Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Meeting

March 22, 2017

Blazing Star Room, Ground Floor, Centennial Office Building

658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155

11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Agenda

1.	Call to order (Chair) a. Introductions b. Approval of agenda c. Approval of meeting minutes from 12/7/2016	11:00	15 min
2.	Review and accept committee and workgroup summaries (All) *page 2* a. Approve updated EPC Charter *page 6*	11:15	10 min
3.	Review/approve committee and GAC work plans (All) *page 9* *GAC page 19*	11:25	30 min
4.	Reports on sun setting committees/workgroups (Kotz) *page 21*	11:55	10 min
5.	Break Networking	12:05	30 min
6.	Geospatial community calendar & discussion forum -GIS/LIS Board feedback (Sjerven)	12:35	10 min
7.	Sector Report (Slaats/Geurts)	12:45	10 min
8.	Legislative update (Ross)	12:55	10 min
9.	Updates on MN GAC priority projects and initiatives (various) *page 29*	1:05	20 min
10.	MnGeo Boundary Data Update and Alignment Project (Wakefield) *page 30*	1:25	10 min
11.	Nominations for the Governor's Geospatial Commendation award (Rader)	1:35	5 min
12.	GAC Appointment/re-appointment process (Ross/Rader)	1:40	5 min
13.	Announcements or other business (All)	1:45	15 min
14.	Adjourn	2:00	

Agenda Item 2. Review and Approval of Committee & Workgroup Summaries

Emergency Preparedness Committee

No report. *[update: report added at end of agenda packet]*

Outreach Committee Status Report

March, 2017

Purpose: To provide information to the GAC and stakeholders about committee/workgroup activities and progress on our work plans.

Committee/workgroup Name: Outreach Committee

Report Date: March 9, 2017

Person generating this status report and their contact information: Kari Geurts and Len Kne

Committee/workgroup:

- Meetings that have taken place: The committee met on 2/3/2016 and the meeting minutes can be reviewed at the Outreach Committee webpage
- Progress on work plan:
    - Activities: The committee had a few informal online meetings to discuss committee activities the group would want to work on. A final Work Plan document has been written and submitted to the GAC. The committee had a formal meeting on 2/3/2016.
    - Accomplishments:
        - The committee has completed a Work Plan document.
        - The committee completed a survey on Open Data for all the counties in MN.
        - Results from the survey were presented at MN GIS/LIS Conference, the MN Government IT Symposium and the Association of MN Counties. The report can be reviewed at the Outreach Committee webpage
    - Progress toward achieving proposed goals:
        - Draft survey written for MN Cities
        - Evaluate the use of the GAC YAK newsletter as another form of outreach for the committee
        - Started collecting GIS success stories to promote the value of GIS to a wide range of stakeholders
    - Problems or impediments: None
    - Required assistance: None
- Sub-group activity that has resulted in progress on the committee's work plan:

Additional comments:

The Outreach committee is planning on meeting in March, 2017.

Parcels and Land Records Committee

Report date: 02/24/2017
Prepared by:

George Meyer
Otter Tail County GIS
Lead Developer
gmeyer@co.ottertail.mn.us
218-998-8313

Meetings:

There will be an Upcoming joint meeting with the Standards committee to review feedback on the current version of the parcel standard. The meeting will be held in Fergus Falls following the Pine to Prairie GIS Users Group. The meeting date has not been finalized as of yet, but will be sometime mid to late March.
Pending the outcome of the meeting; changes will be made and the standard will be sent back for another review by the stakeholders, or standards will be approved and forwarded to the GAC for adoption. Additional information and detail of the meeting agenda can also be obtained from Geoff Maas, chair of the Standards Committee.

Progress on work plan:

Updating the work plan for 2017 will be discussed at the joint meeting. Items to be discussed will be pending results of the data standard, methods for assisting counties with submitting data in the standard, and revisiting the existing work plan to determine the next set of actions. If this is not feasible at the joint meeting, then a meeting will be scheduled to determine the work plan at the earliest opportunity.

Additional comments:

The Parcels committee has been inactive for some time; I believe mostly waiting for things to move forward with the parcel standard. I will be working this year to revisit the previous work plans, speak with other committee members and the GAC to try to determine the next course(s) of action the committee needs to take, and updating the relevant documentation in the process. From past information, it appears that the next phases should include aggregating PLS level data. With the creation of the geospatial commons, I believe sharing and uploading to this data store should be at least one of the tools used.

Standards Committee

Report Date: March 10, 2017

Prepared By: Geoff Maas, *geoffrey.maas@metc.state.mn.us*, 651.602.1638
MetroGIS Coordinator, Metropolitan Council
Chair, Standards Committee

Meetings: Last meeting occurred (as phone conference) on August 31, 2016

No formal meetings since last report to the GAC on November 17, 2016
(Committee members are in frequent communication regarding the Parcel Standard under review)

Past meeting minutes are available here: *http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/*

Current Standards Committee Progress and Accomplishments:

A) Work Plan Document
A draft Standards Committee Work Plan document and Committee Charter was developed in August 2016 and reviewed by Committee members in September 2016. A modified version of the Standards Committee Work Plan containing the comments and revisions of Committee members was published in Dec 2016/Jan 2017 for approval in April 2017

B) Parcel Data Transfer Standard Progress to Date
The proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard was published in October 2016 for a ninety (90) day public review period. Over 450 agencies and individuals were contacted, including county GIS staff, survey departments, state agency stakeholders, local government interests, regional agencies and the Minnesota Association of Assessing Officers. In addition to the proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard document, a detailed 7-page FAQ resource was prepared and a sample data set in the proposed standard (one Congressional township in Anoka County) was provided to prospective reviewers and data consumers. The review period for the Parcel Data Transfer Standard closed on January 20, 2017.

Committee Chair Geoff Maas has prepared a Comments report collecting these comments and an Alignment Report which aligns the comments received with the actual attribute or subject matter concern it relates to.

Chair Maas will be meeting with the Arrowhead Regional GIS Group on March 14, 2017 in Duluth and the Pine-To-Prairie GIS Group in Fergus Falls on April 5 to specifically work through these comments and gain addition insights into the needs of the parcel data producer community.

The Standards Committee will convene in April 2017 to review the intel gathered from these review sessions and decide on next steps to advance the standard.
All these materials were submitted to MnGeo to be posted on the Standards Committee website on March 9, 2017:
http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/parcel_attrib/parcel_attrib.html

The Committee will convene jointly with the Land Records and Parcel Committee to discuss and determine next steps on the process for approval of the proposed Standard. A joint meeting of these Committee's is being planned for 2017.

C) Additional Committee Work Activity

The Standards Committee is anticipated to review the readiness of the Metro Address Point Standard as a candidate for review as a statewide standard sometime in Summer/Fall 2017

A 'glossary of terms' resource and a draft standards approval work flow document remains in development by the Committee chair. These resources are anticipated to be submitted as drafts to the Committee for review during April 2017 and tested as an appropriate process in the work of advancing the Parcel Data Transfer Standard.

Agenda Item 2a. Approval of Updated EPC Charter

Emergency Preparedness Committee

Charter

Work Plan date: February 3, 2017

Chair and vice chair:

Steve Swazee
sdswazee@sharedgeo.org
(612) 239-6981

Randy Knippel
Randy.knippel@co.dakota.mn.us
952-891-7080

Link to committee/workgroup charter: http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/emprep/EPC-Charter-2014.pdf

Accomplishments from 2016

- Conducted 4 formal meetings, including a committee business meeting and an education presentation open to anyone
- Presented at several conferences and forums promoting the U.S. National Grid
    - UMGEOCON, LaCrosse, WI
    - MnGISLIS Annual Conference
    - AMEM Annual Conference, Breezy Point
    - MESB Board
    - MnUSA Snowmobile Association
    - Iowa USNG Summit
    - MNUSA Snowmobile Association
- Supported SharedGeo efforts to expand Minnesota USNG mapping efforts to Iowa
    - Knowledge transfer of county and state mapping procedures to SharedGeo staff
- Formed new Tiger Team for Damage Assessment
    - Respond to MGAC directive to pursue a data model for damage assessment.

Work Plan for 2017

Planned activities and deliverables:

- Conduct at least 3 meetings of the full committee
    - Discuss Tiger Team progress and provide guidance from the broader Committee
    - Knowledge and idea sharing
    - Educational presentations
- Focus on existing Tiger Team activities
    - U.S. National Grid

        - Mission: Promote the use of the U.S. National Grid
        - Increase formalization of workgroup
            - Identify and engage GIS and EM professionals in Minnesota who are currently involved in implementing the USNG
            - Participate in efforts to formalize regional and national USNG workgroups
            - Participate in efforts to develop state and national USNG resources
                - Websites, tools, procedures, documentation
        - Continue to pursue opportunities to increase awareness of the U.S. National Grid
            - MEMA monthly meeting (February)
            - HSEM Governor's Emergency Manager Conference (February)
            - MNGISLIS Annual Conference (October)
            - others
    - Damage Assessment
        - Mission: Develop consistency of damage assessment data and related tools
        - Ensure success of this newly formed workgroup
            - Establish a leader
            - Establish participants
            - Establish a workplan
            - Generate regular progress reports
    - Common Operation Picture
        - Mission: Raise awareness of the need to share operational information about emergency events across jurisdictions
        - Assess related systems currently being used in Minnesota and their ability to interact
            - Software systems
            - Standardized data
            - Real-time sensors and reporting technology
        - This workgroup has not been formally endorsed; however, the group's leader is actively involved in developing and implementing a COP solution and will help establish a broader context for that solution along with the other solutions currently implemented across the state.

Roles and responsibilities:

- U.S. National Grid
    - Leader: Randy Knippel, Dakota County
    - Randy is the primary participant in this group engages a cadre of other people in the GIS, Emergency Management, and Public Safety communities that are also implementing the USNG, as needed.
- Damage Assessment
    - Leader: Cory Richter, City of Blaine
    - Cory has established a list of participants representing local government in the metro area and out-state area, as well as the private sector.
- Common Operating Picture
    - Leader: Guy Konietzko, GeoComm
    - Guy is the primary participant at this time and will be engaging others through his professional connections.

Resources:

- Committee members primarily rely on the resources available to them through their employer, with their employer's endorsement:
    - Time commitment
    - Software and hardware
    - Expenses
- SharedGeo provides additional resources as they are able to, when it fits within their mission, business plan, and budget

Committee/workgroup needs:

- Committee will work within the constraints of the capabilities and availability of its members

Dependencies and interrelationships:

- This Committee depends on support from MnGeo, to the extent they are able to provide it
    - Publish and update U.S. National Grid maps
    - Provide formal endorsement when necessary
    - Engage State agencies where applicable
    - Promote the use of the USNG in State agencies
    - Act as liaison to State agencies when necessary

Risks:

- Potential instability caused by leadership or participant availability
    - Mitigation:
        - Ensure leaders and participants and their sponsoring organization (employer) have a vested interest in their mission
- Lack of MnGeo supporting resources
    - Mitigation:
        - Keep MnGeo informed of activities that could benefit from their involvement so they can plan accordingly
        - Minimize this dependency

Additional Comments: none

Date approved by the Geospatial Advisory Council:

Agenda Item 3. Review Work Plans

EPC Work Plan

Work Plan date: February 3, 2017

Chair and vice chair:

Steve Swazee
sdswazee@sharedgeo.org
(612) 239-6981

Randy Knippel
Randy.knippel@co.dakota.mn.us
952-891-7080

Link to committee/workgroup charter: http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/emprep/EPC-Charter-2014.pdf

Accomplishments from 2016

- Conducted 4 formal meetings, including a committee business meeting and an education presentation open to anyone
- Presented at several conferences and forums promoting the U.S. National Grid
    - UMGEOCON, LaCrosse, WI
    - MnGISLIS Annual Conference
    - AMEM Annual Conference, Breezy Point
    - MESB Board
    - MnUSA Snowmobile Association
    - Iowa USNG Summit
    - MNUSA Snowmobile Association
- Supported SharedGeo efforts to expand Minnesota USNG mapping efforts to Iowa
    - Knowledge transfer of county and state mapping procedures to SharedGeo staff
- Formed new Tiger Team for Damage Assessment
    - Respond to MGAC directive to pursue a data model for damage assessment.

Work Plan for 2017

Planned activities and deliverables:

- Conduct at least 3 meetings of the full committee
    - Discuss Tiger Team progress and provide guidance from the broader Committee
    - Knowledge and idea sharing
    - Educational presentations
- Focus on existing Tiger Team activities
    - U.S. National Grid
        - Mission: Promote the use of the U.S. National Grid
        - Increase formalization of workgroup
            - Identify and engage GIS and EM professionals in Minnesota who are currently involved in implementing the USNG

                - Participate in efforts to formalize regional and national USNG workgroups
                - Participate in efforts to develop state and national USNG resources
                    - Websites, tools, procedures, documentation
            - Continue to pursue opportunities to increase awareness of the U.S. National Grid
                - MEMA monthly meeting (February)
                - HSEM Governor's Emergency Manager Conference (February)
                - MNGISLIS Annual Conference (October)
                - others
    - Damage Assessment
        - Mission: Develop consistency of damage assessment data and related tools
        - Ensure success of this newly formed workgroup
            - Establish a leader
            - Establish participants
            - Establish a workplan
            - Generate regular progress reports
    - Common Operation Picture
        - Mission: Raise awareness of the need to share operational information about emergency events across jurisdictions
        - Assess related systems currently being used in Minnesota and their ability to interact
            - Software systems
            - Standardized data
            - Real-time sensors and reporting technology
        - This workgroup has not been formally endorsed; however, the group's leader is actively involved in developing and implementing a COP solution and will help establish a broader context for that solution along with the other solutions currently implemented across the state.

Roles and responsibilities:

- U.S. National Grid
    - Leader: Randy Knippel, Dakota County
    - Randy is the primary participant in this group engages a cadre of other people in the GIS, Emergency Management, and Public Safety communities that are also implementing the USNG, as needed.
- Damage Assessment
    - Leader: Cory Richter, City of Blaine
    - Cory has established a list of participants representing local government in the metro area and out-state area, as well as the private sector.
- Common Operating Picture
    - Leader: Guy Konietzko, GeoComm
    - Guy is the primary participant at this time and will be engaging others through his professional connections.

Resources:

- Committee members primarily rely on the resources available to them through their employer, with their employer's endorsement:
    - Time commitment

    - Software and hardware
    - Expenses
- SharedGeo provides additional resources as they are able to, when it fits within their mission, business plan, and budget

Committee/workgroup needs:

- Committee will work within the constraints of the capabilities and availability of its members

Dependencies and interrelationships:

- This Committee depends on support from MnGeo, to the extent they are able to provide it
    - Publish and update U.S. National Grid maps
    - Provide formal endorsement when necessary
    - Engage State agencies where applicable
    - Promote the use of the USNG in State agencies
    - Act as liaison to State agencies when necessary

Risks:

- Potential instability caused by leadership or participant availability
    - Mitigation:
        - Ensure leaders and participants and their sponsoring organization (employer) have a vested interest in their mission
- Lack of MnGeo supporting resources
    - Mitigation:
        - Keep MnGeo informed of activities that could benefit from their involvement so they can plan accordingly
        - Minimize this dependency

Additional Comments: none

Date approved by the Geospatial Advisory Council:

Outreach Work Plan

Work Plan date:
January 27, 2017

Chair and vice chair:
Len Kne, Co-Chair
University of Minnesota
612-624-7591
lenkne@umn.edu

Kari Geurts, Co-Chair
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
651-259-5275
kari.geurts@state.mn.us

Link to committee/workgroup charter:
http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/outreach/Outreach_Committee_charter.pdf

Accomplishments from 2016

- Reestablished the committee after a period of inactivity.
- Set promotion of free and open data as our priority.
- Design and execute survey of county GIS staff to measure perceptions and concerns about free and open data.
- A report of the county survey results is available on the MnGEO website.
- Give presentations at three conferences (MN GIS/LIS, Association of MN Counties, & Government IT Symposium) on free and open data.
- Started collecting testimonials on the importance of GIS and free and open data from GIS experts and policy makers.

Work Plan for 2017

Planned activities and deliverables:

- Design and execute survey of city GIS staff to measure perceptions and concerns about free and open data. This will be modified version of the county survey completed in 2016.
    - Develop list of city GIS staff using MnGEO, LMC and other resources.
    - Modify survey questions to meet city needs.
    - Collect data.
    - Draft report.
- Look for presentation opportunities to promote free and open data.
- Look for other organizations to collaborate on the promotion of free and open data.
- Look for newsletters, blogs, other forms of media to promote free and open data.
- Collect additional testimonials on the importance of GIS and free and open data. Focus will be to increasing the number of testimonials from policy makers and elected officials.

Roles and responsibilities:

Active Committee Members

- Brad Anderson
- Will Craig
- Scott Freburg
- Kari Geurts (co-chair)
- Andrew King-Scribbins
- Len Kne (co-chair)
- Geoff Maas
- John Mackiewicz
- Victoria Reinhardt
- Cory Richter
- Gerry Sjerven
- Alison Slaats
- Michelle Trager
- Annette Theroux

The survey subgroup consisting of Kari Geurts, Geoff Maas, and Len Kne meet regularly to plan the next round of survey and what the best outlets (i.e. conferences, newsletters, etc.) are to advocate for free and open data.

The co-chairs will be responsible for calling four full committee meetings in 2017.

Resources:

- Equipment - none
- Software - none
- Data - none
- Other - none

Committee/workgroup needs:

The Committee will be working with MnGEO staff to identify an appropriate collaborative workspace for the committee.

Dependencies and interrelationships:

We work closely with MetroGIS in their effort to promote free and open data. We expect this year to increase our working relationship with the League of MN Cities and Association of MN Counties.

Risks:

None

Additional Comments:

None

Date approved by the Geospatial Advisory Council:

Parcels and Land Records Work Plan

No plan

Standards Work Plan

Work Plan (Version 1.1)

1 - General Information

Committee name:	**Standards Committee**
Date Work Plan Prepared:	**First Draft 08.31.2016** **Revised Draft 12.21.2017**
Period covered by this work plan:	**07.01.2016 – 06.30.2017**
Committee chair name and contact information:	Geoffrey Maas, GISP MetroGIS Coordinator Metropolitan Council *geoffrey.maas@metc.state.mn.us* 651.602.1638
Committee vice-chair name and contact information:	*<<No vice chair has been selected>>*

Draft charter: http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/Charter_StandardsCommittee.pdf

2 - Planned Activities and Deliverables

2.1 What does the committee plan to accomplish in the coming year?
For 2016-2017, the Standards Committee anticipates the following accomplishments:

- Development, review and adoption of a **Committee Charter and Work Plan;**
  A draft has been prepared and reviewed and is pending formal approval of the Committee;

  Development, review and adoption of a **Data Standard Development and Approval Process and Flow Chart;** A draft has been prepared, reviewed and revised. Based on the work of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard, further revision and review will be necessary to accurately reflect the process.

- A 90-Day Stakeholder Review Cycle of the **Parcel Data Transfer Standard**, including collection of stakeholder responses (Completed in February 2017);

- Comments from stakeholder review and alignment document (alignment of comments to specific features of the standard) was prepared in February and March 2017;

- A series of follow up, review and listening sessions are planned for the Parcel Data Transfer Standard with stakeholders in the Arrowhead Region (March 14, 2017), Pine-To-Prairie Region

(April 5, 2017) and Southeast Minnesota GIS (June 20, 2017), additional statewide outreach and listening sessions are anticipated in Spring 2017;

- Distribution for review of the Metro Address Point Standard (V. 3.0[2016]) as a potential candidate for a statewide Address Point Data Standard. This work is anticipated later in 2017;

- Committee to provide review and comment on the forthcoming 9-1-1 GIS Data Standards;

2.2 When does the Committee plan to meet in the coming year?
For 2016-2017, the Standards Committee will convene as follows

- Anticipated meeting in April 2017 to approve work plan and charter as well as review the input on the Parcel Data Transfer Standard from the comment period and listening sessions;
- During calendar 2017 as needed based upon work tasks, review or revision tasks arising from new/existing standards.

3 - Roles and Responsibilities

3.1 Provide estimates of the staffing requirements of <u>active</u> committee participants. Six (6) to twelve (12) engaged individuals representing a diverse cross-section of the geospatial community in Minnesota.

3.2 Provide a list of actively participating members

MEMBER	AGENCY	EMAIL
Andra Bontrager	MCEA (Non-Profit)	abontrager@mncenter.org
Chris Cialek	MnGeo	chris.cialek@state.mn.us
David Fawcett	MPCA	david.fawcett@state.mn.us
Adam Iten	Emergency Communications Network	adam.iten@state.mn.us
Peter Henschel	Carver County	PHenschel@co.carver.mn.us
Mark Kotz	Metropolitan Council	mark.kotz@metc.state.mn.us
Nancy Rader	MnGeo	nancy.rader@state.mn.us
Dan Ross	MnGeo	dan.ross@state.mn.us
Ron Wencl	USGS	rwencl@usgs.gov
Geoff Maas, chair	MetroGIS	geoffrey.maas@metc.state.mn.us

3.3 Who is expected to do which committee activity/what tasks will participants perform?
Members can reasonably be expected to attend meetings (either in person or via conference call), review research materials, and contribute their input and experience on each topic as it is raised and presented. Specific tasks of research, outreach, document development and so on will be assigned in accordance with each standard creation or revision project as it materializes.

3.4 What skill sets, knowledge and/or experiences are desired of participants?

- Broad knowledge of geospatial data use by their stakeholder agency and similar agencies;

- Ability to understand and support an inclusive, transparent and broad-reaching stakeholder process;
- Holding a senior technical level or managerial level position in their respective agency;

3.5 What is the expected time commitment of participants?

- The Committee chair can expect to commit 3-5 hours/month on document preparation, managing communications with the geospatial community and other members of the Committee;
- Other members can expect 1-2 hours per month on responding to communication, reviewing documents, providing feedback and attending meetings;
- These numbers may vary depending on the number of new standards being advanced or number of existing standards being revised.

4 - Resources

4.1 Identify what resources have been committed and where they are coming from:
At present, the in-kind staff commitments of the agencies the members are employed by will be sufficient to meet existing staffing and resource needs.

5 - Project Needs

5.1 Identify any additional needed equipment, software, data, staffing, or other resources that have not yet been committed, and identify any likely or suggested sources.
The Committee will need a functional state agency standards approval process in place, presently this resource does not exist.

The Committee does not require any significant material resources other than being able to post its material on the MnGeo webpage;

6 - Dependencies and Interrelationships

6.1 What, if any, other projects or activities depend on committee/workgroup success?
The proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard (put out for comment Oct 2016-Jan 2017) depends upon the actions, support, and facilitation of the Committee.

6.2 Is the Committee's activity related to another committee/workgroup or project?
The proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard (put out for comment Oct 2016-Jan 2017) depends upon the actions, support, and facilitation of the Committee.

7 - Subsequent Work

7.1 What follow-on work is anticipated?
The work of the Standards Committee will be on-going, to monitor and respond to the needs for standards as described by the geospatial community.

7.2 Who is expected to perform the subsequent work?
Members of the Committee will volunteer or assign upcoming tasks among themselves or members of the geospatial community as tasks, timelines and circumstances dictate.

7.3 When will this be needed?
As tasks, timelines and circumstances dictate.

8 - Risks

8.1 - Describe any potential risks
No immediate risks are evident as of this writing.

8.2 - What could cause the committee/workgroup to fail?

- Lack of engagement by the membership;
- Lack of leadership by the chair;
- Lack of trust from the geospatial community in the standards development process;
- Lack of a standards approval process in state government to get standards where they can be listed as part of the state standards http://mn.gov/mnit/programs/policies/geospatial/

8.3 What can be done to mitigate the risks?
The Committee would benefit greatly by having a standards approval process developed and adopted in state government to get standards where they can be listed as part of the state standards.

The Committee chair needs to develop materials that are clear, concise, and easy to work with so the group can make good use of its time to advance the work. The Committee needs to maintain and strengthen its relationship to the entire geospatial community to advance and increase knowledge about why standards are important and useful, share information, define and act on topics of shared interest, and to strengthen relationships among geospatial professionals. State leadership needs to ensure that there is a standards approval process in place that engages the professionals and serves the highest and best aims of agency need, data producers and data consumers.

9 – Notes and Comments
This Committee is unique as its 'product' is in fact a 'process'.

Standards Committee Work Plan (Version 1.1)

Prepared on: *August 31, 2016*
Revised on: *December 21, 2016*

Author: *Geoff Maas, Committee Chair*
geoffrey.maas@metc.state.mn.us
MetroGIS Coordinator, Metropolitan Council

Approved by Geospatial Advisory on ***(insert date)***

GAC Work Plan

Work Plan date: 3/22/17

Chair and vice chair: Mark Kotz, Dave Brandt

Link to GAC Mission and Guiding Principles:

Accomplishments from 2016

- Updated the GAC's mission statement and guiding principles to more clearly define the GAC as a coordinating body for the Minnesota geospatial community.
- Updated and clarified committee and workgroup reporting relationships so that they report directly to the GAC and not to MnGeo.
- Updated and streamlines committee reporting documents (status reports, charters, work plans, etc.)
- Convened the Outreach Committee and sunsetted the Geospatial Commons and Geocoding workgroups
- Organized a panel at the GIS/LIS conference to envision and get feedback on the future of a a committee on elevation and hydrography.
- Identified statewide geospatial project important to the geospatial community (as represented by GAC members) and recommended priorities for these projects and initiatives to MnGeo.

Work Plan for 2017

Planned activities and deliverables:

The GAC meets on a quarterly basis. The Leadership Team meets between GAC meetings. The bulk of the work is done by the committees and work groups of the GAC. Key goals of the GAC itself for 2017 include:

- Sunset the inactive Digital Elevation and Hydrography Committees and the Metadata Workgroup.
- Launch a new committee focused on elevation and hydrography data.
- Launch a new subgroup under the Emergency Preparedness Committee to focus on developing an emergency management damage assessment data standard for MN.
- Promote and facilitate progress on the statewide geospatial projects and initiatives identified by the GAC. Some of this work will be done by MnGeo and some by GAC committees (e.g. free and open data, data standards)
- Continue to increase outreach to the geospatial and related communities. This will be done both through the formal efforts of the Outreach Committee and less formally by GAC members further reaching out to and coordinating with their sectors.

Roles and responsibilities:

Chair: Mark Kotz
Vice Chair: Dave Brandt
MnGeo Ex-Officio member/CGIO: Dan Ross
Leadership Team: (acts as an executive group to develops agendas, identify strategic items, etc.)
Members: Mark Kotz, Dave Brandt, Dan Ross, Victoria Reinhardt, Michelle Trager, Blaine Hackett

Resources:
No significant resource commitments for the GAC beyond the time/talent of members.

Council needs:
The GAC relies on MnGeo staff for scheduling and hosting meetings, creating minutes and other administrative functions.

Dependencies and interrelationships:
Committees and Workgroups: The GAC is completely dependent upon the committees and workgroups that do most of the actual work of the GAC. The GAC must also stay in touch with a wide group of stakeholders in the geospatial community to be able to represent their interests. Most GAC members represent a specific sector, though a few are at-large members.

Risks:
A change in legislature or lack of MnGeo support could negatively affect the ability for the GAC to accomplish goals.

Additional Comments:

Date approved by the Geospatial Advisory Council:

Agenda Item 4. Final Reports from Sunsetting Committees

Minnesota Digital Elevation Committee

Final Report

Report date: 1/13/2017

Prepared by: Timothy N. Loesch

How long did the committee/workgroup exist?

The Digital Elevation Committee was formed under the auspices of the former Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information on September 20, 2006, continuing the work of Minnesota's Digital Elevation Working Group which functioned for years on a mission to improve Minnesota's elevation data. A subsequent LiDAR Research and Education Subcommittee was formed in August 2010.

What did the committee/workgroup accomplish?

The workgroup accomplished much of its mission during its existence and had the following accomplishments:

1) Supported the acquisition of LiDAR data in the State of Minnesota through a coordinated approach to support, technical assistance, promotion, training and distribution of data
2) Defined acquisition, data quality, data processing and data product standards for elevation data
3) Successfully lobbied Minnesota Legislature to allocate Clean Water Legacy funds for the acquisition of more than 50,000 square miles of LiDAR data in Minnesota.
4) Provided oversight and direction to several in-state LiDAR acquisitions including
    a. Red River Watershed
    b. Southeast Minnesota
    c. Rice County
    d. McLeod County
    e. Minnesota LiDAR Project
        i. Minnesota River Watershed
        ii. Arrowhead Project 1
        iii. Metropolitan
        iv. Central Lakes
        v. Arrowhead Project 2
5) Production of the MnTOPO web portal to acquire high resolution elevation data where people can access consistently formatted and well documented data for Minnesota.

Who should be informed?

- Minnesota GIO
- Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council
- Minnesota GIS/LIS Members
- Digital Elevation Committee Website

Additional comments:

- This workgroup has been inactive for some time as the leadership of the committee retired and/or moved on to other work duties and obligations preventing them from continuing participation.
- The need for coordination of elevation data collection, education and standards is still needed and anecdotal evidence suggest a continued need for updated high accuracy elevation data.

Hydrography Committee

Final report

Report date: 01/27/2017

Prepared by: Mark Olsen

How long did the committee/workgroup exist?

- 1999 to 2010
- Mission (2000): The Hydrography committee exists to help foster the development, integration and sharing of hydrography data statewide.
- Revised mission (2005): To promote consistent development of hydrography data and enable data exchange through coordination, cooperation and standards development.

What did the committee/workgroup accomplish?

- Standards and guidelines development
    - Basin feature – 2000
    - Watershed update guidelines - 2001
    - Watercourse/reach feature – 2003
    - Watershed standard - 2005
    - Digital Stormwater System Data Exchange – 2010
- Assessment of user needs
    - Hydrographic data needs and data inventory (in partnership with MetroGIS) – 2000
    - NHD user needs assessment - 2005
- Coordination
    - NHD data development coordination
        - Negotiated use of DNR 1:24K as source data
        - Grant submittals/awards – USGS and EPA
        - Hosted variety of technical seminars and training
        - Met Council (Steve Kloiber) integration of storm sewer data into NHD, making MN the first state to do this
        - Developed MN NHD update and maintenance procedures
    - Watershed delineation
        - Delineation/aggregation procedures consistent with Federal guidelines
        - Federal review for WBD compliance
- Fostered development and sharing of information
    - Inter-agency activity coordination
    - Numerous conference presentations and seminars on MN hydrography data activities

Who should be informed?

- The following three standards are published externally on MN.IT's web site, here: http://mn.gov/mnit/programs/policies/geospatial/gis-pages/

- Codes for the Identification of Reaches and Watercourses in Minnesota
- Codes for the Identification of Basins in Minnesota
- Codes for the Identification of Watersheds – Hydrologic Units – in Minnesota

Additional comments:

- Consideration is currently being given to the formation of a new LiDAR/Hydro committee. This would provide a forum for the discussion and consideration of ongoing and emerging hydrography data issues.

Metadata Workgroup

Final Report

Report date: 02/1/2017

Prepared by: Nancy Rader

This report summarizes the accomplishments of the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council's Metadata Workgroup, outlines remaining issues, and recommends that the workgroup be sunset.

The council's Standards Committee formed the workgroup in March 2011. It was most active during 2011, with sporadic activity afterward, most of which occurred during 2015.

Members of the revived Standards Committee have decided that although metadata issues remain, there are insufficient resources and no high enough priority issues to continue the workgroup at this time. Metadata topics will be a standing item on Standards Committee meeting agendas, and if any issues become high enough priority, a workgroup could be reconstituted.

Workgroup accomplishments

The Metadata Workgroup's charter lists three major objectives:

1. Recommend methods for creating and editing metadata that are compatible with ArcGIS 10.
2. Recommend a metadata format for web services.
3. Recommend changes to the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines (MGMG) by evaluating new international standards.

The workgroup largely accomplished these objectives by:

1. Developing an updated stand-alone metadata editor that follows MGMG and by developing instructions for using ArcGIS 10 to create metadata compatible with MGMG.
2. Concluding that our current methods for documenting web services are sufficient for current basic needs.
3. Concluding that the existing version of MGMG is sufficient for current needs.

In addition, the workgroup:

4. Recommended metadata requirements for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons.
5. Presented for several years at the Minnesota GIS/LIS conference, held one workshop and presented one webinar.

The remainder of this report provides more details on these accomplishments and then outlines remaining issues.

Developed two new methods to create and edit metadata following the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines (MGMG)

1. Developed MME, an updated stand-alone metadata editor

Background: The previous stand-alone metadata editor (DataLogr) that had been customized to produce MGMG metadata had a very outdated interface so was little used.

Response: The workgroup customized the EPA's Metadata Editor (EME) to create the Minnesota Metadata Editor (MME). EME was selected because it uses a streamlined metadata standard that was very similar to Minnesota's MGMG, and the original EME source code was free and publicly available.

The workgroup's customization included:

- Removing EPA-specific content from the interface and the help
- Removing elements not contained in MGMG
- Removing MGMG elements that were not often used
- Adding several missing MGMG elements
- Editing picklist options to match MGMG
- Reformatting the input interface
- Updating the stylesheet to create a cleaner, more-readable html
- Improving the stylesheet to ensure that the html is more accessible to people who use screen readers (this task is in final testing before release)

Credits: The workgroup decided what customization was needed and tested the beta versions. Jim Gonsoski did the programming.

2. Recommended how to use ArcCatalog 10 to create MGMG-compliant metadata

Background: At ArcGIS 10.0, the Esri metadata model radically changed. The popular MGMG Editor add-in, customized by the Metropolitan Council for use with ArcGIS 8 and 9, was no longer functional. Since many organizations that could contribute geospatial data to the Minnesota Geospatial Commons were accustomed to creating their metadata in ArcCatalog, research was needed to find ways to make metadata created in ArcCatalog work for the Commons with the least customization.

Response: The workgroup decided that ArcGIS was changing too often to devote resources to customizing and maintaining an MGMG version of the native ArcGIS metadata editor. Instead, Susanne Maeder developed instructions on using ArcCatalog's existing editor to follow MGMG, Producing ArcCatalog 10 Metadata for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons.

Evaluated revising the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines (MGMG) to be compatible with new international standards

Background: MGMG v 1.2, a streamlined version of the Federal Geographic Data Committee's metadata standard[1], was adopted in 1998. Currently, it is a State of Minnesota guideline, not a full standard. For many years, the international community has been developing international metadata standards[2] and it was time to assess whether MGMG needed revising to match the "ISO standard".

- The workgroup drafted a crosswalk between MGMG and ISO. Many elements have a straightforward match; however, some issues proved sticky:
    - Some ISO elements have the same identifying tags and are distinguished only by their location within a structure of nesting fields. Since MGMG does not use the same structure, this would be a challenge to implement.
    - Several MGMG elements do not have a clear match to ISO.
- ISO provides several elements to describe web services, which we would like to be able to do, however, these fields did not seem to provide information that was understandable or useful for most people documenting services.

Response: The workgroup concluded that there are not yet sufficient business needs to migrate MGMG to be fully compliant with ISO. We are able to accomplish what we need to do with the current version of MGMG.[3]

Recommended metadata requirements for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons

Background: A handful of metadata elements are required by the Commons in order for the site to function; the site checks these elements and flags errors. Resources are not published until errors are fixed. The Commons also gives warnings in order to alert publishers to missing information. Publishers are encouraged to fill in these elements, but warnings do not block publication of a resource. The question was whether any additional MGMG elements should be mandatory, and which elements should simply be desired or optional for metadata to be published on the Commons.

Response: The workgroup developed a recommendation for each element. The report, Metadata Requirements for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons – Draft Recommendation, provides more detail about the criteria used, an overview of the recommendation and then more detailed best practices, concluding with a list of implementation issues.

---

[1] The FGDC's standard is the Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (CSDGM); it is still widely used since many organizations have found that, at present, they have insufficient resources or business needs to migrate to the newer ISO standards.

[2] Most of the geospatial metadata elements are in the International Organization for Standardization's ISO 19115 standard, although some sections are contained in other ISO standards that apply to broader kinds of data, not just geospatial data, e.g., ISO 19157 which covers elements describing data quality. Each standard is in a different cycle of revision, so it's hard to point to one finished version that will cover all the elements needed to describe geospatial data. There has also an effort to develop a "North American Profile" (NAP) of the international standard; the main differences are that NAP provides more complete domain and code lists and more detailed best practices guidance. There has been little activity on NAP for the past several years.

[3] For example, the Minnesota Geospatial Commons allows publishers to link to their web services and web apps without needing additional web-service-specific elements from the metadata record; see an implementation of this in the Emerald Ash Borer resource which links to a web map and a map service in addition to other formats.

The draft recommendation was approved by the Commons operational team, the Chief Geospatial Information Officer and, on June 24, 2015, the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council.

Presentations

- **Minnesota GIS/LIS Conference**
  - *Changes Coming to the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines*, October 7, 2011, St. Cloud. Presenters: Nancy Rader and Mark Kotz.
  - *Minnesota Metadata Editor (MME) Released*, October 5, 2012, St. Cloud. Presenter: Nancy Rader.
  - Next Generation Metadata – Content for the Geospatial Commons, October 9, 2015, Duluth. Presenters: Mike Dolbow, Susanne Maeder and Nancy Rader.
  - *Becoming a Publisher on the Minnesota Geospatial Commons*, October 27, 2016, Duluth. Presenter: Mike Dolbow.
- **Workshop**
  - *Safeguarding GIS Data through Metadata*, for MnDOT staff, June 25, 2015, Arden Hills. Presenters: Joella Givens, Nancy Rader, Chris Cialek, Susanne Maeder.
- **Webinar**
  - *Minnesota Metadata Editor*, topic in a MnDOT webinar series, October 20, 2015. Presenters: Jesse Pearson and Susanne Maeder.

Remaining issues

- **Finalize recommended metadata requirements for the Commons**
  - The metadata requirements document is still labelled "discussion draft". The Geospatial Technical Committee no longer exists to finalize it. Are any other steps or review needed in order for "discussion draft" to be removed?
  - Implement the recommendation via governance policies, especially addressing the question of what "mandatory" means in practice:
    - Should "mandatory" mean that a resource will not be published to the Commons unless the element is filled out, even if only to indicate that the information is unknown or not available? Currently, resources can be, and are, published with some mandatory elements blank.
    - Or are some mandatory elements actually treated only as "desirable". This would mean a resource would still be published if the element is blank, but publishers would be highly encouraged to fill something in right away or in future.
  - The DNR's data governance group is discussing more explicit guidelines for data stewardship and expectations for metadata for the agency's published data. This is a promising avenue for developing workable governance for Commons metadata.
- **Recommend best practices for documentation of services such as REST endpoints**
  - The Commons allows for some information about web services; however, it may be desirable to provide more information, perhaps structured more usefully.
  - For an insightful discussion of the additional detail needed for three different types of audiences interested in services (data consumers, data managers, and application developers), see the Commons Workgroup's Web Services Requirements Subgroup Report on "Comprehensive Web Service Documentation" (p. 1-4)
- **Maintain the Minnesota Metadata Editor (MME)**

    - No staff are currently available to maintain or enhance MME.
    - The next version of the EPA's Metadata Editor (EME v. 4.0) is available. It has several attractive features, such as being compatible with ISO19115 and not using an Access database; however, the EPA does not yet recommend it for use to document geospatial data. No staff are currently available to customize this version for use in Minnesota.
- **Revise MGMG 1.2?**
    - In future, there may be a strong enough business need to justify the effort to migrate to the ISO 19115 metadata standard.
    - In future, there may be a strong enough business need to adopt MGMG as a State of Minnesota geospatial **standard** rather than **guideline**. This would entail public review.
    - The workgroup recommends monitoring North Carolina's experience with using a streamlined ISO 19115 standard that is very similar to MGMG; it has potential to be adopted widely at the state level across the U.S.
- **Update educational materials**? Although this was not part of the workgroup's mission, the following educational materials were produced or updated – perhaps additional materials would be useful:
    - MME tutorial, linked from the MME webpage
    - MME FAQ
    - MME help was put online so it could be more easily accessed and updated
- **Conduct more training?** This was not part of the workgroup's mission, but could be useful in future. Metadata assistance is currently provided on an as-needed basis by staff working with Commons publishers, which is likely the best "teachable moment". If more training is needed, more resources will need to be identified.

Who should be informed about the workgroup sunsetting?

- Minnesota Standards Committee
- Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council
- Minnesota Geospatial Commons team
- The workgroup's website will be updated to reflect the fact that it has sunset.

Report prepared by: (With review and editing by several workgroup members.)

Nancy Rader, Minnesota Geospatial Information Office (MnGeo)
nancy.rader@state.mn.us
651-201-2489

Metadata Workgroup Members

- Chris Cialek, MnGeo
- David Fawcett, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Jim Gonsoski, Metropolitan Council (previously at the Minnesota Department of Agriculture)
- Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
- Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
- Susanne Maeder, MnGeo
- Jesse Pearson, Minnesota Department of Transportation
- Nancy Rader, MnGeo
- Hal Watson, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Agenda Item 9. Updates on MN GAC priority projects and initiatives

Additionally, here are MnGeo priority project and initiative updates

GAC Rank	GAC Focus in 2017	Project or Initiative Description	Status	Project Owner	Champ
1	Y	All public geospatial data in MN is free and open to everyone	Active	Len Kne	Ross
2	Y	Assurance that the current MnGeo imagery service will be maintained and improved via a sustainable funding model, including policies on what layers are added and removed over time	Active	Mike Dolbow	Ross
3	Y	Development of an active LiDAR Committee and additional support to move us forward toward updated LiDAR data and related standards	Proposed	Sean Vaughn?	
4	Y	Improvements to MnGeo imagery service capabilities, such as HTTPS, tiling, downloading options, and increased refresh frequency	Active	Mike Dolbow	Ross
5	Y	State wide publicly available parcel data (including a data standard)	Active	George Meyer	
6	Y	State wide publicly available address points data (including a data standard)	Active	Adam Iten	Ross
7	Y	State wide publicly available street centerline data (including a data standard)	Active	Adam Iten	Ross
8	Y	An emergency management damage assessment data standard for rapid, post-event damage assessment GPS field collection	Idea		
9	Y	MN-focused basemap services	Active	Sonia Dickerson	Ross
10	Y	State wide publicly available Geocoding service	Active	Mike Dolbow	Ross
11	Y	Parks and Trails Data Standard	Active	Jim Bunning	Ross
12	N	A policy and procedures for archiving and preserving historical geospatial data	Proposed	Ryan Matke	
13	N	Having aerial photography collections from dozens of years and geographic areas, with no retirement or removal of layers within a freely accessible imagery service	Proposed	Mike Dolbow	Ross
14	N	State wide publicly available Point-in-poly lookup services (for Counties, CTUs, legislative districts, etc.)	Idea		Flemming
15	N	A master address points QA/QC tool – known as the 'Fishbone tool'	Idea		
16	N	A real time assessment and planning tool similar to what Oregon has	Idea		
17	N	A tillable change finder like Pictometry's ChangeFindr	Idea		

Agenda Item 10. MnGeo Boundary Data Update and Alignment Project

Project Summary

Overview

MnGeo is leading an effort to define a stakeholder supported process with the intent to update and align Minnesota's statewide GIS boundary datasets, informed by authoritative data. These statewide datasets include the foundational Public Land Survey System (PLSS) boundaries and other geospatial data layers, many with boundaries concurrent with the PLSS, including cities, township and county boundaries. Aside from the County, Township and Unorganized Territory (CTU) dataset maintained by MnDOT, no state entity has the responsibility to develop or maintain statewide boundary data. Consequently, existing data layers were developed at different times by different agencies for different purposes and with differences in resolution, and accuracy. As a result, other government and tribal entities are developing improved data to more accurately represent area of interest or project. MnGeo recognizes an opportunity to partner with authoritative data producers on a process to, over time, acquire and integrate more current, accurate and authoritative data into the body of statewide boundary layers.

History

The original PLSS layer for Minnesota was developed in the late 60's from section corners digitized from USGS 1:24,000 quadrangle maps. In the early 90's, MN DNR updated the PLSS with a grant from the LCCMR. This effort incorporated more accurate section corners collected by state agencies and local governments using the best GPS technology available at the time. The accuracy of those corner locations are recorded to vary from .5 to 80 feet. No statewide update has been completed since.

PLSS sections and section subdivisions are the foundational units of land ownership and serve as the building blocks of other boundary information, land ownership and land management units, often with coincident boundaries. These include a variety of jurisdictional boundary areas from large units like counties or natural resource areas like parks and forests, to small individual units like parcels. However, due to a variety of factors, many of those boundaries vary in accuracy and are rarely represented as coincident in statewide GIS datasets in use today.

The Need for Greater Accuracy

Most public and municipal services rely on accurate boundaries to be delivered effectively. From school districts to ambulance districts, accurate boundaries are required to define where those services need to be provided and by whom. Likewise, land ownership and taxation is predicated on accurate boundary information. In order for a landowner to be confident of his or her holdings, correct and accurate boundary data is essential. Likewise, good data is required for taxation purposes. Inconsistent and incorrect boundaries lead to service gaps and land disputes on a variety of levels.

Scope

MnGeo will lead an effort to identify stakeholders, authoritative data stewards, and resources required to develop, document and evaluate a process for updating, aligning and maintaining statewide geospatial boundary data layers going forward. While the PLSS is considered the primary dataset to be improved, related datasets will be considered as well, at least including county boundaries and CTU's. In addition, methods for resolving conflicts and inconsistencies will also be considered.

Goals

The following initial goals have been identified, however these goals are subject to modification as informed by stakeholders.

- Identify what boundary data can and should be updated and aligned to produce better statewide boundary layers for MN
- Identify the best authoritative sources for geospatial boundary data in MN (current and future)
- Identify and bring stakeholders of authoritative boundary data together to define a best practices guideline for updating and aligning coincident boundary data for MN
- Explore tools that might assist in the process of updating and aligning boundary data (some research has already begun)
- Provide a proof of concept to test the guideline
    - Document issues encountered, recommendations and or solutions for resolving issues
    - Update the guideline as needed based on the results of the POC
- Define and document agency responsibility and resources for maintaining statewide boundary data going forward
- Produce implementation plan and next steps for moving forward.

Challenges

The following represent known and suspected challenges this project will need to consider.

- Data: Understanding the "landscape" of what "better" data exists to inform this effort, the format of those data and methods to access those data consistently over time.
- Processes: Defining a stakeholder supported technical process to integrate and adjust statewide datasets
- Uniformity: Not all areas of the state have a county surveyor nor has existing data been created in a consistent fashion or format. Therefore, updates processes will need to be flexible enough to accommodate these factors and allow for incremental updates, of both time and location.
- Conflicts: There will be areas where acquired data may not agree. A process to resolve differences will need to be developed and adopted by stakeholders.
- Maintenance: As opposed to a one-time event, this effort will need to accommodate ongoing updates. A data steward willing to commit to continued management of this process and affected datasets will need to be identified.

Deliverables

This project seeks to deliver a conceptual business plan that documents priorities, stakeholders, data needs, data sources, potential standards and technical processes to integrate accurate authoritative data into statewide boundary datasets.

Beyond Scope

While this project seeks to identify the appropriate stakeholders, priorities and potential methodologies to develop more accurate statewide boundary data for Minnesota it will not result in:

- Finalized, updated datasets
- Automated processes and scripts, or tools in place to support the effort moving forward.

Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council
Committee/Workgroup Status Report

Emergency Preparedness Committee

Report date: March 13, 2017

Prepared by:
Randy Knippel
GIS Manager, Dakota County
Randy.knippel@co.dakota.mn.us

Steve Swazee
President, SharedGeo
sdswazee@sharedgeo.org

Meetings:
March 9, 2017

Progress on work plan:
First meeting – focus on information sharing and educational seminar from Guy Konietzko, GeoComm on situational awareness solutions being created for 2018 Super Bowl.
Encouraged & supported Tiger Teams. (See attached status report from Damage Assessment Tiger Team)
U.S. National Grid Tiger team:

- Steve Swazee is engaging national USNG leaders
    - Pursuing development of USNG Institute to measure and track USNG implementation, nationally
    - Create a mechanism to host national USNG seminars and sharing
- Randy Knippel gave presentation at HSEM Conference with BJ Kohlsted, Lake County Emergency Manager
- Randy Knippel gave presentation at monthly Metro Emergency Managers Association (MEMA) meeting
- Pursuing formal participation in Tiger Team by emergency response representatives

Additional comments:

Randy Knippel also joined MEMA as a liaison to the GIS community, will attend monthly meetings and report on GIS activities in the State, MetroGIS, and Metro Counties.

Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council
Committee/Workgroup Status Report

Emergency Preparedness Committee
Damage Assessment Standards Tiger Team

Report date: March 1 2017

Prepared by:
Brad Anderson
GIS Manager City of Moorhead
brad.anderson@ci.moorhead.mn.us

Cory Richter
GIS Coordinator City of Blaine
crichter@ci.blaine.mn.us

Todd Lusk
Senior GIS Specialist Dakota County
Todd.Lusk@CO.DAKOTA.MN.US

Meetings:
1st Meeting - January 10th 2017
2nd Meeting - February 13th 2017
Next Meeting: March 7th 2017 @ 9:00am

Progress on work plan:

- **Approved Purpose Statement**
- **Appointed Project Owner, Project Champion, and Co–Chairs.**
- **Researched NSGIC resources for data standards and best practices**
  - Pre-Incident Checklist: https://www.nsgic.org/public_resources/Pre-Incident-Checklist.pdf
  - Stakeholder Report: (specifically pages 13-16) https://www.nsgic.org/public_resources/Issues_and_Recommendations_for_Four_National_Geospatial_Issues_040114_Final_Revision.pdf
  - FEMA Directive 092-5, states US National Grid is the standard geographic reference system:
  - https://www.uscg.mil/hq/cg5/cg534/nsarc/USNGDirective(2015_10_15_1802)_(3).pdf
- **Documented three known Damage Assessment data schemas currently in use in Minnesota. The excel spreadsheet is based on the one used by the Next Generation**

911 Standards Workgroup, and will be used to help map out the (proposed) Minnesota Damage Assessment standards.

- **The Group feels it in on track for the year, and has made good progress. We have only met twice.**
- **There are only a couple of impediments, but we are working through them with no problems. City resources in Waseca and Blaine are being used for the conference call system, and the online scheduler.**

Additional comments:

- **The Workgroup members are talking with their respective Emergency Managers, Fire Department personnel, and Building Codes officials to learn what specific data would be valuable for them to collect.**
- **ESRI has good information on how their Damage Assessment template was developed through an ESRI blog:**
    - https://blogs.esri.com/esri/arcgis/2012/10/02/whats-new-in-the-public-safety-damage-assessment-template/

- **The Workgroup is looking to present at the Association of Minnesota Emergency Managers (AMEM) conference this September in Breezy Point, MN.**
- **The Workgroup is initially focusing on the data needs for the first 'windshield' damage assessment collection. The needs for the second and third inspections will be addressed in future meetings.**