Standards Committee Meeting
Geospatial Advisory Council
Maple Grove Public Works
9030 Forestview Lane North, Maple Grove, MN, 55369
February 26, 2018, 1:00 PM

Meeting Minutes - February 26, 2018

Minutes prepared and submitted by Vice Chair Andra Bontrager and Chair Geoff Maas
Approved by the Standards Committee: July 18, 2018

1) Call to Order
Chair Maas called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm and thanked Heather Albrecht and the City of Maple Grove for making its meeting room and conference call facilities available for the meeting.

2) Welcome, Introductions and Standards Committee Roll Call

Attendees:
Jessica Fendos, Ramsey County
Heather Albrecht, City of Maple Grove
Mike Koutnik, ESRI
Peter Morey, MnDOT
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Alan Laumeyer, Goodhue County
Bart Richardson, MnDNR
Mark Sloan, Clay County
Geoff Maas, chair, MetroGIS
Victor Barnett, Ramsey County
Andra Bontrager, Vice Chair, MCEA
George Meyer, Otter Tail County
Scott Patnoe, MnDOT
Jim Krumrie, MnGeo
Philipp Nagel, City of Waseca
David Sajevic, MnGeo
Nancy Rader, MnGeo

Absent:
Dave Fawcett, MPCA
David Kramer, Minnesota State University-Moorhead
Dan Ross, MnGeo
Jared Haas, City of Shoreview
John Nerge, City of Brooklyn Park

3) Approve Today's Meeting Agenda
Motion to Approve: Albrecht; Second: Bontrager, no discussion, unanimous approval;

4) Approve Minutes from November 30, 2017 Standards Committee Meeting
Motion to Approve: Albrecht; Second: Krumrie, no discussion, unanimous approval;

5) Review and Approval of Revised Standards Committee Charter
Chair Maas put forward minor grammatical and text revisions to the Standards Committee Charter and offered these for the review and approval of the Committee. Committee members

offered improvements and suggestions and corrected minor typographical errors. Maas indicated he could make the changes and would advance the revised document to the Geospatial Advisory Council for their approval at their upcoming meeting on March 28, 2018.

Motion to approve changes to Standards Committee Charter: Kotz, Second; Fendos, Discussion: none, unanimous approval;

6) Review and Approval of Revised Standards Committee Work Plan
Chair Maas revised the Committees' Work Plan based upon the recent changes and updates to the tasks it is taking on. The Committee offered minor wording and spelling corrections and approved the Work Plan for advance to the Geospatial Advisory Council.

Motion to approve changes to Standards Committee Work Plan: Kotz; Second, Riley, Discussion: none, unanimous approval;

7) Parcel Data Transfer Standard

7a) Re-cap of Parcel Standards Development and Review
Chair Maas provided a very brief recap of the recent developments regarding the Parcel Data Transfer standard, notably, that review that the candidate standard has recently undergone since Fall 2016, and most recently, the public review session during February 2018.

7b) Review/Discussion of Comments Received during Public Stakeholder Review Period.
At its November 30, 2017 meeting, the Standards Committee agreed to put the Draft Parcel Data Transfer Standard v. 3.2, out for an additional 30-day public review based upon the changes made to it in late 2017 resulting from comments received during calendar year 2017 and due to its alignment with the recently adopted Address Point Data Standard. The public review period took place from January 8, 2018 through February 9, 2018. Comments received from the public were assembled and distributed to the members of the Standards Committee for their consideration prior to the meeting.

The Standards Committee discussed the comments received during the recent 30-day review period:

One recommendation received was the expansion of the attributes using a Yes/No domain to have its field width from 3 to 10 to accommodate possible expansion of domain values beyond Yes and No. These elements included the following:

- *Element 4.31 – Multiple Uses*
- *Element 4.40 – Garage*
- *Element 4.42 – Basement*
- *Element 4.49 – Green Acres Program*
- *Element 4.50 – Open Space*

- *Element 4.51 – Agricultural Preserve*

Kotz: My observation would be that the domain is not determined to specifically fit a 10-character width, if additional values are to be used in the future and suggested for inclusion, we can then determine the correct character requirement

Fendos: Another possibility would be to use numerical codes to represent the values (assigning a number code, instead of spelling out any potential value), this would save us from needing to make the width larger.

Nagel: To keep it consistent with the Address Point Data Standard, we might examine using Yes/No/Unknown as a baseline domain for these kinds of attributes.

The group discussed scenarios where Yes, No and Unknown values would potentially be used and decided that 'No' and 'Unknown' are not equivalent values and it would be valuable to include 'Unknown' as an option in an expanded domain. The group also examined the Address Point Data Standards and realized that the Yes/No/Unknown attribute was used in it, but appeared with a field width of 7 in some cases and as a field width of 10 in other.

The **recommendation** of the Standards Committee for these attributes was to:

- Standardize the field width of these attributes to 10 characters in both the Address Point Data Standard and Parcel Data Transfer Standard.

- Utilize a domain of values as follows: Yes, No, Unknown and allow <null> values as valid

Another observation received concerned *Element 4.39 – Finished Square Footage*. This commend indicated that in the field of property assessing there has been discussion as to what is meant by finished square footage; the trend is to move toward the IAAO definition of gross building area.

From Page 76, *Glossary for Property Appraisal and Assessment* (International Association of Assessing Officers) Ground Area of Building—*The total area included at mean grade level within the outside surfaces of the exterior walls and the center lines of party walls, not including the area under open porches or steps or in courts or shafts. Compare cubic content of building; floor area of building.* (https://www.iaao.org/media/Pubs/IAAO_GLOSSARY.pdf)

Another observation received concerned *Element 4.39 – Finished Square Footage*. This commend indicated that in the field of property assessing there has been discussion as to what is meant by finished square footage; the trend is to move toward the IAAO definition of gross building area.

Riley: This attribute comes to use from the CAMA (Computer Aided Mass Appraisal) which we don't control. Many systems handle this differently I wonder if there are some best practices

we can apply to this. We should try to discover what we're actually getting and note any issues as we move forward.

Maas: Any thoughts from the other county representatives?

Sloan: Our square footage comes from the tax system as well.

Fendos: We can check with our assessors' office about the inputs we are getting.

Maas: OK, if the county representatives are willing to put a little time into looking into this, I will email out a note out to you all to perhaps give us a general idea if what we are getting for square footage, whether this is just the main dwelling unit or an aggregate of all buildings on site. Thanks for being willing to have a cursory look at this; I don't think this will change what anyone will actually do *per se*, but we can at least report it more completely in the metadata and explain the attribute better.

Maas to send out a separate notice to Meyer (Otter Tail County), Sloan (Clay County), Fendos (Ramsey), Riley (Carver County) and Laumeyer (Goodhue County) to get a general idea about what exactly is coming out of the CAMA/tax systems related to square footage. The county representatives would provide what intel they could at the next Standards Committee meeting

Administrative Ownership. A final note was raised by Maas about the removal of *Element 5.2 – Administrative Ownership* from this version of the Draft Parcel Data Transfer Standard. As there is no complete set of domain values identified, the attribute is optional and is not something that will be automated (i.e., populating this attribute will require a significant amount of custom scripting) it was decided that was acceptable to leave this off at this time. Once a set of domain values is completed, reviewed and approved this attribute can be advanced to the Standards Committee for inclusion in a future version of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard. At present the most compelling business need for this attribute is found the Northeastern Minnesota (the Arrowhead Region) for documenting public lands (federal and state) for the forests management areas of those counties.

Abbreviated Legal Description. The Standards Committee also discussed the role, function and presentation of the 'Abbreviated Legal Description' (ABB_LEGAL) attribute. It was noted that while much of the time the current width of 254 characters was sufficient to capture a generally used legal description such as 'THE EAST 84.91 FEET OF LOT 7, BLOCK 13, EAST SIDE ADDITION TO MINNEAPOLIS' or similar, it would obviously be truncated for longer more detailed legal descriptions.

The group agreed that calling the attribute 'Abbreviated Legal Description' was its most evident remedy for this and that abstractors or professionals performing title searches or needing detailed legal descriptions who were relying on GIS data alone were not doing their due

diligence; *GIS data is a not a legal document* and should not be used as such; it is a digital representation of items described in officially recorded legal documents.

The ABB_LEGAL (Abbreviated Legal Description) attribute in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard was intended to contain as much of a legal description as feasible from an automated process receiving data from the CAMA/tax system. Any user of the data wishing to discover the full legal description would need to examine the actual legal records on file with the County Recorder and not rely on GIS data as the primary source for this information.

Discussion regarding address data carried in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard.
The Parcel Data Transfer Standard was aligned with the Address Point Data Standard in December 2017, questions arose from the Committee about how the addresses in the parcel standard were to be populated, e.g. should data from the address point data be used to populate the parcel? This is problematic as a single parcel can have numerous addresses on it.

The Parcel Data Transfer Standard can carry *three distinct addresses* within it, these are the Situs Address (the identified physical location of the parcel) which is both described and atomized out into its component parts in Elements 2.1 through 2.17, the Owner Address (Elements 4.4 through 4.9) and the Taxpayer Address (Elements 4.10 through 4.14). Each of these address features has a different function in relation to the parcel.

The situs address locates the parcel in its physical location, the owner address indicates where correspondence to the property owner can be directed and the tax payer address indicates where a tax bill or relevant tax correspondence may be sent. There are instances where all three of these addresses could be identical or all three could be completely different.

Concerns were raised about the role of the parcel data to provide an address; it was decided after some discussion that the role of the parcel data is not to provide an address *per se*, that any address associated with the parcel is acceptable so long as its associated use (*situs, owner or taxpayer*) is known and understood by the user.

The group was cautioned not to use the term *primary situs address* as this term has specific usage and application in the realm of 911 and computer aided dispatch and parcels containing multiple addresses of equal importance might not be properly accommodated.

Geometry
Questions were raised about how to handle stacked geometry and non-contiguous polygons representing parcels. It was agreed that the Parcel Data Transfer Standard does not determine how polygon geometry are to be treated, its primary concern is the attribution, however, a set of examples and guidelines for treating parcel geometry would be useful in a Best Practices Guide to accompany the standard.

Discussion of other features and attributes of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard.

The Committee reviewed and discussed the comments received from Tanya Meyer of the Metropolitan Council which noted that guidance on use of zeros, nulls and 'no information' would be helpful and much welcomes. Attention should be paid to both the value and the data type in determining how each attribute will appropriately handle the value (0), no data (blank) and a null value (<Null>). Examples of each of these in a best practices guide were seen as desired and would be helpful.

Need for a Best Practices Document to accompany the Parcel Data Transfer Standard
Given the path the data takes from the CAMA/Tax system and the series of specialized terminology in use, the Committee agreed that having clear best practices described as part of the standard and potentially 'Best Practices Guide' to accompany the Parcel Data Transfer Standard or appear as an appendix to the standard document

Maas to work with Parcel and Land Records Committee to develop a 'Best Practices Document' as a resource to accompany the Parcel Data Transfer Standard to facilitate its use and understanding. This guide should include at minimum examples and explanations of the following:

- ***Examples of stacked, non-adjacent and non-contiguous geometry with the understanding that the standard does not dictate how these are handled, the standard is only concerned with the attributes;***
- ***Definitions and uses of addresses of various kinds found in the standard;***
- ***Applicability of consistent practice for values such as zero, blank and <null> for each attribute for which they are relevant;***
- ***Consistency of practices, domains and attributes across standards to extent possible;***

7c) Standards Committee Recommendation on Parcel Data Transfer Standard
Chair Maas indicated that the Committee was at the point where it can entertain a decision on recommending the Parcel Data Transfer Standard to the Geospatial Advisory Council or in recommending another action for the advance and refinement of the standard.

Kotz offered ***a motion to approve*** the Parcel Data Transfer Standard as discussed by the group and recommended to advance to the Geospatial Advisory Council for approval at its upcoming March 28 meeting with the following modifications in place:

- Incorporation of the changes recommended from the Committee's discussion;
- Revision of the Yes/No fields in the standard to a field width of 10 characters;
- Revision of the Yes/No fields in the standard to include the 'Unknown' in the domain of values;
- Revision of the Yes/No fields to permit <Null> values where valid and applicable.

Second, Koutnik;

Discussion by the group after the motion/second included the need to simply get the standard out there in the hands of practitioners and in use by the geospatial community. The standard can be revisited and modified as needed in the future based on the community's usage of it and experience with it.

Vote: Unanimous approval. Motion carries.

Maas will work with the members of the Parcel and Land Records Committee prepare a version of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard for the review of the Geospatial Advisory Council so it may decide at its next regular meeting on March 28, 2018 on approving or making other recommendations for the standard.

8) The Minnesota Road Centerline Standard (MRCS) Proposal

A proposed statewide road centerline proposal was advanced for consideration of the Committee by the NextGen9-1-1 Standards Work Group. This group offered the Minnesota Road Centerline Standard (MRCS) v. 0.4 as a candidate for the Committee to review and to be put out by the Standards Committee for a minimum of a 60-day public review period.

The MRCS v. 0.4 uses as its basis the Metro Regional Centerline Collaborative (MRCC) v. 1.7 schema. This schema (MRCC v. 1.7) has been in development for just under four years by the Seven Metropolitan Counties and has been seen fit to satisfy the many core business needs for NextGen9-1-1 usage as well as other common business needs associated with road centerline data (geocoding, routing, cartographic representation, etc.). The extensive incorporation of the MRCC attribution by the NextGen9-1-1 Standards Work Group indicates a desire to capitalize on the knowledge gained in the metro effort.

Jim Krumrie of the NextGen9-1-1 Standards Work Group indicated the MRCS represents a merger of the metro work and a few NextGen fields and MnDOT needs, the MRCS is offered as a way to meet a large user base for road centerline data.

Nagel: As we have discussed earlier today, it would serve us well to apply what we are doing with addresses and parcels to this standard as well with field widths and descriptions.

Krumrie: Yes, we intend to get these to match, the MRCS was pulled from the MRCC earlier and these have not developed in synch with the emerging Address and Parcel Standards.

Barnett: I'd recommend we stay close to the MRCC to the extent possible, as it is a working document, in that the Seven Metro Counties and the Metropolitan Council has established scripts and processes for validating, aggregating and publishing the centerline data in a standardized format.

Kotz: Also, I would want us to have consistent language, we would not be changing the elements but we wish to have consistent descriptions.

Specific differences between the MRCC (in use) and the MRCS (proposed) include the expansion of domains to cover the entire state (MRCC domains generally cover just the metro for features such as Postal Community), the addition of three new attributes and the expansion of lists of values in some domains and the need to examine differences in state and metro approaches, among these were Elements 9.1 – Functional Class and Element 9.2 – Surface Type.

Functional Class attribute discussion.

Morey: The functional class code in the metro standard (MRCC) is serving dual purposes, it contains a federal code and a metro code. MnDOT would like to see these two codes separated out into two separate fields, a federal code and a Metropolitan Council code.

Maas: The code as we carry is in the MRCC is a conflation of the federal one-digit code followed by the three-digit Metropolitan Council code. The Metropolitan Council breaks down arterial roads to ensure the federal funding it manages in its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization does not all go just to the central cities. As the use of Functional Class is small and specialized, we could just remove it from a proposed standard.

Kotz: Not certain that would work, this is a critical element for the Metropolitan Council, perhaps separating the two codes would be a good idea to delineate between where the data comes from.

Barnett: IS the federal functional class category decided upon or applied at the local government level or the MnDOT level?

Patnoe: The rules for federal functional class applicability to roads are determined by the state. Local government agencies can apply to have those classifications changed.

Bontrager: How does the split of the fields affect the domain that is currently in use? Are there existing domains that exist separately?

Maas: Yes, we had merged the single-digit federal code with the three-digit metro code when creating the MRCC version. I can provide those to you, Jim (Krumrie) for including in the proposed MRCS.

The group discussed the proposal and agreed that establishing two attributes for Functional Class would be a suitable idea.

More detailed understanding of the work flow of the road centerline data through metropolitan and state governments as to how these attributes gets populated is needed. The role of a centerline standard is not to delineate which system is best or correct, as there may be differences between state agency and metro agency approaches to defining functional class, rather, the standard is to provide data to the user community. Putting this information out

through review for the entire stakeholder community may prove to be a productive means to advance and understand the issue more fully.

Surface Type attribute discussion:
Morey: For the MRCS proposal, we have asked that several other values be added as part of the proposal beyond the 'Paved' and Unpaved' in the current metro standard, these values include other specific surface types such as bituminous, concrete and so on.

Albrecht: For both Surface Type and Functional Class, are there federal guidelines that we should be aware of? We should probably be thinking about broader requirements that are forthcoming.

Maas: Good question, I would defer to others on knowledge of the federal requirements, my guess is that MnDOT staff and transportation planners at the Metropolitan Council understand that much more fully than we should be expected to. Relevant to our work here as the Standards Committee, these attributes are essentially considered optional in the MRCS proposal; but having a place for this information to 'land' in a standard is probably a good idea, but there is no way to require a local data producer to provide them by any means.

Capturing an attribute such as surface type by category would certainly be valuable but, obviously, a very laborious effort. I don't know enough about how Functional Class is determined or captured to speak intelligently on that. Simply putting all this out for a public review might be the best way to get an understanding on how the community understands it, is concerned with it and to what extent it needs this material.

NextGen9-1-1 Standards Work Group to work with MnDOT staff to acquire the list of domain values they wish to see incorporated into the candidate version of the MRCS standard to be put out for public review.

Maas: In light of our discussion, if the following modifications were made to the proposed MRCS, would the Standards Committee be willing to entertain a motion to put it out for public review? The needed modifications prior to a review would include:

- To match the verbiage at the beginning of the MRCS standard document to more closely emulate that of the Address Point Data Standard and Parcel Data Transfer Standard;

- To apply the Yes/No/Unknown (String, 10, Conditional) attribute where applicable in the MRCS to match the other standards;

- To split Element 9.1 Functional Class into two attributes:
  Element 9.1 - Federal Functional Class - Federal, FCLASS_FED, (String, 1, Optional)
  Element 9.2 – Federal Class: Metropolitan Council, FCLASS_METC, (String, 3, Optional)

Domain values for both attributes already exist and can be applied accordingly;

- Reorder Pavement Type as Element 9.3 and expand its domain from 'Paved' and 'Unpaved' to include the surface type categories as identified by MnDOT.

Barnett: Do we need an extended review timeline due to the level of importance of this standard?

Maas: According to our currently approved process, the minimum review period for a standard under public review for the first time is 60 days, the Committee could recommend 90 days or another time period if it so wishes.

Koutnik: Do we anticipate a second round of review for this standard?

Maas: Given the importance of road centerlines to all levels of government and the attention this standard will draw, I think a second round of review is highly likely. Getting it out there for the initial 60 days might be the best way to get the conversation started, get it on people's radar and get comments rolling in.

Barnett: I propose a ***motion to publish*** the MRCS out for a 60-day public stakeholder review with the contingent changes that resulted from our discussion.

Kotz: I ***second the motion***, with a friendly amendment to set a requirement to make sure the attributes and elements of the MRCS are set to match those in the Address Point Data Standard.

Discussion: none; unanimous approval, motion carried.

The MRCS v. 0.4 will be modified as follows (effectively becoming "v. 0.5") and will be put out for a 60-day public review period:

- To match the verbiage at the beginning of the MRCS standard document to more closely emulate that of the Address Point Data Standard and Parcel Data Transfer Standard;

- To apply the Yes/No/Unknown (String, 10, Conditional) attribute where applicable in the MRCS to match the other standards;

- To split Element 9.1 Functional Class into two attributes:
  Element 9.1 - Federal Functional Class - Federal, FCLASS_FED, (String, 1, Optional)
  Element 9.2 – Federal Class: Metropolitan Council, FCLASS_MET (String, 3, Optional)
  Domain values for both attributes already exist and can be applied accordingly;

- Reorder Pavement Type as Element 9.3 and expand its domain from 'Paved' and 'Unpaved' to include the surface type categories as identified by MnDOT;

- Attributes and elements of the MRCS are set to match those in the Address Point Data Standard where applicable;

Maas will work with Jim Krumrie and the NextGen9-1-1 Work Group to transmit the relevant information and instructions to them so the MRCS v. 0.5 proposal can be staged for a 60-day public review period.

9) Other Business

Kotz: With the advance of the standards we are working on, we have come up with a new format for the standards document, including format, colors and so on. This format can be applied to new standards documents as well. We have used it in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard and can retro-fit it to the Address Point Standard Document.

Group agreement that using the new standard formatting was acceptable and desirable for keeping things consistent.

Morey: Another questions returning to centerline, is there any feature element to cover roadways and driveways that are gated or chained?

Maas: The closest we had in the MRCC was the 'Emergency Access' which has been carried into the MRCS. This was simply a 'Yes' or 'No' field to my recollection. During the review period, MnDOT can recommend the addition of other values to that domain if it wishes.

10) Next Meeting

Maas: We do not have a date, time or venue identified for our next meeting. I will circulate the notes from this meeting when finished and copy the Committee on relevant events as they occur. I will work to schedule our next meeting shortly after the 60-day MRCS review period is complete (estimated to be sometime in June 2018) and the stakeholder input from that review session is completed.

11) Adjournment

Maas proposed a motion to adjourn, Albrecht, Second.
Chair Maas thanked everyone for their time and their contributions to the discussion and adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.