



## **MetroGIS Policy Board Minutes: 1997-1998**



**January 15, 1997 Agenda**  
**Wednesday, January 15, 1997**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**Metropolitan Council -- Council Chambers**  
**230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

1. Welcome/Introductions
  - David Arbeit, Chair, MetroGIS Coordinating Committee (Director of Minnesota Land Management Information Center--LMIC)
  - David Hartley, Metropolitan Council Representative to MetroGIS Policy Board
2. GIS: Government's Information Solution
3. I-35W Corridor Coalition Project: Why We Need to Cooperate
  - Dennis Welsch: Member, MetroGIS Coordinating Committee (Community Development Director, City of Roseville)
4. MetroGIS To Date (Steering Committee of MetroGIS Coordinating Committee)
  - Richard Johnson, Liaison to Governor's Council on Geographic Information (Associate Regional Administrator, Metropolitan Council)
  - David Arbeit: Chair, MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
  - Margo Labau, Policy Advisory Team Liaison (Manager, Administrative Operations, Anoka County)
  - Will Craig, Data Content Advisory Team Liaison (Assistant Director, CURA, University of Minnesota)
  - Ron Wencil, Standards Advisory Team Liaison (National Mapping Division Liaison, US Geological Survey)
  - Jim Sydow, Access Advisory Team Liaison (Director, Technology Information Education Services - TIES)
5. Action Items
  - a. Select Date and Time for Next Meeting (March 1997?)
  - b. Authorize Steering Committee to Set Agenda for Next Meeting
  - c. Authorize Chair of Steering Committee to Moderate Policy Board Meetings until a Board Chair is Appointed
6. Closing
  - David Arbeit: Chair, MetroGIS Coordinating Committee

**\*\*Adjourn to the Social/Poster Session (Room 1A-C)\*\***

## January 15, 1997 Minutes

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

David Arbeit, Chair of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, called the first meeting of the MetroGIS Policy Board to order at 7:05 pm. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Pat Scott (Minneapolis) and Terry Schneider (Minnetonka). Counties Anoka: Dennis Berg; Carver: John Siegfried; Dakota: Joseph Harris; Hennepin: Randy Johnson and Jeff Spartz (alternate); Ramsey: Victoria Reinhardt; Washington: Dennis Hegberg. Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (RileyPurgatoryBluff Creek Watershed District).

Metropolitan Council: David Hartley; and Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District).

Board Members Absent: Scott County: Edwin Mackie.

Steering Committee Members Present : Chair, Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Liaison to Data Access Team: Jim Sydow (TIES); Liaison to Data Content Team: Will Craig (University of Minnesota); Liaison to Policy Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Liaison to Standards Team: Ron Wencil (USGS); and Metropolitan Council representative to Governor's Council on Geographic Information: Richard Johnson.

Steering Committee Members Absent: None

Support Staff Present: Randall Johnson, Rick Gelbmann, Heidi Welsch, David Vessel, Mark Kotz, and Tanya Mayer.

David Arbeit explained the agenda for the evening; introduced the members of the Steering Committee and support staff, summarized the role of the Steering Committee as ex officio members and support to the Board; stated the names of Board members and the organizations they each represent; and stressed that their respective organizations are each expected to play an important role in moving the MetroGIS from concept to reality. His presentation focused on the goal of MetroGIS to address fundamental issues that cannot be addressed by the GIS investments of individual organizations.

David Hartley, the Metropolitan Council's representative to the Policy Board, welcomed his colleagues on the Board to the MetroGIS initiative. He stressed that the Council's role is to facilitate a stakeholder governed process through which the Council is a participant the same as each of the other stakeholder organizations. He also noted that the specifics of the Council's facilitator role have been unanimously endorsed by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. He likened the Council's role in the creation of the MetroGIS to the role it played to facilitate the creation of the Metropolitan Radio Board. Mr. Hartley emphasized that a collaborative and cooperative approach to the development of a mechanism to enable widespread sharing of GIS data is in the public interest and that significant cost savings and improved decision support can result from the work that lies ahead.

### 2. GIS: Government's Information Solution

A 15minute video tape produced by the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA) was shown. A number of case studies, including Hennepin County, were used to illustrate how geographic information system (GIS) technology can improve information for decision making through integration of data from a number of sources and how the use of GIS can help organizations make more efficient use of existing resources.

### 3. I-35W Corridor Coalition Project: Why We Need to Cooperate

Dennis Welsch, Member of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, Director of Community Development for Roseville, and Chair of the I35W Corridor Coalition, explained that the goal of the I35W Coalition is to facilitate collaborative development and redevelopment of the I35W corridor located in southern Anoka, eastern Hennepin and Ramsey Counties. Dennis noted that in addition to the 3 counties, the Coalition's membership also includes 3 school districts and 7 cities, representing a combined population of nearly 152,000 persons with the potential for \$80 million in new tax base and over 2500 new jobs. Dennis stressed that the Coalition's economic development and redevelopment objectives cannot be achieved until the variety of existing data sources are integrated to enable the Corridor to be analyzed and marketed as one entity. He emphasized that GIS is the perfect tool to accomplish the required data integration, data sharing, and analysis.

#### 4. MetroGIS to Date

David Arbeit presented an overview of the Informational Forums sponsored by the Metropolitan Council and LMIC in October 1995, the December 1995 Strategic Planning Retreat, and visioning and organizational work that took place during the Winter of 1996. Each member was given a notebook containing background information about the MetroGIS mission statement, organizational structure, and contact persons.

Richard Johnson explained the Metropolitan Council's reasons for proposing a regional GIS and for offering to facilitate its creation. Richard also summarized the resources that the Council has committed to the initiative and explained some of the early successes.

Margo LaBau, Liaison to the Policy Advisory Team; Will Craig, Liaison to the Data Content Advisory Team; Ron Wencil, Liaison to the Standards Advisory Team; and Jim Sydow, Liaison to the Data Access Advisory Team individually introduced themselves, provided a brief statement of their respective organizations' interest in MetroGIS, and then summarized their Team's respective purpose, strategic issue assignments, and activities to date. Margo LaBau also summarized the components of the MetroGIS organizational structure and emphasized that considerable thought had been given to developing an effective way to communicate Board and Coordinating Committee directives to each of the Teams and, conversely, to communicate Team rationale to the Board for recommended courses of action. David Arbeit suggested that Item 5c should be acted on before Items 5a and 5b. The Board accepted this request. c) Steering Committee Chair to Moderate Policy Board Meetings until a Board Chair is Appointed. Member Siegfried moved and Member Scott seconded to Authorize the Steering Committee Chair to Moderate Policy Board Meetings until a Board Chair is Appointed. Motion carried unanimously.

a) Next Board Meeting Data and Time. Member Schneider suggested that the Board should consider meeting monthly rather than quarterly until it is familiar with the issues and work to date. The Board concluded that it needs to give the Steering Committee ample opportunity to prepare for the next meeting and that the frequency of Board meetings should be a topic of discussion at the next meeting. Member Scott moved and Member Berg seconded to schedule the next meeting for 7 to 9 pm on Tuesday, March 25, 1997 at the Metropolitan Council's facility in St. Paul. Motion carried unanimously.

b) Agenda for Next Meeting. Member Hartley suggested that the project staff investigate options to the Joint Powers Agreement rules to legitimize the Board as a free standing entity which has the authority to include nongovernmental interests.

Member Harris asked whether the Policy Board will make appointments to the Committees and Teams. David Arbeit noted that the Coordinating Committee has adopted interim operating guidelines that address this matter and has directed its Steering Committee to present them to the Board for discussion as one of the first matters forwarded to the Board. Member Harris also asked for clarification about the Council's financial support of the MetroGIS. Richard Johnson stated that the Council has budgeted funds and allocated staff to support the project. Member Hartley, speaking on behalf of the Metropolitan Council, stated that the Council's goal is to transition over the next couple of years from principal facilitator to being just another member of the MetroGIS consortium. Member Schneider noted that he would like more background information regarding the events that have shaped the MetroGIS initiative to date. Randall Johnson and David Arbeit noted that the MetroGIS WEB site is a good source for additional information. Board members were also encouraged to contact Randall Johnson (2916638) directly if they desire any additional information.

Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to authorize the Steering Committee to set the agenda for the March Board meeting and to add the three items mentioned by Members Hartley and Harris (board legitimization options, appointments to committees/teams, and the Council's financial commitment) to the list of six future Board agenda items referenced in the accompanying staff report, dated January 6, 1997. Motion carried unanimously.

## **6. Closing and Adjournment**

David Arbeit explained that a number of posters and exhibits were on display in the adjoining room to demonstrate the importance and benefits of sharing GIS data among ourselves. He invited everyone to take a few minutes to visit the exhibits, ask questions of the exhibitors, and to introduce themselves to one another.

Member Berg (Anoka County) stated that he was initially skeptical of the Council's motives concerning the MetroGIS but that he is now comfortable with the objectives of the initiative and believes it will result in a winwin situation for all involved. He cautioned, however, that everyone needs to be mindful of the desire of some organizations to recapture their individual investments. He also stated that communication channels regarding the MetroGIS need to be open with the counties that adjoin the Metro Area. Randall Johnson stated that establishing ongoing communication about the MetroGIS with the adjoining counties has been is on the list of objectives for 1997. Randall Johnson also noted that the Governor's Council on Geographic Information is a vehicle for this communication. Member Berg stated that officials in the adjoining Counties should be added to the mailing list for the proposed MetroGIS newsletter that is referenced in the report for Agenda Item 5b.

Member Siegfried stated that he can tell that a significant amount of progress has already been made to collectively define the objectives and to obtain broad based support for the initiative. He thanked those involved for their contributions.

Member Berg moved and Member Harris seconded to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by: Randall Johnson, AICP, GIS Liaison, Metropolitan Council



**Tuesday, March 25, 1997 , 7:00 P.M.  
Metropolitan Council: Council Chambers  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN  
(Interim Board Moderator -- David Arbeit, Chair Coordinating Committee)**

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a) January 15, 1997
4. Discussion Items
  - a) Metropolitan Council's Financial Commitment to MetroGIS (Separate Cover)
5. Action Items
  - a) Operating Guidelines -- Policy Board
  - b) Legitimization of MetroGIS
  - c) Meeting Schedule
  - d) MetroGIS Newsletter -- 1st Issue
  - e) Communication between Board Meetings
  - f) Meeting Notification Guidelines
6. Information Items
  - a) Response to Member Schneider's Information Request
  - b) Strategic Issue Assignments and Progress
  - c) Business Information Needs Project -- Status Update (hand out at the meeting)
  - d) Listing of Board Member Names and Contact Numbers
7. Other Business
8. Next Meeting (Date, Place and Time)  
May xx, 1997,
9. Adjourn

## March 25, 1997 Minutes

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by David Arbeit, Chair of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Pat Scott (Minneapolis); Counties: Joseph Harris; Hennepin: Randy Johnson and Jeff Spartz (alternate); Ramsey: Victoria Reinhardt; Washington: Dennis Hegberg. Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District); Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District).

Board Members Absent: Counties-- Anoka: Dennis Berg; Carver: John Siegfried; Scott: Edwin Mackie; Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Terry Schneider (Minnetonka); Metropolitan Council: David Hartley.

Coordinating Committee Liaisons Present : Chair, Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Liaison to Data Access Team: Jim Sydow (TIES); Liaison to Data Content Team: Will Craig (University of Minnesota); Liaison to Policy Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Liaison to Standards Team: Ron Wencil (USGS); and Metropolitan Council representative to Governor's Council on Geographic Information: Richard Johnson.

Coordinating Committee Liaisons Absent: Liaison to Standards Team: Ron Wencil (USGS)

Support Staff Present: Randall Johnson, Rick Gelbmann, Heidi Welsch.

### ACCEPT AGENDA

David Arbeit suggested that Items 5d, 5e, and 5f be considered before other business items in the event any members arrive late. Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the agenda as suggested by David Arbeit. Motion carried unanimously.

### ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Scott moved and Member Halvorson seconded to approve the summary of the Board's January 15, 1997 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### ACTION ITEMS

#### d) MetroGIS Newsletter -- Authorization to Publish 1st Issue

Heidi Welsch of the MetroGIS staff summarized the contents of the proposed first issue of the MetroGIS newsletter entitled "Coordinates". A draft was given to the Board and the members were asked for comments and informed that the first issue would be mailed in April if the Board is comfortable with it. Member Scott asked whether inquiries have been received for this type of information. David Arbeit noted that questions about MetroGIS are gaining in frequency.

Member Scott asked who would be receiving the newsletter. Heidi Welsch explained that about 750 copies of the first issue will be mailed. The mailing list currently includes: each member of the MetroGIS Policy Board; all persons affiliated with MetroGIS committees and teams; the chief administrative and chief elected official of the 400+ local units of government that serve the Metro Area; selected state and federal agency administrators, state legislative staff, nonprofit economic development organizations, and the 150+ persons who attended the regional GIS forums sponsored by the Council and LMIC in October 1995.

The general consensus of the Policy Board was that the newsletter was well written and contained useful information. Member Harris suggested that the first issue be postponed until the Policy Board Chair is elected and their name can be included along with the other Team and Committee Chairs in the Contact Section. The Board concurred with Member Harris's suggestion.

#### e) Communication Between Board Meetings

Randall Johnson of the MetroGIS staff asked the Board members if they want to receive any of the materials prepared for the Coordinating Committee as part of their agenda packets or as a separate mailing. The consensus was that the agenda sheet for the preceding Committee meeting would be adequate. Staff was also asked to include the Committee agenda with Board's agenda packet; a separate, earlier mailing is not necessary.

#### f) Meeting Notice Guidelines

Margo LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, presented a recommendation from the Coordinating Committee that the Metropolitan Council's Metro Meetings publication be utilized as the means of providing public notice of the Policy Board's meetings.

Member Harris moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the following meeting notification guidelines for MetroGIS:

Post the times, locations, and whenever possible, agenda items for all Policy Board meetings in the Metropolitan Council's Metro Meetings.

Provide direct mailings of agenda materials to interested persons, upon request.

Motion carried unanimously.

#### DISCUSSION ITEMS

##### a) Metropolitan Council's Commitment to MetroGIS

Richard Johnson, Associate Regional Administrator for the Metropolitan Council and member of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, summarized the report for this agenda item. He affirmed that the Metropolitan Council is committed to facilitating creation of a regional GIS and outlined the resources that the Council has committed to the effort. The Board had asked for this information at its January meeting.

Richard explained the reasons for the Council's commitment. In 1994, the Council concluded that: a) it needed a parcel-based GIS and more accurate land use information to more effectively communicate with local government concerning growth management matters and b) the most cost-effective means to obtain the desired data would be a collaborative initiative with other government, in particular with the counties.

As an incentive for others to participate in a collaborative effort, Richard explained that the Council had authorized a contribution of \$1.2 million toward an estimated \$6 million project to obtain orthoimagery for the Metro Area in exchange for access to the county's parcel data. Richard also explained how the orthoimagery incentive program evolved into the current Data and Cost Sharing Agreement initiative with the counties in response to suggestions from county officials.

Since October 1995, in addition to the funds committed to Data and Cost Sharing Agreements, Richard noted that the Council has spent \$102,000 to support MetroGIS Team functions, special purpose projects, and several large group forums. These expenses do not include Council staff allocated to MetroGIS or costs incurred to address the Council's own business needs.

Richard concluded his remarks by restating the Council's commitment to facilitating the process to define the form and function of MetroGIS; that the Council will continue to look to MetroGIS officials for guidance on expenditure of facilitation funds; that the Council views itself as one of many organizations that will benefit from MetroGIS; and consequently that the Council will look increasing to other stakeholders to either sponsor or assist with MetroGIS implementation activities as stakeholder needs and roles are more clearly defined.

Member Reinhardt thanked the Council for supporting the MetroGIS initiative to date and for its commitment for the next couple of years but felt it important to communicate to Council officials that at the conclusion of the study and debate other stakeholders may conclude that they are not willing to proceed beyond the Council's initial investment. Richard Johnson acknowledged this possibility but stated that he and the Council are optimistic that the benefits of a collaborative, regional data sharing mechanism will be recognized and that other stakeholders will conclude that continued involvement is in their best interest.

Member Fiskness stated that watershed organizations are a prime example of the need for a collaborative data sharing mechanism because they often involve portions of multiple cities and multiple counties and they typically do not have the resources to independently develop GIS capabilities. Member Fiskness suggested that watershed organizations should be looked to as a way to measure the success of the MetroGIS initiative, given their high level of dependence upon other organizations for data and that multi-local government organizations often comprise their jurisdictions. He stated that he is convinced that sharing of GIS data and resources is the most cost-effective means to meet watershed needs in a manner consistent with tax payer expectations.

David Arbeit noted that it will take time for the common needs of MetroGIS stakeholders to be defined, but that through the Metropolitan Council's leadership a process has been implemented to collectively define the form and function of a regional solution.



## ACTION ITEMS

### a) Operating Guidelines - Policy Board

Margo LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, explained that on March 6th the Coordinating Committee unanimously recommended the suggested operating guidelines for the Policy Board. Margo summarized the major provisions. Several clarifications were agreed upon: a) Article II, Sections 2 and 3 -- reconcile need for board resolution for alternate members and board authorization for primary representations; b) Article II, Section 2 -- clarify that each AMM representative may vote but can not vote for the other in their absence; c) Article II, Section 7 -- require a quorum only to take action, not needed to convene a meeting.

### Motions:

Member Johnson moved and Member Halvorson seconded to approve Articles I and II of the MetroGIS Operating Guidelines (dated March 6, 1997), subject to inclusion of the three revisions agreed upon by the Policy Board.

Motion carried unanimously.

Member Reinhardt moved and Member Harris seconded to: 1) ratify the current membership of the Coordinating Committee and 2) direct the Committee and its Policy Advisory Team to continue their review and preparation of the remaining Articles of the MetroGIS Operating Guidelines as appropriate to the continued development of MetroGIS. Motion carried unanimously.

Member Harris moved and Member Hegberg seconded to elect Member Reinhardt as Policy Board Chair. Motion carried unanimously.

Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to postpone election of vice chair until the next meeting because several members were not in attendance. Motion carried unanimously.

### b) Legitimization of MetroGIS

Margo LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, explained that on March 6th, the Coordinating Committee unanimously recommended a procedure to legitimize MetroGIS as a free-standing entity. At its January meeting, the Board had asked the Coordinating Committee to address this matter.

Margo summarized the major components of the recommended procedure as follows: a) creation of a working group of the Policy Advisory Team that would include legal staff from several of the Board member organizations and b) wait until the Board has clarified the desired functions of MetroGIS and finalized the membership of the Board before the working group would recommend a course of action to legitimize MetroGIS.

Margo stated that Member Berg was unable to attend this meeting and that he had asked her to inform the Board that he concurs with the Coordinating Committee's recommendation to draw upon a broader group of expertise, and that he would seek participation from Anoka County legal staff.

Member Harris concurred that before the Board's legal form is formalized that its function needs to be articulated. Members Spartz and Johnson stated that they believe the Board needs to move expeditiously to legitimize itself because the private sector is moving very quickly in this arena, and the public sector could lose out on valuable opportunities if not in a position to take advantage of options as they present themselves. Member Spartz stated that a common practice of government units that wish to join forces for a particular purpose is to enter into a joint powers agreement and to contract with non-government organizations as necessary.

Chairperson Reinhardt asked for clarification as to the number of legal staff envisioned for the working group. Margo Labau explained that representation for each of the major stakeholder classes is intended or a group of about five or six persons. She clarified that a representative is not proposed from each of the eleven individual organizations.

Richard Johnson stated that recommendation contemplates that background research would begin on a number of possible options that allow for public and non-public membership and then to study these options in depth once the Policy Board has defined the function and Board membership for MetroGIS. Richard Johnson also noted that the Council's Data and Cost Sharing Agreement initiative is intended to provide an interim structure to help the Board define the functions that should be the substance of a long term structure.

Member Scott raised concern that forming the suggested workgroup at this time may be premature and may divert resources from higher priority needs. David Arbeit responded by stating that there is no compelling need to define a specific legal structure at this time, given that: a) each of the key stakeholders continues to allow their staff to participate on the Advisory Teams that have been working on the strategic issues with the assistance of the

Council's facilitation commitment, and b) he knows of no technical reason for a legal structure until the Policy Board has resources of its own to manage or wishes to enter into contracts as an entity.

Chairperson Reinhardt noted that she is not opposed to the suggested process, but like Member Scott is concerned about the timing. Member Harris concurred, noting that he is ready to engage legal staff. Member Harris also commented he believes that the current process allows for any organization with an interest, public or private, to participate via the Coordinating Committee and its advisory teams but that he believes it is still too early to consider opening the Policy Board to non-government interests.

Member Johnson suggested that staff look at models that may be applicable and present them to the Policy Board for discussion. Member Harris suggested that the agreement arrangement used by Dakota County to partner with several cities within the county and Dakota Electric be considered.

Gary Stevenson, Director of the Dakota County Land Information and Survey Department and member of the Coordinating Committee, addressed the Board at the request of Member Harris. Gary acknowledged that the Dakota County Partnership had been in existence since the late 1980's. He also commented that the Data and Cost Sharing Agreements being sought by the Metropolitan Council with each county will give MetroGIS a three-year window of time to test solutions to institutional and technical obstacles to data sharing.

Member Scott moved and Member Harris seconded to table action on the recommended procedure and to limit activity at this time to review of existing options by staff. Motion carried unanimously.

#### c) Meeting Schedule

Randall Johnson of the MetroGIS Staff presented a suggested meeting schedule that calls for the Policy Board to meet every other month for the remainder of 1997. The consensus was that meetings on Wednesday evenings best fit schedules and that the Council's facility is a good location. May 28th, September 24th and November 19th were selected. Staff was directed to look at staffing and facility availability for a July meeting to be held on July 17, 23, or 30th. Member Scott moved and Member Halvorson moved approval to:

1. Generally hold MetroGIS Policy Board meetings at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility and begin them at 7:00 PM
2. Hold meetings on May 28th, September 24th, and November 19th.
3. Direct staff to look into the best option in terms of staffing and facility availability for a July meeting on one of the following dates: 17, 23, or 30.
4. Notify all members, in writing, as soon as possible of the approved meeting schedule.

Motion carried unanimously.

#### 6. INFORMATION ITEMS

##### a) Response to Member Schneider's Information Request

Chairperson Reinhardt suggested that this matter be postponed to the next meeting because member Schneider was not present. The Board concurred.

##### b) Strategic Issue Assignments and Progress

There was no discussion of this item.

##### c) Business Information Needs Project Update

Will Craig, Coordinating Committee Liaison to the Data Content Advisory Team, presented an overview of the preliminary results of the Business Information Needs survey conducted in February. He distributed a list of the top 15 information needs: needs important to stakeholder organizations and which require dependence upon other organizations for the data to answer the need. Will Craig stated the top needs include a good mix of data that many organizations collect. He also noted that many of the items also appear to be those things that are more cost-effective to collect on a regional or collaborative basis. He stated that his hope to be able to justify the need to share data seems to be holding true.

Will Craig and David Arbeit, Craig's research partner on this project, invited the Board members to attend the May 22nd presentation of the final results. Board members asked when a recommendation requiring the highest priority needs to MetroGIS would be brought to the Board for consideration. Staff noted that the current expectation is for the Board to discuss a recommendation at its May 28th meeting.

##### d) Listing of Board Member Names and Contact Numbers

There was no discussion of this item.

#### 7. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked David Arbeit for moderating the first two Board meetings and she thanked staff and committee members for their contributions to the project.

NEXT MEETING

May 28, 1997; 7:00 PM; Metropolitan Council, Mears Park Facility

ADJOURN

Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to adjourn at 9:25 PM. Motion carried unanimously.



**Wednesday, May 28, 1997**

**7:00 P.M.**

**Metropolitan Council -- Council Chambers**

**230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

1. Call to Order
  2. Accept Agenda
  3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - March 25, 1997
  4. New Board Members
  5. Business Items
  - a. Election of Vice Chairperson \*\*
  - b. MetroGIS Information Need Priorities \*\*
  - c. Current Board Membership
  6. Information Items
  - a. Response to Member Schneider's Information Request
  - b. MetroGIS -- General Activity Update
  7. Other Business
  8. Next Meetings: 7:00 PM, Location: Metropolitan Council, Council Chambers
  - Wednesday, Jul. 30, 1997
  - Wednesday, Sep. 24, 1997
  - Wednesday, Nov. 19, 1997
  9. Adjourn
- \*\*Action Requested

## May 28, 1997 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Reinhardt. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Pat Scott (Minneapolis) and Terry Schneider (Minnetonka); Counties Anoka: Dennis Berg; Carver: John Siegfried; Hennepin: Jeff Spartz (alternate); Ramsey: Victoria Reinhardt; Scott: Edwin Mackie; Washington: Dennis Hegberg. Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District); and Metropolitan Council: Bill Schreiber.

Board Members Absent: Counties-- Dakota; Joseph Harris; Hennepin: Randy Johnson, Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District).

Coordinating Committee Liaisons Present : Liaison to Data Content Advisory Team: Will Craig (University of Minnesota); Liaison to Policy Advisory Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Liaison to Standards Advisory Team: Ron Wenzl (USGS).

Coordinating Committee Liaisons Absent: Chair, Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Liaison to Data Access Advisory Team: Jim Sydow (TIES).

Support Staff Present: Randall Johnson, Rick Gelbmann, Heidi Welsch.

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Accepted as submitted.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES

Member Fiskness moved and Member Hegberg seconded to approve the minutes of the Board's March 25, 1997 meeting, subject to clarifying member Harris represents Dakota County in the members present section. Motion carried unanimously.

### 4. INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS

Chairperson Reinhardt introduced Member Schreiber. Member Schreiber stated he is replacing David Hartley as the Metropolitan Council's representative to the Policy Board because David Hartley had resigned from the Council to pursue an out-of-state employment opportunity. Member Schreiber commented that MetroGIS is an exciting opportunity for the Council to collaborate with local government to achieve common needs and that he is looking forward to representing the Council in this endeavor. Chairperson Reinhardt reported that the Ramsey County Board had appointed Janice Rettman as Ramsey County's alternate to the Policy Board.

### 5. BUSINESS ITEMS

#### a) Election of Vice Chairperson

The group discussed electing the vice-chairperson with the understanding this person would become the chair the following year was discussed but decided not to pursue this course at this time to maintain flexibility and because the Board's operating guidelines would need to be amended to implement this policy.

Member Siegfried nominated Member Fiskness (watershed district representative) to serve a Vice-Chairperson which led to discussion and general acknowledgment that county representatives to the Board should be in the leadership roles given the significant investments counties have made to implement GIS. Member Siegfried stated he is comfortable with a focus on county leadership but also does not want to exclude others. Member Berg was asked if he would serve as vice-chair. He stated that he would accept if nominated. Member Fiskness withdrew his name from nomination.

Member Schneider nominated Member Berg to serve as vice chairperson through April 1998. Member Siegfried seconded the nomination. Chairperson Reinhardt closed the nomination process, hearing no other nominations. Member Schneider moved and Member Scott seconded to elect Member Berg as vice chairperson by acclamation for the coming year. Motion carried unanimously.

#### b) MetroGIS Information Need Priorities/Next Steps Methodology

Information Need Priorities: Will Craig, Coordinating Committee Liaison to the Data Content Advisory Team, presented an overview of the process the Team used to identify priority information needs of cross-jurisdictional importance. He also acknowledged the participants and those who guided the project. He reported that at its April 24th meeting, the Coordinating Committee had concluded there is a natural break between the information needs

ranked numbers 13 and 14 and that concentration on the top thirteen information needs (see recommendation for a listing) is reasonable for the time being.

He also explained that the Coordinating Committee selected four of the thirteen top needs for immediate attention because they provide a foundation for work on the others. These four foundation needs are "jurisdictional boundaries", needs associated with an addressable street network data base, "land use plans", and "parcel boundaries". The reasons for selecting each of them were noted. Craig also explained the Coordinating Committee believes MetroGIS should build upon projects underway at Metropolitan Council to make addressable street centerline and soils data available for the entire seven-county region. He encouraged the Board to be open to other situations where a similar economy of scale can be achieved.

Board members commented that some of the information needs appeared to overlap and questioned whether some of them should be collapsed. Craig explained that some collapsing is expected but the preference of the Coordinating Committee's is to leave the decision to the experts that will be invited to participate in the next step of the project. The members concurred with this approach.

Member Schreiber asked if property description data maintained by county assessors will be among the core data, in particular, property valuation data. Craig explained that a variety of data will be needed to answer the high priority information needs and subject matter experts will be looked to identify the needed data. Randall Johnson explained that the Metropolitan Council's GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements with the metro area counties will provide access to property description data by government organizations for their internal business purposes whether or not these data are needed to answer the top thirteen information needs.

Questions were raised about how varying accuracy and varying data update frequencies would be met. Staff noted that both characteristics about data that subject matter experts will be asked to address for each information need and that the workgroups may conclude that multiple specifications are needed to accommodate the range of needs.

Member Hegberg suggested that census tract boundaries should be included with the jurisdictional boundary information need, given their importance to reporting for a number of private and public organizations. Craig stated that he would prefer the jurisdictional boundary information need category to remain as simple as possible to enable effective testing of the "next steps" methodology.

Member Berg noted that in terms of broad information needs, Anoka County needs a more efficient way to handle lot dimension information. They respond to about 2000 inquiries a year for this information. Staff noted they would expect this need to be addressed by the "parcel boundaries" workgroup.

Member Scott stated she had spoken with Minneapolis staff that attended the May 22nd public presentation of the Information Needs Project results and she is comfortable with the priorities recommended by the Coordinating Committee. Member Siegfried concurred, noting that he believes the results of this participatory process are as good as can be expected.

**Next Steps Methodology:** Craig explained the seven-step methodology (see recommendation) endorsed by the Coordinating Committee to identify appropriate data sources for each priority information need. Responding to a question, Craig estimated the work of the jurisdictional boundaries workgroup would be completed by the end of summer and the current thinking is to complete the workgroup tasks for the top four information needs by June 1998.

Member Fiskness asked whether the data bases that are to support MetroGIS will be in a central location. Staff explained that the current thinking is the data bases will be distributed among a variety data producers and a task of the information need workgroups is to identify the most appropriate source(s) for each information need. Staff also explained that the Access Advisory Team is working on a WEB Index Model to coordinate access to these data bases in a manner transparent to the user. Also explained was the expected relationship between the information needs workgroups and the work by the Standards Advisory Team to identify solutions to data sharing obstacles.

Ron Wencil, Standards Advisory Team Liaison, noted that a priority to overcoming data sharing obstacles is to describe data holdings in a common way through use of an agreed upon "metadata" format.

**Request for Direction: Board Endorsement or Information:** Will Craig explained the Coordinating Committee had debated whether to seek formal Board endorsement of the top thirteen information needs and the next-steps methodology. He reported that the group was generally of the opinion these are details within the context of addressing a broader strategic issue and, as such, should be within the purview of the Committee to decide.

However, he also noted the Committee had agreed to seek direction from the Board how it wants to handle

matters of this type. The debate focused on a sensitivity of how to best to communicate with the Policy Board without burdening it with unwanted details.

Chairperson Reinhardt explained that she had asked staff to place these items on the Policy Board's agenda for formal endorsement because she believes they will set team and committee work programs for some time to come. The consensus of the Board was this discussion was useful and informative and that it is important to give the Board an opportunity to raise questions to insure that everyone is moving forward together. Board members also concurred with Chairperson Reinhardt that they would prefer matters of this type to be brought before the Board for endorsement rather than for information.

Member Scott moved and Member Schneider seconded to approve the following recommendations of the Coordinating Committee, as presented in the staff report dated May 12, 1997:

- a. To endorse selection of following thirteen information needs as the priorities for MetroGIS to concentrate on initially: 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)
- b. To endorse the following next-phase methodology to identify the appropriate data sources for information needs that are priorities to MetroGIS:

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]
- c. To endorse a strategy to test and refine the next-phase methodology with the "jurisdictional boundaries" information need 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: Motion carried unanimously.

c) Policy Board Membership

Margo Labau, Coordinating Committee Liaison to the Policy Advisory Team, presented this item. The reasons for selecting each of the constituencies currently represented on the Policy Board and on the Coordinating Committee were explained. Labau also explained: 1) the process used to define the term "stakeholder" and summarized the three levels of stakeholder interest, 2) the process used to seek endorsement from key stakeholder which led to appointment of the Policy Board members, and 3) the Committee's expectation that any adjustments to the initial Board membership would be decided by the Policy Board.

Board direction was sought regarding the potential for Board membership by private providers of essential public services. Labau explained that this direction is sought at this time because the Information Needs Project may identify organizations important to the success of MetroGIS that are not represented on the Board. She noted that this subject has not been discussed by the Policy Advisory Team or the Coordinating Committee and is brought before the Board to seek permission only to begin exploring options.

The consensus was to hold the Board's voting membership to the current members and to encourage other stakeholders to participate in Board discussions. Staff was asked to prepare a list of non-government organizations that will likely benefit from MetroGIS for discussion at the next meeting. It was agreed if a previously unrepresented organization(s) is discovered to be important to the success of MetroGIS that it would be in the interest of MetroGIS to bring them into the process as early as possible.

It was agreed that MetroGIS needs to be cautious about any private sector relationship it pursues that might appear as an unfair advantage by any particular company and a broad-based perspective is a must for any particular interest group. The current mechanism for representation by school districts, watershed management organizations, and cities was cited as the type of interest class representation that should be sought for any unrepresented interests, particularly private sector interests. The group concurred that a subcommittee to represent utility company interests should be investigated because utility companies provide essential public services, they have a business need for much of the same data needed by the Board member organizations, and because they generally have data and resources useful to a multi-participant GIS.

#### 6. INFORMATION ITEMS

##### a) Response to Member Schneider's Information Request

Member Schneider stated that he would like more information about the Metropolitan Council's GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement initiative with metro area counties. The Board concurred that a briefing on the objectives, status, and general provisions of these agreements would be helpful. Staff agreed to provide this information at the July 30th meeting and to provide a copy of an executed agreement to Board members. Gary Stevenson of Dakota County was asked if a copy of the Dakota County GIS Partnership agreement could also be shared with the Board since the partnership includes a private utility. Gary agreed to send a copy to MetroGIS staff for the July 30th meeting.

##### b) MetroGIS -- General Activity Update

There was no discussion of the information provided in the packet.

#### 7. OTHER BUSINESS

##### a): Communication with Board Members

Board members concurred that staff should assume that Board members do not know much about MetroGIS and to think of ways to bring them up to speed. It was agreed that concise educational/background materials should be prepared to orient any new members with activities that have shaped MetroGIS.

##### b) July 30, 1997 Policy Board Meeting

A workshop format as agreed upon for the July 30th meeting and the primary focus will be to discuss the Council's GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement initiative with the metro area counties. Staff was asked to provide a copy of a representative executed agreement to the members for their review before the meeting. Member Schreiber asked for an update on data sharing and GIS program development obstacles perceived by the counties, noting that MetroGIS should not be a barrier to counties that want to move ahead faster than MetroGIS can accommodate. County staff were invited to attend and to participate in this discussion.

#### 8. NEXT MEETINGS

- Wednesday, July 30, 1997
- Wednesday, Sept. 24, 1997
- Wednesday, Nov. 19, 1997
- 7:00 PM, Metropolitan Council, Mears Park Facility

#### 9. ADJOURN

Member Scott moved and Member Siegfried seconded to adjourn at 9:15 PM. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, AICP, GIS Liaison, Metropolitan Council





**Wednesday, July 30, 1997**  
**7:00 PM**  
**Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A**  
**230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
- May 28, 1997
4. Information/Workshop Items
  - a. General Activity Update
  - b. Explanation of the objectives of the Metropolitan Council's GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Initiative with metro area counties. Example: Agreement with Dakota County
  - c. How are counties organizing for GIS with organizations within their boundaries, including the private sector? Example: Dakota County's GIS Partnership Agreement
  - d. Preliminary Coordinating Committee agenda for August 28, 1997
5. Discussion Items
  - a. Representation of Non-Government Organizations in MetroGIS Decision Making
6. Other Business
7. Next Meetings
- Date: Wednesday, Sep. 24, 1997 (Reschedule to Oct 1, 1997?)
8. Adjourn

## July 30, 1997 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Chairperson Reinhardt. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Pat Scott (Minneapolis), Terry Schneider (Minnetonka) and Alt. Donn Wiski (Roseville); Counties Anoka: Dennis Berg; Carver: John Siegfried; Dakota; Joseph Harris; Ramsey: Victoria Reinhardt; Scott: Edwin Mackie; Washington: Dennis Hegberg; Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley PurgatoryBluff Creek Watershed District); and Metropolitan Council: Bill Schreiber.

Board Members Absent: Counties:-- Randy Johnson (Hennepin), Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District).

Coordinating Committee Members Present : Data Content Advisory Team Liaisons: Will Craig (University of Minnesota) and David Claypool (Ramsey County); Data Access Advisory Team Liaison: Jim Sydow (TIES); Chair, Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Gary Stevenson (Dakota County); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Dave Drealan (Carver County); and Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin County).

Coordinating Committee Liaisons Absent: Policy Advisory Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Standards Advisory Team: Ron Wencil (USGS).

Visitors: Dennis Feller, Lakeville Schools; Chuck Ballentine, Metropolitan Council

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Rick Gelbmann, Heidi Welsch.

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Siegfried motioned and Schneider seconded to accept the agenda as submitted.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES

Member Schneider motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the minutes of the Board's May 28, 1997 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

#### INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS

Chairperson Reinhardt introduced two new Board alternates. Donn Wiski has been appointed Policy Board Alternate for AMM. He is a Roseville City Councilmember. Richard Johnson has been appointed Policy Board Alternate for the Metropolitan Council. He is the Associate Regional Administrator of the Metropolitan Council.

#### 4a. GENERAL ACTIVITY UPDATE

David Arbeit distributed a handout prepared by staff which described the MetroGIS work program along a timeline. He explained that the update is meant to show the relationships among the three core projects that comprise the current work program: GIS data and cost sharing agreements, Information Needs Project and WEB Index Project. The Board has already taken action on issues concerning the Information Needs Project. Progress and recommendations of the first information need workgroup are expected to be presented to the Policy Board in September. Arbeit explained that the WEB Index Project is scheduled for completion in May or June on 1998. Contract negotiations between selected project consultant and Metropolitan Council are currently underway. Member Siegfried asked whether registration of the 'MetroGIS' name at a national level is necessary. Gelbmann explained that the web index project will involve designing special computer applications to support MetroGIS and that registration of the name is part of the process to reserve rights to the intellectual property that will likely be created and a precaution to insure that we will continue to be able to use the term "MetroGIS". Will Craig noted that there is also public relations value to be gained at a national level. Chairperson Reinhardt noted that Member Randy Johnson had spoken about GIS in Minnesota at the NACCO conference in July and that it is important to preserve our right to use the name "MetroGIS". Member Hegberg noted a recent GIS demonstration presented by HUD to the NACCO conference. Arbeit stated that several federal agencies (HUD, EPA, etc.) are developing GIS programs. The members agreed that it is important that MetroGIS continue to communicate and coordinate with all such efforts.

#### 4b. Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Initiatives

Randall Johnson explained that the Council's data and cost sharing agreement initiative implementstwo provisions of its 1996 statement of its role in the creation of MetroGIS: "facilitate the execution of data and cost sharing agreements among stakeholders" and "participate financially in a fair share of the long-term maintenance of the MetroGIS." Johnson noted that the Council has worked with each county separately to devise a data and cost

sharing agreement that meets individual local needs. In addition to provisions for sharing existing data and helping with projects necessary to each county, all agreements include normalization of a forum or user group. The forum is intended to help communications among all GIS users within the county.

Member Schneider stated that it would be helpful for staff to briefly outline the provisions of all of the agreements. Johnson referred to p.15 and 18 of the agenda packet which provided the concepts and types of data covered by each of the agreements. Carver County's agreement concentrates on the parcel coverage for the county. Ramsey County is working to update planimetric information derived from aerial photography and development of a 'one stop electronic GIS data access point'. Scott County's agreement is to assist with digitizing soils data and development of a 'one stop electronic access to GIS data'. Anoka County's agreement addresses improved efficiency of data distribution to the public and other local government that serve the county. Pat O'Connor noted that Hennepin County expects to complete a data and cost sharing agreement this fall. He noted that meetings among the 4 county departments which use GIS have begun to take place. Pat Scott asked whether the meeting would only be internal to the county or whether input would be given from municipalities and other organizations within the county. O'Connor stated that as soon as internal groups had been organized, other government organizations within Hennepin County would be included in the process.

Member Fiskness noted that objective #5 of the data and cost sharing agreements ("promote a forum for frequent dialogue among local government that serve each county to address GIS issues and opportunities of common interest") could include marketing of MetroGIS data. He posed the question: What can the Policy Board do to help adoption of MetroGIS? As an example, he noted that watersheds sometimes are charged for data from municipalities. How can organizations and agencies outside of the counties be brought into the MetroGIS data sharing philosophy? Claypool noted that in Ramsey County, the user group has worked hard to reach a data sharing agreement. He noted two major limitations to sharing data within counties: 1) municipalities do not always agree to join in sharing data and 2) middle managers unfamiliar with the efficiencies to be gained by sharing data can be obstacles to implementing the principals of MetroGIS. The group agreed that the Dakota County model of sharing data and resources among the cities and other entities within the county is an excellent example that may be used by other counties to facilitate sharing.

Randall Johnson noted that the MetroGIS newsletter, Coordinates, is intended to help communicate and promote the benefits of sharing data.

Member Scott questioned whether historical differences between counties make data sharing a more difficult issue. She asked whether data sharing among a combination of public and private organizations is easier in Dakota County than in Hennepin or Ramsey Counties where systems and methods are more established and communities are already more invested. Stevenson replied that the data sharing that is occurring among Dakota County entities was not as easy as it might seem. The agreement took 4 years to reach among 11 city councils and the county board. The agreement never dictated system specifications. Stevenson reported the key to the successful agreement was keeping it simple. Member Harris added that success in sharing data does not depend upon a county's level of development or establishment. He noted that even in Ramsey and Hennepin Counties there would be a great value to data and cost sharing.

Stevenson noted that one of the biggest benefits realized in Dakota County has been cooperation with the improvement and updating of the tax parcel map.

Claypool noted the benefits of inviting and securing partners prior to development of datasets where common need exists.

Member Schneider asked how efficiencies and cost savings can be documented. Stevenson noted that Will Craig and Don Johnson from the University of Minnesota Center for Urban and Regional Studies (CURA) conducted a study of the benefits that Dakota County has realized from use of GIS. Chairperson Reinhardt asked staff to send copies of the report to Board members.

Member Schreiber stated that he is leery of focusing on cost-savings as the primary benefit of sharing GIS data. He noted that a strong emphasis should be placed on the importance of providing the best information possible to support decision-making. Investing in GIS and data sharing allows for access to the best available data. Bad decisions are costly. Craig concurred stating that cost saving was assumed and that the study of Dakota County focuses on the indirect benefits of GIS such as improved decision making capabilities.

Randall Johnson noted that county and Council officials are tracking data sharing activity as a component of the data and cost sharing agreement initiative and that this information is intended to be used as a partial means of evaluating the benefits of data sharing and the principals of MetroGIS.

Member Schneider stated that he agreed with Member Schreiber but emphasized that while it may be easy to justify investment in GIS and data sharing at a county level, it is not as easily justifiable at a city level. The importance of utilizing cost-benefit/efficiency as a justification for GIS at a municipal level should not be underestimated.

Randall Johnson noted that he will be compiling a list of data available through the agreements, contact persons and responsibilities of the receiving organizations for distribution this fall.

#### 4c. How the Private Sector Works With the Agreements

Stevenson noted that Dakota Electric is a partner in the Dakota County GIS Partnership. Member Berg asked what resources Dakota Electric brought to the table. Stevenson replied that participation of Dakota Electric has been extremely important. Dakota Electric has invested \$127,000 toward the development of the partnership's GIS database. The county does not keep Dakota Electric's data layers on its system, but the partners have access when needed. Other private organizations that did not originally invest in the Dakota County project are now buying data from the partnership.

Member Fiskness asked what formula was used to determine the contribution of each member of the data sharing project. Stevenson reported that the formula is based primarily on the area of the jurisdiction. Revenue from data sales returns to the members in the same proportion. Stevenson reported that the system of cost sharing is working well thus far.

#### 4d. Preliminary Coordinating Committee Agenda for August 28

There were no questions or comments on this item.

#### 5. DISCUSSION ITEM: REPRESENTATION OF NON-GOVT. ORGANIZATIONS IN MetroGIS DECISION-MAKING

Randall Johnson referred to a table on page 27 of the agenda packet which illustrated all non-government organizations represented on teams and committees in MetroGIS. Chairperson Reinhardt asked the group to discuss its thoughts on the role of non-government organizations in the MetroGIS decision making process. Member Schreiber stated that although it is appropriate to have private interests involved, he is concerned with perception of private consultants and other who may use data differently than government. He suggested that private interests could form an additional advisory team that would be open to any and all private interests. Schneider agreed with Schreiber and described two different categories of private organizations: utilities and providers of essential public services; and everyone else.

Arbeit stated that the Coordinating Committee had thought long about this issue before seeking endorsement of the initial Board membership. Initial Board membership was intentionally limited to government organizations; but the possibility of private organizations' involvement was preserved to be dealt with as the Board desired. Arbeit noted that nationally multi-participant GIS endeavors often include non-government interests, usually utility companies, on their boards. He encouraged the MetroGIS Policy Board to remain open to this possibility noting that one non government representative on a board with 12 public representative would not be compromise the public interest.

Board members noted there are both good and bad examples of involving private organizations in data sharing ventures.

Harris asked whether anyone was aware of any private organization that feels left out of the MetroGIS process. No one knew of any. Harris confirmed that all MetroGIS Policy Board meetings are open to the public and are handled through a public notification process at the Metropolitan Council.

Schreiber stated that a project such as MetroGIS must be controlled by the public sector. Harris agreed stating that input from non government organizations should be sought but that government agencies should be the driving force. Members Berg and Fiskness noted that the question of whether non government organizations should take the lead in MetroGIS is well served to have been asked; but that the public interest is best served by public entities managing the MetroGIS; and continued that Metropolitan Council's appropriate role is as facilitator and organizer. The group concurred.

Berg stated that it was important to have a discussion about the role of private organizations, at this time, while MetroGIS is organizing. The group agreed. Siegfried noted and the group agreed that it remains important for the non-government organizations to have a viable means of communicating their interests to the Policy Board. The group agreed.

Harris suggested and the group agreed to strike "investigate options" from the recommendation and to add the word "process" to the end of the motion statement. Member Berg motioned and Member Harris seconded to

approve recommendation 5a as amended: "Direct the Coordinating Committee to insure GIS interests of non-government organizations are adequately represented in the MetroGIS decision-making process."

The motion passed unanimously.

#### 8. NEXT MEETINGS

Chairperson Reinhardt stated that she will be unable to attend the next meeting if held on September 24th and asked for the group to consider moving the date. It was decided to leave the meeting scheduled for September 24th and that Vice-Chair Dennis Berg would moderate the meeting. Member Scott suggested and the group agreed to hold meetings in room 1A of Metropolitan Council Offices heretofore rather than in the Council Chambers.

Next meetings:

- Wednesday, Sept. 24, 1997
- Wednesday, Nov. 19, 1997
- Time: 7:00 PM, Metropolitan Council, Mears Park Facility, Rm. 1A

#### 9. ADJOURN

Member Schreiber moved and Member Schneider seconded to adjourn at 8:50 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Heidi Welsch, Assistant GIS Liaison



**Wednesday, September 24, 1997**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A**  
**230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

1. Call to Order
  2. Accept Agenda
  3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - July 30, 1997\*\*
    4. Discussion and Action Items
  - a. Initiatives With Objectives Similar to MetroGIS
    1. Right-of Way Advisory Task Force to the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) -- Location of Utilities GCGI Land Records Modernization
    - b. Meeting Schedule - 1998\*\*
      5. Information Items
    - a. General MetroGIS Activity Update
      1. Article From CURA -- GIS in Dakota County: Benefits Add Up
      2. Preliminary Coordinating Committee Agenda for October 24, 1997
    6. Other Business
    7. Next Meetings
- Date: Wednesday, Nov. 19, 1997
8. Adjourn
- \*\*Action Requested

## September 24, 1997 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Vice-Chairperson Berg. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Pat Scott (Minneapolis) and Terry Schneider (Minnetonka); Counties: Anoka: Dennis Berg; Carver: John Siegfried; Scott: Edwin Mackie; and Washington: Dennis Hegberg; Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley- Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District); Metropolitan Council: Bill Schreiber; and Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District)

Board Members Absent: Counties: Randy Johnson (Hennepin); Dakota; Joseph Harris; and Ramsey: Victoria Reinhardt

Coordinating Committee Members Present : Data Access Advisory Team Liaison: Jim Sydow (TIES); Data Content Advisory Team Liaisons: Will Craig (University of Minnesota) and David Claypool (Ramsey County); Policy Advisory Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Vice Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: Brad Henry (Minneapolis); Gary Stevenson (Dakota County); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); and Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin County).

Coordinating Committee Liaisons Absent: Standards Advisory Team: Ron Wencil (USGS).

Visitors: Luci Botzek, Botzek Associates; Jeff Grosso, Goodhue County Surveyor.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Rick Gelbmann, Heidi Welsch.

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as submitted.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES

Member Fiskness motioned and Member Mackie seconded to approve the minutes of the Board's July 30, 1997 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

### 4 DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

#### 4a. Initiatives with Objectives Similar to MetroGIS

##### (1) Rights of Way Task Force of the Public Utilities Commission (PUC)

Jerry Knickerbocher, Chair of the Mapping Subcommittee of the Rights-of-Way Task Force and Director of Legislative and Regulatory Affairs for the MN Telephone Association, explained the 1997 legislation that led to the creation of the Rights of Way Task Force and that the utility location reporting rules to be promulgated by this process will apply only to utility construction that occurs after the date of the rules adoption (digital records maintained prior to the date of the new rules would not have to be translated to a format compatible to that of the road authority). He noted that the Task Force has until November 1st to prepare a proposal for consideration by the PUC. He noted the membership of the Task Force; research that has been conducted; and the Task Force's concern that its recommendations not to duplicate or preclude the work of others. Mr. Knickerbocher invited MetroGIS officials to offer their opinions of viable courses of action, noting that his subcommittee has raised more questions than it has been able to answer.

David Claypool and Gary Stevenson stated that the proposed rules need not be complex if management of rights-of-way is the objective. They suggested that the Task Force consider recommending that requiring following reporting information: x, y, and z coordinates at sub-meter accuracy, along with a description of the utility/facility, and the owner's name. Both noted that requiring latitude and longitude coordinates would be compatible with any GIS mapping system and that the coordinate values can be easily and cost-effectively collected with standard GPS equipment. Others on the Coordinating Committee concurred.

Member Scott asked for clarification about what happens after the Task Force's November 1st deadline to propose rules to the PUC. Mr. Knickerbocher stated the rules-making process will be initiated and that the PUC has until March 1998 to adopt rules. He also conceded that an option might be to seek further direction from the legislature if the Task Force concludes that other capabilities need to be in place before the intent of this legislation can be realized, such as, existence of digital cadastral data for each county.

There was general discussion of the effect on and need to coordinate with the Gopher State One Call program, that physically marking the location of utilities by hand before digging will continue and will introduce error no matter how accurate the mapping system, general needs of rights-of-way authorities to effectively manage their

rights-of-way, the need to insure proper reconstruction of road surfaces following utility construction, the need to locate utilities as close as possible to their real world location to save time and resources when future construction is proposed in the vicinity, and the likelihood of a need for hard copy and electronic data reporting standards due to diversity of record keeping capabilities among the state's road authorities (city and county).

The Board thanked Mr. Knickerbocher for bringing this matter to its attention and concurred that uniform utility construction reporting standards make sense to implement the legislative intent to improve management of rights-of-way and to facilitate data sharing.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Scott seconded to direct the Coordinating Committee to prepare a recommendation on its behalf to the Rights of Way Task Force of the Public Utilities Commission offering examples and suggesting the pending utility construction reporting standards should be kept simple and to the minimum needed to effectively management construction within rights-of-way. The Board also asked the Coordinating Committee to state MetroGIS has found that utility network information need is a lower priority than information needs associated with parcels, coordinate systems, road networks, etc. which must be resolved before utility locations can be effectively addressed. Motion carried, ayes all.

## (2) GCGI Land Records Modernization

Jeff Grosso narrated a presentation seeking Board endorsement of Land Records Modernization legislation sponsored by the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. Gary Stevenson, Will Craig, David Claypool, and David Arbeit were also present to answer questions about this initiative. The presentation included general information about the benefits of GIS; its importance of GIS technology to cost-effective management of land records, conclusions of a 1996 survey that counties will need financial and technical assistance to realize the benefits of GIS technology; an overview of Wisconsin's Land Records Management Program; and the objectives of the MN initiative to improve local capacity, integrate data, foster data sharing and improved access, provide technical assistance and start-up funding.

It was reported that concept endorsement had been received from the policy subcommittees of the Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC) and the League of Minnesota Cities. Endorsement from their respective Boards is expected. Member Siegfried, member of AMC's policy subcommittee, explained that AMC is overall supportive of the objectives but that several smaller outstate counties have raised concerns about the details of how the initiative would be finance. They will not likely support taking on more responsibilities if state funding is not provided.

David Arbeit reported that this proposal, along with a \$10 million funding allocation, was presented to the Governor for the inclusion the administration's legislative agenda for the last session. It was well received by the administration but was not carried forward because their was no apparent local government champion. The current endorsement process was designed to provide the support component.

Member Schreiber asked if a standard property identification number (PIN) will be needed to implement the initiative. Gary Stevenson explained that the Governor's Council on Geographic Information has found that a state-wide PIN standard is not necessary, provided parcel numbers are unique. Retrofitting of existing database design is not expected to be needed.

David Arbeit noted that as MetroGIS begins to look for long term funding options, it may want to look to a state funded program. Member Berg noted that although the Wisconsin model of a fee on transactions is a stable source of financing, it is also very difficult to budget for. David Claypool mentioned that interest among county officials for statewide land records management reform is growing.

Member Schneider noted that coordination between MetroGIS and other initiatives, such as this and the PUC's Rights-of-Way Task Force, is needed to insure their output is consistent with the needs of MetroGIS. There was general agreement that the Board would consider revising the MetroGIS Information Needs priorities adopted on May 28th if convinced a change is necessary to coordinate with the work of another initiative. Member Berg encouraged the Board to consider acting on this endorsement request as an opportunity to influence the development of a statewide standard that is also important to the success of MetroGIS.

Motion: Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to direct staff to draft a letter to be signed by Chairperson Reinhardt stating that the MetroGIS Policy Board endorses the objectives of the Land Records Management initiative of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. The letter of endorsement is to note the membership of the MetroGIS Policy Board and not mention financing. It was also agreed that the article from CURA, entitled "GIS in Dakota County: Benefits Add Up", should be included as an attachment. Motion carried, unanimously.



#### 4b) Meeting Schedule - 1998

Vice-Chairperson Berg noted that officials from County government can not commit to a 1998 meeting schedule until they receive their committee appointments in January. Member Scott moved and Member Siegfried seconded that the Board will meet on Wednesday, January 28, 1998, and at that time it will set its meeting schedule for the remainder of 1998. Motion carried, ayes all.

Staff was asked to include a tentative Board meeting schedule with the agenda materials for the January 28th meeting and to ask each member to respond if any of the dates present a conflict.

#### 5. INFORMATION ITEMS

##### 5a. General Activity Update

Randall Johnson summarized the information provided in the agenda packet. Particular note was made of the acquisition of a license from The Lawrence Group (TLG) that permits free access by government to TLG's street centerline database for the entire region. This license was acquired by MN/DOT and the Metropolitan Council on behalf of government and academia with jurisdiction in Minnesota. It was noted that the benefit to government will not only accrue from free access to this fundamental dataset but also that more efficient interaction with consultants is also expected due to the defacto standard of a street centerline dataset common to the entire region.

##### 5b. Article From CURA - GIS in Dakota County: Benefits Add Up

At its July 30th meeting, the Board had requested a copy of this article. Will Craig, one of the article's authors, explained that 86 percent of the Dakota County departments are making use of GIS which is adding up to major benefits in improved program efficiency, better and more timely information for decision support, and more efficient use of resources. He noted that specially tailored versions of the article had been published in city and county publications and a third version had been published in a national trade magazine. Will noted that the nation is watching the strides that are being made in Minnesota to advance the use of GIS technology. Member Berg commented that the public-private partnership employed by Dakota County to develop and maintain its GIS is unique and provides a model that others can learn from. Member Schreiber reiterated that GIS is a powerful tool to provide better information to decision makers and that it provides a viable means to administer our respective organizations more cost-effectively.

##### 5c. Preliminary Coordinating Committee Agenda for October 24, 1997 Meeting

There was no discussion of this item.

#### 6. OTHER BUSINESS

None

#### 7. NEXT MEETINGS

- Wednesday, Nov. 19, 1997
- Wednesday, Jan. 28, 1998
- 7:00 PM; Metropolitan Council, Mears Park Facility; Rm. 1A

#### 8. ADJOURN

Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to adjourn at 9:05 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, GIS Liaison



**Wednesday, November 19, 1997**  
**7:00 P.M.**  
**Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A**  
**230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

1. Call to Order
  2. Accept Agenda
  3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - September 24, 1997 \*\*
    4. Discussion and Action Items
      - a. MetroGIS Addressing Guidelines \*\*
      - b. Regional City, Township, & County Jurisdictional Boundaries Dataset
      - c. Soils Data Distribution Policies Advisory Team \*\*
      - d. Letter Of Endorsement -- Land Records Modernization Initiative
    5. Other Business
    6. Information Items
      - a. Telecommunications Utility Mapping Mandate -- Coordinating Committee Response & Draft Rule
      - b. MetroGIS Availability of The Lawrence Group's Regional Street Centerline Dataset
      - c. Preliminary Coordinating Committee Agenda for December 18, 1997 meeting
      - d. General MetroGIS Activity Update
  7. Next Meeting: January 28, 1998, 7:00 PM, Metropolitan Council Chambers
  8. Adjourn
- \*\* Action Requested

## November 19, 1997 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Reinhardt. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities: Pat Scott (Minneapolis), Terry Schneider (Minnetonka) and Alternate Donn Wiski (Roseville); Counties: Anoka: Dennis Berg; Ramsey: Victoria Reinhardt, and Washington: Dennis Hegberg; Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District); Metropolitan Council: Bill Schreiber.

Board Members Absent: Counties: Randy Johnson (Hennepin); Carver: John Siegfried, Dakota; Joseph Harris; and Scott: Edwin Mackie; and Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Data Content Advisory Team Liaisons: Will Craig (University of Minnesota) and David Claypool (Ramsey County); Policy Advisory Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Standards Advisory Team: Ron Wencil (USGS); Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Vice Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: Brad Henry (Minneapolis); Gary Stevenson (Dakota County); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Jim Hentges (Scott County); Alan Srock (Utilities-NSP); Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); and Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin County).

Coordinating Committee Liaisons Absent: Data Access Advisory Team Liaison: Jim Sydow (TIES)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Heidi Welsch.

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Schneider motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES

Member Fiskness motioned and Member Schneider seconded to approve the minutes for the Board's September 24, 1997 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### 4. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

#### 4a. MetroGIS Address Data Guidelines

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Arbeit introduced this item. Ron Wencil, Standards Advisory Team Liaison, summarized the proposed guidelines for working with address data. Wencil noted voluntary guidelines, rather than mandatory standards, are recommended as a place for MetroGIS to start because there is no single best answer for the variety of intended uses of address data. It was noted that the proposed guidelines are expected to be expanded over time and as revisions to the guidelines are debated the result may move closer to standards. David Arbeit explained that the process of refining the guidelines will be shaped by the Business Information Needs Project. He also explained that users of The Lawrence Group's (TLG) street centerline file, which is now available free of charge to all government serving the Metro Area, will need to follow the recommended guidelines to take full advantage of the robust geocoding capabilities provided by the TLG dataset. Free access to this dataset is expected to be the incentive needed to facilitate wide-spread compliance with the proposed guidelines.

Member Schneider complimented the Team on the readability of the guidelines document. Other members concurred that the document is good example of how to effectively communicate technical information to a variety of interests.

Board members discussed whether there would be an advantage to the region to pursue a standard versus the recommended guidelines. Ron Wencil noted that he believes a state or federal agency, rather than regional organizations, would be in a better position to implement a standard. He reported the US Census Bureau is in the early stages of development of census related standards, which include address data, and that the proposed MetroGIS address guidelines have been shared with Census Bureau officials. The Board accepted the notion of guidelines because it does not want to alienate any stakeholders and it does not have the authority to require compliance.

It was explained that the Metropolitan Council will fund the printing and distribution of the address guidelines document to organizations which obtain a license for the TLG dataset, organizations represented on the Policy Board, and several other key users of the dataset through 1998. Board members agreed to postpone discussion of the cost of broad and longer term distribution of this document to the Board's January 28, 1998 meeting. On

January 28th, it was agreed that staff would provide the Board with a comprehensive overview of anticipated MetroGIS expenses and anticipated funding needs. Staff was asked to address a variety of funding options, including private sector, grants, legislature, etc.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Schreiber seconded to adopt and promote use by MetroGIS participants of the address data guidelines set forth in the document entitled Guidelines and Issues for Working with Address Data as approved by the Coordinating Committee on October 24, 1997. Motion carried, ayes all. Member Scott arrived.

#### 4b. Interim Regional City, Township & County Jurisdiction Boundaries Dataset

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Arbeit introduced this item. David Claypool, Data Content Advisory Team Liaison, summarized the proposed interim strategy to address the highest priority information need of MetroGIS. Claypool explained that the Metropolitan Council is currently compiling a regional dataset from best available data and has agreed to share the resulting dataset with MetroGIS participants at no cost while further study is in progress to define long term data caretaker responsibilities and options. The current thinking of a hierarchical data custodianship concept was explained which would rely upon local government, most likely the counties, as the primary caretaker for jurisdictional boundary data and on a yet to be designated organization to compile a regional dataset from county data.

Rick Gelbmann, GIS Coordinator for the Metropolitan Council, explained that Washington County is in the midst of a MetroGIS pilot project designed to define the responsibilities for the caretakers of this county and regional datasets. The results of the pilot will be shared with the Data Content Advisory Team which will then prepare a list of organizations that are candidates for custodianship of the regional dataset. Negotiations will then be pursued with each candidate and ultimately Board designation will be sought. It was noted that Mn/DOT, Metropolitan Council, and LMIC are currently thought to be the likely options.

Arbeit noted that the subject of jurisdictional boundaries is a statewide issue and that currently there is no authority responsible to maintain a digital dataset. Member Schneider noted that counties seem to be the most appropriate organizations for city and school district boundaries, as opposed to Mn/DOT. Claypool explained the Washington County pilot project is expected to provide a means to objectively evaluate the options and that preliminary information from the Washington County pilot should be available by February 1998.

Member Hegberg cautioned that MetroGIS not get caught in the middle of boundary disputes. Claypool explained compilation of a regional dataset is intended to identify problems not resolve them. Board members agreed that a policy to this end needs to be adopted and clearly communicated to participants.

Motion: Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to endorse an interim solution of relying upon the regional city, township, and county jurisdictional boundaries dataset being compiled by the Metropolitan Council to address MetroGIS's county and minor civil division boundaries information need. (Discussion of long term data custodian responsibilities and candidate organizations options will commence upon completion of the Washington County Jurisdictional Boundaries pilot project.) Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 4c. Soils Data Distribution Policies Advisory Team

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Arbeit provided an overview of why soils survey data varies from county to county, how the data is used, relevant work of the Soils Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information, the Metropolitan Council's business need to compile a regional dataset from the several independent sources into a single integrated dataset, and the Metropolitan Council's offer to share the regional dataset with MetroGIS stakeholders once several data distribution policy issues are resolved.

In response to the Council's offer to share this data, Arbeit reported that on October 24th the Coordinating Committee established the Soils Data Distribution Policies Advisory Team and, given the significance of the issues to be addressed, agreed that the Policy Board should be invited to designate one of its members to serve on the Team as a liaison of the Board.

Margo LaBau, Policy Advisory Team Liaison, explained that pending completion of this regional, multiple source dataset by the Metropolitan Council and the Council's offer to share it provides MetroGIS with an opportunity to discuss solutions to policy issues that Policy Board members raised early on when the concept of a regional GIS was offered for discussion. She also explained that distribution of the policy issues involved with the distribution of the regional soils dataset goes beyond the scope of the data and cost sharing agreements, that sustainable solutions to the soils distribution policy issues require all organizations with an intellectual interest to participate, and that the results of these policy debates are expected to serve as a prototype for distribution of other datasets.

Members raised questions about the appropriateness and need for a policy Board member to participate on a Team charged with recommending options. It was agreed that given the importance of the issues, the presence of a Policy Board liaison would be beneficial with the understanding that the Board member's role is limited to that of a messenger of Policy Board goals and objectives.

Member Hegberg suggested that Member Fiskness would be the best person to serve as the Board's liaison to this Team, given his watershed district perspective. Member Fiskness questioned the appropriateness of a data consumer (watershed district) rather than a data producer (county) serving as the Board's representative on the Team. It was agreed that the Team membership should include some consumers of soils data, such as watershed districts, in addition to those organizations with an intellectual property claim.

Members raised questions how much energy to put into using the regional soils dataset as a policy prototype for other datasets, given the inaccuracy of the data and its source being digitized public soils survey atlases. Arbeit noted that the Coordinating Committee's position is there would be value to discussing options to these policies issues with a low-risk dataset such as soils. All agreed that compilation of the individual source datasets into a regional dataset adds value to the individual data sources and that benefit would be received from the proposed discussions.

Board members asked for an estimate of the duration of the Team's work. LaBau estimated that several meetings are likely over a period of about six months. She stated she expects numerous issues to be raised since this is the first attempt to address data distribution, such as what constitutes public information, notwithstanding soils data is at the lower end of the cost-to-develop spectrum.

Board members offered strategies to minimize the time commitment. A matrix was suggested to illustrate which organizations currently disseminate soils data and what they get in return. It was speculated that the added value of the aggregation into a regional dataset may be the only value appropriate for MetroGIS policy makers to discuss. Staff was also asked to consider interviewing each of the organizations with an intellectual claim in the pending regional dataset and report the findings at the first meeting. This would not only give the Team an idea of the divergence of opinion that exists but would also help the members gauge the complexity of the task.

Motion: Member Scott moved and Member Schreiber seconded to accept the Coordinating Committee's suggestion that members of the Policy Board whose organizations have an intellectual interest in the regional soils dataset should be conferred with concerning appointment of representatives to the Soils Data Distribution Policy Advisory Team from their respective organizations. Motion carried, ayes all.

Member Berg volunteered to serve as Policy Board liaison to the Soils Distribution Policy Advisory Team with the understanding that his role is limited to that of messenger of Board policy. The group agreed.

#### 4d. Letter of Endorsement -- Land Records Modernization Initiative

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Arbeit explained that at its September 24th meeting the Policy Board had directed staff to draft a letter to the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) to be signed by Chairperson Reinhardt and state the MetroGIS Policy Board supports the objectives of the GCGI's Land Records Modernization Initiative. The draft letter was shared with the members for comment. No comments were received.

Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Schneider seconded to accept the draft letter of support to the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) regarding the GCGI's Land Records Modernization Initiative..

Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 5. OTHER BUSINESS: None

#### 6. INFORMATION ITEMS

##### 6a. Telecommunications Utility Mapping Mandate - Coordinating Committee Response and Draft Rules

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Arbeit noted that as directed by the Policy Board, the Coordinating Committee had forwarded comments Public Utilities Commission concerning pending rules governing Telecommunications Utility Mapping requirement. Notable portions of the most recent draft of the pending rules were summarized. Member Scott asked if the Committee has any concerns with the pending rules. Arbeit noted and David Claypool, Ramsey County Surveyor, concurred that the draft rules are fully compatible with concerns previously raised by Coordinating Committee members and consistent with long term MetroGIS interests.

Alan Srock with NSP and the utility representative on the Coordinating Committee, explained that he believes MetroGIS is an appropriate forum to work through these issues and that the draft rules and the guidelines being developed through MetroGIS are a good first steps. Member Schneider commented that this forum is an example of what MetroGIS is to become.

Member Fiskness asked to what degree is what we are doing through MetroGIS subject to obsolesce. Arbeit stated that has been very little interest among MetroGIS participants in hardware/software specifications which are subject to obsolesce. Rather, the majority of interest has been in the data content needs which are much less susceptible to obsolesce. It was noted that it is logical that vendors will follow the lead of MetroGIS, given its consensus based approach to protocol that affects a large number of users.

6b. MetroGIS Availability of the Lawrence Group Regional Street Centerline Dataset

No discussion of this item.

6c. Preliminary Coordinating Committee Agenda for October 24, 1997 Meeting

No discussion of this item.

6d. General MetroGIS Activity Update

No discussion of this item.

7. NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, Jan. 28, 1998; 7:00 PM; Metropolitan Council, Mears Park Facility; Rm. 1A

Chairperson Reinhardt reminded the members that the focus of the January 28, 1998 meeting will be funding for MetroGIS and encouraged full board participation in the discussion.

8. ADJOURN

Member Scott moved and Member Fiskness seconded to adjourn at 8:55 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, GIS Liaison



## **MetroGIS Policy Board Minutes: 1998**

## January 28, 1998 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - November 19, 1997 \*\*\*
4. Consent Agenda
  - a. Operational Guidelines -- Coordinating Committee & Advisory Teams \*\*\*
  - b. Metadata Guidelines \*\*\*
5. Discussion and Action Items
  - a. Relevance of MetroGIS to National Initiatives
  - b. MetroGIS Financial and Staffing Resource Needs
  - c. Legal Organization and Supplemental Funding \*\*\*
  - d. 1998 Meeting Schedule
6. Other Business
7. Information Items
  - a. Preliminary Coordinating Committee Agenda for February 26, 1998 meeting
  - b. General MetroGIS Activity Update
8. Adjourn

\*\*\* Action Requested



## January 28, 1998 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m. by Chairperson Reinhardt. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities: Terry Schneider (Minnetonka) and Alternate Donn Wiski (Roseville); Counties: Dennis Berg (Anoka); John Siegfried (Carver); Don Maher (Dakota); Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey); and Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District); Metropolitan Council: Bill Schreiber; Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District).

Board Members Absent: Counties: Dennis Hegberg (Washington); Randy Johnson (Hennepin); and Edwin Mackie (Scott).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Data Content Advisory Team Liaisons: David Claypool (Ramsey County); Policy Advisory Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Standards Advisory Team: Ron Wencil (USGS); Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Vice Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: Brad Henry (Minneapolis); Jay Wittenstock for Gary Stevenson (Dakota County); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council); and Patrick O'Connor and Alt. Gary Caswell (Hennepin County); Data Access Advisory Team Liaison: Jim Sydow and Dick Carlstrom (TIES); Larry Charbeneau (The Lawrence Group); Virginia Erdahl (Washington County); Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council)

Support Staff: Heidi Welsch.

Others: Chuck Ballentine (Metropolitan Council); John Carpenter (The Lawrence Group)

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

MOTION: Member Schneider motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES

MOTION: Member Schneider motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the minutes for the Board's November 19, 1997 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### 4. CONSENT ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt introduced the consent items: Operational Guidelines for the Coordinating Committee and Advisory Teams; and Metadata Guidelines. She asked that discussion, if necessary, be postponed until the next meeting.

MOTION: Member Halvorson motioned, Member Berg seconded to approve both items on the consent agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

### 5. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

#### 5A. RELEVANCE OF MetroGIS TO NATIONAL INITIATIVES

Member Johnson was originally scheduled to briefly present the relevance of MetroGIS to national initiatives. However, he was not able to attend the meeting. Chairperson Reinhardt explained that meetings have recently been held with Commissioner Johnson (who is currently the President of the National Association of Counties), Chairperson Reinhardt, leadership of the Coordinating Committee, and staff. The meetings have focused on how MetroGIS might fit in with national initiatives.

David Arbeit explained that 2 weeks ago, the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) held an annual steering committee meeting. Representatives of federal agencies, states with GIS councils, and other important organizations are represented on this committee. Commissioner Johnson was in attendance as well as Chris Cialek of LMIC and the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. Arbeit explained that a study has recently been compiled by the National Academy for Public Administration. The study focuses on how to more proactively engage GIS collaborative approaches around the country. The study proposes creation of a 'National Spatial Data Council'. The proposal closely parallels the efforts of MetroGIS.

Arbeit also noted that the Policy Board should look for a willingness of the federal government to put funds toward efforts such as MetroGIS.

## 5B. METROGIS FINANCIAL AND STAFFING RESOURCES NEEDS

Chairperson Reinhardt noted that at the first meetings of the Policy Board in 1997, it was decided that decisions related to funding of MetroGIS should be put off until a better understanding of the direction of MetroGIS was gained. The Board asked that issues of funding be brought back to the Board in the beginning of 1998. By holding the first funding discussions in January, it is hoped that county budgeting processes are still in preliminary stages. She also noted that an extra meeting can be scheduled before March, if necessary.

David Arbeit, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee, presented information to the Board on the benefits of MetroGIS. He began with the original vision of MetroGIS: "Develop an ongoing, stakeholder governed, metropolitan wide mechanism through which participants easily and equitably share geographically referenced data that are: accurate, current, secure, of common benefit, and readily usable."

Arbeit continued that GIS provides benefits to organizations whether or not they collaborate in MetroGIS. GIS improves efficiency, data management, customer satisfaction, and decision making. By collaborating through MetroGIS, benefits can be maximized. Building synergy allows reduction of costs; multiple uses of same data; and improved quality of data. It also helps leverage technological investments and resolves data conflicts. MetroGIS is producing tangible benefits already. He especially noted: strengthened working relationships; consensus about priority information needs; address and metadata standards and guidelines that have been adopted; savings from newly available data; development of the access tool DataFinder. More specifically, Arbeit noted that there have been more than 80 documented instances of sharing data as a direct result of the MetroGIS data and cost sharing agreements through the end of 1997. At least 18 organizations have received licenses for the regional street centerline dataset that was developed by The Lawrence Group and made available to participants through MetroGIS. Larry Charboneau, president of The Lawrence Group, stated that before the agreement with Metropolitan Council and MnDOT, the regional coverage would have cost \$80,000 per copy. Chairperson Reinhardt noted that there may be many communities that will benefit but are not yet aware that the data is available to them.

Arbeit went on to discuss particular projects that have been enhanced through funds and resources allocated on behalf of MetroGIS including: counties; I35W Corridor Coalition; Ramsey County Users Group; and Water Districts. Lasting benefits will result from the collaborative efforts of MetroGIS participants as GIS is recognized as a basic business tool; common information needs are identified; informal professional networks are enhanced; commitment to standards are strengthened; and policy bodies are actively engaged.

Arbeit explained the project expectations for 1998 - 2000. Important work planned for MetroGIS during the next several years includes: identification of specifications and custodians for critical data; more complete development of DataFinder; definition of the range of service functions; definition of the legal structure; solidification of the financing; execution of more permanent data sharing agreements; and formalization of solutions for organizations and financing.

Chairperson Reinhardt asked if there were any questions for Mr. Arbeit. Member Schneider stated that there needs to be a greater effort to get the word out to cities regarding the benefits available through MetroGIS.

Margo LaBau, Chairperson of the Policy Advisory Team, presented preliminary results of the MetroGIS participant satisfaction survey. She explained that the purpose of the survey was to get input from MetroGIS participants and to measure the level of satisfaction with the program, staff, and leadership. She emphasized that the survey was not meant to be a scientific survey and that the results she presented were preliminary. Overall return rate was 43%; however, return rate of the members of teams and committees (core group) was 70%. She explained that on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being excellent), the following preliminary results:

Question	Overall Score	Score of Core Group
1. Effective use of your time?	3.6	3.9
2. Progress of MetroGIS	3.6	3.7
3. Communications	3.9	4.1
4. Diversity of Representation	4.4	?
5. Web Site	63% said average or better;	62% said info is useful
6. Newsletter	overwhelmingly positive	

LaBau noted that the final report for the survey will be available within 6 weeks.

Alternate Member Richard Johnson explained the MetroGIS expenses and revenues as presented in the agenda report. In 1995, the Metropolitan Council began to look into how GIS was being done in the region. Instead of working in isolation, Metropolitan Council chose to work toward collaboration and coordination through MetroGIS. The Council recognized MetroGIS as a major effort and has put significant resources into the project. Johnson noted that the Council intends to continue at least a base level of support equal to the amount that would be allocated to dataset acquisition without MetroGIS. However, he stated that the Council cannot continue to fund the effort at the current level on an on-going basis.

Chairperson Reinhardt asked for clarification of the long-term vs. short-term financial situation. Arbeit explained that there is a 3 year window for the data and cost sharing agreements between the counties and the Metropolitan Council. The agreements will begin expiring in early 2000. There is a need to cover costs of MetroGIS until the year 2000. By that time, it is hoped that long-term financial arrangements can be made.

Member Schneider commented that it may be helpful to consider counties following the same 'formula' as Metropolitan Council in using data acquisition estimates to fund MetroGIS. Member Johnson noted that all participants have contributed to the effort through staff time and other means. Such contributions need to be accounted for as well.

Member Siegfried asked what other sources of revenue exist and what has been accumulated as far as sales date so far. Alt. Member Johnson explained that data sales have not yet been explored. Arbeit noted that there may be potential for data sales in the future -- year 2000 and beyond; but that no agreement for such sales is in place at this time.

Member Schneider expressed concern with the need to wait for long term financial planning until the year 2000. He advocated visionary thinking among the members now and to recognize added value as something that might help keep funding the project.

Member Maher voiced support for selling info that MetroGIS has to finance the project, much as Dakota County has done.

David Arbeit presented some options for addressing supplemental funding for 1999-2000: redirection of expenditures; savings dividend (allocate portion of 'cost avoidance'); and grants. He stated that staff is currently working on applications to two federal grant programs through the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) and the Department of Commerce (TIIAP). Arbeit noted that grants are highly competitive and that we cannot count on them. Other grant options for the future may include: IISAC, Board of Innovation and Cooperation; and private foundations.

Other opportunities for the long-term may include funding through the Land Records Modernization initiative that is being put forward through the Governor's Office. However, Arbeit noted, the best possible scenario would be introduction of legislation in the 1999 session for funding in 2000.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked Arbeit for bringing the issues forward. She stated that Ramsey County is very supportive of the MetroGIS effort; however, she mentioned it would not be easy for the county to allocate funds for MetroGIS. She stated that the Board needs to make some decisions about where to go from here in the short and long term. She also noted that decisions do not need to be made until the March meeting. She asked that the Board members identify the information needed for helping to make decision.

Member Wiski noted that if MetroGIS means savings for public, it might be possible to divert the property tax savings to MetroGIS. He thought the Dakota County model of gaining funding from outside organizations (such as utilities) would be worth investigating. Wiski also noted that the cable model of subscription fees might work for MetroGIS.

Member Berg noted that the structure of charging fees, subscriptions, etc. needs to be carefully thought through in order to consider liability and immunity issues. Member Berg also noted that property records are big winners in the long run with MetroGIS. He suggested looking into a deed tax or fee for the long-term. He noted that the county levy limits makes it difficult for counties to fund an operation such as MetroGIS at this time.

There was some discussion of whether legislation is necessary for a deed tax or fee. The group agreed a deed tax or fee is worth looking into.

Member Schreiber stated that the amount of money require seems small in comparison to the great benefit being gained. He noted that there may be opportunities for interesting legislative debate; but how do we get through 1999? He stated that the value of a project such as MetroGIS is significant and that it would be a shame to have it fall apart due to lack of monetary commitment.

Member Schneider questioned why there was no mention of LCMR funding. David Arbeit stated that staff had considered LCMR but felt that a proposal from MetroGIS would be too metropolitan and too urban to have a good chance.

## 5C. LEGAL ORGANIZATION AND SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Chairperson Reinhardt introduced this item, noting that the motion is asking to form a committee to review potential legal organization and supplemental funding options. Staff will organize a committee including representatives from each of the Policy Board organizations.

The group agreed to add to the action requested:

e) Investigate user-fee and/or membership fee options for funding MetroGIS.

f) Investigate mortgage deed tax fee and other options for funding MetroGIS.

MOTION: Member Schneider moved, Member Berg seconded to pass the motion as follows:

1. Direct staff to convene a team of persons, with appropriate expertise, from organizations represented on the Policy Board to recommend an interim legal authority and procedures needed to share MetroGIS expenses among key stakeholders until a long term financing program is implemented. This Team shall present its recommendation to the Policy Board before the Board decides a course of action for the projected 1999 budget deficit.
2. Authorize:
  - a. Staff to pursue supplemental grant funding from organizations staff deems most appropriate.
  - b. The Metropolitan Council, or such other organization(s) as appropriate, to serve as the responsible organization(s) for application and administration of grant funds.
  - c. The Policy Board Chairperson to sign the grant application(s) on behalf of the MetroGIS Policy Board.
  - d. Each of the Policy Board organizations to be listed on the grant application(s) as cooperators.
  - e. Investigate user-fee options for MetroGIS funding.
  - f. Investigate mortgage deed tax fee, membership fees, and other options for MetroGIS funding.

Motion carried.

Chairperson Reinhardt noted that the model used for calculating Metropolitan Council's estimated "base cost" contribution will be made available to each member organization. Member Schneider suggested that everything in the formula, including FTE's be converted to dollar amounts.

## 5D. 1998 MEETING SCHEDULE

MOTION: Member Fiskness motioned, Member Siegfried seconded to adopt the meeting schedule for 1998 as follows:

- March 25
- May 27
- July 22
- September 23
- November 18

The motion carried.

Chairperson Reinhardt noted that elections for Chair and Vice-Chair will be held at the next meeting.

## 6. OTHER BUSINESS

Member Schneider explained that he and Chairperson Reinhardt had recently attended a meeting of the League of Minnesota Cities (LMC), the Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC), and the Association of County Recorders to discuss how to support the proposed Land Records Modernization effort. He noted the differing perspectives of out-state and metropolitan representatives. A legislative initiative is likely to get discussion of disparities of out-state vs. metro areas. Chairperson Reinhardt also noted that the meeting discussed the Wisconsin model. Member Schneider stated that MetroGIS needs to continue monitoring the LRM effort.

## 7. ADJOURN

Before adjournment, Chairperson Reinhardt welcomed new Policy Board member Don Maher. Member Siegfried noted that staff should contact Scott County to ensure Commissioner Makie is still the Scott County delegate to MetroGIS. Member Schneider noted that a new Association of Minnesota Municipalities (AMM) representative to replace former member Pat Scott will be announced soon. Alternate Donn Wiski will serve as alternate for both AMM seats.

MOTION: Member Maher moved and Member Fiskness seconded to adjourn at 9:15 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Heidi Welsch, Assistant GIS Liaison

## March 25, 1998 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order & Welcome New Members
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - October 18, 2000 **action**
4. GIS Technology Demonstration – 2000 Census & Redistricting
5. Action and Discussion Items
  - a. Accomplishments 2000
  - b. Regional Parcel Dataset: Academic and Non-Profit Access Policy **action**
  - c. MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundaries Dataset: Non-Government Access Policy **action**
  - d. Endorse as a Best Management Practice: National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) **action**
  - e. Planned Future Land Use Dataset:
6. Information Sharing
7. Derivative Dataset / Intellectual Property Rights
  - a. Strategic Initiatives Update
  - b. Regional Parcel Dataset Update -- Public and Private Sector Agreements
  - c. 2001& 2002 Professional Services Contract Update
  - d. Registration of "MetroGIS" and "MetroGIS DataFinder" names
  - e. County User Groups Update
  - f. National GeoData Alliance Update
  - g. Coordinating Committee 12/14/00 Meeting Summary
8. Next Meeting: April 11, 2001 (Election of Officers)
  - Adjourn

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

## March 25, 1998 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities: Terry Schneider (Minnetonka) and Alternate Donn Wiski (Roseville); Counties: Dennis Berg (Anoka); John Siegfried (Carver); Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey); and Dennis Hegberg (Washington); Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District); Metropolitan Council: Alternate Richard Johnson; Technology Information Education Services (TIES): Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District).

Board Members Absent: Counties: Don Maher (Dakota); Randy Johnson (Hennepin); and Edwin Mackie (Scott); Metropolitan Council: Bill Schreiber.

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Data Access Advisory Team Liaisons: Jim Sydow (TIES) and Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Data Content Advisory Team Liaisons: David Claypool (Ramsey County) and Will Craig (U of M – CURA); Policy Advisory Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Standards Advisory Team: Ron Wencil (USGS); Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: David Arbeit (LMIC); Vice Chairperson-Coordinating Committee: Brad Henry (Minneapolis); Gary Stevenson (Dakota County); and Patrick O'Connor (Hennepin County).

Visitors: Chuck Ballentine (Metropolitan Council)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson.

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

MOTION: Member Schneider motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES MOTION: Member Siegfried motioned and Vice-Chairperson Berg seconded to approve the minutes for the Board's January 28, 1998 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Alternate Member Wiski arrived.

### 4. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

#### 4a. MetroGIS Participant Satisfaction Survey

Margo Labau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, presented an update of the preliminary survey findings she presented to the Board on January 28th. She summarized the results of a number of questions and stated overall, respondents feel good about what is happening with MetroGIS. A number of written program improvement suggestions or needs were received. Ms. LaBau informed the Board that the Coordinating Committee has asked the Policy Advisory Team to look into these comments and suggest program improvements, as appropriate. The findings of most note are as follows.

The low number of responses from the Access and Content Advisory Team members can, to some extent, be explained in that some of the persons invited to participate on these teams have never been active but have been retained on the team rosters. The Policy Advisory Team will look into instituting a "graceful exit policy" to



rejuvenate these teams with new and interested members. Ms. LaBau also speculated that a perceived lack of focus/weak leadership, lack of clear expectations, lack of a clear understanding of how the members and their work fits in, and possibly a sense of too much bureaucracy also have contributed to the low response rate for these teams.

In addition to instituting a "graceful exit policy"; the Policy Advisory Team will be looking into ways to improve communication between the Advisory Teams and the Board and Coordinating Committee; clarify team expectations; clarify team chair and liaison responsibilities, and implement ways to simplify staff's support of the advisory teams; Coordinating Committee and Policy Board, including more use of e-mail and faxing versus mailings. The Policy Advisory Team and Coordinating Committee will also continue their work to define long term funding and structure options for MetroGIS, identify ways the public and private sectors can collaborate to achieve MetroGIS objectives, and modify the work program to address participant expectations for the coming year.

Board members commented that a theme among many of the comments appears to be some frustration that Team member expectations are not being met and the process is taking longer than Team members would prefer. Ms. LaBau explained most of these concerns were offered by technically oriented people but acknowledged that administrative-oriented people are also beginning to raise these concerns.

The group acknowledged the value of the survey and agreed that everyone who was sent one should be informed of the results and provided with a summary of what will be done to address identified concerns. The Committee was also encouraged to resurvey participants on a regular basis and to use a format that provides a way to evaluate whether the respondents perceive an improvement since the previous survey (e.g. here are the concerns we believe you raised in the previous survey, here are the program modification we made, do you believe they were effective?)

Member Siegfried mentioned that more Board member interaction with Advisory Teams and the Committee members may be another option to improve communication and to talk with Team members about how their work is being used to solve problems. Staff agreed to provide Board members with an updated list of the membership of Advisory Team. Member Siegfried also mentioned that a short synopsis of what has been accomplished and what remains to be accomplished would be helpful to him.

Member Hegberg arrived.

#### 4b. Revised MetroGIS Financing Proposal For 1999

Richard Johnson, Associate Regional Administrator with the Metropolitan Council, noted staff had evaluated the potential of several supplemental funding sources as requested by the Policy Board and concluded that none was viable for 1999, except for the possibility a grant award. Two grant applications had been submitted, a copy of each was provided to each Board member.

Mr. Johnson stated that based on the examination of supplemental funding options and the Council's objective to facilitate MetroGIS, 100 percent Council funding of a revised MetroGIS target budget of \$375,000 is proposed for 1999. If a grant award were received, the funds would be over and above the funding proposed from the Council. He explained that Policy Board adoption is not sought at this time since it is early in the process. He expected to bring the matter back to the Board in the Fall. It was also clarified that the revised budget includes continuation of a newsletter as requested by the Coordinating Committee. Member Schneider suggested use of broadcast fax rather than printed newsletter to reduce costs and support.

Chairperson Reinhardt and the Board commended the authors of the grant applications, noting the applications are very professionally done, easy to understand, and contain very useful information about the objectives of MetroGIS.

Member Schneider noted, that although pleased with the grant applications, he remains concerned that identification of long term sustainable funding source for MetroGIS must remain a high priority. Vice-Chairperson Berg mentioned MetroGIS might qualify for funding from the Agricultural Preserve Surplus that he believes exists in each county. The group also discussed the possibility of enacting some form of the 1998 Deed Tax initiative by the 1999 Legislature. Patrick O'Connor, Coordinating Committee member and Hennepin County Auditor, stated that Hennepin County would be supporting this legislation next year. Chairperson Reinhardt stated that Ramsey County would also be supporting this legislation. The consensus was this legislation failed this session because it was too large of a change from current policy, involving a shift in the use of some \$100 million in revenue.

#### 4c. Election Of Policy Board Officers

Chairperson Reinhardt turned the meeting over to Vice-Chairperson Berg. Prior to accepting, Vice-Chairperson nominated Member Reinhardt to serve another term as Chairperson. Member Fiskness seconded. No other nominations were submitted. Vice-Chairperson Berg declared Member Reinhardt to be elected to serve as Chairperson through March 1999 by white ballot.

Vice-Chairperson Berg turned the meeting back to Chairperson Reinhardt.

Chairperson Reinhardt asked for nominations for Vice-Chairperson. Member Schneider nominated Member Berg. Member Siegfried seconded. No other nominations were submitted. Chairperson Reinhardt declared Member Berg to be elected to serve as Vice-Chairperson through March 1999 by white ballot.

### 5. OTHER BUSINESS

None

### 6. INFORMATION ITEMS

#### 6a. Demonstration Of MetroGIS Data Finder

Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Coordinator and Coordinating Committee liaison to the Data Access Advisory Team, summarized the Data Finder project, including developing of the concept, retaining a consultant, and developing the prototype. A key design objective was to provide an easy tool to help users quickly determine overlaps and proximity of the jurisdictions, which is fundamental to facilitating data sharing.

Key points in Mr. Gelbmann's presentation were as follows. Metadata is the foundation of Data Finder. Data Finder is an indexing tool by which users can search for data holdings and evaluate the usefulness of datasets for their specific needs. Links will be provided in the metadata to obtain the data, either electronically or by other means as the producer chooses. Data holdings will remain with the data producer, generally only the metadata will be located at the Data Finder site. Data producers will be responsible for determining if they want to participate. It will be the responsibility of the producers to submit metadata, decide the data types they want described and searchable from Data Finder, decide how the data will be accessed, and decide the type of security measures to be employed to guard against corruption of their data. An administrator would support data Finder. This person would be responsible for insuring that all metadata complies with standards before it is entered into the Data Finder database.

Tanya Mayer, GIS Specialist with the Metropolitan Council, demonstrated the features of Data Finder using a live link to the Data Finder website.

Security measures were mentioned that data producers could employ to guard against unauthorized access and to ensure that source data is not corrupted. Staff noted that funds are included in the approved 1998 and proposed

1999 budgets to populate Data Finder with metadata and to develop a geographic search capability. An individual would be hired to work with data producers to develop metadata for datasets of priority to MetroGIS, beginning with the spatial and parcel attribute data each county has agreed to share with other government through the Council's GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement initiative.

Member Fiskness questioned how commitments would be obtained from all the various organizations to post and update metadata and to share their data. Staff responded that a process is in place (Business Information Needs Project) to address datasets of importance to MetroGIS. Other organizations would participate on a voluntary basis. The MetroGIS process is structured and includes designation of a custodian, agreement on custodian responsibilities, and development of guidelines and standards to insure integrity and currency of the datasets. Recommendations for the top two priority information needs should be presented for Policy Board consideration at the May 27th meeting. Posting and updating of metadata for other datasets will be at the discretion of data producers. Member Fiskness commented that it would behoove organizations to take advantage of Data Finder to reduce staff time involved in filling data requests and answering questions about their data holdings.

The group questioned how the availability of Data Finder will be advertised and how prospective participants will be educated on the importance of metadata. Mr. Gelbmann reported that Washington County has a pilot project in process to document a step-by-step process to guide development and maintenance of metadata. This document will be posted on the Web site and its use promoted. This pilot project is one of two pilots being undertaken by Washington County in conjunction with their Data and Cost Sharing Agreement with the Council. A second means of educating participants of the importance of metadata involves the plan to assign an individual to work directly with data producer staff to develop key metadata.

A question was also raised about how data from multiple sources will be aggregated. Mr. Gelbmann stated that he believes this will occur in two ways. First, the Metropolitan Council, and possibly other organizations with multi-county jurisdiction, will integrate locally produced data into a regional datasets they will then share with others (e.g., the Council's regional jurisdictional boundaries dataset). Another option is the development of applications that would allow participants to aggregate data from various sources when and for only the area they need (e.g., a school district comprised by portions of three counties). Mr. Gelbmann noted that that later option may be the only practical way to work with parcel boundaries given that technology is not mature enough to efficiently deal with one million parcels as a single dataset.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked staff for the demonstration of Data Finder. Board members encouraged staff and the Coordinating Committee to demonstrate applications of technology relevant to MetroGIS. Jim Sydow, Coordinating Committee liaison to the Data Access Advisory Team and Team Chair, noted that the Access Team was charged with task of providing guidance to staff on this project. The Team, together with staff, defined a beginning and an end, met only when a decision was needed, and despite the low survey return rate by team members Mr. Sydow believes the Team and staff successfully carried out their responsibilities.

Member Fiskness asked how closure is brought to tasks such as this for the participants. Margo LaBau, Coordinating Committee liaison to the Policy Advisory Team and Team Chair, noted that thank you letters have been sent in some cases but that more attention to closure is needed. The Policy Team will consider ways to accomplish this at its next meeting.

#### 6b. Dakota County Parcel Query Application

Gary Stevenson, Coordinating Committee member and Director of Surveying and Land Information for Dakota County, provided an on-line demonstration of a recently developed Internet-compatible application used to query parcel-based information. Dakota County GIS staff developed his application. It allows property record searches by owner name, address, and PIN. A map is displayed which includes property lines, lot dimensions, building footprints, driveways, and street edges. A table that includes a number of parcel attributes retrieved from the County's database and maintained for property taxation accompanies the map. Mr. Stevenson also noted that

Dakota County, the Lakeville School District, and TIES are collaborating to expand the application to include data maintained by school districts.

Vice-Chairperson Berg noted that Anoka County's GIS does not have the capability to display property dimensions and asked how Dakota County captured this information. Mr. Stevenson explained that the dimensions are entered into the database as opposed to digitizing property lines from paper maps. David Claypool, Coordinating Committee member and Ramsey County Survey, explained that the data entry process (COGO) used by Dakota and Ramsey Counties results in the ability to display accurate property dimension data in the same manner for all parcels, regardless of the way the parcels were created (e.g. platted, metes and bounds, RLS). Vice-Chairperson Berg noted that Anoka County has assigned several staff to answer property information inquiries, primarily from the real estate community, and that an Internet based application like Dakota County's could potentially reduce the county's expenses to provide this information.

#### 7. NEXT MEETING

The Board was reminded that its next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 27, 1998.

#### 8. ADJOURN MOTION

Member Fiskness moved and Member Berg seconded to adjourn at 8:55 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

## May 27, 1998 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary

- March 25, 1998 \*\*\*

4. Discussion and Action Items

- a. Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset: \*\*\*
  1. Regional Custodian – Metropolitan Council
  2. Primary Source Custodian – Metro Area Counties
  3. Intellectual Property Rights Policy
- b. Revenue Sharing Proposals
  1. Street Centerline Datafile
  2. Orthoimagery
- c. MetroGIS Program Improvements –Survey Follow-up

5. Other Business

1. Demonstrate Uses of Regional Street Centerline Dataset

6. Information Items

- a. Preliminary Coordinating Committee Agenda for June 25, 1998 meeting
- b. MetroGIS Regional Street Centerline Data Users Forum – Wednesday, June 3rd
- c. Synopsis of Accomplishments and Listings of Team Members
- d. General Activity Update and Current Happenings

7. Next Meeting: Wednesday, July 22, 1998

8. Adjourn

\*\*\* Action Requested

## May 27, 1998 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities: Terry Schneider (Minnetonka) and Alternate Donn Wiski (Roseville) for Kathy Thurber (Minneapolis); Counties: Dennis Berg (Anoka); John Siegfried (Carver); Don Maher (Dakota); Alternate Jeff Spartz for Randy Johnson (Hennepin); Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey); and Dennis Hegberg (Washington); Metro Chapter of MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District); Metropolitan: Bill Schreiber and Alternate Richard Johnson (Metropolitan Council).

Board Members Absent: Counties: Edwin Mackie (Scott) and School Districts: Thomas Halvorson (Bloomington School District and Technology Information Education Services [TIES] )

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Data Access Advisory Team Liaison: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Data Content Advisory Team Liaison: Will Craig (U of M – CURA); Policy Advisory Team Liaison: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Standards Advisory Team Liaison: Ron Wencil (USGS), David Arbeit (LMIC).

Visitors: Chuck Ballentine (Metropolitan Council) and Jim Maxwell (The Lawrence Group—GIS Consultants)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

MOTION: Member Fiskness motioned and Member Hegberg seconded to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING MINUTES

MOTION: Member Siegfried motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the minutes for the Board's March 25, 1998 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### 4. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

#### 4a. Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset

Margo LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, summarized the process that led to the recommendation before the Board and complimented Washington County for its pilot project documentation which was the foundation for this recommendation. Richard Johnson, Associate Regional Administrator for the Metropolitan Council, informed the Board the Metropolitan Council is willing to accept the recommended regional custodian responsibilities for this dataset. Staff reported that each of the organizations that contributed source data has authorized the Metropolitan Council to share the resultant regional dataset with government organizations that serve the Metro Area.

MOTION: Member Maher motioned and Member Siegfried seconded to designate:

1. The Metropolitan Council as the official custodian and compiler of the regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset.
2. Each of the seven counties as the primary source data custodians for the regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset.

Motion carried unanimously.

#### 4b. Regional Street Centerline Dataset

Margo LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, summarized the process that led to the recommendation before the Board. Board members concurred staff and the Coordinating Committee should seek cooperation from the US Census Bureau to coordinate the year 2000 census geography with the MetroGIS regional street centerline dataset and to keep the Board advised of progress and issues.

MOTION: Member Fiskness motioned and Member Siegfried seconded to designate The Lawrence Group's Street Centerline Datafile as a primary source of addressing information for MetroGIS.

Motion carried unanimously.

#### 4c. Revenue Sharing Proposals

The Lawrence Group's (TLG) Proposal: Jim Maxwell, with The Lawrence Group, outlined his company's proposal to donate to MetroGIS ten percent to their sales revenue from their Street Centerline Dataset. It was agreed that language referencing the term of the donation should be included in the custodian agreement with the Metropolitan Council (see below). Mr. Maxwell accepted this suggestion and noted that the donation would continue as long as his firm is participating in MetroGIS. It was also acknowledged that a more formal agreement might be appropriate if and when the Policy Board attains legal authority to enter into agreements on its own behalf.

Metropolitan Council Proposal: Richard Johnson, Associate Regional Administrator for the Metropolitan Council, explained Council's offer to donate to MetroGIS proceeds from the sale of its 1997 orthoimagery. Preliminary estimates are that non-government would be able to purchase the data for \$20/CD-ROM and government would be able to obtain the data for the Council's cost of reproduction, estimated to be \$5-\$7/CD-ROM. He also noted this proposal is intended to promote the concept of directing revenue to MetroGIS that is received from datasets compiled from multiple sources or developed collaboratively by MetroGIS stakeholders. The 1997 orthoimagery is an example of the latter. Mr. Johnson also informed the Board the Council is prepared to serve as fiscal agent for funds under the direction of the Policy Board.

Members suggested that the Metropolitan Council should consider adding a surcharge to its cost of reproducing the data for sales to government and also to increase the fee for non-government purchases. It was agreed that a means should be developed to allow data users, in particular cities, to participate in the support of MetroGIS.

MOTIONS:

1. Member Schneider motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to accept The Lawrence Group's offer to donate ten percent of its Street Centerline Datafile sales revenue to MetroGIS with the understanding that the custodian agreement will include a statement that addresses the longevity of this arrangement. Motion carried unanimously.
2. Member Schneider motioned and Member Fiskness seconded to accept the Metropolitan Council's offer to donate revenue to MetroGIS in excess of its reproduction costs from sales of its 1997 orthoimagery dataset. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Member Fiskness moved and Member Siegfried seconded to accept the Metropolitan Council's offer to serve a fiscal agent for the funds donated to MetroGIS and under the control of the Policy Board until MetroGIS has legal standing. Motion carried unanimously.

#### 4d. MetroGIS Program Improvements – Survey follow-up

Margo LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, summarized changes made to improve the MetroGIS program as a result of the MetroGIS Participant Satisfaction Survey. Member Schneider suggested that the Coordinating Committee encourage its advisory team leaders to take ownership of their teams and to actively participate in determining their direction rather than to defer to staff. He also suggested the Committee look at the AMM version of a "graceful exit" procedure where team/committee members are asked to affirm in writing their membership desires on an annual basis. Those members who do not respond are dropped from the membership rosters.

#### 5. OTHER BUSINESS

##### 5a) Demonstrate Uses of Regional Street Centerline Dataset

Jim Maxwell, The Lawrence Group, and Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council, demonstrated uses of street centerline data. Mr. Gelbmann also demonstrated an application being developed by the Council to simplify geocoding activity. This application will be shared with others.

#### 6. INFORMATION ITEMS

No discussion.

Member Siegfried thanked staff for providing the background material presented in Items 6c and 6d.

#### 7. NEXT MEETING

Member Maher moved and Member Fiskness seconded to cancel the July 22nd meeting and to hold the next meeting as previously scheduled on September 23, 1998. Motion carried unanimously.

#### 8. ADJOURN MOTION

Member Fiskness moved and Member Berg seconded to adjourn at 8:50 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinat



## September 30, 1998 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order
2. Introduce New Representative from TIES
3. Accept Agenda
4. Accept Meeting Summary
  - May 27, 1998 action
5. Discussion and Action Items
  - a. Next Phase -- GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements Initiative
  - b. Study to Evaluate Benefits of MetroGIS
  - c. MetroGIS Functions (Scope of Services) action
  - d. MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial and Organizational Model Project
6. Demonstration
  - Uses of Orthoimagery: State of Minnesota, Metropolitan Council, and City of Minneapolis
7. Information Items
  - a. MetroGIS Regional Street Centerline Data Project Nominated For Exemplary GIS Award
  - b. 1999 MetroGIS Budget Update
  - c. MetroGIS Strategic Initiatives Update
    1. Preliminary Data Finder Guidelines -- Participant Roles and Level of Effort
    2. All seven GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreements In Place
    3. Business Information Needs Project Coordinator Hired
  - d. Revenue Sharing Agreement signed with The Lawrence Group
  - e. State GIS/LIS Conference – October 7-9 in St. Cloud
8. Other Business
9. Next Meeting: Wednesday, Nov. 18 1998
10. Adjourn

## September 30, 1998 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Reinhardt at 7:00 p.m. It was held at the Metropolitan Council's Offices in St. Paul.

Board Members Present: Association of Metropolitan Municipalities (AMM): Terry Schneider (Minnetonka), Counties: Dennis Berg (Anoka); John Siegfried (Carver); Don Maher (Dakota), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey); and Dennis Hegberg (Washington); Metro Chapter of the MN Association of Watershed Districts: Conrad Fiskness (Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District); Metropolitan Council: Bill Schreiber and Alternate Richard Johnson; School Districts: Antoinette Johns (Brooklyn Center School District and Technology Information Education Services [TIES]).

Board Members Absent: AMM: Kathy Thurber, (Minneapolis), Counties: Randy Johnson (Hennepin) and Edwin Mackie (Scott).

Coordinating Committee Members Present Visitor: Data Access Team Liaison: Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council); Data Content Advisory Team: Will Craig (U of M – CURA); Policy Advisory Team: Margo LaBau (Anoka County); Standards Advisory Team: Ron Wencil (USGS), David Arbeit (LMIC), David Claypool (Ramsey County), Gary Stevenson (Dakota County)

Visitors: Chuck Ballentine (Metropolitan Council), David Pitt (U of M), Jeanne Landkamer (free lance writer & consultant to MetroGIS)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

### 2. INTRODUCE NEW REPRESENTATIVE FROM TIES

Antionette (Toni) Johns introduced herself to the Board members as the new representative from TIES replacing Tom Halvorson. Each of the current members introduced themselves to Toni Johns.

### 3. ACCEPT AGENDA

Item 6, Demonstration of Orthoimagery, was postponed to the next meeting. Member Schreiber moved and Member Berg seconded to approve the agenda as revised. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 4. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Hegberg moved and Member Siegfried seconded to approve the minutes from the May 27, 1998 Policy Board meeting, subject to revising the 4th line in the second paragraph under Item 4c-Revenue Sharing Proposals from "... government would able top obtain..." to "...government would be able to obtain...". Motion carried ayes all.

### 5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### 5a. Next Phase – GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement

Randall Johnson summarized the objectives of the Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Initiative discussed in the staff report dated September 8, 1998 and summarized the contents of the document included with the agenda

packet entitled "Moving MetroGIS from Concept to Reality: An Overview of the MetroGIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Initiative" including information about the objectives of the Data and Cost Sharing Agreement initiative, contacts to obtain data, responsibilities of organizations that receive shared data, and detailed information about the data available from each of the seven counties and the Metropolitan Council via the agreements.

Chairperson Reinhardt stated this document is a valuable tool to communicate the importance of the Data and Cost Sharing Agreement initiative to successfully moving MetroGIS from concept to reality. She also stressed the importance of insuring policy makers who represent key MetroGIS stakeholders are knowledgeable of how the initiative affects their respective organizations and, as such, that she has asked staff to arrange to mail a copy to each county commissioner serving on each of the seven county commissions and to other key policy makers along with a cover letter from herself asking these policy makers to become acquainted with the initiative.

Chairperson Reinhardt shared a letter with the Board members from the Metropolitan Mosquito Control Commission as an example of the substantial benefit that can be achieved through data sharing. In this case, the Commission was able to quickly address a significant health problem in a timely manner through the availability of data made available free of charge through activities associated with the MetroGIS initiative.

Discussion ensued about the means through which data resources can be searched and shared. David Arbeit summarized the State's Geospatial Data Clearinghouse and MetroGIS's Datafinder projects, noting standardized documentation of data (metadata) maintained by the variety of stakeholders is fundamental to data sharing and to ensuring data are properly documented for internal business purposes. Board members acknowledged significant progress has been made to provide an effective means to search data holdings and that demonstration of the utility of these metadata search and data retrieval tools should be scheduled for an upcoming Policy Board meeting.

#### 5b. Study to Evaluate Benefits of MetroGIS

Will Craig, manager of the MetroGIS Benefits Study, summarized the objectives of the study for which he received a National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) Grant. In addition to summarizing the information presented in the staff report dated September 9, 1998, he explained that a nationally recognized consortium of universities interested in the use of GIS technology has cited the need to measure the benefits of collaborative GIS efforts, such as MetroGIS, as one of its top ten research priorities. The investigators (Will Craig, David Pitt, and Jay Bell, all with the University, will expand upon the methodology used to document the benefits of the Dakota County GIS two years ago. They will utilize data sharing logs being maintained by each of the seven counties and the Metropolitan Council as a source of individuals to interview. They will be looking at where data requests are coming from, what the recipient organizations are doing with the data, and asking the recipients if they are ahead for receiving shared data. They will also be looking for what is not working.

Craig asked the Board to endorse the study and to encourage the staff affiliated with their respective organizations to cooperate with the interview needs of himself and his associates. He explained that most interviews are anticipated to last an hour or less. In some cases, however, where substantial data sharing activity is occurring he anticipated the interviews may take longer.

Member Schneider stated he supports the request of the Board to endorse the study to encourage participation of staff. He asked that Craig also consider noting the level of enthusiasm of those he interviews as a measure for evaluation by the study.

Member Siegfried inquired whether an assessment of accuracy is proposed for the study. Craig stated the study team plans to interview all recipients of data shared as noted on the data sharing logs thus there will be no need to

address sampling error. Issues concerning accuracy of the data used by recipients are planned to be identified in the interviews with the questions "Did the data you received meet your needs?"

Members encouraged Craig to prepare a final report summary written for a non-technical policy maker audience (avoids jargon) and which includes examples of benefits that policy makers at various levels of government can relate to in terms of more informed, better decisions. Craig stated these suggestions are consistent with his expectations. Members thanked Craig for undertaking this study. Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Schneider seconded to endorse the MetroGIS Benefits Study as proposed by Will Craig and to encourage staff from their respective organizations to cooperate with the study team. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 5c. MetroGIS Functions (Scope of Services)

Margo LaBau, Chair Policy Advisory Team, summarized the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee, as presented in the staff report dated September 8, 1998, the process and considerations involved. She emphasized the proposed listing of functions is intended as a scoping document, without much detail, and that it is intended to be a living document, subject to modification as the Policy Board learns more about the needs of MetroGIS stakeholders.

LaBau noted this is the first step in the process of deciding issues concerning the appropriate legal entity for MetroGIS and appropriate long term financing options; options which the Board has asked the Coordinating Committee to investigate. She explained the matter is before the Board at this time because the consultant that will assist with the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Model Project (Agenda Item 5d) needs Board direction on the scope of desired functions to provide a focus for their work on the project. LaBau also noted she believes the Board can use this list of functions to describe what MetroGIS is about to their peers and constituents.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked the Committee for including a list of the functions it believes is not appropriate for MetroGIS as well as identifying those functions it believes to be appropriate.

Board discussion ensued concerning a position on "endorsement" and "enforcement" of standards for software and hardware. Rick Gelbmann explained the research of stakeholder capabilities that went into development of Datafinder. Datafinder utilizes worldwide-recognized standards for Internet access and can be accessed via standard common browsers. Once a user locates and downloads the data, they are currently responsible for converting it to a format supported by their organization. Gelbmann and LaBau explained a promise to stakeholders early on was MetroGIS would not endorse a single software or a single hardware standard, rather the emphasis would be on developing exchange formats that permit organizations to use the software and hardware that best meet the needs of their respective organizations.

Staff noted that work on a translation utility is expected to begin later this year and that the goal will be to support translation of data between all major GIS software formats utilized by MetroGIS stakeholders. A policy matter that will likely come before the Board is what constituent the "major" formats to be supported by the translation utility.

Members concluded voluntary compliance with suggested guidelines or self-regulation, is the most prudent approach for MetroGIS. All agreed that Item 4 "Endorse standards for hardware and software" under Coordination Activities that are Not Appropriate for MetroGIS should be deleted. All members also agreed the term "GIS" should be added to several of the functions recommended as appropriate for MetroGIS (e.g. Items 8 and 9 under Coordination and Technical Functions and Item 1 under Research Functions).

The possibility of expanding the voluntary compliance principles to the "collar" was raised as a matter that should receive some discussion as MetroGIS matures. Members concurred there is interest in the "collar" counties for coordination on various matters with metro area counties.

Motion: Member Berg moved and Member Schreiber seconded to endorse the functions that should be initially core to the business of MetroGIS, those desirable to pursue as the opportunity arises, and those inappropriate for MetroGIS as recommended by the Coordinating Committee on August 27, 1998 and included in the Board's September 30, 1998 agenda packet, subject to deleting Item 4 "Endorse standards for hardware and software" under Coordination activities inappropriate for MetroGIS, and adding the adding the term "GIS" added to several of the functions recommended as appropriate for MetroGIS as necessary to clarify the intent of each function. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 5d. MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial and Organizational Model Project

Randall Johnson thanked David Arbeit for his assistance on the grant application and noted that the work to date also could not have been achieved without the assistance of other members of the Policy Advisory Team. He then summarized the project objectives and deliverables as outlined in the staff report in the agenda packet; interrelationships between this project and the Business Information and Datafinder Initiatives; and progress made to secure a consultant. A requirement of the grant finding is the results of the study must be presented at a national conference to be determined by the applicant.

No questions were asked. Staff was thanked for the update.

#### 6. DEMONSTRATION

Uses of Orthoimagery Postponed to the next meeting

#### 7. INFORMATION ITEMS

7a. Nomination of MetroGIS Regional Street Centerline Data Project for Recognition by Governor as an Exemplary GIS Activity.

Staff announced that this commendation has been received and that official presentation of the award will occur at the GIS/LIS Conference at the luncheon on Friday, October 9th.

7b. Revenue Sharing Agreement with The Lawrence Group

Member Schneider cautioned that until the Policy Board has legal standing to spend funds, its should rely upon the Metropolitan Council to administer the funds donated to MetroGIS. No discussion of the other Information Items.

8. OTHER BUSINESS: None

9. NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, November 18, 1998

#### 10. ADJOURN

Member Maher moved and Member Fiskness seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m. Motion carried, ayes all.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, AICP, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

## November 18, 1998 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary

- September 30, 1998 **action**

4. Demonstration (30 minutes)

- Uses of Orthoimagery: State of Minnesota, Metropolitan Council, and City of Minneapolis

5. Discussion and Action Items

- a. 1999 Meeting Schedule **action**
- b. Exemplary GIS Award from Governor -- MetroGIS Street Centerline Data Project
- c. Preliminary 2000 MetroGIS Budget
- d. Revenue Donated to MetroGIS **action**

7. Information Items

- a. Fall 1998 Issue of MetroGIS newsletter "Coordinates"
- b. Annual Report Preparation
- c. MetroGIS Strategic Initiatives Update

8. Other Business

9. Next Meeting - January 27, 1999

Adjourn

**Meeting Summary  
MetroGIS  
Policy Board  
November 18, 1998**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

*Chairperson Reinhardt began the meeting at 7:20p.m. A quorum was not present.*

Members Present: Chairperson Reinhardt, Terry Schneider, Conrad Fiskness and Alternate Richard Johnson for Bill Schreiber. (*Need seven of twelve members in attendance to act on business items.*)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Rick Gelbmann, Patrick O'Connor, and Gary Stevenson

Visitors: Don Yeager (LMIC), Tanya Mayer (Metropolitan Council) and Tera Maganue (City of Minneapolis).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

No discussion or action

**3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY**

No discussion or action due lack of quorum

**4. DEMONSTRATION --ORTHOIMAGERY**

**State of Minnesota:** Don Yaeger, with the Minnesota Land Management Information Center, explained the term "orthoimagery" and called attention to the general need for increasingly higher levels of imagery resolution and positional accuracy as one moves from federal to state to metropolitan to uses by local units of government. Minnesota is the one of two states that has a complete state coverage of orthoimagery. The state's coverage has a resolution of about one meter (can distinguish features one meter to greater in area) and positional accuracy of plus/minus 40 feet of (about 1:12,000 scale), whereas, local government often requires submeter accuracy and the ability to distinguish smaller than one meter of area to support their needs. The USDA is a predominate user at the federal level and is the lead agency to obtain a national coverage. DNR is the predominate user among Minnesota state agencies. MN/DOT uses it to support preliminary highway design and LMIC has used it to map pipeline locations.

**Metropolitan Council:** Rick Gelbmann and Tanya Mayer, demonstrated how the Council is using orthoimagery to support updating of a regional existing land use database. This orthoimagery was produced from an April 1997, 20,000-foot altitude flight that includes the entire seven county area. The flight lines were the same as used for the 1991 imagery acquired for the state to provide an opportunity for comparison. The specifications for the Council's 1997 flight included 2-feet of resolution (distinguish features with 2 feet and greater area) and a positional accuracy of plus or minus 40 feet to the actual location on the earth's surface. The 1997 imagery has been registered to the same base coordinates as other regional datasets (e.g., The Lawrence Group's Street Centerline dataset) so they can be used together. This imagery is available free of charge to government on CD-ROM. Over 1000 CD's have been distributed by the Council since mid-summer (the entire region comprises a set of 77 CD's or about 3.5 gigabytes of data) to government and private sector interests. The Council uses orthoimagery to support a variety of functions, including first time use of on-screen capture of land use information as opposed to interpreting aerial photos and digitizing the distinct land use areas (planimetric information) derived from the aerial photos. .

**City of Minneapolis:** Brad Henry and Tera Maganue explained and demonstrated the use of low level (about 6 inches of resolution – features with 6 inches or more area can be distinguished) and highly positionally accurate (plus/minus 6 inches of the true location on the ground) color

orthoimagery to support City of Minneapolis business uses including site plan review, street design, street and utility facilities management, property inquiries, etc. Tera demonstrated a number of the planimetric (captured from orthoimagery) features maintained by the City (e.g., signs, fences, driveways, trees, bridges, building footprints, curbs). Brad noted that a major expense involved in the development of orthoimagery is the need for an elevation model. Once produced, production of orthoimagery from subsequent flights is substantially less expense where the elevation model can be reused (areas with little construction that changes the lay of the land since the previous flight).

Brad Henry estimated a cost of about \$1.00/parcel to produce their low-level imagery now that the elevation model is in place. He also noted that the amount of data storage needed to support low level imagery is substantially greater than for the higher-altitude imagery used by the Council and the State. The possibility was raised of flying once to accomplish each of the three flights discussed. It was noted that lowering the flight level from 20,000-feet would substantially increase data storage requirements and the number of images. These consequences are currently unworkable for areas much larger than a county and that flights higher than 1,500 to 2,500 feet generally are not adequate for design uses needed by Minneapolis.

Rick Gelbmann noted that a combination of a low-altitude flight in urban areas and a higher-altitude flight in rural areas will be considered for the next flight of the metro area in the year 2000. He noted that the Council's goal is to fly the entire metro area in 2000 to correspond to the 2000 census and that coverage of the entire metro area all at the same general time is needed to effectively create a year 2000 existing land use database. He also expects to seek out partners, as was the case with the 1997 flight, who are also in need of a year 2000 flight. Gary Stevenson noted that by the year 2000, imagery from satellites might be of a quality that can effectively replace the current technology that uses jets and airplanes to capture the imagery. The combined cost of the Council's cooperative project to capture the 1997 20,000-foot imagery and process it to create orthoimagery for the entire metro area was approximately \$125,000.

Policy Board members agreed this demonstration provided them with useful and interesting information and that the Coordinating Committee should plan a similar demonstration this coming spring when more members can attend.

## **5. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

### **5a) 1999 Meeting Schedule**

No discussion or action due lack of quorum, except it was agreed that the next meeting should be scheduled for Wednesday, January 27, 1999.

### **5b) Exemplary GIS Award from Governor – MetroGIS Street Centerline Data Project**

Brad Henry explained that he received this award on behalf of MetroGIS at the 1998 State GIS/LIS Conference. He stated this is an important acknowledgment of the public-private partnership formed to address a priority data need of MetroGIS stakeholders and because a substantial number of the organizations have taken advantage of access to this regional street centerline database made possible through the partnership.

### **5c) Preliminary 2000 MetroGIS Budget**

Staff noted the current plan is for the Coordinating Committee to endorse a year 2000 budget recommendation at its December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting for Policy Board consideration on January 27<sup>th</sup>. Chairperson Reinhardt asked if any of the Board members had any comments they wanted to forward to the Coordinating Committee.

Member Schneider commented he supports adding a subscription fee for cities to the MetroGIS revenue sources for year 2000. His philosophy, which the others concurred with, is some fee is better than giving the data away. If a unit of government must budget for a subscription fee they will likely discuss the value-to-cost which will be a healthy for MetroGIS.



**5d) Use of Funds Donated to MetroGIS**

No discussion or action due lack of a quorum.

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

Staff was encouraged to investigate the option of distribution of the MetroGIS newsletter. No other discussion.

**7. NEXT MEETING**

January 27, 1999. Staff was asked to begin a policy of sending Board members a meeting reminder a couple weeks before each meeting.

**8. ADJOURN**

The meeting concluded at 8:20 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



## MetroGIS Policy Board Minutes: 1999

## January 27, 1999 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Discussion and Action Items
  - a. Overview 1998 Annual Report
  - b. Expectations for 1999-2000 **action**
  - c. Year-2000 MetroGIS Budget **action**
  - d. Information Policy Task Force Report to Legislature
  - e. Unique Parcel Identifier Guideline **action**
  - f. Revenue Donated to MetroGIS **action**
4. Other Business
  - a. Election of Officers **action**
  - b. 1999 meeting schedule **action**
5. Information Items
  - a. MetroGIS Strategic Initiatives Update
  - b. Article -- Speech by Vice-President Gore Calls for Expansion of NSDI
  - c. November 18, 1998 Meeting Summary (no quorum)
6. Other Business
7. Adjourn

## January 27, 1999 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 7:02p.m.

Members Present: Conrad Fiskness, Dennis Hegberg, Antoinette Johns, Victoria Reinhardt, Bill Schreiber, Terry Schneider, and John Siegfried.

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann, Brad Henry, Patrick O'Connor, Gary Stevenson, and Ron Wencil.

Visitors: Jeanne Landkamer

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Schneider moved and Member Schreiber seconded to approve the agenda, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

- Overview of 1998 Annual Report

Brad Henry, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the accomplishments of MetroGIS in 1998. He provided examples of how the City of Minneapolis uses the regional datasets that have been endorsed to date to illustrate the value of the standardized data across jurisdictional boundaries. Access to data in a common format for communities that adjoin Minneapolis is saving city staff substantial time and improving the quality of information for decision making.

Staff summarized the format, objectives, and draft articles proposed for the 1998 annual report. Board members suggested that staff integrate information about the following topics into the articles: 1) cite tangible examples of savings in time and money that are being realized from data sharing activity, 2) cite specific examples of how organizations are using GIS, and 3) summarize progress made by metro counties on their GIS program development

Member Johns noted the Lakeville School District was able to significantly shorten their decision making timeline on a variety of matters due use of GIS and the Roseville District, likewise, can now make school bus routing decisions in days rather than weeks. The Lakeville District is also on record stating development of its GIS capability would not have been possible without the data sharing agreements put into place by the Metropolitan Council to facilitate MetroGIS. The license agreement secured by the Council and Mn/DOT which provides free access to the regional street centerline dataset maintained by The Lawrence Group was recognized as facilitating use of this dataset by some smaller organizations that may not have otherwise had the resources to purchase it.

#### 3b) Expectations for 1999 and 2000

Brad Henry summarized the expectations for MetroGIS for 1999 and 2000 as endorsed by the Coordinating Committee in December. He stressed the importance of MetroGIS Data Finder initiative, noting that if data can not be quickly located some valuable projects will not be pursued.

Member Schneider suggested revising the verb tense from past to future to better communication the accomplishments expected in 1999 and 2000.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Schneider seconded to adopt the expected MetroGIS accomplishments in 1999 and 2000, as recommended by the Coordinating Committee on December 17' 1998, and to add the following statements to those proposed by the Committee: 1) specifically mention the expectation for development of a regional census geography

dataset compatible with other MetroGIS endorsed datasets; 2) issues associated Y2K are not expected to be a problem for MetroGIS; 3) forums and workshops are routinely held to share the objectives of MetroGIS, progress made to achieve the objectives, activities in progress, and how MetroGIS products and services are assisting stakeholders address business needs; and 4) specifically identify the datasets that will become available in 1999 and 2000 for use by stakeholders. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 3c) Year 2000 MetroGIS Budget

Brad Henry and staff summarized the year 2000 budget as recommended by the Coordinating Committee on December 17, 1998. The Metropolitan Council is the only significant source of revenue identified. The Policy Board will determine if additional funding is necessary following completion of the Fair-Share Financial Model study and, likewise, seek out additional revenue sources as it deems appropriate.

Member Fiskness commented that mention of marketing efforts is a sign that MetroGIS is maturing, noting that if MetroGIS's product is of value it should sell itself and should be looked to as a source of revenue. Members agreed the data and services developed by MetroGIS should be demonstrated in workshops and forums for representatives of variety of stakeholder organizations.

Member Schneider commented it would be helpful if staff would present budget proposals in the form of options with a range of costs from low to high with an explanation of the impact depending on the options selected. (Note: This strategy has been incorporated into the developables for the Fair-Share Financial Model and staff have reinforced to the consultant the need to present the options in this manner.)

Motions: Member Hegberg moved and Member Fiskness seconded to endorse the year-2000 budget as recommended by the Coordinating Committee on December 17, 1998, with to the following modifications: 1) the work program and budget should be modified as necessary to include a series of workshops and forums to inform and promote use among stakeholders of MetroGIS endorsed data, products, and services and 2) the "State Legislature" should be added as a revenue option under the "Other" category. The amount should be left as "TDB" until future revenue needs are determined by the Board. Motion carried, ayes all.

Member Siegfried moved and Member Johns seconded to authorize staff to seek formal approval for the Metropolitan Council's portion of the 2000 funding. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 3d) Information Policy Task Force Recommendations to the Legislature

Margo LaBau, Chair of the Policy Advisory Team, provided an overview of the Information Policy Task Force recommendations, the status of the Task Force's report to the legislature, and discussions with Senator Betzold regarding this matter. She reported Senator Betzold will be introducing legislation in the 1999 session, is aware of extensive opposition among government officials to the Task Force's recommendations and, consequently, that his legislation will likely differ from that proposed by the Task Force.

David Arbeit, member of the Coordinating Committee and Director of LMIC, provided copies of written testimony that had been submitted to the Task Force. Gary Stevenson, member of the Coordinating Committee and Director of Land Information and Surveying for Dakota County, reported he had testified at the Task Force's January 5<sup>th</sup> hearing against the proposed elimination of the cost recovery provision for development of data with commercial value and the proposed elimination of copyright authority without Legislative approval. Stevenson also questioned the public purpose of providing free GIS data to firms located outside of the state.

Members expressed concern for the potential of staff-intensive data requests that would likely result likely disrupt core business operations with no means to recover the costs. Board members also concurred these data requests could tie up scarce computer time, again without the ability to pass along the costs to the those directly benefiting from the requests. LaBau also mentioned that the loss of ability to recover costs of data development may also have the effect of stifling research and development to improve databases. The Board also concluded the Task Force's report is significantly lacking in the identification and quantification of the impacts of its recommendations on government operations.

Board members agreed with Chairperson Reinhardt's suggestion that the MetroGIS should submit a formal response to the expected legislation and notify its stakeholders of the Task Force's recommendations and pending legislation. It was agreed that the MetroGIS's response must focus on the GIS-related impacts of the legislation, in particular, the issues surrounding the proposed elimination of cost recovery for datasets with commercial value.

Member Fiskness noted that advocacy by the MetroGIS Policy Board on behalf of broadly representative government needs will add legitimacy to the benefits to be gained by sustaining the multi-participant, MetroGIS organization.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Schreiber seconded to:

- Send a letter, signed by the Policy Board Chairperson, to Senator Betzold and to a variety of other organizations which may have a possible interest in the matter explaining Task Force's recommendations and pending legislation, MetroGIS's concerns, who MetroGIS represents and its goals, MetroGIS's intention to submit a formal response, and a suggestion that others follow the matter and submit a response.
- Direct MetroGIS managers to draft a formal statement in response to the expected legislation and submit it to the appropriate Legislative Committee(s). A draft of the statement shall be sent to each Board member for comment and the Policy Board Chair shall approve the statement before it is submitted to the Legislature.

Motion carried, ayes all.

### 3e) Unique Parcel Identifier Guideline

David Arbeit and staff summarized the reasons for proposing a unique parcel identification number guideline, the work of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) on this topic, and the Coordinating Committee's recommendation to endorse the guideline adopted by the GCGI for use by MetroGIS.

Staff also stated that adoption of this guideline would not have any impact on county business practices, unless the counties choose to add this identifier to their databases for their own business reasons. Rather, it will be used by the regional custodian to integrate county parcel data into a dataset(s) that contains portions of multiple county parcel databases.

Motion: Member Schreiber moved and Member Schneider seconded to endorse the Unique Parcel Identification Number (PIN) Guideline as approved by the Governor's Council on Geographic Information and promote its use by MetroGIS, as recommended by the Coordinating Committee on December 17, 1998. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 3f) Revenue Donated to MetroGIS

Staff explained that a separate account is maintained by the Metropolitan Council for funds donated to MetroGIS and that the understanding of the donating organizations is that these funds can not be spent without approval of the MetroGIS Policy Board. The balance in the account is about \$8,500; about \$6,400 donated from the Council from orthoimagery revenue and about \$2,100 from The Lawrence Group's sales of their street centerline dataset. A suggested procedure was summarized for authorizing use of these funds, as presented in the staff report dated January 15, 1998. The Metropolitan Council's decision to donate any revenues it receives from its Soils datasets which were developed collaboratively with other agencies was also noted.

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Fiskness seconded to:

- Authorize funds donated to MetroGIS and managed by the Metropolitan Council to be treated as contingency revenue for MetroGIS, subject to Policy Board approval prior to expenditure.
- Accept the Metropolitan Council's offer to donate to MetroGIS any revenue it receives from non-government organizations, in excess of its reproduction and handling expenses, for soils data it develops .

Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 4. OTHER BUSINESS

- Election of Officers

Chairperson Reinhardt mentioned she had suggested holding the election before setting the 1999 meeting schedule rather than holding the election at the next Board meeting as has been the practice the previous two years. This procedural change was suggested so the meeting schedule could be coordinated with the newly elected Board chair's preferences. Members agreed with Chairperson's suggestion to hold the elections at the January meeting.

Member Schneider affirmed his belief that the Board officers should be county representatives and asked if there had been any interest expressed by the county representatives. Chairperson Reinhardt noted she had not heard from any of the county members other than Member Berg who had expressed interest in reelection as vice chair. She noted she would accept reelection as chair if that were the wish of the Board.

Motion: Member Hegberg moved and Member Fiskness seconded to elect Victoria Reinhardt as Policy Board Chairperson and Dennis Berg as vice-chairperson during 1999. There were no other nominations. Motion carried ayes all.

- 1999 Meeting Schedule

Member Hegberg moved and Member Siegfried seconded to meet quarterly in 1999 on the following dates and to begin the meetings at 6 p.m. at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park offices in downtown St. Paul: Wednesday, April 21, Wednesday, July 28, Wednesday, October 27, and Wednesday, January 26, 2000. Motion carried, ayes all.

- Acceptance of Meeting Summary

Member Schneider moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the November 18, 1998 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### 5. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the materials in the agenda packet. There was no discussion.

#### 6. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:59 p.m.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

## April 21, 1999 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - a. January 27, 1999 **action**
4. Demonstration
  - a. North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition – Presentation of Capabilities
5. Discussion and Action Items
  - a. MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Study **action**
  - b. Information Policy Legislation Update
6. Information Items
  - a. Data Request from the Star Tribune
  - b. Coordinating Committee Membership – Invitation to State Agencies
  - c. MetroGIS Strategic Initiatives Update
7. Other Business
  - a. MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset Guidelines **action**
8. Next Meeting - July 28, 1999
9. Adjourn



## April 21, 1999 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:10p.m. It was held at the Roseville City Hall.

Members Present: Dennis Berg (Anoka County), Willis Branning, (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Patrick O'Connor alternate for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Edwin Mackie (Scott County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Richard Johnson alternate for the Metropolitan Council, Terry Schneider (AMM), John Siegfried (Carver County), and Donn Wiski (AMM).

Members Absent: none

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Virginia Erdahl, Rick Gelbmann, Brad Henry, Gary Stevenson, Dennis Welsch, and Ron Wencil.

Visitors: Beth Hobbs and Trudy Richter of the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Project consultant team, David Windle with the North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition, Jerry Happle with PlanSight, GIS consultant to the I-35W Corridor Coalition, and a graduate student from St. Catherine College.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted, as submitted.

### 3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY

Member Siegfried moved and Member Johns seconded to approve the summary of the January 27, 1999 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 4. DEMONSTRATION

Brad Henry, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee, introduced David Windle, GIS Coordinator with the City of Roseville, and Jerry Happle, principal with PlanSight and GIS consultant who have played instrumental roles in the development of the North Metro

I-35W Corridor Coalition's leading edge subregional GIS:

David and Jerry commented on:

- Why the Coalition was formed;
- The partners which include seven cities – two in Anoka County and five in Ramsey County – that share the I-35W highway corridor as a resource, several school districts, and several state and regional agencies;
- Benefits that are being realized by the partners from their collaboratively developed GIS;
- How their GIS capability is being used to support a variety of economic development, housing, transportation, and community development initiatives;

- The Coalition's foundation GIS datasets – parcel boundaries and attributes, future land use plan designations, existing land use designations, zoning, and addressable street centerlines;
- the Coalition's intranet-based data warehouse which is password-accessible by each city partner by high speed communication connection;
- The Coalition's internet-based "On-line Atlas" ([www.I35W.org](http://www.I35W.org))
- A partnership between the Coalition and the Office of Commercial Real Estate Developers (OCR) pursued to enhance the OCR's rich text-based database of commercial real estate data by linking it to a state-of-the-art GIS. David demonstrated an application that provides the user with the ability to search the database from a spatial perspective and map query results – capabilities not possible without integration with GIS technology.
- David commented on the importance of GIS Users Groups to championing cooperative GIS initiatives, such as the I-35W effort, and encouraged each of the county representatives on the Policy Board to support establishment of users groups in each of the counties where they are not currently active.

Member Johns asked if the Coalition will attempt to consolidate socioeconomic data at the parcel level and make it available to decision makers, noting that although school districts collect this type of data, it often is incomplete. Dennis Welsch, Community Development Director for the City of Roseville and active participant in the Coalition's affairs, commented that the Coalition's most cutting –edge work is its current effort to integrate socioeconomic data from a number of sources (motor vehicle registration, work force data from the dept of economic security, school district census, city utility records, etc.) Through integration of data from these sources, a comprehensive profile with a high degree of accuracy is being developed for each residential household within the seven cities. To insure data privacy, this parcel level data will be summarized to "block face" geography, similar to census blocks but more robust in terms of flexibility for analysis. Staff noted MetroGIS is following this project and will invite the Coalition to demonstrate their findings in the near future.

Member Siegfried commented that the Coalition's work is very impressive but questioned whether organizations like the Carver Counties in the region, who are new to the technology, have the expertise necessary to accomplish anything like that of the Coalition. David Windle and Jerry Happle responded that the Coalition's GIS database was developed with ArcView – GIS software that is extensively used throughout the metro area and capable of interoperation with other software such as Intergraph products utilized in Hennepin County. He also noted the software used to develop the Coalition's web site is commonly used throughout the metro area. Finally, the Coalition's experiences will be used by MetroGIS to encourage standardized data development procedures that, in turn, should greatly assist the start-up of similar collaborative initiatives. Gelbmann commented that as regional foundation data solutions are accomplished, the complexity of start-up and operation of GIS collaborative initiatives should be greatly reduced.

Member Schneider commented that a timetable of planned MetroGIS data development activities would be helpful. Staff noted that the Technical Advisory Team has a schedule of activities for development of desired specifications for each of MetroGIS's priority Business Information Needs. This activity has been in progress for two years. The actual development of datasets to address the desired specifications has also been in progress for over a year – street centerlines and jurisdictional boundaries are operational. Once the cost component of the Fair-Share Financial model is finalized, the Technical Advisory Team will refine a schedule and the anticipated cost for development of data to address the remainder of MetroGIS's priority information needs.

Members thanked the Coalition's representatives for their informative presentation.

## 5. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

- MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Study

Virginia Erdahl, Chairperson of the Policy Advisory Team, introduced Beth Hobbs, the consultant manager for the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Model project. Ms. Hobbs explained her reason for appearing before the Board is to seek endorsement of

several draft assumptions that, once finalized, will drive development of a model to fairly allocate the costs of achieving and sustaining the MetroGIS vision and to identify an organizational structure appropriate for MetroGIS.

Ms. Hobbs summarized the study objectives, offered a timeline for the remainder of the study, and summarized the decisions that will be sought from the Board at the October 27, 1999 meeting.

The presentation and dialogue lasted about an hour. Topics discussed in response to the draft assumptions were as follows:

**Defining benefit:** Stevenson raised a concern that basing user rates on perceived benefits would be difficult to define and differentiate within the study timeframe. Staff noted the methodology seeks to assign an estimate of the relative benefit that each of the major organizational classes (cities, counties, school districts, watershed districts, metropolitan, state, federal, non-government) believe they will receive from the existence of MetroGIS, that is, qualitatively rank the benefit to each organizational class that would accrue from their ability to obtain access to multi-county data from multiple data sources consistent with their needs. These estimates will be derived from the 1997 MetroGIS survey used to establish the thirteen-priority information needs and from the results of the MetroGIS Benefits Study currently being conducted by Will Craig. (Note: since the Board meeting, staff identified a survey conducted by the National Association of State Councils on Geographic Information as another possible source of information to estimate relative benefit. Over 400 local, state, metropolitan, and federal government organizations that serve Minnesota participated in this survey.) Staff acknowledged the proposed assignment of relative benefit is meant as a starting point and as better information is gathered the model would be adjusted accordingly.

**Contribution of Data:** Clarification was requested for the draft assumption "Data producers will continue to share, at no cost to MetroGIS, data that has been developed for their own needs". Staff explained the intent is that producers would receive modest compensation to help keep their data current and to provide access to government of all types that serve the seven county area for no more than a modest fee to cover the costs of reproduction, as is currently occurring with the interim GIS data and cost sharing agreements. One individual noted that the payments from the Council, as part of the current agreements, might be construed as receiving payment for the data. Commissioner Reinhardt indicated that what data producers will provide MetroGIS is "access" at no cost. She noted that sharing data to some could imply that data have no value if provided at no cost.

It was agreed this assumption should be restated as two separate assumptions. The first, stating MetroGIS participants (subscribers/contributors) will receive access to MetroGIS data free of charge other than a possible modest cost for data reproduction if shared by medium other than telecommunications. The second, stating producers of endorsed primary data contributed to MetroGIS should receive compensation for providing access to this data in a manner similar to the supplemental data maintenance payment currently in effect. It was agreed the model must also inherently recognize the large investments that counties have made to develop their GIS capabilities and the significant value of this investment to MetroGIS.

**Existing Agreements:** It was agreed that existing agreements must be recognized in the fair-share formula (e.g. collaborative development of the Dakota County GIS by cities, Dakota County Electric and the County, numerous local governments in Ramsey County sharing the cost of GIS data maintenance with the County, etc through formalized partnership agreements). Staff noted that the Fair-Share Financial Model consultant had been previously informed of the need to factor these agreements into the equity formula.

**Data Privacy:** Member Branning asked if issues concerning data privacy will be the responsibility of data producers or data recipients. Staff explained this topic is being addressing on a dataset-by-dataset basis and acknowledged the critical need to insure all data privacy issues are appropriately and legally addressed before implementing a solution for any given dataset. Gelbmann noted that in many cases, summarizing detailed data of a personal nature, for instance characteristics of households or crime data maintained at the parcel level, to a higher level geography, such as census blocks, will generally eliminate the ability to identify a specific household. Member Johns reported that school districts are looking to MetroGIS to access better socioeconomic data for their program development and facilities management needs.

**Data Sales:** Member Johns asked for clarification why data sales are not proposed to be included in the initial fair-share model. Staff offered the following reasons: A) a premise of the study is to take a conservative perspective and determine if MetroGIS can be sustained by its participants without significant supplemental sources of revenue since this would be the likely be case for the first couple years of operation, B) it will be some time before regional datasets which could be sold (street centerline solution involves licensing access to a privately owned dataset) are available (staff called attention to another assumption that MetroGIS will not benefit from sales of data contributed in the form contributed), C) there is uncertainty whether the

legislature will drastically change the rules that currently govern government's cost recovery capabilities for GIS data, D) there is no definitive evidence that data sales would provide more than a small portion of MetroGIS' operating budget, and E) if the Policy Board decides at the October 27<sup>th</sup> meeting that the MetroGIS concept is worth taking to the next level, the matter of data sales policy would be one of the first initiatives to tackle. Gelbmann commented that offering private sector organizations an opportunity to advertise on the Data Finder site could be a possibly supplemental revenue source.

Chairperson Reinhardt stated the assumptions should specifically state that data consumers can not obtain data from MetroGIS in the form contributed but rather must obtain it directly from the primary data producer. Member Schneider agreed with the proposed philosophy to pursue a conservative course to start but suggested that MetroGIS managers look for benefits that might be realized from allowing access/sales of participant data through MetroGIS and not to delay formulation of policy until requests for the data begin to be received.

The group agreed with the proposal to omit data sales from the initial model with the understanding the model will be flexible enough to include data sales as a component when the policies are in place and that work would begin on the necessary policies immediately following a Board decision that a long-term financial support and organizational scheme should be pursued for MetroGIS.

Alternate Member O'Connor recommended that the list of alternative MetroGIS organizational options to be presented at the October meeting should include privatization. Ms. Hobbs noted she would pass this request along to Trudy Richter, the member of the consultant team managing the organizational structure component. Member Berg commented that if government's opportunity to recapture the costs of developing sophisticated GIS data is eliminated, he believes Anoka County may reduce its investment in its GIS operations and, consequently, privatization may be the only way to continue to support its development and maintenance.

Member Schneider moved and Member Siegfried seconded to endorse the following assumptions upon which to devise a fair-share financial model and appropriate organizational structure for MetroGIS:

Financial/Cost Assumptions:

- Broader funding support for MetroGIS is needed.
- Fair user rates will be established based on perceived benefit to the user.
- Benefits to the user will be defined (financial and non-financial).
- User rates will be set to assure a financially stable MetroGIS.
- A flexible model will be developed as a tool for MetroGIS, allowing modifications based on MetroGIS' changing needs.
- Producers of endorsed primary data (data which is integrated into an approved regional data solution) that is contributed to the MetroGIS data pool will receive nominal compensation from MetroGIS for their participation in the form of a "supplemental data maintenance payment". This payment is to compensate the producer for sharing data to all government at no cost other than to cover modest data reproduction expenses and to defray costs attributable to sharing data with organizations outside of their jurisdictions.
- Producers of primary dataset will not be asked to support tasks or data related activities that exceed their internal business needs. They will be encouraged, but will not be required to update/enhance primary datasets that are inconsistent with regional specifications. (E.g. the amount of supplemental data maintenance payment will be proportionately higher for fully compliant primary datasets.)
- Regional data custodians will be compensated for all tasks in excess of their internal business needs.

- Data consumers will have free access to data obtained from MetroGIS' primary and regional data producers when by telecommunications transfer and shall not pay more than a modest fee to cover data reproduction costs for other means of data transfer.
- Not all primary data is of equal value in terms of counting toward defraying the costs of collaboration assigned to a particular organizational class (cities, counties, school districts, watershed districts, metropolitan, state, federal, and non government.) The model shall recognize the large investment counties have made to develop their GIS capabilities and the significant value of this investment to MetroGIS.
- Financial support for MetroGIS will come primarily from data consumers proportionate to the benefit perceived by organization class.
- Existing formal GIS cost sharing agreements among counties and units of government within their boundaries must be recognized in the fair-share financial formula.

Data Sales Assumptions:

- Intellectual property rights for producers of primary data contributed to MetroGIS shall remain intact.
- MetroGIS will not benefit from sales of data in the form contributed to MetroGIS by primary producers unless authorized by the primary producers.
- Data sales will be "zeroed-out" in the initial fair-share financial model.

Motion carried, ayes all.

The proposed timeline for the remainder of the study was summarized. The Policy Board will have an opportunity to review draft findings and recommendations at the July 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, prior to the Peer Review Forum. Members concurred with the proposed Peer Review Forum to share the preliminary findings with managers and policy makers of organizations that will be affected by the recommendations. Member Schneider commented he would prefer if the study could be completed more quickly but also noted he understands the need to provide adequate opportunity for review, comment, and possible revision of recommendations. The timeline and the decisions to be sought from the Board at the October 27<sup>th</sup> meeting were unanimously endorsed, as presented.

5b) Information Policy Legislation Update

No discussion due to lack of time.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

a) Data Request from Star Tribune

No Discussion

b) Coordinating Committee Membership – Invitation to State Agencies

No discussion due to lack of time.

c) MetroGIS Strategic Initiatives

No discussion due to lack of time.

## 7. OTHER BUSINESS

- MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset Guidelines

Consideration of this item was postponed to the next meeting due to the lack of time.

## 8. NEXT MEETING

July 28, 1999, starting at 6:00 P.M.

## 9. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:15 p.m.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

## July 28, 1999 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
  - April 21, 1999 **action**
4. June 9th Congressional Testimony - Bring written testimony mailed on June 4
5. Discussion and Action Items
  - a. Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset Guidelines **action**
    1. MetroGIS Structure Update
      - a. Legal organization
      - b. Operational organization
      - c. Fair-share financial model
      - d. Peer Review Forum
    - b. Application for ESRI's Public Access Grant Program **action**
6. Information Items
  - a. MetroGIS Strategic Initiatives Update – Data Development Schedule
  - b. Benefits Study – Participant Satisfaction Survey
  - c. Information Policy Legislation Update
  - d. Washington County Jurisdictional Boundary Procedures Available for Use by Other Counties
  - e. Fair-Share Financial Model Project Presentation - NACO Conference February 2000
  - f. MetroGIS Communications.
7. Other Business
8. Next Meeting - October 27, 1999
9. Adjourn

## July 28, 1999 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. It was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Centre offices in downtown St. Paul.

Members Present: Willis Branning, (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Edwin Mackie (Scott County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Richard Johnson alternate for Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council), Terry Schneider (AMM) and Donn Wiski (AMM).

Members Absent: Dennis Berg (Anoka County), Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), and John Siegfried (Carver County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Virginia Erdahl, Rick Gelbmann, Brad Henry, Gary Stevenson, and Will Craig.

Visitors: Trudy Richter of the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Project consultant team, David Hemsey (Carver County).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Theresa Foster, and Melissa Walker.

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

It was agreed to act on Items 3, 5a, and 5c before considering the remainder of the agenda. Chairperson Reinhardt encouraged member organizations who have not designated an alternate Board member to do so to insure quorums can be met given the importance of the decisions that will face the MetroGIS Policy Board in the coming months.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Branning moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the April 21, 1999 meeting summary as submitted. Motion carried ayes all.

### 4. JUNE 9<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the testimony she and her fellow panelists presented at the June 9 Congressional Subcommittee Hearing. She reported she had emphasized a need for the federal government to assume some of the start-up financing needed by GIS collaboratives and to consider participating on an ongoing basis consistent with benefit received. She also noted she intends to meet with several of Minnesota's congressmen to inform them of MetroGIS and to ask that they support the Community/Federal Information Partnership (C/FIP) program proposed for funding, beginning FY2000. (An explanation of the program was included in the agenda packet.)

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Henry then summarized the type of benefits generally realized when GIS is deployed within an organization. These include: automate once-use many times, reduced time to respond to data requests from constituents and decision makers, improved data accuracy, and better more timely data to support decisions and operations. He also summarized some of the benefits that can accrue to participants of collaboratives, such as MetroGIS, including: data readily available from outside of the jurisdiction, common language that expedites application and data development, possibility of data developed/secured by the collaborative more cost effective than locally developed & maintained data, one contact for many sources of data and services. Henry used the examples included with the written testimony submitted for the June 9<sup>th</sup> Congressional Subcommittee Hearing and from Minneapolis based projects to illustrate these benefits. Chairperson Reinhardt added an examples shared at the Subcommittee Hearing that the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District recently benefited significantly from the presence of MetroGIS when it was able to respond quickly to an encephalitis outbreak through use of several regional GIS dataset. Without their quick action, made possible by MetroGIS, many people could have been seriously hurt. Chairperson Henry closed by reporting that 10-20 percent of the GIS data inquires received by the Minneapolis



GIS department request data from surrounding communities or illustration of data metro wide which can not cost-effectively be done without access to regional datasets such as those associated with MetroGIS.

Member Fiskness commented that he believes standardization of procedures and guidelines is a benefit of the MetroGIS initiative and asked if any effort is underway to document examples. Coordinating Committee member Craig stated he is preparing to survey MetroGIS participants as part of his MetroGIS Benefits Study and that he will include a question or two to address this topic. Committee members Arbeit, Claypool, and Gelbmann also provided examples of how standardized procedures can minimize the cost of application development used by multiple organizations. They also acknowledged that the network of technical GIS expertise is growing, which by itself promotes cost efficiencies through sharing of knowledge on a variety of data and GIS systems undertakings.

## 5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

### a) Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset Guidelines

Member Schneider moved and member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board endorse use of the U.S. Census Bureau's "FIPS" county and place name codes for MCD's (minor civil divisions) as standard MetroGIS codes from identifying counties and MCD's and to promote their use among MetroGIS stakeholders. Motion carried, ayes all.

### b) MetroGIS Structure Update

#### (1) Legal Organization

Policy Advisory Team Chairperson Erdahl reported that the Policy Advisory Team has concluded that a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) Association is the most viable available option currently available to MetroGIS but that the Team is recommending that a Business Plan should be prepared before any action is taken. The Business Plan would set forth strategies necessary to build toward a mature MetroGIS, include a marketing plan to insure all critical milestones and assumptions can be achieved, evaluate whether a JPA structure provides the necessary authorities, and, if so, when it should be created.

Board members concurred with the Team that the MetroGIS organizational structure should continue to provide voting memberships on the Policy Board for cities, watersheds, and schools. The group briefly discussed the complication that individual cities and watersheds would likely have to enter into the JPA to secure voting memberships, which complicates the organization. Member Schneider suggested that the Committee's final recommendation should consider seeking legislative authority sooner than later if the Joint Powers Agreement authorities unnecessarily complicate provision of these voting memberships. Member Wiski concurred that it is important for MetroGIS to continue to include all current interests as voting members to ensure accountability, particularly in light of the forthcoming recommendation to raise revenues through subscription fees. He commented that Roseville has clearly demonstrated significant value to use of GIS by the city. The strategic question is does coordination produce value consistent with the proposed subscription fees?

Member Johns offered that TIES utilizes a member/associate member structure through which associate members are involved in discussions but do not vote. She suggested this might be a means to effectively broaden participation in policy deliberations. Trudy Richter, lead for the organizational structure component of the fair-share model study, noted the Policy Advisory Team is aware of this option but concluded that the Coordinating Committee and Advisory Team structure provides adequate option for non-voting members to participate.

#### 5(b)(2) Operational Organization

Chairperson Reinhardt stated she had encouraged the Coordinating Committee to investigate ways to improve communication between itself and the Policy Board in light of the upcoming major decisions. Board members suggested that emailing them minutes of Coordinating Committee meetings immediately following the meetings in addition to continuing the current practice of updates on topics of interest every 4 to 6 weeks. Board members also endorsed the concept of the Coordinating Committee sending them ideas or proposals for feedback and agreed to the idea of special workshop meetings to discuss important topics prior to the Committee developing a recommendation of the Board taking action.

#### 5(b)(3) Fair-share Financial Model

Policy Advisory Team Chairperson Erdahl presented the major assumptions and cost drivers that have been built into the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Model and she summarized the resulting proposed fair-share subscription fees to support the costs of MetroGIS. Finally she explained that the Policy Advisory Team is recommending preparation of a Business Plan to define a detailed subscription phase-in strategy along with a timeline for development of regional data solutions to insure that revenues from fees and supplemental sources are adequate to cover expenses. Staff noted that the project consultant is continuing to refine the model and that the projected subscription fees presented at the forum will likely differ somewhat from those included in the agenda materials.

Member Schneider commented he believes three fundamental topics that need to be addressed before the Policy Board will be in a position to act on the fair –share financial model project recommendations: define the costs, define the benefits, and define how the proposed subscription fees relate to the amount of funding actually budgeted for GIS activities by prospective subscribers. He noted that the significant progress appears to have been made to address the first two topics and he offered to investigate the possibility of collaborating with AMM to conduct a survey to address the third topic.

Coordinating Committee member Stevenson noted the Dakota County GIS Partnership is opposed to the proposed subscription fees for local government. He also stated that the benefit of access to data from neighboring jurisdictions is yet to be documented and he and his partnership members are not convinced that adequate benefit exists to justify the proposed subscription fees.

Members Schneider and Johns commented they believe the GIS programs of Dakota County and its partner local governments may be significantly ahead of the norm in the region and that these achievements should be used as an example of what is possible. Both members disagreed with the partnership’s disapproval of the proposed subscription fee to support the evolution of similar capabilities throughout the region. Member Johns commented that the Lakeville School District is highly complimentary of MetroGIS, noting they could not have accomplished their GIS objectives without the agreements that had been put into place to facilitate data sharing. Member Schneider also commented that most organizations he is familiar with have a broader vision that looks beyond their own internal needs. He encouraged the other Board members to give MetroGIS philosophies a chance to evolve and to test the value of the collaborative.

Chairperson Reinhardt suggested three minor changes to the names of organizational classes (changes "cities" to "municipalities" and add "district" after "schools" and "watershed"). She also encouraged the others to support management’s proposal to seek feedback from prospective participants before presenting final recommendations to the Board.

Motion: Member Wiski moved and Member Mackie seconded to authorize MetroGIS management to share its preliminary cost sharing projections with prospective MetroGIS participants at the Peer Review Forum scheduled for September 16 and to seek feedback about their willingness to participate. Motion carried, ayes all.

Member Schneider suggested that in addition to the proposed mailing staff should look into the possibility of a broadcast fax from AMM to its member organizations.

#### 5(b)(4) Peer Review Forum

No discussion other than members recommended that the presentation include a demonstration of the benefits to be realized from collaboration. Staff also agreed to send Board members the list of organizations sent invitations.

#### c) Application for ESRI's Public Access Grant Program

Member Johns moved and Alternate Member Johnson seconded that the Policy Board endorse the Metropolitan Council applying on behalf of MetroGIS for an ESRI Public Access Grant. Motion carried, ayes all.

Member Branning left the meeting.

#### 6. INFORMATION

There was no discussion of the items described in the agenda packet and the members introduced no items.

## 7. OTHER BUSINESS

None

## 8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will held on October 27, 1999. The group agreed to a 6:30 p.m. starting time. Chairperson Reinhardt asked staff to mail the agenda packet a week earlier than normal given the significance of the topics to be considered. It was agreed that a decision will be made at the October 27<sup>th</sup> whether a special meeting will be needed to act on recommendations from the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Model and Organizational Structure project.

## 9. ADJOURN

Member Fiskness moved and Alternate Member Johnson seconded to adjourn at 8:00 p.m. Motion carried ayes all.

Prepared by Randall L. Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

## October 27, 1999 Minutes

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. It was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Centre offices in downtown St. Paul. Chairperson Reinhardt welcomed the newest member to the Board, Roger Williams representing the Metropolitan Council, and asked each member and those in the audience to introduce themselves.

Members Present: Dennis Berg (Anoka County), Willis Branning, (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council), Terry Schneider (AMM), and John Siegfried (Carver County).

Members Absent: Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Barbara Johnson (AMM), Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), and Edwin Mackie (Scott County),

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Gary Caswell for Patrick O'Connor, Will Craig, David Claypool, Virginia Erdahl, Rick Gelbmann, Brad Henry, Jerome Johnson, Richard Johnson, Ron Wencil, and Dennis Welsch

Visitors: Trudy Richter of the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Project consultant team, David Bitter of the MetroGIS Benefits Study team, and John Connelly, Co-Chair Technical Advisory Team.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Theresa Foster, and Melissa Walker.

### 2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Siegfried moved and Member Schneider seconded to approve the agenda as proposed. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Member Siegfried moved and Member Johns seconded to approve the July 28, 1999 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

### 4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Gary Stevenson shared an application that Dakota County is piloting entitled "Screening for Childhood lead Exposure Using Geographic Information System and Internet Technologies". It was noted that physicians are using and helping to refine this application. Access is password protected due to the sensitivity of the data involved. Chairperson Reinhardt commented that this is an excellent example of how use of GIS technology is helping decision-makers address quality of life issues.

### 5 ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### a) MetroGIS Financing and Structure

1. MetroGIS Benefits Study: Dr. William Craig and David Bittner, both with the University of Minnesota, summarized the preliminary results of their MetroGIS Benefits Study. William Craig is also a member of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. Their yearlong study was conducted in two parts – interviews of recipients of shared data and a mail survey of individuals that have or are participating in the MetroGIS activities and decision making. Mr. Bittner summarized the results of the interviews noting that the participants cited benefits of MetroGIS that fall into three major categories: improved working relationships, provision of regional datasets, and development and support of Data Finder.

Dr. Craig then summarized the preliminary results of the mail survey, noting that a response rate of 80 percent had been achieved. He stated he will be providing the Board with a more detailed analysis in the coming weeks. The results show that in addition to access to data, MetroGIS is positively affecting participating organizations in several ways, the most noteworthy are

improved working relationships, improved communication about GIS technology and its applications, and improved attitudes about data sharing. Respondents also commonly cited three data needs that are outside of MetroGIS' thirteen priority information needs: orthoimagery, soils, and contour/elevation data. Craig noted that the first two are being addressed by the Metropolitan Council and others as part of their internal business needs and that some work is occurring on the development of contour data in conjunction with development of orthoimagery. Respondents identified the need to address long term funding, legal organizational structure, and access to more data as the priorities for the near term. In summary, Dr. Craig stated that MetroGIS is benefiting the metro area in three major ways: more data is being shared; more communication is occurring among peers; and there is an improved attitude about data sharing.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that as we move forward with the Business Plan, we must continue to focus on ways to measure "perceived value" and on methods to clearly communicate benefits.

Board members encouraged the Coordinating Committee and staff to actively seek out ways to include the "collar counties" in MetroGIS activities. Members also asked staff to report at the next meeting about who outside of the Metro Area has requested a license to use the regional street centerline dataset. Rick Gelbmann agreed to prepare a report.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that the 80 percent response rate is outstanding and reflects the importance of the issues at hand.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Fiskness seconded to acknowledge the preliminary findings of the MetroGIS Benefits Study. Motion carried, ayes all.

- MetroGIS Financial Model & Organizational Structure Project Report: Policy Advisory Team Chairperson Erdahl reminded the Board that this project was funded with a grant from the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) project, summarized past Board action at its April 21<sup>st</sup> (assumptions) and July 28<sup>th</sup> meetings (endorsed preliminary findings for Peer Review), and summarized the proposed functions, organizational structure, associated support costs, and highlights of the fair-share model that were shared for comment at the Peer Review Forum on September 16th.

Board members acknowledged that the current organizational structure does not provide legal standing and that the best organizational option under current State law, joint powers agreement (JPA), has shortcomings in terms of securing voting memberships for all current members as directed by the Board at its July 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. All agreed that this matter must be a high priority to resolve in the Business Plan.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Branning seconded to acknowledge receipt from the consultant team of the Fair-Share Financial Model project report, dated October 7, 1999. Motion carried, ayes all.

- Peer Review Forum: Coordinating Committee Chairperson Henry provided an overview of the presentations and results of the small group sessions hosted at the September 16<sup>th</sup> Peer Review Forum. Chairperson Henry summarized the conclusions drawn by MetroGIS management from the Forum as follows: 1) there is strong support for continuing MetroGIS' collaborative and communication functions, 2) there is a need to better communicate the benefits of the data integration function proposed by MetroGIS as opposed to each organization having to internalize these integration costs, 3) generally local government viewed the proposed subscription fees as too high, and 4) little comment was received regarding the proposal to pursue a separate joint powers agreement structure to govern MetroGIS.

Henry stated that as we are able to demonstrate and document benefits of collaboration in a manner that prospective participants can directly apply to their own circumstances, participation and willingness to assist with costs to support MetroGIS will increase. Board members concurred.

Members agreed that a transition period will be necessary where supplemental funding will be required to support MetroGIS activities but that instituting a subscription fee based revenue program should still be the long term goal. All agreed that education on the uses of GIS and on the benefits of collaboration should be an emphasis of the work program for the next few years. The members also generally agreed that the subscription fee methodology must accommodate the varying circumstances among participants and that what is considered fair and reasonable in one county may not be appropriate in another.

Member Schneider requested, and the group concurred, that: 1) research should be conducted for the Business Plan to document what prospective participants are spending on data acquisition and GIS deployment and 2) on design of an outreach program to improve awareness of what is possible through use of GIS relevant to satisfying internal business needs of prospective participants. He also stated that cities in general understand the large investment that metro area counties have made to convert their property records to digital form and, therefore, are not concerned about the proposal to declare county contributions to MetroGIS satisfied if they share their data.

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Berg seconded to accept the Peer Review Forum proceedings entitled "A report of the MetroGIS Fair-Share Financial Model Peer Review Forum, September 16, 1999". Motion carried, ayes all.

- Recommendations & Next Steps: Coordinating Committee Chairperson Henry summarized actions sought from the Board: 1) finding of adequate public purpose to proceed to the next step, 2) endorsement of the modified functions as recommended by the Coordinating Committee, and 3) endorsement to proceed with preparation of a Business Plan for MetroGIS

Henry reiterated a finding of the Fair-Share Financial Model Study that support of the desired collaborative functions identified for MetroGIS exceed the internal business needs of individual MetroGIS participants. He also restated a finding of the MetroGIS Benefits Study that continued support of activities that promote and foster data sharing are as highly valued as access to shared data.

Member Berg suggested that the Business Plan should include investigation of the option of privatization, noting that if passed, information policy legislation pending for the 2000 session would dramatically reduce resources available in his county to finance GIS technology and to service information requests. In particular, he suggested that partnerships with the utility companies should be investigated. He emphasized the need to be proactive and to have defined options available for discussion with the Legislature when the hearings begin for SF2237, noting that a Business Plan which addresses information policy issues in a broadly supported manner could be very valuable when testifying before the Legislature. Member Branning commented that a significant amount of work remains to address the issues proposed to be dealt with in the Business Plan. He expressed some concern that completion by March 2000 is very ambitious.

Member Siegfried noted that if MetroGIS moves too quickly to implement a cost sharing program the result could be devise and counter-productive. He favors the Metropolitan Council continuing, for the time being, to support collaborative activities that promote and facilitate data sharing. Member Schneider concurred that there will be the need for a transition period but that he would like to see work continue as part of the Business Plan to mature the subscription program so that we are ready to proceed when the time is right to implement it. He also concurred with Member Berg that MetroGIS should investigate cooperative arrangements with the private sector.

Member Johns suggested, and the group concurred, that the Business Plan scope of work should specifically state that an appropriate governance structure will be identified along with timelines for a decision and for implementation.

Member Williams, representing the Metropolitan Council, noted he believes MetroGIS is an important endeavor with tremendous benefit possibilities for all involved. He stated that the Council sees its role as one of many partners and has no interest in "owning" MetroGIS but rather wants a structure that is good for everyone. He also cautioned that the Council does not have the resources to continue to pay for the entire endeavor. He explained that he will share the findings of the Benefits Study with the Council at a Council retreat scheduled for next week and that he would advocate for continued Council support of the MetroGIS initiative.

Member Fiskness commented he believes successful achievement of MetroGIS' desired outcomes and vision will require more nurturing before a definitive structure is sought. He believes that prematurely moving to a subscription fee or other user fee system could be detrimental to the buy-in needed for long-term success. Member Schneider concurred that it will take some time to acquire the critical mass of buy-in but he also restated his belief that organizations other than the Council should share in the costs to support MetroGIS to promote the value of the collaborative functions.

Motion: Member Berg moved and Member Branning seconded to find that adequate public purpose exists to move to the next phase of implementation – preparation of a Business plan for MetroGIS as explained in the accompanying staff report dated October 1, 1999 -- with the understanding that the concept of a subscription fee will be matured as part of the Business Plan deliberations and maintained as a revenue option until the time is right to pursue implementation. Motion carried ayes all.

Motion: Member Williams moved and Member Branning seconded to endorse the Coordinating Committee's recommended modifications [accompanying staff report dated October 1<sup>st</sup> ] of MetroGIS' program assumptions concerning classification of core functions and MetroGIS' role concerning development of regional datasets. Motion carried, ayes all.

Motion: Member Williams moved and Member Berg seconded to acknowledge the Metropolitan Council's commitment to continue financing MetroGIS' coordination-related functions with the understanding for the need to review the results of the proposed Business Plan in terms of what it will take to make MetroGIS a reality for the long term and with the understanding there may be a need for some additional commitment from the Council for 2001 beyond its internal business needs. Motion carried, ayes all.

#### b) MetroGIS Data Solutions

1. **Regional Parcel Data:** Technical Advisory Team Liaison Claypool explained the Coordinating Committee's recommended data specifications for a regional parcel dataset solution; proposed roles and responsibilities for counties as primary custodians of parcel data, and proposed roles and responsibilities for the yet to be determined regional custodian. He noted that the Coordinating Committee plans to recommend a regional custodian once the technical design for the regional dataset is agreed upon and the candidate organization(s) have had an opportunity to evaluate their ability to perform all expectations. Mr. Claypool also explained that Dakota County staff have accepted responsibility to coordinate a technical design team comprised of county GIS technical specialists and others as appropriate charged will piloting a regional parcel dataset solution.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked Dakota County for agreeing to coordinate the regional parcels workgroup. She also emphasized the need to build on past work of the Technical Advisory Team and upon the North Metro 1-35W Corridor Coalition parcels pilot project. Chairperson Reinhardt also requested regular updates due to the critical nature of this work to the Business Planning process and ultimately the success of MetroGIS.

Member Siegfried suggested that the design team investigate the GIS data repository concept used by the 37-county Minnesota River Basin project wherein all of the data is stored in a central repository at Mankato State University.

Member Berg asked whether the counties will be required to modify their data in any way to contribute it to the regional dataset pool and, if so, who will be expected to pay for these modifications. Staff Coordinator Johnson stated that a principle of MetroGIS is that data are to be contributed by organizations in exactly the form maintained by the organization for their internal business needs. If any modifications are required to merge or integrate into a regional dataset, the users are expected to pay for these modifications. Johnson also summarized the concepts of primary data custodian (counties in the case of parcels) and regional data custodian (to be determined for parcels).

The group agreed to postpone demonstration of the preliminary results of the Regional Parcels Workgroup's efforts to join parcel data from each county until following the meeting.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Williams seconded to endorse, as policy for MetroGIS, the data specifications and role and responsibility assignments specified in Attachments A and B to the accompanying staff report dated October 11, 1999:

- a. Desired data specifications for a regional parcel data solution (Attachment A)
- b. Assignment of the role of primary producers of parcel data to each of the seven counties (Attachment B)
- c. Responsibilities for counties in their recommended role (Attachment B)
- d. Responsibilities for the regional parcel data custodian (Attachment B)

Motion carried, ayes all.

Motion: Member Branning moved and Member Siegfried seconded to accept the Coordinating Committee's recommendation to postpone assignment of the role of the Regional Parcel Data Custodian until more is known about the specifics of the technical design and associated data maintenance requirements. Motion carried, ayes all.

1. Municipal Boundary Mapping Guidelines for Counties: Technical Advisory Team Liaison Claypool explained the Coordinating Committee's recommendation to adopt a voluntary policy that each of the seven metro area counties follow the guidelines developed by Washington County for capture and maintenance of municipal boundary data. He noted that use of the same or similar data capture guidelines by each of the seven counties will reduce time and cost to integrate each of the county's jurisdictional boundary data into the regional dataset that the Metropolitan Council has agreed to maintain for MetroGIS.

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Williams seconded to:

1. Endorse the MCD (minor civil division) jurisdictional boundary guidelines developed by Washington County as guidelines for MetroGIS (counties serving in the role of primary producers of MCD boundary data) with the understanding these guidelines are intended to be improved and enhanced overtime
2. Promote use of these guidelines by each of the seven counties.

Motion carried, ayes all

#### b) 2000 Meeting Schedule

Member Siegfried moved and Member Schneider seconded to set the following meeting schedule for 2000, with the understanding the additional meetings will be likely be needed during the first quarter to support preparation of the Business Plan: Wed., January 26<sup>th</sup>, Wed., March 29<sup>th</sup>, Wed., July 26<sup>th</sup>, and Wed., October 18<sup>th</sup>. Motion carried ayes, all.

#### 6. INFORMATION

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the September 29<sup>th</sup> briefing of the Metropolitan Council regarding MetroGIS. Member Williams noted that on October 6<sup>th</sup>, the North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition briefed the Metropolitan Council on its comprehensive planning and GIS programs and thanked the participants of the September 29<sup>th</sup> MetroGIS briefing for setting the ground work for the Oct 6<sup>th</sup> briefing. Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair Claypool commented on a federal funding program that is progressing through Congress that will provide funding for development of Global Positioning System (GPS) infrastructure critical to establishing control for property data maintained by counties.

#### 7. OTHER BUSINESS

See last item

#### 8. NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, January 26, 2000

#### 9. ADJOURN

Member Fiskness moved and Member Branning seconded to adjourn at 8:50 p.m. Motion carried, ayes all.

After Adjournment REGIONAL PARCEL PILOT PROJECT UPDATE Gary Stevenson, Director of Land Information and Surveying for Dakota County and member of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, demonstrated progress made to date to "stitch together" parcel data received from several of the counties. He also demonstrated the ability to query against the merged parcel data. Board members were impressed with the results to date and encouraged Stevenson to maintain close communication as the technical work group progresses with this project.

Prepared by  
Randall L. Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator