



August 16, 2010

Request for Proposals

Next-Generation Shared Needs Assessment – MetroGIS Community

Introduction: This project involves conducting an assessment of geospatial needs shared by organizations that comprise the MetroGIS community. The assessment entails not only shared geospatial information needs but also organizational needs that must be addressed to effectively realize the MetroGIS vision. That vision being “*organizations serving the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area are successfully collaborating to use geographic information technology to solve real world problems*”.

MetroGIS is a regional spatial data infrastructure (SDI) serving the seven-county, Minneapolis- St. Paul metropolitan area (region). Participants include representatives of local, county, regional, state, and federal government entities serving the region, as well as private industries, utilities, non-profits, and educational institutions. The principal focus is to implement solutions to shared geospatial needs of the over 300 local and regional government interests that serve the region. That said, local and regional government interests recognize that substantial further efficiencies are possible if partnerships with non-government interests, which have like needs, are able to be realized.

Proposals Requested: To conduct the Next-Generation MetroGIS Needs Assessment. The consultant will work under the general direction of a MetroGIS Project Advisory Team via a professional services agreement. Our plan is to execute this agreement through Purchase Order procurement process, which will be administered by the [Metropolitan Council](#) (Council) on behalf of the MetroGIS community. The Terms and Conditions for working from a purchase order are presented in Attachment E. Note that the Council does not sign terms and conditions of other parties.

A general scope of work and expectations of the consultant for this project are presented in Attachment A. It is hoped that the project will be underway by mid-September. Findings and recommended courses of action are to be presented to the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee in March 2011 and to the MetroGIS Policy Board in April 2011. Funding for the 2010 component is approved. Funding for the 2011 components is included in MetroGIS's 2011 requested budget but cannot be guaranteed until the 2011 budget is officially adopted which will not occur until December 2011.

Proposals will be judged based upon:

- 1) Quality and completeness of proposal relative to achieving each of the major deliverables, including evidence of availability of personnel with appropriate expertise to achieve project goals and milestones within the agreed upon time frame.
- 2) Proposer qualifications (see listing in Attachment A):
- 3) Cost.

Questions about this Request for Proposals must be submitted by **Thursday, August 19, 2010** to be responded to. The Council retains the right to answer or not answer any question. Answers to these questions will then be shared on **Monday, August 23, 2010** with all interests who request, or who have been sent, this Request for Proposals. For proposals to qualify for consideration, they must be received by email by **Friday, September 3, 2010**. Please submit questions and final proposals (need not exceed 3-5 pages) to Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, at randy.johnson@metc.state.mn.us – **subject line: Next-Generation MetroGIS Needs Assessment.**

ATTACHMENT A

Project Description and Expectations

Overview and Context:

MetroGIS was created in 1996 to foster an environment through which collaborative solutions to shared information needs of the 300 local and regional government organizations serving Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area can be realized. Substantial [progress](#)¹ has been made to address such needs and, in so doing, improvements have been made to access, interoperability, quality, completeness and general fitness of geospatial data required to support local and regional government operations. These solutions have also greatly improved the operations of state and federal government interests as well as a variety of non-government interests that serve the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. And, as importantly, these solutions have been accomplished in a manner consistent with realizing the vision of the [National Spatial Data Infrastructure](#) (NSDI).

Notwithstanding these successes, to maintain relevance to changing stakeholder business needs, MetroGIS leaders have endorsed the proposed assessment because they believe that:

- 1) A number of shared information needs have arisen since the previous MetroGIS information needs assessment was conducted that should be formally recognized as priorities for collaborative solutions.
- 2) Significant potential exists for additional cost reduction and efficiency improvements if non-government interests that serve the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area were to engage as active participants in existing and yet-to-be implemented regional solutions to shared geospatial needs (framework data, web services, and applications).

The desire to explore partnerships with non-government interests, which share geospatial needs of local and regional government, has been a priority of MetroGIS leadership for some time.² Notwithstanding, little progress has been made because of our inability to effectively define geospatial needs that are shared by the respective public and non-public constituencies. Three forums have been held to better understand potential for partnering across sectors. They were held on [November 15, 2005](#), [January 24, 2008](#)³, and [November 20, 2008](#). Although, all three forums resulted in valuable knowledge sharing and catalyzed the development of three framework web services,⁴ none resulted in the higher-order goal of establishing partnerships with non-government interests.

Purpose and Deliverables: This proposed next-generation needs assessment is to provide the foundation for an action plan to ensure that limited resources are used to tackle the highest priority shared geospatial-related needs of the MetroGIS community. The following broad deliverables are sought via this assessment:

1. Identify priority shared geospatial data, web service, and application needs of local and regional government that serve the MetroGIS community.
2. Identify geospatial needs of non-government interests which align with those of MetroGIS's local and regional government interests and are of sufficient value to warrant acknowledgement as candidates for cross-sector collaborative solutions.

¹ The MetroGIS geospatial commons includes 227 datasets, 9 of which are endorsed as a regional or framework solutions, discoverable and accessible via MetroGIS DataFinder (www.datafinder.org). In addition, MetroGIS's geospatial commons also includes GeoServices Finder (<http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/GeoServiceFinder>), developed by MetroGIS in collaboration with the state of Mn.

² See the discussion under Strategy 2 - Pursue Public-Private Partnership Opportunities on page 31 of the [2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan](#).

³ [Click here](#) for action taken as a result of the January 24, 2008 forum.

⁴ As an outcome of the November 2008 forum, MetroGIS financed development of 3 geospatial web services that are now viewed as framework services (foundations for application development): Geocoder Service, Proximity Finder Service, and Best Image Service.

3. Identify process and organizational development needs faced by MetroGIS that must be addressed to effectively implement solutions to priority shared information needs.

MetroGIS leadership desires the following topics to be addressed, to the extent practical, in the course of addressing the above-described deliverable, in preparation of the next-phase action planning:

- 1) Define emerging shared needs that are important to realizing MetroGIS's [vision and mission](#), be they technology or organizational in nature.
- 2) Compare and contrast the relative value and priority of previously identified needs (Attachment B) against emerging needs.
- 3) Describe the relative level of support needed to accomplish next-generation top priority shared geospatial needs
- 4) Identify opportunities for interaction/collaboration that cross the boundary between public and non-public interests (e.g., "If you do this, we can do that...").

An action plan, in which specific strategies are articulated to act on the findings of the subject needs assessment, is not a deliverable of this project.

Project Management Expectations:

- 1) **Funding:** The project is proposed to begin in September 2010. Completion is desired by April 2011. Up to \$15,000 has been allocated for the 2010 component. Funding for the 2011 component is included in MetroGIS's 2011 budget request. However, the 2011 project funding cannot be guaranteed until the Metropolitan Council approves its 2011 budget, which is not scheduled to occur in December 2010. The needs assessment proposal should offer a work plan that is staged accordingly.
- 2) **Project Oversight:**
 - a) The MetroGIS Staff Coordinator will serve as project manager.
 - b) A Project Advisory Team will be created, whose members include individuals with appropriate expertise from the MetroGIS community. The project manager will serve as lead support to this team. The consultant will work under general direction of the Project Advisory Team.
- 3) **Consultant Roles And Responsibilities:**
 - a) Submit a draft written report for review and comment by the project manager and members of the Project Advisory Team, which documents the study process and includes a written narrative describing the findings for each above stated assessment deliverable.
 - b) Address comments on the draft report, modify the draft report accordingly, and submit a written final report to the Project Advisory Team within a timeframe consistent with agreed upon milestones.
 - c) Present the assessment results to the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee at its March 2011 meeting and the MetroGIS Policy Board at its April 2011 meeting.
- 4) **Process Expectations:**
 - a) The assessment methodology must:
 - Build upon / be directly comparable to the "shared information needs" component of the first-generation, data-centric, needs assessment conducted by MetroGIS in 1996-97 (Attachment C) and
 - Identify any desired enhancements to regional solutions to shared information needs that have been implemented (Attachment D).
 - b) The MetroGIS Staff Coordinator will keep the consultant team apprised of any related developments with the in-progress [MetroGIS's Quantify Public Value \(QPV\) Study](#), which has potential to provide insight relevant to the subject Needs Assessment.

Qualifications of Consultant:

Required:

- 1) Experience conducting needs assessments involving geospatial data, web services, and applications utilized to support business operations government interests, especially local and regional government interests.
- 2) Experience conducting needs assessments involving geospatial data, web services, and applications utilized to support business operations of non-government interests (academic, non-profit, for-profit and utility).
- 3) Understanding of how organizations (public, non-profit and for-profit) utilize and add value (tangible and intangible) to geospatial data created by others to support internal business operations that, in turn, is valuable not only to themselves but also to others (i.e., foundation upon which to pursue partnerships).

Preferable:

- 1) Experience conducting assessments to define geospatial data, web services, and applications for business and information needs **shared** by government and non-government interests.
- 2) Experience conducting assessments designed to improve organizational effectiveness, in particular, for collaborative organizations, such as MetroGIS, that are comprised of many cross-sector interests, functioning as a virtual enterprise to collaboratively address shared geospatial-related needs.
- 3) Experience defining and developing solutions to shared information needs for multiple participant communities of interests, such as MetroGIS.
- 4) Understanding of the collaborative environment that has been cultivated, through MetroGIS's efforts, in the Twin Cities metropolitan area to widely leverage geospatial related investments that have been made by the various stakeholders.
- 5) Aware of the objectives of the [National Spatial Data Infrastructure](#) (NSDI) and how MetroGIS is striving to establish itself as a functional component of the NSDI.

ATTACHMENT B

Background Information - Unsolved MetroGIS Objectives and Needs -

- A. **Unresolved Key Needs Defined in Current Business Plan:** Some 30 program objectives were identified in the [2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan](#), beginning on page 52.

Although important accomplishments have been achieved over the past three years, substantive progress remains elusive for three of the highest-priority objectives defined in the 2008-2011 Business Plan:

- Defining Shared Application Needs,
- Accomplishing Partnerships with Non-Government Interests,
- Securing Adequate Technical Coordination Capacity.

Remaining relevant to changing stakeholder needs, a higher-order goal of the three above-cited objectives, will not be possible unless sufficient support resources are captured. Capture of such resources is not possible unless the value of collaborative solutions to shared geospatial needs is clearly understood by executives and policy makers.

- B. **Benefits/Public Value Created:** A compelling public value creation case needs to be made to realize sustained resource contributions from multiple sources. The MetroGIS [Quantify Public Value \(QPV\) Study](#) was pursued to address this need, specifically to develop a means to measure public value created via the MetroGIS geospatial commons (spatial data infrastructure).

The study is anticipated to be complete by June 2011. The goal is to develop a trusted, replicable prototype “QPV” methodology. The scope is limited to parcel data and Hennepin County, given the relatively small budget. If successful, the model is expected to provide insight important to development of an effective performance measurement program for MetroGIS’s efforts as well as provide important insight needed to define benefits associate with support of the “fostering collaboration function”; the means by which regional solutions to shared geospatial needs are accomplished. Defining this benefit is a requirement to expanding support of this function beyond the Metropolitan Council, a need that has been recognized for some time by the Policy Board and understood to be vital to long-term stability of this function. More should be known by late fall 2010 whether the study will yield the desired methodology. **The results are expected to provide insight that is important to other important MetroGIS program objective, including the proposed next-generation needs assessment. As such, communication and coordination between the two projects is a must.**

- C. **MetroGIS Goals Related to Demonstrating Value and Catalyzing Partnering**

Four outcomes defined by MetroGIS relate to /serve as drivers for the proposed next generation needs assessment. Their sources are the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan (organizational goals – OG) and a workshop hosted by MetroGIS in November 2008 to define shared service needs (*project goals – PG*) [order of listing is not intended to imply relative importance]. They offer sound reasoning for outcomes of MetroGIS’s efforts as they serve as vehicles to “demonstrate value to policy makers” and “catalyze partnership” opportunities:

- **Catalyze Partnerships with Public-Private / Non-Traditional Users (OG):** By catalyzing application development, organizational partnerships, which are important to addressing shared information needs, might also be identified. MetroGIS leadership has defined a goal of catalyzing partnerships that involve multiple sectors and non-traditional users to address shared information. It was hoped that the proposed competition could accomplish the identification of opportunities to act on this goal.

- **Demonstrate the Value of Web Services/Applications to Policy Makers (OG):** Assist decision makers better understand the value to their business operations that can be realized using web services and / or applications supported by web services when standardized across multiple jurisdictions.
- **Expand Publishing of Web Services (PG):** An incentive is needed to encourage data owners to publish their data as web services. The thought is that making their services available would lead to development of applications that would be recognized by the data owners as a low risk-high reward means to explore the potential of creating value important to them via publishing services.
- **Implement Geospatial Commons (PG):** The competition was expected to expedite in-progress work to stand up the infrastructure needed to centralize publishing and finding web services. This proposed infrastructure is now called the Geospatial Commons. MnGeo and MetroGIS were collaborating on this need before the competition idea was conceived. Significant progress has been made towards this end. Regardless of the fate of the competition, this important work should continue to be supported and will facilitate the sharing of data and web services long term.

D. Candidate 2011 Regional GIS (Technical) Projects

Each of the following candidate projects aligns with one or more the outcomes defined in the Business Plan and is tentatively a candidate project for the 2011 MetroGIS work plan:

- **Place-based Budgeting Web Application:** The idea that the MetroGIS community be considered as a testbed option was conceived by the Staff Coordinator during a NGAC discussion on March 25. This idea was shared with Hennepin County Commissioner Johnson at the NGAC meeting before offering the Twin Cities as candidate testbed location. At the March 31 meeting of the MGAC, staff learned of a similar interest of David Arbeit, state GIO. This type of application functionality has resonated well among policy makers that it has been shared with and acts on a current administration priority.
- **Emergency Preparedness Structures Web Application:** The Emergency Management Preparedness Workgroup oversaw the prototyping via a federal grant of a web-based application that utilizes “crowd sourcing” and web services to populate the locations of and various descriptors (attributes) for hospitals, fire stations, medical clinics, and schools. This proposal would seek to move from prototype to operational application for the Twin Cities.
- **Geospatially Enabling Community Collaboration (GECCo)** initiative of GITA (Geographic Information and Technology Association). The Staff Coordinator learned of this initiative (see Attachment D) while attending the March NGAC meeting. It appears to be well aligned with MetroGIS’s goal to catalyze public-private partnerships. As of this writing, conversations were in progress with GITA leadership to learn more about how MetroGIS might leverage this initiative.

ATTACHMENT C

First-Generation (1996-97) MetroGIS Information Needs Assessment

The last comprehensive information needs assessment conducted by MetroGIS was in 1996-97. Thirteen priority shared information needs were identified and are listed below. These data-centric needs guided MetroGIS's efforts for over a decade. The methodology utilized to define these shared information needs was highly participatory. The following is a general description of that process. A summary of regional solutions that have been implemented to address these priority information needs is provided in Attachment D. More information about the processes involved, questionnaires, intermediate deliverables, etc. are provided at http://www.metrogis.org/data/about/index.shtml#identify_needs.

MetroGIS First-Generation Priority Shared Business Information Needs

(Note, the “#xx” that follows each need statement corresponds to a pre-ranking listing 87 mutually exclusive information needs.

| Rank | Information Need Statements <i>(I need to know...)</i> |
|------|--|
| 1 | the boundaries and characteristics of a specified jurisdiction (<i>ex: city, school district, county, police and fire districts</i>). (Jurisdictional boundaries #47) |
| 2 | the street addresses for specified locations. (Street addresses #42) |
| 3 | about land use or development plans that have been officially adopted by public bodies. (Land use plans #10) |
| 4 | who has rights to a property, including ownership, leases, easements, rights-of-way. (Rights to property #1) |
| 5 | the boundaries and location of a specified parcel. (Parcel boundaries #44) |
| 6 | the locations and characteristics of water features (<i>ex: lakes, wetlands, floodplains, aquifers, watersheds</i>). (Lakes, wetlands, etc. #31) |
| 7 | how a piece of land is being used, including whether or not it is vacant. (Land use, existing #4) |
| 8 | the boundaries and characteristics of census areas (<i>ex: census blocks, block groups, tracts</i>). Census boundaries #48) |
| 9 | where people live and how to contact them. (Where people live #2) |
| 10 | the regulations that affect the use of a piece of land, such as zoning. (Land Regulations #6) |
| 11 | the locations and characteristics of roads/highways. (Highway / road networks #27) |
| 12 | the socioeconomic characteristics of an area's population (<i>ex: census tract, count, city</i>). (Socioeconomic characteristics of areas #71) |
| 13 | a unique identifying attribute of a land parcel, such as parcel ID. (Parcel identifiers #46) |

Overview of Process Used to Define the First-Generation Shared Information Needs.

Although the business needs of local and regional government were the principal drivers for setting the above-listed priorities, numerous representatives of non-government as well as state and federal government interests, interacting from a metropolitan perspective, also participated in identification of these first-generation shared information needs.

The process was highly participatory, including over 125 stakeholder participants and three separate events over a period of 9 months. The project was undertaken to tackle the highest priority need of the MetroGIS community at that time “*identify the data sets and their characteristics which provide the greatest utility for the Metro Area GIS data user community*”.

Local government interests were defined as cities, townships, school districts, watershed districts and watershed management organizations, soil and water conservation districts, counties, as well as organizations that perform services that are an extension of local government interests: economic development partnership, school district consortia, etc. The terms “regional government” and “metropolitan perspective” mean public organizations whose jurisdiction is the seven-county, Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area (e.g., Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, Metropolitan Airports Commission, and Metropolitan Emergency Services Board).

The initial phase of the process utilized six focus groups, organized by significant government responsibility:

- Community Development, Planning, and Research.
- Human, Social, and Educational Services, Public Health (code enforcement, Licensing, and Nursing) and Libraries.
- Parks, Environmental Protection, Natural Resources.
- Property Records.
- Public Safety and Judicial.
- Public Works, Utilities, Transportation, Communication.

Each of these six focus groups was populated with 20-25 individuals possessing extensive content expertise and representing all forms of government that serve the seven county Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, together with academic, non-profit and for profit interests. Each was simultaneously facilitated in a separate room in the same the building. The goal was for each group to offer as many responses as possible, using a variety of facilitation methods, to the question “What information do I need to do my job”. More than 850 individual responses were captured. With the aid of Advanced Information Strategies (ASI), the responses were consolidated into 87 mutually exclusive information need statements.

The second major phase involved two, multiple day, business object modeling exercises. The result was a comprehensive business object framing model comprised of interconnected “model fragments” for most of the 87 consolidated information needs. Note, **the business object framing model component is not desired to be repeated for the second-generation assessment.** The exercises offered limited value to subsequent efforts to define solutions to the subject information needs and also did not provide any value for the exercise to rank the 87 needs according to their relative importance.

The final phase involved asking the 125 focus group participants to participate an exercise to the rank the relative importance of each of 87 mutually exclusive information needs relative to their respective organizations’ business needs. The survey asked the respondents to answer two questions, on a scale of 1-5, for each of the 87 information needs:

- 1) How important is having this information to my organization’s business operations?
- 2) How depend is my organization on another organization(s) to obtain this data from which to secure this information?

The result was the 13 priority (regionally significant) information needs listed above. These information needs are not only significant to the internal business operations of key MetroGIS stakeholders. Designation as “regionally significant” also means that a dataset maintained by one organization has significant utility by other governmental organizations that serve the metropolitan area. The more multi-jurisdictional applicability across the various focus groups, the more regionally significant. As such, these 13 information needs cannot be fully addressed without collaborative measures among the stakeholders.

In May of 1997, the Policy Board endorsed this listing of 13 priority information needs, along with a plan of action to begin developing regional/collaborative solutions for each.

ATTACHMENT D

MetroGIS Regional Solutions to Shared Information Needs Implemented to Date

Eight regional datasets, three foundation web services, and two applications have been implemented thus far to address shared geospatial information needs of the MetroGIS community. Several additional regional solutions to shared geospatial needs are also in process. [Click here](#) to access a PowerPoint presentation in which a summary of these accomplishments is provided. Additional background information about what constitutes a shared information need and specific solutions can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/about/index.shtml#whatis>.

Each regional data solution (to a priority shared information need) is comprised of three components. These components are detailed in a regional policy statement that accompanies each solution and each is endorsed by the MetroGIS Policy Board. The components are:

- Content specifications,
- Custodial roles and responsibilities to manage a particular solution,
- Acceptance of responsibility by willing organization, with a related business need and sufficient operational capacity, to manage the solution.

MetroGIS created a consensus-based, broadly representative process to identify desired specifications for data needed to answer each priority information need as well as candidate custodians for these data and their responsibilities. Specifically, the process involves:

- Identifying priority regional information needs common to stakeholder organizations, in particular, those government interests represented on the MetroGIS [Policy Board](#) (cities, counties, metropolitan, school and water management districts).
- Identifying data needed to answer each priority information need.
- Identifying primary and regional data custodians and their responsibilities.
- Defining critical standards, integration and aggregation specifications, and institutional policies necessary for MetroGIS stakeholders to share commonly needed priority data.

The seven NSDI Framework Functions, outlined in the [Framework Handbook](#) published January 1998, have also been incorporated into this methodology.

Information about each of regional solution that has been implemented to date can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml>. Additional information, including adopted Regional Policy Statements, can be accessed via links from this main webpage. Note, that for several of the priority information needs, more than one regional dataset solution is involved. In many cases, a many-to-one relationship exists between a particular information need and the data types required to address it. The table provided on the following page provides a listing of the organizations that have agreed to support regional solutions to shared information needs of the MetroGIS Community.

**ACCEPTED CUSTODIAL RESPONSIBILITIES –
METROGIS ENDORSED SOLUTIONS TO SHARED GEOSPATIAL NEEDS**
(Last Updated: May 18, 2010)

| Established Partnerships | Summary of Collaborative Roles |
|--|--|
| <i>11 organizations have assumed a total of 24 roles in support of endorsed regional solutions to shared geospatial related needs of the community</i> | (Bundling Operational Capacity Across Organizations to Address Shared Priority Needs) |
| I. Fostering Collaboration | |
| Primary Sponsor – Metropolitan Council Foster Collaborative Environment (<i>regional solutions to shared geospatial needs</i>) | Facilitate collaborative decision-making structure; including business planning, performance measures monitoring and reporting, needs assessments, and agreements, as well as outreach and advocacy efforts to encourage use of and feedback about adopted regional solutions and best practices. (For details see Section 1.3.2 – www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf) |
| II. Regional Data Solutions | |
| (2 roles) County: Anoka (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries) | Produce and maintain parcel data in consistent format. Submit quarterly updates to regional custodian (Council) in regional format. (For detailed roles see www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/history_pub/policy_sumv2.0.pdf) |
| (2 roles) County: Carver (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries) | Produce and maintain boundary data, submit quarterly updates to regional custodian (Council) in regional format. (For detailed roles see www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/county_mcd/policy_summary.pdf) |
| (2 roles) County: Dakota (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries) | (All seven counties have agreed to assume responsibility for the same roles and responsibilities concerning the region parcel and city/county boundaries datasets. Their combined level of support was estimated in 2007 to involve 20+ FTE . This effort includes surveyors, assessors, and GIS staff.) |
| (2 roles) County: Hennepin (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries) | |
| (2 roles) County: Ramsey (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries) | |
| (2 roles) County: Scott (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries) | |
| (2 roles) County: Washington (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries) | |
| | (Counties use these data to manage property-related records and to support their tax collection responsibilities.) |

| | |
|---|--|
| (1 role) DNR - Land Cover | Manage regional database and collaborative process to acquire land cover data compatible with agreed upon data content standards. DNR uses this database to support a number of its metro area natural resources and wildlife management programs. Annual support is about .5 FTE . (For detailed roles see www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/land_cover/policy_summary.pdf) |
| (1 role) University of Minnesota Population Center (Socioeconomic Characteristics) | Manage content of Socioeconomic Resources Website at www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp . Annual support is about .2 FTE . (For detailed roles www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/socioeconomic_characteristics/policy_summary.pdf) |
| (5 roles) Metropolitan Council | |
| ⇒ Census Geography data | Produce census geography data at time of decennial census that align with other locally produced foundation geospatial data. (For detailed roles see www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/census/policy_summary.pdf) |
| ⇒ County/MCD Boundary data | Assemble boundary data produced by counties into regional dataset. (See County Boundaries above for the specific roles) |
| ⇒ Planned Land Use data | Develop and manage regional dataset. (For detailed roles see www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/planned_land_use/policy_summary.pdf) |
| ⇒ Parcel data | Assemble parcel data produced by counties into regional dataset. (See County Parcels above for the specific roles.) |
| ⇒ Street Centerline data | Contract with NCompass (formerly The Lawrence Group) to maintain data to desired specifics. (For detailed roles see www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/street_centerlines/roles_respon_specs.pdf) |
| III.--Regional Web Services and Applications | |
| (1 role) – Metropolitan Council Host DataFinder Application (one-stop data discovery and distribution portal) | Maintain hardware and software platform for DataFinder and DataFinder Café and maintain currency of metadata posted on DataFinder. (For details see Section 1.3.2 - www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf) |
| (1 role) – MnGeo Host Geocoder Service | Maintain hardware and software platform required to host the regional Geocoder service. (For details see – <i>adoption of the regional policy statement anticipated Oct 2010</i>) |
| (1 role) – MnGeo Host GeoServices Finder | Maintain hardware and software platform required to host GeoServices Finder. (For details see – <i>adoption of the regional policy statement anticipated Oct 2010</i>) |
| | |
| (Total of 25 roles supported by 11 different organizations) | |

ATTACHMENT E

Purchase Order Terms and Conditions (Professional/Technical Services) (Local Funding)

The following terms and conditions will apply to this procurement:

1. Definitions. As used in this purchase order, "Buyer" means the Metropolitan Council or a division, program, or department of the Metropolitan Council. "Vendor" means the individual, company, or organization from whom the services are ordered. "Work" means the provision of the services ordered under this purchase order, including furnishing necessary parts, materials, machinery, tools, and equipment.

2. Purchase Order Authority; Applicable Terms. The Vendor's copy of the purchase order, when properly signed, is recognized by the Buyer as authority for commencing performance of the Work, supersedes all previous communications and negotiations except as specifically incorporated, and constitutes the entire agreement between the parties. No terms stated by the Vendor in accepting or acknowledging an order shall be binding on the Buyer unless accepted in writing by the Buyer. In particular, commencement of performance of the Work by the Vendor in the absence of the Buyer's agreement to the Vendor's proposed terms will constitute the Vendor's acceptance of the terms of this purchase order and any terms or documents incorporated in this purchase order by reference. This order is subject to any special specifications, terms or conditions accompanying or incorporated by reference in this order by the Buyer.

3. Completion of Work; Payment. The Work must be completed no later than the delivery date or dates specified in this purchase order. Unless the Buyer agrees otherwise, services on the Buyer's property must be provided between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

The Vendor shall submit a monthly invoice containing Vendor's estimate of payment due and owing based on the percentage completion of the Work during the billing period. On verification and acceptance by the Buyer, the Buyer will pay Vendor the invoiced amount. Upon completion of the Work, the Vendor shall submit a final invoice and request for payment of the amounts then owing. The Buyer will pay this final invoice upon the Buyer's approval and acknowledgement of satisfactory completion of the Work.

4. General Terms. The Vendor will supervise and be solely responsible for all aspects of the Work. Unless the Buyer agrees otherwise, the Vendor will provide and pay for all labor, materials, parts, equipment, tools, machinery, transportation, and other facilities necessary for completion of the Work. The Vendor shall be responsible for the satisfactory work performance of all its employees or subcontractors in performing the Work. Persons employed by the Vendor to perform the Work shall not be considered employees of the Buyer for any purpose.

The Vendor shall procure and keep current any licenses, permits, or certificates which may be required for the performance of the Work and will obtain and pay for all permits, licenses, and inspections necessary for completion of the Work.

All reports, data, materials, information, and other work products prepared and developed in connection with the provision of services: (a) shall become the property of the Buyer; (b) shall not be the subject of an application for copyright by or on behalf of the Vendor, its subcontractors, their agents or employees; and (c) shall not be made available to any person without the prior written approval of the Buyer.

5. [Reserved]

6. Indemnity; Insurance. The Vendor agrees to defend, indemnify, and save the Buyer harmless from any expenses, damages, or claims arising from the performance under this purchase order by the Vendor, its agents or employees.

The Vendor shall procure and maintain insurance sufficient to protect the Buyer against claims for injuries to persons or damage to property which may arise from or in connection with the performance of the Work by the Vendor or its employees, subcontractors, representatives or agents.

7. [Reserved]

8. Applicable Law; Compliance with Law. The laws of the state of Minnesota shall govern this purchase. In the performance of its obligations pursuant to this contract, the Vendor agrees to comply with all applicable provisions of federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and directives, and agrees that the most recent of such provisions will govern this contract at any particular time.

9. Non-Discrimination. The Vendor agrees that it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, membership or activity in a local civil rights commission, disability, or age.

10. Record-keeping; Audit. The Vendor agrees to keep and maintain during the performance of this purchase and for a period of six years following, records and files relating to the final financial aspects of this purchase, and further agrees to allow the Buyer or designated federal or state personnel to enter on the Vendor's premises and to inspect, copy and audit the above records, files, and premises.

11. Prompt Payment. The Vendor agrees to pay any subcontractors and material suppliers within 10 calendar days of the Vendor's receipt of payment from the Buyer for undisputed services provided by the subcontractor or material supplier. The Vendor shall pay to the subcontractor or material supplier interest of one and one-half percent per month or any part of a month on any undisputed amount not paid on time. On unpaid, undisputed amounts of \$100 or more, minimum monthly interest rate shall be \$10. The Vendor will defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the Buyer for any mechanics' or materialmens' liens that are filed relating to the Work. At the request of the Buyer, the Vendor will deliver to the Buyer a complete release of all liens which may have filed and/or complete receipts and waivers of lien rights for all labor, materials, and equipment for which a lien could be filed and the Vendor's sworn statement verifying that all charges for labor and materials have been paid.

12. Conflict of Interest. The Vendor certifies that to the best of its knowledge no officer or employee of the Buyer has any pecuniary interest in the business of the Vendor and that no person associated with the Vendor has any interest that would conflict in any manner or degree with the provision of services under this purchase order.

13. Workers Compensation; Tax Withholding. Vendor represents that it is compliance with the workers compensation coverage requirements of Minnesota Statutes, section 176.181, subdivision 2, and that it, and all its subcontractors or material suppliers under this contract, are in compliance with the tax withholding on wages requirements of Minnesota Statutes, section 290.92.

14. Termination. The Buyer may terminate this purchase order at any time and for any reason by giving Vendor thirty days written notice of the termination. In such event, all Work completed by Vendor shall become the property of Buyer and Vendor shall be entitled to compensation for all

authorized services satisfactorily completed under this purchase order prior to the date of termination.

15. Data Practices. Consistent with Minnesota Statutes, section 13.05, subdivision 6, if any data on individuals is made available to the Vendor by the Buyer pursuant to this purchase order, the Vendor will administer and maintain any such data in accordance with Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13 (the "Minnesota Government Data Practices Act"), and any other statutory provisions applicable to the data. If and to the extent that Minnesota Statutes, section 13.05, subdivision 11, is applicable to this purchase order, then: a) all of the data created, collected, received, stored, used, maintained, or disseminated by the Vendor in performing this purchase order are subject to the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act; b) the Vendor must comply with those requirements as if it were a government entity; and c) the remedies in Minnesota Statutes, section 13.08 apply to the Vendor. In the event the Vendor receives a request to release data referred to in this section, the Vendor must immediately notify the Buyer. The Buyer will give the Vendor instructions concerning the release of the data to the requesting party before the data is released.

16. Assignment. The Vendor shall perform with its own organization all the work provided for under this purchase order and shall not assign, subcontract, sublet, or transfer any of the work without receiving the express written consent of the Council.

17. Commissioner of Health Licensing, Certifications, and Rules. All asbestos-related work or asbestos management activity, if any, performed by the Vendor under this purchase order shall be performed: a) by persons or subcontractors licensed or certified (for the types of such work or activity to be carried out) by the Commissioner of Health under the Minnesota Asbestos Abatement Act, Minnesota Statutes, sections 326.70 to 326.81; and b) in accordance with rules prescribed by the Commissioner of Health related to asbestos abatement and asbestos management activity. Prior to commencing any such work, the Vendor shall provide to the Buyer copies of currently valid licenses or certificates (for all the types of asbestos-related work or asbestos management activities to be carried out under this purchase order) issued by the Commissioner of Health under the Minnesota Asbestos