

MINNESOTA GEOSPATIAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

3/2/2016

Blazing Star Room, Ground Floor, Centennial Office Building, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155

Attendees

Members: Brad Anderson, City of Moorhead; Rob Bigelow, Bolton & Menk, Inc.; Jeffrey Bloomquist, Farm Service Agency; Andra Bontrager, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy; David Brandt, Washington County; Scott Freburg, MN.IT @ Dept. of Education; Kari Geurts, MN.IT @ Dept. of Natural Resources; Len Kne, University of Minnesota; Andrew King-Scribbins, Hennepin County; Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council; John Mackiewicz, WSB & Associates; Philipp Nagel, City of Waseca; Ben Richason, St. Cloud State University; Cory Richter, City of St. Paul; Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County; Dan Ross, MnGeo; Gerry Sjerven, Minnesota Power; Alison Slaats, MN.IT @ Agriculture and Board of Animal Health; Annette Theroux, Pro-West & Associates; Michelle Trager, Rice County.

Non-Members: David Bendickson, MN National Guard; Jim Bunning, MnGeo; Chris Buse, MN.IT Services; Chris Cialek, MnGeo; Mike Dolbow, MnGeo; Brad Henry, University of Minnesota; Mike Koutnik, Esri; Geoff Maas, MetroGIS; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Bart Richardson, MN.IT @ Dept. of Natural Resources; Ron Wencil, U.S. Geological Survey.

[The meeting slides referenced in these minutes are online.](#)

Call to order

Kotz called the meeting to order, then asked for introductions, starting with the three new members. Bontrager and Theroux introduced themselves. New member Ryan Anderson could not attend. Members and other attendees introduced themselves.

Approval of agenda. Kotz asked for approval of the revised agenda, noting that the hard copies are the most current. No additions suggested, **agenda approved.**

Approval of [meeting minutes from 12/2/15](#). Motion passed unanimously.

Review and approval of committee and workgroup summaries

Kotz noted that this is relatively new for this Council. We've agreed that each committee or workgroup should regularly provide a one-page summary, and offer to do a presentation only if they have updates to provide. This way, there is not a lot of discussion on committees and workgroups unless there is an important topic. Kotz asked for any questions or thoughts on the reports. None were offered. **Reinhardt moved to accept the reports, Richter seconded.** Rader noted that there is no report from the Elevation/LiDAR or Hydro Committees, as they are still reevaluating their mission. **Acceptance passed unanimously.**

Kotz noted that there is a guide for committees and workgroups on the MnGeo's Council web page. That guide is currently being updated, as noted in the slide.

Ross elaborated that the new templates are also available, and that we look at these roles and responsibilities every year. MnGeo's legislation specifies that it provides support to the Council, but doesn't specify details on committees. What we're recommending for support and expectations around committees is in the slide. Ross asked the group if there are any other duties that might be expected from workgroups. Kotz noted that he will send this to the committee and workgroup chairs.

Rader pointed out that in the Committee and Workgroup reports, the Emergency Preparedness Committee noted difficulties with meeting space.

Kne offered that the duties seem reasonable, and that the COB cafeteria could be a good meeting space. Reinhardt asked if we should be adding meeting space as a duty for MnGeo to provide. Kotz noted that it was merely noted as a difficulty from one committee. Reinhardt asked if the duties could be amended to provide space if requested. Ross noted that MnGeo is willing to help if we know what the needs are. Reinhardt noted that if we could include that in the list, "Logistical help if requested", and Ross noted that it would be considered.

Parcels and Land Records Committee update

Richardson noted that the Committee was formerly known as the DCDC, for "Digital Cadastral Data Committee". There are sometimes references to DCDC remaining, so be aware of the name change and that it's actually the same Committee. His current request is to formalize and adapt a parcel standard started in 2012. It was on the verge of being accepted, with a public review document out that was commented on.

The new document says "Parcel Data Attribute Standard". It used to be "DCDATS", but again that's still just a reference to the old committee name. The standard effort stalled in 2012 due to the Department of Revenue beginning a PRISM program for collecting tax revenue attributes. At first, it seemed they were the same attributes required in the proposed standard, so the committee saw an opportunity to collaborate.

However, with the slow progress out of Revenue's effort, the Parcel Committee would like to move forward with a standard that isn't tied to PRISM, primarily because Revenue wasn't willing to guarantee an ability to tweak the data to match the standard. Last fall the standard was presented again at GIS-LIS, and now we're looking to have the Standards Committee look at it again.

Richardson noted that the attributes have changed slightly. His prior work at the DNR helped him understand that the proposed standard didn't have enough attribute fields. So, new fields have been added to align with what counties deliver: OWN_ADD_L4 and TAX_ADD_L4. They've also added an "Original PIN" field, in order to be able to call up PIN-based links such as PDFs from County websites. This allows for both a statewide unique PIN and the original PIN.

There have also been an extended number of characters in the address fields. The standards committee will reconvene and look at the standard hopefully for approval this summer.

Geurts asked if the DNR would continue to do a statewide compilation, and Richardson said no. Geurts asked if it was available on the Commons, and Richardson and Ross noted that we'll tackle the data compilation later today. Richardson agreed that a big hurdle for a statewide layer is adopting a standard.

Kotz noted that the standards approval process goes through several steps:

1. A standard is brought to the Committee, which approves it for review. This step has already been done once before, so the revision should be approved for review quickly.
2. The standard is publicized for public review.

3. The Committee and GAC decides whether or not a public review period has been thoroughly address by various stakeholders.
4. Comments from the review are gathered and responded to by the Committee.
5. After review, the Standards Committee works on it again to see if it's ready for the GAC.
6. If it is, that standard can then be approved by the GAC.
7. After that, if necessary, it can go to the state agency GTC for final approval as a state agency standard.

Ross asked if the request from northeast users on a “land owner type” attribute was addressed, and Richardson said it would come in under the comment area, noting that many folks want that. Ross said that the domain for that attribute has already been approved.

Review charter and work plan of the Outreach Committee

Kotz called on Geurts and Kne to present. Kne noted that the Committee has been re-constituted, and two meetings have taken place in the last month. The Charter is fairly brief, but Kne read the mission for awareness – essentially becoming a “relationship building” committee. Geurts added that she hopes everyone has had a chance to review. Kne wants to get the Charter approved so that they can move on to priorities.

Kotz asked Kne to touch on the key points. Kne replied that it will be a Committee of the GAC, looking to promote the priorities of the GAC. For example, identifying stories that highlight the benefits of GIS to the citizens. As a result, hoping to have a toolkit that anyone on the GAC can use to bring those stories to influential groups. The Committee will be a permanent standing committee, reporting to the GAC. Membership is open to the GAC and any other interested citizen.

Members will be responsible for active participation, but membership will not be required for contributions of stories. The Committee itself will be compiling and collecting such stories more than actually writing them. They hope to work on the schedule with online meetings and face-to-face meetings as possible. Meetings will hopefully take place alongside GAC meetings as well as GIS/LIS meetings.

Reinhardt noted that she felt empowered by the morning Committee meeting, as the tools can be used by a staff person to go in front of a policy maker. The Committee can deliver information on how folks can accomplish this, or provide models on how folks can show the value, so the outputs are useful. As a policy maker, she noted that this is very exciting, since staff often don't know how to get the attention of policy makers who make decisions about funding. The first thing that people need to show is the value. This will be a very personal way to do outreach. As soon as you get a champion that sees the value of GIS efforts, it can blossom from there.

Ross said that he will appreciate the efforts from the policy aspect as well. Last year he went before the legislature to talk about the Council, and this formalizes the process for showing the value of the Council. Kotz echoed that this is a productive and useful approach, and that Will Craig once branded this effort the “Stories Committee”. Brandt noted that the free and open data efforts are likely to become part of the Committee, but does it need to be formalized?

Geurts replied that since they were just getting momentum as a committee, taking on all free and open data might be too broad, but the Committee could certainly be a “promotional/marketing arm” of other Committees. Kotz noted that perhaps the Outreach Committee could provide advice to the Council on a recommendation. Geurts said that they could get that on their discussion agendas.

Brandt moved to approve the charter, and Nagel seconded. Koutnik noted that if the committee needs Esri tools for stories, they are available. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Geurts further reported that today's meeting was productive. They worked on a model for how the Committee will be effective and measure success. Key is developing materials and a toolbox, identifying organizations to present the stories to, and figuring out key actions for what we're seeking when we approach organizations. That way we have an understanding of what we're asking for. She called for feedback on the initial focus on four areas of audiences and topics:

- Surveyors
- Open and Free Data
- Aerial Photography
- K-12

Geurts asked for feedback on which area the GAC might want focused on at first, or if there is another area to focus on first. Sjerven noted that based on parcel standards, it seems that it could be added to the list. With a short turnaround, the Outreach Committee could ensure that communications are targeted so that public feedback can be obtained quickly.

Bloomquist said that one option for the Committee would be to showcase various projects around the state. Could we tell the story of projects over time? Geurts agreed, that we could have a toolbox and a story map for different business cases across the state. Kne noted that there are great MN examples, and even good examples from other states. Bloomquist said it can be stated as, "how GIS made a difference in community X". Geurts said it gets overwhelming when you think about collecting all information from everywhere, so can we hone in on something tangible to focus on? Then momentum can be applied elsewhere.

Ross said that Next-Gen 911 already has a good communications plan that can be broadened for this group. For example, newsletters, etc. King-Scribbins noted that even with a good communications plan for NG911, there are still some folks not being reached. There are a lot of GIS groups that the Outreach Committee could distribute information to. Ross noted that maybe the Consortium should have a newsletter again.

Reinhardt noted that the plan talks about the geospatial community, and what we do is getting news to the larger community, and then taking things to the next step of getting things to decision makers. Geurts said that then we have to tailor the toolbox to the targeted audience we're trying to reach. Then, folks can have something concrete to work with.

Anderson said that NG911 does have a great communication plan. Even in the Red River Valley, that even with good data, his area has some work to do to bring things up to speed. It's a high priority, and if they are going to change their datasets, they are going to need some resources to get it done.

Koutnik said that the GAC might want to think about putting out messages to the community, and perhaps there should be a contest. There are all sorts of good stories, if people have an incentive to create stories, then they might be more motivated to provide them.

Bendickson said that the K-12 aspect should be synced with MAGE's (MN Alliance for Geographic Education) efforts, since that group is already going and will have a lot to contribute.

Reinhardt said that she will be a judge at this weekend's "Geo:Code" event, and that is a type of event that is exciting and needs to be advertised. When you bring people together to work on things like this, the excitement spreads.

Ross said that MN.IT and MnGeo are moving toward a GovDelivery tool that hopefully will mean a tool for reaching broader communities. If the stories come in, that might be a tool to distribute them.

Kne recapped: as a committee they'll decide what to do about open data, they'll help out with parcels, and then start gathering stories and think about contests. Geurts added that they are planning an April and a May meeting.

Governance and relationship with the GTC

Kotz noted that there are multiple governing organizations. The GAC is the one for the broad community, and the GTC is a similar group within state government. As we've refined our relationships, we're looking for a "picture" of the relationships. Maas had provided a new diagram to attempt to explain the relationships. (See slides.)

The GAC reports to and gets feedback from the community. Ross noted that the GTC is for state agencies, providing guidance. It only meets when there is something to vote on. It's entirely a policy body at this point, with the exception of a few things. It also decides how we recover costs for services that MnGeo provides. Right now, there is no strong connection between the GAC and the GTC, other than the standards process. Ross asked if there should be a stronger connection? The GAC does more than just policy.

Kotz noted that he is also a member of the GTC. He now thinks that maybe there doesn't need to be a stronger relationship between the GAC and the GTC, although a topic might come up in the future that would change that. He asked if members from state agencies would want to weigh in.

Reinhardt said that there may be times when the GTC and GAC could work on a specific issue, so the GAC could be available to provide input, or could seek input from the GTC. It might be simply acknowledging that there may be times when the two groups need each other. It doesn't really change the lines, other than having awareness.

Slaats noted that she is also on the GTC. Ross noted that as we open up the Geospatial Commons to the broader community, we'll have challenges on how to pay for it, which needs input from both groups. When we think about things like an address standard, once it's approved, we'll recommend that all agencies change to that standard. There are so many different databases for addresses now, all with different designs. He noted that there will be topics like imagery that will go to both groups. He noted that state agencies think about these things differently. Geurts noted that decisions have impact in both directions. Ross agreed with Reinhardt that it's not necessarily about the strength of the relationship, but merely that one exists.

Freburg asked if the GTC has a document repository, and Ross replied that it doesn't, and only policy decisions have come out, and those go to the external MN.IT website that shows standards. But even standards will go through a different process as we look at the Standards Committee.

Geurts noted that right now there are 3 folks on both groups, and Ross said that maybe we should codify that. Geurts noted that maybe we need a liaison beyond the CGIO position. Kotz said maybe that should be a function of one of the state representatives to the GAC.

Reinhardt asked if the GTC is named well, since it's a policy committee. Ross said it is primarily policy, although we talk about major technology investments. The GTC talks about things like bundling services. Ross noted that the diagram seems close, but we should perhaps consider a permanent liaison position between the two.

Koutnik asked, if the GTC also would deal with things like the objectives of state agencies, does there need to be a legislative change for moving things forward? Ross said yes, and that he'll talk about that in the next section.

Break

Sector Reporting Discussion

Kotz noted that in the past, we would communicate about what's going on in our various sectors, and he'd like to discuss how to do that again. That could work well if folks stay within their timeframe of allotted time to present. Another option we could do is a "round table", at introductions – it could be a regular part of introductions. That's being done at MetroGIS; it takes a lot of time, but it is useful for making connections. He asked for the GAC to consider it for future meetings.

Brandt noted that the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee "lightning round" means that you have to keep people focused – it can be tough to moderate. So, while good, it needs to be tightly moderated. Geurts suggested that rather than having everyone do it at every meeting, perhaps at a certain meeting, a certain sector can get a "turn" to do highlights. So, perhaps a rotation could be done. Brandt said that his preference would be an agenda item.

Reinhardt noted that at the Clean Water Council, they have an item for updates (or conflicts). That way, if something is available, the opportunity is there, but it's OK if there isn't anything. For here, is it actually an update from the sector, or from the organization the member is employed by?

Kotz noted that it should specifically be for the sector represented. Sjerven said that with user groups, it's often the last item on the agenda. Then if time remains, it's available for folks to do a round table of updates. The drawback of that is trying to capture those things in minutes if the meeting goes over time. Kotz noted that he would stick to a defined ending time. Kotz noted that he will make an agenda item for the next meeting to try it.

Governor's Geospatial Commendation Award

Ross called on Rader to explain the issue at hand about this award, which dates to the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. Rader noted that the slide shows the MnGeo web page on the award. The bar is set high, as the award isn't given every year. We'd like to move the deadline for submissions up to May 31 (used to be June 30th). There are a lot of steps in the process, and in order to give the award at the fall Consortium Conference, it can be a time crunch. It does take a while to compile information for a nomination, so now is the time to get started.

Ross noted that this should go out in the next GIS/LIS E-announcement, and Sjerven said that it would be good to do that so folks see the shorter deadline. Rader noted that we'll also need a committee each year to review submissions. Kotz called for volunteers now, noting that he chairs the GIS/LIS awards committee and finds it rewarding. Richter, Brandt, Bontrager, King-Scribbins, Mackiewicz, Nagel, and Geurts volunteered, with Geurts offering to chair the group.

MnGeo Image Server governance

Dolbow explained that we need to make decisions on when to *remove* imagery from our WMS service, asking if the group wanted to weigh in on decisions like that. When the service started, we had about 5 layers. Now we're approaching 50. The service will stay free for users, but MnGeo does incur infrastructure costs to host it. It is also a bit confusing for users, as it is cluttered with many layers. Dolbow asked if the group agreed that occasionally layers could be considered for removal from the service (and archived elsewhere), and if perhaps a new committee could make recommendations on removals (and on the Composite Imagery Service) for the GAC to vote on each year.

Kotz asked if there was a group on the Composite service, and Dolbow replied that there was, but it could have broader involvement. Ross noted that it should have wider representation.

Freburg noted that the K12 community will still be using older photography. One of the most popular uses is to create a swipe map of historical imagery. He recommends keeping as much in the WMS as possible.

Brandt noted that they use all years of aerial photography for specific use cases. There are a lot of use cases at the county level where different staff use different years. However, removing non-high resolution collections might be acceptable.

Kotz noted that we have to remember that MnGeo is an organization with limited resources, and that's just a reality, so it's good to make informed decisions about it. Many hands were raised when Kotz asked if people in the organization use the service. Kotz asked Dolbow to form a recommendation group. Ross asked for additional volunteers, and Bloomquist, Slaats, Theroux, Bigelow, and Wencil volunteered. (Geurts suggested also talking to Zeb Thomas from DNR.)

Mackiewicz asked if a tiled service would be in scope, and Dolbow said not initially. Kne asked if the audience for the service is everyone or just state agencies, and Ross said it's everyone. He wants to continue to fund the service for the community, but we just need some guidance. It seems like we get new imagery from somewhere every year, and with higher resolutions, we're seeing large increases in storage space required. 6-inch collections are very large.

Kotz said that MnGeo needs to figure out how to finance the Geospatial Commons over time. From his perspective, if he's going to help contribute to efforts like this, it's easier if he has a compelling argument that it meets a business need for his organization. Kotz sees that the benefit from the WMS service is more easily described in "dollars and cents" to decision makers than is the Commons.

Koutnik said that more and more field inspection work is being eliminated because photography is allowing for more work to be done in the office. This could be an interesting business story to highlight.

Slaats asked that the group should have usage information to make decisions, both in terms of which layers get used the most, and which ones cost how much on disk space. If the main driver is not just reducing clutter but keeping costs stable, how does that factor in? Koutnik said that inspections could be caught up as a benefit to offset costs. Kotz noted that that is an argument for imagery in general. He said some organizations have the ability to host imagery, others don't.

Richter noted that aerial photos don't always help with field inspections. It can only reduce some of the work. Dolbow agreed to form a committee from the volunteers and present recommendations.

Legislative updates

[Note: portions of the following section have been clarified post-meeting by MN.IT @ DNR's Time Loesch. -Ed]

Ross noted that Tim Loesch had provided information on the Vegetation Buffer initiative for us to review. DNR has been working closely with local governments that have digital data. MN.IT @ DNR staff are working hard to integrate that data into DNR hydrographic data. Once integrated the maps will be reviewed by counties for accuracy, then appear on the DNR's public web page. Loesch encourages folks to follow the DNR web page for updates.

For Ditch Authorities that don't have digital data on ditches, they have to be created, which can be a huge effort. To expedite this process MN.IT @ DNR staff have developed a set of tools to make this task easier. Most of the

public ditches exist in DNR's data but are not identified as Public Ditches. The tools developed allow the Ditch Authorities to identify Public Ditches either by selecting a set of existing linework or by adding new lines where existing linework does not exist or does not accurately represent the location of the ditch. The DNR intends to share that information back to the Ditch Authorities and to BWSR.

Reinhardt asked if the reported number of local governments was a number that represented who actually has data, or who has actually submitted data, and Geurts replied that it represents who has submitted it. Reinhardt also asked that since the Governor has said he won't require enforcement on private ditches, will the mapping include all ditches? Ross said his understanding that the scope will be all public ditches excluding all private ditches. Reinhardt said that it's critical to have all records for a complete map if we can get it; the enforcement side shouldn't drive the map collection. Ross and Geurts agreed with Reinhardt's opinion, but noted that private ditches simply won't be included under the current scope.

Brandt asked if the DNR was reaching out to counties, and Geurts said the effort is taking place. Brandt said they're ready to supply data. Trager said that communications sometimes go to soil & water contacts, so sometimes the GIS contact isn't aware of the request. Geurts said she would relay that information to Loesch. Ross and Geurts noted that the initial outputs will not necessarily be available to everyone, since the initial review goes to specific groups.

Ross also noted that in the Clean Water Legacy bill, there is language to provide data to a Clearinghouse, which no longer exists. So, we are currently looking at replacing that with the Commons (or something less specific), and to strengthen sharing language. In the past only metadata has been required to publish, and we're pushing to actually get the data published as well. We'll ask this committee to communicate about changes to the language. Ross has been instructed to create language, work with the community to get input, and then craft it for the next legislative session (2017). This is one way for the GAC to influence policy.

Parks and Trails

Ross continued, noting there are two projects for parks & trails of regional significance, one formerly under the U of M, but both are now under guidance of the DNR. The first project is an app to facilitate discovery of parks and trails, simply being able to discover them and learn more via links. So, it's not trying to consolidate the information, but instead trying to create a gateway for discovery of existing information.

The second project is the legislature wanting to track how Legacy money is being spent on parks & trails – they know how, but now they want to know where. This is because they want to look at how to build out complementary systems. So, an app for tracking the grants will facilitate that, and will come with a statewide standard for parks & trails. These are two separate projects, but related.

Reinhardt said that for tracking grants, there are questions about supplementing vs. supplanting existing funds with Legacy grants. She noted that it can be a big issue – if state funds are reduced, and Legacy funds are expected to backfill shortages, it's controversial. We should keep in mind that such applications can be used in different ways.

Ross noted that there are not yet web resources on these specific projects. Rader asked if the standard would go to the Standards Committee, and Ross said it would, especially talking to DNR, Met Council, and MN parks & trails commission.

National Geospatial Data Act

Ross noted that Senator Cotton from Arkansas joined as a sponsor of the act, but it likely won't be acted on during this Congress. In future sessions, we may also ask the GAC to help support this act.

Updates on major initiatives

Next Generation 9-1-1

Ross relayed efforts on Next Gen 911 as shown in the slide. There are efforts on data readiness, a data repository, and data standards. The slide shows the general schedule for the effort in 2016.

Standards are being addressed one at a time, starting with centerlines. The required layers are shown in slides as well. Some data pieces had to be created, such as PSAP boundaries. There are some counties that share PSAPs, and there are other areas that have one PSAP serving multiple counties. Everything except for the Red Lake area has been compiled for Emergency Service boundaries. Gaps and overlaps that have been identified will be returned to the PSAPs for resolution.

The slides also showed synchronization of 911 data, such as Master Street Address Guide (MSAG), Automatic Location Information (ALI), and English Language Translation (ELT) datasets.

For standards, we've compared other states and NENA standards, so a new version "1.0" will be a starting point, which will change over time. There are several approval levels for those standards to go through, not just the GAC. The goal is to have standards completed by the end of the calendar year.

MnGeo Priority Projects

Drainage Records

Ross said this project is on schedule. The primary focus is to provide a template for drainage record data collection and an updated guideline for completing the data. This is different than DNR's buffer effort. The "standard template", can be leveraged as a data model that can be used to get records from paper to digital form. We're also working to identify two counties to get into the template and publish on the Geospatial Commons. The template itself will also be available in the Commons.

Koutnik asked what the relationship was between this effort and DNR's effort, and Ross said that they are only related in the sense of the long term products. Right now the efforts are very separate. Koutnik asked if we were still talking about the same features on the ground, and Ross said yes, but the model could apply to all ditches, not just public.

Geospatial Commons

Dolbow relayed progress on the Commons, including efforts to get records harvested by data.gov at the federal level. Geurts asked if non-spatial data could be published on the Commons, and Dolbow replied that the publisher documentation identifies when tabular data can be included: whenever a foreign key to spatial data can link the table, or if the records can be geocoded such as addresses. Bontrager asked about efforts to coordinate with Minnesota's state open data site, and Rader and Buse replied that it was created due to a legislative mandate.

Aerial Imagery Master Contract

Ross relayed the progress for this contract. We just issued the first work order under this contract, for the Met Council. There will be additional work orders on separate local buy-ups. The cost savings are between 50-60% for counties that come in under a master contract like this. It's open to other states that may also use it. The effort is already starting to pay dividends. Any cooperative purchasing partner can work off the contract. Nine vendors are now approved.

Parcels

Ross noted that MnGeo has collected parcels from about 45 counties. The standard is moving forward, and we have a new Student Worker that will be working on aggregating the data we've collected. Geurts asked if the normalization process was similar to what DNR did, and Dolbow and Ross said that it was, with a goal to try and automate it as much as possible via Python scripting.

Centerlines

Ross reported that centerline initiatives have been rolled into NG911 efforts. DOT still has their own instance of roads, and as roads come from both DOT and local agencies, MnGeo will merge them and make them available for NG911 needs. DOT has agreed to a single geography for each centerline in Minnesota, and they will work with every county to agree on where the common connection points are. They've identified three counties to work with to pilot that. The goal is to have that done for northeast and metro by the end of the year.

Address Points

Also under NG911, we'll come up with one standard, although it will be broader and for more than just NG911. Ross noted that we're comparing models right now, gathering data, and trying to evaluate it against the needs.

Slaats asked about address points in rural areas – will they just be center points of parcels? Ross replied that some are parcel centroids, some are entrance points from the road (driveway), and others are rooftop. The standards group will have to discuss whether or not placement is important, as each provider sees it differently. In greater Minnesota, they are discussing potentially a need for multiple points where residences and businesses have long driveways. In urban areas, the discussion is around sub-addresses where many points can be stacked up in one place. Kotz noted that placement is an open question, and that MetroGIS has provided an attribute to denote where it was placed.

Announcements or other business

Kotz called for announcements. Trager noted that GIS/LIS Spring Workshops are being set up for May 19th at the U of M. The group is also looking at remote locations as done in prior years. Registration should be available by early April.

Freburg noted that a mapping competition is taking place this spring for grades 6-8 and 9-12. Announcements are coming out tomorrow, and there will be cash prizes. The GIS/LIS Conference will again have an educator day this fall.

Ross noted that the Upper Midwest (UM) GeoCon conference is coming up in May in LaCrosse, WI.

Brandt noted that Geo:Code 2.0 is happening this weekend, and is at capacity. King-Scribbins noted that last year it was focused on Hennepin County and was a very traditional hackathon, but this year there will be additional tracks for folks to come and learn as well as hack. Ross noted that MN.IT Commissioner Tom Baden will provide opening remarks.

Sjerven said that if there was interest in doing a hackathon or something similar at the GIS/LIS Conference this year or in future years, the Consortium is willing to look at that.

Kne noted that two apps have been released by the U in the past two weeks. The first is a solar application that is now available on the Department of Commerce website for solar installers and homeowners to use. It is at mn.gov/solarapp, and will eventually be hosted by MnGeo. The second app is a tool called the MN Infrastructure Stress tool. It allows infrastructure at a city level to be viewed, in terms of drinking water and wastewater

treatment. It's meant as a policy tool, and is hosted on the State Auditor's website. It is all data from MN Departments of Health and PCA, digitized for the map.

Sjerven noted that by next meeting, the call for presentations for the GIS/LIS Conference will have gone out and likely be closed. The fall Conference will be later this year, October 26-28th.

Kotz adjourned the meeting.