

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Purpose Statement and 2005 Detailed 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 commonly needed geospatial data among MetroGIS stakeholders.

Major Responsibilities¹

- Advise the Policy Board on matters concerning the design, implementation, and operations of MetroGIS, to include, but not be limited to: a current business plan, datasets and their characteristics which provide the greatest utility for the MetroGIS community (regional datasets/solutions), standards and/or guidelines that facilitate data sharing among MetroGIS stakeholders, and data delivery and access procedures.
- Oversee performance measure and user satisfaction monitoring to periodically evaluate who is using DataFinder, what data are being accessed, and satisfaction with the functionality and data provided.
- Oversee provision of effective opportunities to share GIS-related knowledge important to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of organizations that comprise the MetroGIS community.
- Oversee implementation of MetroGIS Policy.
- Advise the Policy Board on the content of its Business Plan that guides the operations of MetroGIS.
- Ensure an effective means of communication among the Policy Board, the Committee, the Technical Advisory Team and any ad hoc workgroups.
- Coordinate the work of the Technical Advisory Team and ad hoc or special purpose workgroups. *(Note: All special purpose workgroups report to the Committee and are dissolved once the specified task is complete.)*
- Remain current and discuss new trends regarding Geographic Information Systems technology and related capabilities as they relate to the MetroGIS community.
- Provide for coordination and outreach with entities such as the Governor's Council on Geographic Information, LMIC, Mn/DOT, State Demographer, federal agencies, etc.
- Perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Policy Board.

2005 MetroGIS Detailed Work Program

A. Priority Common Information Needs

Responsibilities: 1) Create and oversee Information Need Workgroups to define broadly supported data content specifications for a regional solution(s) to each priority common information need. 2) Oversee/assist staff with negotiations and recommend a qualified regional custodian willing to accept the custodian roles and responsibilities defined by a Workgroup for each priority common information need. 3) Recommend solutions to the Policy Board to resolve related intergovernmental policy obstacles. 4) Create and oversee a Technical Advisory Team to encourage knowledge sharing on a variety of technical topics important to the MetroGIS community.

Task	Lead Support	Method	Start/End
1. Address Information Need Enhancement <i>Recommend a sustainable regional strategy to resolve the need for household and non-residential unit addresses that go beyond data available via parcel and street centerline datasets (apartment units, mobile home units, strip centers suites, office suites, etc.)</i>	Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council) & Staff Coordinator	MetroGIS Workgroup	In progress Spring 04 – Mar 05

¹ See Appendix A for further information regarding general expectations and responsibilities.

<p>2. Regional Emergency Preparedness Information Need</p> <p>a) Define the characteristics of commonly needed Emergency Preparedness-related data and roles responsibilities necessary to sustain a collaborative solution for their assembly, updating, documentation, and distribution, which to the extent practical, meet National HSIP (Homeland Security Infrastructure Protection) and Strategic National Stockpile (SNS) needs.</p> <p>b) Obtain policy maker approval of the roles and responsibilities proposed for the various partners associated with Item a.</p> <p>c) Develop an evaluation process to identify desired enhancements to the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness website implemented in April 2004 and associated roles and responsibilities, including evaluation criteria and perspectives (organizational and professional) that need to be involved.</p>	<p>Randy Knippel (Dakota County) / Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council)</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p> <p>TDB</p> <p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p>In progress Spr 04 – Mar. 05</p> <p>Spring 05</p> <p>Summer 05</p>
<p>3. Regional Existing Land Use Information Need</p> <p>a) Build the Version 1 dataset (Policy Board approval pending January 2005), for evaluation as a long-term solution.</p> <p>b) Recommend “best practices” to address more complex land-based information needs than the Version 1 solution can support.</p> <p>c) Decide if the Version 1 solution is practical to maintain long-term. If so, decide regional custodian(s) roles, access policy - endorse a custodian(s) to implement roles and responsibilities defined by the workgroup</p>	<p>Paul Hanson (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>Staff Only</p> <p>Phase II MetroGIS Workgroup</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p>In progress TBD- ?2006 (Council’s 2005 Existing Land Use data is prerequisite)</p> <p>(New) Jan 05- ?</p> <p>TBD - 2008? (evaluate 2-3 years after V1 in place)</p>
<p>4. Regional Highway and Road Networks Information Need</p> <p>a) Complete a joint effort with MnDOT to define and implement a LRM (Linear Referencing Model), which incorporates the needs of the MetroGIS community.</p> <p>b) Conduct a needs assessment with E911 officials to define and address road data characteristics that were not identified in the Roads Information Needs Forum conducted in Oct 2002.</p> <p>c) Recommend a regional solution(s) that addresses desired road network data specifications identified by the community and identify custodial roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>d) Coordinate with MnDOT to secure willing and able organizations to carry out desired regional custodian roles and access policy.</p>	<p>Mike Dolbow (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p>In progress Aug 02 – Spr. 05?</p> <p>(New) Winter 2005</p> <p>Summer 2005</p> <p>(start when “c” completed)</p>
<p>5 Jurisdictional Boundaries -Regional School District Dataset</p> <p>a) Define data characteristics of desired regional solution and appropriate roles and responsibilities. (Completed in 2001)</p> <p>b) Identify a regional custodian, access policy & coordinate with state to the extent applicable.</p>	<p>Staff Coordinator, David Arbeit (LMIC) and Jane Harper (Washington County)</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p>In progress Fall 2005</p>
<p>6. Jurisdictional Boundaries - Regional Watershed District Dataset</p> <p>a) Define data characteristics of desired regional solution and appropriate roles and responsibilities. (Completed in 2003)</p> <p>b) Identify a regional custodian, access policy & coordinate with the state to the extent applicable.</p>	<p>Jane Harper, Washington County / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>County Workgroup (Possibility of Peer Review Forum)</p>	<p>In progress Summer 2005?</p>

<p>7. Regional Lakes & Wetlands Information Need a) Document desired data characteristics. b) Conduct a pilot project to refine roles and responsibilities concerning management of these data. c) Identify gaps in current authority/practice at state and federal levels, which hamper efforts to achieve a regional solution that is part of the NSDI and convey these issues to the GCGI, via the Policy Board, for consideration via MSDI processes. d) Recommend a regional custodian(s) and related access policy.</p>	<p>Paul Hanson (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p>In progress May 99 – Spr. 05? Winter 05 Winter 05 Summer 05</p>
<p>8. Regional Land Cover Dataset Host a data user satisfaction forum</p>	<p>Bart Richardson DNR-Regional Custodian</p>	<p>Peer Review Forum</p>	<p>(New) Apr or May 05</p>
<p>9. Regional Parcel Dataset Enhancements <u>Public Sector / Academic Version:</u> a) Complete one-time software programming necessary to implement the next-generation Regional Parcel Dataset (55 attributes and parcel points as endorsed by Policy Board 7/28/04). b) Investigate why prospective users of the data are not using it. (Question raised by Policy Board Member O'Rourke) c) Implement online parcel data license application procedure. (Assumes next-generation Data Sharing Agreement executed by the counties and Council in 2004) <u>Neighborhood Groups/Specified Non-Profits:</u> Evaluate findings of pilot with Hennepin County to determine if broader regional policy needed. <u>Private Sector Version:</u> a) Finalize common license document. b) Implement a website to streamline ordering of parcel data from multiple counties (data fulfillment remains with counties) c) Complete pilot project begun late 2003 and decide if a parcel data sharing program with utilities will be pursued.</p>	<p>Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council) / County GIS Units Staff Coordinator Staff Coordinator Staff Coordinator and County Data Producer Workgroup Staff Coordinator and County Data Producer Workgroup</p>	<p>Staff Only MetroGIS Workgroup MetroGIS Workgroup MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p>In progress January 05 (New) (Part of Survey associated with Business Plan Update) In progress July 04 -Feb 05 In progress Fall 04 – Spr. 05 In progress Aug 02 – ?? (Postponed efforts until new public sector license in place)</p>
<p>10. Regional Socioeconomic Characteristics Of Areas Information Need <u>Phase I follow-up activities:</u> a) Evaluate satisfaction with Socioeconomic Resources Web Page b) Complete specified enhancements to three existing datasets - County social service records, First Call for Help, and county birth and death records to enhance their usability- (Update 1/28/05 – proposal submitted to Dept of Health for desired enhancements to birth and death records. The other two initiatives were researched and found impractical.) <u>Phase II:</u> a) Define a regional solution(s) for information needs that cannot be sufficiently met with existing data; e.g., where the nature, geographic detail, or reporting frequency is inadequate. Data sources considered might include existing commercial services, new summaries of local government data, or new technologies; e.g., Excensus' iBlocks or US Census's ACS and LED programs.</p>	<p>Staff Coordinator / U of M Population Center Will Craig TBD Staff Coordinator TBD</p>	<p>TBD Workgroup Phase II MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p>In progress Spr 05 (Complete 1/05) (New) Summer 2005? (To follow Solution for Address Information Needs– See 1) TBD.</p>

b) Identify regional custodian(s), access policy - endorsement of a custodian(s) to implement roles and responsibilities defined by the workgroup.			
11. Regional Street Centerline Dataset <i>Identify a strategy(ies) to address Census Enhancement Project and E911 community needs not currently met with the TLG Street Centerline Dataset, paying special attention to opportunities to leverage MnDOT's LRM initiative and pending investments by or on behalf of PSAP..</i>	Mike Dolbow (Metropolitan Council – regional custodian) / Staff Coordinator	MetroGIS Workgroup	(New) Jan 05 - ?
12. Land Regulations and Rights to Property Priority Information Needs – <i>A topic for the proposed Retreat-Item D3 below: Decide what, if any, action is appropriate for MetroGIS. (No action has been taken to date because no organization(s) has stepped forward to support the investigation phase as has occurred with each of the other common information need where work is complete or in progress.)</i>	Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Contractor	Retreat of Coordinating Committee	TBD Decide any next steps via Business Planning topic
13. Identify “Second Generation” Common Priority Information (Data and/or Application) Needs. <i>A topic for the proposed Retreat-Item D3 below – “Are we done?” If this topic is appropriate for MetroGIS, initiate the effort once regional solutions are essentially complete for all 1st generation common information needs for which an organization(s), with a related business need, has agreed to support the processes involved in recommending a regional solution. Note the Land Regulations and Rights to Property decision called for above</i>	Staff Coordinator / Prof. Services Contractor	TBD	TBD
14. Define a strategy/procedure to consider requests for regional endorsement of dataset developed by others (Sect 3.1.2 Item 4 Business Plan) <i>(Note: Postpone until a prototype opportunity presents itself to avoid a theoretical process that does not work efficiently in practice)</i>	TBD Subject Matter Expert / Staff Coordinator	TBD	TBD- See Note

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
1. Migrate DataFinder Café to newer version of ArcIMS and a server with more capacity.	DataFinder Manager	Staff Only	(New) Jan 05 Investigate options
2. Continue to promote use of standardized metadata and use of DataFinder for distribution of data with value to others	Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council)	Staff Only	Ongoing
3. Evaluate if Web Mapping/ Feature/ Coverage Services should be a component of DataFinder. <i>(Note: MetroGIS staff are participating in GCGI discussions of a “service broker capabilities” concept. The results of which are expected to determine how MetroGIS will approach Mapping Services and how we will utilize a \$15,000 WMS grant obtained in 2004).</i>	DataFinder Manager and Mark Kotz, GIS Database Manager	TBD	TBD (Postpone until GCGI evaluation is complete – see note)

4. Implement a mechanism (<i>ApplicationFinder</i>) to help data users easily locate existing geospatial applications	DataFinder Manager	Staff Only	<i>(New)</i> Jan 05 - ?
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	------------	-----------------------------------

C. Common Geospatial Application Needs

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

Task	Lead Support	Work Group	Start/End
1. Identify existing geospatial applications and post to “ApplicationFinder”. <i>(Note: Need to decide whether to limit to those that address priority information needs of local and regional government interests.)</i>	TBD	TBD	<i>(New)</i> Summer 05? (Once ApplicationFinder is in place)
2. Conduct a needs assessment to identify new geospatial applications needed to address priority common information needs. <i>(Note: A topic for the proposed retreat. Should MetroGIS go here? If conducted, coordinate with GCGI “Capabilities Broker” effort.)</i>	TBD	TBD	TBD <i>(see note)</i>
3. Evaluate user satisfaction for the Regional Mailing Label Application and identify a strategy to address desired enhancements	DataFinder Manager / Staff Coordinator	TBD	<i>(New)</i> Fall -05

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	Method	Start/End
1. Produce the 2004 Annual Report	Communications Consultant	Staff Only	In Progress Jan 05-Feb 05
2. Host a Special Meeting (Retreat) of the Coordinating Committee in Spring 2005. The purpose is, through a facilitated discussion, to reach agreement on desired outcomes concerning emerging needs in preparation for the 2005 MetroGIS Business Plan Update.	Staff Coordinator/ Professional Services Consultant	Group Discussion	In progress Dec 03 – Spr 05 (Preparations postponed June 04 for Data Sharing Agreement)
3. Update Business Plan. In addition to direction obtained from the retreat, a component of the Update process should involve a user satisfaction evaluation, three focuses of which should include: a) investigation of why a large number of potential users are not using data distributed via DataFinder that are recognized as commonly needed, b) why in 2004 there were 149 licensees of the street centerline dataset and only 50 for the regional parcel dataset, and c) document benefits received from Café’s existence from users’ perspective. Other specifics to be guided by the results of Coordinating Committee’s retreat (D3).	Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Contractor	MetroGIS Workgroup	Spr 05 – Sep 05
4. Outreach. Promote awareness of endorsed regional geospatial data solutions, best practices, and opportunities for involvement, in particular, among metro-wide organizations of administrators for school and watershed districts, counties, and cities. <i>In particular, target non-traditional users to encourage their use of the data and services supported by MetroGIS.</i>	Staff Coordinator / managers of general web site and DataFinder	Staff and Committee Members	Ongoing
5. Prepare MetroGIS Benefits Testimonials for 1-2 Additional Stakeholders	Communications Consultant	Staff Only	Ongoing

6. Oversee Performance Measure activities , evaluate results of performance measurement and refine MetroGIS activities and procedures, as needed.	Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Consultant	<i>Depends on the measure (i.e., evaluation of producer satisfaction and compliance with responsibilities & user satisfaction with data quality and access.</i>	Ongoing
7. Administer tasks and activities set forth in the Business Plan , not specifically identified in his workplan.	Staff Coordinator/ Professional Services Consultant	Staff Only	Ongoing

E. Coordination with Related Initiatives

Task	Lead Support	Method	Start/End
1. Monitor activities of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI), federal programs, and others, as appropriate, and seek participation and coordination in work of others relevant to MetroGIS.	Staff Coordinator	Staff Only	Ongoing
2. Participate in Mn Spatial Data Infrastructure (MSDI) policy making related to topics of importance to MetroGIS's efforts.	Staff Coordinator	Staff / Committee & Board Members	Ongoing

F. Other:

As defined by the MetroGIS Policy Board

APPENDIX A General Expectations and Responsibilities

1) **Oversee Effective Solutions to Priority Common Information Needs**

- Information Needs Workgroup Process – Oversee the workgroup process to define desired regional data specifications, identify candidate data custodians, and define custodian responsibilities for each priority information need. See Table below for related 2003 activities.
- Redefinition of Priority Information Needs – Oversee the process to identify new priority information needs.
- Data Standards -- Recommend solutions to data standards needs necessary to enhance the effectiveness of data sharing.
- Regularly report progress -- Keep the Policy Board apprised of progress made to address priority information needs.

What is expected of an Information Needs Workgroup?

Each information need is addressed through a replicable process. In general, the process begins by assembling a small **workgroup** of content experts. They will then attempt to identify one or more datasets required to meet the information need. In some cases, this process takes place in a formal Peer Review Forum with more content experts and users. In other cases it is not such a formalized process because the dataset(s) that meet the information need are intuitively recognized.

Once the dataset(s) required to meet an information need is identified, the **workgroup** is tasked to:

- Refine the desired specifications identified via a Peer Review Forum,
- Identify desired data standards and guidelines,
- Identify desired roles and responsibilities for the custodian organization(s) - organizations responsible for data creation, maintenance, documentation, and distribution; and,
- Identify candidate custodial organizations that have a business need and appropriate expertise to carry out the desired roles and responsibilities.

The workgroup makes recommendations to the Coordinating Committee, which in turn makes a recommendation to the Policy Board. The process is complete when the Policy Board has adopted, as policy for the MetroGIS community, parameters (data specifications, standards, roles and responsibilities, etc.) addressing the four components listed above. The adopted parameters are posted on the MetroGIS website for each “MetroGIS endorsed regional dataset”. Once an endorsed dataset is operational, the Committee is responsible for overseeing monitoring of user satisfaction to continually enhance the regional solutions.

2) **Enhance Access to Shared Data (*DataFinder - Data Search and Distribution Mechanism*)**

- Facilitate collaboration: – Oversee development of applications and scripts; telecommunication and related solutions for security issues; institutional solutions needed to improve online access to shared data related to priority information needs.
 - Identify security issues – best practices
 - Integrate web mapping service technology with GIS technology to provide access to source data
- Metadata Enhancements – Monitor efforts to enhance and expand metadata for core regional data and posting it on DataFinder.
 - Promote use of endorsed metadata guidelines.
 - Encourage integration of metadata development and updating into position descriptions and everyday use.
 - Promote increased diversity of organizations posting metadata on DataFinder and increase the number of the metadata records.

- Coordinate with Minnesota's GeoGateway -- Ensure coordination of design and procedures between Minnesota's GeoGateway and MetroGIS DataFinder.
 - Monitor technical developments that impact NSDI Clearinghouse activities and DataFinder efforts.
 - Enhance Geographic Search Capabilities (e.g., 2001-02 NSDI Web Mapping Service Grant Project and 2003 partnership with LMIC)

3) **Resolve Privacy Issues Relating to Access**

(Note: These activities are generally incorporated into the recommended solutions for each priority common in formation needs – Section 1.)

Oversee identification and resolution of issues relating to distribution of sensitive data of regional significance and recommend widely acceptable guidelines, in particular universal data summary/aggregation units, to address issues relating, but not limited to:

- Sensitive Data
- Definition of Public Data
- Responsibility of Data Security
- Data Practices Act