

MetroGIS

**Regional Planned (Future) Land Use:
Peer Review Forum
May 15, 2001**

***Final*
Turn-Around Document
May 22, 2001**

Compiled by
Theresa K. Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator
Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

Maplewood Community Center
Maplewood, Minnesota

Table of Contents

Peer Review Participants and Organizational Team	3
Welcome and Forum Objectives	4
Evolution of Prototype Regional Coding Scheme	5
Issues Identified During Testing of Prototype	6
Identification of Additional Issues/Concerns	6
Group Discussion	10
Next Steps and Closing	15
Process Evaluation Form	16

PEER REVIEW PARTICIPANTS:

Participant:	Organization Name	Organization Type
Mark Andrie	City of New Brighton	City
David Arbeit	LMIC	State
Jeff Buss	MN Pollution Control Agency	State
David Drealan	Carver County	County
Nancy Duncan	National Park Service	Federal
Rick Gelbmann	Metropolitan Council.	Metro
Brian Isaacson	MN DOT	State
Jeremy Johnson	City of Blaine	City
Jane Kansier	City of Prior Lake	City
Jason Linahl	Northwest Planning Consultants	Private
Marcia McCloskey	USACE – St. Paul District	Federal
Dave Pehoski	MN DOT	State
Ann Pung-Terwedo	Washington County	County
Brad Scheib	Hoisington Koegler Group	Private
Larry Soderholm	City of Saint Paul - PED	City
Dick Thompson	Metropolitan Council	Metro
Mark Vanderschaaf	City of Saint Paul – PED	City
Brian Vollum	MN DOT	State
David Wanberg	Sanders, Walker, Bergly Inc	Private

PANEL MEMBERS:

Design Center of AUL: Jason Zimmerman, Carol Swenson
City of Roseville: David Windle
Metropolitan Council: Paul Hanson
PlanSight, LLC: Jerry Happel

ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT:

William Johnson, Moderator (Bethel College)
Will Craig, Chair, MetroGIS Coordinating Committee (CURA)
David Windle, Evolution Speaker (City of Roseville)
Paul Hanson, Pilot Project Speaker (Metropolitan Council)
Jason Zimmerman, Pilot Project Speaker (Design Center)
Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator
Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

GUEST:

Wira Noeradi (Design Center)

WELCOME

At 1:10 p.m., Will Craig, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, welcomed the participants and provided context as the importance of the Forum to achieving the mission of MetroGIS. He then asked each participant to state their name, the organization they were representing, and why they were interested in Planned (Future) Land Use data.

Participant Introduction Comments

Name	Organization	Comment
Marcia McCloskey	USACE – St. Paul District	Works in Corps’ Real Estate Office. Building GIS to serve their regional (multi-state) office and eventually national coverage. Need consistency in coding across numerous jurisdictions. Interested to see how the proposed regional coding scheme might be of help to them to achieve broader GIS program needs.
Jeremy Johnson	City of Blaine	Attending on behalf of the Community Development Director to see if the regional dataset adds any value to better understand what is happening in adjoining jurisdictions – outside of the I-35W Corridor Coalition.
Brad Schieb	Hoisington Koegler Group	General interest in how this dataset might be of value to assist his firm to better serve their city clients’ planning needs.
Nancy Duncan	National Park Service	The Services’ Mississippi River Corridor Recreation Area crosses numerous cities. A consistent Future Land Use coding scheme that captures the essence of the numerous individual adopted land use plans would be extremely useful in their efforts to analyze land use impacts on natural resources within their multi-jurisdictional area of interest.
Jane Kansier	City of Prior Lake	General interest in proposed regional dataset and how it might be of value as a resource for the city’s planning activities.
Rick Gelbmann	Metropolitan Council	Planned land use is fundamental to the Council’s development coordination, transportation, waste management, and Smart Growth Initiative responsibilities. A coding scheme that permits apples to apples comparison of locally adopted plans would be extremely useful.
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul - PED	General interest in how the proposed regional dataset might be of use to the city’s planning activities.
Mark Vandershaaf	City of St. Paul - PED	Strong interest in projects, such as this, that promote data sharing and interested in how this dataset might be of use to the City of St. Paul’s planning functions.

Name	Organization	Comment
Dave Drealan	Carver County	Member of MetroGIS Coordinating Committee since inception. As a producer and user of the planned land use data for minor civil divisions throughout the county supports efforts to develop a consistent coding scheme that permits like to like comparisons across multi-jurisdictions.
Mark Andrle	City of New Brighton	Interest in modifications suggested/made with the proposed regional solution since it was prototyped by the I-35W Corridor Coalition.
Ann Pung-Terwedo	Washington County	Wants to see how the proposed regional dataset scheme would impact the county's land use planning activities.
Dick Thompson	Metropolitan Council	Interested to see how this dataset might be used to assist with Council technical assistance and comprehensive plan review activities.
David Arbeit	Mn Land Management Information Center (LMIC)	Co-sponsor of MetroGIS since inception. Interested in seeing how the proposed scheme might be used by LMIC in its responsibility to monitor land use activity throughout the state.
Dave Pehoski	MnDOT - Metro	Looking for uniformity in data across numerous jurisdictions, a uniform coding scheme that permits like to like comparisons is the only viable alternative.
Brian Vollum	MnDOT - Metro	Looking for a workable scheme that provides consistency in land use coding across numerous jurisdictions
Jeff Buss	Mn Pollution Control Agency	Interested in concept of consistent coding across numerous jurisdictions to aid in air pollution related studies and monitoring.
Jason Linahl	Norwest Planning Consultants	The firm's GIS Coordinator. Attended to learn how the proposed dataset might be of use to their firm, which provided planning services to numerous communities, generally on the urban fringe.
David Wanberg	Sanders, Walker, Bergly Inc	<i>Arrived after the introductions had been completed.</i>

Will Craig concluded his welcoming comments and turned the program over to the panel of presenters.

EVOLUTION OF PROTOTYPE REGIONAL CODING SCHEME

David Windle, GIS Coordinator with the City of Roseville, explained the evolution of the prototype regional planned (future) land use dataset and subject of this Forum. Mr. Windle summarized the role of the North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition, pilot funding received from MetroGIS, and testing of the prototype that had been undertaken by the Coalition and the

Metropolitan Council which lead to the findings to be presented at the peer review forum. A brief bullet summary of the evolution is included below. The slides for Mr. Windle's presentation are attached in Appendix A.

- In July 1997, the Metropolitan Council on behalf of MetroGIS, provided project financing to the I-35W Coalition to devise a subregional coding scheme for both future and existing land uses. The concept was to create a subregional scheme to facilitate land use analysis across seven city and two county boundaries.
- From August 1999-May 2000, a MetroGIS workgroup, comprised of community development professionals representing urban core, suburban and rural communities and DNR, modified the Coalition's prototype to accommodate the needs of the entire seven-county metro area.
- MetroGIS Coordinating Committee accepted the prototype for further testing (June 2000)
- MetroGIS Coordinating Committee accepted Metropolitan Council's offer to test prototype as part of its Smart Growth Twin Cities initiative (June 2000)
- I-35W testing as pilot as part of their Build Out Study (August 2000)

ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING TESTING OF PROTOTYPE

Paul Hanson, GIS Specialist with the Metropolitan Council, explained how he developed the regional dataset using the coding scheme prototyped by the Coalition and refined by a MetroGIS work group. Mr. Hanson then summarized a number of issues that arose as he progressed through the implementation process which involved capturing the Planned Land Use designations from all 191 individual communities in the region and then "mapping" these individual designations to the prototype regional coding scheme. The specific issues that Mr. Hanson identified are listed in the attached slides in Appendix B. In general, his comments dealt with public/semi public uses, Institutional versus Park and Recreation uses, Park and Recreation versus Open Space uses and Marinas and Water Access.

Jason Zimmerman, Research Fellow with the American Urban Landscape Center at the University of Minnesota and associate with the I-35 W Corridor Coalition, summarized issues with the prototype coding scheme that the Center identified as it assisted the Coalition with its Build Out Study. The specific issues that Mr. Zimmerman identified are listed in the attached slides in Appendix B. In general, his comments dealt with issues raised regarding use of housing density versus housing type and regarding coding of mixed and multiple uses.

IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL ISSUES/CONCERNS

Following a break, William Johnson, Professor of Political Science at Bethel College, moderated two group exercises. He began this portion of the forum by recognizing the enormous amount of

work and creativity that had brought the effort to this point. He also commented and the group concurred that this proposed scheme must be flexible to the ever changing world of land uses and as such the scheme will have to continually evolve. The current challenge is to find a point in the development of the regional scheme that everyone can accept as a place good enough to call version one and begin implementation. Finally, he asked of each of the panelists that would participate in the group discussion with the participants to introduce themselves:

- Paul Hanson -- GIS Specialist, Metropolitan Council. Project Manager, Council's Planned (Future) Land Use Pilot Project
- Jason Zimmerman -- American Urban Landscape Center at the University of Minnesota and associate with the I-35 W Corridor Coalition, Member of Coalition's Planned (Future) Land Use Testing Team.
- Carol Swenson -- American Urban Landscape Center at the University of Minnesota and associate with the I-35 W Corridor Coalition, Manager of Coalition's Planned (Future) Land Use Testing Team.
- David Windle – GIS Coordinator, City of Roseville, Member of I35W Corridor Coalition Team that developed original prototype generalized planned future land use coding scheme.
- Jerry Happel, PlanSight LLC, Consultant to I35W Corridor Coalition Team that developed original prototype generalized planned future land use coding scheme.

The first exercise involved asking each of the participants to add any additional issues or concerns to the list of sixteen items previously identified by Paul Hanson and Jason Zimmerman during their respective pilot projects. Theresa Foster and Blaine Hackett captured each of the participant's comments on flip charts.

Discussion Items Identified by the Participants

Participant	Affiliation	Discussion Item
Dave Drealan	Carver County	Requested 1) modification of the agriculture designation to provide for a series of subcategories such as tilled and pasture 2) refinement of the scheme to distinguish between traditional farmsteads and what at first glance may look like a farmstead but does not involve any farming related activity.
Marcia McCloskey	US Army Corps of Engineers	Asked for clarification how Drealan would use the more detailed information. Drealan – mostly for water related planning
Ann Pung-Terwedo	Washington County	Requested creation of residential density category between urban and rural to accommodate the local planning designations of 1 unit to 2.5 acres and 1 unit to 5 acres. She commented that up to 1 unit to 1 acre should remain with urban densities and that the 1 unit to 10 acres and higher should be affiliated with rural densities.

Participant	Affiliation	Discussion Item
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul	Requested expansion of the upper end of the density range to accommodate three additional classes – 40, 60 and 80 units to the acre. He also noted that scheme needs to be flexible enough to accommodate locally used downtown urban classification for mixed uses in one building.
Brad Scheib	Hoisington Koegler Group	Would there be any advantage to adding a density/intensity measure for non-residential uses – neighborhood versus regional scale?
Brian Vollum	MnDOT-Metro	Asked for clarification of which tier (1-3) applied to each of the 16 questions. Paul Hanson answered the question.
Rick Gelbmann	Metropolitan Council	<p>Assuming the MetroGIS community can agree on a regional coding scheme, what thought has been given to how to maintain the currency once the dataset is developed and who would be responsible?</p> <p>Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator commented that the update mechanism and responsibilities will be addressed as a component of the regional solution assuming closure can be reached on a scheme. He acknowledged that the Council is certainly a candidate if it is interested and the MetroGIS community is comfortable with the arrangement. The results of this Forum will be a gauge of the amount of time needed to move to the next level of decision making.</p>
Richard Thompson	Metropolitan Council	<p>Has anyone successfully implemented a regional planned land use coding scheme with the objectives sought here.</p> <p>Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator commented, that to his knowledge, an effort of this complexity (191) cities in a seven county area has not been tried any place else. Carol Swenson, Design Center, noted that even if a similar effort had been tried the idiosyncrasies due to local values would make the scheme difficult to use elsewhere.</p>
Marcia McCloskey	US Army Corps of Engineers	<p>Will the location of right-of-way and easements be included?</p> <p>Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator commented that these topics will be addressed in detail by a separate Business Information Need Workgroup – Rights to Property and possibly by the Roads and Highways Information Needs Workgroup.</p>

Participant	Affiliation	Discussion Item
Dave Drealan	Carver County	<p>How will MetroGIS decide whether a requested enhancement is applicable to too narrow of a constituency to be applicable to the regional solution.</p> <p>Paul Hanson, Planned Land Use Project Manager, Metropolitan Council, commented that the intent is to provide as much flexibility as possible and to provide a means to capture all of the idiosyncrasies and diversity found in the locally adopted plans.</p> <p>Rick Gelbmann, GIS Supervisor, Metropolitan Council, commented that the key is that the regional dataset will be derived from locally adopted land use plans. If some of the ideas expressed around the table do not show up in the local plans then they probably should not be a priority to accommodate.</p>
Jane Kansier	City of Prior Lake	<p>Many of the codes in the prototype scheme seem to contemplate an unrealistic amount of detail for a land use plan and the codes seem to more consistent with defining existing land use.</p> <p>Jason Zimmerman, Design Center and I-35W Coalition, commented that an objective of their original prototype design was to see if it would be possible to use the same coding scheme for existing and planned land use. The Coalition's thinking was that use of the same schemes would improve analysis and project capabilities through better ability to use recognized modeling techniques. Their conclusion was that land use planning designations do tend to be less definitive even when applied to nearly developed suburban areas and consequently I-35W has dropped the concept of the same schemes for both. However, they have found that the tiered scheme embedded into the current prototype provides the flexibility they want and need when working in areas with varying detail in the designations provided in their plans.</p> <p>Paul Hanson, Planned Land Use Project Manager, Metropolitan Council, reiterated his previous comment that the objective is to have a flexible enough scheme to capture the range of detail provided in currently adopted land use plans.</p> <p>David Windle, City of Roseville, concurred with Jason and Paul, noting that there is an enormous variety of detail</p>

Participant	Affiliation	Discussion Item
		in the schemes presently in use by the 191 metro area communities and that the challenge is to accommodate this variety in the regional scheme. He also concurred that the proposed third tier was specifically provided for communities such as the core cities and other developed cities where future land use is not as much of guess as it might be on the urban fringe.

GROUP DISCUSSION

The second exercise involved a group discussion about each of the sixteen coding issues and obtaining direction from the participants as to how MetroGIS should proceed. Theresa Foster and Blaine Hackett captured each of the participant's comments on flip charts.

William Johnson (Bethel College) facilitated discussion among the participants and the panel members for each of the sixteen issues identified during the I-35W and Metropolitan Council pilot projects. A detailed listing of the comments and conclusion follows.

1. Do we need a Public/Semi Public designation?

Name	Organization	Comment
Ann Pung-Terwedo	Washington County	Churches have changed over the years to include more uses and more potential for undesirable impact when located among and adjacent to adjoining residential uses. Separate individual use into its own category.
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul	<p>Public/Semi Public is too general to be useful, is there a need to embed ownership into function? This information can be obtained other ways.</p> <p>The group engaged in substantial dialogue and then reached agreement that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the general class of public-semi public is desirable and should be retained. Important to quality of life and provision of services. 2) several subclasses at the 2nd and possibly 3rd tier (e.g., primary schools, secondary schools, colleges, government offices, churches, etc.) should be added to provide additional insight needed for analysis of impacts. 3) the key is to develop good definitions of the classes and subclasses

Name	Organization	Comment
Brian Vollum	Mn DOT - Metro	<p>Asked if right-of way is/will be included in the semi-public category.</p> <p>David Windle, City of Roseville, Paul Hanson, Planned Land Use Project Manager, Metropolitan Council, commented that in the Planned (Future) Land Use dataset right-of-way does not have any attributes and is cartographically portrayed as a white or blank area on the map. Both noted that the Highway/Roads dataset would be better place to distinguish road function and ownership.</p>

2. How do you want to code School Grounds?

Name	Organization	Comment
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul	Agreement no need to distinguish recreation area on school sites because as general rule most understand that schools and colleges have recreation uses associated with them.
Brad Scheib	Hoisington Koegler Group	Agreed to add a third tier to Institutional to provide more detail for those who wish to provide it. In addition to recreation uses, it was also acknowledged that social services are more commonly provided in conjunction with schools.

3. How do you want to code Cemeteries?

Name	Organization	Comment
All	All Participants	Agreement, just another type of institutional use.

4. Where do we re-code Park Reserves?

Name	Organization	Comment
Marcia McCloskey	US Army Corps of Engineers	<p>Questioned how much detail is needed for land use planning purposes. Can code in the general category at 1st tier and code in more detail in the 2nd and 3rd tiers, with specific types of park uses in these tiers.</p> <p>Rick Gelbmann, GIS Supervisor, Metropolitan Council noted that the scheme should be flexible enough to capture the detail provided in locally adopted plans.</p>

5. Are Marinas Park and Recreation or Commercial?

Name	Organization	Comment
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul	Code publicly owned but leased to private operators
Jane Kansier	City of Prior Lake	Call Marinas Park and Recreation

6. Where do we re-code privately owned Open Space?

Name	Organization	Comment
Brad Scheib	Hoisington Koegler Group	<p>Paul Hanson, Planned Land Use Project Manager, Metropolitan Council, noted that this issue applies mostly to privately owned open space associated with homeowner’s associations..</p> <p>The group concurred that it’s important to keep the flexibility to show these privately owned areas as they are fundamental to cluster developments.</p>

7. Do we need both Housing Type and Housing Density?

8. What do we do if Housing Density can not be calculated?

Name	Organization	Comment
Jane Kansier	City of Prior Lake	<p>The group concurred that both options of classifying residential development should be retained in the proposed planned (future) land use coding scheme. Density is the more important of the two and structure type provides additional detail.</p> <p>Housing Density should remain in the 2nd (Top) Tier and Housing Type should be the 3rd (Next) Tier</p>

9. How do we want to re-code Manufactured Housing?

Name	Organization	Comment
		The group concurred that the scheme should assume a density classification (medium, etc) and treat manufactured homes as just another type of housing structure.

10. Are the currently suggested density ranges adequate?

Name	Organization	Comment
		<p>The group did not add anything to the earlier discussion wherein it agreed that additional density categories should be added to the top and bottom of the current scheme (category in between urban and rural for 1unit to 2.5 and 5 acres and to accommodate 40, 60, 80 units to the acre).</p> <p>In addition, the group concurred that they need to be provided both net and gross densities. Gross (2nd Tier), Net (3rd Tier)</p> <p>They also concurred that the staff needed to look into APA Resources as developed for the density structure.</p>

11. Can mixed density classification be handled in the 3rd tier

12a. Do we want to work with Net versus Gross Densities?

12b. Can we calculate all Net and Gross Densities?

Name	Organization	Comment
		<p>Carol Swenson, Design Center, commented that there is no agreement on how to define Net and Gross Density. The group agreed that planned density should be reflected by Net density in concept. All agreed that this topic should be delegated to a future workgroup (researched) before deciding a course of action.</p>

13. Are 2nd Level Mixed Use Designations misleading?

Name	Organization	Comment
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul	<p>There must be a way to make comparisons of Mixed Use by size of lot.</p>
Rick Gelbmann	Metropolitan Council	<p>Vertical Mixed Use – Not clear if utilized and this is a different issue. Can we capture mixed use without implying something else</p>
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul	<p>Is the issue tied to scale? How do you define scale?</p> <p>Downtown land use is vertical mixed use; horizontal should be the primary issue as a category</p>

14. Can 2nd Level Mixed Use designations be renamed?

15. Can 3rd level Mixed Use designations fulfill all needs?

Name	Organization	Comment
Larry Soderholm	City of St. Paul	The scheme needs to have the flexibility to accommodate horizontal (block face) mixed uses as well as vertical mixed uses (single building or parcel) that occur in the core cities. Larry suggested that MetroGIS look at the categories used in the Calthorpe games for ideas how to name the categories.
Brian Vollum	Mn DOT – Metro	The combinations that are workable in the core cities are different from what are workable in the suburbs. All agreed that mixed uses have to be captured in a meaningful way because huge implications for transportation planning. All agreed that additional subcategories are probably the answer at the 2 nd and 3 rd tiers.
Mark Vanderschaaf	City of St. Paul	Cautioned that the classification scheme needs to be flexible (not get too detailed) to insure it can quickly adjust to changing market conditions.

16. Do we need Multiple Use designation? Where?

Name	Organization	Comment
		Paul Hanson commented that this topic is a result of several communities stipulating that one of two or three land uses are acceptable in a particular area. The end result will be a single, not mixed use. All agreed that the scheme needs to maintain flexibility to capture this situation but that the name should be changed because it does not convey the true meaning.

General Comments

Name	Organization	Comment
Brian Vollum	Mn DOT - Metro	<p>What are MetroGIS’ plans for working with the “collar counties”. He referenced the recommendation at the preceding Regional Parcels Forum on April 19 to the same question.</p> <p>Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, commented that a recommendation is being prepared to ask the Governor’s Council on Geographic Information to take up the issue of how to integrate the work of all regional collaboratives, such as MetroGIS, with geospatial policy for the entire state.</p>
Jerry Happel	PlanSight, LCC	<p>What plans does MetroGIS have to insure that the adopted scheme is continually reviewed and modified as necessary to meet current needs.</p> <p>Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, commented that MetroGIS’ Business Information Needs process includes a “user satisfaction”/ evaluation component. Theresa Foster stated that endorsed the roles and responsibilities for all regional custodians do / or will be modified to include periodically co-hosting an evaluation with MetroGIS.</p>

NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING

Blaine Hackett, PlanSight LLC, and Member of the Technical Advisory Team thanked the participants for taking a half-day out of their schedules to help MetroGIS evaluate the regional future land use classification system. He summarized the process that MetroGIS will use to decide the next steps for the regional land use dataset. In the coming months, MetroGIS will decide if the prototype concept is practical. Feedback obtained at this peer review will be the primary source of information for deciding policy. If agreement is reached, MetroGIS will finalize agreement on the regional coding scheme; agree on primary and regional custodian roles and responsibilities; seek acceptance of a qualified organization to serve as regional custodian; identify incentives to cities to participate.

All participants will be emailed the turn-around document within two weeks. He asked that they provide any additional comments and changes at that time.

PROCESS EVALUATION FORM

Hackett explained that the goal of this activity is to collect feedback from participants and to make adjustments for future peer review forums. Each participant was asked to complete the evaluation form before departing the workgroup meeting.

Question:	Pre-session Contact and Information	Explanation of Forum Outcomes	Question 1. Was the evolution of the prototype regional coding scheme clearly communicated?	Question 2. Were the issues identified during testing of the prototype clearly communicated?	Question 3. Was the identification of additional issues/concerns informative and of value?	Question 4. Was the group discussion exercise informative and of value?	Question 5. Did the organization team provide you the necessary next steps?	Encourage Diverse Viewpoint	Obtain Consensus	Manage Time	Address Your Goals and Needs	Adequacy of Facilities	Usefulness of Peer Review Forum	
Participant														
1	*	3	3	*	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	2.64
2	3	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	2	2	3	4	3	3.00
3	3	3	2	3	3	4	*	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
4	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.62
5	4	2	2	2	3	*	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.42
6	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.08
7	*	*	*	*	4	4	*	4	*	*	*	4	4	4.00
8	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	3.08
9	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2.62
10	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	*	3	*	3	3	3.36
11	*	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	3	3	2.33
12	3	2	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	2	3	4	3	2.92
13	3	3	2	2	2	3	*	4	2	4	3	3	3	2.83
Avg	2.90	2.58	2.83	2.91	2.92	3.25	2.27	3.23	2.27	2.75	2.73	3.15	3.00	2.83

* Note: Not all participants completed an evaluation form or answered each question

Volunteers for Workgroups

Planned (Future) Land Use:

Wira Noertram (612) 627-1850 x208

Ann Pung-Terwedo (651) 430-6715

Brad Scheib (612) 252-7122

Jerry Happel (651) 653-5141

David Wandberg (651) 221-0401

Larry Soderholm (651) 266-6575

Existing Land Use:

Wira Noertram (612) 627-1850 x208

Ann Pung-Terwedo (651) 430-6715

Jerry Happel (651) 653-5141

David Wandberg (651) 221-0401

General Comments:

Group Discussion Exercise: Room too big for good interaction by group

Facilities: Lovely except for size of room

Obtain Consensus: It is not clear to me if anything was resolved

Evolution of Prototype: Evolution was less important, reality of discussion objective didn't emerge until late in the forum, too much detail on evolution.

Address Goals and Need: Not well articulated as to users, uses; goals, objectives.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4:20 p.m., William Johnson thanked the participants for coming and putting in a solid three and a half hours worth of work, he encouraged participants to feel free to send comments or suggestions about the process or suggestions about the peer review forum to MetroGIS staff if anything else should come to mind. Meeting adjourned.