MetroGIS CC Meeting

Meeting Date: 12/9/2021 1:00 PM
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting
Link to Outlook Item: *click here*
Invitation Message
Participants

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

1. Call to order

Chair Erik Dahl called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM

2. Approve Today's Meeting Agenda (action item)

Matt McGuire requested a change to the agenda to add an item about the seat for the non-profit sector
Randy Knippel moved to approve the agenda
David Brandt seconded.
The motion passes

3. Approve Minutes from last meeting (action item)

Harold Busch motioned to approve the meeting minutes
Randy Knippel Seconded.
The motion passes

4. Data Licensing

Joey Reid, from Metro Transit presented about Licensing GIS data
What is a GIS data license?
Licenses are official permission to do, use or own something
Licenses for code, content or data

- Code: **MIT**, **Apache**, **GPL2**
- Content: **CC-BY** (you can do what you want with it as long as you cite the creator, **CC0** no restrictions)
- Data: **ODbL** (Open Database License), **PDDL** (Public Domain Data License)

MN Data Practices Act is not a data license - no implication of license

PDDL - https://opendatacommons.org/licenses/pddl/ (full text - https://opendatacommons.org/licenses/pddl/1-0/)
Essentially, it means you are free:
To Share - to copy, distribute and use the database
To Create - to produce works from the data
To Adapt - to modify, transform and build upon the database.
As long as you: *blank*
Blank as in, there are no restrictions.

The license explicitly dedicates content to the public domain and it cannot be revoked. This is the most extreme license available.

Why license when we have the MN Data Practices Act? The MN Data Practices Act allows for the placement of restrictions on subsequent use of the data, such as on derivative datasets, copies and distribution.

Placing a license on GIS Data reduces uncertainty, provides clarity and simplicity. You can know at a glance what the restrictions are. It also provides for the opportunity to attribute the data, and expressly deny warranty.

A concern: End users can't accept license agreements on behalf of their employers. Our strategy at the Council is to preapprove some licenses.

Questions:
Q: Pete Wiringa - Are there any existing licenses on the Geospatial Commons? Anything else in play at this point?
A: Joey Reid - DNR has a license that they apply. It is not a straightforward license - it is customized.
For more details, review the slides and video.
Q: Pete Wiringa - Is Met Council set on PDDL?
A: Joey Reid - PDDL is most well-known license that matches public domain data. We're not pushing a particular license.

Q: Randy Knippel - ODbL and DBCL, what's the biggerst difference between those and PDDL?
A: Joey Reid - Biggest difference between PDDL and ODbL is that PDDL gives up all rights. Can't control its use.
Q: Randy Knippel - Are you saying ODbL is not sufficient for OpenStreetMap?
A: Joey Reid - OSM has a note on their license compatibility that it could be an issue if OSM adopts a new version of the ODbL.
https://wiki.openstreetmap.org/wiki/Import/ODbL_Compatibility

Q: Randy Knippel - Are saying that even though we currently cite ODbL, that we should instead or in addition be citing PDDL?
A: Joey Reid - No. You can't combine them with PDDL since it provides no option for other license.
Q: Randy Knippel - Under PDDL somebody else could take it with their own Copyright on it?
A: Joey Reid - They could claim that yeah. I don't think they have any standing to enforce it. The reason why that's not a big concern is because we continue to publish the data freely available under the PDL. So why would you go to someone who has a Copyright on it and use restrictions on the same data set when you can get it for free from us with no restriction.

Q: Randy Knippel - What's the biggest motivation to use that?
A: Joey Reid - Compatibility. We produce data that we want to be useful. Releasing it without restrictions makes it as useful as possible to the world.

Q: Alison Slaats - I heard you say that we could improve the Commons by exposing that CKAN property to allow to expose licenses if they're associated with resources on the comments. What other things could the commons as a tool do to make this easier?
A: Joey Reid - I think associating specific licenses with each data set and exposing those is the key.

Q: Matt McGuire - Aggregating data is something we do in a number of cases and would want licensing to make continue to make that possible. Do you have thoughts about that?

A: Joey Reid - That's definitely something you would want to figure out a way ahead of time if possible. You could claim that the aggregated product is sort of distinct, and therefore falls under the most restrictive license. Which you know isn't going to be terribly restrictive in any case here. if it requires Attribution or something like that, then it might fall under that while still maintaining the public domain content separately under its own public domain license, for example. I like Tanya's suggestion here.

Tanya Mayer: We might consider adding the agreed upon license in the County Data Sharing Agreements.

Q: Randy Knippel - What happens if you if you don't cite anything? What is the default?

A: There is no default.

Randy Knippel - Meaning what? What we've got what we ran into is we adopt free and open data policy and so we just put the data out there without any restrictions, explicitly defined. But then we had people coming back, and now wanting us to sign their license that are there.

They wanted us to sign something to acknowledge that they could do what they wanted to do with it.

Joey Reid - It's essential for Google to know that they're not going to be sued for using your open data and if you're open data aren't covered by a really explicit clear agreement. They don't really know what they're getting into. That uncertainty is the risk.

- ## 2022 Workplan Presentation (McGuire)
Matt McGuire presented the content of the draft 2022 workplan.
The draft was released to the CC two weeks (11/24) prior to the meeting.
Three changes were identified to the draft document:
1. Marcia Broman provided additional details to the GIS Data Provisioning for NextGen9-1-1 project brief.
2. Changes to the CC Roster in the document
    a. Remove Jessi Wyatt
    b. Remove duplicates
0. Remove the priority number 10, Ash Borer Detection, from the project and priorities lists.

6. Vote to approve workplan (action item)
Erik Dahl asked for motions to approve the three changes to the draft work plan.
Randy Knippel moved the to approve the three changes to the document.
Pete Wiringa Seconded the motion.
No discussion.

Motion passed.

Erik Dahl asked for motions to approve the work plan as amended.
Randy Knippel moves to approve the 2022 work plan as amended.
David Brandt seconded the motion.
No discussion.
Motion to approve the 2022 MetroGIS Workplan as amended passed.

7. Regional Data Upload (McGuire, Broman, Lusk et al.)

Matt McGuire gave a brief update on the Regional Data Upload topic.
The state is planning on retiring the E911 CKAN portal which MetroGIS has been using to upload county datasets to be aggregated into regional datasets, including the AddressPoints, Centerlines and Parcel data.

We came up with an alternative plan to use the Met Council's ArcGIS Portal as an upload destination.
A script was developed and shared with each county via GitHub.
Hopefully, we will be able to move forward by the end of the year.
Marcia added that it was noted yesterday to the GIS managers that about half of the Metro counties that do upload data have successfully tested so and just finished up that testing and are ready to move on.

8. Lightning Round

Joseph Mueller, MnDoT

introduced himself. Joseph works in the Metro District Maintenance Asset Management area of MnDoT. Joseph holds one of two seats representing State Agencies on the Committee.

Alison Slaats, MNGeo

provided an update MnGeo and the Geospatial Advisory Council Parcel and Land Records Committee. The committee sent out a survey to all counties in Minnesota asking about the status of open data and willingness to share their parcel data publicly in an aggregated parcel dataset for the state.
MnGeo is hoping to have a first cut of an aggregated dataset of all counties that have opted-in to be published in January.
MnGeo would like Metro Counties to respond the survey.

Also, the GAC 3DGeo Central Mississippi Lidar acquisition block proposal to USGS was successful and recommended for funding. Thank you to MetroGIS and other partners on this call for making this proposal successful. 20 local partners committed $1,580,685 and USGS recommended $2,288,336 funding from 3DEP.

MnGeo Director/GIO Position posting: https://bit.ly/3HOui2Q (open until 12/14)

Pete Wiringa, U of M

There are a couple of talks to TCMUG/OSGeo on UUMPT in the archive.
https://www.osgeo.org/local-chapters/twin-cities-mn-usa-chapter/

U-Spatial is also hiring, two developers
https://jobsearch.cla.umn.edu/344968

Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council
Matt noted that Jessi Wyatt has left the Great Plains Institute and the Committee is now looking for a new representative from the Non-profit sector. Matt asked that if anyone knows someone who would be an good candidate to sit on the CC and represent non-profits, let us know.

Catherine Hansen, DNR
MNIT DNR ITS3 position to join the Wildlife Business Services Team as a web/mobile developer is open from 12/3/2021 – 12/10/2021

External applicants can access the posting here
Application Support Specialist - ITS3 Job ID 50907

Randy Knippel, Dakota County
Randy introduced an intern, Maya Vellicolungara.
Randy mentioned that he is the chair of the Metro GIS Data producer workgroup which includes Metro County GIS Managers, and Matt McGuire from Met Council. The meetings are to discuss common issues and share projects we are working on. The group has met specifically to discuss priority number 8, increased frequency of Parcel updates. The group is looking to go to a bi-monthly update frequency based on feedback from a meeting that Geoff Maas ran with data producers.

Also noted that if there are any questions to ask the counties, the MetroGIS Data Producer work group is a great forum for that. Let Randy know and he will get it on the agenda.

David Brandt, Washington County
David represents MetroGIS on the GAC and had this update. We have a GAC meeting next Wednesday, Dec 15th.
In addition to covering some stuff we've covered here, we will get an update on clean water council policy statement, open data parcel reports, looking at maybe a Hub for the GAC, a Lidar update, and a project prioritization effort similar to what we've done. If you've got any questions, ask David Brandt.

Anyone is welcome to attend the GAC meeting.

Brad Henry
Local one call group UUMPT for sharing underground utility data. This group includes Barb Cederburg and Steve Swazee. Brad suggests that MetroGIS should endorse this project.

We don't currently share underground utility information. Brad exhorts Dave to feature this at the next meeting.

9. Next Coordinating Committee Meeting (action item)

If you have topics, reach out to Matt McGuire, David Brandt or Erik Dahl.
Randy asked if there was a possibility of a hybrid online/in person meeting. After some discussion of the relative merits of hybrid vs online or in-person only. If we can find a venue.

David Brandt motioned to tentatively plan for the meeting online in March.
Randy Knippel seconded
No discussion
Motion passes

Erik Dahl mentioned that everyone should check out the MetroGIS Teams site.
David Brand mentioned that ESRI is holding their conference in person.

10. Adjourned at 2:10

David Brand motioned to adjourn
Randy Knippel seconded