

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Metropolitan Counties Government Building
June 23, 2011**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Wakefield called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. She asked the members and others in attendance to introduce themselves.

Members Present: Bob O'Neil (Metro Cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* John Slusarczyk (Anoka), Peter Henschel (Carver), Gary Swenson (Hennepin), Jim Bunning (Scott); Matt Koukol (Ramsey), David Brandt (Washington); Randy Knippel (Dakota); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), and Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom; *Non-Profits:* Sally Wakefield (Envision Minnesota), *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (U of M) and Ben Verbick (LOGIS), *State:* Fred Logman (MnGeo) and Joella Givens (MN/DOT); *Utilities:* Allan Radke (Xcel Energy), and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Melissa Baker, Capital Region Watershed District.

Members Absent: *Academic:* Francis Harvey; *Cities:* *Non-Profits:* Jeff Matson (U of M CURA on behalf of Mn Council of Nonprofits); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (NCompass Technologies), *Metropolitan:* Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, Rick Gelbmann and Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council), and *State:* Tim Loesch (DNR).

Open Seats: *Business Geographics and Cities* (Metro Cities)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Mark Kotz, MetroGIS Staff Support Team,

Visitors: Policy Board Member Maluchnik (Carver County)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

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

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Verbick moved and Member Bitner seconded to approve the March 24, 2011 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF APRIL POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Wakefield asked if the members had any questions about the material presented in the packet. None were asked.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Next Generation MetroGIS Needs Assessment – Draft Final Recommendations

Michael Turner, with AppGeo and lead support for this project, was introduced by the Staff Coordinator. He joined the Committee meeting via the Internet and phone line.

Turner began his [presentation](#) with a brief overview of the objectives of the Next Generation MetroGIS Needs Assessment. He then presented two recommended actions for each of the three major summary categories of needs identified at the previous Committee meeting (1. Communication and Collaboration, 2. Data, and 3. Organizational). Turner's recommendations addressed a "need" and an "opportunity" in each of these three major categories. The members were encouraged to ask questions about any aspects of these recommendations that they were not clear on in preparation for a ranking exercise planned as part of the Agenda Item 5b. The ensuing discussion is summarized as follows:

Comments that apply to all three major summary categories:

- Committee members concurred that each recommendation addresses an important need. No other options were offered.
- Each of the scopes was deemed a reasonable and doable.
- The finalized project scopes should include a project description (charter) describing project importance and the specific outcomes to be sought.

1) Communication and Collaboration:

- Revamp informational website
- Social media Committee and Collaboration Forum

The discussion about the collaborative forum began with question to Mark Kotz regarding the status of incorporating social media/Web 2.0 tools into the design of the proposed Geospatial Commons. He noted that although the primary focus has been on addressing a stakeholder preference to have one place to go to find out who is doing what. Web 2.0 tools have been discussed but are a low priority at the present time.

Terner commented that he and his assistant had spent a fair amount of time on the MetroGIS information website and found it to be cumbersome and does not take advantage of current technology. He encouraged MetroGIS to treat this site as our calling card and increase its importance as a corporate asset.

Desired Outcomes: The group concurred that a design requirement should be support of distributed editing by multiple participants from their respective systems. Terner offered that this requirement is doable offering an option referred to as “crosslinks” and another that works by granting “edit” privileges for a “branch” of the website, in addition to staff. The revised site should also help Committee members better represent their constituencies by providing an interactive web presence that offers stakeholders a “real time opportunity to share their needs, share opportunities for lowering the cost of doing business across the region, and inform themselves about collaborative opportunities.

2) Data:

- Identify required improvements to regional solutions
- Plan for development of regional, base map title service

All concurred with Terner’s comment that GIS is IT and that IT changes rapidly and the need to turn data into more user friendly products, such as web services.

Desired Outcomes: The process to identify improvements needs to provide a means to continuously monitor changing stakeholder needs, allow important needs, suitable for collaborative solutions, to become apparent. The current system of evaluating need for improvement on a set cycle is no longer adequate. The new system also needs to be help MetroGIS leadership decide what is more important –small changes to established solutions verses pursuing new solutions. The new system also needs to build on the current system in which roles and responsibilities are defined (who does what) but also effectively monitor user satisfaction with the carrying out of these responsibilities.

Three types of data were data were noted by the Terner: 1) that with a local authoritative source, 2) federal/state produced data which can be used as a base to improve upon, and 3) data which represent a snap shot in time (e.g., imagery, LiDAR) which must be redone to update.

The members concurred that the new system should incorporate the idea that geospatial data represent two broad types of objects: 1) physical objects (street signs, roads, bridges, buildings, etc.), which are candidates for crowd sourced updating and 2) invisible/

conceptual objects (e.g., street centerlines, jurisdictional boundaries) which require authoritative sources.

The members also concurred that the process should, as in the past, involve defining a “wish” list from which a “to do” list is generated. To make the “to do” list a finding would continue to be made that the required resources (funding, equipment, and human resources- support and advocacy) exist. In addition, the next-generation process should also include a listing of desirable projects which do not qualify for the “to do” list but which MetroGIS would serve as the as the advocate to secure the required resources.

Lastly, “pushing” data to provide providers will require an understanding of commercial licensing restrictions.

3) Organizational:

- Streamline MetroGIS process to make organization more nimble
- Pursue a public-private partnership

Desired Outcomes: Two types of organizational changes are needed – a) improve operational efficiencies and 2) define a process to monitor and adjust strategic direction, which actively involves industry leaders to advise the Policy Board. In addition, the definition of the term “regional significance” should be revisited to ensure that important opportunities are not being inadvertently overlooked, in particular involving Research and Development focused projects. Seek out opportunities for bi-lateral (cross sector) data sharing and document the lessons learned and how the experience creates public value.

Authorization: The Committee authorized the Staff Coordinator, together with the Chair and Vice Chair, to craft an amendment to the Operating Guidelines that addresses the general outcomes defined above for presentation to the Policy Board at its July meeting. Motion carried, ayes all.

Editor’s note: The following process requirements preceded the project recommendation in the agenda report presented to the Coordinating Committee. No mention was made of any issue with these requirements; therefore, they are included with the specific project recommendations:

“Each of the following suggested projects would begin with an evaluation of: 1) all related past MetroGIS actions focusing in what worked well and what did not work as well as had been hoped for, and 2) needs and preferences of the current stakeholder/user community. Additionally, solutions will not be complete until an evaluation of organizational capabilities has been conducted and a willing entity with sufficient operating capacity has accepted responsibility for support.”

b) **2011 Work Plan Refinements and Direction for the 2012 Work Plan**

Staff Coordinator Johnson introduced Mark Kotz who was asked to conduct a paired comparison exercise to rank the importance of each of the candidate projects identified in the previous agenda item (green). Johnson also informed the group that previously approved but postponed projects (brown) were included in the draft listing. Kotz began the exercise with several questions designed to clarify the members’ preferences and understand of the candidate projects. The results follow. Work on the Outreach Plan to define outcomes for the Website redesign and social media projects. Work on Identify Improvements to Regional Solutions to be accomplished under the current AppGeo Needs Assessment contract.

Priority	Item	Estimate of Cost/when	Count
----------	------	-----------------------	-------

Approved on:
September 22, 2011

1	Redesign & Re-Launch MetroGIS Web-site & social media	2012 (5-10K)	11111111
1	Identify Improvements to Regional Solutions	\$12K / Immediately	11111111
1	Create Outreach Plan	\$0-staff / Aug.	11111111
4	Implement Address Points Editing Tool	\$10K / soon if sole source?	111111
5	Streamline MetroGIS Processes (Guidance Committee, Nimble)	\$0, staff / July	11111
6	Have Regional Base Map Services (push, pull, etc)	\$??	1111
7	Pursue Public Private Partnership		111
8	Define Organizational Structure for Cost Sharing Across Sectors		11
9	Develop Leadership Succession Plan		1
10	Develop Performance Metrics		

Motion: Alternate member Logman moved and Bitner seconded to authorize the Staff Coordinator, together with the Chair and Vice Chair, to craft a budget for the remainder of 2011 to present to the Policy Board at its July meeting based upon the priority preferences defined in the above described exercise resource availability subject to sharing it for comment with the Committee. Motion carried, ayes all.

Motion: Read moved and Bitner seconded to direct staff to add a category to the budget named “discretionary project funds for regionally significant initiatives” involving a small amount of funding (e.g., \$5,000) that can be committed by the Staff Coordinator. Motion carried, ayes all.

c) Scenario and Visualization Tools – Corridors of Opportunity Initiative

Table to the September meeting due to lack of time.

d) GIS Demonstration for July Policy Board Meeting

Members Koukol Henschel confirmed that they are prepared to present the topic “*GIS Web Viewer – Exploring and Discovering Recreational Opportunities*” at the July Policy Board meeting. The Committee confirmed its earlier selection of this topic for the July meeting.

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 Thursday, September 22, 2011.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator