

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg. – Room 209
June 22, 2004

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Harper called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and asked all present to state their name and the organization they represent.

Members Present: *Counties:* Bill Brown and Scott Simmer (Hennepin), Dave Drealan (Carver), Jane Harper (Washington), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Randy Knippel (Dakota); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Mark Vander Schaaf for Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District), and Nancy Pollock, Metropolitan 911 Board; *Non-Profits:* Sandra Paddock (formerly with Wilder Research Center); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (URS Corp.); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC), Joella Givens (Mn/DOT), and Robert Maki (DNR); *Utilities:* Al Laumeyer (CenterPoint Energy Minnegasco); *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Ned Phillips (Rice Creek Watershed District).

Members Absent: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Business Geographics:* Chet Harrison (CB Richard Ellis); *Cities:* Bob Cockriel (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington), and Karen Johnson (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul); *Counties:* [vacant] (Anoka), David Claypool (Ramsey); *Federal:* Ron Wencil (USGS); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); and *Schools:* Lee Whitcraft (TIES).

Support Staff: Mark Kotz, Steve Fester, Randall Johnson, and Kathie Doty (Richardson, Richter & Associates, Inc.)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as submitted, with the exception that Item 5c was dropped at the request of Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Arbeit moved and Hentges seconded to approve the summary for the Committee's March 31st meeting, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF APRIL 28 POLICY BOARD MEETING

Staff Coordinator Johnson and Chairperson Harper summarized the major topics considered by the Policy Board at its April 28th meeting.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Operating Guidelines – Fourth Reading

Chairperson Harper summarized the changes presented in Section 10 of Articles II and III which propose a procedure for communicating with Policy Board and Coordinating Committee members who have not attended for a specified period of time. She noted that the currently proposed language is a compromise between language suggested by the Committee at the last meeting and concerns raised by Chairperson Reinhardt that the previously suggested language was too harsh.

Motion: Read moved and Henry seconded that the Coordinating Committee approve proposed modifications to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines, as illustrated in the document dated May 5, 2004, and recommend Policy Board approval. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) Enhancements to Regional Parcel Dataset – Policy Statement

Mark Kotz summarized the process that resulted in the proposed changes. He emphasized that the proposed changes presented in the proposed Regional Policy Statements are the same as considered by the Committee at its March 31st meeting and which the Committee directed staff to put into regional policy statement format for formal approval at this meeting. Arbeit suggested that the report to the Policy Board should make it clear that the counties will each need to modify their current attribute extract routines to implement the proposed enhancements, but that the one-time programming resources proposed in the next generation data sharing agreements are acceptable to each county and not onerous by their own admission.

Motion: Henry moved and Knippel seconded that the Coordinating Committee approve the enhancements to the MetroGIS-endorsed Regional Parcel Dataset, as identified in the modified Regional Policy Summary Statement dated May 5, 2004, and recommend that the Policy Board authorize implementation of these modified polices, effective January 1, 2005. Motion carried, ayes all.

c) Regional Parcel Data Policy – Historical Versions & Public Domain Access

Item removed when the agenda was approved.

d) Regional Parcel Data Policy – Unlicensed View Only Access

Knippel summarized the proposal as outlined in the staff report. He commented that the Emergency Preparedness (EP) Workgroup is working with the seven metro area counties to resolve any and all concerns related to maintaining security for parcel data if this proposal is pursued to waive licensure for access via only the proposed application. Knippel also commented that the primary purposes for the application are to educate emergency managers about GIS data that are available to them, engage the emergency managers to point out problems with the current data and provide guidance for their refinement, and raise the awareness of emergency managers about GIS technology and how they can benefit from its use. He emphasized there is little in the way of GIS functionality in the current version of the application and it is not intended to be used in emergency situations.

Knippel closed with a comment that several of the counties are already offering view-only, unlicensed access to parcel data via their own Internet-based property information query applications. He and the other members of the County Data Producers Workgroup believe this proposal is simply an extension of what is already a recognized policy by some of the counties.

Motion: Givens moved and Knippel seconded that the Coordinating Committee:

- 1) Defer to the seven counties to decide if a policy of supporting view-only access to parcel data via an ArcIMS server based EP application provides sufficient protection for their data. If the counties are willing to acknowledge their approval via the example letter / resolution, dated May 18, 2004 (attached to the staff report in the agenda packet), the Committee recommends that the Policy Board endorse and promote this activity as a matter of regional policy.
- 2) Recommend that the Policy Board request the Metropolitan Council to begin support of this DataFinder-related responsibility upon receiving affirmative acknowledgement from the counties in the form of the above referenced letter / resolution.

Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Socioeconomic Information Needs – Web Resources Page Custodian

The Staff Coordinator summarized the proposal, noting that a specific U of M department had not yet been settled upon to perform the proposed custodian functions. It was agreed that as long as there are no changes to the cited roles and responsibilities listed in the report, there is no need for the Committee to delay action on the proposed statement until the actual U of M department is settled upon. The members also concurred that it is a good thing that MetroGIS's custodian base for regional data solutions will

broaden to include a non-government entity, with the U of M posed to join the ranks of the Metropolitan Council, DNR, and the seven counties.

Motion: Read moved and Givens seconded that the Coordinating Committee approve the Regional Policy Statement, dated June 11, 2004, which sets forth the custodial roles and responsibilities necessary to support the Internet-based Socioeconomic Resources Page, and recommend its approval by the Policy Board once the U of M selects a specific department to act as the custodian. Motion carried, ayes all.

Note: The Staff Coordinator agreed to speak to Will Craig about the need for the U of M to settle upon a specific department and annual timing for updates to the website before the Committee's recommendation will be submitted to the Policy Board for its consideration.

f) Performance Measures – Data Anomaly Discussion

Kathie Doty, member of the MetroGIS Staff Support Team, pointed out a spike in data downloading activity that occurred in April. Arbeit commented that MetroGIS's status as a node of The National Map may explain the additional activity. Kotz agreed to speak with Alison Slaats, DataFinder Manager, to investigate this possibility. (*Editor's note: After the meeting, staff confirmed that the current DataFinder Café use statistics do not include viewing of Web Map Services, and therefore the impact of the TNM is currently not being tracked.*) Givens mentioned that the spike could also be due to organizations gearing up for summer field projects. The group concurred that this is a strong possibility. Maki also mentioned that students approaching end of semester project deadlines could also have an impact of the level of use.

g) Fall Workshop – Refine Preliminary Agenda & Pre-Retreat Issue Discussion

Kathie Doty, member of the MetroGIS Staff Support Team, summarized a preliminary workshop preparation strategy that the workgroup had developed. The option of surveying the broad MetroGIS constituency prior to the fall workshop and using the results to guide workshop discussion generated considerable Committee discussion about past practices and objectives for the proposed workshop. In the end, it was agreed that a survey should be administered following the Committee's SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) exercise that is currently proposed for the September Committee meeting. The results of the SWOT exercise would then be used to craft questions for the survey of the broader community.

Maki commented that a lot has changed in the world of technology since MetroGIS launched nearly 9 years ago. This changing technology world needs to be integrated into the vision. Vander Schaaf concurred, noting that solutions to common application needs will likely play a heavier role than in the past.

Read commented that the theme for the workshop "Are We Done?" makes her nervous. She used the metaphor that MetroGIS has nearly completed laying of the train tracks but now we have a railroad to run. On the other hand, Brown stated that he liked the theme. In the end, it was agreed that the theme is provocative, which was the intent, and serves the purpose of needing to balance perceived needs of the producer and user communities as well as provide perceived real value to each stakeholder. Harper commented that if at the workshop the conclusion is that more needs to be done, those needs must be acknowledged by those with the required resources.

It was agreed that the proposed SWOT exercise would be an excellent opportunity to regroup ourselves in current needs and expectations that must be clearly understood before deciding if there will be a next level or phase, whatever that may be. It was also agreed that 2-3 hours should allotted for the SWOT exercise.

h) GIS Demonstration for July Policy Board meeting

Henry moved and Givens seconded that the Coordinating Committee invite Dennis Welsch to share with the Policy Board on July 28th how the City of the Roseville has improved its responsiveness to community needs via use of the GIS and robust socioeconomic data. Motion carried, ayes all.

6. PROJECT UPDATES

- a) The Staff Coordinator commented that negotiations are in progress with the Dakota and Hennepin County attorneys in hopes of reaching agreement from a legal perspective on the Next Generation Data Sharing Agreement and Parcel Data License. He mentioned that the goal is to distribute the proposed agreement to the other counties by the end of July.
- b) The Staff Coordinator commented on the strategic alliance that is continuing to mature between the Metro 911 Board and MetroGIS via the work the MetroGIS Address Workgroup. Knippel and Pollock affirmed the need to maintain regular communication between the Metro 911 Board and the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup.
- c) Knippel summarized the efforts of the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup to engage the emergency preparedness community in an effort to refine data relevant to their needs and inform them of GIS resources available to them. He also commented on the workgroup's efforts to publish articles in various publications to increase awareness of GIS resources available to emergency managers and encouraged Committee members to pass along articles that would be of interest to the emergency management community.
- d) Arbeit updated the group on the current effort to enhance GeoIntegrator and integrate it and DataFinder Café now that the Legislature has unfrozen grant funds that were dedicated to the project last year.
- e) Drealan summarized the work of the County Data Producers Workgroup including the regional mailing label application, which is on hold for the next generation data sharing agreement, and the potential for sharing parcel data with utilities. Laumeier affirmed his company (CenterPoint Energy) is interested but that he has not had an opportunity to thoroughly evaluate the potential of the proposal. The Staff Coordinator also mentioned that he had heard from the Dakota County Electric Coop and they too are interested in further talks.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

Chairperson Harper encouraged the members to review the information provided in the agenda packet.

8. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

September 29th at 1:00 p.m.

9. ADJOURN

Givens moved and Henry seconded to adjourn at 2:55 p.m. Motion carried, ayes all.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson and Steve Fester
MetroGIS Staff