

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 21, 2016, 1 PM - 3:30 PM

Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

Minutes Approved by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee on Oct 13, 2016



In Attendance:

Curtis Carlson, Northstar MLS

David Brandt, Washington County (Vice Chair)

Brad Henry, University of Minnesota

Pete Henschel, Carver County

Dan Ross, MnGeo

Tony Monsour, Scott County

Randy Knippel, Dakota County

Mark Maloney, City of Shoreview

Carrie Magnuson, Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District

Gordy Chinander, MESB

Erik Dahl, EQB (Chair)

Norine Wilczek, MnDOT

Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

Ben Verbick, LOGIS

Len Kne, U-Spatial

Jeff Matson, CURA/Non-Profit

Ron Wencil, USGS

Absent:

Gary Swenson, Hennepin County

Nancy Read, Metro Mosquito Control

Hal Watson, DNR

John Slusarczyk, Anoka County

David Bitner, dbSpatial

Hal Busch, City of Bloomington

Matt Baker, Metropolitan Airports Commission

Matt Koukol, Ramsey County

Eric Haugen, Resource Data, Inc.

Guests:

William Blake, Allina Health

Andy King-Scribbins, Hennepin County

Adam Iten, Emergency Communications Network

Paul Youngstrom, Metro Mosquito Control District

Jennifer Crites, Metro Mosquito Control District

Ryan Stovern, St. Louis County

Jim Bunning, MnGeo

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

1) Call to Order

Chair Dahl called the meeting to order at 1:07 PM

2) Approve Meeting Agenda

No changes advanced; Motion: Kotz; Second: Carlson

3) Approve Meeting Minutes from March 24, 2015

No changes advanced; Motion: Brandt; Second: Kotz;

4) MetroGIS Benchmark Award – Outgoing Policy Board Chair Terry Schneider

The Coordinating Committee honored out-going Policy Board Chair Terry Schneider, by presenting him with the MetroGIS Benchmark Award. Coordinator Maas reiterated the

importance of having elected officials aware of the work we do in the geospatial field within our individual agencies. Mayor Schneider was quick to compliment the GIS staff of the cities, counties, watershed districts, Council, state agencies and other interests present. Schneider also praised how well the geospatial technical staff of all the various agencies work with one another to find common solutions that serve the needs of all citizens.

Schneider has been on the MetroGIS Policy Board since its inception on January 15, 1997, and served as the board's chair from 2007 until 2016.

5) Parcel Data: General & Administrative Ownership Categories

Ryan Stovern, GIS Principal with St. Louis County gave a presentation on generalized and administrative ownership attribute categories for parcel data that are currently in development in the counties of the Arrowhead Region (Cook, Lake, St. Louis and Carlton). Stovern described the initial business need for the generalized ownership attribute arising from the Pagami Creek Fire in the summer of 2011. Many agencies needed to use each-others data for response and accounting of the burned area and many errors and discrepancies were found, the generalized domain of values was developed as a means to streamline interagency work and make the parcel datasets easier to use.

The current generalized ownership domain as of June 2016 is as follows:

- 01 – Federal – Lands owned by the United States**
- 02 – State – Lands owned by the State of Minnesota**
- 03 – County Fee – Lands owned by the County**
- 04 – Tax Forfeit – Tax Forfeit lands, owned by the County, managed by the State**
- 05 – Municipal – Lands owned by Cities and Counties**
- 06 – Tribal – Lands owned or Controlled by Tribal Nations or interests**
- 07 – Regional – Lands owned by regional commissions or park districts**
- 08 – Port Authority – Lands owned or controlled by port authorities**
- 97 – Unknown – Any parcel with a PIN in the GIS, but not in the tax system**
- 98 – No Value – Any parcel without a PIN and not in the tax system**
- 99 – Private – Any lands without a public ownership interest**

This generalized ownership categorization makes it easy to quickly display data across the region seamlessly. In the Arrowhead region a large number of partner agencies and organizations are working together, these include:

Governmental Agencies (Active)

United States Forest Service - Superior National Forest 2011
Cook County - 2011
Lake County - 2011
St. Louis County – 2011
MnGeo - 2012
MN DNR - 2012
Carlton County - 2014
Arrowhead Regional Development Commission – 2015

Non-Governmental Agency Partners

Esri - 2012

Nancy von Meyer - 2013

Minnesota Power - 2013

Governmental Agencies (Interested, But Not Currently Active)

National Park System - Voyageurs National Park

Koochiching County

Fond du Lac Band of Ojibwa

Itasca County

Aitkin County

The partners will also be looking to include the Grand Portage and Bois Fort Tribal interests as well as Minnesota Power in the foreseeable future.

Next steps for the effort include finalization of the generalized ownership attributes and to begin work on developing administrative ownership attributes. Stovern noted that the creation of the queries is extensive and labor intensive for getting just the generalized categories assembled, and that a larger effort will be undertaken for the administrative domain values. The administrative domains will assist the state level agencies, particularly the GAP stewardship program and other recreational lands mapping efforts. There remain some challenges with categories like school district properties and non-tax paying entities like church property, but we work through them as we go.

Additional future work is to engage land surveyors from federal, state and local levels to ensure the accuracy of the survey lines and administrative boundaries. There are a number of known errors and anomalies in the data that will take extensive time and effort to work through and address.

The partners in the Arrowhead region are working with the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission for funding and working with the National Forest Service for in-kind staff contributions to assist in the effort.

Stovern indicated that one of the key reasons for the initial success is that all four counties (Cook, Lake, St. Louis and Carlton) are working on a shared parcel fabric. Koochiching, Itasca and Aitkin Counties are interested in what we're doing, but are not yet involved in parcel fabric work.

Carlson: Are you working with Superior (Wisconsin) on the effort?

Stovern: Not specifically on our current parcel effort, but we do work closely with them on many other things. Douglas County (Wisconsin) is not part of our parcel fabric work.

Maloney: How are you handling Conditional Use Deeds in your data?

Stovern: We actually have very few, there are only 25 conditional use deeds in St. Louis County, one example is Lester Park Golf Course.

Stovern closed his presentation with the acknowledgement that there was a great deal of work to do, but that it is creating a lot of value and the partnerships in the Arrowhead region are stronger with this kind of shared effort.

6) Hennepin County Fiber Optic Network Overview

Andy King-Scribbins, Community Connectivity Manager for Hennepin County provided an overview of the county's current and planned fiber optic network. King-Scribbins spent the first part of his presentation providing description of what fiber optic technology is, why it is important and how Hennepin County is making use of it to meet its various business and functional needs.

At present, Hennepin County owns or leases space in 120 locations throughout the county and seeks to ensure all of these sites are eventually connected via fiber optic network, these include all county government facilities, PSAPs, fire halls, police stations, EMS facilities, clinics, sheriff's office and so on. He indicated that they are presently a long way from meeting that goal.

In planning for their future network, the county emphasizes the use of its existing ownership; current major planning the fiber network is focused on the use of its county highway right of way as it controls the access. This also helps to connect signals and other facilities the county needs to manage and operate.

Hennepin County is actively looking to partner with other agencies and interests installing fiber in the county, and is currently working with school districts, Metro Transit and other agencies seeking a permit to perform work in county right of ways. Partnering has the obvious benefits of sharing infrastructure, enhancing the capacity and reducing the cost.

With Metro Transit, two major efforts are in the works, there are the proposed Southwest line (Green Line Extension) and Bottineau Line (Blue Line Extension); plans are to have a full end to end fiber infrastructure in place which align with these light rail projects. These projects would facilitate Hennepin County's Government center to have eventual connection and linkages with Scott and Carver County governments.

Hennepin County is focused on 'future-proofing' its fiber network. Every asset we install in the ground is expected to last a minimum of 20 years, and we are installing empty conduits along our conduit containing fiber; the empty one enables us to expand when needed later on. We are ensuring there is more than needed capacity and we will not need to drill again for 20 to 30 years.

On the GIS side of things, we are mapping three basic categories of the network: the **existing network** which is Hennepin County's fiber system, the **partner network**, where we are working with or sharing the fiber with another agency and the **planned routes**, which are the proposed or desired connectivity of the system. Many of our agencies from public works to the sheriff's office to emergency management are interested in where we have our current and planned system, so being able to map it and share that info with them is very important.

Hennepin County is making use of Crescent Link (<http://crescentlink.com/>) which is an extension for ArcGIS; it enables you to have a single line and point to hundreds of strands of information with that single line an facilitates editing and managing the fiber data in the ArcGIS environment. Some agencies not on the ArcGIS platform, they are using CAD or simply Google Earth, and we are able to provide them the data in a format they can use for their work.

For the future of our fiber network, we want to more fully integrate the public works and transportation areas with advanced transportation management, traffic counts and signal timing. In the even 'bigger

picture' we're looking at the 'internet of things' and integration of our emergency siren system, emissions tracking, and the entire array of sensors in Hennepin county for all kinds of mapping and analysis work.

Brandt: How do you work with Gopher One Call?

King-Scribbins: Within the City of Minneapolis there is one major Gopher One Call account and elsewhere we contract with a third party, usually Delcom does the locational work.

Knippel: How accurate is your fiber locator?

King-Scribbins: It depends on where you are looking, with our Trimble units we within about 1 foot. Anything not GPS'd we generally work with a 20 foot or so buffer.

Chinander: What are you doing for re-routes and redundancy?

King-Scribbins: All of our existing loops have redundancy built in so if something is cut we can quickly be back on line.

King-Scribbins thanked the group for their time and questions.

7) Image Tiling Specification – Report Back

Matt McGuire of the Metropolitan Council provided a report back to the Committee on the continued development of the draft of the Imaging Tiling Specification. At the March 2016 meeting, after a presentation by McGuire, the Committee approved the creation of a work team to examine options for a shared image tiling specification. The work team consisted of Jessica Fendos of Ramsey County Justin Hansen of WSB Engineering, Matt McGuire of the Metropolitan Council and Joe Sapletal of Dakota County. The team met in person once and had several conference calls and electronic exchanges since March and developed a working draft recommendation for a shared image tiling scheme.

McGuire re-iterated the benefits of a shared tiling scheme for sharing data, enhancing the ability to combine, distribute and build shared applications, reduction of redundancy, maximizing uptime and creating a common operation picture and working together in mutual aid situations.

McGuire informed the Committee of the Work Team's recommendation was the Web Mercator Tiling Scheme (WMTS), but indicated that the WMTS has some issues and 'the more closely you examine it, the harder it can be to see' and that while the WMTS is widely used by a variety of agencies, interests and vendors there is not a single definition of the specifics which underlie its structure and that there are numerous slightly different scales in use in the realm of the WMTS.

McGuire highlighted the benefits of using WMTS: that it meet key business needs of delivering high resolution imagery (WMTS has been defined to a scale of 1:70) and that it works very well for on-line mapping applications being widely supported by web frameworks and well understood by the web development community.

However, McGuire also identified some risks and drawbacks including:

- The National Geospatial Advisory Notice admonition to not Web Mercator; (http://earth-info.nga.mil/GandG/wgs84/web_mercator/)
- That at 45-degrees the measuring errors are significant, and;
- That it cannot be reliably used for measurements of distance and area.

To alleviate the distance and area problem is the option of setting up the viewer of the data in Web Mercator, but having an underlying measuring capacity in another system to return more accurate distance and area measurements. McGuire reiterated that the WMTS is also **not** recommended for engineering or survey work or for where measurements derived from printed media are needed.

McGuire suggested the following next steps for the shared image tiling specification.

- The draft document is posted on the MetroGIS website under Best Practices as a working draft, the Committee and geospatial community is encouraged to review the document and submit any changes or recommendations.
- The document is available here: <http://www.metrogis.org/how-do-i-get/best-practices.aspx>
- The counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota and Scott and the Metropolitan Council have partnered to fly the entire metro region at 1'-resolution and their respective counties at 6"-resolution in April 2016. As this imagery comes on line in fall of 2016, there is an opportunity to build a sample tiling scheme with these images, blocking them together and sharing the files using the common WMTS as a test case to try this.

The Shared Image Tiling Work Group will ask that the Coordinating Committee offer revisions, rejection, approval, or approval with conditions for the recommend shared tiling scheme at its next meeting on October 13, 2016.

8) Policy Board Update

Maas gave a brief update on the recent Policy Board meeting which occurred on April 27, 2016. Minnetonka mayor Terry Schneider has stepped down after 7 years of service as the Policy Board chair and 19 in total with the Board. The new chair is the city of Richfield mayor Debbie Goettel and new vice chair is Mary Texer, board member of the Capitol Region Watershed District. There is also a new seat available from Metro Cities with Terry Schneider leaving, Maas will contact Metro Cities to ensure they delegate a new member to the Board.

Maas indicated that the Policy Board has formally approved the proposed changes from 2014 and 2015 to the MetroGIS Operating Guidelines and Procedures. The key changes include the following:

- A revised description of the roles and responsibilities of the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board based on their current actual functions;
- Work plan & budget are recommended and adopted by the Coordinating Committee;
- That allotments from the MetroGIS budget are to align with approved work plan projects;
- Approve of two (2) additional seats for city government at the Coordinating Committee

The next annual in-person meeting the MetroGIS Policy Board is scheduled for April 26, 2017, periodic electronic updates will be provided to the Policy Board members as events warrant.

9) Coordinating Committee Alternate Members

Maas reminded the group that all Coordinating Committee members are entitled to have an alternate represent their interest at the Coordinating Committee. With all members of our professional community having tighter schedules and many meeting commitments, sending an alternate member is an appropriate and encouraged means of representing your interest in the MetroGIS collaborative. Maas encouraged all members who have not done so to designate an alternate and to provide the alternates name and email address for documentation in the MetroGIS roster.

10) MetroGIS Work Planning Project Updates

Maas directed the group to the MetroGIS work planning page on its website where a new, updated and simplified template for work projects is available along with detailed instructions for filling the form out and submitting for consideration by the group in the MetroGIS 2017 project planning cycle.

All MetroGIS work project planning materials are available here:

<http://www.metrogis.org/projects/Project-Templates.aspx>

Current Work Plan Updates:

10a: Address Point Aggregation

Maas provided a brief recap of recent action on the aggregation and address point development effort. At present five of the seven metro counties have address points prepared and in continual production. Metropolitan Council staff are aggregating this data twice per year (April and October) and publishing it to the Geospatial Commons as the Regional Address Point dataset. Important recent developments include the appearance of a 911 Address Point Specification which meets the business needs of the NextGen 911 data consumer community. MetroGIS staff has been working with 911 interests to develop a comparison document showing key difference between the current metro specification and 911 specifications. Metro Address Work Group representatives will be meeting with 911 interest in fall 2016 to work through differences in the specifications and find common ground in their business needs for the data. The group will also revisit the aggregation strategy with the full set of partners to determine the best way to aggregate the address point data in the metro.

More information about Address Point Aggregation can be found here:

<http://www.metrogis.org/projects/address-point-aggregation.aspx>

10b: Metro Regional Centerlines Collaborative

Maas provided a brief recap of recent action on the MRCC effort. The MRCC is currently in the 'Second Build' period (February 29, 2016 – September 30, 2016) where the partners are using Version 1.4.2 of the MRCC specification to build a first release to the public this fall. The members of the MRCC have been documenting the variety of issues as they arise during the Second Build process, sharing their ideas and concerns on the project's BaseCamp site. The data is presently being aggregated via the portal developed and hosted by MnGeo. The MRCC team will congregate again on August 11 to work through the following issues:

- How and when the Linear Reference System attributes will be handled;
- Dealing with border streets with two valid names;
- Population of the emergency access attribute;
- Better definition of key project terminology;
- Approval of 'touch points' along county boundaries for alignment between counties;
- Asses the need for and potential to include postal community attributes;

September 30 is the proposed date for a public release of the MRCC dataset, with monthly updates anticipated after the first release. A 'Best Practice Guide' is in development as is a second round of stakeholder review of the public dataset. Finally, project members will be making a presentation about the MRCC's progress to the GIS/LIS Conference in Duluth October 26-28, 2016.

More information about MRCC project can be found here:

<http://metrogis.org/projects/centerlines-initiative.aspx>

10c: Support for the Geospatial Commons

The Metropolitan Council and MnGeo executed a contract on June 20, 2016 for \$14,110 of the MetroGIS 2016 budget dedicated to support the Minnesota Geospatial Commons.

10d: Free + Open Geospatial Data Initiative

As of July 21, 2016, nineteen (19) counties in Minnesota have either adopted resolutions making their data open or are simply publishing their data freely and openly via their own portals or the Geospatial Commons. The most recent county, Waseca, had a resolution adopted by their Board of Commissioners on June 21, 2016.

The Free + Open 'White Paper II' resources document is now in Version 4.0 (Updated on May 6, 2016) with future updates prompted by questions and concerns received by the geospatial community.

The Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council created an Outreach Committee in early 2016, this committee is co-chaired by Len Kne and Kari Geurts and is in the process of developing two surveys for release in August 2016, one survey is designed for Free + Open Counties (19) with another designed for Non Free + Open Counties (68). The two purposes of the survey are to understand where counties are at on the issue and to collect 'narratives of success' of how geospatial is helping counties do their work better regardless if they make their data public or not. The survey will be distributed in August, results tabulated and reported on in September with presentations on the results at the MN GIS/LIS Conference in October and the Government IT Symposium in December. A proposal was also tendered to the

Association of Minnesota Counties for their annual conference in December in Minneapolis, but their conference committee rejected the proposal for inclusion this year.

10e: 2016 Aerial Imagery Collection Effort

The Metropolitan Council and four Metro Counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota and Scott participated in a buy-up of aeriels this spring. The entire region was collected between April 9 and 22 at 1' resolution (leaf off) with the four counties collected at 6" resolution. As of this writing, the vendor Surdex is performing the ortho-correction with the first round of imagery to be available for the initial phase of QAQC checking in August. The entire contract will be concluded on December 1, 2016. For further information on the project, please contact either Tanya Mayer (MetCouncil) or Chris Cialek (MnGeo).

10f: Historical Aerial Imagery Archive Project

Representatives from the University of Minnesota and Borchert Map proposed a project for 2016 to scan and geo-rectify a series of imagery from 1956 and 1966 thought to have originated with the Metropolitan Council. The Council and University developed a contract, but during their due diligence discovered that the Council no longer owned the images, but had transferred its ownership to the Minnesota History Center in 1991. After a thorough legal review by the History Center, they denied their approval for serving the imagery up on a publicly searchable website, as the holder of the copyright of the images was not definitively known. The Borchert Map Library performed the scanning and geo-rectification of the images for its internal collection and the Metropolitan Council is presently negotiating a purchase of the digital files for \$4744.83 for its internal project use. Borchert Library staff and Minnesota History Center staff are continuing to examine the ability to release the material with the risk of copyright violation appearing to be very low.

10g: Park and Trail Dataset and Data Standard

The project was submitted in 2015 for work in 2016 to develop a statewide data specification for park and trail resources. In the intervening time, state agencies have been determining how to meet their Legislative mandate to represent parks and trails of regional significance and working with the University of Minnesota's Center for Changing Landscapes in a parallel process to meet their business need for park and trail data. Over the course of 2015 and early 2016 the metro counties and Metropolitan Council have expressed a business need for a dataset that captures all park, recreational and natural lands and trail, not just those of regional significance. The metro partners have developed a charter and envision a process similar to that taken on by the MRCC in documenting the core business needs of the producer and user community. The metro effort is anticipated to begin in late 2016, while the state level effort is currently occurring with a deadline of June 30, 2017 for both its projects and the development of a data standard.

10h: Metro Regional Stormwater Dataset

At present this project remains an information gathering and research effort. To date, 21 agencies and interests have had their business case documented—those who need an inter-jurisdictionally integrated stormwater feature dataset. MetroGIS Coordinator Geoff Maas has a list of 25-30 more interests yet to be interviewed. At present there is no project champion, no project owner or designated work team active, however, when these do appear and the project becomes a priority, there will be a solid body of resources to draw upon. MetroGIS retains a 'splash page' on its website with information and links to relevant documents for those interested in the project's potential.

11) Lightning Round Updates

Participants are encouraged to share any updates they have on what their agency is doing in currently involved with.

Chinander (MESB): No update

Wencil (USGS): Dewberry has completed the National Hydrography Requirements and Benefits Study (HRBS) for the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). The firm conducted the study—which was sponsored by USGS and the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Natural Resources Conservation Service—to establish a baseline understanding of national business uses, needs, and associated benefits for national hydrography data; and to inform the design of an enhanced future program that balances requirements, benefits, and costs. The final report is 640 pages, had the input of over 500 agencies and estimates there would be over \$600 million in annual program benefits if all the requirements were met. The new series of USGS topographic quad maps are available, all but six (6) Minnesota counties are complete and are in GeoPDF format, with a vector model version available as well. The next round of 3DEP (3D Elevation Program) is gearing up, please remember that “NED (National Elevation Dataset) is dead” and that everything is LiDAR based. A new 3DEP update will be coming out in the coming weeks

Henschel (Carver Co.): We are going to use the Local Government data model from ESRI for Rapid Damage Assessment. Public Infrastructure, Residential and Commercial assessment are all supported within the data model. Dakota County has implemented the data model and will be doing a live training exercise next week. Carver County will be joining them in their exercise to learn what works and doesn’t work well during a real event.

Iten (Emergency Communications Network): We are continuing to work on the 911 standards, we’ve received over 300 comments and questions related to the centerline standard to date and we are in early development phase of the address point standard as well. We’ve been working closely with Geoff (Maas, MetroGIS) to understand how we align with what we need and where the existing metro address point standard is. We have started with the NENA standard as a baseline—itsself is still in draft form—as well as standards in use around the U.S. to see what other states are doing, including your metro standard and then developed our specification to meet the NextGen 911 requirements. We are hoping your address group can convene soon, ideally in August, so we can see how we align. We will be bumping a second round of review out to Greater Minnesota soon, a second review of the draft 911 material. We’ll then be diving into the PSAP boundaries, fire and law boundaries and the medical sections as well. Despite my initial hopes, we aren’t going to see the approval of the draft in calendar 2016, but we know this is a long term process. One of the benefits we see is for our data to be standardized to that the vendors who can consume the data can align their products with our standards.

We will be having another newsletter coming out soon, and work continues on the 911 portal at the state. The MRCC has a development space on the portal and the 911 folks are making use of that data. We hope the future will see scripted uploads to help automate the process, eliminate manual requests and manual work and we hope to see continued increased connection to the Greater Minnesota community with this part of the effort.

I want to re-iterate our big “thank you” to Dakota County for sharing their Joint Powers Agreement documentation with us, this is really proving to be a useful template for working elsewhere in the state, helping us to engage with address authorities on a process that works.

Monsour (Scott Co.): We have finalized address points for the entire county, we started with centroids for the parcels, individual sites, parcels with numerous points and so on. We're also engaged with the Joint Powers Agreement approach with our cities. We've had an intern this summer to help work on sorting out our error records and we are also working with our new dispatch software from LETG (which is now owned by Zuercher). Also, we have had a long-term interim CIO in Scott County, we are now advertising for a full time position; this is at the same time as two other counties looking for a new CIO as well.

Carlson (NorthStar MLS): We are currently maintaining parcel data for seventy (70) counties in Minnesota and Wisconsin and are in the midst of our summer 'updates and mergers', because we have ready access to your data, the Twin Cities metro gets updated more frequently. I am now working as well with the Minnesota Department of Revenue on their eCRV system (Electronic Certificate of Real Estate). This is a system used by auditors and assessors for documenting sales, the Department of Revenue releases this data weekly. It came on line in October 2014 and a user group has formed around it and we are hoping to get the Dept. of Revenue to comply with the forthcoming parcel data transfer standard. The eCRV data is more interested in the data 'capture' side than the data 'distribution' side. While it is publicly available and delivered up via ftp and xml, we would really like to see them comply with the parcel standard. (More info on eCRV: <http://www.revenue.state.mn.us/CRV/Pages/eCRV.aspx>)

Maloney (City of Shoreview): Shoreview is in its fifth year of response to the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB), we are sharing data with the Department of Agriculture, but not sure who else might be dealing with this. I do know the City of Hastings is now getting an EAB quarantine. In Minnesota we are on the rising part of the curve for EAB and we (at least at the city level) need to know what resources exist for cities and counties dealing with EAB in Minnesota. If EAB touches on what you work with and you know what kinds of tools can be used for that we need to connect for the community those responding to EAB.

Also, I am still trying to find a multiple-jurisdiction highway crash mapping application for multiple jurisdictions, crash data and so on. Highway patrol and local law enforcement agencies maintain different data so it's a challenge to bring it together. Things the amount of damage, injury data at the local level: it is a challenge to create a map showing all the crashes just in our jurisdiction; we are still searching out the best way to compile that data.

Verbick (LOGIS): With our Hennepin County cities, we working actively working on address points data development, management and aggregation, Hennepin County are more involved, they are focused on getting participation from municipal governments, as many members to meet with Hennepin County on implementation of address point editor in our cities in August. Also, I'm happy to report a number of our cities are taking advantage of the MRCC road data specification and are examining it for potential alternate implementation of their road dat.

Kne (University of Minnesota): The U of M is evaluating the development of a large asset management system, a number of proposals being looked at, Dan Sward is the primary contact for that. Another big thing on campus is the 'Pokémon Go' phenomenon, the U of M is major 'hot spot' for that.

Matson (CURA): As the fall semester nears, we'll have students coming in and there are always opportunities to use students for internships. I am working with Andra Bontrager, the new GIS Specialist

at the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy to ramp back up the non-profit GIS users group in the metro, we are compiling a list of non-profit GIS users in the metro and state.

Wilczek (MnDOT): Pass

Kotz (Metropolitan Council): Based on what I heard from Adam Iten, I see the need to reconvene the Address Point group again soon and to work to get those standards out there. I will be reaching out to those of you who are on the Address Work Group, and some of you who may not remember you are on the Address Work Group. Some of you might not be aware of this: the Metropolitan Council has its own police force, the Metro Transit Police; and we are in the process of transitioning from the LETG to the services of LOGIS, who use TriTech, we are using LOGIS for GIS data support and this project functionally extend the geographic coverage of LOGIS to the entire metro region.

Brandt (Washington Co.): We are currently working on getting TriTech set up, it is taking a bit of time to get it rolled out; we are working with our cities to get them on board. Also, our IT Direct, Mjyke Nelson has left Washington County he has taken a position with Dakota County Electric Co-operative; his move creates a spot to fill on the MetroGIS Policy Board. Also, Washington County is working to become a data provider to Google map, as we field so may calls to fix things the public is viewing in Google, we hope to be on their approval list soon.

Ross (MnGeo): I just wanted to re-iterate that we are in the process of working to update the county GIS contact list and to begin to develop a city-level contact list for GIS.

Henry (University of Minnesota): I'll just mention that we've got the second MN2050 infrastructure survey wrapped up; interestingly, it has taken longer to draft the press release than to develop the actual survey itself. We are working closely with the University of Minnesota, and with Len's group at U-Spatial to develop the interactive materials to present the data; having these interactive tools at public meetings really engages the audience and the elected officials that are participating. Infrastructure remains a big issues with a lot of interest.

Knippel (Dakota Co.): I am reporting from two perspectives, as the Chair of the Data Producers Work Group with includes Olmsted County and from Dakota County. Our park and trail project is getting going, this is a collaborative effort among our partner agencies, we have a project charter and we see ourselves modeling this effort off of the method we used for the MRCC project. Dakota County hosted a developer event a few weeks ago; essentially a workshop to get our various staff members connected and to discuss our ability to develop applications and custom widgets and share effort in that arena.

We are also using the dispatch system TriTech through LOGIS and encountering some interesting challenges of getting that together particularly with impedance values, we will continue to work through that.

As was mentioned earlier, we are involved with the recent aerial buy up, we'll be getting the 6" leaf off, and we've also found that we have a need for leaf-on imagery for which we'll also be using the State Master Services Contract. We found this to be really easy to work with, we put in a scope of work to the nine registered vendors and got eight highly competitive responses; very aggressing pricing for the leaf-on imagery proposal. Finally, we are subscribed to the ESRI Community Base Maps program, now that our data is free and open, it's all up in the ESRI system including building foot prints. We were at one

time considering having our own base map, however, now we are now strongly considering just using the Community Base Map instead.

12) Next Coordinating Committee Meeting:

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for **Thursday, October 13, 2016, 1 pm.**

13) Adjourn

Motion to adjourn: Maloney; Second: Carlson.

Chair Dahl adjourned the meeting at 3:13 pm