

Meeting Notes
MetroGIS Producer Work Group
Wednesday, November 4, 2002

Present: Dave Drealan - Chair (Carver County), Jane Harper (Washington County), Randy Knippel (Dakota County), David Claypool (Ramsey County), Bill Brown (Hennepin County), Jim Hentges (Scott County), Gary Swenson (Anoka County), Randy Johnson (MetroGIS) and Kathie Doty (Richardson, Richter, & Associates, Inc.).

1. **Approval of Meeting Notes From the September 25, 2002 Meeting**

Meeting notes from the September 25 meeting were reviewed and a revision to the Scott County portion was offered. Meeting notes were approved as revised.

2. **Discussion of the Policy Board Direction With Regard to Distribution Notes Parcel Data**

The group discussed distribution of Parcel Data to the private sector. Bill Brown noted that it is difficult to determine how the market will respond since we have never sold or distributed parcel data plus 25 attributes in the form that they are now available. The group feels that future sales of parcel data without attributes will not be significant, but there may be a market for parcels with attributes, especially if these datasets can be subsetted..

3. **Game Plan for Distribution**

Randy reviewed the Policy Statement and indicated that the plan was for this document to be approved by the Policy Board and then go to the counties for approval. Counties can determine whether they want to take the Policy Statement to their Boards or simply review with management staff. A cover letter under Commissioner Reinhardt's signature will be prepared to refer the Policy Statement to counties. The results of county input on the Policy Statement will be reported to the Coordinating Committee on December 18 and to the MetroGIS Policy Board on January 29. The target for reporting on internal county discussions to develop comments on the Policy Statement is December 9, 2002.

With regard to developing more specific recommendations between November and March, 2003, the group worked on outlining a process that would streamline access to datasets but would not require the development of an e-commerce tool at this time. Randy Knippel suggested that MetroGIS and the counties promote the use of the new datasets, and Randy Johnson agreed that distribution of information could be made to business magazines and broadcast emails to existing lists. However, the group also acknowledged that since the market for this data is not well understood, it may be a challenge to promote to the right sectors. The market may be comprised of business analysts and market analysts and not necessarily the realtors and developers that we are most familiar with.

Further details associated with how a distribution could occur were discussed. Counties are generally in favor of centralizing as much of the process as possible, and would like requests be made electronically. Pricing of the dataset was briefly discussed and Dave Drealan suggested the possibility of the counties agreeing on one price for a test period. However, it was also acknowledged that having differential prices would not necessarily

be a show stopper for a pilot distribution. The primary benefit to users is not necessarily having one price, but the fact that they could access compatible data in the same coordinate system regardless of which metro counties is of interest. It was also discussed that fees can vary even within a county depending on how one accesses the data, and therefore, having one fee might be a challenge for other reasons. The main goal of a pilot would be to test the value of the new dataset at this point in time and to glean more information about the markets for parcel data plus attributes.

Dave Drealan asked about availability of funding from MetroGIS to build an e-commerce tool and whether there was an end point for these funds being available. Randy Johnson indicated that there is some funding in the 2003 budget for DataFinder enhancements, and that funding beyond 2003 is unknown.

Another detail discussed related to how interested users could identify what parcels they want to purchase. The goal would be to have users identify areas of interest electronically, i.e. through "clipping" the area of interest and sending this on electronically. However, manual method were also discussed; Randy Knippel and others indicated that it is not unusual for interested users to use paper methods, circling the area of interest on a paper map, and simply faxing that to the counties. Randy Johnson agreed to talk to technical staff in the Council GIS Department to determine whether there are ways to electronically identify data of interest. He indicated that he did not think that it was possible to identify parcels without making them available for downloading - if a user can see parcel boundaries, they can get the data. He also agreed to talk to Allison about the possibility of using municipal boundaries and major roads to identify areas of interest, rather than parcel boundaries.

The primary objective the group agreed upon was to simulate, to the extent possible, a one-stop shopping experience from the data user perspective. One feature would be a consistent licensing process and uniform license. From the user perspective, they could also find information from DataFinder to learn about procedures required to access parcel data plus attributes, and the goal would be to make it as simple and easy as possible.

At the end of this discussion, it was determined that additional technical information is required with regard to how to access data. Kathie and Randy will draft that material for the Work Group to review and distribute these prior to the next meeting, so that we can move forward on working out details associated with parcel data distribution to the private sector.

3. Discussion of Work Group Work Plan

The Work Group did not get to discussion of other items that are presently on their plate. This agenda item will be referred to the next meeting of the Work Group.

4. Next Meeting Date

The group agreed to meet at 1:00 p.m. on November 25, to continue discussions on working out the details associated with distribution of data. (this date was subsequently re-scheduled to December 6 at 9:30 AM).

The meeting was adjourned.