Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Meeting Minutes

September 28, 2016

Blazing Star Room, Ground Floor, Centennial Office Building

658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155

11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Attendees

Members Present: Ryan Anderson, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe; Brad Anderson, City of Moorhead; Rob Bigelow, Bolton & Menk, Inc.; Andra Bontrager, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy; David Brandt, Washington County; Scott Freburg, MN.IT @ Dept. of Education; Blaine Hackett, RESPEC; Andrew King-Scribbins, Hennepin County; Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council; John Mackiewicz, WSB & Associates; Philipp Nagel, City of Waseca; Ben Richason, St. Cloud State University; Cory Richter, City of Blaine; Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County; Dan Ross, MnGeo; Gerry Sjerven, Minnesota Power; Alison Slaats, MN.IT @ Agriculture and Board of Animal Health; Michelle Trager, Rice County; Danielle Walchuk, Region Nine Development Commission.

Members Absent: Jeffrey Bloomquist, Farm Services Agency; Kari Geurts, MN.IT @ Natural Resources; Len Kne, University of Minnesota; Annette Theroux, Pro-West & Associates.

Non-Members Present: Mike Dolbow, MnGeo; Brad Henry, University of Minnesota; Mike Koutnik, Esri; Geoff Maas, MetroGIS; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Ron Wencl, U.S. Geological Survey; Eddie Anderson, Hennepin County; Sean Vaughn, MN.IT @ Natural Resources; Sally Wakefield, MnGeo.

Meeting slides are online.

Call to order (Chair) and Introductions

Kotz called the meeting to order and asked for introductions. The group provided introductions. Kotz congratulated Maas and Trager on being recent recipients of GIS/LIS Polaris Awards.

1. Approval of agenda
    a. Kotz asked for agenda review and approval. No changes proposed.
2. Approval of meeting minutes from 6/1/2016
    a. Kotz called for changes. None proposed.

Review and accept committee and workgroup summaries (All)

Kotz noted two committee reports came in, and some committees were excused from reporting. Ross noted that the EPC is working on their work plan. Kotz noted that Rader is working on sunsetting the metadata workgroup.

Future of LiDAR/Hydro panel at conference (Sjerven & Ross)

Sjerven noted that after the last meeting, he thought we needed a presentation about this at the conference. He collaborated with others to create a panel for the conference and discuss directions for the future. The schedule for the panel was relayed on the slides. Sjerven plans to moderate, bringing together leaders of past committees. Vaughn, Wencl, and two other speakers are planned. Sjerven asked the Council to identify where we take this from here on out. If there is a future working group, who should lead it, who should be on it? He noted that he is willing to bring interested parties together to listen to different perspectives, find common ground, and how we bring recommendations back to the GAC. He wants to know what kind of feedback to collect.

Vaughn noted that in the past we had a Hydro committee that kind of fizzled out. We had a digital elevation committee that brought LiDAR to MN. Beneath that there was a LiDAR research and education subcommittee, but when the parent committee fizzled, that left some "dangling" efforts. Now, we need to deal with future collections, and also how hydrography in the future will best be developed from LiDAR data. So we need to merge interests into a new committee. There's enough people in each of the two camps to form a new committee.

Ross added that we have six counties that need to be updated for digital elevation, and we have some organizations going out on their own to do collections. We need to define what the next collect looks like, and how we fund it. Brad Anderson noted a new collect will come for the Moorhead area. Wencl noted there's an LCCMR project in progress[1], and reminded that not all LiDAR is the same – think of it like imagery, you need to keep it updated for various purposes.

Brandt noted that we have users for the end information, like solar capacity. Energy folks are really interested in updated data. At last week's emergency manager's meeting, he sat in on a presentation using LiDAR data to model landslides. So there's bigger interests out there than before, and it's hard to believe we can't generate enough support to fund it.

Vaughn noted there's plenty of support in the technical realm, but we need to educate the decision makers who have the power to fund it on the usefulness. Those folks often note that it's not a priority for their constituents. He noted that in emergency response efforts, particularly on floods, we can use the data to predict flood inundation.

Rader asked if the hydroconditioning step could be expanded on due to its importance, and Vaughn agreed, noted that LiDAR is a reflection of the surface. Every place we have subsurface flow such as culverts, those are "digital dams" where water won't flow through the model. "Fixing" that often changes the route of the water in the model, changing analysis. It's critical to educate people about this issue, that we also needs funds to do hydroconditioning to make the data do what we need it to do. The expense is in the millions.

Ross and Sjerven noted that there are 30 minutes dedicated to this presentation at the conference. Folks on former mailing lists have been notified about the presentation. Sjerven wants to know if people want to be involved, who wants to be actively involved from the GAC, and who we haven't talked to before that we should involve. Some of the problems we've had in the past are getting a bit lost with disconnected efforts.

Koutnik asked when the panel will be, and Sjerven replied it will be 8:30 am on Friday.

---

[1] [Development of Innovative Cost-Saving Methodology for Forest Inventory](#)

Vaughn asked how we actually choose people for participation, given the broad interest, and make sure people know that they need approval from their supervisor and manager to spend time on the committee. If we get 65 people volunteering, what do we do? How many of those people can really commit and actually move goals forward.

Sjerven said he thought we could identify those things via a group charter, and at this point we want to cast a wide net and hear from as many people as possible. Vaughn agreed that would be a good vehicle. Bontrager asked if the conference was the initial outlet, and Sjerven noted it would serve as a "kickoff", merely to gage the interest – not actually hold a meeting per se. We would try to then meet in mid-November or December for a conference call for further discussions. He didn't think we'd have a formalized committee until early 2017.

Vaughn noted that we held a meeting already to scope out needs last November, so we have a foundation of a formerly tight-knit group, and we definitely need to reach out to a broader spectrum of stakeholders. Susanne Maeder prepared an e-mail list of all former relevant committees that is useful to "kickoff" the effort.

Kotz noted that he feels this is an important topic and thanked folks for their involvement.

GIS/LIS Consortium conference update (Sjerven)

Sjerven noted the conference will be October 26-28 in Duluth. Keynote speakers are in place, Ryan Stovern has done a great job chairing the effort. Details on the speakers were on the slides.

Important dates:

- 10.7: end of early registration. Presenters only get the double discount if they meet that deadline.
- 10.26 is educator day. Freburg noted we have 53 teachers signed up so far, 44 are teachers, and others are technical coordinators. Many of them are new, from school districts he hasn't talked to before. There is a teacher from Duluth who will be the speaker, along with the winner of the spring's student mapping competition. He asked for volunteers to help during that day if anyone is interested. Sjerven noted that day will coincide with the workshops.
- 10.28 is the fun run – registration for that closes this week. Send a note to Geoff Maas if you need to register before your conference funding is complete.

We'll be back at a Grandma's location for entertainment, and a beer tasting, along with food at each event.

The Blue Heron research vessel has been secured for tours on Wednesday and Thursday afternoon for those that are interested. The Esri Hands-on Learning Lab will also be back.

Workshops and select sessions were detailed on the slides. Ross noted that the data sharing panel will have seven individuals on it to provide an update of where we are at, and where we can go. We're looking to turn a corner on filling holes like in some of our cities as well as other areas.

Open data effort & survey update - Outreach Committee (Kne & Geurts)

Kotz noted that both Kne and Geurts are unable to attend, asking Maas for an update. Maas noted that the GAC activated an Outreach Committee earlier in the year, and a robust survey was put together over the summer to ask county governments a variety of questions about open data and their positions on open data. The committee is reviewing the data right now. As of 2 weeks ago, we have 55 responses. When Kne is back from his break, we expect to have final results. The intention is to present these findings at the conference this fall. There will be a

similar panel at the IT Symposium, and we asked to present to the Association of MN Counties. We were turned down, but perhaps next year we'll have better luck.

Reinhardt noted that the national association of counties conference had Jack Dangermond as a speaker, and she saw a positive response from other county commissioners.

Maas said that there are pretty consistent themes of the kinds of requests being asked of counties – parcels, centerlines, address points, and imagery. A final report will be published when completed.

Break

Sector reports (Mackiewicz & Walchuk)

Mackiewicz reported (details on slides) that WSB occupies a unique space in that 90% of their clients are government clients, so he feels strongly that he also represents many government interests. They see much utility from the Minnesota Geospatial Commons, especially downloadable data. That's not always the answer he wants to hear, but it happens a lot at WSB. He sees hours and hours of updating parcel datasets and aerial photography, because data quality, user experience, and cartography is key to their application development. If staff can't see a map service the way they want it, or if it's not updated frequently enough, that's when they download and update things. He'd rather see his staff developing new tools instead of manipulating data.

He would like to see frequent parcel data updates, and frequent aerial photography updates. They are working with Maas to create a new tile caching scheme for photography, for example.

Mackiewicz noted that LiDAR was a big surprise recently for him; he expected engineers to say that it wasn't good enough or recent enough to be usable, and he was wrong. It's used on a daily basis by engineers working on DOT projects, county projects, etc. The question he's getting now is how to get it more frequently updated. WSB can be a voice from the private sector for the business need. The same applies to aerial photography – newer, better, faster, more recent.

Activities at the GAC provide more opportunities for WSB. The public sector investments are being multiplied at the private sector level. He promotes the activities of the GAC, for example surveys – WSB makes sure that clients know about surveys and are engaging on providing input on business needs. He serves as a sounding board to clients who are interested in how surveys affect them. For example, local government agencies have a lot of storm sewer data that they are holding on to which would have big benefits if we rolled them up to aggregated versions. They usually want to cooperate, but often they are much more focused on their internal needs at the outset much before they consider outside needs.

Mackiewicz noted that they hold user group meetings with current and potential clients for larger trends in the GIS community.

Ross commented that he'd like Mackiewicz to attend the data sharing panel at the conference so that people hear from private sector folks about how important data sharing is. Mackiewicz responded that he will try to get someone to attend.

Koutnik noted that he also appreciated the desire to use services more frequently than downloaded data, and how they can do things like reduce data storage problems and incorporate updates. In the past, service-oriented architecture was limited by bandwidth, but now we can even do analytics online against these services. Mackiewicz

said a lot of their internal efforts are working with their CAD folks, as the tools are there for them to use services like GIS folks have been able to do for a long time. Ross noted that he will have slides later in the meeting about how we've moved past technology and data as the problem.

Kotz added that early on in MetroGIS history there were concerns about private sector usage of data, but now many stakeholders see that as a huge benefit. Not everyone is on that page, so there's still an important story to tell, especially beyond the traditional GIS community. If the Outreach Committee wanted to do some storytelling, perhaps showing how one data sharing effort can benefit many different sectors would be powerful.

Walchuk noted that a handout was delivered by e-mail. She represents non-metropolitan regional government organizations (RDOs). They were established by law to provide technical assistance to counties. Their assistance is a wide range of services, including GIS. Each RDO provides unique services to their members. The typical GIS services are in planning projects, especially if local GIS staff need more capacity. They benefit from exchange of information, which she shares with her members when it is relayed via the GAC. They act as a regional connector by passing questions from locals to state/federal, and vice-versa. Their strategy for communicating with the sector is primarily through a statewide RDO conference. They have a large assortment of local members, so communication with an RDO is often a very efficient way to work with locals.

Koutnik asked what the GIS capacity was among RDOs, and Walchuk noted that 4 have capacity: Region 9, SRDC, Upper Minnesota RDC, and ARDC. Ross noted that we probably don't communicate with the RDOs enough.

Engaging and coordinating with regional user groups (Kotz)

Kotz noted that he brought the idea of engaging and coordinating with regional user groups to the GAC leadership team recently. The GAC represents the whole state, and we're tied in closely with some constituent groups, but maybe not as many as we'd like. We know there are regional user groups; to what degree do we want to engage with them more deliberately, and what do we offer them? (Potential ideas were on the slides.) Kotz asked for additional discussion, noting that in some areas user groups are highly focused on technical, but there are also many folks who would still have input for the GAC. Perhaps RDOs are another way to engage.

Ryan Anderson replied that a new user group in Bemidji has recently started. There are a lot of professionals who use GIS now, but don't hear about what's going on at the GAC. He wondered how that interaction could best be facilitated, but he agreed it was important.

Ross noted that a few years ago we considered adding a member from each user group to the Council, but we decided that probably wasn't needed, since there's already a lot of representation from regional groups from existing GAC members. Kotz asked the group who were members of regional user groups, and most members raised their hands.

Koutnik noted that in addition to geographic user groups, there are also domain user groups, such as ones related to forestry and utilities. Sometimes those are more energized than groups based on localities.

Nagel noted that Trager usually provides an overview to the SE regional group, and south central MN had a recent kickoff user group meeting. Perhaps an informal survey of regular user group attendance would reveal if we have all of them covered or not. Even a five minute presentation could be a starting point.

Vaughn noted that building momentum comes from sharing a message with user groups. When we talk about foundational data, we need to get better about educating decision makers who have access to funding. We can get

together with our colleagues and talk about a need, yes, but how do we get these folks to bring that same message to decision makers to get them to assist with funding.

Sjerven noted that the old Governor's Council used to do a meeting once a year outside the metro. He knows that in his area such a meeting was really looked forward to, as it was a chance to show what was being done locally. He wasn't sure if it was worth doing that again or not. Do we do one a year in another location, or do we add a fifth meeting, since we already have full agendas for the GAC and it might be hard to do a longer combined meeting. Also, who do we invite to attend? Otherwise often our only chance to see folks is at the conference.

King-Scribbins wondered if that could be another function of the Outreach Committee: travelling around and bringing messages to user groups. Sjerven said that would likely be good, but sometimes messages get mixed up in communications when it's separate meetings. Plus, the networking opportunity during carpooling to non-metro meetings presented another benefit.

Koutnik noted that what this comes down to is relationship-building. It's not just an event or communication, it's building a community. Because that's the kind of effort that gets us to decision makers. Also, we tend to think of the data as the goal, but decision makers don't think that way – we need to form stories about how the data can help solve problems. Often times for a foundational data set, it only takes one compelling use case to get someone on board. Even just a list of compelling, consistent value propositions can be useful.

Kotz noted that he was going to reach out to each of the individual user groups to at least make an initial contact to introduce the GAC and solicit input. He asked if Council members were also members of the user groups, they could consider delivering a short report on the GAC to those user groups. And it doesn't have to be regional groups, it can also be topical groups.

Koutnik asked if there was a catalog of such groups, and Kotz replied that the list is available on the MN GIS/LIS website. Bontrager noted that in-person meetings are valuable, but one potentially missing piece here is an online forum for posting and sharing information. Ross replied that he has asked MN.IT Communications for access to GovDelivery, and we hope that it will be provided. That has some potential.

Kotz noted that the Consortium's LinkedIn site had some potential. Sjerven said they've looked at things like listservs in the past, and it becomes an issue of moderating content. Actually having volunteers or staff to monitor those things is important. The Consortium feels that there are other mechanisms to do that so far. Ross said it was worth some more thought at least.

King-Scribbins noted that just meeting notices being posted would be useful. Sjerven noted that within the Consortium site, you could join a group. They could make a "GAC user group", for example. Then if anyone sent a message to a shared e-mail, then everyone in that group would get the e-mail, and the notifications would be tracked on a page. So, the Consortium has some of those capabilities. But there's some uncertainty on what the precise platform should be. The Board is interested in supporting something if they can.

Koutnik said it's great to have a platform, but having a purpose for the platform is key. Sjerven agreed, noting that folks who use GIS everyday might be interested, but these decision makers we're talking about are not going to become Consortium members.

Hackett noted that they were at the south central user group last week, and a lot of projects shown used foundational layers like LiDAR. And sometimes there are decision makers at those meetings, but now we have to

get those folks to realize that many of those layers come from statewide investments. Ross said it sounds like we need to think about more communication mechanisms.

Kotz asked if anyone would be willing to be a liaison of the GAC to a user group. He noted that Brandt already does that for MetroGIS. Slaats noted that the "GAC Yak" is a newsletter that she and Geurts put together to share with state agency colleagues. They've done one to see if it's effective and got good feedback. She doesn't mind continuing to do that, but maybe someone could make PowerPoint presentations out of each meeting to share.

Sjerven committed to be a liaison to the northern user group. Bontrager noted she's trying to re-start a nonprofit user group. Trager for southeast. Nagel for south central. King-Scribbins for Hennepin County (and beyond). Ryan Anderson for northwest/north central. Brad Anderson and Bigelow for Pine to Prairie.

King-Scribbins asked if there was a southwest group, and Ross noted he wasn't sure how active they were.

Reinhardt asked for clarification of duties, and how she would be comfortable sharing something like the GAC Yak with the Ramsey County user group, but wasn't sure about beyond that. Kotz noted that Ramsey County folks get messages through MetroGIS as well, but Association of MN Counties would be a ripe audience. Reinhardt noted that they probably aren't the right audience.

Parcel data standard update (Maas)

Maas conveyed information on the Standards Committee, which he now chairs. They convened in August, and they have a draft parcel data transfer standard in the works. Next week it will be published for a 90-day review and public comment period. There will be a sample dataset, a geodatabase template file, and a really easy means for folks to provide input. This standard has an origin from the MetroGIS parcel standard, with some changes. This is a joint effort of the Standards Committee and the Parcels and Land Records Committee.

The Standards Committee is working on a new charter, including details on things like a more inclusive review process. They have a list of about 430 recipients of folks to look at the parcel standard, and hope that effort will be a good demonstration of new procedures for the Standards Committee.

Ross noted that MnGeo has done an assessment of local sources and how they match the standard. MnGeo and DNR are moving ahead toward aggregating all available local sources towards the draft standard.

Kotz noted that once the standard is approved MetroGIS will look at migrating to that standard for their domain. He noted that it's excellent to see this moving forward. He also noted that MetroGIS has a set of specifications for address points, and they now have 5 counties producing data in that specification. They are working with MnGeo's Adam Iten on revising their specifications to meet the needs of the 911 community, and once that's done, such specifications will likely be good to propose as a standard. Ross noted that a draft road centerline standard is also being worked on.

Maas replied that the metro partners are working on that, and it meets a lot of use cases including 911, with some 60 attributes. They are hoping for a mid-November public release for review. They'll be seeking informal input at that point on the specification. The metro counties have made a lot of effort towards a robust spec and are seeking input.

Recognizing accomplishments and setting goals for the year (Kotz)

Kotz asked to what degree we want to report our accomplishments for the GAC. However, most of the real "heavy lifting" is done by the committees. So, his current thought is that each year we create a report for the GAC, including committee accomplishments and goals for the future. If we have a work plan from each committee, we can ask what was fulfilled and use that. He'd like to transition to using a calendar year for reporting instead of the state fiscal year.

For specifics, at the December meeting, we could ask committees to submit accomplishments and goals, and then sum those for the full GAC. The agenda packet has examples of accomplishments we could report on and goals we could put forward. One example he'd like discussion on is our charge of recommending priorities to MnGeo. Perhaps just once a year, we could take MnGeo's current projects plus any additional ideas, and prioritize those from member and constituency perspectives. In MetroGIS, they ask members to identify to what degree folks have an identified business need for each idea. That means that members can really gather around something and put time and effort into it. They also identify if a committed leader exists, if funding is available, etc. Those items are good indicators of success. Kotz would be happy to propose a method on such an exercise. He called for comments on those ideas.

Slaats said she supported the ideas. Ross noted that the Governor's Council used to have an annual report. Kotz noted that such a report can be very simple and link to other resources. Ross noted it will help with recruitment. Freburg said it could be shared with user groups.

Ross expressed support for GAC prioritization of MnGeo projects. Bontrager asked for more detail. Kotz relayed that the GAC doesn't have authority to tell MnGeo precisely what to do, but the GAC is charged with making recommendations on what MnGeo does – which is a great opportunity. So, if we find out what the business needs are of our constituents, we can advise MnGeo on those priorities. It's our responsibility to convey that message to MnGeo. MnGeo is free to propose projects and pursue those they think are important, but until they hear from a representative group, it's hard to validate their ideas for priorities. If there's an important need but no funding, we can make a note of such an item.

Ross noted that a good example is the Geospatial Commons. When we listened to the community, they said it was a priority, and state agencies found a way to help fund it and create it. Brandt noted that it was also a priority for MetroGIS, who also contributed.

Koutnik said such an idea could be an organizing principle for this council. It could be a work item for each of those regional user group liaisons as well. Kotz noted that to the extent we can identify the value, we can find the funding. Richason asked what the time frame would be, and Kotz said it would be one of our meetings. In MetroGIS, they create an annual work plan, which can be changed on a vote.

Ross noted that he'd like to see that at the end of the calendar year, because it takes us months to plan. Kotz said he will propose a process to run by the leadership team and see if we can make that happen for December. Vaughn asked if there is a mechanism for gathering such input from GIS professionals in agencies that are not part of MN.IT. Ross noted that Geurts and Slaats are spearheading an effort internally to state agencies to gather such input. He agreed that MN.IT has changed the game a little bit, but two-thirds of MnGeo's funding has always been contracting efforts and still is, so state agency priorities often drive our projects anyway.

Wakefield noted that as GIS professionals we can identify a set of technical priorities, but how do we align those with business priorities? Ross said we need to let agency business needs drive that. Vaughn said that agency businesses don't always know what those needs are. Ross said that Slaats and Geurts' effort is open to all state agency stakeholders and users. Slaats said that GIS professionals need to be able to listen to those needs and translate them into technology solutions that help meet those needs. Bontrager said that the crux of it is often illustrating the return on investment, and quantifying how the technology leverages an investment.

Reinhardt noted that in Jack Dangermond's presentation at a national county conference, return on investment was a focus. One of the things she took back to her county and AMC was that you can't expect maps and other products of GIS to just be there without an investment. Many of the state supports for GIS came about by telling those kinds of stories. It's not always obvious to decision makers what the case studies demonstrate.

Koutnik noted that Dangermond's talk has been posted and he's willing to share a link to view it.

Brandt noted that prioritization has helped at his county – when they see priorities set by a larger stakeholder community, he can bring that back to his colleagues because often they are already working on such data efforts, but considering the outside need can shift or enhance the efforts. Ross noted that it doesn't just relate to projects. For example, members previously said that they merely needed a purchasing program for aerial imagery, which we met.

Legislative update (Ross)

Ross presented details in a slide. For example, for projects funded with money from the Clean Water Fund, we're asking that data, not just metadata, be provided to MnGeo to be made available online through the Minnesota Geospatial Commons (unless made private under Chapter 13). Reinhardt asked if it was only for clean water funding, and Ross noted that it was. Reinhardt noted that counties previously had pushback for the last data sharing change legislation. This may seem like a small change in the language, but some counties might struggle with this, especially if the proposal is a surprise. Ross clarified that it only applies if data is collected via clean water funding (usually through grants). Reinhardt still noted that it would be good to run this through AMC.

Vaughn noted that the proposed change came about because of how much duplication of data is happening. We can't control that until we implement standards, and then tie standards to funding. Now, local government units are hungry for something to fall back on, to be able to say that data will go back to state agencies for usage by wider users. Reinhardt noted that if we have support from the counties, that legislation can come through the AMC platform, which can be powerful.

Ross noted there are two parks and trails projects for MnGeo this year: a data standard for parks and trails, and a website for tracking funding and planning out of the Legacy Fund; and a responsive website for parks and trails of regional significance.

Ross relayed notes from Tim Loesch on the buffer mapping project, which has moved from the data development stage to the implementation stage. The DNR is taking comments from registered users (county and SWCD staff for the most part) and considering them for updates. Two planned updates to that map are scheduled for early November and late January. Those updates will be available on the Geospatial Commons.

MnGeo priority projects and initiatives

Ross noted that NG911 is still our largest project. Details were in the slide. Ross thanked counties and PSAPs for sharing their data, which we're evaluating and validating. He noted that standards are not being developed in a vacuum.

Ross noted that the Geospatial Commons will get a bit of a refresh in coming months for the newest branding efforts happening for state agencies. He added that the master contract for aerial imagery is being used, most recently with a 2016 metro collection. Additional projects on drainage records modernization and an application for the State Archeologist are also in MnGeo's work plan.

Ross noted that we've received parcel data from just about every county, which is a major step forward from past efforts. He thanked Wakefield and MnGeo staff for collecting the data, state agencies like BWSR for cooperating, and counties for providing data. On the slides were maps that show where we have collected data, and how each county matches up against the proposed standard.

Ross added that road centerline and address point efforts are continuing. Koutnik asked about placement of addresses, and Ross said that structure has been recommended by standards, but access point and driveway entrance is not determined. Rader and Kotz noted that there is an attribute in the proposed standard for saying how the point was placed. Kotz added that the Census Bureau is proposing changes to the FGDC proposed standard.

Announcements or other business

Richason noted that there is a big push within the MnSCU system to be more coordinated in terms of things like transfer standards, and they are trying to develop "2+2" programs for GIS certification and similar degrees.

Freburg noted that he was happy to sit on the GIS/LIS Board and see a consolidation of an education investment fund, which covers K-secondary efforts. There will be an education budget each year approved by the Board, and he is excited to be able to provide more resources towards those efforts.

Trager noted that there is a southeast user group meeting next week in Rochester.

Slaats echoed a thanks to counties for sharing parcel data, which gets used frequently in supporting her business customers. State employees are using the data all the time, and it's very useful to not have to seek individual contracts with counties.

Richter has been working with the Science Museum of MN for a GIS-themed day on November 19th. They will have interesting demonstrations such as drone racing and an application programmer teaching kids how to make GIS applications. They are looking for more ideas of things to pursue, and expecting about 1,000 visitors. The event is listed on the [museum website](#).

Reinhardt said Ramsey County will have a workshop on their open data policies next Tuesday, and impacts on their county wide goals. As chair of the county board, she gets to chair these workshops sometimes, and while other commissioners expect her to chair this event, she would like to see others get more connected to the subject and has sought help from three other commissioners. She recommends that those who work for counties should look to their boards and volunteer to present.

Ryan Anderson noted that there is an ArcGIS online map currently out showing properties owned by Minnesota Chippewa Tribes (MCT). The MCT Trust Lands and Resources Map is embedded in the MCT website.

Hackett will be attending the Black Hills GIS conference next week.

Bontrager will talk about the nonprofit GIS sector at the conference next month. She expressed thanks to the GAC members for guidance, feedback, and advice.

Brad Anderson noted that he has previously struggled to connect with other representatives of cities, and thanked Rader for creating the city GIS contacts list, which is now up to 36 entries, which is a useful resource to him. Rader said she would send out the link and invitation letter that could be forwarded to any known city GIS contact.

Brandt said that metro counties are now tackling standardization of park, bikeway, and trail information, with Hennepin County providing project management.

Wencl noted that cooperative funding for LiDAR has a deadline fast approaching: 3DEP is the new federal elevation program. The call for funding in FY2017 (starts October 1) closes October 10th.

Adjourn