



Policy Board Members:

Victoria Reinhardt,  
Chairperson  
Ramsey County

Jim Kordiak,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Anoka County

Tom Egan,  
Dakota County

Tom Workman,  
Carver County

Roger Lake,  
MAWD

Dennis Hegberg,  
Washington County

Dan Cook,  
TIES

Randy Johnson,  
Hennepin County

Steve Elkins,  
City of Bloomington  
Metro Cities

Terry Schneider,  
City of Minnetonka  
Metro Cities

Joseph Wagner,  
Scott County

Tony Pistilli,  
Metropolitan Council

Coordinating Committee

William Brown,  
Chairperson  
Hennepin County

Ned Phillips,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Rice Creek WSD

Staff Coordinator

Randall Johnson

**Wednesday, January 30, 2008**

**6:30 p.m. (Rescheduled from January 16)**

**Metropolitan County Government Offices**

**2099 University Avenue, St. Paul**

(Go to <http://www.mmcd.org/directions.html> for a map and directions)

## Agenda

Page

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Accept Agenda**
3. **Accept October 17, 2007 Meeting Summary** *action* 1
4. **GIS Technology Demonstration:** 7  
*GIS's Role In Response to I-35W Bridge Collapse*
5. **Action/Discussion Items**
  - a) MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Model Recognized by State and Leveraged In Federal Grant Application 9
  - b) Twin Cities Regional Economic Development Web Site 19
  - c) 2007 Accomplishments Report *action* 23
  - d) 2007 Performance Measures Annual Report *action* 29
6. **Major Activity Update** 33
  - a) January 24th Workshop: Milestone to Defining MetroGIS's Role Related to Addressing Shared Application Needs
  - b) Leadership Succession Plan Development
  - c) *GeoServices* Finder Project – LMIC Project Lead
  - d) Regional Geocoding Pilot Project - MMCD Project Lead
  - e) Data Synchronization Mechanism – Carver County Project Lead
  - f) Outreach Plan Modifications
  - g) Priority Business Information Need Solutions and User Satisfaction Forums
  - h) County Data Producers Workgroup
7. **Information Sharing** 39
  - a) Presentations / Outreach / Studies
  - b) Metro and State Geospatial Initiatives Update
  - c) National/Federal Geospatial Initiatives Update
  - d) December 2007 Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
8. **Next Meeting**  
April 23, 2008 (*election of officers for 2008*)
9. **Adjourn**



**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Policy Board**  
**Metropolitan Mosquito Control District Offices**  
**October 17, 2007**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. She welcomed all attendees, introduced Councilmember Steve Elkins, whose appointment to the Policy Board is pending by Metro Cities (Association of Metropolitan Municipalities), and invited them to introduce themselves.

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Tom Egan (Dakota County), Bill Brown for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Roger Lake (Metro Watershed Districts), Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), and Dick Carlstrom for Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES).

Members Absent: Tom Workman (Carver County) and Joseph Wagner (Scott County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Will Craig, William Brown, Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, Brad Henry, Randy Knippel, Nancy Read, and Mark Vander Schaaf.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Jonathan Blake (Richardson Richter Associates and member of the Staff Support Team)

Visitors: Steve Elkins (AMM – City of Bloomington; pending appointment to the Policy Board), Dave Hinrichs (Metropolitan Council), Mike McLean (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District) and Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council)

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

Member Egan moved and Member Schneider seconded to approve the proposed agenda, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**3. MEETING SUMMARY**

Member O'Rourke moved and Member Lake seconded to approve the July 25, 2007 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION**

***Web maps open government to citizens - Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (MMCD)***

Mike McLean, MMCD Director of Public Affairs Director, commented that through the use of the subject web-based application, the District has found a way to continue its practice of person to person service while at the same time opening up communication lines with the customer. The result is more access to information (transparency) that used to be the domain of staff and feedback regarding policy implications (accountability). He then provided an overview of the type of information that is accessible via the MMCD map site ([http://www.mmcd.org/main\\_lead.html](http://www.mmcd.org/main_lead.html)).

Nancy Read, MMCD Technical Coordinator, then commented on how the MMCD was able to leverage the web application interface developed in cooperation with the OpenMNND project (<http://www.openmnnd.org>) and GeoMoose project (<http://www.geomoose.org/moose>). The total cost of development was \$5,000, none of which was for software since the software developed via the OpenMNND and GeoMoose projects are open source, that is, available free of charge over the Internet. The only cost to the MMCD was to customize its data to work with the application.

Randy Knippel, a member of the OpenMNND project team, commented that he believes this is the first application that is running on the regional parcel dataset.

## 5. CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda for consideration.

## 6. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

### a) **2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan – Final Adoption**

Business Planning Oversight Team Chairperson Read introduced the topic to the Board members. She recapped direction provided by the Policy Board at the April and July meetings including the vision and mission statements, guiding principals, core functions, preferences for expanding the scope of MetroGIS's functions, major activity areas for the next 3-5 years and a summary of the milestones in the Plan development process that began with the February 8, 2007 Strategic Directions Workshop. See [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07\\_1017/6a\\_presentation.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07_1017/6a_presentation.pdf) for the slide presentation used for Agenda Items 6a and 6b.)

Mission Statement Modification: Read then explained that the Coordinating Committee, in the course of refining the proposed strategies, recognized the need to modify the mission statement (drop the word "technology" following geographic information and drop capitalization of Metropolitan Area). Chairperson Reinhardt called for comment from the members. None was received.

**Motion**: Member Schneider moved and Member Pistilli seconded to approve the revised mission statement. Motion carried, ayes all.

Outreach Strategy Modification: Read then explained the Committee believes that outreach to increase awareness of services available through MetroGIS's efforts should be a priority activity but is concerned that this proposal not be found to be inconsistent with the Board's preference to postpone adding a marketing component to the Outreach Plan.

Member Schneider suggested that the program object be renamed "outreach and identification of opportunities" to address the Committee's concern.

**Motion**: Member Schneider moved and Member Egan seconded to remain the outreach program objective to include the language "and identification of opportunities". Motion carried, ayes all.

Operational Plan Components: Read then summarized the two priority next steps presented in the Operational Plan chapter of the Business Plan: define MetroGIS's role related to addressing shared application needs and a plan to secure additional technical leadership resources needed to achieve the scope expansions defined in the new Business Plan. Both recommendations are to be submitted to the Policy Board for consideration at the April 2008 Policy Board meeting. No modifications were offered to the proposed next steps.

There was not further discussion of the Business Plan other to recognize the Business Planning Oversight Team and staff for their considerable effort to capture the many ideas offered and effectively and efficiently work through differences.

*(Editor's Note: Agenda Items 6a and 6b were considered as if a single agenda topic. See Item 6b for the motions pertaining to both items.)*

### b) **2008 Work Plan and Revised Budget Proposal**

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Brown summarized the process by which the proposed 2008 program objectives were identified and proposed budget to support the proposed work objectives, as presented in the agenda report.

Chairperson Reinhardt recognized that the proposed work program as aggressive but necessary to maintain relevance with changing stakeholder needs. She also thanked the Business Planning

Oversight Team, Coordinating Committee and staff for their considerable effort to maintain MetroGIS's relevance.

**Motion:** *(Editor's Note: Includes Agenda Items 6a)*

Member Egan moved and Member Schneider seconded to:

- 1) Adopt the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan, dated October 17, 2007, including the above-approved modifications.
- 2) Adopt the 2008 major work program priorities and 2008 expense budget for MetroGIS's "Foster Collaboration" function, as presented in the agenda report dated October 2, 2007.

Motion carried ayes all.

**Motion:**

Member Pistilli moved and Member Egan second to:

- 1) Authorize a Request for Proposals for expert assistance to assist with hosting a forum through which to define MetroGIS's role related to addressing shared application needs and authorize up to \$8,750 for this contract.
- 2) Authorize staff and leadership to make presentations to organizations that serve custodial roles to ensure they are comfortable with the expectations outlined in the 2008-2011 Business Plan.

Motion carried ayes all.

**c) Regional Address Point Database – Next Steps**

Mark Kotz, lead staff to the MetroGIS Address Workgroup, provided an overview of the vision adopted by the Board in April 2005 for the regional address points database, the need to define the data synchronization process before a regional custodian can be secured and the process used by which the Workgroup to arrive at its recommendation to partner with Carver County to develop the data synchronization mechanism as an extension of an internal business need.

The slides presented by Kotz can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07\\_1017/07\\_1017\\_addressupdate.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07_1017/07_1017_addressupdate.pdf)

Member Schneider challenged the Workgroup to think big, referring to the request for \$10,000. He stated that cities are investing significant resources to support public safety related functions and that if the efficiency of these programs could be improved through the existence of the proposed dataset that the Workgroup should not hesitate to ask for what it takes to implement it. Chairperson Reinhardt commented that the current proposal is to develop a proof of concept that if successful, implementation resource proposals will follow. Staff Coordinator Johnson also mentioned that if the data synchronization pilot is successful, he expects to begin with Members Schneider and Elkins' assistance a dialogue with Metro Cities leadership to decide next steps regarding implementation.

Elkins asked for clarification of the current process to notify organizations of new addresses. Kotz mentioned that the specific parties notified interestingly, vary from city to city but in all cases numerous organizations – public and private – are routinely notified of new addresses and streets. The vision involves a regional database that each of these parties of interest would be made aware of and to shift the burden of notification to those interest who want the information by having them access the regional dataset directly as they wish.

Member Kordiak asked how we can assure that we obtain the deliverable defined in the report. This comment lead to a general conversation among Board members following which the members concluded that Carver County had presented a well thought out, cost effective proposal and that they would likely invest what it takes, beyond their proposed match if need be, to accomplish the deliverable.

Member Pistilli asked if the proposed synchronization mechanism could be expanded to other regional data solutions such as parcels. Staff noted that synchronization of point data will involve

a simpler process than synchronizing polygon data such as parcels but he agreed to keep in the mind the need as the point data mechanism is developed and to offer recommendations for tackling the more complex polygon data.

**Motion:** Member Kordiak moved and Member Egan seconded to:

- 1) Endorse continued effort to implement a regional “Occupiable Units” database, change the name from “Occupiable Units” to “Address Points”, and work to further refine custodial roles and responsibilities as described in the agenda report, dated October 5, 2007.
- 2) Authorize use of \$10,000 of MetroGIS’s Special Projects funds to contract with and pay Carver County one half of its costs to develop a working example of a synchronization mechanism that works with the online maintenance tool that is under development by Carver, Scott and Hennepin Counties

Motion carried, ayes all.

**d) 2008 Meeting Schedule**

**Motion:** Member Pistilli moved and Member O’Rourke seconded to approve the 2008 meeting schedule as presented in the agenda packet: January 16<sup>th</sup>, April 23<sup>rd</sup>, July 23<sup>rd</sup>, and October 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Motion carried, ayes all.

**7. MAJOR ACTIVITY UPDATES**

No questions or comments were offered concerning the topics listed in the agenda materials.

**8. INFORMATION SHARING**

**a) Twin Cities Regional Economic Development Web Site**

The Staff Coordinator asked the Policy Board members who are affiliated with counties if they aware of a request for financial participation in the proposed web site from the Regional Chamber of Commerce.

Member O’Rourke noted that Washington County has agreed to be a subscriber because the County Board wants to be responsive to the city officials within the county that have asked the county to take a higher profile role in fostering economic development activity. She also summarized the types of real estate and socio economic data that is proposed to be available from the site and the principal purpose is to assist companies evaluate site options for expansion or new develop in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. She mentioned the proposers had mentioned that Ramsey County had agreed to participate. Chairperson Reinhardt noted that she was not aware of such a commitment.

Brown noted that a representative of the Regional web site proposal has a meeting scheduled with three Hennepin County Commissioners and that he has asked to attend. He commented that Hennepin County is being asked to pay \$46,000 and that has concern for how the funding will be used, in particular the cost of data and whether some of the data sources could be supplied via MetroGIS for less.

Elkins commented that he is member of the Chamber and is aware of the proposed project. He noted that the Chamber is sponsoring it because they believe the Twin Cities is at a competitive disadvantage with those metro areas that have implemented this tool.

Member Kordiak asked who has access to the data which led to a brief conversation about interest in meeting with the proposers to evaluate the potential for leveraging capabilities.

Member Pistilli commented that he would like to know more about the Chambers business model regarding this service. Member Schneider commented that he favors exploring a partnership as the Chamber’s proposal offer a good test case for evaluating policy implications regarding each

of the three scope expansions (e.g., add applications to regional data solutions, seek out partnerships with non e government to address shared information needs, and improve interoperability with jurisdictions that adjoin the seven county Metropolitan Area.)

Schneider commented that if a meeting is held, it should be with those persons who are making the decisions. It was agreed that meeting should be sought. Elkins agreed to contact the Executive Director and explain the situation. Members Schneider, Pistilli, O'Rourke, Brown, and Chairperson Reinhardt expressed interest in participating in the dialogue if a meeting is set up.

Staff was asked to report back to the Board at the January meeting.

**b) Debrief Event Proposed – GIS Involvement in Response to I-35W Bridge Collapse**

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that she had attended the luncheon at the GIS/LIS Consortium's Annual State Conference on October 11<sup>th</sup>, as the Staff Coordinator's guest when he received the Consortium's Polaris Award, and that prior to the award ceremony that she had the opportunity to experience a presentation about the use of GIS technology in response to the bridge collapse and experiences of the GIS professional to respond to needs of emergency response officials. Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the type of information shared and Board members concurred that the Coordinating Committee should attempt to arrange for this presentation to be given to the Board at its January 2008 meeting.

**c) Description of MetroGIS added to Wikipedia**

Member Kordiak requested clarification about who uses Wikipedia to which Coordinating Committee members Gelbmann and Craig offered examples.

**9. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for January 16, 2008.

**10. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Prepared by:

Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

and

Christopher Kline  
MetroGIS Support Team





**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: William Brown, Hennepin County  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** GIS Technology Demonstration  
*GIS's Role in Response to I-35W Bridge Collapse*

**DATE:** December 26, 2007  
*(For the Jan. 16<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The GIS Technology Demonstration planned for the October Policy Board will focus on the role GIS technology played in response to the I-35W Bridge Collapse.

Paul Weinberger (City of Minneapolis), Dan Ross (MnDOT), and Joella Givens (MnDOT-Metro District) will make the presentation.

### **BACKGROUND**

Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt attended the State GIS/LIS State Conference in October 2007 and sat in on the luncheon presentation about how City of Minneapolis and MnDOT staff leveraged GIS technology to assist in responding to the I-35W bridge collapse. Chairperson Reinhardt was impressed and asked if it would be possible to repeat that presentation for the Policy Board at its January 2008 meeting. Coordinating Committee member Givens made arrangements to do so.

### **ABSTRACT FROM GIS/LIS CONFERENCE PROGRAM**

#### **"I35W: RESPONSE, RECOVERY, AND PLANNING**

On August 1, 2007 the Interstate 35W Bridge collapsed over the Mississippi River. Dozens of vehicles were on the bridge at the time, including a school bus carrying around 60 children and construction equipment and many workers. In minutes, The City of Minneapolis, Mn/DOT, and Homeland Security Emergency Management implemented emergency operations plans. Minneapolis Police and Fire departments, first responders, and partners from many other agencies quickly showed up at the scene. Incident Command, headed by the Minneapolis Fire Department, was quickly set up on the 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge. At the height of the response, there were more than 75 firefighting personnel and 75 law enforcement units at the scene, including divers and members of special collapsed structure rescue teams. GIS staff responded as well. Within hours of the incident, geospatial technology and data was used in a variety of ways to support the rescue crews, recovery teams, and emergency response personnel. GIS was also used to support recovery efforts after the immediate response and is being used in the planning process for the new bridge.

With the many agencies responding, instituting GIS for the efforts needed to be a collaborative effort. Minneapolis reached out to other agencies and vendors for added support to plan, respond, and provide shared information to assist efforts at the site. This session will provide a timeline for GIS activities and introduce how geospatial technology has been used in the response, recovery, and planning phases of the efforts and work that has been taking place. We will provide some insight as to lessons that have been learned throughout the process and will speak to how awareness of the technology has risen due to this event."

### **PREVIOUS GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION TOPICS**

The Policy Board has asked for a demonstration of GIS technology to be a regular component of each of its meetings. Refer to the listing on the next page of the previous demonstration topics.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

No action requested.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### PREVIOUS GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS

- Oct. 2007: Web maps open government to citizens - Metropolitan Mosquito Control District
- Jul. 2007: Metropolitan Council new “Maps” mini website
- Apr. 2007: Efficiencies Realized Through Coordinated Application Development: Lessons Learned From The OpenMNND Project
- Jan. 2007: Effective Decisions Through Effective Data Distribution
- Oct. 2006: Minnesota 3-D: An Online Mapping System Designed Close the Spatial Mismatch Between Affordable Housing And Living Wage Jobs
- Jul. 2006: What does MetroGIS Mean to Minnesota Geospatial Architecture Plan?
- Apr. 2006: Evacuation Planning for Homeland Defense – U of M Research Project
- Jan. 2006: (*No presentation*)
- Oct. 2005: Natural Resources Atlas Made Possible Via Data Sharing
- Jul. 2005: Ramsey County GIS User Group’s Internet Mapping Service (IMS) site
- Apr. 2005: How Watershed Districts Are Benefiting from MetroGIS’s Efforts
- Jan. 2005: Regional Mailing Application
- Oct. 2004: Improving Operational Effectiveness with GIS - Dakota County’s Experience
- Jul. 2004: City of Roseville’s Combined Use of Socioeconomic Data and GIS Technology to Improve Decision Making and Service Delivery
- Apr. 2004: Metro 911 Board initiative to integrate GIS into day-to-day operations of 27 Metro Area PSAP’s
- Jan. 2004: Scott County’s Use of GIS technology to improve intra-department efficiencies
- Oct. 2003: GASB34 – GIS Technology’s Relevance
- Jul. 2003: Minneapolis Neighborhood Information System use of GIS and data sharing activities
- Apr. 2003: Metropolitan Mosquito Control District use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jan. 2003: Emergency Management Response applications developed by Carver and Washington Counties.
- Oct. 2002: Metropolitan Airports Commission use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jul. 2002: MetroGIS DataFinder Café Rollout
- Mar. 2002: Presentations from each metro county regarding their respective GIS programs
- Jan. 2002: GIS’s role in responding to the World Trade Center tragedy – Mapping Ground Zero (*Paul Olson, Grand Rapids Office of the Minnesota DNR - Division of Forestry*)
- Oct. 2001: TIES – Benefits to School Districts as a result of MetroGIS
- Jul. 2001: DataFinder And Functionality Sought Via Proposed Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism (*since named DataFinder Café*)
- Apr. 2001: LMIC’s Metro viewer software: A Mapping Tool for the Public
- Jan. 2001: Regional Census Geography and Legislative Redistricting Software/Process
- Oct. 2000: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition’s Socio-Demographic Database Development
- Jul. 2000: DataFinder and Council’s Internet-based Existing Land Use Application
- Apr. 2000: Regional Parcel Dataset (Version 1)
- Jul. 1999: Presentation to House of Representatives Subcommittee on June 9th
- Apr. 1999: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition GIS Capabilities
- Nov. 1998: Orthoimagery and its Uses
- Sep. 1998: DataFinder and Dakota County’s Parcel Query Application
- Jan. 1997: Benefits from GIS in general and uses being made by all classes of stakeholders represented on the Policy Board



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: William Brown, Hennepin County  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Regional Emergency Preparedness Solution

**DATE:** December 28, 2007  
(For the Jan 16<sup>th</sup> Mtg.)

### INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this report are to share with the Policy Board:

- 1) Progress made to implement the vision of a regional emergency management solution as endorsed by the Board in 2005 to:
  - Uniformly managing data important to emergency preparedness and response activities.
  - Nurturing critical working relationships with a host of organization interests, including state agencies.
- 2) An application submitted for federal grant funds to leverage the regional solution under development for Twin Cities Metropolitan Area for application throughout the state of Minnesota.

Randy Knippel, Chair of the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, and Steve Swazee, Co-chair of the Emergency Preparedness Committee of the Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information, will be the presenters.

### PREVIOUS ACTION

#### 1. December 17, 2007- Coordinating Committee:

- Concluded that a presentation to the Policy Board was in order to share progress made to achieve the vision of a regional emergency preparedness solution and to inform them of a grant application that if awarded would leverage the subject solution for statewide implementation. (See Attachment E)
- In response to a request from MnDOT, the Coordinating Committee accepted the Chair of the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup's suggestion that the Workgroup be assigned the tasks of developing a strategy to ensure that licensed geospatial data (e.g., parcels and imagery) are available to organizations that need it for response to emergency situations, such as the I-35W Bridge collapse. (See Attachment B for more background on this request.)

#### 2. October 19, 2005: The Policy Board endorsed the vision for a county-based collaborative solution and provided constructive criticism regarding a pilot project to develop procedures (see Attachment A).

### PROGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL SOLUTION

In 2005, following Policy Board endorsement of a vision statement for a regional Emergency Preparedness data solution, a pilot was initiated an experimental effort that involved all seven counties assuming various primary and regional custodian responsibilities to collaboratively manage numerous Emergency Preparedness related data types. The Policy Board endorsed the pilot at its October 2005 meeting and requested modification of the outreach materials to more clearly define the objectives and benefits in a manner that policy makers and senior managers could relate to. (See Attachment A for an excerpt from the October 2005 Policy Board meeting summary.)

A decision was made to combine the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup and the Governor's Council on Geographic Information's (GCGI) Emergency Preparedness Committee (EPC) to better coordinate issues and opportunities of common interest and leverage related work via the GCGI that needs broader management and policy buy-in from the counties. In the course of the work of the combined interests, state agency officials, in particular Kris Eide, the Director of the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (HSEM) have become involved in this effort and recognize the work that has been done by MetroGIS as an important priority for the state, as well as an opportunity for statewide implementation (see Attachment D).

**RECOMMENDATION**

No action is requested. Board members are, however, encouraged to offer suggestions as to ways the Workgroup can continue to develop political legitimacy for the subject regional emergency preparedness data solution.

# ATTACHMENT A

## EXCERPT

### Policy Board Meeting Summary

October 19, 2005

#### **5a) Emergency Preparedness – Proposed Interim Regional Solution Report**

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read introduced the need for regional interoperability of emergency preparedness-related data with the following scenario. A jet aircraft is having difficulty and dumps fuel before landing. The fuel falls across a three county area. Emergency responders need to assess the impact on water intakes.

She then introduced Randy Knippel, Dakota County GIS Coordinator and Chair of the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, noting that the Coordinating Committee had endorsed the proposed collaborative solution presented in the agenda materials at its September 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. The presentation slides can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/05\\_1019/slides.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/05_1019/slides.pdf).

Knippel summarized the collaborative vision (for the details see the White Paper dated September 1, 2005 at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/emergency\\_prep/ep\\_endorsed.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/emergency_prep/ep_endorsed.pdf)), noting that the seven counties are proposed to be the core participants and that officials affiliated with each of the counties had been actively involved in the development of the vision. He commented that the initial focus is on public health related topics such as data related to the Strategic National Stockpile initiative and that a major benefit is provision of a common operating picture for how the GIS and Emergency Preparedness/Management communities can collaborate. The key is recognizing that all disasters are local and that local officials possess the detailed knowledge needed to quickly respond. Moreover, to apply outside resources – nearby communities, state, federal assistance – quickly and effectively, there is a compelling need to create systems that facilitate easy and comprehensive access to data about the specific locality involved. In short, the protocols proposed by the Workgroup are designed to capture a host of data important to effectively respond to emergencies and create a sustainable mechanism with defined organizational roles and responsibilities to keep these data current and readily accessible. He also noted that a website has been created to improve communication with and understanding by the emergency preparedness community.

Before concluding his presentation, Knippel invited Debra Ehert of the Minnesota Department of Health to comment from the perspective of a benefactor of the proposed vision. Ms. Ehert spoke strongly in favor of the proposal, noting that the efforts of the Workgroup have been critical to their ability to effectively integrate GIS technology into their day-to-day business functions. She emphasized that the existence of cross-jurisdictionally compliant data are critical to achieving the Department of Health's mandates, as there is a major spatial dynamic to their work.

Knippel concluded his presentation by summarizing the components of the recommendation. In response to a question from Member Delaney, Knippel commented that the Workgroup is **asking if the Board concurs that the vision has political legitimacy before further testing is initiated**. Policy Board members then suggested that in addition to seeking a finding of legitimacy from the Policy Board, the Workgroup should be seeking the desired acknowledgement from the Pawlenty Administration, in particular the Department of Public Safety, as well as from the Legislature, League of Cities, and Association of Minnesota (and Metropolitan) Counties. At the county level, Board members concurred that the focus should be on seeking legitimacy from the Emergency Management Coordinators (EMC), as opposed to directly from the County Boards, noting that if the EMC's are sold on the idea, they will recommend it to their respective county boards. Member Delaney noted that each of the county EMCs is responsible for detailed plans to satisfy FEMA compliance standards and that access to accurate data is critical to their ability to effectively carry out this planning requirement.

Member Schneider commented that he supports the vision concept as most cities and counties have detailed plans that call for a high level of coordination. He concurred with other members that the plan should seek to obtain recognition at the state level sooner rather than later. He also offered constructive criticism concerning the graphic that illustrates the process, which is included in the agenda materials.

The Board concurred with Member Schneider that the graphic needs to focus on demonstrable program-related outcomes familiar and important to policy makers and that the terminology needs to be more aligned with their worlds.

Vice-Chair Kordiak asked for clarification about how the Workgroup expects the Emergency Management community to use GIS technology. Knippel responded that the goal is to raise awareness of the value that the GIS professional can bring to a disaster response effort and include them on the team. No one is expecting the Emergency Managers to use the technology themselves in the time of a crisis.

Member Schneider noted that the presence of accurate data maintained in a system that permits analysis of “what if” scenarios would provide an enormously valuable training tool.

**Motion:** Member Egan moved and Member Delaney seconded, with the understanding that the process graphic will be improved to illustrate program rather than process outcomes, that the Policy Board and, in particular, each county representative:

- 1) Advocate among the leadership of their respective organizations for the next phase of testing and further refinement.
- 2) Offer suggestions for how the proposed roles and responsibilities might work better in their respective organization.
- 3) Authorize Chairperson Reinhardt to sign a letter inviting members of the EP community to attend an outreach event(s) at which the subject interim strategy will be explained and next steps discussed.

Motion carried, ayes all.

## ATTACHMENT B

### County Data Producers Workgroup Excerpt from Meeting Summary October 31, 2007

#### 6. Formalize Emergency Preparedness Data Responsibilities

Knippel explained ....that he would like to .... take steps to pursue recognition of the emergency preparedness data as an officially endorsed MetroGIS dataset with custodial responsibilities tied to the counties as outlined in the published project report dated September 1, 2005. Ensuing activities would be related to updating the existing datasets using the custodian roles outlined in that report. This will then be offered to the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) Emergency Management Committee (EPC) as a candidate model for statewide implementation.

Members generally supported the concept of moving forward but want more details regarding data layers and names of county GIS contacts involved in previous emergency preparedness data efforts.

#### **Action:**

Knippel will provide details requested to members. Members will verify contacts or identify updated contacts and talk to them about emergency preparedness data to identify any issues with the county's role. Knippel will work with Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, to define the process for creating MetroGIS endorsed data sets for emergency preparedness using custodian roles, as defined in the 2005 report.

*(Editor's note: This topic was shared with the Coordinating Committee on December 18, 2007. A grant application for federal funding to enhance the subject regional emergency preparedness solution and potentially expand the concept beyond the Metropolitan Area were acknowledged as an exciting opportunity that should be shared with the Policy Board at its January 2008 meeting.)*

## ATTACHMENT C

**From:** "Joella Givens" <Joella.Givens@dot.state.mn.us>  
**To:** <randy.johnson@metc.state.mn.us>  
**Date:** 9/17/07 4:12PM  
**Subject:** data sharing for emergencies

Randy,

My boss stopped down today with a concern about data sharing for future emergencies. We discussed the various data sharing agreements we now have, including their limitations (i.e. no sharing). He is directing me to work toward solving the problem.

As I see it, we can go **two ways**. We could **visit every contract and data sharing agreement we have, and amend it to add a clause for emergencies**. **Or** we could **develop a separate 'emergency contingency' agreement** and execute that between us and the parties we have agreements with. Then if an emergency developed, we could share any data from that agency, even if from multiple agreements in the past.

We will need to get some agreement that this is a worthy goal.

Then we will need to establish **what constitutes an "emergency"** for this agreement. We will also need to designate who can declare an emergency for this purpose. I believe that MESB may be useful here. I was unable to reach Gordon this morning, but left him a voice mail and have cc'ed him on this e-mail.

Then we need to define what can be done with the data in such an emergency. Can we provide the data to other responders? (eg. cities, counties, state and federal agencies, relief organizations, etc.) Can we make it available on a web site? Does the data producer need to be notified that the data is being shared under this agreement?

I think there are certainly more questions than answers here. However I believe that **MetroGIS is the best vehicle to vet the issue and develop a solution**. I am willing to work with individual counties one at a time if needed, or bring the issue to the Coordinating Committee or Policy Board if appropriate.

Your thoughts??

Thanks,

Joella Givens  
GIS Manager  
Mn/DOT Metro - Waters Edge  
1500 West County Road B-2  
Roseville, Mn. 55113

[joella.givens@dot.state.mn.us](mailto:joella.givens@dot.state.mn.us)

**ATTACHMENT D**

**Endorsement from  
Mn Department of Public Safety**

*(following page)*

# MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY



## Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management

444 Cedar Street, Suite 223, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-6223  
Phone: 651/201-7400 Fax: 651/296-0459 TTY: 651/282-6555  
Internet: [www.dps.state.mn.us](http://www.dps.state.mn.us)

December 18, 2007

Randal Johnson  
MetroGIS Coordinator

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I would like to commend MetroGIS for its leadership in emphasizing the importance of GIS for emergency preparedness and coordinating development of critical GIS data to support emergency managers in the Twin Cities area. I want to encourage MetroGIS to continue these efforts, in coordination with pending statewide efforts to do the same.

The Emergency Preparedness Committee (Committee) of the Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI), which I chair for FY2008, is the principal organization for promoting, coordinating, and standardizing GIS use across all levels of the state's Emergency Management community. I believe my state position, as Director of the Minnesota Homeland Security and Emergency Management division, will provide greater emphasis to the Committee's work and higher visibility within the emergency management community. I firmly believe GIS is an important resource that is underutilized for emergency planning and response in Minnesota. Thus, together with my co-chair, Steve Swazee, we are refocusing the Committee efforts for 2008, emphasizing the need for local government involvement and collaboration across jurisdictions. We are proceeding with a heightened sense of urgency due to recent disaster events in our state.

As you are aware, MetroGIS has a history of providing organization for GIS efforts in the Twin Cities area and has been involved in encouraging GIS use for emergency preparedness for several years. In fact, many of our Committee members are from the metro area and have been involved in that work. As a result, we are looking for ways to leverage those past efforts, beginning with the 2005 MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup Project Report. This report includes a collaborative data custodian model that is the logical starting point for developing a future statewide model.

I would encourage you to formally institutionalize the MetroGIS model for the Twin Cities so we can work together to ensure accurate, complete, and timely data is available for emergency response. There is an immediate need for that data in the Metro area, so I would also encourage on-going efforts to refine it. Such a coordinated effort between counties and cities through MetroGIS would be an important component of our statewide efforts. Consequently, I would greatly appreciate it if the importance of this issue could be communicated to your constituents so that adequate resources could be allocated to this activity.

Sincerely,

Kris A. Eide, Director  
Chair, Emergency Preparedness Committee  
Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information

Alcohol  
and Gambling  
Enforcement

ARMER/911  
Program

Bureau of  
Criminal  
Apprehension

Driver  
and Vehicle  
Services

Homeland  
Security and  
Emergency  
Management

Minnesota  
State Patrol

Office of  
Communications

Office of  
Justice Programs

Office of  
Traffic Safety

State Fire  
Marshal and  
Pipeline Safety



# ATTACHMENT E



Victoria A. Reinhardt

BOARD OF RAMSEY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
DISTRICT 7

DARREN E. TOBOLT  
ASSISTANT TO COMMISSIONERS  
Darren.Tobolt@Co.Ramsey.MN.US

221 COURT HOUSE  
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102  
TEL: (651) 266-8150 FAX: (651) 266-8370  
Victoria.Reinhardt@Co.Ramsey.MN.US

December 17, 2007

John Hoshal, GIS Services Supervisor  
Land Management Information Center  
Minnesota Dept. of Administration  
658 Cedar St., Suite 300  
St. Paul, MN 55155-1603

Dear Mr. Hoshal:

I am pleased to offer support for your FGDC CAP grant proposal; prepared in collaboration with several MetroGIS stakeholders and other state and federal organizations through the Governor's Council on Geographic Information - Emergency Preparedness Committee (GCGI EPC).

It is my understanding that this project will result in continued refinement of structures data needed for homeland security and emergency management by emphasizing data stewardship and multi-level government partnerships. It is also our understanding that you intend to leverage several MetroGIS efforts including its shared data custodian model and address points application. As proposed, this project will promote collaborative data development within our region and statewide through the GCGI EPC. This is an important principle behind MetroGIS and therefore the Policy Board recommends that the FGDC encourage it as well by awarding the grant for this project.

As importantly, MetroGIS leadership believe this project will also benefit organizations beyond those directly involved in the project. For example, it will allow smaller counties and cities to engage in needed data development without a major investment in software. Expanding on MetroGIS efforts will also help nurture FGDC goals of good stewardship for homeland security and emergency management data in general. We are pleased to support such national geospatial initiatives that foster improved access to these critical data.

Minnesota's First Home Rule County

print on recycled paper with 10% or more of 100% post-consumer content



MetroGIS is a voluntary partnership of organizations in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area that rely upon geographic information systems technology to accomplish their business functions. The MetroGIS Policy Board provides direction for the MetroGIS Organization and is comprised of twelve elected officials - each representing a core stakeholder or stakeholder community. Members include each of the seven metropolitan counties, the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities (AMM), Metropolitan Chapter of the Minnesota Association of Watershed Districts (MAWD), Technology Information Educational Services (TIES - school districts), and the Metropolitan Council. The Policy Board also serves as a political reality check for all actions fundamental to the success of MetroGIS. For more information about our organization, please visit [www.metrogis.org](http://www.metrogis.org).

Thank you for the opportunity to demonstrate our continuing support for collaboration between the MetroGIS and the GCGI EPC communities. We look forward to working with you on this exciting project.

Sincerely,



Victoria Reinhardt  
Ramsey County Commissioner and MetroGIS Policy Board Chair

cc: MetroGIS Policy Board members  
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee members



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Staff Support Team  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Twin Cities Economic Development Web Site

**DATE:** December 28, 2007  
(For the Jan. 16th Meeting)

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to share the results of a meeting on December 7, 2007 at which members of the Policy Board met with the President of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and project leads for the proposed Regional Economic Development Website. The main purpose of the meeting was to initiate talks to explore how the two organizations might collaborate, given the overlap of key organizational interests, concerning the proposed Website.

### PREVIOUS POLICY BOARD CONSIDERATION

At its October 17, 2007 meeting, the Board directed staff to set up a meeting with the leadership of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce to explore the potential for collaboration between the Chamber and MetroGIS regarding the proposed website.

The Policy Board requested the subject meeting for several reasons (an excerpt from the meeting summary is provided in the Reference Section.):

- 1) The target audience and funding partners for the proposed website include all seven metropolitan area counties, four counties that adjoin the seven metro counties (Chisago, Isanti, Sherburne, and Wright,) and possibly other interests who are currently active participants in MetroGIS's efforts.
- 2) The objectives of the proposed website Board also align well with objectives set forth in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan and offer a good test case for evaluating policy implications regarding each of the three scope expansions adopted earlier in the same meeting:
  - Add applications to regional data solutions
  - Seek out partnerships with non- government to address shared information needs
  - Improve interoperability with jurisdictions that adjoin the seven county Metropolitan Area

The letter sent to Todd Klingel, President of the Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce, requesting this meeting is presented in Attachment A.

### SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 7, 2007 MEETING

Policy Board members Schneider, Elkins, and O'Rourke, along with the Staff Coordinator, met with Todd Klingel, President of the Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce, Janna King and Russ Riblett (by phone). Both parties explained their respective objectives. Mr. Klingel commented that the Chamber opted to pursue this initiative as a means to foster economic development cooperation that has not been as widespread in the past as desired. Mr. Riblett commented that in his experience building similar web sites that the presence of regional datasets (data normalized across multiple counties) as have been created through MetroGIS's efforts is not typical and that leveraging these regional assets presents an opportunity to set the Twin Cities apart from other regions. The group recognized that uniformity among the various websites must be maintained to support apples-to-apples comparisons but the group also concurred that if the completeness, accuracy, and correctness of the locally-produced data were better than available via national datasets, as are the typical data sources, that an advantage can be gained.

It was agreed that once the Chamber has completed the initial roll out of the website, planned for mid-winter 2008, and is satisfied that it is operating as designed that they will initiate further conversations with MetroGIS to discuss potential enhancements using regional datasets and cooperative outreach that achieve common needs. See Attachments A and B for communication following the meeting. Policy Board Member O'Rourke, who also serves on Website Steering Committee, agreed to serve as the liaison between the two interests.

### RECOMMENDATION

No action requested at this time.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### Excerpt from October 17, 2007 Meeting Summary

#### 8a. Twin Cities Regional Economic Development Web Site

The Staff Coordinator asked the Policy Board members who are affiliated with counties if they aware of a request for financial participation in the proposed web site from the Regional Chamber of Commerce.

Member O'Rourke noted that Washington County has agreed to be a subscriber because the County Board wants to be responsive to the city officials within the county that have asked the county to take a higher profile role in fostering economic development activity. She also summarized the types of real estate and socio economic data that is proposed to be available from the site and the principal purpose is to assist companies evaluate site options for expansion or new develop in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. She mentioned the proposers had mentioned that Ramsey County had agreed to participate. Chairperson Reinhardt noted that she was not aware of such a commitment.

Brown noted that a representative of the Regional web site proposal has a meeting scheduled with three Hennepin County Commissioners and that he has asked to attend. He commented that Hennepin County is being asked to pay \$46,000 and that has concern for how the funding will be used, in particular the cost of data and whether some of the data sources could be supplied via MetroGIS for less.

Elkins commented that he is member of the Chamber and is aware of the proposed project. He noted that the Chamber is sponsoring it because they believe the Twin Cities is at a competitive disadvantage with those metro areas that have implemented this tool.

Member Kordiak asked who has access to the data which led to a brief conversation about interest in meeting with the proposers to evaluate the potential for leveraging capabilities.

Member Pistilli commented that he would like to know more about the Chambers business model regarding this service. Member Schneider commented that he favors exploring a partnership as the Chamber's proposal offer a good test case for evaluating policy implications regarding each of the three scope expansions (e.g., add applications to regional data solutions, seek out partnerships with non-government to address shared information needs, and improve interoperability with jurisdictions that adjoin the seven county Metropolitan Area.)

Schneider commented that if a meeting is held, it should be with those persons who are making the decisions. It was agreed that meeting should be sought. Elkins agreed to contact the Executive Director and explain the situation. Members Schneider, Pistilli, O'Rourke, Brown, and Chairperson Reinhardt expressed interest in participating in the dialogue if a meeting is set up.

Staff was asked to report back to the Board at the January meeting.

# ***MetroGIS***

*Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data*

---



December 10, 2007

Todd Klingel,  
President & CEO  
Minneapolis Regional Chamber of Commerce  
81 South Ninth Street, Suite 200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

## **Regional Economic Development Website**

Dear Mr. Klingel,

Thank you for meeting with MetroGIS leadership last Friday afternoon and arranging for members of your website development team to participate in the conversation. Your personal leadership and passion for the Chamber's venture into the Internet world of mapping-based information dissemination is refreshing. I was also pleased with your enthusiasm to further investigate ways to leverage MetroGIS resources to achieve needs and opportunities shared by both organizations.

To the extent that the Chamber's website development team can leverage the existence of the DataFinder.org website and or the standards and best practices that are operational as a result of MetroGIS's efforts, please do so. As I noted in the meeting, there is no fee to post data on the DataFinder website or to leverage its robust distribution capabilities. In addition, the Chamber's status as a non-profit organization and the "view-only" application design regarding display of geospatial data also open the door to the ability to grant access to the MetroGIS regional parcel and street centerline datasets via DataFinder. These datasets and each of the other endorsed regional datasets are standardized across the entire region and are updated at a minimum of quarterly. The standards upon which they are maintained are also being investigated by officials beyond the Metro Area as catalysts for implementation of standards to achieve inter-regional sharing of data and related resources. In this regard, I believe that the business purposes served by the subject website can further catalyze securing these much-desired standards.

The best to you and your team as you progress toward the official launch of the Regional Economic Development Website. I am looking forward to further talks about how data resources, standards, and knowledge sharing made possible through MetroGIS's efforts can be leveraged to potentially enhance the functionality of your application as well as how our shared interests can be leveraged to improved data interoperability with counties and other jurisdictions that the adjoin the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

Respectfully,

Randall L. Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

cc: MetroGIS Policy Board

## ATTACHMENT B

**From:** Todd Klingel [TKlingel@minneapolischamber.org]

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 11, 2007 1:48 PM

**To:** Johnson, Randy

**Cc:** Terry Schneider; Steve Elkins; Victoria Reinhardt; molly.o'rourke@co.washington.mn.us; Pistilli, Tony; Gelbmann, Rick

**Subject:** RE: Regional Economic Development Website

Thank you Randy, and thanks for taking the time to meet with us. Our team was eager to learn of the great work MetroGIS has been doing in the community and welcome the opportunity to marry the two projects in any area that makes sense.

We are delighted that our “business purpose” initiative may assist your efforts to engage some of the outlying communities in your program.

Although the site will be live early next year, we know it will always be a work in progress and look forward to your help in enhancing its value in the months and years ahead.

Sincerely,

Todd Klingel



Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: William Brown, Hennepin County  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** 2007 MetroGIS Major Accomplishments and Annual Report Theme

**DATE:** December 19, 2007  
(For the Jan. 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

### **REQUEST**

The Coordinating Committee respectfully requests the Policy Board to comment on the listing below of MetroGIS's major accomplishments over the past year and on the suggested theme for the MetroGIS 2007 Annual Report which it unanimously approved at its meeting on December 18.

### **MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS DURING 2007**

Major accomplishments in 2007 included (*a detailed listing of activities and accomplishments over the past year is also attached for the Board's information*):

- ✓ Completed a comprehensive update of MetroGIS's policy foundation and objectives with adoption of the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan. Components of this accomplishment include corroboration of the need to: sustain current practices, pursue three major scope expansions (applications, interoperability with adjoining jurisdictions, and partnering with non-government interests), and secure additional technical leadership/coordination resources to achieve desired scope expansions.
- ✓ Launched work on the top two priorities defined in the Business Plan: 1) define MetroGIS's role related to addressing shared application needs and 2) define a strategy to secure additional technical leadership/coordination resources.
- ✓ Made significant progress to realize the vision of a Regional Address Points Dataset:
  - Confirmed interest among address producer via the Web Application Viability Assessment Project in achieving a Regional Address Points Dataset.
  - Defined the need for and partnered with Carver County to develop a "data synchronization" mechanism which is needed to effectively manage processing of data received from numerous sources.
  - Continued to make progress to align proposed regional address standards with emerging national standards and demonstrated they are achievable.
- ✓ Partnered with the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District to oversee development of a regional geocoding services as a Regional GIS Project.
- ✓ Reached agreement with The Lawrence Group (TLG) to permit "view-only" access of their TLG Street Centerline Dataset via web-based applications hosted by organizations licensed to access and use the source data.
- ✓ Made substantive progress toward achieving the vision of "ApplicationFinder" concept via the Web Services Broker pilot project managed by LMIC as a Regional GIS Pilot Project.
- ✓ Realized continued growth in data distribution activity via DataFinder.

### **2007 ANNUAL REPORT**

The proposed main theme for the 2007 annual report is - how the existence of MetroGIS is making a difference and how adopted scope expansions are expected to increase MetroGIS's relevance. Jeanne Landkamer has again agreed to produce the MetroGIS Annual Report, as she has done for the past several years.

As has been the case for the past several annual reports, a single page, double-sided format, written from Chairperson Reinhardt's perspective, is proposed. The report would again be distributed in combination with an informational brochure, which was last updated in 2004 and can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual\\_reports/05brochure.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual_reports/05brochure.pdf). Funding for production of a new brochure is included in the 2008 budget to reflect the objectives of the new 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan Update.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board suggest any additions and/or modifications to the:

- 1) The summary listed above of major MetroGIS accomplishments in 2007.
- 2) The proposed themes for the 2007 annual report of "how the MetroGIS's efforts are making a difference and how pursuing three scope expansions are expected to increase MetroGIS's relevance".

# Year End Detailed Status Report

## MetroGIS Activities and Accomplishments

- 2007 -

### I. Regional Information Need/Data Solutions – Data Component:

#### a. Address Points

Made significant progress to realize the vision of a Regional Address Points Dataset. Completed a Web Application Viability Assessment and concluded that sufficient interest exists among local government address producers to proceed. Authorized a partnership with Carver County to develop a data synchronization mechanism. Continued to make progress to align proposed regional address standards with emerging national standards and demonstrated they are achievable

#### b. Census Geography

No effort in 2007

#### c. Emergency Preparedness

Work was focused on direct participation in the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) Emergency Preparedness Committee (EPC). Significant activity developed during the summer resulting in the re-activation of the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup to coordinate data development in the metro area as a starting point for statewide efforts in 2008. The collaborative data custodian model, documented in the 2005 project report, is being adopted by the GCGI EPC for statewide implementation.

#### d. Existing Land Use:

No effort in 2007

#### e. Highways and Roads:

- Public-sector managed, E911 -compatible street centerline dataset. No progress made by MetroGIS workgroup on development of a public-sector managed, E911 -compatible street centerline dataset. The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) operationalized specialized software to ensure Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) data records can be fully synchronized with associated street centerline data managed in a GIS environment. As such renewal of the agreement to access with The Lawrence Group's (TLG) street centerline data was secured. The current agreement with TLG authorizes one additional renewal (2009). Agreement was also reached with TLG in a separate agreement that authorizes licensed users to incorporate the TLG street centerline dataset into web-based applications their host provided access by non-licensed users is restricted to view-only. This "view-only" access provision is the first of its kind and represents a major step forward toward policy innovations which balance of intellectual property rights with the desire to utilize licensed data in web-based applications. At the time of this writing, the new agreement was proceeding through legal review.

- Anchor/segment database model. No substantive progress was made on a second collaborative initiative for which MnDOT is the lead organization. The project involves operationalizing an anchor/segment database model under development by MnDOT with consultant assistance. The software needed to support this initiative failed to meet design requirements and the project was ceased.

#### f. Hydrology

No effort in 2007.

#### g. Jurisdictional Boundaries

- Watershed District Boundaries. The results of Washington County pilot project were conveyed in October 2006 to representatives of the Mn Board on Soil and Water Resources BSWR. A recommendation of the Washington County pilot was that BWSR is the most logical entity to serve in the roles of Regional Custodian. As of this writing, BWSR had not yet responded to the proposal.

- School District Boundaries. No work was initiated to identify an appropriate regional custodian due to budget cuts and reorganization of LMIC. LMIC had earlier been identified as the most logical custodial option given their as contractor relationship with the Department of Education.

#### h. Land Cover (MLCCS)

The extent of coverage exceeds 95 percent. A map of the coverage status can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/land\\_cover/mlccs\\_metro\\_progress\\_planned.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/land_cover/mlccs_metro_progress_planned.pdf). A meeting of users/content experts was hosted on December 6th by DNR Metro, the custodian, to review and improve the MLCCS QA/QC process. Topics covered included: 1) processes to identify interpretation errors including

field errors vs. aerial photo errors, or level 4/5 errors vs. level 1/2/3 errors, 2) review guidelines to determine acceptable levels of subjective natural community interpretation and/or quality ranking interpretation, 3) methods for scoring quality and differences for various attributes, and 4) method preferences for accomplishing quality checking. In addition to the December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, a MLCCS user group / review meeting is being planned for this coming winter as funding has been secured and the lead support staff, Bart Richardson, has received permission to dedicate some time to updating the MLCCS. The current manual was produced 4 years ago and according to Mr. Richardson, changes are long overdue.

i. Parcels:

▪ Government and Academic Interests

No changes were made to the data standards or custodial roles and responsibilities. Metropolitan Mosquito Control District pioneered approval to host a public-access web application that “runs on” the Regional Parcel Dataset. See <http://mmcd.mapmorph.net/mmcd/mmed.html>. The key to approval is that the application does not permit the user to gain access to the source database (“view-only” access).

▪ Non-Profit and For-Profit Access

No progress beyond that achieved in 2007 via the County Data Producers Workgroup that resulted in each county accepting a practice of permitting non-government access to parcel data, without fee, by specified non-profit interests on a county-by-county basis subject to licensure.

▪ There were **117** government and academic licensees at the time of this writing.

j. Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas

No substantive changes from the resource that existed in 2006. The MetroGIS Socioeconomic Resources Page can be viewed at ([http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic\\_resources/index.asp](http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp)).

k. Street Centerlines with Address Ranges.

▪ The term of the agreement between the Metropolitan Council and The Lawrence Group to provide access to this dataset without charge to government and academic interests was extended to include all of 2008.

▪ Agreement was also reached with TLG to permit “view-only” access to their TLG Street Centerline Dataset via web-based applications hosted by organizations licensed to access and use the source data. The formal agreement is expected to be finalized in early 2008.

▪ There were **193** government and academic licensees at the time of this writing.

## **II. Regional Information Need/Data Solutions –Application Component:**

- a) Shared Application Needs: With the adoption of the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan in October (see III-b), addressing shared application needs was defined as the top priority for MetroGIS’s efforts in 2008. By year end, a Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup was created to oversee development of a recommendation, a contract was entered into with PlanGraphics, Inc. to assist the workgroup, and a forum was set for January 24<sup>th</sup>. The January 24<sup>th</sup> forum is to serve as the principle vehicle through which the MetroGIS community will define MetroGIS’s role(s) related to addressing shared application needs.
- b) Mailing Label Application: This application became fully operational in May 2005 as a pilot to illustrate the concept of a regional application solution to the Policy Board. It was deactivated in January 2007 for lack of activity required to justify allocation of staff resources for necessary security upgrades.
- c) Emergency Preparedness: A prototype application was launched in April 2005 for testing and refinement. No substantive changes made since that time awaiting approval of a comprehensive policy for MetroGIS’s role related to emergency planning needs. This application is password protected and has been used exclusively as a training and outreach tool to educate the emergency services community on resources available from the GIS community.

## **III. Special Studies/Projects –Leveraging Investments**

- a) MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop. This Workshop was held on February 8, 2007. It was facilitated by Professor John Bryson and provided the foundation from which the strategies and policies set forth in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business plan evolved. A summary can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/about/business\\_planning/sdw/workshop\\_summary\\_07\\_0626.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/workshop_summary_07_0626.pdf).
- b) MetroGIS Business Plan Update: A comprehensive update of MetroGIS’s policy foundation and objectives was accomplished with adoption of the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan. Components of this accomplishment include corroboration of the need to: sustain current practices, pursue three major scope

expansions (applications, interoperability with adjoining jurisdictions, and partnering with non-government interests), and secure additional technical leadership/coordination resources to achieve desired scope expansions.

- c) Conservation Easement Data Capture and Mapping– Washington County used its \$4,000 payment from the MetroGIS Parcel Data Sharing Agreement to hire an intern to write a conservation report, entitled “Open Space Interests in Property - Cataloging and Mapping Conservation and Scenic Easements in Washington County, Minnesota”. (The report can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07\\_1218/finalreport\\_washingtoncounty.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07_1218/finalreport_washingtoncounty.pdf).)
- d) Promote of DataFinder As A Common Tool – Leveraging the Investment: Washington County continued its use of the web server that supports Café to provide external Internet access to the county’s parcel query application activity. Use of the Café server is saving the county approximately \$10,000 annually in Application Service Provider (ASP) fees plus the cost of hardware and software and related licensing expenses.
- e) Work Launched on Top Two Priorities: A Workgroup formed immediately following the October Policy Board adoption of the 2008-2011 Business plan and a consultant team was secured in November to begin the process of addressing the top two priorities defined in the Business Plan: 1) define MetroGIS’s role related to addressing shared application needs and 2) define a strategy to secure additional technical leadership/coordination resources.
- f) Regional GIS Projects:
  - ApplicationFinder Concept: Mn LMIC (Land Management Information Center) and Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) worked in a “Service Broker” pilot project, funded by MetroGIS in 2006 that builds upon the ApplicationFinder preliminary concept endorsed by the Coordinating Committee at its December 2004 meeting. The goal is to aid stakeholders discover existing applications that would be helpful to achieving various business needs. At the time of this writing, The final project report was expected to be submitted in early January 2008.
  - Regional Geocoder: Partnered with the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District to oversee development of a regional geocoding services.
  - Data Synchronization Mechanism: Defined the need for and partnered with Carver County to develop a “data synchronization” mechanism which is needed to effectively manage processing of data received from numerous sources, as part of the proposed Regional Address Points Dataset (see Item XX)

#### **IV. Data and Information Discovery and Acquisition – Other than Topical Applications**

- a) Support MetroGIS DataFinder
  - DataFinder: Roles and responsibilities were carried out in support of DataFinder. No modifications made to the software. Realized continued growth in data distribution activity
  - Data User Information. At the time of this writing, no option had been defined to achieve the product that Quova, Inc previously provided to document the geographic location of the entities that download data from DataFinder. The manner in which the Council processes log files for its web server is not compatible with the methodology used by Quova.
  - In addition to the Metropolitan Council, 9 organizations are utilizing MetroGIS to distribute geospatial data they maintain and 17 are using DataFinder as a search tool for discovery of their data.

#### **V. Outreach**

- a) Annual Report:

The 2006 Annual Report was distributed to over 1,900 persons and handed out at several conferences and forums. A copy can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual\\_reports/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual_reports/index.shtml).
- b) Newsletter Articles:

Articles about MetroGIS’s activities and accomplishments were submitted for publication in each of the quarterly issues of the statewide GIS/LIS newsletter.
- c) General Information Web site - [www.metrogis.org](http://www.metrogis.org):

This website serves as MetroGIS's institutional memory and main vehicle for keeping participants informed. This site is averaged over 6,900 visits per month.
- d) County GIS User Groups:

Quarterly updates of MetroGIS's activities are provided to each user group. Staff attended as many user group meetings as possible to encourage use of adopted best practices and answer questions about MetroGIS's activities.

e) Special Events:

February 8<sup>th</sup> Strategic Directions Workshop (See [http://www.metrogis.org/about/business\\_planning/sdw/workshop\\_summary\\_07\\_0626.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/workshop_summary_07_0626.pdf)).

f) Coordination with Geospatial Activities Beyond the Metro Area:

In 2001 in response to the federal I-Team initiative and adoption of the initial regional parcel data, MetroGIS leadership has encouraged the Governor's Council (GCGI) to foster collaborative efforts throughout the state through which MetroGIS's stakeholders could achieve interoperability with adjoining jurisdictions. Two GCGI efforts in 2007 that directly involved MetroGIS added energy to that effort:

- May 2007 – St. Cloud, Mn: The Governor's Council on Geographic Information hosted a forum entitled Models for Regional Collaboration. The Staff Coordinator shared information about MetroGIS's accomplishments, objectives, organizational structure and stakeholders, challenges, etc.
- July 2007: The Staff Coordinator and David Claypool, member of the Coordinating Committee each were recommended for selection to the proposed National Geospatial Advisory Committee. As of this writing, member selection had not occurred.
- October 2007 – Rochester, MN (State GIS/LIS Conference): The Staff Coordinator participated on a panel hosted by Bill Swing with the GCGI as an extension of the Models for Regional Collaboration event held earlier in St. Cloud.
- Staff and Coordinating Committee members served as liaisons to Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) committees and workgroups: Strategic Planning, Emergency Preparedness, Hydrographic Data and Standards, Geospatial Infrastructure Workgroups and served on the Council itself. In addition, Rick Gelbmann, a Coordinating Committee member, was appointed to his third term as GCGI Chair.

## **VI. Project Management/Administration**

- a) Administered Performance Measures Program. Quarterly reports to the Coordinating Committee were produced in addition to an annual report. Efforts were made to prepare for a project in 2008 to update the Performance Measures to coincide with the policies set forth in the new Business plan.
- b) Maintained currency of content on MetroGIS's general information website ([www.metrogis.org](http://www.metrogis.org)) - the primary source of a wide variety of information about MetroGIS's mission, accomplishments, benefits, participants, meeting schedules, projects and lessons learned, and endorsed policies.
- c) Maintained currency of metadata and postings of data accessible via [www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org) - MetroGIS's primary data distribution mechanism.
- d) Maintained licensing records for access to street centerline data (193) and parcel data (117).
- e) Managed the bid proposal process for the two pilot Regional GIS Projects which received authorizations totaling \$24,000 and a bid process to secure a facilitator for the proposed January 2008 forum to set the policy framework for MetroGIS's role related to addressing shared application needs.
- f) Significant documents produced:
  - 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan (It can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/about/business\\_planning/2008-2011\\_businessplan.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/2008-2011_businessplan.pdf))
  - 2006 Annual Report ([www.metrogis.org/about/annual\\_reports/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual_reports/index.shtml))
  - Summary report for the February 8<sup>th</sup> Strategic Directions Workshop". (It can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/about/business\\_planning/sdw/workshop\\_summary\\_07\\_0626.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/workshop_summary_07_0626.pdf).)
  - 2007 Performance Measurement Annual Report. (It can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07\\_1218/performance\\_measures\\_report\\_2007\\_cc.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07_1218/performance_measures_report_2007_cc.pdf).)
- g) Meetings supported by MetroGIS staff support team:
  - Policy Board (4)
  - Coordinating Committee (4)
  - Technical Advisory Team (3)
  - Business Information Needs - Workgroups, Data User Forums, Training, etc.:
    - ✓ Address /Web Assessment Workgroup (3)
    - ✓ Strategic Directions Workshop Planning Team (2)
    - ✓ Business Planning Oversight Team (10)

- ✓ Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup (2)
- ✓ County Data Producers Workgroup (0 supported by MetroGIS staff)
- Special Events: (1)
  - ✓ February 8, Strategic Directions Workshop (see item VI “f” above)

## **VII. Recognitions**

October 2007: The Mn State GIS/LIS Consortium presented its Polaris Award to MetroGIS Staff Coordinator in recognition of MetroGIS accomplishments. In the words of Will Craig, member of the GIS/LIS and Governor’s Council on Geographic Information Boards “I admit it is an award to you as a person, but the award also honors MetroGIS by implication. Put another way, it is because of your accomplishments at MetroGIS that GIS/LIS honored you.”



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: William Brown, Hennepin County  
Staff Contact: Chris Kline (651-602-1363)

**SUBJECT:** 2007 MetroGIS Performance Measures Report

**DATE:** December 19, 2007  
(For the Jan 16<sup>th</sup> mtg.)

## INTRODUCTION

The draft 2007 Annual Performance Measures Report (separate document), dated December 6, 2007 is hereby presented for the Policy Board's acceptance along with several conclusions presented in the Report on matters relating to future Performance Measurement procedures and activities.

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

At its meeting on December 18, 2007, the Committee unanimously approved the 2007 Annual Performance Measures Report, dated December 6, 2007 and recommended that the Policy Board also approve it.

## MAJOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The 2007 Annual Performance Measurement Report is organized around four MetroGIS outcome statements defined in Performance Measurement Plan, adopted by the Policy Board in 2002. The 2007 Report summarizes comparable data collected over a five-year timeframe for most of the ten performance measures.

The findings and conclusions presented below represent an overview of a more detailed analysis presented in the actual annual report.

### 1. Ease of Data Discovery and Access

- **Use** of the endorsed socioeconomic web resources **regional applications tripled**. This result supports a policy statement in the current Business Plan noting that addressing common information needs often involves securing data and an application(s) to use those data to answer particular question(s).
- **Searchable metadata** records and **downloadable datafiles** in DataFinder **increased by 16** (6.7 percent) **and 9** (5.7 percent), respectfully.
- Data **discovery** events **decreased by 13.6 percent** from the previous year, while **downloads of actual data increased 40.2 percent**. Introduction of the new Café and RSS services may be attributable for the decrease in visits, while boosting downloads of the data.

#### Comment/Suggested Action:

- 1) The software platform for DataFinder Café was replaced in October 2006. The new platform (GeoCortex IMF software and a higher capacity server) supports the functionality provided by the former platform plus it provides the capability to distinguish among use of web mapping services, not only from downloads of source data but it can also distinguish online browsing of data from actual use of a web mapping service as data source.
- 2) Modifications to the current performance measures should be pursued to provide a means to effectively integrate data use reporting metrics with those for MetroGIS supported applications.

### 2. Data Currency and Usefulness (Endorsed Regional Data Solutions)

- All **endorsed regional data solutions** were **maintained to the specifications** established by the MetroGIS community.

- “**Endorsed regional data solutions**” comprised **28.2 percent of the total downloads** in 2007, which is consistent with the long term average.
- **Only four** endorsed regional datasets were in the top 10 downloads for 2007.

Endorsed regional datasets (*for which data access metrics are maintained by MetroGIS*):

Dataset <sup>(1)</sup>	# of Downloads	2007 Rank
<b>Parcels</b>	953	1
<b>Census Demographic Profiles</b>	661	2
<b>Street Centerlines</b>	556	3
<b>County &amp; Municipal Boundaries</b>	398	4
<b>Census Geography</b> (e.g. tracts and blocks)	164	11
<b>Planned Land Use</b>	139	15

<sup>(1)</sup> Eight regional solutions have been enacted by MetroGIS but only six are tracked for purposes of Performance Measurement Reporting. Land Cover is distributed by DNR, its custodian. The Land Cover metadata record is posted on DataFinder but directs the user to DNR’s website. The Unique Parcel ID solution is a component of the Regional Parcel Dataset and, thus, not tracked separately.)

Comments/Suggested Action:

- 1) Parcels and Street Centerline dataset downloads reached their highest volumes recorded since 2003; their downloads have increased every year.
- 2) Download events for County & Municipal Boundaries, Census Geography, and Planned Land Use have decreased since 2003.

It is possible that introduction of the availability to access data via map services may be responsible for some or all of the decrease in downloads via FTP and Café. Unfortunately, the nature of web services does not permit a direct comparison with data download activity because each pan, zoom, etc. of a web service results in a refresh which is counted as another download. Staff will continue to investigate ways to interpret web service activity. A larger concern is if the decrease is due to the data sets no longer meeting user needs. Peer review forums have not been held for these regional datasets for some time. Such forums are currently anticipated to be included in the 2009 work program. Resources permitting, staff can investigate the potential of hosting one or more of these forums in the second half of 2008, if the Committee so wishes.

**3. Internal Efficiencies, Level of Cooperation**

- **Ten** (10) stakeholder **organizations** continue to effectively support **23** distinct primary and regional **custodian roles** in accordance endorsed regional solutions to common geospatial needs.
- The **number of organizations** utilizing DataFinder to **publish metadata** (18) and / or actual **geospatial files** (10) remained the **same as last year**.

Comment/Suggested Action:

In accordance with achieving the objective of MetroGIS DataFinder serving as a one-stop-shop for geospatial data for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, outreach efforts should continue to encourage data producers, who are not currently taking full advantage of the existence of DataFinder to consider using it (or increasing their use) to share knowledge of their data holdings and leverage its one-stop-shop distribution potential.

**4. Decision Making, Service Delivery**

**No testimonials** were completed as of this writing for the 2007 reporting period, although an interview was conducted with Sally Wakefield about benefits realized by the non-profit 1000 Friends of Minnesota, from MetroGIS’s efforts. This testimonial will be included in the 2008 Performance Measurement Report unless completed before year end.

Comment/Suggested Action: User testimonials to value gained from MetroGIS’s efforts should continue to be developed as they are presently the only method available to assess MetroGIS’s impact on improvements to its stakeholders’ internal organizational effectiveness and efficiency.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board accept the MetroGIS 2007 Performance Measurement Report and the conclusions offered therein, including setting of performance measurement targets.

## REFERENCE

### **BACKGROUND**

1. This is the sixth annual Performance Report produced about MetroGIS. The five previous reports can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/perf\\_measure/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/perf_measure/index.shtml). Much of the analysis related to MetroGIS DataFinder capabilities and use.
2. The Policy Board has requested a performance measures based report on MetroGIS's activities on an annual basis. Presentation of this report has occurred at the Board's January meeting in the past. To accommodate this schedule, an October 1 to September 30 time frame has been used.
3. For five years prior to 2007, staff had captured performance measurement data on a monthly basis and shared one or more anomalies (positive and troubling) with the Coordinating Committee on a quarterly basis for insight into possible causes and for direction as to any desired changes in policies or procedures. This insight was in turn incorporated into the annual Performance Measurement Report.
4. The 2008 Workplan calls for a project to update the Performance Measurement Plan, which provides the foundation for annual performance measurement reporting, to ensure consistency between performance measures and the outcomes defined in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan.





**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Major Activity Update

**DATE:** December 26, 2007  
(For the Jan 16<sup>th</sup> mtg.)

Since the Policy Board last met, progress was made in the following areas. Any information provided by persons other than the Staff Coordinator is noted.

**A) JANUARY 24<sup>TH</sup> WORKSHOP PLANNED - "MEETING SHARED GEOSPATIAL NEEDS BEYOND DATA"  
*MILESTONE EVENT TO DEFINE METROGIS'S ROLE RELATED TO ADDRESSING SHARED APPLICATION NEEDS***

On October 17<sup>th</sup>, following adoption of the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan, the Policy Board set its priorities for 2008. Defining MetroGIS's role(s) to address shared application needs was set as the top priority for 2008. Significant progress has since been made to define this role:

- 1) A Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup was created to oversee the project and has met weekly, except for the week of Christmas, since created,
- 2) A request for bids for consultant assistance was issued in late October and a contract was entered into in November with PlanGraphics, Inc., a nationally respected GIS consulting firm, to assist the Workgroup with this project. Funding for the consultant contract is from MetroGIS's 2007 "foster collaboration" budget.
- 3) A website has been created by PlanGraphics, Inc. to provide access to all working papers.
- 4) Preparations are nearly complete for a workshop on January 24<sup>th</sup> entitled "*Meeting Shared Geospatial Needs Beyond Data*".

The Workshop planned for January 24<sup>th</sup> will serve as the principal vehicle by which to define the role(s) that MetroGIS should play to address shared application needs as well as initial activities to act on the desired role(s). Confirmation has been received by nearly all of 30 individuals invited to participate. The 30 individuals invited possess various professional and organizational perspectives and represent the breadth of the MetroGIS community. The results of this workshop will be used to develop a recommendation that will be presented to the Coordinating Committee in March for comment. Policy Board consideration is planned for April, in accordance with direction received from the Board at the October 2007 meeting.

**B) LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION PLAN PROJECT**

At its meeting on December 18<sup>th</sup>, the Coordinating Committee accepted for further development several foundation components for a Leadership Succession Plan that had been suggested by the staff support team. These components, as accepted by the Committee, are presented in Attachment A. Feedback from Board members is also invited.

The staff support team had asked for guidance and corroboration from the Committee concerning suggested foundation concepts before expending further resources to develop a more complete proposal for Committee consideration. Development of a Leadership Succession Plan was identified by the Policy Board on October 17, 2007 as a high priority project to complete in 2008.

The Committee provided the following direction to the staff support team:

1. Expand Leadership Succession Plan Key Elements document into more detailed draft plan for next Coordinating Committee meeting
2. Draft plan will be used as a starting document for a Succession Planning Workgroup

3. Document should focus on succession elements that MetroGIS can directly influence (i.e. staff representatives as opposed to elected representatives)
4. Include another Key Element: "Structural Issues" (i.e. appointment of alternates for Coordinating Committee as well as Policy Board members, etc.)

**C) 2006 REGIONAL PROJECT – GEOSERVICESFINDER PROJECT (LMIC PROJECT LEAD)**

A draft final project report was presented to the Coordinating Committee on December 18<sup>th</sup> for Committee comment. No concerns were raised with prototype web application but several questions were asked about recommendations involving next steps that MetroGIS and others can take to continue to mature the functionality provided by the application. The project team then met on December 20<sup>th</sup> to discuss how it will address comments offered by the Committee. The PowerPoint presentation used update the Committee can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07\\_1218/5e\\_service\\_broker\\_presentation.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07_1218/5e_service_broker_presentation.pdf). The draft report will be posted on the MetroGIS website when available.

**D) 2007 REGIONAL PROJECT – REGIONAL GEOCODER APPLICATION (MMCD PROJECT LEAD)**

After an open Request for Proposals, the project team chose a programmer who is currently converting a high-quality address look-up ("geocoder") program so that it can be accessed as a web service and run on MetroGIS datasets. Funding for the project is from MetroGIS's 2007 "foster collaboration" budget, while project management and service contract(s) are being handled by the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District. Working out language related to intellectual property rights for the interagency agreement took more time than had been anticipated, given the deliverables are intended to be "open source".

**E) DATA SYNCHRONIZATION MECHANISM – CARVER COUNTY PROJECT LEAD)**

This project was authorized by the Policy Board at its October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. A draft contract between the Metropolitan Council which will be funding the project, and Carver County, whose IT and GIS staff will be developing the mechanism, was forwarded to the Carver County legal staff for review the week of December 17. As of this writing, no comment had been received from Carver County.

**F) OUTREACH PLAN MODIFICATIONS**

Suggested revisions to the Outreach Plan that was adopted by the Policy Board in 2002 were presented to the Coordinating Committee on December 18 for consideration. The Committee accepted the modifications, as presented in the "clean" language in Attachment B, but agreed to postpone any further consideration until after its March meeting, given higher priorities for staff's resources.

**G) PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEEDS AND USER SATISFACTION FORUMS**

**1) Property Address information**

- (a) Regional Address Points Dataset: On October 17<sup>th</sup> the Policy Board concurred with the Committee's recommendation that the Metropolitan Council fund a project with 2007 MetroGIS "foster collaboration funding" involving a partnership with Carver County to **develop a "data synchronization" mechanism** that permits management of address data, as a component of a regional solution, that are provided by multiple parties and define the custodial/organization responsibilities necessary to implement and sustain the mechanism. The results of this project are expected to provide the information needed to seek out and secure the organization commitments necessary to achieve the vision on the regional address points dataset. See Item E, above, for the status of the funding agreement.
- (b) TLG Street Centerlines: Agreement was reached earlier this year to permit licensed users of the TLG dataset to allow it be used in web-based applications they host which are designed to be viewed by non-licensed interests provided the source TLG data can be accessed. Due to lack of legal resources, this past fall, the agreement to authorize "view-only" access has not been finalized. It is expected to be finalized in early 2008.

## **2) Land Cover Information**

A meeting of frequent users of the regional Land Cover (MLCCS) dataset was hosted on December 6th by Bart Richardson with DNR Metro, the custodian, to review and improve the MLCCS QA/QC process. Topics covered included: 1) processes to identify interpretation errors including field errors vs. aerial photo errors, or level 4/5 errors vs. level 1/2/3 errors, 2) review guidelines to determine acceptable levels of subjective natural community interpretation and/or quality ranking interpretation, 3) methods for scoring quality and differences for various attributes, and 4) method preferences for accomplishing quality checking. Plans are in the works to also host a broader user forum this coming winter.

## **H) COUNTY DATA PRODUCER WORKGROUP ACTIVITIES**

This workgroup last met on October 31<sup>st</sup>. The meeting summary can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/private/cdpw/07\\_1031.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/private/cdpw/07_1031.pdf)

# ATTACHMENT A

## LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION PLAN – FOUNDATION ELEMENTS

*(Endorsed by Coordinating Committee – December 17, 2007)*

**1. Statement of Purpose** – MetroGIS will develop a Leadership Succession Plan to prepare for the future retirement or other replacement of key political leadership, staff and technical support. The Plan will include MetroGIS’s strategies for seamlessly integrating new leaders and staff into MetroGIS without losing momentum on current projects and without losing valuable institutional knowledge.

**2. Identification of Key Leaders and Staff** – The MetroGIS Leadership Succession Plan must specifically address the succession plans for, at a minimum, the following key individuals and positions:

- MetroGIS Policy Board and Coordinating Committee membership, in particular chairpersons
- MetroGIS staff, particularly the Staff Coordinator position
- Key participant organization staff (e.g. county GIS managers, technical staff)
- Champions and advocates within critical stakeholder organizations
- MetroGIS workgroup leadership and members

**3. Identification of Requisite Skills and Experience for Key Leaders and Staff** – The Plan should include thorough job descriptions and/or identification of skills and expertise needed to carry out the roles and responsibilities listed above. This includes details on each position/role’s general duties and obligations, expected time commitment and a description of any required expertise.

**4. Development of a Succession Planning Structure** – The Plan should describe in detail the procedures to be followed in the event of the retirement or other replacement of the individuals identified in #2 above. Delineation of key responsibilities – including the identification of potential successors and the development and implementation of training programs and materials – should be offered in the Plan.

In the case of dedicated MetroGIS staff, the plan would include the process for MetroGIS to provide input and recommendations to the Metropolitan Council regarding the evaluation and hiring of new staff. In the case of workgroup participants, the process would be a less formal recruitment of interested and qualified staff from participant organizations.

Included in the Succession Planning Structure are elements including, but not limited to:

- Process for identifying potential new staff and Technical Support
- Plan for reviewing the success of individual staff or leader transitions to gauge the success of the succession process
- Expected timeline to hire, train and fully integrate MetroGIS staff into system, particularly at the Staff Coordinator position.

**5. Plan for Maintaining Political Legitimacy during Transitional Phases** – MetroGIS’s effectiveness is in large part due to the political support of its participating organizations. Without this support, much of the professional staff assistance MetroGIS needs – in implementing its programs, staffing its workgroups and maintaining the viability of DataFinder – would likely be unavailable. It is important to prepare MetroGIS to maintain this support and political legitimacy during transitional phases.

**6. Address “Volunteer Burnout”** – MetroGIS relies heavily on volunteers from participant organizations for technical assistance, workgroup participation and other key organizational activities. As discussed in the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan, the potential pool of participants for these activities has shrunk in recent years, largely due to volunteer burnout. The Leadership Succession Plan should contain strategies for growing participation in workgroups and reducing the burden on frequent volunteers to ensure the vitality of future volunteer projects.

**7. Structural Issues and Opportunities within the MetroGIS Organization**

*(Appointment of alternates for Coordinating Committee as well as Policy Board members, etc.)*

# ATTACHMENT B

**PLAN FOR**  
**OUTREACH AND IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES**  
**(Update of 2002 High-Level MetroGIS Outreach Plan)**  
*(Last updated: December 5, 2007)*

**Purpose**

This Outreach Plan is intended to guide MetroGIS's communications and outreach activities with leadership of organizations and entities that both current and prospective contributors and beneficiaries of MetroGIS's efforts. Specifically, the following six target groups of outreach interests have been identified:<sup>1</sup>

- ✓ Currently active interests willing to investigate further collaborative opportunities
- ✓ Non-government entities willing to share resources,
- ✓ Municipal government entities which are potential contributors and or beneficiaries
- ✓ Departments within participating organizations that are not participating
- ✓ Organizations with data and resources value to others who are not participating
- ✓ Jurisdictions that adjoin the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area

In addition, this Plan recognizes the importance of MetroGIS continuing to foster relationships with organizations with which it has previously coordinated, including the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI), MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC), and Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC).

This Outreach Plan is a companion document to the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan, which identified outreach as a key organizational priority. Specific communications and outreach tactics, as well as budget implications, will be included in annual work plans.

**Continue Current Practices**

1. Produce an Annual Report and distribute it, principally via email, to the chief elected and chief administrative officials with local and regional government entities serving the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area and individuals included in MetroGIS's contact database.)
2. Produce an informational brochure every 2-3 years to distribute along with the Annual Report and to use as a handout at forums and conferences that focuses on benefits that have been experienced by stakeholders through MetroGIS efforts.
3. Administer Participant Satisfaction Surveys and host Peer Review Forums for implemented regional solutions and use each use as an opportunity to communicate past accomplishments as well as to receive feedback as to desired enhancements.
4. Maintain a current, complete, accurate, and easily accessible web-based institutional memory of all aspects of MetroGIS efforts.
5. Submit articles for the quarterly MN GIS/LIS newsletter.
6. Regularly attend county-based GIS user group meeting in all seven counties to observe and document interests that are shared among the groups.
7. Host workshops and educational sessions at the annual MN GIS/LIS conference and in cooperation with others to facilitate knowledge sharing.
8. Accept requests to speak about MetroGIS to stakeholder communities and continue the philosophy of encouraging Policy Board, Coordinating Committee and Team leadership to take the lead, supported by staff.
9. Keep the leadership of Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) and MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC) informed of MetroGIS' activities and continue to participate in activities of the GCGI and LMIC as invited.
10. Encourage Policy Board, Coordinating Committee, and Advisory Team members to proactively identify stakeholder workshop and conference opportunities, which would be appropriate/beneficial for MetroGIS to participate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Identified in Tactic 1, Chapter 3, Section VI of the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan. A sixth group, currently engaged interests, is listed to insure that new collaborative opportunities are also fostered among those interests that are currently participating.

11. Seek out opportunities to promote MetroGIS's philosophy, practices and projects via the news media and hands-on workshops.
12. Leverage workgroup membership as a means to establish on-going dialogue with stakeholders to both define shared opportunities and educate constituents on the benefits of collaborative solutions to shared geospatial needs..

### **Suggested New Practices**

Prior to the adoption of the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan, the majority of MetroGIS's outreach efforts targeted organizations that already utilized and understood the value and potential of GIS technology and therefore recognized the benefit of a collaborative approach to addressing GIS needs. With the adoption of the 2008-2011 Business Plan, MetroGIS expanded the scope of its outreach activities to include organizations that do not currently utilize GIS technology, or do so sparingly. MetroGIS will work to improve awareness and understanding of the benefits of GIS technology and collaboration among these non-users. To that end, the following new practices will be adopted:

- a) Through the use of targeted messages, achieve ongoing communication about shared opportunities with representatives of the six constituencies identified in the Purpose Statement, above.
- b) Initiate regular communication with officials affiliated with jurisdictions that adjoin the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, in particular counties, to pursue opportunities for coordination and cooperation with these counties in joint projects to address shared geographic information needs.
- c) Expand use of electronic tools to foster exchange of ideas and obtain feedback from stakeholders.
- d) Pursue opportunities to present to professional organizations of policy makers and managers of key stakeholder interests.
- e) Promote adoption of standards with interests beyond the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area (regional, state or federal) via case-by-case negotiations with the goals of eventual applicability statewide of polices and commitments to knowledge sharing and removing barriers to sharing and leveraging geospatial resources.
- f) Pursue opportunities to establish public-private partnerships, particularly to address application needs. (Note: The first step in this process is the establishment of a public/private working group, comprised of volunteers from MetroGIS participant organizations as well as private sector representatives, which will work to identify opportunities for collaboration.)
- g) Establish a partnership with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) to collaborate on outreach activities of common interest, in particular, to improve understanding among individuals affiliated with government in jurisdictions adjoining the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area and Greater Minnesota of MetroGIS' data sharing philosophy, practices, and lessons learned. In addition, share on an ongoing basis with the GCGI any information learned from MetroGIS's efforts to encourage the adoption of standards with entities beyond the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.



**TO:** Coordinating Committee  
**FROM:** MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)  
**SUBJECT:** Information Sharing  
**DATE:** December 24, 2007  
(For the Jan 16<sup>th</sup> meeting)

Announcements and information provided by persons other than the Staff Coordinator are so noted.

**A) PRESENTATIONS / OUTREACH / STUDIES (not mentioned elsewhere)**

**1. Articles Submitted for the Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium Newsletter:**

An article was submitted about the 2008-2011 Business Plan. It can be viewed at <http://www.mngislis.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=218>

**2. Presentations:**

Mark Kotz, Lead Staff to the MetroGIS Regional Address Points Dataset Workgroup, presented about the progress made on this dataset at the State IT Symposium the week of December 11...

**B) RELATED METRO AND STATE GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE**

**1. Washington County – Cataloging and Mapping Conservation and Scenic Easements**

The project report, completed earlier this year, can be viewed at ([http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07\\_1218/finalreport\\_washingtoncounty.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07_1218/finalreport_washingtoncounty.pdf)).

The two outcomes from this project are:

- a. A database that contains all conservation and scenic easements and associated primary attribute data that allows users to search, analyze and map the agreements. This database would be made available to communities and organizations.
- b. An efficient process in which future holdings can be added to the database.

**2. Strategic Planning Report - Governor’s Council on Geographic Information**

The Governor’s Council on Geographic Information has endorsed an invitation from Department of Administration Commissioner Dana Badgerow to propose State GIS Coordination as a Drive to Excellence project. Commissioner Badgerow chairs the Drive to Excellence Sub-Cabinet, appointed by Governor Pawlenty as “a state-government reform initiative that focuses on serving citizens better: Increasing quality in government, increasing customer service in government and reducing costs in government.” The Drive to Excellence Sub-Cabinet includes eight state commissioners and reports directly to the Governor.

The Strategic Planning Committee of the Governor’s Council on GI is in the process of preparing a Drive to Excellence project team charter for a State GIS Coordination project. The project’s purpose would be to develop, recommend and implement an organizational and governance framework to coordinate GIS as an “enterprise” activity of state government. The project’s focus is state government functions and services, with the understanding that state government has functional relationships with local and regional governments and other stakeholders as partners and customers. As such, this project addresses the state government foundation needed to achieve a broader vision adopted by the Governor’s Council on Geographic Information “to improve services statewide through the coordinated, affordable, reliable, and effective use of GIS.”

The Drive to Excellence project would be informed by the recommendations outlined in *Foundations* and *Compass Points*, and advised by stakeholders such as the Governor’s Council.

### 3. Communication with Adjoining Counties Expedited by Metropolitan Council

“Bell stated that adjacent county participants had been given handout information on the Council’s digital atlas regarding MetroGIS as discussed by Kari. He encouraged everyone to view adjacent county information on the Council’s webpage at [www.metrocouncil.org](http://www.metrocouncil.org). Bell added that John Kari will be contacting each adjacent county participant soon for participation in a survey that will continue to build adjacent county relationships, particularly in the capacity of providing information.” – Draft Minutes from Chair Peter Bell’s Semi-Annual Meeting with Adjoining Counties on December 7, 2007.

## C) RELATED FEDERAL/NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE

### 1. Local Appointments Sought to New National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC)

Applications for appointment to serve on the newly created National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) were submitted by Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, and David Claypool, charter member of the Coordinating Committee. The selection process had not been completed as of this writing, although the application deadline was in June.

### 2. Spatial Data Infrastructures (SDI)

Interesting commentary, from an international perspective, can be viewed at <http://vectorlmedia.com/vectorone/?p=131>. The piece is entitled “Are Spatial Data Infrastructures (SDI) moving forward, backward or spinning wheels?”

The following is an excerpt “...*the success of SDI will be manifested in the business and operating systems of the world around us. If we don’t see signs of fundamental processes changing how we collect, use and share information, then I would question whether or not SDI are achieving the goals they ought to be.*

*GIS and other spatial technologies are strategic technologies. Where land and people are involved, so too should these technologies be present, enabling improved decision making processes.”*

MetroGIS’s newly adopted Business Plan sets forth community-focused objectives that are in keeping with these comments. The pending Performance Measurement Plan Update also offers and opportunity to further act on these philosophy behind these comments.

### 3. A Research Agenda for USGS

By Will Craig, University of Minnesota

A new report from the National Academies Press pushes the USGS to focus its research agenda on issues that will improve the capabilities of *The National Map*. The study was commissioned by the USGS to help its new Center of Excellence for Geospatial Information Science (CEGIS) develop its research agenda. The report is called *A Research Agenda for Geographic Information Science at the United States Geological Survey* and is available at [http://books.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12004](http://books.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12004).

The report contains 12 recommendations. Number 1 frames the discussion on improving the capabilities of *The National Map*, but the writers recognize that this does not narrow the scope sufficiently. They use eight criteria to establish a more specific list of topics: “CEGIS research should (1) be important to *The National Map*; (2) be important to USGS disciplines; (3) be relevant to society; (4) solve a problem and target a customer; (5) be foundational, understandable, and generalizable; (6) enable multidisciplinary integration; (7) focus on data content; and (8) show potential for early, visible success.”

Recommendations 2-5 provide those priority research areas.

2. The three priority research areas for CEGIS should be (1) information access and dissemination, (2) integration of data from multiple sources, and (3) data models and knowledge organization systems.

3. The two priority research topics within the area of information access and dissemination should be to reinvent topographic maps in an electronic environment and to investigate user-centered design for The National Map web services.
4. The two priority research topics for CEGIS within the area of data integration should be generalization and fusion.
5. The two priority research topics in the area of data models and knowledge organization systems should be developing geographic feature ontologies and building the associated feature data models and gazetteers.

The remaining seven recommendations focus on how these research areas should be pursued. They call for a broad research activity involving USGS, other federal agencies, academia, and the private sector. Recommendation 10 will be of most interest to Consortium members

10. Because of USGS's core role in integrating data from local sources for *The National Map*, CEGIS should establish collaborative activities with state and local agencies that have progressive activities in GIScience.

**D) DECEMBER COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING**

The summary of the December 18<sup>th</sup> Coordinating Committee meeting can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07\\_1218/07\\_1218m.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/07_1218/07_1218m.pdf) .