

**Summary
MetroGIS Policy Advisory Team
November 29, 2000**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairperson Erdahl. It was held at the Roseville City Hall.

Members Present: David Arbeit (LMIC), William Brown for Partick O'Connor (Hennepin County), Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann for Eli Cooper (Metropolitan Council), Virginia Erdahl (Washington County), Brad Henry (AMM-Minneapolis), and Ed Shukle (Anoka County).

Members Absent: David Claypool (Ramsey County) and Dennis Welsch (AMM-Roseville)

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) and Gordon Chinander (Carver County).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff/Policy Coordinator, and Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted after adding Item 4h, Private Sector Component of Regional Parcel Dataset Update.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

The summary of the May 25, 2000 team meeting and the summaries for the May 25, June 16, July 27, and October 3, 2000 special meetings of county representatives to the Coordinating Committee were approved as submitted.

4. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 2001 Policy Advisory Team Work Plan:

Randall Johnson summarized a proposed 2001 work plan for the Policy Advisory Team, noting that it is based upon the generalized work plan and budget priorities endorsed by the Policy Board in July, it is coordinated with the Technical Advisory Team's proposed work program, and it assumes that a professional services consultant will be retained by mid-January 2001. The staff also summarized the scope of work for the proposed professional services contract, which was provided in the agenda packet, in response to several questions from Team members.

Motion: Henry moved and Arbeit seconded to recommend that the Coordinating Committee approve the detailed 2001 work plan for the Policy Advisory Team as presented in the Team's agenda packet. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) 2001 Meeting Schedule

The team agreed to meet, at a minimum, on the first Wednesday of the month, the month prior to the Coordinating Committee's meetings, beginning February 7, 2001. The Team also agreed that the proposed 2001 work plan will require meeting more often than quarterly and consequently, tentatively, set meetings for March 7, April 4, and May 2.

c) Planned Future Land Use Regional Dataset – Access and Update Policy

Randall Johnson noted that this matter is presented for discussion and direction concerning who can have access to the resulting datasets and to begin a dialogue on how best to maintain them.

He began by summarizing the activities to date to address this priority information need:

- The generalized planned future land use coding scheme developed by the I-35 Corridor Coalition, as a pilot for MetroGIS in 1998-1999, was the starting point for MetroGIS' in September 1999 to facilitate agreement on a generalized coding scheme for the entire seven, county metropolitan area;
- In June 2000, the Coordinating Committee endorsed a preliminary regional planned future land use coding scheme as recommended for testing by the Technical Advisory Team;
- The Council agreed to test, beginning August 2000, the generalized scheme as part of its Smart Growth initiative,
- The Council's pilot project methodology involved building/assembling a digital version of the officially adopted planned land use map for each of the 190 metro area communities and "mapping" the officially adopted designations for each community to the preliminary regional generalized planned future land use categories;
- **The Council's pilot project methodology for the regional generalized dataset also involves aligning the planned future land use designation boundaries with parcel boundary data obtained from the counties and then "dissolving" the parcel boundaries for all but the perimeter of the planned future land use designation polygons.**
- **The Council's Version 1 methodology does not involve adding either a "generalized regional" or the "officially adopted community" planned future land use designation to the regional parcel dataset. These enhancements could be pursued if the identified as desirable by the user community (see Peer Review Forum below) .**
- The Council estimates that Version 1 of both the "digital mosaic dataset" of 190 individually adopted planned future land use maps and the regional generalized planned future land use datasets will be complete by January 1, 2001. A log has been kept of the coding issues that have arisen as the Council has been building Version 1 of the regional planned future land use dataset.
- From January to March 2000, the Council will be using the generalized dataset to support analysis fundamental to its Smart Growth initiative and as issues with the coding scheme arise they will also be documented.
- A peer review forum is scheduled for May 2001 to identify and seek comment and direction regarding unresolved issues with the proposed regional coding scheme.

Staff also explained that representatives from several cities – urban core, suburban, and freestanding – have been actively involved in expanding and refining the scheme developed by the I-35 Coalition to create the regional coding scheme via the MetroGIS' process. Craig suggested briefing the city representatives to the Policy Board on this matter before seeking action from the Policy Board.

This item is on the Team's agenda to discuss an access policy proposal with the county representatives. The Council GIS and MetroGIS staff propose to make both the "mosaic of individually adopted planned future land use plans" and the "generalized regional planned future land use" datasets available, without fee to anyone who wants them via the Internet. Johnson noted that permission will be sought from the 15-20 communities that provided digital data for their respective designations. Drealan asked staff to speak with him about the future land use boundary data supplied by Carver County on behalf of several townships within the county.

Agreement: The county representatives unanimously concurred that a policy of access without fee to anyone who wishes access for the regional datasets is an acceptable policy from their perspectives. All agreed that the counties do not have an intellectual property right claim on either dataset because their parcel data, although used to establish the boundaries of the future land use designation polygons, cannot be obtained from the future land use dataset.

Staff was directed to send a draft waiver/resolution to each county for official action on this policy. The members were supportive of making both the officially adopted individual plan dataset and the regional generalized dataset available to whomever wants access without fee or licensure.

Rick Gelbmann commented that he would like to develop an interactive Internet-based mechanism that would allow the individual communities to submit proposed changes their to officially adopted planned future land plans to the Council and for the Council to in turn provide the updated approved changes to the cities. The members concurred that this data must be current to be useful and encouraged staff to develop an effective means to maintain the currency of these datasets, once available.

Henry commented that establishment of coding standards for capture of planned land use data in and of itself will be a valuable contribution of MetroGIS.

d) Data Users Forum – Regional Parcel Data Pilot Project

Johnson explained that that Public Sector Regional Parcel Data Pilot Project got underway on November 20 and that planning will begin in January for the Peer Review Forum scheduled for April 2001. He asked for one or two representatives from the Policy Advisory Team to participate in the planning for the forum. No one volunteered. Johnson asked members to contact him if they have any questions and to give further thought to serving on the forum committee.

e) Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset – Private Sector Access Policy

The staff summarized past MetroGIS action concerning this matter. Gelbmann commented that if the counties would agree that the MCD/County jurisdictional boundary data that they supply for the regional dataset could be distributed to anyone, without fee, that the processes used to align this data with other regional data would be greatly simplified. He also noted that if this regional dataset could be distributed without fee or licensing that the related updating and distribution processes could also be greatly simplified. Johnson noted that a disclaimer, consistent with State Law provision adopted in 2000, would accompany the dataset.

Stevenson noted that like the regional planned future land use dataset, currency of boundary data is critical to its usefulness. He also suggested that discrepancies along the county borders should be identified by the regional custodian (Metropolitan Council) and presented to the affected counties for resolution. Gelbmann noted that the Council has not updated Version 1, in part, because of the currently access limitation to government.

Motion: Gelbmann moved and Shukle seconded to recommend that MetroGIS:

- 1) Endorse a MetroGIS policy of designating the Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary dataset as “public domain”, that is, distributed without fee or licensure to non-profit and private sector interests, as well as public sector interests.
- 2) Seek acceptance of this policy by the producers of the primary data that is assembled by the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian, into the Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary dataset.

Motion carried, ayes all.

The county representatives asked staff to send them updated versions of the waiver/resolution that will be required from each of them. It was also agreed to delete reference to “anonymous FTP” in the resolution.

f) Regional Parcel Dataset – Non-Profit Access Policy

Staff noted that the Policy Board had postponed deliberation of this topic until it had acted on a private sector policy, which occurred on October 18th. Staff clarified that the agreements that are in place for government access to the regional parcel data and for the data sharing agreements in general apply only government that have jurisdiction within the seven county metropolitan area.

Agreement: It was unanimously agreed that concerning access to the regional parcel dataset:

- Academic interests should be distinguished from non-profit interests,
- Academic interest means any public or private institution of higher learning located in the State of Minnesota and affiliated with the University of Minnesota, MNSCU, or the “board of private colleges”. (The latter term is a placeholder for the actual name.)
- Academic interests should be subject to the same licensing rules government interests,
- Non-Profit interests should be treated the same as For Profit (Private Sector) interests. *The group noted that the only fair policy given the vast diversity of circumstances would be treat all non-profits the same and if they would be working on a project valuable to a qualifying government or academic interest that they should receive access via that interest.*
- Any interest – academic, non-profit, for profit – can have access, without fee, when working on behalf of a qualifying government interest and the required third party agreement has been properly executed.
- Any requests for exception or appeal of a decision by the Metropolitan Council in its role as distributing authority shall be forwarded to each of the counties for a final decision.

The group also agreed that a recent request from Macalester College for access to parcel data should be granted, assuming Ramsey County concurs, and they should be permitted to participate in the Public Sector Pilot project. Staff agreed to follow-up with the legal staff, who drafted the licensing documents, to accommodate this request.

g) Professional Services Consultant Selection Committee

Staff asked 3-4 members of the Team to consider volunteering to serve on the Consultant Selection Team, which is tentatively scheduled to meet on January 9 and 16. Will Craig (U of M and Chair of the Coordinating Committee), Ed Shukle (Anoka County) and Virginia Erdahl or Jane Harper (Washington County) volunteered. The other members of the Selection Team will include Rick Gelbmann or Eli Cooper (Metropolitan Council), Randall Johnson (MetroGIS staff), and Gordon Backlund (Metropolitan Council Contracts Units).

Staff was asked to send full copies of the Request for Proposal, the proposed ranking criteria, and the proposed ranking scheme to each for their review and comment.

h) Regional Parcel Dataset -- Private Sector Agreement Update

MetroGIS staff noted that the Council’s legal staff is reviewing changes proposed by the Hennepin County legal staff and that the plan is to send the document to the other counties this week. Chairperson Erdahl asked each county representative to summarize his or her respective position concerning a fee. Most all leaning toward a fee of \$0.05 but several are considering providing more data than the minimum. Only Dakota County has received Board approval to enter into an agreement. The others are planning to seek Board approval on December 12 or 19th, if they receive the agreement this week. Anoka County may encounter a scheduling problem with their committee review process, which Commissioner Kordiak is attempting to expedite.

Staff emphasized that for the primary data submitted by the counties that the only the metadata provided will be that provided by the counties. Any questions received will be forwarded to the counties. The Council has prepared metadata for only the regional dataset.

5. INFORMATION SHARING

Staff provided a brief update regarding the status of activities to register the MetroGIS name with the state and federal governments. A trademark attorney has been given the go ahead to proceed with the federal application and to finalize the application for state registration.

No discussion of the other items presented in the agenda materials.

6. NEXT MEETING

February 7, 2001

7 ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator