

**Wisconsin Land Information Council
Minutes 2016-03-24**

Meeting Date: Thursday, March 24, 2016
Time: 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Location: Department of Administration (please r.s.v.p. and bring photo ID)
 Conference Room 924A
 101 E Wilson St, 9th Floor
Remote ID: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/770613845>
 Or +1 (872) 240-3312
 Access Code: 770-613-845

WLIC Appointees (Y = present; N = not present; T = participated by teleconference)							
Al Brokmeier	T	Jim Giglierano	Y	Mark Paulat	Y	Nathan Vaughn	T
Adam Derringer	Y	Maria Holl	N	Kristeen Pelot	T	Howard Veregin	Y
Don Dittmar	Y	Cori Lamont	N	Tim Statz	Y	Cynthia Wisinski	T
Daniel Frick							
Other Attendees							
Mike Friis – DOA (T)							
Peter Herreid – DOA							
Davita Veselenak – DOA							

1. Roll call and introductions

2. Approval of meeting minutes from February 10, 2016 meeting

- Motion to approve by Tim Statz
- Seconded by Howard Veregin
- Motion passed

3. Purpose of meeting (Dittmar)

- Meeting is to discuss public comments on the *Draft1 WLIP Program Plan*.
- Request from Don that recommendations are clear and voted on.

4. Discussion

a. Funding Model

- Funding model request from LION is to maintain the status quo, where revenues are divided evenly amongst all 72 counties.
- The LION model would allow greater flexibility of Strategic Initiative funding.
- Lidar and orthos are aligned to ground control. PLSS is not necessarily what the imagery would be tied to, although the two work together.
- Imagery projects often require control with identifiable places on the earth.
- PLSS does not enhance directly imagery, but PLSS does directly enhance parcels.
- One position is that funding go toward statewide strategic initiatives, rather than strictly locally-determined needs.
- Benchmarks 1-4 are geared toward parcels/PLSS, and not beyond that. Some feel funding should go to these priorities only.
- The question is the importance of parcels/PLSS are more or less relative to orthos and elevation data.

- The first draft is not explicit about whether a county would have to forfeit Strategic Initiative funding if they did not do orthos or lidar in the assigned year. But the dollars themselves do not go away, as they carry to the next fiscal year.
- Dividing the state into regions for a statewide program for aerial imagery would not necessarily reduce costs. Over 4-10,000 square miles, economies of scale cease to apply.
- Some desire imagery acquired at a single pass for the whole state, rather than in thirds. A whole-state approach is also very complex.
- Some do not see value in contracting with a single vendor, which would limit county choices.
- The model of the Parcel Initiative for 2016-2017 is geared toward achieving the objectives of the statutes.
- Another way of viewing the funding model—funding the counties to generate the data that has a standard or spec which is specified by the state.
- Rather than having DOA coordinate one master contract, there is the option to allow counties to make purchases based on standards specified by the state. Standards would be key in this model.
- Shawano, Brown, Rock, and other counties force the county to go through an RFP process, even when a state contract exists.
- Motion from Al Brokmeier:
- The WLIC recommends that the next draft of WLIP Program Plan include a funding model where Strategic Initiative funding is evenly distributed amongst all 72 counties.
- Seconded by Dan Frick
- Friendly amendment from Adam Derringer: Append “following recommendations, schedules, and priorities to be determined by DOA with advice from the Council.”
- Second friendly amendment from Adam Derringer: “following recommendations, schedules, priorities, and standards to be determined by DOA with advice from the Council.”
 - **Motion 2016-03-24-01:**
 - *The WLIC recommends that the next draft of the WLIP Program Plan 2016-2020 include a funding model where Strategic Initiative funding is evenly distributed amongst all 72 counties, following recommendations, schedules, priorities, and standards to be determined by DOA with advice from the Council.*
 - Motion passed unanimously by voice vote

b. Priorities for WLIP Strategic Initiative grants

- State agencies are another stakeholder in having needs and goals for land information funding.
- Utilities are also dependent on GIS data.
- Suggestion that new data can be collected to assess priorities and statewide standards.
- One option is to reach out to different organizations. But the question would be how to reach out to them, and the medium for the dialog.
- There is concern for priorities for other foundational element layers in the alternative funding model.
- Benchmark set #1 and #2 are similar and could be combined in the next draft plan.
- Priorities after parcels/PLSS for 2018 and beyond are what have yet to be determined.
- October 1, 2017 would be the target date for setting priorities.
- DOA will look into options for data collection
- Motion from Don Dittmar:
 - **Motion 2016-03-24-02:**
 - *WLIC recommends the next draft of plan include the following Strategic Initiative priorities (with no particular funding allocations attached):*
 1. *Additional parcel benchmarks and standards – to be determined by October 1, 2017*
 2. *PLSS*
 3. *Additional foundational element layers – to be determined by October 1, 2017*
 - Motion passed.

c. Access

- There is \$105,000 in the proposed budget for access to data.
- There is some concern that the number is low, for facilitating access to data. Tech support, software, maintenance, administration, hosting, bandwidth, metadata, searchability, and other costs need to be taken into account.
- Having open access and preservation capabilities add to the complexity of the access question.

- Motion from Mark Paulat:
 - **Motion 2016-03-24-03:**
 - *WLIC recommends DOA move forward on drafting a revised data access section of the WLIP Program Plan taking into account on comments received from community.*
 - Abstain – Adam Derringer. Motion passed.

- Motion from Howard Veregin, seconded by Derringer:
 - **Motion 2016-03-24-04:**
 - *The Revised WLIP Program plan should contain a clear statement that counties will be required to make available in the public domain all data created acquired or developed with WLIP retained fees or grants, in accordance with local, federal, or state statutes.*
 - Motion passed.

d. Other issues of concern

- The next draft of the WLIP Program Plan will take into account public comments, but will focus mainly on the Council discussion.

5. Planning process timeline revisions

- Wednesday, April 27th – Next draft of plan will be released

4. Future activities/Action items

- Next meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 1:00 p.m. Agenda items to be determined.

6. Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.