

Meeting Notes
County Data Producer Work Group
Thursday, July 22, 2004
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg., St. Paul.

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

Members Absent: No one has been assigned to take Gary Swenson's place (Anoka County)

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS)

1. Summary of June 22, 2004 meeting:

Several of the members had not reviewed the summary of the March meeting so no action was taken. Staff agreed to send the summary along with the summary of this meeting to the members.

2. Procedure for Responding to Requests

Chairperson Drealan suggested that the workgroup agree on a set of principles to govern its decision making to avoid the misunderstanding that resulted with the group's consideration of Will Craig's request for MetroGIS to pursue a policy of supporting access to archived versions of the Regional Parcel Dataset.

The group agreed that it will abide by the following procedural principals when considering topics within its scope of authority:

- a) All proposals need to be in writing
- b) The Workgroup Chair will decide if the proposer/applicant should be invited to attend the workgroup's initial discussion of the proposal.
- c) The Workgroup will decide whether a proposal has merit for further investigation – whether the members should take the proposal to their respective managements for comment. This decision will be documented and include an explanation of any concerns as well as anticipated benefits. Proposals may move forward with less than seven counties in favor.
- d) If a proposal has merit for further consideration, the Workgroup will agree on the process for further review prior to initiating such review. The review process is expected to vary from proposal to proposal depending upon the nature of the proposal.

3. Next Generation Data Sharing Agreements

The Staff Coordinator explained that the Dakota and Hennepin County attorneys had just completed their review of the proposal they received in early May and that the Metropolitan Council's attorney is now reviewing their comments. Staff noted that a meeting had been held with Chairperson Reinhardt on June 25th to receive direction concerning how to expedite the legal review process that was, at that time, nearly six months old with no end in sight. Chairperson Reinhardt authorized a less than seven-county agreement if that is what it takes to move forward in a direction that the majority of parties can agree on.

Staff mentioned that one of the complications has been the desire of the Hennepin County Attorney to require the Hennepin County Board to sign off on the online licensure application as opposed to authorizing the concept at the policy level and delegating the specifics to management to work out. Several of the workgroup members concurred with staff's preference that the agreement should include only high level policy direction and that managers should have the authority to work out the operational details. They concurred that including specifics, such as the text for the "I agree" buttons and their sequence, in the agreement would potentially hamper timely implementation of refinements should they be found necessary. That said, they agreed with staff's position to include the "I agree" statements if that is what is needed to achieve agreement and execute the agreements. All agreed that the process has already taken too much time and that the issues need to be frankly shared with the Policy Board. It was agreed that there is too little time to bring the impasse to the Board next week but that if resolution is not essentially achieved at the August 4th demonstration of the online application to the Dakota and Hennepin County attorneys that staff is to speak with the Workgroup Chair to discuss options.

4. Historical Parcel Data Request

Chairperson Drealan summarized the request, which was attached to the agenda materials. After some discussion, the group concluded that the first proposal – support historical versions of the Regional Parcel Dataset and provide access to licensed users – was acceptable but that action on the second proposal - unlicensed access to anyone who wished it when the data are at least 3 years old and missing name and address data – should be postponed until the non-profit access issues had been resolved.

Motion: Harper moved and Knippel seconded to:

- 1) Recommend that the Roles and Responsibilities stipulated in the Policy Summary Statement for the Regional Parcel Dataset be modified as necessary to accommodate supporting historical versions of the Regional Parcel Dataset and providing access to licensed users, subject to the Council and counties entering into an agreement that permits the Council to distribute the data.
- 2) Postpone further consideration on the request for unlicensed access to three-year old data even when missing names and addresses, until the workgroup concludes its consideration of a proposal currently before it to grant parcel data access without fee to specified non-profit interests.

Motion carried, ayes all. (Editor's note: Claypool had left the meeting before this vote but had indicated his approval before he left.)

A reason given for recommending approval of the first proposal was that none of the counties is currently archiving their parcel data in manner that would lend itself to easy access and that archiving the regional dataset would be a great serve to both the entire user community including the counties themselves.

It was agreed that this action should be forwarded to the Coordinating Committee for consideration at its September meeting.

5. Updating TLG Street Centerline Data

Due to limited time, this topic was not discussed.

6. Regional Policy For Access to Parcel Data by Non-Profits and Community Groups

Chairperson Drealan summarized the proposal that had been submitted by Will Craig and that was attached to the agenda materials. The group generally felt that if a decision were made to open access to non-profits, that the organizations cited in this application would probably be on the list. That said, the group concluded that it should step back and attempt to better understand the breadth of the non-profit community as they believe the list could be much larger than currently before them.

Staff was asked to explain the current Third Party access rules and why they are generally not workable – access must be for a specified project affiliated with a qualifying public party which generally means restricted to the geography of that party's jurisdiction.

Harper suggested that a modified Third Party agreement might be one option, which would grant access in a manner that addresses the problems associated with the current 3rd party access rules.

Everyone agreed to give the matter some thought on the own prior to the next meeting, including possibly speaking with others in their respective organizations.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for August 26 at 9:30 a.m.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Submitted by,
Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator