

Meeting Notes
MetroGIS County Data Producer Workgroup
Wednesday, October 31, 2007
Dakota County Northern Service Center
West St. Paul

Members Present: Randy Knippel – Chair (Dakota County), Pete Henshel (Carver County), Bill Brown (Hennepin County), John Slusarczyk (Anoka County), Jim Hentges (Scott County), and Jane Harper (Washington County)

Members Absent: none

Staff Present: none

Chairperson Knippel called the meeting to order at 10:35 am

1. Our workgroup mission statement

Discussed changing statement on workgroup web page on MetroGIS website. The thought was that the existing statement was too narrowly focused. Agreed to new language as follows:

The County Data Producers Workgroup of the Coordinating Committee is charged with working toward data solutions and standards that have common interest between metro counties. A primary focus has been in developing solutions to parcel data access and other common data and common needs related to their acquisition, development, maintenance, and use.

Action: Knippel will send new language to MetroGIS staff to change web page.

2. Twin Cities Economic Development Web Site

This was a follow-up discussion to that of the same topic at the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board meetings. The concern is that county officials are being contacted about a project that apparently could benefit from increased knowledge of and collaboration with data and expertise at the counties, and through MetroGIS. Jana King has referenced activities with the metro counties; however, we are not sure who has contacted whom.

We are also not clear on what role the Regional Chamber of Commerce has played, nor their level of awareness of GIS data and other resources represented by MetroGIS. Group was not clear on whether Policy Board committee reacting to this was meeting with consultants or the Regional Chamber. Group feels the Regional Chamber should be made aware of the resources available to them through MetroGIS as an opportunity for collaboration and cost-savings.

We also feel that Chambers of Commerce, in general, should be an outreach focus and incorporated into the communication plan as an immediate focus area. Members felt the counties could be proactive in this regard by facilitating outreach to chambers.

Action:

- Each workgroup member will assess the current status of this project in their county, including contacts, level of interest, and level of commitment for this project and send to Knippel who will assemble for a report to the Policy Board.
- Knippel will inquire as to Policy Board actions on this item and respectfully encourage contact with the Regional Chamber.
- Workgroup will pursue identification of and outreach to chambers of commerce within their county and report progress at next meeting. Will encourage targeted outreach to chambers by MetroGIS outreach and communication plan and GCGI outreach committee.
- Knippel will develop initial language of a position statement reflecting the group's concerns and ideas to be reviewed by members and refined for each member to share with their respective representative on the Policy Board.

3. Recorder Compliance Fund

Discussion was prompted by recent article in GIS/LIS News by Will Craig at Will's request. The article was focused on examples of counties using these funds to further efforts to build parcel data. Workgroup would like to see further investigation, research and analysis of how the fund is being used and can be used, especially in the context of the metro area. Has anyone talked to MACO or the MN Recorder's group? Lisa Hanni (Goodhue Recorder) may be a resource.

Action:

- Each member will assess their county's administration of the fund and use of fund and report back to group. Knippel will coordinate and assemble report for Policy Board.
- Knippel will report back to Will Craig and suggest further research.

4. Data Fees and Royalties

a. Standardizing fees

Group agreed that any focus exclusively on fees will not be very productive. However group sees value in assessing and comparing current GIS products to look for opportunities for efficiency and collaboration. Group is also interested in looking for opportunities to align or standardize products with particular interest in incorporating the national grid.

Action:

- Each member will report current products to Knippel who will coordinate and develop report for review.
- Once the report is ready, members will look for opportunities for discussion at next meeting.

b. Other public / private models

This discussion was driven by an email from Will Craig to Bill Brown as Coordinating Committee Chair, pointing out a data distribution model in Australia where a public / private partnership was formed and the data is distributed through private companies with royalties returned to the originating agencies. Workgroup felt this item was addressed through recent Policy Board discussions pertaining to the visioning process and business plan development where no particular focus will be given to public / private partnerships; however, we will remain open to considering any proposals by private entities.

Action: none

5. Data licensing - revisit derivative work restrictions

Members have common, recurring issues raised by potential data customers about licensing restrictions. Discussion included current activities to refine license by Ramsey County through consultation with their attorney, desires by Hennepin to create a “shrink wrap” license (supported by other members), and concerns by Dakota about license language related to copyrights preventing marketing of derivative products.

Action:

Claypool will share license language resulting from consultation with their attorney. Knippel and Brown will engage their attorneys in follow-up conversations. Attorneys from those three counties worked together on licensing discussions previously. Results of those discussions will be shared with the group, potentially impacting licensing language of all 7 counties.

6. Formalize emergency preparedness data responsibilities

Knippel explained that the current state of the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup is officially listed as “inactive”. However, given recent renewed activity on the GCGI Emergency Preparedness Committee (EPC), he would like to reactivate it and take steps to recognized the emergency preparedness data as an officially endorsed MetroGIS dataset with custodial responsibilities tied to the counties as outlined in the published project report dated September 1, 2005. Ensuing activities would be related to updating the existing datasets using the custodian roles outlined in that report. This will then be offered to the GCGI EPC as a candidate model for statewide implementation.

Members generally supported the concept of moving forward but want more details regarding data layers and names of county GIS contacts involved in previous emergency preparedness data efforts.

Action:

Knippel will provide details requested to members. Members will verify contacts or identify updated contacts and talk to them about emergency preparedness data to identify any issues with the county's role. Knippel will work with Randy Johnson to define process for creating MetroGIS endorsed data sets for emergency preparedness using custodian roles as defined in the 2005 report.