

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Policy Board**  
**Metropolitan Counties Government Center**  
**2099 University Avenue, St. Paul**  
**January 27, 2010**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

Members Present: Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES), Randy Knippel for Tom Egan (Dakota County), Steve Elkins (Metro Cities – City of Bloomington), Randy Maluchnik (Carver County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Roger Lake (Metro Watershed Districts), Gary Swenson for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Molly O’Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Dave Hinrichs for Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council) and Terry Schneider (Metro Cities - City of Minnetonka). Coordinating Committee Chairperson Sally Wakefield attended in the capacity of a non-voting, ExOfficio member.

Members Absent: Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County) and Joseph Wagner (Scott County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Jim Bunning, Rick Gelbmann, Randy Knippel, Tim Loesch, Nancy Read, Mark Vander Schaaf, Sally Wakefield, and Vice Chairperson Peter Henschel.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

Visitors: Will Craig ( U of M CURA), David Arbeit (MNGeo), Lezlie Vermillion Scott County Deputy Administrator and Public Works Division Director, and Marilyn McCarter, Scott County CIO.

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

Member Kordiak moved and Alternate Member Hinrichs seconded to approve the agenda, as proposed. Motion carried, ayes all.

**3. MEETING SUMMARY**

Member Kordiak moved and Alternate Member Hinrichs seconded to approve the October 14, 2009 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION**

*How Use of Shared Web Services is Improving Organizational Efficiencies* was the topic of the demonstration. Chairperson Schneider informed the members this demonstration was developed in part of provide context for Agenda Item 5a.

Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (MMCD) Technical Manager and member of the Coordinating Committee, introduced the topic by explaining what a web service is by using the example of the regional geocoding service that was developed under her direction as a MetroGIS funded project and the subject of Agenda Item 5a. Her explanation included the importance of the types of data (parcels, street centerlines, landmarks, and the pending address points dataset) and their characteristics to the ability of the geocoding service to return accurate map coordinates for addresses processed by the service. Read also acknowledged that when the Policy Board authorized MetroGIS funding to add a landmark extension to the regional geocoder functionality that Board members had raised questions as to which landmark database would be appropriate. She then showed map-based examples of the pros and cons of several of the best landmark data options and shared that the Geocoder Service Workgroup had concluded that the best option was the Landmark component of the NCompass Street Centerline Dataset. It was also noted that the Workgroup is considering teaming up with individuals associated with Open Street Map to explore options to improve the quality of landmark data. Chairperson Schneider asked if it would be possible to create a filter to allow the best aspects of multiple sources to be leveraged. Read responded that all options on the table but reiterated that the service is providing value under the current setup.

Read concluded her remarks by noting that as a result of the availability of the regional geocoding service, MMCD has greatly improved efficiencies related to processing of information received by phone

from the public. She offered that updating the regional parcel dataset more frequently than quarterly could further improve the efficiency of the service and that the workgroup is investigating a way to effectively inform users when programming changes are made to the code that operates the geocoder service. [Click here](#) to view Ms. Read's presentation slides.

Jim Bunning, Scott County GIS Manager and member of the Coordinating Committee, demonstrated a crime mapping application used by Scott County officials that incorporates the regional geocoding service explained by Ms. Read. The purpose of his demonstration was to help Policy Board members gain a better understanding of MetroGIS's objective to act on the motto build once and use by many. [Click here](#) to view Mr. Bunning presentation slides. Tim Loesch, DNR GIS Manager and member of the Coordinating Committee, closed the demonstration with a general overview of how web services are an essential component of DNR's geospatial technology enterprise. He showed a few examples of how use of web services is greatly improving efficiencies related to data acquisition and management. [Click here](#) to view Mr. Loesch's presentation slides.

## 5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

### a) **Geocoder Service Enhancements – Accept Final Reports**

Coordinating Committee Chair Wakefield explained that the Coordinating Committee had recommended acceptance of the final project reports, as presented in the agenda report.

Member Kordiak asked about the significance of approving these final reports. Staff Coordinator Johnson explained that submission of a final project report is a requirement of the funding that MetroGIS provided for each project. These reports document the projects, what worked, what could be improved upon, and document recommendations for future action to resolve issues and or opportunities identified during these projects.

**Motion:** Member Kordiak moved and Member Cook seconded to accept the final project reports for enhancements made to the MetroGIS Geocoder Service that are presented in Attachments C (Landmark Extension) and D (Improve Performance with Local Data) , as recommended by the Coordinating Committee.

Motion carried, ayes all.

### b) **Accomplishments in 2009**

Staff Coordinator Johnson introduced the topic by commenting that from time questions have been raised that go to the big picture of MetroGIS's purpose, major functions, and major accomplishments. In response, he touched on each of these topics in a [presentation](#) to provide context for both the report to the Policy Board on accomplishment in 2009 (Item 5b) and the report for the recommended 2010 work plan and budget (Item 5c).

Johnson's concluded his comments with a brief summary of the major accomplishment during 2009, obstacles that had been encountered and remedial action that had been/was being pursued to address them. Chairperson Schneider commented that as MetroGIS's efforts have transitioned from a focus strictly on shared data needs to also addressing shared application needs that chances are better that one's ability to comprehend how they might be able to leverage collaborative solutions to accomplish more with less. He concluded his comment by stating that he is confident that solutions accomplished through MetroGIS's effort will get a lot more attention given the realities of the financial environment that we all have to deal with.

**Motion:** Member Kordiak moved and Member Elkins seconded to:

- 1) Accept the listing below of MetroGIS's major accomplishments during 2009.
- 2) Recognize that the Technical Leadership Workgroup has performed an extremely valuable service over the past year but cannot be expected to function at the level expected of dedicated support.

Motion carried, ayes all.

There was no discussion of Recommendation 3 from the Coordinating Committee other than Chairperson Schneider encouraged the members to think about ways to help the Coordinating Committee overcome technical support limitations needed to expedite priority projects important to maintaining relevancy to changing stakeholder needs.

**c) Budget/Objectives for 2010**

Coordinating Committee Chair Wakefield reported that the Coordinating Committee had recommended the Board's approval of the 2010 work program and budget as presented in the agenda report. Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the major program objectives for 2010 noting that they are the same as preliminary accepted at the October 2009 meeting with the exception that achieving a Next Generation Street Centerline Data Access Agreement has been added because the agreement reached in 2009 was only for 1 year. He also reported that the budget was the same as preliminary approved by the Board in October. There were no questions.

**Motion:** Member Kordiak moved and Member Elkins seconded to that the Policy Board:

- 1) Approve the 2010 program objectives presented in Attachment A of the agenda report
- 2) Approve the 2010 "Foster Collaboration" budget presented in Attachment B of the agenda report.
- 3) Agree to reevaluate the 2010 budget and work plan by mid- year if dedicated supplemental technical support resources, consistent with the work program needs, are not able to be secured.

Motion carried, ayes all.

**d) Regional Policy Statement – Socioeconomic Web Resources Page**

Will Craig, recently retired member of the Coordinating Committee, introduced himself and commented that he had chaired the workgroup that developed the MetroGIS Socioeconomic Web Resources Page that launched in 2004 and that he had recently guiding a significant upgrade to the site to integrate new data resources, in particular, private data sources.

At this point, Chairperson Schneider interrupted Mr. Craig's presentation to present him with a Certificate of Appreciation for his service as a active member of MetroGIS Coordinating Committee from its creation in February 1996 until September 2009 when he resigned to given another the allow opportunity to serve. Following a round of applause and thank you comments, Craig demonstrated how one can use the Socioeconomic Web Resources Page to discover and access data, how the site is integrated with DataFinder, and properties of data sources that were added over past year as part of the grant received from the University's Transportation Center in conjunction with a research related to light rail. He concluded his remarks by explaining the changes proposed to the Regional Policy Statement that governs the Socioeconomic Web Resources Page and confirmed that the U of M Population Center remains committed to managing the web site content.

Chairperson Schneider concurred with the recommended changes to Regional Policy Statement, given that content management of site implies an evolutionary process to update (keep current) and expand data source listings as new data become available/are discovered.

**Motion:** Alternate Member O'Rourke moved and Member Elkins seconded to that the MetroGIS Policy Board:

- 1) Concur with the Coordinating Committee's finding that as the Socioeconomic Web Resources Page now includes data that was originally intended to be part of a Phase II effort, and the University of Minnesota Population Center (designated custodian) is committed to continuing to monitor opportunities to improve upon the resources searchable – public and private, that the Phase I label and related language should be officially removed from the Regional Policy Statement, as illustrated in Attachment A of the agenda report.
- 2) The members, if not currently aware, are encouraged to become familiar with the Socioeconomic Web Resources Page and encourage broader use via their respective interest groups.

Motion carried, ayes all.

**e) Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council (MGAC) – Summary 1st Meeting**

Chairperson Schneider introduced this topic by calling to the Board’s attention that several of its members had been appointed to the newly created Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council (MGAC), one of two Councils that advise the Mn Chief Geographic Information Officer. He then introduced David Arbeit, Mn Chief Geographic Information Officer and member of the Coordinating Committee, to summarize events that led to the creation of the Mn Office of Geographic Information (MnGeo) in May of 2009, which he directs, its mission, its structure, and his general expectations for how it will function. He concluded his introductory comments by noting that there is now a home for several issues with which MetroGIS has grappled and which have ramifications broader than the metro area. He also stated that lessons learned through MetroGIS’s efforts can and will be leveraged, encouraged MetroGIS representatives to call attention to issues and opportunities that MnGeo should be paying attention, and reported that among the first actions of the MGAC was approval of a letter of support for a 2010 federal grant proposal from the MetroGIS community. Staff Coordinator Johnson provided a brief summary of the proposal (see [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/10\\_0127/InfoShared.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/10_0127/InfoShared.pdf)).

Following Arbeit’s comments, Chairperson Schneider commented that MetroGIS is well represented on the MGAC with 6 out of the 23 members and that former MetroGIS Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt has agreed to serve as the first chairperson of the MGAC.

Alternate member Knippel asked Mr. Arbeit to explain the major differences between MnGeo and LMIC and between the Governor’s Council on Geographic Information (CGGI) and the MGAC. His response was as follows:

|  | <u>Then</u>                | <u>Now</u>                            |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|  | <u>LMIC</u>                | <u>MnGeo</u>                          |
| Legislative Mandate:                   | No                         | Yes                                   |
| Authority to Act                       | None                       | Yes                                   |
| Formal budgetary status                | No                         | Yes                                   |
| Influence Legislative priority setting | No                         | Yes                                   |
|  | <u>CGGI</u>                | <u>MGAC</u>                           |
|  | Existed by Executive Order | Created by Statute                    |
| Budget                                 | No                         | Yes                                   |
| Formal Coordination Role               | No                         | Yes (mandate with several of “musts”) |

Arbeit closed by stating he believes that the existence of MnGeo, together with MGAC, create a platform from which to effectively advocate for Legislative initiatives. He also mentioned that Legislators are now more aware of the value of using geospatial technology and have becoming more map savvy.

Chairperson Schneider closed the discussion with a comment that believes the progress can be made to effective deal with geospatial coordination issues and opportunities issues for three major reasons:

- There is a better understanding of the need to and value of collaborating
- Advancements in technology
- Evolution of understanding in the Legislature of the value what can be accomplished with geospatial technology.

No changes were offered to the geospatial needs/opportunities cited by the Coordinating Committee that it believes are more appropriately addressed at the state level. The members of Policy Board, who are also members of MnGeo Statewide Advisory Council, agreed to pass these needs to the full Statewide Geospatial Coordinating Council for consideration.

**f) Suggestions for Consideration by MGAC/MnGeo**

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Wakefield summarized the five topics listed in the agenda report that the Coordinating Committee had identified to pass along for consideration by the MGAC. David Arbeit, Mn Chief Geographic Information Officer authority to who the MGAC provides advise, explained that 4 of the 5 topics are currently being worked on by MnGeo associated committees and workgroups. He agreed to make sure that MetroGIS leadership is apprised of these efforts. He conceded that the topic – Access to Licensed Data (publicly and privately-produced) by Emergency Responders” is not currently being worked on. Member Kordiak moved and Alternate Member Hinrichs seconded to ask the members of MetroGIS leadership, who are also members of the MGAC, to pass along for consideration by the full MGAC the five topics presented in the agenda report entitled “Suggestions for Consideration by MGAC/MnGeo, dated January 7, 2010.

Motion carried, ayes all.

**g) Modify remainder of 2010 Meeting Dates**

Member Kordiak introduced the request to amend the meeting dates for the remainder of 2010.

Member Elkins moved and Alternate Member Swenson seconded to amend the Policy Board’s 2010 meeting schedule to meet one week prior to the previously set dates but continue to meet on Wednesday evenings: April 21, July 21 and October 20:

Motion carried, ayes all.

**6. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Policy Board is scheduled for Wednesday April 21, 2010.

**7. ADJOURN**

Member Elkins moved and Alternate Member Swenson seconded to adjourn at 8:12 p.m.

Motion carried, ayes all.

Prepared by:  
Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator