

**CT GIS U2U Network Standards Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**

August 18, 2016, 10:00 AM  
Office of Policy & Management  
Room 2A, 450 Capitol Ave.  
Hartford, CT 06106

**Attendees:**

Al Sylvestre, [Department of Labor](#)  
Carl Zimmerman, [Western Connecticut Council of Governments](#)  
Curtis Denton, [City of Bridgeport](#)  
Dan Czaja, [Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection](#)  
David Scherf, [City of Torrington](#)  
Eric Lindquist, [Office of Policy and Management](#) (OPM)  
George Obeng, [Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments](#)  
Glenda Prentiss, [Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments](#)  
Jason Courter, [New England Geosystems](#)  
John Durling, [Department of Transportation](#)  
Laura Zajac, [Connecticut Housing Finance Authority](#)  
Mark Goetz, [Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments](#) (President of GIS U2U Network)  
Mark Hoover, [Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments](#)  
Michael Furnaro, [Latitude Geographics](#)  
Steve Anderson, [VHB](#)  
Thad Dymkowski, [Prime 3SG](#)  
Tyler Kleykamp, [Office of Policy and Management](#)

**1. Introductions**

Eric Lindquist called the meeting at 10:05 and everyone in the room introduced themselves.

**2. Discuss purpose and need for a statewide GIS standards committee**

Tyler Kleykamp, Chief Data Officer for the State of Connecticut and former chairman of the Connecticut Geospatial Council, offered opening remarks and set the stage for continuing the prior standards development work of the Geospatial Council before it disbanded in 2013. Tyler said that data standards were developed in fits and starts, and the only one that ever became finalized was the statewide parcel/cadastral standard. Establishing a standard for address points is OPM's next priority, although the cadastral standard should be updated as well. Tyler said that quality address point data is needed to establish a statewide geocoding service, which would be used by a much broader audience than just GIS professionals. He mentioned that the timing for an address point standard is good because the data hasn't yet been widely developed at the municipal level like parcels have. Tyler cautioned that the standard

needs to be simplistic, so that it can be understood and utilized by towns that don't even have GIS staff.

Mark Goetz said the National Address Database that the U.S. DOT is implementing is worthwhile to consider. He said that it is important to have a process for keeping data up to date and relevant. We need to look at what we want as an end product and figure out how to get Town A's data into there. Mark said we can have extra fields and just not use them all. Mark envisions a web application to upload the data.

Tyler reiterated that there is currently no state funding to do anything above and beyond standards development at this point. Mark said that this effort and the resulting applications should be couched as an economic development tool. Carl Zimmerman said that many towns are spending small amounts of money developing address point data that add up to more than what the State would need to spend if the effort was coordinated; he suggested aggregating and repurposing these funds at the State level. Tyler said it is best to stay out of the political realm and the perception of taking money away from towns would not sit well at this time. He continued that the group should focus on what can be done in an administrative capacity at OPM.

Mark said the group needs to conduct an inventory of what towns have so it is known which towns need to create address points. Laura Zajac asked whether Vision Appraisal could assist with this purpose. Jason Courter asked whether it was possible to get data from the U.S. Post Office. Thad Dymkowski said that he has tried and was unable to get Post Office data. Thad said that the most important application of address points is public safety.

Mark said there is a need to differentiate between a common household address and an apartment complex address. If everything is consistent at the State level it makes it easier for everyone.

Glenda said we need to know the quality of address data (parcel centroid, building centroid, front door, end of driveway, etc.). Carl said that in WestCOG, there is 18 towns using 30+ vendors; each time you split off it makes it harder to integrate back together. Carl said that towns are already starting to go their own ways with MS4 permit mapping required by DEEP's new MS4 general permits.

Thad asked about road centerlines and whether DOT would provide that data. There was further discussion.

Mark asked about consistency with the NAD83 state plane coordinate system. Tyler said he does not see why there is need to dictate which projection is used. Mark mentioned that most people don't care about high-level accuracy but the standards should be as broad as possible.

### **3. Discuss how new standards are to be adopted and implemented once they are recommended to OPM by the committee**

Thad asked what the enforcement mechanism is for the standards, once developed. He invoked the concept of the stick and carrot. Tyler responded that the only

enforcement tool is to make it a condition of state-funded data development. For example, in the past OPM required COGs to follow the cadastral standard when receiving grants to develop parcel data. Tyler noted, however, that it is hard to keep track of state grants to municipalities, as grants for data development can come from many different agencies.

Glenda said she believes most municipalities will willingly adopt a data standard without being forced.

Mark advocated for adding DOT right-of-ways to the parcel standard in the long-term; he embraced the concept of a long-term vision and not expecting immediate results.

Dan Czaja said that, regarding address points, the most efficient short-term thing the group can do is find a way to obtain all of the data that exists, and find a way to make it fit together. Tyler agreed with Dan, adding there needs to be a simple yet practical standard for those municipalities trying to get off the ground. There are users out there that are trying to do things especially useful to the State — healthcare being one example.

Dan said that we need something to indicate a level of accuracy/confidence (building centroid/parcel centroid/building entrance, etc.) and also something to indicate where the data came from.

#### **4. Consider creating subcommittees for address point standards and parcel standards; if subcommittees are to be created, establish leadership roles**

After some discussion, the group was in general agreement that the Standards Committee could support the creation of an address point standard workgroup and a parcel standard workgroup simultaneously. Mark said that the workgroups should each be analyzing and setting the criteria/attribution that their respective data standards will include and share work products with the overall standards committee.

Dan Czaja will lead the address point standard workgroup, with Eric Lindquist as co-leader. Mark will lead the parcel/cadastral standard workgroup. There was discussion among the group regarding the creation of an MS4 mapping standard workgroup (possibly led by DEEP); this would be further discussed at an MS4 mapping meeting at UCONN in the coming week.

There was also discussion regarding authoring a new authoritative town boundary layer to replace the current town boundary layer hosted by DEEP, which is known to have significant accuracy issues. Eric Lindquist suggested that the standards committee look into this down the road but at the present time focus on the creation of new standards for data development.

**5. Develop a work plan; agree on meeting frequency and locations (for each subcommittee, if applicable)**

It was suggested that the new address point and parcel workgroups use document sharing platforms such as Google Drive, Microsoft OneDrive, or Dropbox to share working documents and minimize the need to have in-person meetings.

The leaders for each workgroup would be expected to communicate with those who indicated interest in the workgroups on the electronic survey that was circulated to create the Standards Committee. Eric reminded the group that everyone is volunteering their time for these efforts and that was much appreciated.

**6. Schedule next meeting**

Mark Goetz suggested that the full Standards Committee meet quarterly. Most members signaled their agreement.

**7. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm

*Minutes prepared by Eric Lindquist, OPM*