



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 25, 2014, 1 PM-3:30 PM

Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

[Minutes Approved: January 22, 2015]

Members Attending:

Dave Brandt, Washington County (Vice Chair)	Gary Swenson, Hennepin County
Jim Bunning, Scott County	Pete Henschel, Carver County
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council	Len Kne, University of Minnesota
Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District	Mark Maloney, City of Shoreview, Metro Cities
Curt Carlson, Northstar MLS	Erik Menze, Resource Data, Inc. (alternate for Eric Haugen)
Randy Knippel, Dakota County	Ron Wencil, US Geological Survey
Gordy Chinander, Metro Emergency Services Board	Joella Givens, MnDOT (alternate for Ben Butzow)
Brad Henry, University of Minnesota	

Guests:

Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
Devin Piernot, MGIS Program student, University of Minnesota
Andrew Walz, MGIS Program student, University of Minnesota

Members Absent

John Slusarczyk, Anoka County	Ben Verbick, LOGIS
Jim Fritz, Xcel Energy	Erik Dahl, EQB (Chair)
Hal Watson, MnDNR	Matt Koukol, Ramsey County
Hal Busch, City of Bloomington/Metro Cities	Dan Ross, MnGeo
David Bitner, db Spatial LLC	Matt Baker, Metropolitan Airports Commission
Eric Haugen, Resource Data, Inc.	Ben Butzow, MnDOT
Francis Harvey, University of Minnesota	Jeff Matson, CURA/University of Minnesota
Sally Wakefield, Non-Profit Representative	

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

1) Call to Order

Vice Chair Brandt called the meeting to order at 1:07pm

2) Approval of Meeting Agenda

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

3) Approval of Minutes from June 26, 2014

Motion: Carlson, Second: Kotz motion carried, minutes approved.

4) Lightning Round

Gary Swenson (Hennepin County): We are conducting on-going research and development for our web app builder and continuing to advance the use of ArcGIS Online. We are also focusing on data governance, the county has appointed a Data Governance Officer; this appointment will be very helpful to us in the long run in GIS as we review which materials we can make public. At Hennepin County we have a lot of data that is not discovered even internally, we have a growing sense of responsibility to manage their data and make it usable both within and beyond the county,

Jim Bunning (Scott County): We are continuing to work toward our upgrade to ArcGIS 10.2.2. Also, I am stepping down from Scott County to become part of MN.IT Services and will be reporting to Dan Ross.

Pete Henschel (Carver County): We have recently opened up the Carver County Open Data Portal (<http://data.carver.opendata.arcgis.com/>) and continue to work with the Metropolitan Council to provide parcel data and now address points as well.

Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council): We have a lot going on with GIS at the Council. We are working to meet the demands for mobile inspection tools. We maintain a large number of infrastructure assets such as manholes and features related to waste water infrastructure. We developed a collector application, the business really liked it, and so there is increased demand and an expectation of quick turn-around. Our various businesses needs at the Council include meeting the rising demand for applications development. Since our last [MetroGIS] meeting, we launched a new transit application which integrates transit with Trip Finder. We have more work projects that are part of 24/7 critical applications, a bit stressful to keep it all going, particularly when something related to transit goes down during the State Fair!

Andrew Walz (MGIS Student, University of Minnesota): I am part of the solar energy research team, we will be presenting later in the meeting.

Devin Piernot (MGIS Student, University of Minnesota): Also part of the research team here to present.

Len Kne, (U-Spatial/University of Minnesota): We continue to work on building out a GIS infrastructure for data at the University. We are ESRI-based; we have strong support from our IT folks, library, and university services in continuing to build out our GIS services. We have Oracle on the backend for databases; we are opening things up on the administrative side, linking up with facilities management work, as well as the research and academic side where we are expanding space to create services. We are actively engaged with researchers, trying to teach and train researchers about the importance of metadata. At present we are targeting smaller projects first, coming out in next two months, leveraging ArcGIS Online, we have good use of it across the system and are getting it embedded into classroom use as well.

Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control Board): We have been working to track beehive locations and are working with cities in the metro to determine where bees are permitted or not, where permits are required and which cities don't care and don't require a permit. We are also interested available imagery outside of the existing MnGeo imagery server, please let me know if anything is forthcoming. I was able to attend the recent FOSS4G meeting virtually—attending the conference from the comfort of my office! There is so much great stuff available on line at the FOSS4G website, if you are interested, please have a look.

Mark Maloney (City of Shoreview/Metro Cities): As I have mentioned in past meetings, the water supply topic remains a huge deal, and has the potential to gobble up a lot of resources, there remains so much agency involvement around the issue. One of the benefits however, is that the many agencies involved are coming to understand the interrelated nature of the issues at hand. DNR has to consider ground water appropriation permits allocations and their longer term implications, for example. Another topic related to GIS is that Shoreview has been involved with Ramsey County Emergency Services; it has taken us a while to coordinate fire hydrant data and coordinates into the system. This may seem rudimentary to most, that in 2014 we are still working on that at the local government local level, but we are all working to do what we can with limited resources.

Eric Menze (Resource Data, Inc/Private Sector Representative): I'm attending in place of the usual representative Eric Haugen today.

Curt Carlson (Northstar MLS/Real Estate Representative) I am very much looking forward to the GIS/LIS Conference next week. We are working to relate Electronic Certificate of Real Estate Value (eCRV) system tabular data into a standardized format, transitioning from paper real estate transactions statewide moving to the HTML based electronic base product which is distributed weekly. Thirty-four (34) counties have full eCRV, forty-one (41)

counties are testing it and twelve (12) counties are not using it yet. With the data we track all real estate sales that occurred in the previous week; the data then goes live the next week.

Ron Wencil (USGS): The main highlight for 2015 from the USGS is the 3DEP program and that all our LiDAR will be 'taken it up a notch' being provided at higher density and higher resolution. Please note, we will be discontinuing support for GNIS at federal level and only maintaining 10 feature classes for structures information moving forward.

Gordy Chinander (MESB): Working with the metro centerlines project; keeping track of NG911 requirements as things continue to happen at the national level. Try to keep the local workgroup informed and up to date on what is happening with NG911 requirements.

Joella Givens (MnDOT): We are seeing strong participation with our Georilla platform, folks are thinking more about spatial information and how to better leverage it, we will be presenting on it at the conference; things are going well on that front.

Brad Henry (University of Minnesota): I'll be presenting with Joella and Brad Canaday at the Conference next week, expanding on the 'Living Map' idea and that we need to get as much of our data into the electronic realm for all planning and engineering projects to be able to use. I'm involved with the MN2050 project and we are working to get the cost side of this understood as well. Twin Cities Public Television (tpt) has a great video about the value of the infrastructure to modern life available and the MN2050 project is currently trying to get support and get an infrastructure survey assembled to every city, county and agency that maintains infrastructure in Minnesota with questions like: do you know the location, condition and age of your infrastructural assets? Are you using any kind of Asset Management tracking software? Are you aware of the current value of your infrastructural assets and the potential cost of keeping it up? Many agencies don't know the full value of their infrastructure let along the cost of keeping it up.

Randy Knippel (Dakota County): Continuing to work on the U.S. National Grid. In the new master parks plan adopted by Dakota County Board we will have USNG markers and signage added in the park. We worked with a focus group of fire department, sheriff's department, and park patrol and dispatch center as well as with park visitors service and park maintenance staff to develop supporting materials; we are circulating a brochure to the public to describe what the markers mean as well. [Randy brought examples of the brochure to the meeting for the Committee to review]. Prior to coming here, I attended a staff lunch for the park opening, and we've got some good discussions about making this happen elsewhere and keeping it moving forward. Also I've been talking to St. Paul emergency management staff, looking to help solve the problem of responders getting lost in parks when trying to respond to a call. SharedGeo has been very instrumental in making these things happen; it has taken some effort to get all the players on board at the same time but is now coming together; I've gotten good comments back from fire chiefs in various cities and we will keep moving toward getting things up in the regional parks and trail system.

David Brandt (Washington County): Last meeting I updated the group on our ADA (American with Disabilities Act) compliance mapping effort, notably collecting of access ramps. We had a consultant quote us a project time of 47 days; we had our interns complete it in 14 days. We are using in a different way of working with the collector: using aliases for the fields and an interface that is more like a answering a set of questions, rather than just filling in fields. It's working so well that we will be making use of it for ADA asset collection for all county buildings, this has been . Good success.

Geoff Maas (MetroGIS Coordinator): As I hope most of you have seen the new website went up quietly in July. It is not complete, there are a couple empty spots and conditions are changing with the open data changes and its availability, so I will be doing my best to keep it up. A reminder, this is your site, please let me know what it needs what I can add that is valuable for you. The conference is next week; we'll have several of the county managers on hand for a 90-minute open data panel, plus Mark Sloan from Clay County. Also, MetroGIS received a State Government Innovation award for all of our free and open data work earlier this year. The ceremony was held back

in August at the Minnesota History Center. Payments to counties are in progress, four are complete for 2014, three remain.

6) Policy Board Update

Coordinator Maas informed the group that the July 23, 2014 Policy Board meeting was not convened. An update notice in lieu of that meeting was provided to the Board members. The members of the Coordinating Committee felt that convening the Policy Board for its next scheduled time in October would be appropriate to provide updates on projects, follow up on the success of the Free and Open Data initiative and the other on-going work of the collaborative. Maas was directed to contact Policy Board chair Terry Schneider and confirm his approval to convene. The next Policy Board meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, October 23, 2014** at the Metro Counties Government Center.

7) Technical Presentations: Solar Capacity Modeling

Two related presentations on solar capacity modeling were given; the first by David Brandt, Washington County GIS Coordinator/GIS Faculty University of Wisconsin-River Falls, who, as part of his recent master's thesis research developed a solar capacity modeling project for the City of Stillwater. The second was by student researchers Andrew Walz and Devon Piernot from the University of Minnesota's U-Spatial lab.

Key points from Brandt's presentation included his methodology for solar capacity assessment, possible impacts to the utility grid of increased solar deployment, the impact of planning and adding solar power infrastructure to planning and zoning and impact on historical districts (in places like Stillwater), development planning, impact on tree planning, design of homes and what level of solar power adaptation is realistic.

Key points from the Walz/Piernot presentation was their methodology of using the work and research of Brandt and extend it statewide; they cited that Brandt's work was a 'blueprint' and were able to extend it statewide in a 1-meter application with a focus on what would be most usable resource for the largest amount of people. Key goals of their final application and its use include raising the general public's awareness, assist solar installers to perform cost estimating and make the data available to anyone working professionally (planners, building trades, etc.) who could make use of this level of data.

Key challenges in building the analysis include the balancing resources available vs. amount of data to be processed. Walz and Piernot described their 'fishnet' concept, to develop a grid across the entire state of optimal size to process each cell in the dataset and up the speed of processing. They were able to use compressed LiDAR data (940 GB compressed, would have been over 10+ TB) They described their use of PostGRES/PostGIS to assign each tile a record and their buffering methodology so each tile considers the shade of neighboring tiles.

The final released application enables a user to view their property, to click a point and determine the amount of solar energy they have access to. The tool also has links to their utility provider and will soon also provide resources for linking to solar installers in their area. As the project is on-going more functionality will be included and added. Additional tools the team hopes to include are dollar calculations of what you could save on your energy bill by adding solar power.

Walz and Piernot also described many of the challenges they faced, notably in using the LiDAR data. They stated that 'not all LiDAR is created equally' and described the various issues which arose in processing the data and that LiDAR is out of date the moment you get it and start working with it. Walz and Piernot hope their findings and innovative use of the LiDAR would help to shape and support continued LiDAR data collection and serve as an advocacy point to spur the much-needed on-going and sustained collection of LiDAR data.

U-Spatial Associate Director Len Kne praised the students and the project stating that with seven (7) dedicated students and no funding, they managed to get it done, and get it done well. The project encompassed approximately \$100,000 in staff time and 30,000 hours of computer processing time. The project was a success due to the 'volunteer/can-do spirit' of those involved and the project was acknowledged by ESRI, winning their Climate Challenge award.

Solar Project Links and Resources:

- Their 'Solar Map' application resource can be found here: maps.umn.edu/solar/
- The Python code used for the project is available on GitHub;
- The project URL is here: solarp.uspatial.umn.edu with source code, services and links available through this site as well.

8) Work Project Updates

At each quarterly meeting, the Committee receives an update on the projects currently active in the Work Plan.

8a) Address Points Aggregation

Both Dakota and Carver counties have their address points created and published to DataFinder. Hennepin County is testing the MetroGIS Address Point Editor tool in the cities of Hopkins and Brooklyn Park. No address point data is presently in production in Washington or Scott counties.

8b) Free and Open Data Updates

Pete Henschel re-iterated that Carver County has stood up its open data portal.

Gary Swenson added that Hennepin County continues to work with its internal review process, with new data being added to their data portal as it is approved; an additional 33 data layers will be added to the portal shortly.

Dave Brandt added that in Washington County internal discussions continue, the issue is coming together and he is hopeful that they can have a resolution passed before the end of the year.

Jim Bunning indicated that no action has occurred in Scott County on the issue, however, he has been granted permission by the county surveyor to give the data away if a party requests it.

Geoff Maas indicated he would be reaching out to (county surveyor) Jim Hentges in the near future to engage him on the issue in Scott County, that several counties in Greater Minnesota continue to call and email for information on the issue, and the presentation to the NSGIC national conference (Sept 16, 2014)—co presenting with New York GIO William Johnson was very well received by the national audience, many people around the United States see Minnesota as an important case study on open data issue.

8c) Support for the Geospatial Commons

Maas: The stated goal of MnGeo remains to have the state agency-level clearinghouses' entire data available through the Commons by the end of the year. As neither Hal (Watson) nor Dan (Ross) is in attendance today, I don't have any more specific details to offer the group.

8d) Address Point Editor Enhancement (Version 3.0)

Kotz: The contract is executed with the vendor, once again we are working with North Point Geographic out of Duluth, key enhancements to be added to this version of the tool include, support address change report and email notices, add functionality to 'Add New Points' tool, added functionality to page-thru and scroll item of multi-selection points, modification to the interface for larger comments field and scrollable pop-out field, support checks for duplicate addresses, adding a tool to calculate a hypothetical address and organization and management of the application's code. Version 3.0 of the tool is anticipated to be completed and available for use by December of 2014.

8e1 & 8e2) State and Metro Centerlines Initiatives

Maas: The Statewide Centerline Initiative remains within the wheelhouse of MnDOT right now; I have not been actively involved for a while on that project. The Metro Regional Centerlines Collaborative has been very active in

the past months. A draft data model is prepared, with a sample dataset showcasing a portion of Anoka, Hennepin and Ramsey County.

Matt Koukol has taken a technical lead role in ensuring that takes place. He is assembling the sample area data and will have MnDOT add (conflate) their route data to this sample. The Implementation and Communications Team which includes members of both the Design Team and the Core Team are finalizing a list of partners to reach out to test the sample data and determining a sound method of gathering, publishing and utilizing their comments. We have had fantastic participation from all the partners involved so far, however, the schedule of the project may need to be extended a bit with the rising complexity of assembling the sample and performing the outreach.

While our progress has been brisk of late with the project, it may be difficult to meet the current deadline of the end of November given the complexity of the tasks at hand.

Chinander: Whatever became of the NCompass data being phased out?

Kotz: NCompass contacted us (Metropolitan Council) to gauge MetroGIS interest in purchasing the data and the rights to it outright. We know that the value of the road centerlines product they are offering will be significantly reduced when a free, public version is available.. We held a conference call—I believe it was this past spring—with the metro county managers, our staff and NCompass folks. After that, we received no significant interest from counties in purchasing the rights to the data. Met Council needs updated data, so purchasing a static dataset that we have to update is not really what we are looking for.

8f) Stormsewer Initiative

Maas: The project remains on a low simmer on the back burner, I have been reaching out to the stakeholders to document their specific business need for a standardized, metro-wide stormsewer dataset, trying if possible to meet with at least one interested agency per week. So far I have interviewed Nancy here at Mosquito Control as well as staff at the University of Minnesota Ecology Department and the Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District. I have a pretty sizable list of folks with varying degrees of interest in the dataset and the idea of bringing this data together; I anticipate that by spring of 2015 we'll have a solid report to base future work upon.

8g) Sharing Beyond the Metro

Maas: Project remains on hold. Once we have the Metro Centerlines material ready to share we can begin setting up meetings with our partners in the surrounding counties. Also, we anticipate sharing our MetroGIS work plan with them and our movement toward free and open data. Again, this was simply a way to get to know what they are working on better and to see how much of their current work and challenges overlap with ours, particularly with centerlines, address points and so on.

8h) Private/Public Data Sharing

Maas: Increased data sharing between public and private sector interests has been on the MetroGIS 'to do' list for a long time; from before I came on board. Again, until we have a specific business need to address, or until a team assembles or an owner steps up, this remains fairly ambiguous. I still like the idea of a 'summit' between public and private interests and am happy to help make that happen, but we need something with more substance to work with. We need to have the business need more clearly articulated before we can proceed.

Kotz: This is something (Policy Board Chair) Terry Schneider has been advocating for, but we haven't had a specific focus. Terry would be an appropriate choice for a 'champion' if things got moving.

9) Selection and Prioritization of Work Plan items for 2015.

9a) Work Plan Survey Results for 2015 Work Plan

Maas: Thanks again to those of you—which was almost everyone—who responded to the survey I sent out in late August to rank and get an indication importance of the various projects to your agency or interest. As you know each fall we’ve been ranking our list of projects and ideas to determine what we will focus our energy on in the coming year.

Based on the results of the survey alone, our project rankings for 2015 look like this:

PROJECT NAME	CURRENT STATUS	How great is your organizations' need for the following projects?			
		HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	NOT NEEDED
Address Points Aggregation	Active	10	5	2	0
Geospatial Commons	Active	8	9	1	0
Address Points Editor 3.0 (Enhancements)	Active	6	3	4	4
Statewide Centerlines Initiative	Active	6	8	3	1
Metro Regional Centerlines Collaborative	Active	11	4	2	0
Free + Open Public Geospatial Data	Active	6	10	1	0
2016 Metro Aerial Imagery Collect	Active	5	9	3	0
Dashboard Application	Proposed for 2015	2	8	6	2
Regional Stormwater Dataset	In Research	5	6	4	3
Increased Sharing Beyond the Metro	On Hold/Pending	2	8	5	2
Public/Private Data Sharing	On Hold/Pending	3	7	6	0
Creation of Regional Basemap Services	Shelved/Inactive	2	6	5	3
Improvements to MetroGIS Geocoder	Shelved/Inactive	1	8	5	2
Increased Frequency of Parcel Updates	Shelved/Inactive	3	4	6	5
Development of High-Resolution Impervious Surface Dataset	Shelved/Inactive	1	7	5	4
Development of High-Resolution Building Footprint Dataset	Shelved/Inactive	2	6	6	3
Follow-On of Quantifying Public Value (QPV) Study	Shelved/Inactive	0	3	5	6

However, we’ll also have Mark [Kotz] up here to walk us through the Prioritization Matrix exercise; we’ll discuss the new project proposals and give the entire list a final ‘gut check’ before approval for inclusion in the 2015 Draft Work Plan document.

We’ve had two new projects arise for consideration, Randy Knippel has formally re-submitted the Dashboard Application proposal after withdrawing it from our last meeting in June and we’ve added the Metropolitan Council’s 2016 aerial buy-up to our list. While this is already technically underway, at in terms of gathering information, if it becomes the partnership we think it will, it will very likely command some of my time as Coordinator, as well as needing staff time from both the Council, from the County GIS departments and that of MnGeo, especially Chris Cialek’s time to get it moving.

Maas: Let’s start by running through the specifics of the two new projects being added to the running order. Randy, would you be willing to brief us on your Dashboard Application proposal?

Knippel: Well, even after all the work of putting the project proposal in the new project template documents, I am withdrawing the proposal a second time, the main reason is that the new Esri Web AppBuilder which ties to ESRI’s ArcGIS Online (AGO) would potentially meet many of the needs we had hope to take care of with the Dashboard App proposal. The bottom line is, is that it looks like, at least from the email that we reviewed from the Esri beta-team, that it would do a lot of what we expected our Dashboard Application to do. You will still need an AGO organizational subscription to develop an application; you’d install it on your own server and then have access the maps and have the ability to make them public without a user AGO dependency; that ability to be a public application is big. From the standpoint of Dakota County anyway, what’s on the horizon with this is that it kind of

“takes the wind” out of what we had proposed with the Dashboard App. We will continue to monitor where that goes, but for now, let’s put the Dashboard App on ‘hold’.

Maas: Oh, you big tease, that’s twice now you’ve pulled it away from us! *(laughter from the group)*...now I feel really bad having made you go through the rigmarole of filling out the project template documents. We can certainly keep the proposal on hold until we have more info, thanks again for taking the time to fill all the forms out; I hope it wasn’t too terribly burdensome.

Knippel: Yeah, well, I ‘cut and pasted’ a lot of it from my earlier document. Getting back to the application in a broader sense, one of the challenges is trying to do a solid return-on-investment on developing a custom application and factoring the maintenance costs. With an agency wide application, it’s a question of scale and being able to meet the lowest common denominator(s) in your agency; you always need to make some concessions to meet those needs. After talking with upper-level management at Dakota County, we are simply looking for a wider opportunity to distribute costs for application development collaboratively with other agencies through MetroGIS. You always take on the risk with new application development about being able to realizing your return on investment that another solution shows up to supplant what you have done or are trying to do.

With the State’s ELA [Enterprise License Agreement] you get a ‘virtually unlimited’ number of ArcGIS Online licenses for the first year, but actual costs in subsequent years are unknown. With the ESRI products, the real question is overall cost, and those costs need to be managed over time as you add more and more users. With ESRI you at some point have to start adding licenses and that adds up quickly. So getting back to our Dashboard Proposals, we keep it on hold, monitor what ESRI is doing and continue to create ways of coming up with cost-effective solutions instead of simply paying for solutions.

Maas: Our other proposal, as I mentioned is the 2016 Aerial Imagery Buy-Up from the Met Council, Mark can you give us the highlights and background on that?

Kotz: The Council budgets for and collects imagery every Census year, and one of mid-point years between the Census years; this time around it will be 2016. We are looking for partner among the counties of the metro and beyond, and working closely with MnGeo. Chris Cialek [at MnGeo] and I can be considered the owners of the project. The Council’s requirements are for half meter, leaf off imagery; however, we know that most of the partners we’ve contacted need 1 foot, 6-inch or better resolution. The Council would like to have higher resolution as well. We sent out a survey to prospective partners and got a good response as to their interest and desire to participate. We asked if they are considering collecting imagery in 2016. Chisago, Washington, Dakota, Scott, Carver, Le Sueur and Sibley responded yes, Isanti, Ramsey and Rice responded ‘maybe’, Sherburne, McLeod and Anoka responded ‘no’ or ‘doubtful’ and [at time of Coordinating Committee meeting] Wright, Hennepin and Goodhue had not responded yet. The second question was ‘If there is a cost share opportunity to collect imagery, are you interested in participating?’ All the counties that responded indicated yes, with the exception of Chisago and Washington. Once we have all the responses we will connect with partners and move forward from there.

Chinander: Is this different than pictometry?

Kotz: The Met Council has no business need for pictometry or oblique imagery. We are only focused on acquiring ortho imagery. Technically our specification is for half-meter resolution, historically that is what we’ve had flown, but we want to leverage the available partners and declining costs of imagery collection.

Knippel: As the costs continue to drop; we can certainly get more with our budget. If we can acquire 4” imagery for the cost of 6” imagery, we should certainly act on that.

Swenson: One of the challenges for partnering is the timing. Mark you mentioned that the metro needs it about every five years, on the Census years and some point in between. It is going to be hard for us [Hennepin County] to consistently line up the budgets. Hennepin County needs to be consistent in its collection and it may be hard to partner one cycle and then not the next.

Kotz: We recognize those challenges. We also know that the state [MnGeo] wants to be able to do these things consistently and have dedicated funding to be able to do it regularly. We will keep the group posted as this develops further and we have more info.

9b) Work Plan Project Prioritization

Kotz: As we've discussed we prioritize the list of projects for next year. We know we cannot do them all so we need to rank them and agree on the order of their importance and priority, and determine which need to be shelved due to lack of a sponsor or owner, lack of a champion, lack of fulfilling a business need or having no project team identified. We also assess 'level of effort' needed for the projects on the list. For example if we are paying a vendor to create something, the effort is to manage that contract and would be low. If we need a consistent amount of staff time from stakeholder agencies to make a project happen that would be medium or up to high level of effort as we would need to do everything.

[Mark then conducted the Project Prioritization Matrix exercise with the group, yielding the list below]

Project or Activity Name	Status	Work on in 2015	Priority Score
Address Points Aggregation	Active	Yes	462
Metro Regional Centerlines Collaborative	Active	Yes	430
Free + Open Public Geospatial Data	Active	Yes	429
Geospatial Commons	Active	Yes	387
Statewide Centerlines Initiative	Active	Yes	333
2016 Metro Aerial Imagery Collect	Active	Yes	324
Address Points Editor 3.0 (Enhancements)	Active	Yes	308
Dashboard Application	Proposed/On Hold	Maybe	252
Public/Private Data Sharing	Inactive	No	174
Regional Stormwater Dataset	In Research	Yes	155
Increased Sharing Beyond the Metro	Inactive	No	108
Increased Frequency of Parcel Updates	Inactive	No	69
Improvements to MetroGIS Geocoder	Inactive	No	48
Creation of Regional Basemap Services	Inactive	No	46
Development of High-Res Building Footprint Dataset	Inactive	No	24
Development of High-Res Impervious Surface Dataset	Inactive	No	22
Follow-On of Quantifying Public Value (QPV) Study	Inactive	No	22

Read: I'd like to see some effort put into the MetroGIS Geocoder once the address points are more fully developed in the metro.

Kotz: You should connect with Mike Dolbow [MN.IT Services]. At the last Statewide Geospatial Advisory Committee meeting he talked a lot about where we are with the various geocoders available in the state, and there is some potential for things moving toward a state-wide geocoding services in the near future.

[Kotz asked the group for additional comments or input on the Project Prioritization Matrix, and hearing none, he concluded the exercise]

Maas: I will ensure the project priorities are entered into the Draft Work Plan document for review and hopefully approval at our next meeting. With that, we've worked through the entire agenda for today's meeting.

10) Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Coordinating Committee is Thursday, December 11, 2014

(The next scheduled meeting of the Policy Board is Thursday, October 23, 2014)

11) Adjournment

Vice-Chair Brandt had to leave the meeting at 3 pm and was unable to adjourn the meeting

(Proxy Vice-Chair Gary Swenson adjourned the meeting at 3:23 pm)