

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Policy Board**  
**Metropolitan Mosquito Control District Offices**  
**July 19, 2006**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Gary Delaney (Carver County), Tom Egan (Dakota County), Scott Simmer for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Jane Harper for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), Dick Carlstrom for Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Joseph Wagner (Scott County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Rick Gelbmann, Nancy Read (Chairperson), and Mark Vander Schaaf.

Visitors: Fred Logman (Mn Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis), Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

Member Fiskness moved and Vice-Chairperson Kordiak seconded to approve the proposed agenda, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**3. MEETING SUMMARY**

Member Egan moved and Vice-Chairperson Kordiak seconded to approve the April 19, 2006 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION**

***What does MetroGIS Mean to Minnesota Geospatial Architecture Plan?***

Robert Maki and Fred Logman, members of the committee of the Governors Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) that developed the Mn State GIS Enterprise Model, introduced themselves and the topic – Strategic Directions and Policy Considerations (pertaining to the proposed model). (A copy of the presentation slides can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06\\_0719/Maki\\_Logman\\_Presentation.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06_0719/Maki_Logman_Presentation.pdf))

Maki began by commenting that MetroGIS can serve as a strategic test of the proposed Mn State GIS Enterprise Model as well as play an important role in facilitating agreement on standards and custodial roles and responsibilities critical to its successful implementation.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that as a member of both the GCGI and the Policy Board she believes that the standards implemented via MetroGIS's efforts and the process used to accomplish their implementation would serve the state well to build upon.

Maki and Logman then explained that leveraging existing investments (minimizing duplication of effort) relating to web services development is the goal of the proposed enterprise concept and that the "service broker" concept is at the core of the proposed enterprise. Maki noted that another descriptor used to define the concept is a "services oriented architecture". They then noted that for the proposed enterprise model to succeed individual agencies will need to trust others to effectively carry out their respective roles in the collaborative scheme and be open to sharing their data assets. They emphasized that achieving the desired integration across agencies will take policy leadership, in which MetroGIS can play an important role. In other words, a new way of doing business will be needed to successfully deploy the

proposed services oriented architecture model across organizations and MetroGIS has successfully demonstrated that a collaborative model is not only doable but pays dividends in efficiencies gained.

Maki and Logman then summarized several support functions that would need to be hosted by individual agencies: functions that would be shared among the participants, foreseen obstacles that a successful collaboration must overcome, and anticipated next steps. (See the presentation slides at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06\\_0719/Maki\\_Logman\\_Presentation.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06_0719/Maki_Logman_Presentation.pdf) for the specifics.)

Member Pistilli asked for an explanation of differences between the proposed Mn State GIS Enterprise Model and MetroGIS's collaborative philosophies approach in general, noting that nearly every presentation slide contained philosophies/functions that are currently operational as a result of MetroGIS's efforts. Member Pistilli commented it that seems, given the number of apparent similarities with MetroGIS, that the State should build on MetroGIS's structure as opposed to replacing it with something new.

Maki responded that a deepening of relationships between and among participants beyond those that exist in the current MetroGIS environment is needed to achieve the connectivity required for computers to talk to computers on a 24 x 7 basis. This level of connectivity is a goal of the proposed enterprise model.

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read attempted to explain the difference between where MetroGIS is today with its DataFinder technology (human discovery and downloading of geospatial data and web services via the Internet to manually carry out analysis/answer information queries) versus the proposed Enterprise Model/Services Oriented Architecture (computer applications obtaining web services from other computers to answer a human query for information, all via the Internet.)

Member Schneider commented that the proposal is more application driven than data focused. He also noted that MetroGIS has previously recognized in its 2003-2005 Business Plan a need to pursue solutions to common application needs in addition to common data needs but an implementation strategy has not yet been defined.

Alternate Member Harper commented that the goals of attaining open sharing of data assets and assuming of custodial functions on behalf of the greater community were necessary to minimize duplication of effort. She then emphasized that MetroGIS learned quickly that active, sustained participation on the part of the participating organizations requires measurable benefit to the participating organizations' internal business needs. Harper also commented that she is skeptical of the altruistic notion of simply asking agencies to take on a function for the good of the community. The lesson learned is that it took MetroGIS a significant amount of time to define common needs, nurture relationships, and align those needs with willing organizations possessing appropriate operational capacity. Altruism proved grossly insufficient.

Logman responded to Harper's comments by explaining that the strategy for implementing the "services oriented architecture" model is to focus on the state agencies first as they have a common budget process and also to look to existing regional entities in Greater Minnesota to lend a hand in defining the implementation strategy to engage local and regional entities.

Member Egan noted that he believes the proposed state enterprise architecture concept warrants further investigation but he is concerned about how the service broker function will perform in reality with the current lack of uniformity across multiple different capabilities within the government sector. Maki acknowledged the need for compliance with both technology (how things connect to things at the technology level) and data standards (uniformity to permit seamless aggregation) for the service broker concept to be successful but noted that standards compliance is doable. The idea is to begin with organizations that have defined common needs and build slowly as the benefits of participating are understood. The need to mature the enterprise model piece by piece is understood and anticipated.

Member Pistilli asked Maki and Logman to explain how success will be defined, and the expected timeframe and cost of achieving success. Logman commented that much of the resource commitment is already in the system and that individual agencies will allocate these resources whether or not the state

enterprise architecture model is pursued. The question is can the reallocation of these resources be accomplished in order to achieve more with the same level of resource through collaboration?

Member Schneider emphasized that MetroGIS has been successful over a long time with limited resources due to its focus on common business needs of core stakeholders and development of inter-organizational relationships with those core stakeholders, as the option of moving more quickly with an influx of funding from the Legislature was not an option. He also emphasized that maturing of the foundation collaborative relationships required documentation of specific benefits relevant to the various organizations pursued to support various functions for the community. He noted that these lessons likely have direct applicability to the proposed statewide enterprise.

Maki commented that the current spending trajectory for technology is unsustainable and that the proposed collaborative statewide enterprise model is designed to address this concern.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that as a member of both the Governors Council on Geographic Information and the MetroGIS Policy Board, she believed it important to foster communication and make sure everyone is on the same page about this proposal. She went on to note that she believes the State can greatly benefit from MetroGIS's accomplishments. Chairperson Reinhardt also stressed that it would be a mistake not to leverage the existing MetroGIS environment by using it as a model to achieve the next level of collaboration envisioned by the enterprise model presented this evening.

## **5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **a) Metropolitan Council Evaluation of MetroGIS- Final Council Action -**

Member Pistilli provided an overview of the Metropolitan Council's evaluation of MetroGIS ([http://www.metrogis.org/CDC\\_MC\\_Resolution\\_MetroGIS/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/CDC_MC_Resolution_MetroGIS/index.shtml)) and briefly commented on the resulting validation of MetroGIS's value to the Council as well as the community. Chairperson Reinhardt commented that not only did the Council conclude that MetroGIS is working, but as importantly directed its staff to inform state agencies of MetroGIS's philosophies and accomplishments and encourage implementation beyond the Twin Cities. Member Pistilli concurred that Councilmembers were skeptical of MetroGIS's value prior to the evaluation but learned much during the process and in the end are strong supporters of MetroGIS, to the extent they are willing to advocate for statewide implementation of the principals.

Member Egan commented that the evaluation resulted in a valuable and productive educational opportunity.

### **b) Major Program Objectives - Remainder 2006**

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read introduced the topic and noted that the Coordinating Committee had unanimously endorsed the recommendation at its June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting to approve proposed objectives for the remainder of 2006. There was no discussion of the proposed objectives.

Read commented that a high priority 2006 activity is missing from the list because it is already completed – the June 1 Imagining Possibilities Forum. She commented that the June 1 forum was hosted as a learning opportunity in preparation for the strategic planning initiative planned for later this year and noted that two statements from keynote speakers resonated well with the pending strategic planning initiative: Ian Masser stated that it is not about technology but about power and Michael Liebhold talked about the rise in civic mapping and that the general public is no longer waiting for government to meet their data needs.

Chairperson Reinhardt mentioned that Will Craig, member of the Coordinating Committee, had asked her to pass along to the Policy Board his reaction to the June 1 forum. Chairperson Reinhardt read aloud the following comments from Will Craig, noting that she greatly respects his opinion:

- 1- A superb event about the future of technology on individual lives, not just on the GIS world.
- 2- The best GIS event I've attended in the past 10 years
- 3- A coup for MetroGIS as the lead organization for planning this event
- 4- Excellent background material for MetroGIS as we move forward and plan our future for the next 10 years.

**Motion:** Vice-Chairperson Kordiak moved and Member Pistilli seconded to ratify the major work priorities for the remainder of 2006 as presented in Attachment A of the agenda report dated July 6, 2006. Motion carried, ayes all.

**c) Regional GIS Projects - Funding Recommendation**

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read introduced the topic and summarized the Committee's recommendation to approve both projects that are the subject of this Agenda Item. Read then introduced David Arbeit, the spokesperson for the proposed Geospatial Services Directory and Broker Project.

Arbeit commented that the proposed project related directly to the Geospatial Enterprise Model explained in Agenda Item 4. He then summarized the proposed deliverables as documented in the agenda report, noting that this project would play a strategic role in the development of the concept that has been developed by the Governors Council on Geographic Information. (The presentation can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06\\_0719/Arbeit\\_Presentation.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06_0719/Arbeit_Presentation.pdf))

**Motion:** Vice-Chairperson Kordiak moved and Member Pistilli seconded to recommend funding of both projects, as described in the agenda materials as recommended for approval by the Coordinating Committee. Motion carried, ayes all.

**d) Time Extension - Policy for Unlicensed, View-Only Access to Regional Parcel Dataset**

Member Egan moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board:

- 1) Affirm its July 28, 2004 finding that a policy of unlicensed, view-only access to parcel data has merit for further consideration as a regional best practice.
- 2) Extend to July 19, 2007, its sunset provision to achieve county affirmation that the subject proposal is consistent with their respective requirements and needs.

Motion carried, ayes all.

**6. MAJOR ACTIVITY UPDATES**

There was no discussion of the topics listed in the agenda report.

**7. INFORMATION SHARING**

There was no discussion of the topics listed in the agenda report.

Member Delaney informed the Board that Member Fiskness would be retiring from the Policy Board following this meeting. He then thanked and recognized Member Fiskness for his long-standing and valuable contributions to the maturing of MetroGIS, and for having served as charter member of Board since its creation in January 1997.

Chairperson Reinhardt also extended her gratitude to Member Fiskness for adding value to the Board's deliberations and offering timely solutions, contributions which in her opinion are a large part of why MetroGIS is where it is today – a leader in the GIS community.

Member Fiskness commented that the pleasure is all his and that he has enjoyed the opportunity to serve on the Board representing the water management organization's point of view.

**8. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2006.

**9. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Prepared by:  
Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator