MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 20, 2013, 1:00-3:30 PM
Metro Counties Government Center, 2099 University Avenue, St Paul

Meeting Attendance:

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee:

David Bitner (Chair), *db Spatial*
Matt Baker, *Metropolitan Airports Commission*
Peter Henschel, *Carver County*
Ben Butzow, *MnDOT*
Nancy Read, *Metropolitan Mosquito Control District*
Mark Maloney, *City of Shoreview/Metro Cities*
Dan Ross, *MnGeo*
Charlie Teff, *Anoka County*
Randy Knippel, *Dakota County*
James Fritz, *Xcel Energy*
Brad Henry, *University of Minnesota*
Derek Lorbiecki, *Hennepin County*
Jim Bunning, *Scott County*
Matt Koukol, *Ramsey County*
Len Kne, *University of Minnesota*
Ron Wencl, *U. S. Geological Survey*
Erik Dahl, *MN Assoc. of Watershed Districts*
Mark Kotz, *Metropolitan Council*
Eric Haugen, *Resource Data, Inc.*

Guests:
Dan Falbo, ESRI
Bill Bushey, *Minnesota E-Democracy*

Staff:
Geoff Maas, *MetroGIS Coordinator*

1) Call to Order:
Chair Bitner called the meeting to order at 1:08 PM

2) Approval of Meeting Agenda:
Motion: Kotz, Second: Read; Motion carried.

3) Approval of March 21, 2013 Meeting Minute:
Motion: Maloney; Second: Wencl, Motion carried.

4) Welcome New Members:
Chair Bitner introduced the new public sector seat representatives and welcomed them to the Coordinating Committee. New members appointed by their respective agencies include **Matt Baker** (MAC); **Ben Butzow** (MnDOT); **Erik Dahl** (MN Association of Watershed Districts) and **Mark Kotz** (Metropolitan Council).

5) Election of Sector Representatives

Chair Bitner had candidates **Eric Haugen** of Resource Data, Inc. (*candidate for the **GIS Consultant** seat*) and **James (Jim) Fritz** of Xcel Energy (*candidate for the **Utilities** seat*) describe their positions, their experience and explain their interest in participating in MetroGIS. The candidates then fielded questions from the Committee. As per the Operating Guidelines and Procedures, the Committee had a brief closed door deliberation during which both candidates were approved. Chair Bitner welcomed the candidates to the Committee.

Brad Henry suggested to Jim Fritz that he bring back to the Coordinating Committee (at its next meeting) some indication of what the utilities industry is expecting from the public sector in terms of data or communication.

6) Roundtable/Lightning Round Update

Bitner:

- Provided a wrap-up of the FOSS4G conference, by all accounts a success: with almost 400 attendees from 34 states and 8 countries; very positive responses to the event.

Knippel:

- Talked about his continued participation in the National Alliance for Public Safety GIS Foundation (NAPSG Foundation).
- Informed the group of an upcoming webinar (July 18) on the US National Grid.

Kotz:

- Updates covered later in the agenda

Bushey:

- Works with E-Democracy and Open Twin Cities
- Participant in the recent two large hack-a-thon events concurrent with the FOSS4G conference, provided a brief overview of those events

Ross:

- Provided an update to the group on the many activities in progress at MnGeo.
- Summarize the impact of recent Legislation (SF1298/HF1390) and next steps for MnGeo on the issue.
- Spring ortho-photos are complete; most of the northern portion of the state has been flown; quality control of the images is underway, and they should be available soon.
- LIDAR is complete for the state; this is a large milestone and will be going live soon.
- Terms for Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council representatives are up. New candidates need to go through the Secretary of State process to be eligible for consideration.
- Due to the new statute language, the State Government Geospatial Advisory Council will sunset, the final meeting of this body will be on July 8, the Final meeting will be on July 8, the Geospatial Technology Committee will replace the State Gov Council.

Wencl:

- US Topographic Maps cycling into production; data is being staged for production
- The Federal sequestration remains in force, however, it will not impact map production.
- USGS is promoting the National Map Corps as a means of crowd sourcing data into the National Map resource.
- Landsat 5 has been decommissioned, however Landsat 8 is up and running.

Maloney:

- Involved with local government transportation research topics emphasizing better communication and integration about projects and data needs across jurisdictions; strong need for better integration and communication at all levels of government.
- Surface water management also came out of the same 'think tank'; transportation discussion always winds up with some discussion of surface water.
- Shoreview is a positive site for occurrence of the Emerald Ash Borer, we need to deploy GIS tools to help contain and control it, and assist our city and other cities respond to DNR for urban forestry applications and tracking.

Kne:

- U of M in looking to hire a training coordinator for internal use of GIS;

Read:

- Was heavily involved with the preparation and execution of the FOSS4G conference.
- Worked with Len Kne on a panel on geospatial portals working to get at the question of ***"how do real GIS users get a hold or real data with a spatial component, how do they actually find, get to and acquire the data?"***
- From the conference, reported on what other local governments are doing with open source resources;

  Examples:
  Portland (Oregon) requires an open source component.
  Pierce County (State of Washington), has switched to an open source solution: their programmers (non GIS programmers) were more comfortable with the open source environment, found it effective for getting more done.

- The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) is now up on the Data Deli for the metro area.
- SharedGeo still advancing US National Grid projects and meeting with Google Maps for crisis situation mapping.

Lorbiecki:

- Hennepin County is having positive results from the County Attorney's Office working toward more free and open data; (*much to the approval and delight of the group*)

Koukol:

- Working with free and open data materials for the Data Producers Work Group/8-County Collaborative.
- Ramsey County is actively working on address points; I am involved directly with the Centerlines Initiative.

- Ramsey County is also working on our parcel fabric;
- Deploying and using ArcGIS Online for a variety of uses (gave the example of playground inspection tools).

Butzow:

- As a new member to the group, he gave a bit of background of his work and education: Received an MGIS from the U of M, has worked at MnDOT for 6 years, GIS Specialist in the Geodetic Unit; moved in Aug 2012 into Joella Givens' group and is excited to be participating in MetroGIS.
- MnDOT Metro Office makes use of an internal open source web mapping application called Georilla and have seen that database increase in use and size over past couple of months, also supporting Rochester district with their Georilla work, working toward becoming a statewide application for MnDOT.

Bunning:

- Looking to fill the Senior GIS Analyst position recently vacated by Josh Gumm;

Henschel:

- Carver County is actively evaluating the new address point editor.
- Just put up a new water monitoring application with live data and using the ESRI storytelling template about water quality;

Baker:

- As a new member to the group, he gave a bit of background of his work and education, originally from New Zealand, studied at the University of Canterbury, worked at New Zealand Department of Conservation and City of Shoreview prior to the MAC.
- Very new to position at MAC, excited to be part of MetroGIS.

Henry:

- Stressed the importance of bridging the gap between GIS and engineering, lowering the time and costs of projects, stresses this in the coursework he teaches at the University of Minnesota;

Dahl:

- Actively developing tools for interactive mapping for watershed field staff to collect water quality data;
- Excited about the prospect of better stormsewer data being available eventually;

Teff:

- No major updates from Anoka County.

7) Policy Board Activity Brief

Coordinator Maas provided an update on recent action of the Policy Board, the most recent meeting of which was on April 24, 2013. As per their request of January 23, the Data Producers Work Group/8-County Collaborative developed a 'white paper' resource and a single-page summary sheet to help focus the discussion to the core issues around Free and Open Data. Dakota County GIS Manager and Data Producers Work Group Chair Randy Knippel provided an excellent presentation and facilitated the discussion of what Free and Open Data could mean in terms of benefit to county governments. The key issue remaining to be fully explored is that of liability of counties for making data public. The meeting

was well attended with the full discussion documented in the Policy Board meeting minutes available on metrogis.org under the Policy Board section. Next meeting of the Policy Board is scheduled for July 24, 2013, the focus of which will be the liability issue.

8) Action Items:

8a) Reapportionment $11,000 from the Centerlines Initiative to the Address Points Editor Project
Coordinator Maas suggested the re-apportionment of $11,000 originally targeted for the Statewide Centerlines Initiative for the Address Points Editor and Dataset Initiative. The Centerlines Initiative remains in progress, however, the $11,000 earmarked would not meet the existing project need for vendor services from MetroGIS' perspective. Mark Kotz provided background on why this was a suitable transfer of budget funds citing the current momentum and activity of the Address Points Project is favorable and the enhanced ability for the Metropolitan Council to secure a sole-source contract with the vendor who provided version 1.0 of the tool.

Motion to re-apportion the $11,000 to the Address Points Project;
Motion: Knippel, Second: Henry; Motion carried.

9) MetroGIS Project Updates

9a) New MetroGIS Website Update
Coordinator Maas, project lead, indicated to the group that the procurement process has begun through the Metropolitan Council, the scope of work is nearly ready and the content for the new site remains in assembly. Maas' vision for the new site is 'less is more', simplicity and emphasis on intuitive interface and attractive design and graphics.

9b) Statewide Centerline Initiative Update
Ross, Koukol and Maas updated the group on the current status and progress of the Initiative, including the pilot partners kick-off in Baxter, Minnesota (May 13), the input from pilot participants. Maas indicated the need for a clear project plan and charter language and that will be in development shortly.

9c) Geospatial Commons Update
Ross provided an update on the project. The majority of the focus is on the back-end at the moment, including the configuration of the CKAN portal tool.

Read: When will we begin to see some deliverables on the Commons?

Ross: Hopefully by fall (2013), we are ensuring the back-end is up first; we will show it when we have it ready. The GDRS will be a key piece of the backbone with this as well; other nodes to put their data in, local governments will be asked if this is a worthwhile means for them to distribute their data as well. Right now we are letting the techs do their work.

Kotz: We have collected a wealth of user stories that govern the needs to be served by the resource.

Read: Some folks around the table are setting up portals as well. We'd like to be informed and in the loop as well. We've got an interest and a stake in how it is being built.

Ross: We understand that. We certainly want to work toward what the best method of communication is. We're early in the process and really involved in the technical end right now and things are still being shaped.

9d) Collaborative Tool Deployment
Maas indicated that if the Metropolitan Council would provide a collaborative tool, it would have to be eShare though SharePoint as per Council rules; this resource is already in existence but not presently in use (no immediate need at the moment for MetroGIS purposes or initiatives).

Each member of the Policy Board and Coordinating Committee has access to the resource (contact Paul Peterson, Metropolitan Council Project Manager for log in and password: (paul.peterson@metc.state.mn.us)

MetroGIS projects are presently making use of other agencies collaborative sites: Dakota County is providing a SharePoint site for the Data Producers Work Group/8-County Collaborative and MnGeo is providing this resource for the Centerlines Imitative. This model of the sponsoring agency providing resources for collaboration may be a solution moving forward.

9e) Address Point Editor Tools and Dataset
Kotz indicated that V1.0 of the Editing tool is complete and in production use in Dakota County and being evaluated in other metro counties as well. The Scope of Work for V2.0 is finalized. The project is scheduled to being in late June with completion by late fall.

9f) Leadership Succession and Operational Procedures
Maas informed the group that the draft revisions are complete with reviews (*gratefully*) provided by Gelbmann (retired), Kotz and Brandt. Document is on offer to Coordinating Committee to review at their pleasure.

Next steps: Recommended changes will be advanced to the Policy Board for review and potential approval at the July 24, 2013 meeting;

9g) Metro Stormsewer Dataset Project Investigation
Maas provided an update on his on-going work in investigating the 'ripeness' of developing a metro regional stormsewer dataset; there is significant interest from many different stakeholders and sectors on the issue, many recent discussions at the legislative level and interest from willing partners such as ESRI, the Science Museum of Minnesota and the University of Minnesota in contributing to the understanding and development of it. Maas indicated that the Metropolitan Council is positioned to be potentially a lead/champion organization for the initiative. This presents an opportunity for the geospatial community to get out ahead of the stormwater issue and assist other sectors with their work.

Maloney: Anything that would make our reporting easier would be welcome and helpful; it is staggering to deal with the many over-lapping interests and agencies that have to deal with water, and specifically the stormwater issue.

Maas: I will be presenting the concept to a variety of audiences in the coming weeks and months to raise awareness and gather additional concerns, comments and ideas.

10) Discussion and Administrative Updates

10a) SF1298/HF1390: Legislative Update

Ross provided an update on the recent legislation (which goes into effect on August 1, 2013); he articulated there were aspects of the originally proposed in the language that would have helped facilitate more data out to the public, but were left out of the final language, these include:

> ***Proposed:***
> *'Non-governmental requestor shall be directed to the original authoritative source for data received pursuant to this subdivision' (This statement was removed from the final language)*
>
> ***Proposed:***
> *'Government entities and agencies sharing and receiving electronic geospatial data under this subdivision are immune from civil liability arising out of any use of the shared electronic geospatial data by government entities and non-government entities, including specifically the public. This subdivision does not authorize the release of data that are not public data or any data purchased from a vendor that is classified as trade secret or copyrighted as part of a written licenses agreement.'*
>
> ***Final language as it appeared in the legislation:***
> *'Government entities and agencies sharing and receiving electronic geospatial data under this subdivision are immune from civil liability arising out of the use of shared electronic geospatial data. This subdivision does not authorize the release of data that are not public data.'*

Ross asked the group where we need to go next with this language and what is needed. He recommended that members take it back to their agencies and governments and ask them if they are comfortable with it. If revisions are needed or need to be developed, they need to occur ***this summer***, as they need to be proposed in October for the next legislative session.

Ross proposed starting a Data Sharing Work Group to further develop the idea and assess the need for more language and to understand how we actually share the data. We should be focused on "avoiding the spider web" of continual incremental cross-jurisdictional sharing and proliferation of derivative datasets (referred to Maas' diagram of stormsewer data producers and consumers reference in 9g above.

Ross indicated he will be meeting with the Association of Minnesota Counties soon and is willing to help Local Government units facilitate the discussion as well; open to and looking for ideas on how to do this.

Knippel: Do you think that the 'must' language could be interpreted as a barrier; that the state cannot do cost sharing with a county?

Ross: No; intent was not one of 'force', it was intended in the spirit of collaboration.

Knippel: Could the state pay the cost differential if it wanted to, in other words, pay money voluntarily to facilitate data transfer?

Ross: Certainly, there is nothing that prevents that.

Maloney: Is there a consistent interpretation of what 'government entity' means?

Ross: This is defined in state statute. The bottom line is, if data is generated by the government, it must be shared among governments;

Kotz: However, there is a distinction between '*government-created/owned'* and '*government-leased data'* (such as the NCompass road dataset); we have a contract to use/lease this data, but we (Metropolitan Council and contract-obligated users) do not own the data.

Ross: Also, pictometry is considered trade secret data, cannot be shared, this has already gone to the Supreme Court; we have a clear idea of what public data is; it is already well defined in state statute; the new language does not affect any of the rules in Chapter 13 of the statutes. The heart of this topic as we've discussed is that information created with taxpayer dollars should be available; government-to-government sharing should be without barriers or impediments. Data that is public created and sensitive or not-for-public release is defined in statute. Some legislators asked why just geospatial data and not all data? I indicated to them that because the strong sense of volunteerism in the geospatial community, we can be an example to the rest of the state.

Group Discussion: Can this be dealt with in the context of a Common License Agreement?

Ross: We do need to develop a Common License Agreement we can work with and use, it is in the attorney's hands right now; the attorneys need to sit down with a diverse/broader group of folks (beginning with Ramsey and Hennepin counties)

Likely we need three agreements:

(i) one for open and public data;
(ii) one for data that has significant commercial value and;
(iii) one for public data that is not intended for public consumption (data that is shared based on need; is public, but protected)

Now that we have legislation behind it, it will simply help us share data better.

10b) Free and Open Data Discussion

Knippel took the group through the presentation he gave to the Policy Board on April 24.
The presentation slides are available here:
Data Policy Presentation (**http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/13_04_24/index.shtml**)

Key aspects of the presentation included how we arrived at the current state of affairs *(Chapter 13.03 Access to government data; Sub.3 (d) providing the initial impetus to charge for data),* and a need to revise laws which are outdated to stay current with present technological practices. Knippel worked the group through the changes in technology, declining cost of GIS deployment, increasing computational power and number of users of the technology.

In the discussion of the Policy Board on April 24, the last remaining key issues are that of avoiding potential litigation (intentional torts) against data producers and the liability aspect.

Henry: So based on this, what is the objective? Do we need categories for deciding what is sensitive and what isn't?

Knippel: No, what we are working toward is a draft resolution that a local government could adopt, counties or cities could take it back to their governing bodies to modify if needed and adopt.

Ross: Sample disclaimer language and cite the laws that already exist to protect Local Governments; we don't want to administer a license, want to have the legal disclaimer language in place.

Group Discussion/Wrap Up/Clarification on the key points of the prior discussion;

Maas: At the next Policy Board meeting (July 24), liability will be the central topic of discussion, the Data Producers Work Group will share the materials we prepare for that meeting with everyone.

11) Next Meeting

The Coordinating Committee is scheduled to meet again on **Thursday, September 19, 2013, 1 PM.**

12) Adjournment

Chair Bitner adjourned the meeting @ 3:36 PM