

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg. – Board Room
September 13, 2006

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Read called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. She introduced Chris Kline, who joined the MetroGIS staff support team that morning. Mr. Kline filled the Administrative-Technician position that assists the Staff Coordinator with support of MetroGIS.

Chairperson Read also presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Bob Cockriel who was resigning from the Committee following this meeting. Mr. Cockriel thanked the Committee for the opportunity to serve and explained that he had arranged through the AMM to have Harold Bush take his place. Mr. Bush is the GIS Manager for the City of Bloomington.

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 and Scott Simmer (Hennepin), Jim Hentges (Scott) and Jane Harper (Washington); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *GIS Consultants:* Terese Rowekamp (Rowekamp Associates); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), 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:* Joella Givens (MN/DOT) and Glen Radde for Robert Maki (DNR); *Utilities:* Al Laumeier (CenterPoint Energy); and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Ned Phillips (Rice Creek Watershed District).

Members Absent: *Business Geographics:* Chet Harrison (CB Richard Ellis); Steve Lorbach (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul), *Counties:* David Claypool (Ramsey), *Metropolitan:* Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board); *Non-Profits:* Sally Wakefield (1000 Friends of Minnesota); and *State:* David Arbeit (GDA/LMIC).

Note: Jessica Horning (Greater Minneapolis Day Care Assoc.) resigned her Non Profit seat on the Committee in August.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Christopher Kline (MetroGIS Staff Support Team)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Givens moved and Bitner seconded to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Henry moved and Bitner seconded to approve the summary for the Committee's June 28, 2006 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. POLICY BOARD MEETING:

Chairperson Read commented that the presentation at the July meeting pointed out the need to insure the message of each Technology Demonstration must be appropriate for policy makers. She commented that Board members were confused by "broker concept", some believing it was a combination of policy and technology as supported by MetroGIS, and as a result follow up

meetings were needed to mitigate the confusion. The confusion was exacerbated by a focus on a “service-oriented architecture” that did not appear to be grounded in the facilitation of inter-organizational data sharing policy that is central to the Policy Board’s efforts but proposed a more complex environment than is currently supported by MetroGIS. Read expressed a need for the next demonstration topic to reestablish rapport with the Board members.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Strategic Directions Workshop Preparations

Chairperson Read requested comments and reiterated the importance of the Strategic Directions Workshop and the need to settle on scoping themes of greatest importance, if possible at this meeting.

Vander Schaaf asked for further discussion regarding the anticipated workshop participants. Read noted that target participants include all Coordinating Committee and Policy Board members, supplemented by others with perspectives important to the future of MetroGIS not currently represented or under represented. Chairperson Read asked members of the Committee members to contact staff with suggestions of highly respected individuals who could provide valuable supplemental perspectives as well as facilitator candidates for the Workshop. Drealan asked about the desired number of participants. The Staff Coordinator replied that there is no fixed number, but a group of 25-30 persons is desirable.

Henry asked about the process for the selection of the facilitator and how their services would be paid for. The Staff Coordinator summarized the desired facilitator characteristics, as had been defined by the Workshop Planning Committee, and noted that the facilitation fee is proposed to be paid from the budgeted MetroGIS funds provided by the Metropolitan Council. Representatives of the Workshop Planning Committee commented that process details beyond that outlined in the staff report had been decided/discussed awaiting selection and participation of a facilitator. (Editor’s note: the final agreement to payment of the facilitation costs calls for \$5,000 from the Council’s funding to MetroGIS and \$2,500 from funds donated to MetroGIS.)

Harper reiterated the need to insure that the Workshop Planning Committee had identified the most important themes around which to design the Workshop. Chairperson Read enforced this notion by posing the question “If _____ does not happen at this workshop, I would be disappointed.” Both Harper and Read asked the members for suggestions/modifications of the themes identified by the Workshop Planning Committee about topics that would make the experience worth they time to participate. It was noted that organizational structure is not intended to be a discussion item. Rather the focus is intended to be on function and if desired function dictates a change in organizational form that will be a matter for investigation during the subsequent Business Plan Update process.

Knippel suggested that a workshop theme should be added to take about ways that MetroGIS could influence/collaborate with the State to achieve statewide cooperation among disciplines to help shape future policy.

The Staff Coordinator was asked to summarize currently defined common information needs and status to achieve regional solutions to share the workshop and to include a summary of the previous major Business plan objectives for background information. The Committee

decided that a target timeframe for the Workshop should be the last week of November (the week after Thanksgiving) or the first week in December.

b) 2007 Budget and Major Program Objectives

Chairperson Read summarized the proposed 2007 budget and program objectives outlined in the agenda report and emphasized that the proposed funding and related staff support are limited to MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" function. That is, stakeholder costs related to maintenance of regional data solutions are not included. Chairperson Read noted that the Metropolitan Council has included these "foster collaboration" support resources in its proposed 2007 budget, as it has in the past, and no substantive changes are proposed to either the program objectives or the budget pending completion of the proposed Business Plan Update initiative.

Chairperson Read then asked for comments regarding the listing of major program objectives presented in the agenda report. Brown asked about the origin of the proposed objective to define "derivative product" in relation to the regional parcel dataset. Member Drealan commented that this topic is on the agenda for the County Data Producers Workgroup and would like to be addressed before year-end. He noted that its origin is in request to define and distinguish parcel related data that is summarized to larger geographies than parcels from data subject to licensure requirements pertaining to source parcel data. No other comments were received regarding the proposed program objectives for 2007.

Harper inquired whether the performance measurement reporting program includes an assessment of custodian compliance with endorsed roles and responsibilities. The Staff Coordinator commented that the annual Performance Measurement report addresses this topic but that the assessment is conducted from an anecdotal perspective, that is, if data users are generally satisfied with the data received then it is assumed that the roles and responsibilities are being appropriately supported. It was agreed that a more direct evaluation should occur as a component of the Business Plan Update process.

Motion: Henry moved and Cockriel seconded that the Coordinating Committee recommend that the Policy Board accept the preliminary 2007 major work program priorities (Attachment B) and preliminary 2007 Budget for MetroGIS's "Foster Collaboration" Function (Attachments C - E) as presented in the agenda report dated August 23, 2006.

Motion carried, ayes all

c) Regional Emergency Preparedness Solution – Evaluation Plan

Vice-Chairperson Knippel provided background that led to the proposal to document issues and concerns of the Workgroup outlined in the agenda report. He began by explaining the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup's accomplishments, current focuses, consolidation with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information Emergency Preparedness Committee, and outreach activities and then summarized the Workgroup's concerns.

Specifically, Knippel noted that the anticipated demand for EM-related GIS data is not as high as anticipated. He commented that he is concerned and disappointed with the current lack of a common operating picture across the state and nationally and stressed a need to educate leadership in the Emergency Preparedness community about the benefits they can realize through the use of GIS technology. Knippel concluded his comments with a statement

that the Workgroup realizes that it needs to regroup and is looking for resources and insight into to how to gain influence at the Agency Commissioner level.

The idea of hosting a strategic visioning event was offered as a possible component of the Business Plan Update process. The Staff Coordinator commented that whether through as visioning process or some similar mechanism, someone will need to look into the problem from the perspectives of: a) soundness of the value proposition, b) political legitimacy/support for the value proposition and c) sufficiency of operating capacity in order to define a strategy to address the concerns mentioned by Knippel.

Discussion ensued about whether the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup should focus its attention on the local or state level, resulting in a suggestion to focus on recruiting local governments to participate. Gelbmann commented that the current focus on data collection should be sustained, prompting Harper to request clarification on the current outreach methodology. Gelbmann replied that the current process assumes development of data and basis application functionality is required to build support for further data development and to nurture supportive relationships with senior level officials.

Chairperson Read noted that one approach to improve understanding of benefits among the leadership of the Emergency Management community might be to find ways to leverage the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board embracing of GIS technology (e.g., include references in training). Brown stated that more effort is likely needed to educate at the grassroots level about the benefits of using GIS technology. Rowekamp commented that the issue seems to be that of classic matter of marketing and suggested the topic be a consideration for the strategic directions workshop/business plan update initiative. Specifically, a decision needs to be made on the level of support that is appropriate for MetroGIS and, in particular, which organization(s) need to assume the lead support role if a priority of the MetroGIS community. Bitner concurred that there is role for members of the Coordinating Committee to leverage their own resources beyond the forum provided by MetroGIS.

The Committee encouraged the Workgroup to document the issues and constraints it has encountered and its concerns to share as topic for strategic direction during the upcoming Business plan Update process.

d) GIS Demonstration for October Policy Board Meeting

Ortho-oblique technology was offered as a topic for the October Policy Board Demonstration. Knippel commented that an ortho-oblique demonstration could be used to pique interest in true GIS applications.

Harper suggested that the Committee consider selecting the M3D project for the next demonstration because of its clear connections to MetroGIS M3D- makes use of MetroGIS's efforts to facilitate regional solutions to common information needs (parcels, socioeconomic, etc), provides a web-based tool to visualize and analyze socioeconomic data which is one of the thirteen common information needs, and it demonstrates how GIS technology can be used to support policy decisions. Harper noted that although the ortho-oblique (Pictometry) imagery is a worthy demonstration topic, she believes a topic with clear connections to MetroGIS's efforts should be selected for the October meeting given the misunderstandings that arose in connection with the July presentation.

Vander Schaaf commented and the Committee concurred that the M3D topic would be a better topic for the October meeting but that the topic of ortho-oblique methods should be considered for the January or April 2007 meeting.

Henry asked what the content of the M3D presentation might include. Staff commented that the M3D presenter will be asked to talk about how MetroGIS's efforts have affected the M3D tool, to include value of streamlined data access policies, regional solutions that are consistent across the seven county area, streamlined data availability via DataFinder, and how socioeconomic data are being combined with other geospatial data by way of the web-based GIS application for decision making etc.

Knippel, Bitner and Henry agreed to work on a message for a demonstration of the ortho-oblique product for a future Policy Board meeting to share with the Committee for comment. Committee members expressed interest in each presentation in addition to a presentation to the Board.

e) TAT Review – Federal Enterprise Architecture, Geospatial Profile V1.1

The Staff Coordinator commented that the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) had not evaluated the subject document, as requested by the Committee at the June meeting, because no member of the TAT had assumed a lead review role. Staff also commented that this type of review is also beyond the general team support responsibilities because the topic is not currently perceived to have relevance to the business needs of the Metropolitan Council who employs the TAT staff liaison (Mark Kotz). The Staff Coordinator emphasized that the Council does not set the agenda for any of MetroGIS's efforts but that to provide support for any given project, the Council must have a directly related internal business need. He closed by noting that in this case, unless a member of the TAT assumes the lead reviewer role, the Committee's request for TAT review may not be able to be realized.

6) PROJECT UPDATES

a) Business Plan Update (Phrase II “Beyond Government Users” input initiative)

There was no discussion of this item.

b) 2006 Regional GIS Projects

The Staff Coordinator informed the committee that he will be sending requests for bids the following day for the Web Editing Application Needs Assessment relating to a regional occupiable units database. He also mentioned that a draft Memorandum of Understanding had been sent to David Arbeit for the Geospatial Services Directory and Broker project.

c) MetroGIS DataFinder Café – Upgrade Project

Gelbmann stated that the beta version of Café Update was being tested and that a meeting of the project oversight workgroup would be held shortly to provide guidance on final design matters. He estimated the updated Café would be operational by early October, noting that all high and medium priority features had been included, as well as many of the lower priority features.

d) Quarterly Performance Measures Anomaly Report

The Staff Coordinator reported that Kline would be producing the report.

e) Priority Business Information Need Solutions and User Satisfaction Forums

Harper will provide an update in December.

f) County Data Producer Workgroup Activities

There was no discussion of this item.

7) INFORMATION SHARING

There was no discussion of the items presented in the agenda materials.

Laumeyer informed the members of an upcoming GITA event, the topic of which would be Gopher State One.

Gelbmann noted that a project is underway at the Metropolitan Council that involves tracking/mapping of easements and asked if any of the members' organizations are involved in this type of activity. Harper and Knippel noted that Washington and Dakota County are involved in similar efforts and offered to put Gelbmann in touch with the appropriate individuals.

8) ADJOURN

Henry moved and Laumeyer seconded to adjourn at 3:05 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

and

Chris Kline
MetroGIS Administrative Technician