

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Metropolitan Counties Government Center
2099 University Avenue, St. Paul
July 21, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

Members Present: Terry Schneider (Metro Cities - City of Minnetonka), Steve Elkins (Metro Cities – City of Bloomington), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Jim Bunning for Joseph Wagner (Scott County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Roger Lake (Metro Watershed Districts), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES), Randy Maluchnik (Carver County), Tom Egan (Dakota County), and Randy Johnson (Hennepin County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Nancy Read, Jim Bunning, Peter Henschel

Support Team: Randall Johnson and Mark Kotz (Chair MnGeo Geospatial Commons and MetroGIS Address Workgroups)

Visitors: Dave Hinrichs (Metropolitan Council)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Elkins moved and Member Reinhardt seconded to approve the agenda, as proposed. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Alt. Member O'Rourke moved and Member Elkins seconded to approve the April 21, 2010 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Jim Bunning, GIS Manager for Scott County, and Peter Henschel, GIS Supervisor for Carver County, shared ways in which Carver, Dakota, and Scott Counties are partnering to deal with shared geospatial related needs, which include: sharing staff and resources, using web-based collaboration tools (e.g., SharePoint), developing shared data and map standards the create common look and feel among their web applications, build applications one and share them (e.g. property information search). It was noted funding for some of the application development work related to trails and parks data was received via the SHIP grant program.

Following the presentation, several questions were asked including:

- Do the seven county GIS managers regularly share information? Yes
- Is the aerial imagery temporal comparison function (SWIPE) being promoted? This function is relatively new but all concurred that the ability to do heads-up comparison of imagery for a select location for multiple time frames has enormous potential for a wide variety of interests.

Click here to view the presentation slides.

5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Elect Officers

Chairperson Schneider commented that both he and Vice Chairperson Egan are willing to accept reappointment if that is the wish of the Board.

Motion: Member Pistilli moved and Member Kordiak seconded to reelect Members Schneider and Egan to continue to serve in their current Chairperson and Vice Chairperson roles until April 2011. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) Minnesota Geospatial Commons – Test Implementation

Mark Kotz summarized the proposed Minnesota Geospatial Commons – Test Implementation project. He emphasized that the term “commons” was deliberately selected to convey the intention that the proposed geospatial commons is where one shares, not just accesses, geospatial data, services, applications and best practices. He then summarized four major functions to be provided by the commons: find; evaluate usefulness; share data, services, applications and best practices; and performance of administration functions for the commons. Kotz then summarized key points about the proposed test implementation including 300 hours of time having been committed by sponsoring organizations to administer the test, MnGeo will host the commons, and the goal is to have a demonstration in place for the fall GIS/LIS Conference. Kotz then asked the Board for its endorsement of the proposed test implementation. ([Click here](#) to view Kotz’s presentation slides.)

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Reinhardt seconded that the Policy Board endorse the proposed Minnesota Geospatial Commons – Test Implementation project. Motion carried, ayes all.

Chairperson Schneider thanked Kotz for his ability to communicate highly technical topics in a manner that makes sense to policy makers (the why, who, cost, and benefits).

c) Next Generation Needs Assessment

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized a proposal for a next generation needs assessment and invited the members to offer ideas for any topics that should be added or subtracted from the preliminary scope that is presented in the agenda report.

Chairperson Schneider commented that the Twin Cities environment 13 years ago when the last comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, was very different from the situation we find ourselves in today. This next generation effort will need to seek opportunities to interact/ collaborate with other interests – “if you do this, we can do that”. Opportunities that cross the boundary between public and non-public interests also need to be a focus of the assessment.

Member Pistilli asked if the Quantify Public Value (QPV) Study will be coordinated with this next generation needs assessment. The Staff Coordinator commented that the two efforts are seeking similar information regarding cross-sector partnership opportunities that have the potential to create public value and that the RFP for the proposed needs assessment will inform the prospective proposers of this fact and call attention for the need to coordinate and leverage the work of each by the other.

Motion: Member Pistilli moved and Member Elkins seconded to that the Policy Board ratify the Coordinating Committee’s recommendation to pursue a next-generation needs assessment with a scope as described in the agenda report and with a target of April 2011 to present the results to the Board.

Motion carried, ayes all.

d) Ratify 2010 Work Plan / Budget Refinements

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized proposed revisions to the 2010 work plan and budget outlined in the agenda report. Each of five new projects, which involve a combined \$57,000 in project funding, was also briefly explained.

In response to the proposed project involving a pilot to test the proposed Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Standard, Member Kordiak asked if knowing where all of the catch basins are located in the Twin Cities is really necessary, to which Read responded “yes” for treating mosquitoes and responding to spills. Chairperson Schneider commented that managing stormwater is a major concern of cities and that he is pleased that the Committee elected to advance it. He continued by noting that cities are being mandated to understand the entire drainage system that serves their

communities, monitor them for anomalies, and to effectively address anomalies in a timely manner. Standardized data is essential to addressing his business need.

Chairperson Schneider further commented that he encourages use of a “scalable RFP”, in which subsequent phases are explained, - examples of this leads to this and this leads to this – and to communicate the idea earlier on for both the consultants and prospective partners that if additional resources are brought to the project the type of additional progress that could be made. In addition to setting this expectation in RFP, he suggested that drafting of letters to prospective sponsors should also be pursued to proactively invite them to engage – if additional resources were to be contributed, this is what we could do.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Pistilli seconded that the Policy Board approve revisions to 2010 MetroGIS Work Plan and \$57,000 “foster collaboration” budget, as presented in the Attachments A and B to the addendum agenda report, dated July 20, 2010, subject to the addressing the comments offered therein regarding the Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Standard Pilot.

Motion carried, ayes all.

e) **Quantify Public Value (QPV) Project Update**

Staff Coordinator Johnson introduced the presentation noting that it was initially created for a presentation requested by the Hennepin County GIS Users group on July 28. He also mentioned that the study idea was conceived during a conversation with Hennepin County Commissioner Johnson while attending a NGAC meeting and that once the idea was conceived contact was made with the FDGC to create a grant funding category for such a project. The category was created for the 2010 grant cycle and our proposal was selected for funding. [Click here](#) to view his presentation slides.

Chairperson Schneider concurred that a key to the success of the study will be to achieve trust among the interests that model is designed to serve. Johnson concurred, noting that the study design calls for use of a broadly participatory process which is intended to build the trust needed for acceptance of the model. Johnson also reiterated that the purpose of this study is to create a prototype and that repeated use of the model will be important to further refine it for use beyond the Twin Cities.

No action was requested of the Board other than to suggest any individuals believed to possess expertise that would be helpful as the project progresses. The listing of advisors presented in the agenda report was found to be acceptable.

6. INFORMATION SHARING

No information was offered.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Policy Board is scheduled for Wednesday, October 20, 2010.

8. ADJOURN

Member Elkins moved and Member Reinhardt seconded to adjourn at 7:50 p.m.

Motion carried, ayes all.