

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Mosquito Control District Offices
March 15, 2001

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Craig called the meeting to order at 9:45 p.m.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Counties:* Dave Drealan (Carver); Jim Hentges (Scott), Gary Caswell for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), Jane Harper (Washington), Ed Shukle (Anoka); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *Metropolitan:* Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); *Non-Profits:* David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom for Lee Whitcraft (TIES); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC), Joella Givens (MnDOT) and Les Maki (DNR).

Members Absent: *Business Geographics:* Steve Lehr (CB-Richard Ellis); *Cities:* Dennis Welsch (Roseville) [large city representative seat vacant), *Counties:* David Claypool (Ramsey) and Gary Stevenson (Dakota); *Metropolitan:* Eli Cooper; *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District), and *Utilities:* Alan Srock (NSP)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

Visitors: Brad Henry (USB/BRW); Alison Slaats, DataFinder Project Manager; Jim Ramstrom (LMIC)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Due to lack of a quorum at the outset of the meeting, Chairperson Craig began with Agenda Items 5d and 5f. A quorum was reached during presentation of Item 5f. The remainder of the business items were followed in the order presented on the agenda. Due to lack of time, there was no discussion or action concerning Item 3 (approval of December 14, 2000 meeting summary), Item 4 (Summary of January 10, 2001 Policy Board meeting), Item 6 or Item 7.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

No action taken on the Committee's December 14, 2000 meeting summary due to lack of time.

4. SUMMARY OF JANUARY 10, 2001 POLICY BOARD MEETING

No discussion due to lack of time.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS (see note in Item 3)

d) NSDI Grant Application

Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator, summarized a grant application that was submitted to the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) the day prior. The grant if awarded would provide funding to assist MetroGIS create several WEB Mapping Services that are OGC (Open Geographic Consortium) compliant. A project team will be established if the grant is awarded. This team would report to the Technical Advisory Team. The benefits to the MetroGIS community would be added flexibility in the form of provision of access to non-vendor specific map services and the opportunity to explore this emerging WEB Map Service technology for its potential to satisfy some of the MetroGIS community's information needs previously satisfied only through sharing of actual geospatial data.

Foster noted that before she included the proposed parcel related WEB Map Service in the application she had spoken with a representative at each county and that no one was opposed to the giving further consideration to the concept.

The consensus of the committee was to proceed with the application as proposed. Staff was directed to send a copy of the complete application to the each of the County Representatives. Staff also asked that

the County representatives contact them as soon as possible if they have second thoughts about the proposed parcel related WEB Map Service proposal.

f) April 11, 2001 Policy Board Demonstration Topic

Chairperson Craig commented that a regular topic on the Policy Board's agenda is a demonstration of GIS Technology. Following his brief overview of the demonstrations that had previously been shared with the Board, he asked if any of the Committee members had a topic that they thought would be timely for the April 11 Board meeting in addition to the option of inviting LMIC to demonstrate its EPPLviewer product as staff had suggested in their report. No other options were offered.

Chairperson Craig invited David Arbeit and Jim Ramstrom of LMIC to provide a sample of what the demonstration to the Board might include and in particular the relevance of MetroGIS' policies concerning data development and best management practices.

During the demonstration, although concept approval had been previously granted by the counties, considerable discussion emerged concerning LMIC's desire to modify parcel, orthoimagery, and street centerline regional datasets to eliminate attributes and convert to a format that eliminates topology in exchange for packaging these datasets with the EPPLviewer and disturbing without fee or license to government and non-government interests.

The group talked briefly about the level of user that might be attracted to this product. a) high end user—not interested, b) middle user - need for high end detail but lack the resources might lead them to occasional use and c) low-end user- it was agreed this is the target user because inadequate funding/expertise and/or interest in more complex GIS solutions.

The group also concluded that although it would be technically possible to convert the data in this product back to something useable in ESRI's GIS products, most would be determine the effort cost and/or time prohibitive. It was agreed that the EPPLViewer product would most likely not be used by the vast majority of stakeholders who need the attributed format that MetroGIS is seeking to make available only to government and under license. Nevertheless, to insure the Committee's concerns do not become an issue at the Board meeting, Arbeit agreed to establish a tracking system for who receives the product and a forced non-disclosure statement that the user would have to read before opening the program.

Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator, commented that this product which is essentially providing the capability to view relationship between map images possesses similar characteristics to the emerging WEB Map Services technology that MetroGIS is seeking grant funding to test (*Agenda Item 5d*). Maki also commented that this product is similar to a product that DNR has developed for its low-end users (allows viewing of data but the data can not be changed and there is no GIS functionality) which has resulted in an effective tool to market data resources and build good will.

Piggott moved and Shukle seconded to invite LMIC to demonstrate its EPPLviewer product at the April 11 Policy Board meeting, assuming a clear connection is made to MetroGIS, because it will:

- 1) Help the Board understand the importance of the data development and standards work that MetroGIS has championed.
- 2) Provide an opportunity to obtain feedback about the quality of the datasets included in the product to the extent that they are able to be used in this product,
- 3) Help promote the concept of "map images" and in so doing help MetroGIS better understand the role of the WEB Map Services technology that is emerging and which MetroGIS is seeking a grant to test,
- 4) Provide an avenue to test and obtain feedback regarding regional data solutions that are in various stages of implementation by MetroGIS.

Motion carried, ayes all.

a) 2002 MetroGIS Budget Proposal

Randall Johnson summarized the 2002 MetroGIS budget proposal, noting it had been unanimously approved by the Policy Advisory Team, and summarized several of the key initiatives.

There was no discussion of the proposal.

Caswell moved and Harper seconded to recommended that the Policy Board adopt the proposed budget, dated February 14, 2001, and forward it to the Metropolitan Council for approval.

Motion carried, ayes all. Staff noted this proposal would be shared with the Policy Board on April 11.

b) Regional Parcel Data Solution Events and Meeting Schedule Revision

Randall Johnson summarized the proposed schedule of events, through a decision by the Policy Board on July 11, 2001, to deliberate and decide policy concerning the proposed regional parcel dataset. In addition to informing the committee that the date for the Parcel Data Users Forum has been set for Thursday, April 19, staff also suggested that the Committee tentatively schedule a special meeting for May 22 or May 23 in the event it is needed to complete work on a recommendation concerning next steps for Board consideration on July 11.

The group briefly talked about decision rules to decide who should be invited to the April 19th Regional Parcel Data Users Forum and concluded that the following priorities should be followed: 1) individuals that used the dataset and submitted an evaluation, 2) individuals that tried to use the data but could not and submitted an evaluation, 3) others who the organization team believes would bring valuable perspective to the forum. The group also concurred that a balance of the user community by organization type should be sought.

Piggott moved and Hentges seconded to tentatively schedule a special meeting of the Coordinating Committee for May 22, 2:30-4:30 to provide direction on issues or options prior to the teams finalizing a recommendation for the Committee's consideration at its regular meeting on June 14. The Committee Chair in collaboration with the Policy Advisory Team will decide if the meeting is needed.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) MetroGIS Outreach Strategy

Chairperson Craig summarized the proposal, which would continue past outreach practices and add efforts to seek coverage in the written media as well as communicate with similar interests outside of the Metro Area. Randall Johnson suggested also including hands-on workshops similar to that hosted on March 9 for the Regional Parcel Data Pilot Project.

Shukle moved and Arbeit seconded to endorse the outreach strategy as presented in the staff report dated February 27, 2001 with the addition of hosting hands-on workshops similar to that held on March 9. Staff noted this plan would be shared with the Policy Board on April 11.

Motion carried, ayes all.

d) ESRI Geography Network Challenge

Alison Slaats, GIS Internet Special at the Metropolitan Council and Technical Lead for DataFinder, explained the ESRI Geography Network Challenge and the benefits that she believe would accrue to MetroGIS from getting involving. She also noted that the work that the tasks needed to participate are the consistent with the work proposed to be undertaken if the NSDI Grant is awarded. The deadline for submitting a statement of intent to participate ins March 30.

The group concurred with Slaats that a benefit of the participation in the challenge would be to promote the innovative MetroGIS organization nationally even if an award is not received. The group also agreed

that if an award is received that the resulting education/training credit would be a wonderful resource to distribute among MetroGIS stakeholders who have a need for it.

Wencl noted that MetroGIS needs to be careful not to promote a particular commercial product and believes that the intension to test and use of the OGC standard (Agenda Item 5d) is evidence of compliance with a policy of openness. He also concurred with Gelbmann that the biggest benefit of this program will be the outreach that it would foster.

Piggott moved and Wencl seconded to authorize application for the ESRI Geography Network Challenge.

6. POLICY AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY TEAM PROJECT UPDATE

There was no discussion due to lack of time.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

There was no discussion due to lack of time.

8. NEXT MEETING

Special meeting, if needed: May 22, 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.

Regular Meeting: June 14, 2001

9. ADJOURN

Hentges moved and Gelbmann seconded to adjourn at 11:30 a.m.

Prepared by,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator