

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee: Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 16, 2022, 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

Location: Virtual

APPROVED



Attendees

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Special Expertise: Erik Dahl (Chair), MN EQB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - Regional: Marcia Broman, MESB
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - Co: David Brandt (Vice Chair), Washington Co.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Govt - Regional: Matt Baker, MAC
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Educational Sector: Pete Wiringa, UMN/U-Spatial	<input type="checkbox"/>	Govt - Regional: Nancy Read, MMCD
<input type="checkbox"/>	Educational Sector: Vacant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - Regional: Matt McGuire, Met. Council
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - City: Harold Busch, City of Bloomington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - Regional: Carrie Magnuson, RWMWD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - City: Tami Maddio, City of Eagan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - State: Catherine Hansen, MnDNR
<input type="checkbox"/>	Govt - City: Jared Haas, City of Shoreview	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - State: Joseph Mueller, MnDOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - City: Jessica Fendos, LOGIS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - State: Alison Slaats, MnGeo
<input type="checkbox"/>	Govt - City: Vacant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Profit: Jeff Matson, MCN/CURA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - County: John Slusarczyk, Anoka County	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Profit: Vacant
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - County: Chad Riley, Carver County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Private Sector: Dan Tinklenberg, SRF
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - County: Randy Knippel, Dakota County	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Sector: James (Jim) Fritz, Xcel Energy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - County: Jesse Reinhart, Hennepin County	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Sector: Vacant
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Govt - County: Geoff Maas, Ramsey County	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Sector: Vacant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Govt - County: Tony Monsour, Scott County	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Special Expertise: Brad Henry, UMN
<input type="checkbox"/>	Govt - Federal: Vacant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MetroGIS (ex-officio): Tanya Mayer, Met. Council

Additional Attendees: Heather Albrecht, Hennepin County (alternate); Nate Owens, Metropolitan Council; Sean Murphy, Metropolitan Council

1) Call to Order (Dahl)

1:03 p.m.

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

Additions/Changes: none.

Motion to approve Agenda: Brandt Second: Maas *Motion carried.*

3) Approve Minutes from last meeting (December 09, 2021) (action item) (Dahl)

Minutes from the last meeting on 12/09/2021 are here (top right: www.metrogis.org)

Motion to approve 12/09/2021 minutes: McGuire Second: Mueller *Motion carried.*

4) Met Council Revised Support Role in MetroGIS (McGuire)

Slide Presentation. McGuire provided an overview of the revised support role for MetroGIS. This is primarily due to a 2019 MetroGIS Coordinator vacancy, followed by a pandemic hiring freeze and keep the lights on focus, then Met Council IT reorg/paradigm shift. In 2022, Met Council approved new position of "Senior GIS Coordinator" which includes 25% FTE capacity for MetroGIS support. Introduction of Tanya Mayer in this new role. McGuire outlined what the role continues to support and no longer supports. In summary, the role includes supporting Metro GIS leadership in 1) creating the vision, policy and procedures that underpin MetroGIS; 2) creating a work plan and budget; and making sure they are approved and visible to the Coordinating Committee; 3) meeting

coordination and minutes development, and 4) managing the content of metrogis.org, the Teams site, and any communications. The role also includes supporting projects, making sure project leaders have what they need to work within the MetroGIS construct, and managing MetroGIS-related project contracts within the Council. The role will not include things like outreach to provide support to help develop open data policies that were approved in the metro; and pushing forward or leading specific projects.

5) MetroGIS Leadership Planning Conversations (Dahl, Brandt)

Overview of planning meetings and discussions the last couple months provided by Dahl and Brandt – to tee-up the CC conversation on the next phase of MetroGIS.

6) MetroGIS Next Phase Presentation and Discussion (Maas)

[Slide Presentation](#). Presentation points:

Comments on points 1) original objectives of MetroGIS have been met 2) on-going role of MetroGIS:

- Wiringa: will any of the regional datasets' transition to being maintained as state-wide datasets in the future – or a plan to do that?
- Slaats: the state could take on that role in the future, and MetroGIS does additional validation checks and provides some more documentation on parcels than the state at this time. However, there is also an interest in having regional datasets. MnGeo willing to have that conversation if MetroGIS would like to do that.
- Maas: for the near term, it will remain at the metro regional level but shared with the state.
- Broman: MESB values having MetroGIS as a collaborative for aggregation/validation. It allows the region to be much more nimble in identifying and resolving issues with the data. MetroGIS has been significantly valuable in moving MESB 911 forward. Prefers to keep the regional data processes through MetroGIS.
- Fendos: Thinks the regional and state projects go hand-in-hand and no conflict to continue to keep that structure to start at the metro region, shared with and expanded to the state.
- Knippel: Met Council is a key stakeholder and beneficiary of these regional datasets. One of the primary drivers of MetroGIS was to have better access to county data. Remember that Metro Council / County relationship can be adversarial, but MetroGIS, and GIS in general, cuts across that because we are looking at technology and how we are able to work together to achieve a common vision. Would hate to lose the Met Council support in this collaborative, or the Met Council not recognizing the value of their role in coordinating and sustaining this collaborative. Don't think the Council would want things to revert back to the way they were 10-15 years ago. We work very well together. I think in a lot of ways then we each individually and within our individual organizations can help emphasize and reinforce the value of that vision. Let's not let this fall back too far. You know, I really think that it is important that the Metro Council stays in a leadership role for this. And it is a key beneficiary, but also represents the value of regional collaborative regional data sets and things like that. This benefits other organizations, MESB, MMCD, Logis, etc. providing services across to multiple government entities in the region. We have accomplished a lot and let's not put ourselves in a position where that has the potential to slide backwards.
- Mayer: While the staff position to support MetroGIS has changed, the other support has not. The Council recognizes they are a key stakeholder and beneficiary. That includes the same budget, metrogis.org website, regional dataset validation and aggregation support, contract management for MetroGIS projects, and so on remains the same. At the same time, this is not a Met Council committee, it only has 1 leadership seat in this collaborative.

Comments on point 3) role of the Coordinating Committee: none

Comments on point 4) rethink or dissolution of the Policy Board (PB) and maintain connection to elected leadership by periodic reporting to the MESB (10 counties) or other:

- Knippel: recently (2019 last Policy Board meeting), he was the designee for their elected official.
- Maas/Brandt: Does PB need to be officially dissolved? How? MetroGIS is not a Joint Powers Agreement or Non-profit organization. PB has not had any fiscal or policy decisions since 2013 (9 years), just updates on what the MetroGIS Collaborative is doing.
- Knippel: There is risk that County Commissioners could decide the GIS collaboration is not important and working against them with dissolving the PB. CC should think about an annual reporting tool to County Commissioners in some manner.
- Broman: I encourage some sort of annual benefit report for not only County Commissioners, but also to communicate all the benefits of the collaborative to leadership supporting MetroGIS (Met Council, Counties, others).
- Slaats: MetroGIS has been a leader in the state for Open Data. Beneficial to have the PB members discuss those benefits.
- Brandt: The intended PB membership and actual representatives at meetings differed, where staff were appointed to attend PB meetings (who were often CC members), as Commissioners are spread too thin.
- Maas: Are there other avenues of connectivity to elected officials, like GAC? GAC does not get to local elected officials, like MESB.
- Brandt: 1 thing that gets officials attention is more awards.
- Knippel: We want to avoid giving the impression of minimizing the value of this group by suggesting dissolving the PB.
- McGuire: I view this discussion as a success – and the reason we are making this organizational change is because we were successful in doing what we set out to do.
- Fendos: Recommends not framing it as dissolving the PB. Instead of a report do an annual presentation of achievements.
- **ACTION:** Contact Victoria Reinhardt, past Policy Board Chair and Debbie Goettel, current Policy Board Chair, on the idea / recommendation. (Maas)

The question: What is the relationship that this collaborative wants to have with leadership?

Comments on point 5) Technical Advisory Team / Work Groups revisited, replaced by a Regional Dataset Work Group?:

- Brandt: likes the ad hoc work group model.
- Broman: suggests dataset specific work groups (3 groups).
- Knippel: likely that the same people will be involved for each, suggests 1 meeting for all 3 and bring in SMEs as needed, or carve out time for a specific dataset and/or problem. Organizationally can be done as 1 group.
- Maas: a lot of the same people and coordination between dataset owners anyway.
- Broman: supports that.

Comments on point 6) Ensure continued data flow with the Regional Dataset Workgroup:

- Knippel: There are a lot of people participating in this group which is the most important part of MetroGIS. The GAC represents that as well, but here as a metro collaborative. Being able to meet virtually really opens the door for a lot more people to engage too. We know each one of us represent a unique perspective on the collaboration that we engage in as well as the different data sets and different common projects that that we engage in. Having this group of people already designated as having a role representing a stakeholder community in the metro region is *very valuable*. If we had to go and scrape that together on an as needed basis because we have a question, it would be awful. We are talking about morphing this MetroGIS thing into something

different and as Matt clearly stated, this is a positive change because it is more of a maturing. I believe in the metro collaboration, and we want to make sure that that is represented. Having this group of people meeting on some kind of a frequency and giving us the opportunity to present questions to each other is very important and I don't want anybody to minimize that.

- Hansen: Perhaps some of us are quiet as we digest the proposed changes to the group. I, for one, am not sure any of the changes would be either bad or good.

7) [2022 Work Plan](#) Priority Items Update

- Priority #2 – Metro Stormwater Geodata Project (MSWGP) ([Maas](#))
Twice publicly reviewed draft standard. [MSWGP Standard](#) is available to look at.
- Priority #3 – External Platform Publishing ([McGuire](#))
 - Apple and Google have asked to use data pushed to the Geocommons by the Met Council. They want to know what the license is. Met Council is thinking of applying the PDDL.
Discussion? None.
 - ESRI would like to see AddressPoint Unit value field improvements before publishing. There is a lot of questionable content in that field. Should we discuss limiting the options for what goes in that field and validating it? Or should the Met Council pursue technical solutions to remove values that do not fit into ESRI's schema.
 - Reinhardt: example? McGuire: has several examples that can be shared with the Technical Regional Dataset Group.
 - Knippel: could this just go to the County Data Producers Group to handle? Counties should be able to have validation tools they each use to produce the data in the standard. Suggest just work together to create a set of validation tools they each use.
ACTION: Add to the next 8-County Collaboration meeting agenda (Knippel)
- Priority #7 – Metro Park and Trail Dataset and Data Standard ([Dahl](#))
 - Alex Blenkush has formally asked to be taken out of the metadata and other project responsibilities for Metro Park and Trail Dataset and Data Standard.
 - Knippel: can we get the Met Council parks group engaged to lead this?
 - McGuire: MC Parks is working with park implementing agencies right now and working on getting a data format agreed to for the regional parks. This has a different focus beyond aggregating parks/trails but to help with funding operation/maintenance of regional parks.
 - Brandt: that was the original intent of the data standard in 2016.
 - Knippel: identify a key stakeholder or primary data owner that could lead a broader effort. After initial effort, suggest Met Council could lead the broader park and trail effort.
 - Tinklenberg: what are the 9 contributing park agencies (Counties, Minneapolis, St. Paul, 3-Rivers Park District, etc.).
 - **ACTION:** Add to the next 8-County Collaboration meeting agenda (Knippel)
- Priority #8 – Increased Frequency of Parcel Data Updates ([Mayer](#))
 - Met Council does not think the new two-month parcel update cadence will be sustainable without improvements to the data submission workflow. While the process itself is not terribly time consuming, the asynchronous interactions between each County data provider and the Council leads to very long lag times. Add to Data Producers

- **ACTION:** Slaats would like to coordinate on timing of quarterly parcel data with Met Council. MnGeo compiles the statewide opt-in public parcel dataset (that includes metro parcel data) at the end of December, March, June, September. (Mayer/Slaats)

8) **2023 Project Planning Timeline** (Brandt)

- Application timeline for 2023 project proposals: June 1 – August 30
- Erik, Chair send email to all CC members, call for project proposals/timeline
- CC meeting 6/16 – announcement
- CC meeting 9/8 – Preliminary review of proposed projects
- CC member prioritization vote – September 15 – October 30
- Draft 2023 Work plan and budget document – November
- CC meeting 12/8 – Final 2023 work plan and budget

9) **Lightning Round Update** (Entire group)

- Reinhardt: Job posting soon for DBA position. Would appreciate help circulating the posting.
- Fendos: Contributed fiber data for 8-cities to Hennepin County Hub; Working on Service Line data with U-Spatial for users with older infrastructure.
- Knippel: Get air photos twice a year with Near Map (oblique in spring, ortho mosaic) through subscription; Created a drone team, purchased a couple drone, and have 3 people as pilots from the GIS group for the potential of precision mapping.
- Slaats: Geospatial commons almost at 1000 resources!
- Brandt: Intern just started working on Parks and Trails.

10) **Adjourn** (Brandt)

Motion to adjourn at 3:06 p.m. Knippel Second: McGuire *Motion carried.*

Next Coordinating Committee Meetings

September 8, 2022, 1:00-3:00 pm

December 8, 2022, 1:00-3:00 pm

Summary of Action Items

- **ACTION:** Contact Victoria Reinhardt, past Policy Board Chair and Debbie Goettel, current Policy Board Chair, on the idea / recommendation regarding next phase of MetroGIS Policy Board. (Maas)
- **ACTION:** ESRI would like to see AddressPoint Unit value field improvements before publishing. There is a lot of questionable content in that field. Discuss creating a set of validation tools each county could use. Add to the next 8-County Collaboration meeting agenda (Knippel)
- **ACTION:** Add Metro Park and Trail Dataset and Data Standard project coordination to the next 8-County Collaboration meeting agenda (Knippel)
- **ACTION:** Slaats would like to coordinate on timing of quarterly parcel data with Met Council. MnGeo compiles the statewide opt-in public parcel dataset (that includes metro parcel data) at the end of December, March, June, September. (Mayer/Slaats)