

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
October 29, 2003**

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Patrice Bataglia (Dakota County), William Brown for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Bob Vogel (Scott County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Jane Harper for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Gary Delaney (Carver County), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), and Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Bob Cockriel, Will Craig, Dave Drealan, Rick Gelbmann, Randy Knippel, Brad Henry, Al Laumeyer

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Trudy Richter, with Richardson, Richter and Associates, and Steve Fester.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Fiskness moved and Member Bataglia seconded to accept the agenda as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Vogel moved and Member Johns seconded to approve the summary of the July 30, 2003 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION – GASB34 and GIS/MetroGIS - What is the Connection?

The Staff Coordinator introduced Brad Henry (URS/BRW) and Bob Cockriel (City of Bloomington), both members of the Coordinating Committee. Henry commented that GASB34 requires all government organizations to identify the infrastructure they are responsible for, its worth, and what they are doing to maintain it, noting that GIS is a technology that can greatly help government not only respond to the GASB34 directive, but in particular, more efficiently manage these assets. By 2004, the rules call for all government units to be compliance. Henry noted that those units that do not comply will likely see their bond ratings drop.

Cockriel explained the substantial benefits that can be realized through implementation of asset management programs, noting that a 75-90 percent reduction in street maintenance expenses are possible. Henry stated that GIS technology can greatly contribute in three ways – collection and correction of data, collate/analyze data, and visualization of the reporting. He also stated that he believes GASB34 presents an opportunity to MetroGIS to pursue regional infrastructure datasets and encouraged the Board to consider adding “infrastructure” to MetroGIS’s list of priority information needs.

In response to a question from Chairperson Reinhardt, Cockriel commented that it may be possible to aggregate some utility location data, but that some are in proprietary systems and can not be shared.

There was some discussion following a comment by Commissioner Kordiak regarding the need for formal asset management programs when the information provided is common knowledge. The notion

that infrastructure needs to be maintained is clearly understood, but the fact that the number of assets is vast, and that much of it is underground, requires a structured systems approach to ensure nothing is overlooked and that repairs are made at optimum times in the various life cycles. (The PowerPoint slides presented to the Policy Board are posted at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/gasb.pdf>.)

5. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATE (See the agenda materials for more information)

a) Regional Mailing Label Application

The County Data Producer Workgroup is overseeing this project. Dave Drealan, who chairs the workgroup, reported that the goal is to launch this application by year-end. He commented that concerns that had been raised about possible interference with existing county revenues from mailing label sales had been addressed and that final modifications to the actual application are in process. He also reminded the Board members that the application will be available only to organizations that have obtained a license to access the regional parcel dataset, since this application runs on that data, and that any change to this policy must be approved by the counties who own the data.

Member Kordiak thanked the group for its work. He shared his belief that it is important to pursue methods to improve access as well as replace manual/labor-intensive processes, as will be case with this application, in order to greatly improve efficiencies. He also stated that he favors foregoing current modest revenues if the procedural change gets the data out to the user quickly and easily and improves staff efficiencies.

b) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy

The County Data Producer Workgroup is overseeing this project. Dave Drealan, who chairs the workgroup, reported that the group has agreed on how to address the topic of fees and that negotiations are in progress with the last county to reach agreement on a single license document. Once the license is finalized, the new procedures will be launched through a web portal that has been built by MetroGIS support staff. Regarding to the license, William Brown noted that Hennepin County is going through a reorganization and that the attorney assigned to this project is new to the proposal. A meeting is scheduled for the first week in November, at which he hopes agreement will be reached. The problem is that Hennepin County has a history of having to deal with lost data, which has resulted in a defensive position regarding the licensing documents.

Vice Chairman Kordiak commented that the Policy Board has been talking about this topic for over two years and that he hopes that any changes suggested by the Hennepin County will result in a better document.

Member Harper commented that Washington County recently was contacted by two private sector organizations that are interested in this data and that an ongoing relationship looks good once the proposed revised procedures are in place.

c) Data Sharing with Utilities

The County Data Producer Workgroup is overseeing this project. Dave Drealan, who chairs the workgroup, reported that a sample of the regional parcel dataset will be delivered shortly to the three participating utility companies for their evaluation. If the utilities are interested in pursuing further talks, the counties will define data that utilities produce for which they have a business need.

d) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Coordination with MN GeoIntegrator

The Staff Coordinator summarized progress on a collaborative project with the MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC) to improve the functionality of DataFinder Café and migrate the physical hosting of Café to the State's system to enable sharing of hardware and annual software maintenance expenses.

e) Priority Common Information Needs

(1) Emergency Management: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council) and Randy Knippel (Dakota County), co-chairs of the Emergency Management Workgroup, reported that their main emphasis since the last Policy Board meeting was to participate in the annual GIS/LIS Conference and speak to Metro Emergency Managers Association officials. They also informed the Policy Board that the Emergency Management Committee of the Governors Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) (Chaired by Gelbmann) and the MetroGIS Committee (Chaired by Knippel) have elected to pursue separate agendas, but in a coordinated fashion, as opposed to continue to meet jointly. The MetroGIS group will focus on building relationships between the GIS and emergency management communities, whereas, the GCGI group will focus on policy and standards matters.

Member Bataglia asked how the two groups intend to address the disparity between metro and greater Minnesota in terms of resources without slowing down progress in areas that have made the necessary commitments. Gelbmann commented that the emphasis in the metro is on action that can be taken now, ranging from assembling priority data into region-wide datasets that are easily accessible by the broad user community, to continuing to build relationships among the various affected interests. He emphasized that the goal is to leverage investments that have been made in data and then establish collaborative role expectations.

In response, Member Bataglia asked if cataloguing of existing, useful data and an evaluation of its suitability related to intended goals is part of the workgroup's plan. Knippel agreed to provide a listing of emergency management-related data resources that have been identified thus far and an indication as to whether each of these data sources meets or exceeds current information needs. The Staff Coordinator encouraged Knippel's group to use a [matrix](#) similar to that developed by the Socioeconomic Workgroup to document the prior information needs and suitability of existing data sources to address these needs.

(2) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas Will Craig, Chair of the Socioeconomic Information Needs Workgroup, informed the Policy Board of the workgroup's efforts to identify existing sources of data that meet or exceed the needs of the community relative to several priority information needs. He noted that this phase of the regional solution is nearly complete. Phase II work is expected to begin Winter 2004. The objective of that phase will be to identify non-traditional sources of data that can be pursued to address needs not met by existing traditional sources.

Two of the prospective US Census sources of data still require federal funding - The American Community Survey (ACS) and the Longitudinal Employer – Household Dynamics (LEHD) program. Craig noted that if these sources were available on an ongoing basis metro-wide, most if not all of the priority data needs identified by the MetroGIS community would be achievable. This comment led to a brief discussion about the shortcomings of existing data sources that would be overcome – update frequencies too slow, nighttime but not daytime population data, mapping resolution is too coarse – particularly for local government needs, in particular, economic and community development efforts.

With regard to the ACS and LEHD programs, Craig asked the Board if it would consider endorsing a resolution of support and requesting that its member organizations include it in their respective legislative agendas. He noted that the Bush Administration has included the ACS program in its budget proposal but congressional support is needed to fund the U.S. Census Bureau implementation of the program. This request spawned comments from Member Bataglia and Chairperson Reinhardt that additional information about the cost and benefits of the program will be needed to clarify the value of the program relative to other initiatives under consideration for inclusion in their counties' respective legislative agendas. Members Bataglia and Reinhardt noted that county government is generally very cautious about the programs for which they

lobby, given past experience that once programs important to local government are in place that some or all of the cost will be passed along to them.

Member Johns stated that the data enhancements related to the proposed ACS program are critical to effectively managing the Brooklyn Center and other school districts with significant minority populations. Better migration and poverty data are needed to ensure the funding formulas reflect reality of shifting populations with special service needs. (Special needs populations are increasingly migrating to the suburbs but the resources are not moving with them resulting in inadequate service capabilities from the suburban districts.) Transportation options are also lacking to access services.

Direction Provided: It was agreed that if the Coordinating Committee wishes to bring this matter to the Policy Board for action at the January meeting, that background information sufficient to justify the value of the program to local government should be circulated to Board members well in advance of the meeting for Board members to share with peers for comment before the Board considers the topic. In response to a comment by Member Johns, Chairperson Reinhardt requested her to identify funding sources affected by the subject data and to share this information with Craig to include in the background information and comment as to whether or not it is possible to determine whether better data might correlate to increased resources to address documented needs.

Due to lack of time, no other Information Needs Workgroup reports were received.

6. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 2004 Meeting Schedule

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the schedule proposed in the agenda materials. No concerns were raised for the dates suggested: January 28, April 28, July 28, and October 27.

Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Harper seconded to approve the 2004 meeting schedule as proposed. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) Update Frequency Policy Change – Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset

The Staff Coordinator summarized the proposed update frequency change from once per year to quarterly, to be done at the same time that the regional parcel data is updated. He also noted that the change had been proposed by the staff who are responsible for the related duties for the primary producers (counties) and regional custodian (Metropolitan Council).

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Pistilli seconded to approve the proposed changes to the regional policy statement concerning the update cycle for the Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset as recommended by the Coordinating Committee. Motion carried, ayes all.

c) 2004 MetroGIS Budget and Agreement Principles

The Staff Coordinator noted that the proposed 2004 budget materials included in the agenda materials show the same total amount as the Board requested in April and the major line items are also unchanged. Board approval will be sought in January, once the Metropolitan Council adopts its final budget for 2004. This information was provided at this time for comment to ensure nothing has been overlooked, and to provide a context for the proposed principles to guide negotiation of data sharing agreements. Staff explained that the line item for funding associated with these agreements is \$50,000. No comments were received on the budget materials

The Staff Coordinator introduced proposed principles to guide negotiations currently in progress to extend the existing GIS Data Sharing Agreement, noting that staff believed that agreed-upon principles would benefit current negotiations through fostering consensus on the objectives as well as provide for

long-term guidance. Chairperson Reinhardt offered modifications to the language included in the packet to improve clarity.

Comments from Members Fiskness and Pistilli led to a discussion about the value of MetroGIS's efforts to the user community as well as to the counties as primarily data producers. Fiskness emphasized the significant benefits that have been achieved by MetroGIS's emphasis on coordination and leveraging of investments and not adding another layer of government. Several of the county members noted that the funding allocated by the proposed agreements, although modest, is important because it recognizes that the Council, on behalf of the broader community, appreciates the importance of the counties' participation and the significance of the parcel data they produce. However, notwithstanding that the counties concur MetroGIS is greatly benefiting the community and understand that their participation is valued, several county members noted that the funding is also important because they believe they receive the least amount of direct benefit from MetroGIS's efforts, generally less than their cost to participate, and because of recent budget cutting that has reduced resources available to support unmandated programs, which include their internal GIS units, as well as those related custodial roles and responsibilities important to the MetroGIS community. Member Brown noted that he believes Hennepin County would be involved in MetroGIS' efforts regardless of whether the proposed funding is offered but cautioned that he is concerned that Hennepin County may not have the personnel to achieve the desired data enhancements that the funding associated with agreements is designed to address.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Johns seconded to adopt the principles as set forth in Attachment A. Motion carried ayes 4, nays 3.

The dissenting Members (Pistilli, Fiskness, and Brown) voted against for the motion for the following reasons: Pistilli did not like the proposed revision removing the phrase "These funds are intended to be a modest gesture of appreciation" from principle 3a as he believed this language helped clarify the intent, Fiskness preferred the matter to be tabled, Brown was not comfortable moving forward until he better understands what Hennepin County would be committing to if the principles were adopted.

Chairperson Reinhardt encouraged the dissenting Members to offer modifications that would address their concerns for action at the January meeting, noting they are to guide negotiations, will not be incorporated into any contracts, and can be modified at any time.

d) 2004 Major Program Objectives

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the objectives presented in the agenda packet and explained that staff is not asking for approval at this time but rather feedback as to any items that should be modified or added. No comments were offered.

Staff noted that approval will be sought at the January meeting once the 2004 budget is final.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt asked the members to review on their own the information items presented in the agenda packet. She called their attention in particular to 7a – PolicyLink Recommendations and 7b – SRF Testimonial, noting that the testimonial involves benefits to counties from MetroGIS's efforts.

8. NEXT MEETING

January 28, 2004

9. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 9:10 p.m.

Prepared by,
Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

ATTACHMENT A

Principles For Allocating MetroGIS's Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funds

Introduction

The following principles are to serve as the basis for allocating the funding identified in the "Data Quality and Access Enhancement ...Projects" line item of the MetroGIS budget. The following principles do not apply to funds acquired through grants or sources other than the Metropolitan Council. Data producers, serving in their role as primary custodians for data that comprise regional data solutions (e.g. counties related to parcel data) are eligible for receive funds from this line item for eligible projects. There is no obligation on the part of the Council pay for projects that exceed the funds identified in this line item. Agreements that allocate funds from this line item must comply with the following principles, which supplement and expand upon, not supercede, the more general principles¹ that have governed MetroGIS's efforts for some time.

Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funding Principles

The following principles are to be embedded in the annual MetroGIS budget, and be approved as part of the budget approval process. Currently the only such recipients of these enhancement project funds are the counties, though it is anticipated that other organizations will serve in similar capacities for regional data solutions that have not as yet been defined.

- 1) Receipt of these funds by a data producer is not a payment for data but rather for services performed of importance to the broad MetroGIS community.
- 2) Funding can also be for specific data enhancements, which are to be identified through a forum of data users and producers, in a manner that is consistent with past, broadly participatory, MetroGIS processes.
- 3) The purpose of this funding is four-fold:
 - a) To recognize the importance to the MetroGIS community of participation by producers of data that are critical components to regional solutions (e.g. parcel data produced by the seven metro area counties).
 - b) To assist data producers in performing primary custodial responsibilities, which have been endorsed by the Policy Board that exceed internal business functions, including extracting, documenting, manipulating, and delivering these data to the regional custodian.
 - c) To finance data quality and access enhancements, defined through MetroGIS's processes.
 - d) To assist data producers with costs associated with sharing of information about what was learned and the outcome of data enhancement projects in accordance with a MetroGIS core function to foster sharing of knowledge.
- 4) Data Producers have the option of pooling funds allocated to other Data Producers for purposes of conducting projects that will have mutual benefit to the producers and to data users.

¹ The following principles governed MetroGIS's efforts. They have evolved over time as a product of decision-making and desired outcomes.

- a) No organization will be asked to perform a task for the collaborative that they do not have an internal need to perform.
- b) Build once, share many times (data and applications).
- c) Investments made by one government interest ought to be leverageable by other government interests.
- d) All relevant and affected interests participate, dominated by none.
- e) Widespread sharing of the data improves data quality and ultimately decision support.
- f) Cost recovery of data development expenses stifles sharing of commonly needed data.