

## **MetroGIS Business Planning Oversight Team**

### **Meeting Notes – June 5, 2007**

12:30 to 3:30 p.m. p.m.

Metro County Government Center

Team Members Present: Nancy Read, Jane Harper, Mark Vander Schaaf, Randy Knippel, and Rick Gelbmann.

Staff Support Team Members Present: Randall Johnson and Jonathan Blake

#### **1) Recap of May 22 Meeting & Update on Meeting with Professor Bryson**

No major changes suggested except for the definition of “participant”. The group concurred that an additional category should be added to the list – data maintainers/contributors that do have any formal custodian responsibilities. The group then spent some time discussing a draft table included in the “Who comprises MetroGIS” Section of the draft Plan. Changes agreed upon:

- Producer vs. custodian needs need to be clarified (i.e. a custodian is a producer but a producer is not necessarily a custodian; a custodian has an official role as maintenance organization for a given regional dataset)
- “Types of participation” Table – Group by time commitment, effort/resources expended, etc. (i.e. a continuum)
- It is important to define cities’ role(s)
- Is the role of “host” for applications (not data) covered? Decision: modify the description of custodian to include data AND applications
- “Data maintainers” (i.e. city that is responsible for adding new addresses) responsible for updating small part of data set / regional data solutions.
- The table needs to be modified to incorporate “Application Developers”.
- To avoid confusion that multiple sponsors are desirable, it was agreed to make the label “sponsor” plural. If left singular, it could be implied that only the Metropolitan Council can serve as a “sponsor”.
- The “sponsor” label was also changed to “collaboration sponsor” to communicate that sponsorship is for the “foster collaboration” function, not custodial activities related to data maintenance and distribution..

Staff agreed to modify the table and send to members for further comment. (Editor’s note: See Attachment A for an updated version of the table in which the changes requested have incorporated.)

The listing of competencies in the summary was accepted as submitted.

Staff commented that the meeting with Professor Bryson had been postponed to June 26 and possibly latter. He also commented that this meeting is optional for team members.

#### **2) Challenges and Strategies (Chapter 7)**

The following modifications to the draft Chapter were agreed upon:

- Include 2-3 word **bolded** title for each strategy (in order to make document more readable and easily scannable)

- For each activity area, add brief “where we are now” or “current status” sentence or two (from Chapter 5 on Current Status)
- Modifications agreed upon to the draft Section were as follows:
  - List all eight major activity areas exactly as listed in the “Concept Map” (disassemble the component part of Items 1 and 2 as presented in the draft document – use the word choice from February 8 Workshop in the seven Challenge and Strategy sections.
  - Rearrange the order to list those items that created the most excitement at the February Workshop (e.g., Applications, Have funding policies, Build advocacy and awareness, expand stakeholders). Continuation of ongoing functions, although critical, should be listed last.
  - Acknowledge DataFinder as a tactic and under #5034 (facilitate better data sharing). It was agreed that it should not be cited as an Activity/Program Area.
  - Consolidate Sections 7.1.4 (marketing, advocacy) with Section 7.5 (Build Advocacy and Awareness). In the “where are we now/current status introduction touch on the level of support currently provided (7.1.4) and then touch on the impacts of the desired expanded scope, which is the topic of 7.5.
  - Agreed there is a difference between marketing solutions and building awareness / support of MetroGIS and GIS technology. Knippel agreed to draft language for the Plan to expand upon the concept that is important to foster the notion that investing in GIS technology is a valuable investment of public resources.
- Staff agreed to send a reorganized and revised Chapter 7 to Team members by the end of the day on Friday, June 8<sup>th</sup> so the Team members can begin working on their revisions, first thing Monday morning. The members volunteered to review the following Area(s):
  - Knippel – #5 and #7 from competencies/strategies chapter → #5027 (build advocacy and awareness) and #5005 (have funding policies to get most efficient and effective use of taxpayer money) from main concepts map
  - Read – #2 from competencies/strategies chapter (expand regional solutions) → #5008 (expand endorsed regional solutions to include support and development of application services) from main concepts map; #5031 (develop and maintain regional data solutions to identified common information needs) from main concepts map
  - Harper – #3 from competencies (expand MetroGIS stakeholders) → #5023 (expand MetroGIS stakeholders) from main concepts; #5016 (promote a forum for knowledge sharing)
  - Vander Schaaf – #5007 (Optimize MetroGIS organization)
  - Gelbmann – #4 from competencies/strategies (facilitate better data sharing → #5034 (facilitate better data sharing)
- Team members agreed to return their comments to staff no later than end of day Wednesday, June 13. Staff will then compile the eight parts into a single updated Section to include in the agenda report to the Committee, working with the members on any specific wordsmithing over the next week. Knippel agreed to work with Bill Brown to take his place at the Committee meeting, as Knippel will be on vacation.
- Agenda report is scheduled to be distributed to the Committee on June 20 (two weeks from Wednesday)

### 3) Overview Organization of Business Plan (Table of Contents)

Not discussed.

#### 4) **Concept for Operations Implications (support options for “Fostering Collaboration”)**

- Johnson commented that Chairperson Reinhardt has asked for as definitive of recommendations as possible to be presented to the Board on July 25 to maintain momentum achieved at the Feb Workshop. He also noted that she expects the Committee to ask the Policy Board to indicate whether the general direction of the Plan is acceptable.
- Staff commented that current support resources are insufficient to support the desired expansion of MetroGIS’s scope called for in the new plan as context for retaining a Technical Coordinator.
- The members concurred that the current support resources will need to be supplemented to achieve the outcomes defined in the Plan but also offered a middle ground option to hiring a Technical Coordinator. The middle ground option involves securing a commitment from stakeholders to dedicate time from their staff time (e.g., 5 percent) to carry out the supplemental roles and to rely more upon technology than in the past. It was recognized that Policy Board/policy makers of stakeholder organizations need to authorize their own staff to support these needs.
- The group did, however, concede that even with volunteer technical staff, someone will still need to coordinate the volunteer activity. There was no discussion of how to achieve this coordination, recognizing that the need must be recognized as a priority before thought is put into the logistics.
- Vander Schaaf explained Transitway Impact Research Program involved four of the seven counties, initiated by Hennepin County and University of Minnesota, includes collaborative needs that overlap with MetroGIS expertise. County staff are involved that might be resources valuable to MetroGIS’s needs as well. Goal to provide standardized socioeconomic data on transit ways to the FTA, etc. Kathie Doty, former Business Planning consultant to MetroGIS is involved with the project.
- The group concurred that the Policy Board needs to be convinced that resources gap exists and that it is in their respective organizations’ benefit to do more than in the past to assist with the support of fostering and achieving collaborative solutions. Knippel noted that many technical support people are willing to participate but need their policy bodies to resources to direct that they formally authorize participation by included dedicate time in their internal workplans. **(Make sure to add as challenge / strategy statements.)**
- Harper offered that when the support recommendation is shared with the Policy Board, it may be helpful to ask a couple participants to share the outcome of a couple projects which encountered obstacles that could have been mitigated had the resources sought via a Technical Coordinator had been in place (3 years and still no traction on a plan for MetroGIS’s role regarding applications.)
- The members also agreed that the cumulative impact of adding up the support of desired tactics measured against current staff resources needs to be clearly stated.

#### 5) **Agenda Report to June 27 Coordinating Committee meeting**

- A process was agreed upon to elicit detailed comment from the Committee on each of the eight subject Activity/Program areas, in hopes of avoiding a special meeting.
  - a) Large Group - Overview and General Questions (25 minutes): Members of the Team will begin this agenda item by summarizing the draft challenge/strategy/major implication statements developed for each of eight subject Activity/Program areas and entertain questions in a larger group setting. It was agreed that these summaries will, in effect, be a dry run for their presentation of this material to the Policy Board in July, in particular the implications of these strategies.

- b) First Small Group Session (25 minutes): Coordinating Committee members will be asked to break into the first of two sets of small groups, organized by activity area. Team members will facilitate discussion for each small group. Committee members will be asked to respond to the questions, including:

Facilitation Questions Specific to Activity Program Area:

- What is missing from the draft challenges and or strategies for this activity area?
- Are any of the suggested strategies inappropriate for MetroGIS to pursue?
- Are any of the statements not clearly stated? Need clarification?
- Are the messages to the Policy Board (Step 1) on target? Clearly stated?
- If the cited changes identified are made can you support the Committee granting concept approval?

General Questions:

- Is there anything missing from the proposed content of the Business Plan (refer to Outline)?
- Offer suggested tactics to implement strategies if they come to mind but the purpose of the discussion is to make sure the strategies are appropriate and stated clearly.
- Are the operational implications appropriate (Chapter 8)? Anything missing.

- c) Second Small Group Session (25 minutes): Committee members move to a new small group. Repeat step “b” process.

- Each Team member agreed to be responsible for supporting (taking notes/facilitating) the small group session(s) at the Committee meeting for which they volunteered to comment on the text in the Plan. (See above)
- It was agreed to expand the Committee meeting by 30 minutes to provide adequate time for this process and to conduct this process at the end of the Committee meeting.
- A proposed time line (Attachment B) was shared. No comments other than the group would prefer to use technology (e.g., Microsoft SharePoint) if possible as opposed to calling a special meeting(s). It was agreed that SharePoint’s potential will be tested by the Team before inviting the Committee to participate in the review of the Plan using this technology.

**6) Next Team Meeting?**

- No discussion awaiting outcome of the Committee meeting.

**7) Adjourn**

Prepared by  
Jonathan Blake, MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
*and*  
Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

## Attachment A

### Table in Section 2.5 of Draft Business Plan

Following the meeting, changes requested at the meeting were incorporated into the subject table. The following version is the updated version:

**Table X: Types of Participation Roles in MetroGIS’s Efforts** (*modified June 7, 2007*)

<b>Type of Participant Role</b> <i>(listed from most to least intensive):</i>	<b>Role Definition</b>
<b>Category 1</b> <i>(need label)</i>	
Collaboration Sponsors	Stakeholder organization which provides financing and/or support for “foster collaboration” functions
Advocates	Employee or policy maker (elected official) of a stakeholder organization that serves as a member of standing board or committee and provides oversight for operations and policy direction. These individuals also serve in the critical role as advocates for support of collaborative solutions by their respective stakeholder organizations and among their peers.
<b>Category2</b> <i>(need label)</i>	
Custodians	Stakeholder organization manages one of more components of an endorsed regional solution (includes data and applications)
Advisors/Project Contributor	Employee or policy maker of a stakeholder organization who participates in a topic specific identification of shared needs and/or in the definition of a shared solution.
Contributors/Producers	Stakeholder organization that maintains and provides data/web services that are part of an endorsed regional solution, publishers of data/web services via DataFinder, and or develops and publishes availability of applications via centralized tool (e.g., ApplicationFinder) for others to use.
<b>Category2</b> <i>(need label)</i>	
Consumers	Stakeholder organization utilizes services affiliated with MetroGIS efforts
Prospective Participants	Stakeholder organization not currently participating but has the potential to do so.

## Attachment B

### SUGGESTED SCHEDULE – DEVELOPMENT OF BUSINESS PLAN

- 1) June 5<sup>th</sup> Business Planning Oversight Team -**
  - a) Complete initial review of Challenges and Strategies
  - b) Complete initial review of Operations Implications / Support Resources Concept
  - c) Decide on content of June 27 Committee presentation
  
- 3) June 26? Meeting with Professor Bryson (Business Planning Oversight Team or Staff Only?)**

Finalize Competencies (*associated with MetroGIS*)
  
- 4) June 27<sup>th</sup> Coordinating Committee Meeting**
  - a) Overview of the progress on Business Plan
  - b) Direction on specified matters – Small Group discussion
    - Challenges and Strategies
    - Operational Implications
    - General content of the Plan
  - c) Set a special meeting as early as possible between Thursday, June 28 and Friday July 13?
  
- 5) July 9-13? Special Meeting of Coordinating Committee**
  - a) Recommendation to the Policy Board – Major components of the Business Plan
  
- 6) July 25<sup>th</sup> Policy Board Meeting**

Concept approval - Comment and direction on initial recommendations
  
- 7) Aug. XX Special Meeting of Coordinating Committee**

Tactical Plans to implement key strategies (Succession Planning, Applications Framework, Performance Measurement, Outreach, etc.)
  
- 8) Aug. or Sept XX: Special Meeting of Policy Board??**

Tactical Plans to implement key strategies (Succession Planning, Applications Framework, Performance Measurement, Outreach, etc.)
  
- 9) Sept. 12<sup>th</sup> Coordinating Committee Meeting**
  - a) Recommendation on final Business Plan recommendations
  - b) Adoption of 2008 Work Plan and Preliminary 2008 Budget
  - c) Begin the process to update the Performance Measurement Plan
  
- 10) Oct. 17<sup>th</sup> Policy Board Meeting**
  - a) Adopt Next-Generation Business Plan
  - b) Adopt 2008 Work Plan and Preliminary 2008 Budget
  - c) Begin process of stakeholder endorsement of the Plan