EMS needs the address before work even begins as there will be workers and equipment on that site (at its address) before anything is actually built. With the tool you can effectively 'drop a dot' to get things started with, however, the county will still need to do some final checks to ensure it is in the right spot as the development fills in. The ability to bring in the preliminary plats is very helpful with this tool. This can potentially help eliminate the usual 'round robin' of notifications.

Chinander: There was a time in Scott County when over 20 different developments were going in at once and it is impossible for a deputy or EMS to know where these are all at.

Read: Can the end user see the history of changes made the points and the database?

Knippel/Sapletal: We do generate and log change reports. We compare the feature classes between databases and can track what kinds of changes have taken place. Todd (Lusk) in our office generates these with indications of CHANGED or MOVED, we keep them for our own tracking, but this would not be evident to the final user. We do version and archive them internally.

Read: When will they be pooled (aggregated)? How good are they now? Do we have to wait for every county to be perfect before we can start using them?

Kotz: When they are published by the counties, we can then aggregate them and make them available.

10) Work Plan Updates

10a) Address Points Aggregation Project

Jon Hoekenga (Metropolitan Council) indicated that tools are being developed by the DNR that will help data providers publish data (including address points) to the **GDRS**. The Metropolitan Council is willing to aggregate address points **monthly** and make them available on DataFinder until such time that the **GDRS** and **Geospatial Commons** are ready.

10b) Free and Open Public Geospatial Data;

Maas provided a recap of updates from previously in the meeting:

- Ramsey and Hennepin Counties adopted supporting resolutions on February 11, 2014
- Dakota County adopted a supporting resolution on March 25, 2014
- The issue was up for a vote before the Carver County Board on April 1, 2014.
- Anoka County has developed a disclaimer and at last notice is not planning to adopt a resolution, just to simply make their data available.
- The status of the issue at Scott County and Washington County as to adoption of a resolution was unknown.

10c) Support for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons;

Dan Ross provided an update on the development work of and features of Release 2.0 of the Commons (gisdata.mn.gov)

The website and 'GeoBroker' will offer **targeted search capabilities** (using key words to find datasets), **notification services and collaboration support capabilities** (the ability to comment on datasets/receive notices if changes occur to datasets), **enhanced account administration** and **automated updates** through the GDRS and GeoBroker. Users will also be able to use key words to find datasets and the ability to comment on datasets and receive notices if changes occur.

Ross also indicated that a Preliminary Operations Plan is in development and shared the anticipated staffing plan to support the Commons. Anticipated staff resources include a 0.5 FTE Content Manager, a 0.5 FTE Supervisor, 1.0 FTE Geospatial Services Administrator, 1.0 FTE Database Administrator, 1.0 Commons/GDRS/GeoBroker Administrator and 1.0 FTE Applications Developer.

10d) Address Points Editor Tool Version 2.1 – Enhancements;

Kotz re-iterated that the Council has carried over funding from MetroGIS's 2013 budget and enhancements and upgrades to the Address Point Editor tool (as 2.1 or 3.0) are possible if desired by the user community.

10e) Support for the Statewide Centerlines Initiative;

Maas gave a cursory update that a MnDOT Business Rules Workshop was conducted on January 27, 2014 at Arden Hills and the next key event of the project will be a toll testing session hosted by ESRI at their Eagan offices in Spring 2014.

10d) Increased Sharing Beyond the Metro;

Maas indicated that this initiative is intended to be a simple offering of outreach and relationship building with the counties surrounding the Metro (including Wisconsin) to share our research on free and open data, share our work plan and determine if areas of shared need or interest can be advanced further in coming months. Action on this item will not begin formally until MetroGIS' new website has been fully deployed and launched.

10e) Private/Public Data Sharing Summit;

Maas indicated that while interest remains in enhancing public/private data flow, this initiative lacks many key pre-requisites such as owner, champion, plan and work team before it can begin work.

10f) Stormsewer Project Research

Maas described the project as still in fact-finding and research mode. He updated the group with a graphic of the various permitting and enforcement authorities which govern stormwater in Minnesota and stated that the next logical step for the project would be for stakeholder agencies to create a 'business need' document relevant to stormsewer network data.

11) Next Coordinating Committee Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 26, 2014

12) Adjournment: Chair Dahl thanked the attendees and adjourned the meeting at 3:33 pm