

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Minutes **DRAFT**

Thursday, August 8, 2019, 1:00 pm – 3:30 pm

Metropolitan Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul



Attendees:

Alex Blenkush, Hennepin County

Chad Riley, Carver County

Len Kne, U-Spatial/University of Minnesota

Jeff Matson, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota

Andra Mathews, MnDOT

Marcia Broman, Metro Emergency Services Board

Carrie Magnuson, Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District

Dan Ross, MnGeo

Tony Monsour, Scott County

Erik Dahl, MnEQB, Chair

David Brandt, Washington County, Vice Chair

Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

Guests:

Duane Anderson, City of Woodbury

Dustin Ellis, Hennepin County Forestry Department

Tami Maddio, City of Eagan

Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

Meeting Minutes (Draft)

1) Call to Order

Vice Chair Brandt called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.;

2) Approve Today's Meeting Agenda

Motion to approve: Read Second: Kotz; unanimous approval by vote, motion carries;

3) Approve Minutes from last meeting on February 28, 2019

Motion to approve: Mathews, Second, Magnuson, unanimous approval by vote, motion carries; Via email Ben Verbick asked that his name be added to the roster of attendees

4) MetroGIS Policy Board Update

Coordinator Maas indicated the most recent Policy Board meeting occurred on Wednesday, April 24, 2019, at 7 pm at the Metro County Government Center. New members from the last election cycle (November 2018) include Anoka County Commissioner Mike Gamache (District 5), who filled the seat vacated by long-term Policy Board member Jim Kordiak, new Metropolitan Council representative Peter Lindstrom (formerly the mayor the City of Falcon Heights) and new Metro Cities representative Steve Fletcher from the City of Minneapolis . The April meeting included project updates on regional activity, the expanding role of GIS in 9-1-1 efforts and how the work at the metro level on standards has influenced and helped the state develop their standards. Policy Board leadership remains supportive and attentive to the work of the MetroGIS collaborative. The next meeting of the Policy Board will be held on Wednesday, April 29, 2020 at 7 pm here at the Metro County Government Center.

5) Coordinating Committee Membership

5a) MnDOT Seat

Andra Mathews, formerly in the Non-Profit Seat, is now with MnDOT and has submitted a request to fill the available MnDOT Seat, Ms. Mathews asks the Committee to accept her letter of intent to fill the MnDOT seat on the Committee.

Motion to approve: Kotz; Second, Koukol; unanimous approval by vote, motion carries;

5b) Non-Profit Seat

Coordinator Maas indicated that with Andra now becoming the MnDOT representative, there is a vacant non-profit seat.

5c) City Seats

The MetroGIS Policy Board approved the addition of two more city representatives on the Coordinating Committee. Currently, the Committee has two (2) seats committed to cities with the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities. Earlier this year, Maas sent out an invitation to city level GIS staff and invited them to observe this meeting. If they remain interested, they are encouraged to submit a letter of interest in joining. If more than two city representatives send in letters of interest, the Committee will then need to vote among them. Maas welcomed the city GIS staff in attendance and thanked them for dropping by.

5d) Academia Seat

Coordinator Maas indicated that the Committee also has one open seat with academia. He contacted the geography and GIS faculty at Macalester and St. Thomas in spring 2019 and got no response or interest. He asked the group if anyone had a contact in academia that they thought might be interested, to please pass their name along.

[Original Agenda Item] 6) Guest Presentation (Postponed to October 2019 meeting)

Initially, Metropolitan Council Community Development planning staff had expressed interest in presenting on 'U.S. Census: Post-LUCA New Construction Address Data Reporting', however, they deferred to give the presentation until the October 2019 meeting.

6) Metro Fire Hydrant Layer

Alex Blenkush from Hennepin County presented on the availability of a partially completed fire hydrants dataset covering much of the metro area. This database was created by Mr. Dave Cole who has been collecting and aggregating hydrant locations as a voluntary effort for many years. The data are distributed to two primary areas: PSAP/dispatch locations, and an Active911 mobile application used by many local first responders.

Mr. Cole approached Hennepin County to see if they could take on the data update and distribution effort that he has been leading thus far, as his intention is to step away from this work sometime in the near future. As Hennepin is just one of the counties in the metro region, a coordinated approach amongst the counties would be required to maintain the database that Dave has been doing. Hennepin County is interested in taking the project on and wishes to know if there is interest to aggregate and offer up a simple hydrants layer for the metro region.

Unfortunately, at present, there are no hydrants data for Washington County, but the other six counties have at least partial coverage in their incorporated municipalities. There may be existing processes in place within each county organizations to collect, maintain and share hydrants data, so it may be as simple as agreeing to have the data aggregated and released on the Geo Commons. Dave Cole mentioned that in the past he had been collecting data on a yearly basis from the source agencies; we have asked him to share his list of data contacts with us.

Kotz: If we advance this as a regional dataset, we would want to establish who is the 'owner' of the hydrants and where that data is coming from authoritatively.

Blenkush: Correct, that we know of, it is mostly the cities; fire chiefs and city staff have been Dave Cole's primary points of contact for the dataset as we have it now, however in some cases counties maintain hydrants. In many cases the data flow is from City Engineers to City GIS Department to the County GIS Departments.

Riley: Having a regional dataset of hydrants would be useful and helpful from a inter-city and inter-agency mutual aid perspective.

Mathews: I've done some hydrant mapping in the past, quality of the data is certainly a concern to be aware of such as accuracy of the point location, is there anything in the data about the condition of the hydrants?

Blenkush: There is no 'condition' attribute in the dataset currently.

Read: Are there other uses of this data, such as insurance companies or water utility analysis? It might be good to develop a list of the full range of stakeholders. We've seen the need for homeowners to

know where hydrants are during winter events and other scenarios, things like Adopt-A-Hydrant and so on.

Kotz: If this data is to be used in critical applications, it will need to come from an authoritative source. Good to have this initial layer as a starting point, but cities would need to take ownership of it longer term, what is their current and future commitment to maintaining it?

Riley: In Carver County, most cities have hydrant data in a digital format on some level;

Brandt: Yes, we've seen it in lots of different schema with different levels of accuracy; it would be nice to have a standard to shoot for that we could move toward and some level of confidence to attached to it as well. Where does it sit with our other priorities? We've mentioned working on things like fiber optic data and others. Knowing the among of work that has been put into it so far, it would be sad to see it stagnate and die, this would be very useful to have this.

Kotz: We could add it to prioritization exercise process at our next meeting this fall;

Riley: Is there an opportunity to work on a larger general water utility standard with hydrants as a part of it? In Carver [County] and our cities, we generally use the ESRI data model for water utilities, but our cities put their data right into the model, we don't see as broad a use outside the cities.

Brandt: We have a unique situation as well, in the City of Stillwater, the water system is independently run, relationship is different than the usual set up, we don't know what they have for data, certainly stakeholders such as our fire chiefs are interested the hydrant data. Alex, do you know when he (Dave Cole) is stepping away from the project?

Blenkush: To be honest, I'm not sure, but we are interested in keeping it up for our own needs and uses as best we can, we are waiting for him to share his list of contact with us so we can reestablish those relationships.

7) Standards Development Update

Standards Committee Chair Mark Kotz provided an update to the group on the status of standards. From the March 6, 2019 GAC Meeting, Kotz reported that minor modifications to Parcel Data Standard we approved based on feedback from MetroGIS implementation on items such as handling of e.g. non-standard parcels. Also, the Committee got prior version of the CTU, County and State code standards approved as GAC standards and revision of the county code changes from 3 to 5 characters to be unique nationally (e.g. 27053, instead of 053).

Kotz further reported from the May 29, 2019 GAC Meeting that the proposed Road Centerline Data Standard was approved, this standard was based upon the Metro Road Centerline Collaborative (MRCC) standard developed by the metro partners between 2014 and 2017 and later modified to meet additional NextGen9-1-1 specifications and reviewed by the statewide community during two stakeholder review sessions during 2018 and 2019. Kotz also mentioned that the US National Grid and Positional Accuracy Measuring and Reporting standards were approved as a GAC Standard and that the GAC standards approval process was formally

approved. Finally, minor tweaks to both the Address Point Standard and Parcel Standard were adopted to align them with NENA standard domains.

Upcoming standards include converting the MGMG into a GAC standard and a standard for Emergency Service Boundaries and eventually remove state agency coordinate system as a standard.

8) New Project Proposals

8a) Emerald Ash Borer – Remote Sensing Pilot Project Proposal

Hennepin County Forester Dustin Ellis and Coordinator Maas gave a short presentation to the group on a potential pilot project to collect fall color and infra-red imagery to determine the location of green and white ash trees on private land. Knowledge of the location of these trees would be enormously helpful in the outreach to private landowners about the costs and benefits of inoculating healthy trees and removing diseased trees.

Ellis indicated the numerous business needs to be met by the effort including public safety, tree health, water quality, and so forth. The pilot project, if accepted, would take place during the summer and fall of 2020, and if successful might leverage a larger area or a metro wide effort in 2021.

The group offered suggestions that the project proposal include review of data available from NearMap, potential contact with staff at the Minnesota Department of Agriculture and Department of Natural Resources and staff at the University of Minnesota doing imagery processing for tree detection.

8b) Regional Data Federation for NextGen9-1-1, Project Proposal

MESB 9-1-1 Data Coordinator Marcia Broman and Coordinator Maas gave a short presentation on the concept for using the existing MetroGIS regional data process for provisioning data for the NextGeneration9-1-1 effort. The existing processes are suitable for providing data for many needs and are a suitable springboard for future work in federating data. The project would document the current models and processes of inter-agency data federation to produce data suitable for ongoing NextGen9-1-1 system consumption, including identification of what is needed for sustainable maintenance of the regional datasets. Key aspects of the project proposal include to formally and thoroughly define and document the current work & data flows, processes, and roles to maintain the regional datasets to be used for ongoing NextGen 9-1-1 system consumption; to discuss, compare and document (in detail) what is needed for ongoing NextGen9-1-1 system use vs. what is currently available and/or feasible and to define and document any gaps or obstacles between where we are now and where we need to be. Worthwhile goals articulated by Broman in the presentation include: Full documentation of current work & data flows for road and address data, including QA/QC feedback processes and timeframes for data updates; documenting the set of known gaps and obstacles to sustaining

accurate, current and complete datasets; process model(s) and role definitions to serve as best practices; improve feedback loops for ongoing error notification and correction; and to define opportunities to improve both the process & the data for NextGen 9-1-1 deployment.

Proposed participants and their roles for this initiative would include the counties of the metro region, who are the primary data creators & aggregators; the municipalities of the metro region who would be working in partnership with counties to provide updated data for aggregation; the Metro Emergency Services Board who would be providing NG9-1-1 validation to the data coming in; the Metropolitan Council who would be providing schema validation, aggregation & publication, and as needed, MetroGIS to provide facilitation, project documentation & coordination.

Broman offered thoughts from MESB current work affirming the strength of a regional effort toward tightening the availability of datasets for 9-1-1. The first, is that MESB has been performing periodic reviews of the data as it has been posted to the Commons and found that changes to the data are not happening with regular frequency. Even though the scripts and processes are set up to run nightly in the case of address points and centerlines, in some cases, data updates can be happening as irregularly as 8 months apart; counties are wildly uneven in their updates, but, we understand why that might be, errors in processing or not receiving updated data from their cities, and so on.

The second is that, in the metro area at least, between 911 and GIS, there is a high match rate and synchronization rate, generally around 98.5% match rate we are observing, which is certainly good, but we still get contacts from telecom service providers with differing data; the reach of telecom doesn't seem to be extending to city and county GIS departments and we need to find a way to close that loop.

Brandt: I talked with Association of Minnesota Counties lobbyist Leah Patton, and we outlined what it might take us to close that loop. The GIS part of NG9-1-1 deployment has been completely overlooked, it just wasn't on the radar, they're thinking more on systems and equipment but not the data that goes into it, so she was trying to get a sense of what that effort will take. Our message is that address points and centerlines are never done, there is a long and continuous maintenance tail, it is a program to be continually maintained not a project with a clear beginning and end.

Koukol: My observation is that 'update time' is not a useful measure, I can update once a day, but if we have not received updated data from our cities, it's not particularly helpful or useful. A more useful discussion would be the data lifecycle discussion, charting data from its creation to its inclusion and finding ways to improve that, document that and make use of that rather than trying to adhere to some short-term update cycle that is determined by a time interval.

Broman: Once we are eventually in a live-NG9-1-1 environment, live validations will be performed and run all the time. At present our bigger issue is the life cycle of getting data from city to county to validation to testing.

Mathews: Do we have an indication of what are other states doing?

Broman: At a statewide level, other states are not federating data up the way we are attempting in Minnesota, this is not really an approach being taken elsewhere.

Ross: We are in some sense similar to what is being done in Arkansas,

Broman: If this is a funding thing or a legislation thing, we need a plan of how this work with some clarity. I asked the various counties to send me any documentation they had in place as to their internal processes as to how the data flows. Washington County provided a good 'swim-lane' diagram, Scott County has done some work, most cases, the counties weren't able to offer anything written down, the data process was a series of informal agreements.

Read: Are GIS staff use the applications like the Metro Address Editor Tool, is this helping to get stuff in?

Koukol: We've done outreach and training, but often the commitment to use the tool and deliver the data fades, and also with city staff turnover, we can lose them providing consistent delivery.

Brandt: Yes, when I talked with Leah (Association of Minnesota Counties lobbyist), we discussed the difference between top down vs. grassroots; the essential piece is building relationships between all levels, point of contact in each of community. By way of example, when we recently had the tornado in Scania Township, having the established relationship and contacts in place was really important for efficiently getting things done.

9) Current MetroGIS Work Plan Projects – Brief Updates

9a) Promote 'Maintenance of Regional Datasets and Resources' to the top of the project list as a core function of the MetroGIS collaborative. Maas presented a case for making maintenance of regional datasets a priority; now that these datasets exist, their continued updating and maintenance needs to be a priority of the collaborative. Maas recommended that maintenance of the regional datasets, these being actions by all partners with the data, contracts, communications, validations, corrections, documentation and so on should be a top priority.

Motion to make maintenance of the Metro Regional Datasets a MetroGIS Work Plan Priority was offered by Kotz, seconded by Mathews, unanimous approval, motion passes. Maas to amend the Work Plan document accordingly to reflect this action.

9b) Active Projects – Status/Updates:

9.1) 9-1-1 Regional Data Viewer

Progress on the 9-1-1 Data Viewer application continues. A prototype was shown to the members of the Policy Board in April and they were both impressed and supportive. Recent months have seen the MESB and Metropolitan Council honing the layout and presentation of the application. Refinements and revisions performed by MESB/MetCouncil have been going on since April including how to best breakdown and present the content, the overall design, addition of tools, and representation of features. Potentially to two (or more) versions depending on the needs we encounter from stakeholder feedback might be presented during the stakeholder review period anticipated this fall. Outreach for user experience testing is anticipated in Fall 2019. The stakeholders are to be specifically contacted during the various phases of prototyping of the proposed viewer.

9.2) Metro Stormwater Geodata Project (MSWGP)

The MSWGP has been very active in the past 6 months with a steering committee meeting on April 30, and several technical team and numerous small group meeting to refine the prototype data standard. The Steering Team successfully selected twelve (12) pilot sites around the metro and as of this writing, about one-third of the cities within those sites have contributed their data for the pilot study.

Maas has been providing outreach and presentation to the professional community including the MPCA (May 25, 2019), GAC (May 29, 2019), MnDNR (June 11, 2019), Metro-MAWD (July 16, 2019) and the Water Resources Center of the University of Minnesota (July 18, 2019) and intends future outreach presentations throughout the 2019 into 2020. Work in late summer and fall of 2019 will focus on approval of the prototype standard as 'good enough to test' at the upcoming 8/27/19 meeting in Bloomington and by late 2019-early 2020, dissemination of data in the prototype standard to the stakeholder community for review, testing and comment. Maas indicated that all project materials are on the MSWGP project page on metrogis.org and encouraged the group if they had questions about the effort to contact him.

9.3) Statewide Road Centerline Dataset

With the GAC approving the state road centerline standard (the GAC RCLS, based upon the metro-developed MRCC schema) on May 29, 2019, the geospatial community now has a reliable and peer-reviewed data standard to work with to federate road centerline data. At the Metro Tech Session on July 17, 2019, the Metro Counties agreed to being transition from the MRCC v.1.7 to the GAC RCLS later in 2019. The Metropolitan Council intends to provide a validation script/tool by mid-September and Counties endeavor to deliver test data in the GAC RCLS format by December 2019 and transition to the metro regional datasets being available in the GAC RCLS format by late January 2020. Maas displayed an 'equivalency' chart comparing the MRCC v. 1.7 to the GAC RCLS and showing the evident similarities.

9.4) Parcel Data Best Practices Guide

The Parcel Data Best Practices Guide remains in development. This guide is intended to contain a collection of illustrated examples, terminology and case studies for how data creators and data producers can best understand, create, use and interpret the geospatial parcel data available from the counties producing it in Minnesota. The guide will be aligned to the materials in the Parcel Data Standard as adopted by the Geospatial Advisory Council and when a first draft is published it will be offered for edit, critique and review by the GAC's Parcel and Land Records Committee and the county data producers across the state. At present, Maas continued to collect examples and work on the draft, ideally complete in fall of 2019.

9.5) Addressing Resource Guide

Maas indicated he is still working on the research and compilation of case examples and resources for the forthcoming guide, the intention of this document is to serve as a resource for both geospatial and non-geospatial professionals. The main purpose of the guide is to help the data producer and user community understand the origins, usage, terminology, and importance of addressing. A draft document is anticipated sometime in late 2019.

9.6) Metro Park and Trail Dataset and Data Standard

Metropolitan Council GIS staff member Jon Hoekenga developed a validation specification based on the Metro-modified NRPA-v. 1.2 metro park and trail schema. The dataset was updated in July and is available from the Geospatial Commons.

9.7) External Platform Publishing

With the consistent status of geospatial data being freely and openly available in the metro and the emergence of the standardized regional datasets for roads, address points, parcels and parks and trails, the metro community is working to connect with larger external platforms an encouraging them consume this data. As per the direction of the Seven County GIS Managers, the Metropolitan Council is acting on the region's behalf to publish the regional datasets to ESRI's Community Basemap. Mark Kotz got the Metropolitan Council to approve it having a presence on the ESRI Community Basemap and publish the regional datasets. Maas has been pinged the San Francisco office of Google about once every two months to get them to use the metro data data and Joe Sapletal of Dakota County has been engaged with Open Street Map to assess its potential to take on the metro regional datasets. Future work includes the final deployment of the regional datasets into the ESRI Community Basemap account by the Council on behalf of the region (once the functional class attribute workflow has been solved). The modification of the regional dataset disclaimer language to include 'public domain' was understood to be a removal of a barrier to Google maps being able to consume the data, with that taken care of hopefully our regional datasets will begin appearing ino clarify its availability as fully public and continued interaction with external platforms to consume the regional materials.

Maintenance Operations:

9.8) Metro Regional Centerlines Collaborative (MRCC) Dataset

The MRCC road centerline dataset has been available since April of 2017 for the Seven Metro Counties and late 2018/early 2019 seeing the addition of Chisago and Isanti Counties to the dataset. Sherburne County's data was added to the dataset in Spring 2019, bringing the total up to ten counties represented. The metro counties endeavor to begin delivering regional data in the GAC RCLS format

9.9) Support for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons

The MetroGIS collaborative continues to support and publish to the Minnesota Geospatial Commons, as do many of the participating agencies and interests. As of August 7, 2019, there are 813 resources available from 30 different organizations available.

9.10) Free + Open Data Progress, Research and Outreach

As of August 1, 2019, 30 counties have made their data freely and openly available across Minnesota. Olmsted County and Cook County have identified open data as a priority and are working internally to move toward county board approval. MetroGIS partners will engage in additional speaking and outreach engagements as they arise, perform and publish updates to our existing documents as needed, continued to perform research on topic as they emerge and to work with our partners in Greater Minnesota as they arise.

9.11) Metro Address Point Dataset

The regional address point dataset has successfully added both Isanti and Chisago counties data in late 2018 and anticipates the addition of Sherburne County's data at some point later in 2019. This dataset will be an integral resource for eventual NextGen9-1-1 deployment.

9.12) Address Point Editor Tool, v. 4.0

The Address Point Editor Tool remains available from GitHub and the Minnesota Geospatial Commons as a resource for governments and jurisdictions who assign addresses and produce and publish address point data. There are no current plans to update the tool, however, if the user community wishes to suggest updates, the tool can be revisited. At the Metro Partners Geospatial Technical Meeting on July 17, 2019 several of the county partners indicated they were not actively using the tool and were unaware if their constituent communities were

10) Lightning Round Update

Blenkush (Hennepin County): The County is extending its Pictometry contract for another year; we will have it available to all our users through August 2020. Also we are kicking off an internal aerial imagery needs assessment this fall, we seek to better understand what all the internal needs are for aerial imagery and to develop a long term budget and plan for it. We are committing resources on improving our road centerline and looking to develop a work flow for the maintenance of building footprints. Our GIS office is developing a schema based on the Microsoft footprints and moving toward the maintenance of the data being handled in the

survey department. We will likely kick off a pilot in one or two PLSS sections and see how it goes. We'd eventually like to establish a process where survey staff can maintain the building footprints on an ongoing basis, pulling in permit information as plats come and working in the new address points, footprints and so on. The primary business driver for this is change detection for the assessor's office. We have a couple staffing updates as well, Tracy Tisbo is leaving, she is headed to California, her last day is August 9. She's been a very talented asset for us and this is a big loss for the county. Her position is posted on our website and will close on August 16. Also, we are filling the position of Project Manager, this would be a replacement for Ann Houghton's position after she retired.

Riley (Carver County): We are making use of our summer intern to collect IT assets throughout our IT department, we recognized that we are not really tracking our inventory of computing devices, printers and scanners very well, we tend to send them out and then realize that we don't track them. Over time, it is hard to assess who has what, so we are using GIS for rapid collection, our intern is collecting asset information at the rate of about 10 people per hour and we are able to pull down data from Dell to get product details. Also, ADA-compliance (Americans with Disabilities Act) is a priority for our county everything ranging from web documents, to our parcel viewer applications, we are working to ensure that everything is ADA compliant. We're looking at it from a GIS perspective, every organization in Carver County has been moving to ADA compliance actually based on some lawsuits that we've faced. Also, we are facing an aging population, this helps us better serve the needs of that set of our citizens.

Kne (U-Spatial): At the University, we have a new president as well as a large level of upper level leadership change, so there is a good opportunity to increase the profile of our spatial resources. Also, U-Spatial has merged with Stacey Stark's geospatial lab at UN-Duluth, which serves to double our resource pool. Finally, we have 9272 ArcGIS On Line accounts, we are almost at the magic number of 10,000, which we anticipate hitting this fall semester.

Matson (CURA): No project updates, but as a reminder, the new semester is less than month away, we have students looking for projects and internships in planning, community development and GIS, so please get in touch if you have a project, we can match you with a student to knock it out for you.

Broman (MESB): You've heard all about NG9-1-1 already, so I will pass.

Maddio (Eagan): We've been focused on asset management, utilities and public works departments are making extensive use of ESRI tools, we've found them to be very helpful to the field deployed workforce, especially using the collector apps and Survey 1-2-3. Increasing levels of deployment helps generate a great deal of really good data.

Anderson (Woodbury): We've also been heavily invested in asset management work for everything ranging from stormwater to water, waste water, trees, roads, parks and traffic signals, facilities management, linking to record plans to asset management package and linking to pipe data to CCTV camera inspection video. , We have opted to move away from an ESRI

solution, which steers us away from license issues and saves us a great deal of money, it does prevent us from leveraging some of the ESRI benefits.

Magnuson (RWMWD): We've been looking to better communicate with our constituent public about flooding issues, related to climate change. We've been creating more materials for our website, for outreach, to tell them more about what we do and I've begun digging into our as-builts for alignment of data with the forthcoming storm water pilot project.

Mathews (MNDOT): I'm now with MNDOT it took me about 3 months to onboard, I'm with the Office of Environmental Stewardship and we support environmental review work for MNDOT projects, so we are a significant seat of coordination within the agency. We have a steering committee for GIS specifically and we are presently in an asset inventory, going through tying features to as-builts drawings and making it available both internally and externally. Actually, we are conducting a process of 'inventorying our inventories'; we have a huge push to standardize our work internally to align things more efficiently. Also, Mn DOT has expanded its GIS staff with five new hires, five of the Greater Minnesota districts didn't have GIS staff, so I have been working to coordinate their various on boarding process as well. Within our own office, we are working to develop and create a base map of a "parent map" to serve many functions—a compilation of resources and services and then creating data for those that do not exist and to manage the authoritative sources. One challenge we are encountering is to identify data stewards and to clarify the roles of stewardship of data within in the organization.

Monsour (Scott County): We are looking to deploy Cartograph for Asset Management, and in preparation for that we are collecting data non-stop through public works with iPads, Trimbles, etc. with that comes the need to polish up the workflows. Along with that, we are working with our Soil and Water Conservation District staff for field data collection. We are also working toward a hosted model for our CAMA, we have to host it in GIS before it goes back out to the system but we can reinforce it as a hybrid model and incorporate parcel geometry and connecting the data, we will see how this development gels and comes together with what we currently have. We will be able to have building plans go into the system, our tax staff can take a building plan, geo-reference it and make a building footprint out of that and it looks to be very accurate.

Read (MMCB): Most of our people are killing mosquitoes right now, but other than that our big project initiative is to map all the stormwater drains along the streets and document if they are sumps and holding water so we can treat them, we're collecting this through our mobile application. We are also looking to use drones for fill-in and augmentation in areas where development has taken place since the last aerial photos were captured. We are very much looking forward to the 2020 aerial collection.

Koukol (Ramsey County): We have re-upped our NearMap contract for another year, ours is a little different than the others worked out with Joint Power Agreement we have with the cities and organizations in the Ramsey County GIS Users Group. The county has the contact and extends it to all the members in the user group, we have the orthophotos but not the obliques

or 3D materials, we look to launch a unified imagery plan among the county folks soon. Typically, we were on a cycle of 2-3 years collecting either ortho imagery or obliques, but we are hearing that we to be getting updated imagery every other year so we will work toward that. We have launched an instance of ESRI roads and highway and will be mimicking the MNDOT State ID on our roads and we look to spin off a local system as well. Our 'kitchen sink' map viewer application "MapRamsey" is moving to an ESRI application. Also, we should have an ESRI ELA by 2020. Also, we are seeing some changes in internal GIS division, in next couple months may be other positions opening to backfill positions, we are growing and expanding.

Ross (MnGeo): MnGeo is working with GAC 3D Geomatics team on LIDAR acquisition plan for the state and we are working with the Secretary of State's Office with elections board registration and election data. Also, there will be new NAIP areal data coming in (available late winter). We also have the new ESRI master contract signed.

Kotz (Metropolitan Council): The Council is in the middle of an upgrade to 10.7 and we are in the middle of migrating from old NCompass centerline data to the MRCC; we are one agency that has been using NCompass extensively for many years for our transit system, so new transition is quite a process in getting legacy systems to work with the new geometry, the new attributes, the larger unique id, and so on. We are working with the transit software vendors, some are upgraded, some still in process. We are flying imagery in 2020 with MnGeo and we will be using the state's master purchase agreement, this flight will be one-foot leaf off, other partners can buy up to higher resolution if you need it, please contact Tanya Mayer in our office if you are interested.

Brandt (Washington): We recently lost a resource for 9-1-1 Address Mapping so it is all-hands on deck to edit address points and maintain our data for 9-1-1. We are working with our Environmental Protection are to roll out a pilot by the end of August with WorkForce to dispatch assigned to facilities inspection; to visit the 3M campus, our concrete and asphalt recycling site, our solid waste facilities, and so on. We are converting existing PDF forms into Survey 123 and their dispatch is able to fill out the forms to close out job; we will see how it works together. Part of rolling that out would be have Portal exposed to the outside and work with ArcGIS On Line. We have been struggling a bit with our internal IT folks to allow connection to our internal databases.

Dahl (MNEQB): No update.

11) Next Coordinating Committee Meeting is scheduled for *Thursday, October 31, 2019*

12) Adjourn

Motion to adjourn: Kotz; second Brandt; Chair Dahl adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm