

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Existing Land Use Workgroup Meeting
Minnesota Counties Insurance Trust (MCIT) Building – Room 203
May 22, 2003

Participants Present: *David Arbeit-DA* (LMIC); *Dick Carlstrum-DC* (TIES); *John Mertens-JM* (Dakota Co.); *David Windle-DW* (Roseville); *Paul Hanson-PH* (MetroGIS staff)

Participants Not Present: *Jim Hafner-JH* (Minnehaha WSD); *Karen Jensen-KJ* (Met. Council - ES);

Agenda: To discuss the “Existing Land Use” priority business information needs as expressed by the MetroGIS community and strategies to fulfill the needs and draft a solution.

Discussion: After a brief period of outlining the work group’s goals by PH, the group proceeded to discuss “hot button” topics such as vacant land and redevelopable land. DA reminded the group that rather than getting bogged down by classification details, that their goal is to think of solutions that will solve/satisfy multiple business needs (i.e. redevelopable land). DW pointed out that in terms of land use information, cities are often less concerned about land uses that remain constant over time but more interested in land uses that change. However DC did point out that there are needs to have knowledge of current uses for things such as potential student yields for a school.

DA did ask DW how Roseville views vacant land – he responded with “no current activity.” JM was curious how the determine underdeveloped land – DW responded with “value” for tax assessors information. PH mentioned that using information from sources such as the tax assessor is a component of a strategy of attempting to fulfill many of the information needs expressed in the planning Forum that was crafted by Rick Gelbman’s Built Environment database. DA also pointed out that it appears components of the Land-Based Classification Standards (LBCS) also reflect many of the same information sources by data like the tax assessor. PH gave a brief overview of the LBCS but raised concerns about its implementation of information such as mixed use. DA suggested that multiple record enters would satisfy mixed use features (many to one comparison of LBCS classifications and a geographic unit- i.e. Galtier Plaza).

DA suggested that Sanjay Jeer (head of LBCS at American Planning Association) could help identify inventory methodologies for the work group. The group agreed that it would be valuable to try and get him/her to answer questions about LBCS. There were also suggestions that maybe it would be good to try and have Sanjay present at the MNAPA conference in Oct.

JM wondered how the LBCS was implemented – What are the assumptions of data sources. One? Or multiple sources to fulfill the various dimensions? The group agreed that it is likely that the LBCS is derived from multiple data sources. JM expressed that he has tried to implement LBCS for some of the transportation planning for Dakota County. He emphasized that the need for detailed local knowledge made implementation next to impossible.

DA suggested that the group conduct some pilots of LBCS implementation. DW said Roseville would love to a pilot. JM cautioned that the dynamics of daily changes seems to have a dramatic effect on the viability of implementing LBCS – there need to be detailed local interest in maintaining such a system. DA offered that as part of the roles and responsibilities, various organizational levels (i.e. Met Council, counties, cities) could have varying roles. PH wondered if there are county needs to aggregate land use information from cities – response from JM implied some need. JM reiterated the need to be cautious about inconsistencies in terminology (etc.) at local levels. DA further outlined that it maybe possible to think of the different dimensions coming from different domains (i.e. Ownership from the counties, Structure from the cities). The work group should look to extract information from various sources rather than encouraging windshield surveys.

PH began discussion about looking at the Planned Land Use (PLU) coding scheme and how it may satisfy the needs for Existing Land Use (ELU). He wondered if there was value in trying to construct a third or even fourth level codes. The group agreed there was. DA was interested in knowing how the Met. Council uses the coding scheme for their Generalized Land Use. PH explained that it is a multi level interpretation of the scheme – not simply a level 1 or level 2. DW explained how the I-35W corridor coalition used the scheme with its Build Out study. DW indicated that there were difficulties in the transformation of information between ELU and PLU. DA was curious how long it would take to redo the process I-35W went through. DW responded not too long with good, knowledgeable community leaders.

DA suggested that we pilot both the PLU expansion and the LBCS in similar locations to assess the time necessary to implement and any financial resources before the work group promotes a solution to MetroGIS. With Roseville as a prime candidate, DW also suggested pursuing an area such as the Northwest corridor group as another possible test area.

PH also quickly mentioned two other potential solutions to investigate further – Rick Gelbmans' Built Environment model and Prof. Francis Harvey's data catalogs.

The meeting concluded by outlining next steps.

Next Steps:

- 1) PH develop 3 & 4 level in the PLU coding scheme model for work group review.
- 2) PH will see if we can get Sanjay Jeers here to present LBCS to work group sometime in early summer – potentially organize with DA.
- 3) PK will further investigate Gelbman's model and possibly line him up to present the idea to the group.
- 4) DW will investigate possibility of having Sanjay Jeer present at the MNAPA conference in October.

Next Meeting: When Sanjay can meet with work group – June? If no meeting can be arranged, PH will work with work group to arrange next meeting.

Prepared by,

Paul E. Hanson
MetroGIS Technical Support