



**Agenda**

**Thursday, November 6, 2003**  
**Centennial Office Building, Room 302**  
**(Southeast of State Capitol Building)**  
**St. Paul, MN**  
**2:00 to 4:00 PM**

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Approve Agenda**

**3. Approve Meeting Summary**

- a) May 15, 2003..... all

**4. Meeting Reports**

- a) September 17 Coordinating Committee Meeting .....Randall Johnson
- b) October 29 Policy Board Meeting .....Randall Johnson

**5. Items Requiring Action or Discussion:**

- a) TAT Purpose and Responsibilities for 2004 Approved by Coordinating Committee ..... Mark Kotz
- b) 2004 Meeting Schedule ..... all

**6. Project and Workgroup Reports**

- a) Regional Parcel Dataset Forum & Next Steps .....Mark Kotz

**7. Technical Presentations & Demonstrations**

- a) Emerging Needs for Points and Addresses for Buildings .....Mark Kotz
- b) Cooperative Addressing Services Initiative (St. Paul & RCGISUG) ..... Bob Basques
- c) Anoka County Addresses and Points for Residential Units .....Gary Swenson
- d) Washington County Address Points Dataset .....Dave Brandt
- e) King’s Companion ArcIMS Application – Technical Issues ..... Jim Maxwell

**8. Information Sharing**

- a) Quova Report ..... Mark Kotz
- b) Major MetroGIS Activity Update
- c) More Information Sharing

**9. Next Meeting = ???**

**10. Adjourn**

### 3. Approve Meeting Summary

See attached meeting notes from May 15, 2003 meeting.

### 4. Meeting Reports

4a) September 17 Coordinating Committee Meeting Highlights .....Randall Johnson

4b) October 29 Policy Board Meeting Highlights .....Randall Johnson

### 5. Items Requiring Action or Discussion

5a) TAT 2004 Purpose and Responsibilities Approved by Coordinating Committee .....Kotz

**Purpose Statement:**

- The Purpose of the Technical Advisory Team is to foster information sharing related to GIS technology within the MetroGIS community and to review technical issues brought to it by the Coordinating Committee, MetroGIS workgroups and MetroGIS staff

**Responsibilities:**

- Meet at least semi-annually. TAT staff will prepare meeting agendas, requesting technical presentations from the MetroGIS community.
- Maintain an e-mail list to provide more timely review of issues between team meetings.
- Provide a forum for presentation and discussion of technical issues relevant to the MetroGIS community, including standards, data development, applications development and new technologies.
- Review and respond to issues presented to it by the Coordinating Committee, MetroGIS workgroups or MetroGIS staff.
- Define and recommend technical strategies, policies and procedures to the Coordinating Committee and assist them in carrying out their work plan when requested.
- Keep abreast of changes to GIS technology and advise the Coordinating Committee of new opportunities for MetroGIS.

**Work Program**

Beginning in 2004, the TAT will no longer have a work program separate from that of the Coordinating Committee. Rather the Coordinating Committee will oversee a single, comprehensive work program and delegate to the TAT those activities it deems appropriate. This change was necessitated by an increasing dependence on special purpose workgroups by the Committee to accomplish technical work program tasks.

5b) 2004 Meeting Schedule ..... All

Meeting dates need to be set for 2004. Should we continue to meet every 6 months?  
Should our meetings be in conjunction (before or after) Coordinating Committee or Policy Board meetings?

## 6. Project and Workgroup Reports

### 6a) Regional Parcel Dataset Forum and Next Steps ..... Mark Kotz

The Regional Parcel Dataset Review Forum was held September 25<sup>th</sup>. The full summary and results document of the forum can be found at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/0903\\_forum.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/0903_forum.pdf). The forum had 14 participants from a broad spectrum of local, regional and state government and the academia, as well as observers from five counties. The purpose of the forum was to identify and prioritize potential enhancements to the regional parcel dataset.

The following table provides a list of the information needs expressed by participants of the Parcel Data Users Forum. Needs are listed in order of priority (number of votes). Only those potential enhancements receiving a vote are listed. See the summary and results document for a full list and breakdown by local, regional and state government.

Most potential enhancements relate to attributes. Those shaded in yellow may require additional geographic data (not just attributes). Those shaded in blue relate to positional accuracy and logical consistency issues.

	<b>Desired Parcel Dataset Enhancement</b>	<b>Votes</b>
1	<b>Residential structure characteristics</b> (e.g. square footage; # bedrooms; dwelling types (single family detached, duplex, townhomes); home style (rambler, split entry, cape cod); garage; basement; heating/cooling)	8
2	<b>Names of all owners</b> , including first and last name in separate fields.	7
3	<b>Addresses for all units on parcel</b> (e.g. all apartments or stores in a strip mall, or buildings on a corporate campus)	6
4	<b>All tax parcels in the polygon</b> (information needed for condos, etc. e.g. parcel points)	6
5	<b>Number of residential units</b>	5
6	<b>Parcel boundaries align to orthophotos/improved positional accuracy</b> (desire is to have parcel boundaries at least as accurate as the Met. Council orthophotos.)	5
7	<b>Type of use</b> (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial; single family vs. multi family; multiple uses)	4
8	<b>Attribute consistency</b> (owners, addresses)	4
9	<b>Year structure built</b> (original structure)	3
10	<b>Address of parcel</b> – both situs and mailing address (issue with city field)	3
11	<b>Owner mailing address</b>	3
12	<b>Public land ownership</b> (type of owner, agency name, tax exemption)	3
13	<b>Easements</b> (e.g. utilities, drainage)	3
14	<b>Name of development</b> in which parcel resides (e.g. “Whispering Pines”)	3
15	<b>Business common name</b> (e.g. McDonalds, Kohls)	2
16	<b>Legal description</b> (e.g. plat, lot & block, metes and bounds)	2
17	<b>Path or trail locations</b> (e.g. bike paths)	2
18	<b>Where is new development</b> (e.g. subdivisions)	2
19	<b>Parcel Size</b> (parcel polygon acreage is OK)	2
20	<b>Conservation easements</b>	2
21	<b>Year of last sale</b> or change of ownership (e.g. issues with sales to relatives for \$1 may not be included in last sale, but is still a change in ownership)	1
22	<b>Historical archives</b> (e.g. land use, value, number of units)	1
23	<b>Right-of-way and easement dimensions</b>	1
24	<b>Building permits</b> on parcel	1
25	<b>Well and septic</b> on parcel	1
26	<b>Improved topology</b> (eliminate unclosed polygons when converting to coverage format)	1

#### Next steps after the parcel data review forum:

1. The MetroGIS Parcel Data workgroup will review the needs and priorities and translate into specifications for potential enhancements to the dataset.
2. The workgroup will also attempt to define the resources necessary to make the desired enhancements.
3. Other stakeholders (e.g. assessors) will be invited to provide feedback on the feasibility of the enhancements.
4. The workgroup will then make recommendations for achieving enhancements, including identifying any issues surrounding standardization of the data.

## 7. Technical Presentations and Demonstrations

### 7a) Emerging Needs for Points and Addresses for Buildings ..... Mark Kotz

Points and addresses for buildings have been important information for a long time. Some utility companies likely already have and maintain this type of detailed data. However, local and regional governments in the metro area have generally not had this type of data available in the past.

An increasing need for this type of data is emerging, in particular, to help with E-911 wireless calls. Parcel polygons and points can provide addresses in many places, but with large parcels for things like apartment complexes and strip malls, parcel data can be of little use to the E-911 community. Many other government entities have also expressed a need for this type of data for use with mailings to residents and businesses, contacting voters, calling effecting buildings in emergency situations (e.g. chemical spills), and many others. This type of data was also the third ranked need in the recent MetroGIS Regional Parcel Dataset review forum.

The next three presentations provide some examples of what is going on in the metro area to related to this emerging need.

### 7b) Cooperative Addressing Services Initiative (St. Paul & RCGISUG).....Bob Basques

#### Initiatives for a Centralized Address Database Service structure.

##### Participants:

- Address Committee of the RCGISUG.
- Address Committee of the City of Saint Paul

##### Summary:

Good address information -- accurate, consistent, and up to date -- is vital to the effective operation of our public agencies and community services. Without good addresses, organizations face delays, added costs and the risk of faulty planning and decision making. With complete, reliable address data, our GIS systems can seamlessly combine information from multiple sources in creative ways, permitting more efficient and economical community services, improved emergency preparedness and better insight into future needs.

##### Objectives

- These two custodians of address information, RCGISUG and the City of Saint Paul, are convinced that a need exists for a centralized, spatially-enabled address database for Ramsey County and it's member municipalities and organizations.
- Additional custodians of addressing data will be added over time as the process matures.
- A maintenance facility for the addressing database is needed.
- A handback system for pushing the data back to the distribution server.
- A notification system is required for routing of changes to the databases to pertinent parties.

### 7c) Anoka County Address and Points for Residential Units ..... Gary Swenson

Anoka County maintains a point layer that has "multiple address/box" records for one parcel polygon (i.e. mobile homes, apartment units, suites, etc.). These points are randomly placed within the parcel polygon to which they belong. For example, in an apartment complex with 6 units numbered 101-106, the parcel polygon will have 1 of these units as its address with box number (101?), and the rest of them (102-106) will be in the points layer. In some cases there is more than one house number located within one parcel polygon. In this instance, the parcel polygon will contain one address (which is randomly selected) and the other address (some of which have different house numbers) will be included in the points layer. Anoka Co. keeps a .dbf file that is the parcel polygon attributes combined with the point layer attributes. This table can be used for queries of residences, without missing any house numbers.

7d) **Washington County Address Points Dataset** ..... Dave Brandt

7e) **King's Companion ArcIMS Application – Technical Issues** ..... Jim Maxwell

## 8. Information Sharing

8a) **Who and Where are the DataFinder Data Downloaders?** ..... Mark Kotz

MetroGIS has purchased a report from Quova™ that shows some interesting information about the location and organization type of users who have downloaded data from DataFinder over the last year. Metropolitan Council staff sent Quova a list of the IP addresses for each download of data from DataFinder from October 1, 2002 through September 30, 2003. If one IP made multiple downloads, all occurrences were included. Quova is able to reliably track IPs to the state and to very broad metro regions (DMAs used by Neilson, which seem to be the Twin Cities and Duluth in MN). Here are the key results.

- 5,329 total data downloads
- 97.2 % of downloads had identifiable IPs in Quova's database
- 97.2% of downloads were in the United States
- 73.6% of downloads were in Minnesota with the next highest state being California at 3.8%
- Download connection speeds were as follows
  - 60.3% = High (T1, T3, Frame Relay)
  - 33.2% = Medium (DSL, Cable, ISDN)
  - 6.5% = Low (Dial-up)
- Top level domains were as follows
  - com = 33.3%
  - edu = 27.2%
  - net = 18.7%
  - mn.us = 16.2%
  - next highest was only 1.7%
- Second level domains were as follows
  - Umn = 25.1%
  - State = 13.4%
  - Rr = 6.0%
  - Visi = 5.3%
  - Sehinc = 5.2
  - Uswest = 4.5%
  - Orbits = 3.8%
  - Mnsco = 3.7%
  - St.Paul = 3.7%
  - Orbis = 2.8 %
  - Other SLDs = 27%

8b) **Major MetroGIS Activity Update**

Updates on the following major MetroGIS activities can be found in the MetroGIS Policy Board meeting packet at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/a\\_10\\_29\\_03.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/a_10_29_03.pdf) , stating on page 9.

- a) Regional Mailing Label Application
- b) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy – Non-Government Access
- c) Data Sharing Initiative With Utilities
- d) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Coordination with MN GeoIntegrator
- e) Priority Common Information Need Solutions

### **8c) More information Sharing**

Updates on the following information sharing topics can be found in the MetroGIS Policy Board meeting packet at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/a\\_10\\_29\\_03.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/a_10_29_03.pdf) , stating on page 27.

- a) PolicyLink Recommendations to the Mpls. Foundation – *Towards a Regional Strategy for Sustaining Community Focused GIS in Twin Cities Metro*
- b) New Testimonial – SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
- c) Definition Clarification – Planned Land Use Coding for Commuter Rail
- d) Presentations / Outreach / Study Activities
- e) Related State Geospatial Data Initiatives Update
- f) Related Federal/National Geospatial Data Initiatives Update
- g) September 17th Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes