

## Standards Committee Meeting

October 25, 2018, 1 pm – 4 pm  
Metro County Government Center  
2099 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101



## Meeting Minutes

*Minutes prepared and submitted by Vice Chair Andra Mathews and Chair Geoff Maas*

### Item 1 – Call to Order

*Chair Maas called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.*

### Item 2 – Welcome and Roll Call

*Chair Maas welcomed the members and called the roll, in attendance were:*

Andra Mathews, MCEA (vice chair)  
Norman Anderson, MnGeo  
Victor Barnett, Ramsey County  
Marcia Broman, MESB  
Alan Laumeyer, Goodhue County  
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council  
Chad Riley, Carver County  
Bart Richardson, MnDNR  
Akiko Nakamura, Department of Public Safety  
Geoff Maas, MetroGIS (chair)

Participating via conference call:  
John Nerge, City of Brooklyn Park  
Heather Albrecht, City of Maple Grove

### Item 3 – Approve Meeting Agenda for October 25, 2018

*Motion: Mathews, Second: Kotz, no discussion, unanimous approval*

### Item 4 – Approve Meeting Minutes from September 25, 2018 Conference Call

*Motion: Kotz, Second: Barnett, no discussion, unanimous approval*

### Item 5a – Modification of Standards Development Flow Chart

*Maas offered a revised version of the current flow chart (v. 1.3) and recommended the removal of processes and actions that are beyond the ambit of the Geospatial Advisory Council and the Standards Committee, namely the usage and approval of standards for state government specific purposes. Revision of the flow chart would be re-versioned as v. 1.4 and replace the existing chart on the Standards Committee website.*

*Motion: Barnett, Second: Broman, no discussion, unanimous approval*



**Action:** *Maas will submit an updated version of the flow chart, as a PDF document to Nancy Rader to be posted on the Standards Committee website.*

### **Item 5b – Approve Revision to Standard Introductory Language**

*Kotz provided some background on the descriptive material that prefaces the standards and provided a revised version which better illustrates the role of the GAC, role of the Standards Committee and the role of the standards produced and approved by those bodies. Kotz asked that this revised language be applied to the preface of each standard (both approved and in development).*

*Motion: Broman, Second: Richardson, no discussion, unanimous approval*



**Action:** *Mark Kotz will apply the approved language to all version of adopted and draft standards in progress and submit updated copies to Nancy Rader for posting on the Standards Committee website.*

### **Item 6 – Approve Revisions to Inclusion Language**

*Kotz presented the updated version of the 'Inclusion' category language used in the standards. The Committee at its past meetings had decided it needed to re-work the terms and definitions to better explain to the stakeholder community. Kotz provided the revised language for each of the four inclusion categories.*

#### ***Inclusion***

*Inclusion is a term used to explain the requirement for a field to be populated in a dataset to comply with the standard. Four types of inclusion are possible: Mandatory, Conditional, If Available, and Optional.*

#### ***Mandatory***

*Field must be populated for each record to be compliant with the standard. Null values are not allowed.*

#### ***Conditional***

*Each field must be populated with a non-null value for each record that is applicable to the feature or for which a specified condition exists.*

#### ***If Available***

*Field must be populated if the data exists in the data provider's database.*

*Motion to approve new language and their use in the existing and forthcoming standards:*

*Motion: Mathews, Second: Riley, no discussion, unanimous approval*



**Action:** *Mark Kotz will apply the revised, Committee-approved language to all versions of adopted and draft standards, as well as to provide revised and relevant examples of their usage (e.g. Address example, Parcel example, Road Centerline example) with each standard.*

### **Item 7 – Approve all standards domains to a single spread sheet;**

*As per the tasks assigned from the July 18, 2018 meeting, Kotz and Krumrie prepared a complete spreadsheet document of values relevant to the existing adopted and forthcoming standards. This is intended to facilitate a centralized place where this data can be accessed, maintained and published. The eventual destination of this resource will be from both the Geospatial Commons as well as the Standards Committee website. This will necessitate the creation and maintenance of a metadata record for the resource.*

*Bart Richardson expressed an interest in the resource also being made available as a geodatabase (.gdb) for ease of immediate integration into GIS work, the group agreed this would be desirable and should also be available.*

*Marcia Broman asked about long-term maintenance and upkeep of the domain resource. At present Mark Kotz has taken on de facto maintenance of the resource (e.g. updating the list as changes are advanced and approved, however, he indicated that discussion and decision by the Standards Committee must occur before any change is applied to the domain resource). Mathews agreed to be another resource for amending and updating the spreadsheet as needed. Maas noted that in the forthcoming governance documents for Standards Committee we should develop some language to address and formalize the issues of stewardship, change management, expansion and review of the domain dataset.*

*Motion for approval of all domains to be centralized and updated as needed as a single resource  
Motion: Richardson, Second: Mathews, no additional discussion, unanimous approval.*

### **Item 8a – Approve Changes to Domain Tables**

*In response notification of errors and omissions received from the stakeholders, changes, updates and revisions to some existing domains are needed. Review and approval by the Standards Committee is needed for them to take effect.*

*These include the following:*

- Domain:** County Code  
**Change:** *Added non-Minnesota counties around Minnesota's border, addition of Out of Jurisdiction value – (Out of Jurisdiction only valid in the forthcoming road centerline standard)*  
**Impacts:** *Address Point Data Standard, Parcel Data Transfer Standard*

**Domain:** County Name  
**Change:** Added non-Minnesota counties around Minnesota's border, addition of Out of Jurisdiction value – (Out of Jurisdiction only valid in the road centerline standard)  
**Impacts:** Address Point Data Standard, Parcel Data Transfer Standard

**Domain:** CTU ID Text  
**Change:** Removed Census Bureau defined unorganized territories; Added a generic Unorganized Territory value; Added OOJ – Out of Jurisdiction which is valid only for the forthcoming Road Centerline Standard  
**Impacts:** Address Point Data Standard, Parcel Data Transfer Standard

**Domain:** CTU Name  
**Change:** Removed Census Bureau defined unorganized territories; Added a generic Unorganized Territory value; Added OOJ – Out of Jurisdiction which is valid only for the forthcoming Road Centerline Standard  
**Impacts:** Address Point Data Standard, Parcel Data Transfer Standard

**Domain:** PSAP Code  
**Change:** Changed the phrasing of the values (often adding "PSAP"); Changed OLMS, Olmsted County to R/OLM, Rochester/Olmsted PSAP; Added OOJ - Out of Jurisdiction; Removed MTKA - Minnetonka Police Department  
**Impacts:** Address Point Data Standard, Parcel Data Transfer Standard

**Domain:** ESN  
**Change:** New domain added to the Address Point Data Standard  
**Impacts:** Address Point Data Standard

**Domain:** MSAG Community  
**Change:** Changed the value of "OOJ" to "Out of Jurisdiction"; added the following communities: Derryname Twp, Lanesburgh Twp, Livonia Twp, Tyrone Twp  
**Impacts:** Address Point Data Standard

**Domain:** Non-Standard Parcel Status  
**Change:** New domain added to Parcel Data Transfer Standard  
**Impacts:** Parcel Data Transfer Standard

**Domain:** Subaddress Type  
**Change:** Added additional new values: kiosk and tract  
**Impacts:** Parcel Data Transfer Standard

**Domain:** Watershed District  
**Change:** Added two missing values:  
Vadnais Lake Area WMO and Eagan-Inver Grove Heights WMO  
Remove an extra space in Upper Rum River WMO; and,  
updated the name of (Vermilion/Vermillion) River WMO  
**Impacts:** Parcel Data Transfer Standard

Approval is requested by the Standards Committee. Changes of this type do not require the additional approval of the Geospatial Advisory Council..

Mathews noted that five of the domains listed were not available in the materials provided and agreed to work with Kotz to ensure all domains are present in the final document. Broman indicated that some of these values are also needed for the forthcoming Road Centerline standard as well.

Motion for approval of all domains to be centralized and updated as needed as a single resource  
Motion: Richardson, Second: Barnett, no additional discussion, unanimous approval.



**Action:** Kotz/Mathews to ensure full set of domains are included in the next iteration of the domain resource. Final version to be sent to Nancy Rader for publication on the Standards Committee website and to the Commons when metadata is complete.

### Item 8b – Values representing School District code

There has been confusion about the standard format for school district identifiers in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard. Existing formats in use within the Minnesota Department of Education include the following: 01-37, 01-0037, 1-37, 37-01, 0037-01

Kotz indicated he had been in contact with Scott Freburg at the Department of Education and that while there is no official format in use even within the Department of Education, he advised the use of the format "00-0000" (e.g. 01-0037) and that he would advocate for the use of that format within the Department of Education. Laumeyer indicated that the Department of Revenue may have codes for the districts that they receive directly from the county assessor's offices.

Motion for approval of the 00-0000 format for school district codes to be carried forward until a better or official solution is advanced. Motion: Barnett, Second: Riley, no additional discussion, unanimous approval.

#### Actions:



Riley and Laumeyer to examine what kinds of data are coming out of county CAMA systems for school district codes. Anderson found and provided the educational codes used by the Department of Revenue.

## **Item 8c – Additional changes requiring discussion and decision**

*Two additional changes to domains have been requested by Hennepin County that require discussion by the Standards Committee.*

### **Item #1 - In domain tables that include the CTU Name**

*Change “Fort Snelling Unorganized Territory” to just “Fort Snelling”.*

*Group discussion: In the standards to date, cities are not indicated as 'cities', however, 'townships' are noted as townships, this is done as there numerous examples where a city and a township share the same name and it is important to be able to differentiate between them.*

*The notable example is Fort Snelling, which is an unorganized territory. It is the only unorganized territory in the metro region and the term 'Fort Snelling' is generally used. The challenge is as we move to a statewide standard for representing these features, we need to think about consistency among all similar values.*

*Barnett: From our earlier discussion, there is a need for applying names to the other unorganized territories around the state. Also, Fort Snelling is unique due to the influence of the airport commission, even if there is no city or township government in place.*

*Broman: In the 9-1-1 world we validate against the CTU Name (e.g. 'Fort Snelling') so dropping or including the unorganized territory label won't disrupt our process appreciably.*

*Kotz: There might be an opportunity to include a CTU Type Domain field, that clearly indicates City, Township, Unorganized Territory.*

*Group discussion: approval to include a CTU Type Domain field to the Domain Tables. Committee can formally approve the revised Domain Tables with the addition at its next meeting.*

*Motion for approval for carrying City, Township, Unorganized Territory in its own column in the Domain Tables.*

*Motion: Barnett, Second: Broman no additional discussion, unanimous approval.*

### **Action:**



***Kotz, as acting steward of the Domain Tables, to add a City, Township, Unorganized Territory field to the tables.***

***Item #2 - In the Watershed District domain, add the value of “None”***

*It has been reported that some parcels are not within a watershed district service area in the metro (and this is certainly true in large parts of Greater Minnesota) and that a 'None' or equivalent value is needed.*

*Kotz: None of our current domains have a 'None' value, except if it is in an Optional field. If the watershed district were to be left as NULL, you would not know if it was not in a watershed district or simply not populated. With that, would we add 'None' to all Optional fields as an option, or just as a business need arises?*

*Riley: Also, this could be a function of the data coming out of the tax records; if so might this also apply to the school district data as well?*

*Mathews: Are we set on specifically using 'None', versus other alternatives such as 'No Value', 'Not Assigned', 'Not Applicable' and so on?*

*Group discussion: 'None' is appropriate for this instance; this Committee will need to look at other revisions on case-by-case and under a situation-specific lens to ensure the meaning of the value applied fits the use and context.*

*Motion for the inclusion of 'None' as a valid value in the Watershed District domain.*

*Motion: Richardson, Second: Laumeyer, no additional discussion, unanimous approval.*

## **Item 9 – Approve Proposed Changes to Address Point Data Standard**

*In response to prior discussions in Standards Committee meetings, minor changes are proposed to the Address Point Data Standard. These changes are minor and would not require either a public review or the formal review or approval of the Geospatial Advisory Council.*

*Motion for the modification of the Address Point Data Standard including:*

- *A revision of both the introductory language and inclusion category language;*
- *Improve the description of the Unique Without Subaddresses element to make it clearer;*
- *Change Lifecycle Status domain table name to Lifecycle Status Address to distinguish it from a similar domain table for roads;*

*Motion: Barnett Second: Laumeyer, no additional discussion, unanimous approval.*

### **Actions:**



*Kotz, as acting steward of the documents of the Standards Committee, to apply the changes to the document and update the version number accordingly. Updated documents to be sent to Nancy Rader for publication on website.*



*Maas/Mathews to present changes to GAC during their update at its upcoming 12/5/2018 meeting.*



*Standards Committee (Maas/Mathews) to include notice to statewide stakeholder community of these minor modifications to the Address Point Data Standard.*

## **Item 10 – Approve Proposed Changes to Parcel Data Transfer Standard**

*The Seven Metropolitan Counties are presently transitioning their quarterly parcel data update from the original Metro Parcel Data Standard to the newly adopted statewide Parcel Data Transfer Standard. In this transition, they have noted several items that require the attention of the Standards Committee.*

### **#1 – Non-standard parcels that do not have a PIN or Tax Payer Name.**

*There are instances where there are parcels that do not have a formally assigned PIN or Taxpayer Name. These non-standard parcels include things such as dedications of right-of-way, parcels encompassing water bodies (in part or in whole) or other non-standard situations where parcels exist but their attribution is incomplete, or not known or special situations apply.*

*As PIN and Taxpayer Name could both legitimately not be applied to parcels (such as the examples above), the inclusion category needs to be changed from Mandatory to Conditional for both attributes. However, if PIN and Taxpayer Name are unpopulated, additional contextual data needs to be included.*

*Group discussion: This change would then also apply to both County PIN and State PIN fields (and Non-Standard Parcel Status, and Taxpayer Name respectively) to become conditional and have required supplemental attributes (polygon point relationship and nonstandard parcel status) applied to provide explanation.*

### **#2 – Addition of a new field to the Parcel Data Transfer Standard: Non-Standard Parcel Status**

With the elements County PIN, State PIN and Taxpayer Name changed to Conditional, a new attribute explaining the non-standard parcel status needs to be created. This would be the **Non-Standard Parcel Status** field. This field also needs a domain of values to reflect the various cases of non-standard parcel behavior.

Basic information about the new attribute:

Element Number:	4.58
Name:	Non-Standard Parcel Status
Database name:	N_STANDARD
Type:	Integer
Width:	Short



Inclusion Category: Conditional  
Domain: Non-Standard Parcel Status (see proposed values below)

Description: *This field is used to provide more information when a record is included in the dataset that is not a standard tax parcel. Such records might not have a unique PIN assigned by the county and/or might not have many attributes populated. This is typically used when the dataset contains things like rights-of-way deeded to the public. Some counties assign PINs to these polygons and some do not. This field must be populated if this record does not include a PIN.*

Domain values (draft):

CODE	VALUE
10	Condominium Common Area
11	Right-of-way
12	Easement
13	Ownership Unknown
14	Gap between parcel boundary descriptions
15	Water Body
16	Ditch
17	Walkway
18	Preliminary parcel where PIN has not yet been assigned
98	Other non-parcel feature
99	Unspecified non-parcel feature

*Richardson: We should give a 'heads up' to the Parcels and Land Records Committee and put this out for brief public review to ensure inclusion of possible values for the field.*

*Motion to approve recategorizing the Inclusion Category of County PIN, State PIN and Taxpayer Name to Conditional, and to add a new field to the Parcel Data Transfer Standard called Non-Standard Parcel Status with an accompanying domain of values and to put this revision of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard out for a minimum 30-day public review period and submit a copy to the Parcels and Land Records Committee.*

*Motion: Mathews, Second: Richardson, no additional discussion, unanimous approval.*

**Actions:**



***Kotz to revise the Parcel Data Transfer Standard document to reflect the accepted changes;***



*Maas/Mathews to coordinate a 30-day public review period for the revised parcel data standard and ensure the Parcels and Land Records Committee is provided a copy.*

*<< At this time in the meeting, the Standards Committee took a 15-minute break >>*

## **Item 11 – Completion of Public and Stakeholder Comments Review and Discussion for MRCS v. 0.5**

*At its prior meetings, the Standards Committee was unable to complete its review and discussion of all the stakeholder comments received during the public review session during the first half of 2018. The following notes outline the final discussion and decisions of the Committee in response to the comments received and their influence on the next version of the forthcoming road centerline standard.*

### **Elements 5.1 and 5.2 - Elevation To/From**

*After discussion, the Committee decided to maintain the Inclusion Category as Mandatory and to encourage the use of '0' (e.g. integer 'zero') as the preferred default setting.*

*The '0' represents 'at grade' (ground level). The group discussed if there were any risks to using '0' as a default as some grade-separated intersections might be missed.*

*Barnett: The risks would be minimal in using the default '0'.*

*Information from the metro's MRCC Best Practices Guide (pp. 26-34) will be added to the next public outreach effort on the MRCS to help communicate the value and usage of this attribute to the entire stakeholder community.*



*Maas to include relevant information from the Elevation attributes taken from the MRCC Best Practices materials in next stakeholder review for MRCS*

### **Element 5.3 – One Way**

*The Committee discussed the various use cases and scenarios surrounding the Speed Limit, and Impedance and their continued inclusion and description in the MRCS.*

*Group discussion regarding use cases for differences between 'one-way' attribute used in conjunction with 'speed limit' being conditional versus mandatory and how routing and modeling scenarios need both to function effectively.*

*Barnett: I feel the current definition of Impedance in the MRCS is not correct.*

Current definition: “The maximum possible safe speed in miles per hour (MPH) at which the road centerline could carry an emergency service vehicle or the impedance value used for controlling Computer Aided Dispatch.”

*Barnett: We should consider potentially removing the Impedance Speed and keeping Speed Limit and possibly changing its definition. Definition could include posted speed or at minimum the speed listed in the statute as a default.*

*Group discussion: Speed Limit definitions have the potential to change over the length of a segment or temporally (e.g. during school hours, speed limit is 15 MPH, when school is out of session, it goes back up to 30 MPH). How do we determine a suitable baseline speed limit to be carried on an unbroken segment? Speed limit variations on a segment are more effectively handled in an LRS (linear referencing system) scenario, as this does not necessitate breaking the geometry. We could use an average, or the speed limit that is more than half of the segment as a proxy.*

*Group discussion: If we change Speed Limit to 'If Available' should we also change the inclusion category of 'Impedance' to 'If Available' as well?*

*Barnett: At least one of the attributes should be mandatory. Speed limit is the more useful of the two, however, we need to change the definition to specify 'posted speed or default statutory speed' and provide some guidance to the community on this. On thinking about this, we should probably set Speed Limit as Mandatory and if we retain Impedance, provide more clarity on it and have it set at 'If Available'.*

*Laumeyer: Do we need a domain of speed limit values? I suspect we should include additional discussion about alleys and other special street designations in our discussion.*

*Barnett: No, a domain would not be appropriate for speed limit since it's a number. Local jurisdictions can set it as they see fit within the law.*

*Richardson: As a general point, if an emergency vehicle can drive on it, it should be probably be included in our road system.*

*Maas: In our metro park and trail data we are examining the potential of topologically relating trails to the road data. This is important but just out of scope for today's tasks.*



***Kotz to recategorize Speed Limit as 'Mandatory' and Impedance as 'If Available' in the MRCS v. 0.6***



*Barnett/Maas to research and describe speed limit, impedance and the relevant statute language for the context of the MRCS; to include findings in materials to be part of next public review outreach package.*

### **Element 6.1 – Change the title of Route Name to Route Abbreviation**

*The Committee agreed that as abbreviations are in use for this attribute it should be changed to reflect its content.*

Name: Route Abbreviation  
Database Name: ROUTE\_ABBR

### **Element 7.7 – Validation Error (VERROR\_911)**

*The Committee agreed that as the standard starts being utilized it will explore how to refine and define this attribute.*

*Current definition: This attribute is used as a flag to indicate a known 911 validation error that has yet to be resolved. If 'Yes' is chosen, then an explanation is required in the comments field. 'No' indicates there are no 911 validation errors for this feature. 'Unknown' indicates the feature has not been tested for 911 validation errors. Nulls are allowed for this attribute.*

*Note: If 'Yes' is chosen an explanation for the error is required in the COMMENTS field.*

### **Element 8.1 – Lifecycle Status**

*The Committee discussed the merits of reducing the domain values down to just three.*

*Barnett: Ramsey County currently only uses three values. We might consider simplifying this, as using things like 'retired streets' can impact topology checks and have implications for networking.*

*Riley: Our stakeholders could potentially be affected by the changes in road status, such as utilities. There is value in having a range of options available, perhaps defining them more clearly and keeping the relevant categories in the standard for the data producers.*

*Maas: I can do some digging on clearer definitions for these, and perhaps let the stakeholders have a crack at them as well.*



*Maas to research, document and present better definitions of each of the terms in the Lifecycle Status domain for the stakeholder community.*

### **Element 8.6 – Source of Data**

*There is a bit of a contradiction between the SOURCE field as used in the Address Point Data Standards and the MRCS. The element's data field name and definition are same as that of 7.4 Source of Data (SOURCE) in the Address Point Data Standard v. 1.1, however, the different examples used show a different intent. Keeping the element and data field names the same may cause confusion for those using both [the address point and centerline] standards.*

*The MRCS v 0.5 currently includes a domain for Source*

*The Address Point Data Standard v 1.1, does not include a domain for Source.*

*Group discussion: Is this field in the MRCS simply supposed to be GIS 911 POC?*

*Barnett/Broman: Very likely, yes, it is. We will do some digging and make a recommendation on the potential treatment of this. The evolution of this in the context of the Address Point Data Standard is not consistent with the MRCS field.*



***Broman/Barnett to research the alignment of the Source of Data/GIS\_911\_POC attribute and bring their findings back to the Committee for further discussion.***

### **Elements 9.1 and 9.2 - Functional Class (Federal and Metro)**

*As these data are not maintained by cities or counties (i.e. local sources do not populate this attribute), the proposal is to remove these elements from the MRCS.*

*The Metropolitan Council (in the metro) and MnDOT (in Greater Minnesota) are the sources for the Functional Class data. Agencies who maintain Functional Class classifications can post the data as a related table or a derivative data layer.*

*Group discussion and decision: Unanimous agreement on removing both functional class elements from the MRCS.*



***Kotz to remove Elements 9.1 and 9.2 from the MRCS documentation.***

### **Elements 9.3 – Surface Type**

*Group discussion: A 'Minimum Maintenance Road' is not a 'surface type', it is a reflection of a maintenance action. Any non-paved road category may be considered a minimum maintenance road, so that designation can be extrapolated from the listed surface type.*

The Committee agreed to add the following values to the domain: Aggregate, Oiled and Brick.

Riley: There still would be value in carrying 'Minimum Maintenance Road' somewhere in the standard, perhaps in another attribute.



**Kotz to add values to the Surface Type domain in the MRCS documentation.**



**Riley to investigate a suitable place in the standard to carry the 'Minimum Maintenance Road' designation.**

#### **Elements 9.4 – Road Class**

MnDOT Road Classifications (carried in St MnDOT Route System) TIGER Road Class definitions (carried in Road Class domain) vary a lot; this might not be a useful field for some uses, however, getting the two-digit MnDOT route system in place would be most valuable.

The Committee agreed to remove it for now, and if it comes back that it is vitally needed we will add it back into the MRCS.



**Kotz to remove Element 9.4 from the MRCS documentation**

#### **Non-Attribute-Specific Comments:**

The Committee reviewed the non-attribute-specific comments that were collected from the stakeholder review; these are cataloged in the Alignment Document available here:

[https://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/roadcenterline/MRCS\\_v\\_0\\_5\\_PublicComments\\_AlignmentDocument.pdf](https://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/roadcenterline/MRCS_v_0_5_PublicComments_AlignmentDocument.pdf)

The Committee discussed and agreed to the following changes, revisions and inclusions:

- A better definition and examples of 'parity' are needed for next round of public input;
- Clearer definitions of the four inclusion categories will be provided in the next round of public input;
- Additional fields such as snow plow routes, while useful, are out of scope for the current iteration of the MRCS;
- Minnesota data producers not attributing any data related to Canada or its provinces. These would be categorized as 'Out of Jurisdiction' or as special cases apply.



*Maas to research and provide better examples of 'parity' as it relates to the MRCS.*

### **Re-visiting the "MnDOT Elements"**

*The following elements contain information related to data that originates from MnDOT or relates to comparing locally sourced data against MnDOT data. MnDOT's needs for roadway data are linked to its extensive use of Linear Referencing Systems and Dynamic Segmentation. After the review and discussion of the various 'MnDOT' elements, the following modifications to the MRCS have been advanced:*

#### *Element 1.1 – ROUTE\_ID*

- *Field width expanded to **18 characters***
- *Inclusion category changed to **Optional***
- *Better explanation of the attribute is to be provided in the next public review period to the stakeholder community*

#### *Element 2.1 – ROUTE\_SYS*

- *Inclusion category to remain as **Mandatory***
- *MnDOT domain of values determined to be suitable for MRCS usage*
- *MnDOT and local agencies to continue to negotiate how segments are categorized using these values*

#### *Element 2.2 – ROUTE\_DIR*

- *Inclusion category changed to **Optional***
- *Better explanation of the attribute is to be provided in the next public review period to the stakeholder community*
- *This is a MnDOT indicator of whether route mileage increases or decreases with the direction of the segment.*

#### *Element 2.3 – DIR\_RTE\_ID (Directional Route ID)*

- *This was removed from the MRCS; it is a concatenation of other fields*

#### *Element 2.3 (Formerly 2.4) – LOC\_STATE (Local to State)*

- *Inclusion category changed to **Optional***
- *Better explanation of the attribute is to be provided in the next public review period to the stakeholder community*
- *This attribute is the relative direction of the road centerline as depicted locally compared to its state depiction. If the state shows the road going in the same direction as the local depiction then the attribute 'Same' is used; if otherwise 'Reverse' is used.*

#### *Element 2.4 (Formerly 2.5) – PRIME\_STATE (Primary Status)*

- *Inclusion category changed to **Optional***
- *Better explanation of the attribute is to be provided in the next public review period to the stakeholder community*
- *This refers to MnDOT's classification of a roadway as primary or secondary.*

**Note:** *A discussion with MnDOT about the lifecycle/work flow process for how these attributes can be populated to the benefit the town, city, county and regional partners is needed.*



*Maas to reach out to MnDOT and determine a way forward on how to leverage these attributes being populated and useful to the local actors.*

## **Item 12 – Next Steps for the MRCS proposal**

*Kotz proposed that all changes identified in Agenda Item 11 be performed, supplementary items be prepared and that a new MRCS draft (v. 0.6) be prepared for discussion at the next meeting of the Committee (conference call on November 27, 2018).*

*Motion to approve changes identified in Agenda Item 11 and have materials ready for final review and approval at 11/27/18 Standards Committee conference call.*

*Motion: Mathews, Second: Barnett, no discussion, unanimous approval.*

## **Item 13 – Work Team to advance the 'Standards Committee Guidelines and Operational Procedures' document**

*A document which codifies and clarifies the Standards Committee Guidelines and Operational Procedures remains in the works. Maas began assembling a draft of the document to describe how the committee was already working and adhering to its de facto operational activities.*

*Maas asked the group for volunteers to continue to review, refine and develop the document to further guide and provide a resource for the group. Mathews volunteered; Maas and Mathews will continue to 'nudge' the document along. Additional materials needed include:*

*Clearly defined roles for stewardship of the Standards Documents*

*Periodic review of data standards materials*

*Roles and responsibilities of agencies using the standards*

## **Item 14 – Next Meeting**

*The next meeting of the Standards Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, November 27 at 1 pm. The Metropolitan Council will host the meeting and provide the call-in number and code to the participants.*



**Item 15 – Adjournment**

*Chair Maas called for a motion to adjourn.*

*Motion to adjourn, Kotz, Second: Barnett, no additional discussion, unanimous approval*

*Meeting was adjourned at 3:56 p.m.*