

Meeting Minutes
MetroGIS Socioeconomic Information Need Workgroup
Tuesday, May 6, 2003
County Insurance Trust Building
(2:00 to 4:00 p.m.)

1. Call to Order/Attendance

Members Present: Heather Britt (Urban Coalition), Paul Buschmann (Hennepin County), Dick Carlstrom (TIES), John Carpenter (Excensus LLC), Will Craig (CURA-U of M), Amy Fisher (MN Dept. of Economic Security), Kathy Johnson (Metropolitan Council), Mary Karcz (Ramsey County), Sandra Paddock (Wilder Research Center), Barbara Ronningen (State Demographic Center), Heidi Welsch (Dakota County), Mark VanderSchaaf (City of St. Paul),

Members Absent: Tim Zimmerman (Hennepin County)

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS) and Tanya Mayer (MetroGIS/Metropolitan Council)

Chairperson Craig began the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

2. Accept Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the April 7th meeting were accepted, as submitted.

3. Preliminary Ranking of Individual Information Needs

Craig summarized the methods used and combined results of the workgroup's priority ranking exercise for each of the individual information needs that had been identify in 1996 and expanded by the workgroup at its previous meeting. He then explained how he had reviewed all of the high and medium rated information needs statements to identify the data elements needed to address them and the summary table (Attachment A) he had developed to illustrate these data elements. (Note: *A copy of the final tally spreadsheet and data element summary table will be posted on the web site to document the workgroup's conclusions.*)

Members commented that the priority ranking exercise was complicated because the individual information needs statements were not mutually exclusive. Staff commented that a decision was made not to modify the listing of needs because of a lack of content expertise and to defer to the workgroup to decide what is and is not redundant and how best to go about defining and illustrating priority needs of the broad community.

Tanya Mayer commented that she had reviewed the data elements presented in the summary table and concurs that all of the data elements required to address the needs had been captured. The group concluded that the most efficient way to proceed would be to evaluate candidate existing data sources for each of the high priority data elements. Staff explained the three deliverables sought from the workgroup process: desired data specifications for a regional solutions, data custodian roles and responsibilities, and candidate organizations with a business need and resources to serve in the capacity of a custodian.

The group talked briefly about what a regional solution might look like and some of the data privacy issues that will need to be addressed. Staff encouraged the group to separate the data needs from the access concerns and to think about possible solutions that involve new relationships for summarizing sensitive data of priority to the broad community. The possibility of MetroGIS assisting with one time set up projects was explained by staff as a possibility in manner similar to what has been accomplished to streamline access to high priority parcel attribute data produced by the counties in a standardized format. Heather Britt commented that the Urban Coalition's advocacy roles might be another option to achieve the concept of one-time set up to streamline access to priority data. Amy Fisher added that if the MetroGIS community identifies, as high priority, data the Department of Economic Security maintains

but which is with is not published in a format that satisfies local needs, that they would be open to modifying their practices to address such a need.

Mark VanderShaaf emphasized that for data for which access is currently available that the goal is not to reproduce it but rather to process / organize in a GIS ready format for immediate use upon access, stream access using Internet distribution tools and provide tutorials to walk users step-by-through the process.

The group spent the remainder of the meeting clarifying the meaning and identifying candidate existing sources for each of the data elements listed in the summary chart prepared by Will Craig.

Table A1: Demographics of Households (evening population): Data found in the Census. Available at resolutions that vary by category: some are published at the block level, while others are at the block group or tract level. Currently published, once per decade; American Community Survey could make this annual. Note: table A1 covers demographic data, but the Census also much housing data – e.g., rent.

Table A2: Other Items: Will be explored at the next meeting.

Table B: Daytime counts and locations: No discussion?

Table C: Parcel / land use issues: Parcel data, produced by the seven counties and assembled in to a regional dataset with attribution consistent across the seven county area, is available from MetroGIS on a quarterly basis; little thought to longitudinal data access (**What does this mean? What enhancement(s) are involved?**). The units/parcel and year built attribute fields for the regional parcel dataset are not populated by all of the counties. MetroGIS is currently investigating options to populate these fields. Need for consistent source of data across Metro Area for sales price, rent, turn-over rate, and business type. Rent data from other sources (**what is the current source?**) tends to be biased towards newer and more expensive units. Affordable housing is fraught with definition questions and the group agreed to put in the parking lot (i.e., set aside as an issue) for now. Business type is an element of current consideration by the MetroGIS Existing Land Use Information Need workgroup.

Table D: Information about employers / employment centers: Several sources, none providing data on benefits. Will be explored next time.

Table E: Service providers – location and nature of services: No discussion?

Table F: School data: This data is fraught with privacy concerns, but much summary data is available at the district level from the Dept. of Children Families and Learning from 1988: see <http://cfl.state.mn.us/datactr/>. For finer resolution information, need to contact the school districts. Not good data for children under school age unless they have enrolled siblings. Most will not have information about college matriculation.

Table G. Crime Information: The group agreed to crime location put in the parking lot (i.e., set aside as an issue) for now

Table I. Information Needs mentioned that are outside the bounds of this workgroup: Zip code areas and neighborhood boundaries noted as priority needs but will be deferred to another group(s) to address.

The following workgroup members agreed to prepare a description of several of the identified candidate existing data sources to share with the workgroup for further discussion at the next meeting. They agreed to report the resolution, time frequency, and time series available of each of the high-priority data elements (**bolded items**) listed in the summary tables prepared by Will Craig (Attachment A). It was agreed that these summary reports would be submitted to staff on or before May 23 and that staff would forward them to the other group members.

Heather Britt/ Heidi Welsch:	Sources for data elements included in Table A2: Demographics of households – Other Items
John Carpenter:	U.S. Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) project - Table D
Dick Carlstrom:	Generally what school districts capture / Department of Education?? - Table E
Amy Fisher:	Mn Dept of Economic Security ES 2002 & OES - Table D
Kathy Johnson:	Metropolitan Council’s annual TAZ employment forecast (TBI?) – Table B, D, and H?
Tanya Mayer:	Metropolitan Council’s Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) – Table D and H?

Note: The group concluded that enough is known about existing and proposed data published by the U.S. Census Bureau that no additional research is needed regarding the data elements listed in Table A1. The characteristics of the data are as follows: Available at resolutions that vary by category: some are published at the block level, while others are at the block group or tract level. Time frequency of once a decade currently; American Community Survey could make this annual.

Heather Britt commented and the group generally concurred that easy access to GIS-ready data proposed for the American Community Survey and generally captured by school districts, as summarized by Dick Carlstrom of TIES, would be extremely desirable

4. Data Specifications for Preliminary High Priority Information Needs

This topic was deferred to the next meeting following discussion of the data source summaries identified in Item 3. It was agreed that once the characteristics of the data available from existing sources is understood for each of the priority data elements that the group would then be in position to identify gaps. John Carpenter encouraged the group to consider solutions that permit flexibility in ways data are rolled up and able to be combined with other priority elements at multiple levels of resolutions to support a variety of needs.

5. Next Steps

No discussion. Need to complete activities for Items 3 and 4 before discussing next steps.

6. Next Meeting

It was agreed to meet again on June 4 from 2-4 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Prepared by

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

ATTACHMENT A
Summary of Summary of Socio-Economic Information Needs
by Data Associated Element^{1,2}

Prepared by Will Craig 5/6/03
(see Attachment C for final version)

A. Demographics of households (evening population)

1. Items found in Census

Number of people	Education/literacy	# Workers
Density	School enrollment	Wage rates
Race / Ethnicity	Place of birth	Employment status
Hhld. type	Languages skills	# Automobiles
Hhld. size	Disability status	Commute mode
Previous residence	Income (median & spread)	Place of work
Age (esp 0-4, k-12, 65+)	Poverty	

2. Other items

<i>Undocumented workers</i>	Spending patterns	Licensed drivers
Migration patterns	<i>Health insurance status</i>	Access to technology; e.g. - TV - cable TV - phone - computer - Internet
Homelessness	Births / deaths	
<i>Wealth</i>	<i>Disease / injuries</i>	
Technical skills	Use of services (welfare)	
Telecommuting	Voter turnout	
Day care needs	Voting patterns	
Retirement plans		

B. Daytime counts and locations

- **Jobs**
- **Service centers** (e.g., nursing homes, day care, group homes)
- *Demographics* as above, esp. economic information

C. Parcel land use issues

Number of units	Value	Turn-over rate
Density	<i>Price (sales)</i>	Affordable housing
<i>Year Built</i>	Rent	Business types

D. Information about employers / employment centers

Industry	# jobs	Wage rates
Occupations	Entry level jobs	Benefits
<i>Sales (esp. retail)</i>	Forecast jobs	Homes of workforce

E. Service providers – location and nature of services

¹ **Bold for highest group ranking**

Italics for semi-high (~1.7-1.9)

² See Attachment B for the actual information needs statements to provide context for the data elements stated herein. The vast majority of these statements were identified in 1997 as the first step in MetroGIS Common Information Needs initiative. They are listed in the order of priority agreed to by the current (2003) workgroup.

Schools	<i>Food Shelves</i>	Neighborhood associations
County offices	Child care providers	Other non-profits

F. School data

Enrollment	Location of kids	Test scores
Building capacity	<i>Travel distances</i>	Graduation rate
Projected enrollment	Turnover / mobility	Dropout rate
Race / ethnicity	Free / reduced lunch	<i>College matriculation</i>
Language spoken at home	Public/private/home school	

G. Crime information

Type by location	Gang location	Crack houses
Probation		

H. Transportation issues

Home / work places	<i>Job travel routes</i>	Business/business mode
Commute mode	Transit dependent needs	

I. Information needs mentioned that are clearly outside our bounds

Traffic accidents	Perceptions of areas	Platting information
Housing discrimination	Various indices: - heterogeneity - <i>segregation</i> - <i>deprivation</i>	Boundaries of - schools - zip codes - neighborhoods - census tracts
Special places for people		
Hours of TV watched		
<i>Retirement location plans</i>		
Location of purchases		
Addresses of vulnerable individuals		

ATTACHMENT B
Summary of Summary of Socio-Economic Information Needs
by Data Associated Element^{3,4}

Prepared by Will Craig 5/6/03
 Modified by Tanya Mayer 5/28/03 to include Ramsey County's ratings
 (*The shaded cells illustrate the resulting changes*)

A. Demographics of households (evening population)

3. Items found in Census

Number of people	Education/literacy	# Workers
Density	School enrollment	Wage rates
Race / Ethnicity	Place of birth	Employment status
Hhld. type	Languages skills	# Automobiles
Hhld. size	Disability status	Commute mode
Previous residence	Income (median & spread)	Place of work
Age (esp 0-4, k-12, 65+)	Poverty	

4. Other items

<i>Undocumented workers</i>	Spending patterns	Licensed drivers
Migration patterns	<i>Health insurance status</i>	Access to technology; e.g. - TV - cable TV - phone - computer - Internet
Homelessness	Births / deaths	
<i>Wealth</i>	<i>Disease / injuries</i>	
Technical skills	Use of services (welfare)	
Telecommuting	Voter turnout	
Day care needs	Voting patterns	
Retirement plans		

B. Daytime counts and locations

- **Jobs**
- **Service centers** (e.g., nursing homes, day care, group homes)
- *Demographics* as above, esp. economic information

J. Parcel land use issues

Number of units	Value	Turn-over rate
Density	<i>Price (sales)</i>	Affordable housing
<i>Year Built</i>	Rent	Business types

K. Information about employers / employment centers

Industry	# jobs	Wage rates
Occupations	Entry level jobs	Benefits
<i>Sales (esp. retail)</i>	Forecast jobs	Homes of workforce

³ **Bold for highest group ranking**

Italics for semi-high (~1.7-1.9)

⁴ See Attachment B for the actual information needs statements to provide context for the data elements stated herein. The vast majority of these statements were identified in 1997 as the first step in MetroGIS Common Information Needs initiative. They are listed in the order of priority agreed to by the current (2003) workgroup.

L. Service providers – location and nature of services

Schools	<i>Food Shelves</i>	Neighborhood associations
County offices	Child care providers	Other non-profits

M. School data

Enrollment	Location of kids	Test scores
Building capacity	<i>Travel distances</i>	Graduation rate
Projected enrollment	Turnover / mobility	Dropout rate
Race / ethnicity	Free / reduced lunch	<i>College matriculation</i>
Language spoken at home	Public/private/home school	

N. Crime information

Type by location	Gang location	Crack houses
Probation		

O. Transportation issues

Home / work places	<i>Job travel routes</i>	Business/business mode
Commute mode	Transit dependent needs	

P. Information needs mentioned that are clearly outside our bounds

Traffic accidents	Perceptions of areas	Platting information
Housing discrimination	Various indices: - heterogeneity - <i>segregation</i> - deprivation	Boundaries of - schools - zip codes - neighborhoods - census tracts
Special places for people		
Hours of TV watched		
<i>Retirement location plans</i>		
Location of purchases		
Addresses of vulnerable individuals		