



Policy Board Members:

Victoria Reinhardt,
Chairperson
Ramsey County

Jim Kordiak,
Vice-Chairperson
Anoka County

Patrice Bataglia,
Dakota County

Gary M. Delaney,
Carver County

Conrad Fiskness,
MAWD

Dennis Hegberg,
Washington County

Antoinette Johns,
TIES

Randy Johnson,
Hennepin County

Gary Schiff,
City of Minneapolis
AMM

Terry Schneider,
City of Minnetonka
AMM

Bob Vogel,
Scott County

Tony Pistilli,
Metropolitan Council

Coordinating Committee

Jane Harper,
Chairperson
Washington County

Dave Drealan,
Vice-Chairperson
Carver County

Staff Coordinator

Randall Johnson,
Metropolitan Council

Wednesday, July 28, 2004

6:30 p.m.

**Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

Agenda

- | | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Call to Order | |
| 2. Accept Agenda | |
| 3. Accept Meeting Summary | |
| a) April 28, 2004 | action 1 |
| 4. GIS Technology Demonstration: | 4 |
| <i>City of Roseville's Combined Use of Socioeconomic Data and GIS Technology to Improve Decision Making and Service Delivery</i> | |
| 5. Action/Discussion Items | |
| a) Regional Parcel Dataset : <i>Attribute Enhancement and Expansion</i> | action 7 |
| b) Regional Parcel Dataset : <i>View-Only Access Policy For Emergency Preparedness Application</i> | action 15 |
| c) MetroGIS Operating Guidelines Modifications | action 19 |
| 6. Major Activity Update | 21 |
| a) Next-Generation Data Sharing Agreement / Online Licensing | |
| b) Priority Common Information Need Solutions | |
| c) Strategic Planning Retreat Preparations Underway | |
| d) County Data Producers Workgroup | |
| • Regional Mailing Label Application | |
| • Regional Parcel Dataset Policy - Access by Non-Profit Interests | |
| • Regional Parcel Dataset Policy – Historical Versions | |
| 7. Information Sharing | 24 |
| a) Outreach Activities | |
| b) Related State Geospatial Data Initiatives Update | |
| c) Related Federal/National Geospatial Data Initiatives Update | |
| d) June 22 nd Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes | |
| 8. Next Meeting | |
| October 27, 2004 | |
| 9. Adjourn | |

Mission Statement

“Provide an ongoing, stakeholder governed, metro-wide mechanism through which participants easily and equitably share geographically referenced data that are accurate, current, secure, of common benefit and easily usable.”

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
April 28, 2004

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Kordiak called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

Members Present: Gary Delaney (Carver County), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), William Brown for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County); Bob Vogel (Scott County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Dick Carlstrom for Antoinette Johns (TIES), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Patrice Bataglia (Dakota County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), and Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Dave Drealan, Rick Gelbmann, Brad Henry, Randy Knippel, and Nancy Pollock.

Visitors: Pete Eggimann (Metropolitan 911 Board)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The meeting agenda was accepted as submitted

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Fiskness moved and Member Delaney seconded to accept the January 28, 2004 meeting summary as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION: Metropolitan 911 Board / MetroGIS Collaboration

Nancy Pollock, Executive Director for the Metropolitan 911 Board, and Pete Eggimann, the Board's Technical Operations Director, summarized an ambitious initiative to integrate, in a coordinated manner, GIS technology into the day-to-day operations of the 27 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) that serve the seven-county, Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. (A PDF version of the PowerPoint presentation can be viewed at www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/042804/911.pdf.)

Pollock noted that Metro 911 Board is a joint powers collaboration of the seven metro area counties and that it is regarded as one of the premier organizations of its type in the country. She also noted that she and Pete immediately sought out advice from the MetroGIS staff once they recognized that GIS technology is the only option to effectively serve wireless callers with requested emergency dispatching services. When the desired GIS capability is fully implemented, all of the metropolitan area PSAPs will be able to accurately locate 911 callers, incident locations, and emergency responders. They will also have this ability even when the location in question is outside of their immediate jurisdictional boundary. And, this ability will allow for faster, more accurate emergency responses than are currently possible, making better use of the limited public safety resources and the associated tax dollars, and making multi-jurisdictional incidents easier to identify and manage.

Eggimann explained the three options considered to provide the PSAPs with the necessary GIS functionality. The 911 Board quickly concluded that collaboration with MetroGIS to leverage significant existing investments in regional data solutions and the trusted process for establishing related multi-participant policy and procedures was, by far, the most cost-efficient option to pursue. The cost for the option that is in the process of implementation is estimated to involve a one-time start up expense of around \$100,000 plus an

annual operating expense of about \$100,000. The other options ranged from a one-time start of \$600,000 to \$1.8 million and annual operating costs of \$160,000 to \$300,000. Neither of the other options would have leveraged existing investment in regional datasets valuable to the 911 Board and both would have involved duplication of current data maintenance efforts.

Eggimann then summarized benefits to the 911 Board beyond the obvious cost savings of the proposed collaboration with MetroGIS, which included overall more accurate, current data for everyone involved through standardized error correction methods and interoperability of systems. He concluded by thanking the MetroGIS organization for accomplishments both in terms of data and cooperative relationships that have been fostered and willingness of the staff to work with the 911 community.

In response to a question from O'Rourke, Eggimann commented that if they have data needs that MetroGIS has not recognized as priorities, the 911 Board is hoping that MetroGIS resources can be tapped if a satisfactory case can be made. If not, the 911 Board understands, that like any other MetroGIS stakeholder, if they have data needs that are not priorities of others they will need to address that need on their own.

In response to question from Vice Chairperson Kordiak, Pollock commented that the wireless providers have generally been responsive to providing the location of their antenna locations to the 911 Board but they have been reluctant to provide accurate information about the coverage areas. Eggimann noted that in 2005 deadlines will come due to market penetration milestones for GPS equipped handsets and that if the current pace is any indication, the providers will probably need to give away phones to meet these requirements.

In response to a question from Vogel, Eggimann commented that they do not expect technology changes to change the current two options to receive emergency calls – land line and via coordinates for wireless devices. The coordinates are however expected to become more sophisticated and include “z” values (elevation).

Vice Chairperson Kordiak reiterated that public safety / E911 matters are extremely important to organizations represented on the Policy Board and noted that he looks forward to following the progress of the 911 Board's project and wished them well as the project unfolds.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Election of Officers for 2004

Member Schneider moved and Alternate Member O'Rourke seconded to maintain the status quo and reelect Victoria Reinhardt to serve as Chairperson and Jim Kordiak to serve as Vice Chairperson for the coming year. No further nominations were offered. Motion carried, ayes all.

d) 2005 MetroGIS Funding Request and Budget

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Harper summarized the Committee's recommendation that the Policy Board approve 2005 MetroGIS funding request as presented in the agenda materials and authorize staff to submit it to the Metropolitan Council for consideration.

Harper commented that the request would maintain the same level of support approved for 2004 (3 FTEs and \$86,000 in non-staff funding). She also stated that this level of funding would be sufficient to support MetroGIS's three core functions.

Vice-Chairperson Kordiak mentioned that the funding request before the Policy Board does not include the value of the data or human resources that are being contributed to MetroGIS's activities and endeavors by a wide variety of stakeholders. Staff further commented that no amount of funding from the Council would be able to ensure the realization of MetroGIS's data sharing objectives without these critical data resource and human resource contributions. Harper commented that over the years MetroGIS has restructured its workgroups to improve operational efficiencies to ensure that adequate progress is made without overtaxing the volunteer participants.

Member Vogel commented that, as a relatively new member of the Board, he would appreciate some background on how MetroGIS has established its priorities, which led to a comment from Member Fiskness that maybe it is time to revisit past priorities given the accomplishments that have been made over the past few years. Staff Coordinator Johnson briefly summarized the participatory processes that

were used to establish the initial priority information needs and function or service priorities. He also mentioned that the Coordinating Committee concurs with Member Fiskness's observation and will be bringing a proposal to the Board at its July meeting to host a workshop this fall to do just that – evaluate the current priorities and identify any new directions that MetroGIS should consider, such as applications to use MetroGIS-endorsed regional data solutions.

Member Schneider commented that the level budget from 2003 to 2005 does not concern him, provided we are able to accomplish priority functions. He noted that he believes that MetroGIS is close to achieving a critical mass whereby other entities will regularly choose to partner with MetroGIS to achieve common needs, such as the pending collaboration with the Metropolitan 911 Board (see Item 4). He noted that the challenges are to continually seek out ways to leverage other resources and to maintain a structure that allows MetroGIS to adapt quickly when such a partnership opportunity arises.

Member Pistilli moved and Member Fiskness seconded to direct staff to forward MetroGIS's 2005 budget request as presented in the agenda materials – 3 FTEs and \$86,000 in non-staff project funding -- to the Metropolitan Council for its approval. Motion carried, ayes all.

6. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES (See the agenda materials for more information)

- a. Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup, summarized the information presented the agenda packet. Staff updated the Board on the negotiations to execute the next generation data sharing agreements. A draft that addresses comments provided by all parties is expected to be distributed the week of May 3rd for hopefully final comment and approval.
- b. Randy Knippel, Chair of the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, updated the Board on the activities of the workgroup. Staff provided an update on the Address Workgroup and noted the importance to the E911 community of this effort.
- c. David Arbeit, Director of LMIC, commented on the collaborative efforts of LMIC and MetroGIS to expand the functionality of DataFinder and to migrate it the state's GeoIntegrator platform to enable sharing of maintenance expenses.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

The members were asked to review the information items presented in the agenda packet on their own.

8. NEXT MEETING

July 28, 2004. (The option of moving the meeting to August 4th was discussed but the membership elected to retain the regularly scheduled meeting on July 28th)

9. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:27 p.m.

Prepared by,
Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



TO: MetroGIS Policy Board

FROM: Coordinating Committee
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

SUBJECT: GIS Technology Demonstration
*City of Roseville's Combined Use of Socioeconomic Data and GIS
Technology to Improve Decision Making and Service Delivery*

DATE: July 6, 2004
(For the July 28th meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Policy Board has asked for a demonstration related to use of GIS technology to be a regular component of each Board meeting. (See the Reference Section for a listing of previous GIS Demonstration topics.)

For the Board's July 2004 meeting, the Coordinating Committee has invited Dennis Welsch and David Windle, Community Development Director and GIS Coordinator, respectively, with the City of Roseville, to talk about their use of detailed household-based socioeconomic data and GIS technology to support comprehensive planning activities. An overview of the presentation is attached.

BACKGROUND

This demonstration is intended to help familiarize Policy Board members with the importance of one of the MetroGIS community's thirteen designated common information need priorities— socioeconomic characteristics of areas. This topic was chosen for the demonstration because a Policy Board member expressed surprise at the January Board meeting to learn that socioeconomic information needs were among the priorities for MetroGIS's efforts.

Given that eight of the twelve current Policy Board members were not on the Board when the current information needs priorities were established, Chairperson Reinhardt and staff have recognized a need to acquaint the current members with the rationale for current priorities. As such, the Coordinating Committee has been encouraged to arrange for GIS Technology Demonstration topics that will help Policy Board members better understand the breadth of information needs that are priorities of the MetroGIS community, as well as other topics core to MetroGIS's efforts.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE'S EXPERIENCE

Ongoing efforts by the City of Roseville and the I-35W Corridor Coalition, regarding improved decision support through use of GIS technology and access to robust socioeconomic data, are serving as a test bed for the broader MetroGIS community.

The City of Roseville and other I-35W Corridor Coalition members are using a GIS technique called thermal mapping to analyze housing and land use trends. The foundation of this analysis is household-based, as opposed to census-geography based, socioeconomic data that contain over 20 fields of information about each residential household in their respective communities. It is important to note that these data are not supported by traditional census sources. This leading-edge use of GIS technology and robust socioeconomic data are providing an unparalleled analytic and decision support tool for city policy making related economic development, land use, transportation capacity building, utility and infrastructure sizing, park programming, emergency services, housing and other city functions. In addition, this data resource aids in collaborative efforts with adjoining cities, area school districts, and others.

MetroGIS's pending investigation of possible regional solutions to common socioeconomic information needs of its stakeholder community proposes to consider lessons learned through Roseville's experience.

RECOMMENDATION

No action requested.

REFERENCE SECTION

Past Demonstrations

- Apr. 2004: Metropolitan 911 Board's proposal to integrate GIS into the day to day operations for the 27 PSAP's (Public Safety Answering Points) that serve the metro area
- Jan. 2004: Scott County's Story - Improving Information Access Efficiencies with GIS
- Oct. 2003: GASB 34 and GIS Technology: The Connection?
- Jul. 2003: Minneapolis Neighborhood Information Network (MNIS) and its role in the area of Community GIS, also known as Public Participation GIS
- Apr. 2003: Metropolitan Mosquito Control District use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jan. 2003: Carver and Washington Counties' use of GIS for Emergency Management
- Oct. 2002: Metropolitan Airports Commission use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jul. 2002: Rollout of DataFinder Café, MetroGIS's state-of-the-art data distribution tool
- Apr. 2002: Each of the seven counties summarized their respective GIS programs
- Jan. 2002: Paul Olson shared his experience as a GIS professional responding to the World Trade Center tragedy at Ground Zero
- Oct. 2001: TIES - How school districts have benefited from the presence of MetroGIS
- Jul. 2001: MetroGIS capabilities current and proposed for data discovery and acquisition via the Internet
- Apr. 2001: LMIC's MetroViewer (EPPLviewer) using datasets made available via MetroGIS' efforts
- Jan. 2001: Regional Census Geography and Legislative Redistricting Software/Process
- Oct. 2000: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition Socio-Demographic Data Initiative
- Jul. 2000: DataFinder and Metropolitan Council's Internet-based Existing Land Use Application
- Apr. 2000: Regional Parcel Dataset (Version 1)
- Jul. 1999: Presentation to U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on June 9th
- Apr. 1999: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition GIS Capabilities
- Nov. 1998: Orthoimagery and its uses
- Sep. 1998: DataFinder and Dakota County's Parcel Query Application
- Jan. 1997: Benefits from GIS in general and uses being made all classes of stakeholders represented on the Policy Board

Some Thoughts on the Uses of GIS and Demographics

Dennis Welsch,
City of Roseville
July 28, 2004

I've been invited to speak with you about the products and community benefits of combining GIS and demography.

Based on the Ramsey County parcel base, Roseville has used a Geographic Information System (GIS) since 1993. It has become a very popular and successful cartographic tool creating thousands of mapping products. In 1997-98 when the City and the seven-city 35W Coalition introduced demography at the parcel level, GIS became the planner's assistant (and asset) for preparing comprehensive plans. To maintain and improve the community quality of life, we plan with and for people and provide improved service delivery to them. Demographic data is essential.

We must understand their aggregate housing size and type, housing value, neighborhood permits and improvement status, and condition, income, family size, age, number of school children, number of vehicles, commuter patterns. With reliable, maintained, and regularly updated data (actual counts), we can very efficiently provide policy makers and the public with more topic depth (in a short time this may be accessible via Internet). Some products and benefits of good social and economic data with GIS include:

- Transportation capacity planning
- Utility/infrastructure sizing
- Housing and community development; projecting new resident needs
- Jobs (Work Force Centers) - defining labor sheds where workers come from and go to work
 - Matching jobs and housing income to provide a choice in commute length
 - Matching job skills with employers within selected areas
 - Matching leased and for sale with projected employee capacity
- School aged enrollments and projections for those under 5 years
- Park programming and equipment
- Emergency services, police, fire, medics, fume and pipeline safety

(Graphic examples of these topics will be available at the July 28th meeting.)



TO: Policy Board

FROM: Coordinating Committee
Chairperson: Jane Harper
Staff Contacts: Mark Kotz (651-602-1644) and Randall Johnson

SUBJECT: Enhancements to Regional Parcel Dataset

DATE: July 8, 2004
(For the July 28th meeting)

INTRODUCTION

Policy Board approval is requested for several proposed enhancements to the Regional Parcel Dataset content specifications and related custodial policies. The number of attributes would expand from 25 to 55. The target release of the proposed modified Regional Parcel Dataset is January 2005. As in the past, Counties are not expected to populate data elements which they do not maintain for internal purposes.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

At its March 31st meeting, the Committee accepted the proposed modifications and directed staff to prepare a marked-up policy statement for formal approval at the its June meeting. At the June 22nd meeting, the Committee unanimously approved the enhancements to the regional parcel dataset illustrated in the attached Regional Policy Statement, dated May 5, 2004. Four general modifications are involved: clarification of existing attribute meaning (*completed*), modification of existing attributes, adding new attributes (mostly housing characteristics that were the top ranked enhancement preferences), and officially adding parcel points as a component of the regionally endorsed solution.

BACKGROUND

1. In September of 2003, a peer review forum was conducted for licensed users of the regional parcel dataset. The purpose was to define and prioritize desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset. Fourteen users of the dataset attended the forum and three others provided comments afterwards. These users represented a wide range of organizational interests. A product of this forum was a ranked list of desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset.
2. Immediately following the forum, a technical workgroup was formed. It was comprised of representatives from each county, along with three regional and local government representatives. Over a period of five months, the workgroup evaluated the desired enhancements and effectively addressed nearly all of the priorities agreed upon at the forum. The resulting recommended modifications are the subject of this report. Mark Kotz, who staffed the workgroup, will be present to answer any questions the Policy Board may have.
3. The proposed 2004-2008 GIS Data Sharing Agreement would provide \$7,000 to each county in 2004 for any one-time programming and/or procedural changes necessary to implement the proposed modifications. Each of the counties has affirmed that their costs to implement the proposed modifications will be covered by the proposed funding.

DISCUSSION

The Regional Parcel Dataset is one of MetroGIS's most valuable and complex achievements. The proposed modifications to the previous version will substantially improve an already valuable asset to the MetroGIS community. A great deal of thanks is due to the counties for agreeing to work with the community to accomplish this feat. To staff's knowledge, each of them is comfortable with the recommended modifications to the Regional Parcel Dataset, continuing to serve in their collective capacities as the designated primary producers of parcel data, and prepared to implement the changes by the proposed target date of January 2005.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board approve:

- 1) The proposed enhancements to the Regional Parcel Dataset, as identified in the Regional Policy Summary Statement dated May 5, 2004, and
- 2) Authorize implementation of these modified policies, effective with the January 2005 update of the dataset.

REFERENCE SECTION

1. The Policy Board last modified the specifications for the Regional Parcel Dataset on October 22, 2002, increasing the number of attributers from 19 to the current 25. Those specifications have been “marked-up” in the attached Regional Policy Statement to clearly illustrate the modifications proposed at this time.

2. The members of the Parcel Data Enhancement Workgroup were as follows:
 - Anoka County: Gary Swenson
 - Carver County: Gordon Chinander
 - Dakota County: Kent Tupper
 - Hennepin County: Bob Moulder
 - Ramsey County: Curt Peterson
 - Scott County: Dan Pfeffer
 - Washington County: Dave Brandt
 - Mosquito Control: Nancy Read
 - Metro 911 Board: Pete Eggimann
 - Representing cities and school districts: John Carpenter, Excensus
 - Workgroup staff: Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council, which serves as the regional custodian for the Regional Parcel Dataset

3. Following each stage of consideration by both the parcel data enhancement workgroup and the Coordinating Committee, each county representative has been asked to identify any issue or concern that their respective county may have concerning the subject recommendations. To staff’s knowledge, all identified concerns have been satisfactorily addressed.

REGIONAL PARCEL DATA BUSINESS INFORMATION NEED POLICY SUMMARY

Preamble:

A guiding principle of MetroGIS is that no organization will be asked to perform a task for MetroGIS for which they do not have an internal business need. Primary custodians are responsible for providing only that parcel attribution data that they maintain for their own internal business purposes and which can be retrieved and provided to the regional custodian without an excessive level of effort. Within these bounds, it is expected that each primary custodian will work toward providing the most complete dataset practical. Regional custodians are not obligated to manipulate data received from the primary custodians at their own expense that when doing so would exceed their business needs. Gaps may continue to exist between defined data needs and available data. MetroGIS will work to identify solutions that bridge these gaps for the broad MetroGIS community. that may exist are the domain of MetroGIS to identify solutions that address the broad MetroGIS community interest.

Parcels – Regional Data Specifications

DESIRED REGIONAL PARCEL DATASET (GOVERNMENT UNITS AND ACADEMIC INTERESTS VERSION)

The regional parcel dataset should be a metro-wide (7-county) dataset with a high horizontal positional accuracy. Each primary custodian (each of the seven counties) should provide their parcel boundary and point data in NAD83, UTM coordinate system, on a quarterly basis to the regional custodian, with complete metadata.

The regional dataset custodian will provide the parcel boundary and point data in NAD83, UTM coordinate system, on a quarterly basis, with metadata, entity and attribute information, and contact information.

Attribute fields attached to each parcel shall be as presented in Appendix A.

Parcels – Roles and Responsibilities

A. PRIMARY CUSTODIAN

Responsibility for the primary (source) data and its maintenance shall remain with each individual county.

B. PRIMARY CUSTODIAN RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Update the primary parcel datasets on a continuous basis.
2. Submit a copy of their primary parcel polygon and points datasets to the regional custodian on a quarterly schedule established by MetroGIS and the regional custodian in shape file format and in UTM, NAD83, meters. The shape files are is-expected to include all attribute fields endorsed by MetroGIS with the exact field name, field length, and field type specified. *It is understood that the attribute fields will be populated at each county's discretion based upon data availability in each county.*
3. Create, maintain, and provide metadata for the dataset. *If a county elects not to submit metadata, contact information for a person with appropriate expertise will be included in the regional metadata.*
4. Primary producers are encouraged to periodically test and report the spatial accuracy of the parcel boundary data they submit to the regional custodian. If testing is undertaken, primary producers are also encouraged to use of the NSSDA testing and reporting procedures.

C. REGIONAL CUSTODIAN

The Metropolitan Council (Council) has been identified and has accepted, on behalf of the MetroGIS community, designation by MetroGIS on July 11, 2001 as the best candidate to carry out the roles and responsibilities associated with assembly and maintenance of the regional parcel dataset.

D. REGIONAL CUSTODIAN RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Compile the regional dataset ~~coverage~~ of parcel boundaries, parcel points and attributes, as agreed upon by MetroGIS, from the primary sources. The data specification standards endorsed by MetroGIS should incorporate use of FGDC cadastral standards to the extent practical.

***Note:** As a matter of MetroGIS policy, the regional custodian shall **not** change the parcel boundary data received from the counties. The counties, as primary custodians, shall be the only entities authorized to modify parcel boundary data as it pertains to the regional dataset*

2. Establish and maintain a process to automate, to the extent practical, the compilation of a regional dataset from the primary sources, including, but not limited to, the following procedures:

a) The regional custodian shall compare each dataset submitted by the primary custodians with the desired standard specifications (UTM, NAD83 coordinates and the attributes in Exhibit A).

Specifically the regional custodian will check:

- field name
- field width
- field type
- field order
- county code and dash appended to PIN
- visual check of projection against orthophotos to see if parcels appear to be in the correct location
- existence and format of metadata

b) Inform the primary custodian where a primary dataset differs from a MetroGIS-endorsed standard. If differences are minimal and only involve attributes, the regional custodian will modify the primary dataset to match the desired standard specifications. If the regional custodian perceives the differences to be significant, it will distribute the primary dataset as provided by the primary custodian with a note to users indicating the differences from the desired specifications.

c) Compile metadata from all sources into one set of regional metadata for the dataset and distribute it in the format provided by the primary custodians. However, the regional custodian will, at the request of a primary custodian, convert metadata in DataLogr, SGML or ESRI's XML formats to a standard HTML format. The regional custodian will also help any primary custodian to develop Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines format metadata. The regional custodian will maintain complete regional metadata and make the supplied county parcel data and metadata available to approved users.

d) Include a contact person for the primary custodian with the distribution of the regional dataset if metadata is not available from a primary custodian.

3. Re-compile, from the primary sources, the regional dataset on a quarterly basis according to a schedule established by MetroGIS.

4. Each parcel shall have a unique parcel identification number consistent with the standard adopted by the Policy Board on January 27, 1999, or as subsequently modified by the Board.

5. Further the use of cadastral standards for the regional parcel boundary dataset, where applicable.

6. In conjunction with the MetroGIS user community, provide a means to notify the counties of gaps/overlaps in primary datasets along county boundaries (interior boundary gaps/overlaps are the responsibility of the primary custodian). The decision as to whether or not to modify any identified boundary anomalies is solely the discretion of the county(ies) involved.

7. Provide for data archive, backup, retrieval, and disaster recovery.

8. Provide for distribution of the dataset via MetroGIS DataFinder and such other media as permitted by the Counties.

9. Execute a quality control/quality assurance procedure that assures the regional dataset user that the data they receive is the same as provided to the regional custodian from the primary producers for assembly into a regional dataset.

10. Support distribution of one quarterly version of the Regional Parcel Dataset for each year, as determined by MetroGIS, as an annual archive along with appropriate metadata.
11. Co-host, with MetroGIS, Data Users Forums on a schedule decided by the Coordinating Committee to obtain feedback from the MetroGIS community as to desired enhancements to the dataset and any associated data access, content, documentation and/or distribution policy(ies).

Parcels – Access Policies

Rules associated with access to the Regional Parcel Dataset, or any portion thereof, shall be decided by the counties, the primary producers of the data. MetroGIS's role is to foster coordination among counties concerning access to parcel data. Such rules may be part of a formal agreement or enacted by letter of intent/resolution from the counties, as determined at the counties' discretion. Each such MetroGIS facilitated policy follows:

1. Data Sharing Agreement – Seven Counties and Metropolitan Council. Through this agreement, which has been a principal focus of MetroGIS's efforts since its inception, the seven Minneapolis – St. Paul Metropolitan Area counties have agreed to provide access, without fee, to government and academic interests subject to obtaining and abiding by the provisions set forth in a License. (*Negotiations in progress for 2004-2008 agreement.*) See (URL) for more information about agreement and (URL) for information about the License and how to apply for licensure.

2. Waiver of License Requirement for Access to Historical Versions of the Regional Parcel Dataset. (Policy proposal tentatively proposed for Policy Board consideration July 2004. See (URL) for a template of the document submitted by each county to ratify this policy.)

3. Waiver of license requirement for view only access. (Policy proposal tentatively proposed for Policy Board consideration July 2004. See (URL) for a template of the document submitted by each county ratifying this policy.)

APPENDIX A
STANDARD PARCEL ATTRIBUTES – REGIONAL PARCEL DATASET

Regional Parcel Attribute ¹	Regional Dataset Field Name	Field Description <i>with some comments</i>	Field Type	Field Width
Unique County ID	COUNTY_ID	Three digit FIPS and State standard county code.	text/string	3
Unique Parcel ID	PIN	Unique regional parcel ID comprised of the county PIN with the county code and dash appended to the front.	text/string	17
<u>House Number</u>	<u>BLDG_NUM</u>	<u>The building or house number of the parcel. (Things like fractional house numbers should be included with this field.)</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Street Prefix Direction</u>	<u>PREFIX_DIR</u>	<u>Street prefix direction for the parcel. Domain = N, S, E, W, NE, NW, SE or SW (as defined in USPS Pub. 28 Appendix B http://pe.usps.gov/cpim/ftp/pubs/Pub28/pub28.pdf)</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Street Prefix Type</u>	<u>PREFIXTYPE</u>	<u>Street prefix type (e.g. Hwy) for the parcel. Few counties store this data separately.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Street Name</u>	<u>STREETNAME</u>	<u>Street name for the parcel. If a county is unable to provide the individual street data fields (direction, type, etc), they may be provided as a combined data element in this field.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>Street Type</u>	<u>STREETTYPE</u>	<u>Street type abbreviation for the parcel (as defined by USPS Pub. 28 Appendix C. http://pe.usps.gov/text/pub28/pub28app.html#508hdr2)</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Street Suffix Direction</u>	<u>SUFFIX_DIR</u>	<u>Street suffix direction for the parcel. Domain = N, S, E, W, NE, NW, SE or SW (as defined in USPS Pub. 28 Appendix B http://pe.usps.gov/cpim/ftp/pubs/Pub28/pub28.pdf)</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Unit Information</u>	<u>UNIT_INFO</u>	<u>Additional unit information for the parcel for condominiums, etc. (e.g. Unit 5B, Suite 8, etc.)</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>City (actual)</u>	<u>CITY</u>	<u>Name of city or township in which the parcel actually resides (not the mailing address city).</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>City (mailing)</u>	<u>CITY_USPS</u>	<u>The mailing address city for the parcel as defined by the USPS.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>ZIP Code</u>	<u>ZIP</u>	<u>ZIP code for the parcel.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>ZIP 4 Extension</u>	<u>ZIP4</u>	<u>The four digit zip code extension for the parcel.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Legal Description Plat Name</u>	<u>PLAT_NAME</u>	<u>The legal description plat name (this is often synonymous with the subdivision name).</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>Legal Description Block</u>	<u>BLOCK</u>	<u>The legal description block within the plat.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Legal Description Lot</u>	<u>LOT</u>	<u>The legal description lot within the block.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Polygon Acreage</u>	<u>ACRES_POLY</u>	<u>The calculated acreage of the polygon within the GIS spatial data. (numeric field with two decimal places)</u>	<u>numeric</u>	<u>11</u> <u>(2 dec)</u>
<u>Deeded Acreage</u>	<u>ACRES_DEED</u>	<u>The deeded acreage of the parcel. (numeric field with two decimal places)</u>	<u>numeric</u>	<u>11</u> <u>(2 dec)</u>
<u>Use Type 1</u>	<u>USE1_DESC</u>	<u>Description of use type 1.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Use Type 2</u>	<u>USE2_DESC</u>	<u>Description of use type 2.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Use Type 3</u>	<u>USE3_DESC</u>	<u>Description of use type 3.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Use Type 4</u>	<u>USE4_DESC</u>	<u>Description of use type 4.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Multiple Uses</u>	<u>MULTI_USES</u>	<u>Flag (Y/N) to indicate if multiple uses exist.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Landmark/Business Name</u>	<u>LANDMARK</u>	<u>Name of the predominant landmark or business on this parcel.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Owner Name</u>	<u>OWNER_NAME</u>	<u>The full (first and last) name of the owner. The format should be last name first where available. (e.g. last name first or last name last) and inclusion of multiple owners is up to each county. Carver and Ramsey report not having this data available. Anoka County will not be providing this data as part of the Geospatial Parcel Data.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>4050</u>
<u>Additional Owner Name</u>	<u>OWNER_MORE</u>	<u>Field for additional owner information where available (e.g. joint owner or additional first name first format).</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>Owner Address</u>	<u>OWN_ADD_L1</u> <u>OWN_ADD_L2</u> <u>OWN_ADD_L3</u>	<u>Mailing address of the owner. Up to three lines may be used. Typically line1 is street address and line2 is city, state & zip, but other variations exist. Note: Only three counties carry this information.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>40 each</u>
<u>Taxpayer Name</u>	<u>TAX_NAME</u>	<u>The full (first and last) name of the taxpayer. The format (e.g. last name first or last name last) and inclusion of multiple taxpayers is up to each county. Dakota reports not having this data available. Anoka County will not be providing this data as part of the Geospatial Parcel Data</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>Taxpayer Address</u>	<u>TAX_ADD_L1</u> <u>TAX_ADD_L2</u> <u>TAX_ADD_L3</u>	<u>Mailing address of the taxpayer. Up to three lines may be used. Typically line1 is street address and line2 is city, state & zip, but other variations exist.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>40 each</u>
<u>Homestead Status²</u>	<u>HOMESTEAD</u>	<u>Homestead status (Y = yes, N = no, P = partial) Note: The inclusion of this field will allow parcel data users to assume the owner is the occupant for these parcels. Not all counties have this data as a yes or no type field (e.g. Anoka, Wash.). Those counties can decide if they want to process it into a Y/N field.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Parcel House Number</u>	<u>BLDG_NUM</u>	<u>The building or house number of the parcel</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Parcel Street Name</u>	<u>STREET</u>	<u>The street name (with street type and direction). This is the actual location of the parcel, which may not be the mailing address.</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>Parcel City Name</u>	<u>CITY</u>	<u>Name of city or township in which the parcel resides (not the mailing address)</u>	<u>text/string</u>	<u>20</u>

Regional Parcel Attribute ¹	Regional Dataset Field Name	Field Description <i>with some comments</i>	Field Type	Field Width
		city or township.		
Parcel Zip Code	ZIP	Zip code in which the parcel resides.	text/string	5
Estimated Market Value - Land	EMV_LAND	Land estimated market value	numeric	11
Estimated Market Value - Buildings	EMV_BLDG	Building estimated market value	numeric	11
Estimated Market Value - Total	EMV_TOTAL	Total estimated market value	numeric	11
Tax Capacity	TAX_CAPAC	Tax capacity of the parcel	numeric	11
Total Tax	TOTAL_TAX	Total tax of the parcel	numeric	11
Special Assessments	SPEC_ASSES	Special assessment value due and payable in the current year.	numeric	11
Tax Exempt Status	TAX_EXEMPT	Tax exempt (Y/N) <i>(Note: The counties that do have this information tend to have it imbedded in other code fields. A Y/N field will be maintained and counties can decide whether to do the processing to create that information to populate the field.)</i>	text/string	1
Exempt Use 1	XUSE1_DESC	Description of exempt use type 1.	text/string	100
Exempt Use 2	XUSE2_DESC	Description of exempt use type 2.	text/string	100
Exempt Use 3	XUSE3_DESC	Description of exempt use type 3.	text/string	100
Exempt Use 4	XUSE4_DESC	Description of exempt use type 4.	text/string	100
Dwelling Type	DWELL_TYPE	Type of dwelling (e.g. single family, duplex, etc.)	text/string	30
Home Style	HOME_STYLE	Home style description (e.g. rambler, split entry, etc.)	text/string	30
Square Footage	FIN_SQ_FT	Finished square footage	numeric	11
Garage	GARAGE	Garage (Y/N)	text/string	1
Garage Square Footage	GARAGESQFT	Garage square footage	text/string	11
Basement	BASEMENT	Basement (Y/N)	text/string	1
Heating	HEATING	Type of heating in use	text/string	30
Cooling	COOLING	Type of cooling in use	text/string	30
Year Built	YEAR_BUILT	Year built	numeric	4
Number of Units	NUM_UNITS	Number of residential units.	text/string	6
Type of Structure	STRUC_TYPE	Type of structure on parcel. <i>Note: There is likely no standardization at all in this data between counties. Recommend a free text field and counties can populated it as appropriate. Not available in some counties.</i>	text/string	30
Last Sales Date	SALE_DATE	Date of last sale <i>Note: Since counties format this data in several different ways within their own databases, it is difficult to know what might be the best field type in the regional shape file (in terms of ease of standardization).</i>	date	8
Last Sales Value	SALE_VALUE	Value of last sale	numeric	11
School District	SCHOOL_DST	Unique school district number	text/string	6
Watershed District	WSHD_DIST	Watershed district name	text/string	50
Green Acres	GREEN_ACRE	Green acres status (Y/N)	text/string	
Open Space	OPEN_SPACE	Open space status (Y/N)	text/string	
Agricultural Preserve	AG_PRESERV	Agricultural preserve status (Y/N)	text/string	
Aq. Preserve Enrolled	AGPRE_ENRD	Agricultural preserve enrolled date	date	
Aq. Preserve Expiration	AGPRE_EXPD	Agricultural preserve expiration date	date	
Parcel Polygon to Parcel Point and PIN Relationship Code	PARC_CODE	This field is used to provide information about the relationship between parcel polygons, parcel points and unique tax parcel identifiers (PINs).	numeric	2

¹ Washington County's agreement specifically exempts "property line dimensional data" from inclusion in the regional parcel dataset. This was the intent and understanding with other counties that raised the issue.

² "Resident name" has been identified by the MetroGIS community as a desirable attribute for the regional parcel dataset. However, this information is not maintained by counties. Until a suitable source for "Resident Name" is identified, "homestead status" will serve as a surrogate for "Resident Name". ~~The North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition is prototyping a database that will include 20+ attributes about households, including resident name. When a suitable source is operational, the field "Resident Name" will be added to the regional dataset.~~

APPENDIX B

Operational/Procedural Clarifications

Note: On October 22, 2002, the Policy Board modified the regional policy statement to include this Appendix and authorized the Coordinating Committee, from that point on, to modify this Appendix and other regional policy statements (parcels and other) when all relevant and affected parties are in agreement.

1. If counties have polygons in their parcel dataset for rights-of-way, lakes or other “non-standard” parcels, these should not be removed from the regional parcel dataset. Counties do not have to go to any extra lengths to create polygons where they do not already exist in their parcel dataset. *(October 2002)*
2. The quarterly update schedule will be April 1, July 1, October 1 and January 1. Valuation and tax information in the Regional Parcel Dataset will generally be updated with the April release. Counties that do not have the new assessments available by April should provide them with the next quarterly release after they are available. Parcel geography and other attributes will be updated with each quarterly release. *(December 2003 Coordinating Committee clarification)*

~~—Counties may, at their discretion, also provide a parcel points shape file (which should have the same coordinate system and attribute fields as the polygon file) and/or a table of additional attributes that can be joined to the parcel geography with the unique parcel identifier. The amount of additional data (if any) and the degree of documentation is up to each county. The regional custodian shall not modify additional data in any way. *(October 2002)*~~

⁽¹⁾ Revision History:

Version 1 - Initial Policy Board Adoption: October 27, 1999

Modified on: January 9, 2002 and October 22, 2002



TO: Policy Board
FROM: Coordinating Committee and Emergency Preparedness Workgroup
Contact: Randy Knippel (952-891-7080)
SUBJECT: Regional Parcel Dataset Policy – *Unlicensed View-Only Access
Via Emergency Preparedness Resource Application*
DATE: July 13, 2004
(For the July 28th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

Policy Board endorsement is sought to establish, as regional policy, the ability to offer unlicensed, view-only access to the Regional Parcel Dataset when accessed via the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources Application.

MetroGIS's Emergency Preparedness Workgroup is currently using this application as a tool to inform the emergency preparedness community about GIS technology and how it can help them carry out their responsibilities, as well as being a visualization tool to identify data concerns and needed refinements necessary for widespread use by the emergency management community. The ability to view parcel data has been identified as a needed refinement.

If the Policy Board endorses this proposal, implementation would be subject to prior approval by the individual counties, as they are the producers of the subject parcel data. A sample approval letter and resolution (whichever a county prefers) are attached, which are intended for the counties to use to affirm their respective approvals.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Coordinating Committee unanimously recommended approval of this proposal on June 22nd. One of the cited reasons for recommending approval is that several of the counties are currently offering unlicensed viewing of parcel data via their own Internet-based applications.

BACKGROUND

- 1) The MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources Application is in prototype phase, running at <http://www.datafinder.org/ep/>. It is currently password-protected and would remain so. The Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, chaired by Randy Knippel, Dakota County's GIS Manager, issues the password as they interact with interests affiliated with the emergency management community.
- 2) The Emergency Preparedness Workgroup has been refining the application's design, general data content specifications, and related data maintenance responsibilities since this past January when it was first launched. The Workgroup expects to submit a proposal this fall seeking Policy Board approval of roles and responsibilities necessary to move the application from its current prototype stage to fully operational. A key component to the ongoing prototyping activities involves refining procedures to streamline use of the application. The Workgroup is seeking the requested approval at this time to ensure any "bugs" are worked out before formal approval is requested this fall.
- 3) In January 2004, the Metropolitan Council agreed to host the subject Emergency Preparedness Resources Application on behalf of the MetroGIS community and assigned staff to assist with its implementation. This application is currently running on the server that supports MetroGIS DataFinder.
- 4) No licensed datasets are currently viewable via this application; parcels and The Lawrence Group (TLG) street centerlines being the most notable. Although the proposed testing does not apply to the TLG street centerline data, a senior TLG official has expressed interest in learning more about this application and how TLG may be of assistance.

RATIONALE FOR PROPOSAL

This application currently does not provide the ability to view parcel data due to complications related to licensure of the data. The time lag required to acquire licensure inhibits the Workgroup's ability to offer emergency managers immediate access to the application when contact is established. Immediate use by emergency managers, as they are contacted, is desired to maintain strong, responsive working relations. The

current licensure requirement is hampering the Workgroup's ability to achieve this objective and, ultimately, widespread use of this application.

As importantly, the current licensing procedures for parcel data were designed to apply to a situation where the actual data are accessible to prohibit redistribution. The subject application would provide the ability to only view the data and only a select group of stakeholders (emergency managers) are intended to have this view-only access. These circumstances are more restrictive than Internet data access policies that have been implemented by Dakota, Hennepin, Scott, and Washington counties. In each case, these counties are currently supporting view-only access to parcel data via their own Internet-based applications.

DISCUSSION

As long as the subject application remains password-protected, this proposal does not present any compatibility concerns with other current MetroGIS supported data distribution procedures or objectives. There is also no need to hold up this proposal until the Board considers the topic of moving the application from prototype to operational phase. If the Board for some reason would not endorse moving the subject application to operational status, the subject parcel data policy could be voided via a contingent sunset clause. This sunset clause concept was not anticipated at the time of the Coordinating Committee's review and is offered by staff as means to keep the review moving forward if the Board decides to do so.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Find that a policy of view-only access to parcel data via the prototype MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources Application has merit for further consideration and refinement as a regional best practice.
- 2) Defer to the seven counties to decide if this policy is appropriate and that the current application provides sufficient protection for their data.
- 3) If the counties acknowledge their approval of this policy via the attached letter or resolution dated May 18, 2004, the Policy Board hereby requests the Metropolitan Council to begin support of this DataFinder-related responsibility upon receiving affirmative acknowledgement from the counties in this regard.

4) Supplemental Sunset Policy Option (staff suggestion)

If the Policy Board elects not to authorize the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources Application to move from prototype to operational status by (insert date – e.g., 6 or 12 months), this endorsement of view-only access of parcel data via Emergency Preparedness Resources Application shall become null and void, unless renewed by all affected parties.

Version: May 18, 2004

EXAMPLE
COUNTY LETTER HEAD

(Date)

MetroGIS Policy Board
c/o Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator
Metropolitan Council
Mears Park Centre
230 East Fifth Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1633

**Regional Parcel Dataset --
Unlicensed View-Only Access Via Web Application**

Dear Randall:

The purpose of this letter is to inform the MetroGIS Policy Board that (*insert County name*) concurs with its proposed regional policy endorsed July 28, 2004 concerning view-only access to the Regional Parcel Dataset without the need for prior licensure. It is our understanding that implementation of this policy would permit anyone interested in viewing the MetroGIS-endorsed Regional Parcel Dataset, via the MetroGIS-endorsed Emergency Preparedness web-based application (*insert URL*), to do so but that their access will be limited to a view-only capability. That is, the actual parcel data is not intended to be downloadable for their use beyond the web application.

In accordance with the MetroGIS Policy Board's request on July 28th, (*insert County name*) hereby:

1. Acknowledges it has reviewed and agrees with the technical manner in which MetroGIS's endorsed Emergency Preparedness web-based application would implement the proposed view-only access capability,
2. Authorizes the Metropolitan Council, in accordance with its role as host of the referenced Emergency Preparedness application, to make (*insert County name's*) parcel data accessible via the referenced application without prior licensure, and
3. Agrees not to hold the Council responsible in any way if an unauthorized entity subsequently identifies a means to access the actual parcel data via this application. In such case, (*insert County name*) acknowledges that the only remedy shall be to request the Council to remove its parcel data from the subject application.

(*insert County name*)'s contact person concerning administration of the Emergency Preparedness web-based application is (insert name). They can be reached at xxx-xxx-xxxx if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

(*person authorized to sign*)



TO: Policy Board

FROM: Jane Harper – Chairperson, Coordinating Committee
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

SUBJECT: Modifications to MetroGIS’s Operating Guidelines
-- *First Reading before the Policy Board* --

DATE: July 7, 2004
(For the July 28th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee is seeking approval from the Policy Board for a number of modifications to MetroGIS’s Operating Guidelines. The proposed changes are, for the most part, to recognize changes in MetroGIS’s operations since the guidelines were initially adopted in 1998, and which have not since been modified. All of the proposed language changes are illustrated in the attached marked-up version of the complete guidelines.

A 15-day notice period is required prior to the Policy Board making any changes to the MetroGIS Operating Guidelines. Consequently, notice of the proposed amendments was emailed to Board members on July 12th, separate from the remainder of the packet, which was distributed the following week.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Coordinating Committee began the process of updating MetroGIS’s Operating Guidelines at its September 2003 meeting. It subsequently considered various changes at each of three meetings, reaching unanimous agreement at its June 22nd meeting. A detailed summary of the changes embodied in the current recommendation is presented in the Reference Section on the following page.

DISCUSSION

The most debated of the proposed guideline changes involved the topic of member absenteeism. Absenteeism has not resulted in the lack of quorum at any Committee or Policy Board meeting, to staff’s recollection, in the 8-½ years of MetroGIS’s operation. However, chronic absenteeism does exist among a few members of both the Policy Board and Coordinating Committee. This absenteeism is a concern because it affects MetroGIS’s ability to ensure broad support among all of the key stakeholders concerning identification of the priority needs and implementation of sustainable actions to address those needs.

As such, the following statement is proposed to be added to the guidelines, along with expectations for addressing absenteeism: (MetroGIS’s) ability to achieve collaboration that is necessary to achieve long-term solutions to common geospatial needs is compromised when its members do not regularly participate in its affairs. Successful implementation of regional solutions requires champions within each of the affected organizations, a role expected of (Policy Board) / (Committee) members.

The debate centered on how proactive MetroGIS should be in seeking to replace members who are often absent from Board and Committee meetings. The proposed guidelines embody Chairperson Reinhardt’s preference for a softer approach for confronting chronically absent members than had been originally preferred by the Coordinating Committee. Chairperson Reinhardt expressed concern that the Committee’s initially proposed language did not treat members as professionals or in a manner that builds trust and, as such, could have potentially caused more harm than good. The current proposal requires the member to be spoken with to work through options, as opposed to dismissing them after failure to attend three consecutive meetings if they have not arranged for an alternate. On June 25th, following the Committee’s June 22nd action, Chairperson Reinhardt requested a minor change to remove the statement that the Board Chair would contact Policy Board members who are chronically absent but rather only stipulate that they will be contacted. The current proposal does this.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board approve proposed modifications to MetroGIS’s Operating Guidelines as illustrated in the attachment dated June 25, 2004.

REFERENCE SECTION

CHRONOLOGY OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

1. September 17, 2003: The Committee gave first reading to the following proposed modifications to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines:
 - Update the context from a proposed regional data sharing mechanism to one that is operational.
 - Remove reference to the Policy Advisory Team that was dissolved in July 2001.
 - Acknowledge the widespread use of ad-hoc or special purpose workgroups, in addition to the Technical Advisory Team, as the principal means to identify components of solutions to common geospatial data needs.
 - Recognize that the Technical Advisory Team has slowly evolved into a mechanism for sharing knowledge, with less involvement in defining strategies to address issues and opportunities, tasks which currently are nearly exclusively accomplished by ad-hoc or special purpose workgroups.
 - Assign a liaison from the Coordinating Committee to serve on each ad hoc workgroup where not currently assigned, in addition to serving on the standing Technical Advisory Team. Several special workgroups (Addresses, Highway and Road Networks, Hydrology, and Socioeconomic- Phase II) did have Committee liaisons.
 - Add to the list of Policy Board responsibilities: ensuring an up-to-date business plan.
 - Clarify the responsibilities of the Coordinating Committee Chair.
2. December 17, 2003: In addition to the changes accepted by the Committee at its September meeting, the following three additional changes to the guidelines were called for, though the Committee postponed formal approval to its March meeting to give the Chairperson and staff an opportunity to draft specific language for the requested "member removal" section:
 - 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.
3. March 31, 2004: The Committee unanimously approved all of the changes it considered at its two previous meetings, except for Article III, Section 10 - Member Removal. The Committee felt that the language should be stronger in terms of automatic removal of a member who has not attended for three consecutive meetings and has not arranged for an alternate. Staff was directed to draft modified language.

Comment: Following the Committee meeting staff prepared a draft of the stronger language. This language was shared with Chairperson Reinhardt because to determine if a "Member Removal" guideline should also be pertinent to the Policy Board. Chairperson Reinhardt raised a concern about the suggested provision - that it may result in more harm than good, given the collaborative and voluntary nature of MetroGIS. She also stated that could not support the Committee's desire for a stronger statement should it be forwarded to the Policy Board for consideration.

4. June 22, 2004: The Committee accepted language that embodied the preferences of Chairperson Reinhardt for a softer approach to dealing with member absenteeism, including changing the section title from "Member Removal" to "Member Absenteeism". The Committee did not reconsider any of other provisions that it had accepted at its March meeting and recommended Policy Board approval of the proposed guideline modifications, as presented in the agenda packet.



TO: Policy Board
FROM: MetroGIS Support Staff
Contact: Steve Fester (651-602-1363)
SUBJECT: Project Updates
DATE: July 20, 2004
(For the July 28th Meeting)

A) NEXT GENERATION DATA SHARING AGREEMENTS

The financial terms associated with the Next Generation Agreements were accepted by the Policy Board at its January meeting. No objections were raised from any of the counties. The Hennepin and Dakota County Attorneys are currently working with MetroGIS staff to finalize the legal aspects of the “next generation” data sharing agreement, accompanying data license, and online license application process. Once the Hennepin and Dakota County Attorneys are comfortable with the documents, the documents will be forwarded to the other counties for comment and approval. These agreements include funding to the counties to assist them with enhancements to the Regional Parcel Dataset proposed to be implemented by year-end. As such, the goal is to have the agreements executed by all parties and in place by early to mid-fall.

Once the new agreement goes into effect, each current user of the Regional Parcel Database will need to execute the new license. Organizations that were licensed prior to December 31, 2003 have been permitted to continue to use the data but no new licensing or data distribution is supported via DataFinder until the new license goes in to effect.

B) PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEEDS (See <http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml> for complete information about the status of solutions for each of MetroGIS’s common information needs.)

(1) Address Workgroup

The group’s goal is to minimize duplication of effort and maximize consistency of address data needed by metro stakeholders, including emergency responders. The group’s specific purpose is to recommend strategies to meet unmet address data-related needs by identifying options and current stakeholders (producers, users, partners). The group will focus primarily on situs (rather than mailing) addresses of all occupiable units and any other officially designated addresses.

To better understand how addresses are created, changed and used at different levels, the workgroup plans to interview a variety of stakeholders in each county that produce and use address data. The group will then compare existing data processes and structures with the data needs of the MetroGIS community, and recommend ways to fill gaps between existing data and needs. A special effort is being made to connect with those responsible for supporting the address needs of Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). This workgroup is being staffed by Mark Kotz with Metropolitan Council GIS staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities.

(2) Emergency Preparedness Workgroup

The Emergency Preparedness Workgroup is progressing in three focus areas: data development and deployment, building relationships with emergency management community, and organizing GIS resources. They are working closely with the Governor's Council Emergency Preparedness Committee to develop shared web resources for communicating with the GIS community as well as the Emergency Management community. Initial data sets have been developed and are now being refined through a pilot project that will use the counties as a focal point in the process.

The workgroup is interested in finding additional GIS professionals with a passion for expanding the use of GIS for Homeland Security issues in the metro area. Please contact Randy Knippel if you would like to contribute to this effort (randy.knippel@co.dakota.mn.us).

(3) Existing Land Use Workgroup

Workgroup members met with Dakota County planners and GIS staff on June 18th to discuss the potential of implementing a solution that is similar in function to the APA's Land-Based Classification System (LBCS) for this information need. Although it was clear that many of those in attendance had a limited understanding of LBCS, overall interest in a LBCS-like solution was good. It is anticipated that an overall recommendation for a regional solution will be made to the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee at their December 2004 meeting.

Current workgroup members represent city, county, school district, watershed district, metropolitan, and state interests. This workgroup is being staffed by Paul Hanson with Metropolitan Council GIS staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities.

(4) Highway and Road Networks

The Highways and Road Networks Technical Workgroup has taken a break since the first of the year to allow MnDOT to obtain software updates that were due at the end of April but which have not as yet been fully implemented. These software updates that are necessary to implement the full functionality of MnDOT's Location Data Manager (LDM). The Workgroup expects to meet with MnDOT shortly after that software update to discuss the possibility of initiating a pilot project in one community, which will attempt to integrate the Lawrence Group (TLG) Street Centerline file with the LDM.

Information about previous aspects of the project, including agreed upon goals, expectations, and participant roles can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/highway_roads/index.shtml This workgroup is being staffed by Mike Dolbow with Metropolitan Council GIS staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities.

(5) Lakes, Wetlands, etc.

The Metropolitan Council's Environmental Services (MCES) division has begun to coordinate efforts within the region to assess the recently adopted state-level standards proposed by the Hydrology Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information for Watercourse and Basins. MCES has also begun developing strategies with the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and others to accommodate any desired modifications and assure that any changes will integrate with State data. This workgroup is being staffed by Paul Hanson with Metropolitan Council GIS staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities.

(6) Regional Parcel Dataset Enhancements

(See Agenda Item 5a)

(7) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas

The MetroGIS Socioeconomic Resource Page (http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources) has been updated. If you are looking for socioeconomic data, this page is a great place to start. It offers a quick search tool based on data source or category. Some 20 data sources are cataloged in seven different categories including: crime, demographics, employment locations, housing, k-12 school data, location of services, and transportation issues. This directory helps users find the data they need. Some of the data can be downloaded directly from the source; for other data, contact information is provided. If you looked at the Resource Page before, take a fresh look. The last major update was made on May 5th and includes more sources and added specificity about mapping resolution, update frequency, and time series.

Use statistics are being collected that will be incorporated into MetroGIS's formal Performance Measure statistics. The only remaining task, other than to monitor user satisfaction over the next 6-9 months, is to identify a willing entity, with appropriate resources to accept responsibility for managing the site content.

The Phase II workgroup (solutions to Socioeconomic information needs that can not be achieved with existing published data) is expected to launch in the latter part of 2004 or early 2005. The Phase II effort will be coordinated with the Address Workgroup's efforts and not launch until more is known about how the Address Workgroup will proceed and possibly not until related solutions are defined by the Address Workgroup.

C) STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT PREPARATIONS UNDERWAY

The adopted 2004 MetroGIS workplan calls for the Coordinating Committee to host a retreat this fall. The primary objectives would be to contemplate technology and organizational changes that have occurred since MetroGIS was established in 1996, discuss how these changes are impacting MetroGIS's current objectives and philosophies, and identify candidate next steps for further discussion in preparation for the Business Plan Update proposed for 2005.

The current thinking is that the Coordinating Committee members would participate in a SWOT (Strengthens, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) exercise prior to the proposed retreat. The SWOT exercise would be followed by: 1) a distillation of the results into a form suitable for more structured policy deliberation, 2) interviews with key leadership and a survey of the broader stakeholder community for feedback and refinement of issues and options, and 3) the proposed retreat of the Committee and other key leadership to identify (maybe reach agreement on) key strategies and objectives for the next 3-5+ years.

Further work to refine the process particulars may have to be delayed until later in the fall or to next year, depending on when closure is reached on the Next-Generation Data Sharing Agreements (See Item A, above). The firm of Richardson, Richter & Associates, Inc. (RRA) is assisting on both efforts. Unfortunately, the data sharing agreement negotiations are consuming substantially more time and expense than anticipated. The \$10,000 budgeted for RRA's assistance in 2004 is already nearly exhausted.

D) COUNTY DATA PRODUCER WORKGROUP ACTIVITIES

(1) Regional Mailing Label Application

This application is ready to go but can not be launched until the Next-Generation Data Sharing Agreement is in place (Item A, above). Only those entities which have licensed access to the regional parcel dataset are proposed to be able to use the application.

(2) Regional Parcel Dataset Policy: Access by Non-Profit Interests

This topic is among several 2004 MetroGIS workplan items that were assigned to the workgroup. A proposal has been received from Will Craig and is scheduled for consideration by the workgroup on July 22nd. Mr. Craig is the Associate Director of CURA at the U of M and is a member of the Coordination Committee, representing the academic community. He also has a long-time working relationship with neighborhood and community groups active in community development-related initiatives in the Twin Cities.

(3) Regional Parcel Dataset Policy: Historical Version Support

A proposal has been received from Will Craig and is scheduled for consideration by the workgroup on July 22nd. The concept was accepted by the Workgroup at its March 2004 meeting. A detailed proposal is now before the group.



Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

TO: Policy Board

FROM: MetroGIS Support Staff
Contact: Steve Fester (651-602-1363)

SUBJECT: Information Sharing

DATE: July 19, 2004
(For the July 28th Meeting)

a) Metro Area GIS Staff Changes

- In May, Gary Swenson resigned his position as the Anoka County GIS Coordinator and began his new position as Director of the Spatial Analysis Research Center (SARC) at St. Cloud State University.
- On June 28th, Gordon Chinander, formerly the Carver County GIS Coordinator, moved to the Metropolitan 911 Board to serve in the newly created capacity as GIS Coordinator.

Best of luck to both Gary and Gordon in their new capacities. Both have made significant contributions to moving MetroGIS forward. The MetroGIS Address Workgroup, in particular, is looking forward to collaborating with Gordon in his position with the Metropolitan 911 Board.

b) Presentations / Outreach / Studies (not mentioned elsewhere)

The following activities occurred since the Policy Board last met.

- Articles Published in Summer issue of GIS/LIS Newsletter
- Keynote – Western Michigan GIS Conference – June 10th.
- County GIS User Group Meetings
- MetroGIS Regional Example in OGC Publication

Articles Published in Summer Issue of GIS/LIS Newsletter

Two articles summarizing major MetroGIS activities since the last newsletter were submitted for the Summer 2004 issue. They can be viewed at <http://www.mngislis.org/newsletter/issue37/issue37toc.htm>.

Keynote Speaker – Western Michigan Regional GIS Conference.

The Staff Coordinator was one of three keynote speakers at a June 10th conference hosted by REGIS (<http://www.gvmc-regis.org>), an Agency of the Grand Valley Metropolitan Council (GVMC). GVMC is located in western Michigan. REGIS, an acronym for "Regional Geographic Information System," provides a common database, infrastructure, and suite of applications used for spatial data management for its members. The conference theme is how GIS technology can be used to effectively facilitate collaboration necessary to address regional/issues that cross county boundaries related to growth and development, improving the quality of life, and coordinating governmental services.

Information Sharing via County GIS User Groups

The Staff Coordinator participated in user group meetings hosted by the Ramsey and Scott County GIS User Groups since the last Coordinating Committee meeting.

MetroGIS Regional Example in OGC Publication

The Open Geographic Consortium (OGC) selected MetroGIS as its regional example for a document describing "Server Architecture Models for the NSDI". A draft of the document describes 3 other large scale models – centralized, distributed, combination – in addition to the "centralized local-regional" model that they labeled for MetroGIS's data discovery/distribution architecture. The authors expect the document to be widely referenced. Once officially published, staff will forward the URL. Mark Reichardt with the OGC was the lead investigator (mreichardt@opengis.org).

c) **County-based GIS User Group Activity**

On May 26th, each County GIS User Group was invited to share information about their respective activities. The following replies were received:

Ramsey County:

- In October 2003, our Enterprise GIS committee built an online mapping service which provides Ramsey County GIS information directly to the public. The data is maintained in partnership with Ramsey County and has been enhanced by links to the County's RRInfo website. Additional enhancements are planned. Visit the service online at <http://maps.metro-inet.us>.
- Our Address Committee has formulated a vision of a County-wide centralized address database that could serve a variety of city business needs and emergency service needs. This year we're taking the first steps toward bringing this vision to reality, working with Ramsey County, our individual member organizations and a work group of MetroGIS.
- Community GIS, a committee under the umbrella of RCGISUG with representation from community groups and the University of Minnesota, is actively seeking grant support for building a resource for community-based GIS, both within and beyond Ramsey County.

Scott County:

- Prior Lake hosted a GIS Open House on May 12, which was open to the public.
- Shakopee will be hosting another open house later this summer (or early fall?)
- The Group is currently contemplating meeting with MetroGIS for a visioning/strategic planning workshop (depending on our time & availability.)

d) **State Geospatial Initiatives Update**

1) **MN Spatial Data infrastructure (MSDI) Plan**

(See I-Teams below)

e) **Federal/National Geospatial Initiatives Update**

- 1) **I-Teams** - The Staff Coordinator and David Arbeit, with LMIC, are serving on a Minnesota Governor's Council Committee responsible for consolidating all of Minnesota's individual, theme-based I-Plans in a document that sets forth a cohesive strategy to guide investments in geospatial technology and data within Minnesota. Plans for the 8 data themes are in various stages of completion. The "wrapper" document which establishes the policy foundation for the data themes and identifies a number of organizational needs and objectives has been accepted by the Governor's Council. The target is to consolidate all of the individual I-Plans into to a single document for submission to the federal Office of Management and Budget by fall 2004. The document also includes a strategy for next steps by Minnesota interests necessary to achieve the vision. A workshop will be hosted at the fall GIS/LIS Conference to share the vision for discussion with the broader community.

2) **Shekhar to NAS/NRC Mapping Science Committee**

Shashi Shekhar has been appointed to the Mapping Science Committee at the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. Shekhar is a professor of Computer Science at the University of Minnesota, a fellow of the IEEE Computer Society, a co-editor-in-chief of the Geo-Informatica Journal (<http://www.kluweronline.com/issn/1384-6175>), and a co-author of a popular textbook titled " Spatial Databases: A Tour" . Shekhar also has served as a member of the board of directors of the University Consortium on GIS, an associate editor of the IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering, and a program co-chair of the ACMGIS Conference.

The NAS/NRC Mapping Science Committee (www7.nationalacademies.org/besr/Mapping_Science.htm) has the responsibility for furthering knowledge and advising the federal government on matters related to GIS. It has produced a series of useful reports that included establishing the NSDI and critiquing the " The National Map" . Current and planned studies are looking at the research directions at the National Geospatial Agency, future directions for licensing data and services as well as expanding research and education in the light of new technologies.