

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg. – Room 205
December 17, 2003

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Harper called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM, introduced the newest member David Bitner, with the Metropolitan Airports Commission, and asked each of the committee members to state their name and the organization they represent.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Cities:* Karen Johnson (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul); *Counties:* Gary Swenson (Anoka), Bill Brown (Hennepin); David Claypool (Ramsey), Dave Drealan (Carver), Jane Harper (Washington), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Randy Knippel (Dakota); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); *Metropolitan:* David Bittner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Mark Kotz for Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), and Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); *Non-Profits:* Sandra Paddock (Wilder Research Center); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom for Lee Whitcraft (TIES); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (URS Corp.); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC), Joella Givens (Mn/DOT), and Robert Maki (DNR).

Members Absent: *Business Geographics:* Steve Lehr (CB Richard Ellis), *Cities:* Bob Cockriel (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington), *Utilities:* Al Laumeyer (CenterPoint Energy/Minnegasco); and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District).

Support Staff: Steve Fester, Randall Johnson, and Kathie Doty (Richardson, Richter & Associates, Inc.)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Charboneau moved and Hentges seconded to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried ayes, all.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Craig moved and Henry seconded to approve the summary for the Committee's September 17th meeting, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 29 POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Harper summarized the major topics considered by the Policy Board at its October 29th meeting.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Election of Officers

Chairperson Harper turned the meeting over to Vice Chairperson Drealan.

Motion: Craig moved and Claypool seconded to nominate Harper to serve as chairperson for the coming year. Johnson moved and Brown seconded to cease nominations and elect Harper by white ballot. Motion carried ayes all.

Vice Chairman Drealan turned the meeting back to Chairperson-elect Harper to preside over the election of a vice chairperson for 2004. Claypool moved and Henry seconded to nominate Dave Drealan. Nominations were closed.

Motion: Claypool moved and Henry seconded to elect Dave Drealan to as serve a Vice Chair of the Coordinating Committee for the coming year. Motion carried unanimously.

b) Operating Guideline Modifications – Second Reading

Chairperson Harper commented that the proposed changes in the guidelines were essentially to reflect the maturing of MetroGIS, noting that the current operating guidelines are same the as originally adopted in 1997.

Craig suggested three modifications for the Committee’s consideration:

- Add a section that provides procedures to remove members from the Committee who are not participating in the Committee’s affairs.
- Clarify expectations for members who represent broad communities as opposed to single organizations.
- Clarify the title for Article IV.

It was agreed to postpone Committee action to the March meeting to give staff and the Chairperson an opportunity to propose specific language changes to address each of the matters raised by Member Craig.

It was agreed that the proposed Member Removal provision should call for Committee action to consider removal of a member after three consecutive missed meetings and failure of a qualified alternate to attend on their behalf. The concept of unresponsiveness (no advance warning) was also noted as considerations. The group also asked staff to offer language to stipulate that there is an expectation concerning members who represent broad communities, as opposed to single organizations, that they should make an attempt to communicate with that community and bring the community’s ideas and concerns to MetroGIS’s deliberations.

The following members volunteered to serve as liaisons for the following MetroGIS workgroups:

- Highway and Roadway Networks: Joella Givens, MnDOT
- Hydrology: Robert Maki, DNR
- Addresses (Sandra Paddock, Wilder Research – volunteered following the meeting)

c) 2003 Accomplishments and Annual Report

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the major accomplishments as outlined in the agenda materials. Craig suggested that MetroGIS should list, as one of its accomplishments, the fostering of the Parcel Data Status Survey completed summer 2003 by a workgroup (chaired by Craig) of the Governor’s Council on Geographic Information. Craig noted that this survey was, in large part, influenced by MetroGIS’s interest in establishing data sharing, in particular parcel data, with the counties that surround the seven-county Metro Area. Craig noted that through this survey, information has been documented on who to contact, as well as, detailed information on each county’s GIS efforts related to parcel data. Craig also asked that the website address for the final report (<http://www.gis.state.mn.us/pdf/GeoDataExchange.pdf>) be included in MetroGIS’s reference to the study.

The report was accepted with no other comments offered.

d) 2004 Budget and Major Program Objectives

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the proposed 2004 MetroGIS budget, noting that no changes had been made to the preliminary version shared with the Committee, at its September meeting, other than the text associated with the proposed Data Sharing Agreement to capture expectations defined by the Policy Board at its October 29th meeting. Johnson noted that that afternoon (Dec. 17) the Metropolitan Council was expected to approve its 2004 budget and that MetroGIS’s requested funding is a line item in the Council’s budget.

No comments were offered other than Givens suggested that a column should be added to the left side of the spreadsheet to make the Section numbers easier to read. Staff noted this will be done before the document is forwarded to the Policy Board for approval in January.

Motion:

Paddock moved and Arbeit seconded to recommend that the Policy Board approve the 2004 MetroGIS budget as presented in the document dated December 8, 2003, subject to the Metropolitan Council adopting a budget that supports the portion of the expenses allocated to the Council. Motion carried, ayes all.

e) 2004 MetroGIS Work Plan

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the proposed major focuses for 2004, calling specific attention to the proposed creation of an Address Workgroup, noting that its impetus arose from a common need of several standing workgroups and current initiatives of the Metro 911 Board and the Ramsey County GIS Users Group to develop an effective means to capture and maintain address data at the suite/unit level. A document prepared by staff (Attachment A), which assembled information about each of the known overlapping interests was shared with the Committee for its information. Comments from the Committee members were as follows:

Address Workgroup

Claypool commented that he has shared the Ramsey County GIS Users Group's concept of a county-wide, enterprise address database on at least three occasions with the FGDC Cadastral workgroup of which he is a member and he encouraged MetroGIS's initiative to align, to the maximum extent practical, with national standards/guidelines where they exist. He also noted that this initiative will be a opportunity for MetroGIS to provide leadership with significance beyond the seven county Metro Area.

Arbeit concurred with Claypool and further noted that a national URISA Committee has been working in this area for some time, in particular, with protocol for dealing with suite/unit addresses that have a many-to-one relationship with parcels, as well as other forms of addresses in addition to the customary parcel (situs) address.

Henry commented that the topic of addresses was particularly difficult in Minneapolis's GIS experience because addressing needs are very different from the variety of perspectives involved - assessor, planner, etc. He cautioned that the first task should to reach agreement on the definition of the terms.

Chairperson Harper encouraged members of the Committee interested in serving on this new Workgroup to contact staff. (Following the meeting, Member Paddock offered to serve as the Committee liaison to this workgroup, given the overlap with the work if Socioeconomic Phase II workgroup, which she is currently a member.)

Socioeconomic – Phase II Workgroup

Craig noted that the language in the draft is no longer accurate and that he would appreciate an opportunity to modify it to align with the Phase II recommendation that will be considered by the Committee later in the agenda. The Committee concurred to allow Craig to modify this language consistent with the motion for Agenda Item 5f.

Motion: Craig moved and Claypool seconded to approve the 2004 detailed Work Plan, dated December 3, 2002, subject to modifications to be provided by Craig for the Socioeconomic Phase II Workgroup. Motion carried, ayes all.

Proposed Committee Retreat

The Staff Coordinator suggested that the Committee consider scheduling a retreat for fall 2004 and meet as a group to discuss possible philosophical changes to address priority information needs that have not been able to be addressed with the "regional dataset" philosophy that has underpinned MetroGIS since its inception. Following a comment from Chairperson Harper that a retreat would be beneficial prior to initiating the 2005 Business Plan Update project, the membership concurred that a retreat should be pursued but that topics should be not be limited to the "regional dataset" philosophy.

It was agreed that the concept of a retreat should be a discussion item on each Committee agenda until it is held to refine the agenda. As an adjunct to the “regional dataset” philosophy topic noted by staff, Member Read suggested discussing the concept of multiple organizations sharing update/maintenance responsibilities for a particular dataset (e.g., separate custodians for the spatial data versus attributes). *(Editor’s note: During discussion of Item 5g, Member Knippel suggested that the Performance Measures should be expanded to include a measure that quantifies the benefits realized relative to the cost to attain these benefits. It was agreed this topic should be a topic of discussion for the proposed retreat.)*

Concept of Adding Utilities as a Priority Information Need

The Staff Coordinator summarized this proposal and its genesis having been the GASB34 presentation made to the Policy Board on October 29th. Vice Chairman Drealan commented that the County Data Producers Workgroup recently initiated a pilot with three utility companies to determine if they have an interest in sharing their infrastructure data with local government in return for access to parcel data. Drealan also noted that since MetroGIS’s 2004 work plan is already very ambitious, the current pilot should be permitted to run its course and be used to define issues and opportunities before initiating any further activity in this area. The Committee concurred.

f) Phase I Socioeconomic Report and Recommendations

Member Craig, Chair of the Phase I Socioeconomic Workgroup, summarized:

- the process and participants involved to arrive at the Workgroup’s recommendations,
- general criteria discovered for data necessary to meet the MetroGIS community’s priority socioeconomic information needs (sub-city level, updated at least annually, and a time series of at least 10 years),
- existing data sources identified to align with desired data characteristics, and
- a prototype website developed by MetroGIS support staff to aid the user search by data theme or data source and quickly locate existing data that satisfy priority information needs.

Craig also explained a proposal to pursue enhancement of three existing data sources to enable them to satisfy desired data characteristics and objectives for the proposed Phase II workgroup. The Phase II workgroup is proposed to address a need, by primarily local government, for small area analysis that can not be accommodated by existing traditional sources of socioeconomic data.

Maki asked how many much of the data can be served today from web sites in the form needed by the user. Craig estimated about 50 percent of the currently identified “best known” data sources can be downloaded, noting that the proposed resources webpage is intended to simply access to these sites as well as direct the user to contacts for commonly needed data that it is not currently available online.

Arbeit commended the workgroup for defining a one-stop Internet protocol to aid users track down the wide variety of data needed to address priority socioeconomic information needs and for its work to actually identify “best known” sources for each priority need. In response to Maki’s question, he also noted that the Workgroup’s efforts are a necessary first step to move toward a solution where the user is readily able to integrate these data into commonly used GIS applications.

Motion: Craig moved and Givens seconded that the Committee:

- a) Recommend that the Policy Board approve, as a Phase I regional solution, the prototype web-based resources page developed by the Phase I workgroup, direct staff to advertise its existence, and direct identification of a custodian / process / method to ensure the currency of the information presented on this site is maintained.
- b) Recommend that the Policy Board:
 - Endorse pursuing modifications to existing datasets related to *County social service records, First Call for Help, and county birth and death records* to enhance their usability and better address priority socioeconomic information needs, and

- Direct the Coordinating Committee to pursue negotiations with the respective data producers to achieve these enhancements.
- c) Authorize the Phase I workgroup to reconvene, at a time it determines appropriate during 2004, to evaluate desired enhancements to the web-based resources identified in Item A and monitor funding progress for the federal ACS and LED programs, as well as, a bring forth recommendation for action as appropriate.
- d) Create a Phase II workgroup and delegate to it the two principal objectives stated in the general findings, listed in this report.

Motion carried ayes, all.

Following the motion, Craig asked for volunteers to assist with documenting the benefits that would accrue to local government with regard to reducing effort currently needed to interact with the Census Bureau to produce the decennial census, if the American Community Survey (ACS) were to be enacted. The purpose of this documentation is to support a pending recommendation to the Policy Board to adopt a resolution in support of Congressional funding for the ACS. Craig also requested feedback as to the envisioned benefits of policy-driven analysis of the census data on an as-needed basis, as opposed to gearing up for the traditional intensive 2-3 year analysis, with no particular policy need in mind, following completion of the decennial census. No comments were made.

g) Annual Performance Measures Report and Recommendations

Kathie Doty, member of the staff support team with Richardson, Richter & Associates Inc., summarized the 2003 MetroGIS Performance Measures Report. Following her presentation, Doty asked the members to comment on staff's conclusions about what the findings mean.

Maki noted that based upon his experience with DNR's Data Deli, download activity will eventually plateau. This is likely because the regular customers see the Deli as a stable source of data that can be accessed when they need the data. What drives increased activity are a) expanding the number of data offerings, b) the breadth of need for the new offerings, and c) the breadth of users. Arbeit concurred, noting that the number of downloads from LMIC's Geospatial Data Clearinghouse were consistently around 650/ per month until they made 2003 orthoimagery available from this site. The availability of the imagery resulted in a more than doubling in the download activity. Arbeit expects this activity to eventually drift back closer to the amount of activity realized prior to making the imagery available; noting that only time will tell. Maki also encouraged MetroGIS to also consider tracking the amount of bundled downloads (multiple datasets downloaded in one session).

Knippel requested more details on the Quova report findings that listed Dakota County among the top 20 entities downloading data, accounting for over 36 downloads last year. He was intrigued by this amount of activity and was not sure who within the county may be involved. Staff agreed to send the raw numbers to Knippel.

Doty asked the Committee to comment on the recommendation that MetroGIS continue to invite more organizations to utilize DataFinder to advertise data holding through posting of metadata, as well as, to use the tool to distribute data. The Committee concurred that this is an appropriate use of staff time. The group also concurred that a note should be added to the DataFinder site encouraging stakeholders to offer metadata postings.

In response to a question raised about the usefulness of incomplete metadata, the group concluded that it is more important to the post the metadata and make the community aware of its existence than to require complete metadata. Arbeit commented that LMIC has received a Metadata Training Grant and they would be happy to coordinate training with related MetroGIS efforts.

Member Knippel suggested that the Performance Measures should be expanded to include a measure that quantifies the benefits realized relative to the cost to attain the cited outcomes, noting the current report only addresses one side of the equation and that an attempt should be made to measure value (time/resources invested to achieve the outcome). Doty commented that the reason for proposing amendment of Measures 6 and 7 at the September Committee meeting was because staff had been unsuccessful in attempts to quantitatively document costs to the producers, a component of Knippel's proposed value measure, and that such a measure in a highly collaborative initiative, such as MetroGIS, is extremely difficult to measure. The Committee agreed that this topic should be noted in the cover memo to the Policy Board and directed staff to include in the list of topics for discussion at the fall 2004 retreat.

Craig requested that the reference to measure numbers on Page 4 be modified to state the description of the measure as opposed to just listing the number. Doty agreed to make this change. Craig also suggested that a performance measure should be added to track use of pending geospatial applications (e.g. regional mailing label). No action was taken at this meeting but the item was referred to the pending Business Plan Update to determine the context for this measure. Finally, staff was asked to place the measures in the correct order prior to sharing the report with the Policy Board.

Motion:

Maki moved and Arbeit seconded accept the 2003 Performance Measure Report and accompanying cover memo, subject to the modifications agreed upon at this meeting, and forward them to the Policy board for consideration. Motion carried ayes all.

h) GIS Technology Demonstration Topic for January Policy Board Meeting

Chairperson Harper commented that she believed the Scott County presentation, as suggested by staff, would be a good topic for the Board at this time. Henry suggested John Carpenter's presentation on the usefulness of small area analysis and mapping that can be achieved with his iBlocktm methodology. Staff commented that if the iBlocktm concept is demonstrated it should be part of a recommendation from the Committee to give the presentation meaning relative to regional best practices and policy for the MetroGIS community.

Motion:

Craig moved and Givens seconded to invite Scott County to present its enterprise GIS story as the GIS Technology Demonstration topic for the January 28th Policy Board meeting. Motion carried, ayes all.

i) 2003 Coordinating Committee Meeting Schedule

Craig moved and Charboneau seconded to approve the Committee schedule as proposed in the agenda materials: March 31, June 30, September 29 and December 15th, beginning at 1:30 p.m. at the Minnesota Counties Insurance Trust Building.

Motion carried, ayes all.

j) PolicyLink Forum and Recommendations

Craig summarized the information presented in the agenda materials, noting that the Non-profit/ Neighborhood Group Community is not asking MetroGIS and its stakeholders (as result of the PolicyLink Report) for anything that is not currently in MetroGIS's work plan. He also commented that the community would be appreciative of MetroGIS supporting their needs, as defined in the PolicyLink report.

The Committee concluded that it would okay for staff to share with the Minneapolis Foundation the actions listed in the agenda materials, as being appropriate for MetroGIS but concurred that this request should not be forwarded to the Policy Board until the specifics of some of the recommendations that will come from fostering the proposed dialogue are more clear, in particular, those that involve access to parcel data.

Motion:

Craig moved and Givens seconded to authorize staff to share with the Minneapolis Foundation the actions listed in the agenda materials, as being appropriate for MetroGIS and note that Policy Board consideration would be best sought when specifics of policy recommendations are available. Motion carried, ayes all.

6. PROJECT UPDATES

a) Next Generation Data Sharing Agreements

Vice Chairman Drealan, Chairperson of the County Data Producers Workgroup, commented that the next-generation agreements are in various stages of review at each county and that they will not all be in place by the end of the year. Committee members were informed that the Regional Parcel Dataset cannot be accessed from DataFinder after the first of the year until these agreements are in place, and that the Council's custodian tasks to assemble a quarterly update also can not be supported until the new agreement is in place. Those who may need parcel data early in 2004 were encouraged to download it before December 31. Once in their possession they can continue to use it until the next agreement is in place. *(Editor's note: At a meeting the following day with Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt, Chairperson Harper agreed to draft a message to each county asking for permission to continue to distribute the regional parcel dataset in the interim prior to enactment of the next generation agreement. All seven counties agreed to this interim measure and distribution was not interrupted.)*

There was no discussion of the items presented in the agenda materials due to lack of time.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

There was no discussion of the items presented in the agenda materials due to lack of time.

8. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

March 31, 2004

9. ADJOURN

Brown moved and Charboneau seconded to adjourn at 3:35 p.m. Motion carried, ayes all.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson *and* Steve Fester
MetroGIS Support Staff Team

ATTACHMENT A

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

PROPOSED ADDRESS WORKGROUP PURPOSE STATEMENT & ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGY

Purpose

Propose a best practice (regional) solution that provides for consistent capture and maintenance of address data, across the seven-county Metro Area, and is consistent with all related priority information needs of the MetroGIS community.

Preliminary Situation Evaluation – What We Think We Know About the Business Needs

- A countywide enterprise database serving all key local government address producer and custodian interests within each of the seven counties.
- Primary producers of address data (building officials, etc) would enter new address information into the enterprise database when assigned - avoiding the need to reenter data by others (e.g. county tax assessor).
- A standardized data entry form that would automatically post data, in the correct format, to the enterprise database. Every primary producer would have “write” access to add records to the database.
- Addresses assigned to properties that have been preliminary platted but have not yet been final platted would be captured as “pending property”. (This is a need for utilities, emergency management, and possibility others.)
- An automated means to notify primary producers of anomalies in address data for investigation. Only the primary producer would have “write access” to modify the data.

Leverage Multiple Related Initiatives/Business Needs – Projects to Keep Tabs On

Investigate opportunities to leverage and coordinate among the following efforts:

- 1) The Ramsey County GIS User Group’s work to implement a county-wide, enterprise database to coordinate capture of address data when initially created by local units of government and provide a means for all producers to detect and correct errors in address records.
- 2) The Metro 911 Board’s GIS initiative with its PSAP (Public Safety Answering Points) affiliates. Up-to-date address data is needed for individual address units (residential and non-residential) that are components of multiple unit structures located on single tax parcels (tax assessor records are not adequate).
- 3) The MetroGIS Phase II Socioeconomic Workgroup’s efforts to improve mapping resolution of a wide range of socioeconomic characteristics by assigning them to “address unit” level records, as opposed to census geography.
- 4) The MetroGIS Parcel Workgroup’s desired improvements to the address components (owner, taxpayer, and resident) of the regional parcel dataset. (tax assessor records may not adequate in all cases).

Assumptions

There are at least three different types of addresses: official parcel property addresses, property and dwelling unit mailing addresses, and delivery addresses. Sometimes these are the same, but they are often different. Achieving full data integration will require a complete and accurate mailing address list and a crosswalk from mailing addresses to parcel and delivery addresses. It makes sense for City and County officials to maintain the parcel addresses. There may be a need for another resource to make sure that mailing addresses and the crosswalks are complete and accurate.

Participants:

Leaders/Liaisons from the following groups/initiatives should be actively involved:

- 1) Ramsey County GIS Users Group – Address Committee
- 2) Metro 911 Board technical lead for GIS initiative with PSAPs
- 3) PSAP – large community and rural perspectives
- 4) City building official/city clerk – assignors of addresses via building permit processes
- 5) County assignors of addresses via septic system/other permit processes
- 6) County Tax Assessor – 2-3 counties with varying business models
- 7) MetroGIS Phase II Socioeconomic Workgroup
- 8) MetroGIS Existing Land Use Workgroup
- 9) MetroGIS Parcel Enhancement Workgroup
- 10) MetroGIS Emergency Management Workgroup
- 11) ??

Time Frame

Organize the workgroup in January 2004. If possible, submit a recommendation to Coordinating Committee by Dec 2004.

Lead Staff

MetroGIS Regional Parcel Dataset Technical Coordinator –Mark Kotz
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator - Randall Johnson
Other??

Next Steps – First Steps

- 1) Corroborate business needs
- 2) Identify possibilities and evaluation options to achieve business needs