Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Meeting Minutes

December 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; 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; Chris Mavis, Hennepin County; Philipp Nagel, Bolton & Menk; Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County; 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, ProWest & Associates.

Members Absent: Scott Abel, Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians; Jeffrey Bloomquist, USDA Risk Management Agency; David Brandt, Washington County; Andra Mathews, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy; Ben Richason, St. Cloud State University.

Non-Members Present: Will Craig, retired; Mike Dolbow**,** MnGeo; Rachel Koch, Minnesota Department of Revenue; Mike Koutnik, Esri; Jim Langtry, USGS; Geoff Maas, MetroGIS; Matt McGuire, Metropolitan Council; Akiko Nakamura, Minnesota Department of Public Safety; Chad Nunemacher, Houston Engineering; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Matt Robinson, Esri; David Sajevic, MnGeo; Alison Slaats, MnGeo; Sean Vaughn, MNIT 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**. Members approved the agenda unanimously.

Kotz called for a **review** of the meeting minutes from **9/5/2018**. Minutes were approved unanimously.

Review and accept committee summaries

Kotz called for any questions or comments on the committee summaries. He called for acceptance, and members accepted unanimously.

Minnesota Geospatial Image Service Sustainability Plan

Kotz asked for McGuire to present the sustainability plan. McGuire relayed that Dolbow from MnGeo asked for a guide to sustain the service. He referred to the proposal in the agenda packet. He showed a proposed "lifecycle" diagram in the slides. Layers in the service would step through a life cycle before being removed from the service, allowing plenty of time for stakeholders to provide feedback.

He relayed a series of decision factors on how layers could move through the life cycle. Usage is easy to measure, easy to track, and a basic correlation to the importance of the layer. He also covered the Roles and Responsibilities envisioned for existing entities such as MnGeo and the GAC, plus a future Committee or "Maintenance Team". He requested that the GAC review the details of the plan in the Agenda packet. His request was to have the GAC review the plan, hopefully approve it in March, and form the Maintenance Team. McGuire said that it's up to the GAC on how to form that team. He noted that one member should also be a member of the Archiving Workgroup, since there is a natural need to have the two groups coordinate and communicate.

Kotz added that the Imagery Service is the #2 priority in 2018, and continues to be a top priority for 2019. A key part of the GAC's mission is to advise MnGeo, and thus this work is a good fit for the GAC. He clarified that we typically define workgroups as a short-term, project-based groups, and Committees are more long-term, so the Maintenance Team would best be described as a Committee.

Ross added that MnGeo serves as the public repository for imagery for the counties, so even if some of those layers were candidates for removal, they might not be removed. Nagel asked if the layers in the Composite Service would be removed, and McGuire said that it was likely that such popular, high-use layers would not be removed. He added that a previous, unofficial group who has decided on what layers go in the Composite could become part of this new Maintenance Team.

Geurts asked how we would communicate about retirements to the wider public. McGuire wasn't sure if it was the role of the Maintenance Team or the GAC's role. Ross responded that there should still be a reference in the Commons to any "retired" dataset.

Freburg asked if there would be a MnGeo page where status would be listed, and Ross responded that there would be. Freburg asked if a set of imagery were removed, would a user base have an avenue to request access in an alternative way. Ross replied that it would probably be part of the communications between this group and the Archiving Workgroup. McGuire said that such user communications are probably outside the scope of this group, but certainly the data should still be available somewhere.

Sjerven asked about the reference to sponsoring certain services, and who would make that decision. McGuire said that such negotiations would be the responsibility of the sponsor and MnGeo to work that out. Sjerven asked for clarification, and McGuire said that anything that gets added recently won't even be considered for removal unless it was low usage. But the Committee wouldn't be responsible for making the decision about sponsorship; it would be a negotiation between MnGeo and whoever wants the layer to remain under a sponsorship.

Mavis noted that from a Surveyor's perspective, the historic imagery has a high value, even if it has low usage. Kotz said they hear those concerns. Kne asked about low usage vs. sustainability, what does that mean? McGuire said we're just trying to give MnGeo some tools and reasoning around making decisions behind the service. It's not about storage space; it's about creating guidelines for handling the data.

Dolbow added that historical significance is a factor in the decision matrix around whether or not a layer would be removed. Richter said that it sounds like usage is merely the initial view of potential candidates, and that other

factors would be considered in the ultimate decision. McGuire agreed, saying that just a strict "usage factor" was too blunt.

Vaughn asked about the difference between hosting and storage. McGuire said that MnGeo didn't bring up any technical issues around this, and Ross responded that hosting means that we provide an online service, storage means it's on a hard drive in a cabinet or something like that. Kotz noted that such questions were really out of scope for this group, but a good question for the Archiving group. Vaughn said that the DNR uses the historical imagery for compliance efforts, and that if layers are removed from the service, it adds costs to their use.

Ross added that any of the imagery collections created through the Master Contract Program should be documented and made available to others, and that he'd like this group to help with that list as it grows. Comments about this plan should go to Matt McGuire.

Kotz called for a motion to create a maintenance committee, a charter and workplan, and a list of members. He thought that the Committee might be best composed if a number of sectors were represented. Mavis volunteered to be on the Committee. **Bendickson moved that we create an Image Service Sustainability Committee**. Vaughn noted that accountability and informed membership is important to this group. Dowell seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Standards Committee Update

Kotz called for an update from Maas. Maas acknowledged a lot of work from the Committee, including monthly meetings through 2018. He relayed the slides on the Committee's recent work. The Committee has a proposed change to the Parcel Standard due to issues found during implementations of the most recent standard. Mostly they are minor tweaks, and several documents with details are available on the MnGeo website.

Some of the unique problems found recently, and addressed with the revision include:
- Parcels legitimately without a PIN
- Point to Polygon relationships

Maas relayed that all documents on the proposed changes are available for review, and that the comment period ends January 11, 2019.

He provided information on how the Metro Regional Parcel Dataset is being updated to the new standard with a completion goal of January 2019. One of MetroGIS's goals for 2019 is a Best Practices Guide on implementing the standard.

Maas then relayed information about the proposed Minnesota Road Centerline Standard (MRCS), which supports many uses. He provided some history on the development of the standard. MRCS developed from the earlier prototype Metro Regional Centerlines Collaborative (MRCC) standard. A Twin Cities metro dataset, following MRCC version 1.7, has been published since April 2017, with about 60 attributes; an MRCC Best Practices Guide is also available.

The NG911 standards group then reviewed and modified the MRCC standard, and brought it to the GAC Standards Committee to propose it as the **MRCS** state standard. Version 0.5 of the MRCS was publicly reviewed Spring 2018. Based on the public comments, the Committee revised MRCS v. 0.5 to create MRCS v. 0.6. The Standards Committee plans to conduct a public review of MRCS v. 0.6 in early 2019, accompanied by a guide explaining the attributes, concepts and terminology.

Maas then reviewed the numbering system the Committee has been using to go through the standards. He reiterated that standards are not mandates, but are tools for the community to use. He reviewed the current timeline presented in the slides.

Kotz thanked Maas for all the work with the Standards Committee.

Filling vacant GAC seats

Ross relayed that we have two positions open on the GAC, and they've been open for a long time. They include the Greater Minnesota Regional Government seat and one of the Federal Government seats. He said he'd like input from the members on filling the seats. Kotz said that if members know of anyone in either sector it would be good to have them apply. Ross added that MnGeo can answer questions, and that anyone interested can be sent to Nancy Rader to be steered through the application and Open Appointments process. Rader said she'd be happy to help anyone with the process, and that it is relatively easy.

Craig asked if the USGS member could be non-voting, since that agency doesn't want to be seen as influencing state government. Kotz said he would be open to that, and Geurts said that the problem might even be just logistical because our current USGS liaison works with 4 states.

Surveyor seat on GAC

Kotz relayed that Stovern proposed this idea. Kotz reviewed the legislation that currently defines the types of organizations and sectors that we have listed at the moment. He said he sees the surveying group as a different "flavor" of sector. Stovern added that the best GIS data is built off the PLS, and that coordination with surveyors in his work has led to significant improvements. He advocates for a permanent seat on the GAC to communicate with the GIS community and back to the surveying community.

Dowell noted that he and Mavis are both members of the Minnesota Society of Professional Surveyors (MSPS) and the Minnesota Association of County Surveyors (MACS), which probably represent about 90% of the professional surveyors in the state. In his experience, this is the first time someone has tried to address the current communications gap between the two professions. Since surveyors are often creating foundational data, having a seat at the GAC table is important. Otherwise surveyors might feel like they're not being invited.

Vaughn noted that LiDAR data as foundational data also relies on ground surveys to make it more valuable. Resolving conflicts in court requires a surveyor. Mavis added that having a surveyor on the GAC goes a long way toward building a bridge and keeping up a communication framework.

Richter asked if how the legislation is framed has previously excluded the surveying community. In other words, is it more about communicating that the GAC is not just geospatial professionals, but people who work with the data, who can come from many professions? Mavis replied that it seemed to be mostly about not knowing about the GAC. Richter then concluded that it was more a communication issue, and another example is Kerr representing the Health Care sector.

Dowell replied that there was no impression of an intentional exclusion, but that there have previously been conflicts between the communities. So communications barriers persisted, but now folks from both communities are realizing how important it might be to work together. He cited an example of communications would be around the Image Service Sustainability Committee discussed earlier.

Craig said that when the list of organizations was created for GAC representation, it said "including", not "only", and that we need surveyors. Anderson added that it boils down to that we need to have representatives from such a critically important sector. Kotz said that we didn't have any surveyors on the GAC before Dowell and Mavis, but it's good to have them now. He asked if it would be any different with an official seat vs. the way we have it now. Also, would it create a slippery slope of folks from other spatial areas of expertise asking questions about additional required memberships?

Ross said that from his perspective, this is long overdue and it's important to include the surveyor community on the GAC. Koutnik reiterated the previous points, saying that the surveyor community deserves a special place at the table.

Kotz noted that if we decide to do this, we need to consider whether or not we add a seat, or somehow ensure there's a surveyor from the current groups.

Reinhardt said that if the perception is important, then she suggests taking one of the at-large seats and making sure that it's a surveyor, because that will make it more important. Koutnik agreed, saying that it would be the responsibility of that person to be the connection. Ross agreed. Rader said that there's no requirement in the legislation to have precisely 23 members, and that we have a lot of flexibility with the at-large seats. Sjerven asked how we would modify the SOS appointments process, and Rader replied that such a change would not require modifications to that process.

Geurts asked for clarification whether or not we change or add, and asked how many at-large members we had, and Rader answered that we have 4**. A motion to convert one of the at-large member seats to a specific surveyor seat was made and seconded**. Ross said there should be discussion about the timing; this is not an issue since the current terms go through June 30, 2019. Kotz called for a vote on the motion and it passed unanimously.

GAC presentations at GIS/LIS & NSGIC Conferences

Ross noted that the Minnesota 90 minute session at NSGIC was very well received by NSGIC attendees. He noted that there was a lot of crossover attendance between the conferences, and asked if the group had any feedback on the co-locating of the conferences.

Kotz replied that he only attended the one session at NSGIC, and that two other state representatives asked him for his presentation materials. Richter said that it was valuable to network with NSGIC attendees, and Freburg seconded that idea. Ross concluded by saying that NSGIC attendees were very complimentary of our work.

Freburg added that he will be traveling to Wyoming to talk about his work with Education groups because of the NSGIC co-location.

Break

Geospatial Priorities Survey results and 2019 GAC priorities

Kotz reviewed the reasoning behind why we create priorities for the GAC to pursue, explaining the reasons relayed on the slides. In his experience, clearly articulated directions lead to better outcomes in collaborative work. This year, we have a list of proposed projects and initiatives. A survey was used to assess the value of these items, and today we'll assess the likelihood of success. We'll then do a preliminary priority calculation and discuss the results, making any adjustments as necessary.

Kotz relayed the results of the survey as displayed on the slide. Over 400 responses were received, which was exceptional. State government and County government accounted for over half of the responses. As a result, Kotz presented both a weighted and an unweighted score for each priority. The weighting process was done according to sector seats on the GAC, giving a slight difference in the order of the results.

Kotz called for questions or discussion about the survey itself. Vaughn replied that the exercise was worthwhile, and that it provided a way for him to communicate about the GAC and MNIT Services within the DNR. Koch asked about the response rate, and Kotz responded that we didn't send it to a specific number of people, so there's no way to answer that question. Maas reiterated that this is a valuable component of our work. Kotz added that when the whole geospatial community weighed in, some priorities fell very low, such as alternative improvements to the imagery service, which fell below "nice to have".

Kotz relayed details about how the value scores and likelihood of success scores go into the master spreadsheet on deciding our priorities. He showed the initial results of that spreadsheet, called for questions, and asked if there were any blanks we could fill in.

Reinhardt asked if the Imagery Service maintenance and improvements could be combined, because otherwise it can be confusing. Kotz said we could decide to do that.

Koch asked about how the success score could change before the GAC rank, and Kotz said that's what we'll do next.

Sjerven said that he and Vaughn can own the "LiDAR Data and Derived Products" item and the "Hydro-DEMs" item, and added that it's hard to designate a Committee as a champion. Kotz replied that when the Owner and Champions are named people, it's more successful than when it's a group. So, committees or the GAC can be sponsors, but having a specific owner named is key. Sjerven said that makes sense. Vaughn said that he advocated to add those priorities, and that we have been behind for a long time without a hydro-modified DEM. As a result, he feels we need a champion of marketing and funding. Support for these types of initiatives is important. Past proposals have been turned down because of the lack of coordinated support, and that a higher priority becomes a tool for his committee.

Kotz responded that Sjerven and Vaughn would definitely make sense as owners of those items, but that we also need a high-level, decision-making champion in order to drive things further. The group went through some edits to the spreadsheet for those two items including owners and work team existence. Vaughn noted that while LiDAR is the initial collection product, the derived products are what are being used, so we have to be better at marketing.

Kotz asked about the updated and aligned boundary data item, and Mavis noted that Ross agreed to be the champion. Stovern added that we have a workgroup for the item as well. Dowell added that it's also been discussed at MACS. Stovern added that it will cost a lot of money in the long run, but that the initial scope of work doesn't require funding.

Ross added that Dolbow will be the owner of the Parcel item, and more details were filled in for that item. Kotz asked for more details on the EM Damage Assessment item, and Richter responded that there were no changes for that item. Kotz looked at the geocoding service item, and there was a brief discussion about that. Kotz called for any final changes to items. There were none so Kotz said we had our preliminary priority score, and now is our opportunity to make adjustments as needed. We can also decide not to do items in 2019 if we want.

Kotz asked about Reinhardt's suggestion to combine the Imagery Service Improvements item with the Image Service Maintenance. **The motion to combine the two items was made and seconded**, to make the improvements item part of the scope of the maintenance item. The motion passed unanimously.

Ross asked about the centerline and address point items and noted that such work would be done anyway as part of NG911, regardless of the GAC's priority. Kotz and Geurts advocated that they remain in the list because of the value of articulating that those items retain priority. Ross added that the Department of Public Safety has recently concluded that address point location data (with no private data attached) collected as part of NG9-1-1 efforts could be shared publicly in the future, once it is in the state standard.

Vaughn asked to modify the Hydro DEM item short name to include "Digital Dam Breaklines". Kotz responded that we're using short names for these, but that longer descriptions are published. Vaughn replied that those terms have been important for education recently.

Kotz called for any items to be removed, and Dolbow asked that the Geocoding Service item be removed. Stovern asked if it was like being "tabled", and Kotz replied yes. The group agreed to mark the Geocoding Service item as "N" in the "Do in 2019" column.

Sjerven asked if the priorities would be publicized as a general list or as a ranked priority, since a higher ranking for some groups can help with promotional opportunities. Ross offered that he could be the champion to increase the scores for their items. Kotz replied that anyone could really use the Value score to relay how important things are. Adding Ross as the champion for the LiDAR item resorted the order.

Geurts noted that having the top priority be Free and Open data gives us a vehicle to pursue other efforts and update the details. Kotz replied that really what we're doing is approving the rank order right now. Geurts said that this helps to go back to the community and say that there are groups working on this, and if someone is interested in something, they can use this as a vehicle to funnel participation.

Reinhardt asked about the "Do in 2019" items and got clarification from Kotz. **Richter motioned to approve the order, and Reinhardt seconded**. The motion passed unanimously.

Approved 2019 GAC Priorities

GAC Rank	Project or Initiative Name
1	All public geospatial data in MN to be free and open to everyone
2	Assurance that the MnGeo imagery service will be maintained and improved via a sustainable funding model, including policies on what layers are added and removed over time. Evaluate improvements such as Web Mercator, tiling, downloading options, and increased refresh frequency.
3	Updated and aligned boundary data from authoritative sources
4	Statewide publicly available parcel data
5	A policy and procedures for archiving and preserving historical geospatial data
6	Statewide publicly available road centerline data (including a data standard)
7	New LiDAR data acquisition across Minnesota for use in developing new derived products guided by committee developed standards
8	Statewide publicly available address points data
9	MN focused basemap services
10	A parks and trails data standard
11	An emergency management damage assessment data standard to provide an accepted specification to support a request for State or Federal assistance after a disaster

12	Accurate hydro-DEMs (hDEM) that serve modern flood modeling and hydro-terrain analysis tools, and the development of more accurate watercourses and watersheds

Sector Report

Sjerven relayed that he's been working in the Utility sector for a few years now, and that it has taken him a long time to learn how to work within the sector. Typically his customers just want to know the answer to their questions about where they can build, and not participate much in the methodology of that. He finds a very narrow focus within the sector practitioners in terms of direct applications to their problems. Recently, however, with the proliferation of higher resolution elevation data and drone usage, worlds are colliding and he has new doors open to initiate discussions.

He discussed additional information on the slides. He sees his next steps within the sector to find out more about drone usage and how to put together safety concerns and communicate those across a wide variety of groups. If we did another statewide LiDAR collection, he now has an avenue to ask utilities how they would use the data. He would also like to see a conference track for utilities, since we've seen value for conference tracks focused on other sectors, like surveying.

Mavis commented that through his prior work with Esri in the utility area, he has seen large repositories of land ownership records. A large transmission company had been using LiDAR for years over encroachment surveys. So, the sector potentially has a giant role with the GAC. Sjerven replied that Minnesota Power has a large ad-hoc system for land ownership records, and vendors have told them they are not alone. So he thinks there are a lot of areas where utilities can learn from each other. There is a lot more sharing now than there was before.

Craig asked if there was any connection between his work and the Geospatial Information and Technology Association (GITA), and Sjerven replied that the local GITA chapter has disbanded so there are more small-scale, user group level interactions. Bendickson said that power outage data websites are very useful for emergency response, and asked if there could ever be a statewide system for reporting that. Sjerven replied that it would be great, but that's a big request. Bendickson asked if it could be a future priority. Reinhardt commented that her work with the Greater MSP Partnership has revealed that sometimes being part of an effort doesn't hurt you and can benefit a wider group.

Legislative updates

Ross relayed that the Geospatial Data Act (GDA) was included in the FAA reauthorization bill, and encouraged the GAC to look at the link in the slides. The impacts of the act in 2018 will be a useful read, and the GDA Tiger Team has been charged with figuring out how to work with state and local governments, which is a huge change in how we all do our work.

Ross also relayed that we are watching the Digital Coast Act and NG911 Act that aren't currently very active, but if that changes, they will impact us.

Finally, in the state legislature, the 16E.30 authorization is possibly going to be modified due to NG911. There will need to be different requirements for NG911 in the tail end of Subdivision 11 b. This will have impact on the local PSAPs and local professionals who work with those PSAPs.

Reinhardt asked for clarification of the language in the legislation, and the group provided those clarifications. Ross replied that there will be seven layers of information that will be affected by NG911, and that changes to that data need to be reflected in NG911 layers within 72 hours.

Koutnik asked about providing data in services, and Ross replied that so much of that depends on getting to a common standard, and there has been a lot of pushback about implementing those standards. Kotz and Ross both replied that the end results can be service-based, even if individual contributions are not.

Updates on MN GAC priority projects and initiatives

Kotz asked for updates from project owners:
- Kne and Geurts noted that they have completed the city survey on Free and Open data. Kne replied that cities are in general supportive at a higher rate than the counties. They had 67 cities respond, which is a relatively low response rate. Barriers to open data are similar to perceived barriers in other places. Maas added that MSPS has invited Maas and Kne to present at their conference.
- Ross said that we have almost statewide data for address points now, but there are many gaps in cities within counties. We are continuing to have conversations on how to fill those gaps, but we've also seen a lot of improvements in the past year.
- Ross added that we're waiting for the road centerline standard to be complete so we can combine 87 counties of data.
- Timerson reported that the Archiving Workgroup did an informal survey at the GIS/LIS conference about archiving, and that the group recently sent out an archiving survey, which is open until the 21st. That survey was distributed via GovDelivery recently.
- Dowell said that he has sent out a request to the MACS on compiling corner data to see what people have in what format. They now have about 30 responses, and have found that areas with strong GIS and surveyors have digital data, but other areas have just a paper index. Stovern has compiled the information into an online map that is available.
- Richter reported that the EM Damage Assessment group met at GIS/LIS and they are managing their contacts with HSEM, and they need a new champion. Anderson reported that he discussed the topic with Jared Hovi, GIS Coordinator at Carlton County, on their approach.
- Ross reported that the MN Great Outdoors application is available but asked Maas for thoughts on the Parks and Trails data standard. Maas said there has been significant work on that front; their work is based on a federal standard and could become a state standard.

Announcements or other business
- Rader reported that MnGeo has made a tweak to their website menus to make things a bit more clear about what pages are dedicated to the GAC, which hopefully will make it easier for people to find the GAC and understand its scope.
- Anderson presented at NDSU and Moorhead State for GIS Day, and noted that the number of students are growing in comparison to years past.
- Mavis asked who has noticed the "plus codes" in Google Maps and if we should look into that. Dolbow opined that it was something we should probably leave alone.
- Dowell promoted the MSPS annual meeting, which will be February 13-15, 2019, in Brooklyn Park.

- Stovern noted that GIS/LIS elections are now open, and there are a few positions that have competition. The conference will be in St. Cloud next year.
- Kerr noted that she spoke to public health nurses recently at a regional conference, and that there was a lot of interest in GIS. A few participants in county health departments were using GIS in emergency response duties, and there is a lot of interest in open data and teaching students about the topic.
- Bendickson noted that the 34th infantry deployment to Kuwait includes a number of imagery analysts that are cross-training in the "geoint" space. Their biggest challenges are in data production and cleaning, because they have too many versions of old data now. Their other decision is around what defines the life cycle of imagery data. They have been using drones extensively for response to hurricanes and wildfires recently.
- Richter noted that the American Public Works Association (APWA) is having a webinar tomorrow on the use of GPS and AVL. Also, prior to the election, Four Directions Vote used Google Maps and other GIS technology to validate the physical addresses listed on picture ID's belonging to the residents of several Indian reservations.
- Reinhardt noted that she recently spoke to Kne's class at the University of Minnesota to discuss GIS in local government and policy issues around it.
- Freburg thanked Esri for putting out recent grants for K-12, which helped them serve 110 teachers recently. At the GIS/LIS educator day, he had both teachers and students attending and working on projects. The classes are moving more into intermediate and advanced skill courses. As a result, he has been talking to MnGeo about putting more services into the Commons. He believes the 2019 map competition will be even bigger than before. Finally, he's had more people respond to him from school districts than ever before. He also relayed that he plans to retire in April, but he may spend even more time with K-12 after his retirement. Kotz asked Freburg if a teacher could take over his spot on the GAC in the future, and Freburg said he's trying to put that together. He thanked everyone who has recently worked with teachers.
- Geurts reported that 200 state agency staff attended a training day on November 15, and it was a really successful day. She thanked everyone involved that helped.
- Tourtelotte noted that ProWest has done some joint workshops with Esri recently in ND and WI.
- Kne reported that they now have over 7,000 named users in ArcGIS Online at the U, and that story maps are exploding in use.
- Kotz noted that there was at one time two advisory groups to MnGeo, and now there is only the GAC. The legislation does not specify what we call ourselves, so we can officially refer to ourselves as the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council (GAC), rather than the Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council.
- Craig noted that Ryan Mattke is on leave for several months in order to write a history of GIS in Minnesota.
- Slaats noted that MnGeo's work plan for the year includes work on parcel data that she hopes will see some progress in 2019.
- Koutnik noted that tomorrow's ArcGIS Online release will include a new feature called user types that changes some pricing for which people have been asking for a long time. ArcGIS 10.7 will be coming early next year.
- Robinson introduced himself as a solutions engineer with Esri.
- Maas noted that MetroGIS has recently done a similar priority exercise, and he has encouraged the group to focus on maintenance of processes and documentation. They have a meeting in April where they will present their work with elected officials.

Adjourn

Kotz called for a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was moved and seconded. The group voted to adjourn at 2:09 PM.