

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg. – Board Room
December 18, 2007

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Brown called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Business Geographics:* Patrick Hamilton (CB Richard Ellis); *Cities:* Jim Engfer (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul), Harold Busch (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* John Slusarczyk (Anoka), Pete Henschel (Carver), Randy Knippel (Dakota), Bill Brown (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Bunning for Jim Hentges (Scott), Jane Harper (Washington); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Rick Gelbmann and Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council), Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); *Non-Profits:* Sally Wakefield (1000 Friends of Minnesota); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom (TIES); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (URS Corp.); *State:* David Arbeit (GDA/LMIC), (Joella Givens (MN/DOT), and Tim Loesch (DNR); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); and *Utilities:* Allan Radke (CenterPoint Energy).

Members Absent: *Metropolitan:* Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board); *GIS Consultants:* Terese Rowekamp (Rowekamp Associates); and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Vacant.

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

Visitors: Chris Cialek and Andrew Koebrick (Minnesota Land Management Information Center- LMIC)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Chairperson Brown suggested altering the order of agenda item 5. The new order was 5a, 5b, 5e, 5j, 5f, 5g, 5h, 5i, 5c, 5d, and 5k. Henry moved and Craig seconded to approve the agenda as proposed. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

The September 12, 2007 meeting summary was as accepted, as submitted, with the exception that staff was asked to modify the spelling of the term RAMONA to ROMONA.

4. SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 17th POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Brown provided an overview of the October 17, 2007 Policy Board meeting. Craig asked for information regarding the technical background of Bloomington Councilmember Elkins who recently became a member of the Policy Board. Staff Coordinator and Johnson member Busch summarized their understanding of member Elkin's association with the IT industry in his work life.

Staff Coordinator also explained that the purpose of the newly created Technical Leadership Steering Committee was to oversee development of a recommendation as to the role that MetroGIS should play to address shared application needs. He noted that a workshop is planned for January 24, 2008 to gather a wide gamut of expertise to define MetroGIS's role in the shared services and applications sector and define the proposed Technical Coordinator's responsibilities. Johnson also noted that he is thrilled that John Antenucci of PlanGraphics, Inc. will be facilitating the workshop.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

(Editor's Note: The agenda items are listed in the order as approved in Item 2.)

a) Recap of Approved 2008 Major Program Objectives

Chairperson Brown introduced the item. The Staff Coordinator then summarized 2008 objectives set by the Policy Board for MetroGIS, as outlined in the agenda report, noting that to achieve them additional support resources will be needed, in particular, technical leadership. He explained that this

conclusion had been presented in the newly adopted Business Plan and that the Policy Board concurs with this finding.

b) Election of Committee Officers for 2008

Chairperson Brown commented that he is willing to serve another term as Chairperson if the members wish him to do so. He also reminded the group that at its September meeting the Committee decided to postpone election of a new Vice-Chairperson following the resignation of Vice Chairperson Ned Phillips in June.

The Chair then turned the election for Chairperson over to the Staff Coordinator who called for nominations. Read nominated William Brown. Johnson called three times for additional nominations. None were received.

Motion: Read moved and Arbeit seconded to elect the William Brown to serve a second term as Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee for 2008. Motion carried, ayes all, except fro Brown who abstained.

The meeting was turned back to reelected Chairperson Brown to conduct the election for Vice-Chairperson of the Committee.

Chairperson Brown explained to the Committee that he had asked member Wakefield before the meeting if she had an interest in serving as Vice-Chairperson and that stated that she would accept if nominated. He then called for nominations for Vice Chairperson.

Givens nominated Wakefield. Chairperson Brown called three times for additional nominations. None were received.

Motion: Givens moved and Harper seconded to elect Sally Wakefield as Vice-Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee for 2008. Motion carried, ayes all, except Wakefield who abstained.

e) Service Broker Project – Demonstration of Capabilities

Chris Cialek, representing the Service Broker Project, began by introducing himself and Andrew Koebrick, who served as the web developer for the application, referred to as “GeoService Finder”. He explained that the purpose of the project was to create an Internet searchable catalog linked to libraries of metadata that describe geospatial applications, services, and components, thereof, that are available for others to use. He then explained the key components of the prototype application, along with the main topics discussed in the preliminary project report, noting that the project is on budget and nearly complete, with submission of the final project report expected in early January 2008.

Among the major points commented on in the presentation were that the application structure is patterned after a design created by the Open Source Geospatial Consortium (OGC), the database fields that contain the metadata record information adheres to international standards for coding such records, and four types of “geo” services are searchable via the application:

- *Remote application:* an interactive application run on a remote server that a client accesses through an internet browser. The client is not required to run any additional software.
- *Standalone application:* software and data that can be downloaded and run locally.
- *Component:* code that can be downloaded and then integrated into routines and executed locally.
- *Service:* an application run at a remote site that a client accesses through the internet; the client needs to run additional software (e.g. using ArcGIS to access photography via a WMS image server, DataFinder Café).

(See http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07_1218/5e_service_broker_presentation.pdf the presentation slides).

Cialek then demonstrated the features of the prototype application from the prospective of how the user interacts with it as well as from how the contributor (of metadata) interacts with it. He concluded his remarks by noting the prototype was designed with the understanding that it is a first step and as such, users will be encouraged to offer suggestions to expand the capabilities and move toward a

more robust architecture and in general assist with fine tuning the application and related maintenance processes as they use the site and participate in the population of metadata records.

A question and answer session followed. The following questions and comments were offered:

1. Read noted that identification of a geographic extent in metadata is not applicable for applications as it is for data/services.

Action: The record coding options will be modified to include a “Not Applicable” or “Undefined” option.

2. Craig asked if thought had been put into how best to populate the library with metadata records.

Action: It was agreed that Committee members should take the lead to identify applications, services, and components, thereof that should be/are available to others and see to it that metadata is developed and contributed to the application library. Momentum to expand the searchable records should come from those affiliated with organizations active in MetroGIS’s efforts first to both expand the number of the records and demonstrate usefulness and as the existence of the application becomes more wide spread effort should shift to seeking records from others. Brown suggested that promoting the service be part of the MetroGIS outreach program.

It was agreed that a mechanism should be added to application to allow users to comment on needs they have that not currently met by items searchable on or by the application.

Craig noted that a possible option to make progress on addressing items on the “needs list” could be to share it with graduate students.

3. Bitner and Read commented that there is need to define how best to address overlaps and connections between regional and state interests related common application needs and to define a means for seamless interaction with DataFinder.

Action: The group concurred that the next steps component of the project report should acknowledge these needs.

4. Loesch commented and members concurred that use of the term “services” in the name of the application is misleading since the application supports searches for application-related products other than “web services”.

Action: The idea of using the term “GeoResources” was offered as an alternative but the decision was left to the project team.

Chairperson Brown that requested the project team to comment on the status of each of the deliverables associated with the project funding agreement. Arbeit stated that he believes the contract requirements have been met and encouraged the Committee members to submit metadata for applications, services, and related products to enable them to be searchable via this application. The Committee agreed that the final project report is the only outstanding deliverable. Cialek informed the members that the project team would be meeting on December 20th to consider comments received for modifications to the final project report.

Motion: Craig moved and Read seconded to grant tentative approval of the project report, subject to:

- 1) Modifications as agreed upon at this meeting.
- 2) Addressing any comments that the Technical Advisory Team or Coordinating Committee members may have when reviewing the next version of the project report. (Staff was directed to provide a link to the revised report and encourage members to review and comment.)
- 3) Acceptance of the modified report by the Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup.

Motion carried, ayes all.

j) Regional Solution Emergency Preparedness – Direction Requested

Knippel provided a brief background of the activities of the Governor’s Council on Geographic Information’s Emergency Preparedness Committee. He noted that the Policy Board approved the

vision in 2005 for an regional solution for emergency management-related data that it agreed that legitimacy for use of GIS technology within the emergency management community was needed. He then shared a letter (Attachment A) that was in the process of being sent to MetroGIS leadership from the Minnesota Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management commending MetroGIS for its leadership in emphasizing the importance of GIS for emergency preparedness and encouraging institutionalization of the model developed by MetroGIS stakeholders for a regional approach to managing data important to emergency planning and resource. Knippel then highlighted organizational relationships between MetroGIS and emergency preparedness groups and summarized a federal grant application that leverages the existing work on a regional data management model developed by MetroGIS stakeholders. In closing, Knippel encouraged the Committee to reactivate the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, given that resources in the Twin Cities are viewed as important to the state wide effort to integrate GIS technology into emergency preparedness initiatives and by doing so an opportunity could be captured to leverage statewide resources needed to fully implement the regional data management model developed by MetroGIS stakeholders.

Brown asked Givens to comment on the related issue which MnDOT officials encountered when responding to the I-35W Bridge collapse of restrictions encountered to ready access to licensed data. Givens further commented that this is not a MnDOT issue but rather a community wide concern. She then commented on the need to incorporate language into existing agreements allowing sharing of data during emergencies. Harper added that the workgroup should investigate the means that counties currently use in their hazard mitigation plans (mutual aid agreements) with their partner local governments as a point of departure. She also commented that the solution will require defining the various types of emergencies and then the appropriate procedures to accomplish the desired sharing.

Motion: Craig moved and Read seconded that the Coordinating Committee accept the County Data Producer's Workgroup's recommendation to reactivate the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup and its efforts to test and refine both the data and organizational responsibility components necessary to achieve the vision, as described in the September 1, 2005 White Paper referenced in Attachment A. Motion carried, ayes all.

Direction to Workgroup: Knippel, on behalf of the reactivated workgroup, accepted responsibility to develop a recommendation to address the need to achieve ready access to licensed data during an emergency. The workgroup's recommendation is to include: 1) who decides an emergency exists and 2) recommended procedures to accomplish access to the subject data.

Motion: Craig moved and Read seconded that the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup report back to the Committee, if possible at the March meeting, on suggested next steps to achieve an emergency plan to access to licensed data. Motion carried, ayes all.

f) Proposed Modifications to Outreach Plan

Jonathan Blake, of Richardson, Richter, and Associates and a member of the MetroGIS Staff Support Team, introduced himself and summarized suggested modifications to the previously approved high-level MetroGIS Outreach Plan, as illustrated in the agenda report. He stated there two areas of focus are suggested: currently active participants and prospective participants. The first would involve outreach to persons and interests within member organizations not currently involved, while the second focus would be on non-participating government interests within the Twin Cities, adjacent jurisdictions, and non-governmental entities. Loesch suggested and the group concurred that contact with metropolitan counties located in Wisconsin should be included as well.

Craig commented that the draft document presented on the agenda report represents a good start but needs more specifics on the "hows" and the target audiences. Staff concurred, noting that the current version was intended to provide the general framework from which a more detailed plan would be developed. He also noted that the Policy Board had provided direction at its July 2007 meeting that it does not want to use MetroGIS funds to hire professional marketing assistance but rather leverage marketing expertise on staff with stakeholder organizations, for which direction was requested.

Read suggested that Coordinating Committee members should identify willing internal marketing/outreach/communication assets and forward them to the Staff Coordinator for evaluation of next steps at the next Coordinating Committee meeting. This comment resulted in discussion of priorities and available staff resources with the decision being that staff should not spend time on this matter until following the March Coordinating Committee Meeting.

g) Proposed Leadership Succession Plan Components

Staff Coordinator Johnson commented that development of a Leadership Succession Plan had been defined as a top priority for 2008 as a result of the Policy Board adopting the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan. He noted that in the Business Plan there is recognition that MetroGIS is heavily dependent on support from several key individuals for its success and should be prepared to quickly transition to willing, supportive, and capable successors when these key supporters leave the effort.

Blake then explained the six components upon which to develop a leadership succession plan, as cited in the agenda report, and asked for comment.

Harper suggested that a seventh component should be added to the list –“Structural Issues”. She offered an example of the Coordinating Committee adopting a policy where each of its members should designate an alternate to attend when they are not able to attend. She also suggested that an attempt should be made to identify the qualities that are desirable in Committee members so current members can identify appropriate alternates and candidates for future membership.

Read commented that the majority of emphasis in the Plan should be on matters that the Committee can control and not spend a lot of time on matters that it cannot control (e.g., transition of Board members following an election).

Motion: Harper moved and Read seconded that the Coordinating Committee that:

- 1) The six components outlined in the agenda report, together with the seventh component offered by Harper, provide a satisfactory foundation upon which to develop a more detailed plan.
- 2) Staff prepare a more detailed plan for consideration by the Committee at the March meeting, focusing on situations that the Committee can control.

Motion carried, ayes all.

h) GIS Demonstration for January Policy Board Meeting

The Staff Coordinator commented that Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt had requested for the January demonstration, the presentation made by Paul Weinberger, Joella Givens and Dan Ross at the State GIS/LIS Conference in October about GIS’s role the response to the I-35W Bridge collapse and that Givens had made arrangements to do so.

Motion: Harper moved and Bitner seconded to select the presentation by Paul Weinberger, Joella Givens and Dan Ross about GIS’s role the response to the I-35W Bridge collapse as the GIS Technology Demonstration for the January 2008 Policy Board meeting. Motion carried, ayes all.

i) 2008 Meeting Schedule

The Staff Coordinator summarized suggested meeting dates for 2008, as outlined in the agenda report. The suggested March and June dated conflicted with Governor’s Council meeting dates and were modified.

The following meeting dates were set for 2008: March 27, June 18, September 17, and December 17, subject to making sure that December 17th does not conflict with the 2008 IT Symposium schedule.

c) 2007 Accomplishments Report

The Staff Coordinator summarized the major accomplishments in 2007, as outlined in the agenda report and requested comment about anything overlooked or not correctly captured. Knippel requested modification of the Emergency Preparedness section to reflect coordination activity that had occurred with state officials and reactivation of the MetroGIS workgroup. Harper

asked that Washington County's document entitled "Open Space Interests in Property - Cataloging and Mapping Conservation and Scenic Easements in Washington County, Minnesota" be added to the list of accomplishments because the county used the \$4,000 received from the Regional Parcel Data Sharing Agreement to hire an intern to write it. Read suggested that the detailed listing of accomplishments be modified to include all of the projects listed in the summary report.

d) 2007 Performance Measures Annual Report

Kline summarized several the key points presented in the agenda report including:

- Use of the endorsed socioeconomic web resources regional applications tripled, likely due to usage by the academic community.
- Data discovery events decreased by 13.6 percent from the previous year, while downloads of actual data increased 40.2 percent. Introduction of the new Café and RSS services may be attributable for the decrease in visits, while boosting downloads of the data.
- Only four endorsed regional datasets were in the top 10 downloads for 2007, compared to all eight in 2006.

Kline then requested feedback and questions from Committee members regarding the report. Loesch commented that it would be helpful to have a count of how many individuals from a type of organization (academic, government, non-profit, for-profit) were downloading each dataset. Kline replied that information was available in the past from Quova, but web server settings used by the Metropolitan Council prevent easy IP address identification. Johnson added that a new contract with Quova had been under negotiation but was abandoned when staff discovered the problem with identification of IP addresses.

Gelbmann suggested that a new application be developed to track the number of users of web services. Loesch commented that DNR requires email addresses to be posted before it downloads data and suggested that this practice might be a solution to consider. Gelbmann suggested that Kline describe the IP address problem in a memo that can be shared with the IS Director.

No further comment was received and there was no objection to forwarding the 2007 Performance Measurement Report to the Policy Board for acceptance.

k) Open Seats on the Coordinating Committee – Water Management Organizations and Non-Profit Organizations

This topic was deferred to the march meeting due to lack of time. .

6. PROJECT UPDATES

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

7. INFORMATION SHARING

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

8. ADJOURN

Knippel moved and Givens seconded to adjourn the meeting at 3:32 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

and

Chris Kline
MetroGIS Administrative Technician

ATTACHMENT A

**LETTER HANDED OUT AT MEETING
(Agenda Item 5j)**

(Chris – ask Knippel for a digital version of the letter)