



## Geospatial Advisory Council Standards Committee Meeting

Metro County Government Center, Room 205  
2099 University Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104  
June 21, 2017, 1:00 PM

### Meeting Minutes

*Minutes prepared by N. Rader and A. Bontrager; compiled by G. Maas*

#### Attendees:

Victor Barnett, MESB	Andra Bontrager, MCEA, Vice Chair
David Fawcett, MPCA	Jessica Fendos, Ramsey County
Philip Nagel, City of Waseca	Adam Iten, Emergency Communications Network
Jared Haas, City of Shoreview	Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Nancy Rader, MnGeo	Bart Richardson, MnDNR
Chad Riley, Carver County	Dan Ross, MnGeo
Ron Wencil, USGS ( <i>via phone</i> )	Geoff Maas, MetroGIS, Chair

#### **1) Welcome and Roll Call**

*Chair Maas called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm and welcomed the members*

#### **2) Approve Minutes from August 31, 2016 meeting**

*Motion to approve: Kotz, Second: Bontrager; Discussion, none; Vote: Unanimous approval  
(Past meeting minutes are archived and available on the Standards Committee page on the MnGeo website: <http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/>)*

#### **3) Approval of Today's Meeting Agenda**

*Kotz recommended the addition of an agenda item for the election or appointment of a vice chair to the Standards Committee, the action was added to the agenda as Agenda Item 7a.  
Motion to approve: Nagel, Second: Bontrager; Discussion, none; Vote: Unanimous approval*

#### **4) The Standard Approval Process**

The Standards Committee has been actively working to develop and refine a process for the creation, development and approval of geodata standards in the state that maximizes the ability to capture the core business needs for—and contents of—standards relating to geodata, and to maximize the transparency, involvement and inclusion of the stakeholder community in their creation, development and review. The recent formal 90-day review of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard which occurred in October 2016 through January 2017 was instructive on how to refine this process further.

Maas asked the group for any suggestions or revisions to the standards approval process graphic, and specifically asked if the 90-day review period was an appropriate length. After some discussion, the Committee concurred that a 60-day review period was sufficient.

Rader recommended changing the wording to 'at least' before the length of the review period as this would allow flexibility in the exact scheduling of the review period.

Fawcett indicated that the Committee should ensure the stakeholders are informed prior to, or near to the beginning of the review period and suggested adding the creation of a Communication Plan to the approval process diagram and a means of identifying the stakeholders.

Kotz indicated that the Committee takes on the task of notifying the GIS community, and that the group that identifies the business need for a given standard notifies any additional stakeholders, depending on the subject matter.

Maas indicated that after a first review, a standard may need to be substantially altered or changed from the way it was originally intended, to address the comments, suggestions and critique of the GIS community as submitted during the review process.

Kotz indicated that the Committee is positioned to review those comments and make recommendations on how to best handle next steps, further review and so on.

The Committee's suggestions for improving the current existing standards development process include:

- The addition of a formal task of stakeholders & reviewer identification to the process;
- The addition of a formal task of having a communication plan for outreach and comment gathering;
- Modifying the Stakeholder Review period from "90 days" to a "Minimum of 60 Days"
- Adding an additional option for the Standards Committee other than 'Approval by Committee' or 'Rejection by Committee' to enable further review, discussion and action as needed appropriate to the standard under review.
- Modifying the 2<sup>nd</sup> Stakeholder Review period from "30 Days" to a "Minimum of 30 Days"

Kotz suggested the Committee approve the flow chart with the changes suggested and advance it to the Geospatial Advisory Council for their review and approval:

*Motion to approve revisions and amendments to the Standards Development Process: Kotz, Second, Fawcett; Discussion, none; Vote: Unanimous approval*

*The Committee directed Maas to update the flow chart graphics to incorporate the requested changes and to have the new revised draft be posted on the Committee's webpage on the MnGeo website.*

## **5) Statewide Address Point Standard**

Kotz, chair of the Metro Address Work Group, summarized the work to date of the development and maturation of the Address Point Standard. The original Address Point Work Group reviewed the FGDC standard in 2004 and made some specific modifications for use in Minnesota; the resulting standard has been in use in the metro since its adoption in 2010.

The NextGen9-1-1 effort began developing its address point standard in 2015 using the NENA (National Emergency Numbering Association) standard as their basis. The metro and NextGen9-1-1 interests convened in August 2016 to explore the similarities in their two data standards, with the metro-work group revising its standard to better align with 911 needs, and all metro-specific references being changed so the standard could be applied in a statewide context. This modified metro standard is being advanced as a candidate for a statewide Address Point Standard.

A key point was the different needs for 'inclusion' of various attributes. Inclusion refers to status of an attribute as Mandatory, Conditional or Optional. For a dataset to be "in compliance" with the standard, it must contain all mandatory elements and all appropriate conditional elements.

Kotz noted several fixes to the copy distributed prior to the meeting; several element numbers were changed so both the standard document and accompanying Excel spreadsheet are in alignment.

Ross indicated a federal address sub-committee headed by the U. S. Census and U. S. Department of Transportation are developing a standard for a proposed National Address Database, and recommended it would be useful for us in Minnesota to assess how our standard aligns with it.

Barnett indicated that the global ID (GUID) should be reduced from the proposed 100 down to 36 (eliminating the 'curly brackets' {} around the GUID number). This led to a discussion of the purpose of the GUID in the standard; key resulting points included:

- The Local ID element enables data creators to maintain their own local ID system;
- The GUID needs to be static so that it supports aggregation, updates, notification of errors and relates to other data. The standard specifies that the characters in a GUID should not change;

- The GUID should be populated by the local address authority; when the state aggregates local data, the state would only populate a GUID *if the element were blank*, and then would provide the state-generated GUID back to that address authority for continued maintenance.

Riley indicated that this topic was discussed extensively in the creation of the MRCC road centerline data standard and dataset, with similar conclusions: the local aggregation (counties) would prepare a GUID for the data in their county, its length being 36 characters with no brackets or quotes.

The Standards Committee asked the Metro Address Work Group to perform the following actions prior to publishing the materials for a stakeholder review period.

- Compare the proposed Minnesota Address Point Standard to the recently published National Address Database being put forward by the U.S. Department of Transportation and Census Bureau; *(performed by Mark Kotz, June 22, 2017)*;
- Change the UNIQUE\_ID width from 100 to 36 to accommodate a GUID; *(performed by Jon Hoekenga, June 23, 2017)*.
- Edit the Address Point Standard Document and accompanying Excel Spreadsheet of the Address Point Standard schema so their content is identical; *(performed by Jon Hoekenga, June 22, 2017)*.
- Incorporate recommended wording changes and revisions in the accompanying materials (FAQ, sample dataset, etc.) prior to publication; *(performed by Mark Kotz, Jon Hoekenga and Geoff Maas, June 23-26, 2017)*.
- Email the edited materials to the Standards Committee membership for ratification; this can be accomplished electronically, without an in-person meeting; *(performed by Geoff Maas, July 6, 2017)*

*Motion to approve a 60-day stakeholder review period for the proposed Minnesota Address Point Standard contingent on completion of requested tasks listed above: Kotz, Second: Fawcett; Discussion, none; Vote: Unanimous approval.*

Materials to be available to the GIS community for the Address Point Standard review period include the following:

- The Address Point Standard document as prepared by the Metro Address Work Group;
- An FAQ document to help orient the reviewer on the reasons for, and content of, the standard;

- An Excel spreadsheet of the Address Point Standard’s components, attributes and domains;
- XML Formatting Template;
- A sample dataset (two cities in Dakota County) in the proposed Address Point Standard format;
- Metadata for the sample dataset;
- Information on how, where and when to submit comments and suggestions on the proposed Address Point Standard;

Stakeholders and reviewers will be directed to these materials posted on the Standards Committee page of the MnGeo website.

## 6) Parcel Data Transfer Standard

Chair Maas provided an overview and status update on the draft **Parcel Data Transfer Standard**. The standard was published for stakeholder review for a 90-day period (Oct 2016 – Jan 2017) and the Standards Committee received a significant number of comments and published two resulting documents: one containing the comments themselves, and another (the ‘alignment’ document) which specifically aligned the comments received with the attributes they discussed.

The proposed **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** is a modified version of the original Metro Parcel Data Standard. As the **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** contains address attributes, the **Parcels and Land Records Committee** has decided that it will wait until after the comments have been received on the forthcoming **Address Point Standard** (from its anticipated review period in Summer 2017) before further advancing the **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** for adoption. Two productive discussion and input sessions about the contents and advance of the **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** were conducted (March 13, 2017 in Duluth and April 5, 2017 in Fergus Falls). Additional insights gained included how to best revise the order of the attributes and renaming the attributes so they better fit with the language of surveyors and assessors. Two additional in-person opportunities were provided as part of other presentations regarding standards on June 20, 2017 in Red Wing and on June 22, 2017 in Mankato. No additional comments were collected on the **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** at these presentations; however a large portion of the statewide GIS community is aware this standard continues to be advanced and reviewed.

Maas noted several specific topics that received significant attention from the review, these include:

- The **OWNERSHIP** attribute. This attribute arose from the business need of the Arrowhead GIS community for representing large amounts of public lands (county, state and national forests, etc.) which occur throughout their region. Although potentially very useful, this attribute would be challenging to implement as it does not arise from the local tax systems and could not be auto populated. The Arrowhead group has gone further to develop a sub-type attribute which would also identify the specific agency or

interest represented. Since these two attributes are relatively new to the standard being examined and are likely to change with some frequency in the coming months as they are developed, an option is to encourage their use, but not to include them in this iteration of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard.

- Respondents advocated for re-ordering many of the elements to align with how they are generally stored in the tax system for a more intuitive resulting dataset.
- The attributes related to the PLSS (Public Land Survey System) were expanded to include a domain value of '3' for PLSS west-half range (previously, only west half-township was available) as well as values to indicate which Prime Meridian (4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup>) was being used.

#### **Proposed Next Steps for the Parcel Data Transfer Standard:**

- Collection and publication of comments on the proposed **Address Point Standard** during Summer 2017 and reporting these comments to the into the **Parcels and Land Records Committee**;
- **Parcels and Land Records Committee** reviews the input from the **Address Point Standard** and convenes in Fall 2017 to organize/agree on/finalize the contents of the address attributes in the **Parcel Data Transfer Standard**.
- **Parcels and Land Records Committee** would review, edit and submit their proposed **Parcel Data Transfer Standard** to the **Standards Committee** for consideration as a state standard;

Ross indicated that there may be potential for re-integrating the parcel standard and PRISM effort of the Department of Revenue. Staff at the DOR involved with PRISM did provide a detailed comment memo on the Parcel Data Transfer Standard during the formal review period in late 2016-early 2017.

Maas will prepare a communication to the Parcels and Land Records Committee in early July based on the decisions and direction of this Committee.

#### **7) Standards Committee Draft Revised Work Plan**

Maas briefly described the current Work Plan document and asked the group if there were changes or revisions to the document they wished to see in its next version (no comments or changes were advanced by the Committee). Maas agreed to revise and update the Committee's Work Plan document for re-publication on the Standards Committee website based on updates from the June 21st meeting.

*Motion to approve revisions to the Committee Work Plan: Ross, Second, Kotz, Discussion, None, Vote, Unanimous Approval.*

### **7a) Election of a Vice Chair for the Standards Committee**

Kotz indicated that with the increasing amount of attention on standards, that having a vice chair for the committee would be a good idea to help spread the work around a bit. Maas asked if there were any volunteers for the position of Vice Chair, and added that he would do his best to keep the position from being onerous or burdensome. Kotz also clarified that this is not a 'chair-elect' position. Andra Bontrager volunteered to serve as vice chair of the Committee.

*Motion to elect Andra Bontrager as the Vice Chair of the MnGAC Standards Committee, approval was unanimous.*

### **8) Other Business and Relevant Updates**

The floor was opened for additional topics or issues for discussion or consideration.

Maas advanced that in recent discussions around the metro, there was some potential in the need for creating some kind of basic standard or specification for geospatial representations of the fiber optic network and that a stormwater data standard remains on the MetroGIS work program into 2018. These two topics, among others, are on the horizon for future consideration.

Iten, Ross and Kotz advanced the concept that there might be an opportunity to merge the NextGen9-1-1 effort with the MRCC effort for a single Statewide Centerline road data standard.

Barnett indicated he had already done a detailed comparison analysis on the two centerline standards and that they were similar enough to warrant a potential merging.

The Committee discussed how this might take place and decided that it would be prudent to:

- Send an invitation to both the MRCC project owners (e.g. MRCC Core Team) and NextGen9-1-1 project owners to consider the creation of a single road centerline standard from their existing standards.
- Direct a letter from the Standards Committee to NextGen9-1-1 and MRCC leadership that the Standards Committee would be receptive to a proposal for a Statewide Road Centerline Standard that joins the NextGen9-1-1 and MRCC road centerline standards and satisfies the core business needs of the involved stakeholders.

The Committee directed Maas to develop the letter of invitation intended for the NextGen9-1-1 and MRCC project leadership stating the above, with an action item for Iten, Maas, Riley and Barnett to draft the formal invitation to the NG9-1-1 project and MRCC to bring a road centerline schema to the Standards Committee for consideration as a candidate for a statewide road standard.

Rader mentioned that updates or suggestions for the Standards Committee web page are welcome.

**9) Next Meeting**

Upon completion of the Address Point Standard review period and the incorporation of received comments on the Address Point Standard by the Parcels and Land Records Committee, the Standards Committee will convene again in Fall 2017 (October-November is anticipated)

**10) Adjourn**

*Chair Maas adjourned the meeting at 2:22 PM*