

MnGeo Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council

Blazing Star Room, Centennial Office Building, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155
December 2, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Members: Brad Anderson, City of Moorhead; Jeffrey Bloomquist, Farm Service Agency; David Brandt, Washington County; Scott Freburg, Dept. of Education; Kari Geurts, MN.IT @ Dept. of Natural Resources; Blaine Hackett, RESPEC; Len Kne, University of Minnesota; Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council; John Mackiewicz, WSB & Associates; Philipp Nagel, Sibley County; Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County; Cory Richter, City of St. Paul; Dan Ross, MnGeo; Alison Slaats, MN.IT @ Agriculture and Board of Animal Health

Non-Members: Mike Dolbow, MnGeo; Will Craig; Brad Henry, University of Minnesota; Mike Koutnik, Esri; Geoff Maas, MetroGIS; Nancy Rader, MnGeo; Hal Watson, MN.IT @ DNR; Ron Wencil, U.S. Geological Survey

[Meeting slides are online](#)

Call to order, welcome and introductions

The group provided introductions. Unfortunately, telephone audio failed for offline participants. Several members attempted to join the WebEx but were unable to listen in due to telephone failures. As a result, the WebEx was closed halfway through the meeting.

Approval of Agenda. No objections.

Approval of September 23, 2015 meeting minutes. No objections, approved.

Discussion & Action: Modification of Council Mission Statement

New proposed mission with related proposed changes to Guiding Principles and Examples of Coordination
Mission: “Act as a coordinating body for the Minnesota geospatial community to improve services statewide.”

Kotz noted that at the last meeting we discussed our mission, and in the interim, the leadership group attempted to further define the mission. He explained that the leadership team noted a continuous theme about acting as a coordinating body, and opted for a streamlined mission statement. Kotz also reviewed the guiding principles and examples of coordination that were provided in the Agenda Packet beforehand. He called for discussion.

Slaats offered that a streamlined statement was preferable, but wasn't clear what improving services statewide meant so she suggested that that portion could be cut. Craig offered that a shorter statement is always better. Geurts asked what kind of services are we talking about. Hackett offered that we are already talking about the MN geospatial community, so calling it “geospatial services” was redundant.

Geurts offered a change of “for effective use of geospatial technology use statewide”. Ross offered that we are working towards enterprise services, which is why we included that. Dolbow offered that the mission was deliberately vague because it is a big mission – improving all services statewide. Kne asked why we don't simply stop at the word “community”. Kotz called for a motion.

Slaats moved to change the mission to “Act as a coordinating body for the Minnesota geospatial community”. Richter seconded. Kotz called for any further discussion. Motion carried.

Kotz called for a motion on the changes to examples and guiding principles. Slaats moved and Geurts seconded. Kotz called for discussion, none was offered. Motion carried.

Discussion & Action: [Committee Reporting Relationships](#)

Kotz noted that there was good discussion and some confusion about this at the last meeting. The leadership team developed a more specific proposal as a result. To clarify, we're not talking about submitting reports as much as we are about who the committee reports to, who they serve, what we call them, etc.

Kotz reviewed some of the questions we reviewed as a result. We want to review two items:

1. Review and update of charter and work plan documents
2. Discussion on questions/answers

Kotz also noted that there is a state agency Geospatial Technical Committee, and we need to figure out how to incorporate that group in broader governance for MnGeo and the community.

Kotz reviewed the questions and answers provided in the slide deck, calling for discussion on each:

1. Who do the committees and workgroups serve? The geospatial community as represented by the Minnesota Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council (GAC).
 - No dissent or discussion.
2. From whom do committees and workgroups get their mission and purpose? Or who must approve them? The mission and purpose could be generated by the GAC or it could come from a grass roots effort and be approved by the GAC.
 - Brandt replied that he thinks about federal initiatives that would require some committee or workgroup involvement. We may also recognize a need for something, but an outside influence might also bring a committee forth. There's "no wrong door", we just have to approve it.
 - The group assented to this. Ross added that it requires a charter and workplan.
3. What must committees and workgroups do to be able to call themselves a committee or workgroup of the MN Geospatial Advisory Council? (Examples in slides.)
 - Ross asked the group if they would like to see updates from each committee at each Council meeting. Richter offered that it would be good to hear at least a periodic update incorporated in their workplan – what is their plan to keep us in the loop about their progress?
 - Geurts agreed with a short written summary that can be reviewed ahead of the meeting. We don't necessarily need to hear a verbal report every time. But without a summary, there can be a disconnect between the committee and the larger group.
 - Freiburg noted that the GIS/LIS Board is also considering changes for themselves in their own committee governance.
 - Kotz noted that he will add a requirement of a short written summary for each meeting. Periodically we may call them in to provide a verbal report or presentation.
 - Ross offered that committees should also feel empowered to submit agenda items to the Council. Geurts added that they should also know that they can ask to be invited.
 - Rader added that it's helpful for Committee Chairs to know that the Council reads and uses the reports, it's seen as less of "busy work". They should know what info we need from them, and how we use it.
 - Geurts offered that perhaps a standing agenda item should be review of committee reports and call for any questions for the committees. That way committee chairs know we are using their reports. Kotz agreed, saying it's OK to make it easy – a chair can say "no new news" and that is acceptable.
 - Kotz asked about the example of "Accept revisions to their work plan..." Ross asked about what that means to the committees and Council. The Council should feel an active connection to the Committee. If the Council feels strongly about something, it should be communicating that to the Committee Chair(s).
 - Kotz called for further comment and none was offered.

4. Who decides if a committee or workgroup should cease to be a committee or workgroup of the MN Geospatial Advisory Council? The GAC makes this decision. Typically this would be done based on a recommendation of the Committee or workgroup.
 - No further dissent or discussion.
5. Who decides if a new MN GAC committee or workgroup should exist? The GAC decides this, but it may be initiated by a self-forming group.
 - Another way to describe this is “no wrong door”. Brandt asked if this was the same as #2 and Kotz said it may be. We can tighten this up if necessary.

Kotz provided a summary of the above discussion. He asked for a motion to approve the suggestions added. Freburg moved, Geurts seconded. Motion carried.

Discussion & Action: Changes to Committees and Workgroups

Kotz reviewed the three Proposed Actions:

1. Ask the Outreach Committee to convene. Ask them to review and potentially revise their charter/mission, based on discussion at last GAC meeting and the new role of the GAC.
2. Sunset the Geocoding Workgroup based on the recommendation of the Chair
3. Sunset the Geospatial Commons Workgroup based on the recommendation of the Chair

Kotz noted that page 4 of the packet lists all the Committees and Workgroups. He asked for feedback on the above changes. He noted that Craig was listed as the Chair of the Outreach group, and willing to help but not chair the group anymore. Andrew King-Scribbins has offered to be involved via prior e-mail. Kotz asked if any other members were interested.

Kotz called for a motion to approve #1. Slaats motioned, and Mackiewicz seconded. Ross offered that this is one of the areas where different sectors can get involved. He noted that if you represent a sector, you should seek out members. Geurts, Kne, Slaats, Reinhardt, Mackiewicz offered to assist on the Outreach Committee. Motion carried.

Kotz asked Dolbow for a summary on #2, and Dolbow noted that some of the problems the workgroup originally wanted to address have been resolved or mitigated. For example, MnGeo is offering a geocoding service for state agencies, and hopes to extend or complement that service with one available to the whole community. Since the group hasn't met for several years, it should be sunsetted. Freburg asked who was working with the various data providers to improve and extend the existing MnGeo service. Ross offered that we're working on updating those layers and changing them to sources that can be shared better. Then we need to have a discussion about what an enterprise geocoding service for the state needs to be. We can discuss that once we have stable data sources behind that service. MnGeo is committed to that process, and Ross doesn't think we need to convene a committee. It's always been a long-term goal to have that.

Kotz noted that a number of existing data efforts can be used by the geocoder once successful. Ross noted that NG9-1-1 is collecting address points and centerlines, and then that data can be used by the geocoder. Freburg just didn't want us to come back and discover we needed a workgroup when we just retired it.

Kotz continued with a brief history of the Geospatial Commons workgroup. A clear vision was articulated along with a prototype, which was then handed off to MnGeo and state agencies to make it happen. He thought it was an example of an effective grass-roots workgroup, but noted that as a result the workgroup itself hasn't met in several years. So, now the workgroup's mission is no longer relevant since the Commons is now operational. He called for questions or comments. Ross noted that this is how MnGeo wants things to work. He wants the Council and the community to tell us what's needed, and for state government (and other partners) to get it done. That's how it's supposed to work.

Craig noted that this is a good example of the difference between a workgroup and a committee. Workgroups, once accomplishing a goal, can sunset. Koutnik noted that this is similar to a lot of governing organizations. Kotz noted that the GAC web page makes note of this as well.

Kotz called for a motion to sunset the two workgroups. Reinhardt motioned, Bloomquist seconded. Motion carried.

Ross asked Kotz to review the remaining committees and workgroups.

- Parcels and Land Records has been very active in the past, and has put together a draft parcel data exchange standard that was submitted to the standards committee and put out for public review several years ago. A recent tweak will be submitted to the standards committee soon.
- The Digital Elevation Committee actively worked on getting the state's LiDAR data set created. Ross noted that it is now going through a redefinition. The current discussion is to further the group to educate the community about other uses of LiDAR – can we use elevation data in other ways. For example, “EleHydro”: for hydrography. The group called for new leadership. The committee looks like it will continue but perhaps refocus.
 - Geurts asked if we were asking for updates of charters from all committees. Kotz replied that we will ask for that from all committees.
- Hydrography Committee has existed for a long time. They are discussing a merge with the elevation group.
- Emergency Preparedness Committee is still active. Ross noted that a meeting notice just came out this morning, for December 10th. It will be at the Wilder Foundation at 2:30 pm and will discuss NG9-1-1 and a Common Operating Picture.
 - Geurts asked if there was a requirement that someone on the Council be on the committee. Kotz replied that the question has definitely come up in the past. The GAC should probably make a decision on that. Kotz said that a requirement that a member *chaired* a committee just didn't always work. His opinion was that if a committee is effective, it shouldn't matter.
 - Reinhardt said that if there's not a member, there should at least be a liaison. We need to have some kind of connection. Kotz noted that committee chairs would often show up at Council meetings.
- Standards Committee. Kotz noted that he will be stepping down as chair and that the committee will be electing a new chair. He anticipates that the next meeting will be when the parcel committee submits a standard for review. Kotz noted that the committee only meets when standards are submitted – there are no standing meetings for the committee.
- Metadata Workgroup. Kotz noted that “stuff just keeps coming up” for this workgroup. But it also does not meet regularly. Rader is the chair and the group is active periodically as issues arise.
- Anderson asked if there were a stormwater group a while back. Kotz replied that a group did exist to propose a standard. Rader replied that it was not a formal group, but it merely formed to develop that standard. The champion departed for a different position, so the [standard remains proposed](#) with a pilot/test, but no official endorsement. Kotz replied that no other standards have come up for MetroGIS, and Maas replied that the stormwater standard is on their work plan as a continued research item for 2016. They are collecting the use cases for folks who need inter-jurisdictional data that such a standard would support.
- Craig asked if there is an official liaison with MnGeo (not the GAC) for each committee. He also asked what it means to “meet”. How much work of a committee can be meeting-less? Kotz replied that whatever makes the committee effective is best.
- Ross added that parcel standard is coming, and NG9-1-1 standards should be proposed by February. A centerline standard will follow as the “MRCC plus” ([Metro Regional Centerline Collaborative](#)). So, be aware that several standards will be proposed for council review very soon. Kotz clarified that a standard has to first go to the committee, then be out for public review, and then responses to public review, potential revisions, possibly a second round of review. That can all take a lot of time, so proposed standards would not be ready for the next meeting. Ross replied that he may be seeking an expedited process for some

standards. Kotz noted that it will be the GAC's decision to approve whether or not the community has been engaged at an effective level. Ross said that NG9-1-1 standards might be different. Kotz said we could then approve a standard just for NG9-1-1 if necessary. Ross said that those will be provided soon.

Anderson presented t-shirts to Rader on the "Geospatial Metadata Tour".

Break – Networking

Discussion: Identifying Potential New Committees and Workgroups

Kotz reconvened with this agenda item. He explained that several new committees and workgroups have been suggested, as detailed in the slide:

1. Free and Open data policies and practices
2. Governance of the Geospatial Commons

Kotz asked if the Council saw a benefit to these groups, and if any members were willing to participate and/or recruit. He called for any discussion, noting that the Commons is operated by MnGeo (MN.IT), with state agency partners, so Ross had asked how much does a non-state government group make sense? He asked for discussion on the Commons.

Slaats noted that a Governance group for the Commons is definitely a good idea. An example of a question that has come up is whether or not CAD data should be included. She asked for Ross's thoughts on it, in terms of the relationship to MnGeo. Ross noted that he's torn in two directions on issues like this. There were two reasons for the Commons to be built: 1) A single portal to help us all share data with each other and 2) set up something for the broader community so that we don't have to spend so much time acquiring that local data. However, the challenge right now is that the Commons is growing so fast that there aren't the resources to fund and sustain its growth. New functions and benefits mean additional costs. MnGeo has to recover all of those costs somehow. Two-thirds of MnGeo's costs are covered by recovery mechanisms. We think it makes sense to add things like CAD, but we need to figure out the costs. There is a challenge as well with the Geospatial Technical Committee (GTC), which governs state efforts, and this is considered a state offering. His goal is to keep the Commons free and open as long as the state agencies can continue to fund it. His recommendation would be to see some kind of combined committee of GTC and GAC members to govern the site.

Reinhardt noted that this was similar to what MetroGIS went through several years ago. Governance can be determined by the value the host receives from it. Sometimes when you're just looking at something from one angle, the value isn't as easy to see. The Metropolitan Council at one point was ready to scrap MetroGIS because they didn't immediately see the value, so they went through a rigorous exercise to audit the value. By the time it was enumerated, they completely changed their minds and advocated for more support for MetroGIS. There needs to be better PR from the community to show this value.

Kotz noted that there is a lot of value in having a group like this be fairly nimble. If an issue arises, if the question could be answered very quickly, MnGeo would have a lot of value out of that speed. Having multiple steps is likely problematic. There may be times when the issue is not fast-moving, but other times time may be an issue.

Geurts asked what exactly we're proposing, and what the relationship would be to the GAC, or to MnGeo, or to the GTC. Ross replied that the Commons was always built for the community.

Watson suggested that MnGeo could convene an "Advisory Board", and invite members of this Council to participate, and that Board could provide the governance advice, etc. Then there could be representation of this group on that board. That might build a bridge and provide a method for input without a potential tug of war. Bloomquist expressed support for that idea. Kotz said that is an effective model. Dolbow offered that he has some ideas he can bring to the leadership team to define such a board. Geurts asked what was next, and Ross said they would bring it to the GTC. Kotz wrapped up the topic by saying that there was no action for the Council at this time.

Kotz shifted to “free and open data”. There are several counties that have now adopted formal policies. It may be a great time to engage the topic, and the Council could help build momentum by providing some advocacy. He called for discussion.

Reinhardt noted that the Outreach Committee really should include this as part of their mission. This is a unique message on this particular piece, so perhaps a Workgroup on this topic could feed into the Committee: who are we reaching out to, what are we advocating, and who should the Outreach group target?

Freburg said this would fit perfectly with that mission. Ross noted it’s one of the key issues he hears from user groups.

Geurts said that it merits enough work and focus to require a workgroup, because the Outreach Committee would have a lot to cover. Kne asked if it was a workgroup *under* the Outreach Committee, and the group agreed. Kotz noted that there were two ways to approach it: informal, part of the Outreach Committee, no charter, etc. Or, we could make it more official. Geurts asked if the Outreach Committee could take that decision on as to whether or not it should be formal.

Craig noted that Maas has put together a terrific white paper on this issue. What do we need to do other than publicize that more? Maas said another document is in the works, and that we have a lot of raw material that needs to be refined. Craig asked what else people have in mind.

Brandt said that part of the issue is that the current materials are “metro centric”. We might need to break down the perception that it’s being driven by the metro. It shouldn’t be entirely on Maas’s shoulders.

Reinhardt noted that we have the information, but the purpose of the Workgroup means getting it away from “metro centric”, approaching non-metro counties, and agreeing that it’s something we need to do.

Koutnik said that some of the potential he sees is actual outreach, not just communications, because folks often don’t look at just materials. Actually getting out and talking to people is a greater investment. Having a group of folks who are ready, almost as a “speakers’ bureau” that are advocates for an organization or an idea. If there are a group of folks who are willing to present to a county board, an IT department, etc., that could move the issue further.

Henry said that the [MN 2050 survey](#) is available online. The numbers show what the value is of the infrastructure in the state of MN, which is a very large number. He noted that Kne is now going to public meetings with a tool to show the infrastructure to cities and counties. One of the things he noted is that once people see the tool and the value of the data, folks are going to ask “how do I get there?”

Reinhardt added that one of the values of this group is there are people around the table that can open those doors. If we want to go to those public meetings, we have folks that can broker those connections. It’s important to know that.

Kotz said that we are asking the Outreach Committee to come back with a recommendation for this workgroup for the next Council meeting. No motion or voting required.

Discussion & Action: Rebranding as MN Geospatial Advisory Council

Kotz reviewed the proposed action: call ourselves the “Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council”. The word “Statewide” means less now that the original “State Government” Council has sunsetted (and been replaced by the GTC). A shorter name is clearer. We’re not proposing an official change to the legislation, but that we are “Doing Business as the MN GAC”. Reinhardt motioned approval. Kne seconded. Motion carried.

Legislative Update

Ross introduced Watson on the [Vegetation buffer mapping legislation/project](#)

Watson provided the following two URLs:

- DNR Buffer Mapping web page - <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/buffers/index.html>
- Public Waters Classification Viewer - <http://arcgis.dnr.state.mn.us/gis/buffersviewer/>

Watson also provided a brief verbal report. The policy is being done at a high level at the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) through deputy commissioners. There are four phases to the project:

1. Fall of 2015: use existing public waters inventory data on basins, lakes, and streams, to identify all of those that will require a buffer. The viewer is for this phase to get out what the scope is of the extent of public waters being considered. At this point, they're not looking for any feedback.
2. Begin working with counties and watershed districts to identify ditches within the benefited areas of public drainage systems. The DNR will coordinate with counties and Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) to figure out how to get or develop digital data that will be used to identify ditches that will require a buffer. There will be some business analysis to identify workflows to transfer existing data, or to develop data, etc. Some counties have this data already due to their taxing process, others do not have the same policies and data.
3. Next will be taking public waters data plus ditch data to combine into a buffer requirements map. There will be an application similar to the viewer, where folks who are authorized can login and provide comments and feedback.
4. Summer of 2016: the DNR Commissioner will approve the buffer maps that come out of the prior phases.

Watson recommended the general buffers web page above to refer customers and stakeholders to. Right now we're identifying water bodies that will require a buffer. That's not the same thing as digitizing a buffer, or making a water body more accurate, so that a precision GPS could guide where a buffer should be. The DNR will be working with landowners to do on-the-ground design of buffers instead of trying to focus too much on highly accurate hydrology and drainage information. There's just not enough time to do that, even though at some point higher accuracy might come out of this process. Ross noted that this is a good example of how geospatial technology can have a positive impact on policy.

Ross also noted that we've been creating a data model for ditches, which hopefully will directly benefit this project.

Hackett asked who ultimately will be tasked with creating a buffer, and Watson said ultimately it will be a local landowner, with assistance from BWSR. Geurts replied that the DNR is supplying the supporting information, and not the enforcement, which will fall on the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR). Hackett asked if this was going to be a mandate that has to be supported by county GIS folks, and Ross said it would likely result in some work for the counties to assist with the implementation. Reinhardt agreed, and Ross added that the intent all along is for BWSR to work with local government. There is a short timeline on the project.

National geospatial legislation. Ross noted that the National Geospatial Data Act of 2015 (S.740) is a bipartisan bill to codify and implement the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI). He reviewed the details noted on the slide. This affects us at the state level, opening the door for some better state/federal collaboration, which is certainly needed. When we look at NG9-1-1, and state addresses, the Census and US DOT are charged with bringing together a national address dataset, which would fit well with NG9-1-1. Eliminating some of the redundancies and accelerating the efforts are also goals. Ross encouraged folks to review the bill at the link in the slide.

He noted that the two sponsors are looking for additional sponsorship, because at a certain level, it automatically gets a hearing on the floor. He has reached out to Senator Klobuchar's office seeking support. He's asking the Council to write a letter to Senator Klobuchar's office supporting the bill.

Koutnik asked if there was a pattern to the states that have expressed support, and Ross noted that it's highly bipartisan and that a wide variety of states are showing support. He hopes that the Governor's Office will approve MnGeo's letter of support. He noted that this is a big effort of the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC), and this is an opportunity to have this Council support NSGIC.

Reinhardt moved that the Council write a letter of support. Nagel seconded. Kotz offered that he would draft the letter with Ross, and that it will be sent to the Council via e-mail for review (not vote). Koutnik asked if the National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) or MAPPS have gotten behind this bill. Ross noted that NGAC has supported it. Craig replied that the Coalition of Geospatial Organizations (COGO) is reviewing, and if 100% consensus is reached, a letter could come from that group. Motion carried.

Craig added that this comes out of the GIO and OMB as well, so hopefully Congress is listening. Ross added that this bill would actually strengthen the role of the NGAC.

Updates on Major Initiatives

Ross noted that all Council members are now members of NSGIC. MnGeo has covered the cost, but now Ross will get clarification on exactly what that means. It should help folks be more aware about national issues. By keeping the Council informed, members can keep others in their sectors informed. There is enough happening at the national level that local folks need to be informed and involved. NSGIC is a good vehicle to get that done. Craig noted that if our e-mails are in the membership database, that will actually cut down on the amount of stuff that Ross will have to relay to the Council. But this is still a new development, so folks might not have the "Welcome" e-mail just yet. Ross added that there are good opportunities to get on committees and hear about other state perspectives.

Craig noted that there is a virtual caucus next week that folks might want to get in on, and Ross noted that he will double-check this for the members, and that he will make sure to get that out to the members.

For NG9-1-1, Ross noted that a project newsletter is coming out about every 6 weeks. The first newsletter focused on FirstNet, which needed Public Safety Entity Boundaries for reporting purposes, to figure out where calls are coming from, and where the gaps are. MnGeo did this so that it could be one once for both FirstNet and for NG9-1-1. Ross reviewed the rest of the information in the slides.

Ross noted that data sharing for NG9-1-1 is much more effective than in the general GIS arena. Only one county has not sent any data, and that is just because they are completing their data efforts.

Ross supplied updates for other [MnGeo priority projects](#):

Parks and trails projects. Ross noted that there are two projects. Several meetings have taken place on both, and the two projects might come together to become one. Creating a data model, and providing better access at a local level, are two goals that are likely to come together. He noted that the U of MN is a significant partner in addition to the groups identified on the slide.

Aerial Imagery Master Contract. Vendor review happening now. This will help almost anyone buy up on contracts.

Parcel Data Collection and Aggregation. We're still working on this slowly, but due to a hiring freeze within MN.IT, MnGeo's efforts have slowed down.

Drainage Records Modernization. On schedule.

Statewide Address Points. There are many counties that do not have these, and so for NG9-1-1, MnGeo will have to generate those from parcels and try to move forward. Craig noted that NENA has said that none of the data they are loading into NG9-1-1 will have public access, so there might be a struggle there. Ross replied that he is closely following the US DOT effort on national addresses. Craig noted that we have to make sure we have data that doesn't go one way and is never seen again.

Geospatial Commons. See slides for update.

Statewide Centerlines. NG9-1-1 has leaped ahead of where DOT has been. DOT has Esri Roads and Highways, but is looking to update data. Currently we're thinking that we'll use the same flow for NG9-1-1 roads to update statewide centerlines for DOT. We've had to step back and reevaluate the data flow for statewide centerlines, and DOT supports making that data public.

State agency collaboration updates. Geurts noted that she and Slaats have been working on improving collaboration and communication amongst state agencies. They sent an e-mail to as many geospatial stakeholders in state agencies as they could initially identify, and that was a lesson in itself since there is no existing complete list. They have feedback from stakeholders and are now trying to document and reach some conclusions. A few initiatives have resulted in sending out a few more targeted questions to GIS leads in agencies. So far they have drafted a summary report and have submitted that to Ross. In the summary they have some suggestions and an outline of a plan. Next is solidifying that plan and providing feedback to the stakeholders that have been approached so far, as well as to the GAC. Stakeholders are excited to see this happen.

Ross noted that a lot of the things that are discovered in state agencies first are later rolled out to the community. Sometimes we put news articles on the Geospatial Commons, but MnGeo also has to redo its website. Those are examples of communications that we need to improve, and if we can improve internally first, that will help. Do we have a good statewide e-mail list? No, but do we have a state agency list? Not yet, but we probably should.

Announcements or Other Business

Kotz asked for announcements. Various members added:

- Kne noted that the U of MN has been doing a project with the state auditor's office looking at infrastructure, primarily underground. They've taken publicly available data, and are going out doing "road shows" at cities. The target audience is city officials and administrators, because a lot of the infrastructure is very old. They bring a large interactive display, which encourages folks to engage. Public officials need to see these first, because they are going to get calls from constituents.
- Bloomquist noted that NAIP 2015 ended on 11.13.2015, and we can expect delivery of those files in the next few months.
- Richter noted that on Friday she'll be meeting with Science Museum folks on a GIS Day exhibit for 2016.
- Anderson noted that his group is very busy with their permitting system. MN State University at Moorhead has approached him for contributions to the Community basemap. The group is working on a model for 3D buildings that could help NG9-1-1.
- Freburg noted that he has access to superintendents and often delivers GAC minutes to those folks to ask for comments. He has gotten replies of appreciation, and expects that to increase as more and more K-12 teachers utilize GIS in their classrooms.
- Koutnik echoed that NSGIC encourages a lot of external participation in their workgroups and committees.

Kotz adjourned the meeting.