

**Meeting Notes**  
**County Data Producer Work Group**  
**Wednesday, September 17, 2003**  
**MCIT Building**

Members Present: Dave Drealan - Chair (Carver County), Jane Harper (Washington County), Bill Brown (Hennepin County), David Claypool (Ramsey County), and Gary Swenson (Anoka County)

Members Absent: Jim Hentges (Scott County) and Randy Knippel (Dakota County)

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS)

Summary of July 30, 2003 meeting:

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

Chairman Drealan called the meeting to order at 11:55.

1. License and Fees for Non-Government Access To Parcel Data

License: Except for Hennepin County, each of the other six county administrations is comfortable with the License as drafted by Anoka County. This conclusion was drawn by the group from email messages received prior to the meeting from the Dakota and Scott County representatives. William Brown (Hennepin County) noted that he still had not been able to meet with the County Attorney for a final sign off. However, he did note that in previous discussions, the concepts were not an issue, provided the data recipient is required to acknowledge the licensing requirements prior to retaining access. It was agreed that the "I Agree" button should be sufficient to achieve this requirement. Staff was asked to send the web address to the prototype application page to each representative (*done on the 18<sup>th</sup>*) to test the "I Agree" function and to get back to staff if it does not meet their expectations. It was agreed that **Chairman Drealan will submit the version of the license to staff that the group wants posted on the web site used to support the one-stop-shop order process.**

Fees: It was agreed that the same fee for each county is not a realistic objective at this time but that this fact should not negatively affect the larger objective to achieve a collaborative distribution mechanism, as significant progress has been achieved to reduce differences among the counties, that the user will be able to obtain the fee information all in one place and be able to access the data via a centralized order capability, and each county will be servicing the requests independently after receiving the application via the centralized MetroGIS web site. Staff offered to develop a web page that lists the fees respective fees. **Each county is to submit a description of the fee information they want posted on the web site by October 1st.**

It was agreed that the web page needs a disclaimer to communicate that for counties that have adopted the Dakota County model for volume and subscription discounts that the discount will apply only within each the respective county, since there is no central billing capability.

2. Mailing Label Application

Representatives from all but Anoka County shared that their administrations are not concurred about implementation of the regional application in terms of negatively affecting current review streams. Reasons were offered that included: 1) the private sector is not likely to purchase the regional parcel dataset to obtain free access to this application, at least as long as driven by the current version of regional parcel dataset which does not uniformly include addresses for apartments, condominiums, and mobile homes and 2) the majority of small community users will continue to use the county processes because they do not the staff to support the work in-house, and 3) the regional application would run on parcel data that is updated only on a quarterly basis which is less frequently than individual county produced parcel data are updated.

It was agreed that if the Anoka County representative is unsuccessful in obtaining permission to participate in the regional mailing label application, that the matter should be raised as a policy issue for Policy Board direction. It was also agreed that a response from ESRI (Item 3) is needed as soon as possible.

3. Report ESRI Software Question

At the July 30 meeting, Randy Knippel agreed to speak with an ESRI representative to confirm if the counties can use ArcIMS within their own shops to generate mailing labels for which a fee is required. No report was received, as Knippel could not attend this meeting. Staff was asked to follow-up with Knippel and forward the findings to the group as soon as possible.

4. Access by Utility Companies to Parcel Data

Chairperson Drealan commented that the Carver and Scott County GIS units are preparing sample parcel data for evaluation by Xcel Energy, CenterPoint Energy Minnegasco, and the Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative representatives to see if the data is useful to the utilities. The data should be delivered by Oct 1<sup>st</sup>. If the data are of interest to the utilities, Drealan noted that the next step will be to identify utility data of interest to local government.

5. Joint Purchase of Air Photos – Aerials Express

Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Manager, attended the workgroup's meeting to learn more about how the counties wished to use 2002 leaf-on, 2-foot, color imagery produced by Aerials Express and to determine if the counties would have any interest in collaborating to acquire 2004 leaf-off, 2-foot, imagery that the Council is considering purchasing.

It was agreed that the Council's and counties' uses are not compatible – the counties believe the leaf-on color imagery, offered by Aerials Express, is a good value for use as a backdrop for their parcel data in a web environment and for the vegetation related analysis pertaining to wetland delineation, septic tank evaluations, green acres assessments, etc., whereas, the Council needs leaf-off for its land use interpretation project. Gelbmann encouraged the Counties to evaluate whether the FSA 2003 color, leaf-on, 1-meter imagery that will be available shortly, noting that it will be substantially less expensive (\$1200 for the entire region, as opposed to several thousand dollars per county). The only significant difference is that resolution is 1-meter, as opposed 2-feet. It was agreed that for the uses anticipated by the counties that this resolution difference should not be a major concern. Gelbmann agreed to share a sample of the FSA data with each county to review before releasing any of supplement data maintenance funds for this purpose. He also noted that the Council would likely be purchasing it and would provide access to the counties without charge.

6. Next Meeting

It was agreed the staff would query the members about the possibility of meeting on either October 20 or 21 to give the group a chance to review the status of the topics to be presented to the Policy Board on October 29<sup>th</sup>.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Submitted by,

Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator