

MnGeo Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council

February 29, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Blazing Star Room, 658 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55155

Attendees

Members: Brad Anderson, City of Moorhead (video); David Arbeit, MnGeo; James Bunning, Scott County; Craig Erickson, Minnesota National Guard (video); Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council; Jon Gustafson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Blaine Hackett, Flat Rock Geographics; Doug Hansen, Crow Wing County (video); John Mackiewicz, WSB & Associates; Robert McMaster, University of Minnesota; Stephen Misterek, City of Minneapolis; Tim Ogg, Board of Water and Soil Resources; Mark Olsen, Pollution Control Agency; Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County; Ben Richason, St. Cloud State University (audio); Dawn Sherk, White Earth Nation; Gerry Sjerven, Natural Resources Research Institute (audio); Steve Swazee, SharedGeo; Kody Thurnau, ARDC (audio); Michelle Trager, Rice County (video); Sally Wakefield, Envision Minnesota.

Non-Members: Laurie Beyer-Kropuenske, Dept. of Administration; Mike Dolbow, Dept. of Agriculture; Jon Eichten, OET; Brad Henry, University of Minnesota; John Hoshal, MnGeo; Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council; Tim Loesch, Dept. of Natural Resources; Fred Logman, MnGeo; Carolyn Parnell, OET; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Ron Wencl, U.S. Geological Survey

Welcome

David Arbeit called the meeting to order. Participants introduced themselves. Many participants attended via video due to snowy weather. Unfortunately, due to problems with the audio connection, although they were able to hear the discussion, their comments could not be heard.

CGIO Succession

Arbeit, Minnesota's current Chief Geospatial Information Officer (CGIO), said that this was his last Council meeting, since he will retire from State service on April 10. 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. The next CGIO will report to Chris Buse, OET Assistant Commissioner. Beyer-Kropuenske said that there would be a retirement celebration from 2:00 to 3:30 PM, on Tuesday, April 10 in the Centennial Cafeteria and that everyone in the community is invited to attend. On behalf of all the council members, Reinhardt thanked Arbeit for his years of work on behalf of Minnesota's geospatial community.

Commissioner Parnell reiterated her support for the council's work and indicated that the geospatial community's collaboration is a great model for State IT collaborations. She has met individually with each of MnGeo's staff to learn what they felt were important characteristics for the next CGIO.

Buse further described the CGIO selection process. The person selected must 1. be well-recognized in the GIS field; 2. must have very strong management skills, be versed in the political and budgeting process, and be able to represent the geospatial community; and 3. must be able to create a vision for the State's geospatial efforts that becomes part of the statewide IT planning. There will be a 5-year vision along with a tactical plan that is supported by initiatives and projects. The CGIO position was nationally advertised, about 60 people applied, and the list was narrowed to 17 strong candidates. A small committee, which includes members of Minnesota's geospatial community and Buse, is narrowing the list down for further consideration. They are aiming for interviews by the third week in March.

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.

State IT Governance Framework

Buse used 4 [slides](#) to describe the developing draft State IT Governance Framework:

- Slide 1 - 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. There are three main governance categories: Vision, Planning, and Technology Operations Alignment.
- The State IT governance structure is primarily focused on State entities and representatives, but decisions need to work not only for the Executive Branch but for stakeholders outside state government. 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 CGIO, and the flow of issues, discussions and decisions will be different. Communications to and from the CGIO 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. In this version, a “Geospatial Technology Steering Committee” would be the primary decision/recommendation making entity. Still need to determine who will be the decisionmakers on the steering committee.
- When State IT governance is finalized, the diagram is likely to change.

Discussion followed:

- Members thanked Buse and Parnell for providing this information.
- What is the difference between the current State Government Geospatial Advisory Council and the proposed Steering Committee? The Steering Committee would take responsibility for much decision making that is currently done primarily by the CGIO.
- What is the timeline on developing the framework? The first draft is due for Parnell’s review the week of March 2.
- Is there a place in this framework for encouraging innovation and collaboration? New ways to do things better? Not specifically, although this whole process is intended to encourage these qualities.

Notes of November 29, 2011 Meeting

Motion to approve the November 29, 2011 [council meeting minutes](#) (Gelbmann/Wakefield). Motion carried.

Report – Liaison to State Government Council

Misterek reported on two highlights of the State Government Council’s January 10 meeting: 1. Tim Loesch had demonstrated DNR’s Geospatial Data Resource Sites (GDRS), and 2. MnGeo is coordinating

negotiations for the next Enterprise License Agreement with Esri for their GIS software, to be effective July 2012. For details, see the [January 10 meeting minutes](#).

Proposed Data Practices Legislation

Beyer-Kropuenske reported on the current status of proposed changes to the State's Data Practices legislation (see [handout](#)). In the first hearing for House File 2201, legislators asked that a definition of "geospatial data" be provided, so language based on what Arizona has used is being considered. Some people would like the changes to be broadened beyond government-to-government data sharing to anyone in the public. So far, the only non-government group specified is Gopher State One Call. The proposed changes would not give any new copyright protection, and do not interfere with the ability for anyone to inspect public data.

Members gave extensive feedback:

- Are legislators aware of the [Sierra Club vs. Orange County lawsuit](#) on the public availability of geospatial data in California? Yes, but California's laws are different. Beyer-Kropuenske hasn't seen any similar litigation in Minnesota yet.
- The main issues with data distribution have always involved cost, liability and legal agreements. Cost is becoming less of an issue than liability and the agreements. It would help greatly to have standard language for agreements, a redistribution hub for data, and availability of data to non-government organizations.
- The Metropolitan Council and MetroGIS have found that negotiating license agreements is very time-consuming. For example, the latest revision of the Twin Cities parcel data sharing agreement with 7 counties took approximately 300 hours of Met Council staff time plus uncounted hours of county staff time to negotiate, even though the changes to the existing agreement were minor.
- Data producers should be allowed the option to recoup the costs of distribution.
- We need to look for ways to reduce the barriers to sharing data.
- It is in everyone's interest to share data widely; immunity from liability would be an incentive.
- Liability protection should apply both to the originator of the data, redistributors and to downstream users of the data.
- Is the Freedom of Information Act of help with ensuring wider availability of data?
- It would be nice if we had the ability to redistribute public data and reduce redundant copies of data sets.
- Who can testify at future hearings? Council members cannot testify on behalf of the council, but other interested people can testify on their own behalf or on behalf of other non-Executive Branch organizations.
- Academia should be added like governmental entities.

Parcel Business Plan Project

Logman reported on the [current status](#) of the project [A Business Plan for Statewide Parcel Data Integration for Minnesota](#).

- The online survey of parcel data consumers and producers will be available March 7-25.
- A stakeholder workshop designed for policy makers and administrators will be held April 5. The workshop will include presentations and discussion about parcel data needs and availability, the legal framework for data, a review of parcel data use in the State, and some general survey results. An understanding of parcel data producer needs and experiences will provide insight for

development of the business plan. The workshop will be held at MnDOT's facility in Arden Hills, with videoconferencing available. Members were given a draft list of invitees and were encouraged to suggest others who should be invited to the workshop.

- The draft business plan is scheduled to be completed in June, with the final plan completed in July.

Statewide Data Initiatives

- Spring aerial imagery program update: see [handout](#).

2012 Legislative Initiatives

- Arbeit reported that House File 2295 contained language about reporting annual state expenditures by geography.

Hot Topics, Member Needs and Concerns

- **LightSquared:** Swazee provided an update on the [controversy](#) surrounding the LightSquared company's broadband proposal; Logman had also generated a [summary](#) of the issue. Swazee provided a [short presentation](#) which explained that the signals that LightSquared would send from ground-based stations would greatly impact existing GPS and navigation communications that were within a significant distance.
- See the Emergency Preparedness Committee's [EPC Blog](#) for examples of other hot topics.

Information Items and Announcements

- Swazee announced that the U.S. National Grid (USNG) was selected as the [FEMA Think Tank's #2 issue](#). Also, Talbot Brooks, who has long advocated use of the USNG, has been hired by FEMA to reorganize their geospatial structure and process.
- Misterek will attend the March 13 meeting of the State Government Geospatial Advisory Council as the liaison from the Statewide Council, but other members may have to attend subsequent meetings.
- Gelbmann announced that a new Twin Cities 7-county regional parcel agreement was just signed. In a major change in policy, historic Twin Cities regional parcel data that is more than 3 years old may now be downloaded by the public for no charge from the [MetroGIS DataFinder website](#).
- **Remaining 2012 Statewide Council Meetings:** May 30, August 29, November 28
- Next State Government Council meeting will be March 13, 2012.

Meeting Adjourned. Notes by Nancy Rader and Fred Logman.