



MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting Summary

Wednesday, January 23, 2013 (Approved 04.24.13)

Metropolitan County Government Offices
2099 University Avenue, St. Paul, MN

Members Present:

Terry Schneider, Metro Cities/City of Minnetonka, Policy Board Chairman
David Bitner, dB Spatial, Coordinating Committee Chair
Jim Bunning, Scott County (alternate)
Steve Elkins, Metropolitan Council
Peter Henschel, Carver County (alternate)
Randy Knippel, Dakota County (alternate)
Jim Kordiak, Anoka County
Mjyke Nelson, Washington County (alternate)
Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County

Interim Members:

Cliff Aichinger, Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District Administrator
(Representing the interests of the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts)

Guests:

Nancy Read, Technical Director, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District
Dave Hinricks, Chief Information Officer, Metropolitan Council
Rick Gelbmann, GIS Manager, Metropolitan Council
Mark Kotz, Systems Database Administrator, Metropolitan Council

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Paul Peterson, MetroGIS Project Manager

1) Call to Order

Chairman Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:06 PM

2) Approve Meeting Agenda

Motion: Kordiak, Second: Reinhardt, *motion carried, agenda approved.*

3) Approve October 17, 2012 Policy Board Meeting Summary

Motion: Reinhardt, Second, Kordiak; *motion carried, summary of last meeting approved.*

4) Introduction of new Metropolitan Council/MetroGIS Project Manager Paul Peterson

Coordinator Maas introduced Paul Peterson. Paul gave the group a summary of his education, work experience and personal life and a brief rundown of the projects he is currently engaged in at the Metropolitan Council and with MetroGIS. The Board welcomed Paul to MetroGIS.

5) Rick Gelbmann, Retirement Announcement

Rick Gelbmann, GIS Manager at the Metropolitan Council and one of the ‘founding fathers’ of MetroGIS, announced his upcoming retirement, scheduled for April 2013. Rick gave an overview of his career and retirement plans and stated his thanks to the Policy Board for their continual work and attention to MetroGIS. The Board acknowledged Rick’s contribution to the MetroGIS collaborative with a Certificate of Appreciation.

6) Presentation:

Address Points and Addressing Authority: Joint Powers Agreements between Cities and County Government in Dakota County, Randy Knippel, Dakota County GIS Manager

Dakota County has been an innovator in Minnesota with the development of joint work between city and county government to develop, implement and manage an authoritative address point system. Key to their current progress is the success of a Joint Powers Agreement between city and county government with a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities.

GIS Manager Knippel provided a technical overview of address point data, processes and the work presently underway in Dakota County. With existing parcel data, the County was able to get 90% with parcel data; however the remaining data provided a number of challenges. Unique situations such as mobile home parks (sites and assets logged as personal property rather than real property), sites on private roads, multi-unit dwelling and commercial structures and expansion/contraction of units within single parcels or structures provide a challenge to completing the dataset.

The authoritative address data point set will serve a variety of purposes in the county for permitting, billing, socials services, geocoding and support for the public safety Records Management System and eventually the NextGen911 system (still emerging), once the authoritative source database is developed it can be distributed, used and relied upon.

Joint Powers Agreement between the counties and cities was originally focused with the interests of the 911 community as the primary driver but immediately became important for clarifying expectations, ensuring adequate resources were available, the formalizing roles and responsibilities of the participants and ensuring that the cities and counties could maximize the benefit of the shared effort.

City responsibilities included the designation a road naming and addressing authority, making contacts to police and fire departments, assigning, updating and tracking new names and addresses to roads under city purview.

County responsibilities included assigning names to county roads, selection of a road database administrator, affixing new road names to roads under county jurisdiction and coordinating the committee effort. County will also host an application that will be available county-wide; each jurisdiction will be able to edit their data. The County will perform additional quality assurance on the back end and distribute the data. All cities are using the MetroGIS Address Editor in Dakota County

Next steps for the project include associating address points with property address, street centerline validation, and to distribute address databases. The county is positioning itself in a facilitating role to continue the work.

Presentation Questions and Answers:

Elkins: Are all cities in Dakota County equipped and utilizing their own GIS systems?

Knippel: There is a range of availability and use, some cities do and some don't, presently about half do not have dedicated GIS staff or departments.

Elkins: Are there cities using the county's GIS system?

Knippel: Yes, four cities presently subscribe.

Read: Does the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) need to be reviewed every year?

Knippel: We have arranged it so the JPA is on-going, and does not need to be renewed each year.

(Brief group discussion on what JPAs do and don't do)

Knippel: When we began the process, we used public safety as the key point of leverage, this included a working relationship with the MESB and the county dispatch center, getting the support of the MESB director was helpful.

Schneider: The general public assumes we are doing this all the time, how does the Dakota County process for developing and managing address points compare or differ from the MetroGIS address effort?

Knippel: We are using the MetroGIS tools; we are part of that effort, not different.

7) Brief Project and Activity Updates

7a) Coordinator Maas provided a brief update of the joint MetroGIS/MnDOT/MnGeo Centerline Initiative including the results of past meetings and the upcoming next steps.

7b) Coordinator Maas provided a brief overview of the MetroGIS Work Plan items for 2013 as well as the budget allotment for these activities. Work Plan items and the priority of item completion were approved by the Work Plan Review Team and the Coordinating Committee. Budget levels were similar to those of from the previous (2012) budget year with only minor adjustments.

8) Action and Discussion Items.

8a) Approval of the MetroGIS 2013 Budget.

Moved: Reinhardt, Second: Kordiak, *motion carried. MetroGIS 2013 Budget was approved.*

8b) MetroGIS Policy Board Restructuring Discussion

Chairman Schneider provided a cursory overview of what has led to the need for the restructuring and the continued discussion.

Kordiak: This body [Policy Board] has been talking to reformulate ourselves, as we know, we have not been particularly active and this body has not been participatory, and we've had some changing faces, we continue to reiterate the same points, and I am frankly exhausted with the discussion. We need to get to the bottom of the issue, and by issue, I do mean the core issue: are we, or are we not going to give away the [county] parcel data. Do we simply need to draft a resolution and sign off on it? My county [Anoka] is prepared to make data available at no charge.

Reinhardt: We still need to discuss the liability issue. Even when we sell the data, we have the same issues regarding liability; the data can still be misused, no matter what means it is available. The reason we haven't moved on freely available parcel data is an indication of how hard it has been to get to this point the Regional Parcel Data Agreements have been a significant amount of work to complete, let alone giving the data away. While we respect and need the work they do, dealing with non-profits and the business sector is not core to the work of county government.

Kordiak: Regarding the parcel data issue, is it as simple a task as just asking our county attorneys to draft up the language we need? Can we assemble a resolution that we all wish to see carried forward?

Schneider: If we draft a resolution in support for broader public access to publicly produced data, and provide it to the counties, then using that and doing it county by county might be a way forward. We can ask Geoff to work with the Coordinating Committee or the appropriate MetroGIS work group to develop draft resolution language that is concise that this body can comment on and then take back to the counties.

Maas: If that is a direction from the Policy Board, we can begin to develop that language at the Coordinating Committee level.

Schneider: It is. It should be concise make a clear case as to why making the data available is of real benefit. The same language utilized by all the counties for the resolution might carry more weight.

Knippel: Our Eight County IT Collaborative, (the seven metropolitan counties plus Olmsted) has been meeting monthly via conference call and quarterly in person. We have been tasked by our county administrators to identify means of reducing costs, and one of the items raised has been data policy. In our discussion, the intention of making all GIS data, not just parcel data, freely available has been, will continue to be discussed.

Nationally there is movement in this direction and there are certainly reasons for understanding the benefits and implications putting the data out there free. Our group is working to tackle it. One approach is for us to develop some draft narrative, give the GIS managers of the counties the ability to pursue what is needed within their counties. Policy changes and major language revisions need to be vetted here [at the Policy Board level] and with your input we can be more deliberate about moving it forward.

Our intention with the GIS managers group is to develop a summary document or white paper of arguments on what this would mean, the benefits, the return-on-investment, implications and so on. [Ramsey County GIS Manager] Matt Koukol has begun some of this work. From our point of view, this is not just parcel data, but deals with all GIS data.

MnGeo proposed the legislation to reduce all liability for government-to-government sharing and there was not only varying support within the metro for that approach but a significant backlash in the outstate counties so it is probably not going to pass.

Some counties are ready to go, some are reluctant. In many cases the cost of administering the sale or licensing of the data is just not worth it for the minor revenue it brings in, in others, counties are dependent on the sale of their data and they would need to find another source to replace that revenue.

We need to assemble a clear set of arguments on the benefit of making the data available. Identifying the cost savings and benefits and working with our county administrators to do so.

Reinhardt: Can we have some language or the white paper to review by our next meeting? Does that provide time for both the Coordinating Committee and 8 County IT Collaborative to address the issue, draft up the materials and bring it to the Policy Board for review and discussion?

Knippel: Our intention [with the 8 County Collaborative] is still to discuss more than just the parcel data availability. With a concerted effort among the counties we can likely assemble this.

Kordiak: Before we get too far, I'd like to hear from other participants at the table.

Aichinger: I have a minor point, how is the data free if MetroGIS is paying \$4000 to each county for it?

Maas: That annual payment is MetroGIS' contractual obligation to the counties, a modest monetary inducement to them to continue to allow the historic parcel data to be freely available, update the metadata of the current data and perform scheduled improvements to their parcels.

Nelson: Washington County is in agreement on moving that working toward a resolution, however, I know that our survey office would be reluctant. The data is commodity that raises revenue for the county. Internal policy discussion needs to take place within our, and other, county governments. With the last legislative attempt, there was a draft from the surveyors association that was strongly opposed to doing what we propose; a direct challenge from the surveyors association.

Kordiak: I like the idea of a white paper and some draft language; however we need a summary document with talking points, information points and bullet points to digest it better.

Henschel: Carver County has had this discussion about data and IT, we know, we're all facing similar issues, we want to move forward in that same direction, and we need to have those internal discussions as well. Bringing this up to the policy level will help.

Bunning: We've already have preliminary approval to release our parcel data.

Reinhardt: I motion that we task the groups [Coordinating Committee/Data Producers Workgroup/8 County Collaborative] to develop a 'white paper' resource and some draft resolution language for review and discussion at the next meeting.

Kordiak: Second (*motion carried*)

Schneider: This is a significant policy issue, if we can make the case for its benefit than let's support it and get behind it, this is the relevant work of this body. Substantive issues need to be raised and addressed and this is certainly one of them.

Reinhardt: When is our next meeting scheduled?

Maas: If we stick to our normal quarterly schedule, we'd meet again here on April 24 [2013]. I've reviewed our Operating Procedures in light of our discussion tonight; there is no language in them that mandates a quarterly meeting.

Reinhardt: Is April enough time to get these materials prepared?

Knippel: It may be possible to hammer out the document and details by April, but we also need a game plan on how to roll this out to the counties and make room to include insight from their internal discussions. If we are given more time to refine it and critique it we can schedule a [Policy Board] meeting data when it is ready.

Schneider: These recommendations can come back at our next meeting, and that can even be into the summer. This is obviously a central reason for this body to meet again and the review of these materials will likely tie to further action.

Knippel: This body [Policy Board] is a good vetting process for working through the issues before they rise to the county board level. It is important to have policy makers present at the meeting as much as possible for that discussion, as opposed to their alternates, since several of the alternates are the same people who will be drafting the materials.

Bitner: From the perspective of the Coordinating Committee, we want to make sure our Policy Board interactions are more effective; this is the kind of discussion dedicated to working on a *specific action*, it enables us to focus and think about what we will do. As to the budget of MetroGIS, at present, all our funding comes from the Council, and final approval needs to return to the Council, we don't lose anything by having our MetroGIS budget developed and approved at the Coordinating Committee level, however, these policy questions are a different matter, we require this body for that purpose.

Reinhardt: In regard to the [five] recommendations, we can still re-convene the policy board as needed, but with the emphasis on the outreach stated in recommendation #4, we can widen our audience and the awareness of what we do, perhaps more productively than having us gathered together on a quarterly basis. If we don't have a Policy Board, then the relevant policy implications will never be addressed so we must retain this body. However, if we do have a scheduled policy meeting, *it must be geared to specifically address issues of policy and we must have the policy makers here.*

Kordiak: How much notice do we feel we need?

Schneider: One month should suffice. We'll have the meetings scheduled as we need them.

Reinhardt: I motion for the adoption of the Five Recommendations.

Elkins: Second (*motion carried*)

Recommendations Adopted:

- (1) The MetroGIS Coordinating Committee assumes responsibility as the operational decision making body of the MetroGIS collaborative (*this includes the approval of the budget, approval of work plan items, decisions on the actions and direction of MetroGIS, etc.*)
- (2) Policy Board meetings will be scheduled as needed to discuss and act on issues of policy import to MetroGIS with a minimum of one meeting per calendar year. A minimum of thirty (30) days notice will be given to Policy Board members prior to the event of a scheduled meeting.
- (3) Policy Board members will be kept apprised of MetroGIS activity and updates in a summary quarterly email or other communiqué; timing of this notice would likely follow the quarterly meeting schedule of the Coordinating Committee. The MetroGIS Coordinator will also prepare a year-end brief summarizing projects, achievements and personnel changes.
- (4) A MetroGIS representative (the MetroGIS Coordinator and other MetroGIS representatives as desired) will provide a brief annual presentation to each metropolitan County Board (or a relevant County Sub-Committee) as well as to Metro Cities and to the Metropolitan Council stating:
 - The origin and purpose of MetroGIS;
 - The value MetroGIS provides to the cities, counties, stakeholders and the Council;
 - Present MetroGIS projects and the needs being met by those projects;
- (5) After a trial period of operating under the above conditions for twelve months, the Coordinating Committee is to assess the efficacy of the new system; after twenty-four months, another review will occur and if the new system is found to be suitable, MetroGIS hires a consultant to assist in rewriting its organizational guidelines and by-laws. If found unsuitable, the issue will be raised for discussion and solution at both the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board level.

9) Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting is contingent on the completion of the white paper resource and draft resolution language by the Coordinating Committee, Data Producers Workgroup and 8 County IT Collaborative.

10) Adjournment

Chair Schneider adjourned the meeting at 7:37 pm