



Technical Workgroup Meeting Roads and Highways Common Information Need

March 11, 2003

1 to 3 p.m.

Room 4B, Mears Park Centre

Summary

Attendees:

Mike Dolbow, *Metropolitan Council*; John Hoshal, *LMIC*; Jim Maxwell, *The Lawrence Group*; David Vessel, *Metropolitan Council*.

1. Workgroup Issues

a. Workgroup Membership

Low turnouts at meetings led us to conclude that several members are extremely busy with the current budget crisis. Nevertheless, we need to continue with this work. We decided to seek out a new member from one of the core cities. Suggestions are encouraged.

b. Workgroup Purpose Statement

A new purpose statement was proposed and agreed upon: *“To create parameters for a Roads and Highways data set(s) that meets the needs of a majority of GIS users in the Metro region.”*

c. Meeting Frequency

It was difficult to agree upon a meeting frequency without a timeline or completion goal, so we discussed that. We will know more when we learn about the spatial standard (see #3), but a tentative goal of December 2003 is proposed. We will continue to meet every 6-8 weeks until suggested otherwise.

2. Review of current process

a. Currently using top needs identified at the user forum to create data specs

A brief review: the needs identified at the user forum have been ranked by the number of “votes” they received, and currently we are examining ten needs at a time.

b. Discussion on first round of specs

Several needs in the first “round of ten” addressed spatial concerns, and we felt the need to understand the spatial standard more before approving them. See #3.

Some discussion occurred around items like traffic volumes and actual speeds, that will initially only be available for small portions of the data set - most likely freeways. It was noted that local collection of this data does occur, and providing the structure for this data to be “hooked in” to the regional solution is the key.

The need of traffic control devices sparked a major discussion. It is obvious that this need cannot be met in a regional data set with the detail that most city planners and public works officials would require. Even turn restrictions and other routing tools

would have to be captured in a separate application or data set. However, for an overview of the traffic controls existing at intersections and along street segments, the need as it was defined was considered adequate. It is our intent for these items to provide that general overview for planners, traffic engineers, and public works officials concerned with corridor, city-wide, or county-wide studies.

c. Is this working?

Yes, for now. However, after the next “round of ten” are completed, the group suggested that the Metropolitan Council ferret out a “core set” of items to complete the attribute portion of the data set. While the user forum provided quite a bit of information, the workgroup felt that there were regional needs missing. The forum was only one source of determining those needs, and if the Council defines a core set of data attributes, these can then be ratified by the region’s users.

David Vessel agreed to work on the next round of ten needs, and Mike Dolbow agreed to identify the initial core set of values for a proposal to the larger group.

3. Data Content Standards - ANSI and NSDI

The group determined that there are still many questions to be answered about the spatial standard as proposed by the federal standards committees, and MnDOT’s implementation of that standard. We want to see a presentation by MnDOT on the standard, including answers to all the “tough questions” about hooking in higher resolution data and attributes from other sources. We also want to know about their pilot projects, timeline for completion, and their willingness to help the region implement this standard. Mike Dolbow will seek out the best individual at MnDOT to make this presentation.

4. Wrap up

a. Review of accomplishments

Current process of creating parameters for the top needs is working fine for now, but a core set of data attributes is needed to focus the discussion. We need to learn more about MnDOT’s implementation of the federal spatial standard before we can come to any conclusions about it. A status report about our progress should be produced for the May MetroGIS TAT meeting.

b. Schedule next meeting

Next meeting tentatively scheduled for the last week in April.

5. Adjourn