

**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



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** GIS Technology Demonstration  
*Minnesota 3-D: An Online Mapping System Designed Close the Spatial Mismatch Between Affordable Housing And Living Wage Jobs*

**DATE:** October 5, 2006  
(For the Oct. 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

The topic for the GIS Technology Demonstration at the October Policy Board meeting will be the online mapping system developed through the Minnesota 3-D (M3D) project, a collaborative effort coordinated by CURA, the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota. The consortium partners include neighborhood and community organizations, city and suburban municipalities, and county, regional and state government entities. The presenters will be Jeff Matson and Oriane Casale.

In addition to demonstrating this first of a kind, online data mapping and analysis tool, the presentation will also touch on how MetroGIS's efforts have impacted development of the M3D application and its ongoing maintenance and use (e.g. streamlined data access policies, regional datasets, and availability of Map Services via DataFinder). A beta version of the site can be viewed at <http://map.deed.state.mn.us/chameleon/m3d.phtml>.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

The M3D project is financed through a 3-year, \$599,000 federal Commerce Department Technology Opportunities Program (TOP) grant. The project is entering its final year.

This online mapping system is designed to help developers and policy makers solve the spatial mismatch between jobs and housing, specifically to close the spatial mismatch between affordable housing and living wage jobs in the Twin Cities Metropolitan area. The online mapping system displays employment locations for the residents of a self-selected area, city or neighborhood as well as the converse: residential location of all employees working in that city. Many other data layers are also available. Already this work has helped the city of Chaska rethink transit routes.

Excerpt from the successful 2004 grant application: "Building on the existing GIS infrastructure, Minnesota 3-D is an Internet-accessible and integrated system of employment, housing and development information and analysis tools for neighborhoods, community development corporations, employment trainers, businesses, central cities, suburbs, counties of the Twin Cities metropolitan region, and the State of Minnesota.... By combining new statewide data on employment and demographics through an agreement with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Census Bureau with the existing region-wide parcel-level housing data, Minnesota 3-D will be a 'first-of-its-kind' system.... Minnesota 3-D is a scalable, standards-based system that can accommodate expanded data layers and geographic coverage. ... With emerging Internet-based mapping technologies, this is the most cost-effective way to maximize access, analytical capacity, and user-to-user information sharing."

## PREVIOUS GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION TOPICS

The Policy Board has asked for a demonstration of GIS technology to be a regular component of each of its meetings. Refer to the listing on the next page of the previous demonstration topics.

## RECOMMENDATION

No action requested.

## REFERENCE SECTION

- Jul. 2006: What does MetroGIS Mean to Minnesota Geospatial Architecture Plan?
- Apr. 2006: Evacuation Planning for Homeland Defense – U of M Research Project
- Jan. 2006: (*No presentation*)
- Oct. 2005: Natural Resources Atlas Made Possible Via Data Sharing
- Jul. 2005: Ramsey County GIS User Group’s Internet Mapping Service (IMS) site
- Apr. 2005: How Watershed Districts Are Benefiting from MetroGIS’s Efforts
- Jan. 2005: Regional Mailing Application
- Oct. 2004: Improving Operational Effectiveness with GIS - Dakota County’s Experience
- Jul. 2004: City of Roseville’s Combined Use of Socioeconomic Data and GIS Technology to Improve Decision Making and Service Delivery
- Apr. 2004: Metro 911 Board initiative to integrate GIS into day-to-day operations of 27 Metro Area PSAP’s
- Jan. 2004: Scott County’s Use of GIS technology to improve intra-department efficiencies
- Oct. 2003: GASB34 – GIS Technology’s Relevance
- Jul. 2003: Minneapolis Neighborhood Information System use of GIS and data sharing activities
- Apr. 2003: Metropolitan Mosquito Control District use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jan. 2003: Emergency Management Response applications developed by Carver and Washington Counties.
- Oct. 2002: Metropolitan Airports Commission use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jul. 2002: MetroGIS DataFinder Café Rollout
- Mar. 2002: Presentations from each metro county regarding their respective GIS programs
- Jan. 2002: GIS’s role in responding to the World Trade Center tragedy – Mapping Ground Zero (*Paul Olson, Grand Rapids Office of the Minnesota DNR - Division of Forestry*)
- Oct. 2001: TIES – Benefits to School Districts as a result of MetroGIS
- Jul. 2001: DataFinder And Functionality Sought Via Proposed Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism (*since named DataFinder Café*)
- Apr. 2001: LMIC’s Metro viewer software: A Mapping Tool for the Public
- Jan. 2001: Regional Census Geography and Legislative Redistricting Software/Process
- Oct. 2000: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition’s Socio-Demographic Database Development
- Jul. 2000: DataFinder and Council’s Internet-based Existing Land Use Application
- Apr. 2000: Regional Parcel Dataset (Version 1)
- Jul. 1999: Presentation to House of Representatives Subcommittee on June 9th
- Apr. 1999: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition GIS Capabilities
- Nov. 1998: Orthoimagery and its Uses
- Sep. 1998: DataFinder and Dakota County’s Parcel Query Application
- Jan. 1997: Benefits from GIS in general and uses being made by all classes of stakeholders represented on the Policy Board



**TO:** Policy Board  
**FROM:** MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)  
**SUBJECT:** Modification to Operating Guidelines – Authorize Decision Making Between Meetings  
**DATE:** September 14, 2006  
(For Oct. 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

An amendment to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines is attached for the Board's consideration. If approved, it would authorize decision-making between meetings for matters that are urgent and operational in nature. Notice of this proposal was emailed to each Policy Board member on September 15, 2006 to satisfy the 15-day notice requirement. A copy of this report was also mailed to each member.

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The proposed amendment (Attachment A) was unanimously approved by the Coordinating Committee at its June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. Note: This item was not considered at the Board's July meeting because the 15-day notice requirement could not be satisfied. (See the Reference Section for a chronology of the Committee's considerations over its last three meetings.)

## DISCUSSION

The Coordinating Committee recognized the need for decision making between meetings at its September 2005 meeting. At its three subsequent meetings, the Committee debated language provisions to insure a balance is provided between the: a) preference to expedite some decisions and b) need to facilitate face-to-face meetings to arrive at consensus on other matters critical to long-term stability and preserving trust in MetroGIS's decision-making processes.

The Committee believes it achieved this balance with the following provisions:

- 1) Limit "between meeting decision making" to decisions related to urgent operational (non-policy) matters. Doing so would go a long way toward mitigating concerns raised in the literature and Robert's Rules of Order concerning E-voting.
- 2) Institute a two-step process for E-voting. This idea was gleaned from the research requested by Chairperson Reinhardt and would mitigate any remaining concerns with the need to balance expediency through E-voting with dialogue to resolve any differences. The proposed two-step process for E-votes would begin by asking if the topic is suitable for an E-vote and, if so, a vote could then occur on the main motion. The threshold for determining whether the topic is inappropriate should be small (e.g., 10 percent of the members is suggested by the Committee). If 10 percent or more of the members declare the topic to be inappropriate for an E-vote, then it is tabled to the next meeting. If the matter is determined to be an appropriate topic for a decision between meetings, then 75 percent of the votes must be in favor to approve the item.
- 3) Ratify at next meeting for the record. The E-vote decision could be acted on immediately following the conclusion of the vote. However, for purposes of properly documenting the action, the decision would be listed as a consent item for ratification at the next regular or special meeting.

## RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board approve the proposed amendment, dated June 28, 2006 (Attachment A), to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines pertaining to rules governing decision-making between meetings via E-voting.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS - ON VOTING BY EMAIL AND QUORUMS (JUNE 2006)

The following excerpts from documents researched in response to Chairperson's request into the matter of what others are doing with respect to electronic voting are offered for the Committee's consideration:

1. Robert's Rules of Order – Page xx, 10th Edition....“the opportunity for simultaneous aural communication among all participants is central to the deliberative character of a meeting. It recognizes, therefore, that meetings may be conducted by videoconference or teleconference, when authorized by the bylaws and when regulated by appropriate special rules of order and standing rules specifying such things as how recognition is to be sought and the floor obtained. On the other hand, it warns that although e-mail or faxes may provide a suitable substitute for postal mail in the issuance of calls for meetings or the conduct of mail voting, **they are not suited for the conduct of the deliberative process under the precedents and procedures common to parliamentary law.**” (*Staff comment: This is the reason that voting would be limited to urgent operational matters. Policy matters would not be permitted.*)

2. Opinion of a Parliamentarian written in 2002 (<http://archiver.rootsweb.com/th/read/APG/2002-09/1031638174>). In his comments, the author, Bobbi King, raises concerns about the use of E-voting and lists 5 concerns about e-voting.
- a. How to assure all members have an opportunity to vote within the time frame required (Sam is on vacation, and doesn't read his email for a month).
  - b. Is secrecy required? (You can't cast a "secret" vote on a group email.) Sometimes a secret, ballot vote is deemed necessary by a member, on the spot as a situation arises; you would lose that option on e-voting. (A vote involving money, a candidate for office).
  - c. Intimidation by seeing results too soon (an overwhelming majority votes Yes, but you want to vote No, but you don't want to be the odd person).
  - d. How do you know this is the actual person? (Spouse? Child? who has access to family email?).
  - e. Can a vote be changed after filing an email message, or is it "set in stone"?

None of these concerns appears to be a substantive concern for the issue at hand for MetroGIS when viewed in the context of Committee's proposal to use e-voting only for urgent operational matters, that Committee has a defined membership, and the safeguards that have been included in the proposed amendment to balance the need to decide a matter and maintain a deliberative and representative process.

3. Electronic Meetings, National Association of Parliamentarians – <http://www.parliamentaryprocedure.org/pdf/AIPemeet5.PDF>. This document contains six reprinted articles, dated 2000-2003, that address various aspects of E-voting. Valuable insight gleaned from these articles, includes:

- Page 6: Recognizes concerns raised in Robert's Rules of Order, 10<sup>th</sup> Version concerning E-voting but also encourages parliamentarians to remain abreast of technological advancements and to remain open to new ways of conducting business.
- Pages 10-25: A detailed point by point argument is made that e-meetings can be designed to comply with Robert's Rules of Order.
- Page 5: Committee members may initiate an electronic vote and the Chairperson should have the authority to declare out of order – deferring to a regular or special meeting - as they would be able to in a face-to-face meeting.
- Page 5: A limited opportunity may be provided for comment on the language/provisions of a motion presented for E-vote. Once this period is over, no changes are permitted to the motion.
- Page 5: A quorum is defined as 51 percent of total members. The number of votes cast, including abstentions, determines verification of a quorum.
- Page 16: At least one officer must participate (in our case the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson)
- Page 17: the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson is the gatekeeper (receives e-votes and verifies they are authentic and within required time frame)
- Page 22: Comments/discussion on the motion must be copied to all members.

- Page 22: Seconds are not required and a motion to adjourn is out of order until the specified time period expires.

3. Article V, Section 5, Faculty Senate Bylaws, University of Texas San Antonio

([www.utsa.edu/senate/fsbylaws/ArticleVo4.htm](http://www.utsa.edu/senate/fsbylaws/ArticleVo4.htm)) (Approximately 80 senators comprise the Senate .)

“Voting will follow Robert’s Rules of Order. .... electronic voting shall follow a two-tiered process: (1) senators will be asked if they vote for or against electronic voting on the case at hand (2) senators will be asked to vote in the case at hand. If a minimum of 5 senators vote against electronic voting the vote will be tabled until the next regular or special meeting of the Senate. A quorum for the electronic vote will be established by receipt of votes from 50 percent of the Faculty Senate Membership.”

3. Part 2, Article 8, Section 2, Constitution and By-Laws of the Smoky Mountain Chapter of the American Meteorological Society ( <http://www.ametsoc.org/chapters/smokymnt/constitution.html>)

A simple majority of the quorum is required for .... matters other than constitutional reform. Voting may take place by one of two methods:

- If a quorum is present at a meeting, voting may take place at that time.
- If a quorum is not present at a meeting, then all matters that require voting will be subject to electronic voting. Electronic voting will take place one week after the minutes for the previous meeting have been made available. After the one week waiting period, the president (or the president's designee) will post the question to all active members via electronic mail. Voting will take place within a one week window beginning with the day the question is posted. This will ensure the vote will be completed by the next meeting. Votes will be made via electronic mail directly to the president (or the president's designee). Members without electronic mail capability will have their vote forwarded by a member who does. Results of the vote will be announced at the next meeting, and by electronic mail to all active members.
- If electronic mail vote is authorized, then the President or a designee of the President shall retain copies of all electronic mail ballots for a period of one year.
- If a quorum is not met via electronic voting, the matter shall be tabled until the next meeting....”

**PAST COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

1) September 21, 2005 meeting: The Committee:

- Concurred that the Operating Guidelines should be modified to permit the Committee to make decisions between meetings, subject to conditions (See Item 5c page 3 of meeting summary).
- Directed staff and Chairperson to propose amendment language to accomplish the desired modification.

2) December 19, 2005 meeting: The Committee unanimously agreed to modify the proposed language to allow the possibility of either the Chair or the Vice Chair appointing a designee if they will be out of touch who can act in their behalf to initiate and act on proposals for decision-making between meetings.

3) March 29, 2006 meeting: The Committee unanimously approved language that restricted decisions between meetings to operational matters – matters of policy must be taken up at meetings – and setting “a quorum for purposes of e-voting as the entire Committee membership.” This latter proposal was shared with Chairperson Reinhardt who directed staff to investigate whether Robert’s Rules of Order addresses e-voting and the quorum requirements involved. She also decided the matter was premature to take to the Policy Board until this investigation was complete.

4) June 28, 2006 meeting: The Committee modified the recommendation it offered at its March meeting concerning quorum requirements, reversing its position and agreeing that the standard 50 percent plus one member is appropriate. In place of a higher quorum requirement, the Committee recommended language requiring a two-step vote – vote on the appropriateness of the topic then on the substance – and increased the approval threshold to 75 percent.

The consensus was that the provisions of the amendment approved at the June meeting satisfactorily addresses previous concerns about potential short comings of E-voting.

**COMMENT FROM MEMBER WILLIAM BROWN AND COMMITTEE RESPONSES TO MODIFICATIONS**

a) Comment from Brown: “ For the sake of discussion I have a few comments to offer prior to our meeting on the 29th. I already feel inundated with email that I have to deal with on a daily basis and this proposal could potentially increase the amount of time that I spend on incidental tasks. I am concerned that the amendment will take the business of the Coordinating Committee out of the framework of scheduled meetings and drop it directly into my daily routine. The proposition also limits the opportunity for spontaneous conversation that I believe is necessary for consensus. Based on past business (I became involved with MetroGIS in 2000), I just haven't seen the emergence of many urgent needs.

b) Response to Staff's Suggested Language Modification - Harper: “I would take out the reference to decisions that are important to long-term success and just reference decisions that are operational rather than policy. The way you have attempted to describe the nature of the types of decisions that would be made using E-vote makes operational issues seem unimportant to the organization's future success. I don't think we should go down the path of making a judgment on which decisions are critical to future success and which ones are not.”

c) Response to Staff's Suggested Language Modification – Maki: “I agree with Jane. This all started simply because it became apparent that, on occasion, the committee needs to resolve certain time-sensitive, non-controversial issues between meeting dates. My experience with the committee leadership is that they have been respectful of protocol and quick to recognize when an issue needs to be deferred for discussion at a full committee meeting.

I, for one, see this as a mechanism for improving the “nimbleness” of the committee, and one that can easily be withdrawn should the committee members feel that it is working at cross-purposes with their intentions.”

#### **COMMENT FROM CHAIRPERSON REINHARDT FOLLOWING DECEMBER 2005 COMMITTEE MEETING**

Excerpt from December report to the Committee: .... “She (Chairperson Reinhardt) concurred that establishing procedures for “between meeting decisions” is a good idea not only for the Committee but also for the Policy Board. She noted that as the Board chair, she would also prefer to have the option of conducting business for an urgent item via e-mail as opposed to having to call a special meeting and find a date where a quorum of the Board is able to attend.

The proposed conditions of a minimum response period and support by both the chairperson and co-chairperson were suggested to maintain internal consistency with the other provisions of the Guidelines. Note that following the conversation with Chairperson Reinhardt, the initially suggested minimum proposed response period was increased from three to five days. This change recognizes that the three-day minimum was set for calling a special meeting. Chairperson Reinhardt felt that a couple of additional days should be provided to allow time to think about a substantive decision before voting. She also suggested that only the Chair and Vice/Co-Chair should be eligible to initiate an E-vote. The version of the proposal attached to this report contains the modifications suggested by Chairperson Reinhardt.”

#### **RULES PERTAINING TO AMENDING THE OPERATING GUIDELINES**

Article V, Section 2 of MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines states that “To become effective, amendments to these Operating Guidelines shall receive two readings; one before the Coordinating Committee and one before the Policy Board, each preceded by written notice to each member of the Coordinating Committee and each member of the Board at least **fifteen (15) days prior** to their respective consideration. Amendment proposals may be considered at a regular or a special meeting of the Committee and/or the Policy Board, provided the notification requirements in this Section are satisfied.”

The Coordinating Committee has satisfied the 15-day notice rule for each of its last three deliberations. Policy Board notification occurred the week of September 11, 2006 for the meeting of the Board the evening of October 18<sup>th</sup>. The early notification occurred because staff was on vacation during the week that the 15-day notice would normally have occurred.

## ATTACHMENT A

### PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

#### MetroGIS Operating Guidelines (Rules for Decision-Making Between Meetings) (Last Modified: June 28, 2006)

(~~Language crossed-out to be deleted and~~ language underlined to be added)

#### Article II Policy Board

##### Section 5. Voting and Decision Making

a) At Meetings: Each organization represented on the Policy Board shall have one vote, unless authorized in Section 2 of this Article to have more than one representative on the Policy Board. In the latter case, each duly appointed member shall have one vote. A motion supported by fifty percent of the duly appointed members or their designated alternates, plus one member, shall be the act of the Policy Board, unless a greater number is required by law or by another provision of these guidelines. Notwithstanding, a consensus process involving all Policy Board members is encouraged for matters fundamental to the long-term success of MetroGIS.

##### b) Between Meetings

To maintain flexibility to address issues and opportunities in a timely manner, the Policy Board may make decisions between meetings, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

- The Chairperson and Vice-chairperson, or their respective designee(s), both conclude that the situation is urgent.
- The call for a vote is made via email and the subject line states “E-Vote Requested – Urgent MetroGIS Business”.
- Members are provided with at least five (5) working days to respond.
- The rules set forth in Section 7 in this Article governing the Board’s quorum shall be satisfied. The number of votes cast shall be used to determine compliance with quorum requirements.
- Prior to voting on the motion, the members must vote on the appropriateness of the topic as an E-vote. If ten percent or more of the members state the topic is inappropriate, the motion is tabled until the next regular or special meeting of the Board.
- Motions must be supported by a minimum of 75 percent of the votes cast to be approved.
- The Board is apprised of the results and the course of action to follow immediately following conclusion of the voting.
- This process is restricted to operational matters. It cannot be used to decide matters of policy. A special meeting would need to be called for such decisions between regularly scheduled meetings.
- The action is ratified at the next regular or special meeting of the Board as a consent item to document the action taken. Ratification is for documentation purposes only. The result of the E-vote shall not be affected.

##### Section 7. Quorum

A quorum shall be present to take action on a business item. Fifty percent of the duly appointed members or their designated alternates, plus one, shall constitute a quorum. Fifty percent of the members present, plus one, even if less than a quorum, may adjourn a meeting.

**Article III**  
**Coordinating Committee**

Section 8. Quorum

A quorum shall be present to act on a business item. A quorum shall consist of fifty percent of the full voting membership, plus one member. Fifty percent of the members present, plus one, even if less than a quorum, may adjourn a meeting.

Section 9. Voting and Decision Making

Each organization represented on the Coordinating Committee shall have one vote, except where organizations are approved to be represented by more than one person.

a) At Meetings

(1) Recommendations to the Policy Board: A motion for a recommendation to the Policy Board must be supported by at least 75 percent of the members present to be approved, unless a greater number is required by law or by another provision of these guidelines. If other than unanimous support, the differing opinion(s) must be carried forward with the recommendation.

Situations where issues of policy arise that are beyond the Committee's scope or where additional direction is needed to resolve a matter shall be passed to the Policy Board for consideration and direction.

(2) Other Motions: A motion that will not result in a recommendation to the Policy Board must be supported by at least 50 percent of the members present, plus one, to be approved, unless a greater number is required by law or by another provision of these guidelines.

b) Between Meetings

To maintain flexibility to address issues and opportunities in a timely manner, the Committee may make decisions between meetings, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

- The Chairperson and Vice-chairperson, or their respective designee(s), both conclude that the situation is urgent.
- The call for a vote is made via email and the subject line states "E-Vote Requested – Urgent MetroGIS Business".
- Members are provided with at least five (5) working days to respond.
- The rules set forth in Sections 8 in this Article governing the Committee's quorum shall be satisfied. The number of votes cast shall be used to determine compliance with quorum requirements.
- Prior to voting on the motion, the members must vote on the appropriateness of the topic as an E-vote. If ten percent or more of the members state the topic is inappropriate, the motion is tabled until the next regular or special meeting of the Board.
- Motions must be supported by a minimum of 75 percent of the votes cast to be approved.
- The Committee is apprised of the results and the course of action to follow immediately following conclusion of the voting.
- This process is restricted to operational matters. It cannot be used to decide matters of policy. A special meeting must be called for such decisions between regularly scheduled meetings.
- The action is ratified at next regular or special meeting of the Committee as a consent item to document the action taken. Ratification is for documentation purposes only. The result of the E-vote shall not be affected.

Section 11. Meetings

The Coordinating Committee shall meet as necessary to carry out its duties. The time and place of the meetings shall be at the discretion of the Committee membership.

Written notice (mail, facsimile, email) of the regular meetings of the Coordinating Committee shall be given to each member at least five (5) days prior to such meetings, and shall comply with the provisions of the open meeting law. Special meetings of the Coordinating Committee may be called by the Chair, provided that at least three (3) days written notice is given to each member and otherwise complies with the provisions of the open meeting law.



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Preliminary 2007 MetroGIS Budget and Major 2007 Program Objectives

**DATE:** October 11, 2006  
(For the Oct. 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

### INTRODUCTION

Policy Board review and comment is requested regarding the attached preliminary listing of Major 2007 Program Objectives and preliminary 2007 Budget for MetroGIS's "Foster Collaboration" Function. Both proposals reflect continuation of the status quo from the second half of 2006 awaiting completion of the pending Business Plan Update initiative. At that time, adjustments would be pursued, as needed.

Authorization is also requested to use the remaining funds donated to MetroGIS to supplement funds provided by the Metropolitan Council to update MetroGIS's business and performance measure plans.

### COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On September 13, 2006 the Coordinating Committee accepted the preliminary 2007 program objectives and budget proposals presented herein, pending completion of the Business Plan Update.

### OVERVIEW

**Objectives:** The proposed preliminary 2007 major program objectives (Attachment A) are comprised of business planning for the next 3-5 years, updating MetroGIS's Performance Measurement Plan, continued effort to implement regional solutions for several priority common information needs, continued work on regional policies to enhance sharing of geospatial resources, and continued outreach efforts.

**Funding:** Support from the Metropolitan Council in 2007 would comprise a continuation of the support approved for 2006 - \$86,000 in project funds and approximately 1.65 FTE. In addition to the \$86,000 in project funds pledged by the Council, there is a balance of funds donated to MetroGIS of \$5,171, assuming a \$941 reimbursement is received from a federal grant award for improvement to DataFinder Café. The Metropolitan Council serves as the custodian and Policy Board approval is required to use these funds. In 2002, over \$20,000 from this account were used to develop DataFinder Café.

The Council has pledged \$5,000 (in addition to \$15,000 for general business planning assistance) to hire a facilitator with desired expertise for the pending the Strategic Directions Workshop. Bid proposals thus far received from facilitators with the requisite skills all exceed \$5,000. Staff believes a suitable use of the donated funds would be to supplement funds pledged by the Council for this and other related expenses related MetroGIS Business and Performance Measurement planning efforts.

### MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS

1. An agreement remains in place with each of the seven counties and the Council to provide access to the regional parcel dataset, without fee, by government and academic interests.
2. Agreed-upon custodial roles and responsibilities (beyond foster collaboration" for support of MetroGIS endorsed regional solutions, which have been accepted by stakeholder organizations, will continue to be performed in accordance with expectations. (Attachment E)

### RECOMMENDATION

- 1) That the Policy Board, offer comments regarding the proposed:
  - a) Preliminary 2007 major work program priorities (Attachment A)
  - b) Preliminary 2007 Budget for MetroGIS's "Foster Collaboration" Function (Attachments B - D)
- 2) That the Policy Board authorize expenditure of the balance of donated funds for business and performance measures plan updates, subject to the Chairperson's approval of specific expenditures.

## Attachment A

### Preliminary Major MetroGIS Program Objectives 2007

- 1) Business Plan Update Initiative (*Workgroup, Lead support - Staff Coordinator*)
- 2) Performance Measurement Plan Update Initiative (*Workgroup, Lead support – Staff Coordinator*)  
(Initiate immediately following adoption of the Business Plan Update project)
- 3) Regional Solutions to Common Information Needs Projects (*Workgroups*)
  - Make substantive progress to achieve April 2004 vision for Next-Generation Street Centerlines dataset
  - Make substantive progress to achieve April 2004 vision for Addresses of Occupiable Units dataset
  - Jurisdictional Boundaries - Water Management Organizations
  - Emergency Preparedness – Implement next steps to refine preliminary solution
  - Peer Review Forums – (Postpone until following Business Plan Update. Candidates include: Existing Land Use, Socioeconomic Web Resources Page, and Hydrology.)
- 4) Performance Measurement Reporting Program (*Lead support – MetroGIS staff*)  
(Produce quarterly anomaly reports and an annual report.)
- 5) DataFinder Enhancements– Phase II (*Lead support – MetroGIS DataFinder Manager*)  
(Investigate feasibility of adding a security capability to support licensed data distribution via Café and modifying statistics reporting to restore capabilities lost when migration was made from code developed by Syncline.)
- 6) Regional GIS Projects (*Lead support – as defined in the proposals*)  
(Invite and fund projects that meet funding criteria.)
- 7) Benefit Testimonials (*Lead support – Staff Coordinator*)  
(Seek out 1-2 additional stakeholder testimonials to the benefits of MetroGIS's efforts.)
- 8) Outreach (*Lead support – Staff Coordinator*)  
(Continue to provide a liaison function with a variety of local, regional, state, national, and international interests that have similar objectives to MetroGIS.)

**ATTACHMENT B**

<b>Funding Balance Sheet</b>		2005	2006	2007
<b>MetroGIS's Foster Collaboration Function</b>		Approved	Approved	Proposed
<b>Revenue Sources</b>				
<b>Metropolitan Council Resources</b>				
Dedicated Staff (approximately 1.65 FTE) <sup>1</sup>		\$112,000	\$113,100	\$123,800
Non-Staff Funds		\$86,750	\$86,000	\$86,000
Regional GIS Projects Rolled over top 2006		minus \$22,000		
Regional GIS Projects Funding form 2005			plus \$22,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$176,750</b>	<b>\$221,100</b>	<b>\$209,800</b>
<b>Grant Funds:</b>				
NSDI CAP Grant Award - DataFinder Café Web Services Enhancements <sup>(3)</sup>			\$15,941	
Proposed 2007 NSDI CAP Grant Application - Performance Measurement Plan Update <sup>(4)</sup>				"?"
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$15,941</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds:</b>				
Funds donated to MetroGIS from stakeholder data sales <sup>(6)</sup>			\$700 <sup>(6)</sup>	\$4,471 <sup>(7)</sup>
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$700</b>	<b>\$4,471</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>\$176,750</b>	<b>\$237,741</b>	<b>\$214,271</b>
<b>Notes:</b>				
<sup>(1)</sup> Dedicated Staff refers to the MetroGIS Staff Coordinator (1 FTE) and the Technical Administrative Assist (about .65 FTE). In mid- 2006, an improved staff time coding system was implemented to improve tracking of time spent supporting MetroGIS activities. The Council's intent is to continue to provide the same level of support for this function as in 2006 but the FTE allocation may fluctuate slightly from the 1.65 FTE that has been estimated to be the level of support provided for past few years. Approved general salary increases of 1.5% for 2006 and 2007 are included.				
<sup>(2)</sup> Unused allotment of \$22,000 for Regional GIS Projects rolled over to 2006.				
<sup>(3)</sup> Grant received by MetroGIS to enhance DataFinder to support the Web Feature Service (WFS) Capabilities.				
<sup>(4)</sup> The announcement is anticipated to be made on October 20, 2006. At that time, a decision will be made if the intended use and funding available consistent with MetroGIS's needs. If so, the application deadline is January 2007 with project awards made in March 2007.				
<sup>(5)</sup> This account was originally set up in 1998. It is comprised of funds donated to MetroGIS. As of October 5, 2006 the balance in this account was \$4,228.92, with an additional \$942 reimbursement pending from a federal grant award for DataFinder Café for a balance of \$5,171. Policy Board permission is required to expend these funds.				
<sup>(6)</sup> Board permission has previously been granted to use up to \$700 for box lunches/facility rental in support of the pending Strategic Directions Workshop currently anticipated for early winter 2007.				
<sup>(7)</sup> <b>Permission is requested (10/18/06) to utilize the remaining balance of these funds</b> to supplement (e.g., consultant assistance) funding provided by the Metropolitan Council for "Foster Collaborating" to support additional activities (e.g., consultant) associated with pending Strategic Directions Workshop, Business Plan Update, and Performance Measurement Plan Update initiatives, subject to approval from the Chairperson for approval of specific expenses.				



**ATTACHMENT D**

**MetroGIS Detailed 2007 Preliminary Expense Allocations**

A	B	C	E		F		G		H		I		J		K		
			Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized
1	(Estimates do not include staff support costs. Projects supported entirely by staff-only expenses are not included. See the adopted work plans for all proposed activities.)																
2																	
3																	
4	Several explanatory notes, by cell, are provided following the table																
5	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function Category</b>	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function</b>	<b>2004</b>		<b>2005</b>		<b>2006</b>		<b>2007</b>		<b>2008</b>		<b>2009</b>		<b>2010</b>		
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)		Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	
7	<b>I. MISSION CRITICAL</b>																
8	1. Promote and endorse voluntary policies which foster coordination of GIS among the region's organizations																
9																	
10																	
11																	
12																	
13																	
14																	
15																	
16																	
17																	
18																	
19																	
20																	
21																	
22																	
23																	

**ATTACHMENT D**

**MetroGIS Detailed 2007 Preliminary Expense Allocations**

	A	B	C	E		F		G		H		I		J	K
				2004		2005		2006		2007					
	MetroGIS Coordination Function Category	MetroGIS Coordination Function	Sub Function / Description	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Approved			Preliminary Request		
5	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)														
6															
24			a) MetroGIS data users forums and Business Information Need Peer Review Forums	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$500		
25			b) Participant satisfaction survey	\$1,000	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0		
26			c) Seed \$'s for regionally significant projects	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)		
27			d) Identify Second Generation Business Information Need Priorities	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500	\$0		
			5) Develop and endorse standards for GIS content, data documentation, and data management for regional data sets. <i>(In addition to normal operating expenses covered as committee expenses.)</i>												
28				[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]		
29			a) Negotiate agreements	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)		
30			b) Facilitate compliance (training sessions, sharing best practices, etc)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)		
31			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$83,000</b>	<b>\$77,576</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>	<b>\$41,029</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>	<b>\$41,029</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>	<b>\$41,029</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>		
32															
	<b>II. FUNDED SUPPORT: IMPORTANT BUT NOT CRITICAL</b>														
33															
34			1. Maintain MetroGIS world wide web site (not DataFinder)	\$0	\$16	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
35			2. Promote collaborative funding of pilot projects that meet regional needs	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)		
36			3. Fill gaps in metadata based on identified priorities												
37			a) Promote/facilitate development and maintenance of metadata & posting with DataFinder (including education forums and one-on-one contact)	\$250	\$0	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)		
			4. Maintain liaison relationships with committees/organizations with similar objectives to MetroGIS (e.g., Governor's Council on GI, county GIS user groups, MACO, NACO.) See 6b for NSDI/GDA expenses.												
38															
39			5. Promote forums for MetroGIS stakeholders to discuss common GIS needs and opportunities												
40			a) Workshops for managers/policy makers to prepare for upcoming legislative session, training related to endorsed regional data solutions, etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
41			b) Facilitate regionwide users groups/forums for knowledge sharing	\$2,000	\$40	\$500	\$40	\$500	\$40	\$500	\$40	\$500	\$500		
42			6. Advocate for MetroGIS needs and desires with state and federal policy makers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
43			a) Pursue authorities (legislation)/policies necessary to achieve MetroGIS objectives (organizational/data access & privacy/long term financing/etc.) (Decision in 1998 to rely upon in-house legal staff/grants)												
44			b) Participate in non-local Workshops/Activities												
45			i) NSDI/ I-Team etc. related activities not paid by host.	\$750	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
46			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>	<b>\$56</b>	<b>\$500</b>	<b>\$40</b>	<b>\$500</b>	<b>\$40</b>	<b>\$500</b>	<b>\$40</b>	<b>\$500</b>	<b>\$500</b>		
47															

**ATTACHMENT D**

**MetroGIS Detailed 2007 Preliminary Expense Allocations**

	A	B	C	E		F		G		H		I		J		K	
				2004		2005		2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
	MetroGIS Coordination Function Category	MetroGIS Coordination Function	Sub Function / Description	Authorized	Actual Spent	Authorized	Actual Spent	Approved	Preliminary Request								
5		MetroGIS Coordination Function															
6		(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)															
48	III. PARTNERED SUPPORT: HIGH IMPORTANCE BUT REQUIRE PARTNERING TO ACHIEVE																
49		1. Create and maintain datasets for MetroGIS based upon identified priorities [i.e., to address 13 priority information needs endorsed by the Policy Board 5/97 as having regional significance. (All expenses covered in I-2. See work plans for specifics)]															
50			a) Develop regional data sets														
51			<b>Business Plan Assumption:</b> MetroGIS endorsed datasets are to be developed by stakeholder organizations with business need & in some cases TBD joint ventures														
52			b) Maintenance of Regional Datasets														
53			<b>Business Plan Assumption:</b> Maintained by org/partnership with business need														
54		2. Help promote development and exchange of GIS applications and procedures that serve MetroGIS needs															
55																	
56			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>														
57	IV. CASE BY CASE																
58		1. Develop master contracts for regional GIS projects, when appropriate															
59		2. Endorse standards for telecommunication protocol and networks (AKA: create guidelines for getting electronic access to the information that is being shared)															
60		3. Provide technical assistance to participants to retrieve, translate, and use data developed and maintained on behalf of MetroGIS															
61		4. Undertake research to meet common regional GIS needs															
62			a) Benefits of Data Sharing/Collaboration (component of outsourced activities pertaining to Performance Measures )														
63																	
64			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>														
65	V. LOW PRIORITY																
66		1. Identify GIS training and continuing education needs and encourage participation															
67		2. Provide a repository of GIS human resources information (centralized job posting/position descriptions)															
68		3. Actively Market MetroGIS data and products. (Low priority ranking is a result of year 2000 survey when still in the midst of building functionality)															
69			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>														



## Attachment E

### ACCEPTED CUSTODIAL RESPONSIBILITIES – METROGIS ENDORSED (Last Updated: November 17, 2005)

<b>Established Partnerships</b>	<b>Summary of Collaborative Roles</b>
<p><b>10 organizations</b> have assumed a total of <b>23 roles</b> in support of endorsed regional solutions to common geospatial related needs of the community</p>	<p>(Bundling Operational Capacity Across Organizations to Address Common Priority Needs)</p>
<p>(2 roles) <b>County: Anoka</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)</p>	<p>Produce and maintain parcel data in consistent format. Submit quarterly updates to regional custodian (Council) in regional format. (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/history_pub/policy_sumnv2.0.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/history_pub/policy_sumnv2.0.pdf</a>)</p>
<p>(2 roles) <b>County: Carver</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)</p>	<p>Produce and maintain boundary data, submit quarterly updates to regional custodian (Council) in regional format. (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/county_mcd/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/county_mcd/policy_summary.pdf</a>)</p>
<p>(2 roles) <b>County: Dakota</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)</p>	<p>(All seven counties have agreed to assume responsibility for the same roles and responsibilities concerning the region parcel and city/county boundaries datasets. Their combined level of support is estimated to involve <b>20+ FTE</b>. This effort includes surveyors, assessors, and GIS staff.)</p>
<p>(2 roles) <b>County: Hennepin</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)</p>	<p>(Counties use these data to manage property-related records and to support their tax collection responsibilities.)</p>
<p>(2 roles) <b>County: Ramsey</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)</p>	<p>(Counties use these data to manage property-related records and to support their tax collection responsibilities.)</p>
<p>(2 roles) <b>County: Scott</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)</p>	<p>(Counties use these data to manage property-related records and to support their tax collection responsibilities.)</p>
<p>(2 roles) <b>County: Washington</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)</p>	<p>(Counties use these data to manage property-related records and to support their tax collection responsibilities.)</p>
<p>(1 role) <b>DNR</b> - Land Cover</p>	<p>Manage regional database and collaborative process to acquire land cover data compatible with agreed upon data content standards. DNR uses this database to support a number of its metro area natural resources and wildlife management programs. Annual support is about <b>.5 FTE</b>. (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/land_cover/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/land_cover/policy_summary.pdf</a>)</p>

<p>(1 role) <b>University of Minnesota Population Center</b> (Socioeconomic Characteristics)</p>	<p>Manage content of Socioeconomic Resources Website at <a href="http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp">www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp</a>. Annual support is about <b>.2 FTE</b>. (For detailed roles <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/socioeconomic_characteristics/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/socioeconomic_characteristics/policy_summary.pdf</a>)</p>
<p>(7 roles) <b>Metropolitan Council</b> (Three categories: data management, data distribution, and fostering regional collaboration)</p> <p>⇒ Census Geography data</p> <p>⇒ County/MCD Boundary data</p> <p>⇒ Planned Land Use data</p> <p>⇒ Parcel data</p> <p>⇒ Street Centerline data</p> <p>⇒ DataFinder (one-stop data distribution portal)</p> <p>⇒ Foster Collaborative Environment (<i>regional solutions to common geospatial needs</i>)</p>	<p>▪ Annual support for <b>DataFinder and regional data custodian roles, combined about 1.25 FTE</b>. ▪ 2005 budget to support <b>Foster Collaborative Environment: 1.75 FTE and \$86,000</b>.</p> <p>Produce census geography data at time of decennial census that align with other locally produced foundation geospatial data. (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/census/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/census/policy_summary.pdf</a>)</p> <p>Assemble boundary data produced by counties into regional dataset. (See County Boundaries above for the specific roles)</p> <p>Develop and manage regional dataset. (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/planned_land_use/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/planned_land_use/policy_summary.pdf</a>)</p> <p>Assemble parcel data produced by counties into regional dataset. (See County Parcels above for the specific roles.)</p> <p>Contract with The Lawrence Group to maintain data to desired specifics. (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/street_centerlines/roles_respon_specs.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/street_centerlines/roles_respon_specs.pdf</a>)</p> <p>Maintain DataFinder and DataFinder Café's hardware and software platform and update metadata posted on DataFinder. (For details see Section 1.3.2 - <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf">www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf</a>)</p> <p>Facilitate collaborative decision-making structure, including business planning, performance measures activities, and agreements, as well as, outreach and advocacy efforts to encourage use of and feedback about adopted solutions and best practices.</p>
<p><b>(Total of 23 roles supported by 10 different organizations)</b></p>	<p>(For details see Section 1.3.2 - <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf">www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf</a>)</p>



**To:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**From:** MetroGIS Staff  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**Subject:** 2007 Meeting Schedule - MetroGIS Policy Board

**Date:** September 6, 2006  
(For Oct 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

**INTRODUCTION**

A suggested meeting schedule for 2007 is presented below for the Board’s consideration. No Policy Board meetings have been scheduled beyond October 18, 2006.

**BACKGROUND**

Meeting location: Due to the lack of sufficient, readily accessible, free parking at the Council’s new facility at 390 N. Robert Street (6<sup>th</sup> and Robert), the last three Policy Board meetings have been held at the Metro Counties Government Center (2099 University Avenue, St. Paul). Nancy Read, chair of the Coordinating Committee has hosted the last three meetings and is willing to do so for the 2007 meetings as well, if the Board wishes to continue to meet at the Metro Counties Government Center.

Meeting dates and times: During this past year, the Policy Board met on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday and 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesdays of the month, beginning at 6:30 p.m. The alternation between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday of the month has been to avoid to know conflicts. The Board has generally met on the third or fourth Wednesdays of the month since it was established in 1997.

**SUGGESTED 2007 MEETING SCHEDULE**

<u>Suggested Meeting Date</u>	<u>Anticipated Major Topics***</u>	<u>GIS Demonstration Suggestions</u>
Jan 17 <sup>th</sup> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Wednesday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results Strategic Directions Workshop</li> <li>• 2007 Regional GIS Project Program</li> <li>• Emergency Preparedness Solution - Version 2</li> </ul>	
Apr 25 <sup>th</sup> 4 <sup>th</sup> Wednesday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Election of Officers</li> <li>• 2007 Regional GIS Project Program- Concept Acceptance</li> </ul>	
Jul 25 <sup>th</sup> 4 <sup>th</sup> Wednesday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Plan Update</li> <li>• Regional Street Centerline Solution – Version 2</li> <li>• Highway and Road Network Information Need Solution</li> <li>• 2007 Regional GIS Project Program- Final Recommendation</li> </ul>	
Oct 17 <sup>th</sup> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Wednesday	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Measurement Plan Update</li> <li>• 2008 Program Objectives</li> <li>• Guidelines for Next Generation Parcel Data Sharing Agreement (2009 - ?)</li> </ul>	

\*\*\* Assumes the outcome of the pending Strategic Directions Workshop will acknowledge previously established priorities and work in-process

**RECOMMENDATION**

The MetroGIS Policy Board is respectfully requested to set its 2007 meeting schedule and location.



**TO:** Policy Board  
**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)  
**SUBJECT:** MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop Preparations  
**DATE:** October 11, 2006  
(For the Oct. 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

### INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee respectfully requests Policy Board comment on the proposed strategy outlined below for hosting the pending Strategic Directions Workshop. A criterion for the design of the workshop is that the **experience must be policy-maker friendly**. The Committee's preference is for several Policy Board members to participate in this workshop to insure the direction agreed upon has political legitimacy. Hosting this workshop is one of the key activities in the current MetroGIS workplan.

### COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On September 13, the Coordinating Committee accepted the Workshop design as presented below.

### ROLE OF STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS WORKSHOP

The purpose for the Strategic Directions Workshop is to set clear direction for the Business Plan Update process, which is scheduled to begin immediately following the Workshop (Agenda Item 5b). Following completion of the Business Plan Update, MetroGIS's Performance Measurement Plan is proposed to be updated to insure it is in lockstep with the next-generation Business Plan. The goal is to present the Updated Business Plan for adoption by the Policy Board at its July 2007 meeting and present the updated Performance Measurement Plan to the Board for adoption in October 2007.

### SUGGESTED COMPONENTS - STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS WORKSHOP

- **OBJECTIVES:**
  - 1) Affirmation/suggested updates of MetroGIS guiding principles.
  - 2) Provide clear direction for the Business Plan Update process concerning preferred priority activities for MetroGIS over the next 3-5 years, including identifying known obstacles that will need to be resolved to accomplish them. (See Attachment B for the challenges identified in the 2003-2005 Business Plan.)
  - 3) Improved understanding of what stakeholders need to obtain from MetroGIS and are able to contribute to MetroGIS.
- **WHO:** 25-30 individuals. Members of Policy Board and Coordinating Committee, supplemented by individuals with perspectives not sufficiently represented by the standing members.
- **WHEN:** Thursday, February 8, 2007 has been selected based upon the availability of the top candidate to facilitate the workshop. The Workshop Planning Team hopes to reach agreement on expectations shortly.
- **INPUTS:** See the Reference Section for information on November 15, 2005 "Beyond Government Users" Forum and June 1, 2006 "Imagining Possibilities" Forums.
- **PROCESS:** Facilitated and policy-maker friendly – with focus on the "What", "Why", "Who" (collaborative opportunities) and "Should dos" (community priorities), not the "How". (The "How" and "When" will be the focus of the subsequent Business Planning process.)
- **FACILITATOR:** Strong facilitation skills. GIS expertise is not required. The objective is to achieve a very clear focus on strategic, policy level direction. Ability to distinguish between the "What/Who" and "How". Ability to determine when the "What/Who" has been sufficiently defined.
- **SCOPING THEMES:** Several policy themes have been identified as having strategic importance to MetroGIS identity and perceived value:
  - 1) Guiding philosophy (What changes, if any, are desired to the MetroGIS's underpinning principles? Should MetroGIS continue to view local and regional government as its core stakeholders?)
  - 2) Are we done? Do we just maintain what we have in place or are there more opportunities to explore?

- a) Adequacy of currently defined common business information needs (Should the list of common information needs be reviewed for possible deletions or additions?)
  - b) Regional geospatial data solutions to common needs (Should solutions continue to be pursued for yet unresolved common information needs?)
  - c) Beyond regional data solutions (Should MetroGIS identify applications and opportunities that should be addressed in the Business Plan? Should MetroGIS foster collaborative solutions to common application/web services needs?)
  - d) Competencies (What resources are needed to maintain the status quo? To go beyond the status quo?)
- 3) Stakeholders and Non-traditional users (What deliverables are needed by stakeholders to remain engaged? What are stakeholders able to contribute to MetroGIS? What functions are best served by MetroGIS versus its stakeholders? What role should MetroGIS play in facilitating access to geographic information by:
- a) Interests other than local and regional government, i.e. non-profits and/or private sector;
  - b) Users in fields beyond community development and environmental services; and
  - c) Less technically-inclined users, who are increasingly able to utilize GIS due to improvements in technical tools?)
- 4) Should MetroGIS pursue a strategy to encourage fostering of statewide collaboration on common geospatial needs and if so, who should be the target organizations/individuals?
- 5) Do we need to change how we do business, how we get things done?
- 6) Geographic extent (How should MetroGIS work with interests beyond the seven county Metropolitan Area (e.g., collar counties) – directly or by promoting needed collaboration policies through Mn Governors Council on Geographic Information and other relevant institutions?)
- 7) Intellectual/Digital Property Rights (What role should MetroGIS play to set standardized best practices/ intellectual rights policy related to derivative datasets, access to data and information via the Internet, etc?)

### **FACILITATOR**

The Workshop Planning Team and Coordinating Committee have each provided oversight in the preparation of qualifications and responsibilities desired of the workshop facilitator (Attachment A). Three facilitation proposals have been received. Talks to refine expectations with the top candidate are in progress. It appears likely that the best proposal will exceed \$5,000, as is the case with the two other proposals, the amount available from the funding currently available from the Metropolitan Council for this project. See Agenda Item 5b for a request to utilize funds donated to MetroGIS to provide funding in excess of \$5,000.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Offer any desired modifications to the suggested strategy to prepare for the pending Strategic Directions Workshop.
- 2) Obtain a commitment from several of its members to participate to insure that core stakeholder perspectives at the policy-maker level are sufficiently represented in the dialogue.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### **A) Strategic Directions Workshop – Oversight Team**

On June 28, 2006, the Workshop Planning Team was created by the Coordinating Committee. The following members volunteered to participate: Nancy Read, Jane Harper, David Arbeit, Mark Vander Schaaf, and Rick Gelbmann. The Team met twice to develop the proposal herein. The preference is to hold off on any further preparations until the facilitator is selected and able to participate in the discussions.

### **B) Summary of Challenges – Current Business Plan (See Attachment B.)**

### **C) Preparation Events – Currently Proposed Workshop**

- 1) June 1 *Imagining Possibilities Forum*: The final summary of the forum is available at [http://www.metrogis.org/specialevents/techpossibilities/Draft\\_Summary\\_Report.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/specialevents/techpossibilities/Draft_Summary_Report.pdf). The “big ideas” shared at this forum will be used to facilitate discussion of strategic initiative that MetroGIS should pursue over the next few years.
- 2) Beyond Government Users - Partnering Opportunities: The Phase II Workgroup began its efforts on August 8. Substantive progress has been made on a recommendation for several “most promising, achievable” partnering opportunities. The group is charged with maturing ideas identified at the forum on November 15, 2005 at which forty-five candidate ideas for potential collaboration between government and non-government interests were identified in three broad topical areas:
  - How can we work together to reduce costs?
  - What innovations can we work together to develop?
  - How can we promote a statewide GIS cooperative effort?

(The summary document for the November 15, 2006 forum can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06\\_0118/forum\\_summary.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06_0118/forum_summary.pdf).)

The MetroGIS Policy Board endorsed the following principles at its January 2006 meeting for the prospective partnership proposals:

- Value added to public sector assets is encouraged provided it does not detract from the public sector objective.
- Contribution of assets to a collaborative solution assumes all parties view the transaction as equitable and relevant to their needs.
- Contributions can be comprised of funds, data, equipment and/or people.
- Equity is defined on an organization-by-organization basis and exists if the collaborative solution is more efficient than pursuing the solution on one's own.

### **D) Strategic Directions Workshop –Preparation Chronology**

The time frame for the most recent MetroGIS Business Plan is 2003-2005. In preparation for launching preparation for the next-generation plan, the Coordinating Committee created a workgroup in March 2004 to oversee the process. That group had met a few times when it became apparent that negotiations for a new parcel data agreement between the seven counties and Metropolitan Council would require more time than had been anticipated. All agreed that the new agreement needed to be in place before the Strategic Directions Workshop was held, so Workshop preparations were suspended until spring 2004. The new agreement was not executed until December 2004.

Work on the Strategic Directions Workshop resumed in late fall 2004, at which time, agreement was reached with Professor John Bryson with the University of Minnesota on a scope of work to facilitate the Workshop. A tentative target timeframe was also set for February 2005. In early February, senior Metropolitan Council management requested delaying the Workshop until they had completed an internal evaluation of the benefits of MetroGIS to its needs. They noted they preferred more time to properly prepare their representatives to the Workshop and make sure they were clear on the Council's expectations relative to its relationship with MetroGIS. MetroGIS leadership agreed with this assessment.

In February 2005, MetroGIS's leadership also encouraged each of the other stakeholder representatives to MetroGIS to identify what their respective organizations need from MetroGIS to remain engaged. The following questions were suggested by Professor John Bryson, who had been retained to facilitate the Workshop, and were distributed to the Coordinating Committee members on February 18, 2005 in a message noting that a decision had been made to postpone the Workshop that had been anticipated to occur the last week of February 2005:

- What are the benefits of collaborating on common GIS needs and opportunities? Or, what is the public value we are trying to create (e.g., making it easier for publicly useful or important work. Non-government interests to do likewise?)
- What are the costs involved in achieving the desired collaboration?
- How are/might these costs be covered?
- In light of the potential benefits and costs, what is our own bottom line?
- How open are we to hearing from others about their views concerning benefits, costs, and bottom lines? (Having participants be clear about their own benefits, costs, and bottom lines is important, but it is also important for participants to be willing to change or modify their views based on new information or insights.)

The Metropolitan Council completed its evaluation of MetroGIS on June 28, 2006 with the adoption of a Resolution that is supportive of MetroGIS and its current structure, and clarified the Council's relationship with MetroGIS. For more information see [http://www.metrogis.org/about/affiliations/index.shtml#met\\_council](http://www.metrogis.org/about/affiliations/index.shtml#met_council). Immediately, following this action, preparations of the Strategic Directions Workshop were resumed, culminating in the proposal presented herein.

## ATTACHMENT A

### Proposed Workshop Facilitator Responsibilities and Qualifications

#### MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop

*Last updated: September 6, 2006*

##### **Facilitator Responsibilities:**

1. Become familiar with the materials generated by the Workshop Planning Team regarding Workshop objectives, desired deliverables, process, participants, etc. in addition to MetroGIS's current mission, functions, and guiding principles.
2. Consult with the Workshop Planning Team to clarify understanding of Workshop objectives.
3. Advise and assist the Workshop Planning Team identify and implement appropriate methods and processes to fully achieve desired objectives for the Workshop.
4. Advise and assist the Workshop Planning Team with the preparation of materials for use during the Workshop.
5. Serve as lead facilitator at the Workshop.
6. Assist in the preparation of a written report summarizing activities of the day and direction received from the Workshop event.
7. Assist in the subsequent Business Plan Update Process, to the extent necessary, to insure direction received at the Workshop is fully and accurately incorporated into the Plan Update processes and documentation.

##### **Required Qualifications:**

1. Demonstrated ability to facilitate consensus among the members of a group of individuals representing diverse professional and organizational perspectives.
2. Demonstrated ability to assist groups identify common needs and opportunities and reach consensus on direction important to business planning.
3. Active listener with ability to:
  - Synthesize multiple comments into common themes.
  - React on the spot and adjust the workshop approach to achieve the desired outcomes (flexible).
  - Discover information important to adoption of a Business Plan Update
  - Notice the importance of political viability in development of goals and directives.
4. Ability to moderate the discussion to point it in the direction needed to achieve the desired outcomes and tactfully conclude the discussion when the objective has been achieved (e.g. distinguish the "what/who" from the "how" and recognize when there has been enough discussion of the "what" to sufficiently understand the matter for purposes of setting strategic direction).

##### **Desired Qualifications**

1. Familiar with characteristics important to successful multi-organizational collaborations.

##### **Funding for Facilitator Contract:**

Metropolitan Council management has agreed to pay up to \$5,000 for a facilitator out of the \$20,000 in the Professional Services component of MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" budget. Each of the facilitation bids received exceed \$5,000, ranging from about \$200 over to several thousand dollars over. Use of funds donated to MetroGIS are proposed to supplement funds provided by the Council. See Agenda Item 5b for the request for authorization to use donated funds for this purpose.

## ATTACHMENT B

### Summary of Previously Defined Challenges MetroGIS Business Plan (2003-2005)

#### Challenges Related to Ongoing work

1. *To ensure that common information needs continue to be accurately identified and appropriately met.*
2. *To continue to develop, maintain, and promote regionally endorsed data that meet the priority common information needs of stakeholders.*
3. *To engage data producers in determining efficient and effective ways to fully utilize existing data discovery and distribution tools developed through MetroGIS (i.e. DataFinder).*
4. *To continue to address data producer issues and user preferences so that barriers and impediments to effective distribution of data are minimized.*
5. *To maintain a high level of involvement in regional data sharing activities that accomplish the MetroGIS mission.*
6. *To work effectively with organizations within and outside the seven-county region, including surrounding counties, and state and national organizations, to develop and promote common policy and technical issues of mutual benefit.*

#### Related to Emerging Issues

1. *To determine effective solutions to meet non-profit and private sector needs for parcel data in a way that benefits both data producers and users.*
2. *To determine whether MetroGIS should expand its role to include fostering the sharing and/or development of geodata applications that respond to common user needs and that reduce support costs for data producers.*

See [http://www.metrogis.org/about/business\\_planning/index.shtml#part1](http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/index.shtml#part1) for the complete document.



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Major Activity Updates

**DATE:** October 5, 2006  
(For the Oct. 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

Information provided by persons other than the Staff Coordinator is noted.

**A) 2006 REGIONAL GIS PROJECTS**

On July 28<sup>th</sup>, the Policy Board recommended funding of both projects as recommended by the Coordinating Committee on June 28<sup>th</sup>. Subsequently, Metropolitan Council management authorized funding of both projects as recommended. Negotiations began in September with the Mn Land Management Information Center (LMIC) regarding a Memorandum of Understanding to guide funding of the “Service Broker” proposal and to draft a Request for Proposals for publication yet this fall for the Addresses of Occupiable Units Project.

**B) METROGIS DATAFINDER CAFÉ UPDATE**

Upgrading of DataFinder Café is nearly complete. The project was in cooperation with Latitude Geographics (British Columbia, Canada), the owners of GeoCortex software which is an integrate component of the improved application. DataFinder Café is once again a state-of-the-art tool for obtaining geospatial data and now 35 Mapping Services via the Internet. The upgrade was made possible with a federal grant from the NSDI program. The detailed upgrade specifications are available upon request. The plan is to demonstrate the new functionality to the Coordinating Committee at its December meeting. Alison Slaats has served as the Project Lead.

**C) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT – QUARTERLY ANOMALY REPORT**

A quarterly performance measures report was not produced due to lack of staff support. Chris Kline, has accepted appointment on September 13<sup>th</sup> to the Administrative Technical position responsible for gathering the data that underpins MetroGIS’s performance reporting. His top priority activity will be to reinstate MetroGIS’s Performance Measurement Program.

**D) PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEEDS SOLUTIONS** (See <http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml> for complete information about the status of solutions for each of MetroGIS’s common information needs.)

**(1) Address (Occupiable Units) Workgroup**

*(Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, Liaison to the Coordinating Committee)*

The Workgroup has agreed on desired regional standards that are compliant with the emerging national street address standard. Several workgroup members are also nearing completion of testing the amount of effort needed to achieve compliance between local address authority organization (cities and some counties) databases and the national standards. This testing will be essentially complete by September 1. The group then plans to meet once the testing is complete. The major components of the regional vision endorsed by the Policy Board in April 2005 (e.g., rationale, need for local government involvement and implementation concepts) are explained in a white paper which can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/street\\_addresses/Occupiable\\_Units\\_Dataset\\_Vision.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/street_addresses/Occupiable_Units_Dataset_Vision.pdf).

(2) **Existing Land Use**

Preparations for a user satisfaction forum remain on hold until following the pending Strategic Directions Workshop. The Coordinating Committee decided at its March 2005 meeting that the Existing Land Use Forum should follow the Workshop, as topics discussed at the Workshop could influence the topics discussed at the land use forum.

(3) **Emergency Preparedness Workgroup**

*(Randy Knippel, Dakota County, Workgroup Chair)*

This workgroup has reached an impasse in its ability to achieve the regional solution adopted by the Policy Board at the October 2005 meeting. The Workgroup leadership agreed to document the problems that it has encountered for discussion at the December Coordinating Committee meeting.

(4) **Highway and Road Networks**

*(Gordon Chinander, Metropolitan Emergency Services Board [formerly Metropolitan 911 Board], Liaison to Coordinating Committee)*

(a) **The “E911 Address and Street Centerline Workgroup”** Preliminary data specifications have been agreed upon by the Workgroup for a next-generation regional street centerline dataset. (More information on this workgroup’s efforts can be found at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/workgroups/e911\\_streets/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/workgroups/e911_streets/index.shtml).) Major prospective producers (all counties and several major cities) of the source data were asked to respond by September 1, 2006, as to whether or not they can support the desired new specifications and, if so, by what date. To staff’s knowledge, only one county and no city interests are prepared to support the required data maintenance in the foreseeable future required to meet the desired regional specifications, many of which are currently met with data obtained via an agreement with The Lawrence Group (TLG). As such, negotiations are in progress with TLG to execute a new agreement, effective January 1, 2007. The current agreement expires on December 31, 2006.

A component of the agreement sought with The Lawrence Group (TLG) is the creation of a means to implement view-only access to TLG data via Internet applications without the need for the user to obtain a licensure. The owner of an Internet application, who wishes to offer view-only access to the TLG Street Centerline dataset, would be required to obtain a license (Web Application Development) from TLG to offer this capability. The license will define the procedures that the host must take to protect the source data from being downloadable.

(b) As of **October 5th** there are currently **184 licenses** issued to access and use The Lawrence Group’s (TLG) Street Centerline Dataset, MetroGIS’s currently endorsed regional solution for address matching. The types of organizations licensed were as follows:

- Local gov’t: **101**
- Regional gov’t: **8**
- State/Federal gov’t: **23**
- Academic: **52**

(c) **The MetroGIS Roads & Highways Technical Workgroup**

This workgroup was established Fall 2004 to foster a partnership between MnDOT and MetroGIS, whereby MetroGIS would provide a mechanism for the local government community serving the seven-county, Twin Cities community to collectively test an application designed by MnDOT to integrate local datasets with MnDOT’s LDM. The lead staff for MetroGIS’s component of the partnership, Mike Dolbow, changed jobs Fall 2005 and staff support ceased at that time for this workgroup. Information about goals, expectations, and participant roles agreed upon prior to Dolbow’s departure can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/highway\\_roads/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/highway_roads/index.shtml).

As far as progress on development of the actual application, Dan Ross, who heads up the project for Mn/DOT, provided the following information: “The vendor provided what they believe to be production ready software to Mn/DOT at the end of July. Mn/DOT staff is currently performing a "Proof of Concept" with the software against identified business flows on a representative sample of the Mn/DOT business data. Ratings of the software should be complete in September. At that point, a decision will be made regarding how to move forward. The statewide data is also undergoing a major update at this time. The BaseMap data is being synchronized with the current Transportation Information System (TIS) and road status updates are being completed as well. Successful approval of the software and data updates are required to allow Mn/DOT to effectively share TIS data (e.g. traffic volumes) with other organizations desiring to use their own roadway geometries.”

**(5) Jurisdictional Boundaries – Water Management Organizations**

The proposed custodian roles and responsibilities, as defined via the Washington County Pilot Project have been shared with each of the recommended candidate custodian interests (counties and Mn Board of Soil and Water Resources [BWSR]). Further talks with the BWSR, county taxation officials, and possibly watershed districts themselves, are needed to finalize a recommendation.

A meeting was held on October 11 with BWSR leadership to explore their interest in serving in the capacity of the regional custodian even though the data would be more accurate than their needs. BWSR recognizes that the proposed procedures could result in less effort than they are currently expending to obtain less robust data and they also understand that this dataset needs to be interoperable with street and parcel data to effectively use it in the Internet environment, which they plan to pursue.

None of the other members of the County Data Producers Workgroup has as yet recognized a need for the procedures developed via the Washington County pilot project, though the group acknowledges that those responsible for property taxation may have a more well aligned business need.

**(6) Lakes, Wetlands, etc.**

*(Nancy Read, Coordinating Committee Chairperson and Workgroup Member)*

From an overall project management perspective, it appears to be time to reassess gaps between the hydrology-related information needs identified in 1997 and those which can be met with currently developed (or developing) data. The concept of hosting a strategy session should be investigated among the workgroup members to determine if there is support to reaffirm the user needs and discuss a strategy(ies) to address any gaps relevant to defining a regional solution.

**(7) Land Cover**

*(Bart Richardson, MN DNR, Regional Custodian)*

The LMCR has recently funded a project to complete MLCCS coverage in the next year and half for Hennepin, Carver, Scott and Washington Counties. Counting the already completed Dakota and Anoka counties, 95% of the metro area will be inventoried by the spring of 2008. Ramsey County will then be the only incomplete county. Also this year, the National Park Service has funded a project to inventory the St. Croix River from Taylors Falls to Prescott and to update the MLCCS data in the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area. For both of these projects, the DNR is coordinating data quality standards and is acting as the data host.

**(8) Parcels** *(Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council, Regional Custodian)*

There are currently **88 licenses** issued to access and use the Regional Parcel Dataset. As of **October 5<sup>th</sup>**, the types of organizations licensed were as follows:

- Local gov't: **39**

- Regional gov't: 3.
- State/Federal gov't: 16
- Academic: 30

**(9) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas** *(Amy West, U of M Population Center, Regional Custodian)*

- Progress is being made on all fronts. Amy West is making progress looking into various ways to provide users with local access to HMDA data (data about home mortgages). Options seem to include the University of Minnesota, the Minneapolis Public Library, and the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. Along with acquiring the data, she is looking at data documentation with an eye to improving our description of this data source.
- We have also discovered DataPlace (<http://www.dataplace.org>), a new comprehensive source of online socioeconomic data being developed by the Fannie Mae Foundation with significant input from the Urban Institute. Eventually data will be available at the tract level and will be useful to the MetroGIS community. We will continue to monitor this.
- Laura Smith at Macalester has been accessing and mapping property foreclosures in North Minneapolis. She has gotten this data in electronic form from both Hennepin and Ramsey counties. Craig will ask the County Data Producers Workgroup about foreclosure data from the other five counties. This could be a useful addition to DataFinder.
- In accordance with a MetroGIS Policy Board request, the Metro Public Health GIS Users Group (Tim Zimmerman, Hennepin County, Chair) has secured agreement from the metro area counties for new ways to publish vital statistics (birth and death data) that present more small area information in formats compatible with GIS, while preserving confidentiality of individuals. Such information (the attributes associated with births and deaths, such as the number of low birth-weight births, births to teenage mothers, etc.) can serve as useful indicators of community well-being. **No update has been received as to whether or not this proposal has been shared with the MN Department of Health for sanctioning.** For more information contact Tim Zimmerman at [tim.zimmerman@co.hennepin.mn.us](mailto:tim.zimmerman@co.hennepin.mn.us) or 612-348-0307.

**E) COUNTY DATA PRODUCER WORKGROUP ACTIVITIES - PARCEL DATA ACCESS POLICY**

*(Submitted by Dave Drealan, Carver County, Workgroup Chair)*

This group last met on September the last week in September. The agenda included discussion of the following topics.

**(1) Regional Parcel Dataset Policy Investigation – Waive Fee Access by Non-Profit Interests**

Following a successful Hennepin County pilot project (Attachment A), each of the other six counties will likely establish a similar policy to waive their fee for access to parcel data for non-profits interests that meet specified criteria. The counties will independently administer this policy and the criteria will likely vary from county to county, based upon the local situation. In general, the rationale is that those non-profits interests that promote and foster economic development activity as an adjunct of government should qualify for a fee waiver.

**(2) Redistribution of Parcel Data Summarized to a Larger Geography**

The question is whether summarization of parcel data to a larger geography (e.g., census block group, census tract, user-defined area) constitutes a “derivative” product that is not subject to the prohibition on redistribution to which the source parcel data is subject. The group concluded that each user must evaluate their specific situation against the requirements specified in the license and decide for themselves if the summarized product is their product to distribute as they wish or subject to the redistribution restrictions that accompany the source data.

**(3) View-Only, Web-based Access Policy for Parcel Data**

The question is can licensed users of the regional parcel dataset offer non-licensed interests the ability to view parcel data via an Internet application if the source data can not be obtained (view-only access). In other words, does view-only access constitute redistribution of data, which is prohibited by the parcel data access agreement. The group concluded that each licensed user/prospective application host must evaluate their specific situation against the requirements specified in the license and decide for themselves if offering view-only access to licensed parcel data violates the license that prohibits redistribution.

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **NO-FEE ACCESS TO PARCEL DATA FOR NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS**

Hennepin County and CURA worked together to develop a set of criteria to be used to determine if access to the Hennepin County parcel data set would be provided to a non-profit organization on a no-fee basis. It should be noted that a non-profit can always purchase the dataset.

The criteria have been distributed to the other Metro Counties for their consideration. At this point there is no consensus that this specific set of criteria will be used by all of the counties. The following criteria were distributed at the June 22<sup>nd</sup> Producers Workgroup meeting.

### **PROPOSED POLICY FOR NO-FEE ACCESS TO PARCEL DATA FOR NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS**

*Last Updated: February 8, 2005*

Hennepin County may provide no-fee access to that portion of the current MetroGIS Regional Parcel Dataset, contained within county boundaries to non-profit and community development organizations for individual projects with specific design and purpose subject to the following conditions.

1. The party requesting the data must meet the legal requirements of a non-profit organization under Minnesota law and must have a public purpose or public benefit mission.
2. The organization must have a current data license agreement with Hennepin County which is subject to annual renewal.
3. The organization must make its request in writing and provide a description for the use of the data.
4. The Board of Directors of the organization is composed of community members whose mission and goals are aligned with local government.
5. The organization serves the purpose of promoting jobs, economic development, affordable housing, environmental improvements, or community development
6. Hennepin County will evaluate each request and approve or deny the request based on a case-by-case basis. The decision whether to approve or deny any request will be within the sole discretion of Hennepin County.
7. Data will be used only for officially approved uses related to the organization's non-profit mission and purpose.
8. Data will not be used for private purposes or financial gain.
9. Direct access will be limited to designated staff and leaders of the organization. Each organization will have data privacy and data security guidelines specific to the organization's programs and applications.
10. Access will be password protected



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Information Sharing

**DATE:** October 11, 2006  
(For the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

Announcements and information provided by persons other than the Staff Coordinator are so noted.

**A) CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION – CONRAD FISKNESS**

At the July Policy Board Meeting, Member Fiskness announced that he would be resigning from the Board effective following the July meeting. Following the meeting, a Certificate of Appreciation (attached), signed by the Chairperson Reinhardt and Vice Chairperson Kordiak, was sent to Member Fiskness. The thank you card received from Member Fiskness is also attached.

**B) TESTIMONIAL – U OF M**

Prof. Shashi Shekhar with the Computer Sciences Department at the University of Minnesota, noted during his presentation to the Policy Board in April that access to standardized data for the region, made available through MetroGIS's efforts, is very important to reaping the full benefit from the use of the emergency management application that he demonstrated to the Board. In response, staff followed up with him about participating in a testimonial to this effect. Jeanne Landkamer, who has conducted each of the other testimonial interviews for MetroGIS, conducted the interview and expects to complete testimonial document by the week of October 23.

**C) PRESENTATIONS / OUTREACH / STUDIES (not mentioned elsewhere)**

**1. Articles Submitted for the Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium Newsletter**

An article about the June 1 Imagining Possibilities Forum ("Imagining Possibilities" Forum Generates "Big Ideas") was submitted to GIS/LIS for their fall newsletter. Readers were encouraged to review the forum summary document at <http://www.metrogis.org/specialevents/techpossibilities/index.shtml>.

**2. Presentations**

Mn GIS/LIS Conference: Two presentations on MetroGIS activities were made - Emergency Management and Address Standards.

**D) RELATED METRO AND STATE GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE**

**1. 2006 Polaris Award Recipients Have Made Contributions to MetroGIS**

Chris Cialek (LMIC), Joella Givens (MnDOT and member of Coordinating Committee), and Steve Lime (DNR) received the mid-career Polaris Leadership Awards at the 2006 State GIS/LIS Conference October 4-6.

Marvin Bauer will also be achieving the Lifetime Achievement Award. He has worked with the Metropolitan Council on land cover mapping (a common information need of the MetroGIS community).

See the GIS/LIS Newsletter at

<http://www.mngislis.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=69>) for more information about the projects and awards.

**2. FGDC Funds Local Mapping Efforts**

*(Submitted by Randy Knippel, Dakota County)*

The Federal Geographic Data Committee awarded a \$75,000 grant to a collaborative represented by Richland County, North Dakota, the State of North Dakota, Dakota County, Minnesota, and the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District of Minnesota. The scope of this project aims at improving the ability of local government agencies to deliver enhanced public access to GIS data through the development of client applications providing a consistent look and feel across multiple agencies and jurisdictions.

**These development efforts center on providing public users greater access to data from multiple agencies without the need to use complex technologies or presentation techniques** making it easier for the general public to understand and use framework data.

Perhaps the greatest benefit of collaborative client application development comes in the form of cost savings. Costs of developing entity specific web-based GIS applications diminish greatly when leveraging the power of the open source model and the collaborative commitments of multiple jurisdictions and agencies at all levels. Also, costs to the end-user diminish when product design and development occurs through the collective efforts of others utilizing the Open Source model, freely distributed to all.. For more information go to <http://www.openmnd.org/>

### **3. Minnesota Uses Grant to Further Develop GIS Strategic Plan**

*(Submitted by Fred Logman, Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis)*

Minnesota received a \$50,000 grant from the Federal Geographic Data Committee to assist the state develop a strategic and business plan in support of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) Future Directions Fifty States Initiative. The National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) has partnered with the FGDC in this program and provides a brochure describing the program and what is needed in each state for success: [http://www.nsgic.org/hottopics/50states\\_initiative\\_handout.pdf](http://www.nsgic.org/hottopics/50states_initiative_handout.pdf). Ten other states received similar grants: Connecticut, Louisiana, Maryland, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The Minnesota geospatial community has a long tradition of cooperation, reflected in more than thirty years of accomplishments involving the development, distribution, and dissemination of digital geospatial data based upon common needs and adopted standards that support the NSDI. In 2004, Minnesota formally adopted [Foundation for Coordinated GIS, Minnesota's Spatial Data Infrastructure](#), a plan for coordinating GI technology to support organizations working within the state. The 2004 plan included recommendations addressing policies, procedures and governance issues that support enterprise solutions.

This project supports the next steps required to develop a sustainable Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure (MSDI), strengthening coordination within the state while supporting the national goals of the NSDI. The goal of this project is to generate a strategic plan for state geospatial services focusing on organizational and operational recommendations. While focusing on Minnesota's executive branch agencies, the plan will also ensure that the needs of the larger Minnesota geospatial community are addressed.

Several areas that will be examined include: establishing a state "geospatial authority," creating an enterprise geospatial organizational structure and governance model, identifying sustainable funding, updating framework data plans, as well as better integrating state geospatial and traditional IT technologies. The plan and project recommendations will be based on information acquired from interviews, studies and facilitated sessions with stakeholders.

The Land Management Information Center (LMIC) is conducting the project, and the project leader is Fred Logman, who has been active in the Minnesota IT and geospatial community for many years. The Governor's Council on Geographic Information, through its Strategic Plan Committee, will actively participate in the one-year project that started in March.

For further information, please contact Fred Logman at: [fred.logman@state.mn.us](mailto:fred.logman@state.mn.us) or 651-201-2495.

**E) RELATED FEDERAL/NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE**

**1. 2007 NSDI CAP Funding Program**

Announcement for the 2007 program is tentatively proposed to be posted at [www.grants.org](http://www.grants.org) on October 20, 2006. The application deadline is tentatively proposed for January 19, 2007 with announcement of awards on March 1, 2007. Staff is considering submitting an application under a new category entitled "Geospatial Line of Business" for the pending MetroGIS's Performance Measurement Plan initiative. MetroGIS's current Plan has been recognized as being among the best for Spatial Data Infrastructure interests in a recent study conducted by Kate Lance, who is a PhD candidate at a University in the Netherlands (see Item E1, below, for more information on this study). Ms. Lance is interested in collaborating with MetroGIS on the grant proposal.

**2 Blue Book – NSDI Build Out**

At the June 1 Imagining Possibilities Forum, Clint Brown, Director of New Product Release for ESRI [Environmental Systems Research Institute], encouraged MetroGIS to review the "Blue Book" on building out the NSDI. The URL is [http://gos2.geodata.gov/wps/portal/gos/kcxml/04\\_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y\\_QjzKL9443sfQA SYGYfpb6kehCFhhCJpZeEDFHC1N9X4\\_83FR9b\\_0A\\_YLc0NCIckdFAEzL9Gs!/delta/base64xml/L3dJdyEvUUd3QndNQSEvNEIVRS82X0tfQTg1](http://gos2.geodata.gov/wps/portal/gos/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QjzKL9443sfQA SYGYfpb6kehCFhhCJpZeEDFHC1N9X4_83FR9b_0A_YLc0NCIckdFAEzL9Gs!/delta/base64xml/L3dJdyEvUUd3QndNQSEvNEIVRS82X0tfQTg1). The document contains several hundred pages divided into several sections: Introduction, six case studies, 13 data-specific theme chapters, design pattern and data-theme specifications, and Summary and Recommendations. The Introduction focused on technical aspects of collaboration but is essentially silent on organizational structure needed to actually achieve and sustain collaborative support of required custodial roles and responsibilities. The Staff Coordinator intends to review the entire document for relevance to MetroGIS's Business Planning process that will launch following the Strategic Directions Workshop (Agenda Item 5d).

**3. NSGIC Promotes Fifty States Initiative**

NSGIC (National States Geographic Information Councils) is holding its annual meeting in Little Rock, October 1-5. Big issue continues to be its "Fifty States Initiative" wherein each state has a strong coordination office. Federal agencies would be required to communicate with that office regarding GIS activities within the state. Minnesota has some of the necessary elements, but no designated office. A strategic planning initiative (Item 3C above) is underway to address this need.

**4. DHS Contracts With ESRI for First Responder Training**

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has entered into a contract with ESRI to provide geographic information system (GIS) software and training to first responders through the Commercial Equipment Direct Acquisition Program (CEDAP). The intent of the CEDAP program is to provide necessary equipment to rural or smaller first responder agencies including law enforcement agencies, fire, and other emergency responders who demonstrate in their application that the equipment will be used to improve their ability and capacity to respond to a major critical incident or improve their ability to work with other first responders. ESRI's CEDAP GIS software and training package consists of two products: ArcGIS ArcView 9.x, ArcGIS Spatial Analyst, and two related Virtual Campus training courses.

**5. Address Data Standard in Second Review Phase**

The MetroGIS Address Workgroup's efforts to define a data standard for a regional Occupiable Units Address Dataset has played a substantial role in the national street address data standard that is being developed through the URISA (Urban and Regional Information Systems Association) under the auspices of the FGDC (Federal Geographic Data Committee). Supporting organizations are NENA (National Emergency Numbers Association) and the U.S. Census Bureau. The national standard completed its second review period in January. Mark Kotz, staff to the MetroGIS Workgroup, has participated on the development team for the content portion of the national standard. Kotz monitored the national discussion and comments from the second review period. In conjunction with

the Address Workgroup, Kotz proposed some minor modifications to the standard. These changes are being accepted and will be incorporated in the next draft.

The national street address data standard consists of four parts: content, classification, quality, and transfer. The standard is expected to have been adopted by the FGDC by the time the Policy Board meets in October, after which it will be made available for a broader FGDC national review. This standard will be used with the proposed regional occupiable units address dataset and the E-911 compatible street centerlines dataset. Specific E-911 and USPS profiles of the standard are under consideration. *(Submitted by Mark Kotz)*

**F) OTHER INFORMATION**

**1. MetroGIS Performance Measurement Plan Recognized**

Kate Lance, who is a PhD candidate at the International Institute for Geo-Information Sciences and Earth Observation (ITC) and Wageningen University in the Netherlands, has recognized MetroGIS's Performance Measurement Plan in research she conducted as an exemplar example among the an international field of Spatial Data Infrastructure programs. Several concepts presented in her paper from other programs and related research are worth considering as potential enhancements of MetroGIS's current measurement criteria.

MetroGIS's proposed 2007 Workplan (Agenda Item 5b) calls of updating of MetroGIS's Performance Measurement Plan following the update of the Business Plan to insure that Performance Measurement Plan reflects policies set forth in the new Business Plan. Staff has extended an invitation to Ms. Lance to participate in the process and she has expressed interest in doing so.

**2. Ian Masser and MetroGIS Staff Coordinator Collaborate on Article**

Following the June 1 "Imagining Possibilities" Forum, at which Ian Masser served as one of the keynote speakers, he invited the MetroGIS Staff Coordinator to co-author an article about MetroGIS. The article was published in European GeoInformatics Magazine (<http://www.geoinformatics.com/asp/default.asp?language=1>) in July.

Quote from Ian Masser to the editor of the GeoInformatics Magazine after returning from the June 1 Forum – "...I found the MetroGIS collaborative SDI (Spatial Data Infrastructure) set up quite fascinating and think that it deserves more exposure to a European audience. During my visit I was fortunate in having the opportunity to talk at some length to the politicians who have backed this project for its last ten years and also to other participants in this initiative which has won several awards in the US." Masser was particularly interested in learning about the leadership role elected officials on the Policy Board have played in providing a political reality check and establishing political legitimacy for MetroGIS's efforts.

**3. Beyond Spatial Data Infrastructures International Workshop at the GIScience 2006**

This Workshop was held on September 20<sup>th</sup> in Germany. The theme is "What might Spatial Data Infrastructures (SDI) look like in 2016?" The workshop format involved answering this question from the perspective of three distinct three scenarios:

- *As-is-scenario*: Scientific and political efforts to get SDI established succeeded only in part. Clearly geodata is better documented, some metadata and web maps are accessible and you can also download some XML encoded topographic and remote sensing data. However integration of spatial information e.g. for environmental impact assessments is still a nightmare: you suffer from a plethora of licensing policies, schematic and semantic mismatches and tedious pre-processing for your analysis tasks.
- *Positive-Integration-Scenario*: SDI is woven into mainstream GRID and Semantic Web technology. Smart agents arrange a chain of services according to the workflow you described to support your spatial analysis tasks. Clearly data is plenty, easy to find and accessible by all without restrictions at the point of use. GEOSS provide the overall framework to link SDIs from and into various application domains and makes it an integral part of e-government. The different SDI business models have converged and now provide millions of jobs in the private and voluntary sectors creating value added services, as well as

allowing NGOs and citizen groups to exercise their democratic right to scrutinize and hold governments to account.

- *Negative-Integration-Scenario*: Technology integration has moved even further than Scenario 2, incorporating SDIs, GMES, Digital Earth and GEOSS, as well as the systems of the major industrial players into the Echelon surveillance system. The increased focus on security in the early 21st century has led to a tightening of data access rights and much greater control of every form of electronic communication. Liberal ideas about freedom of information and data privacy have fortunately been shed in the light of terrorist concerns, and SDIs are now recognized for their true value: i.e. the ability to track the location of every individual at all times.

Staff hopes the proceedings will be available for review prior to the hosting MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop, as there appears to be substantial overlap with MetroGIS's situation. For more information see <http://sdi.jrc.it/ws/BeyondSDI>.

**F) MEETING SUMMARY – SEPTEMBER 13<sup>TH</sup> COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING**

The meeting summary for the Committee's September 13, 2006 meeting can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/index.shtml#agendas\\_minutes](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/index.shtml#agendas_minutes)



# CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

presented to

## Conrad Fiskness

### **Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts**

Thank you for your invaluable contributions and leadership to the development and realization of the MetroGIS vision. You distinguished yourself as a willing and active participant and a charter member of the MetroGIS Policy Board from January 1997 to July 2006.

Your dedication to acceptance of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology as a standard business tool of government has helped to bring together the vast MetroGIS stakeholder community to improve the way we share and use geospatial information.

On behalf of the MetroGIS community, thank you for your valued contributions and we wish you the best in your next endeavors.

*July 2006*

---

**Victoria Reinhardt, Chair**  
MetroGIS Policy Board and  
Ramsey County Commissioner

---

**Jim Kordiak, Vice-Chair**  
MetroGIS Policy Board and  
Anoka County Commissioner

August 2016

Dear Randy

Please pass on my thanks for the Certificate of Appreciation to Chair Victoria Reinhardt, Vice Chair Jim Kordiak and all the members of the Policy Board.

I truly appreciate being recognized with this certificate and it brings closure to an enjoyable and informative almost ten years.  
I take great pleasure in having been a part of a very unique and valuable endeavor.  
Thanks again! Conrad Fiskness