

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Metropolitan Mosquito Control District Offices
October 18, 2006**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and recognized Roger Lake who joined the Board as the water management organization representative, replacing retired member Fiskness. She invited Member Lake to introduce himself and then asked each of the other members and visitors to also introduce themselves.

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Gary Delaney (Carver County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Roger Lake (Metro Watershed Districts), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Tom Egan (Dakota County), Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Joseph Wagner (Scott County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, Randy Knippel, Nancy Read (Chairperson), and Mark Vander Schaaf.

Visitors: Oriane Casale (MN DEED) and Jeff Matson (CURA)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Chris Kline

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Pistilli moved and Member Schneider seconded to approve the proposed agenda, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Delaney moved and Member Pistilli seconded to approve the July 19, 2006 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Minnesota 3-D: An Online Mapping System Designed to Close the Spatial Mismatch Between Affordable Housing and Living Wage Jobs

Will Craig, Associate Director of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) at the University of Minnesota and Member of the Coordinating Committee, introduced Oriane Casale (MN DEED) and Jeff Matson (CURA). Craig summarized the collaboration between CURA and DEED to manage the M3D project and role of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Technology Innovations Program (TIP) that funded it and that the project is in its third and final year of TIP funding. He explained that the primary objective of the project was to provide an online analytical tool capable of addressing issues related to resolving the mismatch between employment opportunities and housing. Another key objective of the M3D project was to create an environment where the user can leave to someone else the complex and time consuming, sometimes prohibitive, world of acquiring suitable data and manipulating it into a useable form prior to use.

Casale used three case studies to illustrate capabilities provided by M3D's online, GIS based application, which is designed to provide assist users with a host of analyses options related to the topic of community economic development, in particular those related to relationships between jobs and housing.

Matson then provided a live demonstration of M3D's capabilities. He showed the ease at which the user can find and use various components of the application and the speed that queries can be answered. He noted that the application contains over 90 data layers, many of which are obtained via MetroGIS DataFinder. Matson emphasized the efficiencies that are gained by the user via use of the M3D

application. That is, the ability to perform analysis without having to spend significant time and effort locating needed data and, in many cases, also having to spend considerable effort readying the data for use. He commented that the M3D project, ongoing support, and users are also benefiting greatly from the regional datasets that have been developed through MetroGIS's efforts. As a result of access to the regional datasets, seamless analytical capabilities for the seven-county region are available minimizing the user's need to support of complex and time consuming manipulation of data from multiple sources.

Chairperson Reinhardt recognized the leading edge and unique capabilities provided by the M3D application and asked how long the amalgamation of the data would have taken before the availability of this application. Casale and Craig collectively replied, stating that acquiring and analyzing the data associated with just one of the case study examples would have taken weeks, if not longer, a process which the user can now use the M3D application to accomplish in a matter of moments.

The Staff Coordinator added that the M3D application is the first to his knowledge to take advantage of the recent upgrade of MetroGIS DataFinder to support 35 Web Mapping Services. Several of these Services are being accessed directly by the M3D application via the Internet, providing the user access to up-to-date data without the M3D manager having to manually load it into the M3D application. The Staff Coordinator also commented that this application's use of Web Mapping Services is a tangible example of the vision for Statewide Geospatial Architecture presented to the Board by at its July meeting.

Members asked a number of questions including:

- Who is using the application? *Response: It has only been available in its present form for a couple of months. Known users include neighborhood group and community development interests. At least one community is also using the application. The City of Chaska is using it to evaluate where their residents are traveling to for work and what type of industry in which they are employed. This information is being used to identify employers to target for local community development policy making.*
- What is the smallest geographic analysis unit? *Response: block group?*
- How is user satisfaction gauged? *Response: Formal user satisfaction monitoring and analysis is a component of the project and is supported by Wilder Research.*
- Who can access the application? *Response: It is accessible, free of charge, by anyone who wishes to use it at <http://map.deed.state.mn.us/m3d>.*

The Staff Coordinator commented that this presentation was selected because of its relevance to the discussion planned for the pending Strategic Directions Workshop – what role should MetroGIS play in the fostering of solutions concerning applications that run on commonly needed geospatial data?

Board members thanked the presenters. (The presentation slides can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/documents/presentations/M3D_PolicyBoard_101806.pdf)

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Modification to Operating Guidelines – Decisions Between Meetings

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read introduced the topic, informing the Policy Board that the Coordinating Committee had recommended the proposed modifications to MetroGIS's operational guidelines, as presented in the agenda report. Chairperson Reinhardt explained that changes had been made to an early version by the Committee at her request to insure consistency with Roberts Rules of Order, for which she thanked the Committee. She also noted that the proposed modifications had been sent to Board members on two occasions for comment and that none had been received.

Member Lake suggested and the group concurred that the appropriateness of the 10% threshold rule (Article II, Section 5b, 5th item) should be monitored, noting that it could be rather restrictive in a time-sensitive matter. Member Kordiak suggested and the group concurred to remove the phrase “as a consent item” from (Article II, Section 5b, last item) to provide the opportunity to discuss the item.

Member Pistilli questioned if voting conducted via email would constitute be a violation of the Open Meeting Law. This comment prompted a question as to whether the Policy Board is subject to the Open Meeting Law. Member Pistilli noted that even if the Board is not technically covered by the Law, the Board may want to continue to operate as if it were subject to the Law given elected officials comprise its membership.

Member Schneider stated that if the Policy Board is subject to the Open Meeting Law, then the modifications would not be permissible based upon extensive research that has been conducted by the City of Minnetonka and the League of Cities. Members agreed with the premise of authorizing between-meeting voting and concurred that if E-voting is not a viable option that delegation of the decision to an Executive Committee should be considered as a Plan B.

Chairperson Reinhart suggested, and the Board agreed, that the matter be tabled to the January 2007 Board meeting. Staff was directed to obtain an option as to whether or not the Policy Board is subject to the Open Meeting Law. If the Board is subject to this Law, the matter of delegating authority for between-meeting decisions to an Executive Committee would then be considered.

b) Preliminary 2007 Budget and Major Program Objectives

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read summarized the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee concerning a preliminary 2007 Budget and Major Program Objectives for MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" function. She also commented that the proposed budget represents the status-quo pending the results of the February 8, 2007 Strategic Directions Workshop.

Read noted that one of the Committee's recommendations requests Policy Board authorization to use all remaining funds donated to MetroGIS to support pending efforts to update the Business and Performance Measurement Plan updates. The Staff Coordinator explained the source of the donated funds, that the remaining balance is approximately \$5,100, and that accomplishing the Plan Update processes planned for 2007 could make use of specialized consultant services that will likely exceed other available resources.

Member O'Rourke questioned whether a better use for the \$5,100 in donated funds might be to pay for any internal staffing expenses that may exceed the planned level of support (1.65 FTE) as opposed to designating it for outsourcing. Mark Vander Schaaf, Director of the Metropolitan Council Department that houses MetroGIS, clarified that the 1.65 FTE allocation is an internal allocation for work programming and that if the actual count is higher than 1.65 FTE, there will be no financial ramifications for MetroGIS.

Member Pistilli asked if funding had been set aside to pursue any new initiatives that may be identified at the February 8th Strategic Directions Workshop. The Staff Coordinator stated that the \$22,000 budgeted for Regional GIS Projects could be used for this purpose. The Staff Coordinator also suggested that an "official call" for candidate proposals not be made until following February 8th workshop.

Motion: Member Delaney moved and Member Pistilli seconded to:

- 1) Accept the preliminary 2007 MetroGIS Budget and Major 2007 Program Objectives, as proposed in the agenda report dated October 11, 2006 for MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" function and
- 2) Authorize expenditure of the balance of funds donated to MetroGIS for business and performance measurement plan updates, subject to the Chairperson's approval of specific expenditures.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) 2007 Meeting Schedule

Member Pistilli moved and Member Lake seconded to set the following meeting schedule for 2007: January 17, April 25, July 25, and October 17. Motion carried, ayes all.

d) Preparations for Strategic Directions Workshop

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read introduced the topic noting that the workshop is planned for February 8, 2007. Chairperson Reinhardt emphasized the need for Policy Board members to participate as the objective is to set policy direction to guide MetroGIS's efforts for the next 3-5 years. Chairperson Reinhardt also emphasized that a requirement of the event is that it must be "policy-maker friendly". The Staff Coordinator reported that an agreement-in-principle has been reached with the Professor John Bryson, University of Minnesota, to facilitate this workshop and that he was expressly sought out because of his demonstrated ability to keep the workshop focused at a policy level and for his ability to achieve objectives. The Staff Coordinator reported that a November 1 meeting is scheduled with Professor Bryson to clarify expectations and that formal invitations to the workshop are anticipated to begin in early November.

Read then shared several candidate discussion topics identified by the Coordinating Committee for which policy direction will be sought (e.g., resolving concerns raised by solutions that require dependencies on other organizations, refining data access policies related to non-government interests in light of technology options only recently possible, and clarifying policies related to citizen expectations of government concerning access to geospatial data.) Member Lake concurred that there is need to be clear on what the community does not want to do as well as to be clear on the why's for all policy implications.

Member Cook asked for clarification about how the results of the workshop would be used. Chairperson Reinhardt commented that the purpose of the workshop is to provide policy level direction for the Business Plan Update process scheduled to begin immediately following the workshop.

Member Pistilli inquired about the status of Intellectual Property Rights relative to regional data solutions. The Staff Coordinator explained that the producer organization (e.g., counties in the case of parcels) retains all intellectual property rights even when the data are aggregated into a regional product by a regional aggregator (e.g., Metropolitan Council in the case of parcel data) because changes to the source data are not permitted.

6. MAJOR ACTIVITY UPDATES

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

7. INFORMATION SHARING

Chairperson Reinhardt called the Board's attend to a testimonial from Professor Shekhar, University of Minnesota, that was the topic of the Technology Demonstration at the Policy Board's April 2006 meeting, which includes the following quote:

In order to run the algorithms (contained in the subject evacuation planning application), the research team needed a variety of geospatial data, including road maps with capacity information and basic daytime population estimates. Much of the data they required were available free of charge on the MetroGIS DataFinder website.

"If we didn't have easy access to these datasets than the use of our algorithms would be extremely difficult if not impossible," said Dr. Shekhar. Collecting and verifying the data from multiple jurisdictions would take a tremendous amount of time. The cost could make such an effort unfeasible.

When finalized, this testimonial will be published on the MetroGIS general information website located at <http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/testimonials/index.shtml>.

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

Member Cook informed the Board of a technology conference that TIES is organizing and invited the members of the Board to attend. He offered to send information about to the Staff Coordinator to pass along the members.

Approved on
January 17, 2007

The Staff Coordinator informed the Board that Professor Ian Masser had invited him to co-author an article about MetroGIS's organizational structure following the June 1 "Imagining Possibilities: The Next Frontier for Geographic Information Technology forum at which he was a keynote speaker". The article which was published in the in the September 2006 issue of the European publication GEOInformatics (See Attachment A or go to http://www.metrogis.org/documents/articles/06_09_MetroGIS_GEOInformatics_Sept2006.pdf).

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2007.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Prepared by:

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

and

Christopher Kline
MetroGIS Support Team

Approved on
January 17, 2007

ATTACHMENT A

(Chris please insert the PDF file that is located in the Board's 10/18 subdirectory – "prelm")