

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee **Purpose Statement and 2003 Work Program**

Purpose Statement:

The MetroGIS Coordinating Committee is responsible for recommending policies and procedural strategies for consideration by the MetroGIS Policy Board to resolve obstacles that must be overcome to achieve widespread sharing of geographically-referenced data among MetroGIS stakeholders.

Lead on Policy Recommendations

On July 11, 2001, the Policy Board dissolved the Policy Advisory Team in an attempt to streamline the MetroGIS decision-making process. With this action, the Coordinating Committee became the entity responsible for developing recommendations concerning policy matters that affect MetroGIS. Depending upon the topics, ad hoc workgroups may be formed to develop a recommendation and dissolve once their specified task is complete.

Coordination with Technical Advisory Team (TAT)

MetroGIS's activities, since adoption of its initial Business Plan in April 2000, are increasingly data-centric, focused on improving regional data solutions and associated data delivery policies and mechanisms in response to performance monitoring and forums designed to obtain feedback from the user community. Beginning with the Policy Board's endorsement of a Business Plan for MetroGIS in April 2000, MetroGIS's activities began to shift from primarily defining the form and function of MetroGIS to addressing custodian and data access policies and procedures needed to implement solutions for assembly, distribution, and maintenance of regional datasets. MetroGIS's activities will be increasingly data-centric, focused on improving regional data solutions and associated data delivery mechanisms in response to performance monitoring and forums designed to obtain feedback from the user community. The Coordinating Committee will rely increasingly upon Technical Advisory Team to recommend courses of action to effectively address desired improvements.

2003 Work Program

A. Priority Common Information Needs

Responsibilities: 1) Oversee/assist staff with negotiations and recommend a qualified regional custodian willing to accept the custodian roles and responsibilities defined by the Technical Advisory Team for each priority business information need. 2) Recommend solutions to related intergovernmental policy needs.

Task	Lead Support	Work Group	Start/End
Regional Lakes, Wetlands Information Need <i>Coordinate with state solution for Regional custodian roles, access policy -</i>	Paul Hanson (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator	Yes	May 99 --? <i>(dependent on GCGI Committee)</i>
Highways and Roads Information Need <i>Coordinate with state solution for Regional custodian roles, access policy</i>	Mike Dolbow (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator	Yes	Aug 02 – Jul 03
Socioeconomic characteristics of areas Information Need <i>Regional custodian(s), access policy - endorsement of a custodian(s) to implement roles and responsibilities defined by the TAT. Candidates include, but are not limited to US Census and Excensus' I-Blocks)</i>	TBD Following Conclusion of TAT responsibilities	TBD	Fall 03 -?

Regional Parcel Dataset – Private Sector Version <i>Potential for Collaborative Distribution Mechanism</i>	Staff Coordinator and Professional Services Consultant	Yes (Formed Aug 02)	Aug 02 – Spr 03
Regional Watershed District Jurisdictional Boundaries Dataset <i>Regional custodian, access policy & coordinate with state to the extent applicable.</i>	TBD by Washington County / Staff Coordinator	TBD Depends on options identified by Wash. Cty.	TBD Depends on Washington. County resources.
Regional School District Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset – <i>Regional custodian, access policy & coordinate with state to the extent applicable.</i>	Staff Coordinator / David Arbeit and Jane Harper	Yes	Summer 03-?
Regional Existing Land Use Information Need <i>Regional custodian, access policy and tie to Land Regulations with decision rules for buildable/not buildable</i>	Paul Hanson (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator	Depends on options identified by TAT	Jan 03 -?
Identify “second generation” common priority information (data and/or application) needs.	Staff Coordinator	Yes	Nov 03–Dec 03 (Design only)
Emergency Management Preparedness Information Need (Note: the Policy Board accepted Coordinating Committee recommendation to expansion the initial 13 common information needs to include this new priority in light of the activity nationwide following 9/11/01, bypassing the typical widely participatory process, consensus based process.) <i>Focus: Investigate collaborative solutions for assembly and distribution of locally-produced data, from disparate sources, important to emergency response and, to the extent practical, meets National HSIP (Homeland Security Infrastructure Protection) needs.</i> <i>Objectives:</i> 1) Define appropriate role for MetroGIS – regional solution. 2) Position the Metro Area for possible grants to expand functionality	Randy Knippel (Dakota County) / Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council)	Yes (Policy Direction from County Data Producer Workgroup)	Winter 03 - ?
Recommend strategy/procedure to consider requests for regional endorsement of dataset developed by others (Sect 3.1.2 Item 6 Business Plan)	TBD Subject Matter Expert / Staff Coordinator	TBD	Fall 03 - ?

B. Data Search/Distribution Mechanism(s)

Responsibility: Recommend intergovernmental policy, roles and responsibilities, and resource priorities necessary to realize full potential of DataFinder and related methods to efficiently and effectively distribute endorsed regional and other datasets.

Task	Lead Support	Work Group	Start/End
Expand the reporting capabilities of DataFinder’s underlying database to better support MetroGIS’s adopted performance measures	DataFinder Manager	No	Spring 03 (Depending on funding)
Expand the functionality of DataFinder Café to add a projection conversion capability to the downloading wizard and capability to communicate with Mn MapServer used by DNR.	See TAT work plan (Partner with LMIC)	No	Spring 03 (Depending on funding)

C. Common Geodata Application Needs

Responsibility: Recommend intergovernmental policy and funding options necessary to meet commonly needed geodata applications, in particular, those that “run” on one or more endorsed regional datasets.

Task	Lead Support	Work Group	Start/End
Identify and prioritize commonly needed geodata applications from the producer and user (local and regional government interests) perspectives.	Producer Perspectives - County Data Producers Workgroup / User Perspectives - TBD	Yes	Spring 03 Producer's Perspective
Facilitate agreement on recommendations for intergovernmental policy, roles and responsibilities, and resources necessary to address identified priority common geodata application needs, focusing on the needs of public safety/emergency management preparedness..	TBD	TBD	TBD (Depending on results or preceding task)

D. Business Planning/Outreach/General Administration:

Responsibility: Recommend intergovernmental policy and funding options necessary to achieve functions consistent with the MetroGIS community's needs and to sustain an appropriate organizational structure.

Task	Lead Support	Work Group	Start/End
Oversee execution of adopted Performance Measure activities, evaluate results of performance measuring and refine MetroGIS activities and procedures, as needed.	Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Consultant	<i>Depends on the measure</i> <i>(i.e., Yes, for evaluation of producer satisfaction and compliance with responsibilities & user satisfaction with data quality and access policies.</i>	Ongoing
Outreach to promote awareness of regional geodata solutions and opportunities	Staff Coordinator	No	Ongoing
Produce 2003 Annual Report	Communications Consultant	No	Dec 02 – Feb 03
Administer tasks and activities set forth in the Business Plan, not specifically identified in his workplan.	Staff Coordinator/ Professional Services Consultant	No	Jan 03 – Dec 03
Prepare MetroGIS Benefits Testimonials for 2-3 Additional Stakeholders	Communications Consultant	No	Jan 03 – Jun 03
Execute 3rd Generation Data Sharing Agreements [counties/Metropolitan Council for parcels]	Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Consultant	No	Jun 03 – Dec 03
Economic Return on Investment Study, including categories of benefits, Associated with Investment in MetroGIS	Staff Coordinator / Metropolitan Council Research Staff	TBD	If time permits, TBD

E. Coordination with Related Initiatives

Responsibility: Monitor activity of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI), federal programs, GeoEnabler Alliance (networking and geodata knowledge sharing facilitation tool), and others, as appropriate, and seek participation and coordination in work of others relevant to MetroGIS.

Tasks (not covered by Technical Advisory Team):

- 1) Liaison to GCGI's Land Record Modernization Committee to investigate statewide parcel dataset in response to 7/11/01 MetroGIS Policy Board request and achieve interoperability of parcel data with "collar counties
- 2) Keep informed about objectives of National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and related national initiatives.
- 3) Liaison to GCGI's Data Committee.
- 4) Maintain communication with USGS concerning possible pilot projects related to their National Map and I-Team programs and with the Census Bureau concerning their new initiative to use locally-produced street centerline data.

F. Other:

- 1) As defined by the MetroGIS Policy Board

Suggested Methodologies

Supplement to 2003 Coordinating Committee and Technical Advisory Team Work Plans

1. (Phase B) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas Information Need

A) U.S. Census Workgroup:

- (1) This group would carry out the following tasks:
 - Extract the “I need to know” statements from the 1996 Business Information Needs Forum group exercise
 - Prepare an initial evaluation of how the MetroGIS community’s information needs compare and contrast the data provided by the U.S. Census to the cited information needs – *Do the data exist? Is its currency, resolution, etc. adequate?*
 - Host a Peer Review Forum with 20-30 expert users of the Census data from the MetroGIS community and ask them to “update” the information needs cited in 1996 and expand upon the initial compare and contrast work of the smaller workgroup
 - Consolidate the information obtained at the Peer Review Forum and recommend a course of action -- how U.S. Census data should be used to address the community’s census data related information needs, roles and responsibilities, and custodian responsibilities.
- (2) The individuals who served as members of the Census Accessibility Workgroup are suggested as the core participants for the leadership/Peer Forum organization group.

B) Excensus Workgroup:

- (1) This group would carry out the following tasks:
 - Review the work of the U.S. Census Workgroup
 - Host a Peer Review Forum to discuss how the Excensus protocol could fill gaps in the information needs not met by the U.S. Census.
 - Consolidate the information obtained at the Peer Review Forum and recommend a course of action -- how could Excensus’s be used in conjunction with U.S. Census data to address the community’s census data related information needs, roles and responsibilities, and custodian responsibilities.
- (2) Individuals highly knowledgeable of Excensus’s protocols and the U.S. Census, as well as, MetroGIS stakeholders would comprise leadership/Peer Forum organization group.

2. Existing Land Use Information Need

- A) Establish a workgroup comprised of respected content experts from cities, counties, and regional interests and preferably work in concert with I-35W Coalition or similar entity to pilot decision rules for developing the regional solution.
- B) This work group would carry out the following tasks:
 - Extract the “I need to know” statements from the 1996 Business Information Needs Forum group exercise
 - Host a Peer Review Forum with 20-30 expert users of the Existing Land Use data from the MetroGIS community and ask them to “update” the information needs cited in 1996.
 - Prepare an initial evaluation of how the MetroGIS community’s information needs compare and contrast the Metropolitan Council’s 2000 Existing Land Use dataset. *Is its currency, resolution, categorization of land uses, etc. adequate for subregional users?*
 - Propose a set of decision rules that address any shortcomings of the Council’s 2000 Existing Land Use dataset and how to resolve instances where all or a portion of a parcel of land that appears to be undeveloped and available is in fact encumbered (recorded easement, City approved PUD, etc.) and not available for development.
 - Recommend a mechanism to capture and relate recorded documents, PUD’s, TDR’s, scenic easements, etc. to parcels which are not but appear not to be developable.

- Pilot a solution that is consistent with the community's needs and recommend a course of action to achieve the desired the data characteristics, roles and responsibilities, and custodian responsibilities.