



TO: Coordinating Committee

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

SUBJECT: Major Activity Update

DATE: March 2, 2010
(For the Mar 18th mtg.)

Since the Committee last met, progress has been made in the following areas, in addition to the projects presented in Section 5 of this agenda packet.

A) REGIONAL GIS PROJECTS

Approved in 2008:

- Address Editing Tool (Technical Leadership Workgroup, Project Lead) \$13,500
(See Agenda Item 5a)

Approved in 2009:

- Best Image Service - \$15,250: At the time of this writing, options were under investigation to expedite the funding agreement to govern the project. Due to the backlog in legal for such agreements, the objective is to utilize procurement processes that do not require legal review.
- Proximity Finder - \$18,750: Proximity Finder Project - SharedGeo received authorization in early January to begin work on this project. SharedGeo and Houston Engineering held an internal team kickoff meeting the week of January 18 for this project and developed plans and questions regarding specifications to go over with the Proximity Finder Workgroup. Houston Engineering led an initial meeting with the Workgroup Mar. 1 to present ideas for the project's goals, data sources, upload tools, and web services, to collect feedback and get the groups agreement on the specifications for programming of the prototype. The report from that meeting will be circulated to the Workgroup for comment and we expect to begin development by the end of March. There are several rounds of prototype review planned, starting at the end of May.

B) REGIONAL ADDRESS POINTS DATASET – LIABILITY DISCLAIMER/WAIVER

(See Agenda Item 5a)

C) NEXT-GENERATION REGIONAL STREET CENTERLINE SOLUTION

A 1-year contract extension was executed between the Metropolitan Council and with NCompass (formerly The Lawrence Group - TLG) securing continued access to the NCompass Regional Street Centerline Dataset at no cost for government and academic interests. This was the fifth in a series of agreements since 1997 with TLG to secure access to their database by MetroGIS stakeholders. The cost to the Council for the 1-year extension is \$61,566, plus \$3,950 for a one-time “Road Character” field enhancement. The terms of the agreement otherwise preserve the status quo. A RFP is planned to be published early-spring in 2010 to secure street centerline data consistent with the specifics for a regional dataset.

D) REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT – METROGIS GEOCODER SERVICE

The expectation is that a proposed regional policy statement for the MetroGIS Geocoder service will be ready for consideration by the Coordinating Committee at the June meeting. The Policy Board accepted the final project report at its January 2010 meeting.

E) DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT – PHASE II

A Request for Proposals was published on October 23, 2009. No proposals were received. The Coordinating Committee concurred with the Staff Coordinator’s suggestion to postpone republishing

the RFP until we learn whether an [application](#) for a 2010 NSDI CAP grant, involving MetroGIS, is awarded. The award decision is expected by the time the Committee meets in March. If the grant is awarded, the work on the proposed quantitative model is expected to have implications for development of the subject performance metrics. (See Item 7a in the Information Sharing Report to the Committee for more information about the grant proposal.)

F) STREAMLINING DATA ACCESS FOR EMERGENCY RESPONDERS

Last fall, this workgroup identified five topic areas for further investigation (see Attachment A for a summary of the meeting and these ideas). At its January 2010 meeting, the Policy Board included this topic area in its list of ideas to bring to MnGeo's/State Emergency Management Committee for attention at a statewide level.

See Attachment B for an overview of the deliverables from the recently completed State Emergency Management Workgroup's FGDC CAP grant funded Structures Database development project.

G) GEOSPATIAL COMMONS – BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION AND EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE

Expansion of support resources available to supporting MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" function, beyond those provided by the Metropolitan Council, is recognized in the MetroGIS 2008-2011 Business Plan as a requirement for long-term sustainability. Further, MetroGIS's current organizational structure (voluntary collaboration of willing organizations) was intended to serve as a means from which to clarify collaborative objectives for addressing sharing information needs and devising an organizational structure appropriate for collaboration across sectors, supported by multiple stakeholders. In Attachment C, a concept is offered for hosting a forum of experts to define such an organizational structure, in accordance with Item 11 in the 2010 work plan entitled "Investigate organizational/governance structure changes necessary to effectively address priority shared geospatial needs".

Two opportunities on a national level are currently in play, that if it is able to be leveraged, have the potential to aid in responding to this local need. They are as follows:

- 1) 2010 NSDI CAP Grant – Category 5 ROI Studies that focus on Multiple Agency Collaborative Endeavors. Although substantial progress has been made through MetroGIS's efforts to establish a geospatial commons (regional solutions to shared information needs and one stop shop to access over 270 geospatial datasets), many believe that significant potential exists to greatly enhance the value of these resources if non-government interests were to have the opportunity to add value to these resources that, in turn, would be value to the community, in particular, public producers. To act on this belief, a proposal was submitted for this grant opportunity. (See Item 7a in the Information Sharing Report to the Committee for more information about the grant proposal.)
- 2) NGAC Action on Metrics Proposal: The Governance Subcommittee of the National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) developed a [whitepaper](#) entitled "Proposal to Measure Progress Toward Realizing the Vision of the NSDI. The high-level concepts presented in this paper were [endorsed](#) by the full NGAC on December 2, 2009 and the Subcommittee was authorized to begin work to build upon those high level concepts. Five categories of metrics are proposed, one focusing on organizational aspects of collaboration to achieve the vision of the NSDI. The need for an appropriate national organization structure is the same need faced by MetroGIS at the regional level.

ATTACHMENT A

Streamlining Access to Licensed Data by First Responders

(Submitted by Gordon Chinander)

Summary of Sept 29, 2009 meeting - Streamlining Data Access for Emergency Responders Workgroup

Group Members present:

Joella Givens, Randy Knippel, John Hoshal, William Brown, Gordon Chinander

Discussion started with the topic of the Emergency Responders who would be requesting this information. A list of potential responders was created and discussed. Discussion then moved back to question the original purpose of this workgroup and the directive from the policy board. The directive was initiated by Gordy's comment on problems with data access during the RNC, and how it should be streamlined for Emergency Responders in an incident response situation.

The Policy Board asked that the Coordinating Committee identify impediments that restrict the flow of spatial data in the event of an emergency, and provide recommendations as how to proceed. The Coordinating Committee then formed this workgroup.

The members of the Data Access for Emergency Responders workgroup discussed this issue at great length, and it was decided that this issue was much bigger than originally imagined for the some of the following reasons;

1. Minnesota statute section 466.03 protects municipalities from alleged or actual inaccuracies arising from the Public's use of GIS data but fails to protect private entities that offer GIS data for use in an emergency response.
2. There are potential legal issues with handling 3rd party data that is licensed for use by the county or city. (e.g. Imagery).
3. Redistribution of data is a major concern. One example would be the case of one agency providing spatial data to another agency. This would bypass the usage and liability disclaimer that would be displayed in the data portal or website.
4. Many agencies hold spatial data that they have created, but also data they have purchased or acquired via a license agreement to use.
5. There are two major parts to this problem, the legal aspects of sharing data (i.e. licensing and liability), and the physical aspects of sharing the data (i.e. who has what data and how do you get it).

The workgroup has identified **5 potential solution areas** for **further discussion and research**;

1. Sample language needs to be developed that people can add to new contracts (especially contracts with private companies) that would provide for the redistribution of the data in the case of an emergency. This language could also be used when creating MOUs relating to emergency response support. This language may include something like "In the event of a potentially life threatening event, as declared by the local Incident Commander, this spatial data will be distributed to individuals and agencies for use in responding to this event."
2. Rewrite or add to Mn Stat. Sec 466.03, so that any (private or public) GIS data producer that offers its data in the event of an emergency shall be protected from any liability resulting from the

use of this data. This language could also contain provisions for those who re-distribute spatial data.

3. Develop a distribution/ data portal for EM data.
4. Create a “Best Practices” document for GIS professionals who need/use spatial data for emergency response. This could include recommendations for agencies that create, own or hold spatial data, as well as those who seek spatial data from others. It could include contacts for various data sets (i.e. who to call for what), procedures for acquiring spatial data during an emergency, and suggestions for getting license agreements and data in place prior to an emergency.
5. Incorporate GIS response issues into ICS/NIMS and local emergency plans. This includes incorporating GIS positions/technology into ICS/NIMS, educating the Emergency Response community about the use of GIS for emergencies, and encouraging all local emergency response plans to address GIS maps and data.

ATTACHMENT B

Statewide Emergency Preparedness Data Project

3/5/10

Randy:

Regarding the status of the FGDC Structures CAP grant, since my report to you in January of this year, on February 26, I submitted the final report to USGS. That report is now available on the FGDC website:

<http://www.fgdc.gov/grants/2008CAP/projects/08HQAG0062>

Project accomplishments included:

- Assessment and standardization of existing structures data (national and state), including attribution, with capacity to add new data and integrate with The National Map.
- Development of a *MnGeo Structures Collaborative* prototype web-based map interface that includes editing and geospatial data entry tools.
- Creation of FGDC and MN State compliant metadata records.
- Creation of a statewide geospatial map library of structures based on a 10K USNG grid.
- Establishment of strategic relationships with state and local data contributors and stewards.

For links to the prototype web-based editing tool and promotional materials including a PowerPoint show with audio, see our *MnGeo Structures Collaborative* web site:

<http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/emprep/structures/index.html>

Although the grant cycle is over, MnGeo and EPC members will continue to test and update the MnGeo Structures Collaborative tool, identify data authorities and custodians, build relationships between federal, state and local government, and promote integration of structures data that will support The National Map.

Best regards,

John Hoshal, MnGeo