

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg. – Room 205
March 30, 2005

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Read called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and asked the members to introduce themselves.

Members Present: *Cities:* Steve Lorbach (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul) and Bob Cockriel (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* Scott Simmer (Hennepin), John Slusarczyk (Anoka), Randy Knippel (Dakota), David Claypool (Ramsey) and Jane Harper (Washington); *Federal:* Ron Wencil (USGS); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District), and Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan 911 Board); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom (alternate for Lee Whitcraft; TIES); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (URS Corp.); *State:* Joella Givens (Mn/DOT), and Robert Maki (DNR); *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Ned Phillips (Rice Creek Watershed District); and *Utilities:* Al Laumeyer (CenterPoint Energy)

Members Absent: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Business Geographics:* Chet Harrison (CB Richard Ellis); *Counties:* Dave Drealan (Carver) and Jim Hentges (Scott); *GIS Consultants:* Terese Rowekamp (Rowekamp Associates); *Non-Profits:* [vacant]; and *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC)

Support Staff: Steve Fester, Randall Johnson, Mike Dolbow, and Mark Kotz (MetroGIS)

Visitors: Adam Baso (City of St. Paul)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Chairperson Read noted that to expedite the meeting Item 5c would be heard after 5a and that item 5b(3) would be held after 5b(1). The agenda was accepted as amended.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Cockriel suggested that the word “schema” that was used in Section 5f (Existing Land Use) of the December 15, 2004 meeting summary should be replaced with a term that is more commonly used. Henry moved and Cockriel seconded to approve the summary for the Committee’s December 15, 2004 meeting, subject to modifying the term “schema”. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF JANUARY 26 POLICY BOARD MEETING

The Staff Coordinator summarized the major topics considered by the Policy Board at its January 26, 2005 meeting, as outlined in the Committee’s agenda materials.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Preliminary 2006 Budget Proposal

The Staff Coordinator summarized the 2006 budget request for MetroGIS’s “foster collaboration” function, as presented in the agenda materials. Mark VanderSchaaf, Director of Planning and Growth Management at the Metropolitan Council, commented that the Council is anticipating the need for budget cuts in 2006 and 2007 and that at this time the effect on MetroGIS’s budget request is unknown. He suggested adding this situation as a bullet to the listing of other uncertainties cited in the staff report when this topic is shared with the Policy Board. He noted that over the next couple of months a workgroup within the Council will hopefully be able to bring more clarity to this matter. He also mentioned that the internal Council workgroup would appreciate an opportunity to collaborate with the MetroGIS workgroup helping to prepare for the MetroGIS Strategic Planning Workshop proposed for this fall, as many of the

questions that have been suggested to help prospective participants prepare for the workshop are also relevant to the Council's internal review.

Motion:

Claypool moved and Givens seconded to direct staff to forward the budget request as set forth in the agenda materials to the Policy Board for its review and comment at the April Policy Board meeting.

b) Strategic Direction Retreat – Clarify Expectations

The Staff Coordinator summarized the staff report and commented that Professor John Bryson is available on September 22 and 23 to facilitate the event. The Committee was asked to set aside both dates for the time being.

In response to question from the Committee, the Staff Coordinator commented that the attendees have not been confirmed, other than in general terms that the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board members are the primary audience. The existing Workgroup that is responsible for preparations will decide the specifics. It was suggested that reference to “retreat” should be dropped given its negative implications. In jest, members offered “advance” and “Operation Enduring Sharing” to emphasize the need for more a more future-oriented event. The Committee also agreed that the private sector should be involved with the event as well as in its preparations and concurred that if Terese Rowekamp is willing, she would make an excellent representative.

c) Regional Solutions to Priority Information Needs

(1) Street Centerline Dataset: E911 Suitability Enhancements

Chinander provided an overview of the workgroup's efforts. Dolbow explained the workgroup's purpose, vision, objectives, definitions (expansion of TLG paradigm, not changing it), concepts of Core Geographic Unit and single official source, and the proposed vision in general.

In response to a question from Knippel about how the proposal ties into current efforts by Mn/DOT related to its Linear Reference Model (LRM) project, the group concurred that the potential exists to tie the two projects together, but the lack of address ranges in the Mn/DOT street centerline database is an impediment that needs to be resolved. All concurred that a good deal of duplication currently exists in the management of street centerline data and that a goal should be to ensure consistency with Mn/DOT's efforts to the maximum extent possible.

The group also concurred with Knippel's realization that the vision proposed by the Street Centerline Workgroup goes beyond typical GIS implementations and will involve agreement on intergovernmental policies to succeed. Staff affirmed that the workgroup concluded early on this would need to be the case to make any serious and long-term efficiency improvements. Chinander concurred, noting that the need to establish compliance with the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) is an example of the need for effective lines of communication with the 911 community that have not been widespread in the past.

Laumeyer encouraged the group to consider involving utility interests as they also have emergency management needs and they, like the 911 community, need street and address data before the counties formally include plat information in their parcel systems. Laumeyer was offered an opportunity to participate in the workgroup and participate with the next phase of the effort.

In response to a question from Maki, Dolbow commented that the current regional street centerline dataset was endorsed for geocoding functions, not routing, noting that the topology is lacking for routing. He also commented that features important to the E911 community, such as ring roads at malls, trails, etc. are missing from the current regional street centerline dataset, and finally that the spatial accuracy in some cases is in need of improvement.

Claypool cautioned that inaccuracies in the location of city boundaries need to be taken into account and that the “go-to” authority to fix such inaccuracies is not necessarily easy to determine. Dolbow and Chinander noted they expect a number of these types of issues to arise as the details of the technical and organizational strategies begin to come together.

Knippel commented that this proposal will likely result in an expansion of the core street centerline data acknowledged as important to everyone versus that currently available via the current regional street centerline dataset. Wencil commented that Mn/DOT should be kept in the loop related to the concept of unique identifiers. He noted that he would like to eventually see address data attached to MnDOT’s data, that it be managed as a component of the LRM, and that the USGS have access. Givens commented that the current communication link between Dan Ross and Dolbow is likely the best way to achieve the desired coordination.

In response to a question from Maki, staff affirmed that the proposed vision for a federated (multi-participant) solution includes an emphasis on organizational roles and responsibilities necessary to create the desired data, as well as, secure commitments from organizations with the resources and needs to maintain its currency, in addition to defining the desired data components themselves.

Bitner encouraged the workgroup to investigate incorporation of Web Mapping and Web Feature Services into the proposed vision in addition to physical sharing of the actual data.

Motion:

Chinander moved and Wencil seconded to accept the vision proposed by the E911 and Street Centerline Workgroup, as outlined in the agenda materials and to direct the Workgroup to develop a proposal for the technical and organization components necessary to achieve the proposed vision. Motion carried, ayes all.

(3) Addresses – Occupiable Units Points Dataset

Chinander introduced the Occupiable Units Workgroup’s recommendation and then introduced Mark Kotz, the workgroup’s lead staff, to summarize the Workgroup’s purpose, scope, proposed definitions, results of its survey of address authorities, gap analysis efforts, recommended vision, and its justification.

Kotz commented that that the address components which exist for centerlines and parcels are not sufficient, and that that there is currently no means to track addresses at the unit level for buildings/units on a single site – a need that has been defined by the MetroGIS community, in particular the E911 community. Henry asked how the vision would deal with the room in which the Committee is currently meeting as a component of the larger building. Kotz responded by noting that the business rules to be more clearly defined before all of the specifics are worked out.

VanderSchaaf asked a question about enforcement that led to a broader discussion about MetroGIS’s role to support the forum through which organizations with the most need would work through the details. The Staff Coordinator emphasized that whatever solution(s) is arrived at in terms of both organizational structure and data specifics, participation would be on a voluntary basis with an emphasis on demonstrating benefits to candidates for participation.

Harper affirmed the value of pursuing a regional solution county-by-county, given the multiple related relationships that already exist among the counties and local governments that interact daily. She was also supportive of personalizing the incentives, as necessary, to address policy and procedure variations from county to county.

Knippel asked for clarification about how the proposed vision would be integrated with the many vendor systems that are already in place related to street centerline data. Chinander responded that he is confident that solid relationships with the vendor community will continue, given how the vendor

community has responded thus far. Harper surmised that if MetroGIS, in collaboration with the Metropolitan 911 Board, is able to agree on best practices, promotion of these agreed upon practices could help communities in their efforts to work with the vendor community.

Cockriel asked to what degree the occupiable unit and street centerline workgroups are coordinating their respective efforts. The Staff Coordinator commented that, by design, there are common members and that the lead staff frequently confer with one another, as is evidenced by their presentation at this meeting and the bringing of the topics to the Committee at the same time. Cockriel stated that he was encouraged to hear that the two efforts are so closely coupled and, as such, suggested that the addresses for occupiable units effort might be in a better position for funding and local support from the Public Safety community down the road if outreach efforts continue to closely couple these initiatives. Members of the Coordinating Committee not currently involved in these groups who are interested in participating were encouraged join one or both groups.

Motion:

Henry moved and Cockriel seconded to accept the vision, as presented in the agenda materials, and direct the Address Workgroup to begin work on development of a proposal for the technical and organization components necessary to achieve the subject vision.

Chairperson Read asked for permission to extend the meeting 15-20 minutes. Permission was so granted.

(2) Existing Land Use – Reconsideration (Tabled by Policy Board at January 26, 2005 Meeting)

Staff Coordinator Johnson commented that since the staff report had been distributed to the Committee members as part of the agenda packet, Metropolitan Council staff in the Planning and Growth Management Unit had determined that the LBCS-based Existing Land Use model is not needed to achieve the Council's purposes. Johnson noted that further investigation of the LBCS-based regional solution had been proposed in the staff report, provided an organization is willing to assume the role of regional custodian.

Mark VanderSchaaf, Director of Planning and Growth Management for the Metropolitan Council, commented on internal needs evaluation concerning the Council existing land use-related business needs. The current thinking is that the LBCS model goes beyond the Council's internal needs but they are supportive of the proposed prototyping to further investigate the concept in the event another interest(s) is willing to assume the regional custodian responsibilities. He asked that the report to the Policy Board be clear that the Council no longer considers itself a candidate to serve as the regional custodian for an LBCS-based solution.

Harper commented that she believes a window of opportunity exists to promote this LBCS-scheme as a voluntary tool for updating comprehensive plans. VanderSchaaf commented that Council management is not currently supportive of encouraging local government to utilize the LBCS model. Cockriel commented that he is amazed that the Council's Environmental Services Division has not endorsed this methodology for its ongoing efforts (e.g., the Regional Center Audit w/DNR and 10-year Water Conservation Emergency Plans), which, by their nature, are greatly enhanced by access to land use data that are normalized across jurisdictions.

Knippel commented that he believes that the topics of whether there is a community need for solution to a particular information need and the discussion about which organization(s) is willing to assume the custodian responsibilities need to be kept separate. Gelbmann added that the LBCS model has been given substantive consideration because it holds promise to address needs that have been identified by the community that go beyond the capabilities of the traditional hierarchical scheme.

Harper commented that the notion of postponing further action on an identified priority common information need due to the lack of an organization to champion a regional solution is among the topics

that should be central to the discussion at the proposed Strategic Planning Workshop, for which the theme is “are we done?” Should resource needs still be investigated? When should we reevaluate the information need premise?

As a result of questions raised by Knippel and Harper, the Committee concurred that the need for an Existing Land Use solution should be confirmed as a one-time event and that if a need still exists (as is expected to be the case), to decide at that time how best to address the organizational implications.

Motion:

Knippel moved and Claypool seconded to convene a one-time event, within the next six months, to affirm whether the MetroGIS community still believes a need exists for a regional solution to Existing Land Use information need. Motion carried, ayes all.

d) Performance Measures Anomaly Report

This item was not discussed due to a lack of time.

e) GIS Demonstration for April Policy Board meeting

Givens moved and Wencl seconded to invite Tim Anderson, with Barr Engineering, to be the presenter for GIS Demonstration topic at the April 20th Policy Board meeting. The topic will be the “How Watershed Districts are Benefiting from MetroGIS’s Efforts”. Motion carried, ayes all.

f) Regional GIS Projects – Call for 2005 Proposals

The Staff Coordinator summarized the call for proposals as outlined in the agenda materials. He emphasized that May 18 is the deadline for submission.

g) Non-Profit Vacancy – Coordinating Committee Seat

This item was not discussed due to a lack of time.

h) Policy on Forwarding Resumes to Committee Members

Chairperson Read asked that any members who do not want to receive requests for job opportunities (resumes, job postings, etc.) from job seekers via email should contact Steve Fester to opt-out. She commented that unless a Committee member asks for further discussion, no other action is anticipated with regard to this item.

6. PROJECT UPDATES

This item was not discussed due to a lack of time.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

This item was not discussed due to a lack of time.

8. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

June 29, 2005, 1:00-3:00 p.m.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourn at 3:15 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff