

**Summary**  
**MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team**  
**Room 302 Centennial Office Building, St. Paul**  
**Wednesday, August 22, 2001**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Jim Maxwell, Chair.

**INTRODUCTIONS:**

Team Members Present: Sherry Coatney (Intergragh Corporation), Dan Falbo (ESRI), Jim Maxwell-Team Co-Chair (The Lawrence Group), Blaine Hackett (PlanSight), Bart Richardson (DNR), Ron Wencl (USGS), and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), David Brandt, Gordon Chinander, John Connelly, Susanne Maeder, Will Craig, David Claypool, Jim Zimmerman, Rick Persons, Bob Diedrich, (SRF) and Trudy Richter (RRA).

Support Staff: Alison Slaats (Metropolitan Council GIS Unit and DataFinder Lead Support)  
Mark Kotz, Paul Hanson,

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA.**

There was consensus to accept the agenda

**3. POLICY BOARD ACTIONS.**

A review of the Policy Board actions in July was offered by Trudy Richter who indicated that the key elements of Policy Board actions included endorsing the regional parcel data set from the pilot phase to a long term commitment; agreeing that MetroGIS should become a member of the National Geodata Alliance; and endorsing the Chair or its designee for the Board of Trustees of the organization. She also indicated that MetroGIS' organizational structure was revised to eliminate the need for a Policy Advisory Team. In addition to the reorganization adopted by the Policy Board, Trudy Richter indicated that another consideration for the Technical Advisory Team was that once an assignment was given to a TAT work group, the results of the work did not need to come back to the full Technical Advisory Team, but could move forward through the approval process. This could hopefully avoid unnecessary steps and meetings. Concerns related to this approach were expressed by Will Craig who indicated that the Coordinating Committee's work would have to increase, since now it provides a rubber stamp, and the group asked to revisit the issue of whether or not work groups should report back to the TAT depending upon the work assigned. Rick Gelbmann agreed that the work group would have more responsibility with this new approach, but also felt that if there were any change resulting from the work performed by the work group as compared to that assigned by the TAT, it would be the responsibility of the work group to report back for consensus.

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARIES**

Rick Gelbmann moved, seconded by Gordon Chinander, approval.

**5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a. Modified Team Work Plan  
Regarding the Modified Team Work Plan adopted by the Coordinating Committee,

Trudy Richter asked that the individuals present focus on the proposed modification to staffing, where the position originally held by Theresa Foster would not be replaced, but that Council GIS staff would assist Randy Johnson in providing support to MetroGIS. There were no concerns expressed with this approach.

- b.1. Coding Scheme Endorsement for Regional and Land Use Dataset Paul Hanson presented the feasibility of a regional coding system for future land use data, making four recommendations including a coding scheme, rules and responsibilities of the regional custodian, identifying the regional custodian and recommending that a work group be assigned to look at the issue of intensity of use as an addition to the coding scheme. As background, Paul indicated that initially a study funded by MetroGIS and conducted by the I-35W Coalition looked at the intent of the data set, the use of appropriate codes and whether APA has established codes. They took conclusions of that study to the Coordinating Committee in June 1999, and certain enhancements were made. In June 2000, the data set was accepted by the Coordinating Committee as a prototype for further testing by the Metropolitan Council, using its smart growth approach, and by the I-35W Coalition through its “build out” project. These parties discovered and recommended certain changes to the prototype. On May 15, 2001, a peer review forum was hosted by MetroGIS, where generally, positive responses were received.

Paul Hanson then summarized the current recommendation that includes modifications suggested at the May Forum. The current recommendation is for a two level scheme, which allows comparison of planned land use throughout the region. The first level of the regional coding scheme provides generalized planned land use information. The second level is a subset of level one providing more detailed planned land use information. During the Team’s discussion it was emphasized that the Council would use comprehensive plans adopted by local communities to input the coding information into these two levels. More importantly, it was emphasized that no changes will result to locally adopted comprehensive plans as a result of implementing the regional coding scheme, as the regional scheme will serve only as a tool to visualize locally-designated planned land use in a consistent format across the region. Bart Richardson mentioned that unless changes are made to certain wording that’s repeated between level one and two, the data sets would not be truly “nested”. The reason the same wording was used is because some communities only mapped to level one, so by repeating the words in the level two allows for a design for all communities. It was suggested that a change be made so as the level one and level two words were not the same, or in level two the word was used along with “undifferentiated” so that people reading level two would know it is a generalized term. Paul also indicated the Council does verify the information once it assigns the codes. A County individual indicated this type of information would be very helpful to the Counties. Bart Richardson moved, seconded by Gordon Chinander, the approval of the coding scheme with the minor language change in level two. Motion unanimously approved.

- b.2.3. Roles, Responsibilities and Regional Custodian

With the minor language change in level two an appointment of Regional Custodian was discussed and it was moved by David Brandt, seconded by Dan Falbo that the roles and responsibilities be approved and that the Met Council be designated as the Regional Custodian. It was also discussed that it is important to recognize the communities having a role in the roles and responsibilities as they are the ones that have the information that needs to be provided.

b.4. Work Group

Paul Hanson spoke briefly about the need for evaluating whether or not intensity of use should be added to this database. Intensity of use is closely linked to land use and allows a description related to units depending on the property height. Paul indicated a work group was needed to look at more standardized codes for intensity of use to answer the questions of whether or not it's a valuable addition, whether or not the data itself is available, and how it should be represented. In discussing volunteers for the work group it was suggested that Terry Schneider or someone else from the Land Use Coalition join the work group as well as Bart Richardson, Mark Vander Schaaf and perhaps David Windle.

Regarding whether or not to take the current recommendations of the Coordinating Committee at this time, it was the view of the TAT that these land use data recommendations not be taken to the Coordinating Committee until a decision is made on the inclusion of intensity of use data, since there is a potential for changes in roles and responsibilities if that was to occur.

c. Regional Parcel Data Set Attributes

Regional Parcel Data Set Attributes and Next Steps was presented by Mark Katz who indicated that all counties now, including Hennepin, had responded. The Policy Board had originally requested 19 attributes be a part of the Regional Parcel Data Set and Mark indicated that a few more have been added. He also indicated that the "resident's name" parcel attribute is not maintained by the Counties and that the best course of action at this time is to add an attribute to indicate whether or not a parcel is homestead. (*Editor's note: The work underway by the I-35W Corridor Coalition is refining a prototype database that will contain 25+ attributes about each household, including "resident name".*) In addition to the land value attribute, the year payable attribute was discussed, as it would be unclear to the user of the database which land value was being used. There was discussion that there needs to be an annual update only on the land value, so as to avoid parcel splits and new market value issues. After discussion the various other attributes and their availability or issues associated with each, Mark recommended that the next step should be to get a version out and get reactions and input. Motion was made by Bart Richardson, seconded by John Connolly to accept the fields identified and get a version out.

Regarding the technical procedures of the primary custodian, certain technical procedures were recommended to limit the Council's process in preparing the data as well as to eliminate the potential error. Rick Gelbmann moved, seconded by Susanne Maeder, primary custodian procedures. County representatives present indicated that

sometimes it would be necessary to rewrite the code and it was also discussed that four times a year a schedule of updates would be set. There was a question whether or not these attributes will be available to the private sector. The general response was that the big buyers already have bought it directly from the counties. There was also a question regarding the applicability of FGDC standards and it was agreed that no further recommendations are needed, that they are being used as much as they can be. Will Craig moved, seconded by Gordon Chinander that nothing more would be needed related to FGDC, approved.

d. Meeting Schedule

Jim Maxwell discussed the schedule and October 25 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. was set for the next meeting date of the TAT.

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

Allison Slaats presented an update regarding MetroGIS as grand prizewinner of the geography challenge and the NSDI web page map services grant award. Everyone present congratulated Allison for winning the award on behalf of MetroGIS.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.