MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Agenda
Thursday, February 28, 2019 1:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Metropolitan Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

Attendees:
Brad Henry, University of Minnesota
Randy Knippel, Dakota County
Hal Busch, City of Bloomington
Matt Koukol, Ramsey County
Andra Mathews, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy
Marcia Broman, Metro Emergency Services Board
Erik Dahl, MnEQB, Chair
Jeff Matson, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota
David Brandt, Washington County, Vice Chair
Alex Blenkush, Hennepin County
Jesse Reinhardt, Hennepin County
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Dan Tinklenberg, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
Tony Monsour, Scott County
Dan Ross, MnGeo

Guests:
Todd Graham, Metropolitan Council
Paul Hanson, Metropolitan Council
Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council
Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council

Staff:
Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

Meeting Minutes (Draft)

1) Call to Order
Chair Dahl called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m.;

2) Approve Today's Meeting Agenda
Motion to approve: Brandt, Second: Knippel; unanimous approval by vote, motion carries;

3) Approve Minutes from last meeting (September 27, 2018)
Motion to approve: Henry; Second, Verbick, unanimous approval by vote, motion carries;

4) MetroGIS Policy Board Update
Coordinator Maas indicated the next Policy Board meeting would be held 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 will fill the seat vacated by

long-term Policy Board member Jim Kordiak, and a not-yet-announced Metropolitan Council representative. At present, the proposed meeting agenda will include 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. Maas asked the members of the Committee if there was anything they wanted to bring to leadership, they were welcome to do so.

5) Review and Approval of 2019 MetroGIS Work Plan
The MetroGIS collaborative prepares an annual work plan, the plan contains a summary of progress on regional projects from the past year and the project priorities form the annual August survey and September ranking exercise. A draft version of the 2019 plan was prepared and published to the MetroGIS website in December 2018 with notice of its publication given to the members of the Committee of its availability. Maas outlined the various project prioritized for the 2019 work cycle, these included (by priority ranking):

#1 – 9-1-1 Regional Data Viewer
#2 – Metro Stormwater Geodata Project
#3 – MRCS (Road Centerline Standard)
#4 – Parcel Data Resource/Best Practices Guide
#5 – Addressing Resource Guide
#6 – Metro Park and Trail Standard
#7 – External Platform Publishing

Also, for the first time, several prior projects have been grouped into a 'maintenance category' as on-going efforts for which the MetroGIS will perpetuate support. Maas also displayed the current MetroGIS program budget of $50,000 (which is a line item in the Information Services Department of the MetCouncil). Of the total $50,000, $28,000 is already committed to fulfilling the contracts with the metro counties to translate their data into regionally-approved standards to create the Metro Regional Datasets.

Maas also presented a comparison chart of the current MetroGIS priority projects in comparison to the Geospatial Advisory Council projects to demonstrate how metro-level projects compare with counterpart projects at the state level. Maas indicated that the project plan is a living document and that the Committee can re-prioritize and revisit each project as it sees fit during the course of the year.

Motion to approve the 2019 MetroGIS Work Plan:
Motion: Kotz; Second: Knippel, unanimous approval by vote, motion carries

6) Standards Development Update
Maas and Kotz provided a summary of the current geodata standards work in process.
The Minnesota Road Centerline Standard (MRCS) is in a 45-day public and stakeholder review period until March 19, 2019. Maas prepared and published an MRCC/MRCS comparison table for the benefit of the stakeholder community to help communicate the changes proposed from MRCC to create the MRCS.

Additionally, the Parcel Data Standard originally adopted by GAC on March 28, 2018 underwent a second period of public review (Nov 26, 2018 - Jan 11, 2019) and is slated to be adopted as version 1.1

by the GAC on March 6, 2019. The Metro county effort to transition to the new state standard led to recognition of changes needed.

Kotz indicated that the Standards Committee is working to transition several of the original Governor's Council on Geographic Information to the GAC format, with several of them proposed for adoption at the March 6, 2019 GAC meeting. Questions about standards development can be directed to STandards Committee Chair Mark Kotz.

7) Guest Presentation – Census Participant Statistical Areas Presentation
Paul Hanson from the Metropolitan Council's Community Planning Department provided a brief presentation on the advance and implementation of the Census 2020 Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP). The 2020 Census Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP) enables invited participants to review and update selected statistical area boundaries for 2020 Census data tabulation following U.S. Census Bureau guidelines and criteria. The Census Bureau will use the defined statistical areas to tabulate data for the 2020 Census, American Community Survey (ACS), and the Economic Census.

The Census Bureau and other statistical agencies tabulate data for many summary geographies including Tracts and Block Groups, these are subcounty "small area" geographies that can be customized to serve local data needs. Through the PSAP the Census Bureau delegates the drawing of Tracts and Block Groups to regional and county agencies.

Every 10 years, Census Bureau asks regional planning agencies and counties to review, validate, or re-draw Census Tracts and Block Groups, this has become solidly a "GIS exercise" with resulting data intended to serve the needs of local governments and data users. The current **Participant Statistical Areas Program** work has begun this month (February 2019). In the Twin Cities region, Metropolitan Council led this work for the last two decennial census counts in 1999 and 2009; and is leading it again in 2019. Of note, there are 33 other agencies handling the responsibility for the other 80 counties of Minnesota.

General time frame for the effort is as follows:

April 15, 2019	MetCouncil Deadline for public comments and requests
May 23, 2019 (Day 120)	MetCouncil final deliverables due to the Census Bureau
January 2020	PSAP verification phase begins. Participants have 90 calendar days to review updates;
2020-2029	Finalized Tracts and Block Groups will be used in American Community Survey and other products offering 'small area' data

Met Council staff have completed a preliminary re-drawing of Tracts and Block Groups in the 7 counties and take an approach that they would define as conservative, these redrawing criterial are implemented based upon following the Census Bureau's criteria following city and town boundaries and with an effort to preserve historical comparability by nesting new Census Tracts inside the old (existing) Tracts. Hanson further indicated that many city boundary changes have taken place and will need to be documented in the changing Tract boundaries for the 2020 Census.

Brandt: In Washington County, we have significant concern for perpetuation of incorrect municipal boundaries, in the last Census we had counts occurring in the wrong municipality, tracts reporting population data from the wrong community, we hope that moving forward , that this can be fixed.

Knippel: We (Dakota County) were very involved in the LUCA process, all but one in city in our county deferred to the county the manage that work for them. The county is already engaged in the Census process in providing support to their cities, I feel it would be a good idea to keep them engaged.

Monsour: Does the Council contact our planners and work with them? We have a lot of unincorporated land in townships and we know where growth is happening and is planned to happen.

Hanson: Yes, we are looking to connect more directly with the counties and would appreciate knowing who the best contact person or persons are. You can get in touch with me and I can relay things to our Local Planning Assistance group; we want to get the right people talking.

Blenkush: We did LUCA for half of our cities, we also would like to have the County kept directly in the loop.

Hanson: Should I be reaching out to County GIS staff for you to disseminate it within your cities and townships? If you are doing the work for the cities, you are probably the better point of contact.

Blenkush: Yes, we can certainly share the information with our constituent cities.

Knippel: Please include us in the communication, each of us (County GIS Departments) will be in a different role but we can help direct.

Mathews: Is there any sort of round of public review period of the Census change material, you mentioned a web service in development, is this part of the January 2020 review process in the schedule?

Hanson: Yes, by then that service should be up, however, it is not intended as a sort of formal public round of review.

Ross: Correct, this is not public, we are also performing this for 10 counties around the state.

Hanson: We will have a final round to provide verification and review before the information we provided is incorporated into the census. In theory, this is publicly-available and it will be accessible; I could share it with the MetroGIS contact list when it is ready.

Knippel: What is driving this current (PSAP) effort? With LUCA, Census did overkill communicating with the cities, and directly to city and counties, how does this work and why is it different this time around?

Hanson: LUCA was focused on addressing, PSAP is focused on the boundaries (tract delineation) specifically to try to keep tracts within the identified population thresholds. Some existing tracts have grown to contain between 3000 to 8000 people, in some tracts we need to split that up. My understanding is that they are reaching out to the local authorities (such as regional agencies), to reduce the amount contact they are reaching out directly to MPOs and state level agencies to coordinate.

Koukol: From when submitted, the county was the LUCA update, other groups might have ceded that to the Council without the GIS office's knowledge. My understanding is that it goes to highest ranking member, but that should spill down to us on the technical side.

Ross: I have materials in my office, will scan those in and get them over to Geoff to share with the group, it discusses in detail things like prison, group housing (group homes) multi-family units and so on.

Knippel: I'm just concerned we have this gap in communication between local and federal entities on this.

Hanson: IF MPO said 'yes' for the PSAP effort; then they probably didn't contact you as a county. I can have Todd Graham reach out to you, he is very knowledge about the programs and the specifics of each.

Mathews: Can you tell us more about when the redistricting actions begin?

Ross: That comes from the Secretary of State's office and the Legislative Coordinating Commission, after the census is complete.

8) Re-calibration of MetroGIS Meeting Schedule
Coordinator Maas indicated that since 2015 when the MetroGIS collaborative decided to have a single in-person Policy Board meeting each year, it also transitioned to a three-a-year schedule for the Coordinating Committee. This change also coincided with more frequent activity at the work group level. Maas requested the Coordinating Committee consider a new meeting schedule. The proposed new schedule roughly corresponds to the established quarterly data collection effort of parcel data and municipal boundaries and the newly-agreed-to bi-annual collection of park and trail data for updating the regional datasets. The proposed new schedule is as follows:

January   > Parcel Data and Municipal Boundary Collection (Beginning of Month)
> Park and Trail Data Collection (Beginning of the Month)
> Coordinating Committee Meeting (End of Month)
  - Amend, revised, adopt work plan and budget
  - Project status updates
  - Review and deliberate new project proposals
  - Guest presenters (as available/requested)

April   > Parcel Data and Municipal Boundary Collection (Beginning of Month)
> Policy Board Annual Meeting (Last Week of the Month)
  - Update Policy Board members on project progress
  - Guest speakers on relevant topics (as available/requested)

July   > Parcel Data and Municipal Boundary Collection (Beginning of Month)
> Park and Trail Data Collection (Beginning of the Month)
> Coordinating Committee Meeting (End of Month)
  >> Mid-year 'check in'
  >> Re-calibrate existing work, plan, budget as needed
  >> Project status updates
  >> Review and deliberate new project proposals
  >> Guest presenters (as available/requested)

August   > Project Prioritization Survey (Survey Monkey)
  >> Send to Coordinating Committee members
  >> 30-day response period

October   > Parcel Data and Municipal Boundary Collection (Beginning of Month)
> Coordinating Committee Meeting (End of Month)
  >> Project prioritization for upcoming year
  >> Post GIS/LIS Conference (recap as needed)
  >> Current project status updates
  >> Review and deliberate new project proposals
  >> Guest presenters (as available/requested)

Both the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board can agree to convene and meet outside of these scheduled times, as need or situation arises to do so as well as retaining the ability for potential conference-call meetings and electronic (email) votes on issues as is needed for both bodies.

Motion for approval of MetroGIS meeting schedule calibration to the January/April/July/December schedule as advanced by Maas.

Motion: Knippel; Second, Mathews, no discussion, unanimous approval.

9) Current MetroGIS Work Plan Projects – Brief Updates

Coordinator Maas provided a brief update on the status of the active projects currently in the MetroGIS Work Plan.

9.1) 9-1-1 Regional Data Viewer
A project for a regional 9-1-1 Data Viewer, primary to enhance the work of non-geospatial enabled 9-1-1 stakeholders in the region was proposed in June 2018, during fall 2018, a formal request for an advisory opinion on the public data status of Emergency Serves Zone (ESZ) and Public Service Answering Point (PSAP) boundaries was tendered to the Data Practices Office. The DPO confirmed that these data were public, and the MESB has since been working to improve, upgrade, provide meta data for and publish its emergency service boundary dataset.

Maas and Marcia Broman from the MESB have developed a project plan (soon to be published on the 'metrogis.org' website) which outlines the specific steps to get the view deployed. This includes extensive user-experience testing with a large list of names of people 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 four steering committee team meetings, one technical team meeting and numerous small group meeting to develop the first prototype data standard, providing outreach to the professional community and determining suitable sites in the metro region for a pilot project to test the emerging standard. Key project highlights include the receipt of a grant from the Water Resources Center of the University of Minnesota for $18,785 in support of the pilot project and the engagement of the Ramsey County GIS User Group to potentially fund and pull together a pilot site within their county.

Work in 2019 will focus on tightening up the prototype standard, final selection of sites in the metro for the pilot project to test the data and by late 2019/early 2020, dissemination of data in the prototype standard to the stakeholder community for review, testing and comment.

Additionally, the project charter for the MSWGP effort has been cited as an example of an exemplary project document by Peter L. Croswell; author of the 'GIS Management Handbook'. He contacted Maas in February 2019 for permission to use the charter, and he will be using it as an example of how an inter-agency project charter should be structured in the forthcoming second edition of his book.

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) Minnesota Road Centerline Standard (MRCS)

The MRCS standard is presently under statewide stakeholder review until Friday, March 19, 2019. The MRCS is the proposed candidate statewide centerline transfer standard. It was created from the metro's MRCC standard and is geared to accommodate numerous common business case uses for centerlines, with usage for NextGen9-1-1 being primary among these. Maas created an Excel spreadsheet table comparing the MRCC v. 1.7 (most current version of the MRCC) with the proposed MRCS v. 0.6 (version out for public review) for the reference and usage of the metro stakeholder community. This table is available from the MRCC project page on metrogis.org. If and when the MRCS is adopted by the Geospatial Advisory Council and the statewide community, the metro partners will need to assess their desire, plan, timeline and schedule for the potential conversion to the MRCS schema.

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.

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. He illustrated an example in the city of Faribault where poor application of numbering principles by the city led to later challenges in applying the correct numbers to new buildings and streets. A draft document is anticipated sometime in late 2019.

9.6) Metro Park and Trail Dataset and Data Standard

The Metro Park and Trail Work Team convened on January 31, 2019 at the Ridgedale Library in Minnetonka. The group agreed to a series of minor revisions to the metro standard (itself based upon the NRPA park and trail schema), bringing the metro version to v. 1.2. These revisions included the removal a several attributes that the group felt would never be populated. The group also decided upon the basic validation categories (based upon the inclusion values set forth by the GAC Standards Committee). The group further agreed to work toward a twice-per-year update schedule, one in January and one in July, roughly corresponding to the first and third quarterly parcel and municipal boundary data collections. Alex Blenkush (Hennepin County) is working on drawing together the first draft of the Park and Trail Dataset Best Practices Guide.

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 has been steering the approvals through the legal, procurement and cyber-security reviews needed for the Council to launch its ESRI Community Basemap and publish the datasets. Maas has been engaged with Google staff in their San Francisco office and Joe Sapletal has been engaged with Open Street Map to assess its potential to take on the metro regional datasets. Future work includes the forthcoming launch of the ESRI Community Basemap account by the Council on behalf of the region, modification of the disclaimer language to clarify its availability as fully public and continued interaction with external platforms to consume the regional materials.

Maintenance Operations:
Numerous efforts and datasets are not in a 'maintenance' position, and are listed below:

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 is added to the MESB service area on January 1, 2019, is also anticipated to join the MRCC dataset in spring/early summer of 2019.

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 February 11, 2019, there are 792 resources available from 30 different organizations available.

9.10) Free + Open Data Progress, Research and Outreach
As of February 28, 2019, 30 counties have made their data freely and openly available across Minnesota, the most recent being McCleod County in late 2018 and Isanti County on January 1, 2019. Other counties such as Olmsted County and Cook County have identified open data as a priority and are working internally to move toward county board approval. On February 15, 2019, Maas and Len Kne presented 'The Advance of Free and Open Data' at the Minnesota Society of Professional Surveyors in Brooklyn Park and received many good questions and support from the group on the initiative. 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.

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.

10) Lightning Round Update

Jeff Matson (CURA): We are currently looking for summer interns, if you know of students or others interested in GIS, policy or planning, we will have spots available.

Jesse Reinhart (Hennepin County): At Hennepin County we are still working on QAQC of our image capture from Spring 2018, we had some hiccups with the data but are getting it tightened up. We hope to have that released on a public facing application soon. We contracted with Sanborn for the last set of flights, still have two separate products orthography and oblique imagery to work with. Essentially the Sanborn imagery is public facing and there is very little overhead to manage that.

Hennepin County has a new Chief Data officer Bill Rodgers and we are working with the Office of Enterprise Analytics. This includes our attorney's office, our data governance team and the GIS office as well. Emphasis on this work is in reducing disparities, with focus on education, housing, health and other topics. Part of our team is working on how e coordinate analysis across the county and this includes GIS and data analytics. Working to come up with a general policy and process for releasing data beyond just spatial data. We have two new Commissioners elected who are very interested in it; especially with better monitoring the outcomes of our county services.

We are also fielding requests to design and build a traffic crash management system; the county currently has a vendor solution and we manage corrections on crash data, we see the future as needing to implement LRS (linear referencing system). I'd like to set up a session on LRS modeling, seeing how other agencies are doing it to see if that is something we can do with it as well. Also, we are focusing more on asset management, a lot of that happening in that in public works.

Also, I'll add that our GIS Project Manager Ann Houghton is leaving the county, her last day in March 15; she is retiring to pursue her other passions. We are having a happy hour for her downtown Minneapolis on March 14.

Dan Tinklenberg (SRF Consulting Group): We've had a number of technical issues cropped up recently, with our engineers using AutoCAD MicroStation in the Windows 10 environment. All counties that are providing imagery in services, there are some non-MWS counties are showing up empty and we are hoping that it is something that counties would consider looking into or enabling on their end, so we can work with the data.

Knippel: Yes, this is essentially 'clicking a box' to enable it.

Verbick (LOGIS): Expand on Jeff Matson's point on interns, we are looking for them for the upcoming summer season for GIS assistance with public safety work we are doing for our constituent cities. Also, our executive director is retiring from LOGIS later this year.

Monsour (Scott County): Not too much new stuff to report, we do have a new application doing work for our environmental health department helping residents determine where they can deposit their various kinds of household hazardous waste materials. Residents can enter the kind of waste they have, and it will tell them what to do with it and where. Also, we are working with the University of Minnesota taking on some classes that look to work with local government, specifically finding property that the county could purchase for low income housing that has access to public transportation and centers of employment to work. We are providing data to the students and getting them what they need. We will be working with them on setting up the models, when done, having an interface built so we can stay on top of it.

Ross (MnGeo): A few things from the state. We are going to be standing up a portal project, related to MNDOT crash data, we are building a series of dashboards and will roll them out sometime in June. WE are working on three cultural resources projects rebuilding systems for the State Archaeologist and State historic Preservation Office. They have lots of federal requirements and reporting to be meet with transportation project that might affect the sites. We are looking at a 2020 flight for the state, MnGeo helping to buy up portion of it. Other big thing working with 3D Geomatics Committee, Alison Slaats is drawing up a statewide LiDAR acquisition plan, we have a bit of scheduling challenge as our state funding and federal funding are on different calendar cycles. If you are interested, please get in touch with Alison to get your contact person identified so we can work with you.

Hoekenga (Metropolitan Council): New metro regional parcel dataset posted tonight, old datasets will exist for a while to enable folks to make the transition from the old standard to the new standard.

Kotz (Metropolitan Council): WE are going to be perusing a contact for an orthophoto flight in Spring 2020, this will be 1' leaf-off, this is a critical need for the Council as we align a flight with the Census to map land use across the region. the Council will pay for the entire metro region at 1' resolution and there will be an opportunity to partner and buy up. Also, we have heard from the Council's internal transportation planning group, they continue to emphasize the need to have 'number of lanes' data for traffic modeling. At present, we know this is not something currently carried in either in metro MRCC or state MRCS centerline standards. We know there

are many ways to approach number of lanes, and that we have never really talked about it in depth, however, it might be valuable to have another piece of information to tie in to the road centerlines.

Brandt (Washington County): Our work lately has focused on public health, we have been around to other counties to see what they do for environmental protection and we are putting a project together for our solid waste facilities with several applications. Additionally, we have been working with the City of Woodbury to use the Address Point Editor Application, we paid to have that ported over to a widget; unfortunately, no other cities are working with the tool at present.

Henry (University of Minnesota): Remain involved with the MN 2050, our report has focused on the value of infrastructure by agency, estimates are that MnDOT and MetCouncil, have roughly 25% of the state's infrastructure, that Counties have roughly 25% and the remaining 50% are maintained by the cities. In light of this, we feel the new [Governor] Walz budget is under-funding for cities. The ASCE released its recent report card after surveying 17 different types of infrastructure and Minnesota was graded as a 'C'. Another group we are engaged with is the Institute of Asset Management and we are working with them on a '3D underground project' that can survey underground utilities and build a 3D model; very helpful to understand what you have before you start moving earth or excavating the ground. This could be a whole new kind of data collection effort, includes public and private utilities, and gets around the challenge of private utilities that are reluctant to share that information.

Knippel (Dakota County): We will have an internship posted in the next week for summer position, we do have RFP out for ortho photography, we did have a fall flight, unfortunately it was not very successful, we only had 2 good days for flying, a combination of mechanical problems, issues with planning out the times, let to the resulting imagery being problematic, and then issues with ortho correction on top of that as well. We did find some ½-meter satellite imagery to backfill the rest of the county where we didn't get imagery, so it was a suitable stop gap for internal customer who uses for environmental regulation and enforcement of our county shoreland zoning protection ordinance, determining distance from waterway of structure. In 2020, we will also be acquiring oblique images for our assessor's office; we will be working with ESRI image server to host the obliques. I also serve as Chair of the MetroGIS County Data Producers Work Group which doubles with the Eight County Collaborative (including Olmsted). We have a monthly conference call, and each alternating month we have a tandem call with the 9-1-1 representatives. If there is something you'd like added to that agenda for us to discuss, please contact me, we are happy to include that.
Hal Busch (City of Bloomington): A few weeks ago, we have started working in getting a data governance framework with the City beyond just GIS data, as that develops I might have some questions on how to advance that. Also, the City of Bloomington is looking to increase its on-line footprint.

Broman (MESB): We have been engaged in a lot of work with Chisago and Isanti County to get their data into the regional datasets, also with Sherburne to get them prepped and into the

regional systems as well, hopefully we'll have their data ready during 2019. We are also working on cell-site routing for the regional towers and antennas for routing of the 9-1-1 service. Working with regional partners we are getting some great feedback, working through continual corrections of data and we are maintaining ongoing communication with county and city partners. During Quarter 2 of 2019 we will be circling back for performing geocoding validation within the 10-County metro area, and ensuring the address points geocode to the centerlines,

Koukol (Ramsey County): Ramsey County is looking to acquire obliques in 2020 and participate in a buy up for an ortho imagery as well, we are waiting to see if the state contract is going to expire or be renewed. Also, Ramsey County IT is looking to fill internships in GIS, these internships would be focused on asset collection on gathering data for our asset management system; we have put together a nice collection of asset of inventory and maintenance of work and we are using multiple esri solutions, the work and workflow can be assigned and tracked by supervisors enable them to check in as you go. Things we will be focused on will be things like signage and storm sewer networks.

Mathews (MCEA): In the last 6 months our work has been focused largely on Greater Minnesota include analysis of impact of feed lots, projects involving mining in Northern Minnesota and we have been involved in a very cool initiative with students from both the metro and greater Minnesota called "Minnesota Can't Wait". This is effectively a group of young leaders, leading coalitions in climate change issues, and we (MCEA) are supporting them with knowledge and legal representation, fossil fuel reduction programs, greening the economy, we have stood up a quick web map for these young people to showcase their work.

11)   **Next Coordinating Committee Meeting** is scheduled for Thursday, July 25, 2019

12)   **Adjourn**: Chair Dahl, adjourned the meeting at 3:28 p.m.