



## **MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Minutes: 1996-1999**



MetroGIS: Next Steps Forum  
Thursday, January 25, 1996  
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 156  
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota, 1890 Buford Avenue

11:30-11:55 / Arrival and Lunch. Box lunches will be provided.

11:55-12:00 / Welcome - Richard Johnson, Deputy Regional Administrator, Metropolitan Council

Review and confirm MetroGIS "concept maps"

(Emphasis on accuracy of strategic issues and attachment of action items to appropriate strategic issues.)

Prioritize and group strategic issues

Review and agree upon interim decision making structure

- Retain strategic planning group as "visioning/coordinating" team
- Create "teams" to address the strategic issues
- Define basic "team" operating procedures
- Create an "administrative procedures" team

2:30-2:45 / Break

Form "strategic issue" teams

(Select core member(s) from strategic planning participants for highest priority strategic issues)

- Form an "administrative procedures" team  
(Select member(s) from strategic planning participants)

Set dates for "team" and "visioning group" meetings

Definition of Metropolitan Council's MetroGIS facilitation role

Proposed means of communicating strategic planning results with stakeholders

4:00 / Adjourn

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Strategic Planning Forum**  
**January 25, 1996**

The meeting began at 12:15 p.m. at the Earle Brown Conference Center on the St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Participants: **Federal Agencies:** Ronald Wencl (USGS); **State Agencies:** David Arbeit (LMIC); **Metropolitan Agencies:** Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); **Counties:** Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), and Jim Hentges (Scott); **Cities:** Brad Henry (Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (Roseville); **Watersheds:** Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro); **School Districts:** Jim Sydow (TIES) and Clark Evans (Minnetonka); **Universities:** Will Craig (CURA); **Utilities:** Alan Srock (NSP); **GIS Consultants:** John Carpenter (Insight Mapping and Demographics; and **Business Geographics:** Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation).

Support staff/facilitators: **Metropolitan Council:** Shelly Bergh Gardner, Marcy Syman, Mark Kotz, David Vessel, and Randall Johnson. **Humphrey Institute -University of Minnesota:** John Bryson and Charles Finn.

Richard Johnson, Deputy Administrator of the Metropolitan Council, welcomed the participants and thanked them for their efforts at the MetroGIS Strategic Planning Retreat held on December 14th.

Randall Johnson and Rick Gelbmann of the Metropolitan Council offered several refinements to clarify the intent of the concept maps that the group had created at the December 14th retreat. John Bryson and Charles Finn also responded to questions from the participants regarding the intent of the maps. A number of map changes suggested by the participants and Council staff were agreed upon. (A summary of the changes is provided in Attachment A.)

The group then participated in an exercise to decide the order in which the identified strategic issues should be addressed. The exercise, known as "paired rankings" was lead by Shelly Bergh Gardner and Marcy Syman of the Council staff. The results of the exercise were as follows (listed in order from the first to the last to be addressed): 1) Define intent of regional GIS, 2) Define outputs/products from system, 3) Decide which data needed by participants in regional GIS", 4) Determine user accuracy needs, 5) Have standards, 5) Standardize data across region, 5) Define Data delivery system, 8) Keep data current and accurate, 9) Define structure of logically integrated system, 10) Have effective/fair governance of participant entities, 11) Be politically supported, 12) Make data available at low cost, 13) Share Resources, and 14) Secure long term financing.

(Note: "Maintain local control" had been ranked number 2 but the consensus of the group (see below) was to remove it from the ranking because it should be addressed as a goal rather than as a task. The concepts "coordinate with county systems" and "develop and use a marketing plan" are action items that were inadvertently ranked as strategic issues. They are associated with the strategies ranked number 1 and 9, respectively. As such, they were also moved from the ranking.)

Randall Johnson and Rick Gelbmann offered an interim MetroGIS decision making model for discussion. The model proposed retention of the strategic planning group as a "visioning/coordinates team" to oversee the decision making process to create the MetroGIS. The participants agreed that they would continue to serve in this new capacity. It was also explained that "teams" are proposed to address the identified strategic issues and that the teams would be empowered to make decisions. Cliff Aichinger suggested, and the group agreed, that the "strategic issue teams" should obtain a "finding of compliance with the intent of the MetroGIS" from the visioning/coordinates team before pursuing any course(s) of action.

John Carpenter noted that it should not be assumed that all resources to create and maintain the MetroGIS will come from the public sector. He stated that he would like to see more private sector interests involved in the process. There was general discussion about the appropriate time to bring elected officials into the process. Richard Johnson noted that creation of the MetroGIS, like the Metropolitan Radio Board, will require decisions that involve sharing of power and allocation of resources and that it would be beneficial to have elected officials involved early in the process. There was also general discussion about the general nature of the goals identified at the December 14th retreat. Charles Finn noted that establishment of high level goals is necessary before the group can move forward to more detailed statements of intent which is often an iterative process, that is, as you learn more about the issues the goals and objectives often are refined.

Gary Stevenson stated that the intent of the regional GIS needs to be better defined before he would be comfortable discussing the decision making model or spending more time discussing how strategic issues should be assigned to teams. Al Srock stated that he would also prefer more detail about the intent of the MetroGIS before creating a committee structure. Will Craig also suggested that the group decide how to address the issues that are more similar to "goal statements" than definitive tasks (i.e., maintain local control) before assigning issues to teams.

The group agreed to suspend the agenda to work on the intent of the MetroGIS. Shelly Bergh Gardener and Marcy Syman facilitated an exercise to help the group clarify a common vision for the intent of the MetroGIS. She asked each participant to answer the question, "what is in it for me (their organization)" to participate in a regional GIS.

Will Craig noted that he found interesting and useful the information presented on the GIS "status/needs/benefits" worksheet that have been created for each county and included in the agenda materials. He noted that a worksheet for the Metropolitan Council would be useful to the discussion of intent of the MetroGIS. Rick Gelbmann noted that the Council is in the midst of an internal needs

assessment and that a “worksheet” will be prepared for the Council in the next few weeks. The following statements regarding the intent of the MetroGIS were offered:

David Arbeit noted that it is important to know what data are needed by the Council and others to support decision making that crosses local jurisdictional boundaries.

Pat O’Connor stated that Hennepin County is supportive of a MetroGIS to “promote effective responsive GIS operation within the County” and that this objective goes beyond sharing data.

Cliff Aichinger stated that he envisions a component of the intent to be a “locally controlled regional GIS”.

John Carpenter noted for organizations that need data, the intent is to gain affordable access to information that is beyond their control in a format they can use. He also stated that the MetroGIS should include a “clearinghouse” function to partially address these data needs.

David Arbeit noted that there appear to be three classes of organizations: 1) those that have the GIS data they need, 2) those that need data for their jurisdiction, and 3) those that need data to address problems that cross jurisdictional lines. He noted the latter two generally favor the concept of a MetroGIS. He asked the question “if an adequate means of local control can be achieved would those that have data be willing to share it with those that need it?”.

Gary Stevenson stated that he agrees a high priority should be common data for regional decision making. He also stated that Dakota County is willing to make its data available for this purpose but he cautioned that he has a more limited view of the intent of the MetroGIS, noting that he is not comfortable with access by others for other purposes.

Cliff Aichinger and Al Srock reiterated that a very valuable component of the MetroGIS is the creation of a means to make data more efficiently available to those that need it.

Jim Sydow stated that TIES wants links established to access data sets maintained by other organizations. He also emphasized that TIES does not want to store or maintain data from other organizations, they only want access to up-to-date information when they need it.

Richard Johnson concurred that a high priority of the MetroGIS should be use of a common data base by local and metropolitan organizations for regional decision making. He stated that the Metropolitan Council favors the development of a Metro-Wide GIS because: 1) the Council recognizes that it needs a GIS capability to carry out its mission and that development and maintenance of this capability through a cooperative effort with local government would avoid significant duplication of effort and 2) the Council recognizes that it needs access to better, more detailed information for regional decision making.

Al Srock stated that a common data base would result in less duplication of effort and, thereby, more cost effective provision/delivery of services such as right-of-acquisition, routing of utility lines, etc.

Will Craig stated that a MetroGIS would improve the Metro Area's ability to compete for economic development.

Ron Wencl noted that Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) has developed the concept of a "data integrator" which when implemented is intended to insure availability of geographic information to those who need it. He noted that gaining access from cooperative efforts, such as the MetroGIS, is preferred to gaining access through a number of individual sources -- one stop shopping. He also noted that the USGS has resources that may be of assistance to the MetroGIS effort and he offered to assist in any way possible.

Shelly concluded this exercise by noting that several of the statements [listed on flip charts] were the same as the goal statements that had been agreed to at the December 14th strategic planning retreat. She also proposed to convert these statements to a paragraph-style mission statement for discussion and approval at the next meeting. The group accepted this proposal.

The group reviewed a draft statement of the Metropolitan Council's role in the creation of the MetroGIS. Randall Johnson and Rick Gelbmann explained the draft statement and asked for comment, noting that it is proposed to be considered for adoption by the Metropolitan Council on February 8th. David Arbeit suggested two changes for clarification: 1) Add "selectively" to the project support statement and 2) add "a fair share" to the long term financial needs statement. John Bryson noted that the term "catalyst" would describe the proposed role better than the term "facilitator". It was noted that term "facilitator" would be deleted and that the other revisions would be included in the draft presented to the Council.

The final activity of the day involved review of a proposed strategy to communicate the activities of the MetroGIS effort with all stakeholders. The group did not raise any objections to relying upon a newsletter to be created for the MetroGIS effort; other existing newsletters; liaisons with existing organizations, such as the Governor's Council on Geographic Information; meeting with stakeholders upon request; and the Internet. A "home page" is proposed to be created from which stakeholders could post comments; download documents, agendas, and minutes; and communicate with other stakeholders. Pat O'Connor asked that Council staff speak with him about coordination of a Hennepin County effort with the proposed MetroGIS newsletter.

The group agreed to reconvene the morning of February 27th.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP  
GIS Liaison

## ATTACHMENT A

### REVISIONS TO CONCEPT MAPS

Description of agreed upon map changes (copies of the revised concept maps are available for review):

Governance Map: 1) upgrade "163 Shares Resources" to a strategic issue with arrows to "405-Reduce data costs" and "405-Eliminate Redundancy", 2) upgrade and combine action items "119-Have effective/fair governance if GIS and 120 Have effective fair governance of participant entities" to one strategic issue (Have fair governance of participant entities) and draw an arrow from concept 119/120 to "101 Be politically supported", 3) change "157 Define issues of Fairness" to an action item associated with concept 119/120, 4) change "114 Explore governance options" from a strategic issue to an action item, 5) delete arrows from 101 and from 117 to 114, 6) draw an arrow from 114 to "116 Establish structure for governance", 7) draw an arrow from concept 116 to "121 Better decision making for participants", and 8) correct spelling "term" in concept "161 Secure long term funding".

(Data) Content Map: 1) change "15 Standards" to "15 Have Standards", upgrade to a strategic issue, and draw an arrow to "37 Use metadata protocol", 2) change "19 Develop standards" to an action item, 3) delete line between "55 Define data descriptors" and "37 Use metadata protocol", 4) draw an arrow from concept 55 to "19 Develop standards", 5) add an arrow from concept 55 to "152 Standardize data across the region", 6) draw an arrow from "10 Identify current efforts/data" to "11 Have data generators clearly identified" and "9 Identify data owners", from concept 11 to "12 Data that accommodates range of stakeholder needs" to "7 Know where data exists", and from concept 9 to "8 Index the data sources" to concept 7, 8) change the link between concept 7 and "1 Have data you need" to show the arrow from concept 7 to concept 1, 9) draw an arrow from concept 10 to "27 Determine user accuracy needs", 10) delete "32 Data content" from the map, it was agreed that this unconnected phrase was an unnecessary map label, and 11) revise "51 Decide which data needed regionally" to "51 Decide which data needed by participants in regional GIS".

Systems Management/Content/Governance Maps: Combine strategic issues 20, 152, and 236 which all state "Standardize data across the region" into one strategic issue.

(Note: "Goals and Strategic Issues" and individual "Strategic Issue" maps are also to be changed to reflect the changes outlined above.)



MetroGIS Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting  
Tuesday, February 27, 1996  
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 156  
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota  
8:30 a.m. - Noon

A memorandum is enclosed to explain each agenda item and any suggested action.  
Please plan to arrive about 10 minutes early to review any additional handout materials.

1. Acceptance of Meeting Summary
  - a) January 25, 1996, meeting
2. Status/Progress Report -- MetroGIS-Related Activities
  - a) Council's GIS Needs Assessment
  - b) Preliminary Draft -- Council's GIS "status/needs/benefits worksheet"
3. Intent of MetroGIS
4. Group and Define Related Strategic Issues\*\*
5. Revised Interim Decision Making Structure
  - a) Consistency requirement
  - b) Process-Meeting Planning Subgroup
  - c) Metropolitan Council role statement
  - d) Clarify team roles
6. Create Strategic Issue Teams
  - a) Identification of Team Interest
  - b) Short Term Team Objectives
7. Interim Data/Cost Sharing Agreements
  - a) MetroGIS Agreement-in-Principle with Ramsey County
8. Next Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting
  - a) Date
  - b) Volunteers
9. Adjourn

\*\* Includes an exercise that we suggest you complete before the meeting

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Visioning/Coordination Team**  
**February 27, 1996**

The meeting began at 8:30 a.m. at the Earle Brown Conference Center on the St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Members Present: **Federal Agencies:** Ronald Wencil (USGS); **State Agencies:** David Arbeit (LMIC); **Metropolitan Agencies:** Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); **Counties:** Margo LaBau (Anoka County), Dave Drealand (Carver), Gary Stevenson (Dakota) [left early], Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); **Watersheds:** Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey- Washington-Metro); **School Districts:** Jim Sydow (TIES) and Clark Evans (Minnetonka); **Universities:** Will Craig (CURA); **Utilities:** Alan Srock (NSP); and **GIS Consultants:** John Carpenter (Insight Mapping and Demographics);

Members Absent: **Cities:** Brad Henry (Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (Roseville) and **Business Geographics:** Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation).

Support staff: **Metropolitan Council:** Shelly Bergh Gardner, Randall Johnson, Tanya Mayer, and David Vessel.

## **1. Summary From Previous Meeting**

The January 25, 1996, meeting summary was accepted as presented. The group agreed that member names need not be associated with discussion items and that individual comments need not be identified unless objections are being raised.

## **2. Status/Progress Reports**

Rick Gelbmann updated the group on the Metropolitan Council's internal GIS Needs Assessment. He stated that the report of preliminary findings is expected to be available by mid-March and he encouraged members of this group to comment on the preliminary recommendations.

David Arbeit asked if the consultant (PlanGraphics) will be providing any recommendations regarding structuring of the MetroGIS effort. Rick stated that PlanGraphics has been informed of the Council's commitment and activities regarding the MetroGIS effort to insure that their recommendations coordinate between the Council's internal and external programs. Rick also noted that PlanGraphics has been asked to focus its work on the internal needs of the Council. David then asked how the Council intends to balance its resources between its internal GIS program needs and the support of the external MetroGIS effort. Rick noted that PlanGraphics has raised this "balance" question and will be

assisting the Council develop a framework to guide these “balance-related” decisions as the MetroGIS effort matures. Rick reemphasized that the Council is committed to allocating significant resources to the creation of the MetroGIS.

Rick also explained that work on a GIS "status/needs/benefits" worksheet for the Council has been postponed pending completion of the needs assessment.

### **3. MetroGIS Intent Statement**

The group unanimously endorsed the Statement of Intent that was offered by staff with the understanding that the three data-related statements of desired outcome are to combine in to one statement. The group also concurred that the statement adequately addressed the meaning of the strategic issue entitled "local control". And, the group concurred there the Statement of Intent would not be enhanced by specific reference any of the following three "goals" identified at the December Retreat but not identified in the follow-up exercise at the January 25th meeting: Promote new definition of community: independent to interdependent, competitive to cooperative; Encourage new cooperative uses-synergy; and Cooperative GIS system assures you have data you need. Council staff noted that a revised version would be prepared for the group’s approval.

### **4. Group and Define Related Strategic Issues**

The group consolidated the fourteen strategic issues that it had agreed upon at the January meeting into four strategic issues themes: governance, standards, data content/outputs, and data access/ delivery. A preliminary work plan was also developed through the use of a Gantt Chart process. This process helped the group visualize the sequencing of issues necessary between and among the four theme areas. Shelly Bergh Gardner facilitated both of these group process activities. (Refer to Attachment A for an illustration of the results of these exercises.)

The final activity proposed for this agenda item was delegated to staff. It was to have involved a group process to define the meaning of top ranked strategic issue for each strategic issue theme area. The group, however, concluded that it preferred staff to propose these definitions for discussion at a future meeting.

### **5. Revised Interim Decision Making Structure**

The group discussed the proposed relationship between the Strategic Issue Teams and Visioning/ Coordinating Team. The consensus was that Strategic Issue Teams should not decide courses of action but rather their charge should be to analyze options and make recommendations. This conclusion, in turn, lead to a brief discussion but no consensus regarding the following questions:

a) How to effectively include elected officials in the decision making process? b) The appropriate time for members to seek "endorsement" of the MetroGIS process from their respective boards/commissions? and c) The need to establish rules for the Visioning/Coordination Team regarding who should serve, member obligations, meeting norms, decision procedures, etc.

It was agreed, with regard to the board/council "acceptance" question, that for the time being the members should seek approval as they deem necessary to continue to participate in the effort. The group asked staff to place the procedures discussion on the next agenda. The remainder of the components of the decision making structure were acceptable, as presented in the staff report.

## **6. Create Strategic Issue Teams**

The members attempted to identify the persons who will serve as the liaison(s) from the Visioning/Coordinating Team to each of the Strategic Issues Teams. Several members indicated interest in the Governance and Data Content/Outputs Teams; Ronald Wencil volunteered to be the liaison to the Standards Team, although he expressed uneasiness about being the only liaison, given his unfamiliarity with the data needs of the local government interests; and David Arbeit volunteered to be the liaison to the Data Access/Delivery Team. It was agreed to postpone this identification of liaison responsibilities, in particular for the Governance and Data Content Teams, until the next meeting. In the interest of adjourning on time, the group also decided to postpone discussion of short term objectives for the strategic issue teams until the next meeting.

## **7. Interim Data/Cost Sharing Agreements**

Time ran out before the packet materials could be discussed.

## **8. Next Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for 8:30 AM on Friday, March 22, 1996. Clark Evans, Margo LaBau, and David Arbeit volunteered to assist with preparation for the next meeting.

## **9. Adjourn**

The meeting concluded at 12:15 PM.

Prepared by,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP



Visioning/Coordinating Team Meeting  
Friday, March 22, 1996  
University of St. Thomas  
Murray Herrick Building - Room 113  
8:30 a.m.

A memorandum is enclosed to explain each agenda item and suggested action.  
Please plan to arrive about 10 minutes early to review any additional handout materials.

1. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries
  - a) February 27, meeting
  - b) March 7, 1996 (Meeting Planning Subgroup)
2. Intent of MetroGIS - Accept Revised Statement
3. Interim MetroGIS Decision Making Structure
  - a) Involvement of Elected Officials/Role of Visioning/Coordinating Team Members
  - b) Procedures Visioning/Coordinating Team \*\*
4. Strategic Issue Teams
  - a) Confirm Liaisons from Visioning/Coordinating Team
  - b) Procedure to Select other Members
5. Next Meeting
  - a) Date
  - b) Volunteers -- Meeting Preparation
  - c) Possible Topics:
    - »Review MetroGIS Work Program (Gant Chart Results)
    - »Definition of Strategic Issues to Be Initially Addressed
    - »Guidelines for Selection of Pilot Projects and Interim Data/Cost Agreements
    - »Metropolitan Council's GIS "Status/Needs/Benefits" Worksheet
6. Adjourn

\*\* Includes an exercise that we suggest you complete before the meeting

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Visioning/Coordination Team**  
**March 22, 1996**

The meeting began at 8:30 a.m. at the Murray Herrick Building on the campus of the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul.

Members Present: Federal **Agencies:** Ronald Wencil (USGS); **State Agencies:** David Arbeit (LMIC); **Metropolitan Agencies:** Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); **Counties:** Margo LaBau (Anoka County), Dave Drealand (Carver), Gary Caswell alternate for Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), and Jim Hentges (Scott); **Cities:** Brad Henry (Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (Roseville); **School Districts:** Jim Sydow (TIES) and Clark Evans (Minnetonka); *and* **GIS Consultants:** John Carpenter (Lawrence Group - formerly Insight Mapping and Demographics).

Members Absent: **Business Geographics:** Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation); **Counties:** Gary Stevenson (Dakota), David Claypool (Ramsey), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington), **Universities:** Will Craig (CURA); **Utilities:** Alan Srock (NSP); and **Watersheds:** Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey- Washington-Metro).

Support staff: Metropolitan **Council:** Marcy Syman, Randall Johnson, Tanya Mayer, and David Vessel.

## **Communications**

Rick Gelbmann informed the group of the Metadata Light guidelines that have been developed by the Standards Committee of Governors Council Geographic Information. Copies were handed out for information and comment. A draft logo for the MetroGIS effort was also offered for comment.

### **1. Summaries from Previous Meetings**

The summaries for the February 28, 1996 Coordinating Team meeting and the March 7, 1996, Process Subgroup meeting were accepted as submitted.

### **2. MetroGIS Intent Statement**

The group unanimously endorsed the following Statement of Intent for the MetroGIS effort:

“Provide an ongoing, stakeholder governed, metro-wide mechanism through which participants easily and equitably share geographically referenced graphic and associated attribute data that are accurate, current, of common benefit and readily usable.

The desired outcomes of a regional GIS include:

Improve the effectiveness, equitableness, responsiveness, and efficiency of participant operations.

Improve understanding of the dynamics of the seven county Metro Area and cooperatively chart courses to improve the quality of life and competitiveness for economic development.

Reduce the cost of data acquisition, management, and maintenance.

Increase credibility of data utilized in cross-jurisdictional decision making; minimize data redundancy.

### **3. Interim MetroGIS Decision Making Structure**

a) Role of Elected Officials: An interim governance team, comprised of members of the Coordinating Team, was formed. The team was directed to define a strategy to engage decision makers in the process and to seek their endorsement of the MetroGIS effort. The recommended strategy(ies) is to be brought back to the Coordinating Team for discussion prior to implementation.

David Arbeit, Clark Evans, Richard Johnson, Margo LaBau, Pat O'Connor, and Dennis Welsch volunteered to serve on this interim team. Virginia Erdahl was also suggested as a member. It was agreed that the decision maker membership should include representatives from all levels of government and non-government interests.

b) Role of Coordinating Team and its Members: The reasons why each of the current members was asked to participate in the MetroGIS process were explained. The reporting responsibilities of each member to their various organizations were also discussed. The following roles were agreed upon for the Coordination Team:

- 1) Continue broad MetroGIS visioning -- stay current and open to new ideas  
(add as an agenda item to encourage regular discussion)
- 2) Define the mission for each Strategic Issue Team
- 3) Coordinate teamwork programs and their work activities with other teams and with the  
Statement of Intent
- 4) Remove obstacles to Strategic Issue Team success
- 5) Make it possible for the correct mix of resources to come together -- facilitate synergy and  
promote collaboration among stakeholders
- 6) Educate affected interests about the MetroGIS effort

c) Meeting Norms -- Coordinating Team: Marcy Syman explained ten characteristics that are present in successful team environments and summarized the expectations that the Coordinating Team had previously set for the Strategic Issue Teams. Each Coordinating Team member was asked to indicate their preference for various meeting norms (i.e., staffing preference, report format, length and timing of meetings, etc.). The consensus was that the Metropolitan Council staff should support all of the teams.

The following staff functions were requested: clerical, meeting summaries, initially serve in a team leader role until the teams are operational, provide process facilitation assistance, assist recruiting team members, and prepare staff reports with recommendations.

The desired time between meetings ranged from 4 to 8 weeks, with the most common response being 6 weeks. David Arbeit and the Metropolitan Council were nominated to be the Coordinating Team leader (oversee meeting content, find/facilitate consensus, move the agenda). Staff was directed to prepare recommendations for the April meeting to bring closure to the meeting norms discussion.

#### **4. Strategic Issue Teams**

The following team liaisons were agreed upon: Data Content/Outputs -- Will Craig and Jim Sydow; Data Access/Delivery -- David Arbeit and Rick Gelbmann, and Standards -- Ronald Wencil. (The Interim Governance Team is to address this matter when it as part of its deliberations to involve decision makers in the process.) All Coordinating Team members were encouraged to submit names of persons that they think should be considered for the Strategic Issue Teams. Staff agreed to contact the persons that had previously expressed interest in the effort at the GIS Forums and to ask them to indicate which of the teams they would prefer to participate on. Staff also agreed to prepare a recruitment letter and background materials to send with the letter.

#### **5. Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for the morning of Friday, April 26, 1996. Scott Beckman and David Arbeit volunteered to assist with the agenda.

#### **6. Adjourn**

The meeting concluded at 11:35 am.

Prepared by,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP  
GIS Liaison



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Friday April 26, 1996  
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 156  
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota  
8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

A memorandum is enclosed to explain each agenda item and suggested actions.  
Please plan to arrive about 10 minutes early to review any additional handout materials.

1. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries:
  - a) March 22, 1996 (Coordinating Team)
  - b) March 27, 1996 (Interim Governance Team)
  - c) March 29, 1996 (4/26 Meeting Planning Group)
2. Refinement of Interim MetroGIS Decision Support Structure  
-- Add a Policy Board and Steering Committee
3. Selection of Coordinating Team Chairperson
4. Strategic Issue Teams:
  - a) Status of Member Recruitment
  - b) Endorsement of Mission Statement for Each Team
5. Phase II "Kick-off" Forum -- May 16, 1996
6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities:
  - a) Interim Data/Cost Sharing Agreement/Pilot Project Guidelines
  - b) MetroGIS Logo
  - c) Metropolitan Council's GIS Needs Assessment
  - d) Preliminary Draft -- Council's GIS "status/needs/benefits worksheet"
  - e) Discussions with Stakeholders/Pending Agreements/Pilot Projects
  - f) Other?
7. Next Meeting:
  - a) Coordinating Team (one month after May 16th Phase II kick off session)
  - b) Volunteer(s) to Discuss Next Coordinating Team Agenda
  - c) Interim Governance Team
8. Adjourn

## April 26, 1996 Meeting Minutes

The meeting began at 8:30 a.m. at the Earle Brown Conference Center on the St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Members Present: Federal Agencies: Ronald Wencil (USGS); State Agencies: David Arbeit (LMIC); Metropolitan Agencies: Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Counties: Margo LaBau (Anoka County), Dave Drealand (Carver), Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Cities: Brad Henry (Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (Roseville); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro); School Districts: Jim Sydow (TIES) and Clark Evans (Minnetonka); Universities: Will Craig (CURA); and GIS Consultants: John Carpenter (Lawrence Group); and Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation).

Members Absent: Counties: Gary Stevenson (Dakota), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP).

Support staff: Metropolitan Council: Mark Kotz, Randall Johnson, Tanya Mayer, Marcy Syman, and David Vessel.

Randall Johnson presented an overview of the agenda and asked if the group wished to add any items or discuss any of the items presented in Section 6 Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities. He also noted that updated materials for Agenda Items 2, 4a, and 6d had been handed out. No items were added and none of the Section 6 items were called out for discussion.

### 1. Meeting Summary Acceptance

The March 22, 1996, meeting summary (Coordinating Team) was accepted as presented. Summaries from the Meeting Planning Team (March 29) and Interim Governance Team (March 27 and April 22) were offered for information.

### 2. Refinement of MetroGIS Decision Support Structure

David Arbeit summarized the recommendation of the Interim Governance Team to add a Policy Board and a Steering Subcommittee of the Coordinating Team to the MetroGIS organizational structure that had previously been accepted. David also explained that the interim Governance Team had agreed that the Policy Board should decide its own membership beyond the core interests, based upon recommendations of the Coordinating Team. The core interests would include representatives from the seven Metro Area counties and the Metropolitan Council. It was noted metro-wide organizations where they exist, such as the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities (AMM), would be looked to fill the seats for the classes of organizations to be represented.

Governance Team members explained that the proposed structure is intended to bring the Policy Board into existence and to give it a means to begin to decide policy issues. They emphasized that the recommended structure will likely be modified as the MetroGIS decision making process matures.

A question was raised about how an organization can make a formal commitment to the MetroGIS if it is not one of the core stakeholders. David Arbeit stated that the Governance Team will begin its work to define a strategy to seek endorsement from stakeholders -- the core interests as well as others whose presence would significantly enhance the MetroGIS -- once a decision support structure has been agreed upon by the Coordinating Team.

A clarification was requested as to reporting relationship between the Policy Board and the Metropolitan Council. Some of the members were under the impression that the Policy Board would be reporting to the Metropolitan Council. Richard Johnson stated that the Policy Board is not proposed to be subordinate to or report to the Metropolitan Council or any organization but rather to be a forum for stakeholders to jointly shape the MetroGIS.

The group unanimously accepted the Governance Team's recommendation to add a Policy Board and a Steering Subcommittee to the MetroGIS Organizational Structure, as presented in David Arbeit's report to the Governance Team dated April 23, 1996, with the following modifications to clarify the Policy Board's membership ("Membership" column on the table):

1. Include the term "policy maker" in the first bullet;
2. State that the representatives from the core stakeholder organizations are to be elected officials from each of the seven counties and a Council member from the Metropolitan Council;
3. State that the other seven seats are to be held by representatives of classes of organizations/interests and not by individual interests and;
4. List examples of the classes of organizations whose representation will be recommended for membership on the board (i.e., cities, school districts, state agencies, legislature, watershed districts, academia, etc.)

### 3. Selection of a Coordinating Committee Chair (formerly Coordinating Team)

Randall Johnson explained that David Arbeit and the Metropolitan Council had been nominated at the March meeting to chair this committee but that few members had participated in the nomination process. To ensure a broad base of support for the appointed person, staff proposed that each member should fill out a written ballot, name any member of the Coordinating Committee as the Chairperson, and not limit their selection to the previous nominees. The membership concurred.

Randall Johnson also stated that he did not believe it appropriate for a Council employee to chair this Committee, noting that this situation could lead to problems obtaining MetroGIS endorsements from organizations that interact with the regulatory side of the Council. Some committee members agreed.

Richard Johnson informed the Committee that the Metropolitan Council intends to enter into an interagency agreement with the Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC) for GIS consulting and project management services related to the MetroGIS project. Richard also emphasized that he does not believe this consultant relationship with the Council should disqualify David from chairing this committee but that both he and David wanted the Committee to be aware of this relationship before it appoints a chairperson.

The results of the voting were: David Arbeit (11 votes), Randall Johnson (3 votes), Will Craig (2 votes), and Richard Johnson (1 vote). Will Craig withdrew his name due to other commitments. A motion to appoint David Arbeit by consensus was made and agreed to. David accepted appointment as Coordinating Committee Chairperson.

### 4. Strategic Issue Teams

An updated listing of persons who have expressed an interest in serving on the Strategic Issue Teams was distributed. It was noted that a second liaison to the Data Content Team was needed. No one in attendance volunteered. Will Craig suggested that a non-planner oriented county representative should be sought for this liaison appointment. The group concurred and asked Will to contact the county representatives that were not present at the meeting.

A draft mission statement was offered for each Strategic Issue Team. The draft statements had been prepared by staff and the Coordinating Committee liaisons to the Teams. It was explained that the purpose of these statements is to give each team clear direction as to its charge.

The group concluded that: 1) each of the teams should be labeled "advisory" to more clearly convey that they are to identify options and recommend courses of action to the Coordinating Committee, 2) the term "mission statement" should be changed to "purpose statement", 3) the "governance team" should be renamed "policy advisory team", and 4) the Access Team is to concentrate on technical data access issues (what and how) and that

the Policy Advisory Team (formerly governance) is to be responsible to recommend courses of action concerning access policy (who and costs).

The following purpose statements were agreed upon for the Strategic Issue Advisory Teams:

Access Advisory Team : Identify the mechanisms for indexing, describing, and accessing current, accurate, and usable geographically-referenced graphic and associated attribute data.

Content Advisory Team: Identify the datasets and their characteristics which provide the greatest utility for the Metro Area GIS data user community.

Policy Advisory Team (formerly Governance): Identify strategies to obtain stakeholder commitment and financial support for a sustainable MetroGIS.

Standards Advisory Team: Identify or develop standards that allow data sharing among the participants of the MetroGIS.

5. Phase II "Kick Off" Forum The purpose of the May 16th Kick Off Forum was explained and preliminary program was offered for comment. Committee members were encouraged to participate in the presentations and the panel discussion to reinforce that the MetroGIS effort is a stakeholder-governed effort. The leadership for each of the Strategic Issue Advisory Teams was asked to meet with staff before the Forum to go over the content of the breakout sessions.

6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities No items were added and no there was no discussion of this items listed on the agenda.

7. Next Meeting The next Coordinating Committee meeting was scheduled for 8:30 AM on Thursday, June 27, 1996. It was also agreed that each Strategic Issue Advisory Team is to meet before June 27th.

8. Adjourn

The meeting concluded at 11:15 AM.

Prepared by

Randall L. Johnson, AICP  
GIS Liaison



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Thursday, June 27, 1996  
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 52  
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota  
8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Acceptance of the Agenda
3. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries:
  - a) April 26, 1996 (Coordinating Committee)
  - b) May 16, 1996 (Phase II Kick Off Forum)
4. Action Items:\*\*\*
  - a) Access Team
    - Revision of team name and purpose statement
  - b) Content Team
    - Date Needs Identification Process
  - c) Policy Team
    - Definition of Stakeholders
    - Endorsement Strategies
5. Update on Advisory Team Activities by Team Leaders:\*\*\*
  - a) Data Access (and Security)
  - b) Data Content
  - c) Policy
  - d) Standards
6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities: \*\*\*  
(Identify any items for discussion as part of agenda approval)
7. Next Meeting
  - a) Coordinating Committee (possible to set a standard meeting date?)
  - b) Steering Committee (to set agenda for next Coordinating Committee Meeting)
8. Adjourn

\*\*\* Report or summary attached

## June 27, 1996 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting order at 8:30 am. The meeting was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center at the University of Minnesota. Members Present: Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); State: David Arbeit (LMIC); County: Dave Drealan (Carver County), Margo LaBau (Anoka County), Jim Hentges (Scott County), Jay Wittenstock for Gary Stevenson, (Dakota County Surveying & Land Info); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council GIS); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Watersheds: Clifton Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District); and Schools: Clark Evans (Minnetonka Schools), Jim Sydow (TIES).

Members Absent: David Claypool (Ramsey County), Pat O'Connor (Hennepin County), Virginia Ehrdahl (Washington County); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Cities: Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County); Academics: Will Craig (CURA); GIS Consultants: John Carpenter (Lawrence Group); Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Utilities: Alan Srock, (NSP).

Visitor: David Hartley, Metropolitan Council Member

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Tanya Mayer, Heidi Welsch

### 2-3. Acceptance of Agenda and Meeting Summaries

The meeting agenda was accepted by consensus. The summaries from the April 26, 1996, and May 16, 1996, meetings were accepted by consensus. Staff noted that slides of the overheads that were presented at the May 16 "Kick Off" meeting are available upon request.

### 4. Action Items

#### A. Data Access Advisory Team Name and Purpose Statement Changes

The committee discussed the Data Content Team's recommendation to change "Data Access Advisory Team" to "Data Access and Security Advisory Team". Jim Sydow, Chairperson of the Data Access Team, explained that the team believes "security" is important aspect of its work and should to clearly stated as part of the team's goals and purpose. David Arbeit expressed that the name change may send a confusing signal in that by including "security" within the team name we would imply that "security" would equal importance to "access", which he does not believe to be the case. Brad Henry agreed, noting that "security" is only one of many important aspects associated with "access" to data and as such is not needed within the team title. Clark Evans noted that he believes "security" is implied by "access"; and that for computer issues, security and data privacy are commonly understood as integral to the topic.

Jim Sydow moved and Clark Evans seconded to modify the purpose statement to include "security" as advised by the Data Access Team. The motion passed unanimously.

Jim Sydow moved and Cliff Aichinger seconded to modify the name of the Team to include "security" as advised by the Data Access Team. The measure failed for lack of consensus.

Following the failure of this the second motion for lack of consensus, the Committee briefly discussed its current practice of requiring consensus to pass on matters. The need for a consensus on all matters was questioned.

Margo LaBau suggested that this might be a subject for the Policy Team discuss. The matter was referred to the Policy Team for study and a recommendation at the Committee's October meeting.

#### B. Data Content Team Process and Direction

Chairperson Arbeit and Randall Johnson summarized a proposed conceptual business modeling procedure for the Committee's acceptance. It was explained that that the focus group procedure that the Data Content Advisory Team has been working on since May to identify regionally significant data would be the foundation for the proposed broader data modeling effort. It was also explained that a data/object modeling consultant is proposed to be hired by the Metropolitan Council to facilitate the focus groups and modeling session and to prepare a final report. David Arbeit also explained that the proposed procedure is intended to be replicated for state interests if a grant that was applied for on June 26th is approved. He also explained the grant application is for a demonstration

project to study how local, metropolitan, and state data needs in Minnesota are similar to and differ from the seven framework datasets affiliated with the federal National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) program. By consensus, the Committee accepted the following conceptual modeling procedure as recommended by the Data Content Advisory Team:

1. Define focus groups. This piece has already been completed by the Data Content Team. Focus group categories are: Community and Economic Development/ Planning/ Growth Management/ Demographics/ Housing/ Employment/ Research; Property Records; Public Works/ Utilities/ Transportation/ Communications; Parks/ Environmental Protection/ Natural Resources; Public Safety/ Judicial; Human, Social, and Educational Services/ Public Health (Code Enforcement, Licensing, Nursing)/ Libraries.
2. Create a strategy for populating the focus groups. This will be done in July by the Data Content Team.
3. Populate the groups.
4. Hold a focus group forum. This forum session would have two components. First, a 30-60 minute overview of the entire process would be given to all participants by the modeling consultant. Second, the participants would break into the focus groups and brainstorm about the business decisions and data needs affiliated with their individual topic areas. The break out sessions would be facilitated by persons familiar with small group facilitation methods but not necessarily by the professional data modelers.
5. The data modeling consultant would create a preliminary data model and summary of the information provided by the focus groups.
6. A Data Modeling Team would be created. It would be made up of 2-3 members of each focus group, 1-2 members of the Standards Advisory Team, and others as appropriate. This group would meet in a 1 to 2 day session to refine, clarify, and reconcile inconsistencies with the preliminary data model.
7. The data modeling consultant would prepare a final report. A draft final report would be provided for comment.

By consensus, the committee also:

1. Accepted the Data Content Advisory Team's proposed methodology to create and populate the six focus groups listed above and including Margo LaBau's suggestion to contact informal associations as appropriate to populate the focus groups.
2. Agreed to revisit the Data Content Advisory Team's purpose statement and limited work program proposal at its August or October meeting once the data modeling effort is far enough along to evaluate the "next Steps" for Team. The committee agreed to send direction to the Data Content Team to continue with the process, utilizing a forum methodology for the focus groups.

#### C. Policy Team Items

**Stakeholder Definition:** Margo LaBau of the Policy Advisory Team explained the Team's reasoning for recommending that the term "stakeholder" be divided into three components: "essential participant", "system enhancer" and "secondary beneficiary". Chairperson Arbeit noted that the proposed definitions greatly clarify the term "stakeholder".

Clark Evans moved and Margo LaBau seconded to accept the definitions as recommended by the Policy Advisory Team and as presented in the staff report, dated June 18, 1996. The motion passed unanimously.

**Endorsement Strategies:** Staff explained the MetroGIS endorsement strategies that are proposed by the Policy Advisory Team for "essential" and selected "enhancer" stakeholders. Margo LaBau explained the importance of allowing stakeholders to choose their own representation for the MetroGIS Policy Board. She also explained that the Policy Team intends to prepare a list of suggested qualifications to help stakeholder choose their representative.

Clark Evans motioned and Chairperson Arbeit seconded to accept the MetroGIS endorsement strategies as recommended by the Policy Advisory Team and as presented in the staff report dated June 18, 1996. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 5. Advisory Team Updates

Jim Sydow, Chairperson of the Data Access Team, reported the formation of four subcommittees. Margo LaBau reported that the Policy Team is working on the MetroGIS endorsement process. All counties have now begun the endorsement process. Data Content Team representatives were not present to report. Clark Evans reported that the Data Standards Team has been defining the process of creating standards; they have also reviewed the efforts of the Governor's Council Standards Team.

#### 6. Information Sharing

Staff explained that this section of the agenda is meant to briefly communicate other events related to the MetroGIS. The committee agreed that it was not necessary to include full meeting minutes from other teams and

committees with each agenda packet. However, it was agreed that a summary diagram of the Data Content Team's data modeling process would be helpful for explanation to the other teams.

Staff informed the group that the Metropolitan Council has completed the entire MetroGIS endorsement process. It was also restated that when the Council approved the MetroGIS Decision Support Structure, it stated a preference to change the name of the "Data Access Team" to "Data Access and Security". Staff noted that since the name change recommendation was not passed by the Coordinating Committee, that this matter will be communicated to the Metropolitan Council.

Efforts to publish MetroGIS newsletter were explained. Example mock-up formats were handed out for comment. It was agreed that the first issue should not be released until all county representatives have had an opportunity to discuss the MetroGIS endorsement process with their County Boards. Staff noted that the earliest date of publication will be October, 1996. Staff also noted that a MetroGIS webpage is also in progress. It was agreed that documents which are in-progress will not be posted on the website. Staff was encouraged to operationalize the website as quickly as possible for communication with the MetroGIS team members. The group agreed that staff reports that convey a Team recommendation should include a list of the team members that attended the meeting at which the recommendation was made.

#### 7. Next Meetings

The Committee agreed, generally, to meet the fourth Thursday of alternating months with exceptions for August and December 1996:

Friday, August 23 -- 8:30 -10:30 a.m.

Thursday, October 24, 1996 -- 8:30 -10:30 a.m

Thursday, December 19, 1996 -- 8:30 -10:30 a.m

Staff was encouraged to find a location that does not charge for parking.

#### 8. Adjournment

Jim Sydow moved and Clark Evans seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Heidi Welsch, GIS Administrative Intern



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Friday, August 23, 1996  
Dunwoody Institute - Room 40  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Acceptance of the Agenda
3. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries:
  - a) June 27, 1996
4. Action Items:\*\*\*
  - a) Policy Advisory Team - MetroGIS Endorsement From System Enhancers
5. Update on Advisory Team Activities by Team Leaders:\*\*\*
  - a) Data Access
  - b) Data Content
  - c) Policy
  - d) Standards
6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities: \*\*\*  
(Identify any items for discussion as part of agenda approval)
7. Next Meeting
  - a) Coordinating Committee -- October 24, 1996 -- location??
  - b) Steering Committee (to set agenda for October Coordinating Committee Meeting)
8. Adjourn

\*\*\* Report or summary attached

<insert PDF>

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS**  
**Coordinating Committee**  
**August 23, 1996**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting order at 8:30 am. The meeting was held at Dunwoody Institute in Minneapolis.

Members Present: *Federal:* Ron Wencil (USGS); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC); *County:* Dave Drealan (Carver County), Margo LaBau (Anoka County), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota County Surveying & Land Info); *Metropolitan:* Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council GIS); *Cities:* Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); *Schools:* Clark Evans (Minnetonka Schools), Jim Sydow (TIES). *Economic Development Partnerships:* Scott Beckman (Dakota County); *Academics:* Will Craig (CURA); *Utilities:* Alan Srock, (NSP).

Members Absent: *Counties:* David Claypool (Ramsey County), Jim Hentges (Scott County), Pat O'Connor (Hennepin County), Virginia Erdahl (Washington County); *Metropolitan:* Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); *Cities:* Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); *GIS Consultants:* John Carpenter (Lawrence Group); *Business Geographics:* Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); *Watersheds:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District);

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch

**2. Acceptance of the Agenda**

Staff requested that Item 4b: MN GIS/LIS Conference Presentation be added to the agenda. The committee accepted the meeting agenda with the addition of Item 4b.

**3. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries**

The summary from the June 27, 1996 meeting was accepted by consensus.

**4. Action Items**

**A. MetroGIS Endorsement from System Enhancers**

Staff explained that the Policy Team has been discussing the process of endorsement by *system enhancers* for cities, watershed districts, and school districts. Staff and Policy Team members were asked to explain their rationale for suggesting that only three system enhancer organizations be initially appointed to the MetroGIS Policy Board. Margo LaBau (Policy Team Chairperson) stated that the Policy Team strongly believes that system enhancer organizations need to participate in policy discussions from the beginning and that the Policy Team wants the Board to determine its own rules, including who should be represented on the Board. The team agreed to include watershed districts, cities, and school districts among the initial Board participants because of their importance to the development of the MetroGIS and because the members were confident that these organizations would ultimately be sought to participate. The Committee concurred.

It was noted that it was the Policy Team's understanding that nearly all cities in the Metro Area are members the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities (AMM) and, consequently, that AMM would be

the best choice for an organization from which to seek representation for cities on the MetroGIS Policy Board. It was also explained that the Policy Team is proposing one representative for large cities and one representative for small cities, to be determined by the AMM.

Metropolitan Association of Watershed Districts was explained to be the only organization that represents all Metro Area watershed districts and, therefore, should be requested to represent watershed district interests on the MetroGIS Policy Board. LaBau added that the Policy Team felt it is more appropriate to ask each of the *system enhancer* organizations to choose their own representation. She referenced the draft letter that had been prepared by staff, which suggests criteria to assist with the selection of representatives from these organizations.

Staff explained the Policy Teams recommendation that Technology Information Educational Services (TIES) should be asked to accept the lead for coordinating MetroGIS representation for school districts and that TIES should be asked to present a plan for incorporating the views of Metro II and Minneapolis school districts.

The group unanimously agreed that TIES, as an organization representing 45 of 50 metropolitan school districts, represent school districts on the MetroGIS Policy Board and that it is also important to extend an opportunity for involvement to Metro II schools (St. Paul and others) and Minneapolis School District. Jim Sydow (TIES) stated that it may be possible for the three groups to cooperate and to agree on a means of common representation in the MetroGIS process. Sydow stated that he will explore the possibilities with Metro II and Minneapolis School Districts and will report progress at the October meeting.

Chairperson Arbeit moved and Gary Stevenson seconded to accept the Policy Team's recommendation to seek endorsement of the MetroGIS and appointment of representatives to the MetroGIS Policy Board from AMM and MAWD on behalf of cities and watershed districts. The motion carried unanimously.

The membership concurred that the draft letter presented in the agenda packet should be reduced to one page and that the four requested endorsement actions should be more clearly stated. It was also agreed that Chairman Arbeit should sign the letter and that it should be sent as soon as possible to the AMM and MAWD. Staff agreed to report on the progress of the discussions with all three of the referenced organizations at the October meeting.

## **B. Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium State Conference Presentation**

It was explained that the MetroGIS initiative is on the program of the Minnesota State GIS/LIS Conference to be held September 26 and 27. Staff noted that a program similar that used for the "Phase II Kick Off" Forum in May is proposed. The team agreed that a presentation is appropriate and that the Kick Off Forum format is appropriate except more emphasis needs to be placed on current activities rather than the retreat and strategic planning efforts. It was agreed that a representative from each Advisory Team (chairperson, if possible) should speak.

The group also discussed whether to provide an overview of the MetroGIS initiative at the September 18th meeting of the Association of County Officers conference and for the state conference of the Minnesota Chapter of American Public Works Association this Fall. These opportunities lead to a suggestion to prepare a 15 - 30 minute presentation that could be used by staff or Committee members as needed. Stevenson and LaBau felt that the Committee should not get out in front of the endorsement process. The group concurred that we would have a much stronger story to tell once the MetroGIS has been endorsed and the Board is operational. It was agreed that since the endorsement process is likely to be

complete by the end of the year, that preparation of a generic presentation should wait for input from the Board.

## **5. Update on Advisory Team Activities:**

### **a) Access**

Chairperson Jim Sydow reported that the Data Access Advisory Team has created four subcommittees. These subcommittees are working to coordinate efforts and reduce duplication with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. He noted that members of the team will be taking part in the data modeling effort scheduled for the Fall.

### **b) Policy**

Chairperson Margo LaBau reported that the Policy Team had invited representatives from each county to talk about the endorsement process at their August 15th meeting. She reported that Carver County has completed the process and that progress is being made in each of the other six counties and that endorsements are expected to be received from all interests by the end of the year. She also explained that the goal of the Policy Team is to convene the MetroGIS Policy Board before the 1997 legislative session begins.

### **c) Data Content**

Randall Johnson, David Arbeit, Will Craig, and Heidi Welsch reported on the Data Content Advisory Team's project to identify regionally significant data needs. It was explained that the first project activity will be a focus group forum planned for the afternoon of September 19, 1996. It is proposed to be facilitated by Advanced Strategies, Inc. (ASI), headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia. Rick Gelbmann explained that ASI has significant experience facilitating projects of this nature. One-hundred-and-one participants have confirmed their attendance. The participants are from a variety of expertise areas, organizations, and geographic areas across the metropolitan area. Nearly three-quarters of the participants are new to MetroGIS.

### **d) Standards**

Vice-Chairperson Ron Wencil reported on the Data Standards Advisory Team. The team has been communicating with the Standards Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information to cooperate and reduce duplicated effort. They have formed an address subcommittee to begin studying specific standards. Rick Gelbmann asked if a Mn/DOT representative is a member of the address subcommittee. He explained that he has recently spoken with MnDOT officials concerning a centerline map with address file to include maintenance for MetroGIS use. Rick explained that Mn/DOT is interested in this project because, although a centerline file is available for no charge from MnDOT, it will not serve the purposes of all the users within Mn/DOT. Rick also explained that the Council currently maintains an address file but that it has not been completed for the entire Metro Area and it is current only as of 1990-91.

Gary Stevenson stated that MetroGIS needs to decide on a coordinate system for the MetroGIS and how the continued use of several systems will be reconciled. The group agreed and requested that Ron Wencil discuss this topic with the Standards Advisory Team at their next meeting and to report on progress back to the Coordinating Committee as to how the Team will pursue this matter..

## **6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities**

A summary was included with the agenda packet. Randall Johnson also reported that the interim agreement process is moving forward in all counties.

## **7. Next Meetings**

### **a) Coordinating Committee**

Thursday, October 24, 1996 -- 8:30 -10:30 a.m.

Thursday, December 19, 1996 -- 8:30 -10:30 a.m.

The group noted that it would prefer to meet at a facility that is designed for meetings. Staff asked about returning to the Earle Brown Center. The consensus was that the modest fee for parking is not a concern, considering the quality of the facility and availability of parking.

### **b) Steering Committee**

It was agreed that the Steering Committee should meet two weeks prior to the every other month meeting of the Coordinating Committee. (These meetings can take the form of e-mail or telephone conversations depending on the agenda topics.) Each Team was asked to formalize their representative the Steering Committee (this person does not have to be the chairperson). Staff noted that a date would be set once each of the Teams all agree on their representative.

## **8. Adjournment**

Chairperson Arbeit motioned and Gary Stevenson seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by,

Heidi Welsch,  
GIS Administrative Intern



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Thursday, October 24, 1996  
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 52  
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota  
8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Acceptance of the Agenda
3. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries:
  - a) August 23, 1996
4. Action Items:\*\*\*
  - a) School District Representation on Coordinating Committee
  - b) First Meeting of the Policy Board
  - c) Advisory Team Work Programs
5. Update on Advisory Team Activities by Team Leaders:
  - a) Data Access
  - b) Data Content
  - c) Policy
  - d) Standards
6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities \*\*\*  
(Identify any items for discussion as part of agenda approval)
  - a) Report dated October 11th
  - b) Letter Recognizing MetroGIS Endorsement
7. Next Meeting  
December 19, 1996
8. Adjourn

\*\*\* Report or summary attached

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS**  
**Coordinating Committee**  
**October 24, 1996**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting to order at 8:35 am. The meeting was held at Earle Brown Conference Center on the St. Paul campus of the University of Minnesota.

Members Present: *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC); *County:* David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Gary Stevenson, (Dakota); *Metropolitan:* Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council GIS); *Cities:* Brad Henry (Minneapolis) Dennis Welsch (Roseville); *Schools:* Jim Sydow (TIES); *Academics:* Will Craig (CURA); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group);

Members Absent: *Counties:* Dave (Carver), Margo LaBau (Anoka); *Business Geographics:* Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); *Watersheds:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District); *Economic Development Partnerships:* Scott Beckman (Dakota County); *and Utilities:* Alan Srock, (NSP).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, Mark Kotz, Tanya Mayer, David Vessel

Larry Charboneau was introduced as John Carpenter's replacement representing The Lawrence Group (TLG) on the Committee.

**2-3. Acceptance of the Agenda and Meeting Minutes**

Gary Stevenson moved and Dennis Welsch seconded to accept the meeting agenda and the minutes from the August 23, 1996, meeting, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

**4. Action Items**

**4A. School District Representation on Coordinating Committee**

Staff explained that Clark Evans had resigned from the Coordinating Committee and from the Standards and Policy Advisory Teams and that he had served in these capacities as a representative of school districts. Staff also noted that Clark regretted having to resign but that his schedule no longer allowed him to attend daytime MetroGIS meetings. The Committee acknowledged the contributions that Clark had made to the definition of the MetroGIS. After discussing the matter, it was agreed that school districts can be adequately represented by Jim Sydow (TIES) and that Clark Evans' position on the Committee will not be replaced at this time.

The committee raised the issue of the need for guidelines for replacing Coordinating Committee members who are affiliated with organizations that do not have representation on the MetroGIS Policy Board. (Organizations represented on the Board appoint their representatives to both the Board and the Coordinating Committee and serve at the discretion of those organizations.) Chairperson Arbeit moved and Dennis Welsch seconded to direct the Policy Advisory Team to recommend membership and member replacement guidelines for Coordinating Committee

members that are not affiliated with an organization represented on the Board. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **4B. First Meeting of the MetroGIS Policy Board**

Staff explained the Policy Advisory Team's suggested program for the first meeting of the Policy Board and noted that all initial Policy Board appointments should be complete by mid-December. It was explained that the purpose of the first meeting, tentatively scheduled for January 8 or 9, is to orient the new board members to the MetroGIS initiative and to demonstrate that a cooperative GIS data sharing mechanism is in the public interest. The primary elements of the suggested program were explained to consist of: 1) a video produced by URISA, 2) orientation to the MetroGIS objectives and accomplishments to date, 3) presentation by Dennis Welsch of the I-35W Corridor Coalition's cooperative effort that was founded to facilitate the sharing of data among the coalition partners and 4) a poster/social session. Only two action items are proposed: setting the date of the first business meeting and authorizing the Steering Committee to set the meeting agenda.

The Committee unanimously endorsed the program proposed by the Policy Advisory Team and directed staff to prepare a list of suggestions for the poster session and to contact Committee members to sponsor exhibits.

#### **4C. Advisory Team Work Programs**

Staff explained that each of the four advisory teams had been asked to document their progress to address the 15 strategic issues assigned by the Coordinating Committee in May. Only the Data Content Advisory Team suggested substantive changes to its work program. The Committee unanimously agreed to the following changes to the Data Content Advisory Team's work program:

- a) Responsibility for Action items 7, 9, 11, 12 from the concept maps: *identify best source of data to satisfy business information needs* was shifted from the Access Team to the Data Content Team.
- b) The Data Content Team's strategic issue # 3 was amended as follows: "Define output / products from system" changed to "*Define needed output / products*".
- c) Responsibility for strategic issue "Define structure of logically integrated system" was shifted from the Data Content Team to the Data Access Team.

#### **5. Update on Advisory Team Activities:**

- a) **Data Content Advisory Team:** Will Craig, Coordinating Committee Liaison to the Data Content Advisory Team, explained that the Team's Business Object Modeling Project began on September 19, 1996 with a Business Information Needs Forum. Craig stated that Team and forum participants were encouraged by the number and breadth of the information needs identified. He summarized that an Object Modeling Session, involving 33 participants from the September 19 forum, on will be held on October 30 and 31 and that a follow-up modeling session is scheduled for December 4th. He stated that the team is committed to its task of identifying the data needs that have significant cross-jurisdictional importance and that the Team is also committed to each of the other strategic issues assigned to it. He also mentioned that the Team realizes there will still be much work to do

following the December 4th modeling session and that it will be important to evaluate the performance of Advanced Strategies, Inc. (ASI), consultant to the Business Object Modeling project, at the completion of the project.

**b) Policy Advisory Team**

Staff explained that status of the MetroGIS endorsement process and that the Policy Advisory Team had formed a subcommittee to plan the first meeting of the Policy Board. Additionally, the team is planning to conduct a survey of other multi-participant GIS groups as background for drafting operating guidelines for the Coordinating Committee and the Policy Board.

**c) Standards Advisory Team**

Ron Wencil reported that David Windle (City of Roseville) has replaced Clark Evans as Chairperson of the Team. Two subcommittees have also been formed: Metro-Wide Coordinate Standard and Address Standards. He reported that the Coordinate Subcommittee expects to prepare a recommendation for the December Coordinating Committee meeting and that the Address Subcommittee expects to have a working draft report by the end of the year.

**d) Data Access Advisory Team**

Rick Gelbmann explained that Access Team plans to formalize the goals for each of its working groups at its next meeting. The work groups are: *Index, Security, Interface and Data Transfer, and Physical Infrastructure.*

**6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities**

A summary was included with the agenda packet. Randall Johnson also reported that the Metropolitan Council's Interim GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement process is moving forward in all counties.

Arbeit reported that the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) and the Land Management Information Center (LMIC) are making progress with a significant legislative proposal entitled the Land Records Modernization Initiative. He stated that it is to be presented to the Governor as a means of promoting integration of land records across county boundaries and that it would provide a funding mechanism to accomplish its objectives. Arbeit noted that the Minnesota initiative is based on a similar program in place in Wisconsin. He also noted that if adopted, it could resolve or move us significantly closer to resolving financing and standards issues that are obstacles to data sharing, including matters to be addressed by the MetroGIS.

Staff acknowledged receipt of a letter from Gary Stevenson authorizing sharing of Dakota County data free of charge with DNR on the basis of the pending GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement with the Metropolitan Council.

**7. Next Meeting**

**December 12, 1996 at 8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.**

**(Following the meeting, the date was changed to the December 18.)**

**Location: TBA**

## **8. Adjournment**

Chairperson Arbeit moved and David Claypool seconded to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 a.m.  
Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by,

Heidi Welsch,  
GIS Administrative Intern



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Wednesday, December 18, 1996  
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 156  
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota  
8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Acceptance of the Agenda
3. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries:
  - a) October 24, 1996
4. Action Items: \*\*\*
  - a) Access Team:
    - (1) MetroGIS WEB Index Model
    - (2) Standard Geographical Unit for Aggregating Sensitive Data
    - (3) Advisor to Interactive Mapping Pilot Project
  - b) Metro-Wide Coordinate System Guideline
  - c) First Meeting of the MetroGIS Policy Board -- Update
  - d) Interim Operational Guidelines -- Coordinating Committee
5. Update on Advisory Team Activities by Team Leaders: \*\*\*
  - a) Data Access
  - b) Data Content
  - c) Policy
  - d) Standards
6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities \*\*\*  
(Identify any items for discussion as part of agenda approval)
  - a) NAIS: Status of Parcel Based GIS in MN - Executive Summary \*
  - b) CURA Study -- GIS in Dakota County\*
  - c) MetroGIS Activity Update (dated December 9th)
  - d) Major Accomplishments -- 1996
  - e) Invitation to speak with MACO -- December 18th

\* (Copies available at the meeting)
7. Next Meeting  
February 27, 1997
8. Adjourn

\*\*\* Report or summary attached

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS**  
**Coordinating Committee**  
**December 18, 1996**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting to order at 8:45 am. The meeting was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center on the St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Members Present: *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC); *County:* David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), Gary Caswell for Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Gary Stevenson, (Dakota); Dave Drealan (Carver), and Margo LaBau (Anoka); *Metropolitan:* Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); *Cities:* Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); *Schools:* Jim Sydow (TIES); *Academics:* Will Craig (CURA); *Watersheds:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District); and *Economic Development Partnerships:* Scott Beckman (Dakota County Partnership)

Members Absent: *Cities:* Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); *Business Geographics:* Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); *Utilities:* Alan Srock, (NSP);and *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, Mark Kotz, Tanya Mayer

**2-3. Acceptance of the Meeting Minutes and Agenda**

Will Craig moved and Cliff Aichinger seconded to approve the October 24, 1996 meeting minutes, as submitted. Gary Caswell asked that designated alternated members to the Coordinating Committee be added to the mailing list for agendas and meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairperson Arbeit suggested that Item 4d should be considered as the first business item because several members must leave no later then 10:30 a.m. Chairperson Arbeit motioned and Will Craig seconded to approve the agenda with the revised order for Item 4d. Motion carried unanimously.

**4. Action Items**

**4d) Policy Advisory Team: Coordinating Committee Interim Operating Procedures**

Chairperson Arbeit, speaking on behalf of the Policy Advisory Team, explained the major components of the Team's recommended interim operating guidelines for the Coordinating Committee and its affiliated teams, as presented in the staff reported dated December 12, 1996. The major components reviewed were as follows: definitions, committee composition, liaison/reporting requirements, voting rules, meeting notification requirements, and an amendment procedure.

David also noted that the Policy Advisory Team is requesting direction from the Policy Board concerning voting and membership guidelines for current and any future members of the Coordinating Committee from organizations that are not represented on Policy Board (such as

LMIC, University of Minnesota, USGS, etc.). Gary Caswell requested that designated alternates to the committee be added as official members.

Meeting Summary 12/18/96

Page 2

There was some discussion about the ease with which the guidelines should be permitted to be amended, once adopted. Gary Stevenson suggested that the guidelines should be flexible to allow prompt responds to situations as they may arise, given that we are learning as we go. It was agreed that members should receive a minimum 15 days prior notice before any proposed amendment changes can be considered and that each amendment proposal should receive two readings before it can be acted on by the Committee. David Arbeit noted that the once the interim guidelines are endorsed by the Policy Board, any amendments would have to be approved by the Policy Board before they could become effective. The committee also agreed that its chair and vice-chair should have annual appointments.

### **Motions**

1. Gary Stevenson moved and Will Craig seconded to adopt the interim operating guidelines for the Coordinating Committee, its Steering Committee, and its Advisory Teams, as proposed by the Policy Advisory Team and presented in the report dated December 12, 1996, subject to the revisions to the amendment procedures and officer terms agreed upon at this meeting and to direct the Steering Committee to inform the Policy Board of these guidelines. Motion carried unanimously. The Coordinating Committee Chair and staff were authorized to make editorial revisions, as deemed appropriate.

2. David Claypool moved and Gary Stevenson seconded to direct the Steering Committee to prepare and present the following recommendations for Policy Board consideration:

- a) Endorse itself (the Board) as a group/entity that comprises the policy decision making authority for the MetroGIS.
- b) Endorse the current Coordinating Committee members, who represent organizations also represented on the Board, as the core voting membership of the Coordinating Committee.
- c) Endorse the other current members of the Coordinating Committee as voting members if the Committee for six months or until such time that the Board adopts voting and membership guidelines for itself and its supporting Committees and Advisory Teams.

### **Amendment #1:**

Will Craig moved and Cliff Aichinger seconded to add the following item as "d" under Motion 2: "Direct the Policy Advisory Team to prepare and recommend interim operating guidelines to govern the Policy Board for Policy Board consideration and that the recommended Policy Board guidelines should be an extension of the interim guidelines adopted by the Coordinating Committee for itself". Motion carried unanimously. Staff was also directed to send each Committee member a copy of the proposed Board guidelines for comment before presentation to the Policy Board.

### **Amendment #2:**

Richard Johnson moved and Cliff Aichinger seconded to add the following item as "e" under Motion 2: "Encourage the Policy Board to continue the diversity and inclusiveness of the Coordinating Committee as it currently exists". Motion carried unanimously.

Vote on the motion, as revised by Amendments 1 and 2, carried unanimously .

Meeting Summary 12/18/96

Page 3

#### **4a(1) Access Advisory Team: MetroGIS Web Index Model**

Rick Gelbmann explained that the Data Access Advisory Team has defined a conceptual WEB index model to facilitate access to GIS data located throughout the region. Rick also explained a pilot project, to be financed by the Metropolitan Council, that the Team has endorsed to test the proposed WEB index model. Will Craig stated that he endorses the WEB index concept proposed by the Team and that he also supports the Team serving as an advisor to the Metropolitan Council for the proposed pilot project. However, Will emphasized, that as general rule, he is opposed to the MetroGIS Advisory Teams acting as an advisor to the Council but noted that he is comfortable making an exception for this proposal because the pilot will directly affect the design of the MetroGIS data access mechanism.

Ron Wencil noted that he also supports further work on the proposed WEB index model but asked for clarification of the definition of 'index', noting that "clearinghouse" is a more commonly used term for the proposed functionality. Gelbmann explained that the Team envisions the 'index' to be similar to a library search engine, allowing access, querying, and searching for data and metadata through a webpage-type environment comprised of numerous links to data producers transparent to persons using the index.

Will Craig noted that he is more comfortable with the term "index" than with the term "clearinghouse" because the term clearinghouse implies a repository/data warehouse (how do I get the data) which is inconsistent with the primary intent of the MetroGIS -- to provide a mechanism to link users to the data sources (who has the data). Coordinating Committee members also asked questions about relationships among 'index', 'query', 'generalization of information', 'data access', server access specifications to manage traffic, and 'metadata' which Jim Sydow and Rick Gelbmann stated can not be adequately answered until the proposed pilot project is completed. Rick Gelbmann also noted that purpose of the pilot is to provide the basis for a detailed design for the MetroGIS data access mechanism.

A concern was also raised that this pilot project should not turn into the development of an application(s). Jim Sydow, Liaison to Access Advisory Team, noted that the purpose of the pilot is test the index model. Scott Beckman stated that he agrees with the need to develop a working model/prototype for an access mechanism. He also concurred that the Team should not become involved in the application development. He suggested that any activity that provides for ease of access to data should be within the Team's scope of work. He also suggested that the Team should first focus on establishing the links between users and producers then proceed to design access to combination sources. The membership agreed with Scott's suggestions and also agreed that the Data Access Advisory Team should focus on designing access links to commonly needed data rather than to data needed for specialized uses with little common benefit.

David Arbeit stated that a "visualization tool", such as being proposed, is important to decide whether the selected data/information will be useful to someone searching for data. He stated that he agrees that the Team should work with the Metropolitan Council on the proposed pilot project to investigate issues that concern the model and concurred with earlier comments that the Team should not become engaged in application development. He also noted that there is a need to coordinate with the clearinghousing development work that is being undertaken by the Governor's Meeting Summary 12/18/96  
Page 4

Council on Geographic Information (GCGI). Rick explained that both he and Tanya Mayer are members of the GCGI Access Team and that the referenced cross-reporting is in place.

Margo LaBau stated that Anoka County staff have many questions about the index model and that she believes some of them will need to be resolved at the Policy Board level, in particular, who will have access to what level of detail of data? Margo stated that she agrees with the need to pursue the pilot project and to continue to refine the model but emphasized that Anoka County can not support the recommended second motion to accept the Coordinating Committee as the approval authority for the index model. She restated that Anoka County believes that adoption of a final model will require resolution of policy matters which is the role of the Policy Board. Margo stated that she would be comfortable with a motion that directs the Access Advisory Team to continue to work out the details of the proposed model and to report back to the Coordinating Committee as further information is available. Will Craig emphasized that the Access Advisory Team's role should be to concentrate on testing the proposed "index" and that discussion of the associated data access issues should follow definition of the index.

Gary Stevenson stated that he is very supportive of the proposed index model and of proceeding with the proposed pilot project to work out the issues that have been raised.

**Motion:**

Chairman Arbeit moved and Gary Stevenson seconded to direct the Data Access Advisory Team to continue to develop and test its proposed WEB Index Model, as outlined in the staff report dated December 12, 1996. Motion carried unanimously.

(Note: The Coordinating Committee concluded that it should not be the final authority for this matter, except during the pilot phase. As such, recommendation Number 2 for this agenda item was not acted on.)

**4a(2) Access Advisory Team: Standard Geographical Unit for Aggregating Sensitive Data**

Rick Gelbmann explained that the Access Advisory Team has concluded that census blocks or census tracts should be used as basic units for data aggregation and that this proposal is being brought to the Committee at this time because the it is an important component of the index model that the Team wishes to test and refine. He further stated that the Team believes that aggregation of sensitive data to the proposed units of geography is a responsible means to address

data privacy issues concerning data about individuals, households, parcel of land, etc. while also providing a practical and useful means to share information with other organizations that have a business need for it.

Ron Wencil, Liaison to the Standards Advisory Team, asked who would direct/manage the data aggregation. Rick noted that the concept is to leave the decision of whether aggregation is needed and the type of aggregation up to the individual data producer, subject only to general guidelines to facilitate sharing with other organizations, and that he hoped to be able to test this strategy with the pilot project. He explained that this strategy of producer-governed generalization was chosen because it appears to be a means to eliminate liability/obligation on the part of the receiving organizations to provide others with the detailed data from which the summary information was

Meeting Summary 12/18/96

Page 5

derived. Rick explained that a generalization mechanism that eliminates liability of others to provide the detailed information is necessary to realize wide-spread data sharing. He noted that additional research is pending and that this issue will also be a matter of discussion for the Policy Team and Policy Board.

Cliff Aichinger stated that he believes the Team's proposal offers a responsible strategy and that there will be ample time for further discussion before a final recommendation is made to the Policy Board.

**Motion:**

Chairman Arbeit moved and Cliff Aichinger seconded to direct the Data Access Advisory Team, for purposes of testing the model [Recommendation 4a(1)], to continue to explore and test to following two (2) common units of geography for those data producers who need to aggregate their data so no discrete entity is identifiable, yet provide a practical and useful means to facilitate sharing of sensitive data. Data producers are not limited to this format. This is a guideline for those who require aggregation of data:

- Census Bureau Census Blocks (with cross-reference tables between decades)
- Census Bureau Census Tracts (with cross-reference tables between decades)

Motion carried unanimously.

(Note: The Coordinating Committee concluded it should not be the final authority for this matter, except during the pilot phase. As such, recommendation Number 2 for this agenda item was not acted on.)

**4a(3) Access Advisory Team: Advisor to Interactive Mapping Pilot Project**

Rick Gelbmann presented a brief overview of the interactive mapping pilot project to be undertaken by Metropolitan Council's Environmental Services and GIS Departments. He noted that other participants in this pilot project may include: City of Minneapolis, Anoka County, City of Roseville, and LMIC and that brief discussions have been held with ESRI and Intergraph to determine if they have any interest in assisting with the project.

The Committee agreed that the Data Access Advisory Team's involvement as an advisor to the Metropolitan Council's pilot project would be useful to the MetroGIS initiative. The consensus was that the Access Advisory Team's involvement should be viewed as a learning experience and as a means to test of the index model (Agenda Item 4a(1)). The Committee also emphasized the need for the MetroGIS Access Advisory Team to work closely with the Access Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information as work progresses with the index model pilot project.

Arbeit moved and Will Craig seconded to authorize the Data Access Advisory Team to act as an Advisory Board to the Metropolitan Council's WEB/ interactive mapping pilot project. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting Summary 12/18/96  
Page 6

**4b) Standards Advisory Team: Metro-Wide Coordinate System Guideline**

Ron Wencil, Liaison to the Standards Advisory Team , explained why his Team is recommending selection of Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) as the Metro Wide coordinate system guideline. Mark Kotz, staff to the Team, explained that data producers would not be obligated to change their current practice and could continue to use the coordinate system and projection that best suit their local needs. Mark emphasized that the UTM guideline would come into play to facilitate sharing among organizations throughout the seven county area.

Gary Caswell asked why UTM was selected over Latitude/Longitude. After some discussion of the pros and cons, the Committee agreed with the recommendation to use UTM. David Claypool asked what type of quality control mechanism is envisioned for conversions of local producer data to the Metro Wide UTM coordinate system. Ron Wencil noted this matter has not been addressed by the Team. Ron also noted that the Team is working on a primer to explain coordinate systems, projections, datums, and how to convert from one another, as well as reasons why the UTM coordinate system guideline was chosen for the Metro Area..

**Motion:**

Gary Stevenson moved and Jim Sydow seconded to:

- 1) Accept the following components as the best practices guideline for a Metro Wide coordinate system guideline for transferring of metro-wide GIS layers:

|                    |                                     |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Coordinate system: | Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) |
| Projection:        | Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) |
| Units:             | Meters                              |
| Datum:             | NAD83                               |

- 2) Direct the Standards Advisory Team to proceed with: a) development of a the primer to explain coordinate systems, projections, and datums, and how to convert from one another, as well as, the reasons why the UTM coordinate system guideline was chosen for the Metro Area, and b) development of a proposal to implement the Metro Area UTM coordinate

system guideline, to include a quality control mechanism for conversions of local producer data to the Metro Wide UTM coordinate system, for consideration by the Coordinating Committee.

Motion carried unanimously.

(Note: The Coordinating Committee concluded it should not be the final authority for this matter. As such, the last recommendation associated with this agenda item was not acted on.)

#### **4c) Policy Advisory Team: First Meeting of the MetroGIS Policy Board**

Randall Johnson summarized the work of the Policy Team and staff to prepare for the first Policy Board meeting on January 15, 1997. The meeting will be held at the Metropolitan Council Chambers in St. Paul, beginning at 7:00 p.m. He noted that a poster/social session will follow the meeting and shared a sample one page exhibit summary format for the Committee's information and comment. The group accepted the proposed format. Randall also summarized the

Meeting Summary 12/18/96

Page 7

presentations to be made by each member of the Steering Committee at meeting, invited all members of the Committee to attend, and noted that eleven of the twelve board members had been named.

#### **6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities**

Will Craig reported that the Data Content Advisory Team is continuing to make progress with its Business Object Modeling Project. He summarized the object modeling sessions that were held on Oct. 30th-31st and on Dec. 4th and noted that the next step, planned for mid-February will be a survey to rank each the business information needs identified at the Business Information Needs Forum held last Sept. 19th. Presentation of the project results is scheduled for May 22nd.

Randall Johnson noted that a list of accomplishments for 1996 was included with the agenda packet. He also noted that immediately following this meeting, several of the county representatives to the Committee would be attending a meeting of the Metropolitan Association of County Officials (MACO), at the request of MACO, to present an overview of the MetroGIS program to their membership.

#### **7. Next Meeting**

**Date:** Thursday, March 6, 1997  
**Time:** 9:00 a.m.  
**Location:** Earle Brown Conference Center; St. Paul Campus, University of Minnesota

#### **8. Adjournment**

Chairperson Arbeit moved and Cliff Aichinger seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:34 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by,

Heidi Welsch  
GIS Administrative Intern

and

Randall Johnson  
GIS Liaison



**Thursday, March 6, 1997**  
**Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 152**  
**St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota**  
**9:00 to 11:00 A.M.**

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a) December 18, 1996
4. Action Items
  - a) Policy Board Operating Guidelines (Policy Team)
  - b) Legitimization of MetroGIS (Policy Team)
  - c) Address Issues and Guidelines (Standards Team)
  - d) Board Direction--Operating Guidelines for Coordinating Committee (Policy Team)
5. Summary of January 15, 1997 Policy Board Meeting -- Chairman Arbeit
6. Update on Advisory Team Activities by Team Leaders
  - a) Data Access
  - b) Data Content
  - c) Policy
  - d) Standards
7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities  
(Identify any items for discussion as part of agenda approval)
  - a) MetroGIS Activity Update (dated February 26th)
  - b) Summary of 1996 MetroGIS Accomplishments
  - c) MetroGIS Newsletter -- First Issue Prototype (hand out)
  - d) "Minnesota Cities" GIS article by Will Craig about Dakota County (hand out)
  - e) Response to Board Member Schneider's Information Request (hand out)
8. Next Meeting  
April 24 , 1997
9. Adjourn

## March 6, 1997 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. The meeting was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center on the St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota.

Members Present: Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); State: David Arbeit (LMIC); County: David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), Pat O'Connor and Gary Caswell [alternate] (Hennepin), Virginia Erdahl (Washington), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver), and Margo LaBau (Anoka); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Schools: Jim Sydow (TIES); Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District); Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County Partnership); Utilities: Alan Srock, (NSP); and GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group)

Members Absent: Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, Mark Kotz

Visitors: John Thuente (ReMap)

### 2. Acceptance of Agenda

Chairperson Arbeit suggested that the meeting agenda order be revised to accommodate schedules. The order he suggested was: 5, 4c, 7e, 4a, 4d, 4b. Gary Stevenson moved and Rick Gelbmann seconded to approve the agenda as revised. The motion passed unanimously.

### 3. Acceptance of the December meeting summary

There was some discussion of Item 4B:(Standards Advisory Team: Metro-Wide Coordinate System Guideline). Ron Wencil, Standards Team Liaison, asked for clarification regarding the motion to "Direct the Standards Advisory Team to proceed with...development of...quality control mechanisms for conversions of local producer data to the Metro Wide UTM coordinate system..." David Claypool explained that the intent of his motion was to insure quality control is built into the system and to insure that data received from others is accurate. David stated that guidelines need to be clear about who (producer of data; recipient of data; etc.) will be responsible for quality control. After some discussion, the committee agreed that documentation produced by the Standards Advisory Team should indicate both recipient and originator of the data will be responsible for reviewing data for quality control. Arbeit motioned and Cliff Aichinger seconded to approve the 18 December 1996 meeting summary as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. Action Items

#### 4c) Standards Advisory Team: Address Issues and Guidelines

The Committee reviewed a draft Address Issues and Guidelines Document created by the Standards Advisory Team. Gary Caswell raised a concern about promotion of particular vendor products or organizations such as ArcView and URISA in the documents produced by MetroGIS. Mark Kotz noted that an objective of the Standards Advisory Team's publication is to provide examples of useful applications of standards without promoting or endorsing a specific software product. The committee agreed that multiple examples using different software products should be sought. The committee also discussed the possible use of a disclaimer in the document. Discussion of the recommendation number 1: "Agree with the Standards Team's finding that there should be no specific MetroGIS address standard but that the US Postal Service standards should be used as a guideline from which to work with address data," lead to a discussion of procedure within the Coordinating Committee and for moving proposals forward from the teams to the Policy Board. While some committee members felt comfortable accepting this recommendation, as stated, other members felt that the Address Issues and Guidelines Document must receive public review before the Committee endorses the U.S. Postal Service standard as a guideline for addresses.

There was a general discussion of the US Postal Service guideline. Cliff Aichinger asked whether the Standards Advisory Team had considered any other standards. Mark Kotz replied that the only other standard being used is the US West standard which is used by 911 emergency operations because it is their only choice. Kotz added that the US Postal Service address standard makes the most sense for MetroGIS and that the US West standard is not appropriate for GIS. Mark also acknowledged that E911 officials had not participated in the Team's discussion. Larry Charboneau and John Thuente both spoke in favor of the U.S. Postal Service address standards from the perspective of the private sector.

Stevenson and others felt that the recommendation to accept the U.S. Postal Service standards as guidelines for MetroGIS could be accepted as a separate action from acceptance of the draft Address Issues and Guidelines Document. Cliff Aichinger stated that he is uncomfortable acting on the items separately until the Committee establishes a procedure for acting on team recommendations. Aichinger stated that he is comfortable with whichever option is chosen but he encouraged the Committee to decide on a process because the first action will set precedent for action of future matters. Will Craig asked if there is any reason why this matter can not be delayed a month or so for further review. It was acknowledged that a deadline does not exist and that the suggested delay would not cause any scheduling problems.

The committee agreed that the proposal is more than likely the best choice for a standard guideline for address data but Rick Gelbmann and others felt that persons and/or organizations who work with address data outside of those on the Standards Advisory Team should be given an opportunity to comment on the team's guidelines brochure and the proposed use of the U.S. Postal Service's address standard for MetroGIS.

Pat O'Connor and David Claypool pointed out that it is important for the Committee not to get bogged down in the technical work of the advisory teams. The advisory team members have important technical expertise which should be relied upon by the Coordinating Committee. There was general agreement from the committee members. O'Connor offered a suggestion that if a motion is not unanimously supported that further discussion of the concerns should be pursued.

Will Craig asked whether the Committee is approving a standard or voting general acceptance of the team recommendation for further review. He supported the latter, noting that others should be notified and given a couple of weeks to offer comments. Then the matter should be brought back to the committee for a final decision. Will also stated that he would prefer a public comment period since this is the first MetroGIS standard to be acted upon; establishing the process is important.

Motion:

Gary Stevenson motioned and Larry Charboneau seconded to accept the Standards Advisory Team's recommendation that there should be no specific MetroGIS address standard but that the US Postal Service standards should be used as a guideline from which to work with address data. The motion failed for lack of con-

sensus. Voting against the measure were: Cliff Aichinger, Will Craig, and Richard Johnson.

Alternative Motion:

Virginia Erdahl motioned and Richard Johnson seconded to: 1) accept for public comment the US Postal Service address standard as the address guideline for MetroGIS and 2) to accept for public comment the draft document prepared by the Standards Advisory Team explaining the address guideline. The motion passed unanimously. It was agreed that the Standards Advisory Team should seek comment and present the results at the next Coordinating Committee meeting and that at that time a final decision would be made on the appropriateness of the US Postal Service address guideline and on the Team's supporting documentation.

David Claypool suggested that if review of a document by other organizations is necessary prior to final acceptance by the Coordinating Committee, the advisory team's recommendation should reflect the review. The committee agreed. Wencil and Kotz agreed that there was no need at this time for action on Recommendations 2 or 3 listing in the staff report.

7e. Response to Policy Board member Schneider's Information Request

David Arbeit explained that staff had received an information request from Policy Board Member Schneider and that he had drafted a response to Member Schneider that will be distributed with the Policy Board agenda packet for the 25 March meeting. The committee agreed that the teams should not take on any tasks that have not been identified in the workplan without direction from the entire Policy Board but that the results of the "GIS Program Status/Needs/ Benefits worksheets" prepared for each metro county should be included in David's response to member Schneider and distributed to the other Board members. The Committee also concurred with staff's proposal to prepare a report that documents the Metropolitan Council's financial commitment to MetroGIS or discussion with the Policy Board at the March 25th meeting.

4a. Policy Advisory Team: Policy Board Operating Guidelines

Margo LaBau explained that the Policy Advisory Team's proposed modifications to Article I (Definitions) the interim operating guidelines which were approved by the Coordinating Committee in December 18, 1996 and the proposed operating guidelines for the Policy Board (new Article II). LaBau explained that these Articles, if acceptable to the Coordinating Committee, will be presented to the Policy Board at the 25 March meeting.

Gary Caswell and Pat O'Connor questioned the need for the Steering Subcommittee now that the endorsement process is complete and the Policy Board is in place. LaBau and Randall Johnson explained that the Steering Subcommittee has a distinct role from that of the Policy Team and that it was created to provide a liaison mechanism between the Policy Board, the Coordinating Committee and its affiliate Advisory Teams; this function is fundamental to the effective communication and can not be provided by any other team. The committee agreed that the definition for "Steering Subcommittee" in Article I (Definitions) should be either moved to directly follow the definition for the "Coordinating Committee" or be included in the definition for the Coordinating Committee. Gary Caswell strongly suggested that the proposed operating guidelines should be revised to allow alternates to the Policy Board to participate in the meeting discussion when the primary organization representative to the Policy Board is present. The committee agreed that it is important to keep Board alternates involved in the Board's discussion. The consensus was to revise the guidelines to permit alternates to participate in discussion but continue to state that alternates not be permitted to vote unless the primary representative is absent. Virginia Erdahl motioned and Al Srock seconded to approve Articles I and II of the MetroGIS Operating Guidelines dated February 27, 1997, as revised, for consideration by the Policy Board at the 25 March meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 4d. Policy Advisory Team: Board Direction-- Operating Guidelines for the Coordinating Committee

Margo LaBau explained the Policy Advisory Team has been discussing two issues of operation for the Coordinating Committee which are proposed to be presented to the Policy Board. The first issue concerns the number of votes required to approve a motion by the Coordinating Committee. David Claypool suggested that a majority of full membership of the Committee must vote in favor of a measure for it to pass. This means that with the current membership of 20 persons, 11 votes must be cast in favor of any motion for it to be approved regardless of the number of members present at any given meeting. Stevenson motioned and Larry Charboneau seconded to endorse this voting method and recommend it to the Policy Board. The motion passed unanimously.

Margo LaBau explained the second recommendation of the Policy Advisory Team concerning representation by non-governmental organizations on the coordinating committee. Gary Stevenson asked for an explanation of the process to be used to add a new member to the Coordinating Committee. The Committee agreed that the process should be explained in the guidelines. It was agreed to postpone action on this matter until the Policy Advisory Team: 1) prepares a recommended process for adding members to Coordinating Committee and 2) a recommendation to the Policy Board for the process of "ratifying" the existing members of the Coordinating Committee. The Team was asked to address ratification of organizations versus the specific person and broad organization ratification such as non-profit versus a particular organization such as Wilder Research. Chairperson Arbeit asked the group if it wished to meet beyond 11:00 a.m.. It was agreed to extend meeting adjournment to until 11:30 a.m.

#### 4b. Policy Advisory Team: Legitimization of MetroGIS

Margo LaBau explained that the Policy Advisory Team believes research of options and preparation of a recommended option for legitimizing MetroGIS should be a shared responsibility of several of the organizations represented on the Policy Board. She explained the Team's recommendation to form a workgroup of the Policy Advisory Team comprised of persons from the legal staffs of several of the organizations represented on the Policy Board who would work with a few members of the of the Policy Advisory Team. This working group would review and suggest options (i.e., how to best include non-profit and for-profit organizations) and possibilities (i.e. joint powers board structure) to legitimize MetroGIS as free-standing legal entity.

LaBau explained that she had shared the recommendation with Dennis Berg, Anoka County's representative to the Policy Board, and that he was supportive. Richard Johnson noted that the traditional joint powers agreement option will not suffice if the Policy Board opts to include non-profit and/or for-profit organizations as voting members.

Cliff Aichinger motioned and Claypool seconded to: a) recommend that the Policy Board approve the following procedure to legitimize MetroGIS as a freestanding entity that may include non-government interests and b) direct the Steering Subcommittee to present this procedure to the Policy Board for consideration:

1. The Policy Board authorizes the Policy Advisory Team to create a working group comprised of a subgroup of its members and persons from the legal staffs of organizations represented on the Policy Board.
2. The Policy Advisory Team will seek Policy Board direction concerning appointment of persons from various legal staffs to serve on the working group and populate the working group.
3. The working group will initiate research and identify appropriate organizational and legal options for MetroGIS.

4. The working group will recommend a course of action for Coordinating Committee and Policy Board consideration after the Policy Board has clarified policies regarding the functions of MetroGIS and the membership requirements of the Policy Board.

The motion passed unanimously.

5-6. Summary of 15 January 1997 Policy Board Meeting and Update of Team Activities

David Arbeit explained that the first meeting of the Policy Board on January 15th was a success. Much positive feedback was received from the board members both during and following the meeting.

Rick Gelbmann briefed the Committee on the Access Advisory Team's work as was outlined in the Update and Information Sharing handouts. David Arbeit explained the current work of the Data Content Advisory Team and mentioned that the final presentation of the Business Information Needs Project will be 22 May 1997. Ron Wencil explained the work of the Standards Advisory Team and reported that the Standards and Content Advisory Teams are considering a joint meeting on April 8 to discuss the Business Information Needs Project and to discuss the "next steps".

7c. Newsletter Heidi Welsch handed out a draft of the proposed first issue of the MetroGIS newsletter "Coordinates" and asked that any comments or suggestions be returned within a week. She noted that it be presented to Policy Board on 25 March for review and approval prior to publication.

8. Next Meeting

Date: Thursday, April 24, Time: 8:30 a.m.; Location: TBA

9. Adjournment Chairperson Arbeit moved and David Claypool seconded to adjourn the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Motion carried unanimously.

Draft prepared by Heidi Welsch, GIS Administrative Assistant

Reviewed by, Randall Johnson GIS Liaison



**MetroGIS Coordinating Committee**  
**April 24, 1997 Agenda**  
**Land Management Information Center (LMIC) -- Room 301**  
**St. Paul, Minnesota 8:30 to 10:30 A.M.**

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a) March 6, 1997
4. Summary of March 25, 1997 Policy Board Meeting -- Chairperson Arbeit
5. Action Items
  - a. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair
  - b. Information Needs of Most Significance to MetroGIS (*Data Content Team*)
  - c. Next Phase of MetroGIS Business Information Needs Project:  
-- Objectives and Conceptual Strategy -- (*Data Content Team*)  
    Designate Second Liaison to Standards Advisory Team  
    Meeting Schedule
6. Update on Advisory Team Activities by Team Leaders
  - a. Data Access
  - b. Data Content
  - c. Policy
  - d. Standards
7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities  
(Identify any items for discussion as part of agenda approval)
  - e. MetroGIS Activity Update
  - f. May 22nd Presentation of MetroGIS Business Information Needs Project Findings
  - g. Updated List of Team, Committee, and Board members (Hand out)
8. Other Business
9. Next Meeting: June 1997
10. Adjourn

## April 24, 1997 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting to order at 8:25 a.m. The meeting was held at the offices of Land Management Information Center (LMIC) in the Centennial Office Building.

Members Present: Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); State: David Arbeit (LMIC); County: Jim Hentges (Scott), Pat O'Connor and Alternate Gary Caswell (Hennepin), Virginia Erdahl (Washington), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota), Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Schools: Alternate Dick Carlstrom for Jim Sydow (TIES); Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County Partnership); Utilities: Alan Srock, (NSP); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis)

Members Absent: Cities: Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Counties: Dave Drealan (Carver); Margo LaBau (Anoka), David Claypool (Ramsey); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (RamseyWashingtonMetro Watershed District)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, David Vessel

### 2-3. Acceptance of Agenda and Meeting Minutes

The agenda was approved by consensus. The minutes of the March 6, 1997 meeting were accepted by consensus.

### 4. Summary of the March 25 Policy Board Meeting

Arbeit stated that there was a fair amount of enthusiasm expressed at the last Policy Board meeting. He also explained that the Hennepin County representatives had expressed some concern that the pace of the MetroGIS needs to move quickly, in particular to take advantage of options to work with the private sector.

### 5. Action Items

#### a) Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Will Craig nominated David Arbeit to serve as Chairperson for the next year. Arbeit stated that he would be willing to serve a second term but would also be happy to allow another member the chance to serve as Chair. Virginia Erdahl motioned and Brad Henry seconded close the nominations and to cast a unanimous ballot for David Arbeit as Chairperson. The motion passed unanimously.

Craig and Pat O'Connor both thanked David Arbeit for his service during the past year. Craig also voiced some concern that the team should not become too dependent on one person. The team agreed that organizations are more healthy when the leadership is rotated among the members and there was some discussion about electing the vice chair with the understanding that the individual would become the Chair the following year. It was decided not to implement this policy at this time.

It was agreed that the primary role of the ViceChair is to preside at meetings in the Chair's absence. Randall Johnson added that the ViceChair may also be called upon to be an advocate for MetroGIS at various interest group meetings. Johnson stated that these opportunities are important to communicate the objectives and

accomplishments of MetroGIS to stakeholders and will likely increase in frequency as MetroGIS matures. The existence of a ViceChair would improve our chances of accepting these invitations.

Charboneau nominated Brad Henry to serve as Vice Chairperson for the next year. Henry stated that he would accept the position if elected. Gary Stevenson motioned and Charboneau seconded to close the nominations and to cast a unanimous ballot for Brad Henry as ViceChairperson. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 5b and c. Information Needs of Most Significance to MetroGIS and Next Phase of the Project

Will Craig, Liaison to the Data Content Team, reviewed the major accomplishments of the Information Needs Project. Over 750 information needs have been identified and have been consolidated into 87 discrete information need statements and a survey of all participants in this project was administered in February. The objective of the survey was to identify those of the 87 discrete information needs that are most important to MetroGIS stakeholders and also require dependence upon other organizations for the data needed to answer the priority information needs.

David Arbeit reviewed the methodology used to analyze the survey responses. Equal weighting was given to the importance and dependence responses to rank the needs and to identify the top ten. Arbeit noted that they added three others to the top ten that scored as a top ten priority for two or more of the six functional groups (i.e. public works, community development, etc.) or which scored as a top ten priority for two or more categories of organizations represented on the Policy Board (e.g. counties, cities, watersheds, etc.). Arbeit explained that the Data Content Advisory Team had endorsed this methodology and the resulting thirteen identified information needs as having the most significance to MetroGIS. The thirteen identified needs are as follows (they are listed in rank order with associated survey number and the abbreviated statement is in parenthesis):

Rank: Information Need Statement ( I need to know...)

1. The boundaries and characteristics of a specified jurisdiction (ex: city, school district, county, police and fire districts). (Jurisdictional boundaries #47)
2. The street addresses for specified locations. (Street addresses #42)
3. About land use or development plans that have been officially adopted by public bodies. (Land use plans #10)
4. Who has rights to a property, including ownership, leases, easements, rightofway. (Rights to property #1)
5. The boundaries and location of a specified parcel. (Parcel boundaries #44)
6. The locations and characteristics of water features (ex: lakes, wetlands, floodplains, aquifers, watersheds). (Lakes, wetlands, etc. #31)
7. How a piece of land is being used, including whether or not it is vacant. (Land use, existing #4)
8. The boundaries and characteristics of census areas (ex: census blocks, block groups, tracts). (Census boundaries #48)
9. Where people live and how to contact them. (Where people live #2)
10. The regulations that affect the use of a piece of land, such as zoning. (Land Regulations #6)
11. The locations and characteristics of roads/highways. (Highway / road networks #27)
12. The socioeconomic characteristics of an area's population (ex: census tract, count, city). (Socioeconomic characteristics of areas #71)
13. A unique identifying attribute of a land parcel, such as parcel ID. (Parcel identifiers #46)

The committee agreed that this list of information needs does not include anything surprising but most agreed they would not have predicted that jurisdictional boundaries would be the highest priority need. The group also agreed that information needs they perceive to be the most important are all in the top thirteen, with the exception that Craig noted that he favors adding the soils information need to this list because it is the highest priority for the Natural Resources Focus group, although its overall rank is 22nd. Discussion of this suggestion was postponed until later in the meeting.

Gary Stevenson questioned whether the process was worth the effort and the estimated \$60,000 cost. Randall Johnson stated that the vast majority of the expense incurred have been for the object modeling component of the project which is not before the Committee at this time, noting that Will Craig and David Arbeit volunteered their expertise to design the survey instrument and to analyze the results. Johnson explained that last summer, before endorsement of MetroGIS had been received from any organization other than the Council, the Coordinating Committee adopted a philosophy calling for a broadly participatory process for this Project and agreed the objective is to achieve consensus from a variety of key stakeholder from across the metro area as to the information needs/data that are of the most significance to the most number of organizations. Johnson stated that he believes this objective has been successfully achieved.

Stevenson stated that he is not convinced that broad buy-in is necessary since many of the principal stakeholders have endorsed MetroGIS. Johnson stated that a significant portion of the project was completed before endorsement was obtained from key stakeholders. Arbeit explained that the Project has provided demonstrable justification for prioritizing and choosing the information needs to focus resources on at this time. Brad Henry stated that he believes that the \$60,000 spent on this project has produced valuable results for a reasonable cost.

Charboneau noted that routing needs are not included on the list and which he found odd since they are a high priority need of the private sector. Arbeit explained that while private sector interests were included in the generation of information needs and in the survey to rank the importance of the needs they were not the primary focus of the Project. He explained that the focus statement approved for the Project states that public sector needs are to be the predominant focus, followed by private providers of essential public services. The needs of other interests were documented to be sensitive to collaborative opportunities but the main focus of the Project is to identify the most information needs of significance to the public sector.

Craig and Arbeit suggested shortening the list of information needs to focus work on for the next phase and suggested the following criteria to select the short list: 1) Does the needed information exist or is it readily available?; 2) Is the information easy to develop?; 3) Are there parties willing to provide resources for development and staffing requirements?

Craig moved and Henry seconded to recommend that the Policy Board adopt the following selection criteria to choose the information needs to be pursued during the next phase of the Business Information Needs Project (referred to the recommendation for agenda item 5b in the agenda materials):

"The need for the information need is high and organizations are dependent on others to meet the need. The need is high for several organizational classes and several functional classes. Other things being equal, the needed information exists, or is readily available, is relatively easy to develop, or the parties are willing to provide resources to develop the information."

Discussion on motion: Gary Stevenson disagreed with selecting on the basis whether a need is easily accomplished and argued that work on information needs should not be delayed because they are not easily accomplished if they are a prerequisite for work on others (e.g., parcels need to be high on the list). Scott Beckman concurred and suggested that another criteria for selecting an information need should be whether it is a foundation element which needs to be addressed before other information needs can be dealt with. Gary Caswell agreed, citing the need to create a framework for work on subsequent information needs. The group ultimately concluded that there is no need to decide on a short list of information needs prior to completing the testing of the next phase methodology other than to decide which information needs are the most suitable candidates to test the methodology.

Arbeit motioned and Charboneau seconded to table item Craig's motion on agenda item 5b for discussion of the next phase methodology (agenda item 5c). Craig and Henry agreed to the motion to table. Motion carried unanimously.

Will Craig explained the seven principal tasks recommended by the Data Content Advisory Team for the next phase of the Project.

O'Connor asked how the Council's data and cost sharing agreements with metro area counties relate to the process proposed for the next steps. Johnson explained that the projects that the Council is assisting with as part of its data and cost sharing agreements will be coordinated with workgroups to be created for each priority information need.

Craig stated that he believes it important for MetroGIS to produce some tangible products soon. He suggested adding the soils information need to the list of 13 proposed priority information needs, even though it ranked 22nd, since the Metropolitan Council is currently assimilating a regional soils coverage and he suggested that the regional soil coverage be claimed as an accomplishment of MetroGIS. The group disagreed with this suggestion to include the soils need as one of the high priority needs and agreed to limit allocation of MetroGIS resources to the thirteen information needs that meet the analysis criteria until the next phase work for them is substantially completed.

Virginia Erdahl stated, and the Committee agreed, that organizations participating in MetroGIS understand that the process of structuring and implementing MetroGIS is timeconsuming. Erdahl also stated, and the Committee agreed, that MetroGIS should not take credit for anything (i.e. regional soils coverage) that would have been completed without MetroGIS. The Committee did, however, acknowledge that MetroGIS should be credited for easing access obstacles to data such as the metropolitan soils coverage.

Stevenson disagreed that MetroGIS needs to be produce products. He views development of a method for long term access for the next generation of users to be more important and predicted that the work by the Council and Mn/DOT to provide wide spread access to the Lawrence Group's street centerline database for the entire region will have a significant positive impact on the viability of MetroGIS.

The committee returned to its tabled discussion of three criteria suggested as a means to focus resources for work on the next phase. Ron Wencil and others agreed that it is important to establish a procedure to move from the identified priority information needs to agreement on data specifications and data sources for each of them and agreed with the Data Content Advisory Team's proposed seven step methodology and the proposed testing and refinement scheme. The Committee also agreed to use of jurisdictional boundaries, land use plans, and the information needs associated with street centerlines and parcels to test and refine the methodology. Finally, the group also agreed that the proposed criteria for a short list are not necessary in the form of a separate motion, given the Committee's agreement on the information needs to be used to test and refine the methodology. Once the methodology has been refined, it was agreed that the Committee would revisit the matter of how to choose the information needs that will be addressed next.

Arbeit moved and Gelbmann seconded to adopt recommendation 5b [methodology for next phase(s)] as presented in a suggested motion handed out at the meeting. During discussion of the motion, the group concluded that the format should be revised to include reference in the lead section to the information needs that will be used to test the methodology and to inform that Policy Board of the course approved by the Coordinating Committee rather than request Board approval. Arbeit moved and Gelbmann seconded to withdraw their motion to approve recommendation 5c as presented in the hand out. Motion passed unanimously.

David Arbeit asked Will Craig and Brad Henry if they would consent to withdrawing their previous motion for agenda item 5b. Craig and Henry agreed. Motion withdrawn.

Pat O'Connor moved and Gelbmann seconded that the Coordinating Committee:

A) Approve the thirteen information needs listed on page 2 of these minutes as the needs of most significance to MetroGIS.

B) Adopt the following methodology to carry out the next phase elements of the project, test and refine the methodology with jurisdictional boundaries, and explore the data and information needs associated with street centerlines, land use plans, and parcel boundaries prior to addressing any of the other top thirteen information needs:

Using all information produced through the modeling process and surveys to date, data analysts will complete portions of the object model corresponding to that need and document all attributes that have been identified. [staff] One or more working groups comprised of subject matter experts will develop more detailed data specifications, supported by project staff and data analysts, as needed. Identify and evaluate all available sources of data relative to the detailed data specifications. [workgroup/content team] Identify and describe any data that are needed but which do not currently exist. [workgroup/content team] Identify obstacles to obtaining needed data and possible ways to overcome the obstacles. [advisory teams] Select preferred data sources [policy board]. Pursue functionality and legal form needed to provide access to preferred data. [MetroGIS and/or data producers]

The motion passed unanimously.

The Committee agreed that it is important to keep the Board informed about Project activities and decisions of the Committee but the group also agreed that it is important not to bog down the Policy Board with process matters. Several of the members stated they do not believe the Policy Board should be asked to approve the Committee's decisions on Agenda Items 5b and c, as had been suggested by staff. Staff was directed to prepare a transmittal for the Policy Board's information and comment and to circulate it for comment prior to presenting it to the Board. The transmittal to the Policy Board is also to include the rationale for selection of the specified information needs to begin the next phase process. It was agreed to seek direction from the Board as to when its approval should be sought.

Larry Charboneau stated, and the Committee agreed, that the Board will look to the Committee to be the experts on appropriate courses of action and to manage the process. It was also agreed that the reports to the Board should be brief and concise and to expect that if the members want more information that they will ask for it. There was some question whether the Policy Board needs to meet in May if the agenda is comprised of only discussion or information items. Staff agreed to speak with Chairperson Victoria Reinhardt for her thoughts on whether or not to hold a meeting in May.

#### 5d. Designation of a Second Liaison to the Standards Advisory Team

Chairperson Arbeit asked for volunteers to assist Ron Wencil as liaison to the Standards Advisory Team, noting the Committee's operating guidelines call for two liaisons. Wencil explained that since Clark Evans reassigned, he has been the only liaison to the Standards Team and that he would appreciate some assistance with the Team liaison duties. No one volunteered.

#### 5e. Next Meetings

The committee agreed to the following dates for 1997 meetings:

June 26 Earle Brown Conference Center; Room 52; 8:30 a.m.10:30 a.m.

August 28 Metropolitan Council Offices, Room 1A (State Fair at Earle Brown)

October 23 Earle Brown Conference Center, Room 52

December 18 Earle Brown Conference Center, Room 52

10. Adjournment

Chairperson Arbeit moved and Craig seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:55 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Draft prepared by Heidi Welsch, Assistant GIS Liaison. Reviewed by Randall Johnson, GIS Liaison.



**Thursday, August 28, 1997**  
**Metropolitan Council, Mears Park Facility -- Room 1A**  
**230 East 5th Street, St. Paul**  
**8:30 to 10:30 A.M.**

1. Call to Order
  2. Accept Agenda
  3. Accept Meeting Summary
    - a) April 24, 1997
  4. Summary of May 28 and July 30, 1997 Policy Board Meetings -- Chairman Arbeit
  5. Action and Discussion Items:
    1. Generalized MetroGIS Work Program -- Status Report (Staff)
    2. MetroGIS WEB Index Project -- Status Report (Access Team)
    3. Work Program -- Information Needs Project (Content Team)
    4. Jurisdictional Boundaries Information Need Strategy (Content Team)
      - (1) Cities/Townships (MCD's) and Counties \*\*
      - (2) School Districts \*\*
  6. Advisory Team Activities Update
  7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
    1. MetroGIS Activity Update Report
  8. Other Business
  9. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meetings -- Sept 24th and Nov 19th)  
October 23, 1997
  10. Adjourn
- \*\* Action requested

## August 28, 1997 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Vice Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council offices in St. Paul.

Members Present: State: David Arbeit (LMIC) [arrived during agenda item 5d(1)]; County: Jim Hentges (Scott), Alternate Gary Caswell for Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), Virginia Erdahl (Washington), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); Margo LaBau (Anoka), David Claypool (Ramsey); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council), Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Schools: Jim Sydow (TIES); Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County Partnership); Utilities: Alan Srock, (NSP); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville).

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (RamseyWashingtonMetro Watershed District); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, David Vessel, Tanya Mayer, Mark Kotz, Rick Peterson

Visitors: Rick Person (City of St. Paul), Chairperson of the Data Content Advisory Team

### 2-3. Acceptance of Agenda and Meeting Minutes

The agenda was approved by consensus.

MOTION Member LaBau moved and Member Caswell seconded to accepted the minutes of the April 24, 1997. The motion carried unanimously.

### 4. Summary of the May 28 and July 30 Policy Board Meetings

Randall Johnson asked if the committee would like a summary of the two previous Policy Board meetings. Member Craig noted that there was a good summary in the written meeting materials. The group agreed that a verbal summary was not necessary.

### 5. Action Items

#### 5a. Generalized Work Program

Randall Johnson explained that the work program will become a regular report to the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board. He asked for comments on the format and the substance of the report. Member Craig requested that more detail be included on the support arrangements with counties. He noted that a 1 page summary document would be sufficient. Member Craig also asked that timelines for some of the specific projects (such as the jurisdictional boundaries work of the Data Content Team) include estimated dates. Member Erdahl agreed that a synopsis of each county's data and cost sharing agreement with the Metropolitan Council would be helpful. Member Welsch requested that the name of the responsible team and contact be placed next to each project on the timeline.

#### 5b. MetroGIS Web Index Project

Member Sydow introduced this item, noting that the Data Access Advisory Team had posted an RFP (request for proposals) last spring. The team met with 3 vendors and selected Lynne Bly and Associates.

Member Gelbmann explained that the Metropolitan Council had authorized entering into a contract with Lynne Bly and Associates. He explained the anticipated timeline and work program for the web index project. Although there have been some delays, good progress has been made to execute a contract. The contract is under review by the Council's legal staff and should be reviewed by the vendor shortly.

Member Gelbmann explained how the web index fits in with the NSDI (National Spatial Data Infrastructure) Clearinghouse Project. Metadata will be sent from MetroGIS to the Minnesota node of NSDI and then to the national repository. 'DataLogr', a software tool developed by the State of Michigan, will be used to enter metadata for MetroGIS. A statewide license for use of 'DataLogr' has been purchased by the State of Minnesota (LMIC) and the Metropolitan Council. 'DataLogr' may be modified slightly to accommodate the needs of the MetroGIS web index.

Member Gelbmann further explained the types of data searches that will be available through the web index include: text query, participant index, thematic query. He noted that the project seeks to use existing technologies as much as possible. Some datasets will be available via FTP (File Transfer Protocol) while others will require participants to contact the dataset owner before it will be released. This method is proposed to preserve control over security of datasets by their owners. Member Charboneau asked if data will be available to private as well as public entities. Member Gelbmann explained that the web index project allows dataset owners to make access decisions. Thus it is likely that different levels of access (i.e. public information; licensed information; etc.) will exist for data maintained by MetroGIS stakeholders. He also noted that policy-related access issues will be framed through this project for consideration by the MetroGIS Policy Board.

Member Caswell asked if the NSDI State Node had been located. Mark Kotz confirmed that a temporary test site has been established but could not state whether official designation of a site had occurred. Member Srock asked if a site will be available for shared datafiles. Member Gelbmann responded that a test FTP site for the Lawrence Group Street Centerline data and Dakota County is currently underway. Gelbmann explained that the project is attempting to create a flexible base and that focus is currently on the framework of the project.

Member Erdahl noted that decisions pending about public vs. private data access to data through MetroGIS are also among the first decisions that have been addressed or will need to be addressed at the county level. Member Gelbmann noted that Anoka County's GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement is to include a pilot project involving data sharing within the entities other than government.

Member Henry asked if there will be an inventory of relevant data that already exists on the web. Gelbmann explained that an inventory is not part of this consultant contract but that a component of the MetroGIS Information Needs Project (see Item 5c) includes identification and evaluation of existing datasets against the desired specifications for each priority information need.

#### 5c. Work Program -- Information Needs Project

Rick Person, Chairperson of the Data Content Advisory Team, introduced himself and explained that the Data Content Advisory Team has been working to refine the Information Needs work program. He asked the group to recall the Board approved 7-step information needs methodology and the 13 information needs that the Board identified as priorities. The work program outlined by the Content Advisory Team refines the 7-step methodology by listing detailed tasks and participant roles.

He explained that strategies to access data necessary to address the top 4 information needs endorsed by the Board are planned to be complete by June 1998. Member Gelbmann commented that the information need

workgroup work program is an evolving process and that changes should be expected as more workgroups complete their recommendations for each of the priority information needs.. Member Welsch noted that an attempt should be made to coordinate the Metropolitan Council and state requirements for updated land use plans with the land use plan information need.

Member Craig noted the importance of multiple datasets to answer a single information need as described in the work program. The group agreed that different scale projects may require different datasets comprised of the same type of information. For instance, a project which maps the number of households per municipality in the region would not need jurisdictional boundaries at as detailed of a scale as, for example, a project requiring the exact area for taxing purposes within the boundaries.

Member Craig also pointed out the importance of defining the 'data class authority' as described by the Team's work program.

There was general acceptance of the tasks and roles outlined in the Information Needs Work program endorsed by the Data Content Advisory Team.

MOTION: Member Caswell moved and Member Sydow seconded to accept the Data Content Advisory Team's recommendation to begin work on the Street Addresses and Land Use Plans information needs as soon as possible. Motion carried unanimously.

#### 5d-1 County and Minor Civil Division (MCD) Boundaries

Rick Person, Chairperson of the Data Content Advisory Team, explained that a workgroup of experts met on 2 June to define desired data specifications for jurisdictional boundaries. At that meeting, the workgroup agreed that top priorities should be county, city and township (minor civil division-MCD), and school district boundaries. Staff compiled the data specifications for existing datasets in the Dataset Comparison Document.

He stated that the Data Content Advisory Team met on 6 August and recommended: "that the Metropolitan Council assumes responsibility for compiling the best available data sources for county and MCD boundaries, re-compile them on a regular basis , and make them available to MetroGIS participants. Organizations contributing data to the effort will be responsible for documenting the data using the Minnesota Metadata Guidelines for Geographic Information. The dataset will be evaluated at least once a year and a recommendation made to MetroGIS regarding the best available source and the need to re-compile the data to reflect changes."

Member Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council, distributed a memorandum that outlined three concerns with the Team's recommendation: Which data should be used?; Who will be the interim dataset custodian?; Who will be the long-term dataset custodian? Gelbmann explained that the Metropolitan Council would like to postpone discussion of the long-term custodian for MCD and county boundary datasets until the Team has considered Washington County's pilot project which addresses jurisdictional boundaries. Issues concerning phasing out of the Minnesota Municipal Board being dealt with at the state level may also need to be considered by the team. Member Gelbmann noted that he expects Washington County's pilot project will produce information useful to MetroGIS and that there may be an opportunity to incorporate the need for a digital municipal boundaries dataset into the discussions concerning the phase out of the Minnesota Municipal Board.

There was some discussion of positional accuracy by the group. The committee agreed that it is important understand that 'best available dataset' vis-à-vis positional accuracy is constantly changing. There may be more than one boundary map necessary to meet the needs of different interest groups. The team also agreed that consistency is important (i.e. it would be good if different projects originate from the same dataset so that data can be combine and compared with ease.)

Member Caswell questioned whether a regional boundary layer needs to be compiled. He argued that an adequate source of this data is available from the counties. Member Claypool noted that some MCD boundaries are not adequately documented in County records. He favored the Team's proposal to assign the on-going maintenance of the proposed regional jurisdictional boundaries dataset to a particular organization as a means of improving the accuracy of this data. Members Craig and Gelbmann also stated that a regional dataset is needed because it is too time consuming to request boundary data from individual counties and consolidate it for various multi-county policy discussions and research projects. The consensus of the group was that a regional dataset should be pursued.

Member Srock noted that it would be in the best interest of MetroGIS to make available as soon as possible several datasets with explanatory metadata that address high priority information needs, even if only interim solutions. The group agreed.

The group asked for clarification of the term 'MCD'. Member Craig explained that "MCD" means 'minor civil division' and refers to any type of civil division of a county including municipalities, townships, villages, boroughs, etc. In the metro area, the only 'minor civil division' that still exist are municipalities and townships.

Member Welsch asked about the status of other jurisdictional boundaries such as watershed districts and taxing districts. Person explained that the workgroup identified a long list of jurisdictional boundaries of interest to MetroGIS. County, MCD, and school districts were set as first priorities by the workgroup.

Member Sydow noted that it is important to separate the task of defining and obtaining a dataset(s) from the on-going maintenance of the dataset(s). Member Erdahl stated that it is premature to determine a long-term solution for County and MCD boundaries and that it would be good to postpone the decision until further work has been completed by the Washington County pilot project and the Data Content Advisory Team.

MOTION: Member Caswell moved and Member Charboneau seconded to table discussion of a county and MCD jurisdictional boundary dataset until the Data Content Advisory Team has had an opportunity to further consider: 1) Washington County's jurisdictional boundaries pilot project, and 2) legislation regarding phasing out the Minnesota Municipal Board. Motion carried unanimously.

5d-2. School District Boundaries Person explained that the 2 June workgroup had agreed on several specifications for school district boundary datasets. Since the issue is quite complex, the Data Content Advisory Team has recommended that the Washington County pilot project on school district boundaries be expanded to include appropriate metro area representation for further study before the Team offers any recommendations concerning a dataset.

MOTION: Member Caswell moved and Member Sydow seconded to endorse: 1) the dataset specifications as presented in the staff report for a regional school district boundaries dataset and 2) to accept Washington County's proposal to include appropriate representatives from around the metropolitan area for school district boundaries in its pilot project and to provide recommendations to the Data Content Advisory Team regarding resolution of school district boundary discrepancies. Motion carried unanimously.

## 6. Advisory Team Activities Update

Policy Team: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS staff, explained that the Policy Advisory Team is testing its proposal to phase out the Steering Subcommittee. The proposal is to hold joint meetings of the Advisory Team liaisons and the Policy Advisory Team to streamline the MetroGIS organizational structure.

Standards Team: Mark Kotz noted that a draft of the Address Guidelines brochure is available. He noted that comments had been sought from many people in the field of GIS. Kotz encouraged the committee members to share the document with people in their organizations involved with recording address data.

## 7. Information Sharing

Member Craig explained that a Metadata Satellite Downlink workshop will be happening on October 15. Interested persons should contact Chris Cialek at 297-2488. Mark Kotz noted that he will be giving a metadata workshop at the Minnesota GIS/LIS Conference on October 1 in St. Cloud.

Member Arbeit and Member Craig discussed the University of Minnesota Digital Information Summit which will be taking place October 22 at the Hyatt. Jack Dangermond, ESRI President and CEO, is scheduled to give the keynote address to the Spatial Information Technology portion of the summit. The summit will focus on ways that the University can help government and the private sector.

Member Arbeit noted that the Governor's Council on Geographic Information recently received endorsement of a Land Records Modernization legislative proposal from the policy subcommittees for the Association of Minnesota Counties and the League of Minnesota Cities. Endorsement is now being sought from the executive boards of both organizations. This is an important and positive step toward statewide funding for the initiative. The group agreed that the MetroGIS Policy Board should be apprised of this matter at its September meeting.

Member Henry asked about the status of the Addressable Street Centerlines dataset created by the Lawrence Group which is proposed to be made available to public agencies through a license obtained by the Metropolitan Council and the MnDOT. Member Gelbmann stated that updated data will be delivered to the Council next week (September 2-5) and that an FTP site will be established soon. He noted that there will be a session regarding availability and access to this data at the Mn GIS/LIS Conference on October 2-3.

Person noted that a Metro Data Fair will take place at the American Public Works Association national conference on September 16. Member Gelbmann will also be speaking at the APWA conference on behalf of MetroGIS.

## 9. Next Meetings:

The committee changed the next meeting date to: Friday, October 24 8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Location to be Determined

## 10. Adjournment

MOTION: Member Claypool moved and Member Henry seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Heidi Welsch, Assistant GIS Liaison



Friday, October 24, 1997  
Metropolitan Council, Mears Park Facility -- Room 1A  
230 East 5th Street, St. Paul  
8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a) August 28, 1997
4. Summary of September 24 Policy Board Meeting
5. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a) MetroGIS Addressing Standards \*\*
  - b) Informational Document -- Working with Address Data \*\*
  - c) Jurisdictional Boundaries Information Need Strategy Cities/Townships (MCD's) and Counties \*\*
  - d) GIS Mapping of Telecommunication Utilities Public Utility Commission Mandate \*\*
  - e) Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines: Use by MetroGIS Participants \*\*
  - f) Operating Guidelines for Coordinating Committee
  - g) Process to Develop Distribution Policies for Regional Soils Dataset \*\*
  - h) 1998 Meeting Schedule \*\*
6. Advisory Team Activities Update
7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
  - a) General Activity/ Work Program Update
8. Other Business
9. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meetings --Nov. 19 and Jan 28)  
December 18, 1997
10. Adjourn

\*\* Action requested

## October 24, 1997 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council offices in St. Paul.

Members Present: State: David Arbeit (LMIC); County: Alternate Gary Caswell for Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), Alternate Jane Harper for Virginia Erdahl (Washington), Margo LaBau (Anoka), David Claypool (Ramsey); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Academics: Will Craig (CURA); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS)

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (RamseyWashingtonMetro Watershed District); Counties: Jim Hentges (Scott), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council), Schools: Jim Sydow (TIES); Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County Partnership); Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP); Cities: Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, Tanya Mayer, Mark Kotz

Visitors: Dick Elhardt, NSP

### 2 and 3. Acceptance of Agenda and Meeting Minutes

MOTIONS : Member Henry moved and Member Gelbmann seconded to accepted the agenda. The motion carried unanimously. Member Henry moved and Member Charboneau seconded to accept the meeting summary from August 28, 1997. Motion carried unanimously.

### 4. Summary of the September 28 Policy Board Meetings

Chairperson Arbeit reported that the Land Records Modernization initiative of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information had been presented to the Policy Board by Committee Members Claypool and Stevenson and Jeffrey Grosso of Goodhue County. The Board acknowledged the merits of the initiative and directed staff to prepare a letter of support for Chairperson Reinhardt's signature. Also summarized was a presentation given by Jerry Knickerbocker, Chair of a workgroup to the Public Utilities Commission, about mapping standards for telecommunication utilities being considered for a bill to the 1998 State Legislature. The Board directed the Coordinating Committee to provide input to the Commission regarding this issue.

### 5. Action Items a and b) MetroGIS Addressing Standards and Addressing Informational Document

Mark Kotz, Standards Team staff, and Ron Wencil, Team Liaison, explained the Standards Advisory Team's recommendations concerning standards for address data. The Team had begun work on addressing data issues approximately 18 months ago. After much study, it concluded that there should not be a mandated MetroGIS standard for addressing data. Kotz explained the purpose and content of a document prepared by the Standards Team entitled "Issues and Guidelines for working with Address Data". The Committee had reviewed the document earlier this year but asked for a broader review by users of address data before the Committee gave further consideration. A list of the additional persons that had been invited to review the document was presented in the report. Kotz noted that no substantive changes had been made as a result of the broader review. Kotz also mentioned that the Team believes this document should be looked upon as a living document, that is, the intent is to update it as needed to reflect current thinking.

There was discussion of the implications of the term 'guideline'. Member Caswell asked why the Team is concerned about recommending definitive guidelines or standards. Kotz stated that the Team considered factors including: there are different needs for different types of addressing applications; there has been considerable investment in systems currently in use; and the Addressing Guidelines document is meant to help users choose the most appropriate and useful techniques and standards.

Member Claypool spoke in favor of the proposed guidelines document, particularly noting the section which highlights common problems with address matching that can be minimized through the use of standards. Alternate Member Harper stated that significant new investment within the Region is imminent and encouraged MetroGIS to promote standardization where possible from this point on. She also challenged MetroGIS decision makers to look to the future (what can be) and not decide courses of action on the basis of past work and investment that is not consistent with current needs. She stated that she supported the promotion of the Team's "Issues and Guidelines" document as a place to start and as more is learned, more information can be added to these guidelines. Member Gelbmann noted that a domain table for addressing data needs to be developed as a standard in the future.

Chairperson Arbeit stated that a single recommendation that combines action on a guideline and the document, rather than two separate motions as presented in the report, is needed for clarity of presentation to the Policy Board. Member Henry suggested that a connection should be made between the proposed guidelines and The Lawrence Group (TLG) dataset. Member Charboneau agreed that it will be important for users of TLG's centerline dataset to follow the guidelines proposed by the Standards Team. Member Charboneau confirmed that TLG's centerline dataset conforms with the proposed guidelines, noting Jim Maxwell of TLG is a member of the Standards Team subgroup that developed the document.

The consensus of the Committee was the "Issues and Guidelines for Working with Address Data" document is exceptionally well done. After much discussion of the most appropriate course of action for subsequent Board consideration and promotion of the document, the Committee decided the two matters before it (guidelines and information document) should be merged into one recommendation to the Policy Board. The Committee also agreed with the Team's recommendation that MetroGIS should not pursue a mandatory addressing standard and concluded that: a) all MetroGIS participants should be encouraged to use the guidelines set forth in this document to insure their systems are capable of taking advantage of the significant public investment to obtain public access to TLG's street centerline dataset and b) before the MetroGIS Policy Board considers the document, it should be modified to prominently state in the introduction the advantages of designing address data bases that comply with the suggested guidelines. This statement was included on page 10 of the draft.

Alternate Member Harper commented that the document is difficult to read for the nonGIS professional, yet the nonGIS professional is often involved in GIS system development. The group acknowledged the merit of modifications to improve the readability of the document, such as the addition of glossary, but decided that it is in the best interest of MetroGIS to distribute this version and improve upon it with subsequent versions. Alternate Member Harper concurred.

The group concurred that the MetroGIS website should not be relied upon as the primary means to distribute the "Issues and Guidelines for working with Address Data" information document. Given the universal need for this data, the group concurred that all MetroGIS participants need to be aware of and encouraged to use these guidelines. Options were discussed for distribution of this document. The group concurred with a suggestion of Member Gelbmann to provide a copy to each licensee of TLG's dataset. It was agreed the document should be mailed to all key MetroGIS stakeholder organizations, to post a copy on the MetroGIS website, and to advertise its existence and how to obtain a copy. (Note: At a subsequent meeting with Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt concerning presentation of this matter to the Policy Board, staff agreed to investigate the cost of printing and mailing the document to the 400+ local government MetroGIS stakeholders for discussion of funding options with the Policy Board.)

MOTION: Member Charboneau moved and Member Henry seconded to adopt the following motion: Whereas many of the benefits of MetroGIS derive from reliably locating events, (places, people, and things); and whereas there are technical requirements for successfully doing this, the Coordinating Committee recommends that the MetroGIS Policy Board adopt and promote use by MetroGIS participants of the addressing data guidelines set forth in the document entitled Guidelines and Issues for Working with Address Data, prepared by the MetroGIS Standards Advisory Team and as approved by the Coordinating Committee on October 24, 1997. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 5c. Jurisdictional Boundaries Information Need Strategy

(Note: Committee discussion of this item had been tabled on August 28, 1997 to give the Data Content Team an opportunity to discuss information not previously available to it.) MOTION: Member Caswell moved and Member Charboneau seconded to remove the item from tabling. Motion passed unanimously.

Member Claypool, Liaison to the Content Team, reviewed the previous concerns of the Coordinating Committee with this item and the current Data Content Team recommendations for: a) the dataset specifications for municipal, township, and county jurisdictional boundaries and b) refinements to the Information Needs Workgroup process to delegate responsibility to the Policy Advisory Team to evaluate dataset custodian issues and to delegate responsibility to the Standards Team to develop data standards from the desired dataset specifications identified by the Information Needs Workgroups.

Member Claypool explained the Team's current thinking that each of the seven counties should be designated as the official source of detailed jurisdictional boundary data and another agency, such as the Metropolitan Council, should be responsible to compile the source data into a regional dataset and to maintain the regional dataset. He summarized the dataset specifications recommended by the Team, in particular, that the regional dataset would maintain the precision of the county parcelbased databases. He also reported the Metropolitan Council has agreed to share its MCD (city/township) and county jurisdictional boundary dataset recently compiled for its internal business needs until such time as a 'better' dataset becomes available.

Member Craig raised a concern that a single boundaries dataset based on parcel-level data will be too large for the general desktop mapping needs of some MetroGIS participants, such as the research community. Mark Kotz explained that through data generalization techniques the precision of a parcel based dataset could be retained in a manner that supports a variety of system requirements and applications. Alternate Member Harper reported that the Washington County pilot project will be addressing the need for generalization and improved usability of the data. Member Craig and others concurred that the parcel-based specification is workable if revised to state the precision accuracy is to be "derived from parcel boundaries".

The group agreed that reliance on the county and MCD boundaries dataset, recently compiled by the Metropolitan Council, is an appropriate solution to the MetroGIS jurisdictional boundary information need until issues concerning long term custodianship of the regional dataset are resolved or until a 'better' dataset becomes available.

Alternate Member Harper expressed concern about the phrase in recommendation #2 in the staff report that limits the frequency of updates to "as needed by Metropolitan Council". She noted this phrase is inconsistent with the needs and goals of MetroGIS, noting that every MetroGIS participant must look beyond our internal needs to create the sought after value added for the Region. She also emphasized that for MetroGIS to be successful, key stakeholder organizations must recognize that the needs of the greater good may go beyond their individual needs and that the specifics of any such discontent need to be brought before the Policy Board for discussion. Member Gelbmann, GIS Coordinator for the Metropolitan Council, agreed to delete the phrase "as needed by the Metropolitan Council for internal purposes" from the recommendation and agreed that the Metropolitan Council would recompile the regional dataset when apprised that significant changes have occurred.

Member Gelbmann commented he believes the information needs process could be improved for subsequent datasets if negotiations with candidate custodial organizations would occur before deliberation by the Coordinating Committee. He supports the Content Team's recommendation #3 to delegate these data custodian responsibilities negotiation to the Policy Team for discussion prior to Coordinating Committee consideration.

Member Wencil questioned the role of the Standards Team in defining the dataset specifications. Member Claypool explained that the Content Team believes its responsibility, primarily through the work of each information needs workgroup, is to identify specifications for each dataset needed to address the thirteen priority information needs and that it should be the role of the Standards Team to develop specific standards for each of the general specifications. The group concurred with this philosophy. Alternate Member Harper noted that the Washington County pilot project will address issues concerning many of the jurisdictional boundary standards needs. Mark Kotz stated that he strongly supported the Content Team identifying the desired specifications and then forwarding this information to the Standards Team.

Member Claypool explained to expedite the process, the Content Team is proposing to send its standards and custodian-related findings directly to the Standards and Policy Advisory Teams and to inform the Committee of these transmittals as information updates. The group agreed that teams and staff should be relied upon to communicate amongst themselves and to intervene only if a problem arises that requires the Committee's attention. Member Claypool also noted the importance of the Content Team completing as much of a task as possible before handing it to another team. Staff stressed that Data Content Team's work on the jurisdictional boundaries information need has been very useful to define deliverables and more clearly state expectations for each component of the Information Needs Workgroup Process. The Committee concurred to modify its information needs process adopted on August 28, 1997 to incorporate the following collaboration element among its Teams for the MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary dataset and for subsequent datasets needed to address priority information needs:

a) The Data Content Team is responsible for compiling a set of "findings" regarding: Potential Dataset Custodian Organizations; Logistics and Procedural Issues; and Dataset Custodial Responsibilities. The findings will include results of staff research as well as information from the Washington County pilot project on municipal boundaries. This set of findings will be used by the MetroGIS Policy Advisory Team to make a recommendation to the Coordinating Committee for the dataset custodian organization.

b) The Data Content Team is responsible for compiling data specifications for the MCD and County boundaries. These data specifications will be used by the MetroGIS Standards Advisory Team to make a recommendation to the Coordinating Committee for the data standards for the subject dataset.

The Committee unanimously accepted the following data specifications for the MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary dataset: The dataset should be metrowide with more precisional accuracy than the existing metrowide coverages provide. The dataset should provide metadata, entity and attribute information, unique identifiers, official map names, label points, and contact information for each county or MCD jurisdiction. The horizontal datum should be NAD83 and the dataset(s) should be in a format that can be converted to as many other formats as possible. The positional accuracy of the jurisdictional boundaries must be derived from parcel layers where the parcel layers conform to positional accuracy requirements that are yet to be determined.

c) Upon receipt of recommendations from its Content, Policy, and Standards Advisory Teams, it will be the responsibility of the Coordinating Committee to recommend a custodian organization, its responsibilities, and data standards for a regional MCD and County boundaries dataset and subsequent datasets needed to address priority MetroGIS information needs. Deliberations regarding the jurisdictional boundaries dataset shall incorporate the results of the Washington County Municipal Boundaries pilot project.

It was agreed that Policy Board action is not required to implement these process refinements. (Note: on May 28, 1997, the Policy Board endorsed a sevenstep, high level, information needs methodology and directed the

Committee to enact a process achieve the objectives of the high level methodology for each of the thirteen information needs the Board had identified as high priorities for MetroGIS. The Committee approved the initial detailed process at its August 28, 1997 meeting with the understanding that refinements would be made as the need was recognized.) Staff noted that a brief summary of refinements stated above would be included in the Board's information update materials.

Member Henry expressed concern that no connection had been made in the data specifications to TLG street centerline dataset concerning MCD and county boundaries. Member Charboneau stated that the private sector will not generally have access to county parcel data and therefore will not be able to use parcelbased boundaries. Member Gelbmann agreed that some integration with TLG dataset is needed.

MOTION: Member Henry moved and Member Charboneau seconded to:

a) Endorse MetroGIS use of the Metropolitan Council's MCD/County boundaries dataset. The Council will re-compile the dataset from the most accurate sources when significant changes have occurred. This solution will remain in effect until a long term data custodian is designated by MetroGIS and/or until a "better" (for example more positionally accurate or more up to date) dataset becomes available. Debate of long term custodial needs will consider the results of the Washington County MCD jurisdictional boundaries pilot project.

b) Present this interim solution to the Policy Board for its information and discussion.

Vote on the motion: Ayes 9, Nays 1, Abstain 0. Motion carried. Alternate Member Caswell opposed the motion because he disagreed with the need to forward an interim solution to the Policy Board for discussion and comment.

To accommodate Member schedules, Items 5f and 5g were considered next, starting with Item 5g.

5g. Process to Develop Distribution Policies for Regional Soils Dataset.

Member LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, explained that the Policy Advisory Team is recommending creation of a new Team to address policy issues related to distribution of a regional soils dataset that the Metropolitan Council is in process of compiling through collaborative agreements with various organizations. Different portions of the regional dataset will remain the intellectual property of the organizations that provided or assisted with the development of data for the regional dataset. The new advisory team would report directly to the Coordinating Committee and would be responsible for recommending solutions to issues involved with distribution of a regional soils dataset with multiple intellectual interest claims. The team would be subject to the same operational guidelines as each of the other MetroGIS Advisory Teams, including designation of a Liaison from the Coordinating Committee.

Chairperson Arbeit noted that although the new Team's focus would be on the regional soils dataset, it is likely that the questions and solutions debated by the Team will have relevance to other regional datasets. It was agreed that the Policy Board should be invited to designate one of its members to participate on the team and that the team name should be revised from "Soils Advisory Team" to Soils Data Distribution Advisory Team".

Staff noted that Policy Board approval is not required to establish this new Advisory Team but suggested that since a Policy Board member is proposed to be invited to serve on the Team, that the concept should be presented to the Board for discussion. Staff suggested the Committee designate a Liaison(s) to this new Team at its December Committee meeting and that the liaison and staff work together to populate the Team.

MOTION: It was moved and Member Henry seconded that the Coordinating Committee:

a) Endorse the Policy Advisory Team recommendation to create a Soils Data Distribution Advisory Team that would report directly to the Committee, whose membership would be comprised of persons who are members of each organization with a verifiable intellectual ownership claim in the pending regional soils dataset, for the purpose of recommending policies for distribution of the soils dataset compiled or derived from source data with multiple owners and consistent with MetroGIS objectives.

b) Invite the MetroGIS Policy Board to designate one of its members to represent the Policy Board on the Soils Data Distribution Advisory Team.

The motion passed unanimously.

#### 5e. Use of Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines by MetroGIS Participants

Due to time constraints, the group agreed to postpone review to the next meeting.

#### 5f. Operating Guidelines for Coordinating Committee

Member LaBau, Policy Advisory Team Chairperson, summarized the proposed changes to the Committee's interim operating guidelines outlined in the team's report dated October 14, 1997. These changes are proposed in response to direction received from the Policy Board and Coordinating Committee over the past several months concerning private sector participation in MetroGIS, voting and quorum requirements, and other operational matters. The revised guidelines also eliminate the Steering Subcommittee and consolidate its responsibilities with those of the Policy Advisory Team. Member LaBau asked if anyone had any questions or concerns. None were offered.

Member LaBau explained that final action could not be taken by the Committee until the December meeting because current and proposed procedures require 15 days of prior member notice to act on an amendment to the guidelines. She encouraged the membership to speak with staff during the next two weeks if they have any concerns about the proposed guideline amendments. It was agreed to act on this matter as a consent item at the December meeting if there are no unresolved concerns at that time.

Due to time constraints, there was no discussion of the guideline implementation issues outlined in the staff report.

Members Gelbmann, Henry, and LaBau left the meeting at 10:45 a.m. The remaining members agreed continue to meet until 11:15 a.m.

#### 5d. GIS Mapping of Telecommunication Utilities

Chairperson Arbeit explained that the Policy Board had directed the Committee to respond in writing to the Mapping Subcommittee of the Rights of Way Task Force to the Public Utilities Commission concerning pending rules for mapping of telecommunication utilities. Staff explained that Member Claypool had prepared a draft letter included in the packet, at staff's request, for the Committee consideration. Member Claypool explained the importance of knowing where utility lines are physically located and that use of handheld GPS receivers would be a cost effective way to acquire the location as well as provide very useful information to government agencies. Legislation passed during the 1997 session authorizes public road authorities to dictate mapping and reporting requirements for utility infrastructure constructed within public rights of way. This 1997 law does not require submittal of data for utilities constructed prior to the effective date of the proposed rules.

Dick Elhardt, NSP, attending for Al Srock, stated that requiring the capture of x, y, z coordinate values has an enormous cost potential for the utility industry. He also questioned whether local government has the capability to

import this huge volume of data. Mr. Elhardt explained that NSP prepares "as built drawings" but does not currently collect x, y, z coordinate values and that they tie their utility construction locations to landmarks, not precision coordinate control points. Chairperson Arbeit noted that he senses a willingness among the task force membership, that includes utility representatives, to comply with the intent of the law, provided a reasonable standards are developed. Mr. Elhardt concurred.

Member Claypool explained that he is concerned that a compromise will be reached that involves scanning of paper asbuilt drawings which would result in essentially unusable data for local government GIS use. His preference is for a reliance on collection of coordinate values that would be useable by any GIS.

The group agreed that Chairperson Arbeit will use Claypool's draft letter and the Committee's discussion as a basis for a letter to the Rights-of-Way Task Force and that Chairperson Arbeit would sign the letter.

#### 5h. 1998 Meeting Schedule

Due to time constraints, the group agreed to postpone discussion of this matter to the next meeting.

#### 6. Advisory Team Activities Update

Due to time constraints, this item was skipped.

#### 7. Information Sharing MetroGIS Related Activities

No discussion.

#### 8. Other Business

None

9. Next Meeting: Thursday, December 18, 1997, 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m., Earle Brown Center, Room 52, University of Minnesota

#### 10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Prepared by Heidi Welsch, Assistant GIS Liaison; and Randall Johnson, GIS Liaison



Thursday, December 18, 1997  
Earle Brown Continuing Education Center - Room 52  
St. Paul Campus of the University of Minnesota  
8:30 to 10:30 A.M.

1. Call to Order
  2. Accept Agenda
  3. Accept Meeting Summary
    - a) October 24, 1997
  4. Summary of November 19th Policy Board Meeting
  5. Consent Items (Second reading)
    - a. Operating Guidelines for Coordinating Committee and Teams\*\*
  6. Action and Discussion Items:
    - a. MetroGIS Financial Resources and Needs
    - b. MetroGIS Participant Evaluation Survey
    - c. Special Meeting -- Proposal for Integrated Parcel, Dwelling &
    - d. Household Database \*\*
    - e. Designate Liaison(s) to Soils Data Distribution Policy Team \*\*
    - f. Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines: Use by MetroGIS Participants \*\*
  7. Strategic Initiatives Updates:
    - a. MetroGIS WEB Index
    - b. Information Needs Workgroup Timeline and "Street Addresses" Workgroup
    - c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements
  8. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
    - a. 1997 MetroGIS Milestones
    - b. Land Records Modernization Initiative: MetroGIS Policy Board Endorsement
    - c. Telecommunication Utilities Mapping Rules: Coordinating Committee Comments
  9. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting -- Jan 28th)  
February 26, 1998
  10. Adjourn
- \*\* Action requested

## December 18, 1997 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The meeting was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center in St. Paul.

Members Present: State: David Arbeit (LMIC); County: Pat O'Connor and Alternate Gary Caswell (Hennepin), Alternate Jane Harper for Virginia Erdahl (Washington), Jim Hentges (Scott), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Academics: Will Craig (CURA); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (RamseyWashingtonMetro Watershed District); Schools: Alternate Dick Carlstrom for Jim Sydow (TIES); Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP)

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Counties: Margo LaBau (Anoka), David Claypool (Ramsey); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County Partnership)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, Mark Kotz

Visitors: John Carpenter, The Lawrence Group

### 2. Acceptance of Agenda

Chairperson Arbeit requested moving item 6A to the last item under Action and Discussion Items to accommodate Members Johnson and LaBau who would be arriving late.

MOTION: Member Charboneau moved and Vice Chairperson Henry seconded to accepted the agenda as revised. The motion carried unanimously.

### 3. Acceptance of the Meeting Summary

Member Caswell stated that he did not recall moving approval of Item 5g at the October 24 meeting and requested the minutes to be revised accordingly. The minutes were changed to: "It was moved and Member Henry seconded..." Member Arbeit also noted a correction for page 6 (third line from the bottom of Item b) from "precisional" to "positional".

MOTION: Member Aichinger moved and Member Henry seconded to approve the minutes of the October 24 meeting, as revised. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. Summary of the November 19 Policy Board Meetings

Chairperson Arbeit reported that the Addressing Guidelines endorsed by the Coordinating Committee on October 24th had been accepted by the Board and that there was some discussion by Board members whether the term 'standard' would be more appropriate than 'guideline'. He also reported that the Policy Board discussed the interim solution for the MCD/county jurisdictional boundaries information need; and progress on the soils data distribution policy advisory team. Policy Board member Dennis Berg (Anoka County Commissioner) volunteered to serve on the soils team. Member O'Connor suggested that in the future it may be better not to create working groups that include Policy Board members on advisory teams

## 5. Consent Items

### a. Operating Guidelines for the Coordinating Committee and Teams

Chairperson Arbeit explained that the Committee had discussed these guidelines at the October 24th meeting and were now being presented for final approval. There was no discussion.

MOTION: Member Drealan moved and Member Henry seconded to accept the MetroGIS Operating Guidelines, dated September 16, 1997 and to forward to them to the Policy Board for consideration.

## 6. Action and Discussion Item

b. MetroGIS Participant Evaluation Survey Randall Johnson explained Chairperson Reinhardt has asked for discussion of MetroGIS financial and staff resource needs to be the primary topic of discussion at the January 28, 1998 Policy Board meeting. He explained to prepare for that discussion, a program satisfaction survey will be sent to members of the Policy Board, Coordinating Committee, Advisory Teams, and ad hoc workgroups on January 2, 1998. The purpose of the survey is to obtain feedback from participants on the MetroGIS work program, accomplishments to date, the effectiveness of team leadership and staff, and the effectiveness of the MetroGIS WEB site and MetroGIS Newsletter "Coordinates" as means of communicating with stakeholders. The Committee agreed there was no need for them to review the survey before it is mailed.

### c. Special Meeting for Integrated Socioeconomic Data Proposal

John Carpenter and Larry Charboneau, both of The Lawrence Group, reported on a concept they are developing to integrate parcel, household, and dwelling unit data from both public and private sources at the blockface level. The concept is being developed to address gaps in current data needed by public and private organizations to support analysis and projections important to their particular business functions. School district census, utility connection, county and state welfare, and state economic security data were cited as principle elements of the proposal. They stated they believe it is important to seek input early in the process from MetroGIS concerning the concept, pilots/demonstrations, and partnership opportunities and requested the Committee to consider setting a special meeting at which a detailed explanation would be presented for discussion and comment.

Mr. Carpenter explained the proposed block face level of detail addresses data privacy concerns for sensitive databases yet provides useful information for a number of analytical needs of public and private organizations which often require data from several sources. He also explained that aggregation at the blockface would have the added advantage of being able to "chained together" the blockface units for corridor analysis which is currently a complex undertaking, at best.

Members Johnson and Craig arrived.

Mr. Carpenter reported that in preliminary discussions with a number of officials from public (mostly school districts and cities) and private sector organizations (utilities, real estate, business geographics) he has found significant interest for pursuing this concept and, consequently, discussions are in progress with perspective host organizations for three pilot projects that would be used to refine various aspects of the concept.

Members Stevenson and Caswell noted that they are concerned if the concept involves sharing parcel data with the private sector. There was discussion concerning whether it is appropriate for the Committee to consider this proposal. Chairperson Arbeit reminded the group that the Policy Board has directed the Committee to investigate collaborative opportunities with the private sector. Member Harper encouraged the group to accept the request for a special meeting to learn more about the concept and acknowledged that one of the constraints that must be dealt with is the desire to preserve current fee structures. Vice Chairperson Henry stated he supports learning

more about the concept because of gaps in this type of data currently available to Minneapolis, noting that he believes the proposed data would add value to the City's data. Member Craig also supported looking closer at this proposal because socioeconomic data are one of the priority information needs which outofdate census data can not adequate address. Member Aichinger supported further review of the concept by the Committee as being consistent with the data sharing principles of MetroGIS and an opportunity to enrich public sector data with private sector data.

The group agreed that there may be many issues associated with this proposal and that the requested special meeting would be a useful venue to both learn more about the concept as well as to clarify concerns. Member Charboneau and Mr. Carpenter agreed to mail out information on the proposal for review by Committee members in advance of the meeting.

It was agreed that in addition to Coordinating Committee members, members of the Data Content Advisory Team will be invited to the special meeting and that members of the Standards and Access Teams will receive a copy of the letter of invitation but will not receive a packet of information prior to the meeting, unless they inform staff of their interest. Coordinating Committee members were encouraged to invite appropriate staff to attend from their organizations , keeping in mind that the room will hold a maximum of 3540 people.

MOTIONS: Member Aichinger moved and ViceChairperson Henry seconded to accept the request for a special meeting of the Coordinating Committee to learn more about The Lawrence Group's concept of an integrated parcel, household, dwelling unit database. Motion carried unanimously, with the understanding that details, including the data to be sought, from whom, and the target users, will be mailed prior to the meeting.

Vice Chairperson Henry moved and Member Aichinger seconded to set the special meeting for January 22, 1998 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the Earle Brown Conference Center in St. Paul. Motion passed unanimously.

Member O'Connor noted, and the group agreed, that a county perspective should be included from the outset of any discussion that involves or has the potential to involve data maintained by the counties. Staff concurred, noting that this agenda item was scheduled following a single meeting with the proposers, to give persons representing County and other perspectives an opportunity to discuss the appropriateness of giving further consideration to the concept.

#### d. Designate Liaison to Soils Data Distribution Team

Randall Johnson stated that the Soil Distribution Policy Advisory Team was created by the Committee at its October 24th meeting to address policy issues associated with distributing a regional dataset with several owners. Chairperson Arbeit noted that the work of this Team would likely have a significant impact on general data distribution policy and asked members to seriously consider volunteering to serve as liaison to the Team from the Committee. No one volunteered.

Member Aichinger observed that soils survey data is not accurate enough to be useful to watershed districts and that this may be the wrong issue to use to frame general data distribution issues. Alternatively, to address the soils dataset issues at hand, staff was asked to invite each of the stakeholders in the proposed regional dataset to a meeting to assess if any of them would have a problem sharing the dataset with other public organizations with the thought that the group of stakeholders may determine it is a nonissue. Staff agreed to develop a proposal for distribution of the regional soils dataset to nongovernment organizations for discussion by the owners of the soils data and to report back to the Committee, with the understanding that staff would not have much time available to work on this matter until discussion in progress concerning MetroGIS budget matters is substantially complete. Staff was also asked to inform Policy Boardmember Berg of the Committee's action.

#### e. Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines: Use by MetroGIS participants

Mark Kotz distributed a copy of the guidelines along with an example of metadata from the Metropolitan Council's Land Use dataset. Chairperson Arbeit noted that review and comment by MetroGIS stakeholders was suggested at the meeting of the Advisory Team Liaisons to maintain consistency with the Committee's past practice of requiring a review period by MetroGIS stakeholders before acting on guidelines or standards for MetroGIS.

Member Stevenson suggested, and Alternate Member Caswell agreed, that since the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) has spent considerable time developing these guidelines that there is no compelling need for MetroGIS to require additional review and comment. There was some discussion of whether or not to seek stakeholder comments on these guidelines. Member Craig noted that adoption of these guidelines by GCGI does not apply per se to local government and for this reason he had concurred with the suggestion for a review by MetroGIS participants. He noted that he would be okay with passing on review by MetroGIS participants if the local government representatives on the Coordinating Committee would be willing to speak for their various counter parts.

MOTIONS: Member Stevenson moved and Alternate Member Caswell seconded to defer to the GCGI's work on the Metadata guidelines for the State and not to require additional review and comment by MetroGIS participants. Motion carried unanimously.

Alternate Member Caswell moved and Member Craig seconded that the Coordinating Committee accept the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines developed by the Governor's Council on Geographic Information and to recommend that the MetroGIS Policy Board accept and promote them as the preferred method of documenting metadata by MetroGIS stakeholders. Motion carried unanimously.

Staff was asked to send a letter to MetroGIS participants, following Board approval, announcing MetroGIS's adoption of the GCGI's metadata guidelines along with the previously approved addressing guidelines. Staff was also asked to state in the letter that the guidelines can be obtained via the MetroGIS WEB site and to give an alternative phone number to receive a paper copy by the mail for organizations that do not have access to the internet.

#### a. MetroGIS Financial Resources and Needs

Randall Johnson explained that Board Chairperson Reinhardt has asked for the Policy Board's January 28th meeting to be dedicated to discussing MetroGIS financial and staffing resources. Input from the Committee was requested concerning the content of the proposed meeting agenda. There was some discussion of the types of perspectives that should be illustrated to demonstrate the benefits of MetroGIS and collaboration. Member Aichinger suggested I-35W Corridor Coalition as a good collaborative perspective. TIES' work with Lakeville school district was also suggested as a good example of how much easier and cheaper GIS startup can be with institutionalization of MetroGIS principles.

Member O'Connor noted that county participation in MetroGIS will likely have to come from savings and in-kind services or staff, given the restrictions on use of their resources, and suggested that grants should be looked to as the primary source of financing to complete work on the definition of the desired form and structure of MetroGIS. Member Johnson noted that as MetroGIS continues to evolve and grow, the Metropolitan Council will continue to contribute to the initiative but will also be looking to other benefiting organizations to assist with support of the organization. Chairperson Arbeit encouraged Committee members to speak with their respective Policy Board members and to encourage them to attend the January 28th Board meeting

## 7. Strategic Initiatives Updates

No discussion

#### 8. Information Sharing / MetroGIS Related Activities

No discussion

#### 9. Next Meeting

Member Craig moved and Vice Chairperson Henry seconded to schedule the next meeting as follows: Thursday, February 26, 1998 8:30 a.m. 10:30 a.m. Earle Brown Center, University of Minnesota

#### 10. Adjournment

Member Charboneau moved and Member Arbeit seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 a.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Prepared by Heidi Welsch and Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Support Staff

**Thursday, January 22, 1998**

**Special Meeting**

**The Lawrence Group's Block Face Socio-Economic Data Pilot Project**

January 22, 1998: Minutes

1. Call to Order

Vice Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The meeting was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center in St. Paul.

Members Present: Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); County: Margo LaBau (Anoka), Dave Drealan (Carver), Alternate Jay Wittstock for Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Alternate Gary Caswell (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington), Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County Partnership); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Schools: Jim Sydow (TIES); State: David Arbeit (LMIC).

Members Absent: Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington- Metro Watershed District)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Heidi Welsch

Visitors: John Carpenter, (The Lawrence Group), Thomas Bisch (Heritage Development), Marcia Broman (Metropolitan 911 Board), Roger Carlson (Minneapolis Assessors Office), Dennis Carlson (Anoka-Hennepin School District), Dick Carlstrom (TIES), John Connelly (Ramsey County Charter Commission), Chuck Krueger (Hennepin County), Suzanne Fliege (The Lawrence Group), Elliott Graham (Ramsey County), Jane Harper (Washington County), Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council), Paul Leegard (Anoka County), Jim Maxwell (The Lawrence Group), Lili Pan (Model Cities of St. Paul), James Peigat (Hennepin Conservation District), Ernie Peterson (City of St. Louis Park), Nancy Pollock (Metropolitan 911 Board), Jim Ramstrom (MN Planning - LMIC), Carol Swenson (University of MN Design Center), Mark Vander Schaaf (St. Paul Department of Planning and Economic Development), David Windle (City of Roseville), Don Yaeger (LMIC)

2. Presentation -- Socioeconomic Database Proposal

John Carpenter, Vice President for Strategic Consulting with the Lawrence Group, thanked the Coordinating Committee for this opportunity to share with it a database development proposal he believes consistent with MetroGIS objectives, noting that "socioeconomic characteristics of a specified area" has been cited a priority information need for MetroGIS. The proposal would integrate socioeconomic, demographic, and parcel attribute data from a variety of sources using blockface geography.

Mr. Carpenter prefaced his remarks by stating The Lawrence Group has no interest in owning or licensing the proposed database. Rather, their interest is to provide GIS services to the consortium of organizations that would contribute to and have access to the database. He also stated that access to the proposed database would be controlled by the consortium participants and that data sharing would be in a very controlled environment.

{Note: copies of slides used in the presentation are available upon request}

Mr. Carpenter summarized how public and private organizations use socioeconomic, demographic, and parcel attribute data to address their business needs and noted some shortcomings with existing data sources to address these needs. He also stated no single organization has a critical mass of this type of data and generally do not produce all the data they need to address their business needs but that he believes solutions to these issues lie with local databases: e.g., school census, utility connects, Dept. of Motor Vehicles for age and owned vehicles, and Dept. of Economic Security for employment data.

The cornerstone of the proposal is to integrate varied data sources at the blockface level of geography. The blockface concept is proposed as a balance between critical data privacy concerns that must be overcome to make it possible for the key data producers to consider participating and a fine enough level of detail to be useful. John emphasized that GIS technology is the key to cost-effectively integrating these data, it provides more flexibility than currently available for the whole of the data involved, and it provides a good bridge between address-based data (households and businesses) and parcel-based data (land and dwellings). He also noted that the proposed database would support numerous applications and the blockfaces could be easily "rolled-up" to support both area and corridor analysis. An example was provided to illustrate the advantages of analysis using blockfaces versus conventional census block geography.

John noted that the current plan is to test and prove the concept with a few public sector pilots and that discussions are in progress to begin these pilots in 1998. It was emphasized that private sector involvement is a long term goal and that any private sector involvement would have to meet the requirements of or fit a profile established by the collaborative.

The concept of relying upon a credible third party to aggregate data from the individual sources and return the source data to the producer was offered as a way to address concerns surrounding the need to guarantee confidentiality. John also shared that in his discussions with prospective participants (public and private), he has learned that most would prefer a third party integrator to minimize issues of trust and to test the cost-effectiveness of contracting for this service. He restated his earlier comment that The Lawrence Group has no interest in owning the data, rather TLG's interest are to support the needs of collaborative and to build upon use of its street centerline dataset that has been made available free of charge to government by the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT.

John closed his presentation by summarizing benefits of this project to MetroGIS and shared some thoughts on the roles that MetroGIS could play in its development. He encouraged MetroGIS to take an active role in the policy matters but noted that The Lawrence Group has a client base (public and private) that needs better data and is interested in pursuing this concept with or without MetroGIS's participation.

Vice-Chairperson Henry recessed the meeting at 10:00 am. He asked each Committee member and each visitor to come back after the break prepared to talk about their thoughts about the proposal and to share any concerns that they believe will need to be overcome for this proposal to be successful.

The meeting was called back to order at 10:15 am.

The following comments were received. A brainstorming format was used (each person was asked to state their comments but there was no discussion). Vice-Chairperson Henry stated that the Coordinating Committee would take these comments under advisement at its next regular meeting and decide how it wishes to proceed.

| No. | Commentor          | Comments  |
|-----|--------------------|---|
| 1.  | Paul Leegard       | How to convert (parcel?) points to blockfaces   |
| 2.  | Jim Ramstram       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Some agencies sell these data to support their programs</li> <li>b. We can not get the same the level of detail here as in Wisconsin</li> </ul>   |
| 3.  | Dennis Welsch      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. New datasets are opportunities for new revenues. How to distribute, to whom, and for what reasons.</li> <li>b. Data Practices Act and Intellectual Property Rights issues for MetroGIS to overcome to achieve data sharing.</li> </ul>  |
| 4.  | Dave Drealan       | Data standards are at the core  |
| 5.  | Elliot Graham      | What does The Lawrence Group bring to the project that MetroGIS can not do for itself?  |
| 6.  | Jane Harper        | a) Define reasons why the project has not already been done What can MetroGIS do to overcome barriers? b) What opportunities exist to further objectives of MetroGIS?   |
| 7.  | Dick Carlstrom     | a) If there is to be data sharing between school districts, cities, and counties, aggregation of school district census data will be necessary overcome data privacy concerns. b) Enthusiastically supports the blockface concept as an effective method to accomplish the required aggregation.  |
| 8.  | Jim Sydow          | a) A better definition is needed of the types of data that school districts can share outside of their organizations. b) Believes parcel attributes aggregated to the blockface would probably be adequate for many school needs for parcel data, such as attendance boundaries for individual schools. Probably do not need parcel boundaries.   |
| 9.  | Mark Kotz          | a) In addition to data privacy/legal issues also anticipates trust and control issues among the data contributors. Supports looking into the proposal of a third party to aggregate data to minimize these concerns. b) How would blockfaces be coordinated with zip + 4 geography?   |
| 10. | Don Yeager         | a) Suggests doing an inventory of working/successful collaborative efforts b) Need to identify prospective pilot/demonstration opportunities.   |
| 11. | Carol Swenson      | Consider providing access for academic research   |
| 12. | Roger Carlson      | a) This is a good idea and should be pursued b) Need to work out timeliness of updates to source databases and to the summary databases to accommodate user needs.  |
| 13. | Mark Vander Schaaf | <p>a) This is a good idea and should be pursuing. Very relevant to his economic development responsibilities. Increasing demand for more detailed information to compare localize situation with the regional context (e.g., jobs versus housing) Very difficult to meet these expectations with existing data sources. b) He is currently involved in a pilot project with the Dept. of Economic Security which he believes would be better served in the context of MetroGIS than limited to the City of St. Paul.</p> <p>(1)Would gladly turn over the to a higher entity to protect against confidentially issues with other limited area projects. (2) More organizations can use the data and should be involved (community development councils, neighborhood groups, etc.) (3) Concur that colleges and universities should have access to support revised curriculums to do more neighborhood based research. Good adjunct source of assistance to local government. (4) Disclosure rules for small area geography fairly restrictive.</p> |
| 14. | Virginia Erdahl    | a) Good idea, worth pursuing b) Will The Lawrence Group street centerline database be integrated with county parcel data.   |

|     |                  |  |
|-----|------------------|--|
| 15. | Chuck Krueger    | a) Agree that issues with Data Practices and Intellectual Property Rights Laws need to be addressed to successfully implement data sharing. b) Believes there is room in a collaborative effort for each organization to address their revenue concerns. c) Suggested that if MetroGIS pursues The Lawrence Group proposal, that the 3rd party contract should be determined through an open bidding.  |
| 16. | Jay Wittstock    | a) Cost benefit analysis should be conducted. Benefit to Dakota County not apparent b) Inventory would be useful c) Frequency of updates will be an issue given the large size of this database. d) How will the blockfaces be integrated with parcel (boundary) data. e) Expensive to update. f) Suggest and RFP process to select the 3rd party integrator is MetroGIS involved.   |
| 17. | Rick Person      | a) The Lawrence Group's street centerline database is a useful regional foundation upon which to add additional attributes. b) Need to correct errors in the file before adding new attributes.  |
| 18. | Dennis Carlson   | a) Privacy must be guaranteed for school districts to be a participant in MetroGIS. This proposal appears to satisfactorily address the need for a balance between the value of the data and the need for data privacy. b) The proposed 3rd party integrator would lend credibility to the process. c) Allocation of resources are increasingly being based on socioeconomic data.   |
| 19. | David Claypool   | a) Concept is good. Ramsey County GIS Users Group representatives believe in the interest of the county and MetroGIS to pursue. b) Inventory is important c) Ownership of the dataset will be a critical issue -- by the collaborative or by the providers of the source data. d) Supports the concept of a 3rd party vendor to aggregate the data but needs to be an open selection process.  |
| 20. | David Arbeit     | a) Thanked The Lawrence Group for bringing this concept to MetroGIS. b) Reflected that had the developers of the DIME files in the 1960's understood the value of this data to others they could very well have adopted a similar concept of summary geography. c) Concurred with the challenges identified by John Carpenter but emphasized the resulting product is worth the effort to attempt to resolve them. d) Builds on MetroGIS principals and the spirit that we have seen so far. e) If MetroGIS does not get involved, concerned that the market for this data will evolve into a proprietary dataset. f) Hopes the notion of collaboration with the private sector does not limit discussion of creative solutions to the needs identified by MetroGIS. |
| 21. | Rick Gelbmann    | a) Good concept. In the spirit of MetroGIS b) Useful for regional needs, employment and other socioeconomic data does not fit neatly into existing summary geography. c) 3rd party aggregation a distinct advantage to creatively leverage other resources to efficiently develop and maintain the product without having to gear up internally but the should be a competitive process. d) The "right" level of aggregation is a sensitive matter. Need to do testing to assure the concept will effectively address data privacy. We can not afford any disclosure of private information.   |
| 22. | Margo LaBau      | a) Even if we can resolve all of the challenges, who do we pay for this. b) Will organizations have to change their business practices to participate?   |
| 23. | Chuck Ballentine | a) Believes beneficial to regional decision making. b) Has a pilot program been thought about? What will the costs be to participate? Up-front funding requirements?   |
| 24. | Brad Henry       | a) What is the timeframe for deliverables? b) Will TLG pursue with or without MetroGIS involvement?  |
| 25. | Gary Caswell     | a) The content is Number 12 on the list of MetroGIS Information Needs. Everything costs time and money. How to reconcile with work on the other priority needs?  |
| 26. | Chuck Krueger    | a) Who will have the rights to the software? Would the 3rd party have these rights?  |

|    |              |  |
|----|--------------|--|
| 27 | David Arbeit | a) If we organize on the proposed blockfaces, how to technically decompose census geography to the block face. b) Clarify what TLG wants MetroGIS to do? |
|----|--------------|--|

Larry Charboneau, President of The Lawrence Group (TLG), introduced himself as a member of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee and thanked everyone for their comments. He noted that if nothing else is done, the fact that over 40 people from a variety of interests gathered to talk about the concept is a huge accomplishment. He also stated that he believes that a concept that brings the public and private sector together to collaboratively address common needs is consistent with the basis principals of MetroGIS.

Member Charboneau commented that TLG is offering the concept to MetroGIS because TLG wants the concept to be successfully implemented and because they believe broad public sector participation would substantially add to the robustness of the product. Notwithstanding, he stated that TLG will pursue the concept with or without MetroGIS's involvement. TLG is open to an RFP approach to select the 3rd party vendor and are confident that their expertise would prevail. He acknowledged that funding will be needed and concurred that conducting pilot projects is the appropriate way to proceed to test the concept.

John Carpenter added that the purpose of this special meeting was to get a general feeling for the support for this concept and to find out if MetroGIS wants to be involved. He emphasized that TLG is responding to a need, not driving the process. And he restated that there is a need for more finely organized data to support planning which will require partnerships, such as MetroGIS, to successfully implement. It was recognized that implementation would be in small pieces and, consequently, that broadly agreed upon standards are important to knit together the pieces. He agreed the cost and benefits need to be documented and noted that TLG is willing to participate and support this need.

John Carpenter concluded his remarks by restating that TLG is very experienced with address issues noting their clients in the this area include over 50 school districts, all major utilities, numerous cities and several state agencies. They have credibility among their clients that had to be earned.

Chuck Krueger asked if the concept would permit the public sector to receive private sector data. Larry Charboneau stated this is a possibility, noting that the private sector has many of the same issues as government and that the private sector is excited about the possibilities provided privacy and security issues can be overcome.

Mr. Charboneau restated that this project has a huge support element and asked who within MetroGIS is going to take it on. He believes a vendor relationship is an appropriate solution and that the attendant challenges are solvable. He also stated that he believes the presence of blockface data would enhance revenue potential for the more detailed source data which would remain under the control of the originating organizations.

David Arbeit asked when it would be possible to see a prototype. John Carpenter noted that work has begun with the City of Roseville and is still taking shape. The idea is to start with a city base and to add to it. He noted that TLG is also working with TIES to look at aggregation issues that pertain to school districts. More should be known in the next few weeks. Dick Carlstrom, with TIES, stated that this work with TLG is being undertaken to build a foundation for other school districts as they begin to implement GIS.

Member Sydow stated data privacy issues need be elevated to the State level. He suggested that MetroGIS work as an advocate on behalf of local government and request the State to give clear direction on an acceptable level of data summary that would permit local government to share data. David Claypool added that clarification is also need as to what is and is not private data.

Member Charboneau added that the real estate industry, through its multiple listing services, is working nationally to share data with the public sector and is interested in collaborating with MetroGIS.

Member Erdahl concurred that revisions are needed to the Data Privacy. She suggested that framing problem as a result of advances in technology may be the most appropriate way to present the matter to law makers. David Arbeit noted that a task force of state agency representatives is currently looking into this matter.

### 3. Adjourn

Vice-Chairperson Henry thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 11:30 am.

Prepared by: Randall L. Johnson, MetroGIS Support Staff



## March 12, 1998 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. December 18, 1997
  - b. January 22, 1998 (special meeting)
4. Summary of January 28th Policy Board Meeting And Update on Grant Applications
5. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a. MetroGIS Participant Satisfaction Survey
  - b. Revised 1999 MetroGIS Expense and Revenue Proposal
  - c. 1998 Meeting Schedule
  - d. Reminder of April Election of Committee Officers
6. Strategic Initiatives Updates:
  - a. MetroGIS WEB Data Finder
  - b. Information Needs Workgroup
    1. MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundaries Dataset --  
Recommendations from Washington County Pilot Project and Next Steps
    2. Concept of Framework Datasets for MetroGIS
  - c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements
7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
  - a. Update -- Proposed Integrated Dwelling, Household, and Parcel Attribute Database
  - b. Update -- TIES GIS Activities (Lakeville School District GIS Pilot)
8. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting -- March 25th)  
April 23, 1998
9. Adjourn

## March 12, 1998 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Arbeit called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The meeting was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center in St. Paul.

Members Present: State: David Arbeit (LMIC); County: Pat O'Connor (Hennepin), Margo LaBau (Anoka), David Claypool (Ramsey); Virginia Erdahl and Alternate Jane Harper (Washington), Jim Hentges (Scott), Dave Drealan (Carver); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Academics: Will Craig (CURA); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); Federal: Ron Wenzl (USGS); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington- Metro Watershed District); Schools: Jim Sydow (TIES); and Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP)

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Economic Development Partnerships: Scott Beckman (Dakota County Economic Development Partnership), Counties: Gary Stevenson, (Dakota)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch, and Tanya Mayer

Visitors: John Carpenter and Jim Maxwell with The Lawrence Group and Chuck Ballentine with the Metropolitan Council.

### 2. Acceptance of Agenda

MOTION: Member Charboneau moved and Member Welsch seconded to accepted the agenda, as submitted.

Motion passed unanimously.

### 3. Acceptance of the Meeting Summary

MOTION: Member Henry moved and Member Sydow seconded to approve the minutes of the December 18, 1997 and January 22, 1998 meetings, as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. Summary of the JANUARY 28TH Policy Board Meeting

Chairperson Arbeit reported that the focus of the January 28th Policy Board meeting was long term financing for MetroGIS. The Board also adopted operating guidelines for MetroGIS and endorsed the use of the MN Geographic Metadata Guidelines for use by MetroGIS participants.

Arbeit also summarized work that has been done to obtain grant funds for MetroGIS. David Arbeit and Randall Johnson collaborated on a NSDI Framework Demonstration grant that requests \$100,000. Member Craig has applied for an NSDI Benefits grant in the amount of \$40,000. If awarded the funds would be received by U of M CURA to document the effectiveness of MetroGIS and the benefits of MetroGIS to the participants.

### 5. Action and Discussion Items

#### 5a. MetroGIS Participant Satisfaction Survey

Chairperson Arbeit introduced this item by noting that significant work has been done by Member LaBau and her staff to administer and compile the results of the survey. Member LaBau summarized the assumptions she and her staff made as they tabulated and reviewed the results. She noted that generally low response rate of 46% is a story in itself. Efforts were made to call and email participants that did not respond to the mailing. She stated that some persons contacted by phone noted that they do not know how they fit in to the project and, as such, elected not to participate. Especially low return rates occurred with the Data Content and Data Access teams. On the positive side, those persons that respond, including the Data Access and Content Team members, rated MetroGIS pace and accomplishments fairly high. Most respondents also believe the project needs to have several successes in 1998 to maintain project momentum.

Criticisms generally expressed concerns of a large time commitment, need for the Coordinating Committee to be more dynamic – reduce amount of rehashing of Team recommendations, becoming too much bureaucratic, too slow of a pace, committee members do not understand how they fit it or how their work fits in the broader program, reduce the amount of paper mailed – rely more on the website. The group agreed that more of the information could be put on the web instead of being distributed through the mail. Member LaBau also emphasized the importance of the advisory team liaisons to communicate the activities of the Policy Board and Coordinating Committee to their Teams.

Members Sydow, Liaison to the Access Team, stated that the Access Team viewed its charge to provide guidance to staff with the Data Finder project at significant junctures in the process which he believes was accomplished

with only a few meetings. Member Charboneau suggested that Teams meet only when they have a task to accomplish. Member Gelbmann, also a liaison to the Access Team, supported this philosophy. Member Johnson arrived.

It was agreed that Teams should meet only when they have a task to accomplish, that it is the responsibility of the Team liaisons to convey this expectation to their respective Teams, and that Teams are not expected to invent their own agendas, but that the Committee expects Teams to propose tasks when they believe appropriate.

Member LaBau suggested two actions to follow up on the survey results. First, she suggested that the Policy Advisory Team should be directed to look into the survey results, including specific comments regarding individuals and leadership, and suggest appropriate changes. Second, she noted that a 'graceful exit policy' might be used to allow people with no further interest or time for MetroGIS to leave the committees or teams. It was agreed that use of such a policy should facilitate rebuilding teams with interested persons around a core of current interested members. Chairperson Arbeit concurred and emphasized that teams should not be penalized for lack of interest among members that may not have had much interest in the project from the beginning.

Member Charboneau expressed concern that support and input from committee and team members not be lost even if they choose to leave the team. The group agreed that it is important to create ways for people to participate when they feel they have knowledge to contribute without necessarily requiring them to participate in all of the teamwork.

Member Aichinger suggested that a letter should be sent to workgroups to explain the status of their work, particularly if no discussion of the topic for a while. Member Srock concurred and suggested the results of the survey should be available to the participants, if possible in electronic format.

The group thanked Member LaBau and her staff for their hard work on this project.

#### 5b. Revised 1999 MetroGIS Expense and Revenue Proposal

Member Johnson explained that the Policy Board had begun to discuss long term financing for MetroGIS at its January meeting. In response to the January discussion, Council management is proposing that the Council include \$375,000 for MetroGIS in its operating budget for 1999. This amount is a decrease of about \$165,000 from the 1999 expenses proposed to the Policy Board in January and a decrease of about \$50,000 from the funds committed by the Council for MetroGIS in 1998.

Chairperson Arbeit explained that the decrease in the budget means that there will not be any funds for supporting local programs, as had been the case in the past programs. Staff Johnson noted that the 1999 budget reductions do not affect the GIS data and cost sharing maintenance amounts that will continue to be paid to counties for the three year duration of the individual agreements. He also explained that the revised budget proposal includes activities to identify gaps in core data and telecommunication needs and allows for continued support of the Data Finder project.

Chairperson Arbeit stated that the revised budget proposal sets a framework to obtain a consensus on needs upon which to move forward collaboratively to address the identified needs and that MetroGIS provides the environment through which to accomplish collaboration. Member Gelbmann cited the Council's cooperative orthoimagery project as an example of a collaborative solution to a common need of several MetroGIS stakeholders. The group concurred that MetroGIS provides an effective environment through which to work collaboratively on common problems and opportunities.

Member Erdahl expressed two concerns. First, given that the participant satisfaction survey rated the newsletter and communication in general as important, cutting the budget for the semi-annual newsletter should be reconsidered. Second, she questioned whether legal services from the Metropolitan Council would still be available to work with the counties on the legal form that MetroGIS should take. Member Johnson affirmed that the Council's legal staff would be available to work on legal matters for MetroGIS.

The group concurred that the revised budget proposal is reasonable and acceptable with the exception of the proposed budget reduction to temporarily suspend publication of the MetroGIS newsletter "Coordinates".

Member Srock offered assistance of his organization to help publish the newsletter.

Chairperson Arbeit asked that anyone with an organization that might be able to support a list-server or to consider taking on a list server responsibility for MetroGIS. He noted that he would look into the matter at LMIC. He also commented that even with the proposed budget reductions, the financial support proposed by the Metropolitan Council to facilitate MetroGIS is unprecedented around the country. He thanked Member Johnson with the Metropolitan Council for his active participation and support of MetroGIS with Metropolitan Council policy makers.

### 5c. 1998 Meeting Schedule

MOTION: Member Aichinger moved and Member Srock seconded to continue to meet every other month on the fourth Thursday of the month beginning in April through the end of 1998, with the exception of the December meeting which would be on the third Thursday of the month. Motion passed unanimously.

### 5d. Reminder of Election for Chair and Vice-Chair

Chairperson Arbeit reminded members that election of a Committee chair and vice-chair for 1998-1999 is scheduled. He explained that although he would be willing to serve again as Chair, he would prefer that the role be rotated.

Member O'Connor arrived.

## 6. Strategic Initiatives Updates

### 6a. MetroGIS Data Finder

Member Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Coordinator and manager of the Data Finder Project, summarized the status of this project. Tanya Mayer, Metropolitan Council GIS Specialist and Data Finder Project staff, demonstrated the search options provided in the first version of the Data Finder. Searches by geography are proposed for the next version. Map Objects programming activities are proposed to accomplish geographic searches and is included in the approved 1998 budget and proposed 1999 budget.

Member Gelbmann shared the work program that the Data Access Team approved for itself on March 5th. The Team's priority activities, in order of priority are:

1. Metadata enhancement – facilitate development of metadata for core regional data and post it with Data Finder. Propose use of MetroGIS funded personnel to assist participants develop their metadata. The MN Geographic Metadata Guidelines will be used. 15 of the numerous fields of metadata are required for each dataset for Data Finder to properly function. All fields will be encouraged to be filled in but a submission will not be rejected if fields are left empty unless part of the mandatory fifteen.
2. Data delivery support – define a strategy to maintain Data Finder as an ongoing service.
3. Data Finder enhancements – implement enhancements such as geographic searches.
4. Enhance access to shared data – develop applications, scripts, facilitate telecommunication and improvements, resolve institutional issues, etc. to improve on-line access to participant data.

Alternate Member Harper noted that the person(s) who will assist with metadata development must be prepared with a list of very specific questions to elicit the needed information from participants. Member Claypool emphasized that the key to data sharing is to get local officials to document their data. He suggested the documentation must be built into each participant's internal business process. Member Claypool gave an example that he will not accept a dataset unless it is accompanied by complete metadata.

Member Wencil stated that he supports Data Finder as a good way to effectively implement metadata standards. He concurred with Member Claypool that training of participants to develop metadata and to learn how to use it to evaluate whether a particular dataset meets their particular needs is a critical need. He cautioned not to link to too many related sites. The focus needs to be on the specific needs of MetroGIS. He encouraged the Data Access Team to work closely with the Standards Team as it develops the geo-searching capability, emphasizing that geo-searching requires standards. He also concurred with Member Harper's concern about the method by which metadata is proposed to be collected. It can not be effectively collected over the telephone and he is opposed to any process that focuses on a subset of the MN Geographic Metadata Guidelines.

Member Harper noted that she could support less complete metadata for legacy data but that new datasets should be required to have metadata fully compliant with the MN Geographic Metadata Guidelines.

Vice-Chairperson Henry stated that Data Finder is an excellent opportunity to show tangible results for MetroGIS. He noted that the Minneapolis GIS service bureau staff spends a significant amount of time explaining the data available and believes Data Finder could save these staff members substantial time.

Chairperson Arbeit thanked Member Gelbmann, Tanya Mayer and the Access Advisory Team for their hard work on this very important project. He also concurred that MetroGIS should not give up complete metadata as called for by the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines for the sake of expediency. He noted that he has concerns that have yet to be addressed as to the compatibility of Data Finder with the Minnesota State Clearinghouse and with NSDI clearinghouse standards.

Member Gelbmann responded that he does not believe compliance with state and federal clearinghouse guidelines is a problem. He also emphasized that all fields included in the metadata guidelines will be encouraged,

but that the reason for focusing on the subset is that Data Finder will not function if any of the 15 core fields is missing.

#### 6b. Information Needs Project

Jurisdictional Boundaries: Alternate Member Harper, member of the Data Content Advisory Team and co-manager of the Washington County Jurisdictional Boundaries Pilot Project, presented an overview of the project and the conclusion that the Metropolitan Council is best suited to be assume the role of custodian of the regional dataset, in large part, because the Council has produced a regional MCD/County jurisdictional dataset for its own purposes. Another product of the project was the identification of several items that should be considered for standards or guidelines to facilitate integration of boundary data across county boundaries.

Member Craig explained that the Content Advisory Team had unanimously accepted the findings of the Washington County Pilot Project and that the Data Content Advisory team has recommended that the Policy Advisory Team lead negotiations of an agreement with the Council to serve the role of regional custodian for this dataset and to pass along the standards matters to the Standards Advisory Team for consideration and recommendation to the Coordinating Committee.

The membership accepted the report and passed the Content Team's conclusions to the Policy Advisory and Standards Advisory Teams for consideration and recommendation to the Committee.

Member LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, stated that she concurs with informing the Committee of the substance of the Content Team's conclusions and that bringing this matter before the Committee as an information item is appropriate because the Committee is not being asked to endorse or otherwise take a position on the Content Team's work but rather is being given an opportunity to offer comments.

Framework Datasets: Member Craig reported that he and Jane Harper, with Washington County, has agreed to work on this concept but that their work is on hold until summer to coordinate with a project Washington County intends to undertake with the Washington County GIS Users Group.

Address Information Need: Member Craig offered a Data Content Advisory Team recommendation for the Committee's consideration. The group discussed the appropriateness of acting on a Team recommendation that is not supported by a written report and not included on the agenda as an action item. The group concluded that because the actions do not obligate any organization to any specific commitment and because the Content Team had met only the week prior due to a rescheduling of this Committee meeting, that the Committee could act on the Content Team's recommendation.

Member Craig explained that his NSDI Benefits grant proposal, if awarded, would address recommendation Two (stated below). [Grant awarded are expected to be announced by July 1998.]

Member Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Coordinator, requested clarification about the tasks the Team had in mind to carry out recommendation two. No additional information was given other than a feed back loop is desirable. TLG, the owner of the dataset, agreed that a feed loop is important to sustaining a dataset that meets participant needs and agreed to work with the Council, which licenses this dataset on behalf of government, on this matter.

MOTION: Member Claypool moved and member Srock seconded the following four-part motion:

1. That the Coordinating Committee endorse The Lawrence Group (TLG) street centerline file as a primary source of addressing information for MetroGIS.
2. That the Coordinating Committee negotiate with the Metropolitan Council to identify and monitor use and potential enhancements to the TLG datafile.
3. Findings of the address workgroup will be passed to the upcoming parcel workgroup for exploration of other sources that might answer information needs related to addressing.
4. That the Coordinating Committee or Policy Team analyze future revenue-sharing possibilities of the TLG datafile.

The motion passed unanimously.

Member Craig stated that the Content Advisory Team believes that its responsibilities are complete for the MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundaries and Address Information Needs.

#### 6c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements

Randall Johnson summarized a negotiating session held the prior work with Hennepin County officials and noted that significant progress was made to resolve remaining issues. He explained the negotiations with Hennepin County are more complex than with the other six counties because both the county's and the Council's licenses are

exhibits to the agreements with is not the case with the other counties. Once the licenses are complete for the Hennepin County agreement, staff will turn to finalizing licenses with each of the other counties.

7. Information Sharing: MetroGIS Related Activities

There was no discussion of either the two items listed on the agenda due to lack of time.

Chairperson Arbeit thanked Vice Chairperson Henry for chairing the January 22nd Special Meeting and for facilitating the discussion, noted that Scott Beckman had resigned from the Coordinating Committee because he is no longer associated with the Dakota County Economic Development Partnership, and expressed best wishes to Heidi Welsch who resigned from MetroGIS to accept a position with Hennepin County.

8. Next Meeting: Thursday, April 23, 1998, 8:30 a.m. 10:30 a.m. Earle Brown Center, University of Minnesota

9. Adjournment

Member Aichinger moved and Member LaBau seconded to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 a.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Prepared by, Heidi Welsch Assistant GIS Liaison and Randall Johnson GIS Liaison



## April 23, 1998 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. March 12, 1998 (rescheduled from February 26th)
4. Summary of March 25th Policy Board Meeting
5. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a. Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset: Designate Custodian \*\*
  - b. Regional Street Centerline Dataset: Monitoring and Revenue Sharing Proposals \*\*
  - c. Access Advisory Team Work Program \*\*
  - d. Election of Committee Officers \*\*
6. Strategic Projects/Advisory Team Updates
7. Information Sharing – Activity Update:
  - a. Participant Satisfaction Survey: Follow-up Strategy
  - b. Comment on FGDC Proposal to Develop Standards for Governmental Unit Framework Data Theme
  - c. Scott Beckman's Resignation from Coordinating Committee
  - d. Status Interim Financing Mechanism Options
  - e. Address Matching Application
8. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting – May 27th)  
June 25, 1998
9. Adjourn

\*\* Action requested

## April 23, 1998 Minutes

(Referenced staff reports and support materials are available upon request.)

### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. It was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center in St. Paul. David Piggott, Metro East Economic Development Partnership, was introduced as the new representative on the Committee of non-profit organizations, replacing Scott Beckman who resigned in March.

Members Present: Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); County: Margo LaBau (Anoka), Dave Drealan (Carver); Gary Stevenson, (Dakota), Alternate member Gary Caswell for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Non-Profits: David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); Schools: Jim Sydow (TIES); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District)

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council), State: David Arbeit (LMIC); Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP)

Visitors: Dick Carlstrom (TIES)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

### 2. Accept Agenda

The agenda was accepted with the following changes: Add Item 5E – Meeting Notes and move consideration of Item 5a after Item 5d.

### 3. Accept Meeting Summary

Member Charboneau moved and Member Erdahl seconded to approve the summary for the Committee's March 12, 1998 meeting, as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. Summary of the March 25 Policy Board Meeting

Vice Chairperson Henry summarized the highlights of the March 25th Policy Board meeting as presented in the staff report. There was no discussion.

### 5. Action and Discussion Items

Regional Street Centerline Dataset: Monitoring and Revenue Sharing Proposals Monitoring: It was agreed that a forum for dialogue is preferred to a survey to discover how organizations are using this dataset and to obtain feedback on desired enhancements. The proposed June 3rd trial run was endorsed. Questions were raised about the appropriateness of hosting a "data users forum" at the GIS/LIS state conference and how to identify the users of unlicensed datasets. These questions will be addressed following the June 3rd trial.

Motion: Member Welsch moved and Member Aichinger seconded to endorse the concept of sponsoring periodic MetroGIS data user forums, beginning with the 1998 GIS/LIS state conference, to monitor user satisfaction and to identify desired enhancements for regional datasets. Motion carried unanimously.

Revenue Sharing: Member Charboneau summarized The Lawrence Group's offer to donate ten percent of their street centerline dataset sales to MetroGIS. This proposal pertains only to data sold by The Lawrence Group to organizations ineligible to license it via MetroGIS. It does not effect sales by others of data derived from this dataset. The proposal also applies to sales of any portion of the entire dataset maintained by the Lawrence Group for Minnesota and the counties in Wisconsin that border the twin city metro area.

Motion: Member Craig moved and Member Claypool seconded to recommend that the MetroGIS Policy Board gratefully accept The Lawrence Group's offer to donate ten (10) percent of their street centerline dataset sales to MetroGIS. Motion carried unanimously.

Access Advisory Team Work Program The process the Team used to arrive at the four proposed priority tasks proposed was explained and a brief summary of each task was provided. A prototype version of MetroGIS Data Finder is on-line. By June, the core functionality of Data Finder should be fully operational. At that time links to the MetroGIS WEB page will be established.

Motion: Member Craig moved and Member Charboneau seconded to approve the following four tasks priorities that the Data Access Advisory Team identified for itself, listed in order of priority (refer to the support materials for a brief description of each):

- \*Metadata enhancement

- \*Data delivery support

- \*Data Finder enhancements

- \*Enhance access to shared data Motion carried unanimously.

#### Election of Committee Officers

Chairperson: Member Craig nominated Member Henry. Member Charboneau seconded. Member Sydow moved and Member Charboneau seconded to close nominations. Motions to close nominations and to elect Member Henry as Chairperson unanimously approved.

Vice-Chairperson: Member Aichinger nominated Member LaBau. Member Sydow seconded. Member Charboneau nominated Member Claypool. Member Stevenson seconded. Member Erdahl moved and Member Aichinger seconded to close the nominations. Motion to close nominations carried unanimously. Member LaBau respectfully declined her nomination. Motion to elect Member Claypool as Vice-Chair carried unanimously.

Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset: Designate Custodians The group agreed with the Policy and Data Content Team's recommendations, accepted the Metropolitan Council's offer to assume the regional dataset custodian responsibilities outlined in the report, and concurred that counties should be the primary custodians for MCD and county jurisdictional boundaries.

The primary focus of the discussion focused on multiple intellectual property rights that may run with the regional dataset created by the Council. Waivers must be received from each of the five organizations with a possible ownership interest (Dakota, Scott, and Washington Counties, Mn/DOT and the Council) before the dataset can be shared. Representatives from the counties noted they did not believe a waiver to share this dataset with other

government would be problem. These waivers will be sought before the May 27th Policy Board meeting. The custodian recommendations will be presented at that time Board endorsement is sought.

Motion: Member Caswell moved and Member Stevenson seconded to recommend that the MetroGIS Policy Board designate:

1. The Metropolitan Council as custodian of the regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary dataset.
2. Each of the seven counties as primary custodians of MCD/County Jurisdiction Boundary data.

Motion carried unanimously.

#### Meeting Notes

Member LaBau proposed taping of Coordinating Committee and Board meetings and volunteered use of Anoka County staff to prepare meeting summaries to free up MetroGIS staff for more substantive activities. The discussion focused on a preference for a briefer form of minutes.

Motion: Member Erdahl moved and Member Sydow seconded to postpone action on Member LaBau's proposal until the Committee has had an opportunity to consider of the effects of a briefer form of meeting summaries. Motion carried.

#### 6. Strategic Projects/Advisory Team Updates

Liaisons from the Data Access, Data Content and Policy Advisory Teams had nothing to add to the information presented in the agenda packet.

Member Wencil reported the Standards Advisory Team has elected Jay Wittstock, GIS Coordinator with Dakota County, as its new chairperson. He thanked Dakota County for permitting Jay to take on this responsibility and thanked the City of Roseville for giving David Windle the opportunity to chair the Team this past year. The Standards Team prepared a letter for Victoria Reinhardt's signature regarding the FGDC's proposal to develop Jurisdictional Boundary Standards. Alternate Member Caswell reported the National Association of Counties (NACO) has created a Geospatial Information Committee that he will chair. This Committee is comprised of individuals that represent NACO on each of the FGDC standards committees. He will keep the Committee apprised of the committee's work.

#### 7. Information Sharing -- Activities Update

No discussion of the items included in the packet.

Member Sydow reported TIES is working with the Lakeville School District to implement GIS as a decision support tool. A parcel-based coverage of the district's boundaries has been developed. He expects this project will frame policy issues regarding data that school districts are permitted to legally share and levels of aggregation needed to insure non-closure of sensitive information. Where applicable, action by the MetroGIS Policy Board and possibly the Legislature would be sought. Dick Carlstrom, Project Manager, noted this summer they expect to test the blockface aggregation method developed by The Lawrence Group. School district officials are willing to share data with others if aggregated.

Member Stevenson reported their Internet based query application no longer supports queries by property owner name due to privacy concerns raised by law enforcement. He cautioned that any unit of aggregation must have accompanying thresholds that insure individual instances can not be identified. The group acknowledged that

aggregation policies for sharing data between government for internal purposes should be distinguished from data made available to the general public.

Alternate Member Caswell reported that NACO is planning to create a local government "starter kit" to aid in setting up electronic information systems and asked for suggestion to include in the kit. A report published by IISAC a couple years ago that Member Claypool, Jeffrey Grosso, and John Lunde worked on and a project underway at LMIC through a LCMR grant were offered.

8. Next Meeting: June 25 1998

9. Adjournment

Member Aichinger moved and Member Gelbmann seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 a.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Support Staff



## June 25, 1998 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda & Introduce New Member from TIES – Lee Whitcraft
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. April 23, 1998
4. Summary of May 27 Policy Board Meeting
5. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a. MetroGIS County and Minor Civil Division Coding Standards
  - b. Advisory Team Work Programs (June 1998 to June 1999)
  - c. Critique of June 3rd MetroGIS Data Users Forum
  - d. Graceful Exit Policy -- Advisory Team Members
  - e. September Policy Board Meeting -- Demonstration of Orthoimagery
  - f. Dakota County's Parcel Data WEB Access Policy
6. Report from Advisory Team Liaisons & Strategic Project Updates:
  - a. Data Finder Project
  - b. Information Needs Project
  - c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements Project
  - d. Long Term Financing and Organizational Structure Project
  - e. General Issues and Concerns
7. Information Items:
  - a. Jim Sydow Resigns from Coordinating Committee
  - b. Coordinating State Clearinghouse and MetroGIS Data Finder Policy  
– Summary June 12th Meeting
  - c. Anoka County Users Group Organizational Meeting – June 11th
  - d. NSP/St. Paul/Minneapolis Electronic Data Exchange Pilot
  - e. State GIS/LIS Annual Conference (October 7-9, 1998)
  - f. NSDI Framework Handbook
  - g. Mn/DOT's "Connecting Minnesota" initiative -- Fiber Optic Data Distribution Opportunities
8. Next Meeting  
August 27, 1998 at LMIC
9. Adjourn

## June 25, 1998 Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. It was held at the Earle Brown Conference Center in St. Paul.

Members Present: Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); County: Margo LaBau (Anoka), Gary Stevenson, (Dakota), Alternate Gary Caswell and Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann and Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Non-Profits: David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); Schools: Lee Whitcraft (TIES); State: David Arbeit (LMIC);and Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP)

Members Absent: Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson, (Dayton Hudson Corporation); County: Dave Drealan (Carver); Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

### 2. Accept Agenda and Introduce New Member from TIES

Item 5d "Graceful Exit Policy" was postponed. The Policy Advisory Team will consider it at their next meeting. The agenda was accepted as revised. Lee Whitcraft was introduced as the new representative to the Committee from TIES, replacing Jim Sydow who will be retiring from TIES effective June 30th. Henry also informed the group David Claypool had accepted an invitation to assume Jim Sydow's role as liaison to the Data Access Team.

### 3. Accept Meeting Summary

Erdahl moved and Arbeit seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's April 23, 1998 meeting with two revisions: 1) show that Jane Harper attended for Virginia Erdahl and 2) revise "non-closure" to "non-disclosure" in the fourth line of the 2 paragraph under Item 7 "Information Sharing". Motion carried unanimously.

### 4. Summary of the March 25 Policy Board Meeting

LaBau summarized the major items discussed by the Policy Board at the May 27th meeting.

### 5. Action and Discussion Items

#### a. MetroGIS County and Minor Civil Division Coding Standards

Mark Kotz, staff to the Standards Advisory Team, summarized the Team's recommendation to establish county and MCD coding standards. These proposals are the result of the Team's work issues pertaining to the regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary dataset. Use of the proposed standard codes would be required only when sharing data. Organizations would continue to use any coding schemes they desire for internal purposes.

Motion: Stevenson moved and Arbeit seconded that the Coordinating Committee:

1. Grant preliminary approval to adoption of the FIPS county code and FIPS place code as MetroGIS standard codes for identifying counties and MCD's (minor civil divisions), and to direct the Standards Team to seek stakeholder review of these proposed standards and develop a final recommendation.
2. Recommend that a lookup/cross reference table containing a variety of MCD codes and names be made broadly available to anyone with an interest through the MetroGIS WEB site. Motion carried unanimously.

#### Advisory Team Work Programs - June 1998 to June 1999

Erdahl suggested including a statement that Teams should coordinate their work with projects underway or planned by stakeholder organizations in accordance with GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements (e.g., implications for Data Finder from Washington County's work on providing electronic access to county data).

Staff requested direction from the Committee on the appropriateness of seeking assistance from a consultant to work on the Parcels Information Need given that hiring a new Information Needs Project Coordinator is taking longer than expected. It was agreed that this is a priority need and use of budgeted funds for either a staff support person or a consultant is acceptable.

Motion: Arbeit moved and Erdahl seconded to:

1. Accept the work programs outlined in Attachment A in the packet for the Access, Content and Policy Teams and the Standards Team work program update handed out at the meeting, as proposed except for the linkage to stakeholder projects suggested by Erdahl.
2. Authorize staff to pursue available support options, including hiring a consultant, to complete the Content Team's work on the Parcels Information Needs by year-end. Motion carried unanimously.

#### Critique of June 3rd MetroGIS Data Users Forum

It was agreed the forum successfully achieved both of its objectives: inform users of potential uses of regional street centerline dataset and obtain feedback on ways to enhance the dataset. It was also agreed that MetroGIS should sponsor a session at the state GIS/LIS conference focused on MetroGIS development data activities but the focus should be limited to the education/presentation component in this setting. A statewide conference setting is not an effective way to seek feedback on desired enhancements to a metro area dataset.

Motion: Welsch moved and Gelbmann seconded that the Coordinating Committee endorse the concept of MetroGIS hosting a presentation at State GIS/LIS Annual Conferences focusing on how a particular dataset(s) is being used to support decision making and how to obtain it, beginning with the October 1998 conference and the Regional Street Centerline dataset licensed from The Lawrence Group. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion: Arbeit moved and Charboneau seconded that the Coordinating Committee endorse MetroGIS co-sponsoring data user forums with custodians of regionally significant databases, outside of the GIS/LIS Conference setting and modeled after the June 3, 1998 pilot, to periodically assess user satisfaction with datasets endorsed the MetroGIS Policy Board. Motion carried unanimously.

It was agreed the organizations who will sponsor data user forums for unlicensed datasets will be responsible for defining a strategy to insure attendees are representative of the variety of interests using the data, yet limited to 28-30 persons found to be the optimum at the June 3rd pilot.

#### September Policy Board Meeting – Demonstration of Othoimagery

The following persons volunteered to demonstrate to the Policy Board how their organization utilizes orthoimagery: Henry (city), Gelbmann (metropolitan), and Arbeit (state). Arbeit noted that Minnesota is the only state in the country where orthoimagery exists for every county.

#### Dakota County's Parcel Data WEB Access Policy

Stevenson summarized issues that have arisen with the County's parcel query WEB application. The County Board directed the site to be taken off-line in May 1998 and permitted it to go back on line mid-June with the understanding that property owner information could not be obtained as a test through August. Gary emphasized the purpose of the application is to provide an on-line property information search tool and not a people information tool. No substantive complaints have been received about the lack of Internet access to property owner name information. As such, county staff will probably recommend in August that the Board allow continuation of a search application that does not provide property owner names. The site is receiving about 4000 hits/week day; about the same as received when property owner names could be obtained. They are monitoring to evaluate whether the Internet access is reducing the number of phone calls for this type of information.

In their research, county officials have learned Minnesota is one of three states in the country Gary refers to as "no-privacy" states. The laws, however, do not state how the information is to be disseminated. Dakota County's position is to provide a defined subset of information via the Internet and if someone wants something else they must ask for it separately. Coordinating Committee members concurred this is an issue the Committee should take on. Dakota County staff continue to have ability to search on and provide property owner information through the County's Intranet. County officials have also learned they do not have legal authority to provide access to the names of corporate property owners, yet restrict access to the names of private individuals. Therefore, no property owner names can be obtained via the Internet. Florida is the only state to Gary's knowledge to have passed laws that allow specified classes of people (e.g., law enforcement) to be exempted from databases available to the public.

Members identified several other data types that will likely raise similar concerns that included lead risk sites, death and birth certificate records, and crime data. It was agreed that issues surrounding finding a balance between data access and data privacy are being discussed throughout the country.

#### 6. Strategic Projects/Advisory Team Updates

Liaisons from the Content, Policy and Standards Teams had nothing to add to the information presented in the agenda packet. Gelbmann, liaison to the Access Team, provided an update on the delivery schedule for the 1997 orthoimagery data for the region. It was agreed this dataset should be a subject of the GIS/LIS Conference session along with the regional street centerline dataset.

#### 7. Information Sharing -- Activities Update

The following items were commented on:

Stevenson noted the Dakota County Partnership and Dakota County GIS Users Groups are moving to the next level. The County will be entering into contracts with some of the non-partner units of government to provide GIS services.

Srock and Henry summarized a collaborative project between Minneapolis, St. Paul and NSP concerning sharing of utility data. Srock noted this effort is framing questions and policy needs involving sharing with others data purchased from counties by NSP which has been enhanced by NSP with their data. A pilot project is planned that should help to further clarify needs. Henry noted in the past the attitude of utility companies has been "why do you need this data" which has given way to an attitude of "how can we help you".

Stevenson noted he is excited about the MnDOT's Connect Minnesota Project and is looking forward to the availability of fiber optic connections between the county and its GIS Partners.

Not mentioned in the agenda materials:

Staff informed the group that Will Craig has received notification that CURA's NSDI Benefits Grant application on behalf of MetroGIS has been approved. The project will officially begin in September or October.

Wencl informed the group of new USGS WEB capability that is the result of a CRADA (cooperative research and development agreement) project between Microsoft and the USGS. Digital orthoimagery produced by USGS and others can be viewed and obtained from this site. <http://mapping.usgs.gov> then click on "digital backyard" which can also be found at <teraserver.microsoft.com>.

8. Next Meeting: August 27, 1998 at LMIC.

9. Adjournment

Pigott moved and Wencl seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 a.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Support Staff



## August 27, 1998 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. June 25, 1998
4. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a. MetroGIS Functions (Scope of Services) \*\*
  - b. MetroGIS Data Finder:
    1. Roles, Responsibilities and Level of Effort \*\*
    2. Metadata and Coordination of Data Finder and MN NSDI Clearinghouse \*\*
  - c. Selection of Project Consultant – Developing a Fair Share Financial Model for MetroGIS \*\*
  - d. Enhancements to Regional Street Centerline Dataset \*\*
  - e. Nomination for Commendation -- Regional Street Centerline Dataset Partnership \*\*
  - f. Responsibilities of Data Access Advisory Team \*\*
5. Strategic Initiative Updates/Report from Team Liaisons
6. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
7. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting – September 30)  
October 22, 1998
8. Adjourn

## August 27, 1998 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The meeting was held at the offices of Minnesota State Planning Agency – Land Management Information Center.

Members Present: Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Counties: Margo LaBau (Anoka), Dave Drealan (Carver); Alternate Jay Whitstock for Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Alternate Gary Caswell for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Schools: Lee Whitcraft (TIES); State: David Arbeit (LMIC); Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP), Watersheds: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District)

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation); Cities: Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville), Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council), and Non-Profits: David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership)

Visitors: Chuck Ballentine (Metropolitan Council)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted with the following change: Agenda Item 4a was moved to follow Item 4e.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Claypool moved and Arbeit seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's June 25, 1998, as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4 ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

#### 4(b)(1) MetroGIS Data Finder: Roles Responsibilities and Level of Effort

Gelbmann, Data Finder Project Coordinator and Liaison to the Data Access Team, summarized the staff report and Team recommendation. The group agreed that use of the term "metadata" should be avoided. "Data documentation" is preferred to avoid confusion among data users with the actual data holdings. The group also concurred that Data Finders' use of browse graphics and WEB links to supplement the text-based data documentation is consistent with industry trends and constitutes the logical "next step" for data documentation efforts.

Motion: Gelbmann moved and Aichinger seconded to accept the contents of the two Data Finder project reports entitled "Participant Roles and Responsibilities White Paper" and "Data Finder Administration: Level of Effort" (costs) as guidelines of what MetroGIS should expect for a resource commitment from various organizations and for maintaining Data Finder. Motion carried, ayes all.

Gelbmann reported, in accordance with the MetroGIS budget proposed last March, it is the Metropolitan Council's intention to fill a two-year, temporary Internet support position yet this year to test and refine the estimates of the level of effort necessary to support Data Finder as set forth in the two referenced reports. It was agreed the

guidelines outlined in the referenced reports should be tested and refined before submitted to the MetroGIS Policy Board for action. Randall Johnson also reported that a component of the Fair-Share Financial Model Project, proposed to begin in October, includes an evaluation of the costs associated with support of Data Finder.

#### 4(b)(2) MetroGIS Data Finder: Metadata and Coordination with the Minnesota Geographic Data Clearinghouse

Gelbmann presented an overview of the staff report and Team recommendation. The group acknowledged that the project managers for the Data Finder and Minnesota Geographic Data Clearinghouse projects have made good progress since a special meeting on June 12th to: 1) achieve a goal that the two systems will key off of the same metadata record and 2) implement system enhancements consistent with a philosophy of working toward an effective convergence of the two systems while providing flexibility to investigate technology options consistent with the needs of their particular constituencies.

Caswell stated he opposes use of two metadata records, even if only temporarily, because of the inherent duplication of effort and possible misinformation that may result if the two versions differ. He suggested lobbying the Federal Geographic Committee (FGDC) to revise their clearinghouse guidelines which have been adhered for development of the Minnesota Geographic Data Clearinghouse. The group was generally uncomfortable with holding up the Data Finder Project to work through the issues with the FGDC.

Gelbmann emphasized the current thinking is for both systems to key off a single metadata record but that the details of how to accomplish this are still being worked out by the staff of both projects. He also explained, and David Arbeit concurred, that although it is the ultimate goal to merge the two systems, available technology does not allow the functionality supported by the individual systems to be merged at this time. There was general agreement that the search interface provided by Data Finder is more user friendly than that used by the State's Clearinghouse and designed in conformance with FGDC guidelines. It was also generally agreed that the Data Finder design differences with that of the State Clearinghouse are justified because they are a result of comments obtained from MetroGIS constituents at Data Finder feedback sessions.

Claypool and Gelbmann clarified that establishment of a LISTSERV, as recommended in guideline number four, is intended to serve as the identification of a need. The Team realizes resources may not be currently available to implement this capability. Gelbmann also explained the Team envisions the LISTSERV site to be open via the Internet to anyone who would want to participate.

Motion: Gelbmann moved and Claypool seconded that the Coordinating Committee approve the following guidelines for Data Finder:

#### Metadata:

All metadata at Data Finder will be accessible through the Minnesota Geographic Data Clearinghouse. Not all metadata at the Minnesota Geographic Data Clearinghouse will be accessible from Data Finder. Metadata records accessible from both sites will have exactly the same content. (The methods and timing to achieve this goal will be resolved by MetroGIS and MN Clearinghouse staff.)

1. Complete Metadata Record: MetroGIS should strongly encourage participants to develop complete metadata records for each of their datasets. A complete metadata record is a record with all known information about that data set and all applicable fields completed (The reference to "fields" means the metadata fields prescribed by the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines.)

2. Communication: Staff to the Data Access Team should continue to participate on the Minnesota Data Clearinghouse Advisory Steering Committee, and vice versa.

3. Feedback Mechanism: MetroGIS should establish a LISTSERV for feedback and mechanism for participants to share information.

Motion carried: Ayes - 13, Nays – 2 (Caswell and Srock)

Minority opinions: Caswell reiterated his concern about duplication of effort to maintain metadata records in two places and for the potential of misinformation if multiple versions of a metadata record exist. Srock noted he voted against the motion because it does not provide for adequate explanation of the design issues that require two sites or for a plan to work through these differences. It was agreed the minutes are to state the Data Finder project manager will be expected to provide the Committee with frequent progress reports that address Member Srock's concerns.

LaBau arrived.

4c). Selection of Project Consultant – Developing a Fair-Share Financial Model for MetroGIS

Aichinger moved and Erdahl seconded to endorse the consultant selection process for the Fair-Share Financial Model Project, membership on the evaluation team and project steering committee, and weighting for each class of evaluation criteria as presented in the agenda report dated August 15, 1998. Motion carried, ayes all.

4d) Enhancements – Regional Street Centerline Dataset

Chairperson Henry and staff summarized the staff report and recommendation. Charboneau concurred with the recommendation that more time should be spent evaluating the desirability and practicality of the suggested database enhancements. The group concluded a workgroup, led by the Content Team and comprised of people familiar with the nuances of this dataset and with the technology necessary to carry out the suggested enhancements, would be the most appropriate forum for further consideration and preparation of a recommendation to the Committee. This discussion led to a general acknowledgment that a single Technical Advisory Team, which spawns ad hoc and task specific workgroups as needed, may be preferable to the current Advisory Team structure comprised of three separate technically-oriented teams (Data Access, Data Content and Standards). [See Agenda Item 4f for further discussion of a single Technical Advisory Team.]

Motion: Charboneau moved and Aichinger seconded to request the Data Content Team to assemble a technically – oriented workgroup to evaluate the desirability and practicality of enhancements suggested for the Regional Street Centerline Dataset (licensed from The Lawrence Group) at the June 3rd Data User's Forum and to prepare a recommendation for the next steps. Motion carried, ayes all.

4e) Nomination for Commendation – Regional Street Centerline Dataset Partnership

Craig moved and Claypool seconded that the Coordinating Committee to endorse nomination of the MetroGIS Regional Street Centerline Project for recognition by the Governor and to authorize the Committee Chair to sign the letter of nomination on behalf of the Coordinating Committee. Motion carried unanimously.

4a) MetroGIS Functions (Scope of Services)

LaBau summarized the reasons why this topic is before the group at this time: 1) the Policy Board has asked for direction regarding functions appropriate for MetroGIS, 2) respondents to last January's Participant Satisfaction Survey asked for clarification of what MetroGIS is to become, 3) work on organizational structure appropriate for MetroGIS requested by the Policy Board can not be undertaken until the desired functionality is agreed, and 4) agreement is needed on the desired initial core functions to provide focus for the consultant who will be assisting us, beginning October 1st, develop a Fair-Share Financial Model for MetroGIS.

Gelbmann and Claypool raised a concern that the list of proposed core and desirable functions was short on technical-oriented functions. His concern was that once adopted, the proposed listing of functions will be difficult to revise. He explained that he would prefer the listing to be reviewed by a team of persons with GIS operational and technical expertise prior to consideration by the Policy Board. The consensus of the other members was the listing of functions adequately defines the scope of desired initial objectives/functions for MetroGIS. Several members commented this listing is expected to be refined as the organization matures and that it is intended to be a living/evolving document, reviewed and updated regularly. It was agreed this intention must be clearly communicated to the Policy Board.

Motion: LaBau moved and Caswell seconded that the Coordinating Committee recommend that the MetroGIS Policy Board endorse those functions identified in the Policy Advisory Team's report dated August 5, 1998 as either core to the business of MetroGIS and otherwise desirable to pursue as the opportunity arises.

Motion carried. Ayes 14, Nays 1 (Gelbmann)

In response to concerns raised during the Committee's discussion, staff agreed to make the following changes to the documentation before submitting it to the Policy Board for consideration: 1) move the column containing comments about the current status of each of the listed functions to the right of the "scope" column and expand upon the cryptic comments, 2) change the "Coordination Functions" category heading to "Coordination and Technical Functions", and 3) change the "Technical Service Functions" heading to "Service Functions".

#### 4f) Responsibilities of Data Access Advisory Team

Gelbmann reported the Data Access Team's attendance is down to 4-5 people in addition to staff, that no one has volunteered to chair the team since Jim Sydow retired in May, and that the remaining members have asked for guidance from the Committee to clarify the Team's responsibilities now that Data Finder is operational. Team members believe the work program adopted in June (see the agenda report) comprises essentially staff responsibilities. Gelbmann believes the Team membership needs more participation from GIS, IS, and telecommunications professionals to effectively develop collaborative solutions to technical issues facing MetroGIS.

The Team's concerns led to general agreement among Committee members that reliance on the three topic-specific standing technically-oriented advisory teams (Data Access, Data Content, and Standards) is probably a less desirable approach than assembling ad hoc, technical workgroups comprised of persons with the appropriate expertise for specific tasks. Notwithstanding, Committee members also believe it important to retain some type of technical oversight team to insure the work of multiple technical workgroups is coordinated.

Motion: LaBau moved and Aichinger seconded to request the chairs and or liaisons for each of the four advisory teams to evaluate the concept of consolidating the three current technical-oriented teams into a single Technical Advisory Team that would create and manage task specific workgroups as needed.

Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 5. STRATEGIC INITIATIVE UPDATES/REPORT FROM TEAM LIAISONS

No discussion of the information presented in the agenda materials.

Craig reported on the objectives of the NSDI-funded Benefits Study that he will be leading, beginning this October. The study objectives are to evaluate the benefits of data sharing and identify problems which hamper data sharing. A source of information will be data sharing logs being maintained in accordance with the provisions of the GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements between the Metropolitan Council and each metro area county. The results are

expected to be integrated into the research for the Fair-Share Financial Initiative also proposed to begin in October.

#### 6. INFORMATION SHARING

No discussion of the items included in the packet.

Caswell reported that Intergraph, Inc and the National Association of Counties (NACO) have created a GIS Starter Kit Program through which counties throughout the country can obtain resources necessary to automate their geo-spatial record keeping. The program is free to NACO members.

Staff reported that ESRI also recently announced a similar Local Government Start Up Grant Program with software and training grants totaling \$2.4 million.

Members were encouraged to pass information about both programs along to qualifying units of government.

7. NEXT MEETING: October 22, 1998 at the offices of Minnesota State Planning (LMIC).

#### 8. ADJOURNMENT

Aichinger moved and Hentges seconded to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 a.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Support Staff



## October 22, 1998 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a) April 26, 2000 *action*
4. GIS Demonstration
5. Action and Discussion Items
  - a) Regional Parcel Dataset: Private Sector Subcommittee *action*
  - b) 2000-2001 MetroGIS Work Plan
  - c) Regional Parcel Dataset: Public Sector Pilot Update
  - d) 2000 Data Practices/Access State Law: HR3501
6. Information Sharing
  - a) Strategic Initiatives Update
  - b) June 5<sup>th</sup> Presentation to Metropolitan Council – Request for Continued Support
  - c) National GeoData Organizational Initiative: The MetroGIS Connection
  - d) Upcoming Conference Presentations
7. Next Meeting
  - December 17, 1998

**Meeting Summary  
MetroGIS  
Coordinating Committee  
October 22, 1998**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The meeting was held at the offices of Minnesota State Planning Agency – Land Management Information Center.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (CURA); *Cities:* Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); *Counties:* Margo LaBau (Anoka), Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Alternate Gary Caswell and Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), and Alternate Jane Harper for Virginia Erdahl (Washington); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); *Metropolitan:* Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC); and *Utilities:* Alan Srock (NSP)

Members Absent: *Business Geographics:* Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation); *Cities:* Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville), *Counties:* Dave Drealan (Carver) and Jim Hentges (Scott); *Federal:* Ron Wencil (USGS); *Metropolitan:* Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council), *Non-Profits:* David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); *Schools:* Lee Whitcraft (TIES); and *Watersheds:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District).

Visitors: Shelly Bergh-Gardner (Learning Resources Manager, Metropolitan Council)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

Charboneau moved and Srock seconded to accept the agenda with the following changes: Items 5a, 5c, and 5g move to the beginning following Item 2 then proceed in the order stated, starting with Item 3.

**5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS;**

**a) MetroGIS Funding Priorities 1999-2000**

Draft funding priorities were presented for discussion. Shelly Bergh Gardner facilitated additions and modifications to the draft listing. The following changes were agreed upon: add supplemental data maintenance payments for counties in 2000, note the 1999 Participant Satisfaction Survey will be financed through Will Craig's NSDI funded Benefits Study, add MetroGIS WEB site maintenance in 2000, and add orthoimagery to regional datasets developed in 1998 and 2000 and existing land use in 1998 and 2000. The group affirmed that the priority for development of a particular regional dataset, associated with the 13 priority business information needs, shall be a function, in large part, of the readiness of an organization of collaboration of organizations to work on these datasets for their own business needs. In other words, Information Need #9 will be addressed before Information Need #5 if the resources are available for #9 before #5.

The group concluded that before it gives further consideration to establishing desired funding priorities for 2000 it would prefer: 1) all functions listed on page 10 of the packet, as adopted by the Policy Board on September 30<sup>th</sup>, to be included in the draft funding priority worksheet along the amount of funding proposed, if any, in 1999 and/or 2000 and 2) the actual dollars spent, if known, for 1998.

Staff agreed to make the suggested revisions and to send a revised worksheet to the group in the next few days for comment. Members also concurred the Committee should strive to endorse a preliminary budget at its December meeting to share with the Policy Board at the Board's January 1999 meeting.

**5c) Creation Of A Single Technical Committee**

Staff reported the Data Content and Policy Advisory Teams have endorsed consolidating the Data Access, Data Content, and Standards Advisory Teams into a single Technical Advisory Team and that the leadership of the Data Access and Standards Advisory Teams have responded favorably to the proposal.

**Motion:** Craig moved and Claypool seconded to: 1) consolidate the Data Access, Data Content, and Standards Advisory Teams in to a single Technical Advisory Team to address issues raised by the Data Access Advisory Team and respondents to the 1998 Participant Satisfaction Survey, 2) direct the preparation of a draft mission statement and work program for the reorganized team, and 3) present the draft mission statement and work program to the prospective members of the new team for comment concerning the final structure. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **5g) 1999 Participant Satisfaction Survey**

Craig stated he is planning to conduct a survey as part of his NSDI funded Benefits Study and that staff's suggestion to postpone the 1999 survey from January to June fits well with his project. He reported the study will measure participant satisfaction with MetroGIS process, accomplishments, and objectives, as the case with the 1998 survey, as well as measure satisfaction with several matters related to data. In addition to using data sharing logs that are being maintained by the seven counties and the Metropolitan Council, the group concurred that an attempt should also be made to log organizations which receive data via anonymous FTP.

**Motion:** Arbeit moved and Gelbmann seconded to postpone the 1999 MetroGIS Participant Satisfaction Survey to June 1999 and to consolidate it with the survey to be conducted by Will Craig as part of his NSDI-funded Benefits Study. Motion carried, unanimously.

### **3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY**

LaBau moved and O'Connor seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's August 27, 1998, subject to the following correction: Page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under Item 4(b)(2), 6<sup>th</sup> line change "and" following Clearinghouse to "which is,". Motion passed unanimously.

### **4. SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 30<sup>th</sup> POLICY BOARD MEETING**

Craig commented that the Board unanimously supported his request that Board members encourage staff from their respective organizations to cooperate with Craig's study team. The group concurred more discussion of the functions appropriate to MetroGIS with the Policy Board will likely be necessary even though Board members did not raise many questions prior to approving the Committee's recommendation.

#### **5b) Fair-Share Financial Model for MetroGIS**

The Committee was informed that a consultant contract has been executed and that the project officially began on October 15th. An overview of the project deliverables was provided and members were asked to suggest any collaborative/fair-share cost allocation schemes they believe relevant to MetroGIS in addition to those identified in the staff report. Gelbmann suggested the consultant team should consider cost-sharing schemes used by Anoka and Washington Counties.

#### **5d) Data Finder – Simplified Use of FTP**

Gelbmann summarized efforts underway to promote development of metadata by MetroGIS stakeholders, noting that most stakeholders agree about the importance of metadata but that allocation of resources to accomplish the work is lacking. Some stakeholders believe the process is overly complex and they are not convinced there is a tangible benefit for work they believe exceeds their internal business needs. LaBau mentioned that Anoka County GIS staff are not convinced of the benefit of producing fully compliant metadata. The notion that metadata is only for technical staff is also an obstacle. Harper concurred this is an issue in Washington County. She reported that as part of the county's data accessibility project, funded through the county's GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement with the Council, they will be looking into ways to create a subset of metadata for the project manager and a subset for the technical person.

Gelbmann stated the current approach is to address these concerns through an education-based promotion program. He mentioned he is also investigating development of a template to simplify the process of using Datalogr. Until these obstacles are overcome, the full potential of Data Finder and the Minnesota Geographical Data Clearinghouse can not be realized.

The benefit of developing metadata, compliant with the state guidelines, and posting it with Data Finder is paying off in savings of Council staff time to fill data requests. The existence of the metadata, together with the Data Finder functionality, has resulted in the opportunity to automate the data delivery mechanism. The Council

recently developed an application that allows a data user to download data via FTP by clicking on the "on-line linkage" hyperlink in the metadata posted with Data Finder. Not only does the process significantly reduce Council staff interaction with the data user but the novice user can now easily use FTP without having to know the intricacies of several line commands. Arbeit extended an offer to other MetroGIS stakeholders to use LMIC's FTP facility in the same manner LMIC has provided use of the facility to the Council to serve data via anonymous FTP.

#### **5e) Handbook – MetroGIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Initiative**

A draft distribution list for this handbook was shared with the group for comment. The group suggested that County administrators should receive the complete document and that County Commissioners should receive a letter describing the document. Staff noted this suggestion would be shared with Victoria Reinhardt, Chair of the Policy Board. The Association of County Officers (MACO) was mentioned as a group that should receive a copy. It was also suggested that the mass media should be apprised since the document has an educational objective. There was general agreement that notifying a variety of stakeholders by mail or by articles in newsletters of the document's existence and its availability from the MetroGIS WEB site is an appropriate strategy.

#### **5f) Handbook – Implementing the National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy**

This item was postponed to the next meeting. No one in attendance had a working knowledge of the document.

### **6. INFORMATION SHARING**

a-d) No discussion

e) Craig asked for clarification of the Metropolitan Council's proposal to donate to MetroGIS proceeds from sales to non-government of soils data it has developed for five of the metro area counties (this proposal does not include soils data for Dakota or Washington Counties). Gelbmann reported that Council approval was expected that evening (which was subsequently received) and that negotiations are in progress with a prospective buyer. A target price of about \$3,500 has been established for data for all five of the counties. Craig questioned whether the public good would be better served if the data were to be given away. Other members noted that the Policy Board has asked the Committee to investigate data sales as a revenue source for MetroGIS.

f-h) No discussion

### **7. OTHER BUSINESS**

Gelbmann reported that a seven-meter shift to the west and a one-meter shift to the north have been discovered for the 1997 orthoimagery the Council is providing to government for the cost of handling. He is working with the contractor on corrective options and an explanation of what caused the shift. The imagery, even with the shift, is within the tolerances defined in the metadata.

### **8. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for December 17, 1998.

### **9. ADJOURN**

Gelbmann moved and Claypool seconded to adjourn at 10:35 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



**December 17, 1998 Agenda  
Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a) April 26, 2000 *action*
4. GIS Demonstration
5. Action and Discussion Items
  - a) Regional Parcel Dataset: Private Sector Subcommittee *action*
  - b) 2000-2001 MetroGIS Work Plan
  - c) Regional Parcel Dataset: Public Sector Pilot Update
  - d) 2000 Data Practices/Access State Law: HR3501
6. Information Sharing
  - a) Strategic Initiatives Update
  - b) June 5<sup>th</sup> Presentation to Metropolitan Council – Request for Continued Support
  - c) National GeoData Organizational Initiative: The MetroGIS Connection
  - d) Upcoming Conference Presentations
7. Next Meeting
  - March 19, 1999

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS**  
**Coordinating Committee**  
**December 17, 1998**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. It was held at the offices of Minnesota State Planning Agency in the Centennial Building near the State Capitol.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (CURA); *Cities:* Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); *Counties:* Margo LaBau (Anoka), Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); *Metropolitan:* Richard Johnson and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); *Non-Profits:* David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC); *Watershed Districts:* Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District); and *Utilities:* Alan Srock (NSP).

Members Absent: *Business Geographics:* Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation); *Cities:* Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); *Counties:* Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin); and *Schools:* Lee Whitcraft (TIES).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

The meeting agenda was accepted as submitted.

**3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY**

Srock moved and Arbeit seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's October 22, 1998 meeting, subject to the following correction: Page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, 1999 Participant Satisfaction: add "June" between "to" and "fits". Motion passed unanimously.

**4. SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 30<sup>th</sup> POLICY BOARD MEETING**

Chairperson Henry summarized the discussion that occurred at the Board meeting. In conjunction with the lack of quorum, it was agreed given the demands on Board members that Board meeting attendance will likely suffer until members perceive the agendas contain issues of significance to their organizations and that meetings should be cancelled if there are no matters that require action. Staff noted this topic has been raised with the Policy Board Chair and that her preference is to use meetings that have less substantive agendas, such as the November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, as an opportunity to educate Board members on various matters important to MetroGIS. Others felt the timing of the November meeting and the poor weather may have also been a cause for the low attendance at the November meeting. Committee members agreed they would like to receive a meeting reminder as has been instituted for Board meetings at the request of Board members.

**Motion:** Richard Johnson moved and Arbeit seconded to recommend that the Board consider meeting on a quarterly basis. Motion carried unanimously.

**5. CONSENT AGENDA**

**a) Year 2000 MetroGIS Funding Priorities and Revenue Resources**

**Motion:** Drealan moved and Arbeit seconded that the Coordinating Committee endorse the year 2000 MetroGIS budget documents presented in the agenda packet and authorize endorsement to be sought from the MetroGIS Policy Board. Motion carried, ayes all.

**6. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS;**

**a) 1999-2000 Expectations (two calendar years)**

**Motion:** Richard Johnson moved and Srock seconded to endorse the 1999-2000 MetroGIS Expectations presented in the agenda packet, with the following additions and modifications:

- Make it clear in the introduction that the time frame is two calendar years.
- 7<sup>th</sup> bullet: Replace the phrase “seven of the nine remaining priority MetroGIS Business Information Needs.” with “another seven priority MetroGIS Business Information Needs.”
- 10<sup>th</sup> bullet: Replace the term “stakeholder” with a term or phrase that clarifies the affected parties include government units either a party to or those named in data sharing agreements and licenses executed to promote the principles of MetroGIS.
- 11<sup>th</sup> bullet: Replace “ an acquisition strategy” with “a strategy is defined to implement the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial and Organizational Model.”

Motion carried unanimously.

#### **6b) TECHNICAL ADVISORY TEAM – STATEMENT OF PURPOSE, 1999 WORK PROGRAM AND SELECTION OF LIAISONS**

Gelbmann stated he would prefer the purpose statement to reflect the new emphasis on special purpose, short tenure workgroups. He also would prefer significantly fewer than 20 persons on the main Team. Wencil noted he would prefer broad representation rather than a team of 6-8 persons. Craig noted he believes a membership of 12 members would be ideal with an upper limit of 20.

**Motion:** Craig moved and Arbeit seconded to adopt the statement of purpose, 1999 work program, and letter to prospective Technical Advisory Team members presented in the agenda packet, with the following modifications:

- Revise the purpose statement to clarify the role of the Team will be primarily that of coordinating the work of special purpose workgroups, consultants, and staff to accomplish the Team’s assigned responsibilities and tasks.
- Revise the letter of invitation to move the content of the last paragraph closer to the top and move the invitation to participate in the reorganized Team closer to the top.
- Revise Item #4 of membership guidelines to read “Team members to provide a balanced representation of stakeholder views and have ability to judge the importance of addressing technical issues”.
- Add a 6<sup>th</sup> item: Establish a process to allow people to participate on a short term basis.

Motion carried unanimously.

David Claypool, Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann, and Ron Wencil, each a liaison to the current technical advisory teams, affirmed they will participate on the new team as liaisons to the Coordinating Committee. The group identified the need for an effective chairperson to insure this new Team remains focused and accomplishes its responsibilities in a timely manner. It was agreed the Coordinating Committee should appoint the Chairperson once the query for interest in serving on the new team is complete and that a co-chair model should be considered (one of the liaisons to Coordinating Committee and one non-Coordinating Committee member). Staff will provide Committee members with the list of persons who express interest in serving on the Team and Committee members will decide via email/telephone on the question of chairperson prior to the first meeting of the Team, tentatively scheduled for February 1999.

#### **6c) 1998 Annual Report**

Arbeit commented that the scoping document for the annual report provided by the consultant is very helpful. He asked if it would be possible to include a product of GIS in the report. Staff will discuss with the consultant. No other suggestions for the content of the report were received. Also, no revisions were suggested to the draft list of 1998 accomplishments.

**Motion:** Arbeit moved and Aichinger seconded that the Coordinating Committee:

1. Endorse the objectives and specifications for the 1998 MetroGIS annual report, as presented in the staff report.

2. Endorse a strategy to simultaneously inform the Policy Board of the substance of the annual report and seek comment from the Board members about the format and contents of the report at the January Board meeting.

Motion carried, unanimously.

#### **6d) Parcel Identification Number Guideline**

Craig stated this recommendation addresses one of the thirteen priority MetroGIS business information needs (Unique Parcel Identifiers) and that the recommended addition of the 3-digit FTSP code to the parcel identification numbers maintained by counties is necessary to integrate parcel data from multiple counties and maintain unique parcel ID's. The group agreed that adoption and implementation of this recommendation would not affect the way counties go about storing and maintaining parcel data and that the work of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information thoroughly addressed the issues by way of a broadly participatory process.

**Motion:** Stevenson moved and Aichinger seconded to recommend that the MetroGIS Policy Board endorse and promote use among MetroGIS stakeholders of the unique parcel identifier scheme adopted by the Governor's Council on Geographic Information on the basis it:

- is needed to integrate parcel data.
- addresses this integration need without affecting county business practices
- addresses one of the thirteen MetroGIS priority information needs.

#### **6e) 1999 Meeting Schedule**

The next meeting of the Coordinating Committee was set for February 25, 1999. The remainder of the 1999 meeting schedule will be set at the February meeting following Board action on their 1999 meeting schedule. The group agreed to hold its regularly scheduled meetings at the State Planning Agency facilitates in the Centennial Building near the State Capitol, when available.

#### **6f) Demonstrations at 1999 Policy Board Meetings**

It was agreed that the North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition should be invited to demonstrate their GIS data warehouse capabilities for the Policy Board at the March meeting (meeting following the January meeting) because it demonstrates the vision sought for MetroGIS. It was also agreed that the Coalition should be invited to demonstrate this capability to the Committee at its February meeting to prepare for the presentation to the Board. Staff agreed to speak with Coalition officials.

The group also agreed a demonstration of the use of MetroGIS-endorsed datasets by the organizations represented on the Policy Board, as outlined in the staff report and including orthoimagery, would be useful and informative for Board members. It was agreed this demonstration should occur at the meeting following the I-35W Coalition demonstration. Volunteers to assist with the specific components of this demonstration will be sought at the February meeting. MetroGIS Data Finder and the accompanying MetroGIS information WEB site will be the subjects of the following demonstration.

#### **6g) 1999 GeoData Forum – Request for Input**

No discussion. Members were encouraged to forward any comments they have to the FGDC. Craig mentioned he had already forwarded a suggestion to add a "benefits" theme to the draft list of forum topics.

### **7. STRATEGIC INITIATIVE UPDATES**

a) **Data Finder:** Gelbmann shared that Data Finder is beginning to serve its intended purpose – provide data users with a tool to quickly locate and obtain information about data they need, increase data sharing activity, and minimize staff time to fulfill data requests. He shared that in one day last week one of the Council's GIS Specialists received five data requests. The requesters were each referred to Data Finder ([www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org)) through which they received answers to all of their questions and were able to quickly and efficiently download the data they needed. Gelbmann also noted

arrangements are in the works to host a metadata development workshop in January and to hire college interns to assist with metadata development, noting that resistance to documenting datasets continues to be a major concern and impediment to realizing the full potential of Data Finder.

b) GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements: No discussion of the summary information in the packet.

c) Priority Information Needs: Craig summarized the Content Advisory Team's work on the parcel information need.

d) Long Term Financial Model: LaBau overviewed the consultant's status and direction provided by Policy Advisory Team noting a presentation is planned for the Policy Board meeting on January 27<sup>th</sup>.

## **8. INFORMATION SHARING**

- a) Gelbmann shared a map product from the Council's in-progress land use interpretation project noting that parcel data (boundaries and property description data) received from the counties has dramatically improved the Council's ability to accurately assess existing land use.
- b) Stevenson asked if the Year 2000 census should be a topic for MetroGIS. Craig noted local government has the most ability to influence the Census Bureau concerning block group boundaries. He believes this topic is best addressed by the individual local units of government and that a role for MetroGIS may be to insure local governments take advantage of the opportunity and that their wishes are heard. Gelbmann reported the Council is initiated discussions with a few local government officials to develop a strategy for a participatory process and that discussion have been initiated with The Lawrence Group to coordinate updates to the census geography with the street centerline dataset. It was agreed an update should be presented at the next Committee meeting, given that the window of opportunity to influence the Census Bureau is available through Spring 1999.
- c) Aichinger mentioned the Ramsey County GIS Users Group is being discussions with Media One regarding use of TV cable as a medium for transmission of GIS data among government units. Stevenson noted Dakota County is in the primarily stages of setting up a pilot project through Marcus Cable to link the County and City of Lakeville also to investigate cable as a GIS transmission medium and to identify the equipment requirements to implement a network. It was agreed this matter should be listed as an information update item at the next meeting.
- d) Craig reported his Benefits Study assistant, David Bitner, has begun to interview recipients of shared data and that there a number of instances to choose from. The problem is few of the recipient organizations spoken with to date have completed their projects or adopted policy in which shared data has played a substantive role. He asked Committee members to help him identify projects which relied heavily on data received from others. He also the interview questions have been modified to address a desire on the part of some to distinguish between data shared as a result of the GIS data and Cost Sharing Agreements and data that would have been shared regardless of the existence of the agreements. Randall Johnson emphasized it was never the intent of the Agreement Initiative to claim credit for all data shared during the effective period of the agreements but rather to provide a window of opportunity to study the impacts of the availability of standardized core data elements from each of the seven counties and standardized access and distribution policies among the counties and the Council.
- e) Claypool reported a new watershed district has been created in Ramsey County and that after much deliberation a boundary description has been agreed upon that is surveyable. He agreed to provide additional information at a future meeting.

## **10. ADJOURN**

Craig moved and Charboneau seconded to adjourn at 10:30 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



## March 19, 1999 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. December 17, 1998
4. Summary of January 27th Policy Board Meeting
5. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a. North Metro I-35W Corridor GIS – Presentation of Capabilities
  - b. MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Guidelines action
  - c. 1999 Meeting Schedule action
  - d. Election of Officers action
  - e. Coordinating Committee Membership – Invitation to State Agencies action
  - f. Parcel Boundaries Information Need direction
  - g. Information Policy Task Force Recommendations and Proposed Legislation direction
6. Strategic Initiatives Updates:
  - a. MetroGIS WEB Data Finder
  - b. Information Needs Project
  - c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Project
  - d. Long Term Financing and Organizational Structure Project
7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
  - a. Final report Lakeville School District GIS Pilot project
8. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting – April 21, 1999)  
  
June 17, 1999
9. Adjourn



March 19, 1999 Minutes

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. It was held at the City of Roseville City Hall.

Members Present : Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); Counties: Paul Leegard (Anoka), Jay Whitstock for Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); Gary Caswell for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin); David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Jane Harper for Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Federal: Ron Wencl (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Non-Profits: David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); Schools: Dick Carlstrom for Lee Whitcraft (TIES); State: David Arbeit (LMIC); and Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP).

Members Absent : Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation, Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); and Watershed Districts: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District)

Visitors: David Windle (City of Roseville) and Jerry Happle (Plan Sight) representing the I-35W Corridor Coalition; John Carpenter (The Lawrence Group); Chuck Krueger (Hennepin County); and Ed Krum (Mn/DOT and co-chair of the MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team)

Support Staff : Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

## 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

It was agreed to consider Item 4 after Item 5g. Srock moved and Gelbmann seconded to approve the agenda, as revised. Motion carried, ayes all.

## 3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Gelbmann moved and Srock seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's December 17, 1998 meeting, as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

## 5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

### a. North Metro I-35W Corridor GIS – Presentation of Capabilities

Chairperson Henry introduced David Windle with the City of Roseville and Jerry Happle, Principal with Plan Sight and GIS consultant to the Coalition. Henry informed the group that the Coalition has been asked to explain its GIS capabilities to the MetroGIS Policy Board at the April 21st meeting. The purpose of the presentation at this meeting is to give the Committee an opportunity to suggest modifications for the presentation to the Board and to inform Committee members of the Coalition's goals and accomplishments.

Windle summarized the Coalition's transportation, housing, and economic development related goals, emphasizing the need for a GIS backbone and ability to work at the parcel level as vital to achieving these goals; the participants, major

accomplishments, and funding sources, including assistance from MetroGIS. Happle demonstrated the contents of the Coalition's on-line atlas available via the Internet and the Coalition's GIS data warehouse available only to Coalition partners via a password protected high-speed network. The data warehouse contains a user-friendly, one-stop-shop to view metadata, view data, download data, obtain "how to" information on a number of procedures, links to other WEB sites, and definitions. Data for each Coalition community has a common look and a common format.

The presentation was very well received. Members did, however, suggest for the Board presentation that Windle and Happle should note the Coalition is an operational example of how GIS can be incorporated into the day-to-day business activities, describe a few examples of how GIS is being used on a day-to-day basis by the member communities, and identify some benefits that are being realized by the members. The group also asked the Coalition to acknowledge its role as a pilot in the development of policy and infrastructure solutions important to the success of MetroGIS with specific reference to its adoption of a generalized Future Land Use Designation scheme.

Windle demonstrated an economic development related GIS application developed by the Coalition that adds significant value and usability to a privately held commercial real estate database (OCR). Piggott (Metro East Development Partnership) commented his organization makes extensive use of the OCR database and that the Coalition's GIS interface is a very valuable asset.

Welsch stated that each of the city planners involved in the Coalition's work view the ability to devise subregional approaches to housing, economic development, transportation, and growth management as cutting edge made possible by GIS technology and the willingness of their organizations to endorse a collaborative approach.

Wencl asked if the Coalition would consider sharing procedures it has developed, in particular for converting between projections. Windle stated he believes the Coalition would consent to posting many of its procedures and definitions on its Internet site.

- MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Guidelines

Gelbmann explained this proposal establishes a guideline to facilitate data sharing and that implementation would have minimal impact on primary data producers.

Motion: Piggott moved and Leegard seconded to recommend that the Policy Board endorse use of the FIPS county and place codes for Minor Civil Divisions (MCD) as the MetroGIS standard for identifying counties and MCD's. Motion carried, ayes all.

Gelbmann asked the Committee for its preference whether staff should continue to include information with staff reports used by the Team to develop its recommendation (e.g., the actual codes that would be assigned to each minor civil division and the comments received from the peer review.) Several members commented that inclusion of this type of information is useful to their understanding of the issues and making informed decisions without the need to ask questions that in effect would rehash ground covered by the Team.

- 1999 Meeting Schedule

Caswell moved and Srock seconded to adopt the meeting schedule for the remainder of 1999 as presented in the staff report (June 24<sup>th</sup>, September 23, and December 16). Motion carried, ayes all.

- Election of Officers

Chairperson Henry called for nominations for Vice Chairperson. Leegard nominated Claypool. No other nominations were received. Caswell moved and Gelbmann seconded to close the nominations and elect Claypool as Vice-Chairperson. Motion carried, ayes all.

Henry turned the meeting over to Vice-Chairperson Claypool who called for nominations for Chairperson. Leegard nominated Henry. Wencl moved and Piggott seconded to close the nominations. Leegard moved and Arbeit seconded to elect Henry as Chairperson.

- Expand Coordinating Committee Membership -- State Agencies

Chairperson Henry informed the group LaBau has accepted a position with Mn/DOT and has stepped down as Chairperson of the Policy Advisory Team. Henry and Welsch noted Labau's change in status lead to a discussion about the role Mn/DOT and other state agencies should have in the affairs of MetroGIS. Subsequently, the Team concluded state agencies should be invited to become voting members on the Coordinating Committee.

Committee members concurred involvement of state agencies with strong commitments to the use of GIS technology is important to the long-term success of MetroGIS. The group concurred with the Policy Advisory Team's recommendation to invite Mn/DOT, given its significant commitment to MetroGIS. The group raised concerns that an open invitation to other state agencies could result in a loss of focus on issues important to local government. The group concluded that state agencies should be represented on the Committee in the same manner as school districts, cities, watershed districts, academics, non-profits, private sector, etc. It was agreed Mn/DOT and one other state agency which produces data relevant to one or more of the priority information needs should be invited to appoint a representative to the Committee. It was also agreed that LMIC would continue to be represented because LMIC possesses special expertise important to the success of MetroGIS, not provided by the State Agencies.

Motions:

1. Piggott moved and Welsch seconded to authorize the Chairperson to send a letter of invitation to the Commissioner of Transportation requesting Mn/DOT to appoint a representative to serve on the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. A copy of the invitation is to be sent to the Chair of the Mn/DOT Geographic Information Council. Motion carried, ayes all.
2. Welsch moved and Harper seconded to request the Governor's Council on Geographic Information to devise a process through which state agencies, which produce data germane to one or more of the 13 priority MetroGIS business information, can select one representative, in addition to Mn/DOT and LMIC, to serve on the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. Motion carried, ayes 15, nays -1 (Caswell)

#### f. Parcel Boundary Business Information Need

Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator, summarized the information presented in the staff report and requested direction from Committee on assumptions that will used to devise a regional parcel data solution. She noted this item is before the Committee at this time to accommodate the interview schedule for the Fair-Share Financial Model project. Members were asked to keep in mind the philosophy that the counties, in their role as primary producers, will not be asked to modify their datasets to accommodate the needs of other stakeholders. If modifications are needed, the tasks and costs of any such tasks will be classified as "costs of collaboration", which will be include in the fair-share allocation model under development.

Comments offered included: Gelbmann suggested that the regional custodian tasks should be phrased as performance standards rather than specific tasks to provide flexibility in devising solution. Harper cautioned that a monthly update schedule (submittal of charges in the county's parcel database to the regional custodian) is about as often as will to be possible for Washington County. Claypool cautioned that whatever guidelines are agreed upon, the tasks require work and that time schedules may not be able to be met from time to time. Charboneau and Srock noted that development and maintenance of a regional parcel data solution will be complex and time consuming. They noted the need to define the costs and custodian candidates in the very near future. The group recognized that more than one solution may be required (parcel points, parcel boundaries, etc) and that a dynamic application that assembles parcel data on as-needed basis for all or a portion of the seven county area need and for a particular use rather than maintaining a parcel data layer for the entire region should be investigated. Caswell noted he would get back to Theresa with his comments once he had an opportunity to think about the assumptions.

#### Information Policy Task Force and Proposed Legislation

Randall Johnson reported that the MetroGIS Policy Board, at its January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, had directed MetroGIS managers to communicate the Board's opposition to the Task Force recommendation to eliminate government's ability to impose a fee to recover the cost of data development. Arbeit summarized the status of Legislation that has been proposed to response to 13 of the 23 recommendations of the Information Policy Task Force. At the present time there is no legislative proposal to revise the

cost recovery authority. Staff would be attending the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing at noon to follow the progress of other Task Force related legislation.

#### 4. SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 30th POLICY BOARD MEETING

No discussion due to lack of time.

#### 6. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES UPDATE

No discussion due to lack of time

#### 7. INFORMATION SHARING

Chairperson Henry acknowledged the Lakeville School District GIS project report included the agenda packet and encouraged the members to bring samples of their GIS work to share with the Committee. He showed an example of how Minneapolis is overlaying orthoimagery with the regional street centerline database and noted that the City is considered doing away with maintaining their own file and relying upon the regional dataset.

#### 8. NEXT MEETING

Thursday, June 24, 1999

#### 9. ADJOURN

Caswell moved and Gelbmann seconded to adjourn at 10:18 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.



## June 17, 1999 Agenda

1. Call to Order & Introduce New Member (Dave Gorg –Mn/DOT)
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. March 19, 1999
4. Summary of April 21st Policy Board Meeting
5. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a. MetroGIS Fair Share Financial Model and Organizational Structure – Progress Report
  - b. MetroGIS Parcel Information Need:
    1. Desired Regional Parcel Boundaries Specifications
    2. Conceptual Implementation Strategy
  - c. MCD Jurisdictional Boundary Guidelines for Primary Producers – Strategy to Test
  - d. MetroGIS Benefits Study – Progress Report
  - e. Demonstration Topic for July 28<sup>th</sup> Policy Board Meeting
6. Strategic Initiatives Updates:
  - a. MetroGIS WEB Data Finder
  - b. Information Needs Project
  - c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Project
  - d. Long Term Financing and Organizational Structure Project
7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
  - a. MetroGIS testifies at US House of Representatives Subcommittee Hearing – June 9th
  - b. MetroGIS Communication Activities
  - c. Final report Lakeville school district GIS project – key issue preserving data privacy
  - d. GIS in Public Works Forum May 26<sup>th</sup> – First in a Series
  - e. Metadata Pilot Completed – Presentation at August URISA Conference
  - f. North Metro I-35W Coalition Paper -- Presentation at August URISA Conference
8. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting – July 28, 1999)  
  
September 23, 1998
9. Adjourn



## June 17, 1999 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. It was held at the Minnesota State Planning offices in the Centennial Office Building, near the Capitol in St. Paul. Dave Gorg, the newest member of the Committee representing the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), was introduced. He manages Mn/DOT's photogrammetric, geodetics, and GIS/Mapping units.

Members Present : Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis) and Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville); Counties: Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); Gary Caswell for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin); David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); State: David Arbeit (LMIC); and Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP).

Members Absent : Counties: Paul Leegard (Anoka), Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation, Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); Non-Profits: David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); Schools: Lee Whitcraft (TIES); and Watershed Districts: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District);

Support Staff : Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as proposed with the addition of Item 5f – Regional Census Geography Information Need Specifications.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Welsch moved and Drealan seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's March 19, 1999 meeting, as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. SUMMARY OF APRIL 21ST POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Henry briefly summarized the major actions of the Policy Board at the April 21, 1999 meeting. There was no discussion.

### 5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Model and Organizational Structure – Progress Report

Chairperson Henry summarized Project Steering Committee's investigation of three options to identify an appropriate organizational structure for MetroGIS. He also shared highlights of the June 2nd Steering Committee meeting at which the Committee provided the consultant with feedback on preliminary model design parameters. Policy Advisory Team Chairperson Erdahl invited interested Committee members to attend upcoming meetings on June 24th and July 7th at which the Team hopes to substantially refine the models to share with the Policy Board on July 28th. Staff clarified that following the Peer

Review Forum in August; a formal recommendation will be sought from the Coordinating Committee prior to presenting the conclusions of the Study to the Policy Board for action.

Chairperson Henry noted the model currently assumes local government units will pay a subscription fee that would comprise a fair share of the cost to operate all aspects of the MetroGIS consistent with the functions adopted by the Policy Board on September 30, 1998 (administration, outreach, technical assistance, data delivery, regional data maintenance, etc) and that a credit is proposed for organizations that participate in a local GIS collaborative. Henry acknowledged the need to coordinate these fee structures so as not to have a negative effect on the formation and nurturing of the local GIS collaboratives. Stevenson stated he is uncomfortable with proposing subscription fees for local government because he believes the Metropolitan Council needs the data under consideration by MetroGIS to carry out its business operations. It was agreed to defer this discussion to the Policy Advisory Team as it considers options for the fair share financial model.

#### MetroGIS Parcel Information Need

##### Desired Data Specifications for Parcel Boundaries:

Technical Advisory Team Liaison Claypool summarized the Team's recommendations for the primary and regional data custodian roles and responsibilities and for the desired specifications for a regional parcel data solution. He also summarized the process used to develop these recommendations as outlined in the staff report to the Committee.

Gorg noted the proposed regional parcel dataset is a subset of the need for a state parcel data solution and asked if any thought had been given to coordinating the two needs. Arbeit noted the Governor's Council on Geographic Information is closely watching the efforts of MetroGIS with the idea that if a solution is achieved in the metro area there is promise but no certainty for application elsewhere.

Stevenson commented he is not convinced there is a need for a regional parcel dataset and that the current data and cost sharing agreements do not permit redistribution of county parcel data. Staff acknowledged that the current agreements would need to be amended to accomplish distribution of an integrated parcel dataset but that the existing agreements were never meant to address the needs of the regional data solutions.

Stevenson commented those who need multiple county parcel data are capable of accomplishing the integration on their own. Charboneau disagreed noting he does not believe school districts, some needing parcel data from three or more counties, do not have the resources to perpetually integrate multiple county on their own and that the duplication of effort that would result from numerous school districts and others would not be in the public interest as well as contrary to the data sharing objectives of the MetroGIS.

Chairperson Henry asked each county representative to speak to this matter:

Hentges (Scott County) : Not opposed to a regional dataset but a new agreement will be needed to address redistribution policies. Drealan (Carver County): Carver County understood, when it entered into the data sharing agreement and when it endorsed the principles of MetroGIS, that a goal of MetroGIS was to facilitate development of a regional parcel dataset. He also recognizes the need to work through liability issues to achieve this goal. Claypool (Ramsey County): Believes development and regular updating of a regional dataset would be in the public interest but cautioned that the integrity of the source datasets must be guaranteed. Opposed to a policy that results in partner organizations having to hire a consultant or otherwise gear up internally to use another partner's data. Such a result would be inconsistent with the fundamental objectives that MetroGIS is attempting to achieve. Erdahl (Washington County): Not opposed to a regional parcel dataset but the solution must preserve the ability of counties to recover data development costs to supplement the costs of supporting their GIS operations. She emphasized that the taxpayer is paying the bill and that we have an obligation to work cooperatively to address issues as cost effectively as possible. Opposed to a policy that results in each unit of government fending for themselves to integrate parcel data from multiple counties.

Welsch spoke in favor of pursuing a regional parcel data solution from his experience with the North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition. He concurred with others that without a regional solution, the resulting inefficiencies of organizations continually reinventing the wheel and duplicating each other efforts is contrary to the objectives of MetroGIS and not in the public interest.

Srock noted that development of a regional dataset is an investment in a product that would have value beyond that of the seven individual primary datasets.

Caswell arrived.

Gorg noted that working together to solve common needs is obviously in the public interest. He supports a coordinated and sustained effort as opposed to a continuous stream of negotiations to establish partnerships to finance single purpose projects as they arise.

Stevenson (Dakota County) clarified he is not opposed to the concept of building a regional parcel database or to the concept of a designating regional custodian. He restated he believes this should be the responsibility of the Metropolitan Council to support and not ask local government to pay a subscription fee when the Metropolitan Council has a business need for regional parcel data solution. Staff noted that the purpose of the fair share financial model is to distribute the costs of MetroGIS, including general administration and regional data maintenance equitably and consistent with benefit received from the presence of a regional GIS. As an option to local government paying a subscription fee, Stevenson suggested that the counties contribute their parcel data to the Metropolitan Council and the Council partner with the private sector to develop the regional parcel database with the understanding that non government can have access provided the counties receive compensation for foregoing cost recovery policies on a transaction by transaction basis. (Note: immediately following conclusion of the Committee meeting staff spoke with each county representative and the private sector members of the Committee members. All agreed to meet to further discuss the option of partnering with the private sector prior to the July 7th meeting with the financial model consultant.)

The group agreed with the Team's recommended data specifications for a regional parcel solution with the following exceptions.

- Stevenson commented that reference to a quarterly update cycle should be a moot issue since the system should be designed to permit a continuous flow of updated data. Gelbmann stated he agreed with this as an ultimate objective but in the near term it is not a realistic objective.
- The group questioned the apparent inconsistency between requiring monthly updates from the primary producers and requiring the regional custodian to post quarterly updates. Foster stated the monthly requirement was a remnant from a previous draft and should have been replaced with "quarterly". Charboneau noted that it takes time assimilate the changes from several primary data producers and offered that the requirement state the primary producers must provide data to the regional custodian as necessary to accomplish a quarterly regional update.
- The group also commented that the horizontal datum specification should specify the specific "adjustment", that Item 3 on page 27 of the agenda materials under strategy for a regional dataset is an appropriate specification but the results should be required to be reported and explained in the metadata, and several members thought reference to vertical datum information should be considered for inclusion in the specifications.

Motion: Stevenson moved and Gorg seconded to refer the proposed specifications for a regional parcel data solution (page 27 of the agenda materials) back to the Technical Advisory Team to address the comments and suggested modifications discussed by the Committee. Motion carried, ayes all.

Motion: Stevenson moved and Caswell seconded to postpone action on the roles and responsibilities for the parcel data information need (page 25 of the agenda materials) until regional custodian specifics are worked out. Motion failed, 3 ayes, 6 nays, 5 abstain.

Chairperson Henry asked for those who voted against the motion to share their reasons. Drealan, Welsch, and Erhahl stated they were opposed to tabling without direction. Caswell noted he is not convinced there is a need for a regional parcel dataset. Craig stated the remaining issues are policy based, not technical, and therefore should be referred to the Policy Advisory Team. Welsch concurred. Drealan preferred to separate the definition of the roles and responsibilities from their assignment to a particular agency, noting he agreed with the proposed roles, and believes it would be beneficial to the overall process to define the desired roles and responsibilities at this time. Wencil stated the regional parcel dataset will be the foundation for MetroGIS data solutions and that it is fundamental to act on.

Motion : Claypool moved and Erdahl seconded to accept the roles and responsibilities suggested by the Technical Advisory Team with any modifications that may result from the Technical Advisory Team's reconsideration of the issues raised by the

Committee and to forward to the Policy Advisory Team the matter of recommending an organization to serve as regional custodian for the parcel boundaries information need. Motion carried, ayes 13, nays 1 (Caswell).

Policy Chairperson Erdahl stated that the Policy Advisory Team would take this matter up as a component of its work on the Fair-Share Financial Model. She also commented she does believe it would be in MetroGIS' best interest to pursue the notion of the Metropolitan Council funding all of MetroGIS. She believes that if this were to be the case, obtaining widespread buy-in for MetroGIS could be compromised due to the political realities associated with the Council's regulatory responsibilities.

Chairperson Henry thanked everyone for their participation in discussion of these issues that are core to moving MetroGIS to the next level.

Conceptual Implementation Strategy:

Randall Johnson summarized a proposal to use a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to identify candidates for a regional parcel information need custodian. He explained that work on the RFP could begin as soon as the desired data specifications are agreed upon but that the RFP would not be published until the Committee is comfortable that the Policy Board will support moving MetroGIS to the next level. Given the preceding discussion, the group agreed that its consideration of this proposal is premature until more specifics are decided about the roles of the regional custodian and the role of the private sector as a financial partner to build and maintain a regional parcel data solution has been decided.

MCD Jurisdictional Boundary Guidelines for Primary Producers – Strategy to Test

Staff introduced this topic by stating Washington County has developed a set of guidelines for capture, updating and rectification of MCD Jurisdictional Boundary data inconsistencies as a pilot project for MetroGIS. Staff also reiterated that the current policy of MetroGIS is that primary custodians will not be required to revise internal business practices to accommodate the needs of MetroGIS and that any data manipulation to utilize primary data in a regional solution will be paid by the user. He also noted that guidelines, such as those developed by Washington County, would be offered to encourage primary producers to voluntarily accept and adhere to common practices that can, in turn, simplify the work of the regional custodian. These efficiencies could then passed along in the form of cost saving to the end user.

Technical Advisory Team Liaison Claypool summarized the Team's recommendations for a strategy to test the MCD Jurisdictional Boundary guidelines developed by Washington County. The Team recommended that two counties undertake separate tests of these guidelines before MetroGIS endorses them.

Erdahl noted that if none of the other counties wishes to participate in the suggested test that the guidelines developed by Washington County could be promoted for use by each county and if they choose to use them to notify MetroGIS of suggest amendments as the need arises.

The group asked Gelbmann to summarize any issues that the Metropolitan Council ran into when it created the regional MCD/County jurisdictional boundary dataset. Gelbmann noted that the Council ran into differences in accuracy and missing data and had to make judgements to merge and integrate data form the primary sources. He noted that some of these inconsistencies could be more effectively dealt with if common business practices were in place.

Arbeit stated there is currently no official uniform source of boundary information for cites in the state and noted the MCD jurisdictional boundaries dataset is a topic of discussion for the Data Committee of the Governors Council on Geographic Information. He stated the Data Committee is aware of Washington County's work in this area and encouraged the counties to review these guidelines and provide feedback.

Motion: Stevenson moved and Arbeit seconded to accept the MCD jurisdictional boundary guidelines developed by Washington County as guidelines for MetroGIS with the understanding: 1) they are intended to be improved and enhanced overtime and 2) the final report from Washington County will be updated to reflect the MetroGIS Policy Board's decision to endorse the Metropolitan Council as the regional custodian for the MCD Jurisdictional Boundary dataset. Motion carried, ayes all.

MetroGIS Benefits Study – Progress Report

Craig reported the following preliminary conclusions from his study: 1) regional datasets are very useful, 2) local user groups very beneficial to increasing levels of trust and thereby increased data sharing, and 3) school and watershed districts could be frequent users of parcel data from multiple counties but must deal with costs of data integration. Craig noted his study will include a MetroGIS Participant Satisfaction Survey. Gelbmann encouraged Craig to touch on areas of benefit other than data access such as data standards, provision of an Internet tool to search for data, etc. Craig noted there would be some anecdotal reference to these other forms of benefit in his final report.

#### Demonstration Topic for July 28th Policy Board Meeting

Chairperson Henry suggested and the group agreed that Policy Board Chairperson should summarize her testimony and the testimony of the other panelists before the US House of Representatives subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology on June 9th. It was also agreed that the examples of benefits from GIS technology included in the written testimony should be presented to the Board. Caswell apprised the group that an outcome of the 1999 GeoData Forum, of which the subcommittee hearing was a part, appears to be a commitment on the part of the FGDC to revisit and redefine governance expectations for the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI). He also apprised the members of the concept of a "chaotic organization" that was introduced at the forum and his belief that pursuing this concept could be what is needed to define a workable governance mechanism for NSDI.

#### Regional Census Geography Information Need Specifications

Technical Advisory Team Liaison Gelbmann summarized the process and Team's recommendation for desired data specifications for a regional 1990 census geography dataset. These specifications include conformance with The Lawrence Group's Street Centerline Dataset and with parcel boundaries as defined by each of the counties. Gelbmann also noted that the Metropolitan Council plans to move ahead with a contract with The Lawrence Group to develop this dataset and, subsequently, a regional 2000 census geography dataset. The roles and responsibilities for maintenance of these datasets will be worked out as part of the project and will be presented to the appropriate MetroGIS teams for consideration.

Motion: Drealan moved and Craig seconded to endorse the desired regional census geography dataset specifications recommended by the Technical Advisory Team and as presented in the agenda packet. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 6. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES UPDATE

No discussion of the narrative that was provided in the agenda materials (page 47 of the packet).

#### 7. INFORMATION SHARING

Randall Johnson summarized Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt's testimony on June 9th to a subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives in conjunction with the 1999 GeoData Forum. Craig summarized his efforts to speak with members of Minnesota's Congressional Delegation while in Washington for the 1999 GeoData Forum.

Charboneau noted that more and more organizations that his firm deals with know of and support the philosophies of the MetroGIS initiative and as a result his firm is experiencing excellent cooperation obtaining updates for their Street Centerline Dataset.

Theresa Foster noted she is coordinating a panel session for the 1999 State GIS/LIS Conference. The topic will be datasets endorsed by MetroGIS; the process used to identify desired data specifications, standards and guidelines; and pending regional datasets. She asked for volunteers to demonstrate the regional street centerline, MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary, and census geography datasets.

Due to lack of time, none of the other items identified in the agenda packet materials were discussed.

#### 8. NEXT MEETING

Thursday, September 23, 1999. Craig suggested that staff look in to the availability for future Committee meetings of the meeting room in the building where the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District is officed.

9. ADJOURN

Erdahl moved and Arbeit seconded to adjourn at 10:45 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.



## September 23, 1999 Agenda

Thursday, September 23, 1999  
Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC) – Rm 301  
Centennial Building, St. Paul, 8:30 to 10:30 a.m.

1. Call to Order & Introduce New Member  
(Les Maki – DNR)
  2. Accept Agenda
  3. Accept Meeting Summary
    - a. June 17th, 1999
  4. Summary of July 28th Policy Board Meeting
  5. Action and Discussion Items:
    - a. MetroGIS Benefits Study –Report on Preliminary Results
    - b. MetroGIS Fair Share Financial Model and Organizational Structure Recommendations
    - c. Regional Parcel Dataset - Desired Boundary Specifications (*Continue Consideration*)
    - d. Update – Subcommittee on Non-Government MetroGIS Participation
    - e. MetroGIS Business Plan Proposal – Update
    - f. Demonstration Topic for October 27th Policy Board Meeting
    - g. Draft Final Report from Fair Share Financial Model Consultant Team
  6. Strategic Initiatives Updates:
    - a. MetroGIS WEB Data Finder
    - b. Information Needs Project
    - c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Project
    - d. Long Term Financing and Organizational Structure Project (See Items 5b and c)
  7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
    - a. Summary of Data Guidelines Endorsed to Date
    - b. Information Policy Legislation Update (Mn SF2237 & U.S. HR354)
    - c. October 13-15 NSDI Organizational Structure Workshop Invitation.
    - d. MetroGIS Presentations at GIS/LIS Conference
    - e. ESRI Grant Application
    - f. MetroGIS Support of Local GIS User Group Forums
  8. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting – October 27<sup>th</sup>)  
December 16, 1999
  9. Adjourn
- \*\* Action requested



## September 23, 1999 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. It was held at the Minnesota State Planning offices in the Centennial Office Building, near the Capitol in St. Paul. Les Maki and Jeremy Johnson, the newest members of the Committee were introduced. Mr. Maki will be representing the Minnesota Department of Resources (DNR). Jeremy Johnson will be replacing Paul Leegard as Anoka County's representative. Paul Leegard recently left Anoka County for a position with MnDOT.

Members Present: Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Cities: Brad Henry (City of Minneapolis); Counties: Jerome Johnson (Anoka), Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); Bill Brown for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), and Jim Hentges (Scott), Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Non-Profits David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership); Schools: Dick Carlstrom and Lee Whitcraft (TIES); State: Dave Gorg (MnDOT) and Les Maki (DNR); Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP). and Watershed Districts: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District)

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation, Cities: Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville), Counties: David Claypool (Ramsey) and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Metropolitan: Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); and State David Arbeit (LMIC)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

Visitors: Trudy Richter, Richter and Richardson (Fair-Share Model Consultant Team), Ed Krum and John Connelly, co-chairs Technical Advisory Team, Steve Lehr (CB, Richardson and Ellis).

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as proposed.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Craig moved and Stevenson seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's June 17, 1999 meeting, as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. SUMMARY OF APRIL 21ST POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Henry summarized the major actions of the Policy Board at the July 28, 1999 meeting.

### 5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

MetroGIS Benefits Study – Report on Preliminary

Craig commented that his survey is comprised of two major components: 1) evaluate benefits of data sharing and 2) evaluate satisfaction with MetroGIS activities and policy. No preliminary results are available on the later but will be for the September 30th Policy Advisory Team meeting. Initial results for the data sharing component of the survey indicate: 1) significant data sharing is occurring within counties, 2) substantially less sharing of county data is occurring outside the county of origin among local units of governments, 3) the street centerline dataset is single most used multi-county dataset with 74 licenses, 4) Data Finder and metadata education efforts are appreciated – most acknowledge the need but put off do these tasks which these MetroGIS incentives are overcoming, 5) and most are appreciative of the networking opportunities sponsored and facilitated by

MetroGIS. There is widespread recognition that these efforts have resulted in better working relationships among organizations increasing trust and understanding that has, in-turn, resulted in increased data sharing activity. Craig's conclusion is that benefits are being derived from the data/products shared but that huge benefits are also being received through the process element of MetroGIS that open the doors to communication among the stakeholders. data sharing

#### MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Model and Organizational Structure

In the absence of Policy Team Chairperson Erdahl, Randall Johnson summarized the Policy Team's preliminary recommendations that had been shared for comment at the September 16, 1999 Peer Review Forum. These recommendations included a creating a formal organizational identity for MetroGIS separate from the Metropolitan Council and implementing a voluntary subscription fee program to equitably share support for: 1) development and maintenance of regional data solutions in excess of the business needs of any one participant but useful to many and 2) 21 data sharing enhancement/facilitation functions that focus on collaborative approaches to common GIS issues and opportunities.

Johnson also commented he believes that the message was not clear that the value of the regional datasets was not in the data but in elimination of the need to individually internalize the costs to integrate/merge the data received from multiple counties.

Chairperson Henry asked each member and visitors to comment on their perceptions of what was learned at the forum (most of the members attended the forum).

- Stevenson: Disagrees that MetroGIS needs to be separate entity from the Metropolitan Council to accomplish its objectives. He stated that many of the stakeholders have successfully and informal agreements accomplished collaborative GIS activities.
- Brown: Believes many of the attendees reacted to the proposal without an appreciation for the benefits that would accrue from the existence of datasets that eliminate the need to integrate data produced by the individual counties.
- Piggott: The differences between the \$500,000 (phase-in & partial functionality) and \$900,000 (all functions supported) proposals were not clear. He encouraged the group to settle on one budget amount to eliminate this confusion in subsequent discussions.
- Drealan: Many county officials are concerned about lost of revenue and the effect on ability to cost recover. Statements from participants that they were clear about the MetroGIS vision and objectives not borne out in their comments.
- Carlstrom: The school district officials who attended generally found the forum very informative. However, they are relatively new to GIS and for the time being at least are comfortable with free access to the parcel data currently available from the counties and to the regional street centerline data produced by The Lawrence Group and distributed by the Metropolitan Council.
- Hentges: Cities believe they will receive relatively little benefit from MetroGIS. The proposed fees are too high for local units of government.
- Aichinger: Attendance in addition to Coordinating Committee members too low to draw definitive conclusions. Not convinced a separate organizational entity necessary. Need to better define benefit in terms of current/future expenditure to support GIS. A dichotomy exists: those who are not using GIS do not appreciate the benefits of the proposed functions and datasets and those who have mature GIS operations are asking what is the benefit to them since they have already build what they need? Fees generally viewed to be too high even at the \$500,000 level. The proposed \$1,000 credit for organizations participating in a local GIS users group generally thought to be too low. If a subscription fee is pursued it should have the flexibility to pay for only the data types needed and consideration should be given to a substantially higher fee for non-members.
- Craig: To meet local government needs, every regional information need may not need to be filled with a regional dataset. Several participants asked about the affect on the tax payer of lack of coordination among government, utility, etc. organizations when meeting individual data needs and concluded that some cooperation is in the public interest to minimize redundancies.
- Srock: Most will have a clear idea of the value of the proposed regional solutions until they use them in their day-to-day operations. NSP does not need the accuracy that local governments need at the present time.
- Gelbmann: Many questioned fairness of proposed fee. Others expressed concern for the need for more flexibility for those who might be only periodic users.
- Krum: What is the cost to the taxpayer for lack of coordination when meeting internal needs for data? Need more education of value to smaller units of government and why important for them to participate.

- Foster: The vision is not widely understood.
- Gorg: Mn/DOT is very interested in a seamless regional parcel dataset. The higher the accuracy the higher the interest.
- Maki: Noted that a high priority of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information is its Land Modernization initiative to assist counties develop and maintain computerized geospatial land records databases in a format compatible with one another. The MetroGIS regional parcel database solution should be coordinated with this initiative. DNR is interested in a successful seven county parcel data solution, applicable to the remainder of the state, as it would reduce the integration they need to do internally.
- Chairperson Henry: In his experience with GIS, people do not understand the benefits until they see their data on the map. He offered the philosophy that learning is best accomplished through a structured "tell-show-do" environment, noting that he believes we are in the "tell" phase with most perspective MetroGIS participants. He also noted that most of the Policy Advisory Team members experienced some sticker shock when the results of the current model assumptions first shared by the consultant but after some thought the benefit to cost was justifiable.
- Johnson: Inadequate support exists for funding development of regional datasets with subscription fees paid by local government. There appears to be some support for a subscription fee to fund the continuation of MetroGIS' communication, research, outreach, data distribution (Data Finder) and consensus building aspects that promote and document benefits of data sharing. That the most expedient way to develop regional datasets will, in the near term, continue to be through small consortiums of organizations with investors other than local government, as was the case with acquisition of a license for The Lawrence Group's street centerline dataset, orthoimagery, etc. It was noted that in her comments to a Congressional Subcommittee in June, Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt asked the federal government to absorb some of the risk for regional collaboratives by providing "bridge financing" until a stable revenue stream can be established. Chairperson Reinhardt intends to speak with the MN Congressional delegation to encourage them to support the C/FIP program that would provide funding to regional collaboratives such as MetroGIS.

Stevenson stated he believes the technical design for a regional parcel dataset could be developed relatively quickly by staff and that through partnering with non-government interests its development could be financed at a level acceptable to all. He also stated he believes providing access to non-government organizations for internal business use is a logical extension of the philosophy set forth in the current GIS data and cost sharing agreements. Srock mentioned he concurs there would be clear benefit to private sector interests that have not already invested significant funds to develop a parcel database as has NSP. He does not believe there would be sufficient value to NSP to participate financially.

Gelbmann commented he believes some of the most successful accomplishments of MetroGIS have involved bringing together small groups of collaborators who have met a data development need. Fostering this coordination/facilitator role to develop commonly accepted approaches should continue to be a focus of MetroGIS.

Wencil stated he believes that the federal government could benefit MetroGIS. But, because federal policy states that if data are purchased/cost-shared they must become public domain, he does not believe the federal agencies can make effective use of the proposed regional datasets at this time. He also is not sure which agency(ies) would be in a position to pay an annual subscription fee.

Maki stated DNR created their internet-based Data Deli and decided to give their data away to anyone who wants it for three reasons – 1) giving data away promotes sharing, 2) selling data created with public funds creates ill will and 3) they could not cost effectively service the data requests. He also mentioned that data requests took off once DNR developed desk top applications which enabled their people to begin use the data on daily basis and suggested that MetroGIS may want to consider adding cooperative application development to the list of functions to be supported.

Charboneau introduced Steve Lehr of CB Richardson & Ellis as one representative of thirty-some private firms that have expressed interest in purchasing a regional parcel dataset for the metro area provided the price is fair, noting that the current prices charged by the individual counties are generally viewed to be excessive. Mr. Lehr stated his firm is very interested in collaborating with area counties to obtain and integrate parcel data for a regional coverage. He emphasized their use would be for internal purposes, that is they would not repackage and sell the data, that their goal is to use the same platform as the counties, but that they need some experience with the county parcel data to decide whether obtaining it would be the most cost effective means to achieve their needs. He likened the efforts of MetroGIS to the early days of the computer industry. The computer industry did not take off until there was a critical mass of desktop users who had proven to themselves the investment was cost effective. He predicted that a similar phenomenon will occur with regional dataset development and use.

To gain the experience they need, he offered to sponsor a pilot project that would not only further their understanding but also help MetroGIS to continue to work through issues pertaining to development and access to a regional parcel dataset.

At the group's request, staff explained that the average annual cost to support the MetroGIS initiative over the past three years has been around \$400,00 (4 FTE and 125,000 to \$150,000 in direct project funding). Stevenson commented that costs to support MetroGIS should continue to be absorbed by the Council as a function of its regional government responsibilities as opposed to being shared with other participants. There was no group discussion of Stevenson's suggestion other than to acknowledge this is a policy matter to be taken up between the Metropolitan Council and the MetroGIS Policy Board. He also agreed to supply staff and to head up a workgroup that will work on a way to cost effectively develop a regional parcel dataset using county data to resolve data needs for metropolitan, state and federal stakeholders. The Committee also concurred that it would be appropriate for the Charboneau's subcommittee that is looking into non-government participation in MetroGIS to work closely with Stevenson's workgroup as potential partners. Staff suggested that both groups become acquainted with the subregional parcel data model prototyped by the North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition as a means to make sure everyone has a similar understanding of the desired outcome.

Aichinger moved and Wencil seconded to: 1) that the logic of the proposed fair share model is valid but that more local government benefit has been assumed than perceived and to find that it is in the public interest to continue to mature the MetroGIS project and 2) to direct the Policy Advisory Team to modify the recommendation shared at the Peer Review Forum as follows for consideration by the Policy Board on October 27th:

1. Remove the data development function from the 22 core and desirable functions endorsed by the Policy Board September 1998 for purposes of the implement a fair-share cost allocation scheme.
2. Recommend a finding of adequate public purpose to move forward with development of a business plan for MetroGIS as an entity that would focus on the previously identified non-data development functions that foster data sharing and that the business plan should investigate the following matters in addition to the specifications previously identified in the Policy Advisory Team's recommendation:
  - Undertake a thorough cost-benefit evaluation.
  - Formalize a policy that development of regional datasets will be deferred to small groups of interested parties guided by standards and guidelines endorsed by MetroGIS and that local government will not be looked to to support development of regional data through the proposed subscription fee program.
  - Evaluate the impact on the cost to support each of the other 21 endorsed functions, assuming MetroGIS would not take the lead for the actual development of regional datasets.
  - Evaluate the appropriateness of the Metropolitan Council paying for all of non-data development coordination/facilitation functions as one of its duties as a regional government.
  - Reevaluate the need for entity separate from the Metropolitan Council to accomplish non-data development functions.

Motion carried, Ayes - 15, Nays – 1 (Stevenson). Stevenson stated he is opposed to the business plan proposal if it involves establishment of MetroGIS as a separate entity from the Metropolitan Council.

#### Desired Data Specifications for a Regional Parcel Boundary Dataset

Staff explained the Committee had postponed action on this item at its June 17th meeting and had directed the Technical Advisory Team to evaluate how the proposed specifications should address HARN adjustments. Technical Advisory Team Co-chair Krum summarized the recommendation of the Team at its August meeting to postpone a decision on HARN adjustments until 2001. An inconsistency for the update specification was also revised to state "monthly".

Motion: Stevenson moved and Gelbmann seconded to accept the revised specifications as presented in Appendix A of the accompanying staff report. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### Update - Subcommittee on Non-Government Participation

Charboneau stated that the subcommittee has prepared a list of over 30 non-government entities that have expressed interest in obtaining parcel data for the metro area. Mr. Lehr affirmed his interest in assisting with a pilot project to evaluate whether private sector interests can be met through collaboration with the seven counties. Charboneau agreed to work closing with Stevenson's regional parcel dataset workgroup (Item 4b). Use of the North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition's prototype was again suggested as a place to ground both groups in a common vision.

#### MetroGIS Business Plan

See Item 4b. Motion includes direction relating to preparation of a business plan. Stevenson reiterated his objection to a conclusion that MetroGIS should pursue a separate identity from the Metropolitan Council.

#### Demonstration Topic for October 27th Policy Board Meeting

Stevenson offered a presentation Dakota County made to a health conference concerning a lead risk study undertaken by the County. The Committee accepted Stevenson's offer.

#### Draft Final Report – Fair-Share Financial Model Study.

Staff noted that a draft copy of the document had been emailed to each member late Wednesday afternoon for the Committee's information and background for this meeting. Staff will be submitting comments on Friday and a final draft is expected within a week or so.

### 6. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES UPDATE

Staff briefly noted that the Metropolitan Council is in the process of filling a two-year temporary GIS Specialist/Internet position. One of this person's responsibilities will be to refine the requirements for support of Data Finder. Staff also mentioned that negotiations are in progress to extent the Dakota, Ramsey and Scott County data and cost sharing agreement for two additional years. There was no discussion.

### 7. INFORMATION SHARING

Staff called attention to the summary in the packet (page 54) of the data standards that have been endorsed by MetroGIS and encourage the members to promote their use. Craig also noted that the topic of the October NSDI Workshop in Denver will be a concept for an innovative organizational structure developed for the VISA Corporation and is hopeful that the ideas shared may be applicable to the organizational issues with which MetroGIS is wrestling. There was no discussion of the other items listed in the narrative.

### 8. NEXT MEETING

Thursday, December 16th, 1999

### 9. ADJOURN

Gelbmann moved and Arbeit seconded to adjourn at 10:45 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.



## December 16, 1999 Agenda

Thursday, December 16, 1999  
Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC) – Rm 302  
Centennial Building, St. Paul  
8:30 to 10:30 a.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. September 23, 1999 **Action**
4. Summary of October 27th Policy Board Meeting
5. Action and Discussion Items:
  - a. Regional Data Solutions:
    1. Census Geography – Roles and Responsibilities **Action**
    2. Land Cover – Data Specifications & Roles and Responsibilities **Action**
  - a. Regional Data Development Process **Action**
  - b. Regional Parcel Data – Technical Design Update
  - c. MetroGIS Business Plan – Function Priority Rankings **Action**
  - d. 2000 Meeting Schedule **Action**
  - e. National GIS-T (Transportation) Conference – MetroGIS Presentation **Action**
6. Strategic Initiatives Updates:
  - a. MetroGIS WEB Data Finder
  - b. Information Needs Project
  - c. GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Project
  - d. Long-Term Financing and Organizational Structure Project
7. Information Sharing -- MetroGIS Related Activities
  - a. Grant Application to Mn Board of Innovation and Cooperation
  - b. Metropolitan Council Survey Results - MetroGIS/GIS Responses
  - c. Letter of Support National DGRS Implementation and GPS Modernization
  - d. NSDI GeoData Organizational Initiative
8. Next Meeting (Policy Board Meeting – January 26th)  
  
February 17, 2000 (suggested)
9. Adjourn

## December 16, 1999 Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER Chairperson Henry called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. It was held at the Minnesota State Planning offices in the Centennial Office Building, near the Capitol in St. Paul.

Members Present: Academics: Will Craig (CURA); Cities: Brad Henry (Minneapolis); Counties: Gary Stevenson (Dakota), Dave Drealan (Carver); Gary Caswell and Chuck Kruger for Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin), David Claypool (Ramsey), Jim Hentges (Scott), and Virginia Erdahl (Washington); Federal: Ron Wencil (USGS); GIS Consultants: Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); Metropolitan: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Schools: Dick Carlstrom (TIES); State: David Arbeit (LMIC) and Dave Gorg (MnDOT), and Utilities: Alan Srock (NSP).

Members Absent: Business Geographics: Tim Nuteson (Dayton Hudson Corporation, Cities: Dennis Welsch (City of Roseville), Counties: Jeromy Johnson (Anoka; State: Les Maki (DNR), Non-Profits David Piggott (Metro East Economic Development Partnership) and Watershed Districts: Cliff Aichinger (Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District). (Richard Johnson resigned from his position with the Metropolitan Council, effective December 20, 1999. A replacement representative to the Coordinating Committee had not been named at the time of the Committee's meeting.)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

Visitors: Trudy Richter, Richter and Richardson (Fair-Share Model Consultant Team), Steve Lehr and Jeff Auger (CB Richard Ellis) and Shannon Txx (ESRI)

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as proposed.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Craig moved and Arbeit seconded to approve the minutes for the Committee's September 23, 1999 meeting, as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

### 4. SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 27th POLICY BOARD MEETING

Chairperson Henry briefly stated the major actions of the Policy Board at the October 27, 1999 meeting. There was no discussion.

### 5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### *Regional Information Need Solutions*

#### *Census Geography – Roles and Responsibilities*

Rick Gelbmann, liaison to the Technical Advisory Team and manager of the Census Geography project, summarized the Team's recommendations outlined in Attachment A of the corresponding staff report, noting that the Metropolitan Council had accepted the role of regional custodian for the census geography information need.

Gelbmann explained that the Council had entered into a contract with The Lawrence Group (TLG) to build a 1990 regional census geography dataset, registering it to the both the regional street centerline dataset and parcel boundary data maintained by the counties. The 1990 dataset is currently undergoing testing. When the testing is completed the final data specifications will be documented. He also noted that work on development of a 2000 regional census geography dataset will begin as soon as preliminary boundary information is released by the Census Bureau, which is expected to occur by summer 2000.

Gelbmann also explained the Metropolitan Council will own the regional census geography dataset but once complete it will freely distribute it via the Internet. However, the address ranges associated with the street centerline dataset will not be

attached to the census geography dataset. The Committee commended the Council for accepting the regional custodian responsibility and for deciding to make it freely available.

Gelbmann moved and Stevenson seconded to recommend that the MetroGIS Policy Board approve the data specifications and roles and responsibilities of the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian for the 1990 and 2000 Census Geography Information Needs, as presented in Attachment A of the accompanying staff report. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### a(2) Land Cover – Data Specifications & Roles and Responsibilities

Rick Gelbmann, liaison to the Technical Advisory Team and member of the Department of Natural Resource's (DNR) Land Cover project team, summarized the Technical Advisory Team's recommendations as outlined in the corresponding staff report, noting that the DNR had accepted the role of regional custodian for the MetroGIS Land Cover information need.

Gelbmann stressed that land cover is the not same as land use and that the proposed recommendations relate principally to vegetation types. He also noted that although the DNR was heading up the project it is based on pilot studies conducted in the metro area. And since DNR has a ways to go to achieve endorsement as a statewide standard, the Technical Advisory Team elected to endorse the proposed classification scheme as a "best practice" for the time being. Wencil, also a liaison to the Technical Advisory Team, noted that he suggested the "best practices" recommendation for MetroGIS participants because the proposed scheme is a hybrid of existing classification schemes and he is uncomfortable endorsing as a standard, in particular, until DNR has received endorsement throughout the state.

Stevenson commented that the classification scheme, with its five levels, is very complicated and that few local government officials will have the expertise to use all of the levels but that the flexibility built into the scheme should accommodate local needs. He also concurred it is too early to endorse as a standard. Arbeit encouraged MetroGIS to be involved in the upcoming discussions to seek endorsement of this scheme statewide to ensure a crosswalk between metro and statewide needs. The group concurred but decided not to include in its formal action.

Gelbmann moved and Arbeit seconded to recommend that the MetroGIS Policy Board:

1. Approve the Minnesota Land Cover Classification System (MLCCS) as a current best practice for all land cover analysis projects in the metro area.
2. Approve the general data specifications and regional data custodian responsibilities as stated in the accompanying staff report.
3. Approve the Technical Advisory Team's recommendation to co-sponsor a training session with the DNR for all interested MetroGIS stakeholders.

Motion carried, ayes all.

#### *Regional Data Development Process*

Theresa Foster, MetroGIS Technical Coordinator, presented the schematic of MetroGIS' Business Information Needs process noting it describes the processes that have been used to date to address priority MetroGIS business information needs. Foster commented that by design it is a flexible process. Foster then introduced Trudy Richter who is assisting MetroGIS to prepare a business plan. Ms. Richter noted that it is important to the Business Planning process to clearly identify each of the steps in the process and to tie them back to the Policy Board's policy decision on October 27, 1999 to concentrate MetroGIS role on coordination activities necessary to achieve data solutions for the its priority regional information needs. Ms. Richter also noted that an equally important component of the schematic is the task (upper right-hand corner) to identify business information beyond the current 13 priorities to ensure a long-term focus. Staff Johnson noted that once work is well in hand to define the specifications and custodial roles and responsibilities for the top thirteen information needs, the current plan is to readminister the survey that was prototyped by MetroGIS in 1997 to establish additional information need priorities.

Wencil moved and Craig seconded to approve the schematic illustration of the MetroGIS Business Information Needs process, as presented in the accompanying staff report, subject to adding a title and changing to text box "Existing Dataset" to "Existing Datasets". Motion carried, ayes all.

## *Regional Parcel Data – Technical Design Update*

Stevenson, project manager for the regional parcel technical design pilot, provided the Committee with a written (see the handout that is attached to this summary for more information) and oral summary of the accomplishments of the pilot project. He provided a live ArcView presentation that illustrated how six of the seven counties parcel boundary data had been merged to form a regional dataset. Anoka County data had not yet been received due to turn over of staff at Anoka County. Stevenson noted that several issues remained to be dealt with which involve varying procedures among the seven counties (multiple pins, right-of-way coding, etc.)

In his report to the Committee, Stevenson stated that the pilot "definitely demonstrated that a Regional Parcel Database can be accomplished with little effort and expense. He also offered a possible scenario in which MetroGIS maintains an FTP site where a server runs automated procedures to combine, verify, and install data for applications. Counties could run automated pre-processing procedures to prepare the data, transform to UTM, and upload the data to the MetroGIS server." He also stressed that it is extremely important that no modifications should be made to the parcel geometry at the server level, that each county should remain responsible for its data and that each county should update the data based on its individual business needs for its own users.

Stevenson stated he believes the pilot study workgroup has accomplish its goal but that the workgroup is prepared to continue to work on a means normalize parcel attribute data among the seven counties, and cooperatively develop procedures and applications for pre-and post-process data of parcel data.

At this point, Stevenson provided a live demonstration of the merged parcel data using ArcView software. The file with parcel boundary data and limited attributes from six counties is currently about 380 megabytes in size. Steven estimated with the addition of Anoka County's data and expansion of the attributes to a core set consistent with the prior work of the Technical Advisory Team that the entire file would be under 500 megabytes or capable of being distributed on a single CD-ROM. Stevenson also commented that the parcel boundary data provided by each of the six counties was very similar in accuracy because each used GPS to capture the boundary coordinates and as such "stitching them together" was straight forward with few gaps and overlaps that would cause problems for regional applications.

Krueger asked what type of scripting was involved to merge the boundary data from six counties. Stevenson noted scripting was not used. His team simply converted each county's data to UTM and the fit together as shown in the demonstration. He further noted there was nothing to stitch together.

Arbeit stated that workgroup's work is very encouraging. He also asked what was learned from the I-35 Corridor Coalition's experience integrating on a smaller scale. Stevenson stated that I-35W elected to "rubber sheet" Anoka County parcel boundary data to line-up with the more accurate Ramsey County data. Stevenson believes this process involves more resources than needed where the other six counties adjoin, again due to similarity in the manner in which they each collected their parcel boundary data. Stevenson stressed the need for a policy that data maintained by each county should not be modified by others. Arbeit asked what would be lost if post processing currently undertaken by I-35W is not done. Stevenson commented that his perspective no significant issues would arise although he acknowledged he has not worked with Anoka County's data.

Gorg asked how the National Data Accuracy Standard would be applied to the regional dataset. It was agreed it would be applied to each county separately and that the accuracy component of the metadata would mostly likely vary from county to county.

Craig praised the pilot project workgroup, noting their work is a dream come true and don't stop. Craig's comment led to discussion of issues and next steps, including the need for testing by a variety of stakeholders and associated access/licensing concerns. Chairperson Henry asked each county representative to express their thoughts about issues and next steps:

- Claypool (Ramsey) cited a need for a high level of communication and active participation by each of the counties in the decision-making concerning how their parcel data will be merged into a regional solution and policies concerning distribution of merged data.
- Stevenson (Dakota) noted that he is beginning to see a change in philosophy among county board members and their concern for too much information currently available that may evolve into opposition to a regional parcel dataset.
- Erdahl (Washington) supports development of a regional parcel dataset but would like more information about the cost to the county to supply data to MetroGIS before full speed ahead. Stevenson noted that he expects the vast

majority of the cost to the counties will involve the need to develop automated procedures. Staff Johnson noted that a principle of MetroGIS is that the users and or grant funds will be expected to pay for costs that exceed internal business needs.

- Drealan (Carver) stated he is very pleased with the work to date and definitely believes worth the effort. He raised a concern that Carver County staff have little time to supply data to MetroGIS and supported the automated approach.
- Hentges (Scott) supports the work and findings concerning parcel boundary data but is concerned that normalizing parcel attributes for access by cross-county applications may be more difficult and time consuming, noting that without access to standardized attributes the value of parcel data is substantially diminished. Craig suggested that the workgroup continue its work on normalizing parcel attribute data for each of the seven counties by concentrating initially on the 24 core attributes already identified by a workgroup he headed up for the Technical Advisory Team.
- Caswell (Hennepin) strongly supported the need to provide automated processes to allow users to integrate data from multiple counties but questioned the need to provide regional datasets. This comment initiated a discussion concerning the need for local government users of multiple county parcel data (watersheds, school districts, and cities located on county boundaries) to test the procedures and to assist MetroGIS define the meaning of the mission statement phrase "data ... in a form readily useable".

Gelbmann offered a suggestion for the next steps (expand the pilot study to include Anoka County's parcel boundary data, define a distribution mechanism, and define a common license agreement) and offered to provide and staff a FTP site at the Metropolitan Council.

Gorg stated that Mn/DOT is a proponent of and user of regional datasets and, as such, offered to head up a workgroup of state and regional interests to evaluate the value added by existence of a regional parcel dataset as opposed to the user having to merge data from each of the seven counties on their own, notwithstanding the existence of automated procedures.

Chairperson Henry commented that licensing will be a key issue and asked the group how it wished to proceed with the concept of access by non-government interests. Charboneau commented that MetroGIS needs to find a way to fund itself, noting that the private sector is a logical partner and from his experience is willing to pay for access as a natural course of doing business provided the fee is reasonable. The user should be permitted to obtain the data and do as they choose with it.

Craig concurred with Henry that licensing and access policies must be worked out upfront and in place before the data is available for distribution.

Trudy Richter, MetroGIS Business Plan consultant, offered a revised listing of next steps for the Committee's consideration (lead entity in italics):

- Complete the regional parcel dataset (add Anoka County) and develop a mechanism to expand the core attributes to the 24 previously identified by a workgroup of the Technical Advisory Team (Regional Parcel Data Pilot Study Workgroup)
- Develop distribution mechanism (Metropolitan Council GIS Unit working with Pilot Study Workgroup)
- Resolve licensing and data sharing issues among government interests and their designated 3<sup>rd</sup> parties (County representatives to Coordinating Committee)
- Evaluate added value of a regional parcel dataset to state and regional interests (Mn/DOT)
- Evaluate privatization option and access by non-government entities (Trudy Richter working with existing public-private partnership workgroup)

Erdahl moved and Craig seconded to approve the five next steps as stated above with the understanding that: 1) policy issues must be dealt with before any substantive work is undertaken by the pilot study workgroup to develop automated procedures and 2) successfully addressing the difficult issues that were ignored for the pilot study (many-to-one relationships, differences in coding procedures among the counties, etc) are at the core of a broadly supported solution, and 3) the policy issues should be presented to the Board at its January 2000 meeting for direction and information. Motion carried, ayes all.

The county representatives affirmed that they did not need any assistance from MetroGIS staff to resolve licensing issues concerning access by other government entities to the regional parcel dataset created by the regional parcel data pilot study workgroup.

Chairperson Henry asked the group for permission to extend the meeting beyond 10:30 a.m. All agreed to do so.

#### *MetroGIS Business Plan – Function Priority Rankings*

Craig presented an overview of the methodology and results from his 1999 MetroGIS Benefits Study. The majority of his remarks pertained to component of the study that pertained the ranking of the 22 functions that the Policy Board had endorsed for MetroGIS in September 1998. The survey asked each of 150-plus respondents to answer on a 1-5 scale how important each of the functions was to their organization and to answer yes or no to whether MetroGIS should invest in each of the functions. Craig commented that the county respondents do not generally see the need to invest in many of the functions but are willing to provide their data to those who are willing to finance the functions. The overall results of the function rankings were presented in a 9-cell, two-axis matrix. Decision rules for five function categories as endorsed by Policy Advisory Team at its December 1st meeting, were summarized.

Staff noted that the Policy Advisory Team was seeking assistance from the Committee to better understand the diversity in the rankings among the organization types concerning the functions that fell into the Selectively Desirable (Med/Med) category to help it complete its recommended function rankings for the MetroGIS Business Plan. No comment was received regarding the proposed function category names or decision rules.

The only function that received comment was G – Create and maintain datasets for MetroGIS .... Staff stated that the MetroGIS Policy Board had taken action on October 27th based, in part, upon preliminary results from this survey. That action was to limit MetroGIS' involvement in development of regional datasets to fostering the coordination activities necessary to achieve broadly supported regional datasets but not to directly finance the actual data development through a subscription fee or other means. Craig noted that he believes one of the reasons for the diversity among the respondents was the survey question was too broad – if a respondent disagreed with a couple of the 13 priorities he believes they may have given a lower rating. He also commented that the concept of a one-stop-shop for data for multiple entities is generally more desirable to a data user, such as himself, as opposed to the need to contact numerous data producers on one's own. After a lengthy discussion, the group concluded that the current policy of case-by-case versus a blanket endorsement for regional dataset development and for a primary focus on guidelines and best practices are the most appropriate roles for MetroGIS.

#### *2000 Meeting Schedule*

Erdahl moved and Arbeit seconded to set the following meeting schedule for 2000: February 17, April 27, June 29, September 28, and December 14. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### *National GIS-T (Transportation) Conference - MetroGIS Presentation*

Rick Gelbmann reviewed the proposal to have MetroGIS represented in the presentations at the National GIS-T Conference to be held in the Twin Cities March 27-29, 2000. Gorg commented that he supports the idea, noting that many organizations around the county recognize the value of the partnerships that Minnesotan's have been able to develop and maintain. MetroGIS is an excellent example and should be shared at the conference. Randall Johnson stated he and other MetroGIS officials will be presenting at the National NACO Conference in Washington D.C the first week in March and that the presentation materials might also be useful at the GIS-T Conference. Chairperson Henry volunteered to present at the GIS-T conference. No decision was made as to who else might participate in the presentation, other than Rick Gelbmann who will be moderating the session, or who will prepare the presentation materials.

#### 6. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES UPDATE

There was no discussion of the information provided in the agenda materials.

#### 7. INFORMATION SHARING

There was no discussion of the information provided in the agenda materials other than for th4e application to the MN Board on Innovation and Cooperation. Steven stated that he is opposed to the application if the funds would be used to hire a consultant to define the technical specifications for a regional parcel dataset. .

## 8. OTHER BUSINESS

Claypool updated the group on the progress of Steve Lehr's private sector pilot project to evaluate the usefulness of county parcel data to the information needs of CB Richard Ellis. (Refer to the memorandum from Steve Lehr that is attached to this summary for more information.) Mr. Lehr stated that the private sector would appreciate an opportunity to be involved in the ranking of data priorities. He also asked for a commitment from the group to allow his group to remain involved in the work of MetroGIS given their large investment. Erdahl commented that Mr. Lehr's investigation is an outgrowth of the public-private partnership subcommittee of the Policy Advisory Team (Erdahl, Claypool and Charboneau) charged with finding ways to involve the private sector as directed by the Policy Board. The group concurred that Mr. Lehr should be provided with all of the county parcel data and leave it up to them to decide what is useful and what is not.

## NEXT MEETING

Thursday, February 17, 2000

## 9. ADJOURN

Erdahl moved and Claypool seconded to adjourn at 1:10 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.