

DISCUSSION AGENDA

MetroGIS Workshop Planning Session 5

“Meeting Shared Geospatial Needs Beyond Data”

Monday, January 14, 2008
1:30 PM – 2:30 PM (CST)

WebEx URL: **TBD**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>
1.	Summary of January 3 rd Meeting – Accurate?	PlanGraphics/Workgroup
2.	Expectations During the Workshop	PlanGraphics/Workgroup
	A. Overview of Process Envisioned	
	B. Roles: Staff/Workgroup Members...	
	C. Breakout room(s) Desired?	
3.	Expectations for the Evening Prior	PlanGraphics/Workgroup
	A. Pre-Workshop Briefing w/Recorders	
	B. Set Up of the Meeting Room	
	C. Dinner Plans	
4.	Additional Preparation Tasks	PlanGraphics/Workgroup
	A. Talking Points for Welcoming Comments	
	B. ?Post Materials on Wall (Purpose, Definitions)	
	C. Summarize Local Survey Results	
5.	Expectations Following Workshop	PlanGraphics/Workgroup
	A. Any Need to Meet Immediately After?	
	B. Summary Report Contents	
	<i>?Process Summary - Examples - 6/1/06 and 2/8/07 Forums</i>	MetroGIS Staff Support Team
	<i>Consolidation/Interpretation of Substance</i>	PlanGraphics
6.	Updates:	
	A. Final Instructions To Participants	Johnson
	B. Local Survey	Loesch
	C. Case Study Presentations	PlanGraphics
	D. Background Readings	PlanGraphics
	E. Glossary	Johnson
	F. Recorders	Brandt/PlanGraphics
	G. Participant Confirmations	Johnson
	H. Catering	Johnson
	I. Room Set Up	Johnson/Read
7.	Other Discussion Items	PlanGraphics/Workgroup



MetroGIS Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup

Meeting Notes – January 3, 2008

2:30 to 4:00 p.m. (CST)

DNR Main Office - St. Paul

Team Members Present: David Brandt (Washington County), Jim Bunning (Scott County), David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council), Tim Loesch (DNR), Jim Maxwell (The Lawrence Group), and Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District).

Team members absent: Bob Basques (St. Paul), Pat Cummens (ESRI), and Ben Verbick (LOGIS).

Support Present: John Antenucci and Jim Fries (PlanGraphics) and Randall Johnson and Chris Kline (MetroGIS)

1) Summary of December 20 Meeting

Accepted, as submitted.

2) Case Study Selection

The PlanGraphics Team reiterated that the objective of this portion of the workshop is to use local examples of successful sharing and that PlanGraphics team will supplement the local examples with examples of best practices from elsewhere. As such, the group decided to discuss the local case study examples first.

b) Local Case Study Examples

Johnson reported that Dan Ross with MnDOT had agreed to talk about the value that sharing web services in the response to the I-35W bridge collapse. He also reported that a response had not yet been received from the Dept of Health, inviting them to present about the recently implemented application that calls on a GIS service. The group agreed that Johnson should make another attempt to arrange for a presentation from the Dept of Health. In addition, Johnson was asked to contact Ben Verbick with LOGIS to talk about an example of LOGIS's application sharing experience, regardless of whether the Mn Dept of Health agrees to participate: (Editor's note – Verbick, with LOGIS, agreed to present when contacted following the meeting). The following presentations were acknowledged as locked in.

- Carver, Dakota and Scott Counties – Jim Bunning (sharing development resources)
- DNR Data Deli – Tim Loesch (sharing infrastructure)
- MnDOT – Dan Ross (sharing web services)
- OpenMNND/GeoMoose – Randy Knippel (streamlined implementation of web-based application)
- Regional Geocoder Project – Nancy Read (collaborative development of an application to be used/shared on a regional basis)
- LOGIS – Ben Verbick (collaborative application development and sharing) ([see note above](#))

In response to question asked by Johnson concerning citing the “activity connection” (e.g., for which partners are sought) components of www.GeoData.gov, the PlanGraphics Team also agreed to tease out the need for this type of sharing from the discussion during the workshop.

Finally, the group agreed that each of the presenters should be asked to cover the following four topics in their 8-10 minute presentations:

- Describe the project/activity, business need sought to be met and value received

- Explain the process/approach used to implement/achieve
- Describe key reasons why the project was successful.
- Describe major obstacles overcome and those that could not be overcome

a) Examples Beyond the Twin Cities:

The PlanGraphics Team shared with the group the following examples of application-related sharing from around the country that they believe best supplement the local examples identified above:

- Louisville/Jefferson County Information Consortium (LOJIC)
- Knoxville-Knox County-Knoxville Utility Board, TN (KGIS)
- Chester County, PA
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania – (Weather, Plume Modeling)
- Michigan

There was general discussion about how to allow participants to ask questions of presenters without taking time away from the other presenters. A suggestion was offered to encourage the participants to write down their questions on note cards for review by the facilitators and to address at an appropriate time later in the day. It was agreed that the purpose of sharing of the examples is to stimulate thinking and not to get into the specifics of any particular example at that time. The PlanGraphics Team agreed to offer suggestions at the next workgroup meeting. All agreed that this topic needs to be addressed in the opening comments when expectations for the day are shared with the participants.

Talking points will be provided to William Brown and others who will provide opening comments to ensure the participants are clear on the desired deliverables and process expectations.

3) (No topic)

4) Preparation Materials

a) Local Survey

A prototype of the web-based pre-workshop survey, developed by the DNR staff, was shared for comment and the DNR staff who worked on the survey were thanked for their quick turn around during the holidays. The following modifications were agreed upon:

General:

- Add a text box for the respondent to provide their name as the first response and make filling in their name a required action to proceed to the next screen.
- Change the rating scheme from “1 through 5” to “Low, Medium, and High” throughout the survey.

Question 1:

- Modify the question language for the first two Subparts (and any others as appropriate) to include the concepts of hosting and consuming without breaking the statement into separate questions. It was agreed that the purpose of the survey is to obtain a general understanding of preferences before the workshop and to rely upon the facilitators to tease out differences during the discussion
- Add a response category “Appropriate for MetroGIS to Foster Sharing Mechanism” to each of the subparts and delete the response “importance to the general public” where it appears.

Question 2:

- Combine into one text box and replace the “Working Title” and “Objective” labels to a single text box labeled “Description”. Continue to offer three opportunities to identify additional shared activities/services.
- Modify the main statement to something like “What other shared activity/service would you like MetroGIS to consider pursuing?”

Question 3:

- Change the lead in statement as needed to accommodate the change called for above from a 1-5 rating scheme to one of low, medium and high (e.g., How important is it to you that MetroGIS foster solutions to the following types of shared geospatial application needs and delivery of shared activities and services using a scale of low, medium and high?)
- Add a text field for additional comments.

Question 5:

- Change “value” to “value to others”
- Change the ranking scheme as noted in the General section.

Responses to questions raised by Loesch with the delivery of the prototype survey:

- Tabulated results are to be password protected (remain on the PlanGraphics project site) and not shared with any of the participants before the workshop.
- No need to track IP address since the survey will not be anonymous. Each respondent will have to enter their name to progress to participate. Responses from anyone other than confirmed participants will not be counted.

b) Background Readings

The PlanGraphics Team thanked those you had submitted suggested readings and shared them with the group. They also noted that they were planning to add several journal articles to the listing that describe trends relevant to workshop discussion topics. Johnson encouraged the members to submit any suggested readings to the PlanGraphics Team before the next meeting. Once the final list is compiled by the PlanGraphics Team, it will be sent to Kline who will post it on the MetroGIS project webpage (see “4c” below).

c) Mock-up of MetroGIS Project Webpage

Johnson and Kline described the preliminary headings presented in the mocked-up webpage and asked the members for feedback on the mocked design. They commented that as had agreed upon at a previous meeting, this webpage will contain materials that workshop participants will be asked to review before the workshop and, in general, serve as the one-stop access point for information about the workshop. As had been agreed earlier, no working documents will be made available via the MetroGIS site but will remain on the PlanGraphics site. In response to a comment offered by Read, the group agreed that the title of the webpage should be changed to correspond to the title of the workshop.

5) Status Update – Participant Confirmations/Missing Perspectives

Johnson noted that after the agenda materials had been circulated for this meeting, Cummins had heard from the Gopal Khanna, with the Office of Enterprise Technology and CIO for the State of Minnesota, that he was keen for OET to participate in the workshop. Johnson also reported that a decision had not yet been made as to the OET staff member(s) best suited to participate. It was agreed that the PlanGraphic Team and Cummins would confer as to the perspective(s) desired and that she would continue to serve as the liaison with OET to arrange for their participation. It was agreed that consideration should be given to the option of requesting representation of both OET policy and technical perspectives.

In response to a comment made by Kotz, the group concurred that representation from cities should be expanded to five, of possible, to equal participation from county, regional and state participants either by substituting city representatives for invitees who have not confirmed their participation and or by expanding the number of participants beyond 30, as permitted by facility set up limitations and the catering budget. The group also agreed that securing city representation from Hennepin County communities should be a top priority.

6) Update - Food Catering

Johnson reported that he had received two bids and that both are within budget. He concurred that funding is sufficient to handle a few more participants/observers. It was agreed that an invitation should be extended to William Brown to stay for the day as an observer following his welcoming comments.

7) Update - Recorders

The PlanGraphic Team stated that they would prefer to secure four individuals to record the proceedings; two for each session on a rotational basis. Each recorder will be expected to prepare a type-written summary of the session(s) they record and submit their summary to the PlanGraphics Team. Brandt reported that several students have expressed interest in serving in this capacity. He agreed to continue to work with the PlanGraphics Team to secure those candidates whose qualifications are best suited for the task. It was also agreed that, if possible, the recorders should plan to meet with the PlanGraphics Team the evening before the workshop to clarify expectations. Brandt agreed to coordinate this meeting.

8) Workshop Program Refinements

None offered to the version attached to the meeting agenda

9) Expectations Following the Workshop

No discussion due to lack of time. Postponed to the next meeting.

10) Other Discussion Items

a) Glossary

The members and the PlanGraphics Team agreed to review the glossary entries posted on the MetroGIS SharePoint site and modify them as they believe appropriate for the workshop. Once finalized, the updated glossary document will be one of the items posted on the MetroGIS project webpage that the workshop participants will be encourage to review before they arrive at the workshop.

b) Assignments

- Johnson and PlanGraphics Team - Agree on revisions to the text for the Local Survey and submit the revisions to Loesch to finalize the actual survey by early next week.
- Johnson - Confirm presenters of local examples of sharing and clarify expectations for content
- Cummins and PlanGraphics Team make decide the perspective(s) desired from OET and speak with the State CIO to arrange for participation.
- Workgroup members – send suggestions for background readings to PlanGraphics
- Workgroup members – offer modifications to the glossary posted in the MetroGIS SharePoint Site
- Workgroup members – offer suggestions for modifications to the mock-up of the MetroGIS project website at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/apps/defineapps.shtml>.

11) Next Meeting and Topics

The next WebEx meeting was set for Monday, January 14, 2008 from 1:30 to 2:30 at DNR's offices on Lafayette Road in St. Paul.

The discussion at the next meeting is to focus on topics related to facilitation of the meeting and expectations for post-workshop activities. The members agreed to defer to staff and the PlanGraphics Team to finalize the local survey and participants based upon the feedback provided at this meeting.

12) Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.