

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
July 28, 2004**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Kordiak called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Members Present: Gary Delaney (Carver County), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), William Brown for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County); Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Mark Vander Schaaf for Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Patrice Bataglia (Dakota County), Chairperson Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Bob Vogel (Scott County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), and Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Claypool, Dave Drealan, Rick Gelbmann, Chet Harrison, and Randy Knippel.

Visitors: Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville) and Scott Simmer (Hennepin County)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Mark Kotz, and Steve Fester

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The meeting agenda was accepted as submitted.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Fiskness moved and Member Schneider seconded to accept the April 28, 2004 meeting summary as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Dennis Welsch, Community Development for the City of Roseville, shared with the Board how the City of Roseville is using GIS technology and address/household-based socioeconomic data to support policy making and operations for a wide variety of services, involving voting precincts, recycling, fire and ambulance services, police and 911 activities, neighborhood watch groups, notification of AM and PM populations in the event of hazardous material spills and natural disasters, leaf pick up, tornado drills, transit planning, park programming, and in general targeting various populations (e.g., senior citizens).

Roseville has invested in developing and maintaining socioeconomic data at a higher level of accuracy than available with U.S. Census data. The result is they are able to more accurately project population, housing, and labor force trends that are extremely important to managing school district, as well as, city operations.

Mr. Welsch commented that access to sound information requires an investment. In addition, if this information is shared with a host of users, including vendors and non-profits, new and important ways to effectively use the information can be discovered as well as partnerships formed to share costs. He closed his comments by stating that when data sharing is absent, pseudo bases are created that hinder valuable synergies present in a collaborative environment. As such, he encouraged MetroGIS to continue its efforts to work on a regional solution(s) to priority Socioeconomic Information Needs and consider demographic database management on a regional scale. (A PDF version of Mr. Welsch's PowerPoint presentation can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/072804/demo.pdf>.)

Member Schneider concurred that a common language related to socioeconomic data is a key to success when so many entities are involved and that maintaining current data is important considering it is ever changing. In response to the currency comment, Mr. Welsch noted that their target is to maintain data that are not more than 18 months old to meet the requirements for area school district operations.

Vander Schaaf commented that the immense volume of data available, together with the numerous combinations, presents a dilemma of where to start and asked for advice regarding a “core” dataset for the MetroGIS community. Welsch recommended using the critical socioeconomic data needs of school districts and cities, the model they adopted. He further noted that there is a direct link between these two sets of needs. He also stated that a strong fiscal justification for basing the “core” on school district data needs is that over 50% of the property tax dollar goes to school districts, so a noticeable impact is likely from efficiencies gained. Welsch closed by stating that Roseville’s current socioeconomic data model involves maintaining 24 data attributes for each household and that with this information they have been able to support all of the activities mentioned and more.

Mr. Welsch was thanked for his presentation. The Staff Coordinating then commented that later this fall or early in 2005, Phase II of MetroGIS’s effort to address common Socioeconomic Information Needs is expected to begin. The Phase II start is to begin once the MetroGIS Address Workgroup completes its efforts that are relevant to maintaining household and business characteristic data at the unit/suite level.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Regional Parcel Dataset : Attribute Enhancement and Expansion

Dave Drealan, Vice-Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee, explained the Committee’s recommendation and introduced Mark Kotz, staff to the Parcel Data Enhancement Workgroup, to explain the process used to arrive at the proposed recommendation and the details of the proposed modifications to the Regional Policy Statement. A copy of Mr. Kotz’s presentation can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/072804/parcels.pdf>

In response to a question from Member O’Rourke, Kotz shared a listing of the individuals who had participated in the forum used to define desired enhancements and their respective affiliations. He explained that no attempt had been made to identify potential users and ask them why they are not using the data as the goal of the forum was to identify desired enhancements from the perspective of the current users. The Staff Coordinator noted that the concept of evaluating why potential users are not using the data warrants further consideration and that he would make a note of it for discussion with the Coordinating Committee.

Vice Chairperson Kordiak and Member Schnieder asked questions to clarify that the decision to populate any particular attribute field would rest with each county and that the funding provided by the proposed agreements is for one-time data extraction programming and is considered adequate by each county. Each of these questions was answered in the affirmative.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the proposed enhancements to the Regional Parcel Dataset, as identified in the Regional Policy Summary Statement included in the agenda materials and dated May 5, 2004, and authorize implementation of the modified policies, effective with the January 2005 update of the dataset. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) Regional Parcel Dataset: View-Only Access Policy For Emergency Preparedness Application

Randy Knippel, Chair of the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, explained the Coordinating Committee’s recommendation that the counties consider authorizing view-only access to the regional parcel dataset via the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Internet application. He also explained that the primary purposes of this application are as an outreach and education tool to help emergency managers better understand how GIS technology can benefit their operations and to aid in building relationships between the GIS and emergency management communities. Knippel also noted that the functionality has

been purposely limited to keep it simple to use. Finally, he stated that Policy Board endorsement of a policy to support view-only access to parcel data via this application would be helpful to point to as specific approval is sought from each county.

Member Schneider expressed support for the application in general but cautioned that if it lacks functionality, it may be counterproductive.

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

- 1) Find that a policy of view-only access to parcel data via the prototype MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources Application has merit for further consideration and refinement as a regional best practice.
- 2) Defer to the seven counties to decide if this policy is appropriate and that the current application provides sufficient protection for their data.
- 3) If the counties acknowledge their approval of this policy via the attached letter or resolution dated May 18, 2004, the Policy Board hereby requests the Metropolitan Council to begin support of this DataFinder-related responsibility upon receiving affirmative acknowledgement from the counties in this regard.
- 4) If the Policy Board elects not to authorize the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources application to move from prototype to operational status by July 28, 2005, this endorsement of view-only access of parcel data via Emergency Preparedness Resources Application shall become null and void, unless renewed by all affected parties.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) MetroGIS Operating Guidelines Modifications

The Staff Coordinator summarized the recommendation by the Coordinating Committee, in the absence of the Committee Chair.

Member O'Rourke moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board approve the modifications to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines, as illustrated in the agenda attachment dated June 24, 2004.

Motion carried, ayes all.

6. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES

a) Next-Generation Data Sharing Agreement / Online Licensing

Vice Chairperson Kordiak asked the Staff Coordinator to summarize the effort to date to achieve agreement. The Staff Coordinator acknowledged the substantial effort of the Dakota and Hennepin County attorneys but also expressed concern that the negotiations are entering their 8th month with issues still outstanding. He commented that unless closure is reached soon, time could expire prior to year end before the agreement can be executed by all parties, which in turn could jeopardize funding provided by the agreement for counties to gear up for the proposed enhancements to the regional parcel dataset (approved earlier in the meeting), not to mention substantively complicating user access to data they need to perform their jobs.

The Staff Coordinator noted that one of issues that had not yet been resolved involves the liability requirements and remedies for any action inconsistent with the rules governing the Council's responsibilities as the distributor/licensor. He commented that to his knowledge this function (redistribution of licensed data for the benefit of the users and the producers - not the entity doing the redistribution) is unprecedented in the country and that, as such, the Council is unwilling to be held liable for damages associated with supporting this function voluntarily in accordance with its role as MetroGIS's primary sponsor. Although there was no vote, none of the Board members disagreed with a remedy that

simply directs ceasing of the subject redistribution function if issues arise and which precluded monetary damages, payment of legal fees, and other typical remedies.

Finally, the Staff Coordinator stated that it is hoped that the parties will be able to resolve the remaining issues at a meeting with the county attorneys on August 4th. Notwithstanding this hope, he asked for direction from the Board in the event agreement can not be reached.

Board members expressed concern that this agreement is not yet in place, given its importance to achieving MetroGIS's vision, and as such, it was agreed that steps need to taken immediately following the August 4th meeting to involve the other counties in the decision-making. Members also concluded that if agreement cannot be reached with all seven counties given the effort that has been made, so be it. All agreed that the primary loser if agreement cannot be reached will be the user community.

Motion: Vice Chairperson Kordiak moved and Member Schneider seconded that if agreement has not been reached by August 10th, or upon recommendation of the Chairperson, that the Staff Coordinator is directed to:

- 1) Forward a proposed agreement to the other five counties for their consideration, along with a cover letter to explain the issues that had not been resolved in the negotiations with the Dakota and Hennepin County attorneys,
- 2) Notify the Policy Board member of the action taken.

Motion carried, ayes all.

b-d) Project Update Items

Given that the meeting had gone past the customary two hours, Vice Chairperson Kordiak encouraged the members to review the remainder of the update information on their own time.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

The members were asked to review the information items presented in the agenda packet on their own.

8. NEXT MEETING

Vice Chairperson Kordiak reminded the members that the next meeting is scheduled for October 27, 2004

9. ADJOURN

Member Fiskness moved and Member Schnieder seconded to adjourn at 8:35 p.m. Motion carried ayes all.

Prepared by,
Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator