

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Existing Land Use Workgroup Meeting
Minnesota Counties Insurance Trust (MCIT) Building – Room 208
Dec. 10, 2003

Participants Present: *David Arbeit-DA* (LMIC); *Dick Carlstrum-DC* (TIES); *David Windle-DW* (Roseville); *Paul Hanson-PH* (MetroGIS staff); *Randall Johnson-RJ* (MetroGIS Staff)

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

Agenda: To follow up on actions taken at the July 16, 2003 meeting; discuss the viability of pursuing a land use coding scheme – LBCS or the modified MetroGIS coding scheme

Discussion: PH began the meeting by briefly reporting the results of July 16th meeting's Next Steps. PH reported that few communities appear to be implementing LBCS. Only the State of Georgia appears to incorporate LBCS for any formal planning process, although still only incorporated as optional. PH also reported that after locating a slew of community coding schemes that addressed specific land inventories, he borrowed many features and classification designations to create a new modified coding scheme. PH suggested that it seems that either the LBCS or the newly generated coding scheme appear to be the two optional base schemes for the workgroup to move forward with.

Initial discussion about the LBCS began with several comments:

PH felt the coding scheme is quite progressive.

DA commented that the discussion of classifying land use in similar fashion has been going on for 30 years. Since it is impossible to have a stable land use coding scheme in the classical model, the strength of LBCS is in its decomposition of information into somewhat non-related dimensions. Although the modified MetroGIS coding scheme is a nice effort to capture significant “cross-tabs” of land use information, it incomplete. Over time, it is inevitable that land use designations will change and having “fixed” land use representations will be too confining.

DA asked for clarification from PH on his comment about LBCS being limited for handling intensity measures. PH responded that his statement may have been overstated and that was principally derived from his understanding of the pilot work done by MetroGIS and the I-35W Corridor Coalition during the planned land use information needs process in 2000 – particularly as it pertains to commercial property. DW clarified that the use of ULI commercial coding in that pilot process was preferable to the LBCS model.

A discussion focusing on the LBCS pilot result followed. DW commented that he was a bit disappointed after he completed the pilot - “The value didn't jump out at me.” DW commented that it seems that we still need to apply other data to the LBCS land inventory data to answer many of the information needs. DA asked whether that would be true with any coding scheme? Everyone agreed that it would but questioned whether the investment necessary to generate an LBCS worth the payoff?

Taking a different approach, the workgroup dissected the new coding scheme a bit. DA questioned whether the modified MetroGIS coding scheme was simply a single representation of a LBCS scheme cross-tab analysis? Everyone essentially agreed that it is. Therefore it was suggested that by supporting the modified coding scheme users would be locked into a single representation of land-based information while if a LBCS type data model was implemented, hundreds of information combinations would be possible based on a particular user's information need. Wouldn't such a model have a truly enhanced value? So, if a perceived deterrent in supporting a LBCS type scheme is the investment necessary to populate a complete model, it was calculated based on the time investment for the pilot area, it would take about two weeks to create an LBCS for all of Roseville. The group agreed that such an investment seemed reasonable, especially if there is a clear conceptual model, illustrated benefits, and clear

guidelines. The workgroup concluded that although our assessment might be grand but it truly is up to communities. The group agreed that a better understanding of community's responds to LBCS is necessary.

The conversation shifted slightly to implementation. It was asked, regardless of the coding scheme we choose, are there efforts to get people (communities) to use it? In other words, does the Council have any position of creating incentives or to help get communities to use a workgroup endorsed coding scheme? RJ implied that MetroGIS might have some financial backing to help initiate community level population of LBCS. PH wanted to clarify that MetroGIS funds are essentially separate from Metropolitan Council funds and that from past dialogs with select Metropolitan Council departments, the current 3-5 year land inventory cycle is sufficient for their business needs and that LBCS has not been warmly received. RJ suggested that there may be other organization such as the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, the Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Minnesota Department of Transportation may have sufficient needs to potentially provide additional support or incentives for communities.

DA suggested that the workgroup attempt to simplify the LBCS model and incorporate more traditional land use language in order to improve the potential of success of conveying the concept of LBCS to prospective supporting organizations and to communities themselves to complete a LBCS. One simple modification or visualization tool that could be implemented to assist in conveying the information is to present the LBCS dimension into a more traditional, pseudo heirarcial model:

- LBCS Site → Level 1
- LBCS Structure → Level 2
- LBCS Activity → Level 3
- LBCS Ownership → Level 4
- LBCS Function → Level 5

If this works in some fashion, then the Metropolitan Council's Land Use inventory could serve some of the information (possibly Site, Activity, and some Structure information). Ownership info could likely be filled through Parcel data. As a result, only Function, some Structure information, and any necessary refinements would be lacking. RJ pointed out that current Council policy with respect with their land use inventory is to have communities to review all Council classifications before data is publicly release. Thus, it seems feasible to invite communities to add any lacking information such as Functions and Structure while they review the land use inventory information. With clear values, input guidelines, and incentives, it seems even more feasible. The group agreed that it maybe more important to have a more applicable and appropriate data model rather than assuring that any endorsed model is complete with all data.

DW wondered whether such an effort still only has only limited value if other data sets (such as demographic data) are not standardized – LBCS only truly works with other data. PH wondered if the idea of standardizing other data is within scope of the workgroup. DW acknowledged that it is not but that the workgroup should keep in mind that efforts toward LBCS are only a partial solution to the land use information needs “problem.”

Time was closing on today's meeting therefore the group attempted to wrap up and outline next steps.

Next Steps:

- 1) DW will contact Mark Vander Schaaf of St. Paul and discuss the usefulness of LBCS or a modified data model that emulates the ideas of LBCS.
- 2) PH will attempt to set a meeting with other communities to discuss LBCS.
- 3) PH will contact Scott county to discuss a county level implementation of LBCS

- 4) PH will talk with Council staff about the possibility of using the LBCS data model to record the upcoming regional land use inventory and illustrate that data summations can be extracted from the model that integrate with previous land use inventory data models.
- 5) DW will talk with Roseville planning staff once again about the benefits of the LBCS data model.
- 6) If all Land Use schemes are really just representations of various cross-tab analysis of a LBCS style database than we should be able to recreate any coding scheme from LBCS organized data. Hence, DW will attempt to recreate the I-35W Existing Land Use map for the pilot area from LBCS organized information. Part of this exercise is to illustrate the cross-tabs for the final land use categories.

Next Meeting: To be announced

Prepared by,

Paul E. Hanson
MetroGIS Technical Support