

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Metropolitan Counties Government Building
September 22, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Wakefield called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. He asked the members and others in attendance to introduce themselves. Rick Gelbmann introduced Janie Norton, as MetroGIS's new Project Manager, noting that her position is intended to serve in a similar capacity to the Technical Coordinator position that MetroGIS identified as a need in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan. Chairperson Wakefield welcomed Ms Norton to the MetroGIS team said that she was thrilled that someone with her expertise is now available to assist with MetroGIS initiatives. The Committee also welcomed her to the team.

Members Present: *Academic:* Francis Harvey; *Cities:* 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); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District), and Rick Gelbmann and Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council), *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom; *Non-Profits:* Sally Wakefield (Envision Minnesota), *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (U of M) and Ben Verbick (LOGIS), *State:* Chris Cialek (MnGeo) and Bart Richardson for Tim Loesch (DNR); and *Utilities:* Allan Radke (Xcel Energy).

Members Absent: *Cities:* Mark Maloney (Metro Cities - City of Shoreview); *Federal:* Ron Wenzel (USGS); *Metropolitan:* Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board; *Non-Profits:* Jeff Matson (U of M CURA on behalf of Mn Council of Nonprofits); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (NCompass Technologies), *State:* Joella Givens (MnDOT); and *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Melissa Baker, Capital Region Watershed District.

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

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Support Team,

Visitors: Allison Brummel, Nora Riemenschneider, and Todd Graham (Metropolitan Council – Corridors of Opportunity Project)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Henry moved and Member Bitner seconded to approve the agenda as submitted with the exception of Item 6b, which Member Vander Schaaf requested to be postponed until the December meeting. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Bitner moved and Member Brandt seconded to approve the June 23, 2011 meeting summary, as submitted except from changing the "He" to "She" in the first line on the first page. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF JULY POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Wakefield asked if the members had any questions about the material presented in the packet. The Staff Coordinator noted that in response to the State Government shut down, the Board has asked the Committee to include a continuity plan for all web services that are implemented as regional solutions via MetroGIS's efforts. He mentioned that proposals are expected at the Committee's December meeting for the Best Image and Geocoder Services.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a) **Scenario and Visualization Tools – Corridors of Opportunity Initiative**

Approved on:
(pending)

Member Vander Schaaf introduced the topic by noting the broad goal of the Corridors of Opportunity Initiative is to develop a model for how to accomplish comprehensive planning for transit corridors. He also noted that the goal is to establish institutions so that the model can be put in to practice after the grant funded initiative expires. He then asked Allison Brummel, the Corridors Project Manager, to offer any additional introductory comments about the broad objective. She noted that another major focus of the project is to reach out to communities that tend to be under-represented in planning processes. Ms. Brummel closed by noting that they are struggling to figure out how to do so effectively and introduced Todd Graham to share the research he has completed to define visualization tools that if broadly used will improve participation by these and other communities. The goals of the visualization component and for the entire “Corridors” initiative are presented in a [slide presentation](#) presented by Mr. Graham. As Mr. Graham progressed through his presentation he invited the Committee members to offer comment on the results of research designed to define best fit visualization tool(s).

Chairperson Wakefield comments that she had asked for Mr. Graham to speak to the Committee to explore opportunities to potentially enhance the proposed tools if they were tied more closely to the GIS environment, that is provide more connectively6t to rich data environment maintained by the GIS community and to identify any data gaps important to rolling out the visualization tools that the MetroGIS community might be able to assist with closing.

A wide-ranging conversation ensued. Some noted that there is big leap in terms of cost (in excess of \$30,000) between what they can do inexpensively today and what the citizens are beginning to expect, based upon their experience with sophisticated games and applications emerging in the private sector. It was noted that there is likely room for a middle of the road solution but the biggest challenge will continue to be to get citizens to participate.

Notwithstanding, Henry commented and others agreed that the visualization project is on the right track. He stressed that the dollars are on the engineering side of the equation and that this tools can leverage those resources to greatly improve communication with citizens through these tools. Henry also mentioned that all of the data types identified in the presentation should be on the both the engineers’ and planners’ systems at the start of the projects to support rapid prototyping. Is this were to be the case a huge opportunity for the GIS and engineering communities to more closely. He closed by stating that MnDOT and others are moving to 3D design and these tools will compliment that transition.

All concurred that these tools are important and valuable because they are expected to create an environment capable of bringing together engineers, planners, and citizens so they have a common understanding of vision for a particular initiative.

Mr. Graham was thanked for sharing his research.

6. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Modify Rules for Executive Committee of Policy Board

Randall Johnson, Staff Coordinator, summarized the proposed changes to the operating guidelines presented in the agenda packet.

Motion: Bitner moved and Read seconded to recommend that the Policy Board modify MetroGIS’s Operating Guidelines, as presented in the agenda report presented in the Committee agenda packet, with the understanding that the term “ex-officio” will be preceding by the “non-voting member” for clarification purposes. Motion carried, ayes all.

(Item 6b – Refine Definition of Regional Significance was postponed to the December meeting when the agenda was approved.)

c) **Preliminary 2012 Work Plan and Budget**

Staff Coordinator Johnson noted that the proposed work plan reflects general direction provided by the Committee at its June meeting. He also mentioned that it is difficult to be more specific at this time because the testing of Address Points Editing Application ran into an unexpected delay which most likely will result in the need to fund much, if not all, of the project enhancements in 2012, assuming the Committee concurs that the project warrants further support.

Johnson then invited Members Knippel and Verbick to describe the issues that had been encountered with the Address Points Editing Application and their understanding of testing process. After a wide ranging conversation, it was agreed that the project should remain a priority. The Committee also requested that staff keep the Committee apprised of efforts taken to capture as much of the 2011 funding for the Address Points Editor as possible by allocating to other uses that have been defined as priorities.

The Committee also concluded that the previous low priority assigned to leadership succession planning should be revised to high priority for 2011 and concluded that no funding is necessary at this time. Bitner thanked Gelbmann for his efforts to secure a new Project manager position but also commented that he would prefer more input from the MetroGIS community when critical support positions are filled. Bitner volunteered to lead a Succession Planning Workgroup, with the understanding others would volunteer to participate, for the purpose of formalizing a means to: 1) nimbly interact with the organization that supplies the subject support person and 2) effectively transition among Board and Committee leaders.

Motion: Member Brandt moved and Member Bitner seconded to create a Succession Planning Workgroup. Motion carried, ayes all.

Chairperson Wakefield and Member Gelbmann volunteered to work with Member Bitner. Staff was asked to send a message to all Committee members to ask them to consider volunteering to serve on this workgroup. (*Editor's note: This message was sent to all Committee members on September 23. No additional volunteers were noted.*)

The final discussion around concerning work planning involved moving on the Phase I of the Website redesign project. Member Read volunteered to host a one-time brainstorming session to develop a high level strategy as defined in the agenda materials. Members Brandt, Gelbmann, and Knippel volunteered to participate with Member Read.

Staff was asked to send a message to all Committee members to ask them to consider volunteering to serve on this workgroup. (*Editor's note: This message was sent to all Committee members on September 23. No additional volunteers were noted.*)

d) **Lightening Round – Ideas for Regionally Significant Initiatives**

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the proposal, as outlined in the agenda report. After a wide ranging discussion, it was agreed that each committee member should be given up to 1 minute to share ideas at the beginning of the meeting that they have for a regionally significant initiatives. It was agreed that this space on the agenda will become more important once the on-line collaboration tool is operational and Committee members have an effective means to communicate with their respective constituencies.

e) **GIS Demonstration for October Policy Board Meeting**

The Staff Coordinator informed the group that Dick Carlstrom is prepared to present at the October Policy Board meeting as earlier requested by the Committee.

All concurred that the presentation ideas listed in the agenda report should be included in the survey proposed to be conducted to set the topics for 2012 (Brendon Slotterback, on concept of "location

efficiency” and MnDOT’s Collaborative Initiative to Improve Sharing of Parcel and ROW data as explained in an article in June 2011 Issue of APWA Reporter.

f) **Reflections on Impacts of MN State Government Shutdown**

All concurred that a contingency plan is a must but that it should be permissive, that is, the policy statement for each regional service-based solution should be stated as follows: It is our intent that this and any other service that is stood up through MetroGIS’s efforts should (*note permissive –not mandatory*) have a contingency protocol to protect against loss of availability. The Committee concurred that as long as the statement is permissive there is no unfunded mandate and therefore no need to conduct a survey of impacts on the community experienced by stakeholders when the current regional services were down for a few days.

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, December 15, 2011.

9. **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator