

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg.
June 17, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Wakefield called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. and asked the others in attendance to introduce themselves.

Members Present: *Cities:* Bob O'Neill for Hal Busch (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* Peter Henschel (Carver), Jim Bunning (Scott); Mike Fiebiger (Ramsey), and Doug Matzek for David Brandt (Washington); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (NCompass Technologies), *Metropolitan:* Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, Amanda Nygren for David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council) and Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); *Non-Profits:* Sally Wakefield (1000 Friends of Minnesota); *Special Expertise:* Keith Anderson for Ben Verbick (LOGIS), *State:* Lisa Miller for Joella Givens (MN/DOT); *Utilities:* Allan Radke (Xcel Energy), and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Melissa Baker for Mark Doneux, Capital Region Watershed District.

Members Absent: *Academics:* Jeff Matson (U of M); *Business Geographics:* (Vacant); *Cities:* Jim Engfer (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul); *Counties:* Bill Brown (Hennepin), John Slusarczyk (Anoka), Randy Knippel (Dakota); *Metropolitan:* Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (URS Corp.), *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom; and *State:* David Arbeit (MnGeo) and Tim Loesch (DNR).

Open Seats: *Business Geographics and Non-Profits*

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator Team, Mark Kotz, Chair of the Address and Technical Leadership Workgroups, and Matt McGuire (Metropolitan Council).

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

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

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Wencl moved and Member Read seconded to approve the March 21, 2010 meeting summary, subject to correcting the spelling of Doug Matzek's last name in the Members Present section. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF JANUARY POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Wakefield asked if anyone had any questions about the information provided in the agenda report. None were offered.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Minnesota Geospatial Commons - Test Implementation

Mark Kotz, Chair of the Minnesota Geospatial Commons Workgroup, a joint MetroGIS and state of MnGeo effort, summarized the Geospatial Commons initiative. [Click here](#) to view the presentation slides. Kotz concluded his presentation with an overview of the of the Clip, Zip and Ship tool development proposal for which \$5,000 is included in the revised 2010 budget (Agenda Item 5c).

The group asked several questions related to the functional capabilities of the proposed Commons, including:

- Will the Commons be public facing? Yes. All agreed if consumer web servers are proposed that the Commons will be widely useful. Will KML format be supported? Yes. What will be the standard projection? The projection will be left up to the producer.

- Will the data be stored on the Common's server or will the user be pointed to servers hosted by the producers? TBD but the goal is a seamless process whereby user gets what they need when needed. How this is accomplished is secondary.
- Will the commons convert Shapefile format to other formats. TBD. Nancy Read commented that this is a need for the in-progress Proximity Finder project and, as such, encouraged the twp project managers to share information.
- Who will be hosting the Commons portal website? MnGeo is hosting the test implementation. The long-term host is to be determined as part of the proposed test. All agreed that an up-time guarantee is becoming more and more critical as mission critical business functions begin to incorporate web services served via the Commons. Charboneau noted that NCompass has incorporated Metro Geocoder into numerous metro area school district websites. He gave a strong endorsement for the functionality but also cautioned that up-time needs to be guaranteed if we are to see continued integration by users into mission critical applications.
- Gelbmann commented that addressing the up time need is a component of a parallel effort to ensure the service is "trusted". Kotz offered that the workgroup is currently looking into a combination of user ranking, testimonials from users, links to producers for easy access to needed information, and provision of metadata like documentation as strategies to improve trust of the services by the user community.

Chairperson Wakefield complemented the project, noting that it has great potential and encouraged the Committee to offer an endorsement as requested by Kotz. She also encouraged expansion of the Commons workgroup to include non-profit and for-profit members as soon as possible.

Motion: Member Brandt moved and Member Chinander seconded that the Coordinating Committee recommend that the Policy Board endorse the proposed Minnesota Geospatial Commons – Test Implementation. Motion carried ayes all.

b) Quantify Public Value (QPV) of Geospatial Commons Study

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the information provided in the agenda report. Harvey commented that the study is comprised of two major components – Return on Investment study internal to Hennepin County and a Quantify Public Value study. The second phase is outward looking building on the first component results.

Read asked how is this study different from other studies, including those associated with GASB34 reporting requirements? Harvey noted that although other Return on Investment studies have been conducted, they are generally "project" or "enterprise" focused. He noted that the project team is not aware of any studies that have attempted to define value created at the regional level.

Johnson and Harvey closed by stating that results of the Task 1 interviews should be complete by the time of the September Committee meeting and they expected to provide a presentation to the Committee along with a more thorough overview of next steps at that time.

c) 2010 Program Objectives/Budget Revisions

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the suggested revisions to the 2010 Work plan and Budget as presented in the agenda report. Chairperson Wakefield asked the members if they were aware of any "shovel ready" projects that should be added to the list of candidate projects prepared by staff. Read offered a storm water related project that is nearing the pilot testing phase. After some discussion, the Staff Coordinator offered an opinion that this project has standing given that it is an outgrowth the hydrology information need defined as a priority some time ago, assuming that a willing and qualified project manager is available to lead it. O'Neil commented that he would like to know more about the benefits and drivers before authorizing the project as a regional GIS pilot project. Chinander asked if a seamless metro wide storm water dataset exists. Read responded that it does not. Chinander commented that such a dataset would be of great importance to the emergency response community.

All agreed that the suggested 2nd generation needs assessment should be among the top priorities for the revised 2010 work plan.

Motion: Member Read moved and Member Chinander seconded to that the Coordinating Committee:

- 1) Accept the revisions to 2010 MetroGIS work plan and “foster collaboration” budget , as presented in this report, subject to adding the storm water project identified during the Committee’s discussion if, upon review of a forthcoming project description the project sufficiently benefits the region and a qualified project manager is demonstrated to be available. And, if this is the case, the Phase II Performance Measurement project would be postponed to 2011.
- 2) Recommend that the Policy Board ratify these revisions.

Motion carried ayes all.

d) Preliminary 2011 Program Objectives

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized each of ten candidate 2011 projects preliminarily offered for the Committee’s comment. He also explained that the proposed funding amounts are intended to be flexible because the actual costs will not be known until the RFP results are received.

The group agreed that the proposed 2nd generation needs assessment is needed to effectively set priorities for 2011 and beyond. The group also concurred that in addition to setting priorities for information need, organizational needs should also be evaluated. Staff clarified the proposed needs assessment is intended to begin in 2010 and extend into 2011 and, as such, it shows up in the budget for both years for a total of \$35,000.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the proposed 2nd generation needs assessment should be the means by which priorities are set for 2011 and beyond, with the understanding that in-progress and previously authorized projects would be the focus of 2011 work until the needs assessment results are known. Staff explained that the next step would be to share this strategy with the Policy Board at its July meeting and incorporate the Board’s direction into a formal recommendation to be considered by the Committee at its September meeting.

e) Demonstrate Regional Street Centerline Dataset Enhancement and Met Council Base Map Service with Met Transit NexTrip Application

Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council GIS Unit, updated the Committee on the addition of a “road character” field to the NCompass Street Centerline Dataset and a base map recently developed by the Council that is used in Metro Transit’s NexTrip application. [Click here](#) to view McGuire’s presentation slides. The group concluded that this demonstration should added to the list of candidates for Policy Board presentations

f) GIS Technology Demonstrations

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the information presented in the agenda report. All agreed the 2nd ranked priority (the top priority was presented at the April meeting) identified at the March meeting should be selected for the Policy Board’s July meeting. The Staff Coordinator agreed to contact Member Knippel to ask if he would be willing to present it. Members Bunning and Henschel agreed to present the 3rd ranked priority if Knippel is not available.

6. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Coordinating Committee is scheduled for September 16th.

PROJECT UPDATES AND INFORMATION SHARING

Chairperson Wakefield asked if there were any questions or comments about the agenda materials posted as separate downloadable documents on the Committee’s meeting webpage.

Approved on:
pending

Chinander offered information on an in progress investigation of GITA's GECCo initiative, noting that more should be known by the Committee's September meeting if partnering with GITA would be valuable to MetroGIS's efforts. Chinander noted that our preference to include policy makers is not typically part of the GECCo method but they see the value and are investigating how to modify the methodology to do so.

7. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

DRAFT