

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Centennial Office Building – Rm 302
May 22, 2001

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Craig called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Cities:* Dennis Welsch (Roseville); *Counties:* Gordon Chinander for Dave Drealan (Carver); Gary Stevenson (Dakota); Jim Hentges (Scott), Bill Brown for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), Jane Harper (Washington), Ed Shukle (Anoka); *Federal:* Ron Wencil (USGS); *Metropolitan:* Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); *Non-Profits:* David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); *Schools:* Dick Carlstrom for Lee Whitcraft (TIES); *State:* Joella Givens (MnDOT) and Les Maki (DNR); *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District).

Members Absent: *Business Geographics:* Steve Lehr (CB-Richard Ellis); *Cities:* Mark Vandershaaf [appointed the week prior] (St. Paul); *Counties:* David Claypool (Ramsey); *Metropolitan:* Eli Cooper (Metropolitan Council) *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC), and *Utilities:* [vacant seat].

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

Visitors: Brad Henry (USB/BRW); Gary Swensen, Anoka County

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as submitted.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Piggott moved and Gelbmann seconded to approve the March 15, 2001, meeting summary as submitted. Motion carried, ayes, all.

Chairperson Craig announced that Theresa Foster, MetroGIS' Technical Coordinator, had resigned her position with MetroGIS and that she had accepted a position with Goodhue County. Theresa thanked the Committee members for their cooperation and assistance on projects that she worked on over the last couple of years. Chairperson Craig, the Randall Johnson, and several Committee members thanked Theresa for her contributions to MetroGIS and wished her well.

4. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Regional Parcel Dataset Next Steps

Policy Advisory Team Chair Hentges summarized the components of the Regional Parcel Data Pilot Project and the considerations of the Policy and Technical Advisory Teams at their joint May 2 meeting that lead to the proposed recommendations before the Committee. He then asked those who had attended that meeting if the meeting summary accurately reflected the deliberation and recommendations.

Brown commented that it is his understanding that, although 19 attribute fields have been agreed upon to provide in the regional dataset as a goal, this policy does not obligate the respective counties to provide the attribute data. The members concurred, noting the objective is for each of the counties to provide as many of the identified attributes as practical for them to do so. Staff also commented that Appendix A to the current GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements list 25-30 parcel attributes that each county has previously agreed to share with other government and that most, if not all of the subject 19 attributes, are likely covered in the current agreements.

Chairperson Hentges then introduced Trudy Richter, President of Richardson and Richter Associates and member of the MetroGIS support team, to present the specifics regarding of the recommendations unanimously forwarded to the Committee from the Policy and Technical Advisory Teams.

Ms. Richter commented that her presentation would cover, as separate topics, recommendations to forward to the Policy Board for action on July 11 and Committee direction to its respective advisory teams. She provided an overview of all of the recommendations and then asked for comments on each recommendation one-by-one, beginning with the recommendations for Board action. No concerns were raised with any of the Board recommendations.

Motion: Piggott moved and Givens seconded to recommend that the Policy Board:

1. Endorse moving from the pilot phase to a long-term commitment to support a quarterly-updated regional parcel dataset solution.
2. Request the Metropolitan Council serve as the regional custodian for the regional parcel data solution, assuming that all roles and responsibilities are clarified and that all affected parties are comfortable with the expectations of their organizations' roles.
3. Endorse amending the data specifications for the regional dataset to include, as a goal, in subsequent versions of the dataset all 14 of the attributes included in the prototype dataset, regardless of whether the fields are populated by all counties, and to populate the regional dataset fields whenever the data are ~~maintained~~provided by the counties.
4. Endorse amending the data specifications for the regional dataset to add following additional attributes to subsequent versions of the regional parcel dataset:
 - Watershed district identification code to compliment the existing county and school district codes
 - Number of Units
 - Type of Unit (single dwelling, condominium, townhouse, mobile home, etc.)
 - Last sales date
 - Last sale value
5. Amend the regional custodian roles and responsibilities for the Regional Parcel Dataset that were adopted October 1999 by the Board to add:
 - A "Quality Assurance/Quality Control" responsibility, defined by the Technical Advisory Team in cooperation with the regional custodian. (*Note: The purpose of this procedure is to insure that the parcel data provided by each of the primary custodians (counties) is the same data that the users receive following assembly into a regional dataset by the regional custodian. This procedure does not have any application to the development of the primary data. The regional custodian shall also include the procedure in the metadata for the regional dataset.*)
 - The task of filling out a "quick reference table" with data supplied by the counties for each version/update of regional parcel data.
6. Request each county to cooperate and provide metadata for:
 - Each attribute associated with the regional parcel dataset using a template provided by MetroGIS for which it maintains data. (*Note: The template shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements: date of county data supplied for the regional dataset, date county data assembled into regional file, and spatial accuracy reported in any manner consistent with the county's business practices.*)
 - Parcel boundaries in accordance with currently endorsed metadata guidelines.
7. Encourage each county to use the MetroGIS endorsed NSSDA methodology, if it chooses to test and report the spatial accuracy of its data.
8. Authorize the Metropolitan Council, on its behalf, to publish a Request for Proposals, not later than early September 2001 to design and implement an Internet-based, data delivery mechanism that:
 - a) Automates the data distribution process, including ability to distinguish between data requests that require licensing and data requests that require fees.
 - b) Provides the user with the ability to specify a geographic area of interest within the seven county area.
 - c) Provide users with multiple format choices to the extent possible and practical.

- d) Works in conjunction with the proposed Internet Map Services capabilities.
- e) As a bid option, provides the user with the ability to specify attributes from all those available for each data theme.

Motion carried ayes all.

Staff offered a marked-up copy of the previously adopted regional data specifications and roles and responsibilities policy summary document and asked for comments whether it made it easier to convey the Committee's recommendations to the Board. No one commented one way or the other.

Ms. Richter then presented each of the activities/studies that the Policy and Technical Advisory Teams had recommended that the Committee assign to them. There was no discussion of the individual activities but the matter of support resources was discussed in light of the resignation of the Technical Coordinator. Staff commented that consultant assistance and reallocation of the Metropolitan Council's GIS staff resources were being investigated as options to keep the technical projects moving forward until a decision could be made what to do with the staff vacancy. Staff accepted a proposal from Harper and Craig to assist with the evaluation of options.

Motion: Stevenson moved and Piggott seconded to approve the proposed modifications to the Policy and Technical Advisory Team work plans as presented on pages 9-13 of the agenda packet, with the understanding that: a) the Committee's emphasis is on the order of the tasks and that the dates are only goals given the resignation of the Technical Coordinator and b) staff will seek input throughout the development of the Request for Proposals for a Data Distribution Mechanism and throughout the process to select the consultant from the Coordinating Committee and from the Technical Advisory Team related to the what it learned from the four data distribution technology demonstrations.

Motion carried ayes all.

Ms. Richter then summarized each of the Technical Advisory Team's proposed changes (listings on pages 9, 10 and 12 of the staff report) to its schedule for undertaking the remaining Business Information Needs studies [Where People Live, Existing Land Use, Planned (Future) Land Use, Property Rights, Land Regulations, Socio-Economic Characteristics of Areas, and Watershed District Jurisdictional Boundaries]. She also noted that the start date listed for the Where People Live Information Need in the staff report should be modified to read To Be Determined (TBD), rather than September 2001. After the staff report had been written, staff had concluded that work on this topic should not begin until the Technical Advisory Team concludes its inventory of the data elements the counties maintain currently for addresses. The Committee concurred.

In light of the uncertainty of staff support resources, the Committee concluded that it should postpone discussion of these scheduling recommendations until at least its September meeting. Staff was asked to report back to the Committee at the next meeting about support options and the impact on the Business Information Needs schedule and other Team activities.

b) Appointment of Brad Henry to the Coordinating Committee

Chairperson Craig introduced this matter and summarized several reasons why he believed Brad Henry should be appointed to the Committee including: 1) until he retired from his long standing position with Minneapolis and his subsequent resignation from the Coordinating Committee in January 2001, Brad Henry had made significant contributions to the MetroGIS initiative serving as its chair and vice chair, 2) he brings continuity to the Committee in terms of the vision, what has been achieved and remaining challenges, 3) enthusiasm for the attaining the MetroGIS vision, and 4) his recommended appointment would be consistent with all rules set forth in the operating guidelines.

Chairperson Craig asked Brad Henry to leave the room while the Committee discussed the recommendation.

Stevenson moved and Brown seconded to appoint Brad Henry to the Committee's membership under the "special expertise membership" provision set forth in the Operating Guidelines.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) MetroGIS Membership in the National GeoData Alliance (GDA)

Chairperson Craig summarized the Staff Coordinator's recommendation that MetroGIS join the GDA as an Institutional Member. Stevenson asked how the GDA would differ from organizations such as NaCO and URISA, noting his concern that it would be one more group to add to growing list of options that he, the other Committee members, and MetroGIS staff must choose from to participate in. Chairman Craig and the Staff Coordinator commented that the GDA's focus is on creating a trusted forum for collaboration among organizations to share data and program resources as well collaborate on geospatial operational issues and opportunities, as opposed to the focus of professional organizations, such as URISA, which focuses on education and information sharing among its professional members.

Wencl commented that the GDA is an effort at a truly national, inclusive organization capable of effectively addressing the breadth of organizational and technical needs and opportunities involved in achieving the vision of the NSDI. He also commented that long-term funding from the FGDC to support the vision of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) is not guaranteed and consequently, a broad-based organization, such as that proposed GDA, is in the geospatial community's collective interest. All however, concurred that MetroGIS must be vigilant that the amount of human capital dedicated to the GDA and other non-local do not unreasonably interfere with MetroGIS' ability to achieve endorsed work objectives.

Aichinger moved and Wencl seconded to recommend that the Policy Board authorize MetroGIS to apply for membership in the emerging National GeoData Alliance as an Institutional Member. Motion carried, ayes all.

With regard to recommendations 2 and 3 in the staff report, the members concurred that the Coordinating Committee should not take a position on whether or not a Policy Board member should consider seeking a seat on the GDA National Board of Trustees on behalf of regional government.

d) Meeting Schedule

Welsch moved and Henry seconded to cancelled the Committee's June 14 meeting and to change the date for the September meeting from the 13th to the 27th. Motion carried, ayes all.

The Policy Advisory Team agreed to change its June 20th meeting to the morning of June 14.

e) July 11 Policy Board Demonstration Topic

The members concurred with staff's recommendation to demonstrate current WEB-based data distribution capabilities provided through MetroGIS DataFinder and to also demonstrate the functionality sought with the proposed Request for Proposals (Agenda Item 4a) for which the Policy Board endorsement will be sought on July 11.

It was agreed that the difference between access to images (LMIC's demonstration in April) and source data needs to be made clear and that the RFP's primary purpose is the latter. Staff was also directed to make the point that we are not longer focused on a DataFinder but have expanded the initial data discovery focus to include data acquisition. Finally, the members suggested the demonstration provide a synopsis of how desired data can be searched for from the perspective of geography and attributes of spatial data themes.

5. INFORMATION SHARING

There was no discussion.

6. NEXT MEETING

September 27, 2001. Staff was asked to include an update on tasks accomplished over the summer and the appropriateness of current priorities, given the resignation of Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator.

7. ADJOURN

Henry moved and Harper seconded to adjourn at 4:00 p.m. Motion carried, ayes all.

Prepared by,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator