MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 27, 2015, 1 PM - 3:30 PM **(Approved, December 3, 2015)**
Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

In Attendance:
David Bitner, db Spatial
David Brandt, Washington County (Vice Chair)
Curtis Carlson, Northstar MLS
Gordy Chinander, MESB
Erik Dahl, EQB (Chair)
Eric Menze, Resource Data, Inc. (for Eric Haugen)
Brad Henry, University of Minnesota
Pete Henschel, Carver County
Len Kne, U-Spatial
Randy Knippel, Dakota County
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Jessica Fendos, Ramsey County (for Matt Koukol),
Carrie Magnuson, Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District
Mark Maloney, Shoreview
Jeff Matson, CURA/Non-Profit
Nancy Read, Metro Mosquito Control
Gary Swenson, Hennepin County
Ben Verbick, LOGIS
Ron Wencl, USGS

Absent:

Dan Ross, MnGeo	Hal Busch, Bloomington
Matt Baker, Metropolitan Airports Commission	Eric Haugen, Resource Data, Inc.
Jim Fritz, Xcel Energy	Tony Monsour, Scott County
John Slusarczyk, Anoka County	Sally Wakefield, Non-Profit Sector
Hal Watson, DNR	

Guests:
Ryan Mattke, Borchert Library
Kevin Dyke, Borchert Library
Adam Item, MN.IT Services

1) **Call to Order**
Chair Dahl called the meeting to order at 1:07 pm

2) **Approve Meeting Agenda**
Motion: Bitner, Second: Verbick

3) **Approve Meeting Minutes from March 26, 2015**
Motion: Bitner, Second: Kotz

4) Action of Approval of the Revised MetroGIS Operational Guidelines and Procedures Approval
      Motion: Bitner, Second: Brandt
      Vote: Unanimous approval;

5) 2016 New Work Plan Project Proposals

5a) Aerial Imagery Archive and Mosaic Project
Kevin Dyke gave a presentation in support of the joint University of Minnesota-Borchert Library/Center for Urban and Regional Analysis project submittal for developing a mosaic and web service of historical aerial imagery for the Seven Metro County area. Kevin provided background on the existing pre-pilot project they have successfully completed using ArcGIS Web Application Builder with swipe function to prototype an interface with imagery from 1956 for the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Kevin demonstrated that they have developed a solid workflow that addresses the numerous idiosyncrasies of working with the old data, and they anticipate using this work flow and refining it to add more imagery. Kevin also described the Minnesota historical Aerial Photographs Online (MHAPO) resource and how it presently receives, on average, around 300 hits per week, indicating a continued interest in archived imagery.

The central focus of the project proposal is to create a seamless mosaic with representative imagery from each decade for historical comparison (for example, a user could swipe 1956 image against 1966 imagery to view the change). Kevin explained that the Borchert/CURA partnership would like to 'scale up' and hire a number of undergraduate GIS students to assist in the work to complete the next two mosaics. For the 1956 pre-pilot, there were 10-12 images, for the next phase there are 60-70 images and the final phase would include up to 400 images.

Kevin highlighted the costs for hosting would be assumed by the University of Minnesota, and that counties and cities could simply point users toward the Borchert Library Resource to view and access historic imagery.

Questions for project proposers:
Chinander: How frequent are the images from the past? Are all the counties the same year?
Mattke: The older images we have and are working with were flights commissioned by Metropolitan Council and its predecessor organizations, and the entire metro is flown in a single year;
Dyke: Individual counties have a large amount of imagery, but not all in the same year, for comparison purposes, the regional dataset is consistent for the years it was flown and makes for a consistent mosaic.

Carlson: Is there a source indicated for the agency that produced the imagery? Such as MnDOT, DNR and other sources? Is there coverage of this kind outside of the metro?
Mattke: As we mentioned, almost all of the data was created for the Metropolitan Council and its predecessor organizations. Our current project would remain just in the metro area, using the regional data; we do have some overlap into adjoining counties, but adding them in more fully would have to come later.

Read: Were these images captured in stereo?
Mattke: No, these are straight imagery; each photo is 3 x 3 ft. and not really workable for stereo applications.

Kotz: What resolution are the images that you are working with?

Mattke: We are scanning them up to 600 dpi, but dependent on the resolution of the original images, you can see things really well to when you zoom into the neighborhood level. The older photos were created at 1:96,000-scale, but as time goes on, they get better and better.

Knippel: Are you scanning directly from the contact prints?
Mattke: Yes.
Knippel: Have you encountered any licensing issues? In the past when we've wanted to utilize old imagery we had to sign agreements with vendors that it was for internal use only.
Mattke: We have had our legal staff look into that a bit. To date, we've got upward of 12,000 photos and images we are making available with no issue via streaming and other services. As the data was created for and paid for by a public agency we understand it to be available.
Knippel: It would be worth your while to confirm the legal aspects of using this imagery.
Wencl: What are the chances of the vendors having the original film? I would guess it is very slim.
Knippel: Checking with the vendor might reveal a better source as well than the contact sheets; I would recommend verifying any legal or copyright details on the images.

5b) State Park and Trail Dataset/Data Standard

Maas gave a short re-cap of the Park, Trail and Recreational Land Data Standard presentation that Hal Watson gave in more detail at the last meeting (March 2015), these included the short and long-term goals of the initiative.

Short-Term Goals:
> Gather & document stakeholder requirements;
> Develop a data standard to meet stakeholder needs;
> Sample dataset and review by the community;

Long Term Goals:
> An adopted data standard;
> Consistently structured recreation data and services;
> Consumable by wide variety of public and private applications;

Next Immediate Steps:
> Add to MetroGIS Work Plan;
> Identify parallel efforts (Hennepin Co/U of M/Council);
> Develop full stakeholder list + work team;
> Stakeholder event, requirements gathering;
> Develop data standard;
> Develop a sample dataset in the new standard for review;

Maas reiterated the need for creating a detailed and inclusive stakeholder list and to bring in any current or parallel efforts and interests as soon as possible. He indicated that he had been in contact recently with stakeholders in other Metropolitan Council Departments, with the Hennepin County Bike Trail Coordinator and others who were interested in the potential to make the standard more inclusive of local needs.

Knippel: At the meeting we had with the DNR earlier in the year, it appeared like their (state) focus was just on the parks and trail of state and regional significance. How will we be able to have this be valuable to the local jurisdictions?

Maas: That is why having this on the MetroGIS plan is important, it provides an avenue for the local input with the regional and state interests. I, and I am sure others, want to be able to cast the net wide on this and ensure we can meet as many of the core needs as possible.

Swenson: As Hennepin County doesn't have a park department (Three Rivers Park District is the implementing agency for Hennepin County outside of Minneapolis) we are in a little different position than the other counties, however, some of our departments such as Transportation are very interested in the trail and connectivity piece and want to be at the table.

6) 2016 Work Plan Project Priority Ranking
Each year, the Coordinating Committee formally revisits the MetroGIS Work Plan document to prioritize and assess the progress on existing projects and rank new project proposals in context with existing work.

6a) Brief Recap of Survey Results
Prior to the meeting, Maas distributed a five question Survey Monkey survey for the members to rank the importance of existing, past and proposed projects. Having received 20 responses, the results are as follows:

		HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	NO NEED	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
IP	Data Aggregation Address Points: Pilot Project	73.68	21.05	5.26	0.00	2.68
IP	Minnesota Geospatial Commons (MetroGIS Support)	52.63	42.11	5.26	0.00	2.47
IP	Metro Regional Centerline Collaborative	52.63	26.32	21.05	0.00	2.32
IP	2016 Metro Aerial Imagery Buy Up	42.11	31.58	26.32	0.00	2.16
NEW	Statewide Park & Trail Data Standard/Dataset	31.58	52.63	10.53	5.26	2.11
IP	Free + Open Geospatial Data Research and Advocacy	21.05	57.89	21.05	0.00	2.00
NEW	Historic Aerial Imagery Mosaic + Archive	31.58	31.58	36.84	0.00	1.95
IP	Statewide Centerlines Initiative	15.79	36.84	42.11	5.26	1.63
R	Regional Stormwater System Dataset	26.32	15.79	52.63	5.26	1.63
OLD	Regional Basemap Services	10.53	52.63	26.32	10.53	1.53
OLD	Improvments to MetroGIS Geocodeer	10.53	31.58	26.32	10.53	1.11
OLD	Increased Frequency of Parcel Data Updates	0.00	31.58	47.37	5.26	1.05

6b) Priority Ranking Exercise
Each fall the Committee conducts a Priority Ranking Exercise. Metropolitan Council GIS Manager Mark Kotz led the exercise, which enables the group to determine the value and priority of projects, how the projects are aligned with the business needs and determine a likelihood of success. Kotz indicated that in the past with MetroGIS there were a number of interesting and desirable projects, however, without requisite champions, owners and work teams in place, no progress was made. This exercise is intended to give the group a starting point with objective criteria for ranking and agreeing to their priority in a work plan.

At the request of the Committee the agenda items were readjusted so the project updates could be given and considered prior to the completion of the ranking exercise.

7) Current Work Plan Project Updates

7a) Address Points Aggregation Project
Maas provided a brief update on the recent meeting in June 30 of Dakota Co, Carver Co, Metropolitan Council, MnGeo, MnDNR, MN.IT Services and MetroGIS personnel and the resulting draft pilot project plan. The plan is to test the aggregation of address points from Dakota and Carver County into the Commons using the GDRS developed by the DNR. This project is to be considered a 'research and development' prototype to test tools and assumptions for other projects to learn from.

7b) Metro Regional Centerlines Collaborative
The MRCC project is making solid progress toward the creation of a 'first build' of the regional road centerline, county GIS staff have agreed to a goal of December 7 for assembly of the centerlines from the Seven Metro Counties.

Monthly conference calls are held among the 'build team' to check in, weigh in on problems or questions and offer mutual assistance. Maas praised the efforts of the counties in their efficient work and Hennepin County project manager Ann Houghton for her continued role in shepherding the process along and directed the group to the growing body of resources on the MetroGIS website for the project.

Regarding hosting, staff from Hennepin County, MnGeo, Metropolitan Council and MetroGIS met on August 26 to deliberate on how the centerline data would be hosted and by what agency. The recommendation from that meeting was that the State of Minnesota/MnGeo would be the most suitable host as they will be required to perform this work for the NextGen9-1-1 efforts. MnGeo staff indicated that they need not wait until December 7 and can begin testing the collection, assembly and replication of the road data as soon as portions of it are ready from the participating counties.

Maas provided one final reminder, that the Metropolitan Council has extended its contract with NCompass for its centerline data through December 31, 2017; the data would be available to partners through the same terms and conditions as past agreements.

7c) Free + Open Public Geospatial Data
Maas announced that he'd received an update from Tony Monsour in Scott County that they anticipated their data portal to be open and a resolution passed at the county board in late September. Maas indicated that he has been in contact with Tim Wotzka in Itasca County and that they planned to open their data in early 2016. Maas was invited to speak to Rice County staff on August 10 and that county is considering the pro's and con's of opening their data as well.

Knippel: While the battles are being fought, the 'war' isn't over; we need to continue to find ways of communicating to our various leaders the value of making the data open. As we all see at budget time there are questions about impacts to the revenue stream.

Maas also introduced the group to the draft 'White Paper II' that he and Dan Ross have been developing. This resource provides answers to many of the questions coming in from Greater Minnesota counties about the terminology, legal and fiscal impacts, liability and process of open geospatial data. Maas encouraged the group to review the document and stressed that it was a living draft that would benefit from further additions, revision and research.

7d) Minnesota Geospatial Commons
Maas provided a quick update on the Commons status, that there are 250+ resources from 15 agencies on offer at the site and that the Metropolitan Council was in process of transferring its DataFinder holdings into the Commons, with 48 of its datasets currently available. Kotz indicated that eventually the Data Finder would be phased out, however it will run parallel to the Commons for the time being as the transfer is underway.

7e) Statewide Centerlines Initiative
The project remains entirely within the wheelhouse of MnDOT and no update was given. MetroGIS partner efforts have been focused on the MRCC effort, which is regarded as the 'advance guard' and 'research and development' wing of the statewide effort at present.

7f) 2016 Aerial Imagery Collection
Mark Kotz gave a short update on the status of the initiative. He re-stated the business need of the Council for 1', leaf-off imagery in Spring 2016 and the desire of the Council to partner with other interested agencies in the collection effort. He also acknowledged the Master Service Contract effort at the state was a big behind in the schedule where it should be. Chris Cialek remains the key contact for the Master Services Contract.

7g) Address Points Editor 3.0
Maas reiterated that the Editor Tool Version 3.0 has been available since March 2015, and that at present there are no formal plans for a Version 4.0, however a few tool improvement recommendations have been documented by Tanya Mayer at the Council. Kotz stated that if the county users of the tool wanted to see a version 4.0 or other improvements, they are encouraged to tender a project request through the MetroGIS work plan process.

7h) Regional Stormwater Dataset Update
Maas indicated that no new work has occurred on the effort, however, he does take the occasional call from interested parties and will document their business case for a region-wide dataset. To date 15 agency business cases have been documented, and a list of up to 20 more are waiting to be interviewed. As this project is the lowest priority on the work plan, other projects have received more effort to date.

Return to 6b) Priority Ranking Exercise:
After the current project updates and conducting the exercise with the group, the approved ranking of projects looked like this:

Project or Activity Name	Status	Work on in 2016	Committee Rank	Priority Score
Address Points Aggregation	Active	y	1	561
Metro Regional Centerlines	Active	y	2	440
Geospatial Commons	Active	y	3	423
Free + Open Public Geospatial Data	Active	y	4	418
2016 Metro Aerial Imagery Collect	Active	y	5	410
Historic Aerial Imagery Mosaic/Archive	Proposed	y	6	407
Statewide Park & Trail Data/Standard	Proposed	y	7	320
Statewide Centerlines Initiative	Active	y	8	279
Regional Stormwater Dataset	Research	y	9	124
Increased Frequency of Parcel Updates	*Inactive*	n	10	63
Creation of Regional Basemap Services	*Inactive*	n	11	62
Improvements to MetroGIS Geocoder	*Inactive*	n	12	46

The only funding request was the Historical Aerial Imagery Mosaic/Archive project with requested $5000 from the MetroGIS budget.

Motion by Kotz to approve to grant the request of the Borchert Library/CURA for $5000 for the Mosaic/Archive project pending they satisfy the copyright and legal availability of the images. Second: Bitner; unanimous approval, depending on the copyright findings of the Borchert on the old imagery.

Mattke and Maas agreed to circulate the copyright information and decision after it has been researched and cleared.

Bitner: Are there any other requests for MetroGIS budget?

Kotz: None that we've heard of so far.

The above priority list will form the basis for the 2016 Work Plan to be drafted and approved by the group at its November meeting.

8) NextGen 911 Briefing
Adam Iten of MN.IT Services provided a status update on the data collection, review and progress of the NexGen9-1-1 efforts around the state and what that means for the GIS community. His slides are available as an appendix to these notes.

He stressed that one of the challenges is that multiple networks are in play and that many technological paths are in place from the point of call into the 911 system. He praised the efforts of the metro community in their development and deployment of address points and streets which will be required data for the project.

He stressed the need for work in the area of cleaning up dispatch boundary data and better integration between GIS and traditional methods used in the emergency response community.

Current tasks completed or in progress for the NextGen911 effort:
The PSAP Request for Information – Summary Report;
NG9-1-1 GIS Data Assessment and Preparation work;
Map View and Editing Tools for counties and agencies that need them in Greater Minnesota
Development of NextGen 911 data standards in Minnesota (MRCC work falls into this)
Development of a Communication Plan

Iten stressed that they received a strong response on their recent survey to the emergency services community, with 95 of 105 agencies responding and providing feedback.

One of the key challenges identified is that each dispatch center has a different version of mapping software, implies that aggregating data and updating the maps will be a challenge. Also, not all counties are in the same level of maturity regarding data development, there are 'superstar' counties and there are others that are not as advanced and need help to get up to speed.

Knippel: Working with NextGen9-1-1 is going to be helpful to make another connection and heighten awareness to our county administration and elected officials about the importance of GIS. We've all been developing all this data, it serves numerous public purposes and helps in reinforcing the whole message of what we are doing collaboratively. I'd like to see this be part of the larger public awareness of what we are going serving these multiple uses. Our communication channels are generally behind the scenes, our departments and technical level folks work well together, but its time we had things more visible and show how important it is at a state level.

Swenson: Adam, what are the current communication paths?

Iten: The state is broken into seven ECN regions; these align with the Department of Public Safety areas. We envision reaching out these areas on a quarterly basis for meetings, directly to the PSAP managers. As for communication, we use the ECN website as the hub, we send out monthly communications, emails to managers, a newsletter. We recently assembled the GIS Subcommittee and had a good turn out with at least one member from each part of the state.

Knippel: I think we'd like to be looped in on press releases on the SECB and 911 work to the larger community. We need messaging for a collaborative effort, to help us continue to demonstrate the value that we are bringing.

Swenson: MESB board should see the presentation you are doing, the timing is right to get that effort moving forward.

Knippel: We need to emphasize the role that counties and cities play in developing and maintaining the data; it is generally perceived as free and 'just happening'. We need a way to message that value.

Iten: We do emphasize the work of the MRCC project, this fits in line with what we need to do. The metro is really ahead of the game in getting this rolling; I was on a call with folks connected to NSGIC and they mentioned it, so we are getting national recognition of what is happening here. We are relying

on MRCC to be our guiding project for the road work and the other work you are going on address points too is vital. We are also working with the counties of Northeastern Minnesota, the Arrowhead Region as our early group; coming up with a plan for them to integrate county by county and as a region. In other parts of the state, especially county that have limited GIS or no tools, we are working to get the red lining capabilities up to identify, document and resolve their issues.

We will we working to create standards around required layers, put out official email for standards work group. We have asked for and identified key individuals to help join that work group to push the standards along, one person for each ECM region at least is desirable. In the metro we are working with Gordy, Marcia, Vic from Ramsey County and Warren from Hennepin County. One of our first goals is to come up with a clear definition of completeness for the six required GIS layers. I don't want to see the standards work drag out, let's get it done and version it out as needed.

9) Lightning Round Update

R. Knippel (Dakota County): I'm providing updates from two perspectives, first from the Data Producers Work Group which is a subset of the Eight County Collaborative group which we've been tasked to assemble by our County Administrators, we have moved to totally over lead the thing by dedicating the first half hour to the NextGen9-1-1 agenda which includes Chisago and Isanti County as standing first half our of that meeting. We meet monthly, really enables us to maximize use of the time, in that group, focus has been on MRCC, NG911 work, significant time doing roundtable to share what's up and ideas they have opens up opportunities for collaboration.

From Dakota County: As I mentioned earlier, it's budget time and we need to be able to continue to show the value of open data. Another thing we've been using more and more are Geospatial PDFs, especially in our parks maps, including signs for the You Are Here signs and maps. We've found the Avenza PDF map tool for creating and working with these, the only difficult part is getting our county staff to see them and use them. Regarding the USNG, we now have four counties, Dakota, Carver, Anoka and Ramsey that have their maps completed and available.

Brad Henry (University of Minnesota): As I have mentioned in past meetings, we are continuing work on the MN2050 initiative, we've completed our infrastructure survey having reached out to all the cities and counties in the state as to who is doing asset management and what kinds of facilities are you maintaining, MnDOT funded the project, Wilder is doing the analysis, and the results are interesting.

Gordy Chinander (MESB): I thing Adam (Iten) pretty well summed up what we're doing in his presentation.

Carrie Magnuson (Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District): No update.

Ryan Mattke (Borchert Library): I'll note that we did recently release and publish over 4000, 1:1200 scale maps and images of the city of Minneapolis from 1938 through 1993.

Ron Wencl (USGS): We've wrapped up the state summaries for the national hydrography study this will help shape the data requirements program and revise our revise data plan accordingly. Our 3D elevation program (3DEP) of high quality level-2 vertical accuracy imagery continues to move. Pre-proposals for 3DEP are due next Tuesday, to date there are no proposals from Minnesota. I hope to announce at our

next meeting that we have started our newest round of 1:24,000 topographic map production, it is set to kick off in October.

Len Kne (U-Spatial): I've got some updates on the solar potential project. We have presented on that previously, it's a statewide LiDAR data, essentially a raster showing solar potential. Recently we've acquired funding from the Minnesota Department of Commerce to help solar installers for getting their state incentives, this involves shade determination and validation with the goal of fewer people having to get up on rooftops to take readings. This is really a nice conclusion to the project, and moving forward MnGeo will be hosting the data and the applications. U-Spatial will also working closely with the MN2050 initiative, we've received a small grant from the University to conduct mapping work to support that.

Adam Iten (MN.IT Services) At the GIS/LIS Conference, I will be doing a 25 minute presentation on the NextGen911 and participating in a 90-minute birds of a feather session on emergency services standards.

Eric Menze (Resource Data, Inc.): We are seeing a sizable increase in our IT support as more companies merging GIS into their IT departments.

Curt Carlson (Northstar MLS): No update, 'business as usual' at Northstar MLS.

Pete Henschel (Carver County): No update.

Jessica Fendos (Ramsey County): We have loaded Version 3.0 of the address editor tool and are testing it with the cities in Ramsey County and working to add points in. We have hired a GIS developer; one of his early tasks will be to enhance MnDOT's set of conflation tools so we can better assign MNDOT data to the MRCC line work. Also, I'll mention the State of Maryland is piloting an application to aid in edge-matching streets between jurisdictions. MnDOT organized a short webinar to gauge its value for their Statewide Street Centerline effort. Maryland is willing to share the code when completed, and it is likely that it may be helpful for the MRCC effort, depending on when it becomes available.

Jeff Matson (CURA): Just a quick reminder, classes at the University begin in a week, if you are looking for interns we can connect you with them. I will also be giving a lightning talk on the Minnesota for the American Community Survey, this is to educate our congressional delegation on the importance of continuing funding for the ACS in the 2020 Census and maintaining the ACS as a much-needed and much-used resource.

Mark Maloney (City of Shoreview): I want to remind everyone that a year from now the International Public works Congress and Exposition will be held here in the Twin Cities. Great opportunity for exhibitor space, and there is increased interest in the intersection of GIS and public works and asset management. This conference is a big deal in the public works world and is a great opportunity to expose your group to public works.

Ben Verbick (LOGIS): For a moment, I will put my MN GIS/LIS hat on and remind everyone if you haven't done so to please register for the conference coming up. With LOGIS not a lot is new, we are doing a lot of work in the public safety arena, and we will be publishing ISO fire response times along centerline information from the all sources we have.

Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council): see that the Consortium just announced the Polaris winners, so I will announcement them here: the winners in 2015 are Sonia Dickerson, Dave Fawcett and our very own Matt Koukol, so be sure to pat them on the back when you see them. As I mentioned earlier, we are moving the Council's data into the Commons. The metadata will appear in both places for a while we will be in a transition period and when we are comfortable with the stability of the Commons we will take the Data Finder down. IF any of you publish on the Data Finder, you have been or will be contacted to re-direct your data.

Nancy Read (MMCD): We have been having some IT changes here, and by the next time we meet we will have wi-fi; we've encountered some technical issues but it is coming. We are in transition with IT staff so I am overseeing the staff right now. We've got our field collection application running, and using it for identification of mosquito habitat, we basically use phone to pull up the parcel address and have it our database. We are always on the lookout for aerial photos so please let me know when you have new ones available.

Knippel: Dakota had a flight this spring; those ortho images should be up in a month.

David Bitner (db Spatial): I wanted to remind the group that the annual NACIS meeting will be occurring here in Minneapolis the week after the MN GIS/LIS Conference.

David Brandt (Washington County): I spoke last week to the Minnesota Association of Assessment Professionals and gave them a lot of info and tidbits about GIS, they were very interested in the work we were doing, I highlighted the work of the Eight county Collaborative, MnGeo, MetroGIS and the MN GIS/LIS Consortium, and tried to show the whole gamut of work that we do, they were pretty blown away by what we are dong collectively.

Erik Dahl (EQB): No update

10) MetroGIS Coordinator General Updates

Geoff Maas (MetroGIS): A couple quick updates, we had our annual policy board meeting on Wednesday, April 29, 2015, a key feature of that meeting was several representatives providing examples of how free and open data is being used and is benefiting their organization. As per our new structure, we convene the policy board once per year, we will meet again in April 2016.

The new Memorandum of Agreement/Contract is in draft form. I've worked with procurement and legal staff at the Council and provided that document to the counties to get their input. The Council would continue to provide the annual $4000 payment for two years, with two 1-year extensions possible through the end of 2019. Under the agreement the counties would continue their current practices of providing parcel data quarterly in standard, provide address point and centerline data quarterly (as available); and providing updated municipal boundaries that Council staff uses as a template for updating the regional boundaries.

I was very fortunate back in May to be invited to Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada to speak to the Northwest Ontario Innovation Centre on what we are doing here in the metro with GIS and data sharing, they were impressed with the level and scope of our efforts.

Finally, at the conference this fall, myself, Matt Koukol and Ann Houghton will being doing a panel on the MRCC effort, Ryan Mattke and myself will be doing a lightning round and a poster on the Ian McHarg map collection and I'll be doing a presentation on the recovery of New Orleans, 10 years since Hurricane Katrina.

11)   **Next Coordinating Committee Meeting**: **December 3, 2015**

12)   **Adjourn**
Chair Dahl adjourned the meeting at 3:41 pm