

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Agenda

Thursday, June 7, 2018, 1:00 – 3:30 pm

Metropolitan Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul



Meeting Minutes (Draft)

Attendees:

Erik Dahl, MnEQB, Chair
David Brandt, Washington County, Vice Chair
Alex Blenkush, Hennepin County
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Andra Bontrager, MCEA
Brad Henry, University of Minnesota
Carrie Magnuson, Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District
Dan Tinklenberg, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
Ben Verbick, LOGIS
Nancy Read, Metro Mosquito Control District
Marcia Broman, Metro Emergency Services Board
Jared Haas, City of Shoreview
Tony Monsour, Scott County
Chad Riley, Carver County

Guests:

Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council
Brad Davis, Scott County
Ron Wencil, USGS Liaison (Retired)

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

1) Call to Order

Chair Dahl called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm

2) Approve Meeting Agenda

Motion to approve: Brandt, Second, Verbick

Vote: unanimous approval, motion carried

3) Approve Minutes from last meeting on March 1, 2018

Motion to approve: Bontrager, Second, Kotz

Vote: unanimous approval, motion carried

4) Honoring U.S. Geological Survey Liaison Ron Wencil – MetroGIS ‘Benchmark’ Award

Coordinator Maas presented Ron Wencil the MetroGIS Benchmark Award to acknowledge his 22 years of service representing federal interests in the collaborative. Ron shared a number of remarks and anecdotes with the group about his time with MetroGIS and his 30-year service working with the U. S. Geological Survey.

5) MetroGIS Policy Board Update

Maas gave a short review of the most recent MetroGIS Policy Board meeting which occurred on Wednesday, April 25, 2018 (7:00 to 9:00 pm). The Policy Board welcomed two new members to take on the vacant seats of the Metro Cities organization. Metro Cities has appointed City of Eden Prairie City Councilman Brad Aho and City of Falcon Heights Mayor Peter Lindstrom as their two representatives to the Board. At the meeting, Maas provided brief project updates on current MetroGIS projects and the advancement of standards. Two guest presentations also took place: a presentation on recent testing of drone technology for its suitability for meeting government needs for acquiring aerial imagery by Randy Knippel of Dakota County and a presentation on the advance and emergence of drones and the policies regarding the use of drones by Katie Gilmore of PAAP of Apple Valley. Chair Goettel and Coordinator Maas also presented the MetroGIS Benchmark Award to out-going Anoka County Commissioner Jim Kordiak who has been with the Policy Board since 1997 and will not be seeking re-election in 2018.

6) Geodata Standards Development Update

Maas (who also serves as chair of the Geospatial Advisory Council's Standards Committee) provided a brief overview of advance of geospatial standards in the state. Recent standards advancements included the following:

The Geospatial Advisory Council approved the proposed **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** at its meeting on March 28, 2018. The **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** was put out for a final round of public review in January and February of 2018 after being modified substantially during calendar year 2017.

The Standards Committee also approved the proposed **Minnesota Road Centerline Standard** (MRCS v. 0.5) for a sixty (60) day public review period. This standard was proposed by the NextGen9-1-1 Standards Work Group and borrows heavily from the established MRCC effort. The MRCS v. 0.5 essentially contains all the attributes of the MRCC with four additional fields, several expansions of existing domains and renaming of domain titles. The Standards Committee put the standard out for public review on April 9th and will be accepting comments for this round of review until Friday, June 8. All comments collected will be published on the Standards Committee website by mid-June and the Standards Committee will convene again on July 18 in St. Paul to review and decide upon further actions to advance the standard.

7) Sidewalk Data Needs

Mark Kotz, GIS Manager for the Metropolitan Council provided an overview of recent discussion among Metropolitan Council program staff and their emerging need for geospatial data representing sidewalks. He indicated that several lines of business within the Council, including Metro Transit, Metro Transportation Services and Community Development have all expressed an interest in acquiring and using routable pedestrian network data. General use cases included marketing, engineering and facilities work, customer service uses, strategic planning and transit-oriented development work as well as multi-modal planning applications and use by the Local Planning Assistance group in the Council's Community Development department.

Earlier this spring, Kotz facilitated an input session with Council staff to gather the list of business needs to be potentially satisfied by having sidewalk data. The needs assessment was tied to documenting the actual business needs, and further exploring what kinds of geographic features and what kinds of locational features are needed, their characteristics (attributes) and how they should be prioritized in importance.

Features desired included:

- The ability to show the locations of sidewalks and other pedestrian paths in a connected routable network;
- Linkages between sidewalks and transit stops;
- Locations where sidewalks are absent (breaks in linkages of pedestrian network);
- Points on each side of road crossing;
- Location of curb-cuts at intersections as a point feature;
- Topological relationship to road data;
- Elevation (z-value) at endpoints of line segments;
- Sidewalk polygons for impervious surface modeling applications.

Extent (geographic aspects) desired included:

- Within ¼-mile of a parcel with a park and ride, transit center or transit station
- Within ½-mile of a parcel with a park and ride, transit center or transit station
- Within ¾-mile of a parcel with a park and ride, transit center or transit station
- Within ¼-mile of points of interest (regional parks, major employers, etc.)
- Within ½-mile of points of interest (regional parks, major employers, etc.)
- Within ¾-mile of points of interest (regional parks, major employers, etc.)
- For entire 7-county metro area
- For entire MPO-service area (this extends beyond the Seven Metropolitan Counties)
- Along all roads with a functional class designation

Attributes desired included:

- Presence of stairs
- Paved vs. unpaved walk way
- Crosswalks
- Marked vs. unmarked crossings
- Owner of the sidewalk asset (city, county, private organization, etc.)
- ADA related specifications (e.g. grade, width ranges)
- Availability (all year vs. seasonal)

GIS staff at the Metropolitan Council has also collected a number of existing sidewalk and walkway datasets that were readily available from data producers around the region. This data varied in both type and completeness, with some in linear format and some in polygon format, with variations in completeness of linear network and topological relationships to other data such as streets not consistent. There is a potential opportunity as a region for a basic model for routable sidewalk data, just as has been done with address point data, parcel data and the MRCC (centerlines) data. Council staff will next begin to explore the use cases brought forward during its input sessions and compare existing available data to those use cases.

Brad Henry: Isn't there a requirement or best practice for pedestrian ramps to be collected?

Mark Kotz: Yes, however, that data is primarily just point data, MnDOT has an ADA inventory requirement, but for example in downtown St. Paul, there are only two streets that the state is concerned with so there is limited data from the state perspective.

Brad Henry: Well, you can start with what data is collected and work from there.

Mark Kotz: We have. To date we have collected a fair amount of the data that is readily available around the metro, there is some published and likely a lot more that is, as-yet-unpublished data, a lot of it isn't readily available. There is significant variation in the quality and completeness of the data that is available as well. In some places there are planimetric lines along edges, which, while useful for some uses, is not routable, the data that is out there doesn't align with the use cases that we have identified so far.

Chad Riley: To what degree could this need for sidewalk data be covered by our emerging park and trail layer? Would sidewalks be separate, or potentially integrated with this layer?

Alex Blenkush: We could look at how to potentially roll them together and build or extract a pedestrian data set. In Hennepin, we have a project where we are looking at ADA aspects carry lines through cross walks and driveways for completeness and routability; we could link to the trail project later on and focus on routability.

Brad Henry: My understanding is that Minneapolis has created some kind of data like this already.

Mark Kotz: St. Paul sounds like they are in the same situation, my understanding is that they will have a routable dataset by the end of the year

David Brandt: In Washington County, we essentially just plugged in whatever data we got from our cities, we are nowhere near any kind of 'best practice' level yet, but we do a code for crosswalk attribution in our park and trail data set.

Tony Monsour: Are you getting the sidewalk data when you are putting new roads into your system?

Alex Blenkush: Yes, for our road projects we are capturing sidewalks where we can; perhaps we can look at expanding the existing trail schema.

Dan Tinklenberg: Perhaps you could start at a basic level from the standard for the trails and have an extract that works in or connects the trails to the more complicated sidewalk network; a derivative dataset resource specifically for pedestrian routing uses.

David Brandt: Perhaps some city and county level needs assessment action would be helpful, also we'd like to be able to see the needs collected at the Council and our needs match those.

Kotz: As cities are largely going to be the authoritative source, we will look to leverage the existing relationships we already have and that the counties have with them to keep the conversation going.

8) New Project Proposal: 9-1-1 Regional Data Viewer

The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, Metropolitan Council and Ramsey County submitted a new project proposal for a 9-1-1 Regional Data Viewer for the consideration of the Coordinating Committee to add to its annual work plan. This would be a web application, primarily for data viewing and basic data searching of core datasets relevant to the NextGen9-1-1 effort in the Metropolitan Emergency Service Board's nine county (soon to be ten county) service area in the metro region. The key business use of the proposed viewer is to serve as a resource and aid to for geospatially enabled and non-

geospatially enabled members of the NextGen9-1-1 work world to view and reference the authoritative datasets. Maas gave a short presentation of the proposal including the following overview of the datasets anticipated to be included and the basic desired functionality of the resource:

Datasets to be carried in the viewer would include the following:

Data to be provided by the Seven Metropolitan Counties:

Address Point Data in the Address Point Data Standard (v. 1.1)

Road Centerline Data in the Metro Road Centerline Collaborative schema (v. 1.7)

Parcel Data in the Metro Parcel Data Standard until a metro-wide data set in the statewide Parcel Data Transfer Standard (v. 1.0) is available (anticipated by October 1, 2018)

Data to be provided by the Metropolitan Council:

Current Municipal Boundary Data for the entire Seven County Metro region;

County Boundary Data for the entire Seven County Metro region;

Data to be provided by the Metro Emergency Service Board:

Emergency Service Number/Zone (ESN[Z]) Service Boundary Data

Master Street Addressing Guide (MASG) Community Boundary Data

Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Service Area Boundary Data

Data to be consumed from existing services:

Aerial imagery from the MnGeo Aerial Imagery Server

Anticipated functionality of the proposed Regional Data Viewer includes the following:

- *Zoom In/Zoom Out/Pan tools*
- *Turn On/Off Layers*
- *Identification (ID) tool*
- *Apply transparency to visible layers*
- *A basic linear measurement tool*
- *Ability for the user to output a printable PDF map*
- *A citation of the data sources and info on link to downloadable data*
- *Ability to search within certain attributes: address, ESN, parcel PIN, etc.*
- *Zoom to searched features*

Marcia Broman: As some of you know, the world of GIS is relatively new to the field of 9-1-1. Our recent focus in the metro region has been in working to get data, namely, centerlines, address points and so on ready for use in the 9-1-1 systems. MetroGIS and the partners around the metro have been really in the advance guard in working toward this. Having regional datasets for address points and centerlines and getting into the hands of those who need it and accessible to the 911 community is very exciting. One of the core needs for this proposed viewer is that we have many skilled County GIS partners who are very savvy working with the technology and the data who need to work with and communicate with PSAP and dispatch personal who are not GIS-abled—don't have access to GIS or use it for their work.

Also, we have the 9-1-1 vendor community (9-1-1 software vendors, CAD systems, telecom service providers and so on) and we need them to be able to view the data. These vendors also tend to often lack access to, experience with and training in GIS. But it is from GIS that the data they will use will be

emerging to put into their future systems. Putting these regional datasets in an easy to use public viewer would allow the data to be searched, queried and identified, would help facilitate the interactions of GIS and non-GIS folks for resolution of disputes, understanding the underlying geography and understanding the data. Up until now, these kinds of data have only been on viewers at county by county level. Having a regional resource that encompasses the entire region will be very helpful for understanding issues at county boundaries. Also, some service providers and PSAP staff have been relying on viewers such as the property records viewer to confirm addresses. This viewer would help them have access to, and to compare the addresses in the points vs. those in the parcels and have the added reference of streets, service districts and municipal boundaries.

We [the MESB] are looking to provide the data we would supply, the ESN[Z], PSAP and MSAG on the Commons, we maintain those boundaries working to do that, to get the metadata and permissions in place. Our service area currently covers the Seven Metro Counties, plus Chisago and Isanti Counties and as of January 1, 2019 will also include Sherburne County.

Finally, while this project is labeled as a 9-1-1 regional data viewer proposal, clearly there could be used for more benefit than just the 911 community, anyone who wanted to potentially use it could hopefully find value in it.

Mark Kotz: I feel this is a good proposal, but I will offer one insight, based on prior experience I have observed that the more general or broad a purpose the service is intended to serve the less successful it is; the project gets diluted and the final product is unused or underutilized. I would recommend a better approach would be to be as specific as possible, with a clearly defined set of users and their needs. If the project is presented to broadly, it will derail its ultimate functionality and success. I have a second comment as well, I would very much recommend having some sort of Service Level Agreement in place with roles and responsibilities defined and assigned and some indicator of how much time is estimated and some form of agreement from directors and leadership of the participating organizations. Having this documentation in place will help the project be more effective.

David Brandt: This is exactly the kind of project we envisioned when we were working toward free and open data, the ability to pull it all together to serve uses like this.

Nancy Read: We have a comparable application for our uses at the moment, I love the fact that we are getting the centerline data being updated almost continually. Also, I am encouraged that projects and needs like this are helping get the standards and standardized data together making it possible of anyone to build a viewer or applications from it.

Andra Bontrager: Are we safe in assuming this application will be fully available for public use?

Mark Kotz: Assuming that all the data the viewer consumes are free and open public datasets and available as services, yes.

David Brandt: Where would this application sit? Whose license would this be on?

Mark Kotz: The MetCouncil would support the viewer and it would, most likely, be on our license most. The actual standing up of the application is not that hard, the work in getting roles, responsibilities and the project set up will take up a significant part of the effort at the beginning.

Nancy Read: Defining the 9-1-1 user needs will be key. When people are migrating this data into the CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch) system, would they be consuming the same data?

Marcia Broman: Yes, the GIS data is already being consumed by the TriTech CAD system and being used for call routing and address validation. Obviously, there are additional functions in the CAD-system, but the key piece for us is that the data is being drawn from authoritative county GIS sources, this is really a huge step forward and very encouraging.

Nancy Read: Is [aerial] imagery used by the CAD system? Would a project like this serve as any kind of incentive for counties to upgrade and publish more imagery?

Ben Verbick: It depends on what data CAD can consume and what it needs to use.

Marcia Broman: The aerial imagery is generally incorporated to provide context; it serves as a support feature rather than a core feature in CAD;

Ben Verbick: Marcia, has there been a determination of the currency of what the authoritative data is going to be? We know this is a difficult process, we have our staff putting in new things [data updates] every week, perhaps even every day. Sometimes we see the data from the county or other sources as behind, it might be lacking a newly assigned address or other new features;

Marcia Broman: Well, this is part of the 'journey' if you will. Having the daily processes in place or moving into place for the metro region to be collected and harvested is a major step forward, the viewer will then also enable all users to view and review what is up as currently as the data is published. The timeframes of updates used to be one year, then six months, then monthly. PSAPs were sometimes updating the data in their systems on a daily basis, other not so much no firm answer, predict for metro area, to start out with monthly updates, then weekly and go from there, we aren't there yet, but we are working toward it and making strong strides in that direction.

Mark Kotz: I sense this tool will allow people to view how current or not current the data is; one of the business needs it will satisfy is providing the data for inspection and comparison to other data.

Ben Verbick: For the non-GIS people, using this as a viewer might be tricky for a while as it will likely be showing them data that differs from what they have and what they know. What they see will differ from what they know or have in their own data.

Marcia Broman: That's probably true, they will see more current data too, things coming in from telecom providers, these will often be giving an address that is not valid in CAD or MSAG system; but will show up in the county-federated data; again, the various work flows and cross discipline awareness is evolving, it's all part of this 'multi-tentacled' animal we are created.

Chair Dahl called for a motion to add the Regional 9-1-1 Data Viewer project to the MetroGIS Work Plan Motion: Kotz, Second: Broman, no discussion Unanimous approval.

Maas will add the Regional 9-1-1 Data Viewer to the MetroGIS 2018 Work Plan and it will be prioritized against the other MetroGIS projects at the September 27 Coordinating Committee meeting.

9) Current MetroGIS Work Plan Projects – Brief Updates

At each Coordinating Committee meeting, a brief update is provided for each active project currently on the MetroGIS Work Plan.

9.1) Address Point Aggregation

Maas apprised the group of the traditional practice of the Metropolitan Council collecting address points twice per year (generally in April and October of each year) to be aggregated and published as the Regional Address Points Dataset. With the adoption of the statewide Address Point Data Standard, MetroGIS will be working with county partners to transition the data to the new standard, and move from a biannual (twice a year) collection to a more automated collection that could pull together the data nightly. Maas also indicated that the Metropolitan Council GIS staff are already working to develop an automated set of routines to harvest the data (pushed up by the counties to the NG9-1-1 data portal, validate, aggregate and publish county-produced address point data in similar fashion to processes created for the MRCC effort. Maas confirmed that the existing five county data set (from October 2017) will remain available on the Commons until the automated processes are developed.

As of June 7, 2018, five of the seven metro counties (Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Ramsey and Washington) had contributed their address points in the new state standard. The goal is to have the new address point workflow and data set operational by late summer if possible.

9.2) Metro Regional Centerlines (MRCC)

Maas indicated that the MRCC project is successfully transitioning into maintenance mode. Counties are pushing their data to the NG9-1-1 portal, where they are harvested, validated, aggregated and published to the Commons automatically on a nightly basis. The MRCC schema is currently “frozen” at v. 1.7 (e.g. no further changes will be made to the schema), unless the MRCC Build Team raises a compelling business need to do so and there is consensus and approval by the MRCC Core Team (leadership). Next steps for the MRCC effort are getting the data fit for consumption in the NextGen9-1-1 environment.

The MRCC Build Team had an in-person work session on May 31st. At this session the group touched on minor correctional issues to be undertaken, approved the first version of the MRCC Best Practices Document and reviewed numerous examples of unique address/centerline/boundary relationships that would potentially have downstream impacts to the

The MRCC Build Team will still schedule monthly check-in calls to touch base on minor issues as they arise. MRCC project participants will monitor the public input and progress of the MRCS statewide centerline proposal through the Standards Committee process during 2018.

9.3) Metro Park & Trail Data Standard/Data Set

Maas and Blenkush indicated that the effort was in ‘low gear’ at the moment, however the most-current geometry of the region was federated, with some attributes populated and the dataset is available from the Commons in v. 1.1 of the metro park and trail standard (patterned on the NRPA standard). Next steps will include further population of attributes by county staff and the development and completion of the supporting documentation for the effort, the dataset and data standard.

9.4) Address Point Editor Tool, v. 4.0

The contract for the newest version of the Address Editor Tool was concluded in March 2018. The contract was for \$15,200 with North Point Geographics in Duluth. The Address Editor Tool project team met on April 12, May 8, May 29 and plans to meet on June 19 toward wrapping up the effort. The widgets created are available from the Minnesota Geospatial Commons, the AppBuilder Widget Package is available from Dakota County's ArcGIS On Line page and the source code is available via Dakota County's place on the Github site.

The final Steps for the Address Point Editor Web AppBuilder tool involve the following:

- Dakota County staff to complete testing and confirm application is running correctly;
- Complete Tool Documentation, a draft is currently being edited by the work team
- A complete metadata record;
- Publication of final documents on the MN Geospatial Commons, ArcGIS Online, Github
- Complete MetroGIS tool web page text (a first draft is complete)
- A formal email announcement to the MetroGIS community when the tool is complete

9.5) Addressing Resource Guide

Maas indicated that research and compilation of materials has begun on the project. The end goal will be a published resource detailing many aspects of how addresses are created and used. The document is intended to be a reference resource to geospatial and non-geospatial professionals alike and to assist in stronger understanding of good addressing practices and how errors in creation will propagate through the system of address data. Maas indicated that the research effort was larger than he originally anticipated. He gave a short presentation on the development of the address point standard and the challenges of addresses and addressing at the UMGEOCON Conference in La Crosse on May 23-24. At present, the project remains in the info gathering and research stage. He remains in contact with League of Minnesota Cities CIO Melissa Reader, as the League is desirous of a resource like this to help their various municipal staff stakeholders. Maas indicated there is a strong likelihood of tying the Resource Guide to a Best Practices Guide for the Address Point Data Standard.

9.6) Statewide Centerline Initiative

Advancement of the Statewide Centerline effort is largely aligned to the advance of the MRCS through the Standards Committee. MnGeo has indicated that it has collected centerline data from all 87 counties and is now seeking a standard to translate the data into. The MRCS standard was published on April 9th for a 60-day public review period. Work on a statewide centerline remains tied to the advance and adoption of a centerline standard.

9.7) Metro Stormwater Geodata Project (MSGP)

Maas reported that the MSGP is at last, formally underway. A Stormwater Geodata Summit was held on April 17 at the Hennepin County Public Works Facility in Medina (9 am – 11: 30 am). The summit included over 60 participants representing city, county, regional, state, federal and private sector interests. Presentations were given by Carrie Magnuson of the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District, Alex Blenkush of Hennepin County and Geoff Maas of MetroGIS. Two break out session took place where small groups provided their general and specific business needs as well as documenting their concerns about sharing data or policy considerations to be addressed.

From the summit:

- A 19-member, self-identifying steering committee emerged, it will convene in Minneapolis on June 26 to prioritize the input and work toward shaping and scoping the project;
- All comments were collected and distilled into ‘Needs Assessment’ statements. These documents can be downloaded from metrogis.org >> Projects >> Stormwater Data.

The steering team will begin a series of 4 to 6 meetings over the next 12 to 18 months to bring together a standard and potentially a pilot test project as well as developing other resources as needed. Carrie Magnuson, Alex Blenkush, Ann Houghton and Geoff Maas form the ‘coordinating team’ for the project to convene meetings, collect input and document the interactions and products of the group. Steering Team Members include the following:

- Heather Albrecht, Maple Grove
- Perry Clark, Carver County
- Masha Guzner, Carver County Watershed Organization
- Brian Jastram, Mississippi Watershed Management Organization
- Mike Koutnik, ESRI
- Joe Lewis, Houston Engineering
- Nicholas Lott-Havey, City of Chanhassen
- Erik Madland, City of Bloomington
- Rachel Olmanson, MPCA
- Meaghan McGinn, SRF Consulting
- Josh Peterson, Dakota County
- Matthey Ritter, City of Minnetonka
- Cory Richter, City of Blaine
- Mark Ryan, Dakota County
- Kristine Stehly, Hennepin County
- John Studtmann, City of Minneapolis,
- Tyler Thompson, Vadnais Lake Area Management Organization

9.8) Free + Open Public Geospatial Data Initiative

This project is now in ‘maintenance’ mode for the MetroGIS collaborative. Maas indicated that 28 counties are presently freely and openly sharing their data in the state. He further indicated he has been in periodic contact with Cook County GIS Coordinator Kyle Oberg as they are preparing to move toward open data in 2018. Caitlin Christensen of Stevens County indicated that her proposal to the Stevens County Board of Commissioners was shot down; the perception is that there is still revenue being raised by the sale of data. Broman and Maas both indicated they have been in communication with Amber Dalbec, GIS Coordinator at Isanti County as they move toward considering a free and open data resolution and action. Maas continues to field questions from Greater Minnesota partners and to periodically update the ‘White Paper II’ resource document (metrogis.org >> Projects >> Free and Open Data) as needed and to serve as a speaker when invited to present on the issue.

9.9) Support for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons (in Maintenance Mode)

As of June 6, 2018, there are 29 agencies providing a total of 743 individual resources on the Minnesota Geospatial Commons. Usage of the Commons and support for its continuation are strong.

10) Other Data Needs Overview

Similar to each of the Seven Metropolitan Counties, the Metropolitan Council also has a GIS Users Group that convenes quarterly. The Metropolitan Council has a GIS Department in its Information Services Department, but also has GIS professionals placed throughout the organization in departments such as Environmental Services, Community Development and Metro Transit. When this group convenes, it discusses relevant advances in the technology, the use of GIS at the Council, emergent needs for data and other topics of interest. At the most recent meeting of the Metropolitan Council GIS Users Group (May 2018), the group was asked about what sorts of data needs they currently have or that they anticipate soon for projects on the horizon.

This list is provided to the Coordinating Committee for review and discussion purposes and to determine if other regional stakeholders potentially have similar data needs:

- Sidewalk system data (discussed at length by Mark Kotz in Agenda Item 7)
- Conservation easements
- General number of lanes in road segments
- Building footprint data with accurate built-area attribution
- Traffic signals at intersections
- Trail data that is routable
- City sanitary sewer data with routing attribution/connectivity to interceptor system
- Powerlines with information on substation points

Several members of the Committee indicated they needed at least one, if not more or even all the datasets listed and discussed above. Key challenges to developing these include identifying the authoritative source, the public availability of the data, determining the full set of business needs and attributes to meet those and, unpacking the proprietary and/or trade secret nature of the datasets produced by non-government agencies in the private sector.

11) Lightning Round Update

At each meeting, members in attendance are encouraged to share info on any projects they are currently working on for the benefit of the group.

David Brandt (Washington County): We have begun to ramp up our fiber-optic mapping, AKS came and talked with us and we are currently working with Crescent Link; the county owns and manages a substantial amount of fiber-optic resources. We currently are managing it in Excel tables, splicing diagrams and as-built drawings. We are working to bring this together into GIS. With our 9-1-1 work we went live with TriTech (CAD software) a couple of weeks ago, it seems to be working and we are supporting from the GIS side.

Matt McGuire (Metropolitan Council): Looking forward to helping with the Regional Data Viewer project.

Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council): I will mention that the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council convened last week for its quarterly meeting. One of the things MnGeo said they are interested in is creating a free and open parcel dataset to be published on the Commons. Currently, only 28 of the state's 87 counties would be available, but the idea would be to publish whichever counties are open and convert their data into the newly approved state parcel data standard. Obviously, this would include the metro counties and perhaps this dataset would encourage other counties not yet open to begin to share theirs as well.

Nancy Read (Metro Mosquito Control Board): Currently, we are working on sharing catch basin location data with the Adopt-A-Drain program at Hamline University, we have a dataset that documents everything we've got in our service area that might hold water. Also, we've got an application for tracking our helicopters in real time, we are using a vendor for that applications and looking to make that available soon. We are planning our 2019 budget and are interested in which counties are going to be doing new photography. Finally, we are beginning to see what MMCD could be leveraging with drone technology, we've been encouraged to see what others are doing and how it is working for them.

Tony Monsour (Scott County): In Scott County, we were once very focused on the infrastructure side of GIS, but that pendulum is swung to the customer side for some time and is now swinging back to working on and focusing on infrastructure. We are presently getting our Portal set up, we will be out at the ESRI User Conference and we are looking for those who have deployed Portal to see what stories they can share. Also, we have posted for an addressing intern, this is the third summer in a row we've posted that internship.

Brad Davis (Scott County): I'm the planning director of Scott County and this is my first meeting, thanks for allowing me to attend. I'm familiar with the addressing issues you've raised, and it seems to me we [in Scott County] are working through all the same issues that the rest of you have discussed and raised. Good to see a group of diverse interests working together on these issues.

Ben Verbick (LOGIS): We are engaged in a lot of field data collection, I think we've have added close to 50 new map services for our members cities. We're leveraging and using ArcGIS Collector, lots of dashboard applications as well, these are popular with Public Works staff. Also, we are making use or Story Maps as well. LOGIS is also looking at Near Map for potential use as well.

Brad Henry (University of Minnesota): Ben, you mentioned working with Dashboards can you give us an example of what you're doing?

Ben Verbick (LOGIS): Certainly, in the St. Paul, the City wants to track everything that is going on with staff, from fieldwork dealing with forestry, replacing streetlight bulbs, doing sewer jetting and clean out. We've stood up a dashboard with all that in there, they can document how many bulbs have been replaced, or are currently out. Applications are what you'd expect,

documenting assets such as how many manholes, which have been inspected and cleaned, things like that.

Dan Tinklenberg (SRF Consulting Group): We are working with Jacobs; which was formerly CH2M Hill and with MnDOT on County Road Safety Plans. We are currently in Phase II, which includes 16 counties scattered around the state, including Scott, Washington and Carver. This includes things like evaluating curves for safety analysis and direct projects for MnDOT to address known safety issues.

Jared Haas (City of Shoreview): We are working on building data for and documenting our pedestrian ramp crosswalks, primarily driven to meet ADA requirements, hopefully we can use this data for possible sidewalk routing in the future. We are also working on apps for tracking diseased tree removal, we are moving away from the old method of interns with notes to track diseased trees.

Alex Blenkush (Hennepin County): Our primary focus right now is the LUCA work preparing for the Census. Hennepin County is working with about half the cities in Hennepin County. We also have a new application tree inventory, based on JavaScript and very similar to the UI2 application we launched last year. With the app, we enabled cities to maintain their own tree inventory; several cities are very interested, the primary purpose of is for managing Emerald Ash Borer, but they are seeing value in managing their tree maintenance data in the app.

We wrapped up our 2018 aerial collection in the middle of May, we will be in QAQC phase through the summer and it sounds like we will have a product from the vendor this fall. This will include both ortho imagery and obliques and a web-based viewer to examine them. Imagery in this collect is 3" resolution.

Andra Bontrager (MCEA): Our office has moved from Exchange Street to our new location on University Avenue, we are having an open house on June 20th, you're welcome to stop by if you'd like, we have a very cool new office space, an open office type layout. Specific to GIS, I've been working on web apps, I will have one up at the October conference in Duluth.

Chad Riley (Carver County): One of our staff, Allison Kampbell, she is our shared city/county position is working with cities that don't have GIS, including Cologne, Meyer and Watertown. These three cities have a combined population of about 7,000 people; they've got a big interest in asset collection and we are coordinating the availability of a shared GPS unit. All pitched in a purchased a high-accuracy unit to share, working over the summer to collect assets with that. Also, we are working to collect our fiber optic data, we will be wrapping up the final phase of our current contract. We are developing a splicing tool in WebApp Builder where you can click on the handheld and view the connectivity in HTML5

Marcia Broman (MESB): We continue to work with our service area counties and their data (centerlines and address points) on QAQC, error checking and general fitness for NextGen9-1-1 usage. Some of the counties are very close to a 100% match rate, very encouraging to see the

quality of the data being developed. The MRCC came through with about 0.8% mismatch, which is very low, and about 2.0% against the address points as they are now. We've seen tremendous strides in the match rates in recent years and months, it is very encouraging. We will be working on beginning a trail with Dakota County's GIS for the creation of a geoMSAG (an MSAG built from GIS data) to eventually replace the current one.

12) Next Coordinating Committee Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Committee is scheduled for **Thursday, September 27, 2018, 1 pm**

13) Adjourn

With no further business, Chair Dahl adjourned the meeting at 2:57 PM