Wisconsin Land Information Council
Minutes 2016-06-08

Meeting Date:	Wednesday, June 8, 2016
Time:	2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Location:	WLIA Spring Regional Meeting	Pine Room
	Hotel Mead & Conference Center	Wisconsin Rapids
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 via teleconference)							
Al Brokmeier	Y	Jim Giglierano	Y	Mark Paulat	Y	Nathan Vaughn	T
Adam Derringer	Y	Maria Holl	Y	Kristeen Pelot	N	Howard Veregin	Y
Don Dittmar	Y	Cori Lamont	T	Tim Statz	N	Cynthia Wisinski	Y
Daniel Frick	T						
Other Attendees							
Mike Friis (T)				Jim Lacy (T)			
Peter Herreid (Y)				AJ Wortley (T)			
Davita Veselenak (T)				Peter Strand (Y)			
Mitch Moline (Y)				Martin Goettl (Y)			
Brandon Tourtelotte (Y)							

1. **Welcome and Introduction** (Don Dittmar)

2. **Approval of previous meeting's minutes**
   - Motion to approve by Cindy Wisinski
   - Seconded by Al Brokmeier
   - Motion passed
   - Discussion of meeting minutes practices.
     - Comment from Derringer: Minutes are not descriptive enough. People are coming back to council members for clarification.
     - Herreid: General guidance for minutes is to limit them to a record of attendance, actions, motions passed, and decisions made. Staff will additionally try to list general discussion topics. DOA feels it is better not to try to capture all of the conversation, because the process of recording a verbal discussion in writing is inherently subjective. Meetings are open and any member of the public is free to attend the meetings and take notes.

3. **Overview of WLIP *Draft 2* Program Plan** (Herreid)
   - Herreid gave a presentation on the *Draft 2 Program Plan.*
   - The changes from *Draft 1* to *Draft 2 Program Plan* were based on motions passed by WLIC, public comments, as well as further research and consideration of topics by DOA staff.
   - A staff work plan is implicit in the *Draft 2 Program Plan*. WLIP staff wants to only commit to a work plan and scope that staff is reasonably confident it can achieve.
   - Although we are planning ahead, DOA is actually just at the beginning of implementing the Parcel Initiative.
   - The Parcel Initiative has an objective for all counties to achieve the searchable format standard for parcels by early 2018. Further development of local parcel datasets is expected beyond achievement of the searchable format standard, which is projected to include additional attributes and spatial inaccuracy connected to the PLSS.

- The *Draft 2 Program Plan* has a re-centering of priorities on the statutory directives of the Parcel Initiative with the statewide objectives to achieve a complete and spatially accurate statewide parcel map comprised of standardized and integrated local parcel datasets, as well as ensure that all WLIP-funded data is freely and openly available online on demand.
- Changes made were consistent with motions from the April, 12, 2016 WLIC meeting.

  - *Recap of Motion 2016-04-12-01*:
    - *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.*

  - *Recap of Motion 2016-04-12-02*:
    - *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

- For Benchmark Set III, the motion did not specify creating a prioritized list of Foundational Element layer categories to be eligible for Strategic Initiative grant funding, but aerial imagery and lidar were included in *Draft 2* based on a the need to specify benchmarks on a short-term timeline. Specifically, there is a near-term need for categories to be identified by the summer of 2016, in order to create detailed standards by June 30, 2017 for the 2018 grant application.
- One camp argues if a county has completed Benchmark Set I and II, counties should not be eligible grant funding until DOA decides on additional priorities with a more deliberative planning process that could take some years.
- Another camp holds that counties should be able to use funding as they see fit, after Benchmark Set I and II have been achieved.
- Regarding the first camp's view of withholding funding eligibility beyond that required to meet Benchmark Set I and II, it would potentially have many negative consequences, including:
  - Withholding funding eligibility penalizing counties for previous progress.
  - It creates an incentive for inefficiency and waste. If counties can only spend Strategic Initiative grant dollars on Benchmark Sets I and II, there will be an incentive to design projects to use up all available grant funding to meet these benchmarks in order not to lose funding.
  - It takes away incentive for to use money efficiently in order to complete other Foundational Element layers beyond those listed by Benchmark Set I and II.
  - It denies counties funding for opportunities for shovel-ready projects for other Foundational Element layers.
  - It removes enforcement mechanism for data to be shared openly, as some counties would not be subject to the grant agreement.
  - It would disenfranchise counties, particularly those that contribute the most to the Land Information Fund.
  - It risks disenfranchised counties approaching legislature, complaining that about their loss of grant funding eligibility while there is a surplus balance in the Land Information Fund.
- There are also problems with the other camp's approach of letting counties select their own strategic priorities, such as completing other Foundational Element layers, after they have completed Benchmark Set I and II.
  - If Strategic Initiative grant projects are simply at the counties' discretion without statewide standards required, grants are not as strategic statewide as they could be.
  - Without a coordinated effort to modernize land records and meet standards for specific Foundational Element layers, Strategic Initiative grants function more like Base Budget grants.
- Because there are issues associated with both camps, it is important to list some additional priorities, beyond Benchmark Set I and II, so that all or nearly all of the Strategic Initiative grants are used to achieve statewide objectives for completion of specific core foundational element layers, meeting standards determined by DOA in collaboration with the WLIC and community.
- According to a 2012 WIGICC survey of priorities, a 2014 WLIP Survey, a 2016 survey conducted by Adam Derringer, an aerial imagery business plan, a USGS 3DEP program for lidar with local match requirement, and individual accounts, lidar and aerial imagery are two logical priorities. This does not mean that there are not other priorities out there.

- In *Draft 2*, Lidar was prioritized over aerial imagery because all counties have aerial imagery in some vintage, but not all have lidar data.
- The aerial imagery business plan was removed from *Draft 2*. Since it was finalized in 2014, no group adopted or promoted it. Nonetheless, it was included in the *Draft 1* plan because DOA considered it worthy of serious public discussion. In the *Draft 1* comments there was no or little support for this particular plan, but rather much opposition. Counties wanted more flexibility on timeline, consortium, and vendor choice.
- Address points and street centerlines were not included in *Draft 2*, because creating an additional benchmark standards for parcels, open data, lidar, and aerial imagery will require a lot of WLIP staff time and attention from the WLIC and community, perhaps not leaving much left over for other layers, at least for this upcoming year. Also, there had been WLIC and community discussion that if the WLIP takes responsibility for address points and road centerlines, it takes away from the argument to use the cell phone fee to fund these layers as many feel is more appropriate.

    - ***Recap of Motion 2016-04-12-03***:
        – Data Access Section – *WLIC recommends DOA move forward on drafting a revised data access section of the WLIP Program Plan taking into account comments received from community.*

    - ***Recap of Motion 2016-04-12-04***:
        – *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, and state statutes.*

- The open data benchmark is part of facilitating data access, while other efforts would focus on assisting other state entities to enhance their repositories, such as at LTSB, Robinson Map Library and WisconsinView. WLIP will need to keep an inventory of all county data for open data, which could easily serve portal functionality by being converted into some kind of portal online. This would not include sensitive data or data subject to state, federal law, etc.
- The plan is meant to be updated on a regular basis, which means that can occur before 2020. But predictability for the next budget cycle is important for the short-term. Implementation planning is the next task.

4. Discussion of public comments on *Draft 2* & 5. Open Comments and Discussion
- Items were prioritized for discussion before items with fewer comments.
- Discussion of whether the plan focuses on the strategic objectives enough and the word "strategy," which could have implications for funding model, process, etc.
- Discussion of goal to avoid a patch-work approach to meeting objectives.
- Discussion of benchmark hierarchy on page 16 in *Draft 2* and whether it was strategic enough.

    - ***Motion 2016-06-08-01***:
    - A motion was made by Veregin, seconded by Derringer:
        – *Eliminate the priorities such that open data, PLSS, lidar and aerial imagery have the same priority when using Strategic Initiative grant funding.*
    - It was noted that this motion language does not eliminate the original parcel benchmarks.
    - The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- Discussion of whether the WLIP Program Plan is strategic, comprehensive, and forward-looking enough.
- Discussion of need for another strategic planning process.

    - ***Motion 2016-06-08-02***:
    - A motion was made by Veregin, seconded by Derringer:
        – *The draft plan incorporate a statement that through the WLIC that a process will be put in place to incorporate stakeholder input to identify strategic priorities, for both the priority elements that are identified in this program plan and for the future, i.e., post-2020. This effort is to be led by the state GIO. This assessment should include consideration of standards, benchmarks, and funding allocation models.*
    - The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- Discussion of a master central repository and/or portal for GIS data.

- Discussion of whether this should be a master repository or assemblage of repositories, linked through a portal.

    - ***Motion 2016-06-08-03***:
    - A motion was made by Brokmeier, seconded by Derringer:
        - *The GIO can continue to explore a statewide repository/portal solution*.
    - The motion passed by voice vote.

- Request made by Adam Derringer to change word "recommends" to "requires" in the following sentence on page 17: "Following the trend of government transparency and open government, the WLIP recommends that counties make public geospatial data freely and openly available, which is important to maximizing the public funds invested in county land information data through the WLIP and to achieving Program objectives."
- Discussion of funding allocation formula.

    - ***Motion 2016-06-08-04 (Defeated)***:
    - A motion was made by Veregin, seconded by Paulat:
        - *Add an explanation after the funding model stating that there may be occasions where the proportional allocation among 72 counties is adjusted to address special strategic purposes.*
    - The motion was defeated by voice vote, with Veregin and Paulat voting yes.

- Discussion on the definition of "survey-grade."

    - ***Motion 2016-06-08-05***:
    - A motion was made by Derringer, seconded by Brokmeier:
        - *Ask the County Surveyors Association to review the definition for survey grade specifications for PLSS.*
    - The motion unanimously passed by voice vote.

    - ***Motion 2016-06-08-06***:
    - A motion was made by Holl, seconded by Veregin:
        - *Extend the title of the WLIP Program Plan to 2021.*
    - The motion passed by voice vote.

- Discussion of lidar standards referenced in Draft 2 plan.

    - ***Motion 2016-06-08-07***:
    - A motion was made by Derringer, seconded by Holl:
        - *Match horizontal and vertical specs for lidar going forward. Looking back, make sure that recent lidar projects still count as meeting the benchmarks, such as FEMA, CDBG, or USGS.*
    - The motion passed by voice vote.

6. **Next Steps/Action Items**
   - DOA – Create Draft 3 of plan for public review, with at least three weeks needed for review period.
   - Herreid – Discuss with DOA management WLIC motions passed, timeline for creating *Draft 3*, releasing *Draft 3* for review, and request by Dittmar that Dittmar and Derringer see draft plan and comment before rest of WLIC and community.
   - Next meeting – Likely in August 2016.

7. **Adjourn**
   - Meeting adjourned at 4:49 p.m.