Address Workgroup Meeting Notes

Wednesday, March 28, 2012
10:00 to 12:00 AM
MESB/MMCD Offices, Room 227
2099 University Ave W., St. Paul

1. Attendees

David Brandt	Washington County
Marcia Broman	Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (contractor)
Kay Simons	Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Jim Bunning	Scott County
Deb Jones	City of Falcon Heights
Joel Koepp	City of Roseville
Mark Kotz (chair)	Metropolitan Council
Nancy Read	Metro Mosquito Control District
Joe Sapletal	Dakota County

2. Note Taker

Kotz agreed to take meeting notes.

3. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves.

4. Approve Agenda

Agenda was approved with no changes.

5. Approve Summary from Previous Meeting

Meeting summary from October, 2011 was approved with no changes. The group also agreed that for future meetings we can approve the meeting summary by email.

6. Update on RFP for web editing tool

Kotz said that a contractor has been selected and the Met Council is working to finalize a contract with them. He hopes that will be completed in April. The contractor has said they can complete the application within three months of the authorization to proceed.

7. Strategies for moving forward

A. Identifying and recruiting active champions

B. Engaging E9-1-1 community to be partners

C. Outreach to cities

Kotz described a concept he had heard from Jack Dangermond at the Esri conference many years ago. Dangermond observed that the new GIS initiatives that seemed to be the most successful were often lead by a "Team of Two"; one person who understands the technology, data and needs at the user level and one person who can advocate for the value at the management or policy level. There was general agreement in the Workgroup that this is a good strategy for us to pursue for address points outreach.

Brandt: That the same Team of Two notion is what fixed our address correction process at the county. Brandt and the Washington County PSAP manager Darlene Pankonie have been working together as such a team of two.

Brandt also suggested that we should have a common message that all champions use to sell the vision. Agreement.

Sapletal: We are focusing on the emergency response people too. This seems like it will be very effective because that is an influential community. We have gotten good buy-in from county dispatch, MESB and cities. We have a modest web editing application we are using for this. Staff in the county GIS department support it.

Kotz: Do Dakota County cities have data they can contribute to the regional address points dataset?

Action: Sapletal will request data submissions for the MetroGIS dataset and respond to Kotz.

Jones: Having an ally on the policy side is very valuable and effective. Emergency response is the big seller. Environmental issues get a lot of attention too.

Broman: For PSAP managers, this can be high interest and a high priority right now. PSAP managers are also good people to have the real world discussions about why this is important. Both Washington and Dakota have significant changes going on

related to new CAD systems. This precipitates a need for better data. Not all counties are at that point yet, but will get their eventually.

All agreed that our focus should be on engaging the people who matter and can make a difference, so that they understand and value the vision of address points, and then take action.

Koepp: Cities may be working together in the future to share GIS resources to create a collaborative GIS enterprise function among a number of cities. A non-GIS example of this is Metro-INET, which is an IT collaborative that exists now among a number of cities that share services like email and telephony. Such a collaborative might allow a group of cities to collaboratively host the address points web editing application in the future. City of Roseville own, operate and support the hardware for Metro-INET.

Jones: This collaborative system allows small cities to have access to technology they otherwise couldn't have (e.g. computer security management, etc.)

Read: It sounds like this has similarities to LOGIS.

Action: Sapletal will ask Randy Knippel if we can use his address points outreach slides and materials as a source of our outreach materials.

Action: Kotz will accept responsibility for compiling a draft Power Point presentation for outreach, or perhaps two. One would be for a speaker to use and the other would be a self-explanatory presentation to turn into a PDF for consumption on the Internet as a good introduction to address points and need/value. To be effective, we need to clearly define our audience = policy makers.

Kotz asked all participants to provide good stories for the vision of address points.

Action: Brandt: We have plenty of stories of not finding addresses and can contribute something.

Action: Sapletal will ask for some good stories from some people in his county.

Action: Jones volunteered to collect the stories and to write them up. She also volunteered to and to help with a web document (e.g. the PPT) that presents the case for the address points vision. She will also look for good national stories.

Action: Kotz will look into getting us a project collaboration site.

Simons: The need to pre-validate street names is important too. This can be critical to preventing mismatch issues. All agreed and more discussion followed.

Identified Champions:

- Brandt and Washington County PSAP Manager Darlene Pankonie
- Randy Knippel and a Dakota County Board Member
- City? TBD

Action: Kotz will approach Terry Schneider about his thoughts on this. Minnetonka is becoming active with address points. MESB recently met with the Minnetonka PSAP manager Marv Solberg and Fong Yang, the GIS staff for the city, as well as Matt O'Brien from LOGIS about efforts to collect and maintain address points for E-9-1-1 purposes. They plan to hire some interns this summer to develop the data. Kotz will also approach Ben Verbick, since LOGIS is involved, and Broman will also contact Solberg.

Brandt: We also need to articulate the message about the different ways that this vision could work in terms of data transfer. Some cities might use the web app, others create themselves. Some might go through a county and others not. All of those methods can work together.

Broman: Is there a place that shows what the status is in the metro now? That could show cities and counties what their neighbors are doing. It would be valuable for MESB to know the status in various places, especially who the addressing authority is. Chinander has a list of this information. It's incomplete but has a lot of good data.

Kotz noted that once the MetroGIS project manager position is filled, that person will have some time to support address points project and this status information and map could be part of their responsibility.

Simons: LOGIS and Metro-INET would probably know who has address points.

Koepp: Roseville may be getting ArcGIS Server in the future and thus would have the possibility of hosting the web editing application.

D. Redistribution constraints

Jones mentioned that the new MetroGIS parcel data agreement that makes 3 year old data freely available has allowed Falcon Heights to redistribute their address points data without need to get approval from the county.

8. Next Meeting Date

Next meeting is scheduled for April 25th.

9. Review Action Items

See items highlighted above.

Meeting adjourned at 11:35