

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
October 22, 2002**

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Willis Branning (Dakota County), Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), John Siegfried (Carver County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Jane Harper for Molly O'Rourke (Washington County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Terry Schneider (AMM-City of Minnetonka), Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis), and Joseph Wagner (Scott County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Bill Brown, Will Craig, Eli Cooper, Dave Drealan, Rick Gelbmann, Brad Henry, Mark Kill, and Ron Wencil.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Kathie Doty, (with Richardson, Richter and Associates, Inc.), and Mark Kotz.

Visitors: Gary Criter (City of Minneapolis).

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as submitted.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Siegfried moved and Member Branning seconded to approve the summary of the July 30, 2002 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION – How the Metropolitan Airports Commission is Benefiting from MetroGIS

Mark Kill, GIS Specialist for the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) and lead staff for the MAC's Airports Noise Abatement Program, briefed the Board about the Program, which involves \$150 million in abatement funds; how GIS technology is being used to manage this program; and how MetroGIS's activities have benefited MAC.

Mr. Kill stated that the availability of the regional datasets, streamlined licensing processes, and DataFinder, all products MetroGIS's efforts, are resulting in MAC being able to manage its noise abatement with more up-to-date data than possible in the past. He also stated that each data update can be accomplished in 4-6 weeks less time than via the previous manual effort to update their foundation data (parcels, municipal boundaries, street centerlines, etc). In the past, MAC staff had to spend much time meeting with numerous staff from the data-producer organizations, in some cases more than one per organization, to describe the data needed and comply with varying licensing and access procedures. Then, once the data were actually received, significant time was required to reformat it to align across adjoining jurisdictions. Availability of DataFinder and regional datasets have eliminated the need for most of this time consuming manual effort.

The next phase of MAC's Airports Noise Abatement Program will expand the distance away from the airport where abatement work can be authorized because the noise threshold will be lowered from the current 65 decibel level. This, in turn, will expand the geographic extent for which foundation data are needed.

Member Kordiak questioned why noise abate programs exist for airports and not for railroads. Mr. Kill commented that it may be because of the frequency and intensity of airport noise which is greater than for railroads. He also commented that it could have something to do with airports generally being public or quasi-public and railroads being generally private.

The members thanked Mr. Kill for his presentation.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Awards to MetroGIS

The MetroGIS Staff Coordinator commented on two recent awards that have been received by MetroGIS – URISA’s ESIG award and MnAPA’s Outstanding Planning Tool award.

Coordinating Committee member Arbeit commented on the significance of the URISA award from his perspective as a former URISA National Board member. He emphasized the prestige of this award, given the tough competition. He complimented staff on the application and for advocating MetroGIS’s unique standing – there is no award category that MetroGIS’s experience neatly falls into. Arbeit closed by stating that the Policy Board and others who have been responsible for evolving MetroGIS to this point should take great pride in the success of MetroGIS and its recognition for this award.

b) MetroGIS 2003-2005 Business Plan

Will Craig, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the Committee’s September 25th recommendation to approve the Plan enclosed with the agenda materials and introduced Kathie Doty, MetroGIS Business Planning Consultant with the firm Richardson, Richter & Associates, to comment on the key components of the recommended Plan.

Ms. Doty summarized the five assumptions upon which the proposed Plan is based and asked if the Board had any concerns or questions. None of the Board members commented. Ms. Doty then explained several of the key strategies presented in the Executive Summary. Chairperson Reinhardt commented that there is nothing of policy substance included in the proposed Plan that the Board had not over the past several months previously discussed and provided direction for.

Member Siegfried requested clarification on the current revenue received from cost recovery for data related expenses. Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair and Business Planning Workgroup member Harper stated that the County Producer Workgroup created by the Board at its July 30 meeting is currently investigating this matter in conjunction with its work on a collaborative strategy for distribution of parcel data to non-government entities. She noted that the results of the Workgroup’s investigation should be ready to share with the Board at its January meeting. Kathie Doty, MetroGIS Business Planning Consultant and a member of the County Producer Workgroup staff support team commented that in the preliminary research conducted for the Business Plan, it was learned that most of the GIS-related revenue being realized is coming from sales of map products, as opposed to digital parcel data. She also noted that staff from each of the counties generally concur that cost recovery for digital parcel data generates reality little revenue.

Member Branning asked for clarification of the statement on Page viii in the Executive Summary concerning the proposed \$75,000 data maintenance payment to counties. Staff agreed to modify the statement to clarify that a total of \$75,000 per year for each of the three planning period years (2003-2005) is proposed to be allocated among the counties.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that after the Plan had been mailed to Board members last week, several editing and clarifying modifications had been suggested. She requested, and Board members agreed, to leave the decision as to whether the changes should be included in the final document up to the Chair’s discretion.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Branning seconded to: a) adopt the proposed MetroGIS 2003-2005 Business Plan, dated October 22, 2002, subject to the clarification requested by Member Branning concerning the proposed annual data maintenance funding and b) direct staff to forward the Plan to the Metropolitan Council, serving in its capacity as primary sponsor, for approval. Motion carried ayes all.

Board members concluded there is no need to seek approval of the approved Plan from the organizations represented on the Policy Board other than the Metropolitan Council. The Council was distinguished from the others since continued funding and staff support for MetroGIS's core functions is being sought from the Council.

Chairperson Reinhardt recognized the members of the Business Planning Workgroup (David Arbeit, Will Craig, Kathie Doty, Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, and Randall Johnson) and thanked them and the Coordinating Committee for their efforts to prepare this Plan, noting that the Plan sets an ambitious but doable course of action for MetroGIS.

c) Regional Parcel Dataset: Public and Academic Version Policy Statement

Will Craig, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the Committee's September 25th recommendation and introduced Mark Kotz, GIS Database Administrator for the Metropolitan Council and lead staff for a workgroup comprised of GIS staff from each of the seven counties, who explained the changes proposed for the regional policy statement. The changes involve adding a parcel attribute, increasing the number to 25, and providing clarification for several operational aspects of policies previously endorsed by the Board, noting that the operational changes expand flexibility for the counties while maintaining consistency with the adopted policies. Kotz noted that Paragraph 2 in Appendix B should be deleted because it mistakenly duplicates text contained in Paragraph 4. He also commented that the Coordinating Committee favors the Board authorizing the Committee to in the future modify the operational clarifications set forth in Appendix B without Board approval in an effort to focus Board deliberation on substantive policy matters.

Members Siegfried and Johns asked if any other attributes, in particular several pertaining to census-related information (e.g., number of households per parcel), should also be added to the regional dataset. The Staff Coordinator commented that such data needs will likely be addressed when a solution to the socioeconomic information need is proposed, which is scheduled to occur in 2003. Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair Harper also commented that a standard operating procedure, in accordance with one of the Challenge Areas set forth in the Business Plan, is to regularly assess each endorsed regional dataset via Data User Forums. These forums are attended by a cross section of the user community to identify any desired enhancements and to ensure the solutions remain relevant to current needs.

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Siegfried seconded to amend the Regional Parcel Dataset Policy Summary Statement, previously adopted on January 9, 2002, as proposed in the agenda packet document dated September 25, 2002, subject to deletion of Paragraph 2 in Appendix B. Motion carried, ayes all.

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Siegfried seconded to authorize the Coordinating Committee, from this point on, to modify Operational / Procedural Clarifications (Appendix B) related to this and other regional policy statements when all relevant and affected parties are in agreement. Motion carried, ayes all.

d) County Data Producer Workgroup Activities - Non-Public Access to Parcel Dataset

County Data Producer Workgroup Chair and Coordinating Committee member Dave Drealan summarized the workgroup's activities since created by the Policy Board this past July to investigate the benefits of a collaborative strategy concerning distribution of parcel data to non-profit and for-profit interests. He noted that there are significant differences among the counties concerning non-government access to parcel data and that the workgroup members have agreed that the first order of business should

be for the counties to reach a common vision of what they might try to accomplish collaboratively. He then summarized the Coordinating Committee's September 25th recommendation that the Policy Board approve the regional policy statement included in the Board's agenda materials as a first step in reaching this common understanding.

Member Johns inquired why the proposed recommendation is requesting Board acceptance and submittal to the counties for their individual endorsement, whereas, the county approval component was not a part of the previous motion concerning the public and academic version of the regional parcel dataset. The Staff Coordinator responded that the public sector version statement is governed by agreements that are in effect with each of the seven counties, whereas, no such agreement exists concerning access by non-government entities. Referral of the proposed vision statement to the counties is to ensure that each is willing to allow their staff to continue to investigate a collaborative strategy among the counties. If a collaborative strategy is pursued, staff believes that agreements, similar to the existing public sector access agreements, would likely be the vehicle to achieve a collaborative solution.

Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair Harper commented that the county staff representatives to the workgroup concur that they would prefer to have a single regional vision endorsed by the Policy Board when they speak to their peers in other internal departments. This would provide something of substance to react to so that any obstacles can be clearly articulated for further investigation. Harper also commented that evaluation of the reasons for the failed initial policy revealed that the lack of the ability to obtain less than the whole (subset) was not available and that the market wanted more than 2 attributes – both of which are addressed with this proposal.

Member Johns suggested that the preamble include a statement that data accessibility is provided in accordance with Data Practices Laws, in particular, rules pertaining to not-public data.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Branning seconded to:

- a) Accept the regional policy statement included in the agenda packet dated September 25, 2002 which sets expectations for a collaborative strategy to distribute parcel data available to private and non-profit interests, subject to adding a statement to the preamble that data distributed via this policy statement are provided in accordance with the Minnesota Data Practices Act, in particular, rules pertaining to not-public data.
- b) Authorize the Chair to forward this policy statement, on the Board's behalf, to each of the seven counties for approval and to confirm that they want their staff to continue to work on a collaborative strategy for distribution of parcel data to private and non-profit interests.

Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Participant Appreciation Event: Certificates of Appreciation

The Staff Coordinator provided an update of the planning that is in process for the event and summarized the proposal to present certificates of appreciation to 14 individuals who have provided significant leadership to moving MetroGIS from concept to reality and to the Metropolitan Council for serving as the primary sponsor. Chairperson Reinhardt urged those members how have not RSVP to do so, if possible to staff this evening.

Motion: Member Branning moved and Member Kordiak seconded to approve Certificates of Appreciation as recommended in the agenda materials. Motion carried, ayes all.

f) 2003 Meeting Schedule

The meeting schedule proposed in the agenda materials was accepted as proposed, although two members noted conflicts – one for the January meeting and one for the April meeting. The Board's meetings in 2003 will be held on the 5th Wednesday in January, April, July, and October, each beginning at 6:30 p.m.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt asked the members to review on their own the information provided in the agenda packet. There was no discussion of any of the other information items presented in the agenda materials.

7. NEXT MEETING

January 29, 2003

8. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:26 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator