

Meeting Notes
MetroGIS Producer Work Group
Monday, December 16, 2002
RRA Offices

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).

1. Update on the Letter from Commissioner Reinhardt

The group briefly discussed distribution and agreed to distribute the letter to each Policy Board member. The letter will be used primarily for internal discussions within each County.

2. Collaborative Solution Options-Revisions

Jane Harper's comments that were e-mailed to the Workgroup prior to the meeting were briefly discussed. The comments were generally approved and will be incorporated into the next revision of this document.

3. Licensing Issues

The group discussed the concept of "shrink-wrap" licensing. This concept means that the conditions of licensing would essentially be in place upon acceptance of the dataset by either public sector or private sector users. A user would either check a box saying that they accept the conditions, or there would be an OK box to be clicked prior to accessing data. Washington and Dakota Counties indicated that the shrink-wrap concept was acceptable, and Randy Knippel suggested that the group proceed with the assumption that shrink-wrapping would be approved. Jim Hentges and David Claypool also indicated that they do not expect any major concerns. Bill Brown indicated that he had not discussed this concept with the County Attorney's office, but shrink-wrapping is a concept that is consistent with the County Auditor's desire to streamline processes. Gary Swenson also indicated that he did not expect any problems. Dave Drealan indicated that Carver County does not license at all. They function under the principle that if you buy it, you own it. He also indicated that his attorney had indicated that shrink-wrapping would be acceptable. The group agreed that the provisions of any license should be included on web pages explaining the parcel datasets and how to access them.

The group also discussed possible fees and the concept of a uniform fee of a nickel per parcel. Randy Knippel indicated that Dakota also charges a minimum overhead charge of \$50 in addition to the per parcel fee. Randy Johnson raised concern about statutory restrictions on what can be charged for. Also discussed briefly was the concept of subscription fees and volume discounts for more regular users. Randy Knippel acknowledged that there are many different pricing options the group could discuss, but the most important thing is to get going on making access to the data easier. The group also acknowledged that there may be two distinct markets for the data: users who want to extract data on a piecemeal basis and occasionally, and users who want to access the entire regional database on a repeated and regular basis. It may make sense to employ different pricing strategies for these two markets.

Mark distributed proposed revisions to metadata for parcel datasets. Through this discussion it became apparent that we need to ensure that all counties have access to DataFinder Café so that parcel datasets with attributes can be extracted as users request such. Randy Johnson asked when the metadata should be revised and whether Counties want the revisions made immediately so that private sector users would know about the impending availability of parcel

datasets. The general response was that we need to make these changes soon, and that MetroGIS should continue to revise metadata and distribute it to the group for final approval. Other support that MetroGIS was asked to provide included:

- Revised licensing provisions.
- Preparation of e a web site with instructions for private sector users interested in accessing parcel data.
- Design of methods for implementing the shrink-wrap concept.

Randy Knippel also indicated that we still need a legal opinion on how the shrink-wrap process will work in terms of whether a signature will be required or just checking off a box.

4. **Other Work Group Tasks**

The group briefly discussed other tasks that are on their agenda and determined that we should deal with non-profits and other issues after the private sector distribution has been organized and is near completion. David Claypool indicated that Ramsey County has an effective process for distributing data to non-profits using the existing user group.

The next meeting was set for January 27 from 1:30 to 3:30 at RRA offices.