

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Visioning/Coordination Team
February 27, 1996

The meeting began at 8:30 a.m. at the Earle Brown Conference Center on the St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Members Present: **Federal Agencies:** Ronald Wencil (USGS); **State Agencies:** David Arbeit (LMIC); **Metropolitan Agencies:** Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); **Counties:** Margo LaBau (Anoka County), Dave Drealand (Carver), Gary Stevenson (Dakota) [left early], Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); **Watersheds:** Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey- Washington-Metro); **School Districts:** Jim Sydow (TIES) and Clark Evans (Minnetonka); **Universities:** Will Craig (CURA); **Utilities:** Alan Srock (NSP); and **GIS Consultants:** John Carpenter (Insight Mapping and Demographics);

Members Absent: **Cities:** Brad Henry (Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (Roseville) and **Business Geographics:** Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation).

Support staff: **Metropolitan Council:** Shelly Bergh Gardner, Randall Johnson, Tanya Mayer, and David Vessel.

1. Summary From Previous Meeting

The January 25, 1996, meeting summary was accepted as presented. The group agreed that member names need not be associated with discussion items and that individual comments need not be identified unless objections are being raised.

2. Status/Progress Reports

Rick Gelbmann updated the group on the Metropolitan Council's internal GIS Needs Assessment. He stated that the report of preliminary findings is expected to be available by mid-March and he encouraged members of this group to comment on the preliminary recommendations.

David Arbeit asked if the consultant (PlanGraphics) will be providing any recommendations regarding structuring of the MetroGIS effort. Rick stated that PlanGraphics has been informed of the Council's commitment and activities regarding the MetroGIS effort to insure that their recommendations coordinate between the Council's internal and external programs. Rick also noted that PlanGraphics has been asked to focus its work on the internal needs of the Council. David then asked how the Council intends to balance its resources between its internal GIS program needs and the support of the external MetroGIS effort. Rick noted that PlanGraphics has raised this "balance" question and will be

assisting the Council develop a framework to guide these “balance-related” decisions as the MetroGIS effort matures. Rick reemphasized that the Council is committed to allocating significant resources to the creation of the MetroGIS.

Rick also explained that work on a GIS "status/needs/benefits" worksheet for the Council has been postponed pending completion of the needs assessment.

3. MetroGIS Intent Statement

The group unanimously endorsed the Statement of Intent that was offered by staff with the understanding that the three data-related statements of desired outcome are to combine in to one statement. The group also concurred that the statement adequately addressed the meaning of the strategic issue entitled "local control". And, the group concurred there the Statement of Intent would not be enhanced by specific reference any of the following three "goals" identified at the December Retreat but not identified in the follow-up exercise at the January 25th meeting: Promote new definition of community: independent to interdependent, competitive to cooperative; Encourage new cooperative uses-synergy; and Cooperative GIS system assures you have data you need. Council staff noted that a revised version would be prepared for the group’s approval.

4. Group and Define Related Strategic Issues

The group consolidated the fourteen strategic issues that it had agreed upon at the January meeting into four strategic issues themes: governance, standards, data content/outputs, and data access/ delivery. A preliminary work plan was also developed through the use of a Gantt Chart process. This process helped the group visualize the sequencing of issues necessary between and among the four theme areas. Shelly Bergh Gardner facilitated both of these group process activities. (Refer to Attachment A for an illustration of the results of these exercises.)

The final activity proposed for this agenda item was delegated to staff. It was to have involved a group process to define the meaning of top ranked strategic issue for each strategic issue theme area. The group, however, concluded that it preferred staff to propose these definitions for discussion at a future meeting.

5. Revised Interim Decision Making Structure

The group discussed the proposed relationship between the Strategic Issue Teams and Visioning/ Coordinating Team. The consensus was that Strategic Issue Teams should not decide courses of action but rather their charge should be to analyze options and make recommendations. This conclusion, in turn, lead to a brief discussion but no consensus regarding the following questions:

a) How to effectively include elected officials in the decision making process? b) The appropriate time for members to seek "endorsement" of the MetroGIS process from their respective boards/commissions? and c) The need to establish rules for the Visioning/Coordination Team regarding who should serve, member obligations, meeting norms, decision procedures, etc.

It was agreed, with regard to the board/council "acceptance" question, that for the time being the members should seek approval as they deem necessary to continue to participate in the effort. The group asked staff to place the procedures discussion on the next agenda. The remainder of the components of the decision making structure were acceptable, as presented in the staff report.

6. Create Strategic Issue Teams

The members attempted to identify the persons who will serve as the liaison(s) from the Visioning/Coordinating Team to each of the Strategic Issues Teams. Several members indicated interest in the Governance and Data Content/Outputs Teams; Ronald Wencil volunteered to be the liaison to the Standards Team, although he expressed uneasiness about being the only liaison, given his unfamiliarity with the data needs of the local government interests; and David Arbeit volunteered to be the liaison to the Data Access/Delivery Team. It was agreed to postpone this identification of liaison responsibilities, in particular for the Governance and Data Content Teams, until the next meeting. In the interest of adjourning on time, the group also decided to postpone discussion of short term objectives for the strategic issue teams until the next meeting.

7. Interim Data/Cost Sharing Agreements

Time ran out before the packet materials could be discussed.

8. Next Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for 8:30 AM on Friday, March 22, 1996. Clark Evans, Margo LaBau, and David Arbeit volunteered to assist with preparation for the next meeting.

9. Adjourn

The meeting concluded at 12:15 PM.

Prepared by,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP