

MnGeo State Government Geospatial Advisory Council

September 26, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Participating

Members: Mike Dolbow, Agriculture; David Fawcett, Pollution Control (for Tad Schindler); Greg Fetter, Commerce; Brian Johnson, Health; Greg Klinkhammer (Employment & Economic Development); Victoria Lemberger, Human Services (for Mary Emerson); Sean Mangan, Public Safety; Dan Ross, MnGeo (Chair); Hal Watson, Natural Resources (for Tim Loesch); Paul Weinberger, Transportation.

Non-members: David Arbeit; Chris Buse, MN.IT; Chris Cialek, MnGeo; Dan Falbo, Esri; Jenel Farrell, MN.IT; Fred Logman, MnGeo; Margaret Martin, Majority Caucus Research; Carolyn Parnell, MN.IT; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Naomi Rettke, MN.IT; Miles Strain, AeroMetric.

Ross called the meeting to order. Participants introduced themselves. There were no changes to the [agenda](#). Minutes for the [May 22, 2012 meeting](#) were accepted (Fetter/Dolbow).

Esri Enterprise License Agreement Update (Cialek) ([slides](#) 3-4)

Cialek reported that the ELA negotiations are nearly done and that the contract should be signed this week. New features include an increase in EDN licenses, credits for ArcGIS Online, and SDKs, especially for mobile. The 3-year contract time period will start October 1, 2012. Billing will continue to be done annually. Agencies are being sent one bill that includes both the 3-month extension of the old contract of July-September 2012 that was paid and the one-year period beginning October 2012. In future, the ELA likely will become part of an agency's overall service level agreement (SLA) with MN.IT since SLAs can include software.

Committees and Workgroups (Ross) ([slides](#) 5-8)

MnGeo currently has [6 committees, 1 subcommittee and 3 workgroups](#). Committees: Digital Cadastral Data; Digital Elevation (with LiDAR Research and Education Subcommittee); Emergency Preparedness; Hydrography; Outreach; Standards. Workgroups: Geocoding; Geospatial Commons; Metadata.

Questions: How will they align with MnGeo's new priorities? Do they need to be active and have regular attendance and output? How high a priority is it for MnGeo to facilitate them? Are any new ones needed? Should any be sunsetted?

Member comments:

- Expectations for groups should be spelled out, including length of term for chairs, and should be the same across all committees. Chairs and members should know what they are agreeing to do.
- They should have at least a minimal schedule, agendas, and notes.
- MnGeo, or MN.IT overall, should provide some level of support since staff from other agencies are already going above and beyond their job to participate. Maybe, but is that the best use of MnGeo's resources?
- Some committees could be more proactive, e.g., Standards.
- There is a growing need for outreach of many forms. The current [Outreach Committee](#) charter focuses on just one important area of outreach: getting compelling stories about geospatial benefits to policymakers. Maybe not all the outreach needs to be handled by a committee;

other staff can monitor news and engage Outreach when it is appropriate to carry a high-impact message to that audience.

- MN.IT's "Morning Java" emails are a way to get geospatial news to IT staff.
- Examples of how GIS is used successfully also help agencies that are just beginning to use GIS.

ACTION ITEM: Ross will ensure that a process and structure for committees and workgroups is drafted and brought back to the council for further discussion.

Optimization

Parnell reviewed the highlights of Phase 4, Optimization, of the IT Consolidation process ([slides 9-19](#)). All State technical staff are now part of MN.IT Services. We are in the *business of providing IT services to our customers* rather than in the business of IT consolidation. This phase's tactical plan focuses on making the IT infrastructure super efficient so we can focus our people, money and creativity on the services that most directly make a difference for our customers and citizens. Geospatial is a model for collaboration and has a very important place in this phase, especially in the area of innovation.

A number of reports (Master Plan 2012, Strategic Plan, and IT Governance Framework) plus other planning documents are now [available online](#); all are based on the results of listening sessions with employees. The Tactical Plan will soon also be online at the same location.

Ross then discussed how the IT optimization can apply specifically to geospatial ([slides 20-28](#)). He identified five areas where opportunities seem greatest for optimization:

- Infrastructure
- Data Management
- Application Development and Management
- Guidance, Governance, and Support
- Innovation

In his meetings so far with state agency stakeholders, the biggest problem noted has been data access (finding the most appropriate data and then getting it). Other thoughts: Could support be handled by a central service desk? By listservs? Likely areas of innovation include mobile, web-editing, and using the Cloud. Input from stakeholders will drive where we go with the geospatial tactical plan. In the future, geospatial data and applications will be more shared. We are going to move toward a services-based architecture. We will need to prioritize what we at MnGeo and the broader state geospatial work on.

Member comments:

- Should the five areas Ross listed also be prioritized? Infrastructure (including the Cloud) and Data Management (including the Geospatial Commons) would seem to be top priorities.
- How do we move these five areas forward? Form a workgroup for each or prioritize first?
- Some tension exists between standard infrastructure and innovation; how do we move from an innovation to a standard way of doing things?
- Geospatial will stand alone less and less as spatial queries get integrated into other non-geospatial business applications. Vendors are touting their abilities to support "data-driven decision-making" – can we do most of this in-house? Yes, we make data available so dashboards can be built on top of them to address the needs of decision-makers. These type of applications work best with coordinated, consistent data, so we need to provide data as much that way as possible.

- Current issues include data in silos and some agencies that are hesitant to share or make their data available.

2012 Legislative Session (Buse) ([slides 29-32](#))

Buse reported on two areas of activity in the next legislative session:

Housecleaning: These are updates to language related to MnGeo's move from the Department of Administration to the Office of Enterprise Technology. The State Government Geospatial Advisory Council would be removed since its role could largely be covered between the Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council and the new Geospatial Technology Committee. Removing the 20% cap on state agency members on the Statewide council is being considered. At Parnell's direction, a fiscal note is being prepared to provide seed money for the Geospatial Commons project.

Data Practices Act: This is a revised version of proposed changes to the State's Data Practices Act that were not passed during last year's legislative session (see [handout](#) from the Statewide council's March 13 meeting) are being proposed in the MN.IT legislative package. See slide 31 for the proposed definition of electronic geospatial data (adapted from a definition used in Arizona), and slide 32 for proposed language on government sharing of electronic geospatial data.

All state agency legislative initiatives have to be presented to and approved by the governor's office.

State Geospatial Governance (Buse) ([slides 33-37](#))

The new [IT Governance Framework](#) creates seven Technology Operations Alignment committees, including a new Geospatial Technology Committee. It will be the primary governing body for decisions and policies that impact the use of geospatial technology in the executive branch.

As CGIO, Ross will chair this committee. One member will be an agency-based CIO; Robert Maki from DNR has been selected. Another member will be a financial officer; Tu Tong from MN.IT Central has been selected. The Geospatial Technical Committee will also include three members from the geospatial advisory councils. To fill the state agency business planning member positions, it's been a challenge to find business staff who really want to be involved to this degree in IT. Before November 1, Ross will determine the remaining members and convene the first meeting by November 15. This body will seek advice and input from external stakeholders, including the Statewide Council. SMEs (subject matter experts) will continue to be the primary initiators and vettors of ideas before they reach the Geospatial Technical Committee.

Member comments:

- If the State Government Council is dissolved, members who are not on the Geospatial Technical Committee will have numerous ways to continue to have input via committees and workgroups.
- May be better to keep the 20% cap on state agency staff on the Statewide Council to maintain its broad representation of Minnesota's geospatial community.
- How long will the term be for the SMEs on the GTC? Not decided yet.
- The GTC is listed as having a GIS Architect. Are there any such staff? Not yet, but they are needed.

MnGeo's Services, Projects and Priorities (Ross) ([slides 38-44](#))

Ross introduced a discussion of MnGeo's future direction, asking for advice and input from council members. Given MnGeo's limited resources, what are the top priorities for staff to focus on to better meet the needs of Minnesota's geospatial community (note that all projects involve partners)? What services are important to each member's agency?

One handout, [Stakeholder Priority Efforts](#), summarized a first-cut of the following seven draft priorities (not in any order, except that LiDAR is already ranked number 1 since it is partly done):

- Delivery of LiDAR/elevation products to the greater geospatial community
- Minnesota Geospatial Commons
- Delivery and implementation of the Statewide Parcel Integration Business Plan
- An ongoing orthophoto program for the state
- Statewide street centerlines
- Statewide addressing standards and tools
- Statewide hydrographic layer

Another handout, [MnGeo Discussion with Stakeholders](#), summarized MnGeo's current activities in the areas described as needed in its 2009 strategic plan.

Ross asked members to:

1. Provide their agency's ranking of the 6 priorities remaining after LiDAR.
2. Respond to the questions on slide 41 about MnGeo's services.

ACTION ITEM: On behalf of their agency, members will send Ross a completed priority ranking form and responses to the discussion questions about MnGeo services.

Additional member comments:

- Hard to choose among the priorities since all are valuable. Some, however, are more foundational (will support other efforts), e.g., LiDAR and the Commons.
- Ross will be at the Next Generation 9-1-1 meeting since that effort needs street centerline and other GIS data.
- The priority ranking from the Statewide Council (20 responses) was: LiDAR and Commons (1 and 2, very close); orthophotos and parcels (3 and 4, very close), followed by centerlines, addresses, and hydrography.
- Stakeholder priority ranking is only one input. Legislative directives, funding resources, and other considerations will also affect the final decisions.

MN GIS/LIS Consortium Conference (Logman)

MnGeo staff will give several presentations at the [2012 Consortium conference](#), as noted on [slide 46](#). Time was too short to poll other members on the topics of their conference presentations. Both Parnell and Ross will speak during the opening program about the IT consolidation and its impact on geospatial.

MnGeo will not have an exhibitor booth this year since it would not be sufficiently different from previous years. Next year, the booth may expand to be a state government geospatial booth that promotes the work of all state agencies.

Future Meetings

- The next scheduled Council meeting is Tuesday, November 13, 2012.

Meeting adjourned. Meeting minutes by Nancy Rader.