



MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

September 20, 2012 (*Minutes Approved: December 20, 2012*)

Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul, MN

Meeting Attendance

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Members:

David Bitner, Chair, *Metropolitan Airports Commission*
David Brandt, Vice Chair, *Washington County*
Melissa Baker, *Capitol-Ramsey Watershed District*
Adam Fisher, *Minnesota Commercial Association of Realtors*
Rick Gelbmann, *Metropolitan Council*
Joella Givens, *MnDOT*
Josh Gumm, *Scott County*
Pete Henschel, *Carver County*
Randy Knippel, *Dakota County*
Mark Kotz, *Metropolitan Council*
Nancy Read, *Metropolitan Mosquito Control District*
Dan Ross, *MnGeo*
John Slusarczyk, *Anoka County*
Gary Swenson, *Hennepin County*
Ben Verbick, *LOGIS*

MetroGIS Policy Board Members:

Terry Schneider, Policy Board Chair, *City of Minnetonka/Metro Cities*

Staff:

Geoff Maas, *MetroGIS Coordinator*

Agenda Item 1: Call To Order

Chair Bitner called meeting to order at 1:10 PM

Agenda Item 2: Approve meeting agenda.

Chair Bitner, suggested a swap of items 6c and 6b in the agenda order.
Approval of revised meeting agenda: ***Gumm, motion; Brandt, second.***

Agenda Item 3: Approve Meeting Summary from June 21, 2012:

Ben Verbick requested one minor change to the June 21 Meeting Minutes
Exchanging the "LOGIS" with "MN GIS/LIS" on page p. 5; Maas agreed to make and publish the change.
Approval of June 21, 2012 meeting minutes: ***Verbick, motion; Givens, second.***

Agenda Item 4: Summary of Recent Policy Board Activity

4a) Policy Board Meeting on July 25, 2012:

Chairman Bitner and Coordinator Maas provided a brief summary of the June 25 Policy Board Meeting and where the changing role of the MetroGIS Policy Board was discussed and a variety of possible options to reconfigure the body were advanced and discussed. These discussions are expected to continue through upcoming Policy Board meetings.

4b) Policy Board Executive Committee Meeting on August 16, 2012:

Chairman Bitner and Coordinator Maas provided a brief summary of the August 16 Executive Session of the Policy Board where Chairman Schneider, Commissioners Reinhardt and Kordiak, Council Member Elkins and Coordinating Committee Chair Bitner and Coordinator Maas met to discuss the changing role of the MetroGIS Policy Board. Issues discussed included addressing the declining attendance of elected officials, the expanded role of alternates and discussion of potential new scenarios for Policy Board function and operation.

Agenda Item 5: Lightning Round and Updates

Note: The following statements represent a good faith effort by the meeting recorder to capture the statements made by the participants and are not a word-for-word transcription of the opinions, ideas or thoughts expressed.

Brandt: Washington County will be engaging in a lean kaizen event to improve its property records flow

Gumm: Scott County met with Hennepin County's development group to discuss methodology, information exchange and future collaboration opportunities

Knippel: Updated the group on the upcoming eight county IT Collaboration (seven Metro counties plus Olmsted); IT Managers coming together to discuss administrative work and their expectations for using private fiber connections.

Read: Mentioned the aerial photo survey, and expressed her hope that the members around the table participated in it

Kotz: Mentioned that the proposed state parcel data attribute standard from MnGeo standards committee is now available; the state standards have built upon (added to) the set of standards already in place by MetroGIS and may affect the MetroGIS specifications in the future.

Fisher: Indicated that MNDAR has hired Megan Barnett-Livgard into its economic development realm, seeking participation of other businesses who want to use their data.

Slusarczyk: Discussed federal grants for fiber connectivity, and recent discussions between county staff, IT staff and Anoka County cities; cities want better access to GIS data; Anoka County received \$70,000 in grant funds for geodatabase replication, purchase software, setting up servers.

Baker: The Watershed district is exploring grants for impervious surface work, looking forward to moving again on storm sewer data standard

Henschel: Carver County is working on grants for fiber-optic network development

Verbick: Briefed the group on the work going into upcoming MN GIS/LIS conference

Gelbmann: Discussed the Corridors of Opportunity projects the Council is involved in: a HUD funded initiative, \$5 million dollar grant for 3 years involving numerous organizations, 7 corridors + how to interlink the best including the realms of transit land use, housing, economic development opportunities; with numerous opportunities for GIS and spatial data for analysis, display and reporting. The Council will likely be looking for additional data from cities and other actors in the region as the project develops.

Givens: Summarized the status of the OET/MNIT consolidation process and where GIS is falling into the new business model

Swenson: Mentioned that significant changes are happening in public works, transit, environmental services; a new assistant county administrator had been hired and she is looking to eliminate “siloed” behavior and to revamp the data resources, better awareness within the county of what is available and how it can be leveraged; larger focus on enterprise thinking.

Ross: Discussed the interest at the state level about fiber networks; MnGeo is mapping fiber schematics of all state assets, using ESRI schematics for conducting the work. Also that 2013 will be a large time of transition time for both MnGeo and the state. New business model in development, IT consolidation and optimization goals across the board, which will also have changes and implications for how the state does GIS.

Agenda Item 6: Action and Discussion Items:

6a) MetroGIS Work Plan Update:

Coordinator Maas presented a recommendation that the existing work, business and strategy plans be folded into one concise document describing what MetroGIS will be pursuing in the next work plan cycle (2013-2016).

Maas asked permission from the group to form a Work Plan Workgroup for one meeting to review and as needed, to revise a plan draft to be developed and delivered for review and approval at the December Coordinating Committee meeting. Kotz, Ross, Bitner, Gelbmann, Swanson and Read agreed to serve on the workgroup (tentatively to be held in November).

6b (formerly 6c); MetroGIS Policy Board Reformation Discussion:

Schneider : At the last Policy Board meeting a dynamic discussion of what should the future role of the Policy Board took place. Is the body simply in existence to just maintain and serve as custodian of what it has already done, or do we need to be more active? What stakeholders need to be more directly participating?

If in fact what we're [the Policy Board] is just doing maintenance, if we're not doing policy, we may not need a Policy Board anymore; our initial concepts are working and can be carried forward and maintained by this [the Coordinating] Committee.

We need to explore those other opportunities and how do we integrate with MnGeo and other statewide efforts? Stakeholder expansion including the real estate industry and other members of the public community; how do we more meaningfully engage with them, and how we should be structured, what other elements do we need to address?

Most likely, the Policy Board will be reconfigured into a different format.

Success includes a better workplan, clearly identifying who is the champion for the various pieces, or they will not get done; a lot of interest + passion and willingness to contribute time and resources.

Who leads, how it unfolds is yet to be determined. We recognize that non-profits, who are major consumers of data, don't have enough resources to make a significant dent, we need the private sectors engagement, they have the resources, but perhaps not the time, energy and resources.

Engaging the private sector, we should encourage them to form their own Coordinating Committee or comparable body of their stakeholder groups; then appoint their chair to participate on the revised policy board of MetroGIS. Another limitation we have is our near complete reliance on Metropolitan Council for funding, in some sense this doesn't allow MetroGIS to grow or expand.

Changing Role of the MetroGIS Policy Board; key question is how to keep the policy makers engaged when little policy or funding is being decided upon.

Major discussion point of the last Policy Board meeting; How does MetroGIS maintain its political connectedness without being too onerous on the elected officials, this discussion prompted a second discussion (executive committee) on the details. A variety of scenarios were discussed for their strengths and drawbacks.

Schneider: The key questions we are dealing with in our way forward:

Should Policy Board dissolve and leave MetroGIS to engage the politicians on a different level?

Should the Policy Board be folded into the Coordinating Committee to form one body?

Should alternates be given more standing and authority to vote and make decisions on MetroGIS actions?

Expanding the role of the alternates, seen as a good idea to have alternates reach out to their commissioner and work with them to engage them on a meaningful level. The Policy Board will be leading the discussions and will return to the Coordinating Committee with their discussions, ideas and findings.

Knippel: What do you see as a suitable timeline for the Policy Board to reinvent itself?

Schneider: Within 6 months we should have a concept on what we need to do, the duration of a few more Policy Board meetings.

Schneider: One thing we see as a great benefit to engaging the private sector is to make the parcel data freely available. Perhaps a test pilot project between government and a non-government to exchange data; making the parcel data more readily available ma

Swenson: Do we have any numbers on the amount of users of the historical parcel data?

Kotz: Unfortunately, there is no real meaningful way to track that.

Schneider: I suspect the value to counties isn't what it once was; with private sector's perception, it is public data, why can't they just have it?

Ross: I see this coming in other areas as well, MnGeo is putting the legislation up for this. I can share with you that there are 15 counties already lining up against it (sharing parcel data) due to the revenue question; they do not want to lose that revenue stream of selling their data. The Metropolitan area is farther ahead than the rest of the state; and the Metro example can be used to build the policy Your [MetroGIS's] Policy Board is an important forum for vetting and discussing those issues.

Schneider: As someone who works in both private and public sectors, I can see the argument from both sides. County department heads have a mission, goal and budget constraints and in many cases is not ready to cut off one of their revenue streams. Bridging the gap between county policy makers and the other actors within and outside the county will be important. There is a 'culture' issue as well, business and governments operate under very different cultures, this can be potentially be a barrier to participation.

Group Discussion: Freeing data producers from liability legislation.

Slusarczyk: We need to get over the legal hurdle, the financial issue will not be such an issue for us, however, it may be for counties in greater Minnesota.

Ross: The [proposed] language is structured to protect counties and cities from liability.

Swenson: Commissioner Reinhardt brought this up; if you want this to work, this has to go through the Minnesota Association of Counties.

Read: Also the county's attorneys

Knippel: This seems like one of the key reasons the Policy Board needs to continue to exist.

Schneider: Agreed, it's not the only issue, but certainly one of the major ones, even if the elected officials are disappearing, we have work left to do. However, is it appropriate to ask elected officials to meet when there are no policy decisions or work for them to do? Using alternates are certainly appropriate; we will have MetroGIS to do some outreach to the various County Boards as to what we they are working on and what we are working on, periodic presentations from MetroGIS to county boards would help them understand us better.

Bitner: We should likely better align ourselves with MnGeo, with MetroGIS serving as the 'test-bed' for MnGeo's ideas

Ross: Agreed.

Knippel: Is there any published formal response for the parcel work yet?

Ross: Not until it gets into the committee process, we are doing proactive outreach now, before the projects. Assuming it will get out of committee this year due to our background work, we are presently prepping for the legislative session. Of note, the liability is less of an issue, it's the potential of lost fees and lost revenue for those counties. MetroGIS's Policy Board's past work and future decisions are crucial, we still need their influence.

Fisher: In engaging the private sector, we could focus on the idea of on MNCAR's data improvement committee, we already have strong relationships with developers, economic development groups, Greater MSP and the business development community; MNCAR is already well placed to explore the formation of the group mentioned by Terry (Schneider)

Read: There is also the Emergency Services side, especially if we are to follow up on the GECCo, the idea of 'implementing authority' fits in with the concepts of Emergency Services response.

Ross: Yes, the parcel data remains important to many of our functions; we have a lot more discussion coming at a state level.

Read: We need to figure out what we need to get set up, our current CC is set up on governmental sharing, is there a need for a parallel CC focused on real estate, emergency services other interest areas with more specific needs?

Schneider: This may be the way to go, getting that external interest

Ross: We are struggling at the state level with the same issues; we do need to include all sectors, we must have the partners from all sectors involved. The state perspective is that data sharing needs to cross all sectors/all groups.

Bitner: Terry, what actions would you like us to take?

Schneider: First, we should convene enough people to talk about how a CC in the private sector would work. We can provide some individuals, host another forum with the stakeholders, help demonstrate a proof of benefit and get together a mini work plan to get things going.

Ross: We need to coordinate between the two, so no replication is happening at the state level, the business and utility communities do not distinguish between the metro area and the state.

Bitner: We will then need to add this to our work plan group discussion. We'll make this work plan item for 2013.

6c (formerly 6b); Non-Profit and Utilities Coordinating Committee Representatives

Discussion Summary: Coordinating Committee engaged in a discussion on filling the vacant seats present on the committee, those of non-profit (recently vacated by the resignation of Sally Wakefield), utilities (recently vacated by Allan Radke) and business geographics (which has not been filled in some time). The group also weighted the pros and cons of adding additional seats (i.e. perhaps a utility seat and a telecommunications seat)

Bitner: If you know anyone in the various seat vacancy areas, please advance their names to Geoff so he can contact them and discuss the potential.

Ross: Adding someone from the Public Utilities Commission might be a good idea. Geoff, John Hoshal will have some suitable PUC contact for you.

Read: Geoff, can you contact the Minnesota Council of Non-Profits for potential candidates? Also, I do not think we should add seats until we have our existing seats filled.

Maas: I will contact them [Minnesota Council of Non-Profits] and touch base with John [Hoshal], and report back on those discussions and contact they yield.

Givens: I agree, let's not expand until our current seats are filled.

Knippel: I agree, we should continue with business as usual until the Policy Board makes its decision about how it wishes to move forward and we fill our seats at this [CC] table and to wait and see if the private sector can form its own committee.

Bitner: In summary we'll (1) work to fill our existing vacancies, (2) hold off on adding more seats until the Policy Board has its direction in place.

Read: I might be easier to talk about the changes if we fill the three seats, then we have the discussion.

Action: Maas to contact MN Council of Non Profits and John Hoshal at MnGeo for candidates from the PUC.

6d) New MetroGIS Logo Ideas:

Coordinator Maas presented some brief logo research and two new potential logo ideas to the group to solicit feedback and engage the group on ideas.

Feedback and suggestions included finding some way to symbolize the metro in the logos in a subtle way so as not to confuse MetroGIS with statewide organizations, smoothing the 'sharpness' of the compass rose elements and ensuring the logo also functions at much smaller sizes (such as on a letterhead).

Coordinator Maas will direct these revisions to be conducted on the logos and present revised version at the next Coordinating Committee meeting.

6e) Recommendations for Technology Presentation at the October 17 Policy Board Meeting

Henry: Dan [Ross] you should perhaps consider presenting on status of the parcels and how things are going in the rest of the state.

Ross: I would be willing to, but it may be a bit early to do that just yet.

Brandt: I think the Carver County presentation [referring to an earlier presentation] would be good, demonstrates real world benefits. Peter, would you be willing to present?

Henschel: Sure

Fisher: Along the lines of the parcel work and accompanying legislation, by making the parcel data available we can make it easy to broker advertising sale for space, Greater MSP is really interested in seeing this. Perhaps a presentation on parcel integration, how to locate/relocate businesses using the data from the real estate perspective

Group discussion/consensus: Line up Adam's idea for the next meeting with later presentations to the Policy Board from Peter Henschel and Dan Ross.

Maas: Adam, I will coordinate with you outside the meeting on getting someone to come and speak to the Policy Board in October.

Agenda Item 7: Administrative Updates

7a) Update on MetroGIS Project Manager Hiring

Gelbmann: We had a candidate accepted the position, then withdrew his acceptance. We are still searching for a candidate, and refocusing on someone with PMP credential and less emphasis on GIS experience; we do continue to emphasize the collaborative/volunteer nature of the organization, we are going to be advertising the position at the upcoming PMI conference. We envision this position integrating with the other PMPs working in IS at the Metropolitan Council.

Knippel: Would this person be used for more than just MetroGIS work?

Gelbmann: Yes, their assignments would include Council work as well.

7b) Communications Workgroup Update

Coordinator Maas provided a summary of recent meetings and work conducted by the Communications Workgroup as presenting a wireframe of the new metrogis.org including the 'flyout' menus and reduction of the side navigation bars from thirty-three to eight.

General response to the initial layout ideas was favorable, with questions about timeline of deployment.

Maas indicated that his goal was to have a web vendor under contract by December 30, however, he acknowledge that he had a significant amount of work to perform to get the existing content packaged in such a way as to deliver to a vendor for bidding.

Agenda Item 8: Project Updates

8a) Address Points Initiative

Mark Kotz provided an overview and update of the address points initiative progress and present status. He stressed that as it moves forward, the relationships that cities have with their counties and how addressing authority is handled will be crucial.

Knippel: Beyond the county level, it might be too much; moving to a state solution might be unwieldy

Kotz: There may be cities who will want to participate, but no hosting county. We see this as inevitably being a hodgepodge of ways to participate. There will be different ways to funnel the data into the system. Eventual goal is to have statewide aggregation. The architecture of what we're developing will be available to all government entities in the state.

Ross: So far this effort has been outstanding on the Metro level in the absence of state level work regarding address points.

Kotz: A number of our counties have also been engaged in work with their cities on address points, Randy can you tell us what is happening in Dakota County.

Knippel: In Dakota County we did create Joint Powers Agreement with the cities; the county has played a significant role in addressing, but it was determined by our lawyers that we didn't actually have the authority, however, we still maintain a role with the cities.

Some cities have significant capabilities and resources and some have none. Dakota County acts in a coordinative role, while the cities assume a lead role that the info they provide is complete; the Joint Powers Agreement clearly defined those roles and responsibilities; we made it clear that they need one person/one point of contact to shepherd the data; cities perform internal coordination of their data. We [the county] would then build a process, provide quality control, perform ID changes and then synchronize and distribute the data.

Also, ultimately we take this address database and use it to populate the site address in the tax system. Higher degree of confidence in the data; we feel we have better data, we are continuing to feed the site address into the tax database, very close to having it done.

All cities are signed on to Joint Powers Agreement; we have a balance in that we rely on the local knowledge (cities) and the technical skill of the county.

Henry: How are you placing the actual address point? Center of parcel? Entry point to the parcel? Are you able to capture a z-value?

Kotz: With addressing, there really is no easy way to assign a z-value, not appropriate for the tools we are employing.

Knippel: The cities have created their own tool, based on the ESRI model, let them know that it isn't the be all end all, actively engaged in development process, will be a pilot site of Address Point

Givens: Good job in getting the relationships developed, that can be the hardest part.

Kotz: For the Address Point editor, we are using MetroGIS's data model, which is compliant with FDGC

Swenson: Similarly, we are doing enterprise work in Hennepin County, the number one priority for our county is the address system, and we are developing a county-wide standard, based on our need for taxation. In the past decade, we have needed to manage addresses outside the tax system. Tax system already has the relationships built; we need to support emergency services, elections, dispatch work. Our Deputy County Administrator is the chair of the committee and this covers 8 major departments at the county.

There are three 'legs' to the project: Establishing a standard in the data model, then performing an impact analysis on current users/customers of existing system (this will be followed by a full report) and making changes to the reference data, revamping the whole works (this will likely impact the centerlines as well)

Biggest challenges: we have the charters ready to be signed; met with Deputy County Administrator on concerns about shoving an agreement in the city's face about how to proceed. We need to forge the relationships in practice first before they are formalized; individuals relationships established first are key.

The City of Minneapolis is doing their own model, linking property to address, address to permit, helping to maintain their address system and understand the hierarchy of super-parcel, parcel, addresses, and building. Estimated to be an 18 month timeline for the project.

Brandt: In Washington County we have an informal process in place, no Joint Powers Agreement, but we have, reached out to the fire chiefs and building officials in each city. The establishment of the relationships are going well, before we get formal with the tools.

Kotz: One of the reasons Washington County is going well is that Dave[Brandt] got testimonials from Emergency Services personnel to leverage the interest and funding.

8b) Payment to Counties for Parcel Data Improvements

Mark Kotz provided a quick overview to the group on the visits made by him and Coordinator Maas to each county to simplify the schedule and payment process for parcel data improvements and metadata updating.

8c) Next-Generation Regional Street Centerline Maintenance Model Update

Coordinator Maas provided a brief update on the Centerline project progress; key points included the official notice of the October 24-25 dates at the MnDOT Arden Hills Facility and the preparation and dispersal deadline of the centerline resource packet (Sept 30 goal)

8d) Registered Regional Parcel Data Users: Survey Results

Rick Gelbmann gave a brief presentation on the results of the survey dispersed to registered users of the Regional Parcel Dataset distributed in July 2012. He included examples of how several users make use of the data for their specific business needs.

Agenda Item 9: Information Sharing Roundtable

With the meeting already running long, the group conceded that the information shared in the lightening round was sufficient for information sharing.

Agenda Item 10: Next Meeting

The Next Coordinating Committee meeting is scheduled for December 13, 2012

Agenda Item 11: Adjourn

Chair Bitner adjourned the meeting at 3:45 PM