

Summary
MetroGIS Policy Advisory Team
Roseville City Hall
February 14, 2001

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairperson Erdahl.

Members Present: David Arbeit (LMIC), David Claypool (Ramsey County), Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann for Eli Cooper (Metropolitan Council), Virginia Erdahl and Jane Harper (Washington County), Brad Henry (AMM-Minneapolis), Ed Shukle (Anoka County), and Dennis Welsch (AMM-Roseville).

Members Absent: Partick O'Connor (Hennepin County)

Visitors: Dave Drealan, (Carver County and member of the Coordinating Committee), Jim Hentges (Scott County and member of the Coordinating Committee), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota County and member of the Coordinating Committee), Larry Hoiium (Anoka County), Joella Givens (Metro MnDOT and member of the Coordinating Committee), and Jim Ramstrom (LMIC).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff/Policy Coordinator, Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator, and Business Plan Update Consultant Team members Trudy Richter with Richardson, Richter and Associates and Jay Witstock with BRW.

AWARD OF CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION

Policy Board Chair Victoria Reinhardt presented certificates of appreciation to Brad Henry and Virginia Erdahl. (A copy of each certificate is attached.) Brad Henry retired from the City of Minneapolis in January and Virginia Erdahl will be retiring from Washington County the end of February. Both were charter participants of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee and Policy Advisory Team.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda as accepted as submitted.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Shukle moved and Arbeit seconded to approve the summary of the November 29, 2000 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4.SUMMARY OF JANUARY 10, 2000 POLICY BOARD MEETING

Randall Johnson summarized the major actions of the Policy Board on January 10. He also summarized the subsequent request of each county to act on three of the policies endorsed by the Board.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Election of Chairperson:

Motion: Claypool moved and Shukle seconded to nominate and cast a unanimous ballot for Jim Hentges to chair the Policy Advisory Team. Motion carried, ayes all. Jim stated that he would prefer Virginia Erdahl to preside over the remainder of this meeting.

b) Next Steps – Regional Custodian for School District Jurisdictional Boundaries Data

Theresa Foster, Technical Advisory Team staff, and Jane Harper, Project Manager for the Washington County School District Jurisdictional Boundary Pilot Project and member of the Technical Advisory Team, summarized the findings of Washington County's Pilot Project and the Advisory Team's

recommendation that the Mn Dept of Children, Families, and Learning (CFL) be pursued as the responsible organization for seeing to it that data users can readily access school district jurisdiction boundary data produced by multiple counties and that counties should be designated as the primary producer of this data. It was also explained that LMIC had been contracted with by CFL in the past to produce school district boundary data and that LMIC had no internal business need to produce this data for their own purposes.

Randall Johnson outlined a proposed strategy for approaching CFL with a request to serve as regional custodian via a workgroup comprised of Jane Harper (Washington County), David Arbeit (LMIC), and staff, which would report back to the Policy Advisory Team. David Arbeit concurred with the strategy as a reasonable way to approach this matter. David also cautioned that LMIC does not have the ability to fund this activity but is willing to accept the responsibly if financed by CFL, noting that the key to the negotiations is to seek confirmation that CFL in fact views this data as a core need.

Motion: Arbeit moved and Gelbmann seconded to endorse the strategy outlined in staff report dated January 29, 2001 pertaining to seeking acceptance from the Mn Dept. of Children, Families, and Learning (CFL) to serve as the regional custodian for MetroGIS' endorsed school district jurisdictional boundary data with the understanding that the workgroup should, at a minimum, be expanded to include a TIES representative from either the Coordinating Committee or Policy Board and that John Carpenter, the Secretary of State's office and the Legislative GIS Office should be asked if they have any interest in participating.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) MetroGIS 2002 Budget Proposal

Randall Johnson asked the Team for feedback about staff's decision to provide the Team with the detailed budget document, the same document that staff uses to manage the day-to-day finances of MetroGIS, rather than the summary version that will be provided to the Policy Board. Johnson explained the rationale for this decision is the collaborative nature of MetroGIS and that, as such, all of the details should to be made available for review and comment. No one expressed opposition to this philosophy.

Johnson then explained that the proposed 2002 MetroGIS budget seeks \$185,000 in project funding and continuation of 3.75 FTE, the same amount of funding and support estimated for 2002 in the Business Plan adopted April 2000. He also commented that the proposed budget incorporates all activities set forth in the 2001-02 work plan as endorsed by the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board.

The Team accepted the proposed 2002 budget without change. Staff was also directed to include a summary of the revenues (donated funds, anticipated grants, Council funds, and county data sharing agreement funds dedicated to the broader MetroGIS community) along with the detailed budget document when the budget proposal is presented to the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board for approval.

d) MetroGIS Outreach Strategy

Staff summarized the proposed outreach strategy – current practices and proposed additions – as presented in the staff report dated January 31, 2001.

Will Craig, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, explained that he has accepted a request from MetroGIS staff to head up the design and analysis of the next Participant Satisfaction Survey. He asked the team to begin to think about questions they would like to add to the previous surveys, in particular, to help MetroGIS improve its outreach efforts. He stated that he believes MetroGIS should implement ways to better convey the benefits of the MetroGIS initiative to non-GIS managers, public officials, and the general public. He also commented that the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) has

a similar outreach need, that he is on the GCGI's outreach/communication committee, and that the two organizations should work together on this effort. He also emphasized that the proposed outreach strategy must be supplemented with continued one-on-one dialogue by members of the Coordinating Committee and staff with essential officials affiliated with each of MetroGIS' strategic partners.

Gelbmann added that the strategy should also place more emphasis on outreach to governments that serve Greater Minnesota. He noted that this past summer, while working on a project with GIS staff from Greater Minnesota, that on several occasions statements were made that MetroGIS' objectives are not consistent with the interests of Greater Minnesota. Gelbmann stated that MetroGIS should proactively address these concerns by conveying benefits that could accrue to Greater Minnesota from the MetroGIS experience.

The proposed strategy was accepted with the modifications suggested by the Craig and Gelbmann. Staff noted that this strategy will be presented to the Coordinating Committee on March 15.

e) Regional Parcel Dataset Workshop

Trudy Richter summarized the purpose of a workshop planned for March 9, which is targeted toward local government interests that did not elect to participate in the Regional parcel Data Pilot Project and have a jurisdiction that crosses into two or more counties or abuts a county boundary. The preliminary agenda was shared for comment.

The only item raised for discussion related to whether academic interests should be invited and whether it would be possible to provide them access at the workshop to the regional parcel dataset per the policy endorsed by the Policy Board on January 10. Following a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that not all of the counties would be able to obtain the required board actions to grant access to the academic community by the time of the workshop.

This discussion led into a general conversation about how to best approach extension of the current pilot project agreement in the event the counties wished to do so following the April 12th forum rather than enforce the June 30, 2000 termination date. The county representatives all agreed that approval of a time extension would be straightforward if no changes are made to the agreement provisions and most likely this approval would be via consent item. The county representatives agreed that each of them should seek their approval from their respective county boards concerning academic access as a separate action. Staff agreed to follow up with of the county representative, in particular, with Hennepin since they were not present at the meeting.

f) Registration of "MetroGIS" and "MetroGIS DataFinder" names

Staff noted that the applications were submitted to State and Federal authorities the week of February 5. The State process is expected to take about a month and the Federal process about two months.

g) Umbrella Data Sharing Agreement and Licensing

Staff explained that the proposed agreement attempts to accomplish the following objectives: 1) extension of the data sharing provisions to December 31, 2003, 2) not provide any of the project funding that was included with the interim agreements, 3) resolve how to best use the \$75,000 currently provided to the counties to partially offset increased data distribution expenses and to assist with data maintenance desired by their data sharing partners, 4) continue to the foster and strengthen support for county-based GIS user groups. The proposed agreement also seeks endorsement of the concepts of data sharing reciprocity among organizations that benefit for data made available via the MetroGIS initiative and the concept of expanding the agreement to encompass all organizations that provide a MetroGIS endorsed service or produce or maintain MetroGIS endorsed data.

Representatives from the organizations that have been recognized as a provider of data or service fundamental to the achieving the vision of MetroGIS (seven counties, Metropolitan Council, MnDOT, and DNR) were encouraged to read through the concept draft and be prepared to discuss provisions that need clarification and what they like and do not like about the draft at the next meeting.

Stevenson stated that he believes the concepts proposed in this draft go beyond the interim agreements between the Council and the seven counties. He stated that a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) may be a better solution, notwithstanding the problems identified with the JPA approach during the Business Planning process.

Gelbmann asked for clarification as to whether the “collar” counties are eligible to receive the data. Staff, noted that the current agreements include the collar counties, including three counties in Wisconsin, in the definition of government unit and that this provision remains intact in the proposed “umbrella” agreement.

It was agreed that the Team, including representatives from each county, should spend time at the next meeting clarifying the objectives of the proposed “umbrella agreement”.

h) LMIC EPPLviewer Project

David Arbeit, Director of the Mn Land Management Information Center (LMIC), summarized LMIC’s request, as outlined in the accompanying staff report dated February 6th, for permission from the counties to package a graphic representation of the counties’ parcel boundary data with their EPPLviewer product. He noted that all parcel attributes would be removed when the parcel boundary data is converted to the EPPL format. The EPPLviewer also provides all of the software on the same CD-ROM that includes the data. Arbeit noted that The Lawrence Group has authorized incorporation of a graphic image of their street centerline dataset.

Jim Ramstrom, also with LMIC and one of the lead support staff for the EPPLviewer product, demonstrated how the graphic representation of the county’s parcel boundary data could be used in conjunction with orthoimagery, a representation of The Lawrence Group’s street centerline dataset, and other data layers for a number of purposes but he emphasized that EPPLviewer does not have GIS analytic capabilities.

The unanimous conclusion after a lengthy discussion by the county representatives was that the described incorporation of parcel boundary data within the EPPLviewer package does not require County approval and is not subject to the license restricting redistribution of their parcel boundary data because: 1) LMIC substantially changed the data (removed all attributes and converted to a representation of the original data), 2) the user can not get back to the source data, and 3) the datedness of the data (November 1999).

The Team also concurred that this type of decision is best made on a case-by –case basis rather than attempt to set a generalized policy.

i) Regional Parcel Dataset – Private Sector Access Agreement

Staff reported that Anoka, Scott and Washington Counties had submitted executed agreements. Drealan stated that the Carver County Board is scheduled to act on February 26, Claypool noted that the Ramsey County Board had approved the agreement in December and that he was under the understanding that it had been executed and submitted. He agreed to check into the matter. Stevenson stated that he was unaware that a final version of the agreement had been sent to the counties for approval. It was noted that Kathy Doty had sent the final version of the document to each county last fall. Trudy Richter agreed to send the document to Stevenson. Staff was asked to call Hennepin County for an update. (*Note:*

Approved on
(draft)

following the meeting, it was learned that the Hennepin County Board approved the agreement on February 15.)

j) Regional Parcel Dataset – Public Sector Pilot Project Update

A summary of the proposed sequence of events, from now through the July 11 Board meeting, was shared with the Team. The Team also accepted the proposed date changes for its meetings and the proposed addition of a workshop for the Coordinating Committee in late May. Team members asked staff to prepare a summary version (dates with event titles but no explanation of objectives) before presenting this information to the Coordinating Committee. The proposed May workshop will be presented to the Coordinating Committee on March 15 for approval.

The revised Team meeting dates were agreed to as follows: A date to be set for sometime during the last two weeks of March, May 2, and a joint special workshop with the Coordinating Committee on May 23 or 24.

Additional Information Item

Joella Givens (MnDOT) handed out cost summary information that she prepared regarding the Kodak Citipix Program. She is willing to coordinate a partnering effort and encouraged those organizations with possible interests to contact her.

6. NEXT MEETING

Staff was asked query each member about their availability the last two weeks in March. The meeting previously set for March 7 was dropped. The April 4 meeting was also dropped. After the March meeting, the next meeting is scheduled for May 2.

7 ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator