Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Meeting Minutes

September 5, 2018

Blazing Star Room, Ground Floor, Centennial Office Building

658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155

11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Members Present: Brad Anderson, City of Moorhead; David Bendickson, Minnesota National Guard; David Brandt, Washington County; Preston Dowell, St. Louis County; Scott Freburg, MNIT @ Dept. of Education; Kari Geurts, MNIT @ Natural Resources; Madeleine Kerr, University of Minnesota School of Nursing; Len Kne, University of Minnesota; Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council; Andra Mathews, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy; Chris Mavis, Hennepin County; Philipp Nagel, Bolton & Menk; Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County; Ben Richason, St. Cloud State University; Cory Richter, City of Blaine; Dan Ross, MnGeo; Gerry Sjerven, Minnesota Power; Ryan Stovern, St. Louis County; Benjamin Timerson, Minnesota Department of Transportation; Brandon Tourtelotte, Pro-West & Associates.

Members Absent: Scott Abel, Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians; Jeffrey Bloomquist, USDA Risk Management Agency.

Non-Members Present: Will Craig, retired; Mike Dolbow, MnGeo; Brad Henry, Minnesota 2050; Rachel Koch, Minnesota Department of Revenue; Mike Koutnik, Esri; Jim Langtry, USGS; Geoff Maas, MetroGIS; Ryan Mattke, University of Minnesota; Akiko Nakamura, Department of Public Safety; Chad Nunemacher, Houston Engineering; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Megan Sisko, MnGeo; Sean Vaughn, MN.IT @ Natural Resources; Clayton Watercott, Metropolitan Council.

References

This meeting included references to the following resources:
- Slides
- Agenda Packet

Call to order (Chair)

Kotz called the meeting to order, and attendees introduced themselves.

Kotz called for **approval of the agenda**. He asked for an addition under item 4, to be marked 4b, a letter of support for the seven metro counties. **Richter moved, Stovern seconded, and members approved the amended agenda unanimously**.

Kotz called for a **review** of the meeting minutes from **5/30/2018**. **Minutes were approved with no changes** proposed.

Review and accept committee summaries

Kotz noted that a few committees will be presenting later, and asked if there were any questions on the committee summaries. **Mavis moved, Mathews seconded accepting the summaries**. **The motion passed unanimously**.

Approve updated charter for Parcels and Land Records Committee

Kotz said that the updated charter for this committee appears to work really well and called for suggestions or changes. None were proposed. **Brandt moved, Dowell seconded to accept the updated charter**, **and the motion was passed unanimously.**

Approval of new Archiving Workgroup

Mattke summarized the workgroup's mission to define best practices and procedures for archiving geospatial data in the state. The workgroup will produce a report along with those practices and procedures. The workplan includes engaging with stakeholders and data stewards to come up with a strategy on archiving aerial imagery layers, and presenting to GIS/LIS in 2019. Additional items include streamlining or eliminating licensing agreements and coming up with an archiving strategy.

Richter asked if a city person could be included in the workgroup. Mattke said that additional individuals would be accepted into the workgroup, and **Richter offered to locate such an individual**.

Kotz said that the efforts of this workgroup will be very important to the state. We should be able to find ways to make the processes clear and not too onerous so that people are incentivized to archive data.

Vaughn asked why this was a short-term workgroup instead of a committee, and Mattke responded that the charge of the workgroup is just to define the practices and procedures. Once those are defined, the implementation will definitely be a long-term effort.

Members asked a few more clarifying questions about the workgroup schedule and Mattke relayed the answers from the workplan. Rader mentioned that a web page is already in place to support the effort.

Kotz called for **a motion to approve the workgroup's charter and workplan**, **and the motion passed unanimously.**

Request for a letter of support to counties meeting new data standards

Kotz asked for the GAC's approval to send a letter of support for the 7 metro counties to continue compiling standard datasets for the region, which helps the counties justify the effort. Maas reiterated the point, noting that such letters of support are being solicited from multiple areas. Essentially we need to acknowledge that 1) we need this data and 2) we support transitioning into the new state standard(s). Brandt added that this shows that we don't take things for granted. Reinhardt asked where the letter would be sent, and Maas replied to the IT managers, but through Randy Knippel. Reinhardt noted that there's no harm in also including the county managers and chair of the County Board. Brandt agreed that was a good idea, and that he **would take that idea back to the Metro GIS Managers meeting next week**. Reinhardt said it's important to not only say "thank you" but also that "this is important", and that it may be most effective to just send it directly to the counties.

Reinhardt **motioned that Kotz compose and send a letter**, and Dowell seconded. Brandt asked about other groups around the state. Anderson replied that folks in his area are also working on this, and Kotz agreed, saying that if other groups would like similar letters, we can consider that. Maas said that we also want to acknowledge that the

new standard is creating some work for the counties and that it's valued. Reinhardt said we could amend the motion to say that the GAC chair could write such letters for any county, without each one coming to ask. Stovern said that they are approaching the counties in the ARDC to discuss similar efforts. **The motion was amended to include any other similar collaborative efforts and passed unanimously**.

Road Centerline Data Standard Update

Maas provided an update. The public review period is finished, and the Standards Committee could not get through all the public comments in their most recent 3 hour meeting. They have some action items going forward that need to be addressed in order to respond effectively to the stakeholder community. The Committee plans a conference call on September 25th, and will convene again in October to finalize the tasks and presumably package the revisions for another public review session. Any questions can be directed to Maas or Mathews.

Adopting Previously Approved GCGI Standards

Maas noted that the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) previously approved 10 standards, and referred to the slides. Kotz said that when they originally created these standards, the contents were developed by the community, but the language around implementation focused on State government, because state agencies had a mechanism to "enforce" the standards for state government. Things have changed quite a bit since then, so it's time to reassess how we implement these standards.

Kotz outlined the requests of the Standards Committee shown on the slides. He asked for questions. Reinhardt said that it does make sense to move forward with these recommendations. **Reinhardt moved to implement the recommendations, and Stovern seconded.** Ross noted that there will still be some standards implemented separately by state government, and Rader said that we can accommodate that. Ross added that when something becomes a state government standard, it may become required by all state agencies. Otherwise he says he supports the notion of standardizing the language and posting them all in one place as best as possible.

Vaughn noted that at DNR they have a team that works on hydrography, including 3 of the standards that are related to hydrography. There is also a new 3D Geomatics Committee that has a workgroup on hydrography. He would like the GAC to recognize the roles of those workgroups and teams. Those groups are hungry for questions and answers, so this is a hot topic. It is hard to find these standards on the MnGeo and MNIT web pages, and so this effort is very important.

Reinhardt said that our effort is allowing that the standards are in two places, but setting a goal of common language in both places. There's nothing wrong with updating the MNIT site as well. If something makes sense to have the same language, then we should do that alongside the MNIT process. There's plenty of work to do, but when you can have standardized language and easy discovery, then you should do that. Reviewing and fully vetting one or two at a time would be very good. We can say "organizations and state agencies" if we need to, or just "organizations".

Vaughn asked what the difference was between a GAC standard and a "state standard", and Kotz said that we're deciding to call these MN GAC standards, and that an addition can be a "state government standard". Vaughn said it's good to allow the expertise to be within the GAC and workgroups, and then others can adopt it. So the stewardship can be with the subject matter experts, the GAC can approve it, and other organizations can adopt it as desired, including state agencies. Kotz said that the benefit to having it be the "GAC Standard", is it covers the

entire geospatial community. There is plenty of opportunity for input and comment for anyone to provide feedback.

Koutnik said he also doesn't understand whether or not the GAC has the authority to declare a "state standard" (not "state government" standard), and what that would mean. Kotz said the GAC has no authority to enforce a standard, but it develops a specification that any organization can adopt – and then enforce themselves as necessary. Vaughn added that tying funds to standards is a great way to "enforce" a standard as well as help local organizations get guidance. Kotz agreed, adding that then it's the organization with the funds that enforces the standard, not the GAC. Maas concurred, adding that the GAC is not an enforcement body, but an *advisory* body. The Standards Committee is very much wedded to a process that ensures a lot of feedback. The resulting standards are a *resource* – a way to communicate with each other. But the Committee can verify that a standard has been out for a robust review, which makes the resource more valuable.

Vaughn added that the DNR has an internal governance body that can both add expertise on content and provide enforcement within the agency. Maas said that often such internal standards are strengthened by public review. Sjerven noted that this will apply to his presentation about the 3D Geomatics Committee. There is an open question about enforcement – where is the weight behind these standards? Is there a mechanism, when we want enforcement behind a standard, to say we want organizations to comply? Kotz replied that this conversation has been going on since the inception of the Committee. The challenge is to create a standard that defines the best specification for sharing data; enforcement is not the point. But because the GAC represents the community, there's some inherent authority because other organizations have chosen to comply. For example, MetroGIS voting to comply with the newest parcel and address points standards. Oftentimes complying makes your life easier to the point where it enforces itself. Until the "carrot approach" doesn't work, we want to keep using it. Sjerven agreed but said that we really shouldn't use the word "enforcement". Kotz agreed saying that will be addressed in the new versions of the standards.

Reinhardt said that realistically, if something really needs enforcement, it would require legislative action. But that shouldn't be necessary. When the counties hear about "standards" from the state, they often think of it as a mandate. But these are different, because so many organizations, including counties, are involved in the decision making process. It's the whole community that develops them, not just "someone else" making a decision that affects others. She thought it was good that it was being discussed here.

Koutnik said that he likes the terms "stewardship", and that an entity that has a vested interest in meeting a standard is the key to compliance. Identifying that organization makes a standard so much more powerful. Mathews added that this is an important step for us to take. She added that this is an opportunity for the Committee to clarify their responsibility and the GAC's. While we have a flow chart on developing a standard, we don't have guidance on how the GAC supports development and "enforcement". How we incorporate the stakeholders in revising things is important. She asked if any standard that has known stakeholders, those folks should be notified about these changes. Maas said that the Committee is working on those mechanisms, and he agrees it should be an iterative and highly inclusive process.

Kotz reminded attendees that none of the standards are created by the Standards Committee, but instead by knowledgeable experts (often in a GAC committee). Maas agreed, saying they are the process not the product. Ross added that the process for state agencies is different than the one for the GAC. MnGeo will shepherd standards through MNIT's process in order to have state agencies adopt it.

After discussion concluded, the motion to implement the recommendations of the Standards Committee passed unanimously.

Update on GIS/LIS and NSGIC Conferences

Stovern provided an update on the GIS/LIS Conference. 301 participants are currently registered. There are 30 vendors, many of which are new. There will be a "Meet Me at the Corner" event that will be part of the conference but free and open to the public. Ross added that the NSGIC conference starts on Sunday and goes through Friday, and each day goes through 10 pm. The Wednesday evening event is open to attendees of both conferences. There will be a joint plenary session on Thursday, including a session on Minnesota. Attendees are allowed to go between sessions in the two conferences Thursday and Friday. The Thursday evening social is still under development. NSGIC is on the harbor side of the DECC and GIS/LIS is on the city side.

The draft agenda for the NSGIC conference is posted here. Kotz added that all of the GAC members are members of NSGIC, so they can register under the member rate.

3D Geomatics Committee Update and 3D Nation

Sjerven referred to the committee updates in the agenda packet and highlighted a few items. Everyone on the Committee met at the DOT Arden Hills facility in June. There were about 43 attendees and the meeting went well to organize the Committee and workgroups. They are still trying to finalize those workgroups. The Committee has grown and the scope is definitely still a challenge. Right now they are trying to get the vegetation/forestry group up and running. Some members have asked about funding opportunities for collection projects, and Sjerven and Vaughn replied that they hope to come up with a white paper with guidelines on obtaining funding. Such projects can then get endorsements from the Committee, or the GAC, and thereby potentially be able to engage with more partners for collaborative purchases. He asked if this would be an important role for this Committee.

Vaughn added that the Committee will really be defining a way for organizations to ask the questions "what do you want to do with the data?" and "how is what you're collecting different than what we already have?" They aren't defining new acquisition standards for LiDAR, because those have already been defined at the federal level. Sjerven added that they'll be presenting details about the Committee at GIS/LIS.

Vaughan noted the organizational diagram for the 3D Geomatics Committee, and noted that the hydrography and landform workgroup is the successor to the former GCGI Hydrography Committee. There is also a new subgroup defining the approach to a statewide database for digital dam breachlines. Between $4 and $7 million have already been spent to modify digital DEMs, and this effort would show how that data could be brought together in a database.

Ross referred to the slides on the 3D Nation study. There were 14 Minnesota responses to a questionnaire on this effort. Langtry said that a consultant, Dewberry, is currently going through the responses to look at what the next steps will be. USGS is looking at some workshops in November to fill in some missing information before the final report will be issued. Ross added this is just the beginning of several collaborative efforts for a better approach to 3D data in the nation. NSGIC and USGS are both involved in national efforts which can then be adopted or referenced by Minnesota to create a state plan.

Timerson asked what the 3D data collection plan was, and Ross said we hope that it'll result in another LiDAR collection in a few years. There is definitely a need to update in the Red River Valley. But we need a plan first on

how we accomplish that and how we fund it. Vaughn added that the 3D Committee's white paper will help guide that plan.

Update on NAIP and LandSAT

Ross noted that there is not too much to report on these items right now. There is a National Imagery Summit on September 20-21, which he will attend. Various perspectives from different organizations will come up, along with funding and licensing discussions. There is no more news on a possible change to a licensed model for either NAIP or LandSAT.

Sector Reports

Bendickson referred to the slides for four general topics:
1. The 24th Infantry Division out of Rosemount is deploying their headquarters, which requires work for their Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT) section.
2. He discussed the slide with a Venn diagram of the functions of Geospatial Intelligence Imagery Analysts, Geospatial Engineers, and the overlapping "GEOINT" functions.
3. In 2017, hurricanes and wildfires impacted 15% of the American population, which was more than the previous ten years combined. The impacts have forced FEMA to rethink a lot of their policies and procedures, such as reducing the complexity of their assistance programs. He added that September is the National Preparedness Month and noted the weekly themes.
4. His final slide outlined a substantial change to the National Guard's drone policy on domestic operations. The new policy will have big impacts on Search and Rescue or Incident Awareness and Assessment operations.

Mavis relayed more information about the "Meet Me at the Corner" event in October, as shown on his slide. The event is designed to introduce people to the importance of the Public Land Survey (PLS) System and what surveyors do. He encouraged members to attend in order to increase collaboration between GIS professionals and surveyors. Mathews asked what the target audience is, and Mavis said that it's any person interested. Stovern added that it's primarily an educational, introductory presentation. He added that registration and details are available on the GIS/LIS web page. Koutnik added that land trust organizations might be very much interested. Dowell added that there will be a "show and tell" with original artifacts from the PLS.

Sjerven added that he hopes this type of session will happen again at future GIS/LIS conferences and thanked the organizers. Ross added that the long term goal should be to work more closely with the surveyor community to update all of our boundary data with the new measurements in the field, which will take years. Reinhardt added that increased communications at the federal level are an indication that such collaborative efforts can succeed, and that it makes a huge difference to the public. Stovern noted that this has taken 5 years to put together.

Mavis discussed a video linked in the slides, on a virtual reality sandbox. They built one as primarily a communications tool, since it can be used to explain just about any spatial problem/concept. There will be a similar sandbox at the GIS/LIS conference, and the one commissioned by Minnesota Society of Professional Surveyors (MSPS) will be available for "check out" to use at events.

Koutnik asked if there would be discussions about coordinate system changes or transformations at the Meet Me at the Corner event. Mavis said they would like to avoid that because it's a bit too much in the weeds.

Removing Priority #9 from list

Dolbow explained that he proposed priority #9 as an alternative to #2, not as something that could be accomplished in addition to #2. They were meant to be, in essence, mutually exclusive choices. By approving a workgroup to look at governance on how we pursue priority #2, the GAC has implicitly said that #9 won't be done. As a result, he would like to at least slim the priority list to 12 items by removing #9.

Mathews noted that she often searches for historical aerial images, and that such imagery would make for a good pilot for the archiving group. She would suggest that we keep it as a low hanging fruit for an archiving project. Kotz countered that he agreed with Dolbow that it's a choice about a limited set vs. keeping everything, and that the group clearly indicated that a sustainable service was a higher priority. As a result, he thought perhaps the 9th priority would be replaced with an archiving service. Mathews said archiving indicates more than she'd willing to commit to, and that she'd be more comfortable with the priority dropping to the bottom. Koutnik suggested #2 should be called a "temporal" service. Kotz replied that we would likely keep some history, but it would be limited and not necessarily keep every addition forever.

Dolbow asked for a reading of the full #2 and #9 priorities, and Kotz complied. Dolbow clarified that removing #9 would not prevent an archiving pilot of historical imagery, because they are separate efforts. Reinhardt noted that removing a priority doesn't mean that it's not done. She thinks just because it's not a priority doesn't mean that something is going away. Kotz clarified that archiving imagery is something we definitely want to do, but by removing the #9 priority, we're saying we don't intend to include every imagery collection in the MnGeo service forever. Instead we want to be able to occasionally remove collections in order to keep that service sustainable. Reinhardt said that as a result we're working toward making those decisions, so work will still be done.

Reinhardt **moved that we remove #9 from the priority list, and Richter seconded that. The motion passed** unanimously. Reinhardt said that we need to regularly update our priorities – because the list makes it appear that things are more active than they are.

Updates on MN GAC priority projects and initiatives

Kotz called for updates on the 2018 priority list from the project owners. On priority #1, Kne reported that progress is slow, but they finished the survey of cities on barriers to free and open data. They have a session at GIS/LIS to report the results. There are not a lot of big surprises; again the barriers are mostly policy and not technology. Ross added that MnGeo has started a project to compile parcel data for free and open data counties, which they hope to complete by the end of June 2019. Dolbow added that the DOT is now publishing actively on the Geospatial Commons, with regular updates to their data resources, each of which typically has multiple data sets.

On priority #2, Dolbow reported that Matt McGuire is leading a workgroup to define a process on making decisions for "retiring" imagery collections from MnGeo's service in order to sustain it.

On priority #3, Mathews reported that the address points standard got another quick review over the summer, so there may be some very small tweaks to that standard. Brandt added that the metro counties all agreed to use the new state standard, and that the 7 county aggregate is now on the Geospatial Commons in the new state standard.

Ross added that NG911's grant program is helping outstate counties build address point data sets. There are still challenges where cities and counties aren't working together to aggregate data. There are still some hurdles to cross when it comes to sharing data developed for NG911 purposes. Kotz added that Maas is working with the

MESB to get an official approval from the Minnesota Data Practices Office on whether or not the MESB can share such data.

On priority #4, Kotz referred to Maas's previous update. The metro road centerline dataset is published using a MetroGIS standard until a GAC standard is approved. Ross reported that MnGeo has some kind of addressable road centerline from all counties, but they aren't standardized and there remains work on matching community names and road centerlines.

On priority #5, Dolbow reported that details on the HTTPS capability of the MnGeo Imagery service are now published on MnGeo's website. We're encouraging users to utilize HTTPS whenever possible, even though HTTP traffic is still allowed via the older URL.

On priority #6, Mathews noted that they will have a table at the GIS/LIS conference for the Archiving group to engage attendees in a survey, and offered that the GAC could have additional materials. Kotz offered to get Mathews some materials on the GAC to display. Kne offered that the workgroup is meeting on Friday, September 7.

On priority #7, Kotz repeated that the standard was approved by the GAC, and that MetroGIS recently discussed moving to that standard with the counties. As a result of doing that work to adopt the new standard, a few suggestions have arisen for tweaking the standard. Stovern added that he and Maas are still working on a best practice document for using the data, and hopes that a draft will be available next spring. Dolbow asked if that document would include details on how to implement the standard, and Stovern said it could in the future.

On priority #8, Dowell noted that his group is working with the BLM on data in the arrowhead and attempting to standardize PLS data in order to further updates. He sees it as a pilot project to see how a statewide project can come together. It's moving forward at a very slow pace, but progressing. Stovern added that the BLM came forward with an initial standard, but encouraged county participants to change it as necessary. Ross added that a goal of the project is to begin to build a potential process toward a standardized set of boundaries for the state.

Dowell added that the letters of support from the GAC, MnGeo, and GIS/LIS helped get pilot project funding from the Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCCMR), which hopefully will be approved by the legislature. This project, remonumenting Lawrence township in Grant County, will demonstrate on how to improve boundaries and GIS data in the state by restoring the PLS.

On priority #10, Richter noted the effort went on break for the summer, waiting for Homeland Security and Emergency Management (HSEM) to complete their work with their "WebEOC" platform and their ArcGIS Collector application. That work continues, but will soon be reviewed against the workgroup's draft. The goals are slightly different: HSEM needs a more detailed assessment for FEMA and reimbursement purposes, and the workgroup is looking more at rapid assessment needs. The two sets of requirements have overlaps, but the former is much more detailed. Anderson said that the initial small number of fields for rapid assessment is important to try and nail down, because it will help cities determine what to collect for FEMA, and because it is not certain yet that they will be able to use the WebEOC Collector application in the event of a disaster. Ross encouraged the group to connect with Jared Hovi in Carlton County on a similar effort, which FEMA was using to determine where further assessment was required.

On priority #11, Vaughn asked how to change the descriptions, and Kotz said we'll be updating priorities at the end of the year.

On priority #12, Ross reported that MnGeo recognizes the need for a shared basemap, but we still don't know how much such a service will be used and how it will be sustainable in terms of staff time and resources. So we're working internally first with state agencies to see how that goes.

On priority #13, Ross noted that the Great Outdoors application uses a different schema than any standard, and a discussion is needed about what kind of standard could be developed. He suggested that we connect with the metro group regarding the standard they are working on.

Legislative updates

Kotz noted that the Geospatial Data Act continues to add sponsors. Ross added that it has been getting some committee hearings, and that it might get heard in Congress this year. Sponsors want all of the geospatial organizations to agree on it, and there are two organizations that still aren't on board. There is some talk on joining it with the Digital Coast Act, which has already passed the Senate.

Ross referred to the slides, noting that the NG911 Act does not yet have bipartisan endorsement. But the national 911 office has opened the door for grants to states. DPS is pursuing a grant for Minnesota with a focus on spatial data. Nakamura added that the Emergency Communications Networks (ECN) division of DPS is working on that.

Announcements or other business

Brandt noted that the next GAC meeting will take place during the MN Government IT Symposium, and that he will miss the meeting to present at the Symposium.

Mathews asked if the Governor's Commendation Award has been announced publicly, and Rader replied that it is still at the Governor's Office.

Kerr was invited to speak about GIS to a group of nurse practitioners and public health staff, and she plans to share what she hears about open data.

Freburg said he is looking forward to having the fourth Educator Day at the GIS/LIS Conference, where we'll have close to 100 teachers attending.

Richter said they are having their City open house on September 26th, and that she will be talking at GIS/LIS.

Bendickson relayed that he will be attending a "Developing a Curriculum" (DACUM) Job Analysis workshop next week in Thief River Falls, and the Association of Minnesota Emergency Managers (AMEM) Conference the following week. Reinhardt complimented Bendickson on his presentation and the entire room on improving public services throughout the state.

Stovern relayed the three winners of the Polaris Leadership Award this year: Chris Pouliot, Stacey Stark, and Jesse Adams. There is no Lifetime Achievement Award this year. Kotz asked if the awards can be mentioned in the Consortium E-announcement before the conference. Stovern added that early bird registration ends September 7th.

Sjerven added that there are new t-shirts this year with the Conference logo, and they are asking folks to order them in advance. The official new logo will be rolled out on the website soon. Polos with the Consortium logo will be available at the conference. The big change in organization around the conference this year is the co-location with NSGIC. The Wednesday event is at the Aquarium, and the Thursday event is at Grandma's. Questions can be directed to the board. Stovern said the program is likely not going to be printed on paper, but instead will be in digital form on an app.

Anderson asked that older phones be considered for the digital program. Koutnik and Anderson both said that Minnesota presenters at the Esri UC were excellent.

Richason added that the NSF grant that SCSU received funded the DACUM event, and he will also be attending the workshop next week. The grant supports a "job analysis" on updating the geospatial curriculum at colleges.

Geurts noted that a state agency training day will be held in November for state government GIS users.

Langtry added that in the next two weeks the FY19 Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) for the 3D Elevation Program to provide funding assistance of elevation data collections will come out

Dolbow encouraged members to subscribe to the newsletter using the details on the MnGeo web page, and that if anyone has announcements they would like to go out via that vehicle, to contact him, Nancy, or write gisinfo.mngeo@state.mn.us.

Adjourn

Kotz adjourned the meeting at **2:00** p.m.