

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Metropolitan Counties Government Center
2099 University Avenue, St. Paul
January 18, 2012

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. He asked the newest member, Mjyke Nelson from Washington County, to introduce himself and then asked the others present to do likewise. Member Reinhardt recognized that Molly O'Rourke, who has presented Washington County on the Policy Board for several years, has been appointed to the position of Washington County Administrator earlier in the week.

Members Present: Terry Schneider (Metro Cities - City of Minnetonka), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Mjyke Nelson for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Randy Knippel for Joseph Harris (Dakota County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Jim Bunning for Joseph Wagner (Scott County), Roger Lake (Metro Watershed Districts), and Steve Elkins (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES), Dave Kelso (Metro Cities - City of Circle Pines), Randy Maluchnik (Carver County), and Gary Swenson for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), and,

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Bitner (Chair), David Brandt (Vice Chair), Rick Gelbmann, Francis Harvey, Nancy Read, Mark Vander Schaaf, and Sally Wakefield (immediate past Chair).

Support Team: Randall Johnson and Mark Kotz

Visitors: Professor John Bryson (U of M) and Dave Hinrichs (Metropolitan Council)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

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

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Reinhardt moved and Alternate Member Bunning seconded to approve the Policy Board's October 19, 2011 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Findings: Defining Values Component of MetroGIS Quantify Public Value Study
Professor John Bryson, University of Minnesota

Staff Coordinator Johnson introduced Professor Bryson. He also commented that this study was pursued in response to the Policy Board's directive to seek out partnership to accomplish shared geospatial needs.

Bryson, in his introductory comments, noted that he has long been interested in MetroGIS's work, having facilitated the 1995 strategic planning workshop that launched MetroGIS and the 2007 strategic planning workshop through which the current strategic direction was developed. He noted that given MetroGIS's accomplishments, he included MetroGIS as a case study in the Fourth Addition of his Strategic Planning Book which was published this past November...

He began his presentation by summarizing the research method, which involved five community if practice focus groups and a finals event to which participants in the five individual community of practice focus groups were brought together to affirm areas of commonality. The conclusions, as presented in the agenda report, were summarized in detail. Bryson stressed the findings documented "starting points" for the capabilities required to accomplish the shared goals and interests: accurate

data, accessibility of data, and executive leadership. All acknowledged that these “starting points” are at the core of MetroGIS’s mission.

Bryson concluded his comments by acknowledging that this qualitative study is a good start but further work is needed to attain the ability to quantitatively measure public value created when organizations participate in a geospatial commons. He also cautioned that although the methodology appears to have worked, the results (logic of the word maps) needs to be validated before attempting to draw more detailed conclusions about the links and the statements in word maps (those goals and capabilities between the starting and highest level goals). Within the contest that everything in principle is measurable, Bryson offered that a next step would include defining measures for capabilities the study participants defined as shared.

Chairperson Schneider thanked Professor Bryson for his presentation, commented that good progress through this work to understand how other sectors think, and invited Board members to ask questions of Professor Bryson. A wide-ranging conversation ensued. The following is a listing of the major discussion points:

- Measures:
 - Pursue relative value as opposed to absolute (e.g., value with and without sharing). Consider that costs to one organization might be result in benefits to others (global view as opposed to internal looking).
 - Regarding Executive Leadership. Concept for quantitative measures is not a “dash board” model but rather episodic in nature. People make things happen, who made a difference. Some sort of anchored measure (good – bad) is envisioned.
- Concept for what a measures scheme might look like to assist policy makers decide if they should place assets into the public domain or cost recover:
 - Focus on measures for “capabilities” not “goals” and “interests”. Focusing on capabilities is the actions associated with geospatial community.
 - Think in terms of a balance sheet containing columns, one for each core value. For a particular proposition list benefits at the top of each value column and costs at the bottom of each value column. Dollars may or may not be able to be associated with particular benefits of costs but should nevertheless be listed.
 - Executive leadership to decide if the proposition is worth it.
 - Think of the decision-making process as in terms of a balance beam for intangibles (alignment or non-alignment with values) within the limits set by available funding.
 - Need to get decision makers to think of benefits and costs beyond what can be measured in dollars.
- Basis for Prospective Partnering: We need to be aware of what other organizations value. Chairperson Schneider argued that the completed study provided significant insight into the sought after quantitative model, not in terms of absolute dollar values but in terms of those values that have to be in the mix to achieve a favorable reaction from a prospective partner(s).
- Further Research:
 - Clarify MetroGIS’s purpose for defining values. (*Editor’s note – the purposes for which the subject study was pursued were to: 1) act on the Board’s directive to seek out partners willing to work collaboratively on shared needs and 2) attain a trust means through which to measure public value created when geospatial data are placed into the public domain.*)

Prof. Bryson offered an example that if MetroGIS wished to promote itself as an entity well positioned to accomplish the “starting points” then use a condensed version of the concept map (logic model) produced for this study, convert it a diagram and state “this is what we do to help you get to where you want to go”. **The members concurred that a next step should include** developing a graphic to tell the value story – use of a single graphic was acknowledged to be an effective way to reinforce the message. All agreed that testimonials should also be sought to reinforce the value story.
 - Need to verify the existence of the relationships between the capabilities and goals illustrated in the “word maps” (results of the focus group sessions).

- If a relation exists, verify if the cause / effect is correctly oriented
- Determine the weight / strength of these relationships. Distinguish between primary and lesser importance.

5. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) **Leadership Succession Strategy**

David Bitner, Coordinating Committee Chair and Chair of the Leadership Transition Workgroup, provided context and summarized the desired roles of the Staff Coordinator position recommended by the Coordinating Committee and subsequently acknowledged by the Executive Committee of Policy Board. He also emphasized that the workgroup intends to offer similar recommendations in the coming months for other key MetroGIS leadership roles.

Chairperson Schneider, a member of both the Leadership Succession Workgroup and Executive Committee of the Policy Board, thanked the Coordinating Committee for initiating this important work. He also encouraged the Metropolitan Council to incorporate as many of the identified roles and responsibilities as it can into the position description that will be published shortly.

Motion: Member Reinhardt moved and Alternate member Knippel seconded to: 1) approve the desired roles and responsibilities of the Staff Coordinator position, as presented in the agenda report, and 2) encourage the Metropolitan Council to incorporate them in to the Staff Coordinator's position description. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) **Strategic Communication Objectives**

Nancy Read, member of the MetroGIS Communications Workgroup, introduced the Coordinating Committee's recommendation. In her [presentation](#), she began by explaining how the recommended communication strategy is a comment of the eight strategic objectives defined in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan. She emphasized that responsibility for communication about MetroGIS's objectives and activities is not the sole responsibility of staff but also a responsibility of all who are involved. Read then explained the four strategic objectives upon which to base the pending MetroGIS Communication Plan, offering examples for each of them.

Motion: Member Reinhardt moved and Alternate member Knippel seconded to accept the four strategic communication objectives, as recommended by the Coordinating Committee and presented in the agenda report. Motion carried, ayes all.

c) **2011 Accomplishments**

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the information presented in the agenda report.

d) **2012 Program Objectives and Budget**

David Bitner, Coordinating Committee Chair, summarized the information presented in the agenda report. There was no discussion.

Motion: Member Elkins moved and Member Reinhardt seconded to endorse the 2012 work plan and budget for MetroGIS's "Foster Collaboration" function, as presented in Attachments A and B of the agenda report, and as recommended by the Coordinating Committee. Motion carried, ayes all.

e) **November 29, 2011 Statewide Geographic Advisory Council (MGAC) Meeting.**

Member Reinhardt, who chairs the MGAC, commented that the MGAC met on November 29 following its rechartering this past summer by the Dayton Administration. Reinhardt noted that MetroGIS's accomplishments were offered as an example to demonstrate value that can be created through partnering to address shared interests. She noted that the second class of MGAC members includes several new appointees, including a tribal representative, and that she is excited that the group is interested in exploring partnering relationships. Chairperson Schneider, who is also a member of the MGAC representing MetroGIS, added that he expects that the pending transition in leadership (GIO is retiring) will result in a situation where the MGAC will continue past efforts to build upon the solid alignment with objectives important to the MetroGIS community.

f) Staff Coordinator Retirement

The Policy Board presented Randall Johnson, retiring Staff Coordinator, with an appreciation award commemorating his service with MetroGIS. (It included the MetroGIS logo, dates of his service - August 1995 to February 2012, MetroGIS's mission statement, and a message inscribed on a blue tinted, translucent, diamond-shaped, sculptured body). Chairperson Schneider also presented Johnson with a personal gift of a 1996 National Community Service Commemorative Silver Dollar. Members Reinhardt and Schneider, who have each served on the Policy Board since its inception and the only members to have served as Chair, offered congratulatory comments. Johnson thanked the members of the Board for the opportunity to work with them to make a difference.

6. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES

No questions were asked.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

No questions were asked.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Policy Board is scheduled for Wednesday, April 18, 2012.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Prepared by:
Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator