



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 26, 2015, 2015, 1 PM - 3:30 PM

Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

MetroGIS™ [Meeting Minutes – Approved August 27, 2015]

Members Present:

Erik Dahl, Environmental Quality Board, Chair
Dave Brandt, Washington County, Vice Chair
Brad Henry, University of Minnesota-Special Expertise
Carrie Magnuson, Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District
Eric Haugen, Resource Data, Inc.
Gordy Chinander, Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Mitchell Winiecki, LOGS (proxy for Ben Verbick)
Chris Mavis, Hennepin County (proxy for Gary Swenson)
Matt Koukol, Ramsey County
Curtis Carlson, Northstar MLS
Randy Knippel, Dakota County
Pete Henschel, Carver County
John Slusarczyk, Anoka County
Dan Ross, Minnesota Geospatial Information Office
Tony Monsour, Scott County
Ron Wencil, USGS
Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council (proxy for Mark Kotz)
Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
Len Kne, U-Spatial-University of Minnesota
Hal Watson, Minnesota Department of Natural Resource

Guests:

Tom Bushey, Hennepin County

Absent:

Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Gary Swenson, Hennepin County
Francis Harvey, University of Minnesota
Ben Verbick, LOGIS
Matt Baker, Metropolitan Airports Commission
Nancy Read, Metro Mosquito Control District
Jeff Matson, CURA-University of Minnesota
Sally Wakefield, SharedGeo (Non-Profit)
David Bitner, dbSpatial
Jim Fritz, Xcel Energy

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

1) Call to Order

Chair Dahl called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm

2) Approval of Meeting Agenda

Motion: Henry; Second: Carlson, motion carried

3) Approve Meeting Minutes from January 22, 2015

Motion: Koukol, Second: Slusarczyk, motion carried

4) Lightning Round Update

Henry: I remain engaged with the MN 2050 effort; we are working on the statewide survey to cities and counties on the status of their infrastructure.

Haugen: No update

Magnuson: No update

Chinander: We will be adding an E911 component to the Data Producer Working Group/Eight County Collaborative meeting beginning on April 8.

Winiecki: LOGIS is working with Hennepin County LOGIS with the deployment of the MetroGIS Address Point Tool, we are in the pre-production phase in both the cities of Maple Grove and Golden Valley.

Bushey: No update, I'm here at Chris's "plus one" today.

Mavis: We've just hired Tom Bushey, also we have just completed our Pictometry flight.

Koukol: We have also completed our Pictometry flight, we'll also be getting high resolution imagery through Surdex in the coming two weeks.

Carlson: Spring is when we (Northstar MLS) conducts our full parcel update, we will be acquiring and working in as many county parcel datasets as we can into our geodatabase to get it up to date.

Knippel: Dakota County has just finished its 2014 contract with Pictometry as they were unable to finish the leaf-off imagery collected last year and needed to complete the collection last week. We are installing the USNG emergency location markers in Lebanon Hills Regional Park this spring and the City of St Paul is also installing them in Lilydale Park. Various uses of the USNG are being mentioned and we are getting some traction with it. The State of Iowa is moving quickly with their work on USNG as well; very encouraging to see. From the Data Producers Work Group, we continue to meet monthly and as Gordy mentioned, we are adding an Emergency Services 911 component to the meetings. In our list of items we are discussion

the creation of 1K USNG maps for the entire seven county metro and Dan (Ross) has indicated we could potentially publish the maps on the Geospatial Commons. I recently attended a metro regional emergency managers meeting, there is a joint powers agreement among multiple counties and cities to work together. The meeting was very well attended and there was support for both the regional map series and USNG. About half of the group were strong advocates for it and the others were at least aware of it.

Henschel: No update

Slusarczyk: In Anoka County, we are in the process of pulling together a new web GIS platform, from WebGIS we are partnering with Dakota and Washington counties on this as well. Our current site is using Silverlight and is not particularly mobile friendly.

Ross: From the statewide perspective, the NextGen9-1-1 is moving along, picking up speed, a lot will be happening before October of this year, we will be leveraging the standards this group had put together on centerlines and address points, many members of this group will be involved in the discussion.

Monsour: We've got a number of things in the works, one of the major ones at the moment that we are focused on address points, we've met with our cities and have some good energy going to get that put together, we've got some interns coming in this summer to work, one big use for this will be to support the new dispatch system.

Wencl: Two main things, we are wrapping up a National Hydrography study requirements and documenting the benefits and core uses of the data. We've received input from all levels of data users in the 50 states, identifying over 600 mission critical activities that depend on the data. In Minnesota we had 53 regional and local responses, incl. Carrie and Geoff here at the table.

We will be hosting a meeting in May centered on the 3DEP program, our funding mechanism for that was to include federal, state, and local partnerships. The 3DEP is really seen as the 'next generation' of elevation data.

McGuire: I am here as proxy for Mark Kotz today, I will be presenting on the Shared Tiled Imagery topic later on.

Hoekenga: I will be providing an update later on regarding Address Point Aggregation work.

Watson: We are working to address the new waterway buffer protection rules that have come down from the governor's office. Essentially, it looks to create a 50-foot buffer along streams and water courses of specific designations and types to protect them from overuse and farming runoff. We are being asked to provide various types of analysis and maps to meet the water quality protection goals.

Kne: We have a couple of events coming up next week, the Career Fair at the University is a chance for you all to post jobs and to network, good chance to connect, this will be next Monday (March 30th). Also, Carl Steinitz, emeritus professor from Harvard University will be giving a lecture on GeoDesign at Coffman Memorial Union; he is the person who actually coined the term 'geodesign'.

Brandt: Washington County is working with Anoka and Dakota on the WebGIS platform.

Dahl: Pass

5) Park, Recreational Lands and Trail Data Standardization

Watson: I am here to essentially make a proposal for a forthcoming project that will need to leverage MetroGIS' existing relationships and work process. The DNR is involved in an application development project that involves integration of multiple jurisdictions park, recreational land and trail data across the region and the state. We have a mandate from the State Legislature to stand up a web application where users can, at a high level, search for and acquire info they want on recreational amenities.

The goal of the DNR specifically is to enhance the integrated use of park and trail data into a , comprehensive and integrated accessible database of *all* regional parks and trails, not just DNR assets, but regional and county as well.

We are focused on using this strategy to develop an integrative website, so users can access this essential info about regional parks across the state.

Objectives of the initiative include: the larger goal to engage Minnesotans in more outdoor recreation; meet the need for users to have access to online info about trails, parks and recreational amenities in an easy to use format. At present, most users are unaware and do not care which agency manages a particular recreational site or amenity. The DNR site would serve as a gateway to increase traffic to local sites; we look to 'promote the brands' of the various organizations that maintain and run the parks, promote the Legacy Amendment funding for this project.

The project is really focused on the 'end user perspective', we as maintaining agencies, data producers and managers; we don't presently publish the information in a way that facilitates a seamless end user experience.

The work to date includes identifying the key partners, these include the DNR, the Metropolitan Council and the ten implementing agencies with works with in the metro region, the Explore Minnesota group, MnGeo, Greater Minnesota Parks and Trails.

We want to create a protocol and standard for aggregation that will allow listed organization to roll up into state-wide dataset, through the architecture of the Commons.

Regional partners can function as coordinators for their constituent group to help the DNR aggregate the information. Our goals are both short term and long term, and include the following:

Short term goals:

Development of a Recreational Data Standard
Partner with MetroGIS in the Standard Development Process
Creation of a Park and Trail End User Website

Long term goals:

A set of consistently structured and reliable recreational data and services;
Dataset that is consumable by a wide variety of public and private applications developers and users;

MetroGIS has had some success in the past with developing data standards, specifically parcels, address points and road centerline data. Randy's (Knippel) comment at a recent meeting helped get us thinking in a larger context, we want to integrate the service so users can write their own applications again, around the park data, with us aggregating, standardizing and building the data, we can facilitate that.

So I am pitching this proposal to solicit the MetroGIS group to facilitate a process, create task force or a work team to develop a standard. Again, we want to not just meet the DNRs requirements, we want the dataset to serve everyone's needs.

Questions/Comments:

Knippel: As Hal mentioned, we met not too long ago, meeting was initiated by the DNR, who I feel may not have realized how we are already meeting and collaborating on these issues. We can probably apply a similar process to the project as we have recently with the Metro Centerlines work, we've been working with a project manager assigned by Hennepin County (Ann Houghton); we could very likely apply the same approach with this.

Brandt: In the past we have used the Technical Advisory Team for this kind of work, is there an opportunity to re-engage that group?

Ross: This is good to have the metro resources ready to use, I would try to include the Greater Minnesota parks and trails commission as well, many of the model elements are already made and we could potentially begin with Houston Engineering's data model, they have been working with the Greater Minnesota group.

Watson: There are some examples of this kind of data model already usable, some federal, some that are in use by the Greater Minnesota group.

Knippel: From our prior discussion, seems like there is a tight timeline for what the DNR needs to meet its mandate, we could probably meet the initial DNR requirements early on, and then develop a more full set of model requirements later on. What is the timeline to meet your deadline?

Watson: I anticipate we need a data model by November [2015] and to be able to test pulling the data in early 2016.

Knippel: I would recommend that the Data Producer Work Group take this on for follow up; We could potentially send this to the TAT and approach Hennepin County to see if we can make use of Ann's (Houghton) time again as project manager. As a follow up item with them, we will need to see the how we work in the non-county interests that operate parks in Hennepin County.

[Note, the non-county interests are three of the ten park implementing agencies in the metro which are the City of Bloomington, City of Minneapolis and Three Rivers Park District]

Koukol: With the metro centerline work, we have already begun to think about the multi-modal nature of the system, as in the trails being connected to the road network for dispatch an emergency services, there may be a way to bring those discussion together and build on what we are already doing.

Maas: For this to be a formal MetroGIS project, we do need to add it to our work plan document and it would likely displace one or two items that are presently on our designated list. It seems like we can determine a strong business need, a champion and an owner, but we need to tighten up who would be on the work team. We will be revisiting our project list later in the meeting when we do updates.

Next Steps for Park-Rec-Trail Data Standard:

Get the item on the Data Producers Work Group/Eight County Collaborative meeting agenda for April 8; have each county designate a staff person to be their contact for the project; this will form the

Hal Watson to collect the DNR's specific data needs to meet their Legislative Mandate
Geoff Maas to work with Metropolitan Council regional park staff to collect their

6) Shared Tiled Imagery Concept

Matt McGuire, GIS System Administrator with the Metropolitan Council, described an emerging need and project concept for developing a shared tiled imagery system and how MetroGIS partners could help realize the benefit of this effort.

The central 'ask' is to work to coordinate on sharing tiling scheme for base maps and aerial images, the main benefits of this would be its applicability for working across county boundaries (seamless at the boundary) and for use in mobile applications. The ability to create our own tiled schema in the metro, where the counties are all using the same scale levels would facilitate this greatly.

Some of the current limitations are the continued reliance on UTM which limits customer choice and the various base map scale levels not aligning across the metro.

Similarities we see across the metro include six of the seven counties providing imagery web services and at six-inch resolution.

Differences we see related to how the data is served up, there are a mix of projections (county coordinates, UTM, Web Mercator are the three most in use); the use of similar but not identical scale levels and a need for standardized tiling rows and columns.

After working through this and presenting it at the TAT in February, I discovered what we are exploring is very close to what ESRI has available through its Community Base Map offering.

The benefits of working on this include:

- Easy to share each other's base maps, facilitates ease of use
- Can combine to build regional base maps both with imagery and imagery and 'decoration' (e.g. feature labels, names, etc.)
- Local redundancy (overlap at county boundaries)
- Common Operating Pictures for all involved
- Ease of access and use in 'mutual aid' situations
- Ability to load a single basemap

Benefits of Web Mercator: easy to mash up (Add from slides)

Utilities are baked into it.

Contribute to community base maps.

Scheme is already defined, wouldn't have to do much.

Issues with web Mercator:

Not best for print,;

NGS advisory out accuracy disclaimer and layout.

A proposal to the CC:

Consider the tradeoffs of Web Mercator

Choose a scheme in a coordinate system

Establish a mechanism for sharing tiles

Agencies that produce data can produce data in the agreed upon format

Share them in an aggregator;

Similar to ESRI Community Base Map, except it doesn't go in farther.

Comments/Questions:

Knippel: Could we extend the existing features of Community Base Map (CBM)? If we were able to get a higher scale in CBM, would solve the problem?

McGuire: Dan Falbo (ESRI) has agreed to host an info session on the Community Base Map when he was at the February 3rd TAT meeting, we could compile questions of that nature for that info session.

Knippel: With our restrictions on sharing data now gone, we can certainly contribute to something like CBM, to meet your proposal sounds like a good reason to move that way. With restrictions gone on the data, we can contribute it. Leverage these concerns, heres a good reason to do it.

Work out the stuff on the back end, shared tiles, etc.

We can explore it in that way

Look at CMB first how we can meet that.

Do one, put it in CMB

Google, local street map, rather than just feeding one vendor

ESRI Community Maps Program Page

McGuire: One of the advantages of web Mercator is that we could readily contribute to CMB, still have the source that can be provided without any extra process.

Ross: The State, and from what you say Matt, the Council is all still in UTM. Depending on the target audiences, be that government agency or public we may wind up having to carry both (Web Mercator and UTM)

Knippel: Google and Bing got things going with Web Mercator a long time ago, it will be hard to 'fight' that as it is now so widely used.

McGuire: If we are sharing information and we all have needs that Web Mercator doesn't meet, we may simply need to maintain and manage two systems.

Brandt: I would be concerned about the limits to the scale threshold, 1:1128 appears to be the lowest (largest) it can go to.

Bushey: Can each county generate tiles at a larger scale for its own use?

McGuire: A possibility, certainly the Council needs larger scale than 1:1128 as well.

Ross: I can see this conversation continue beyond the metro, for example, we've been working with the State Patrol on their tile cache system.

Next steps:

Contact Dan Falbo @ ESRI and get a demo/info session set up focused on CBM

Each county research the CBM to see what does/doesn't meet your existing needs

7) Policy Board Update

Maas provided a quick update, indicating that the next Policy Board meeting would be the 2015 Annual Meeting as would occur on April 29th. Agenda items for this meeting are to include updates on projects,

8) Revised MetroGIS Operational Guidelines and Procedures Approval

Maas mentioned that a draft revision of the current

9) Work Plan Project Update Briefs

9a – more state partners, aggregate metro only, need to attack it more widely

Better way to do that more than just aggregate points and centerlines

Set a meeting in april to get a data aggregation process

Adam Item is very excited in that.

DR can roll it up if it has to; NG911 focus

Curt: Statewide parcel standard: DOR – stuck with new data model, mandate to do that;

Mandate,, didn't' want the two to be different

State agencies together to bring them together... discussion with the committee DOR and state needs...

Proposed standard, in flux, the way it is.

DOR – not much of a match, 60% match with metro standard, frozen it until 2016.

Most of the data (CAMA) not looking for that.

Geography with pin:

Commons: large amount of work.

219 resources in there;
Public release
Looking for partners
Many way to participate
Link to portals –
Reference to your data, points back to your site
Recognize that as the measn to it.
Metadata training is almost complete
Texting export of the data, will be announcement on the commons.

Stateside
Roads and Highways tools, moved to production,
Set up the tools, exposed to the partners, hopefully will be state wide
NDSU work with the engineers in the state
Train them up on the tools
Additonal work to do, data model has changed, MnDOT moving old data into new model
Frozen period updating internal data,
Final data model in May 2015.
Tools are up for the partners...

Goals: extended the tools
Data reviewer extension available on the local end;
Changed as it comes along
Work flows with local government, to help move forward
Accommodate various work flows;

Eventually working toward the MRCC model.

Edit the geography, one where you edit the attributes.
One packet, extension is one, one is esri roads and highways.
Two views of the data,: engieners: road authorities, who will enter the geometry
Provision for multiple geometries?
Don't' count on it.
Handle both LRS and single

\$\$\$: Software development for centerlines development.

10) MetroGIS 2015 Budget Programming Discussion

Maas reminded the group that at present MetroGIS had not programmed its remaining \$50,320 for calendar 2015. He posted the list of active projects and indicated that none of the projects had an immediate or overt need for funding; rather, they were being met by labor or in-kind

services. The one suggestion was that custom development work might be required for the Metro Centerlines aggregation work later in the year, the group agreed to revisit this at its next meeting.

11) Next Coordinating Committee Meeting is presently scheduled for Thursday, July 23, 2015, it was noted that this date occurs during the ESRI User Conference and might be pushed to August instead. Maas indicated he would look into pushing the meeting to a later date to accommodate this request.

12) Adjourn

Motion to Adjourn: Koukol, Second: Knippel, Chair Dahl adjourned the meeting at 3:17 pm