



# MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 21, 2013 **[Minutes Approved: June 20, 2013]**

1:00 PM – 3:30 PM, Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

## Meeting Attendance:

### MetroGIS Coordinating Committee:

David Bitner, <i>dbSpatial, (Chair)</i>	Dave Brandt, <i>Washington County, (Vice Chair)</i>
Bill Brown, <i>Hennepin County</i>	Jim Bunning, <i>Scott County</i>
Dick Carlstrom, <i>TIES</i>	Rick Gelbmann, <i>Metropolitan Council</i>
Francis Harvey, <i>University of Minnesota</i>	Randy Knippel, <i>Dakota County</i>
Mark Kotz, <i>Metropolitan Council</i>	Matt Koukol, <i>Ramsey County</i>
Mark Maloney, <i>City of Shoreview/Metro Cities</i>	Jeff Matson, <i>CURA/University of Minnesota</i>
Bob O'Neill, <i>City of Bloomington/Metro Cities</i>	Chad Riley, <i>Carver County</i>
Nancy Read, <i>Metropolitan Mosquito Control Board</i>	Dan Ross, <i>MnGeo</i>
Ben Verbick, <i>LOGIS</i>	Ron Wencil, <i>USGS</i>
Joella Givens, <i>MnDOT</i>	Tim Loesch, <i>MNDNR</i>

### Guests:

Dave Hinricks, <i>Metropolitan Council</i>	Alan Palazzolo, <i>Code For America</i>
Michelle Trager, <i>Rice County</i>	Eric Haugen, <i>Resource Data, Inc.</i>

### Staff:

Geoff Maas, <i>MetroGIS Coordinator</i>	Paul Peterson, <i>MetroGIS Project Manager</i>
---	--

### **1 ) Call to Order:**

Chair Bitner called the meeting to order at 1:06 PM

### **2 ) Approve Meeting Agenda:**

Chair Bitner recommended three revisions to the agenda:

- > The addition of Alan Palazzolo presentation (becomes Agenda Item 5c)
- > Inverting the order of agenda items 8a and 8b;
- > Dan Ross to speak about the Enterprise License Agreement (becomes Agenda Item 9b)

Motion to approve: Givens; Second: Harvey, agenda approved;

### **3 ) Approve Meeting Summary from December 20, 2012**

Motion to approve: Verbick; Second: Maloney, agenda approved;

#### **4 ) Acknowledgement of Rick Gelbmann's contributions to MetroGIS and upcoming retirement from the Metropolitan Council in April 2013**

Rick described the highlights of his tenure with the Metropolitan Council and MetroGIS, thanked the members of the Committee for their continued work, dedication and commitment to geospatial data collaboration. On behalf of the Coordinating Committee, Coordinator Maas presented Rick with an engraved cornerstone dually symbolizing Rick's abiding interest in architecture and celebrating his foundational role in creating the MetroGIS collaborative.

#### **5a ) Roundtable Updates**

**Bitner:** Updated the group on the upcoming FOSS4GIS North American Conference in May in Minneapolis; preliminary program is up, deadline for the 'early bird' special to register is April 1.

**Read:** Described her role in FOSS4GIS preparations; indicated that any organization that is interesting in sponsoring the event can get their logo up on their website; updated wetlands data should be up on the DataFinder within the month;

**Kotz:** Reminded the group of the upcoming retirement party for Rick Gelbmann on April 5 at Champ's, His updates on address points would be cover later in the agenda;

**Peterson:** Indicated his continued participation in the Centerline Initiative and development of the MetroGIS Collaborative tool

**Carlstrom:** Just finished analysis of Burnsville school district; before and after the housing boom of the late 2000s; number of students living in single family homes decreased from 80% to 70%; corresponding to an increase in students in multi-family homes by 10%; significant in that housing stability is tied to student performance;

**Givens:** Indicated that she is stepping down as the MnDOT representative to the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, has enjoyed her tenure and has recommended Ben Butzow of MnDOT/MNIT Services to assume her seat on the Committee;

**Knippel:** Described his involvement in preparing a US National Grid Implementation Guide; funded with Department of Homeland Security grant;

**O'Neill:** City of Bloomington is moving from the SmallWorld to the ESRI environment;

**Wencl:** USGS is revising the 7.5 minute quad map series; updated the group on the Federal budget sequestration and its impact on his work;

**Matson:** Updated the group on the upcoming Hack-a-thon (May 25) just after the FOSS4GIS and National Neighborhoods conferences; indicated there may be requests for data from the agencies and organizations at the table above what is currently readily available (crime data, energy data, etc.);

**Harvey:** Discussed the training courses available from U-Spatial, waitlist for the introductory courses which are very popular and will include more courses on working with LiDAR; Harvey is also working on a 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition GIS primer book, and is looking for evocative examples of GIS usage to share with students;

**Maloney:** Mentioned how a rising need for stormsewer data may be tied to chloride reduction projects and other projects working with the MPCA; local governments will be looking for a tool to assist with that work as well as groundwater/surface water interactions; Maloney has been monitoring and testifying during the Legislative session and there may be GIS implications of many of those issues;

**Koukol:** Current issues will be covered later in the agenda;

**Slusarczyk:** Anoka County is working with Houston Engineering, rolling out new mobile applications as well as significant amounts of mapping and analysis of crashes in the US Highway 10 Corridor through the City of Ramsey;

**Ross:** Provided an update on the process and progress of SF 1298 at the Legislature, and expressed his desire to hear from the group on the issue (freeing up government-to-government data sharing of all kinds); despite the criticism and debate, he remains committed that this is the right thing to do; MnGeo has been partnering with DNR to make more LiDAR available; Ortho flights in central Minnesota (large 9 county buy up, excellent cost sharing mechanism), continued work on the National Hydrography dataset as well as telephone exchange boundaries/working with the Department of Commerce on that issue as well as HSEM mapping (~1200 maps);

**Riley:** Working on collaboration with Carver County Fire Departments, web mapping application for updated building data access;

**Verbick:** LOGIS is reviewing its business model for its member cities; reviewing RFPs for new public safety system; distribution of county imagery among participants; mentioned upcoming MNGISLIS workshops;

**Trager:** Southeast Minnesota GIS users group are presently working on an agreement to share data within the 11 county area; Rice County has finished up a new address signage initiative and review of its addressing system, contractor has nearly finished installing all the new signage; mentioned the MN GIS/LIS workshops, registration is open and MN GIS LIS is working in conjunction with FOSS4GIS conference;

**Bunning:** <no updates/pass>

**Gelbmann:** Retiring from the Metropolitan Council on April 4; brought to light two key initiatives:

(1) Met Council land records management system, the Metropolitan Council presently maintains over 8000 different land records tied to 20,000 to 30,000 pages of related documentation; this system is now internal to the Council's business needs but sees the potential for external uses of the resource; other organizations (DNR, county governments, etc.) may have a similar need for a comparable product; he invited anyone interested to visit the Council for a demo;

(2) Census geometry alignment: The Council performed this 10 years ago after the Census geography was released: alignment of TIGER data with the NCompass data based on parcel info; this met an

internal need of the Council so centerline based address points would fall into the correct Census geometry; these data are in constant need of topological maintenance; areas of non-physical/non-visible boundaries; moving forward it would be good to have many agencies using, sharing and contributing to a consistent set of corrected data; savings of time and redundant effort and the knowledge that the best data is available to all;

**Swenson:** Involved with several topics to be covered later on the agenda; Hennepin County is deep into its address standardization project;

**Brown:** The department has finished the COGO for the parcels outside the City of Minneapolis; stated goal of achieving 95% accuracy; summer of 2013 will see the statistical analysis of vertices, points and polygons that have been surveyed and collected over the last 30 years, many points to analyze and collect, very hopeful they will hit their accuracy goal;

**Brandt:** Washington County has enabled the Amazon Web Services for GIS, indicated that it is working well at a cost of \$115-\$125 per month, cheaper than what the county has been paying for previously; still working out aspects of the data updates, happy to share the details on that if anyone wishes to know more; the county is moving to a new CAD/RMS for 911 public safety which relies heavily on GIS data; the software implementation is taking a bit longer than originally anticipated;

**Loesch:** Working with the state LIDAR acquisition project, scheduled to be finished by June 30; working closely with the USGS, MnGeo and counties; data viewer and a download application should be ready to go by May 1;

**Maas:** Maas with Gordy Chinander met with Allina Medical Services and did a cursory white-board 'GIS 101' with them; they are keenly interested in products like the Address Points to be able to deliver better service with emergency response; 2013 round of parcel payments will commence shortly; will set up meetings with county GIS managers and supervisors in the coming month; Maas will be providing a report on the past 12 months of 'old' parcel downloads from DataFinder;

## **5b ) Data Producer Work Group Update**

**Knippel:** We are examining the differing approaches to IT and GIS in each of the eight (Seven Metropolitan Counties + Olmsted County) counties to determine areas of collaboration and cost savings, identify opportunities to take these issues to county administration; GIS is not always treated consistently in the 8 counties; working toward some uniformity;

Recent example of collaboration: Data acquisition, specifically shared RFP for purchasing ortho photography, Dakota and Scott counties working together (same RFP, separate contracts with a single vendor); pleasantly surprised at the bids, of the 13 respondents, 11 were within 10% of one another, competitive price, 5-25% reduction in cost for Scott and Dakota Counties to work together

**Bunning:** After Dakota and Scott began the process, Carver join us as well;

**Knippel:** Also, we are currently collaborating to develop a 'white paper' research document (to be discussed further in Agenda Item 8a);

## 5c ) Alan Palazzolo: Code for America Presentation

**Palazzolo:** Expressed his respect for the MetroGIS collaborative and all the data they make available and make possible to acquire; tremendous resource; many people out there utilize it.

Palazzolo gave a short presentation on several open source initiatives he is involved in:

(1) 'Adopt-A-Hydrant';

This project is involved in cataloging hydrants for which private citizens agree to keep clear in winter months; while 'unofficial' were able to acquire official hydrant data from the cities; developed an application for tracking the ~18,000 hydrants in the cities of Minneapolis and St Paul; the 'Open Twin Cities' is interested in continuing this kind of work;

(2) "All My Governments/Who Governs Me" Project;

A citizen/user by using their address be able to collect a list of all relevant jurisdictions that govern or impact their location; example shown, one site in St Paul had over 1000 different jurisdictions/agencies to which they were subject, city, county, councils, districts, boards, commissions, service areas, etc; Application of the tool; improve citizen information about how to be an informed citizen, better linkage to services;

He proposed and discussed the idea of collaborating to create a databases and develop applications for finding service centers (police, library, medical care, parks, etc.), this is above the present ability to determine what district or service area a user is in.

**Read:** A lot of emphasis to make government data available as web mapping services so that applications like this could to attach to live data, not just static/dated data, individual shapefiles that are quickly outdated.

**Palazzolo:** Agree that map services are the best way to move forward, in reality the end user doesn't know or particularly care where their data is coming from, but for applications development, building it this way (using active services) would be incredibly helpful and result in a stronger end result and a better product;

## 6 ) Brief on Recent Policy Board Activity

Coordinator Maas provided a brief update on recent Policy Board activity, the most significant changes include:

The quarterly Policy Board meetings will remain scheduled and used only as needed; they will be cancelled if no policy or fiscal issues are on hand to discuss;

The MetroGIS Coordinator has been tasked with engaging in a more formal outreach program, this includes presentations to the relevant stakeholder bodies represented in MetroGIS, notably county governments, Metro Cities and Metropolitan Council committees and sub-committees; Coordinator Maas will be working with these groups to find times and venues to conduct MetroGIS presentations;

The MetroGIS Work Plan has been transferred as an official duty of the Policy Board to the responsibility of the Coordinating Committee; the Committee is responsible for the preparation and approval of an

annual Work Group. Efforts will be made to coordinate the MetroGIS plan with MnGeo's plan and other state geospatial initiatives to avoid duplicative effort and maximize efficiencies;

The Policy Board has tasked the Data Producers Work Group with developing a 'white paper' on the benefits, drawbacks and issues surrounding public data/geospatial data sharing; the paper and its findings will be presented to the Policy Board at their next meeting on April 24, 2013.

## **7 ) Action and Discussion Items**

### **7a ) Approval of 2013 Work Plan**

Coordinator Maas quickly reviewed the main points of the Draft Work Plan to the group and asked for group approval; Motion to Approve: Gelbmann; second: Brandt, motion carried, plan approved;

### **7b) Method for Adding Membership to the Coordinating Committee**

Coordinator Maas has reviewed (in depth) the existing language in the Operational Guidelines and Procedures for MetroGIS. He found the language containing insufficient detail and processes for a transparent process to fill current vacancies at the Committee level and no clear provision for adding new seats to reflect potential agency and input needs; Maas proposed an outline of steps for pursued and self-identifying candidates for the consideration and critique of the group;

After some discussion, it was agreed that this was a good direction but more information was needed; Vice Chair Brandt and Givens agreed to review the proposed language additions to the Operating Guidelines and that a short-term work group was desirable to flesh out the issue; additional work is to be conducted by Coordinator Maas and a report back on progress at the June Committee meeting;

## **8 ) Discussion Items and Administrative Updates**

### **8a ) 'White Paper' on Data Sharing for the MetroGIS Policy Board**

At its January 23 meeting the Policy Board tasked the Data Producers Work Group with developing a 'white paper' on the benefits, drawbacks and issues surrounding public data/geospatial data sharing in order to work toward developing some draft resolution language in support of 'freeing up the data'.

**Knippel:** At the last (Jan 23, 2013) Policy Board meeting, Commissioner Kordiak (Anoka County) indicated his support for making the parcel data freely available and that the body should develop a resolution in support of this, put this resolution before the counties so they could support it or reject it; Commissioner Reinhardt (Ramsey County) stressed that she wanted to more fully explore the issue, particularly the liability aspect of making data freely available. The discussion summary from that meeting is captured in the Policy Board minutes, available on the MetroGIS website.

The 8 County Collaborative/Data Producers Work Group was already in the process of documenting our various counties approaches to how we handle the issue, not just with parcel data, but with all data. At the request of the Policy Board we have taken the info we have gathered so far to develop this requested 'white paper' resource document.

**Koukol:** In Ramsey County, we have taken the initiative to push the idea of freely available data as the processing of requests, sending out paper billing and collecting money uses a significant amount of staff

time that could be better spent elsewhere; with the ease of having a service available where customers and consumers could get the data within minimal hassle; we feel this provides better public service.

Our 8 county group is continually exploring this issue; understanding all these inconsistencies between the counties, it would be so much better if we could get some alignment there and not just on the parcel data but on all the data; bottom line is that we need uniformity.

**Knippel:** As we track SF 1298 [HF1390] it may also come into play; so for the next Policy Board meeting we are preparing three things: the white paper, a single-page summary resource and offering some draft resolution language; after our discussion the Policy Board members can then take this back to their respective bodies; one of our challenges remains is that at the last meeting, only two county commissioners were in attendance (Kordiak and Reinhardt), with the exception of (Board Chair/Mayor of Minnetonka) Terry Schneider, all other members at the table were alternates; we need to have our elected officials around the table for this.

Knippel presented the Committee his PowerPoint presentation on the content of the forthcoming white paper, including description of existing conditions of data availability, an understanding that the benefits of making data more available are both direct and indirect (there is not always a clearly evident, direct or immediate return-on-investment), a list of some of the challenges (revenue loss, liability, control of data), need for a larger enterprise approach to data, accountability, making sure the authoritative source is one available and in use most widely; another challenge is that data is often developed with a specific purpose in mind however would be very useful to many external users as well;

Knippel cited the need to demonstrate local examples, county examples and state examples and that there is federal movement in this direction as well; he referenced the NSGIC Guidelines for Best Practices document 'three myths' as another useful starting point for describing the issue to policy makers; the NSGIC document recommends changing policies that inhibit geospatial open data sharing.

**Knippel:** We will have the April 24 Policy Board meeting set up as a kind of workshop to engage them in a dialogue, provide them with the resources to take back to their county boards;

**Ross:** This is good work, I wish to commend the group on this effort; In my recent efforts of working on SF 1298 I have developed a list of at least sixteen items of relevance that I have encountered, I am happy to share with the Data Producers Work Group; the can add to the substance of the discussion.

**Knippel:** We'd be grateful to have that list, Dan. Thank you.

### **8b ) Is there interest in having a "Public-Private Data Provider Summit" in 2013?**

**Maas:** One of the topics I have encountered in the body of literature of MetroGIS, at various meetings and in one-on-one discussions is the knowledge that both the private and public sectors desire greater access for one-another's data; in my view, keeping this discussion in motion is of benefit to the issues we have just heard described by Randy [Knippel] regarding more open data from the county perspective and indeed all geospatial data.

My question to the group is: 'Is there interest in having a formal summit of private and public data producers?' I am not advocating that we must, I am simply throwing it out to the group to gauge the interest and get your ideas. MetroGIS is certainly willing to sponsor the event and do the needed organizational work to get an event like this together.

**Givens:** Haven't we had something like this occur already? I think we have, what was the follow up to those earlier meetings?

**Gelbmann:** We have, since the earliest days of MetroGIS, been working to engage the private sector. For this we would need to select the big data producers we want at the table; take care in identifying who is best suited to represent their interest. There has been a general rise in sophistication in all areas of the geospatial world, we many now be better positioned to get more done and learn more from the private sector.

**Knippel:** In light of we are trying to do with the white paper and with SF 1298 in process, we should wait until we've got things finished and have a clearer picture of where we stand; let the dust settle.

**Read:** Also, getting the Utilities seat filled here on the Coordinating Committee filled first, would be helpful. We should also engage providers beyond utilities and include NAVTEQ.

Brief group discussion on 'what is the focus' and 'what/who would gain' by having this summit; general agreement that this is desirable but the timing for 2013 is not yet 'ripe' for such an event; a work group to plan the event was seen as desirable; issue is to be discussed further with an event more likely in 2014.

## **9 ) MetroGIS Project Updates**

### **9a ) Centerline Initiative**

Dan Ross, Paul Peterson, Matt Koukol and Geoff Maas gave a brief update on the progress and current state of the Centerlines Initiative.

Key points:

Half Day Technical Session, with good input from many metro cities was conducted in January 2013;

Contract between ESRI and MnDOT was signed in February 2013;

Since February, project managers from MnDOT, MnGeo and MetroGIS have been meeting regularly to shepherd the project along;

Pilot project will be kicking off with six participants (Ramsey, Carver, Mahnomen, Stearns, Benton Counties and the White Earth Nation) in Spring-Early Summer 2013; MnDOT will commence ingesting local data;

Primary consideration at present is the conversion of MnDOT's TIS (Transportation Information System) to an LRS (Linear Reference System) and getting the initial tools developed;

NextGen911 also has a list of attributes will enter the database at some point, we are working to 'cross-pollinate' with the work already being done on the Address Points.

At the upcoming April ESRI Session, we will work to demonstrate the tools to the pilot project partners the tools, work through the list of core and desired attributes and determine what the pilot participants need to get out of the pilot project.

## 9b) Enterprise License Agreement Update

**Ross:** The present agreement has expired and has been amended up to 4 or 5 times (state is no longer willing to amend the contract); we have asked them to take out all professional services and managed services language from the agreement; primarily because ESRI can't provide the needed the security requirements; moving forward, we (any entity with a state contract) will be getting better pricing than in the past

## 9c) Address Point Project Update

**Kotz:** Editor Tool: Version 1 is complete and available to any/all government entities in the state from the MetroGIS website. Tool has been acquired by Anoka, Carver, Ramsey, Scott and is in deployment by Dakota County, including the cities of Burnsville, Eagan and Farmington;

Editor Tool: Version 2 will address needed enhancements; a steering team to develop an RFP has been formed including Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council), Joe Sapletal (Dakota County), John Slusarczyk (Anoka County), Josh Gumm (Scott County) and Nate Christ (Carver County). Enhancements identified include domain controls, multi-editing functions and ability to upload preliminary plats.

**Ross:** How does this align with Gordy's [Gordon Chinander, MESB] work with the NextGen911 initiatives?

**Kotz:** As of right now, I don't know;

**Ross:** We will have a need to integrate with the 911 community; it is a huge job; but provides an opportunity for MetroGIS and is something we need;

**Kotz:** Our stated goals for 2013 regarding the Editor Tool are as follows:

Anoka County:	Deploy the Editing Tool + 4 Cities
Carver County:	Deploy the Editing Tool + 3 Cities
Ramsey County:	Deploy the Editing Tool + 3 Cities
Scott County:	Deploy the Editing Tool
Washington County:	Deploy the Editing Tool & 1 City

Hennepin County is moving forward on their own initiative and Dakota County is leading the charge being ready for Editing Tool V2 (50% of Cities, All Mobile Homes, 50% of Apartment Complex Addresses and a Workshop for the Addressing Committee);

## 9d ) Geospatial Commons Update

Still discussion on moving toward this portal platform, many issues, some are not quite ripe for action;

**Bitner:** The geo-commons style of "thinking" is really a global movement, driven in the European Union by the INSPIRE LAWS;

**Read:** From my past work (Lake Superior project) you do encounter as many cultural issues as functional issues with data sharing, collaboration, moving forward; good to keep that in mind;

## **9e ) Collaborative Tools Update**

**Peterson:** Provided an update on the deployment of a new eShare solution for MetroGIS's collaborative tool needs.

Improvements and modifications from the last version, however, if the Metropolitan Council is going to manage and fund the tool it will need to be eShare in the SharePoint environment unless another agency wishes to fund and host a collaborative tool solution. Among its benefits are strong version control and security

**Kotz:** We are all aware of the challenges to using the SharePoint environment, we also examined BaseCamp, but the Metropolitan Council IS Department does not want to start granting lots of individual exceptions, which is a reasonable decision, too much to manage.

**Bitner:** If we do want to make it more open, provide easier and ad hoc access the user name/password and access difficulty remain a sticking point;

## **9f ) Metro Region Storm Sewer Project Investigation**

Coordinator Maas provided an update on his individual meetings with a broad range of stakeholder interests on the potential for a pilot project and movement on developing a regional stormsewer dataset and finalization of the existing provisional data standard.

He indicated there is significant interest at the state, county agency and watershed district level on having access to standardized stormsewer data.

Several entities have provided letters of support and/or verbal support for moving forward. It is anticipated that a work group to finalize the standard and a second pilot project are on deck for 2014.

## **9g ) MetroGIS Website Update**

Coordinator Maas provided an update on the status of the forthcoming new MetroGIS website resource. Current work includes:

- Distilling existing content, some for use, some for archiving
- Archiving the existing site so it remains a viable research resource for those who need it
- Goal of having an RFP to web development firms by May 1, 2013
- Desire for a 'sprint team' review of the user interface experience through Summer 2013
- Goal of having the new site up on October 1 with 75% of the content in place.

## **10 ) Next Meeting is scheduled for July 24, 2013**

## **11 ) Adjournment**

Chair Bitner adjourned the meeting at 3:29 PM