



Address Workgroup Meeting Notes

Wednesday, May 16, 2012

10:00 to 12:00 AM

MESB/MMCD Offices, Board Room

2099 University Ave W., St. Paul

1. Attendees

Mark Kotz	Metropolitan Council
Deb Jones	City of Falcon Heights
Nancy Read	Metro Mosquito Control District
Randy Knippel	Dakota County
David Brandt	Washington County
Pete Henschel	Carver County
John Slusarczyk	Anoka County

2. Note Taker

Slusarczyk agreed to take meeting notes.

3. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves.

4. Approve Agenda

Agenda was approved with no changes.

5. Update on RFP for Web Editing Tool

Kotz said that the contract is going to the vendor today (5/16) and that the vendor expects to have the application ready to deploy within three months after the authorization to proceed on the project.

Knippel said that Dakota County would like to host the application and is willing to be a beta tester. The application may be installed at other counties as well. If there is a demand, Met Council would consider hosting the application for communities that don't have a regional aggregator (County) to host the application. Met Council will aggregate all regional address points data on a quarterly basis for now, similar to parcels, and distribute them. Slusarczyk suggested the metro counties using the shared county network (through state connection) as a repository for SDE synchronization.

6. Outreach Feedback from Policy Board

An address points project update was presented at the last Policy Board meeting. Kotz was trying to find out “Who needs to hear the message” and what formats would work best for policy makers. The Board responded saying that it would be most important to explain to cities HOW they could create address points.

7. Dakota County Address Joint Powers

The process started in mid-2010 when it was obvious that the E911 CAD system would require accurate GIS data (address points & road centerlines) to accurately route calls. Knippel worked closely with Gordy Chinander, and the Dakota Co. Treasurer and Auditor to develop an updating process and to make Dakota County GIS the first point of contact for address updates.

Dakota County wanted the authority to name streets to ensure new streets would adhere to their existing street grid. They found they could not legally name streets they had no jurisdiction over so they entered into a JPA with cities/townships to provide assistance in assigning new street names and addresses, but the city/township ultimately assigns it.

Dakota County took on the role of central repository for the streets and address points database. Changes are sent to Dakota County GIS first and, through an update process, other departments at the county are notified. Cities/townships are still responsible for providing change notifications to utilities, post offices and other non-county agencies.

To improve the accuracy of their address points, Dakota Co. created a composite geocoder and ran addresses from E911, InfoUSA, utilities and other sources through it to create the initial address points dataset.

The JPA between Dakota Co. and cities describes liability and outlines roles and responsibilities of both organizations. Knippel is willing to share the JPA and a Board justification document with other counties or cities.

Action: Knippel will send JPA, board justification document, Power Point and other documents to Kotz for distribution to workgroup.

8. Washington County Coordination with Cities and PSAP

Like Dakota County, this initiative is being driven by a new GIS based CAD system at Washington County.

Washington County has gone through a thorough cleaning process of their GIS centerline file by first having their Surveyors office check centerlines against parcels to find errors. Next they ran the data through MESB’s cleaning process to find geocoding errors and those were resolved.

Brandt met with local fire and police chiefs to recruit them as advocates for the local updating of the GIS centerline and address points file. Securing those individuals as “champions” of this local updating process is critical to getting buy-in from city staff.

9. Outreach Materials

Jones expressed concerns that it might be difficult to convince city managers to spend resources on updating address points when their resources are spread thin already.

Brandt restates the tactic of recruiting police and fire chiefs to advocate for process to be added to the city addressing workflow.

Discussion occurred about focusing more on “how” than on “why.” The key is to show cities how easy the update process can be with the new web application. Knippel suggested hosting a Sharepoint site to house all the support documentation and testimonials.

A MetroGIS hosted web page was suggested to be a one stop shop for the address points project. Support documentation, testimonials, training materials, Power Point presentations and other materials could be hosted on this site. It could be used as a tool to recruit/inform cities.

Action: Jones will develop a draft Power Point presentation focused on cities as the audience. It will focus on why address points are important and how they can be created. This can be the first outreach product and can also be used as a template for the MetroGIS website on address points editing.

Action: Kotz will ask Met Council management if any web content or development staff could be used to help create an address points web page.

10. Panel on Implementing Address Points

Kotz has submitted a proposal for a panel session on address points implementation at the GIS /LIS Conference. Panelists include Joel Koepp and Randy Knippel. The idea is to talk to other city/county staff about the process of implementing local updates to address points.

11. Next Meeting Date

Next meeting is scheduled for June 27, 2012.

12. Review Action Items

See items highlighted above.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10