

Meeting Notes
County Data Producer Work Group
Monday, March 31, 2003
Roseville City Hall

Members Present: Dave Drealan - Chair (Carver County), Jane Harper (Washington County), Randy Knippel (Dakota County), Bill Brown (Hennepin County), Jim Hentges (Scott County), and Gary Swenson (Anoka County)

Members Absent: David Claypool (Ramsey County),

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS) and Mark Kotz (MetroGIS/Metropolitan Council)

Prior the meeting, the group spent a few minutes talking about the role of County GIS and GIS in general concerning Emergency Management and ongoing efforts to educate the community on the benefits of using GIS technology as well as efforts to identify sources of data that need to be coordinated for quick access in times of emergency. Randy Knippel agreed to send information he had received about a NSGIC resource citing several suggested emergency management related data guidelines. All agreed there is a need to be more proactive to advocate for the benefits of GIS to the emergency management community. It was agreed as a future agenda idea to talk about outreach efforts that should be pursued.

Meeting Summary for January 27 meeting

The document is posted at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/index.shtml#private2>. No changes were suggested.

1. Shrink-Wrap License

- Anoka County: The county attorney is not concerned about the shrink wrap concept but needs proof that the recipient has acknowledged agreement to the license provisions. No concerns with draft liability protection language.
- Carver County: Risk management and legal staff are okay with the idea of a shrink wrap license, the draft long-form license prepared by staff, and the procedures used by Toronto and Kentucky for web-enabled licensure.
- Dakota County: The county attorney had not yet been consulted. Suggested that the form be generic enough to apply to all data, not just parcels. The group concurred and discussed options to accomplish, including an appendix attached to the license for listing the data covered by the license.
- Hennepin County: Legal staff okay with shrink-wrap concept, provided the data recipient has to complete some affirmative action to gain access. The procedures used by Toronto and Kentucky that require clicking an "I agree" button to pass from the license to the order form was thought to be adequate.
- Scott County: No additional concerns noted.
- Washington County: Legal staff and affected department heads okay with the draft long-form license prepared by staff and the shrink wrap concept but want to include a declaration of copyrighted data to preserve options to cost recover.

Gary Swenson agreed coordinate with the Anoka County Attorney to:

- 1) Modify the draft license prepared by staff to make it generic and applicable to all data,
- 2) Remove the text crossed out and add the text underlined by staff,
- 3) Include both a conventional signature page and proposed language that would permit the document to be used in a shrink wrap process,
- 4) Send to the other county representatives to review with their legal staffs. All agreed that there should be no reference to fees in the license.

For the next meeting: It was agreed to discuss how to advertise availability of the data via this new process. Randy Knippel agreed to prepare a proposal for discussion at the next meeting to address volume discounts and subscriptions.

2. Data Request Instructions

The group agreed that the instructions should be simplified and that the users should be given the option to identify the county(ies) for which data is requested. Mark Kotz agreed to draft a proposal for discussion at the next meeting.

3. Regional Mailing Label Application

Staff reported that Carver County had agreed to share their application with the MetroGIS community, that 4 of the 7 county reps stated they are in favor of pursuing a regional project, and that a mailing label application remains a high priority of the Metropolitan Council. After some discussion concerning next steps, it was agreed that Alison Slaats, technical manager for the Council project, should investigate the difficulty of deploying Carver County's application in conjunction with the regional parcel dataset. If reasonably straightforward, it was agreed she should do so to enable the community to use it, generally decide whether it will meet their needs, and identify any desired enhancements. All agreed that launching a Version One relatively quickly to test and refine through an iterative process is the preferred method to address this common need.

However, if Alison concludes that the application will not be easy to convert to run on the regional dataset, the workgroup agreed that a thorough needs assessment should be undertaken to ensure that if the project proceeds, the end result will satisfy broad community needs. The group asked staff to invite Alison to attend the next meeting to report on her findings.

Harper asked if the application could be used to eliminate the need for Washington County to support some of the functions currently part of their QuickAccess product. The group concurred that this is not likely running on the regional parcel dataset. All agreed that the proposed project should remain focused on the regional parcel dataset.

4. Data Maintenance Payment and Current Budget Situation

Discussion was postponed to the next meeting. The members were referred to the information provided in the Coordinating Committee agenda packet for April 9 that would be mailed that afternoon.

5. One-Time Programming to Populate Units/Parcel Field in Regional parcel Dataset

Mark Kotz explained this request, which is driven by an internal need of the Metropolitan Council. This information is currently only reported in the regional dataset by Ramsey County. The other county representatives agreed to email Mark with an explanation whether the data is captured and an estimate of the amount of effort needed to populate the field in their portion of the regional parcel dataset. If need be, this topic will be discussed at the next meeting.

6. Distribution of Individual County Parcel Datasets via DataFinder

Staff explained a request that had been received to access county parcel data that is not part of the regional dataset via DataFinder. Currently, the only parcel data available in this manner are the seven county components of the regional dataset. Dave Drealan expressed some interest on behalf of Carver County but the consensus of the group was that until there are more requests the group should concentrate on the other high priority activities that it has previously agreed to address.

7. Other Items Added at Meeting - Data Distribution Proposal from Barclay Mapping

It was agreed to discuss this proposal at the next meeting.

8. Next Meeting

It was agreed to meet next on May 8, starting at 1:30 at the Roseville City Hall. Agenda items are to include:

- License proposal for private sector access to parcel data
- Method to describe data request
- Fee proposal – subscription and volume discounts
- Barclay map proposal (emailed prior to this meeting)
- Advertisement methods to non-government
- Regional mailing label application research results
- Units/parcel - effort required
- Data maintenance payments/ next version of GIS Data Sharing Agreements

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Submitted by,
Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator