

Meeting Minutes
MetroGIS Socioeconomic Information Need Workgroup
Tuesday, November 18, 2003
MN Counties Insurance Trust Building
(2:00 to 4:00 p.m.)

1. Call to Order/Attendance

Members Present: Paul Buschmann (Hennepin County), Heather Britt (Urban Coalition), John Carpenter (Excensus LLC), Will Craig (U of M), Amy Fisher (MN Dept. of Employment and Economic Development), Kathy Johnson (Metropolitan Council), Tim Zimmerman (Hennepin County), and Mark VanderSchaaf (City of St. Paul)

Members Absent: Mary Karcz (Ramsey County), Barbara Ronningen (State Demographic Center), Dick Carlstrom (TIES), Sandra Paddock (Wilder Research Center), and Heidi Welsch (Dakota County)

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS) and Tanya Mayer (MetroGIS/Metropolitan Council)

Chairperson Craig began the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

2. Accept Agenda

The agenda was accepted as proposed.

3. Approve minutes from October 28, 2003

The October 28, 2003 meeting summary was accepted, as submitted.

4. Member Reports – Tasks Assigned Last Meeting

1. Craig reported that he had meet with staff and that a prototyping process is underway for a web-based resources page to make it easier for users to find socioeconomic data they need. The goal is to submit the prototype page to the Coordinating Committee with the Phase I Workgroup Report and Recommendations.
2. Buschmann reported that he had been unable to connect with the contact person at the First Call For Help and that he and Welsch are still pursuing a dialogue among the seven counties concerning improving access to and usability of social services data.
3. Carlstrom reported to staff prior to the meeting that TIES remains interested in serving as a custodian for a school location dataset and that he hopes to have a decision sometime in December.

5. Review of Phase I Report

Chairperson Craig summarized the draft Phase I workgroup report. Following a substantive discussion, several modifications were agreed upon for the Phase I report and the accompanying gap analysis matrix, which Craig agreed to address in to the final report. The areas concentrated on were as follows:

- Add a statement that the matrix is an attachment.
- Modify the matrix to remove the comment field, assuming all of the comments are adequately dealt with in the report. Several changes to the numbers were suggested. Staff asked the members to submit a written summary of all desired changes.
- Numerous small editing and corrections.
- The document should convey a stronger finding that existing data sources do not address a majority of the priority needs and that there is a need for additional work to address these them. The latter statement is to establish a clear need for a Phase II workgroup.

Craig requested Carpenter's assistance for modifications to Section 6 regarding direction to the Phase II workgroup and agreed to send the modified version to the members for comment prior to forwarding it to the Coordinating Committee for consideration on December 17th.

Several members of the current workgroup expressed interest in participating in the Phase II effort. Staff was asked to contact each member for a formal reply when the Phase II effort is initiated.

6. Review Phase I Recommendations

Craig summarized the draft recommendations that had been sent to the members with the agenda materials. Changes agreed upon were as follows:

- a) Change “Internet-enabled resources page” to “web page”. Recommend that the Phase II workgroup identify an appropriate custodian to ensure that the content of this page is kept up-to-date.
- b) Add a new item “b”: Design a comment mechanism into the web page (Item a) that provides the users with a means to inform MetroGIS of data sets not listed and to identify other outstanding unmet needs and widely advertise the existence of the site.
- c) (old “b”) 1) drop the term “federal”. Add a new item “4” stating “Use the comments from web site users in conjunction with comments received at a user forum to be hosted by MetroGIS approximately six months from the time the web page is operational to evaluate the effectiveness of what has been accomplished to date and identify further desired action that MetroGIS should pursue.
- d) Change “c” to “d” and modify to insure the concept of the need to further investigate options to accommodate small area analysis needs, that is an emphasis on address level data management, is clearly communicated to the Phase II workgroup.

7. Next Meeting

Assuming the Coordinating Committee accepts the workgroup’s Phase I report and recommendations, staff explained that an invitation will be sent to all current members, and individuals yet to be identified, to reconvene as the Phase II workgroup at a time convenient to the participants.

8. Adjourn

Britt moved and Zimmerman seconded to adjourn at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Randall Johnson, AICP