

MnGeo State Government Geospatial Advisory Council

March 13, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Participating

Members: David Arbeit (Chair), MnGeo; Will Craig, University of Minnesota/Statewide Advisory Council; Mike Dolbow, Agriculture; Mary Emerson, Human Services; Greg Fetter, Commerce; Greg Klinkhammer, Employment and Economic Development; Tim Loesch, Natural Resources; Sean Mangan, Public Safety; John Paulson, Health; Craig Rhombs, Education; Tad Schindler, Pollution Control; Paul Weinberger, MnDOT (for Dan Ross).

Non-members: Laurie Beyer-Kropuenske (via phone), State Information Policy Analysis Division; Pat Cummins, Esri; Brad Henry, University of Minnesota; John Hoshal, MnGeo; Fred Logman, MnGeo; Carolyn Parnell, OET; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Ed Valencia, OET.

Arbeit called the meeting to order. Participants introduced themselves. There were no changes to the [agenda](#). Updated minutes for the [January 10, 2012 meeting](#) were accepted as distributed at the meeting.

GIO Succession: Arbeit said that this was his last Council meeting, as his last day with the State is April 10th. He said that where MnGeo and State geospatial are today, was his vision when he started 18 years ago. He feels that he is leaving things in good shape for the future. Logman indicated that there was going to be a retirement celebration from 2:00 to 3:30 PM, on Tuesday, April 10th in the Centennial Cafeteria and that everyone in the community is invited to attend.

Arbeit continued by stating that the State Chief Geospatial Information Officer (CGIO) position was nationally advertised and that there were about 60 applicants. A small committee reviewed the applications and narrowed the list down for further consideration. That shorter list was further narrowed to applicants who will be interviewed the week of March 19th. Narrowing down the list to three applicants to be interviewed was difficult. The GIO position will report to Chris Buse, OET Assistant Commissioner, who was very surprised and pleased by the number of highly qualified applicants. After the interviews, a recommendation will be made to Carolyn Parnell, State CIO and OET Commissioner, who will make the appointment. It is anticipated that the new CGIO will be identified by the time Arbeit retires. Commissioner Parnell stated that she had met with all MnGeo staff to learn what they felt were important characteristics for the GIO. Will Craig said he was a member of the review committee and that salary seemed to be a secondary consideration for some of the applicants who felt the position would be challenging, interesting and very important for the State as well as statewide geospatial community. Arbeit concluded by saying that although he was retiring, he would be around and may be at future meetings.

State Government IT Governance Framework & MnGeo: Valencia started the discussion by indicating nothing has been finalized, everything is preliminary and that geospatial is fairly new to the State IT world. Valencia then provided some general themes:

- Governance is a critical element in the State's IT consolidation process and subsequent operational environment.

- IT governance will determine how decisions are made and how the State’s business needs are supported by IT. The framework is not yet complete and having the new GIO be part of the geospatial governance discussion is important.
- Governance is within the strategy of where State IT is going and what it will look like.
- Both the strategy and governance will continue to evolve and change over time.

Valencia then used four [slides](#) prepared by Arbeit and Chris Buse to provide some additional information.

- Geospatial will be within the OET/State IT framework and governance.
- The governance structure will make clear where and by whom decisions are made.
- Slide 2 - The group or committee that will make most geospatial decisions and provide recommendations to the State CIO will include representatives from the other IT domains such as architecture and security. In the same way, geospatial will have some representation or input into the decisions of other IT domains.
- The State IT governance structure is primarily focused on State entities and representatives.
- Geospatial governance will in some way have non-state representation/input.
- Slide 3 - The prior way of looking at “Virtual MnGeo” will be changing. The focus will no longer be the GIO and the flow of issues, discussions and decisions will be different. Communications to and from the GIO will continue to be important.
- Slide 4 depicts one vision for geospatial governance. The relationships between the advisory councils, committees/workgroups and MnGeo will be different. Roles, relationships and responsibilities will be made clear. A “Geospatial Technology Steering Committee” will be the primary decision/recommendation making entity.
- When State IT governance is finalized, the boxes are likely to change.

Commissioner Parnell provided some additional comments:

- The multi-agency team working on IT governance has completed their work and now it is up to OET management to finalize the initial governance structure(s).
- It is important that the new GIO have input into the geospatial governance structure.
- She and OET are aware of the collaborative culture of the geospatial community and do not want to do anything that will discourage or disrupt it.

Comments from Council members included:

- They appreciated the opportunity to view and comment on the geospatial governance structure.
- Did there need to be two councils or committees representing State government? Consideration should be made to having only one advisory council – something like the Statewide Council with added state government representation.
- The structure depicted in the fourth slide seems to have a lot of levels and boxes (entities). A simpler and more agile structure may be better.
- Would the lines of authority extend beyond State government?
- Even though the diagram (4th slide) seems to have a lot of levels and entities, it formalizes the vetting process that has been used for a number of concepts and issues, so it may not be too extensive.

Commissioner Parnell stated that what was viewed and discussed is only a draft and nothing is finalized. Further, once a State IT governance structure is implemented, it will not be permanent but will change and adapt over time. What is implemented for geospatial will be similar to what is done for the other IT domains such as security and architecture.

Proposed Changes to the Data Practices Language: Beyer-Kropuenske participated by conference phone to update the Council on the status of the proposed Data Practices Language in HF2201/SF2190. The bill has a number of changes only one of which is focused on geospatial data. The goal of the geospatial language is to reduce the obstacles to governmental entities sharing data. Current impediments include: cost to provide or acquire data, technology, available data, concerns about liability, and loss of revenue. Another significant issue is the inability to redistribute or share data. For example; MnDOT, DNR, BWSR, and Education individually acquire parcel data from counties and because of county licensing restrictions, they are not able to share the data among themselves, thereby duplicating the work not only for the agencies but also for the counties.

Beyer-Kropuenske indicated there was opposition to the bill in the House and that it might not get out of its originating committee by Friday, March 16th, which would mean that it wouldn't move forward this session. Her goal at this time is to get some form of the bill out of its originating committee so that there is a possibility some portions could be passed this session. Beyer-Kropuenske stated that it is hard to get any action on the Senate version if it appears there would not be a House companion bill. Commissioner Parnell stated another option at some point may be to put the geospatial data sharing provisions into the IT consolidation statutes. Beyer-Kropuenske said it may be necessary to "shop" the geospatial language in other committees and other bills.

The Council was provided three versions of the [geospatial focused language](#).

- The first is the original language as introduced
- The second allows educational entities and Gopher One Call to acquire the data along with governmental entities, provides for inspection of the data, and contains a definition of "electronic geospatial data" which was adapted from Arizona statutes.
- The third added language to allow for recovery of the cost for data distribution but not commercial value and to allow redistribution.

Arbeit provided the Council with some preliminary results on *obstacles to data availability* that were generated from the survey that is being conducted as part of the [Parcel Business Plan development Project](#). With over 100 survey responders so far, one question shows that liability and misinterpretation of data were significant concerns of entities providing parcel data. Having a way to mitigate concerns should improve data sharing. Beyer-Kropuenske reminded the Council that Minnesota law assumes that governmental data is complete and accurate, so the legislature may not be willing to eliminate civil liability for governmental data.

Comments from Council members included:

- This is a good step in the right direction
- Need to make sure that the language is clear – the last sentences of the third version may need some work
- Allowing redistribution is important since it permits multiple uses
- Protecting data producers from downstream liability is important

The discussion concluded with Beyer-Kropuenske stating that she did not think the Data Practices updates would be passed this session.

Esri Enterprise License Agreement: Arbeit and Logman reported that MnGeo is coordinating work and negotiations for the next Esri ELA with Materials Management Division (MMD) and OET. They expect

the new agreement to be in place by July 1, 2012, when the current agreement expires. Logman indicated that the requests and directions set by the ELA Committee for the next ELA have been incorporated into the draft agreement. Updated agreement components (Esri standard language) received last week from Esri are being incorporated into the latest draft per MMD's request. MnGeo is using the current language as a base and "red lining" any changes or updates to the existing agreement that was accepted by both parties and their lawyers with the hope that focus is on the updates and changes. Arbeit said that it appears MMD wants to do the negotiating with Esri and that MnGeo will try to be part of the negotiations process and conversations. MnGeo is planning to call a meeting of the ELA Committee in the next few weeks to review the proposed agreement and status of negotiations.

MetroGIS Parcel Data License: Logman said that he has been working on getting Attorney General approval of the new [MetroGIS Public Party Regional Parcel Dataset License](#) and that Patty Nolte has approved the language. He has also been working with Rick Gelbmann at the Metropolitan Council to see if the State could execute a single agreement for all State agencies acquiring the data instead of each agency entering into their own agreement. Metropolitan Council has approved that approach as long as agencies receiving the data are made aware of the provisions of the data license. Patty Nolte also approved executing the agreement once for all agencies. As this is a technology-related matter, MnGeo will take the agreement to OET for signature. When executed, MnGeo will either send copies to the agencies that have previously executed individual agreements or let them know the license has been reviewed by the Ag's office and they can execute them. Council members commented that a single State license was the right way to go.

NSGIC Mid-Year Highlights: Will Craig reported that NSGIC was formed in 1991 and now has all 50 states, Washington DC, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as members. NSGIC holds its mid-year meetings in Annapolis, MD. NSGIC held its 2011 annual meeting last summer in downtown Minneapolis; the annual meetings are moved from state to state each year. February 26 – 29, 2012 meeting highlights included:

- A workshop conducted by Jack Dangermond, Esri founder and CEO
- In general NSGIC members were not happy with the performance of the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) which sits down several levels in the Federal government and discussed where it should be located to be more effective.
- The [Transportation for the Nation](#) initiative is "rolling up" state road data to create a single federal data set.
- Next Generation 911 is progressing, and address points are going to be a big part of that effort. Several states have made very good progress on generating statewide address point data sets using federal broadband funds. Minnesota has not able to take advantage of that opportunity as the broadband mapping funding went to Connect Minnesota, a non-profit organization, rather than to a State agency.
- In Wyoming, 23 counties have started an effort to create a statewide parcel data layer working from the county-level up. This approach is different than the more common state-down effort.
- King County (Seattle) Washington has completed an FGDC grant ROI project that showed a 10 to 1 return on funds invested in geospatial technology and data.

Craig then reported on "Hill Day", an annual event where NSGIC conference participants go to Washington DC to meet with congressional delegations to promote states' geospatial efforts. These are opportunities to inform congressional delegations about state programs, needs and

opportunities as well as develop connections. Chris Cialek and Craig joined several other NSGIC members and met with the Senate GIS Work Group, a new group of Senate staffers who have started meeting to share geospatial ideas and develop collaborations. Craig and Cialek also met with a member of Senator Franken's staff and the connection has resulted in subsequent requests for maps, including one of power generation facilities located on tribal lands. [Meeting information](#) is available from the NSGIC archives.

2012 Legislative Session: One Council member commented that there has been some talk about doing something different organizationally with the Legislative GIS Office including moving it to the Executive Branch. There were no other legislative session updates.

Parcel Data Integration Business Plan Project: Logman provided an [update](#) on this project that is developing a business plan containing strategies to lead the State and its partners to building and maintaining an authoritative statewide parcel data layer. Items covered included:

- Project description and schedule
- The need to extend the grant and project timeline in order to acquire broad consumer survey response, ensure good producer workshop participation and generate a viable business plan.
- An online survey is currently being conducted to identify business needs/uses, obstacles to acquiring and issues with producing and using parcel data. The survey closing date is March 21st (*was extended to March 27th*). Members were encouraged to complete the survey. Survey results will be used in the workshop and will inform the business plan.
- A "producer workshop" will be conducted on April 5th at the MnDOT Arden Hills Training Center and via videoconference links. Invitees include Statewide Council members and MACO members, as well as county decision makers, administrators, and GIS staff. The goal of the workshop is to identify issues, obstacles and possible solutions to developing and maintaining a statewide parcel dataset; these will be used to generate strategies within the business plan.

Agency Projects, Needs, Issues and Other Business

Arbeit reminded the Council that there were written updates on the [spring orthoimagery](#) and [LiDAR projects](#) with the meeting material. Arbeit then asked if there were agency needs or other business.

- Loesch reported that DNR was in the process of contracting for the collection of LiDAR data this year for Blue Earth County.
- Emerson asked if members had privacy concerns using Esri's geocoding service since human services records contain non-public data. Members said that the only data that needed to be passed to the Esri service was an address. By minimizing what is sent, there should not be privacy concerns.

There was no additional discussion or business.

The next scheduled Council meeting is Tuesday, May 8, 2012 [*later rescheduled to May 22*]. The Council applauded Arbeit for his many years of service.

Meeting adjourned. Meeting minutes by Fred Logman and Nancy Rader