MetroGIS Coordinating Committee

Thursday, March 1, 2018, 1:00 – 3:30 pm
Metropolitan Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

Meeting Minutes (Draft)

Attendees:
David Brandt, Washington County, Vice Chair
Tony Monsour, Scott County
Randy Knippel, Dakota County
Alex Blenkush, Hennepin County
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Andra Bontrager, MCEA
Brad Henry, University of Minnesota
Jeff Matson, CURA
Norine Wilczek, MnDOT
Hal Busch, City of Bloomington
Curt Carlson, Independent Contractor
Carrie Magnuson, Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District
Dan Tinklenberg, SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
Norm Anderson, MnGeo
Ben Verbick, LOGIS
Nancy Read, Metro Mosquito Control District
Marcia Broman, Metro Emergency Services Board

Guests:
Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council
Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
Joe Sapletal, Dakota County

Staff:
Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

1) Call to Order
Vice Chair Brandt called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm

2) Approve Meeting Agenda
Motion to approve: Knippel, Second, Kotz
Vote: unanimous approval, motion carried

3) Approve Minutes from last meeting on September 21, 2017
Motion to approve: Henry, Second, Kotz
Vote: unanimous approval, motion carried

4) Honoring U.S. Geological Survey Liaison Ron Wencl – MetroGIS 'Benchmark' Award
Coordinator Maas gave an acknowledgement of Ron's 22 years of contributions to the MetroGIS collaborative as U. S. Geological Survey's federal liaison. Ron was not present to receive his award; however, Maas will see to it he receives it at some point in the future.

5) MetroGIS Policy Board Update
Coordinator Maas indicated the next MetroGIS Policy Board meeting would occur on Wednesday, April 25, 2018 at 7 pm and that the executive board of the Metro Cities organization 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. The meeting agenda at the upcoming April 25, 2018 meeting will include standard project and budget updates, a presentation on drone technology by Randy Knippel and presentation of the 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) NCompass Road Centerline Contract and Data Availability
Metropolitan Council GIS Manager Mark Kotz provided an updated on the renewed contract between the Metropolitan Council and GuideK-12 (NCompass) through December 31, 2019. The contract will continue to operate as it has in the past through with the same availability to qualifying users; these being governments and academic interests.

Kotz indicated that the Metropolitan Council is examining the eventual transition of translating the MRCC data into NCompass format in the interim as the Council's transit routing software uses the NCompass data format for its present operation.

The Metropolitan Council's intention is to keep the contract going until transition to MRCC data can take place. The Metropolitan Council has spent nearly 20 years of data integration with the NCompass data and its transit software, and it will be an effort to translate over to an MRCC-based dataset for many of the Council's applications. When this transition takes place, the Council will end its contract with NCompass, if this happens prior to the current contract ending (prior to 12/31/2019), there would be no more updates and access for registered users.

David Brandt: Washington County makes use of the NCompass data for Wisconsin and Chisago County, and there are many counties which use data from the NCompass dataset to augment their out of area needs.

7) Standards Development Update
Coordinator Maas, who also serves as chair of the Geospatial Advisory Council's Standards Committee, provided a brief overview of the development and the current status of geospatial standards in the state. Recent standards advancements include the following:

The Geospatial Advisory Council approved the proposed **Address Point Data Standard** as a state standard at its meeting on December 6, 2018. This standard is posted on the MnGeo website: http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/address/address_standard.html

At its most recent meeting on February 26, 2018, the Standards Committee recommended the proposed **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** for advancement and approval to the Geospatial Advisory Council at its

next meeting on March 28, 2018. The **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** was put out for a final round of public review after being modified substantially during calendar year 2017.

The Standards Committee also discussed, made suggestions for modification and approved the proposed Minnesota Road Centerline Standard (MRCS v. 0.4) 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 MRCC effort. The MRCS is essentially the MRCC with four additional fields, several expansions of existing domains and renaming of domain titles. The Standards Committee anticipates having the public review period to commence in the first week in April. Comments will be collected from this review and the Standards Committee will convene again after the comment period to recommend a next action.

8) 2018 Work Plan Review and Approval

8.1) Revisit Approved Work Plan Priority Ranking from September 2017 meeting
Coordinator Maas refreshed the group on the priority ranking of projects that were agreed to at the last meeting from the prioritization exercise; these were, in rank order:

Project	Work on in 2018	Committee Ranking	Priority Score
Address Points Aggregation	Yes	1	484
Metro Regional Centerlines (MRCC)	Yes	2	400
Metro Park & Trail Dataset/Data Standard	Yes	3	400
Address Point Editor Tool (v. 4.0)	Yes	4	377
Addressing Resource Guide	Yes	5	290
Statewide Centerlines Initiative	Yes	6	270
Regional Stormwater Data Project	Yes	7	168
Free + Open Public Geospatial Data*	Maintenance	M	516*
Support of the Geospatial Commons*	Maintenance	M	418*
MetroPlus Free Geocoder	No	Inactive	108
Increased Frequency of Parcel Updates	No	Inactive	66
Creation of Regional Basemap Services	No	Inactive	42

8.2) 2018 MetroGIS Budget Review
Coordinator Maas apprised the group of the decline in budget allotted to MetroGIS for calendar 2018.

Since 2012, the MetroGIS Collaborative has been allocated an annual budget of $86,000/year. As the MetroGIS collaborative does not generally use its entire funding budget during each program year and the Metropolitan Council Information Services department has been directed to cut costs, MetroGIS' budget has been reduced for 2018. Maas indicated that this

2018 Rank	Project/Expense	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
	MetroGIS Budget	50,000	86,000	86,000	86,000	111,000	86,000	86,000
CC	Seven Metro Counties & MetCouncil Memo of Agreement & Data Contract	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000
CC	MetroGIS Website Kentico CMS Upgrade to Version 10.0	(n/a)	2,800	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)
E	MetroGIS Misc. Expenses (a) - Allotted	*2,000*	*2,000*	*2,000*	*2,000*	*4,500*	*4,500*	*4,500*
E	MetroGIS Misc. Expenses - Total Spent	---	0	328	1,897	113	775	2,990
1	Address Points Aggregation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Metro Regional Centerlines (MRCC)	0	0	0	0	0	(n/a)	(n/a)
3	Metro Park & Trail Dataset/Data Standard	0	0	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)
4	Address Editor Tool (v. 4.0)	15,200	0	0	5,680	0	20,080	13,760
5	Addressing Resource Guide	0	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)
6	Statewide Centerlines Initiative	0	0	0	0	0	(n/a)	(n/a)
7	Regional Stormwater Data Project	0	0	0	0	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)
M	Free + Open Public Geospatial Data Initiative	0	0	0	0	0	0	(n/a)
M	Support for the Geospatial Commons	0	4,071	14,110	0	14,000	(n/a)	(n/a)
C	Historic Aerial Imagery Mosaic & Archive Project	(n/a)	(n/a)	4,775	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)
C	2016 Aerial Imagery Coordination	(n/a)	(n/a)	0	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)
C	New MetroGIS Website	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	(n/a)	59,995	25,000(b)	(n/a)
	Committed or Already Spent for 2018	43,200	34,871	47,213	35,577	102,108	48,855	44,750
	Remaining/Unspent/Unused for 2018	6,800	51,129	38,787	50,423	8,892	37,145	41,250

was not an indication of the Metropolitan Council's lack of faith in the work of MetroGIS, simply, a correction to align with current fiscal realities. The work of MetroGIS is highly valued at the Council and should a project arise where funds exceeding the $50,000 budget allotment were needed, both Maas and Kotz are confident funding can be secured from the Information Services Department budget through the Metropolitan Council.

8.3) Alignment of MetroGIS Project Ranking with Geospatial Advisory Council Priority Ranking. Coordinator Maas shared the MetroGIS priority list in comparison to the project priority list of the Geospatial Advisory Council. Maas asked the group if there was any interest in re-aligning or re-prioritizing metro projects in light of how they stack up against the priority ranking of state projects.

MetroGIS Ranking	MetroGIS Work Plan Item Project Name	Geospatial Advisory Council Project Name	GAC Ranking
1	Metro Address Points Aggregation	Statewide Address Points Data	3
2	Metro Regional Centerlines (MRCC)	Statewide Centerlines Initiative	4
3	Metro Park & Trail Dataset/Data Standard	Park and Trail Dataset/Data Standard	13
4	Address Editor Tool (v. 4.0)	Statewide Address Points Data	3
5	Addressing Resource Guide	No comparable GAC Priority	X
6	Statewide Centerlines Initiative	Statewide Centerlines Initiative	4
7	Regional Stormwater Data Project	No comparable GAC Priority	X
M	Free + Open Geospatial Data Initiative	All public geospatial data freely open	1
M	Support for the Geospatial Commons	No comparable GAC Priority	X
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Maintenance of MnGeo Imagery Service	2
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Improvements to Imagery Service	5
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Policy for Archiving/Preserving Geodata	6
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Statewide Parcel Data (Incl. Data Standard)	7
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Updated/aligned boundary data	8
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Archived aerial imagery resource	9
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Emerg. Mgmt. Damage Assessment Data	10
X	No comparable MetroGIS project	Advance standards for LiDAR and hDEM	11
Inactive	Metro-level basemap services	Statewide Base Map Services	12

8.4) Vote to approve 2018 MetroGIS Work Plan
Motion to approve the 2018 MetroGIS Work Plan: Knippel, Second, Kotz
Vote: unanimous approval, motion carried;

9) Current Work Plan Projects – Brief Updates

9.1) Address Point Aggregation
Maas apprised the group of the traditional practice of the Metropolitan Council collecting regional address points in April and October of each year to be published as the Regional Address Points Dataset and that with the new statewide Address Point Data Standard adopted, it was hope that County partners would begin to transition their data to be translated into it. Maas also indicated that the MetCouncil would be interested in creating an automated set of routines to consume, validate, aggregate and publish county-produced address point data in similar fashion to processes created for the MRCC effort.

Hoekenga: As with our upcoming ability to with the MRCC to pull together data on a nightly basis, we can move toward this with Address Points as well if the counties desire that. We would incorporate that same work flow, ingesting the data, running validation, aggregation and publishing it up to the Commons.

Read: Can parcels work that way also?
Kotz: They potentially could.

9.2) Metro Regional Centerlines (MRCC)
Maas and Hoekenga indicated that the MRCC v. 1.7 had been published to the Commons in mid-February and the Metropolitan Council would be turning on the nightly-automated validation and aggregation tools for live collection from the County partners. The MRCC schema is currently "frozen" at v. 1.7 (no changes will be undertaken) so the Build Team can firm up the automated processes.

Vic Barnett of Ramsey County has been rigorously testing the ingest of MRCC v. 1.7 data into TriTech computer aided dispatch (CAD) software and has indicated that the routing features function with no problem. Next steps for the effort include: refining the validation/aggregation processes**,** working through address range overlaps, completion and publication of a new version of the MRCC Best Practices and Guide Document by March 31, 2018, working with the MESB on outreach to Chisago and Isanti Co. staff to include their data in the workflow and published products. Monthly check-in calls of MRCC Build Team are to continue for the foreseeable future and the MRCC participants will monitor the public input and progress of the MRCS on statewide centerline proposal through the Standards Committee process.

9.3) Metro Park & Trail Data Standard/Data Set
Alex Blenkush of the Hennepin County GIS Office provided an update and overview of the status of the Metro Park and Trail Data Standard/Data Set effort. Park site IDs are about 80% populated regionwide, there are some invalid domain codes and numerous geometry issues with the data, mainly, data spilling over into neighboring counties. Blenkush offered steps for improvement including more rigorous adherence to the agreed upon unique ID code, standardization of cases, removal of geometry overlaps and validation of values against agreed upon values in the approved schema. Blenkush noted that project support documents are in the works, including language for a potential data agreement between

the participating agencies, attribute completeness matrices and eventually a project best practices document will be prepared to accompany the dataset and inform both the user and consumer communities as to what the data is, how it was created and its utility for geospatial professionals. Next steps for the project include a soft data release in March 2018, continued outreach to stakeholders, on-going data clean up, working with the Metropolitan Council for preparing validation and aggregation routines similar to that in the MRCC and a planned formal data release in August of 2018. The project Build Team will continue to engage in periodic conference calls and meetings as needed to keep the data set updated and work through any issues encountered.

Carlson: Are private parks included in this dataset?

Blenkush: There may be for some areas, we are trying to comprehensively collect and represent all recreational lands.

Brandt: It's been a challenge from a county perspective to pull all this together. I've reached out the communities in our county, some don't have GIS staff, sometimes we are literally dealing with PDFs, hand drawn maps, lacking data from local sources can be tough. We do know that the city of Stillwater has some private park areas and we are trying to include them

Monsour: We have some overlapping data as Three Rivers Park District manages some portions of Scott County.

Brandt: Additionally, park boundaries don't always line up with parcel data, and data directly from cities can be interesting to work with, we are doing what we can to bring it all together.

Blenkush: We are dealing with many overlaps all over the metro region with this dataset. Especially with trails and bikeways, we have geometry, but many attributes remain unpopulated at this point. We have many issues, duplicate boundaries, coincident features from multiple sources (e.g. regional, state, county all showing the same feature), gaps at intersections and in rights of way, many challenges to be solved but we are at least aware of what we're working with. We are looking to publish some geometry guidelines for local data producers, as most of this data is being sourced from multiple sources, our focus now is to identify the

Tinklenberg: Does this dataset contain bicycling facilities part of this dataset? Are on street features coincident with the MRCC dataset?

Brandt: Our data for this effort comes from many sources, each agency has its own technique for preparing data so there is some wide variation in the data.

Blenkush: The City of Minneapolis has is snapped to the centerline, while some cities digitize a separate line off the centerline, you will also see a single line representing multiple facilities.

Carlson: Will this data have connectivity for routing?

Blenkush: That would be considered a "nice to have" feature at this point, a great deal of clean up and geometry rules will need to be established.

Brandt: They aren't connected even internally, for example, within the City of Woodbury there are breaks at every intersection, the at this point is just not topologically sound.

Read: Will sources use the aggregated data?

Brandt: Not all will, most we hope to use it over time and it will inform how they move forward with creating their data.

Blenkush: That would be helpful if they did, as having a connected system and network would be more feasible from original source agencies using what we are working toward, more updates in the actual schema would facilities work flow and make the data better for everyone.

Knippel: This is some ways different from other projects, some of the data already existed, some didn't and we don't' at this time have an urgent or direct business driver, but still, we are working on it in various ways, establishing a starting point and trying things to get it rolling. In Dakota County, being a part of the project is a great help for us engage the cities and show them the process, to put an application out there for them, and indicate to them that 'this is best that we have, please provide us some input and help us represent your park and trails better'. So we are shooting for a common level of completeness, accuracy and we can incrementally grow from there. We also feel is will be useful to put the data out there as is as a starting point, even if incomplete.

Carlson: How did you engage the state with this effort?

Blenkush: The state's project has been more 'points with amenities' focused, their most urgent business needs were different than what we intended to put together.

Anderson: The State project, was largely driven by DNR needs, and has a Legacy-funding focus, we rounded up Greater MN to gather their information for the DNR as the sponsor of the project.

Knippel: Do we have a method for bringing in the state and federal lands?

Blenkush: Park and Trail Build Team have discussed that, we are hoping for a single request method for those features.

Blenkush went on to list the next steps for the project, these include:

- A probable 'soft data release' in March 2018
- Continuing outreach to project stakeholders
- On-going data clean up, including tightening up unique IDs, domains, overlapping features, etc.
- Continuing to issue data requests to our local partners
- Working with Metro Council/MetroGIS for starring validation and aggregation process development in late spring into summer of 2018
- An anticipated formal data release in August 2018
- Check-in calls with the Build Team to see how things are going and review any schema changes and requests.

Read: In the trail dataset, is there consideration with official trails only, is there provision for includions of unofficial trail networks, or criteria for what kinds of trail will be included:

Blenkush: We've got a lot of room with what our sources provide us and what we can accommodate in the schema, our codes allow for variation, even for things like 'designated walking roads'.

Carlson: This is certainly relevant to 911 applications and usage as well.

9.4) Address Point Editor Tool, v. 4.0

Joe Sapletal from Dakota County provided an update on the advance of the next generation of the Address Editor Tool. The project team has been working with North Point Geographics to create an upgraded version in the WebApp Builder Environment. The initial budget was $15,200 of which $9,500 has been paid out so far, with the project and contract set to close at the end of March
Meeting every other week with the developers and team to chart progress

The interface will feature a geo-referencing widget, batch upload and report tool. Currently Dakota County is testing the geo-referencing widget functionality, Ramsey County is testing the Batch Address function and Carver County is testing the Report Tool Sapletal used screen-shot slides to demonstrate the key look, feel and main features of the interface for each of the tools.

He indicated that testing and feedback would continue over the next few weeks, the project team would be meeting with the developer on March 12, 2018 and some supporting documentation would be put together in on the tools. Final testing is anticipated to be complete by March 23 and the contract is anticipated to be closed by March 30.

Bontrager: Will this tool have wider availability than just government?

Sapletal: We will have the widgets available on GitHub and have a link to them from the Commons and encourage people to use them as their needs dictate.

Bontrager: When can we expect to see these available?

Sapletal: As soon as the final ones in our hands, as soon as I have the metadata written, we can put them up.

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 he has spoken with representatives from the League of Minnesota Cities and they are keen to have access to this resource, as new city clerks have many questions about how to handle addressing for new developments. Maas anticipates having an initial draft ready by late May 2018 and intents to give a short presentation on the project at UMGEOCON in La Crosse in May. At present, the project remains in the info gathering and research stage.

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 collected centerline data from all 87 counties and desires a standard to translate the data into. The MRCS standard is anticipated to be put out for a 60-day review this spring and comments collected and documents.

9.7) Regional Stormwater Data Project
An event, the Metro Stormwater Geodata Summit is planned for Tuesday, March 6 at the Hennepin County Public Works Facility in Medina. Ann Houghton, Alex Blenkush and Jesse Reinhart from Hennepin County, Carrie Magnuson from the Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District and Geoff Maas of MetroGIS have been involved in the planning of the event. The event is primarily geared toward documenting the various business needs of the participants and their agencies for stormwater conveyance system data and also to document concerns and questions about data availability, completeness and security issues. Fifty-seven (57) individuals have registered representing city, county, regional, state and federal interests as well as private engineering consulting and academia. At this meeting, there will be a request for members to form a steering team to convene 4-6 times over the next 12-16 months to address the issues raised. If no steering team self-identifies, then the Metro effort will continue to perform research and to support Hennepin County in federating its 45 cities worth of stormwater data.

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 now freely and openly sharing their data in the state. He further indicated he has been in contact with Cook County GIS Coordinator Kyle Oberg as they are preparing to move toward open data in 2018. Maas continues to field questions from Greater Minnesota partners and to periodically update the 'White Paper II' resource document as needed and to serve as a speaker when invited to present on the issue. Maas indicated he has been invited to the Minnesota Chapter of the American Planning Association conference in Rochester (Sept 26-28, 2018) to present on the topic.

9.9) Support for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons
At present, there are 29 agencies providing a total of 726 individual resources on the Minnesota Geospatial Commons. Usage of the resource and support for its continuation are strong.

10) Lightning Round Updates

Brad Henry: Remains involved with the MN 2050, excited to see the stormwater event on the calendar, but reminded the group this is just one of many kinds of infrastructure to content with. Henry mentioned the newly formed IAM (Institute of Asset Management, which includes government at all levels and has the goal of making asset management easier for those agencies trying to engage in it. He asked that interested members provide him their email address to get involved if they wish.

Jeff Matson: No update at this time;

Randy Knippel: Dakota County has their data at 6" resolution from their fall flight; they had to relax their standard for sun angle requirements from their usual standard, but have performed quality assurance on the data and published it to the Commons. County GIS staff is spending significant time to support their dispatch system and have established a Joint Powers Agreement with their dispatch center, which serves the county and all its cities. The system itself is administered by LOGIS, and providing the data

into the system has proven to be a challenge. The county has stepped up its quality assurance on this data, which ultimately will help us with other work, such as preparing for Census and LUCA. The County GIS office has been working with the County Transportation Department with drone imagery for all county road projects, capturing before, during and after imagery primarily for documentation purposes. This helps if there are challenges to the project, need for later remediation, impacts to private property and so on. The imagery is at 2 cm (+/- 4 cm) resolution with movie files and derived products like point clouds, 3D photo mesh, raw imagery and so on. This package totals about 150 GB of data for a three-flight 5-mile line road project, so as you can imagine, storage becomes an issue quickly, however, this technique is very cost effective and more robust than past approaches of just documenting with photos from the back of a truck; with drones we can achieve 'saturation documentation' for most aspects of the project.

Also, I'd like to remind everyone that we continue to have the GIS manager meet as the MetroGIS County Data Producer Work Group, this meets concurrently with the Eight County Collaborative which includes Olmsted County. Every other month we expand the meeting ti incorporate a dedicated half-hour for 911 work and invite others from city, state and regional groups to participate for broad er issues. Please contact me if there is something you'd with the counties to focus on or discussion

Norine Wilczek: We continue to pull together our internal 'Georilla' application, this is our internal web mapping application for MnDOT personnel, still not live publicly yet, we are currently switching over our back-end servers, once it is live, I would love to do a demo to this group about it.

Hal Busch: Bloomington is still reeling from replacing all our software applications, we have dedicated the last 3 to 5 years of replacing it all.

Alex Blenkush: Hennepin County is preparing for LUCA, we anticipate getting data from the Census Bureau shortly and working to amend the address files. We look to have imagery flown this spring, and delivered this fall. We are once again hosting a GeoCode 'hack-a-thon' event, on the weekend of March 24-25. For the event, we are prioritizing our open data, and emphasizing the ability to connect open government and county residents. GIS data will be a significant component of the event and we are partnering with U-Spatial. The event will be at the library in downtown Minneapolis.

Tony Monsour: Scott County we also we be conducting a spring aerial flight with Pictometry, last year we got missed by them and we are now in the last year of our contract with them, we are curious to see other counties working on imagery options as well. We have launched our new GIS application for public use, we're using JavaScript and WebApp Builder, we have done a large amount of customizing and we have met with businesses and city folks and public meetings over the course of the last year. It has been well received and we've only had to do some minor fixes and we've put out some enhancements as well. We have also conducted training for public and other county staff. We've had sessions at four different public libraries during the day and the evening and we've had some local businesses involved and general public participating as well. More presence and exposure with the GIS has enabled the county to generate more ideas, we are getting folks used to using it and stimulating new county department interest such as requests for creating new applications. One new area of business is working with our health and human services department, making connectivity and spatial analysis a part of their work and thinking. An example includes the child welfare programs and understanding where foster care is, linked to parks, playgrounds schools, services and so on, we are looking to reach across the county boundaries to other partners and find new uses, layering in things like school districts and so on. Until now, these departments had not been fully spatially integrated and we are looking to make it

visual and spatial. In regard to NG911 work, we continue our integration with new dispatch software, convert our centerlines from MRCC to MSAG that works with dispatch software, very close to finishing that up and moving toward automation.

Curt Carlson: Glad to be able to collect as much free and open parcel data as possible and am loading up the tax payable info into my system performing correlation with Department of Revenue eCRV against tax payable data from parcel data for several clients.

Norm Anderson: I wanted to loop back to our earlier mention of the cascading geocoder at MnGeo. There is one layer we use that is proprietary, and if there is ever to get a public version we will need some funding. It takes a hefty amount of infrastructure resources for that kinds of work and we get charged back from MN.IT Services. We could move toward a statewide geocoder, but we'd need to swap out the proprietary data and bring more resources to bear.

Carrie Magnuson: Main task recently has been preparing for the Summit on March 6. In addition to GIS I wear a few other hats at the watershed district and am working to launch our new website and stripping off the old web maps. We've been working on a video for shallow lakes and using a lot of data from he Commons for our equity initiative, and seeing that many of our projects are ending up in wealthy white neighborhoods, so we are working to target areas in areas of poverty with water protection needs.

Ben Verbick: LOGIS is busy working with Dakota county address points and centerlines. We are very pleased with the Commons and all the data becoming more and more current, this very valuable to our constituent members.

Matt McGuire: I am part of the GIS Collaborative and Coordination Committee at the state, this is group of analysts and technical practitioners involved in code sharing and application sharing. We have been working on developing a service naming convention, we have a draft form convention on how to name services for the public to use. The document available through Hal Watson at the DNR, he is the author of it. The main work group recommendation we came up with that the services should be named identical to the data it carries as identified on the Commons. Also, the Metropolitan Council has published the MRCC, Address Points Dataset as services and we hope to transfer all our services into the new naming convention.

Nancy Read: I'm excited about the new imagery that is going to be available. We will be doing annual wetlands updates and structures updates. We have had a request from the Adopt a Drain program, and we are working on an aggregate catch basin dataset for the entire metro. We have all storm water drains, mapping those that hold water (sump manholes), we assembled this 10 years ago for tracking which ones we've treated. Finally, we are signing up for service for real time helicopter tracking for our fleet and we are currently discussing if that information should be public.

Marcia Broman: Continuing to work with our nine-county service area, we're very encouraged to have them all in the same schema with the same validations on the horizon. This is of huge benefit to the MESB. Over next few weeks we will be working with 911 validations making sure all addresses for 911 are accommodated, results of that will go back to the counties for corrections as needed. We are anxious to have regular update process to be occurring, puts the this puts the metro area in a solid position to be engaging with 911 vendors for geoMSAG creation to move forward toward NextGen911. We are glad the Metropolitan Council is providing these validation and aggregation services to bring this data together.

Jon Hoekenga: As Matt indicated, we will be advancing and rolling a service layer for all our resources at the Council over the next month.

Mark Kotz: One of the GAC's priorities list is to develop a policy and procedure for arriving geospatial data, lots of data we all create and collect but we haven't put thought into where do we store this to it remains accessible. We've been working with Ryan Mattke, the head of the Borchert Map Library. He will be doing an initial presentation at the next meeting of the GAC and going forward, developing some sort of more formal protocol to archive this data and make it available. We hope the University takes a significant role in it and perhaps there is a means to harvest this automatically, this data is very useful for change detection uses and other uses. One other item, Geoff and I were invited to present to the Chair, Regional Administrator and Deputy Regional Administrator last week. They are big supporters of GIS at the Council and of the work MetroGIS is doing. The Council and its leadership very much sees the value of the collaborative and remains supportive.

Geoff Maas: We will be doing some minor back end updates to metrogis.org in the coming month, please contact me if you are looking for something and can't find it. Also, in my conversations with the Arrowhead Geospatial Collaborative, they are looking to standardize PLSS corners across their counties. I pulled together the PLSS schemas in use in the metro (each county is doing it differently) and shared your schemas with them as a point of reference.

Dave Brandt: I will be presenting GIS activities to our county board in a workshop next week. The last time I did a GIS specific workshop for the Board was 2006. Also, Washington County is one of about a dozen counties nationwide that are engaged in a Sub-County Assessment of Life Expectancy(SCALE) project sponsored by the Center for Disease Control (CDC). We are having a portion of our county re-flown by Pictometry as well later this spring due to leaf-on issues in 2017. At long last, our deployment of TriTech CAD/RMS will hopefully go live this May. It has taken about 7 years of 'coming coon' to bring this to a head. Also, we anticipate starting our fiber optic network mapping project and we hope to have our address points wrapped up in March.

11) Next Coordinating Committee Meeting: **Thursday, June 7, 2018, 1 pm**

12) Adjourn