

MnGeo State Government Geospatial Advisory Council

November 9, 2010 Meeting Notes

Participating

Members: David Arbeit, MnGeo (Chair); Mike Dolbow, Agriculture; Jessica Fendos, Employment and Economic Development; Greg Fetter, Commerce; Jennifer Johnson, Corrections; Tim Loesch, Natural Resources; Sean Mangan, Public Safety; Denise Moreland, Human Services (for Mary Arvesen); Denton Peterson, Health; Craig Rhombs, Education; Dan Ross, Transportation; Tad Schindler, Pollution Control; Ed Valencia, OET; Cindy Valentine, Labor and Industry (by phone); Michelle Weber, Management and Budget. Rebecca Foster, City of Edina, represented the Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council.

Non-members: John Blood, Public Safety – HSEM; Eric Breece, OET; Chris Cialek, MnGeo; Dan Falbo, ESRI; John Hoshal, MnGeo; Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council; Fred Logman, MnGeo; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Ron Wencil, USGS.

David Arbeit called the meeting to order. Participants introduced themselves.

September 21, 2010 Meeting Notes

One change noted: Tim Loesch indicated that he was not at the last meeting to volunteer to participate on the Data Practices Language Workgroup, but that he was “volunteered” with his permission. With this change the [September 21, 2010](#) meeting notes were accepted.

Office of Enterprise Technology Briefing

Ed Valencia indicated he would provide information about OET legislative and budget initiatives at the next meeting. He went on to highlight three OET activities:

1. Data Center co-location initiative. Last week OET and MMB issued mandates that stated:

A) *Critical IT assets*, defined as those that if they fail people die or would be adversely impacted (i.e., entitlements) will be in a “Tier 3” (most secure level) data center within two years. No existing OET data center provides Tier 3 security. An RFP has been issued for a third party Tier 3 center. Cost is expected to be approximately 30% higher than current OET data center rates. OET expects the Tier 3 site to be available around March 1, 2011.

B) *Non-critical IT assets* can go into the Tier 3 data center or will be co-located into 2 or 3 additional data centers which are likely to be State owned and operated. Co-location of non-critical IT assets must be completed within five years.

There are currently an estimated 40 State data centers including OET’s that house servers, mainframes and mini computers. The next step is to provide a template for agencies to assess their needs and assist with planning. Agencies will do their own planning and update their plans on a quarterly basis.

The vision is for the “end state” to be better than we have today. Valencia was asked if data center co-location would provide savings. He replied that OET expects aggregate State data center spending to be about the same, but that the strategy will provide substantial cost avoidance as costs to maintain 40 separate centers are expected to go up significantly.

2. The State is planning to move *Share Point* and *Exchange* services from being hosted at OET into the Cloud computing environment. The environment will be customized for and exclusive to the State and will NOT be shared by any other entity. David Arbeit noted that some states are exploring moving GIS applications into the Cloud.

3. The annual [Minnesota Government Information Technology Symposium](#) will be December 7-9, 2010, at the RiverCentre in downtown St. Paul. Ed encouraged members to attend.

Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council Report

Rebecca Foster, Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council liaison, reported the following about the 9/29/2010 meeting:

1. The Emergency Preparedness Committee provided a presentation about their committee to the Council.
2. Howard Veregin, Wisconsin State Cartographer, described efforts to create a permanent GI council in Wisconsin, the [Wisconsin Geographic Information Coordinating Council](#) (WIGICC) (also see an [overview article](#)). He expressed interest in attending future meetings by video or phone connection.
3. The Statewide Council discussed continuation of the advisory councils. It recommended that they both be extended until June 20, 2015 and that "Tribal Governments" be added to the list of Statewide Council stakeholders in the statute as they were inadvertently left out. The Statewide Council does have a tribal government representative, Dawn Sherk, White Earth Nation.
4. It was suggested that geospatial community develop a long term plan and funding strategy for statewide imagery, both leaf-on and leaf-off.
5. Discussed potential changes to the State Data Practices Act/Chapter 13 that were discussed by the State Government Council at its 9/21/2010 meeting. If the State is planning significant changes, it should work with the League of Minnesota Cities and the Association of Minnesota Counties to provide city and county input and possibly support. There is strong interest by some cities to have better and free access to county and state data. Arbeit added that he has heard from several sources that liability for the data and its use is a bigger concern than cost recovery for many local governments.

Governor's Commendation Award – Agenda item skipped. See [announcement](#).

MnGeo Briefing

Arbeit announced that the next meeting of the ESRI ELA Group would be on Tuesday, November 30th from 2:00 to 4:00 PM. If members have topics they would like to see discussed they should let Cialek know. The meeting agenda and location will be announced.

Standards Discussion

Ed Valencia described where geospatial standards fit into the enterprise IT perspective. The State CIO and OET are statutorily mandated and authorized to develop, implement and administer enterprise IT policies, standards and guidelines. OET has implemented an IT governance structure that involves state agencies and staff. Arbeit reminded the Council that he, as Chief Geospatial Information Officer, sits on the Architecture Review Board to represent the geospatial community and that several members of the GI community participate in I-Gov domain teams, including Chris Cialek who serves on the data/information domain team. This is an evolving process that has not yet been used to review or implement GIS standards. Valencia used [slides](#) to provide the enterprise perspective.

During discussion about the slides and information, the following points were made:

- The establishment process for standards is new and no standards have been established through it yet.
- A number of existing standards on the OET website are GIS standards.
- Many of the GIS standards were approved through the Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information and the Information Policy Council and were implemented prior to the I-Gov initiative.

- Some of the “GIS Standards” are data standards that should apply to all enterprise systems and data holdings (e.g., county codes).

Mike Dolbow asked: What do we do when we discover a data set or service that is not in compliance with existing standards? This generated some discussion.

Motion by Dolbow: If a data set is found on a state website or within one of the State’s data clearinghouses that is not in compliance with existing GIS standards, the State CGIO and Geospatial Standards Committee should be notified, and the data set removed from the website or clearinghouse until it is brought into compliance.

Discussion of the motion included:

- There is no enforcement of geospatial standards at this time and no one wants to be the standards “cop”.
- OET has the authority to set and enforce State IT standards, and the community has said it will comply. Therefore, compliance is really a volunteer function at this time.
- One non-compliance issue was recently identified, brought to the attention of the department generating the data and quickly resolved in the next generation of the data.

Dan Ross suggested that we go through all of the “GIS Standards” and take them through the new OET enterprise process. Mark Kotz, Geospatial Standards Committee Chair, suggested the Standards Committee could:

1. Review existing state geospatial standards and prioritize them for appropriateness for moving through the OET process
2. Recommend a first cut of standards to move through the process and suggested modifications to those standards (e.g. compliance language)
3. Report this to both Geospatial Advisory Councils for feedback and direction

The motion did not receive a second and was withdrawn. Arbeit brought the discussion to an end in order to get to other meeting business with the recognition that this topic would be brought back at a subsequent Council meeting. Cialek’s presentation on the geospatial data standards planned for this meeting will be included in that discussion. MnGeo, the Standards Committee and others will do some additional work on this topic.

Emergency Management and Response/Geospatial

David Arbeit informed the Council that he had heard from a legislator after this year’s Special Session concerns about:

- Concern about the unavailability of current flood plain maps for affected areas.
- The ability to have real time imagery generated during an emergency response.

Arbeit reported that he provided the legislator with information about DNR’s flood mapping program and that the statewide LiDAR program will support development of new flood plain maps, but that completing them will take time and resources. He further emphasized that “real-time” imagery was a special challenge that the community is working on but will not be easily solved.

John Blood, Department of Public Safety, Homeland Security and Emergency Management, described plans for a day-long workshop scheduled on Friday, November 12th to coordinate agencies and organizations involved in emergency preparedness and response and explore strategies for providing geospatial information technology/data. Over 40 people have been invited including representatives of ESRI, FEMA, USGS, state agencies, local government and other partners. The day is planned to review and discuss:

1. Where is HSEM going with GIS?
2. Each agency will describe what GIS technology and data related to next Spring's flooding:
 - a. That they have in place
 - b. That they need
 - c. That they lack
3. HSEM and ESRI are going to provide a demo of DLAN and its the GIS functionality.
4. Discussion of moving forward and what items and issues need to be addressed and by whom.

John Blood suggested reporting back to the Council at its next meeting.

2011 Legislative Session – Agenda item skipped.

Agency Issues and Needs – Agenda item skipped.

Informational Items and Announcements

- There were no announcements
- [Committee, Workgroup](#) and [Project Reports](#) were provided in meeting materials.

Future Meetings

- State Government Advisory Council 2011 Meetings will be on Tuesdays: January 11, March 15, May 10, July 12, September 13, and November 8; from 10:00 AM to 12:00 noon.
- Next Statewide Advisory Council meeting will be December 29, 2010. The 2011 meetings will be on 5th Thursdays (March 21, June 30, September 29 and December 29)

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting notes by Fred Logman and Nancy Rader.