

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team**  
**Centennial Office Building – Room 302**  
**November 18, 2004**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Maxwell called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

Members Present: Bob Basques (City of St. Paul - Public Works), Dave Brandt (Washington County), Gordon Chinander (Metro 911 Board), Brad Rupert for Peter Henschel (Carver County), Rick Zellmer for Dan Falbo (ESRI), Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), Susanne Maeder (LMIC), Jim Maxwell (The Lawrence Group), Michael Munson (Metropolitan Council), Curt Peterson (Ramsey County), Bart Richardson (MN DNR), Scott Simmer (Hennepin County), John Slusarczyk (Anoka County), Kent Tupper (Dakota County), Tim Zimmerman (Hennepin County Community Health)

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

Visitors: Alison Slaats (MetroGIS DataFinder Manager)

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as submitted, except that Item 6 would be presented before Item 5. Kotz asked that everyone introduce themselves. Team members, staff, and visitors stated their names and organizations represented.

**3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES**

The minutes of the November 6, 2003 meeting were approved via email earlier this year.

**4. ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION OR DISCUSSION**

**a) Elect a Team Chair**

Kotz gave a brief description of the Chair's roles and responsibilities. Johnson reminded the Team members that most of the Team's work in the past has been delegated to special purpose workgroups, such as the Address Workgroup, and that the Team now functions primarily in information-sharing and feedback capabilities.

After Chair Maxwell inquired if any current members would be interested in assuming the role of Chair, Basques volunteered for the position. No further nominations were put forth. The membership unanimously approved Basques as the new Team Chair for the next year.

**b) TLG Street Centerlines - Potential Enhancements for the Metro 911 Board**

Maxwell explained how the Metropolitan 911 Board is looking to make use of The Lawrence Group's (TLG) street centerline dataset to meet its internal business needs. He stated that this would involve a number of potential enhancements possibly including both graphic and attribute data, for instance:

- Adding EMS (Emergency Management Service) zone attributes,
- Adding addresses that do not necessarily correspond to a street, such as those found in shopping malls, dormitories, and other "vanity" address (i.e., "One 3M Drive"),
- Adding MSAG (Master Street Address Guide) attributes, insuring that street names are included that correspond to the names in the ALI (Automatic Location Information)/MSAG databases,
- Updating the regional dataset more often than quarterly, and
- Maintaining a consistent dataset over the entire seven county area. Chinander expressed concern that if local units of government elect to develop their own street centerline dataset that the regional needs might be compromised unless agreed upon standards are followed.

Maxwell then sought feedback from the Team members on how to move forward with the needed changes. He noted that TLG would consider providing a different product for 911 needs and/or distributing updates of the regional dataset more frequently than quarterly. Chinander stated that adding more attributes, such as MSAG compliant addresses, would be better than maintaining two separate data products. Gelbmann also encouraged the group to consider the full range of update preferences and then evaluate how to best handle the distribution/access options.

Johnson explained that in the past, MetroGIS had focused primarily on information needs required by many, but that now the time may be right to explore solutions that might be needed by a smaller number of stakeholders, but still be critical needs.

Kotz suggested that the maintenance of the data and the format in which it is distributed are two separate, but related, issues. TLG could potentially create different flavors of the dataset for different users from the master dataset.

Maxwell noted that phone companies' address data might not match very well with existing address data.

Chinander agreed to try to document the Metropolitan 911 Board's needs and specifications within the next two weeks (before a related meeting scheduled for December 2<sup>nd</sup>) and send this information to staff (Kotz) who will distribute it to the group.

### **c) MetroGIS Mailing Label Application - Background and Brief Description**

Alison Slaats, GIS Web Applications Developer for the Metropolitan Council and MetroGIS DataFinder Manager, described the need for and the development of a region-wide mailing label application using the MetroGIS-endorsed Regional Parcel Dataset. She explained that she had requested the metro-area counties test the application and has received some feedback from them. She then demonstrated the Web-based application, slides from which can be viewed in PDF format at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/ta/meetings/041118/label.pdf>.

After the demonstration, there was general acknowledgement of the benefits of the subject application. A brief discussion ensued about the possibility of the following enhancements:

- Add a capability to use an existing feature, such as a watershed boundary, to select parcels for labels.
- Add a capability to select parcel along a road segment for labels.
- Add a capability to select parcels by querying the attributes for specified characteristics.
- Add the PIN to the label printout.

Slaats commented that a formal needs assessment was not conducted but rather the application was developed in response to an opportunity identified by Anoka County Commissioner Kordiak, a member of the MetroGIS Policy Board. She noted that the cited enhancements could be investigated when preparing for a subsequent version(s), assuming the community agrees that these enhancements are desired.

Several members asked if an audience wider than the counties had been asked to test the application. Johnson commented that a broader test audience is not possible until the 2004-2008 Parcel Data Sharing Agreement is in place for the Regional Parcel Dataset. In accordance with the data sharing policy established by the data sharing agreement, this application will be available only to licensed users of the regional parcel dataset. The licensure process is expected to begin in late December or January following county approval of the pending agreement.

Johnson noted that this presentation is proposed to be shared with the Policy Board at its January meeting as the GIS Technology Demonstration topic.

#### **d) MetroGIS “ApplicationFinder” Concept**

Kotz explained how MetroGIS has begun to provide solutions to common geospatial information needs in the form of applications, as opposed to solely focusing on data. To accommodate this move into the realm of applications, MetroGIS has begun developing an “ApplicationFinder” concept. This Web-based mechanism is very preliminary in nature, and Team members were asked to provide feedback on its scope and content and whether they were aware of any similar applications currently in operation. Kotz’s presentation slides can be viewed in PDF format at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/ta/meetings/041118/app.pdf>. He commented that this proposal will be presented to the Coordinating Committee along with a recommendation to establish a workgroup to develop a recommendations for business and scope rules needed to move from concept to an operational application.

Maeder commented that individuals affiliated with state agencies have talked about this type of capability but that nothing has occurred beyond the early talking stage. Kotz commented that staff is unaware of a capability of this type in operation elsewhere. There was no opposition to MetroGIS pursuing the concept. In particular, Brandt noted that he receives a number of inquiries for general information about the existence of applications and believes a centralized information resource where a variety of applications are described with information about how to access them would save him and the callers substantial time and effort.

The following scope items were offered for consideration by the proposed workgroup:

- Should the proposed ApplicationFinder include custom software extensions?.
- Focus the scope, at least initially, on the identified priority information needs of the MetroGIS community, as opposed to the range that is otherwise possible.
- The group also cautioned to keep the different types of applications separate, i.e., those appealing to established GIS users vs. those appealing to the general public.
- Add a requirements section to the list of items to be explained in the standard description information
- Add a decision tree (wizard) to help the user decide the application/resource(s) that would best meet their particular need.

Richardson and Maeder volunteered to participated on the proposed workgroup, if established by the Coordinating Committee.

#### **e) 2005 Meeting Schedule**

Maxwell asked the group whether the proposed frequency of meeting every 6 months is acceptable. Chinander stated that he did not want to wait that long to get feedback on subjects such as the 911 Board’s need for street centerline data. Kotz replied that the existing Address Workgroup could address that issue.

It was agreed that the Team would meet on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursdays in both May and November of 2005. Meeting agendas will be sent via email approximately 1-2 weeks before meeting.

## **6. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS & DEMONSTRATIONS**

### **a) City of St. Paul Address Management Project (STAMP)**

Basques described the addressing assignment and maintenance service that the City of St Paul has been developing over the past year. The goal is to have a single addressing service that will allow all City personnel to more easily lookup, assign and maintain address-related information.

The Ramsey County GIS Users Group will be looking at this application to determine its appropriateness for use by cities in Ramsey County to more easily work with their own address information.

## **5. PROJECT AND WORKGROUP REPORTS**

### **a) Coordinating Committee and Policy Board Updates**

Johnson summarized the actions of the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board at their recent meetings. Full summaries of both meetings are available at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/index.shtml> and <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/index.shtml>.

### **b) Socioeconomic Information**

Kotz briefly showed the socioeconomic resources page that is linked to from the metadata on DataFinder.

### **c) Address Workgroup**

Due to a lack of time, the members were encouraged to read, on their own, the materials provided with agenda packet.

## **7. INFORMATION SHARING**

There was no discussion on the items contained in this section. Members were encouraged to review this information on their own time.

## **8. NEXT MEETING**

Pursuant to deciding to hold meetings on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday in May and November, the next meeting will be Thursday, May 19, from 2:00-4:00 p.m., location to be determined.

## **9. ADJOURN**

Maxwell adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Prepared by,  
MetroGIS Support Staff