

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS**  
**Coordinating Committee**  
**August 23, 1996**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting order at 8:30 am. The meeting was held at Dunwoody Institute in Minneapolis.

Members Present: *Federal:* Ron Wencil (USGS); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC); *County:* Dave Drealan (Carver County), Margo LaBau (Anoka County), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota County Surveying & Land Info); *Metropolitan:* Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council GIS); *Cities:* Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); *Schools:* Clark Evans (Minnetonka Schools), Jim Sydow (TIES). *Economic Development Partnerships:* Scott Beckman (Dakota County); *Academics:* Will Craig (CURA); *Utilities:* Alan Srock, (NSP).

Members Absent: *Counties:* David Claypool (Ramsey County), Jim Hentges (Scott County), Pat O'Connor (Hennepin County), Virginia Erdahl (Washington County); *Metropolitan:* Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); *Cities:* Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); *GIS Consultants:* John Carpenter (Lawrence Group); *Business Geographics:* Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); *Watersheds:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District);

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch

**2. Acceptance of the Agenda**

Staff requested that Item 4b: MN GIS/LIS Conference Presentation be added to the agenda. The committee accepted the meeting agenda with the addition of Item 4b.

**3. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries**

The summary from the June 27, 1996 meeting was accepted by consensus.

**4. Action Items**

**A. MetroGIS Endorsement from System Enhancers**

Staff explained that the Policy Team has been discussing the process of endorsement by *system enhancers* for cities, watershed districts, and school districts. Staff and Policy Team members were asked to explain their rationale for suggesting that only three system enhancer organizations be initially appointed to the MetroGIS Policy Board. Margo LaBau (Policy Team Chairperson) stated that the Policy Team strongly believes that system enhancer organizations need to participate in policy discussions from the beginning and that the Policy Team wants the Board to determine its own rules, including who should be represented on the Board. The team agreed to include watershed districts, cities, and school districts among the initial Board participants because of their importance to the development of the MetroGIS and because the members were confident that these organizations would ultimately be sought to participate. The Committee concurred.

It was noted that it was the Policy Team's understanding that nearly all cities in the Metro Area are members the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities (AMM) and, consequently, that AMM would be

the best choice for an organization from which to seek representation for cities on the MetroGIS Policy Board. It was also explained that the Policy Team is proposing one representative for large cities and one representative for small cities, to be determined by the AMM.

Metropolitan Association of Watershed Districts was explained to be the only organization that represents all Metro Area watershed districts and, therefore, should be requested to represent watershed district interests on the MetroGIS Policy Board. LaBau added that the Policy Team felt it is more appropriate to ask each of the *system enhancer* organizations to choose their own representation. She referenced the draft letter that had been prepared by staff, which suggests criteria to assist with the selection of representatives from these organizations.

Staff explained the Policy Teams recommendation that Technology Information Educational Services (TIES) should be asked to accept the lead for coordinating MetroGIS representation for school districts and that TIES should be asked to present a plan for incorporating the views of Metro II and Minneapolis school districts.

The group unanimously agreed that TIES, as an organization representing 45 of 50 metropolitan school districts, represent school districts on the MetroGIS Policy Board and that it is also important to extend an opportunity for involvement to Metro II schools (St. Paul and others) and Minneapolis School District. Jim Sydow (TIES) stated that it may be possible for the three groups to cooperate and to agree on a means of common representation in the MetroGIS process. Sydow stated that he will explore the possibilities with Metro II and Minneapolis School Districts and will report progress at the October meeting.

Chairperson Arbeit moved and Gary Stevenson seconded to accept the Policy Team's recommendation to seek endorsement of the MetroGIS and appointment of representatives to the MetroGIS Policy Board from AMM and MAWD on behalf of cities and watershed districts. The motion carried unanimously.

The membership concurred that the draft letter presented in the agenda packet should be reduced to one page and that the four requested endorsement actions should be more clearly stated. It was also agreed that Chairman Arbeit should sign the letter and that it should be sent as soon as possible to the AMM and MAWD. Staff agreed to report on the progress of the discussions with all three of the referenced organizations at the October meeting.

## **B. Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium State Conference Presentation**

It was explained that the MetroGIS initiative is on the program of the Minnesota State GIS/LIS Conference to be held September 26 and 27. Staff noted that a program similar that used for the "Phase II Kick Off" Forum in May is proposed. The team agreed that a presentation is appropriate and that the Kick Off Forum format is appropriate except more emphasis needs to be placed on current activities rather than the retreat and strategic planning efforts. It was agreed that a representative from each Advisory Team (chairperson, if possible) should speak.

The group also discussed whether to provide an overview of the MetroGIS initiative at the September 18th meeting of the Association of County Officers conference and for the state conference of the Minnesota Chapter of American Public Works Association this Fall. These opportunities lead to a suggestion to prepare a 15 - 30 minute presentation that could be used by staff or Committee members as needed. Stevenson and LaBau felt that the Committee should not get out in front of the endorsement process. The group concurred that we would have a much stronger story to tell once the MetroGIS has been endorsed and the Board is operational. It was agreed that since the endorsement process is likely to be

complete by the end of the year, that preparation of a generic presentation should wait for input from the Board.

## **5. Update on Advisory Team Activities:**

### **a) Access**

Chairperson Jim Sydow reported that the Data Access Advisory Team has created four subcommittees. These subcommittees are working to coordinate efforts and reduce duplication with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. He noted that members of the team will be taking part in the data modeling effort scheduled for the Fall.

### **b) Policy**

Chairperson Margo LaBau reported that the Policy Team had invited representatives from each county to talk about the endorsement process at their August 15th meeting. She reported that Carver County has completed the process and that progress is being made in each of the other six counties and that endorsements are expected to be received from all interests by the end of the year. She also explained that the goal of the Policy Team is to convene the MetroGIS Policy Board before the 1997 legislative session begins.

### **c) Data Content**

Randall Johnson, David Arbeit, Will Craig, and Heidi Welsch reported on the Data Content Advisory Team's project to identify regionally significant data needs. It was explained that the first project activity will be a focus group forum planned for the afternoon of September 19, 1996. It is proposed to be facilitated by Advanced Strategies, Inc. (ASI), headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia. Rick Gelbmann explained that ASI has significant experience facilitating projects of this nature. One-hundred-and-one participants have confirmed their attendance. The participants are from a variety of expertise areas, organizations, and geographic areas across the metropolitan area. Nearly three-quarters of the participants are new to MetroGIS.

### **d) Standards**

Vice-Chairperson Ron Wencil reported on the Data Standards Advisory Team. The team has been communicating with the Standards Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information to cooperate and reduce duplicated effort. They have formed an address subcommittee to begin studying specific standards. Rick Gelbmann asked if a Mn/DOT representative is a member of the address subcommittee. He explained that he has recently spoken with MnDOT officials concerning a centerline map with address file to include maintenance for MetroGIS use. Rick explained that Mn/DOT is interested in this project because, although a centerline file is available for no charge from MnDOT, it will not serve the purposes of all the users within Mn/DOT. Rick also explained that the Council currently maintains an address file but that it has not been completed for the entire Metro Area and it is current only as of 1990-91.

Gary Stevenson stated that MetroGIS needs to decide on a coordinate system for the MetroGIS and how the continued use of several systems will be reconciled. The group agreed and requested that Ron Wencil discuss this topic with the Standards Advisory Team at their next meeting and to report on progress back to the Coordinating Committee as to how the Team will pursue this matter..

## **6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities**

A summary was included with the agenda packet. Randall Johnson also reported that the interim agreement process is moving forward in all counties.

## **7. Next Meetings**

### **a) Coordinating Committee**

Thursday, October 24, 1996 -- 8:30 -10:30 a.m.

Thursday, December 19, 1996 -- 8:30 -10:30 a.m.

The group noted that it would prefer to meet at a facility that is designed for meetings. Staff asked about returning to the Earle Brown Center. The consensus was that the modest fee for parking is not a concern, considering the quality of the facility and availability of parking.

### **b) Steering Committee**

It was agreed that the Steering Committee should meet two weeks prior to the every other month meeting of the Coordinating Committee. (These meetings can take the form of e-mail or telephone conversations depending on the agenda topics.) Each Team was asked to formalize their representative the Steering Committee (this person does not have to be the chairperson). Staff noted that a date would be set once each of the Teams all agree on their representative.

## **8. Adjournment**

Chairperson Arbeit motioned and Gary Stevenson seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by,

Heidi Welsch,  
GIS Administrative Intern