

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Metropolitan Counties Government Building
March 24, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Henschel called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. He introduced Matt Koukol as the new representative from Ramsey County and asked the others in attendance to introduce themselves.

Members Present: *Academic:* Francis Harvey; *Counties:* John Slusarczyk (Anoka), Peter Henschel (Carver), Jim Bunning (Scott); Matt Koukol (Ramsey), David Brandt (Washington); Randy Knippel (Dakota); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (NCompass Technologies), *Metropolitan:* Rick Gelbmann and Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council), David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), and Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom; *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (U of M) and Ben Verbick (LOGIS), *State:* Nancy Rader (MnGeo). *Utilities:* Allan Radke (Xcel Energy), and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Melissa Baker, Capital Region Watershed District.

Members Absent: *Cities:* Hal Busch (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* Bill Brown (Hennepin), *Non-Profits:* Sally Wakefield (1000 Friends of Minnesota) and Jeff Matson (U of M CURA on behalf of Mn Council of Nonprofits); *Metropolitan:* Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, and *State:* Joella Givens (MN/DOT) and Tim Loesch (DNR).

Open Seats: *Business Geographics and Cities* (AMM: Core Cities)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Support Team,

Visitors: None

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Bitner moved and Member Henry seconded to approve the agenda with order changes as follows: 5c, 5a, 5d and 5b. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Radke moved and Member Bitner seconded to approve the December 19, 2010 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF JANUARY POLICY BOARD MEETING

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the information presented in the agenda report.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

c) GIS Demonstration for April Policy Board Meeting

In addition to the two candidate demonstrations presented in the agenda report, Bunning offered a third for consideration – a web-based application for keeping citizens apprised of flood-related road closures.

Following a brief summary about each of the three candidates, the Committee decided all should be presented to the Policy Board in the following order:

- Scott County Road Closures and Flooding – *Jim Bunning, Henschel*
- GIS Web Viewer – Exploring and Discovering Recreational Opportunities – *Henschel, Koukol and Brian Fischer (Houston Engineering)*
- TIES efforts to foster greater use of GIS technology among school districts (principal uses being understanding housing stock to understand population characteristics for census

projections, setting school attendance boundaries, and supporting bus operations –
Carlstrom.

The Committee encouraged presenters of the Scott County demonstration to make a point of sharing with the Policy Board that Carver County created the application and shared it with Scott County and that MnDOT has also been involved.

a) Next Generation MetroGIS Needs Assessment

Michael Turner, with Applied Geographics and lead support for this project, was introduced. He joined the Committee meeting via the Internet.

Turner began his [presentation](#) with a brief overview of the pre-workshop survey conducted in December, the needs assessment workshop hosted on January 13, and a recap of the MetroGIS's current policy foundation. He then noted that a number of ideas had been captured for next-generation projects, including ideas for improving MetroGIS's effectiveness, and that all of them can be "mapped" to one or more of the current strategic objectives defined in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan.

Turner then highlighted the suggestions received in three major categories of findings: ***Communication & Collaboration, Data, and Organizational***. He closed his presentation with a slide entitled "discussion starters" and encouraged comment from the members.

Henry commented that the substance of the presentation to the Policy Board needs to focus on policy issues. A suggestion was made to using Slide 20 (a lot has changed in recent years) to launch the presentation with the Board and also to set the stage for offering insight into how MetroGIS's efforts can make a difference to address the ever-changing geospatial environment. A lengthy discussion ensued during which several policy issues and opportunities were offered to share with the Policy Board for direction prior to attempting to recommend specific next step actions.

The policy related considerations identified by the Committee were as follows:

- **Status quo or expand function:** Should MetroGIS continue to serve principally as a forum to collectively establish standards and roles and responsibilities for support of collaborative solutions? Stated another way, should MetroGIS consider offering services beyond its current "foster collaboration" functions of:
 - a) Support a forum to foster collaboration,
 - b) Catalyze solutions to geospatial data, web service, and application needs shared by its stakeholders, and support an Internet data, service,
 - c) Support an online discovery tool for geospatial data, services and application (e.g., DataFinder).
- **Collaborative Space Emphasis:** Consider greater investment in tools and activities that create a collaborative space (e.g., web-based tools) for MetroGIS stakeholders to use regardless of whether the solutions would be regional in significance. If no additional resources, this means less investment in solutions to shared data, service and application needs.
- **Multiple Funding Sources:** Should MetroGIS continue to seek out an organizational structure that permits it (Policy Board) to receive, manage, and expend funding from multiple sources?
- **Role of MetroGIS Policy Board:** Do Policy Board members believe that continued existence of the Policy Board, comprised of policy makers, is important to achieving MetroGIS's vision and mission? What do Board members believe their role is? Should be? What changes in membership should be considered? The Coordinating Committee believes this discussion might be best served if the Committee were to first specify what it needs from the Policy Board to be successful.
- **Authority to Commit Resources:** To improve nimbleness, consider authorizing designated officials (e.g., Chairpersons, Staff Coordinator) to commit MetroGIS resources up to a

- designated amount. Currently, expenditures must be included as line items in a budget approved by the Policy Board, which meets quarterly.
- **“Push” Data to Commercial Providers:** Consider pursuing a policy of “pushing” locally-produced data (e.g., imagery, parcels, street centerlines, jurisdictional boundaries) to national providers (e.g., Google, Bing, Map Quest) so that these high quality, locally-produced data, which are paid for by taxpayers, are available for the taxpayer to use in ever-increasing commercial applications that they use in their personal lives. This idea is a game changer, consistent with the current policy to seek out partnerships with non-government interests, with potential for significant additional reduction in duplication of effort. Key policy issue - define the boundary between governments standing up applications versus having the private sector do so in a manner that leverages locally-produced data.

The Staff Coordinator agreed to share this list of issues with the Committee members for confirmation before developing the presentation for the April 20 Policy Board meeting

d) Explore Potential for Collaborative Street Centerline Maintenance Model

Staff Coordinator Johnson introduced this agenda item, noting the Policy Board has approved this project for 2011 and 2012 funding last October. He also explained that NCompass and Applied Geographics, the contractor retained for this project, had collaborated on a joint proposal to the RFP. Charboneau (NCompass representative) commented that NCompass is fully on board with the notion that some portion of the NCompass Street Centerline Dataset needs to be moved to the public domain to remain competitive. Johnson also noted that Applied Geographics is also providing support for the National Transportation for the Nation, the results of which will hopefully be able to be leveraged during this project. Johnson concluded his introductory remarks by noting that although the study is not expected to begin until the Next Generation Needs Assessment is complete, he thought it important to ask the Committee to authorize creation of a Project Advisory Team at this time so that work could begin now to populate the Advisory Team. Michael Turner, with Applied Geographics, then commented on the broad objectives of the study.

In response to Vice Chairperson Henschel’s call for a motion to create the proposed Advisory Team, three projects currently underway in the Twin Cities, involving at least three counties, LOGIS, and the MESB with major deliverable deadlines by year-end, were identified.

A wide-ranging discussion ensued about the purposes of those projects and how the subject study would add value and not be duplicative. Ultimately, the Committee found that the MetroGIS project is important to bring resources to the table that all concurred will be needed to address obstacles out of scope/beyond the skills of those involved in the current, mostly technically focused efforts. All concurred that the current efforts will also provide an outstanding means to “tee up” critical obstacles that the MetroGIS resources can focus on for solutions. “

Motion: Wencil moved and Bitner seconded that the Committee authorize creation of a Street Centerline Maintenance Study Advisory Team, with the understandings that:

- a) It would not officially begin work until mid to late summer, which is consistent with the current project plan and
- b) A meeting should be held as soon as possible with affected parties to clarify expectations on all parts.

The following Committee members volunteered to serve on the Project Advisory Team:

- Bitner
- Charboneau
- Koukol

The Committee then directed the Staff Coordinator to set up a “clarify expectations” meeting of the affected parties to ensure all understand that the goal of MetroGIS’s project is to build upon/leverage the other projects and in no way duplicate their work.

Knippel volunteered to attend the initial “clarify expectations” meeting and Verbick (LOGIS) agreed that someone from LOGIS would attend. Staff was directed to encourage Gordon Chinander (MESB) and Givens (MnDOT) to also attend. Charboneau commented that the key to the next-generation street centerline maintenance model is to define an efficient means for cities to contribute their address and street centerline data as they create it—a current objective in the proposed study.

b) 2011 Budget and Work Program Refinements

The Staff Coordinator noted that \$3000 previously allocated to the proposed GECCo Forum this fall can be used for other purposes as federal financing has been secured for the forum. He mentioned that a revised budget would be proposed at the June Committee meeting as a component of the recommendations that follow needs assessment. He also noted that collaboration with the NGAC on defining organizational structure options is no longer an option. No comments additional were offered.

6. MAJOR PROJECT UP-DATES

No comments offered.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

No comments offered.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Coordinating Committee is scheduled for June 23, 2011.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator