

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
July 30, 2003**

1. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCE NEW MEMBER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Terry Schneider (AMM-City of Minnetonka), Patrice Bataglia (Dakota County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), William Brown for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Gary Delaney (Carver County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Bob Vogel (Scott County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County) and Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Bill Brown, David Claypool, Will Craig, Dave Drealan (Vice-Chair), Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper (Chair), Brad Henry, Randy Knippel, Nancy Read, and Ron Wencl.

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

Visitors: Jeff Matson (Minneapolis Neighborhood Information System), Dan Falbo (ESRI), Jonette Kraideweis (Mn/DOT), Dan Ross (Mn/DOT), and Chet Harrison (CB Richard Ellis).

Chairperson Reinhardt asked everyone, including the visitors, to introduce themselves.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Schneider asked for Item 8a to be heard as an action item following agenda item 6c. Member Fiskness moved and Member Delaney seconded to accept the agenda, as modified. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Schneider moved and Member Bataglia seconded to approve the summary of the April 30, 2003 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. OVERVIEW OF METROGIS – VISION, FUNCTIONS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND BENEFITS

Staff Coordinator Johnson provided a brief overview of why MetroGIS was created; its vision, functions and accomplishments; and benefits that are being realized by the community as result of the these accomplishments.

Member Schneider encouraged staff to actively seek out ways to inform as many constituent groups as possible of the information provided in this presentation. It was agreed that as a first step the PowerPoint Presentation would be sent to each member of the Policy Board, Coordinating Committee, Technical Advisory Team, and county GIS user groups to share with co-workers and colleagues that may have an interest.

Member Bataglia asked if MetroGIS is aware of PSAPs (E911 Dispatching centers) and the current effort to integrate GIS into their business operations. Johnson noted that MetroGIS is aware of this initiative and at the Metropolitan 911 Board's request is cooperating in their efforts to learn more about GIS technology. Member Bataglia commented that the PSAPs generally feel they have been left behind. Staff asked Member Bataglia to raise this concern later in the meeting when the Board heard an update from the leadership of the Emergency Management Workgroup.

5. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Will Craig, member of the Coordinating Committee, introduced Jeff Matson, director of the Minneapolis Neighborhood Information System (MNIS), noting that Public Participation or Community GIS is a national phenomenon but the Twin Cities is a leader in the movement.

Jeff began his presentation by noting that Minneapolis has a number of established and respected neighborhood/community groups that have extensive needs for geospatial data and that parcel level housing related data is at the core. He explained the goals of MNIS are to provide to these groups technical capacity, improve data, improve relationships, and improve networking among the neighborhoods. Mr. Matson noted that a substantive 3-year Department of Commerce grant had been received to help achieve these goals primarily through developing a website to improve access and assisting with the needed data improvements. In addition to the partnership with the Department of Commerce, other partners include the City of Minneapolis, and CURA at the U of M. The complete presentation is available at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/ppgis.pdf>. MNIS's website is at <http://www.npcr.org/MNIS>.

6. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt explained that Policy Board "ratification" is sought for the following three action items. She noted that she had requested this action to ensure that the Policy Board was fully aware of the pending actions, which had been approved by the Coordinating Committee on June 18th. She emphasized that Board approval was not required but that she wanted to avoid any misunderstandings in the future should an issue arise.

a) Highway and Road Network Information Need Solution – Partnership with Mn/DOT

Coordinating Committee Chair Harper summarized a proposed partnership with Mn/DOT as had been endorsed by the Coordinating Committee on June 18 for Policy Board ratification and then introduced Michael Dolbow, project manager, to provide a brief overview of the specifics of the proposed partnership. Dolbow summarized the efforts of a workgroup that made the recommendation to partner with Mn/DOT, noting that the roads and highways standard that Mn/DOT has been developing for three years has merit but needs refinement, and that both partners are looking forward to what the other can bring to the process. He then introduced Jonette Kreideweis with Mn/DOT who commented that the data content standard that Mn/DOT has developed thus far permits crash, traffic, and bridge data produced by many different Mn/DOT units to be used interchangeably. She stated that Mn/DOT is aware that road data produced by local government is often times superior to data produced by others and that use of this standard by all levels will greatly enhance data sharing.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked Mn/DOT for their willingness to collaborate with MetroGIS and affirmed that this is an incredible opportunity for the MetroGIS community.

Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Delaney seconded to ratify the Coordinating Committee's conclusion that MetroGIS should accept a partnership invitation from Mn/DOT to jointly refine a Highway and Road Networks standard that Mn/DOT developed and ensure related local government needs are adequately addressed by the proposed standard. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) Geospatial Data Theme Categories – Modifications Directed by the Board

Coordinating Committee Chair Harper introduced the two category name changes (elevation and land ownership) that had been made by the Coordinating Committee to the Data Theme Category Standard in response to direction received from the Policy Board when it adopted the categorization scheme at its April 30, 2003 meeting. Board ratification of these changes was requested.

Motion: Member Bataglia moved and Member Vogel seconded to ratify changes made to the Geospatial Data Theme Categories names and definitions by the Coordinating Committee as described herein and as previously directed by the Policy Board. Motion carried, ayes all.

c) Planned Land Use Information Need Solution – Modification of Roles and Responsibilities

Coordinating Committee Chair Harper introduced two modifications made by the Coordinating Committee on June 18th to the Regional Planned Land Use Dataset roles and responsibilities and requested Policy Board ratification. She also summarized the purpose of the Regional Policy Statement which sets forth the agreed upon roles and responsibilities, noting that in prior direction, the Policy Board had authorized the Coordinating Committee to implement changes to Board-approved policy statements if all affected parties agreed, hence the request for Board ratification as opposed to approval.

Chairman Harper introduced Rick Gelbmann, member of the Coordinating Committee and representative of the regional custodian (Metropolitan Council) to explain the proposal accepted by the Coordinating Committee to postpone alignment of the Planned Land Use data with parcel boundary data until substantially less labor-intensive procedures can be implemented. It was noted that this topic will be scheduled for review beginning July 1, 2005, if not investigated earlier in connection with a related common information need. Gelbmann commented that the second change involved adding a category entitled "rail transit way" to the list of coding options.

Staff Coordinator Johnson emphasized that the regional dataset is a generalization of the actual land use plans adopted by the individual communities and that this action would in no way affect those plans. In other words, if a local community does not show rail transit ways in their locally adopted plan it will not show up in the regional dataset. He also clarified that the Planned (or Future) Land Use dataset is different and separate from the proposed Regional Existing Land Use dataset. Finally, Gelbmann clarified that the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian of the Planned Land Use dataset, will continue to update it on a quarterly basis; only realignment with parcel boundaries has been temporarily postponed.

Motion: Member Delaney moved and Member Fiskness seconded to ratify the Coordinating Committee's decision to modify the regional policy statement for the Planned Land Use priority information need, as explained in the staff report presented at the Policy Board meeting. Motion carried, ayes all.

8a. Cost Savings Measures Implemented

Member Schneider spoke on behalf of receiving the entire agenda electronically because he likes the ability to save and retrieve information at a later date should he want access. Other members who rely upon dialup Internet service noted that electronic access takes a great deal of time to download and that they would prefer to continue to receive the agenda packet via postal mail. Staff noted that multiple distribution formats could be supported and agreed to send a message to each Policy Board member to ask if they would prefer electronic access or continue to receive their agendas via postal mail. If staff does not receive a response, the default will be to continue to mail the paper packet.

7. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES

a) Regional Mailing Label Application

Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup, explained that earlier today the workgroup had viewed a prototype regional mailing label application developed by Alison Slaats of the MetroGIS staff which clearly demonstrated such an application is technically feasible. He noted that there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved before the application is deployed, such as reconciling possible impacts on revenues currently received by the counties for similar products. The group expects to offer a recommendation to the Policy Board at its October meeting.

b) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Cooperation with MN GeoIntegrator Project

This item was not discussed.

c) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy – Non-Government Access

Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup, noted that a draft common license and a proposed fee schedule were being reviewed by each county. The workgroup is waiting for each of the seven county administrations to respond with comments and/or endorsements.

d) Data Sharing Initiative with Utilities

Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup, summarized an exploratory meeting held on July 10th with representatives of Xcel Energy, CenterPoint Energy Minnegasco, and Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative, noting that both sides (counties and utilities) see merit in further discussions. Next steps will include providing the utilities with a sample of the regional parcel dataset and, if there continues to be interest, setting up a forum for public sector representatives to identify data they may be interested in that are produced by the utilities.

Member Bataglia asked which county interests have been involved. Drealan explained that the initial discussions have been informal with an assumption that at a minimum the counties' right-of-way management and emergency management functions could take advantage of data produced by the

utilities. The plan is to investigate what data may be available and then invite a broad public community to participate in a more formal information discovery process if the decision is to move forward with the collaborative process.

e) Talks with Collar Counties Proposed to Foster Sharing Data

This item was not discussed.

f) Priority Common Information Needs

Chairperson Reinhardt encouraged the Board members to review the report Agenda Item 7 for information about each of the activities currently in progress. She then introduced Coordinating Committee members Knippel and Gelbmann to summarize their work with Emergency Management Workgroup:

Knippel and Gelbmann, co-chairs of MetroGIS's Emergency Management Workgroup summarized the three core initiatives of the workgroup and described how they are coordinating with a parallel MN Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) workgroup, which they also co-chair. *(Note: see the Agenda Item 7 staff report for the details.)*

Member Schneider commented that the 800-megahertz project possesses substantial resources and that the leaders of that group may be interested in these MetroGIS and GCGI efforts. Knippel commented that he would follow-up as part of their efforts to build relationships and awareness to avoid duplication of effort.

In response to a question from Chairperson Reinhardt, Gelbmann noted that Paul Olson, who presented to the Policy Board about how GIS was used to address the September 11th tragedy in New York City, has accepted an invitation to participate in this effort.

Member Bataglia commented that she is a member of the Metropolitan 911 Board and that the Board is aware of MetroGIS. She concurred that potential exists for further collaboration through facilitating PSAP/911 Board use of the technology. She stressed that they need more than the data, they need to better understand how GIS technology can be put to use to solve their information needs, particularly in times of crisis, and resources available to them to accomplish this end.

Member Delaney encouraged Knippel and Gelbmann to include as a workgroup member someone from the Carver County team that developed the online GIS capabilities currently in use by the Carver County public safety community.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt asked the members to review, on their own, the other information sharing items described in the agenda packet.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for October 29, 2003.

10. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator