

MnGeo State Government Geospatial Advisory Council

January 11, 2011

Meeting Notes

Participating

Members: David Arbeit, MnGeo (Chair); Mary Arvesen, Human Services; John Blood for Sean Mangan, Public Safety; Mike Dolbow, Agriculture; Jessica Fendos, Employment and Economic Development; Scott Freburg for Craig Rhombs, Education; Tim Loesch, Natural Resources; Dan Ross, Transportation; Ed Valencia, OET.

Non-members: Chris Cialek, MnGeo; Dan Falbo, ESRI; Joella Givens, MnDOT; Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council; Susanne Maeder, MnGeo; Fred Logman, MnGeo; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Ron Wencil, USGS.

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

November 9, 2010 Meeting Notes

The Meeting notes for the [November 9, 2010](#), meeting were accepted.

Office of Enterprise Technology Briefing

Ed Valencia suggested that members interested in what is new at OET visit their [Up to the MN.IT](#) newsletter web site.

1. Data Center co-location initiative. All agencies were required by the end of last year to complete and send to OET a questionnaire regarding their computer centers. This information is being used by OET to develop a report due to the Legislature on January 15th on computer room consolidation. A couple of project goals are to move the enterprise from supporting 40+ data centers to 4 thus avoiding considerable space and maintenance costs as well as providing higher level data centers for those applications whose business needs require them.
2. OET has just completed their multi-year effort to consolidate all state agencies' email systems into a single package. Processing is now being done at OET and in the Cloud. The use of [cloud processing](#) is saving the state money compared to a total in-house solution.
3. Gopal Khanna, State CIO and OET Commissioner, resigned in December and the Deputy Commissioner has been running the agency since then. Newly elected Governor Dayton has not yet appointed a new CIO/OET Commissioner. Two key OET positions are not appointed: Chris Buse, security, and Ed Valencia, enterprise architecture, procurement, standards and portfolio management. Valencia expects the security and I-Gov initiatives started under CIO Khanna to continue under a new Commissioner.
4. Valencia indicated that the new administration under Governor Dayton is pushing technology as a way to do State business differently and more efficiently than we have for the past 20 years. Also there is growing interest in mobile technology taking advantage of multifunction phones, tablets and other newer technology to deliver State services and information.
5. OET will be submitting seven mandated reports to the Legislature on January 15th, three of which have standards components.

Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council Report There was no Statewide Council report.

Standards Discussion

Background: At the November 9, 2010, Council meeting, Ed Valencia described where geospatial standards fit into the enterprise IT perspective and OET's I-Gov initiative. [Valencia's November presentation](#) focused on the enterprise technology governance environment where there are multiple domain groups, an Architectural Review Board (ARB), CIO Council, a State CIO and a developing process by which MN State Government technology standards are to be established. David Arbeit, State CGIO, is a member of the ARB, representing the geospatial community.

Chris Cialek, Co-chair of the Standards Committee, [presented](#) current State geospatial standards and summarized the history of geospatial standards and the processes they went through to be established.

Cialek indicated that the existing geospatial standards fell into three clusters:

1. Standards that had been approved by the Governor's Council on Geographic Information, the Information Policy Council (replaced by the CIO Council), the Information Policy Office (now an OET responsibility), and then were implemented as [Information Resource Management \(IRM\) standards](#) by the Department of Administration Commissioner who had responsibility and authority prior to the creation of OET and establishment of a State CIO in 2005. These include:
 - Codes for MN Counties
 - State Agency Coordinate Interchange
 - MN Geographic Metadata Guidelines
 - Positional Accuracy
2. Standards that had been approved by the Governor's Council on Geographic Information, but had not gone through other community reviews because the processes were being re-engineered. These standards are on the OET website as geospatial standards and include:
 - Codes for the Identification of States
 - Codes for Lake and Wetland Basins
 - Codes for Watersheds
 - River Reach/Water Course Identifiers
 - City, Township and Unorganized Territory Identifiers
 - US National Grid
3. New standards that are in the process of being created or reviewed. Some of the geospatial standards that are anticipated include:
 - Stormwater Conveyance
 - Thoroughfare, Landmark, and Postal Address Data Standard
 - MN Geocode Model

Cialek indicated the six standards in the second category went through significant community review after which they were approved by the former Governor's Council on Geographic Information, but have not gone through the new OET review and approval process. Most of these standards are National standards that MN has reviewed and adopted. All of these standards contain common components including:

- Applicability
- Purpose
- Requirements
- Compliance
- References

Cialek also informed the Council that the FGDC website has a list of [64 approved federal standards](#).

Cialek then provided four recommendations to the Council for consideration that he and Standards Committee Co-chair Mark Kotz had formulated:

1. OET consider the 4 previously ratified IRM standards (listed in number 1 above) as state approved, and that OET inform the CIO Council of that decision.
2. OET address the 6 standards that were approved by the Governor's Council and posted by OET as geospatial standards (listed in number 2 above) by sending them directly to the ARB to consider for ratification.
3. OET provide advice and guidance to the Standards Committee and OET's Data Domain Team to help each group prepare for and deal with new proposed standards.
4. MnGeo adopt a procedure that includes the reporting of instances of non-compliance to the Standards Committee for research and recommendations.

Council Chair Arbeit called for a motion on the recommendations so the Council could discuss them.

Motion by Mike Dolbow with a second by Dan Ross for the Council to adopt the four recommendations Cialek presented. Arbeit then called for discussion. (**Motion was eventually withdrawn.**)

Tim Loesch said that many of these standards were developed in the 1990s and he wondered if they should be reviewed to see if they are still relevant today. Mark Kotz responded that all of the standards have been reviewed in the last couple of years and except for the Metadata Standard, they do not need to be revisited. Maeder noted that the Hydrography Committee needs to update the watershed code standard to refer to the most current watershed dataset. Mike Dolbow indicated he believes the Minnesota Geospatial Metadata Guidelines are indeed more of a "guideline" than a "standard". Arbeit noted that the Metadata document as it is written, would be considered a "standard" not a "guideline" by the ARB. Arbeit went on to say he feels that these standards need to address compliance and what an agency can do if they absolutely need an exception to the standard in order for the "geospatial standards" to fit with the OET enterprise standards model.

Action Item: The Standards Committee should update the ten geospatial standards to include compliance, exception and any other information needed to fit the OET enterprise technology standards structure.

Chris Cialek stated that he did not feel standards compliance should be the geospatial community's responsibility, as data standards should impact all State data holdings and systems not just geospatial ones. Dan Ross indicated that MnDOT looks at these standards as rules that apply to all MnDOT databases not just geospatial ones.

Motion by Mike Dolbow with a second from Tim Loesch that: MnGeo adopt a procedure that includes the reporting of instances of non-compliance with geospatial standards to the Standards Committee for review and recommendation. **Motion carried.**

Action Item: MnGeo will establish a process where non-compliance with geospatial standards can be reported to MnGeo, documented and forwarded to the Standards Committee for review and recommendation.

Motion by Dan Ross with a second from Mike Dolbow that: MnGeo work with OET to begin with three of the IRM Standards (county codes, coordinate interchange, and positional accuracy), define on-going procedures and report back to the Council. Chris Cialek indicated that he did not think that the Data Domain Team would know what to do with the standards unless they were provided some guidance. David Arbeit suggested that all 10 of the standards should be updated and then referred to the ARB which would

determine where they should go and provide some direction. Arbeit's suggestion was accepted as a friendly motion amendment. **Motion carried, as amended.**

Action Item: Arbeit will contact Valencia to discuss the established geospatial standards and work with him to get these standards, after being updated to include needed information, moving through appropriate processes so they can be fully implemented.

Emergency Management and Response/Geospatial

John Blood, Department of Public Safety, Homeland Security and Emergency Management (HSEM), described two HSEM workshops recently conducted to identify and try to address GIS needs of HSEM, state agencies, counties, cities and other MN emergency managers and partners. The next meeting of that group will be either February 8th or 10th from 1:00 to 4:00 PM. Blood said that anyone who had not received notice of the previous meetings should let him know so that he can update his contact list.

He went on to explain that HSEM uses *DisasteLan* (DLAN) as its common operating picture system for all MN disasters to provide situational awareness. Just added to DLAN this week was a new *Silverlight* viewer. They also will be using the *Flex*-based viewer developed by ESRI, previously known as MIPER and now called MESA. DLAN and its viewer will be for HSEM's internal use while MESA will be for use by HSEM's external partners such as counties and cities. Both viewers can provide access to similar data. HSEM will add applications to MESA to address partners' needs based on requests they receive. One goal is to have the data and information needed accessible from both viewers to answer the question: What is located there (a specific physical place)? Answering this question will require having access to numerous State agencies' data.

In addition to DLAN and MESA, HSEM is planning to use the ESRI *ArcGIS On-line* as the data sharing platform for MN emergency management. Use of the [ArcGIS On-line](#) does not require that you are an ESRI customer. To participate, staff will need to acquire an *ArcGIS On-line* ID and apply to be a member of the MN emergency management data sharing group. Blood indicated that he will be sending an announcement shortly to his list that will provide information for signing up to be a member of the MN emergency management group. All of this is part of HSEM's effort to get ready for spring 2011 flooding, which they expect to be widespread across much of MN. David Arbeit noted that HSEM is collecting a lot of data that many agencies would like to have access to it to address non-emergency business needs.

Action Item: John Blood to send out information on *ArcGIS On-line* and how to get invited into the Minnesota Emergency Management Group to Council members and those he invited to the two workshops.

John Blood stated that HSEM is working with Xcel Energy and Minnesota Power to acquire outage data in a timely manner. Blood also indicated that HSEM is "going mobile", working on apps that could promote "crowd sourcing" and is purchasing some mobile equipment.

Dan Ross said he wanted to discuss incident imagery. During the spring 2010 floods, MnDOT worked with the Civil Air Patrol to acquire, post-process and serve up imagery on a daily basis. Issues Ross identified include: Who is going to provide the imagery? Who can order it? For what areas of the State can it be acquired? How is it going to be paid for? Will it be timely? How will it be made available? Ross said a small group needs to get together to address these and other imagery questions before the spring flooding begins.

Action Item: John Blood will bring together a small group to address the incident imagery issues Ross identified above.

Dan Ross also indicated that MnDOT was beginning to train counties to use MnDOT's road closure application, so that counties could enter road closure information during an emergency.

Tim Loesch stated that LiDAR and elevation data were going to be in demand and was concerned about the adverse impact on DNR resources as DNR's LiDAR data was very heavily accessed during past flooding. He was also concerned about the data residing on a single server in a single data center. Loesch went on to say that there are over 15 million individual contours in their database. David Arbeit stated that MnGeo might have some resources which could be applied to help address the need for access to elevation and LiDAR data.

Action item: MnGeo discuss LiDAR and elevation data distribution needs and options with Tim Loesch.

2011 Legislative Session

David Arbeit indicated that he did not know the status of the draft legislation submitted to update the data practices statutes or provide for the continuation of the Advisory Councils as no word has come from Governor Dayton's office yet. Tim Loesch anticipates DNR will be seeking additional Clean Water funds to complete statewide LiDAR coverage.

Agency Issues and Needs – Agenda item skipped.

Informational Items and Announcements

There were no announcements.

CAP Grant – Parcel Layer Business Plan. David Arbeit provided a quick summary of the application for a [CAP Grant](#) MnGeo submitted to assess the current state of Minnesota parcel data and develop a business plan to provide guidance for creating a statewide parcel data layer. Arbeit noted that MnDOT and DNR have been entering into agreements with counties to acquire their parcel data to help them meet their own agency business needs. Tim Loesch stated that as DNR enters into new or renews county data sharing agreements for their parcel data, they are changing the language to make the data available to all state agencies not just for DNR's use. Arbeit thanked Loesch and said this is the type of collaboration and enterprise thinking that is needed. Arbeit also noted that the former Land Records Modernization Committee (now the Digital Cadastral Data Committee) has been working for some time to lay the groundwork to acquire or build a statewide parcel data layer and that several counties are willing to provide or serve their parcel data. Arbeit then mentioned and thanked the individuals and organizations that wrote letters of support for the MnGeo grant and have agreed to participate in the project.

[MnGeo 2010 Year in Review](#), [Committee and Workgroup Reports](#) and [Project Updates](#) were provided in the meeting materials. Mike Dolbow stated he would find the information provided in the *MnGeo 2010, Year in Review* more meaningful if it were related to the priorities in the Applied Geographics report.

Action Item: MnGeo will update the "MnGeo 2010 Year in Review" to relate it to the priorities identified in the Applied Geographics final report.

Future Meetings

Tim Loesch stated that he thought the Council meetings seemed rushed and did not provide enough time to adequately discuss and address all the items on the agenda. Loesch also suggested adding times to the agenda for each item so participants would be able to see how long items were anticipated to take. Arbeit indicated that his agenda had estimated times and that today's meeting was mostly "on time". The Council agreed that future meetings should be scheduled for 3 hours.

Action Item: Schedule future Council meetings for three hours.

- State Government Advisory Council 2011 Meetings will be on Tuesdays: March 15, May 10, July 12, September 13, and November 8; from **9:00 AM to 12:00 noon**.
- Statewide Advisory Council 2011 meetings will be on 5th Thursdays (March 31, June 30, September 29 and December 29) from 1:00 to 4:00 PM.

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting notes by Fred Logman and Nancy Rader.