

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
January 10, 2001**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6.30 p.m.

Members Present: Willis Branning (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Patrick O'Connor alternate for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Terry Schneider (AMM), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Antoinette Johns (TIES), Barbara Johnson (AMM), John Siegfried (Carver County), and Joseph Wagner (Scott County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit (LMIC) Will Craig (Chair), Eli Cooper, Jim Hentges, Ed Shukle, Gary Stevenson, and Ron Wencil.

Visitors: Lee Meilleur (Legislative GIS Office) and Jeanne Landkamer (MetroGIS Communications Consultant)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Hegberg moved and Member Kordiak seconded to accept the agenda, with the following changes: add a new item 5f, Use of Funds Donated to MetroGIS, and move 5a to follow 5f. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY

Member Branning moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the summary of the October 18, 2000 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION – 2000 Census and Redistricting

Lee Meilleur, with the Legislative GIS Office, demonstrated the GIS software (Maptitude) that the Legislature will use to develop its redistricting proposals, using Chairperson Reinhardt's commissioner district, and he summarized the events and deadlines leading up the required adoption of a redistricting plan. Board members discussed the impact of the Legislature's activities on the deadlines for local government redistricting requirements.

Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Supervisor, demonstrated the problems encountered with attempting to align the federal TIGER data with higher accurate parcel and street centerline data available in the seven county metro area. He also demonstrated how these problems have been eliminated or substantially reduced as a result of MetroGIS' Regional Census Geography project. Gelbmann noted that he believes use of the MetroGIS Regional Census Geography dataset, as opposed to the substantially less accurate TIGER data, will aid local units of government more easily define their new precincts and wards and maintain these areas than would be possible using TIGER data. Evaluation of changes in population and development will also be more straightforward when the data elements align with one another.

Member Kordiak questioned aligning census geography boundaries with low accuracy hand digitized street centerline and parcel data, as opposed to using GPS and COGO technologies to establish them. This question led to discussion of MetroGIS' guidelines that parcel data is the foundation data element, that it is the sole decision of each county to determine how accurate of a parcel dataset they want to

maintain which varies from county to county, and that other data that are coterminous in the real world with parcel boundaries are aligned with the parcel data to maintain a high degree of relative accuracy between these data elements. Board members concurred with the rationale that as parcel data accuracy improves relative to the real world, the accuracy of the aligned data also improves but without affecting the high relative accuracy between the data elements.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

b) Regional Dataset – Academic and Non-Profit Access Policy

William Craig, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee and member of the Policy Advisory Team, summarized the considerations and recommendation of the Policy Advisory Team and Coordinating Committee outlined in the agenda materials.

Member Kordiak questioned whether “written acceptance of this policy from each of the seven counties” means Board approval. Staff stated that the intent is for each county to decide on its own whether a letter from a staff member or board action is required. This explanation was acceptable to the members. Staff noted that a sample letter of approval was included in the agenda packet.

Staff also commented that this policy is not intended to go into effect until the regional parcel dataset pilot project concludes. At that time, if the user community concludes that the dataset should continue to be supported, a new agreement between the seven counties and Metropolitan Council will be required if the Council is to continue to aggregate and distribute a regional parcel dataset. The new agreement would be expanded to include academic interests if all seven counties endorse this policy.

Motion: Member Hegberg moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board:

- 1) Endorse a Regional Parcel Dataset access policy that stipulates
 - a) Academic interests will be treated the same as government interests.
 - b) Non-profit interests will be treated the same as for profit interests.
- 2) Direct staff to request written acceptance of this policy from each of the seven counties as the producers of the primary data assembled by the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian, into the Regional Parcel Dataset.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) Regional MCD/Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset – Non-Government Access Policy

William Craig, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee and member of the Policy Advisory Team, summarized the considerations and recommendation of the Policy Advisory Team and Coordinating Committee outlined in the agenda materials.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member O’Connor seconded that the Policy Board:

- 1) Endorse a Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset access policy that stipulates non-government interests will be treated the same as government interests, that is, access to this dataset without fee and without licensure.
- 2) Direct staff to request written acceptance of this policy from each of the seven counties and Mn/DOT as the producers of the primary data assembled by the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian, into the regional dataset.

Motion carried, ayes all.

It was agreed that the method of approval by each county will be the same as agreed to in the previous item.

d) National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) – MetroGIS Best Management Practice

Ron Wencl, member of the Coordinating Committee and liaison to the Technical Advisory Team, summarized the considerations and recommendation of the Technical Advisory Team and Coordinating Committee outlined in the agenda materials.

Member Kordiak asked about impact on his organization if the NSSDA is endorsed by MetroGIS. This question led to a discussion about the difference between the NSSDA, which is standardized means of measuring the accuracy of a dataset, and the process by which a MetroGIS stakeholder organization decides, for itself, based upon its own internal needs the accuracy that it will seek for any particular dataset, such as parcels. Staff emphasized that use of the NSSDA is also voluntary. Wencl commented that he believes organizations will find it useful to include this standard in contracts as quality control tool when stakeholder organizations outsource data development. O'Connor asked staff to follow-up with each county as to their intentions to use the NSSDA if the MetroGIS Policy Board endorses its use as a best management practice.

Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Hegberg seconded that the Policy Board endorse Minnesota IRM Standard 19, Version 1: *A Methodology for Measuring and Reporting Positional Accuracy in Spatial Data* as a "Best Management Practice" and promote its use by the MetroGIS community.

Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Regional Planned Future Land Use Dataset – Intellectual Property Policy Testbed

Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Supervisor, summarized the issues and information presented in the agenda report and used a multiple phase schematic drawing to illustrate the progression of activities that comprise development of the regional planned future land use dataset that is nearly complete.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Hegberg seconded to endorse an intellectual property rights policy that if a MetroGIS endorsed dataset is produced by aligning it with any other dataset(s) the resulting dataset is the sole property of its developer if the user cannot access the source dataset(s) via the new dataset.

Motion carried ayes all.

Member Schneider asked for clarification about the proposed coding scheme for the regional parcel dataset and cautioned against generalizing low, medium, and high density designations into a single residential designation as shown in the schematic for the regional dataset. Gelbmann commented schematic was designed to illustrate the intellectual property policy questions and does not include the complete scheme that is being tested. The Council is currently testing for region-wide application, as a pilot for MetroGIS, the multi-level, planned future land use coding scheme also developed by the I-35W Corridor Coalition as a pilot for MetroGIS and that the findings will be shared for discussion at a Peer Review Forum tentatively scheduled for May 2001. Notwithstanding, staff agreed to pass Member Schneider's concerns along to the group that will be evaluating version one of the regional planned future land use dataset.

f) Professional Services Contract – Use of Funds Donated to MetroGIS

The staff handed out a report and summarized a request that the Board authorize use of funds that had been donated to MetroGIS to supplement budgeted funding for the proposed 2001-2002 Professional Services contract, if other means do not close the funding gap.

The Board concluded that in the future it would like to review the scope of work for major contracts, such as this, before the contracts are let. Staff was asked to send the members copies of the scope of work, a summary of the bids, and a summary of changes made to the scope of work during negotiation of the contract.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Branning seconded to authorize use of funds in donated to MetroGIS, amounting to \$20, 600, to supplement budgeted funding for the proposed 2001-2002 Professional Services contract, if other means do not close the funding gap.

Motion carried, ayes all.

a) 2000 Accomplishments

Staff summarized MetroGIS' major accomplishment in 2000 and noted that the material in agenda packet will be used to produce the 2000 Annual Report. Chairperson Reinhardt stated that she believes MetroGIS' accomplishments in 200 were many and that MetroGIS continues to be a national leader in implementing an effective way for government to collaborate on initiatives critical to GIS data sharing. She asked the members to contact staff with any items that should be added to the detailed listing of accomplishments included in the agenda packet.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

There was no discussion of the Information Items provided in the agenda materials.

Alternate Member O'Connor informed the Board that Brad Henry, Coordinating Committee chair for two years and charter Coordinating Committee member, and Virginia Erdahl, Policy Advisory Team chair for two years and also a charter Coordinating Committee member, would both be retiring and leaving MetroGIS. He stated that their vision and commitment to achieving the vision of MetroGIS will be greatly missed and suggested that each should receive a commendation from MetroGIS. The Board agreed.

Motion: O'Connor moved and Member Schneider seconded to direct staff to prepare a commendation from MetroGIS for retiring Coordinating Committee members Erdahl and Henry and for Commissioner Mackie who represented Scott County on the Policy Board until this year.

Motion carried, ayes all.

.

7. NEXT MEETING

April 11, 2001

8. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:25 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator