



Address Workgroup
Wednesday, January 27, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon
Meeting Summary

1. Attendees:

John Slusarczyk, Mark Kotz, Deb Jones, Kent Tupper, Ben Verbick, Bob Moulder, Brad Roman, Dave Brandt, Gordon Chinander, Joel Koeppe

2. Note Taker – John Slusarczyk

3. Introductions

4. Agenda approved

5. December meeting summary approved

Meeting summary was approved with one change.

6. Review Work Plan

Plan was reviewed. No discussion.

7. Moving Forward with Phase 1 Data Distribution

Discussion occurred as to whether approval from the Policy Board is needed to distribute data. Kotz stated that Randy Johnson (MetroGIS Coordinator) indicated that approval was not needed if the Workgroup wanted to distribute some data in Phase 1 to get the project up and running and test the data delivery process. Moulder questioned “open access” to the address points data set and Kotz stated the data access would depend on the distribution policy of the county/city. If the data originates from within a county that county has issues with open distribution then the data set would be restricted to licensed parcel data users for now.

Chinander asked about non-metro counties (Isanti Co.) gaining access to the parcels or address points dataset. Kotz states that any governmental agency can have access to the parcel data and thus any protected address points data if the license agreement between that county and MetroGIS is in place.

Some discussion occurred about the definition of a “derivative product” and whether or not cities can openly distribute address points whose geometry is based off county parcels, centroids or address points. Verbick asks if cities can openly distribute data that they created from scratch without objections by Hennepin County. Roman and Moulder suggested that any product whose geometry is based off Hennepin County’s parcel or parcel centroids seems as though it would be bound by the parcel data agreement.

Verbick asked other county’s positions on the cities openly distributing the address points. Tupper says Dakota County will distribute under their current parcel agreement with MetroGIS but will not object if a

city openly distributes address points that were derived from county parcel data.. Brandt stated that Washington County will give parcel centroids to the cities, let them modify (make their own) and redistribute. Slusarczyk said that Anoka County will take a position similar to Dakota County.

8. LMCIT Liability Disclaimer Update

Verbick has no update and has not made contact with Chris Smith. Terry Schneider from the City of Minnetonka might try to contact the attorneys

9. Pick an Interim Liability Disclaimer?

Group read and discussed three sample liability disclaimers from the City of Edina, Met Council and MN Dept. of Education. Kotz suggests picking a disclaimer to use as an interim until the official disclaimer is drafted. Moulder questions whether the language “GIS data include a copy of this disclaimer and this metadata” implies redistribution is acceptable. Kotz say this disclaimer is only intended for “open access” data.

Brandt and Jones suggested Edina’s disclaimer with no objections from the group. Several recommended keeping the word “shall” instead of “it is recommended” with regards to the disclaimer being passed on during redistribution. Verbick suggested taking the first sentence from the Met Council disclaimer referring to MN Statutes Chapter 13 and adding it to the Edina disclaimer. All agreed that the Edina disclaimer with the Chapter 13 wording is acceptable.

10. County/City Data Ownership Update

Discussed in item #7.

11. Ratify Changes to Data Specifications

Kotz briefly reviewed changes to the data specifications that were approved at the last meeting. Group approved updated specifications document.

Action: Kotz will publish final specifications on the MetroGIS web site.

12. Ratify Changes to Metadata

The name was changed to “MetroGIS Address Points Dataset.” Chinander would like the words “Seven County Metropolitan Area” removed from the title so the data set is not limited to just the metro area. Moulder commented that metro should remain in the title since MetroGIS’ charter is the seven county metro area. Kotz suggested removing the words “Seven County” and keeping “Twin Cities Metropolitan Area” which everyone agrees to.

Kotz proposes a change to the “Spatial Extent of Data” section. He recommended changing the wording to read “Contributing cities and counties in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.” No objections from the group.

Chinander asked about the possibility of storing the data in a KML format in addition to shapefile. There was also some discussion about whether or not to make address points available as a web service. These topics were added to phase 2 of the work plan.

Action: Kotz is going to check into feasibility of KML and report back.

13. Approve Changes to Regional Policy Statement

Kotz said approval will be sought at the next Policy Board meeting. Kotz also notes some changes made to the wording on the responsibilities of the regional custodian that the workgroup defined at the December meeting. Additions were also made to Exhibit 2 of the document regarding regional custodian data validation. The group was fine with these changes/additions.

14. Review Action Items

Kotz stated that data is ready to distribute and that address points datasets can be sent to him. Kotz told Moulder that he will notify Hennepin County if any municipalities within Hennepin County submit data for open access. Tupper questioned whether MetroGIS will solicit the availability of this data to cities. Kotz said that there is no plan to do that now, but pointed to an outreach plan as part of the workgroup's defined work plan in phase two of the project.

Kotz noted that meeting in February may be canceled if there are no updates to report.

15. Adjourn