

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg. – Room 205
March 29, 2006

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Read called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. and asked each of the guests to introduce themselves.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Cities:* Bob Cockriel (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* John Slusarczyk (Anoka), Dave Drealan (Carver), Randy Knippel (Dakota), Bill Brown (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), and Jane Harper (Washington); *Federal:* Ron Wencil (USGS); *GIS Consultants:* Terese Rowekamp (Rowekamp Associates); *Metropolitan:* Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board), Rick Gelbmann and Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council), and Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom (TIES); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (URS Corp.); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC), Joella Givens (Mn/DOT) and Robert Maki (DNR); *Utilities:* Al Laumeyer (CenterPoint Energy); and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Ned Phillips (Rice Creek Watershed District).

Members Absent: *Business Geographics:* Chet Harrison (CB Richard Ellis); *Cities:* Steve Lorbach (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul); *Counties:* Jim Hentges (Scott); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission); *Non-Profits:* [vacant].

Visitor: David Brandt (Washington County), Jessica Horning (Greater Minneapolis Day Care Assoc.), Fred Logman (LMIC & Governor's Council on Geographic Information); John Rogers and Brad Roman (Hennepin County), and Sally Wakefield (1000 Friends of Minnesota).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Steve Fester.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Chairperson Read suggested moving Agenda Items 5d and 5g in front of Item 5a. Givens moved and Cockriel seconded to approve the agenda, subject to the revision suggested by Chairperson Read. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Slusarczyk moved and Givens seconded to approve the summary for the Committee's December 15, 2005 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF JANUARY 18, 2006 POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Read highlighted actions of the Policy Board at its January 18, 2006 meeting, as outlined in the agenda report.

Vander Schaaf commented on the status of Metropolitan Council's progress evaluation of MetroGIS, noting that the Council members involved have been quite impressed with what they have learned about MetroGIS. He noted that his expectation is that the forthcoming recommendations will focus on how to strengthen the Council's relationship with MetroGIS and be forward looking.

Vander Schaaf also commented on the creation of the Department of Data Resources within the Metropolitan Council, which he now heads up. The new department is comprised of the Council's GIS and Research Units and the MetroGIS support team, elevating all three components to enterprise-wide support expectations. He explained that the genesis for creating this new department was the Regional Administrator's recognition that technology needs to play a more prominent role in the way the Council does its business and provides services. He noted that as a result of this reorganization, he (Vander Schaaf) now reports directly to the Regional Administrator and that the MetroGIS Staff Coordinator now reports directly to him, greatly increasing the visibility of MetroGIS as a critical component to achieving the Council's business functions. In response to a question from Arbeit, Vander Schaaf noted that these organizational changes are constructive in terms of

improved understanding of the benefits received via the collaborative environment that has been created by way of the Council's investment in MetroGIS.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

d) Non-Profit Representative to Committee

Chairperson Read asked each of the candidates, Sally Wakefield, with 1000 Friends of Minnesota, and Jessica Horning, with the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Center, to summarize their respective backgrounds and what they believe they would bring to the Committee.

Candidate Wakefield commented that she possesses a working knowledge of MetroGIS's collaboration efforts. More importantly, although she is new to the non-profit community, she would bring a working knowledge of community planning assistance and related data access needs and concerns to the table. She also commented on the need for non-profits to begin to work collaboratively to leverage limited resources and that serving on the Committee would help her facilitate action to address this need.

Candidate Horning explained that she has been working for non-profits interests in the Twin Cities for her entire career, noting that her focus is in the field of social services and advocacy. She commented that she is a frequent user of DataFinder to obtain data that is critical to addressing their needs. Horning commented that it is unfortunate there are not two openings as she and Wakefield bring two distinct perspectives to the table.

Arbeit asked Wakefield to clarify her role with 1000 Friends of Minnesota. Wakefield commented that she is responsible for assisting local units of government address their land use planning needs, in particular balancing conservation and economic base needs and opportunities. She utilizes GIS to help the participants better understand options and consequences of those options. 1000 Friends of Minnesota also leverages Google Earth to provide citizens with the ability to visualize options and opportunities via their home Internet connections using data created or assembled by 1000 Friends. In the process, 1000 Friends is attempting to demystify spatial data and promote the notion that a neutral analytic tool can improve decision making.

Vander Schaaf asked each candidate to respond to how their respective non-profit organizations provide services that meet the requirement of being "adjunct to local government". Wakefield responded that their clients are nearly entirely local government and that the service is community planning related. She commented that although 1000 Friends is a statewide organization, nearly all of their work is focused on edge communities associated with the seven county Metro Area. Horning commented that the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association has contracts with the Department of Human Services to manage child care assistance programs provided by local government. They work closely with the City of Minneapolis and sixteen other communities.

Gelbmann asked both candidates what they could bring to the table in terms of resources. Both commented that data development is in its early stages but growing. Both were open to sharing data that is not of a private nature. For instance, Horning commented that they are geocoding daycare center locations region-wide and will be sharing them with M3D.

Laumeyer asked each to summarize the data they are currently obtaining from others. Horning responded that the TLG Street Centerline database is the primary data they use that is obtained from others. Wakefield noted they are using parcels, boundaries, planned and existing land use, as well as aerial imager.

Chairperson Read asked both candidates to leave the room.

Arbeit asked if the bylaws permit both candidates could be appointed. Read commented that the bylaws restrict non-government representation to 30 percent of the membership and that adding both candidates would not exceed the limit.

After some discussion about options (sharing a seat as is the case with the utility representatives) it was decided that both candidates should be invited to join the Committee because they bring very different perspectives – land use planning versus human services. The group also asked that the candidates be reminded

that the bylaws encourage representatives of broad communities to attempt to bring the community's perspective to the table.

Motion: Craig moved and Givens seconded to invite Jessica Horning, with the Minneapolis Day Care association and Sally Wakefield, with the 1000 Friends of Minnesota, to both join the Committee on the basis that each represents vastly different segments of the non-profit community. Motion carried, ayes all.

g) Reschedule September 2006 Meeting Date

Chairperson Read explained that the proposed rescheduling of the September Committee meeting is to avoid a conflict with the national URISA conference in the event that any members or staff wish to attend the conference.

Motion: Givens moved and Claypool seconded to reschedule the September 2006 Committee meeting from September 20 to September 13. Motion carried, ayes all.

a) Modification to Operating Guidelines – Decision Making Between Meetings (2nd Reading)

Chairperson Read summarized the rationale presented in the agenda report. The only matter discussed was the concept that for E-voting, a quorum should be considered the entire committee membership, as opposed to 50% plus one member.

Motion:

Brown moved and Arbeit seconded to approve the draft modified language presented in the agenda packet dated March 21, 2006, subject to replacing reference to Section 8 in the fourth bullet with the statement that a quorum for purposes of e-voting is defined as the entire membership. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) June 1st Forum – Update on Preparations

Chairperson Read invited Craig to summarize the forum planning efforts to date as he had offered the idea of hosting a forum at the last meeting. Gelbmann explained the subthemes of Customer, Backroom, and Management/Organization. Harper suggested that providing several subthemes for the keynote speakers to incorporate into their talks could improve the prospects for identification of ideas on point with strategic planning needs of the MetroGIS community. She offered the following four suggestions, which the forum planning workgroup members agreed to pursue.

- Opportunities to foster collaboration
- Going beyond data to applications
- Reaching non-traditional users
- Private –public partnerships

Brandt commented that in the morning session we hope to hear about exciting visions and opportunities and then in the afternoon we will have an opportunity to explore how well our community is aligned to take advantage of these visions and opportunities.

Maki complimented the workgroup on its work, noting that he is excited to see this forum coming together. He reminded the Committee that less than a year ago, the Strategic Planning Workgroup was struggling with the need to identify an effective way to inject a technology awareness into the pending strategic planning process that is sufficient to inspire the participants to think critically about the next generation of opportunities. This forum, in his opinion, will accomplish that need.

After some discussion of pros and cons, the group concurred that the 250-person maximum is consistent with the purpose of the forum from MetroGIS's perspective – the need to explore big ideas via questions and answer with the experts who keynote the event. It was generally agreed that if the audience is larger than 250 individuals, it should be a GIS/LIS event.

Read requested a show of hands as to who is planning on attending and most, if not all, of the members indicated an intent to attend. No concern was expressed for the proposed \$60 fee and some commented \$60 would be a bargain for the proposed program. The Staff Coordinator shared the concept of hosting a reception the evening prior for direction. The idea was well received. Craig encouraged the workgroup to provide wine,

given the caliber of speakers involved and distances they will travel to participate. The idea of co-sponsors assisting with the reception was suggested for investigation.

The Staff Coordinator explained the support roles that have been defined and that 20+ individuals will be needed to serve in these capacities. Members interested in serving were asked to contact staff. It was also agreed that the entire Committee should be notified of the next Forum Planning Workgroup meeting.

c) 2006 Regional GIS Project Proposals – Concept Review

Chairperson Read summarized the purpose of this program and the role of the Committee in the review of the project proposals, as outlined in the agenda report. She emphasized that this is the concept review phase and, as such, some of the program specifics are not expected to be well developed until the next phase of review. Chairperson Read then invited each of the proposers to summarize their concepts.

Proposal C (in the packet): Street Centerline Dataset Enhancements - TLG

Chinander noted that the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) is planning to develop an ESZ data layer, so there is no need for MetroGIS/TLG to do so. Vander Schaaf confirmed that the Council has an internal business need for the other two components of the proposal (update frequency and private roads) and that these enhancements will be pursued as a part of the negotiations with TLG for the next generation contract which are underway.

Motion: Cockriel moved and Givens seconded to deal with these proposed enhancements to the TLG database with other programs that are operational and funded to accomplish these proposed enhancements. Motion carried, ayes all.

Chairperson Read requested an update at the next meeting on progress that has been made by the Street Centerline Workgroup to implement the adopted vision for a next generation street centerline dataset.

Knippel commented that he believes more should be done to define a process to detect and address other potentials for duplication of effort, such as is evidenced by this proposal. Discussion of this topic was postponed to the next meeting.

Proposal A (in the packet): Multiple-Address Building Mapping- Hennepin County –

John Rogers, a member of the Hennepin County project team, explained that the Hennepin County proposal seeks to develop capacity to maintain an occupiable unit address database. The proposed pilot project would focus on priorities for emergency managers – dense commercial development (malls, etc.) – and seek to enhance an existing database through improved coordinating with cities. The ultimate goal is to attain a sustainable database that meets the specifications for use of the 3D Analyst tool.

Chinander noted that the current proposal to focus on commercial addresses would provide a good start but that the E911 community needs all occupiable units as called for in the adopted regional vision statement. He then inquired whether the address points to be received from the cities would be compliant with E911 needs. The proposers stated that E911 compliance is not currently anticipated. Chinander invited the Hennepin County team to join the MetroGIS Address Workgroup.

Vander Schaaf inquired whether local government partners are supportive of the proposal. The proposers responded by recognizing the need to develop appropriate inter-organizational processes, as well as the address database.

Maki asked how the proposers envision the results of the pilot project expanding to the other counties. The response was that the project will focus on development of procedures that should be portable.

Harper spoke in favor of using a pilot process similar to those used in the past where the lead sponsor encourages the involvement of other stakeholders during the development of the product/procedures by other stakeholders and then host a peer review forum to vet the results for discussion among content experts affiliated with the broader community to insure it/they can be replicated – the goal of a regionally-funded project.

Arbeit asked if the resulting database could be made available as a web service that is accessible by others. Brown commented that the project team has not considered the implications of a web service environment but is willing to do so as the concept of sharing is consistent with current thought.

At 2:27 p.m. Chairperson Read invited a motion to extend the meeting another 30 minutes. Givens moved and Claypool seconded to extend the meeting to 2:57 p.m. Motion carried, ayes all.

Knippel inquired how the proposed project would integrate with Minneapolis's current activities in this area relative to Emergency Services. Brown commented that the group needs to be mindful that a critical mass is needed to move forward but that not all parties may be on board when the project launches.

Craig commented that he would like to hear about the other Occupiable Unit Address related proposal to better understand how the two proposals might be blended and/or aligned with one another. The group agreed to suspend discussion of the Hennepin County proposal for a presentation on the Proposal D, from Mark Kotz and the MetroGIS Address Workgroup.

Proposal D (in the packet): Needs Assessment for Regional Occupiable Units Web Editing Application - Address Workgroup

Gelbmann, speaking on behalf of Kotz, presented an overview of this proposal, as outlined in the agenda packet. The key objective is to better understand what is needed to motivate local producers of address data to participate in the ongoing maintenance of data assembled into a regional occupiable unit database. The proposal may include development of examples of web interface options to help prospective local government participants articulate their needs. Gelbmann concurred that this proposal and the proposal from Hennepin County appear to be complementary and should fit together nicely.

Brandt (member of Address Workgroup) encouraged the proposer of Project A to utilize/test the address standards that have been defined by the Address Workgroup. Gelbmann expanded upon this thought by noting that an evaluation of the workability of these standards by the custodian organization is also important. Harper further commented that different producer/custodian models will likely be needed to support updating of the resulting dataset as communities have different support capabilities. Chinander commented that testing and refining the custodian roles and responsibilities needed to attain the regional vision should be a component of both of these address related proposals but acknowledged that the envisioned regional solutions are likely to be broader than the either of the proposed pilots.

General discussion ensued about the relationship between Proposals A and D (above).

The group concurred that both proposals (A and D, above) have merit to move to the next phase but that each of their defining characteristics should be documented and that potential connections/overlaps between them need to be defined. It was agreed that they should not be consolidated but that the line between them needs to be clear to both groups. Both proposers agreed that maintaining an active liaison relationship is in both of their best interests. The Hennepin County representatives concurred with the Committee's suggestion to include representatives from the other counties in their deliberations to improve the chances that the procedures developed for Hennepin County can be used by others. Hennepin County officials also agreed to consider the viability of incorporating web service technology in their design. Both parties agreed to use the Address Workgroup as a means to facilitate knowledge transfer.

Finally, Claypool mentioned that Ramsey County has a contractual relationship with Century College to collect address points. He noted that this work may be relevant and useful to the proposed pilots and agreed to introduce the parties.

Motion: Craig moved and Givens seconded that: a) pursuance of Project A would have value to the MetroGIS community, b) Project A's similarity with Project D requires a clear delineation of the boundaries and linkages of each, c) Project A leadership needs to join the MetroGIS Address Workgroup to work out details of coordination and include an outline of them in their final proposal. Motion carried, ayes all.

Motion: Givens moved and Wencl seconded to find that pursuance of Project D would have value to the MetroGIS community and that its similarities with Project A require a clear delineation of the boundaries of

each and a need for ongoing coordination (as above). The projected cost also needs to be more specific. Motion carried, ayes all.

Proposal B (in the packet): Architecture to Support an “ApplicationFinder”

Chairperson Read introduced this proposal in the absence of David Bitner the proposer. (Editor’s note: Bitner had a scheduling problem that precluded his attendance.) Logman (visitor with LMIC & Governor’s Council on Geographic Information) spoke in favor of the proposal as a valuable initiative to help define an efficient path as the community moves beyond collaboration to address common data needs. Maki concurred, noting that he is excited to see this proposal, as there is clear need for prototypes to move the community forward in the realm of collaboration on tools/applications of common need.

Craig commented that he supports the proposal at a conceptual level but is concerned that the proposer is at a disadvantage because he was unable to obtain feedback from the Committee at this meeting. He also argued that if this proposal is to be favorably considered at the next phase of review the proposer will need to seek out feedback from committee members on his own and define who will be involved and who will do the work.

Motion:

Craig moved and Chinander seconded to find that pursuance of Project B would have value to the MetroGIS community but that to receive favorable consideration at the next phase of review the proposer must seek out comment on the concept proposal from Committee members on his own and clearly define who would be involved and who would do the work. Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Strategic Directions Workshop

There was no discussion of this item due to lack of time. Chairperson Read asked the members to contact the Staff Coordinator if they have an interest in serving on the recommended workgroup.

f) GIS Demonstration for April Policy Board Meeting

No discussion due to lack of time. (Editor’s note: The presentation for the January Policy Board meeting was postponed to the April meeting so no need to discuss unless a change was desired.)

h) Quarterly Performance Measures Anomaly Report

There was no discussion of this report due to a lack of time.

6. PROJECT UPDATES

There was no discussion of this report due to a lack of time.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

There was no discussion of this report due to a lack of time.

8. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

June 28, 2006, 12:30-3:00 p.m.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator