

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Coordinating Committee**  
**MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg.**  
**September 16, 2010**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Wakefield called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and asked the others in attendance to introduce themselves.

Members Present: Cities: Hal Busch (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* Bill Brown (Hennepin), Peter Henschel (Carver), Jim Bunning (Scott); Mike Fiebiger (Ramsey), Doug Matzek for David Brandt (Washington); Randy Knippel (Dakota); *Metropolitan:* Rick Gelbmann and Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council); (Metropolitan Council) and Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); *Non-Profits:* Sally Wakefield (1000 Friends of Minnesota); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (U of M) and Ben Verbick (LOGIS), *State:* Joella Givens (MN/DOT) and Tim Loesch (DNR); *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); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (NCompass Technologies), *Counties:* John Slusarczyk (Anoka), *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom; and *State:* David Arbeit (MnGeo).

Open Seats: *Business Geographics and Non-Profits*

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Support Team, and Mark Kotz, Chair of the Address and Technical Leadership Workgroups.

Visitors: Dave DiSera (EMA and GITA) and Steve Swazee (SharedGeo and GITA)

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

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

**3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY**

Member Henry moved and Member Verbick seconded to approve the June 16, 2010 meeting summary, as submitted. 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) Proposal MetroGIS Co-Host GECCo Event**

The Staff Coordinator Johnson clarified that he, not GITA, recommended the \$3,000 contribution proposed in the agenda report to co-host a GECCo event after learning of the GECCo (*Geospatially Enabling Community Collaboration*) initiative last March and investigating its value to accomplishing MetroGIS objectives. Johnson then introduced Dave DiSera and Steve Swazee to explain the GECCo initiative, emphasizing that this proposal presents a low risk/high reward scenario to explore partnerships with non-government, a high priority of the Policy Board, by focusing on the scope on addressing shared information needs of the emergency response community, another priority of the Policy Board.

Highlights of the presentation included:

- GITA brings the private sector to the table, a key stakeholder that is often missing from discussions about collaborative solutions to shared information needs.
- The proposed Twin Cities GECCo would expand the participants of a previous GECCo's to include policy makers to leverage the collaborative environment that exists in the Twin Cities.
- GITA believes the Twin Cities environment presents an opportunity to develop a clear model for addressing the need for higher level policy-driven organizational mechanism needed to actually act on desired collaborative solutions.
- A statement of intent to contribute by MetroGIS is extremely valuable to demonstrate to state and federal authorities the strength of the concept.

Following the [presentation](#), there was general discussion about:

- Topics addressed in the previous six GECCo events hosted by GITA and the general outcomes,
- The need to align a Twin Cities GECCo with related in-progress efforts such as Exercise 24,
- Liability issues that have dissuaded utilities from sharing data in the past even though they realize they could benefit,
- GITA membership involving utilities and telecoms, interests MetroGIS has long desired to bring to the table,
- The opportunity to act on a priority of the Policy Board to seek out collaborative opportunities with the private sector in response to a question about how this initiative differs from what MetroGIS is already doing,
- Value perceived by the Council as its funds would be used to which Vander Schaaf and Gelbmann concurred that the Council sees value in that the experience is expected to aid with a current Continuity of Operations initiative in progress at the Council.
- Expectations for MetroGIS's role in the planning and actual participation.
- Conversation that was in progress with DHS when this presentation was made seeking their support of multiple such event across the country,
- Whether the "up to" should be removed from the proposed motion (e.g., a contribution from MetroGIS of up to \$3,000)

**Motion:** Member Knippel moved and Member Givens seconded to recommend that the Policy Board approve a contribution of up to \$3,000 in 2011 to co-sponsor a GECCo event in the Twin Cities in 2011. Payment of these funds is contingent upon all other financing required for a successful forum to be obligated. Motion carried ayes all.

**b) 2010 Accomplishments – Projects Completed and In-Progress**

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the information provided in the agenda report, noting that the purpose for this item is to provide context for discussing a suggested 2011 work program; the next agenda item. No questions were asked. Gelbmann commented that a project manager is needed for development of the proposed "Clip, Zip, and Ship" tool to support the emerging Geospatial Commons now that Jessica Deegan has changed jobs and is no longer with the Council.

**c) 2011 Program Objectives/Budget**

Staff Coordinator Johnson presented a suggested work plan for 2011, as outlined in the agenda report. The only program objective for which discussion ensued regarding the proposed Next Generation MetroGIS Needs Assessment and is summarized below.

In response to a question about how the proposed needs assessment would compare to the assessment conducted in 1996-97, Member Gelbmann commented that this version would go beyond data to deal with web services and applications. Chairperson Wakefield added that she is delighted to see that the project is not limited to shared geospatial needs of government interests but is intended to explore shared needs of the broad community of institutions that serve the seven county area.

In response to question from Knippel about the proposed allocation of \$50,000 to this study over two years, Vander Schaaf commented that this type of community-focused needs assessment will be necessary shortly to successfully compete for community/economic development grants offered not only by the federal government but also most foundations. He went on to mention that foundation and government grant programs are currently being retooled to require holistic/regional planning focuses to qualify for consideration and that GIS enterprises, coordinated across regions/multiple jurisdictions, to support the planning efforts, such as the mission of MetroGIS, are also increasingly viewed as a key element for successful applications.

**Motion:** Member Gelbmann moved and Member Henry seconded that the Coordinating Committee:

- 1) Endorse the program objectives presented in Attachment A of its agenda report as priorities for 2011.
- 2) Endorse the 2011 “Foster Collaboration” budget presented in Attachment B of its agenda report.
- 3) Recommend that Policy Board endorse the subject 2011 MetroGIS Work Plan and Budget.

Motion carried ayes all.

**d) GIS Technology Demonstration – October Policy Board Meeting**

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the information presented in the agenda report. All agreed the 2<sup>nd</sup> ranked priority (“*Emergency response maps consistent across jurisdictions, based on U.S. National Grid*”) that was identified at the March Committee meeting should be selected for the Policy Board’s October meeting (the top priority was presented in July). Member Knippel agreed to make the presentation. He asked for advice from the Committee as to how to best frame the presentation in terms of seeking support to broaden use of the National Grid Mapping Standard. The Committee concluded that the Policy Board should be informed of the value of pursuing this standard. If Board members concur that wide spread use of the standard would benefit MetroGIS stakeholders then the Board should be asked to instruct the Committee to offer an advocacy strategy for the Board’s consideration.

**e) Refine E-Vote Process**

Chairperson Wakefield explained the rationale for the suggested changes to the current E-Voting procedure as explained in the agenda report. Harvey suggested that the three day comment period be clarified to state “three full business days”. The members concurred

**Motion:** Member Radke moved and Member Harvey seconded to that the Coordinating Committee recommend that the Policy Board modify MetroGIS’s Operating Guidelines as described in Attachment A, of the Committee’s agenda report and dated, August 23, 2010, subject to refinement of stipulating “three full business” days for the comment period.

Motion carried ayes all.

**f) Quantify Public Value (QPV) of Geospatial Commons Study Update**

Member Harvey, who serves as the Research Coordinator for the QPV Study, began his comments by mentioning that the study is comprised of two major components – Return on Investment study internal to Hennepin County and a Quantify Public Value (QPV) study which will focus on benefits, from the taxpayer’s perspective, to institutions that serve the geographic extent of Hennepin County. He then provided an update of the overall project and, in particular, the Hennepin County ROI component which was nearing completion at the time of this presentation. [Click here](#) to view Harvey’s slides.

One of Harvey’s slides showed the Hennepin County Departments/Offices from which representatives participated in the study. The term “surveyor” was listed on a slide intending the meaning “department of the county surveyor”. Member Brown, the Hennepin County Surveyor, noted that he had not participated in the interviews, to which Harvey and Johnson noted that the slide

Approved on:  
*December 16, 2010*

would be changed for future presentations to make clear that the office, not the person, was involved. There were no other comments.

**6. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Coordinating Committee is scheduled for December 16, 2010.

**7. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator