

**Meeting Summary  
MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team  
Centennial Office Building – Room 302  
November 6, 2003**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Maxwell called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

Members Present: Bob Basques (City of St. Paul - Public Works), Dave Brandt (Washington County), Gordon Chinander (Carver County), Damon Dougherty (Intergraph Corp.), Bob Diedrich (SRF Consulting), Dan Falbo (ESRI), Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), Susanne Maeder (LMIC), Jim Maxwell (The Lawrence Group), Michael Munson (Metropolitan Council), Gary Swenson (Anoka County), Ron Wencil (US Geological Survey), Tim Zimmerman (Hennepin County Community Health).

Support Staff: Steve Fester, Randall Johnson, and Mark Kotz.

Visitors: Alison Slaats (Metropolitan Council), Wallis Turner (Student).

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as submitted. Kotz asked that everyone introduce themselves. Team members, staff, and visitors stated their names and organizations represented.

**3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY**

Meeting notes from the May 15, 2003 meeting were approved unanimously.

**4. MEETING REPORTS**

**a) September 17 Coordinating Committee Meeting and b) October 29 Policy Board Meeting**

Johnson summarized the actions of the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board at their recent meetings. Highlighted were:

- Coordinating Committee's decision to switch to quarterly updates for the jurisdictional boundaries dataset.
- Presentation at the Policy Board meeting explaining GASB34 (asset management mandate).

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>.

**5. ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION OR DISCUSSION**

**a) TAT Purpose and Responsibilities for 2004 Approved by Coordinating Committee**

The new TAT Purpose Statement approved by the Policy Board was reviewed. Comments previously received from team members were incorporated into this statement.

**b) 2004 Meeting Schedule**

In light of the change from an advisory committee to more of an information-sharing body, Maxwell asked the team how often they would like to meet. Brandt asked if meetings would only be held if there

was a specific assignment. Johnson replied that the team exists as a permanent networking group, as opposed to a specific workgroup, which would be responsible for specific work assignments.

It was agreed to meet biannually, with 2004 meetings in May and November, preferably on the second Thursday of each month. Staff was directed to look into these options and notify the team once a schedule is set.

## **6. PROJECT AND WORKGROUP REPORTS**

### **a) Regional Parcel Dataset Forum & Next Steps**

Kotz summarized the desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset that were identified at the forum held on September 25<sup>th</sup>. On November 17, a workgroup is scheduled to begin meeting to define the scope of these enhancements.

Maxwell asked if the counties had any reaction in regard to enhancement #6 (Parcel boundaries align to orthophotos/improved positional accuracy). Kotz stated that this item was basically focussed on Anoka County and they are working on a more positionally accurate dataset. Gary Swenson (Anoka County) reiterated that this work is in progress.

Chinander asked if enhancement #4 (All tax parcels in the polygon) also included TIFs (Tax Increment Financing) districts. Kotz replied that it was intended to focus on ownership parcels like condos, where multiple parcels exist in one polygon. Kotz said that all counties already handle this situation in their data, but the methods differ between counties.

Rick Gelbmann mentioned that another MetroGIS workgroup was working on emergency preparedness issues.

## **7. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS & DEMONSTRATIONS**

### **a) Emerging Needs for Points and Addresses for Buildings**

Kotz briefly explained how a point dataset could help emergency response professionals in the event of an actual emergency.

### **b) Cooperative Addressing Services Initiative (St. Paul & RCGISUG)**

Basques gave an overview of the City of St. Paul / Ramsey County GIS Users Group's initiatives for a centralized Address Database Service structure. He stated that no formal activity has been taken at this time, but that a four page draft has been developed which outlines the need for address information. He also demonstrated the parcel address lookup prototype that has been developed.

Johnson asked if the Metropolitan 911 Board would be able to use this service. Basques stated that they would be able to. Basques continued to say that the Ramsey County GIS Users Group could evolve into a central management entity for this service for use by municipalities in the County.

The following are links to the information presented at the meeting:

City of Saint Paul Draft:

[http://pwultra5/cp\\_tiles/address\\_proto/Conceptual%20Design.pdf](http://pwultra5/cp_tiles/address_proto/Conceptual%20Design.pdf)

Ramsey County GIS Users Group:

<http://www.ramseygis.org/Webpages/documents/Phase1%20Report%20090103.pdf>

Address lookup Prototyping work (not for production use), parcel-based only at this time:  
[http://pwultra5.ci.stpaul.mn.us/cp\\_tiles/address\\_proto/index.html](http://pwultra5.ci.stpaul.mn.us/cp_tiles/address_proto/index.html)

**c) Anoka County Addresses and Points for Residential Units**

Swenson provided an overview of the point layer developed by Anoka County to track multiple residence units that exist for single parcel polygons. He explained that the demand for this information was initiated by county commissioners, and was implemented by the County's Property Records division. The dataset includes condos, mobile homes and apartment units. Maxwell asked Swenson how the County maintains the currency of these data. Swenson stated that there is no system in place to do this; that they rely on data provided to them by municipalities and other sources in Anoka County.

Maxwell also asked if the Anoka County GIS Department knows what the completeness and currency of their address database is. Swenson replied that they have no way of knowing; they have resources such as voter registration and cities/townships that give them updates, but that they don't have an efficient way of testing the completeness and accuracy of the database.

**d) Washington County Address Points Dataset**

Brandt gave an overview of work done in Washington County in regards to their Address Points Dataset. The county purchased a call notification system which included addresses and phone numbers for structures provided by InfoUSA. Brandt said that the addresses were linked to parcels where there was an address match and the center of the polygon was used for the address point. If no parcel match existed, then they would be matched to the TLG centerlines and a point created at an offset from the street. If still no match was found, a point from InfoUSA was used, which can often fall in the wrong parcel, due to low positional accuracy.

Brandt also explained the process by which new addresses are assigned in the county and said it could be more streamlined in the future.

**e) King's Companion ArcIMS Application – Technical Issues**

Jim Maxwell did not discuss this topic due to time constraints. Those wanting to know more about this topic may contact Jim directly at The Lawrence Group.

**8. INFORMATION SHARING**

There was no discussion on the items contained in this section.

**9. NEXT MEETING**

Staff was directed to establish meeting dates for 2004 as discussed in Agenda Item 5(b).

**10. ADJOURN**

Maxwell adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Prepared by,

MetroGIS Support Staff