MetroGIS Policy Board Minutes: 2000-2002

January 26, 2000 Agenda

Minnesota Department of Health
Snelling Office Park Building, 1645 Energy Park Drive, St. Paul

1. Call to Order & Introduction of New Members
2. Accept Agenda
3. Accept Meeting Summary
    - October 27, 1999 **action**
4. Election of Officers **action**
5. Consent Items

a. MetroGIS Data Products and Custodian Responsibilities
    1. Regional Census Geography Dataset
    2. Regional Land Cover Dataset **action**

6. MetroGIS Policy Board Workshop (See Attached Program)

. Business Plan Workshop (4:45 to 7:45 p.m.)

a. Establish Organizational Structure **action**
b. Consider Public Sector Subscription Fee **action**
c. Consider Data Access Policy for Private and Non-Profit Sector **action**

7. Information

. MetroGIS Strategic Initiatives Update

a. Information Policy Legislation Update (US HF 354 and MN SF2237)
b. Board of Innovation and Cooperation Grant Proposal Update
c. NACO Presentation March 5th Washington, D.C.
d. 1999 Accomplishments

8. Next Meeting

. March 29, 2000

9. Adjourn 8:00 p.m.

January 26, 2000 Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 4:45 p.m. It was held at the Department of Health facility on Energy Park in St.Paul.

Members Present: Willis Branning (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Dennis Hegberg and Alternate Jim Stafford (Washington County), Alternate Lee Whitcraft for Antoinette Johns (TIES), Barbara Johnson (AMM), Alternate Patrick O'Connor for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Terry Schneider (AMM), John Siegfried (Carver County), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Edwin Mackie (Scott County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool (Vice Chair), Alternate Dick Carlstrom, Eli Cooper, Will Craig, Virginia Erdahl, Rick Gelbmann, Jim Hentges, Brad Henry (Chair), Jerome Johnson, Edward Schukle, Gary Stevenson, and Ron Wencl.

Visitors: Steve Lehr, CB Richard-Ellis

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster and MetroGIS Fair-Share Business Plan consultant team members Trudy Richter, Yvonne Chaillet, and Kathie Doty of Richardson and Richter and Mark Beauchamp of Virchow and Krause.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted, as submitted.

3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY

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

4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Member Siegfried moved and Member Schneider seconded to nominate Member Reinhardt to serve as chairperson for the coming year. There were no other nominations. Motion carried, ayes all to elect Member Reinhardt as Policy Board Chairperson.

Member Branning moved and Member Schneider seconded to nominate Member Siegfried to serve as chairperson for the coming year. There were no other nominations. Motion carried, ayes all to elect Member Siegfried as Policy Board Vice-Chairperson.

5. CONSENT ITEMS

a. MetroGIS Data Products and Custodian Responsibilities

Member Schneider moved and Member Siegfried seconded the following motions concerning approval of data solutions for the regional census geography and regional land cover information needs:

1) Census Geography: That the MetroGIS Policy Board:

a. Endorse the proposed regional data specifications and regional custodian responsibilities for the MetroGIS census geography information need, as recommended by the Coordinating Committee and as set forth in Attachments A and B of the accompanying staff report dated January 18, 2000.
b. Accept the Metropolitan Council's offer to serve as regional custodian for the MetroGIS census geography information need
c. Accept the Metropolitan Council's acknowledgment that the responsibilities to support MetroGIS' regional census geography information need are consistent with its internal business needs, and therefore, no supplemental support will be required from MetroGIS.

2. Land Cover: That the MetroGIS Policy Board:

a. Endorse the Mn DNR's Minnesota Land Cover Classification System (MLCCS) as a "current best management practice" that satisfactorily addresses MetroGIS' land covert information need.
b. Endorse DNR's administration of its MLCCS, in accordance with the roles and responsibilities stated herein, as satisfactorily addressing the regional custodian responsibilities desired by MetroGIS for its land cover information need.
c. Acknowledge that DNR has an internal business need to maintain the MLCCS and, therefore, no supplemental support will be required from MetroGIS.

Motion carried ayes all.

6. MetroGIS POLICY BOARD WORKSHOP

Trudy Richter of the MetroGIS Business Plan consultant team summarized the actions of the Policy Board at its October 27′ 1999 meeting that directed the preparation of a Business Plan. She also stated the project team's expectations for the workshop.

Brad Henry, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, briefly summarized the mission of MetroGIS, benefits of deploying GIS technology, benefits that can be attained through collaborative deployment among multiple organizations, the Metropolitan Council's sponsorship role, several accomplishments and early impacts of MetroGIS -- both data and non data related.

Kathie Doty of the MetroGIS Business Plan consultant team noted several of the key functions that the Policy Board has endorsed as appropriate for MetroGIS to support and which have been assumed to drive the cost side of the business plan. She emphasized that data development costs are not included in the budget estimates as directed by the Board at October 27th meeting, rather that the costs are limited to those to support functions designed to foster cooperation and coordination. Ms. Doty noted that 86 percent of the financing to date, or about $1.3 million, has been provided by the Metropolitan Council and that remaining 14 percent has come from grants and MnDOT. She stated that funding for 2000-2001 is proposed to come from the Council and grants and that the Business Planning currently assumes that MetroGIS stakeholders will begin to participate in the support of MetroGIS through payment of subscription fees, beginning January 1, 2002. Finally, she noted that the Metropolitan Council's approved 2000 budget for MetroGIS is $431,000. She also shared the currently proposed budgets for 2001-2003, with the 2003 budget being $500,000, noting that the Council is assumed to continue to host MetroGIS' support staff and stated that the overhead costs associated with this hosting of the staff are not included in the proposed budget figures.

Mark Beauchamp of the MetroGIS Business Plan consultant team summarized the key aspects of the proposed fair share financial model. He explained that the model has been developed based on the concept that it must be consistent with perceived benefit. To accomplish this design requirement, "allocators" were devised from information received from the 1997 Business Information Needs Survey, the September Fair Share Model Information Forum, the 1999 MetroGIS Benefits Study, and extensive guidance from the Policy Advisory Team. In addition, conservative participation rates were used for local government units. The resulting proposed cost allocation percentages were shared, with the Metropolitan Government share at 59 percent and rest at 9 percent or less.

Trudy Richter concluded this portion of the presentation with several example fees, including a proposed discount for user groups. The participants were then given four questions to discuss while eating dinner. The participants were also asked to remain at the tables that they had been assigned when they arrived for the dinner discussion. A facilitator was assigned to each table.

Chairperson Reinhardt clarified that the counties will not lose revenues and that she believes that consolidating the county's data distribution activities with MetroGIS may in fact result in savings to the counties. Gelbmann offered that consolidation of the distribution function could also result in a de facto marketing benefit that could increase sales over those that may otherwise be experienced by the County.

Staff provided clarification about the general responsibilities that would comprise the proposed four FTE's of staff support.

The participants were then asked to discuss and respond to the following questions in each of the four discussion groups:

1. Does the fair-share model generate reasonable subscription fees for the various subscription classes?

2. What changes or alternates, if any need to be considered?

3. Should the Board continue to support the concept of a subscription fee for the public sector to fund the coordination functions of MetroGIS?

4. Can you endorse the subscription fee concept with your government agency?

Dinner was served.

Concerns and comments (group participants listed in appendix):

Group #1 (Kathie Doty Facilitator)

- Overall supported the concept of a subscription fee for public sector with the understanding that there may not be a need for a MetroGIS as the result of rapidly advancing technology. There was some uneasiness over government charging government but the group concurred that the benefits of collaboration are worth pursuing.

Group #2 (Yvonne Chaillet Facilitator)

- Generally okay with the subscription fee concept but concerned that the necessary participation may not be achieved.
- Ability to collect the proposed fees from state and federal agencies was questioned and suggested use of grants to offset these fees.
- The proposed fee for higher education was questioned
- Suggested referring to as "funding targets" rather than "subscription fees".

Group 3 (Mark Beauchamp Facilitator)

- Supported the concept of a subscription fee in some form. Generally believe the fees are still too high but want more information about the specific functions and benefits

- Watersheds are limited to $200,000 operating expenses. The proposed fair-share fee will be tough to pay unless each district is very clear that the benefit will equal or exceed the subscription fee.
- Need to refine the proposed fee for higher education. Too high if a grant funded project is not involved. Suggested education should pay a base fee and a pro-rated amount on a dataset by dataset basis thereafter.
- Liked idea of a discount for consortiums/user groups.

- Concerned that the subscription fee could be viewed as taking money from one pocket and putting into another. The belief was that the cost to collect the various fees may exceed the value of the fees obtained.

- Questioned why private sector is not proposed to help support the funding for the coordination activities.
- Suggested that the base cost should be increased to cover some of the expenses that will be incurred to distribute the public domain data, assuming that subscription fees will be collected only when a license is required.

Group 4 (Trudy Richter Facilitator)

- Concurred with the previous group that the cap on watershed district operation expenses is a concern but also supported the consortium discount concept as one means to overcome.
- Concern for creation of unnecessary bureaucracy
- Want more detail about the functions included in the budget and the related staff support expenses.
- Concurred with the user group/consortium idea but also want to insure flexibility for varying circumstances among the users groups.

Ms. Richter thanked the groups for their feedback and closed the discussion of the proposed subscription fee for the public sector. She then explained a proposal to provide data access, at a discounted rate, to private/non-profit organizations; summarizing the proposed roles and obligations of MetroGIS, counties, and private/non-profits, which would include privately funded research by higher education (other higher education uses would be have access as if government) that would be necessary to implement the concept.

The participants were then asked to discuss and respond to the following questions in each of the four discussion groups during dessert:

1. Is it preferred for MetroGIS to coordinate data distribution on behalf of counties for private and non-profit sector' internal use?

2. Are the components of the fee reasonable?

3. When should closure be reached on fee amount, licensing agreements and amendments to data sharing agreements?

Dessert was served.

Concerns and comments (group participants listed in appendix):

Group #1 (Kathie Doty Facilitator)

No additional comments

Group #2 (Yvonne Chaillet Facilitator)

- Concurred that the private sector should have options – MetroGIS for multiple county data and the counties if only a single county involved assuming no revenue loss to the counties.
- Agreed that the necessary agreements should be executed ASAP and that we should begin to the test the market for fees acceptable to the private sector that could, in turn, be used to reduce the operating expenses used to calculate the subscription fees scheduled to be instituted January 2002.
- Need to clarify the role of the counties.
- Some concern raised about the visibility of the counties as the data source would be reduced.

- Consortium idea is okay provided it is implemented in a similar way to the proposal for the public sector: a discount against the fee that would be paid by the members of the consortium not one fee as if a single organization for the consortium to divide among themselves.

Group #3 (Mark Beauchamp Facilitator)

No additional comments.

Group #4 (Trudy Richter Facilitator)

- Concurred that the concept should be pursued. There would be definite benefits to the private sector of a one-stop-shop to obtain data as well as to public sector data producer in terms of less time and effort to service requests.

Ms. Richter thanked the groups for their feedback and closed the discussion of the private sector/non-profit and turned the meeting over Chairperson Reinhardt for Board action on five recommendations:

Motions:

1. Member Schneider moved and Member Hegberg seconded to direct MetroGIS staff to meet with respective government staff to develop a Joint Powers Agreement with current Policy Board membership voting rights and the current committee structure.

Motion carried, ayes all, with the understanding that staff will provide a couple of scenarios ranging from voluntary to a business model.

2. Member Hegberg moved and Member Kordiak seconded to endorse for inclusion in the Business Plan the adoption in March 2000 of the Fair-Share Model subscription fee for the public sector funding of MetroGIS. First subscription fee payable the first quarter of 2002.

Motion carried, ayes all, with the understanding that a subscription fee is acceptable in some format and that a revised version, including the changes suggested at this workshop, will be brought back for further discussion at the March meeting.

Staff was also directed to provide details on the budgeted costs for Board discussion and to provide more than one budget option.

3. Member Siegfried moved and Alternate Member O'Conner seconded to endorse for inclusion in the Business Plan in March 2000 the adoption of a service fee for the payment by the private sector to MetroGIS.

Motion carried, ayes all, with the understanding that staff will investigate options to reduce the proposed $490,000 operating budget with fees collected from the private sector service fee and that, if necessary and if possible, that an interim arrangement should be pursued to expedite access to the data over that possible through the creation of a joint powers agreement.

1. Member Hegberg moved and Member Siegfried seconded to

a. Direct MetroGIS to coordinate counties meeting to: (1) establish reasonable cost recovery fees for internal use only and (2) Agree on a standard licensing agreement.
b. Direct MetroGIS and the Counties to develop terms and conditions and rights to parcel data so MetroGIS may develop, distribute and update regional datasets.

Motion carried, ayes all, with the understanding that MetroGIS' anticipated action in March will be contingent upon approval by each if the respective County Boards.

Coordinating Committee member Will Craig noted that the cost to distribute to data is not trivial, that by the Counties agreeing to delegate some of their data distribution tasks to MetroGIS will result in cost savings to them, and that he hopes that the counties will be willing to share these cost savings with MetroGIS.

1. Member Hegberg moved and Member Siegfried seconded to work with the Metropolitan Council to resolve support issues, including:

- Assign data sharing agreements to MetroGIS once it is a separate legal entity
- Sign an agreement with MetroGIS to fund the 2001 budget for MetroGIS including support of FTP site for MetroGIS data distribution services
- Agree to staffing and reporting requirements for MetroGIS for 2002 and on.
- Agree to host staff for 2002 and on, including provision of accounting, human services, IS support.

Motion carried, ayes all, with the understanding that MetroGIS' anticipated action in March will be contingent upon approval by the Metropolitan Council, if the Council has not acted by that time. Staff was also directed to provide detailed information about the functions proposed to be supported by staff and the level of support would be provided.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS

No Discussion

8. NEXT MEETING

March 29, 2000

9. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:15 p.m.

Prepared by,
Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

April 26, 2000 Agenda

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

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

- January 26, 2000 **action**

4. GIS Demonstration (Regional Parcel Dataset)

5. Action Items

a. Business Plan and Regional Parcel Dataset Pilot Project **action**
b. Modify July Meeting Date **action**

6. Information Sharing

a. Strategic Initiatives Update
b. 1999 MetroGIS Annual Report
c. NACo and NSDI Presentations, March 5-6, Washington, D.C.
d. NSDI GeoData Organizational Initiative: The MetroGIS Connection
e. National GIS-T Conference – March 27-29, Minneapolis
f. Information Policy Opinion – March 10, St. Louis County

6. Next Meeting

7. Adjourn

April 26, 2000 Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. It was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park facility in St. Paul.

Members Present: Willis Branning (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Alternate Lee Whitcraft for Antoinette Johns (TIES), Edwin Mackie (Scott County), Alternate Patrick O'Connor for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Terry Schneider (AMM), John Siegfried (Carver County), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Barbara Johnson (AMM)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Larry Charboneau, David Claypool (Vice Chair), Eli Cooper, Will Craig, Virginia Erdahl, Rick Gelbmann, Jim Hentges, Brad Henry (Chair), Jerome Johnson, Edward Schukle, Gary Stevenson, and Ron Wencl.

Visitors: Steve Lehr, CB Richard-Ellis and Shawn Toscano, ESRI

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Kathie Doty of Richardson and Richter

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Fiskness moved and Member Siegfried seconded to accept the agenda as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY

Member Schneider moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the summary of the January 26, 2000 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Rick Gelbmann, Coordinating Committee, and Brad Henry, Coordinating Committee Chair, presented and demonstrated highlights of Version 1 of the regional parcel dataset. Henry stressed this dataset was assembled as a place to start to address one of the key priority information needs previously identified by the MetroGIS community. In particular, that the limited number of attributes attached to each parcel were selected because they were easy to accomplish and that the proposed pilot project is, in part, intended to obtain feedback from the user community about the desired enhancements to the data content and CD-ROM method of distribution.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked Gary Stevenson and Dakota County for volunteering to oversee the development of Version 1 of this dataset. Member Branning (Dakota County) thanked the Metropolitan Council for financing the costs of collaboration that have brought MetroGIS to this point.

Chairperson Reinhardt noted that resolution of policies concerning private sector access to parcel data are fundamental to MetroGIS' next steps and offered a modified version of the Business Plan recommendation, to that presented on page 15 of the staff report included in the agenda packet, for the members to keep in mind as the Business Plan is presented. She explained that after meeting with representatives of the private sector she decided the decision making process outlined in the proposed Business Plan would not address the needs quickly enough. She noted that the proposed modifications maintain the intent of the Plan but speed up the process. She also emphasized that these modifications do not assume any predetermined outcome as to how or if the private sector's needs will be/can be addressed to the private sector's satisfaction.

Chairperson Reinhardt also noted that the modified motion postpones action on the recommendation in the Business Plan to redirect the $75,000 supplemental data maintenance payment until more information is known about the proposed centralized data distribution functions.

In the subsequent dialogue, Chairperson Reinhardt clarified that it is possible that a more formal organizational structure than at present, such as a joint powers agreement, may be needed to effectively address the private sector data access issue. It was also noted that county officials have already initiated talks to identify common ground regarding non-government access fees for parcel data.

a) Business Plan and Regional Parcel Dataset Pilot Project

Kathie Doty, of Richardson, Richter & Associates, and member of the Business Planning Team, explained the Business Planning process, previous direction that had been received from the Board including functions that MetroGIS should support, proposed function priorities and resulting budget estimates, funding to date, funding options investigated and the Metropolitan Council administration's acceptance (subject to full Council acceptance) to sponsor the entire coordination budget, and proposed pilot project to refine the regional parcel dataset and related distribution policies including the role of the private sector.

Board members discussed several matters relating to distribution of regional data, updating of regional data, funding to improve regional data distribution capacity, and need for direction concerning the proposed postponement of action regarding redirection of the $75,000 supplemental data maintenance payment. Board members also discussed and agreed upon several refinements to Chairperson Reinhardt's modified recommendation (Item 3) concerning how the private sector members would be nominated, need for diversity among the size of the participating private sector firms, and relationship between the existing Coordinating Committee and the proposed Regional Parcel Dataset Subcommittee. All members concurred that it would not be in the public interest to act today in a manner that would preclude private sector involvement at a later date. And consequently, that it is important that the Policy Board understand the private sector's interests from the outset of the development of policies concerning the regional parcel dataset.

Board members accepted a proposal from Coordinating Committee Charboneau to oversee a process whereby he would coordinate development of a list of potential private sector interests and then rely upon a self nomination process resulting in a list of candidates for consideration by Chairperson Reinhardt and Vice-Chairperson Siegfried, who would oversee appointment of private and public sector representatives. It was also agreed that: 1) the members should not be dominated by elected officials, 2) the county staff should be familiar with their county's costs to develop the geospatial data included (or proposed) in the regional dataset and the legal aspects concerning their access policies, 3) the county staff should be familiar with typical data requests from the private sector, and 4) the private sector representatives should be knowledgeable of the parcel-related data their respective firms desire from the counties. It will then be up to the private sector to decide if they can accept the fee identified through this process.

Member Kordiak volunteered to co-chair the subcommittee as the Board's representative. Member Mackie also volunteered to serve in a dual capacity as private sector and Board representative. Board members accepted these offers.

The group also concluded that that the proposed subcommittee should focus on the private sector and that policy relating to non-profits and academia should be dealt with after private sector policy is set. There was concurrence on the Board and among the Coordinating Committee members present that the academic and non-profit fees would most likely fall somewhere on the continuum between access policy set for the private and public sectors.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the MetroGIS Policy Board:

1. Accept the proposed Business Plan for MetroGIS, dated April 19, 2000
2. Authorize the next steps presented in the Business Plan and generalized as follows:
    a. Accept the Metropolitan Council management's proposal (to be confirmed with the Council) to continue to fund MetroGIS' coordination functions.
        - Postpone further consideration of a subscription fee program for the public sector
        - Initiate discussions between the Metropolitan Council and the counties concerning continuation of the practice of funding a supplemental data maintenance payment to the counties
        - Expand functions to support centralized internet-based distribution of regional data
    b. Request each county to immediately authorize distribution of the regional parcel dataset to the public and private sectors for the pilot project
        - Agree on a licensing agreement for distribution of the regional parcel dataset
        - Commence pilot project with MetroGIS distributing regional parcel datasets
        - Obtain feedback from data recipients

        - Assess MetroGIS' involvement and any budget or function modifications
    c. Request each of the counties, the Metropolitan Council, and others as appropriate to enter into a common data sharing agreement through December 31, 2003 (the Business Plan's term)
    d. Advocate within and among the respective organizations to facilitate and encourage organizational policy and actions consistent with MetroGIS' objectives.
        - MetroGIS will continue to be stakeholder-governed
        - Stakeholders will continue to participate in the affairs of MetroGIS
        - MetroGIS will register its name with State and federal authorities
        - MetroGIS will use outreach and educational opportunities to inform potential users of MetroGIS
3. Form a subcommittee made up of Private Industry, Counties, and Metropolitan Council to work directly with the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee and Policy Board to determine costs and legal structure that will meet the needs of the Private Sector.
    a. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Policy Board will oversee the development of the subcommittee
    b. The subcommittee will be co-chaired by one member of the Policy Board and a member from the private sector, the latter as determined by the subcommittee.
    c. The subcommittee will submit a report on recommendation at the next MetroGIS Policy Board meeting for its consideration.

Motion carried, ayes all.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked the Metropolitan Council for allowing the MetroGIS experiment to continue. Member Fiskness also thanked the Council for agreeing to continue to fund MetroGIS, avoiding the need to force the notion of a subscription fee at this time. Member Siegfried thanked the Business Planning team for its work and Chairperson Reinhardt thanked David Claypool for his assistance in preparing the modified recommendation.

b) Modify July Meeting Date

It was agreed to hold the July meeting on the 19th rather than the 26th as had been originally scheduled.

6. INFORMATION SHARING

There is no discussion of the items presented in the agenda packet materials except for the 6c, NACo and NSDI Presentations March 5 & 6. Chairperson Reinhardt summarized these presentations and commented that according to comments received and questions asked, MetroGIS' efforts to organize and sustain multi-participant GIS collaboration continue to be on the cutting edge and others continue to express interest in applying what we have learned.

7. NEXT MEETING

July 19, 2000

8. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:25 p.m.

Prepared by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

July 19, 2000 Agenda

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

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary - April 26, 2000 **action**

4. GIS Demonstration

5. Action and Discussion Items

   a. Regional Parcel Dataset: Private Sector Subcommittee **action**
   b. 2000-2001 MetroGIS Work Plan
   c. Regional Parcel Dataset: Public Sector Pilot Update
   d. 2000 Data Practices/Access State Law: HR3501

6. Information Sharing

   a. Strategic Initiatives Update
   b. June 5th Presentation to Metropolitan Council – Request for Continued Support
   c. National GeoData Organizational Initiative: The MetroGIS Connection
   d. Upcoming Conference Presentations

7. Next Meeting

   - October 18, 2000

July 19, 2000 Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6.30 p.m. It was held at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices in St. Paul.

Members Present: Willis Branning (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Lee Whitcraft alternate for Antoinette Johns (TIES), Patrick O'Connor alternate for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Edwin Mackie (Scott County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Terry Schneider (AMM), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council)

Members Absent: Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Barbara Johnson (AMM), and John Siegfried (Carver County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Larry Charboneau, David Claypool (Vice Chair), Eli Cooper, Virginia Erdahl, Jim Hentges, Gary Stevenson, Ed Schukle, and Ron Wencl. Visitors: Steve Lehr, CB Richard Ellis

Support Staff: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS); Trudy Richter and Kathie Doty, Business Plan consultant team members (Richardson, Richter and Associates); and Alison Slaats (Metropolitan Council)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Fiskness moved and Member Williams seconded to accept the agenda with the addition of Item 5e, MetroGIS Internet Site – Policy Member Contact Information. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY Member Schneider moved and Member Williams seconded to approve the summary of the April 26, 2000 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

David Arbeit (LMIC) and Alison Slaats and Eli Cooper (Metropolitan Council) provided the members with: 1) an overview of the comparison of the functionality between Minnesota GeoData Clearinghouse and MetroGIS Data Finder and explained how the revisions to Data Finder that are underway will eliminate the need for duplicative metadata records to search in both environments; 2) a demonstration using the Council's recently produced 1997 Existing Land Use dataset as an example of the value of data sharing and collaboration that resulted in a substantially more accurate dataset over that possible in previous years in significantly less time. In previous years, data obtained from aerial imagery was the only source. Parcel data, obtained from the counties, was used in conjunction with aerial imagery to develop the 1997 dataset; and 3) an overview of the Council's Internet-based tool to provide interactive access to its Existing Land Use data.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

Regional Parcel Dataset: Private Sector Subcommittee Recommendation

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked the members of the subcommittee and staff for their hard work to meet the Board's challenge of a broadly supported recommendation at this meeting.

Kathie Doty, consultant staff to the Subcommittee, summarized the Policy Board's direction to the Subcommittee at the April 26 meeting, the Subcommittee participants, the deliberation process and the Subcommittee's recommendation.

The key points of the recommendation were:

1. An annual fee of $0.01/parcel for access to the non-government version of the regional parcel dataset (parcel geography plus PIN and address attributes). Payment of this fee would include access to quarterly updates when they are implemented.
2. The Metropolitan Council would serve as the assembly and distribution agent.

3. Distribution would be by CD-ROM without any customizing of the data delivered until such time that MetroGIS would choose to implement automated distribution capabilities for its own needs. [If data are desired for less than the whole dataset, the requester will need to work directly with the affected county(ies)].
4. Only one version of the regional dataset, that produced by Dakota County in fall 1999 less attributes other than the PIN and address, would be distributed in 2000. The target is the end of September, assuming all necessary agreements are executed.
5. Beginning in 2001, the Council would assemble a current version for distribution to the public and private sectors and work would be undertaken, as resources permit to develop automated assembly and delivery mechanisms, assuming the public sector stakeholders identify such mechanisms to be desirable.

Doty commented that it will be each of the counties' responsibility to guarantee that all fees collected are consistent with the provisions of the Minnesota Data Practices Law and that an annual review process is proposed to insure the program remains responsive to changing needs.. Member Kordiak commented he believes the Subcommittee's recommendation is sound and that all viewpoints were carefully considered. He also noted he believes that this recommendation, if put into place, will likely result in the counties reviewing the basis for their fees for non-government access to parcel attribute data.

Larry Charboneau, speaking on behalf of the private sector, thanked the Policy Board for establishing the Subcommittee and stated that he believes the $0.01/parcel proposal is very fair. He encouraged each of the counties to execute all of the necessary agreements. Eli Cooper, speaking on behalf the Council, stated that the Council is committed to moving forward and that it supports the recommendation.

Schneider asked if the Subcommittee had discussed how to compensate the assembly/distribution agent for the overhead costs associated with providing these services, such as adding a surcharge to the fee received by the counties. Chairperson Reinhardt noted that the Policy Board had postponed action on a recommendation presented to it on April 26th as part of the Business Plan to redirect $75,000 currently paid to the counties as a component of the data sharing agreements to compensate for these expenses, beginning January 2002. The members concurred that the postponement should remain in effect at least until the proposed regional parcel dataset pilot project is complete.

Motion: Fiskness moved and Branning seconded the following actions:

1. That the MetroGIS Policy Board members request their respective county boards and the Metropolitan Council to direct their staff to work through the MetroGIS to establish an agreement between the counties and the Metropolitan Council that will:
    a. Allow for assembly and distribution of a regional parcel dataset (RPD), as specified in the proposal presented to the Board on July 19, to the private sector by the distribution agent, the Metropolitan Council;
    b. Establish a fee of $.01 per parcel to be charged to interested non-government purchasers of the regional parcel dataset.
    c. Establish a mechanism for distribution of revenue from sales based on each county's proportion of total parcels in the region.
    d. Address other concerns of the counties and Council, as needed
2. That the MetroGIS staff provide updates on progress towards distribution of the RPD to the Private Sector representatives of the subcommittee and continue to facilitate the resolution of issues regarding distribution of GIS data to this sector.

Motion carried ayes all.

The members agreed that if all necessary agreements have not agreed upon by staff of all affected organizations by the first week in August and that the private sector agreements are ready to be acted on by the parties, that separate the approval for the private and public sector processes is encouraged to maintain the schedule for the public sector regional parcel dataset pilot project.

O'Connor commented that Hennepin County views this agreement to reduce its fee to $0.01/parcel as a pilot project and that if enactment significantly reduces fees currently received from the sale of parcel attribute data, without a compensating improvement in efficiency, Hennepin County will need to reevaluate its participation.

b) 2000-2001 MetroGIS Work Plan

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that she had asked for this topic to be included as a discussion item to insure the Board member all have a common understanding of the specific tasks involved in accomplishing the next steps set forth in the Business Plan, accepted by the Board in April. Policy Advisory Team Chairperson Erdahl commented that 2000-2001 work plan is a detailed version of the next steps set forth in the Business Plan that was accepted by the Policy Board on April 26. Erdahl also noted that no changes are proposed to the general tasks presented in the Business Plan to maintain a stable environment until the regional parcel dataset pilot projects are complete. Board members agreed with the Member Schneider's suggestion that work should begin immediately to register the name "MetroGIS" with state and federal authorities, rather than delay this work until December as currently presented in the work plan.

c) Regional Parcel Dataset: Public Sector Pilot Project Randall Johnson summarized the objectives of the public sector regional parcel dataset pilot project. Trudy Richter thanked each of the county members for the cooperation that she has received from the county attorneys to finalize the necessary agreement and licensing documents, noting that the process has been very productive and has likely established a strong base from which to gain the agreement needed to accomplish distribution to the private sector (Agenda Item 5a). Richter also handed out a model resolution for each county to use to adopt the proposed agreements. Staff agreed to forward an electronic version of the resolution to county officials.

d) 2000 Data Practices/Access State law: HF3501 David Arbeit summarized several of the major provisions of data practices law enacted this past spring as part of HF3501. David Claypool informed the Policy Board of a model data practices policy prepared by the State that is out for comment. It was noted that each unit of local government must, by law, enact a data practices policy consistent with State guidelines. Staff agreed to forward information to Board members about how to obtain a copy of the model policy.

e) MetroGIS Internet Site: Board Member Contact Information The members concurred that they do not want their pictures posted on the MetroGIS Internet site.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS Chairperson Reinhardt stated that she was very pleased and encouraged by the strong support MetroGIS' request for continued funding received from the Council on June 5 and subsequently on June 7. She thanked Member Williams, the Council's representative to the MetroGIS Policy Board, for his support and leadership. Member Williams commented that the data and collaboration received by the Council, as a result of the MetroGIS initiative, is viewed by Council members as very sound investment.

Chairperson Reinhardt also commented that MetroGIS has been invited to be a presenter at the National City Engineer's Conference in April 2001 and that she had asked staff to follow-up on the request.

7. NEXT MEETING: October 18, 2000

8. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:32 p.m.

Prepared by, Randall Johnson MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

October 18, 2000 Agenda

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

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary

   a. July 19, 2000 **action**

4. GIS Technology Demonstration

5. Action and Discussion Items

   a. Regional Parcel Dataset: Private Sector Access Policy **action**
   b. Regional Parcel Dataset: Public Sector Pilot Update
   c. 2001 Meeting Schedule **action**

6. Information Sharing

   a. Strategic Initiatives Update
   b. Coordinating Committee elects new chair
   c. Professional Services Contract –2001& 2002
   d. November 17th Presentation to Memphis Area Data Sharing Initiative
   e. Conference Presentations
   f. County Users Group Update
   g. CB-Richard Ellis Demonstrates Regional Parcel Dataset at National Conference
   h. National GeoData Alliance Initiative: Phase I Completed
   i. Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary

7. Next Meeting - January 10, 2001

Adjourn

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
October 18, 2000

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6.30 p.m. It was held Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices in St. Paul

Members Present: Willis Branning (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Barbara Johnson (AMM), Patrick O'Connor alternate for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Terry Schneider (AMM), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).
Members Absent: Edwin Mackie (Scott County) and John Siegfried (Carver County)
Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Claypool (Vice Chair), Will Craig (Chair), Eli Cooper, Virginia Erdahl, Brad Henry, Jim Hentges, Ed Schukle, Gary Stevenson, and Dennis Welsch.
Visitors: John Connelly (Co-chair, Technical Advisory Team), Steven Lehr, CB-Richard Ellis. John Carpenter and Joseph Strauss (North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition)
Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Business Plan consultant team member Kathie Doty (Richardson and Richter Associates)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA
Member Fiskness moved and Member Johnson seconded to accept the agenda as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY
Member Hegberg moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the summary of the July 19, 2000 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION –
North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition's Socio-Demographic Database Development
Dennis Welsch (Roseville Community Development Director, member of the Coalition's management team, and member of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee) thanked MetroGIS for pilot project funding that made it possible for the Coalition to launch its work and achieve its early objectives which set the foundation for the Coalition's development of a socio-economic database of sufficient detail to meet the Coalition's needs. He then introduced John Carpenter (Insight Mapping and Demographics and consultant to the I-35 Corridor Coalition) and Joseph Strauss (Director of the Coalition) who both participated in the presentation.
John Carpenter stated that design and use of the Coalition's socio-economic database development project is driven by GIS technology and is very flexible by design to enable it to be used for a variety of needs. He summarized the objectives of the project, current data sources, desired additional data sources, the concept of an iBlock - the fundamental component of the database, the data currently maintained for each iBlock, and some of the ways the Coalition is

using the database for analysis. He also shared example maps and reports that are being be generated from the database. Joseph Strauss stressed that the Coalition work could not have been accomplished without financial assistance from the McKnight Foundation, the Legislature, Council Livable Communities funds and MetroGIS. He stated that as a result the Coalition partners are able to make much better decisions and an effective means to analyze and implement policies consistent with Smart Growth strategies. He also commented that much work remains, including development of commercial profiles similar to their household profiles, obtaining income data, completion of their build-out study and more.

Members asked questions about other options considered before deciding to develop the iBlock concept from scratch, updating efficiency, licensing requirements and access by non-coalition members, use of generalization techniques to address data privacy issues, and amount of manual work needed to develop and support the database. Member Williams, Metropolitan Council liaison to the Coalition, commented that the amount of cooperation at both the staff and policy maker levels to balance community development needs and opportunities among the seven cities is both amazing and unprecedented and that he credits this cooperation to the availability of data and the use of GIS technology to present these data in a meaningful manner to support decision making.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Regional Parcel Dataset: Private Sector Access Fee

Patrick O'Connor, representing Hennepin County, commented that he had discussed, with several managers at Hennepin County and with County Board Chair Johnson, the Policy Board's July 19, 2000 recommendation to set a fee of $.01/parcel for a regional parcel dataset. He noted

that the consensus was that they believe $0.01 per parcel is too low to maintain the data sales revenue Hennepin County depends on to support their operations. O'Connor also noted that Hennepin County has held a public hearing and is prepared to reduce its current $0.10 fee/parcel to $0.05/parcel. He also commented that a reduction to $0.05 per parcel across the board for all counties represents a substantial reduction from the current fee charged by each county for private sector access.

Member Kordiak, Chair of the Board Subcommittee that recommended the $0.01 per parcel fee endorsed by the Board at the July meeting, noted that he was disappointed to learn that Hennepin County is not willing to endorse the $0.01 per parcel proposal following the amount of effort put in by the subcommittee which included a representative from Hennepin County. He offered some options and urged the group to find a middle ground that included all seven counties.

Member Schneider also suggested that the counties might consider a sliding scale- lower price for a whole county purchase than for a small area purchase. Chairperson Reinhardt suggested an option of each county choosing a fee from $0.01 to $0.05/ per parcel as they deemed appropriate. Steven Lehr, CB-Richard Ellis, informed the Board that in an attempt to bring a sample of the market's thinking to the discussion he had contacted ten private sector firms from ten different industries (e.g., utilities, real estate, surveyors, environmental). He reported that most are willing to purchase the proposed regional parcel dataset for $0.01 per parcel but that none would

purchase it at $0.05 per parcel. He also cautioned that the proposed dataset contains a minimal amount of data and that to be useable most firms would have to invest additional funds to obtain more attributes.
Options were discussed and matters associated with the agreement clarified.
Motion: Member Branning moved and Member Johnson second to modify Item 1b of its July 19, 2000 action and recommend that each of the seven county boards establish a fee of up to $0.05 per parcel established annually, to be charged to interested non-government purchasers of the region parcel dataset. Motion carried, unanimously.
Board members understood that the fee to be set by each county may differ within the range of $0.01 to $0.05 per parcel; that the two cited attributes per parcel are a minimum requirement and counties may choose to include more attributes if they so desire; the target effective date for new fee January 1, 2001; and that all other components of the July 19 motion remain unchanged.

b) Regional Parcel Dataset: Public Sector Pilot Project Update

Randall Johnson commented that to his knowledge each of the seven county boards had approved the multi-party agreement for the public sector regional parcel data pilot project and that the Metropolitan Council had also authorized execution of the agreement. He explained that
the invitation letters will be mailed once all seven signature pages have been received from the counties. The proposed project milestones were summarized, with final being recommendation of policy and procedures for Board action July 2001.
There was no Board discussion or action.

c) Meeting Schedule for 2001

Member Branning moved and Member Schneider seconded to set the following Board meeting schedule for 2001, each meeting beginning at 6:30 p.m. at the Council's Mears Park Centre offices and all on 2nd Wednesdays of the month: January 10, April 11, July 11, and October 10.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

The was no discussion of the information items presented in the packet and no new items were offered.

7. NEXT MEETING

January 10, 2001

8. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:32 p.m.
Prepared by,
Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

January 10, 2001 Agenda

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A, 6:30 pm
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

1. Call to Order & Welcome New Members

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary

- a. 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: Derivative Dataset / Intellectual Property Rights

6. Information Sharing

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

7. Next Meeting: April 11, 2001 (Election of Officers)

8. 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."

Approved
(Draft)

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
January 10, 2001

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6.30 p.m.

Members Present: Willis Branning (Dakota County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Patrick O'Connor alternate for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Terry Schneider (AMM), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Antoinette Johns (TIES), Barbara Johnson (AMM), John Siegfried (Carver County), and Joseph Wagner (Scott County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit (LMIC) Will Craig (Chair), Eli Cooper, Jim Hentges, Ed Shukle, Gary Stevenson, and Ron Wencl.

Visitors: Lee Meilleur (Legislative GIS Office) and Jeanne Landkamer (MetroGIS Communications Consultant)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Theresa Foster

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Hegberg moved and Member Kordiak seconded to accept the agenda, with the following changes: add a new item 5f, Use of Funds Donated to MetroGIS, and move 5a to follow 5f. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY

Member Branning moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the summary of the October 18, 2000 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION – 2000 Census and Redistricting

Lee Meilleur, with the Legislative GIS Office, demonstrated the GIS software (Maptitude) that the Legislature will use to develop its redistricting proposals, using Chairperson Reinhardt's commissioner district, and he summarized the events and deadlines leading up the required adoption of a redistricting plan. Board members discussed the impact of the Legislature's activities on the deadlines for local government redistricting requirements.

Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Supervisor, demonstrated the problems encountered with attempting to align the federal TIGER data with higher accurate parcel and street centerline data available in the seven county metro area. He also demonstrated how these problems have been eliminated or substantially reduced as a result of MetroGIS' Regional Census Geography project. Gelbmann noted that he believes use of the MetroGIS Regional Census Geography dataset, as opposed to the substantially less accurate TIGER data, will aid local units of government more easily define their new precincts and wards and maintain these areas than would be possible using TIGER data. Evaluation of changes in population and development will also be more straightforward when the data elements align with one another.

Member Kordiak questioned aligning census geography boundaries with low accuracy hand digitized street centerline and parcel data, as opposed to using GPS and COGO technologies to establish them. This question led to discussion of MetroGIS' guidelines that parcel data is the foundation data element, that it is the sole decision of each county to determine how accurate of a parcel dataset they want to

maintain which varies from county to county, and that other data that are coterminous in the real world with parcel boundaries are aligned with the parcel data to maintain a high degree of relative accuracy between these data elements. Board members concurred with the rationale that as parcel data accuracy improves relative to the real world, the accuracy of the aligned data also improves but without affecting the high relative accuracy between the data elements.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

b) Regional Dataset – Academic and Non-Profit Access Policy

William Craig, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee and member of the Policy Advisory Team, summarized the considerations and recommendation of the Policy Advisory Team and Coordinating Committee outlined in the agenda materials.

Member Kordiak questioned whether "written acceptance of this policy from each of the seven counties" means Board approval. Staff stated that the intent is for each county to decide on its own whether a letter from a staff member or board action is required. This explanation was acceptable to the members. Staff noted that a sample letter of approval was included in the agenda packet.

Staff also commented that this policy is not intended to go into effect until the regional parcel dataset pilot project concludes. At that time, if the user community concludes that the dataset should continue to be supported, a new agreement between the seven counties and Metropolitan Council will be required if the Council is to continue to aggregate and distribute a regional parcel dataset. The new agreement would be expanded to include academic interests if all seven counties endorse this policy.

Motion: Member Hegberg moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board:

1) Endorse a Regional Parcel Dataset access policy that stipulates
   a) Academic interests will be treated the same as government interests.
   b) Non-profit interests will be treated the same as for profit interests.
2) Direct staff to request written acceptance of this policy from each of the seven counties as the producers of the primary data assembled by the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian, into the Regional Parcel Dataset.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) Regional MCD/Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset – Non-Government Access Policy

William Craig, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee and member of the Policy Advisory Team, summarized the considerations and recommendation of the Policy Advisory Team and Coordinating Committee outlined in the agenda materials.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member O'Connor seconded that the Policy Board:

1) Endorse a Regional MCD/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset access policy that stipulates non-government interests will be treated the same as government interests, that is, access to this dataset without fee and without licensure.
2) Direct staff to request written acceptance of this policy from each of the seven counties and Mn/DOT as the producers of the primary data assembled by the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian, into the regional dataset.

Motion carried, ayes all.

It was agreed that the method of approval by each county will be the same as agreed to in the previous item.

d) National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) – MetroGIS Best Management Practice

Ron Wencl, member of the Coordinating Committee and liaison to the Technical Advisory Team, summarized the considerations and recommendation of the Technical Advisory Team and Coordinating Committee outlined in the agenda materials.

Member Kordiak asked about impact on his organization if the NSSDA is endorsed by MetroGIS. This question led to a discussion about the difference between the NSSDA, which is standardized means of measuring the accuracy of a dataset, and the process by which a MetroGIS stakeholder organization decides, for itself, based upon its own internal needs the accuracy that it will seek for any particular dataset, such as parcels. Staff emphasized that use of the NSSDA is also voluntary. Wencl commented that he believes organizations will find it useful to include this standard in contracts as quality control tool when stakeholder organizations outsource data development. O'Connor asked staff to follow-up with each county as to their intensions to use the NSSDA if the MetroGIS Policy Board endorses its use as a best management practice.

Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Hegberg seconded that the Policy Board endorse Minnesota IRM Standard 19, Version 1: *A Methodology for Measuring and Reporting Positional Accuracy in Spatial Data* as a "Best Management Practice" and promote its use by the MetroGIS community.

Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Regional Planned Future Land Use Dataset – Intellectual Property Policy Testbed

Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Supervisor, summarized the issues and information presented in the agenda report and used a multiple phase schematic drawing to illustrate the progression of activities that comprise development of the regional planned future land use dataset that is nearly complete.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Hegberg seconded to endorse an intellectual property rights policy that if a MetroGIS endorsed dataset is produced by aligning it with any other dataset(s) the resulting dataset is the sole property of its developer if the user cannot access the source dataset(s) via the new dataset.

Motion carried ayes all.

Member Schneider asked for clarification about the proposed coding scheme for the regional parcel dataset and cautioned against generalizing low, medium, and high density designations into a single residential designation as shown in the schematic for the regional dataset. Gelbmann commented schematic was designed to illustrate the intellectual property policy questions and does not include the complete scheme that is being tested. The Council is currently testing for region-wide application, as a pilot for MetroGIS, the multi-level, planned future land use coding scheme also developed by the I-35W Corridor Coalition as a pilot for MetroGIS and that the findings will be shared for discussion at a Peer Review Forum tentatively scheduled for May 2001. Notwithstanding, staff agreed to pass Member Schneider's concerns along to the group that will be evaluating version one of the regional planned future land use dataset.

f) Professional Services Contract – Use of Funds Donated to MetroGIS

The staff handed out a report and summarized a request that the Board authorize use of funds that had been donated to MetroGIS to supplement budged funding for the proposed 2001-2002 Professional Services contract, if other means do not close the funding gap.

The Board concluded that in the future it would like to review the scope of work for major contracts, such as this, before the contracts are let. Staff was asked to send the members copies of the scope of work, a summary of the bids, and a summary of changes made to the scope of work during negotiation of the contract.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Branning seconded to authorize use of funds in donated to MetroGIS, amounting to $20, 600, to supplement budged funding for the proposed 2001-2002 Professional Services contract, if other means do not close the funding gap.

Motion carried, ayes all.

a) 2000 Accomplishments
Staff summarized MetroGIS' major accomplishment in 2000 and noted that the material in agenda packet will be used to produce the 2000 Annual Report. Chairperson Reinhardt stated that she believes MetroGIS' accomplishments in 200 were many and that MetroGIS continues to be a national leader in implementing an effective way for government to collaborate on initiatives critical to GIS data sharing. She asked the members to contact staff with any items that should be added to the detailed listing of accomplishments included in the agenda packet.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS
There was no discussion of the Information Items provided in the agenda materials.

Alternate Member O'Connor informed the Board that Brad Henry, Coordinating Committee chair for two years and charter Coordinating Committee member, and Virginia Erdahl, Policy Advisory Team chair for two years and also a charter Coordinating Committee member, would both be retiring and leaving MetroGIS. He stated that their vision and commitment to achieving the vision of MetroGIS will be greatly missed and suggested that each should receive a commendation from MetroGIS. The Board agreed.

Motion: O'Connor moved and Member Schneider seconded to direct staff to prepare a commendation from MetroGIS for retiring Coordinating Committee members Erdahl and Henry and for Commissioner Mackie who represented Scott County on the Policy Board until this year.

Motion carried, ayes all.
.

7. NEXT MEETING
April 11, 2001

8. ADJOURN
The meeting concluded at 8:25 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

***Policy Board Members*:**

Victoria Reinhardt,
Chairperson
Ramsey County

Conrad Fiskness,
MAWD

Antoinette Johns,
TIES

Dennis Hegberg,
Washington County

Randy Johnson,
Hennepin County

Barbara Johnson,
AMM

Jim Kordiak,
Anoka County

Joseph Wagner,
Scott County

Willis Branning,
Dakota County

Terry Schneider,
AMM

Roger Williams,
Metropolitan Council

John Siegfried,
Vice-Chairperson
Carver County

Coordinating Committee

Will Craig,
Chairperson
U of M

David Claypool,
Vice-Chairperson
Ramsey County

Staff

Randall Johnson,
Metropolitan Council

Theresa Foster

Wednesday, April 11, 2001

6:30 p.m.

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A

230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary — *Page*

a) January 10, 2001 — ***action*** — *00*

4. GIS Technology Demonstration –

Visualizing the Metro: A Mapping Tool for the Public — *06*

5. Action and Discussion Items

a) Election of Officers — ***action*** — *09*
b) 2002 MetroGIS Budget Proposal — ***action*** — *13*
c) MetroGIS Outreach Strategy — ***action*** — *30*
d) Status of Authorizations Requested from Counties — *37*
e) Certificates of Appreciation (*Brad Henry & Virginia Erdahl)* — *42*

6. **Information Sharing** — *47*

a) 2000 Annual Report
b) New Policy Advisory Team Chair
c) Professional Services Contract with Richardson and Richter
d) NSDI Grant Application
e) ESRI Geographic Network Challenge
f) Major Project Update
- Regional Parcel Data and Other Business Information Needs
- Umbrella Data Sharing Agreement
- DataFinder Evaluation
- Registration of “MetroGIS” and “MetroGIS DataFinder” names

g) County User Groups Update

7. Next Meeting

July 11, 2001

8. 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."

MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

Wednesday, October 17, 2001

6:30 p.m.

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A

230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary *Page*

a) July 11, 2001 ***action*** ***1***

4. GIS Technology Demonstration –
How School Districts Are Benefiting From MetroGIS ***7***

5. Action and Discussion Items

a) 2002 Meeting Schedule ***action*** ***10***
b) Affect of MetroGIS Restructuring *12*
c) Regional Parcel Data Solution --- *15*
Mn GCGI Accepts Request to Investigate as Model for State Policy
d) Praise from USGS – Data Gathering Initiative Following Sept 11th *20*

6. Information Sharing and Project Updates ***22***

a) Major Project Updates:
(1) Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism
(2) Next Generation Data Sharing Agreement
(3) NSDI-Funded Web Mapping Services Training and Project
(4) Common Business Information Needs
(5) Performance Measurements/Update of Business Plan
(6) Trademarking of "MetroGIS" and "MetroGIS DataFinder" names
b) Regional Parcel Dataset (Private Sector/NonProfit Version)
c) MetroGIS Staff Coordinator's Summer Detail in Washington D.C.
d) Metropolitan Council Consideration of 2002 MetroGIS Budget Request
e) MetroGIS and LMIC Co-Host Metadata Workshops
f) MetroGIS is Keynote at East Central Florida Planning Council Event
g) 2001 National GeoData Forum – Chairperson Reinhardt a Panelist
h) Coordinating Committee Elects New Vice Chair
i) MetroGIS Internet Site Usage Statistics

7. Next Meeting
January xx, 2002

8. 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."

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
October 17, 2001

1) CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Willis Branning (Dakota County), Lee Whitcraft for Antoinette Johns (TIES), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Dennis Hegberg (Washington County) and Joseph Wagner (Scott County). John Siegfried (Carver County), Barbara Johnson (AMM), Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Terry Schneider (AMM).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Eli Cooper, Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, and Brad Henry.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Trudy Richter (Richardson, Richter & Associates)

2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as submitted.

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of July 11, 2001 were accepted as submitted.

4) GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Dick Carlstrom, representing TIES (Technology Information and Education Systems), thanked the Policy Board and the MetroGIS organization for the progress that has been made to foster sharing of geospatial data produced by other and fundamental to school district decision making. He stated that the advancements in GIS technology that he was about to share would not have possible without the data sharing agreements that have been negotiated to implement MetroGIS objectives and the regional datasets, in particular street centerlines and parcels, that have been made available through MetroGIS's efforts.

Ten school districts, which are members of TIES, are currently using GIS technology to support a range of decision making and two additional TIES affiliated districts are embarking on the use of GIS technology. Mr. Carlstrom summarized examples of four major ways that these districts are using the technology: communication with public, make decisions regarding facilities management and bus routing, monitor growth within their districts, and plan for change. TIES provides support that ranges from general advice to turnkey projects to continual support, depending on the wishes of the districts.

In responses to questions, Mr. Carlstrom commented that as more and more districts begin to use GIS, the opportunity for subregional and regional analysis of issues of common interest to districts will likely be engaged in by TIES noting that regional

datasets are essential to this type of analysis. He also commented that with each new project, the district(s) involved seek the most current versions of the data they need for their analysis.

(Note: A document, which contains much of the information shared with the Board, can be viewed at http://ties.k123.mn.us/main/adminsrv/gis_toc.html)

5) ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 2002 Meeting Schedule

The following meeting schedule was accepted for 2002 (all Wednesdays): Jan 9, Apr. 10, Jul 10 and Oct 9. Board members stated that they would like to hear about some of the county operations, in particular, how they are addressing data sharing.

b) Affects of MetroGIS Restructuring

Chairperson Reinhardt stated that she had asked staff to summarize the affect of the July 11 Board action calling for streamlining of MetroGIS's decision making structure and that she would like a report this end included prepared for each Board meeting. The Staff Coordinator summarized the affect since July, including cancellation of four meetings and reliance more on email and telephone contacts. Staff also noted that the call for restructuring came a time when much of the formative work of MetroGIS was wrapping up and that the attention is more and more moving to monitoring implementation of agreed upon solutions, which does not require the effort expended in previous years on the part of the stakeholder community. He did, however, caution that there is a need to continue to communicate effectively to ensure everyone is on the same page although there are fewer meetings.

c) Regional Parcel Data Solution: Mn GCGI Accepts Request to Investigate as Model for State Initiative

Chairperson Reinhardt and the Staff Coordinator reported that on September 19th, the Mn Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) had agreed to use MetroGIS's regional parcel dataset as a place to start to investigate the possibility of a statewide parcel dataset. Staff also reported that the matter had been assigned to the Council's Land Records Modernization Committee and that the first meeting to begin this investigation would be held on October 18th.

d) Praise from USGS Data Gathering Initiative Following September 11th.

The Staff Coordinator reported that at the September 27th Coordinating Committee meeting Ron Wencl, USGS National Mapping Division Liaison to Minnesota and member of the Committee had offered praise to the work of MetroGIS and to LMIC (Mn Land Management Information Center) for their efforts to implement Internet enabled data discovery tools and to MetroGIS for its one-stop-shop approach for any required licensing and data access instructions. David Arbeit, Director of LMIC, spoke to the "easy of access" issues that are beginning to receive more attention in the wake of September 11th. He surmised that the across-the-board affect of these issues may likely generate federal level policy discussion. The Staff Coordinator also commented that MetroGIS's proposed Internet Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism will have a robust security module that will permit the Board to easily implement any business rule(s)

concerning data access that it deems appropriate and, as such, MetroGIS's government to government data sharing objectives will be unaffected.

6) INFORMATION SHARING

a) Major Project Updates

(1) Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism: The Staff Coordinator commented that MetroGIS had received several strong proposals and that the negotiations are in process with the top rated candidate to design and implement an Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism. The top proposal meets or exceeds all design requirements within the allocated budget. Staff emphasized that once operational which is proposed for August 2002, MetroGIS will have put into place the final tool necessary to achieve the objectives it set out to do six years ago, completing the transition from primarily definitional to operational.

(2) Next Generation Data Sharing Agreement: Trudy Richter, of Richardson, Richter & Associates and member of the MetroGIS Staff Support Team, commented that negotiations are in process between the seven counties and the Metropolitan . The primary goal of the agreement being sought with each county is to gain permission for the Metropolitan Council, acting in its designated capacity as the regional parcel data custodian, to assemble county-produced parcel data into a regional dataset and redistribute it to the MetroGIS data user community. Another objective is to seek agreement on a single license agreement to expedite and simplify access by the user community. Ms. Richter noted that a meeting is scheduled for Oct 24 with Hennepin County to discuss their request to use their own license rather than a common license.

(3) to (6) No discussion of these project update items.

b) Regional Parcel Dataset (Private Sector/NonProfit Version)

Member Kordiak asked staff to comment on the efforts that had been made to advertise this dataset and the lack of sales. The Board concurred with staff's suggestion to survey several prospective purchasers of this data to investigate why they have not purchased the data and report the findings to the Board at the Board's January meeting.

c-i) No discussion of these information items

7) NEXT MEETING

Next meeting is scheduled for January 9, 2002.

8) ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 7:50p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

Wednesday, January 9, 2002

6:30 p.m.

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A

230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary *Page*

a) October 17, 2001 ***action*** ***1***

4. Action and Discussion Items

a) 2001 MetroGIS Accomplishments, Annual Report and Effects of Restructuring ***5***

b) 2002 - 2003 Short Term Goals and Objectives ***action*** ***12***

c) 2002 – 2003 MetroGIS Budget ***action*** ***15***

d) Regional Parcel Dataset – Specifications and Custodial Roles ***action*** ***34***

e) Performance Measures ***44***

f) Recap of GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Initiative (1996-01) ***47***

g) Notice of election of officers – April meeting

5. Information Sharing **50**

a) GCGI LRM Committee – Progress on Statewide Parcel Dataset Policy

b) Major Project Updates:

- Internet –Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism / Web Mapping Services
- Progress on Priority Information Needs/Regional Datasets
- Registration of "MetroGIS" and "MetroGIS DataFinder" names

c) National GeoData Alliance Update

d) Lessons From Practice: A Guide to Creating and Sustaining Geodata Collaboration

e) Certificates of Appreciation – Gary Stevenson and Gary Caswell

f) U.S. Census Bureau Interest In Integrating TLG Data in Their TIGER Database.

g) Australian Public Sector Mapping Agencies – Parallels to MetroGIS

h) MN GeoGateway Receives Collaboration Award

i) MetroGIS Internet Site Use Statistics

j) Minutes December 13, 2001 Coordinating Committee Meeting

6. GIS Technology Demonstration – Paul Olson, MN DNR **55**

GIS's Role in Responding to World Trade Center Tragedy – Mapping Ground Zero

(Not later than 7:45)

7. Next Meeting

April 10, 2002 *(1 hour for each county to share information about their GIS programs)*

8. 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."

Approved
4/10/02

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
January 9, 2002

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6.30 p.m.

Members Present: Terry Schneider (AMM), John Siegfried (Carver County), Willis Branning (Dakota County), Patrick O'Connor for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Molly O'Rourke (Washington County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Antoinette Johns (TIES), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Barbara Johnson (AMM), and Joseph Wagner (Scott County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Eli Cooper, Will Craig (Chair), Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, Jim Hentges, Randy Knippel, Gary Stevenson, and Ron Wencl.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Kathie Doty and Trudy Richter with Richardson, Richter and Associates.

Visitors (GIS Demonstration Only): *Presenter:* Paul Olson (DNR), *MetroGIS Staff:* Alison Slaats, Steve Fester, and Mark Kotz, and *Others:* Dave Henze (Carver County) and Nicole Pederson (student)

Chairperson Reinhardt welcomed Member O'Rourke, Washington County Deputy Administrator and the county's newly appointed representative to the Policy Board. Each of the other members introduced themselves to member O'Rourke. Chairperson Reinhardt thanked Gary Stevenson for his contributions to MetroGIS and wished him well in his in position in the St. Cloud area. Gary introduced Randy Knippel, Dakota County GIS Manager, who will be taking his seat on the Coordinating Committee representing Dakota County's interests.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Chairperson Reinhardt stated that Item 4e would be heard after 4b. Member Schneider moved and Member Fiskness seconded to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Branning moved and Member Siegfried seconded to approve the summary of the October 17, 2001 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 2001 MetroGIS Accomplishments, Annual Report and Effects of Restructuring

Coordinating Committee Chair Craig summarized the list of accomplishments that had been endorsed by the Coordinating Committee at its December meeting. He commented that the paper he presented in November at a conference in Australia contained a section about MetroGIS and as such could be added as another item in the listing of outreach accomplishments. Member Branning and Chairperson Reinhardt commented that the listing was well organized and easy to understand.

Member Siegfried commented that he would like to see a stronger emphasis in 2002 on education about GIS technology and benefits from its use. Coordinating Committee Chair Craig commented that this is also a goal of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) and that MetroGIS can collaborate to increase understanding using real world examples of the benefits. Member Schneider commented and others concurred that the primary focus needs to be on those stakeholders who use the

technology, not the general public. Member Fiskness commented that the television show "The District" incorporates ESRI's GIS technology but the focus is on the use rather than the technology itself.

Chair Reinhardt called attention to the summary of affects from the restructuring noting her pleasure with the affects to date. There was no other discussion of the restructuring topic.

Board members also did not suggest any additions or modifications to the either the listing of accomplishments or to the suggested themes for the 2001 annual report as presented in the agenda materials.

b) 2002-2003 Short Term Goals and Objectives

William Craig, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee summarized the short-term objectives and deliverables proposed for 2002 as endorsed by the Coordinating Committee at its December meeting.

Member Schneider commented that the deliverables and goals presented in the agenda materials were acceptable to him given the resources that are available. He stated he believes that substantially more progress could be made if other resources such as from the non-profit and for profit communities could be secured.

Member Fiskness commented that a critical mass still remains to be achieved and asked what the tipping event might be and when to achieve the critical mass that would provide the impetus to capture resources from others. The Staff Coordinator commented that he believes the tipping event will be the launch of the Internet Data Distribution Mechanism currently under development and scheduled to be operational this summer.

Chairperson Reinhardt also commented that the substantial increase in attention to pubic safety and public health following the September 11th terrorist attack will also increase the awareness of the power of GIS and the need to expand our capabilities to support these needs.

Motion: Member Schneider moved and Member Conrad seconded that the Policy Board approve the 2002-2003 short term goals and major deliverable expectations for 2002 as presented in the agenda materials dated December 14, 2001.

Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Performance Measures

Kathie Doty, of Richardson, Richter and Associates and member of the MetroGIS Staff Support Team, summarized the objectives of MetroGIS's performance measures project (e.g., to measure ease of access to needed data by users, ease of participation by producers, and improved decision support and service delivery). She also summarized the preliminary work of the Performance Measures Workgroup that began its work in late October.

Member Schneider commented that the term "anecdotal" should be changed to "testimonial". His concern was that the term "anecdotal" might convey non-factual accounts rather than factual accounts benefits.

Chairperson Reinhardt also commented that the proposed measures are very doable.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Williams seconded that the Policy Board approve the preliminary performance measures proposed by the Workgroup and direct the Workgroup to develop a plan for implementation for the Board's consideration.

c) 2002-2003 MetroGIS Budget

William Craig, Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee commented that MetroGIS is moving into a fully operational phase and that the budget reflects this transition - $420,700 for 2002 and $384,000 for 2003. He also called attention to the proposed significant reduction in non-staff expenses from 2002 to 2003, given the budget crisis that is facing the state and that this reduction could be made without adversely affecting MetroGIS's core functions, in larger part because the large projects to define desired functionality will be completed in 2002.

Chairperson Craig commented that the only line item in the non-staff portion of the budget that was questioned by the Coordinating Committee was staff's proposal to allocate $14,000 to support of the County based GIS Users Groups. He also noted that after discussing the matter, the Committee supported the proposal. No one on the Board raised any concerns.

The members asked Member Williams, as representative from the Metropolitan Council, whether the proposed 2003 MetroGIS budget is doable. Member Williams stated that the proposed cost of sponsoring MetroGIS is currently perceived by the Metropolitan Council to be worth the return on the investment, in large part, because of its significant value to the Council's internal business needs and that he hopes that MetroGIS will continue to be a priority of the Council.

Member Schneider commented that in 2003 there will be a good deal of housing work done by foundations that could take advantage of MetroGIS's work. He encouraged staff to make sure they are aware of the data developed via MetroGIS's efforts and of other benefits MetroGIS brings to the community. These foundations might be a source of funding to help sustain MetroGIS's activities. Coordinating Committee Chair commented that MetroGIS will be documenting success stories for this exact purpose as part of the Performance Measures Initiative discussed earlier in the agenda.

Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Branning seconded that the Policy Board approve the:

1) 2002 final MetroGIS budget allocations dated December 3, 2001
2) 2003 preliminary budget request, dated December 3, 2001, and authorize staff to submit it to the Metropolitan Council for its approval.

Motion carried, ayes all.

d) Regional Parcel Dataset – Specifications and Custodial Roles

Jane Harper, Washington County representative to the Coordinating Committee and Vice-Chair of the Committee, summarized the Committee's recommended amendments to the data specifications and custodian responsibilities for the regional parcel dataset solution. She noted that the amendments are the result of the regional parcel data pilot project, which formally was launched November 2000 after nearly of a year of preparation. The most prominent modifications to early policy adopted October 2000, include: 1) expansion to 24 of the attributes to be attached to each parcel, 2) adding a preamble to the table of desired attributes stating that if a county does not produce a particular attribute or if it is too difficult to extract that they are not obligated to include in the attributes submitted to the regional custodian, and 3) appointment and acceptance by the Metropolitan Council as the regional custodian.

Member Schneider asked whether the proposed 24 core parcel attributes can be expanded if needed to support another Business Information Need, such as Future (Planned) Land Use. Staff affirmed this possibility, noting that if the Regional Future Land Use dataset involves parcel attribution not currently identified, the additional attribution will be included in the recommendation to the Board in April 2003 as part of the Regional Future Land Use dataset recommendation. Staff also noted that as Data User Forums are held to assess satisfaction with operational regional datasets that additional attribution is expected.

Alternate Member O'Connor respectfully requested the regional custodian to work with the primary producer to capture as much basic metadata as practical when the data is received from the primary producers (counties) rather than simply include a contact name with undocumented data for the user community.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Williams seconded to adopt the amended regional parcel dataset data specifications and custodial responsibilities set forth in the agenda materials dated December 13, 2001.

Motion carried ayes all.

f) Recap of GIS Data and Cost Sharing Agreement Initiative (1996-2001)
No discussion of this item due to lack of time.

g) Notice of Election of Officers - April Meeting
Chairperson Reinhardt reminded the members that at the April meeting elections will be held for the Chair and Vice Chair.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS
Chairperson Reinhardt thanked Coordinating Committee Chair Craig for including MetroGIS in his paper that he presented at a November Conference in Australia and the Staff Coordinator for his work on the Lessons from Practice: A Guide to Creating and Sustaining Geodata Collaboratives. She also noted that she and Staff Coordinator will be traveling to Chicago for a GeoData Alliance Board of Trustees Meeting on February 2nd.

There was not discussion of the items identified in the agenda materials due to lack of time prior to the GIS demonstration.

6. NEXT MEETING
April 10, 2002

7. ADJOURN
The business portion of the meeting concluded at 7:45 p.m.

The Policy Board agreed that it will set aside the first hour of the meeting to hear from each of the seven counties about their respective GIS programs and activities. Staff was directed to communicate this request to each of counties and to share with them the information outlined in the report to the Board.

The Board Members Reassembled In The Council Chambers

GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION –
GIS's Role In Responding To The World Trade Center Tragedy – Mapping Ground Zero
Paul Olson, Grand Rapids Office of the Minnesota DNR - Division of Forestry, spoke about his experience, and that of several of his DNR and U.S. Forest Service colleagues, and how they used GIS technology, in particular protocols developed to support fire mapping systems, to support the search and rescue operations for the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center September 11, 2001.

The technology presentation concluded at 9:30 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

Policy Board Members:

Victoria Reinhardt,
Chairperson
Ramsey County

Conrad Fiskness,
MAWD

Antoinette Johns,
TIES

Dennis Hegberg,
Washington County

Randy Johnson,
Hennepin County

[open],
AMM

Jim Kordiak,
Vice-Chairperson
Anoka County

Joseph Wagner,
Scott County

Willis Branning,
Dakota County

Terry Schneider,
AMM

Roger Williams,
Metropolitan Council

John Siegfried,
Carver County

Coordinating Committee

Will Craig,
Chairperson
U of M

Jane Harper,
Vice-Chairperson
Washington County

Staff Coordinator

Randall Johnson,
Metropolitan Council

Wednesday, April 10, 2002
6:30 p.m.
Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary *Page*
a) January 2002 ***action*** **1**

4. Consent Agenda
a) Nominations for URISA's ESIG Award and
Governor's Council GIS Project Commendations ***action*** **6**

5. Overview of County GIS Programs **11**

6. Action and Discussion Items
a) Election of Officers ***action*** **14**
b) Future (Planned) Land Use Information Need Policy &
Launch Event ***action*** **17**
c) Performance Measures Plan ***action*** **39**
d) Regional Parcel Dataset - Private Sector Version:
Evaluation of Inactivity **59**

7. Information Sharing **62**
a) MetroGIS Participant Appreciation Event (November 14, 2002)
b) Internet Data Distribution Mechanism – Beta Test April 9-May 3
c) Second Generation Data Sharing Agreement Executed &
Public Sector Regional Parcel Dataset Authorized
d) MetroGIS Annual Report Mailed
e) Reengineered MetroGIS General Web Site Live in February
f) E911 Board Interest in Street Centerline Dataset and in MetroGIS
g) Progress on Priority Information Needs/Regional Datasets
h) GCGI LRM Committee – Progress on Statewide Parcel Dataset Policy
i) National GeoData Alliance Board Meeting – February 1-2 in Chicago
j) GIS Delegation from Japan Visits MetroGIS
k) Invitation to Global Spatial Data Infrastructure (GSDI) Conference
l) NIMA Twin Cities Ortho Flight
m) March 20, 2002 Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

8. Next Meeting
July 10, 2002

9. 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."

Approved
July 30, 2002

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
April 10, 2002

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Kordiak called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Members Present: Terry Schneider (AMM-City of Minnetonka), Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), John Siegfried (Carver County), Willis Branning (Dakota County), Patrick O'Connor for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County) [arrived after the start], Molly O'Rourke (Washington County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Antoinette Johns (TIES) and Joseph Wagner (Scott County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, David Claypool, Eli Cooper, Will Craig (Chair), Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, Brad Henry, Jim Hentges, Randy Knippel and Gary Swenson.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Jeanne Landkamer, Steve Fester, and Kathie Doty, with Richardson, Richter and Associates.

Visitors: David Brandt (Washington County), Bill Brown (Hennepin County), and Gordon Chinander (Carver County).

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

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

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Fiskness moved and Member Schneider seconded to approve the summary of the January 9, 2002 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

a) Nominations for URISA's ESIG Award and Governor's Council GIS Project Commendations

Member Fiskness moved and Member Williams seconded to authorize staff to prepare and the Board chair to sign 2002 applications for URISA's ESIG Award and the Minnesota Governor's Council GIS Project Commendations. Motion carried, ayes all.

5. OVERVIEW OF COUNTY GIS PROGRAMS

The Policy Board received a presentation from each county to share information about their respective GIS programs. Each presenter (Gary Swenson – Anoka County; Gordon Chinander – Carver County; Randy Knippel – Dakota County; Bill Brown – Hennepin County; David Claypool – Ramsey County; Jim Hengtes – Scott County; and David Brandt – Washington County) had been asked to address five questions relating to support of GIS services internal to the county and to others, fees for services, whether a website is supported, and whether COGO and GPS had been/is being used to develop and maintain their respective parcel databases. The presentations lasted about 90 minutes. The slides for each presentation are attached to this meeting summary. The Board also directed staff to post them to the MetroGIS' general information Internet site.

The Board members concurred that the presentations were excellent, demonstrating how GIS is being integrated into day-to-day business functions of the counties. Commissioner Kordiak thanked each of the presenters for their enthusiasm. Chairperson Reinhardt noted that it was her intention to ask for this type of update on an annual basis.

Vice Chairperson Kordiak turned the meeting over Chairperson Reinhardt.

6. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Election of Officers

Chairperson Reinhardt explained that MetroGIS's bylaws call for annual election of a chairperson and vice chairperson.

Member Siegfried nominated Member Reinhardt (Ramsey County) to serve as chairperson for the upcoming year. Member Kordiak nominated Member Johnson (Hennepin County). Nominations were closed. A vote was taken by a show of hands. Nine in favor of Member Reinhardt and one (Member Kordiak) for Member Johnson. Member Reinhardt was declared the MetroGIS Policy Board chairperson for the coming year and was thanked for accepting this responsibility.

Member Branning nominated Member Kordiak for Vice-chair. No further nominations were received after three calls. Member Kordiak was declared the vice-chair for the coming year and thanked for his willingness to continue to serve in this capacity.

b) Planned Land Use Information Need and "Launch Forum"

Jane Harper, Vice-Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee at its March 20 meeting to endorse the desired data specifications, custodial roles and responsibilities, and designation of the Metropolitan Council to serve as regional custodian. Ms. Harper than introduced Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council GIS Manager, who explained the importance and benefits of this dataset, the interests that participated in its development, and the development process.

Gelbmann credited the I-35W Corridor Coalition for its significant efforts to prototype, as a pilot for MetroGIS, the unprecedented regional coding that permits like-comparisons of the land use plans across the 190-community metro area in a manner that provides substance and also provides the user with the ability to also access the official designation as adopted by the local unit of government. He also credited Paul Hanson, of the Council's GIS staff, for his significant contribution to building, from scratch, the actual regional dataset.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board approve the following specifications for the Regional Planned Land Use dataset, regional land use coding scheme, regional custodian, and custodian roles and responsibilities:

1) The Regional Planned Land Use Coding Scheme, the tiered system and outlined codes as presented in the attached Policy Summary Document, dated March 6, 2002.
2) The proposed data specifications as presented in the attached Policy Summary, dated March 6, 2002.
3) Designation of the Metropolitan Council to serve as the custodian of the Regional Planned Land Use datasets and supplemental databases on behalf of the MetroGIS community.
4) The proposed roles and responsibilities of the regional custodian organization, as presented in the attached Policy Summary Document, dated March 6, 2002.

Motion carried, ayes all.

c) Performance Measures Plan and Business Plan Update

Kathie Doty, of Richardson, Richter and Associates and member of the MetroGIS Staff Support Team, summarized the objectives of MetroGIS's performance measures project (e.g., to measure ease of access to needed data by users, ease of participation by producers, and improved decision support and service delivery) and explained that the proposed Plan was built upon several candidate measures that the Board had endorsed at its January meeting. She then summarized the components of the Plan, which had been approved by the Coordinating Committee on March 20 for Board consideration, noting the Committee had directed staff to modify Measures 6 and 7 to minimize effort on the part of the producers. These

changes were addressed in the version before the Board. Doty concluded her remarks by sharing an example of the data collected to serve as benchmarks for several of the measures, noting that in addition to the data, staff will attempt to explain what the numbers mean.

Member Schneider complimented the staff and the project team for developing a straightforward and meaningful performance measures plan, noting that it is very easy to get lost in the complexity of attempting to identify meaningful measures. Member Fiskness also spoke in favor of the proposed Plan as a valuable management tool to ensure that the MetroGIS is able to adapt to changing needs and is outcome-based.

Alternate Member O'Connor asked the Metropolitan Council's representative if the Council supports the Plan and how it was financed. Eli Cooper stated that the Council is very supportive and excited about the products that have emerged from the MetroGIS collaborative effort. Staff Coordinator Johnson noted that the cost to develop the Plan and to carry out the proposed Business Plan Update, of which the Performance Measures Plan is a component, are part of a two-year contract with the firm of Richardson, Richter and Associates, and are specified in MetroGIS's approved 2002 budget and work plan.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board approve:

1) The MetroGIS Performance Measures Plan, dated March 21, 2002, as recommended by the Coordinating Committee.
2) The proposed Business Plan Update process, in particular, the proposed focus on current and emerging challenges.

Motion carried, ayes all.

d) Regional Parcel Dataset – Private Sector Version: Evaluation of Inactivity

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized staff's proposed evaluation of the lack of interest in this dataset, as outlined in the staff report, in preparation for the annual review by the Board at its July meeting. The annual review is called for in the multi-party agreement executed in May 2001. This agreement authorizes the Metropolitan Council to assemble the seven county parcel components and distribute the regional assembly. She then asked Hennepin County to comment on their intentions with regard to the multi-party agreement. Alternate Member O'Connor stated that Hennepin County intends to continue to participate but that they would prefer to use their own license.

This statement initiated comments from the Anoka and Dakota county representatives that their Boards had approved the multi-party agreement and the accompanying common license as a package. Both commented that if Hennepin County wants their own license that maybe they would also reconsider. Chairperson Reinhardt requested Hennepin County to endorse a time extension to permit the Policy Board time to work through the issues. Alternate Member O'Connor stated that he would look into this matter the following day.

There was no action by the Board other than the Chairperson's request for cooperation from Hennepin County in the form of an extension to accommodate the agreed upon evaluation. The requested extension will enable MetroGIS to continue to move forward with its work to provide an efficient means of access by non-profit and for-profits interests to parcel data from multiple counties.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt shared with the Board a proposal for MetroGIS to host a Participant Appreciation Event on November 14th to celebrate MetroGIS's accomplishments. She encouraged everyone to mark the date on their calendars. The Staff Coordinator noted that the Coordinating Committee had suggested that the Board consider holding the event in conjunction with a Board meeting. The Board concluded that a decision regarding a Board meeting preceding the event on the same evening does not need to be made until the July Board meeting. Staff invited interested Board members to participate on the program committee.

Member Fiskness spoke in favor the proposed event, noting that use of GIS and collaboration on common needs has come a long way since the he joined the Policy Board in 1997. He wondered out loud what things will look like five years from now.

There was no discussion of any of the other information items presented in the agenda materials.

Minneapolis City Council Member Gary Schiff was introduced as the newest Board member, appointed by the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities on April 4 to represent large cities on the Policy Board. He noted that several neighborhoods in his ward are daily users of GIS technology, that he has had formal training with GIS software, and looks forward to serving on the Policy Board.

8. NEXT MEETING
July 10, 2002

9. ADJOURN
The meeting concluded at 8:47 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

Policy Board Members:

Victoria Reinhardt,
Chairperson
Ramsey County

Conrad Fiskness,
MAWD

Antoinette Johns,
TIES

Molly O'Rourke,
Washington County

Randy Johnson,
Hennepin County

Gary Schiff
City of Minneapolis
AMM

Jim Kordiak,
Vice-Chairperson
Anoka County

Joseph Wagner,
Scott County

Willis Branning,
Dakota County

Terry Schneider,
City of Minnetonka
AMM

Roger Williams,
Metropolitan Council

John Siegfried,
Carver County

Coordinating Committee

Will Craig,
Chairperson
U of M

Jane Harper,
Vice-Chairperson
Washington County

Staff Coordinator

Randall Johnson,
Metropolitan Council

Tuesday, July 30, 2002

6:30 p.m.

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A

230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary ***Page***

a) April 10, 2002 ***action*** **1**

4. GIS Technology Demonstration:
MetroGIS's New State-of-the-Art Internet Data Distribution Mechanism **6**

5. Action and Discussion Items – Direction to Staff

a) 2002 Business Plan – Key Policy Challenge Areas

(1) Challenges Related to Ongoing Work ***action*** **12**
Comment and Direction on Inclusion in Business Plan

(2) Challenges Related to Emerging Issues ***action*** **21**
Policy Discussion and Direction on Inclusion in Business Plan

b) MetroGIS Participant Appreciation Event - November 2002 ***action*** **44**

6. Information Sharing **48**

a) URISA's ESIG Award Application– Status
b) Progress on Priority Information Needs/Regional Datasets
c) Performance Measures: DataFinder and General Website User Statistics
d) Outreach Efforts – *other than conferences*
e) 2002 Excellence in Government National Conference – July 15-17
f) MnAPA State Conference – September 11-13
g) Global Spatial Data Infrastructure (GSDI) Conference, September 16-19, Budapest
h) GIS/LIS State Conference – October 2-4
i) 2002 URISA National Conference – October 26-30
j) GCGI LRM Committee – Progress on Statewide Parcel Dataset Policy
k) June 19, 2002 Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

7. Next Meeting
October 9, 2002

8. 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 easily usable."

Approved
October 22, 2002

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
July 30, 2002

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

Members Present: Terry Schneider (AMM-City of Minnetonka), Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Willis Branning (Dakota County), Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Molly O'Rourke (Washington County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Antoinette Johns (TIES), John Siegfried (Carver County), and Joseph Wagner (Scott County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Bill Brown, Eli Cooper, Dave Drealan, Jane Harper, Brad Henry, Jim Hentges, and Randy Knippel.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Steve Fester, Kathie Doty, with Richardson, Richter and Associates, and Alison Slaats.

Visitors: Gary Criter (City of Minneapolis)

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

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

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Branning moved and Member Kordiak seconded to approve the summary of the April 10, 2002 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION – MetroGIS DataFinder Café

Alison Slaats, MetroGIS DataFinder Manager, summarized the project objectives and demonstrated the functionality of MetroGIS's recently launched DataFinder Café -- a state-of-the-art Internet-enabled data browsing and distribution application. Another purpose of the demonstration was to help the Board members better understand the particulars involved in the emerging issues that would be presented for discussion later in the agenda: (1) the blurring of the line between data distribution and increasing interest in online GIS applications used to analyze relationships between and among data objects and/or produce maps and (2) whether or not to pursue an eCommerce extension to Café to extend its robust data downloading functionality to distribution of parcel and other data for which a fee is required for access by non-government interests.

In response to a question from Member Kordiak, the Staff Coordinator noted that development of DataFinder Café has cost between $85,000 and $90,000 in addition to the previous investment in the development of MetroGIS DataFinder, costing in excess of $150,000 over the past 4 years, all financed by the Metropolitan Council with funding allocated to MetroGIS. Staff also noted that the Metropolitan Council, on behalf of the MetroGIS community, is also absorbing the annual out-of-pocket software maintenance expenses in excess of $20,000 and related hardware expenses which have capacity beyond the Council's internal needs.

Member Fiskness asked staff to comment on who can have access to the software code. The Staff Coordinator noted the contract with Syncline, the software developer, at his insistence, permits the Council, who owns the code to share it, free of charge, with any government interest serving the State of

Minnesota that would further the objectives of MetroGIS. At that point, the Staff Coordinator introduced David Arbeit, Director of Minnesota Land Management Information Center (LMIC) to share with the Board LMIC's intention to leverage the Council's investment in DataFinder Café and deploy it statewide as a component of the state's GeoIntegrator project. Arbeit announced that he had received notice this afternoon that the state Office of Technology had awarded a $117,000 grant for this purpose. Staff commented that the City of St. Paul is in the process of gearing up to use Café as the primary means to distribute geodata to both internal and external users and the negotiations are in progress with the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission to take advantage of the investment made to date in DataFinder Café.

Member Branning asked for clarification as to whether the data producer would continue to decide which data are shared and under what circumstances. Staff responded that the data producer community, through MetroGIS's Common Business Information Needs polices development process, decide collaboratively the access rules for data they produce. He noted as an example product of this process the current data sharing agreements with each county. Staff also emphasized a foundational MetroGIS philosophy that no interest will be asked to do anything for the broader MetroGIS community for which the interest does not have an internal business need.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 2002 Business Plan – Key Challenge Areas

Jane Harper, Vice Chair of the Coordinating Committee, introduced Kathie Doty, member of the MetroGIS Staff Support Team and with the firm Richardson, Richter and Associates, who summarized the June 19 recommendations of the Coordination Committee concerning key challenges areas that have been identified for MetroGIS through a process that began in March 2002. The discussion was approached from two perspectives: challenges relating to ongoing work and those related to emerging issues. (Note: The Attachments cited next to each section refer to the attachments to the staff report dated July 23 and included in the agenda materials.)

(1) Challenges Related to Ongoing Work (Attachment B)

Doty summarized five challenge areas related to ongoing work and requested direction from the Board to continue to include in MetroGIS's Business Plan. The five areas are: Common Information Needs, Regionally Endorsed Data Solutions, Organizational Constraints to Data Distribution, Support for the MetroGIS Mission, and Outreach and Broader Coordination.

There was general discussion about the progress that has made to address the thirteen initial priority common business information needs. A table was provided in the staff report that showed six completed, five in progress, and two (Rights to Property and Land Regulations) that had not been started. Staff was asked to comment on the reasons why the two had not been started and whether they should be dropped from consideration. The Staff Coordinator commented that although these two common information needs had been identified as priorities by the data user community, to date, no organization has been identified that has a business need to investigate/implement a regional solution. Member Schneider commented that a regional (normalized) dataset for the seven-county area may not be possible given the complexities involved and differences in local policies that by their nature can not be effectively merged into a normalized solution. He encouraged the Committee to consider the possibility of a *technology solution, as opposed to a standardized data content solution*, such as a one-stop-shop concept for access to the many components.

There was also general discussion about the multitude of decision-making benefits that could occur by encouraging *continuity between data produced beyond the Metro Area and regional data solutions endorsed by MetroGIS.* The Staff Coordinator commented that this concept of integrating the geodata policies of the metro area with those for the surrounding counties is at the core of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) I-Plan initiative. He also noted that work on a statewide parcel data policy, which incorporates principals endorsed by MetroGIS, is progressing nicely and that its impetus was the Policy Board's request last July to GCGI asking it to pursue a statewide parcel policy.

Motion: Member Branning moved and Member Williams seconded to direct the Coordinating Committee to include in the Business Plan Update the five Challenge Areas related to Ongoing Work, presented in Attachment B to the staff report. Motion carried, ayes all.

(2) Challenges Related to Emerging Issues

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that much progress has been made by MetroGIS to resolve common geodata needs. She also commented that had the Board not acted last July to direct the Request for Proposals that lead to implementation of the DataFinder Café, the possible solutions before them now to address emerging issues would not be options.

- Distribution of Parcel Data to Non-Profit and Private Sector (Attachment C)

  Staff support team member Doty summarized the history of MetroGIS's involvement in this matter, dating back to April 2000, and the findings of the market analysis conducted by staff in April and May, as outlined in the staff report.

  Chairperson Reinhardt asked staff to comment on the potential for the opposite of the desired effect of implementing an automated and collaborative solution; that is, less revenue from data sales and an increase in staff time. Doty commented that in general the county representatives interviewed believe pursuing an automated solution would be a plus but she also acknowledged the benefit varied among the counties and are there are still unknowns. Coordinating Committee Vice Chair Harper commented that for Washington County the benefit is limited when only parcel data is considered but she believes that the ability to use an automated system (eCommerce + DataFinder Café) to distribute other data for which a fee is required for access (elevation, imagery, etc.) greatly increases the potential benefit.

  Members Kordiak and Johnson concurred that the ability, via DataFinder Café, to distribute portions of the parcel dataset, as opposed to the all or nothing, is a better business proposition. The question before the Board is now how much more is MetroGIS willing to invest to pursue the additional technology needed to automate and support online fee collection. Member Kordiak asked whether the fee for access has to be consistent among the Counties, noting that he believes the $0.05/parcel fee is too high for Anoka County. The Staff Coordinator commented that the data model upon which DataFinder Café has been developed was purposefully developed to be policy driven; that is, the counties could each have different fees if they so chose. Member Kordiak also stated that this is not a novel proposition and is doable if we would choose to move forward, noting that Anoka and other counties currently provide online access to their property records data to non-government interests for a fee.

  Member Schneider encouraged staff to look into the state and League of Cities eCommerce initiatives to determine if there is a possibility of partnering, given the scoping price of $40,000+; or if partnering is not an option, to investigate ways to simplify the proposal, such as eliminating the design complexity, which provides the flexibility for counties to charge varying fees.

  Doty summarized the Coordinating Committee's June 19 recommendation, which called for establishing a workgroup made up of individuals affiliated with data producers and with the appropriate expertise and established six objectives (a-f) to be addressed in a multi-party agreement. Staff noted that a seventh objective, "g", was added to the recommendation by staff for the Board's consideration in response to comments received from the Coordinating Committee chair during the preparation for the Board meeting. It also noted that Dave Drealan, Carver County Planning & Zoning Director, had agreed to chair the recommended workgroup.

  Board members noted their preference for additional market information before getting into design issues and concurred that objective "d" (a means to ensure the product is attractive to the target customers) should be the first objective.

Motion: Member Schiff moved and Member Johnson seconded to approve the Coordinating Committee's June 19 recommendation to establish a workgroup comprised of representatives with appropriate expertise and leadership from data producers, supported by MetroGIS staff, to begin negotiations for a multi-party agreement that would address provisions a-g listed in Attachment C to the staff report dated July 23, with the understanding that the workgroup will deal with market and fee matters first, and that it will report its progress to the Board.

Motion carried, ayes all.

- *Common Tools for Data Discovery and Distribution (Attachment D)*

Coordinating Committee Vice Chair Harper commented that much of MetroGIS's activity to this point has been focused on resolving issues and challenges that benefit the data user. She encouraged the Board to endorse a philosophy that encourages sharing of the development and use of tools for data discovery and distribution as a means to keep the producer community actively involved in MetroGIS.

The consensus of the Board was that a philosophy of fostering sharing of geodata applications and tools for discovery and distribution of data is appropriate for MetroGIS. The Board also concluded that no further action was necessary at this time concerning this challenge area, given the eCommerce component is common to the challenge of a collaborative solution to distribution of parcel data to non-government interests, and thus achieving the common tools challenge will be a natural outgrowth of successfully addressing the distribution of parcel data to non-government.

- *Common Geodata Application Needs (Attachment E)*

Staff support team member Doty summarized the background and policy implications outlined in Attachment E of the staff report. Member Kordiak commented and other members agreed that it is a good idea to share applications and to move in this direction. The members also concurred it is important to move cautiously, endorsing the concept of establishing a workgroup that would help the Board define an appropriate scope for collaborative application-based activities.

Member Schneider noted his concern about getting too far into applications, suggesting that MetroGIS should let it be known to the software development community that MetroGIS invites them to suggest ideas for joint ventures and to foster a means sharing of independently developed applications. He also stated his preference, which was shared by other Board members, that MetroGIS needs to keep is focus on ensuring that the data user is able to secure commonly needed data, when they need it, in the form they need it, in accordance with the intent of MetroGIS's mission statement.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Branning seconded to endorse the "Common Geodata Application Needs" as an emerging challenge area for the Business Plan Update, as outlined in Attachment E of the staff report and dated July 23, with the understanding that a workgroup will be established to help the Board identify a proper scope for MetroGIS's involvement and that MetroGIS proceed into this area cautiously and secondarily to efforts to address common information needs via regional endorsed data solutions.

Motion carried, ayes all.

b) MetroGIS Participant Appreciation Event

The Staff Coordinator informed the Board the original November 14 date no longer works. November 19 was proposed and acceptable to everyone present. Staff also commented that Nancy Tosta had accepted an invitation to keynote the event, noting that she is well known in the geodata community, having served as president of URISA, Director of California's Teale Data Center and Staff Director of the FGDC at the time the NSDI concept was conceived.

c) I-Team Designation Request

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the invitation that had been received from Ron Matzner, the National I-Team Coordinator, for MetroGIS to seek designation as an I-Team, noting that the expectations of MetroGIS would be: 1) to keep doing what it has been to foster geodata coordination and implementation of solutions to common geodata information needs and 2) participate in Minnesota's I-Team initiative. Chairperson Reinhardt stated that she did not see any negatives to accepting this invitation and encouraged the Board to accept the invitation.

Motion: Member Branning moved and Member Schneider seconded that the Policy Board endorse the concept of seeking designation as an I-Team and direct its management leadership to draft a letter of acceptance for Chairperson Reinhardt's signature.

Motion carried, ayes all.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt called attention to several upcoming conferences at which papers will be presented about various aspects of MetroGIS. Staff also encouraged the Board members to suggest non-GIS conference opportunities that would be in line with MetroGIS's outreach plan, such as the Minnesota state planners conference (MnAPA). I-35W and MetroGIS will be teaming up to promote use of the recently endorsed regional Planned Land Use dataset.

There was no discussion of any of the other information items presented in the agenda materials.

7. NEXT MEETING

October 9, 2002

8. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:40 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

Policy Board Members:

Victoria Reinhardt,
Chairperson
Ramsey County

Conrad Fiskness,
MAWD

Antoinette Johns,
TIES

Molly O'Rourke,
Washington County

Randy Johnson,
Hennepin County

Gary Schiff
City of Minneapolis
AMM

Jim Kordiak,
Vice-Chairperson
Anoka County

Joseph Wagner,
Scott County

Willis Branning,
Dakota County

Terry Schneider,
City of Minnetonka
AMM

Roger Williams,
Metropolitan Council

John Siegfried,
Carver County

Coordinating Committee

Will Craig,
Chairperson
U of M

Jane Harper,
Vice-Chairperson
Washington County

Staff Coordinator

Randall Johnson,
Metropolitan Council

Tuesday, October 22, 2002

6:30 p.m.

Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A

230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Accept Agenda

3. Accept Meeting Summary ***Page***

a) July 30, 2002 ***action*** **1**

4. GIS Technology Demonstration:

Metropolitan Airports Commission's Benefits from MetroGIS

5. Action and Discussion Items

a) Awards to MetroGIS **9**
- URISA's ESIG Award for Enterprise Systems: *MetroGIS As A System*
- MnAPA's Planning Merit Award: *Regional Planned Land Use Dataset*

b) MetroGIS 2003-2005 Business Plan ***(separate Plan Document)*** ***action*** **14**

c) Regional Parcel Dataset: Public and Academic Interest Version - Modify Regional Policy Statement ***action*** **17**

d) County Data Producer Workgroup Activities
- Parcel Data – Accept Private Sector Version Policy Statement ***action*** **27**
- Update on Workgroup Activities

e) Participant Appreciation Event: Certificates of Appreciation ***action*** **30**

f) 2003 Meeting Schedule ***action*** **39**

6. Information Sharing **41**

a) I-Team Designation Received
b) Progress on Priority Business Information Needs
c) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder Café & Coordination with MN GeoIntegrator Project
d) State Geodata Initiatives Update
e) Federal Geodata Initiatives Update
f) Conferences Presented At
g) Outreach Efforts – Other than Conferences
h) Performance Measures Report
i) September 25, 2002 Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

7. Next Meeting

January xx, 2003

8. 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 easily usable."

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
October 22, 2002

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Willis Branning (Dakota County), Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), John Siegfried (Carver County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Jane Harper for Molly O'Rourke (Washington County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Roger Williams (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Terry Schneider (AMM-City of Minnetonka), Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis), and Joseph Wagner (Scott County).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Bill Brown, Will Craig, Eli Cooper, Dave Drealan, Rick Gelbmann, Brad Henry, Mark Kill, and Ron Wencl.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Kathie Doty, (with Richardson, Richter and Associates, Inc.), and Mark Kotz.

Visitors: Gary Criter (City of Minneapolis).

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as submitted.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Siegfried moved and Member Branning seconded to approve the summary of the July 30, 2002 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION – How the Metropolitan Airports Commission is Benefiting form MetroGIS

Mark Kill, GIS Specialist for the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) and lead staff for the MAC's Airports Noise Abatement Program, briefed the Board about the Program, which involves $150 million in abatement funds; how GIS technology is being used to manage this program; and how MetroGIS's activities have benefited MAC.

Mr. Kill stated that the availability of the regional datasets, streamlined licensing processes, and DataFinder, all products MetroGIS's efforts, are resulting in MAC being able to manage its noise abatement with more up-to-date data than possible in the past. He also stated that each data update can be accomplished in 4-6 weeks less time than via the previous manual effort to update their foundation data (parcels, municipal boundaries, street centerlines, etc). In the past, MAC staff had to spend much time meeting with numerous staff from the data-producer organizations, in some cases more than one per organization, to describe the data needed and comply with varying licensing and access procedures. Then, once the data were actually received, significant time was required to reformat it to align across adjourning jurisdictions. Availability of DataFinder and regional datasets have eliminated the need for most of this time consuming manual effort.

The next phase of MAC's Airports Noise Abatement Program will expand the distance away from the airport where abatement work can be authorized because the noise threshold will be lowered from the current 65 decibel level. This, in turn, will expand the geographic extent for which foundation data are needed.

Member Kordiak questioned why noise abate programs exist for airports and not for railroads. Mr. Kill commented that it may be because of the frequency and intensity of airport noise which is greater than for railroads. He also commented that it could have something to do with airports generally being public or quasi-public and railroads being generally private.

The members thanked Mr. Kill for his presentation.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Awards to MetroGIS

The MetroGIS Staff Coordinator commented on two recent awards that have been received by MetroGIS – URISA's ESIG award and MnAPA's Outstanding Planning Tool award.

Coordinating Committee member Arbeit commented on the significance of the URISA award from his perspective as a former URISA National Board member. He emphasized the prestige of this award, given the tough competition. He complimented staff on the application and for advocating MetroGIS's unique standing – there is no award category that MetroGIS's experience neatly falls into. Arbeit closed by stating that the Policy Board and others who have been responsible for evolving MetroGIS to this point should take great pride in the success of MetroGIS and its recognition for this award.

b) MetroGIS 2003-2005 Business Plan

Will Craig, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the Committee's September 25th recommendation to approve the Plan enclosed with the agenda materials and introduced Kathie Doty, MetroGIS Business Planning Consultant with the firm Richardson, Richter & Associates, to comment on the key components of the recommended Plan.

Ms. Doty summarized the five assumptions upon which the proposed Plan is based and asked if the Board had any concerns or questions. None of the Board members commented. Ms. Doty than explained several of the key strategies presented in the Executive Summary. Chairperson Reinhardt commented that there is nothing of policy substance included in the proposed Plan that the Board had not over the past several months previously discussed and provided direction for.

Member Siegfried requested clarification on the current revenue received from cost recovery for data related expenses. Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair and Business Planning Workgroup member Harper stated that the County Producer Workgroup created by the Board at its July 30 meeting is currently investigating this matter in conjunction with its work on a collaborative strategy for distribution of parcel data to non-government entities. She noted that the results of the Workgroup's investigation should be ready to share with the Board at its January meeting. Kathie Doty, MetroGIS Business Planning Consultant and a member of the County Producer Workgroup staff support team commented that in the preliminary research conducted for the Business Plan, it was learned that most of the GIS-related revenue being realized is coming from sales of map products, as opposed to digital parcel data. She also noted that staff from each of the counties generally concur that cost recovery for digital parcel data generates reality little revenue.

Member Branning asked for clarification of the statement on Page viii in the Executive Summary concerning the proposed $75,000 data maintenance payment to counties. Staff agreed to modify the statement to clarify that a total of $75,000 per year for each of the three planning period years (2003-2005) is proposed to be allocated among the counties.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that after the Plan had been mailed to Board members last week, several editing and clarifying modifications had been suggested. She requested, and Board members agreed, to leave the decision as to whether the changes should be included in the final document up to the Chair's discretion.

Motion: Member Siegfried moved and Member Branning seconded to: a) adopt the proposed MetroGIS 2003-2005 Business Plan, dated October 22, 2002, subject to the clarification requested by Member Branning concerning the proposed annual data maintenance funding and b) direct staff to forward the Plan to the Metropolitan Council, serving in its capacity as primary sponsor, for approval. Motion carried ayes all.

Board members concluded there is no need to seek approval of the approved Plan from the organizations represented on the Policy Board other than the Metropolitan Council. The Council was distinguished from the others since continued funding and staff support for MetroGIS's core functions is being sought from the Council.

Chairperson Reinhardt recognized the members of the Business Planning Workgroup (David Arbeit, Will Craig, Kathie Doty, Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, and Randall Johnson) and thanked them and the Coordinating Committee for their efforts to prepare this Plan, noting that the Plan sets an ambitious but doable course of action for MetroGIS.

c) Regional Parcel Dataset: Public and Academic Version Policy Statement

Will Craig, Chair of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the Committee's September 25th recommendation and introduced Mark Kotz, GIS Database Administrator for the Metropolitan Council and lead staff for a workgroup comprised of GIS staff from each of the seven counties, who explained the changes proposed for the regional policy statement. The changes involve adding a parcel attribute, increasing the number to 25, and providing clarification for several operational aspects of policies previously endorsed by the Board, noting that the operational changes expand flexibility for the counties while maintaining consistency with the adopted polices. Kotz noted that Paragraph 2 in Appendix B should be deleted because it mistakenly duplicates text contained in Paragraph 4. He also commented that the Coordinating Committee favors the Board authorizing the Committee to in the future modify the operational clarifications set forth in Appendix B without Board approval in an effort to focus Board deliberation on substantive policy matters.

Members Siegfried and Johns asked if any other attributes, in particular several pertaining to census-related information (e.g., number of households per parcel), should also be added the regional dataset. The Staff Coordinator commented that such data needs will likely be addressed when a solution to the socioeconomic information need is proposed, which is scheduled to occur in 2003. Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair Harper also commented that a standard operating procedure, in accordance with one of the Challenge Areas set forth in the Business Plan, is to regularly assess each endorsed regional dataset via Data User Forums. These forums are attended by a cross section of the user community to identify any desired enhancements and to ensure the solutions remain relevant to current needs.

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Siegfried seconded to amend the Regional Parcel Dataset Policy Summary Statement, previously adopted on January 9, 2002, as proposed in the agenda packet document dated September 25, 2002, subject to deletion of Paragraph 2 in Appendix B. Motion carried, ayes all.

Motion: Member Johns moved and Member Siegfried seconded to authorize the Coordinating Committee, from this point on, to modify Operational / Procedural Clarifications (Appendix B) related to this and other regional policy statements when all relevant and affected parties are in agreement. Motion carried, ayes all.

d) County Data Producer Workgroup Activities - Non-Public Access to Parcel Dataset

County Data Producer Workgroup Chair and Coordinating Committee member Dave Drealan summarized the workgroup's activities since created by the Policy Board this past July to investigate the benefits of a collaborative strategy concerning distribution of parcel data to non-profit and for-profit interests. He noted that there are significant differences among the counties concerning non-government access to parcel data and that the workgroup members have agreed that the first order of business should

be for the counties to reach a common vision of what they might try to accomplish collaboratively. He then summarized the Coordinating Committee's September 25th recommendation that the Policy Board approve the regional policy statement included in the Board's agenda materials as a first step in reaching this common understanding.

Member Johns inquired why the proposed recommendation is requesting Board acceptance and submittal to the counties for their individual endorsement, whereas, the county approval component was not a part of the previous motion concerning the public and academic version of the regional parcel dataset. The Staff Coordinator responded that the public sector version statement is governed by agreements that are in effect with each of the seven counties, whereas, no such agreement exists concerning access by non-government entities. Referral of the proposed vision statement to the counties is to ensure that each is willing to allow their staff to continue to investigate a collaborative strategy among the counties. If a collaborative strategy is pursued, staff believes that agreements, similar to the existing public sector access agreements, would likely be the vehicle to achieve a collaborative solution.

Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair Harper commented that the county staff representatives to the workgroup concur that they would prefer to have a single regional vision endorsed by the Policy Board when they speak to their peers in other internal departments. This would provide something of substance to react to so that any obstacles can be clearly articulated for further investigation. Harper also commented that evaluation of the reasons for the failed initial policy revealed that the lack of the ability to obtain less than the whole (subset) was not available and that the market wanted more than 2 attributes – both of which are addressed with this proposal.

Member Johns suggested that the preamble include a statement that data accessibility is provided in accordance with Data Practices Laws, in particular, rules pertaining to not-public data.

Motion: Member Kordiak moved and Member Branning seconded to:

a) Accept the regional policy statement included in the agenda packet dated September 25, 2002 which sets expectations for a collaborative strategy to distribute parcel data available to private and non-profit interests, subject to adding a statement to the preamble that data distributed via this policy statement are provided in accordance with the Minnesota Data Practices Act, in particular, rules pertaining to not-public data.
b) Authorize the Chair to forward this policy statement, on the Board's behalf, to each of the seven counties for approval and to confirm that they want their staff to continue to work on a collaborative strategy for distribution of parcel data to private and non-profit interests.

Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Participant Appreciation Event: Certificates of Appreciation

The Staff Coordinator provided an update of the planning that is in process for the event and summarized the proposal to present certificates of appreciation to 14 individuals who have provided significant leadership to moving MetroGIS from concept to reality and to the Metropolitan Council for serving as the primary sponsor. Chairperson Reinhardt urged those members how have not RSVP to do so, if possible to staff this evening.

Motion: Member Branning moved and Member Kordiak seconded to approve Certificates of Appreciation as recommended in the agenda materials. Motion carried, ayes all.

f) 2003 Meeting Schedule

The meeting schedule proposed in the agenda materials was accepted as proposed, although two members noted conflicts – one for the January meeting and one for the April meeting. The Board's meetings in 2003 will be held on the 5th Wednesday in January, April, July, and October, each beginning at 6:30 p.m.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt asked the members to review on their own the information provided in the agenda packet. There was no discussion of any of the other information items presented in the agenda materials.

7. NEXT MEETING

January 29, 2003

8. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 8:26 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator