

MetroGIS Business Planning Oversight Team Meeting Notes
Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (2099 University Avenue)
Wednesday, July 18, 2007
2:00-5:30 PM

Categorizations:

1. Reaffirmation of existing policies
2. Expanded role and/or resources
3. Modification of policy/practices

(1) "Secure technical leadership" – *Expanded role and/or resources*

(2) "Expand support Resources" – *Expanded role and/or resources*

(3) "Secure adequate dedicated support" – *Expanded role and/or resources*
General purpose: To carry out the plan

(4) "Develop outreach and marketing plan" – *Expanded role and/or resources*
General purpose: To develop the plan

(5) "Develop plan for shared applications" – *Expanded role and/or resources*

(6) "Identify public/private partnership opportunities" – *Reaffirmation*

(7-8) "Foster open data source model" – *Possible modification of policy, but Technical Advisory Committee needs to look at this and clarify the definition and purpose*
DA – Open source data model is probably the wrong terminology. The industry term is probably Extract, Transform, and Load (ETL).
BB – Does not appear to be any policy issue on this item
DA – This is a parking lot issue, not something that needs to be discussed at July Policy Board meeting.

(9) "Use outreach to promote standards and best practices" – *Reaffirmation*
RJ – Will Craig interpreted this as MetroGIS as going to outside counties and advocating for their use of our standards. However, the point is to advocate within current MetroGIS community, not to outside entities.
NR – This is an especially critical for emergency services.
NR – This may be a reaffirmation for parcels, but it is an expanded role when it comes to outside organizations

(10) – *Needs further development*

(11) "Encourage leadership to assume advocacy roles" – *Reaffirmation*
NR – Collaboration is a two-way street, so policymakers need to act as advocates for GIS
RJ – This is good public policy; not just about GIS per se. Policymakers are there not for technical expertise but to direct staff to collaborate and make MetroGIS work.
JH – Leave in statement but change direction requested, making it a less critical issue.
RK – Offer to Policy Board as an assumption and ask if there is an objection.
DA – This seems like a re-statement or re-affirmation of existing guiding principles, so it may not require as much time and effort as other points. Use this as a reminder to them that this has traditionally been the Policy Board's role, but it should be re-stated because of its importance.

(12) "Periodically evaluate board and committee membership" – *Modification of policy or practices*

(13) “Develop measures of public value” – *Parking lot (this is a tactic that could be dealt with in the performance measurement program)*

BB – Policy question is, “Should we be measuring impacts to the public, who are secondary beneficiaries?” Primary beneficiaries are the governmental units who serve the public.

MV – Thought it should go to Policy Board at some point to resolve whether or not this is a necessary function of MetroGIS, considering MetroGIS is a capacity building organization.

RJ – We are measuring the value at the stakeholder level (counties, school districts, etc.)

(14) “Promote the greater public good” – *Potential modification of policy and practices*

NR – The part about “justifying resources” was the key point of this item, not necessary the language regarding “greater public good.”

RK – On February 8, we discussed doing more than just those activities that are in an organization’s own self-interest. “Promoting the greater public good” could be seen as a departure from this past “self-interest” approach.

DA – “Greater public good” needs a new label. It needs a label that indicates the limited scope of this item. We are saying that there is a need to encourage participants to do more than they would otherwise do just for themselves. (In other words, MetroGIS as an organization does not exist to eradicate poverty.)

BB – If a strategy conflicts with a current policy, we need to identify for the Policy Board the specific items that conflict.

BB – Strategy and principle are two separate items and need to be understood as such.

RJ – This could be introduced to the Policy Board as more than a strategy, but rather as an overarching philosophy.

DA – Not all solutions from this point on would be “regional solutions,” but may instead be “sub-regional solutions.”

(15) “Investigate regional cost sharing partnership for data acquisition” – *Modification of policy and practices*

DA and RJ – This does not rise to the level of a Policy Board discussion.

(16) “Foster refinement and standardization of cost recovery policies” – *Reaffirmation*

RK – We are already doing this.

BB – It has not traditionally been MetroGIS’s role to discuss the counties’ financial situations.

RK – County Producer Workgroup has dealt with this on an ongoing basis.

BB – This has been dealt with on a case-by-case basis by each county (i.e. if the county chooses to implement certain policies, they will do so).

RK – The title of this item is not an accurate summary of the actual language in the plan. We need to change the title.

DA – The description is inaccurate as well. Some counties make the investments in GIS on a cost recovery model.

RK and DA – New language (summary): “We need to find a way to encourage GIS investments without tying them directly to cost recovery. We also need to find ways to justify the public investment in GIS.”

RJ – RK will redraft this item.

(17) “Seek coordination of legislative funding initiatives” – *Modification of policy and practices*

RK – Discussion at the forum dealt with lobbying.

NR – Would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

(18) “Implement policies that optimize investment” – *This is a principle and should not be taken to the Policy Board*

(19) “Foster a marketplace for geospatial resources” –

NR – Different from current practice, but not necessarily different from current policy

RJ – There is a policy question (“How do we relate to the vendor community on this?”). Nancy will write a couple of sentences to explain this issue.

(20) “Outsource application solutions” – *Tactic, does not need to go to Policy Board*

(21) “Pursue non-desktop application solutions” – *Tactic, does not need to go to Policy Board*

General discussion

JH – RJ could identify consent/non-consent points prior to Board meeting, then ask the Board if that staff recommendation is acceptable. One way to bundle is to single out items that one or two people checked.

RK – Divide into categories by type or scope of Policy Board involvement that is needed. The categories should discuss level of involvement or amount of discussion. We could use four categories (i.e. high, medium, low, etc.).

JH – Categories should be: Reaffirmation of existing policies; Expanded role and/or Expanded resources; Modification of policies and practices