



**Policy Board Members:**

Victoria Reinhardt,  
Chairperson  
Ramsey County

Jim Kordiak,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Anoka County

Patrice Bataglia,  
Dakota County

Gary M. Delaney,  
Carver County

Conrad Fiskness,  
MAWD

Dennis Hegberg,  
Washington County

Antoinette Johns,  
TIES

Randy Johnson,  
Hennepin County

Gary Schiff,  
City of Minneapolis  
AMM

Terry Schneider,  
City of Minnetonka  
AMM

Bob Vogel,  
Scott County

Tony Pistilli,  
Metropolitan Council

**Coordinating Committee**

Jane Harper,  
Chairperson  
Washington County

Dave Drealan,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Carver County

**Staff Coordinator**

Randall Johnson,  
Metropolitan Council

**Wednesday, January 28, 2004**

**6:30 p.m.**

**Metropolitan Council -- Room 1A  
230 East Fifth Street, St. Paul, MN**

## Agenda

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Accept Agenda**
- 3. Accept Meeting Summary**

a) October 29, 2003	<u>Page</u> <i>action</i> 1
---------------------	--------------------------------
- 4. GIS Technology Demonstration:**  
*Improving Information Access Efficiencies with GIS - Scott County's Story* 7
- 5. Action/Discussion Items**

a) 2003 Accomplishments and Annual Report	<i>action</i> 9
b) 2004 Budget	<i>action</i> 19
c) 2004 Major Program Objectives	<i>action</i> 25
d) 2003 Performance Measures Report and Recommendations	<i>action</i> 34
e) Socioeconomic Information Need Regional Solution - Phase I	<i>action</i> 37
f) GIS Data Sharing Agreements with Counties – Adoption Status	47
- 6. Major Activity Update** 48

a) Priority Common Information Need Solutions	
b) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Coordination with MN GeoIntegrator	
c) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy – Non-Government Access	
d) Regional Mailing Label Application	
e) Data Sharing Initiative With Utilities	
- 7. Information Sharing** 53

a) Professional Services Contracts – Communications and Business Planning	
b) Gopher State One Call – Concern for Change in Fee Policy	
c) Regional Parcel Dataset- Procedural Clarifications	
d) “Looking for Data Stewardship” notice added to Website	
e) Outreach Activities	
f) Related State Geospatial Data Initiatives Update	
g) Related Federal/National Geospatial Data Initiatives Update	
h) December 17th Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes and 2004 Officers	
- 8. Next Meeting**  
April 28, 2004 (*election of officers*)
- 9. Adjourn**

### Mission Statement

*“Provide an ongoing, stakeholder governed, metro-wide mechanism through which participants easily and equitably share geographically referenced data that are accurate, current, secure, of common benefit and easily usable.”*

**Meeting Summary**  
**MetroGIS Policy Board**  
**Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices**  
**October 29, 2003**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Patrice Bataglia (Dakota County), William Brown for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Bob Vogel (Scott County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Jane Harper for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Gary Delaney (Carver County), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), and Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Bob Cockriel, Will Craig, Dave Drealan, Rick Gelbmann, Randy Knippel, Brad Henry, Al Laumeyer

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Trudy Richter, with Richardson, Richter and Associates, and Steve Fester.

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

Member Fiskness moved and Member Bataglia seconded to accept the agenda as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**3. MEETING SUMMARY**

Member Vogel moved and Member Johns seconded to approve the summary of the July 30, 2003 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION – GASB34 and GIS/MetroGIS - What is the Connection?**

The Staff Coordinator introduced Brad Henry (URS/BRW) and Bob Cockriel (City of Bloomington), both members of the Coordinating Committee. Henry commented that GASB34 requires all government organizations to identify the infrastructure they are responsible for, its worth, and what they are doing to maintain it, noting that GIS is a technology that can greatly help government not only respond to the GASB34 directive, but in particular, more efficiently manage these assets. By 2004, the rules call for all government units to be compliance. Henry noted that those units that do not comply will likely see their bond ratings drop.

Cockriel explained the substantial benefits that can be realized through implementation of asset management programs, noting that a 75-90 percent reduction in street maintenance expenses are possible. Henry stated that GIS technology can greatly contribute in three ways – collection and correction of data, collate/analyze data, and visualization of the reporting. He also stated that he believes GASB34 presents an opportunity to MetroGIS to pursue regional infrastructure datasets and encouraged the Board to consider adding “infrastructure” to MetroGIS’s list of priority information needs.

In response to a question from Chairperson Reinhardt, Cockriel commented that it may be possible to aggregate some utility location data, but that some are in proprietary systems and can not be shared.

There was some discussion following a comment by Commissioner Kordiak regarding the need for formal asset management programs when the information provided is common knowledge. The notion

that infrastructure needs to be maintained is clearly understood, but the fact that the number of assets is vast, and that much of it is underground, requires a structured systems approach to ensure nothing is overlooked and that repairs are made at optimum times in the various life cycles. (The PowerPoint slides presented to the Policy Board are posted at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/gasb.pdf>.)

## **5. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATE (See the agenda materials for more information)**

### **a) Regional Mailing Label Application**

The County Data Producer Workgroup is overseeing this project. Dave Drealan, who chairs the workgroup, reported that the goal is to launch this application by year-end. He commented that concerns that had been raised about possible interference with existing county revenues from mailing label sales had been addressed and that final modifications to the actual application are in process. He also reminded the Board members that the application will be available only to organizations that have obtained a license to access the regional parcel dataset, since this application runs on that data, and that any change to this policy must be approved by the counties who own the data.

Member Kordiak thanked the group for its work. He shared his belief that it is important to pursue methods to improve access as well as replace manual/labor-intensive processes, as will be case with this application, in order to greatly improve efficiencies. He also stated that he favors foregoing current modest revenues if the procedural change gets the data out to the user quickly and easily and improves staff efficiencies.

### **b) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy**

The County Data Producer Workgroup is overseeing this project. Dave Drealan, who chairs the workgroup, reported that the group has agreed on how to address the topic of fees and that negotiations are in progress with the last county to reach agreement on a single license document. Once the license is finalized, the new procedures will be launched though a web portal that has been built by MetroGIS support staff. Regarding to the license, William Brown noted that Hennepin County is going through a reorganization and that the attorney assigned to this project is new to the proposal. A meeting is scheduled for the first week in November, at which he hopes agreement will be reached. The problem is that Hennepin County has a history of having to deal with lost data, which has resulted in a defensive position regarding the licensing documents.

Vice Chairman Kordiak commented that the Policy Board has been talking about this topic for over two years and that he hopes that any changes suggested by the Hennepin County will result in a better document.

Member Harper commented that Washington County recently was contacted by two private sector organizations that are interested in this data and that an ongoing relationship looks good once the proposed revised procedures are in place.

### **c) Data Sharing with Utilities**

The County Data Producer Workgroup is overseeing this project. Dave Drealan, who chairs the workgroup, reported that a sample of the regional parcel dataset will be delivered shortly to the three participating utility companies for their evaluation. If the utilities are interested in pursuing further talks, the counties will define data that utilities produce for which they have a business need.

### **d) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Coordination with MN GeoIntegrator**

The Staff Coordinator summarized progress on a collaborative project with the MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC) to improve the functionality of DataFinder Café and migrate the physical hosting of Café to the State's system to enable sharing of hardware and annual software maintenance expenses.

### **e) Priority Common Information Needs**

**(1) Emergency Management:** Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council) and Randy Knippel (Dakota County), co-chairs of the Emergency Management Workgroup, reported that their main emphasis since the last Policy Board meeting was to participate in the annual GIS/LIS Conference and speak to Metro Emergency Managers Association officials. They also informed the Policy Board that the Emergency Management Committee of the Governors Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) (Chaired by Gelbmann) and the MetroGIS Committee (Chaired by Knippel) have elected to pursue separate agendas, but in a coordinated fashion, as opposed to continue to meet jointly. The MetroGIS group will focus on building relationships between the GIS and emergency management communities, whereas, the GCGI group will focus on policy and standards matters.

Member Bataglia asked how the two groups intend to address the disparity between metro and greater Minnesota in terms of resources without slowing down progress in areas that have made the necessary commitments. Gelbmann commented that the emphasis in the metro is on action that can be taken now, ranging from assembling priority data into region-wide datasets that are easily accessible by the broad user community, to continuing to build relationships among the various affected interests. He emphasized that the goal is to leverage investments that have been made in data and then establish collaborative role expectations.

In response, Member Bataglia asked if cataloguing of existing, useful data and an evaluation of its suitability related to intended goals is part of the workgroup's plan. Knippel agreed to provide a listing of emergency management-related data resources that have been identified thus far and an indication as to whether each of these data sources meets or exceeds current information needs. The Staff Coordinator encouraged Knippel's group to use a [matrix](#) similar to that developed by the Socioeconomic Workgroup to document the prior information needs and suitability of existing data sources to address these needs.

**(2) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas** Will Craig, Chair of the Socioeconomic Information Needs Workgroup, informed the Policy Board of the workgroup's efforts to identify existing sources of data that meet or exceed the needs of the community relative to several priority information needs. He noted that this phase of the regional solution is nearly complete. Phase II work is expected to begin Winter 2004. The objective of that phase will be to identify non-traditional sources of data that can be pursued to address needs not met by existing traditional sources.

Two of the prospective US Census sources of data still require federal funding - The American Community Survey (ACS) and the Longitudinal Employer – Household Dynamics (LEHD) program. Craig noted that if these sources were available on an ongoing basis metro-wide, most if not all of the priority data needs identified by the MetroGIS community would be achievable. This comment led to a brief discussion about the shortcomings of existing data sources that would be overcome – update frequencies too slow, nighttime but not daytime population data, mapping resolution is too coarse – particularly for local government needs, in particular, economic and community development efforts.

With regard to the ACS and LEHD programs, Craig asked the Board if it would consider endorsing a resolution of support and requesting that its member organizations include it in their respective legislative agendas. He noted that the Bush Administration has included the ACS program in its budget proposal but congressional support is needed to fund the U.S. Census Bureau implementation of the program. This request spawned comments from Member Bataglia and Chairperson Reinhardt that additional information about the cost and benefits of the program will be needed to clarify the value of the program relative to other initiatives under consideration for inclusion in their counties' respective legislative agendas. Members Bataglia and Reinhardt noted that county government is generally very cautious about the programs for which they

lobby, given past experience that once programs important to local government are in place that some or all of the cost will be passed along to them.

Member Johns stated that the data enhancements related to the proposed ACS program are critical to effectively managing the Brooklyn Center and other school districts with significant minority populations. Better migration and poverty data are needed to ensure the funding formulas reflect reality of shifting populations with special service needs. (Special needs populations are increasingly migrating to the suburbs but the resources are not moving with them resulting in inadequate service capabilities from the suburban districts.) Transportation options are also lacking to access services.

**Direction Provided:** It was agreed that if the Coordinating Committee wishes to bring this matter to the Policy Board for action at the January meeting, that background information sufficient to justify the value of the program to local government should be circulated to Board members well in advance of the meeting for Board members to share with peers for comment before the Board considers the topic. In response to a comment by Member Johns, Chairperson Reinhardt requested her to identify funding sources affected by the subject data and to share this information with Craig to include in the background information and comment as to whether or not it is possible to determine whether better data might correlate to increased resources to address documented needs.

Due to lack of time, no other Information Needs Workgroup reports were received.

## **6. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **a) 2004 Meeting Schedule**

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the schedule proposed in the agenda materials. No concerns were raised for the dates suggested: January 28, April 28, July 28, and October 27.

**Motion:** Member Fiskness moved and Member Harper seconded to approve the 2004 meeting schedule as proposed. Motion carried, ayes all.

### **b) Update Frequency Policy Change – Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset**

The Staff Coordinator summarized the proposed update frequency change from once per year to quarterly, to be done at the same time that the regional parcel data is updated. He also noted that the change had been proposed by the staff who are responsible for the related duties for the primary producers (counties) and regional custodian (Metropolitan Council).

**Motion:** Member Johns moved and Member Pistilli seconded to approve the proposed changes to the regional policy statement concerning the update cycle for the Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset as recommended by the Coordinating Committee. Motion carried, ayes all.

### **c) 2004 MetroGIS Budget and Agreement Principles**

The Staff Coordinator noted that the proposed 2004 budget materials included in the agenda materials show the same total amount as the Board requested in April and the major line items are also unchanged. Board approval will be sought in January, once the Metropolitan Council adopts its final budget for 2004. This information was provided at this time for comment to ensure nothing has been overlooked, and to provide a context for the proposed principles to guide negotiation of data sharing agreements. Staff explained that the line item for funding associated with these agreements is \$50,000. No comments were received on the budget materials

The Staff Coordinator introduced proposed principles to guide negotiations currently in progress to extend the existing GIS Data Sharing Agreement, noting that staff believed that agreed-upon principles would benefit current negotiations through fostering consensus on the objectives as well as provide for

long-term guidance. Chairperson Reinhardt offered modifications to the language included in the packet to improve clarity.

Comments from Members Fiskness and Pistilli led to a discussion about the value of MetroGIS's efforts to the user community as well as to the counties as primarily data producers. Fiskness emphasized the significant benefits that have been achieved by MetroGIS's emphasis on coordination and leveraging of investments and not adding another layer of government. Several of the county members noted that the funding allocated by the proposed agreements, although modest, is important because it recognizes that the Council, on behalf of the broader community, appreciates the importance of the counties' participation and the significance of the parcel data they produce. However, notwithstanding that the counties concur MetroGIS is greatly benefiting the community and understand that their participation is valued, several county members noted that the funding is also important because they believe they receive the least amount of direct benefit from MetroGIS's efforts, generally less than their cost to participate, and because of recent budget cutting that has reduced resources available to support unmandated programs, which include their internal GIS units, as well as those related custodial roles and responsibilities important to the MetroGIS community. Member Brown noted that he believes Hennepin County would be involved in MetroGIS' efforts regardless of whether the proposed funding is offered but cautioned that he is concerned that Hennepin County may not have the personnel to achieve the desired data enhancements that the funding associated with agreements is designed to address.

**Motion:** Member Kordiak moved and Member Johns seconded to adopt the principles as set forth in Attachment A. Motion carried ayes 4, nays 3.

The dissenting Members (Pistilli, Fiskness, and Brown) voted against for the motion for the following reasons: Pistilli did not like the proposed revision removing the phrase "These funds are intended to be a modest gesture of appreciation" from principle 3a as he believed this language helped clarify the intent, Fiskness preferred the matter to be tabled, Brown was not comfortable moving forward until he better understands what Hennepin County would be committing to if the principles were adopted.

Chairperson Reinhardt encouraged the dissenting Members to offer modifications that would address their concerns for action at the January meeting, noting they are to guide negotiations, will not be incorporated into any contracts, and can be modified at any time.

#### **d) 2004 Major Program Objectives**

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the objectives presented in the agenda packet and explained that staff is not asking for approval at this time but rather feedback as to any items that should be modified or added. No comments were offered.

Staff noted that approval will be sought at the January meeting once the 2004 budget is final.

### **7. INFORMATION ITEMS**

Chairperson Reinhardt asked the members to review on their own the information items presented in the agenda packet. She called their attention in particular to 7a – PolicyLink Recommendations and 7b – SRF Testimonial, noting that the testimonial involves benefits to counties from MetroGIS's efforts.

### **8. NEXT MEETING**

January 28, 2004

### **9. ADJOURN**

The meeting concluded at 9:10 p.m.

Prepared by,  
Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

## ATTACHMENT A

# Principles For Allocating MetroGIS's Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funds

### Introduction

The following principles are to serve as the basis for allocating the funding identified in the "Data Quality and Access Enhancement ...Projects" line item of the MetroGIS budget. The following principles do not apply to funds acquired through grants or sources other than the Metropolitan Council. Data producers, serving in their role as primary custodians for data that comprise regional data solutions (e.g. counties related to parcel data) are eligible for receive funds from this line item for eligible projects. There is no obligation on the part of the Council pay for projects that exceed the funds identified in this line item. Agreements that allocate funds from this line item must comply with the following principles, which supplement and expand upon, not supercede, the more general principles<sup>1</sup> that have governed MetroGIS's efforts for some time.

### Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funding Principles

The following principles are to be embedded in the annual MetroGIS budget, and be approved as part of the budget approval process. Currently the only such recipients of these enhancement project funds are the counties, though it is anticipated that other organizations will serve in similar capacities for regional data solutions that have not as yet been defined.

- 1) Receipt of these funds by a data producer is not a payment for data but rather for services performed of importance to the broad MetroGIS community.
- 2) Funding can also be for specific data enhancements, which are to be identified through a forum of data users and producers, in a manner that is consistent with past, broadly participatory, MetroGIS processes.
- 3) The purpose of this funding is four-fold:
  - a) To recognize the importance to the MetroGIS community of participation by producers of data that are critical components to regional solutions (e.g. parcel data produced by the seven metro area counties).
  - b) To assist data producers in performing primary custodial responsibilities, which have been endorsed by the Policy Board that exceed internal business functions, including extracting, documenting, manipulating, and delivering these data to the regional custodian.
  - c) To finance data quality and access enhancements, defined through MetroGIS's processes.
  - d) To assist data producers with costs associated with sharing of information about what was learned and the outcome of data enhancement projects in accordance with a MetroGIS core function to foster sharing of knowledge.
- 4) Data Producers have the option of pooling funds allocated to other Data Producers for purposes of conducting projects that will have mutual benefit to the producers and to data users.

---

<sup>1</sup> The following principles governed MetroGIS's efforts. They have evolved over time as a product of decision-making and desired outcomes.

- a) No organization will be asked to perform a task for the collaborative that they do not have an internal need to perform.
- b) Build once, share many times (data and applications).
- c) Investments made by one government interest ought to be leverageable by other government interests.
- d) All relevant and affected interests participate, dominated by none.
- e) Widespread sharing of the data improves data quality and ultimately decision support.
- f) Cost recovery of data development expenses stifles sharing of commonly needed data.



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** GIS Technology Demonstration  
*Improving Information Access Efficiencies with GIS - Scott County's Story*

**DATE:** January 12, 2004  
*(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Policy Board has asked for a demonstration of GIS technology to be a regular component of each Board meeting.

For the Policy Board's January 2004 meeting, the Coordinating Committee has invited Scott County to showcase how its interdepartmental coordinated use of GIS technology has improved:

- 1) Public access to a variety of data and records maintained by the county's Recorder, Assessor and Surveyor offices by making transparent the distinctions between these offices to the end user,
- 2) Internal coordination of information management and dissemination functions performed by the Recorder, Assessor and Surveyor offices, and
- 3) Efficiency of communication between these county offices and local units of government that serve the county.

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

(Refer to the listing on the next page.)

### **RECOMMENDATION**

No action requested.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### Past Demonstrations

- Jan. 1997: Benefits from GIS in general and uses being made all classes of stakeholders represented on the Policy Board.
- Sep. 1998: DataFinder and Dakota County's Parcel Query Application
- Nov. 1998: Orthoimagery and its Uses
- Apr. 1999: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition GIS Capabilities
- Jul. 1999: Presentation to U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on June 9th
- Apr. 2000: Regional Parcel Dataset (Version 1)
- Jul. 2000: DataFinder and Metropolitan Council's Internet-based Existing Land Use Application
- Oct. 2000: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition Socio-Demographic Data Initiative
- Jan. 2001: Regional Census Geography and Legislative Redistricting Software/Process
- Apr. 2001: LMIC's MetroViewer (EPPLviewer) using datasets made available via MetroGIS' efforts
- Jul. 2001: MetroGIS capabilities current and proposed for data discovery and acquisition via the Internet
- Oct. 2001: TIES - How school districts have benefited from the presence of MetroGIS.
- Jan. 2002: Paul Olson shared his experience as a GIS professional responding to the World Trade Center tragedy at Ground Zero.
- Apr. 2002: Each of the seven counties summarized their respective GIS programs
- Jul. 2002: Rollout of DataFinder Café, MetroGIS's state-of-the-art data distribution tool
- Oct. 2002: Metropolitan Airports Commission use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jan. 2003: Carver and Washington Counties' use of GIS for Emergency Management
- Apr. 2003: Metropolitan Mosquito Control District use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jul. 2003: Minneapolis Neighborhood Information Network (MNIS) and its role in the area of Community GIS, also known as Public Participation GIS.
- Oct. 2003 GASB 34 and GIS Technology: The Connection?



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Jane Harper  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** 2003 MetroGIS Accomplishments and Annual Report

**DATE:** January 14, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

### **REQUEST**

A listing of the MetroGIS's major 2003 accomplishments is offered below for the Policy Board's information. A brief summary of the most significant highlights is presented in the attached "milestones" article, which will be printed on the backside of the Chair's letter, also attached, and inserted into the brochure that was printed last year. The brochure and insert will then be distributed to the nearly 2000 individuals on the MetroGIS contact list. Comment from the Policy Board is requested prior to printing and distributing these materials.

### **SIGNIFICANT 2003 ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- ✓ Sustained adequate funding for MetroGIS from the Metropolitan Council following the transition to a new administration and significant funding cuts throughout the Council's programs.
- ✓ Reached an agreement-in-principle with LMIC to collaborate on enhancements to DataFinder Café and integrating Cafe into the State's geospatial infrastructure.
- ✓ Reached agreement on a five-year data sharing agreement with each of the counties that clarifies rules for Regional GIS Project funding, establishes parameters for custodial responsibility compensation, and achieves a single data licensure procedure. (See Agenda Item 5f.)
- ✓ Leveraged MetroGIS's collaborative effectiveness through a partnership with MnDOT concerning a regional highway and road network solution and participation in a Metro 911 Board initiative to integrate GIS technology into the day-to-day operations of the 27 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) that serve the Metro Area.
- ✓ Created an Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, which is working closely with a similar newly formed Workgroup of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information.
- ✓ Completed Phase I of the Socioeconomic Information Need, resulting in an online listing of web-based resources.
- ✓ Prototyped MetroGIS's first regional geospatial application – mailing labels.
- ✓ Refined Performance Measures Reporting and added another testimonial to the benefits of MetroGIS's efforts.
- ✓ Initiated substantial outreach activity.

A detailed listing of the activities and accomplishments is also attached.

### **2003 ANNUAL REPORT**

Beginning last year, an annual report format change was introduced. The report is now comprised of a brochure "wrapper" that is intended to be used for at least two issues of the report. A double-sided, single page insert is used to summarize the major highlights of the immediate past year. The brochure that was used last year and will again be used this year can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual\\_reports/03brochure.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual_reports/03brochure.pdf).

The core theme for the 2003 annual report insert is the same as last year - how the existence of MetroGIS is making a difference. In particular, this past year MetroGIS's impacts were demonstrated not only through easier and quicker access to data needed, in the form needed, for a variety of stakeholders but equally as important by other organizations leveraging the collaborative processes fostered by MetroGIS and products of this collaboration. Jeanne Landkamer has again been retained to produce the MetroGIS 2003 Annual Report. She has produced MetroGIS's last five annual reports.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board suggest any additions and/or modifications to the 2003 Milestone and Chair's letter pieces:

## **2003 MetroGIS Annual Report – Letter from the Chair**

*(Front side of a double-sided page to be printed and distributed as an insert in the MetroGIS communications brochure produced last year)*

While the terrible tragedy of 9/11/01 is more than two years behind us, we live with its aftermath and its lessons every day. One of the clearest lessons for government is the critical importance of geospatial data in planning for and responding to emergencies.

From its beginnings, MetroGIS has worked diligently and successfully to build an infrastructure of regional geospatial data, and a culture and tools for sharing the data. With our local and regional partners, we've built a Web-based catalog of datasets, now totaling 161, with regional data about topics as diverse as political boundaries, major shopping centers and soils. We've developed an innovative Web mapping service for viewing and distributing the data. Our DataFinder site is visited by more than 1,100 unique users monthly.

Just as importantly, participants in MetroGIS have created a culture of sharing both data and knowledge about how to develop and use the data. New relationships have formed among GIS managers and technicians, planners, surveyors, and a host of other government employees and policymakers. This has led to increased communication, better decisions, and increased efficiency through reduced duplication of effort and collaboration on common needs.

These relationships are valuable assets as MetroGIS and its state, federal and nonprofit partners work to better prepare for and respond to a variety of potential emergencies. In 2003, MetroGIS formed an Emergency Preparedness Work Group. The group's objectives are to develop applications for quick distribution of relevant data in times of emergency, and help educate emergency management professionals about the potential and importance of GIS data in emergency preparedness and response.

MetroGIS is working closely with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information, which formed a committee to do complementary work. That committee's focus is on state-level policy development and planning issues related to emergency preparedness.

We formed other strategic alliances in 2003 that are leveraging technology and sharing data and expertise to improve government services and reduce costs. Chief among these are partnerships with the Minnesota Department of Transportation to establish a "common geospatial data language" to describe road sections in the Twin Cities area, and with the Metropolitan 911 Board to integrate GIS technology into the day-to-day work of the seven-county metropolitan region's 27 emergency dispatching facilities.

These initiatives illustrate how, as MetroGIS matures, we are expanding our focus from gathering and creating data to developing applications to improve its usefulness. In 2003 we also developed a Web-based mailing label application, based on a prototype created by Carver County, that runs on top of the regional parcel dataset. In 2004, MetroGIS will convene users to determine what other common business applications should be explored for development at the regional level.

Though invisible to the average citizen, these efforts bear fruit each day across the region. With GIS data, quickly obtained, governments make better decisions about issues that make a difference in people's lives-- school closings, disease control, highway construction, crime prevention and others. MetroGIS's mission of data sharing makes government more efficient and effective. We can be proud of our work.

## ***2003 – A Year of Transition for MetroGIS***

From its beginnings, participants in MetroGIS have worked diligently and successfully to build an infrastructure of regional geospatial data and tools to distribute the data. In 2003, the focus began to shift more clearly to developing applications for using the data. MetroGIS formed partnerships that leveraged regionwide data infrastructure and data-sharing experience to help a variety of initiatives move forward.

### ***Major milestones in 2003***

**Preparing for emergencies** - MetroGIS and the Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information undertook a major initiative to help the region and the state better prepare for and respond to emergency events. The MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup has three primary tasks:

- 1) Organize and standardize existing relevant data, and develop applications for quick distribution of the data in times of emergency;
- 2) Reach out to GIS professionals to gather data and enlist help with the project; and
- 3) Reach out to the emergency management community, to educate them about the potential and importance of GIS data in emergency preparedness and response.

**Assisting 911 dispatchers** - The Metropolitan 911 Board recruited MetroGIS to assist with an ambitious project to integrate GIS technology into the day-to-day work of the seven-county metropolitan region's 27 emergency dispatching facilities, or Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). The goal of the project is to instantly provide dispatchers with accurate maps of the locations of callers from both wired and wireless telephones. MetroGIS will assist in defining procedures to 1) accomplish improved consistency and currency of GIS data, in particular, address data; and 2) help integrate address data with other commonly used geospatial data.

**Creating mailing labels** - MetroGIS developed a Web-based mailing label application, based on a prototype created by Carver County, that would run on top of the regional parcel dataset. The first version is slated for release in early 2004. The application meets a common business need of local governments (creating mailing labels). An advantage of the new regional GIS application is that it allows users to quickly and easily create mailing label sets that cross jurisdictional boundaries. In 2004, MetroGIS will convene users to determine what other common business applications should be explored for development at the regional level.

**Identifying road segments** - The Minnesota Department of Transportation initiated a pilot project with MetroGIS to establish a "common geospatial data language" to describe road sections in the Twin Cities area. Once established, tested and approved, the language will increase the productivity of GIS users by enabling them to easily combine road and highway information from multiple sources. It will also result in clearer information for decision-makers. Collaborating in the project are the Metropolitan Council, The Lawrence Group (TLG) and local governments.

**Expanding data distribution** - The Minnesota Land Management Information Center and MetroGIS teamed up to develop GeoIntegrator, a statewide, Web-based geospatial data distribution tool that expands the capabilities of MetroGIS's DataFinder Café and integrates Café into the state's geospatial infrastructure. GeoIntegrator is anticipated to launch in 2004.

**Reaching long-term data agreements** - MetroGIS negotiated the third generation of data-sharing agreements with the seven metropolitan counties. The agreements clarify rules for regional GIS project funding, establish parameters for compensation of regional data-solution custodians, and achieve a single license procedure for parcel data. Approval of the agreements by all the county boards is expected by early 2004.

## **2003 Policy Board Members**

Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County, Chair  
Jim Kordiak, Anoka County, Vice Chair  
Gary Delaney, Carver County  
Patrice Bataglia, Anoka County  
Randy Johnson, Hennepin County  
Bob Vogel, Scott County  
Dennis Hegberg, Washington County  
Tony Pistilli, Metropolitan Council  
Terry Schneider and Gary Schiff, Metro Area Cities  
Conrad Fiskness, Metro Area Watersheds  
Antoinette Johns, Metro Area School Districts

Primary Sponsor - Metropolitan Council  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator - Randall Johnson, 651-602-1638  
Mears Park Centre  
230 E. Fifth St., St. Paul, MN 55101-1626  
Phone 651-602-1363  
Fax 651-602-1674  
TTY 651-291-0904

[www.metrogis.org](http://www.metrogis.org) – For current information on MetroGIS activities

[www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org) – The regional geodata discovery and distribution tool

## Detailed Listing of Significant MetroGIS Accomplishments - 2003 -

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

#### a. Emergency Preparedness

An Emergency Preparedness Workgroup was established. The group organized into three subgroups and made notable progress establishing contacts with the emergency management community, identifying critical data resources, as well as specifications for a prototype web-based information dissemination tool. The group has established a liaison channel with a similar committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI). The chair of the GCGI committee is a member of the MetroGIS workgroup and its steering committee. Outreach efforts have included making presentations to at the State GIS/LIS Conference, Public Health Strategic Stockpile (SNS) Planning Committee, and State Office of Emergency Management, and Metro Emergency Managers Association (MEMA).

#### b. Existing Land Use:

A Peer Review Forum was held on April 17<sup>th</sup> to initiate work on this information need. The characteristics of the desired data content requirements for a regional solution were identified. The technical workgroup made substantial progress on a recommended strategy and will attempt to complete its work by March 2004.

#### c. Highways and Roads:

A strategic partnership between MetroGIS and MnDOT was entered into in July. Through this partnership, MetroGIS will play a substantial role in defining components of a scheme (Linear Reference Model – or LRM) that will make it possible to interrelate data collected by many different organizations pertaining to road and highway networks.

#### d. Hydrology

Metropolitan Mosquito Control District's data evaluated for component of regional solution. No substantive progress made on establishing content guidelines or custodian matters. Awaiting the affected state agencies to agree on statewide policies since the metro area solution needs to be integrated with data produced by the state.

#### e. Jurisdictional Boundaries

- Municipal and County Boundaries: The custodial responsibilities were modified to stipulate quarterly updates, at the time of the regional parcel data updates. The former policy vaguely called for annual updating of this regional dataset.
- Watershed District Boundaries. Washington County made substantial progress to complete a pilot study that will be used to shape regional policy related to data content and custodian responsibilities. The final recommendations are expected to be submitted to the Coordinating Committee in early 2004.

#### f. Land Cover

Several more producers have contributed to the regional dataset, demonstrating that establishing standards and promoting them can work in a voluntary, multiple-participant environment.

#### g. Parcels:

- Government and Academic Interests: Over 50 desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset were identified at the Data Users Forum hosted by MetroGIS on September 25<sup>th</sup>. Of these 50 suggestions, 15 received were identified as the most significant from a regional perspective. A technical workgroup expects to submit a recommendation early in 2004 regarding specifications and options to accomplish the desired enhancements. To address a previously cited need, a link was added to the metadata to encourage data users to inform the data producers of any anomalies they identify in the data.
- Non-Profit and For-Profit Version. The County Data Producers Workgroup reached agreement on a strategy to collectively modify their respective fees to include a discount for volume purchases, a web site was developed to implement a single point of access to order parcel data,

agreement was reached to pursue a “shrink-wrap” licensing concept and significant progress was made to reach agreement on a single license document. Launch of the proposed mechanism to collaboratively distribute parcel data to non-government is expected to occur early 2004.

#### h. Planned Land Use

The regional coding scheme for Planned Land Use was modified to address a transit need and the procedures for updating alignment with parcel data were modified.

#### i. Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas

- Business Information Needs Workgroup – Phase I of a regional solution was completed. Existing data sources that satisfy priority socioeconomic information needs were identified and gaps between desired and existing data were identified. Phase II was authorized and is proposed to begin in 2004.
- Accessibility Workgroup: - US Census Tract data were formatted for distribution via DataFinder. These data comprised the 11<sup>th</sup> most often downloaded datasets, even though available for only a portion of the year.

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

#### a. Next Generation Data Sharing Agreement

Agreement with the Chair was reached. The counties will hopefully approve by year-end. If so, issues that have been lingering for two rounds of negotiations will be resolved.

#### b. Integration of DataFinder Café and State GeoIntegrator

An agreement-in-principle was reached with the MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC) to expand the functionality of DataFinder Café and integrate it with the state’s system (GeoIntegrator). The project will result in a Version 2 of the Café program, which is expected to be operational by mid-2004.

#### c. Metro 911 Board Project

MetroGIS was invited to assist the Metro 911 Board in developing a Request for Information to assess options regarding integration of GIS technology into the day-to-day operation of the 27 PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Points) that serve the seven county area. MetroGIS also participated in the workgroup that developed subsequent recommendations to launch the initiative to be considered by the full Metro 911 Board in January 2004.

#### d. Regional Mailing Label Application Initiative

A mailing label application, that runs on top of the regional parcel dataset, was prototyped based upon an application that had been developed by Carver County. Issues regarding possible impact on existing revenue streams delayed the launch, which is proposed to occur by early January.

#### e. Regional Parcel Dataset– Non-Government Version

See item I(g).

#### f. PolicyLink – Improving Access to Geospatial Data by Community Groups

On May 20, Will Craig presented information about MetroGIS's activities and policies to a summit on ways to improve access to geospatial data by community groups. PolicyLink conducted a series of interviews with key organizations over the summer and presented their findings at a follow-up forum on November 14<sup>th</sup>. MetroGIS was cited as a critical player to accomplish the desired ends. Talks are expected to continue in 2004.

#### g. Investigate Exchanging Parcel for Utility Infrastructure Data

Representatives from Xcel Energy, Centerpoint Energy Minnegasco, the Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative and Dave Drealan, representing the seven counties, agreed to investigate the concept of sharing parcel and utility infrastructure location data. Parcel data for a portion of Carver and Scott Counties were provided to the three utilities in October. If the utilities believe access to the regional parcel dataset would be of value in exchange for utility location data, further discussions will be held to evaluate interest in modifying the utility locations to align with parcel data and interest, in general, by local government in having access to utility location data for emergency preparedness, rights-of-way management, etc.

#### h. The National Map Pilot

MetroGIS DataFinder was designated as the “go-to” source of data for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area for The National Map.

#### i. Partnership with MnDOT

See Item I(c).

### **III. Data Discovery and Acquisition**

#### **a. Enhance MetroGIS DataFinder**

- *DataFinder Café*: ...See 2(a) above
- *User Information*: The databases that support performance measure reporting for DataFinder and DataFinder Café were modified to permit MetroGIS to better measure usage and characteristics of use. An agreement with Quova was reached to provide information about who is downloading data from DataFinder and where they are located. The finding was that 77 percent of the downloading activity is within the seven county metro area and adjoining counties.

#### **b. Promotion of DataFinder As A Common Tool – Leveraging the Investment:**

- A successful test was conducted from August to September by the City of St. Paul to investigate the possibility of using MetroGIS's DataFinder Café to support the City's internal and external geodata distribution needs. St. Paul is currently using Café in this capacity.
- Washington County is using the web server that supports Café to provide external Internet access to the county's parcel query application. Use of the Café server is saving the county approximately \$10,000 annually plus the cost of hardware and software and related licensing expenses.

### **IV. Outreach**

#### **a. Annual Report:**

The 2002 Annual Report was distributed to over 1500 persons and handed out at several conferences and forums. The format was modified to comprise a brochure style with a single page insert specific to the reporting year. The brochure addresses the broad goals and benefits and the one-page insert summarizes the accomplishments that year. The change was made to reduce costs in response to the budget reductions that occurred in 2003. 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 the three issues of the statewide GIS/LIS newsletter.

#### **c. [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 receiving in excess of 5,000 visits per month.

#### **d. County User Groups:**

Quarterly updates of MetroGIS's activities are sent to each users group. Staff tries to regularly attend user several meetings to encourage use of adopted best practices and answer questions about MetroGIS's activities. In August MetroGIS provided \$500 to the Hennepin County User Group to assist it with its organizational expenses.

#### **e. Coordination with State (Beyond Metro) Geospatial Activities/Information Requests:**

- Will Craig, member of the Coordinating Committee, chaired the 2003 Parcel Data Status Survey conducted on behalf of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. The result was a comprehensive documentation of the organizations, primarily counties, that produce parcel data in Minnesota. According to Craig, this survey was, in large part, influenced by MetroGIS's interest in fostering data sharing, in particular parcel data, with the counties that surround the seven-county Metro Area. Information was documented on who to contact, as well as, details about each producers efforts related to parcel data. The final report can be viewed at (<http://www.gis.state.mn.us/pdf/GeoDataExchange.pdf>).
- MetroGIS's Emergency Preparedness Workgroup established a relationship with the MN Office of Emergency Management in January. The leadership of the two Regional Review Committees (RRCs) that cover the Twin Cities have been integrated into MetroGIS's efforts to implement regional solutions to common Emergency Preparedness Information Needs.
- The Staff Coordinator participated on a Governor's Council workgroup with David Arbeit, member of the Coordinating Committee, that produced a guide for organizations interested in sharing geospatial data. Through a decision tree format it leads the reader through the many

requirements set forth in the Data Practices Act and offers proven options to address each. The final document can be viewed at <http://www.gis.state.mn.us/pdf/GeoDataExchange.pdf>

- The Staff Coordinator and David Arbeit served on the Governor's Council Data Committee workgroup charged with overseeing I-Planning for the state. Many of the lessons learned through MetroGIS's efforts and its fundamental philosophies have embedded into the state's I-Planning efforts.
- Staff and committee members also served as liaisons to Council committees and workgroups: Emergency Preparedness, Hydrographic, Land Records Modernization Committee, and Data Sharing Guidelines Workgroups.
- Via the Land Records Modernization Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information, staff established a networking relationship with representatives from Chisago, Goodhue, and Wright Counties in accordance with MetroGIS's Outreach Plan, relating to the collar counties, and to share knowledge about common GIS needs and opportunities.
- Influenced the Minnesota Statewide Parcel Map Inventory project, a survey of digital parcel data development throughout Minnesota, which was initiated and funded by Mn/DOT. More information and the final project report can be found at <http://rocky.dot.state.mn.us/SPMI/>.
- Several members of MetroGIS's Coordinating Committee and the Staff Coordinator participated on the GIS curriculum committee for Anoka-Ramsey Community College, which meets 2-3 times per year.

f. Coordination with **National/International** Geospatial Activities/Information Requests:

- January: Policy Board approved adding MetroGIS's signature to NSGIC's Resolution of Interdependence – Homeland Security
- January: DirectionsMag.com published an article about MetroGIS.
- March: GeoWorld Magazine published an article about MetroGIS as its cover story. - <http://www.geoplace.com/gw/> plus a printed article.
- March: The St. Paul Board of Realtors published an article about MetroGIS in their newsletter.
- March: The Coordinator of the State of Montana GIS Office interviewed MetroGIS staff regarding MetroGIS's efforts to streamline licensing and matters concerning intellectual property rights.
- April: The OGC published an article about MetroGIS in their newsletter.
- March: Interviewed by Rochester-Olmsted County GIS consortium concerning policies for distribution of regional parcel data.
- Apr. 28: Interviewed by Sarah Hawks, a graduate student from U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, who is developing a thesis on the organizational aspects of regional GIS.
- May 1: Interviewed by Brian Berandier, with REGIS, a multi-county Geospatial Data Collaborative in NW Michigan, about a funding model for MetroGIS. Also interested in Area Integrator SIG.
- May 1: Invitation to participate in Open Data Consortium study funding by FGDC.
- May 20: Staff Coordinator was a panelist for URISA's Summit in Washington D.C., titled "*National Programs...Local Implementation*", to facilitate dialogue between federal program managers and local officials.
- May 29: Interviewed by Gardner Group regarding MetroGIS effort to facilitate data sharing via use of technology. This interview was a follow-up to a conversation that occurred at an April Summit sponsored by the Pawlenty Administration.
- September: Interviewed by Dee Ann Davis, MIT, regarding data privacy issues that have been dealt with by MetroGIS.

g. Presentations:

- Feb. 19: Transportation Advisory Board of the Metropolitan Council, St. Paul
- Feb 9 and October 20, the MetroGIS Staff Coordinator shared MetroGIS's objectives, accomplishments, and lessons learned at two U of M Graduate GIS Seminars.
- May 20: Will Craig presented at the PolicyLink Summit. Minneapolis, (See II-f)
- Sept 24: The Staff Coordinator summarized MetroGIS's objectives, accomplishments, participants and lessons learned at a meeting of the Scott County GIS Users Group, Belle Plaine.

- Oct 21: At least two members of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee made presentations at the Conference on Policy Analysis that cited MetroGIS's efforts, Minneapolis
- Oct 30: Staff met with MnDOT senior managers to summarize MetroGIS's objectives, accomplishments, and participants prior to discussing the new partnership to collaborate on Linear Reference Model (LRM) project. (See I(c), St. Paul
- See I(a) - Emergency Preparedness outreach efforts.

## **V. Project Management/Administration**

- Administered Performance Measures Plan – quarterly reports to the Coordinating Committee. The Policy Board requested an annual presentation that includes recommendations to address any issues or concerns that are identified. Following a several month effort to define a quantitative method to document producer benefit as called for by the adopted Plan, the Coordinating Committee accepted a staff recommendation to modify this policy to utilize a qualitative approach.
- Obtained Metropolitan Council approval of a 2004 budget for MetroGIS at a level consistent with the proposed workplan.
- Maintained currency of information on [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. Currently this site is experiencing over 5000 visitor sessions/month, up from about 1500/month in 2001.
- Maintained currency of metadata and data accessible via [www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org) - MetroGIS's primary data distribution mechanism. Currently this site is experiencing about 1700 sessions/month, up from about 800/month 2001.
- Maintained licensing records for access to parcel (45) and street centerline data (140).
- Significant documents produced:
  - 2002 Annual Report ([www.metrogis.org/about/annual\\_reports/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual_reports/index.shtml))
  - Summary of the April Regional Existing Land Use Peer Review/Launch Forum ([http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/existing\\_land\\_use/turnaround.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/existing_land_use/turnaround.pdf))
  - Summary of the September Regional Parcel Data Users Forum (<http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/index.shtml#enhance>)
  - The sixth testimonial to the benefits of MetroGIS's efforts to stakeholders was documented. SRF Consulting was the subject. It can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/testimonials/srf.pdf>.
- Meetings supported by MetroGIS staff support team:
  - Policy Board (4)
  - Coordinating Committee (4)
  - Technical Advisory Team (2)
  - Business Information Needs - Workgroups, Data User Forums, Training, etc.:
    - ✓Emergency Preparedness Workgroup (3 workgroup meeting, plus misc. projects)
    - ✓Parcel Workgroup (Sept. Forum plus 1 workgroup meeting)
    - ✓Socioeconomic Characteristics Workgroup (6)
    - ✓Regional Existing Land Use Workgroup (April Forum plus 3 workgroup meetings)
    - ✓Highway and Roads Workgroup (4)
    - ✓County Data Producers Workgroup (5)
  - Special Events: none

# MetroGIS

## Roles and Responsibilities

### Balance Sheet

Function Performed	Custodian / Steward <sup>(1) (2)</sup> <i>Accepted Role On behalf of the Community</i>	
<b>1. General Collaboration and Coordination</b>  <i>Staffing and funding to support forums and workgroups to define common needs and collaborative solutions, perform satisfaction monitoring, foster use of endorsed best practices, fund partnership agreements, support decision-making processes, etc</i>	Metropolitan Council	
<b>2. MetroGIS DataFinder</b>  <i>Staffing and funding to support Internet-Based Tool for Search and Discovery of Commonly Needed Geospatial Data for MetroGIS community</i>	Metropolitan Council	
<b>3. Regional Data Solutions</b>  <i>Staffing and funding to develop, maintain, and document Regional Data Solutions to Priority Common Information Needs as of July 2003:</i>	<b>Primary Producer</b>	<b>Regional Producer/Aggregator</b>
<b>a. Addressable Street Centerlines</b>	The Metropolitan Council via a contract with The Lawrence Group (TLG)	Metropolitan Council
<b>b. Census Geography</b> (aligned with parcel and street centerlines) 1990 and 2000 Datasets	The Metropolitan Council via a contract with The Lawrence Group (TLG)	Metropolitan Council
<b>c. Jurisdictional Boundaries</b> (aligned with parcels and street centerlines) <i>Cities and counties</i> <i>School districts (policy pending)</i> <i>Watershed Districts (policy pending)</i>	Counties	Metropolitan Council
<b>d. Land Cover</b>	20+ diverse government, academic, and private sector entities	Mn DNR
<b>e. Parcels</b>	Counties	Metropolitan Council
<b>f. Planned Land Use</b>	Cities	Metropolitan Council
<i>(Custodial Policies Pending)</i>		
<b>Emergency Management</b> <b>Existing Land Use</b> <b>Highway and Road Networks</b> <b>Hydrology - Lakes and Wetlands</b> <b>Land Regulations</b> <b>Rights to Property</b> <b>Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas</b>		

<sup>(1)</sup> For links to the listings of specific roles and responsibilities for each endorsed regional dataset go to [www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml).

<sup>(2)</sup> Since 1997, the seven counties have agreed to share their parcel data with other government and academic entities that serve the Metro Area as a component of Data Sharing Agreements executed with the Metropolitan Council. For more information see [www.metrogis.org/about/history/sharing.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/about/history/sharing.shtml).



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Jane Harper  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** 2004 MetroGIS Budget

**DATE:** January 14, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

### **REQUEST**

The Coordinating Committee respectfully requests Policy Board approval of the 2004 MetroGIS budget allocations summarized in the attached funding balance sheet.

### **PAST ACTIONS**

October 29, 2003 The preliminary 2004 budget, which is the same as the version submitted for approval at this time, was shared with Board for comment. No modifications were requested. In a related action, the Board adopted guiding principles (attached) for the allocation of the \$50,000 line item entitled "Data Sharing Agreement and Data/Access Enhancements" (Regional GIS Projects).

December 17, 2003: The Coordinating Committee recommended that the Policy Board approve the attached 2004 budget allocations, subject to the Metropolitan Council approving funding requested. No modifications were proposed to the preliminary figures that had been shared with the Policy Board at its October 29<sup>th</sup> meeting.

December 17, 2003: The Metropolitan Council adopted its 2004 budget, which provided for the level of funding requested by MetroGIS and summarized in the attached MetroGIS funding balance sheet. (Continuation of 3 FTEs in staff support and \$86,000 in non-staff project funding.)

### **SUMMARY OF THE 2004 METROGIS BUDGET**

No changes have been made to the figures presented in the funding balance sheet or detailed budget allocation documents that were shared with the Policy Board on October 29<sup>th</sup>. The line items in the detailed budget allocation document continue to be arranged, as in the past, according to the priority functions agreed upon in 2000, as a component of the 2000-2003 Business Planning effort. The only changes to this document since the Board's last meeting involve updating some text to reflect the Board's approval of Guiding Principles for funding Regional GIS Projects that involve Data/Access Enhancements, as noted above. The formatting has also been adjusted to make the function categories easier to identify.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board approve the attached 2004 MetroGIS budget allocation document, dated December 18, 2003.

<b>MetroGIS</b>			
<b>Funding Balance Sheet</b>			
<b>Revenue Sources</b>		<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
		<b>Approved</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Metropolitan Council Resources:</b>			
	Staff ( <i>Reduced from 3.25 FTE to 3.0 FTE July 2003</i> )	\$213,000	\$200,000
	Data Maintenance Agreements and Data Quality/Access Enhancements <sup>(1)</sup>	\$50,000	\$50,000
	DataFinder Enhancements/Support	\$12,750	\$12,500
	Other Non-Staff Operating Expenses	<u>\$37,750</u>	<u>\$23,500</u>
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$313,500</b>	<b>\$286,000</b>
<b>Grant Funds:</b>			
	NSDI Web Services Grant <sup>(2)</sup> & Partnership with LMIC - DataFinder		<u>\$15,000</u>
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>
<b>Other:</b>			
	DataFinder Enhancement Partnership with LMIC (in addition to NSDI grant) - Est. Value	\$22,000	TBD
	Unused funds donated to MetroGIS from stakeholder data sales <sup>(3)</sup>		<u>\$1,000</u>
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$22,000</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$335,500</b>	<b>\$302,000</b>
<b>Notes:</b>			
	<sup>(1)</sup> Compensate producers with roles and responsibilities for regionally endorsed data/applications and support data/application enhancements of significance to the MetroGIS community.		
	<sup>(2)</sup> Grant received by MetroGIS. Received permission to transfer to LMIC, assuming GeolIntegrator enhancements accomplish the Web Mapping Service (WFS) objectives of the grant funding.		
	<sup>(3)</sup> A custodial fund was set up in 1998 at the Metropolitan Council to receive, manage and disburse donated funds. These donated funds accumulated from 1997 through 2000 from sales of TLG Street Centerline & 1997 Orthoimagery data. No additional donations are anticipated. A total of \$25,538 was received of which \$1,000 remained as of 12/31/03. These funds were used for development of DataFinder Café, in accordance with Board approval.		

### MetroGIS Detailed 2004 Budget Allocations

A	B	C	E	F	
1	(Estimates do not include staff support costs. Projects supported entirely by staff-only expenses are not included.)				
2	See the adopted work plans for all proposed activities.)				
3					
4	<i>Several explanatory Notes, by cell, are provided following the table</i>				
5	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function Category</b>	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function</b>	<b>Sub Function / Description</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Proposed
7					
8	<b>I. MISSION CRITICAL</b>				
9		<b>1. Promote and endorse voluntary policies which foster coordination of GIS among the region's organizations</b>			
10			a) Support Teams, Committees and Board		
11			i. Copying, postage, local travel, room rental, etc.		
12			ii. Supplemental staff support (outsource) strategic and business planning, business information needs activities, performance measures, and special studies.	\$15,000	\$15,000
13			b) Participant appreciation function	N/A	N/A
14			c) Outreach		
15			i. Printing - Annual Report/Promotional Brochure. Assume no other printed materials for handouts.	\$3,000	\$500
16			ii. Communications Outsourcing/Supplemental Staff Support	\$2,500	\$3,000
17			iii. Copying, postage, local travel		
18		<b>2. Facilitate data sharing agreements and licensing among MetroGIS stakeholders (assist with custodian roles and enhancements to data quality and access) and fund enhancements to regional datasets</b>			
19			a) Establish long-term partnerships with producers of data important to addressing priority common information needs (data and applications) of the MetroGIS community for the purpose of collaboratively enhancing the quality of these data and improving access to them consistent with broad stakeholder needs. (e.g., data sharing and maintenance agreements with the seven metro area counties for widespread access to parcel and related data along with the agreement with The Lawrence Group (TLG) for widespread access to street centerline data both have served as fundamental components of MetroGIS's regional solution strategy since early in the evolution of MetroGIS due to the importance of these data to the stakeholder community.) As MetroGIS's efforts expand to address a broader range of priority information needs, principles adopted by the Policy Board (October 29, 2003) will be used to decide the allocation of funds among the variety of data producers critical to sustaining regionally endorsed solutions and to finance enhancements to regionally endorsed datasets.	\$50,000	\$50,000
20		<b>3. Provide a directory of data within the regional and a mechanism for search and retrieval of GIS data. (The goal is to provide a single access point with information on how to search for sources of data.)</b>			

### MetroGIS Detailed 2004 Budget Allocations

	A	B	C	E	F
5	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function Category</b>	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function</b>	<b>Sub Function / Description</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Proposed
21			a) Project Funds to enhance DataFinder functionality ( <i>Expand geographic search capability, develop applications/scripts, etc. to enhance &amp; improve on-line access, support/outsource technical and administrative services to distribute regional datasets (may include hardware and software )</i> , etc. \$15,000 NSDI Web Mapping Service Grant funding planned in 2003 for GML enhancement via partnership with LMIC for \$37,000 project. No other use can be made of these funds. <b>Assumes a partnership beginning Fall 2003 with LMIC to host DataFinder on state system and share cost of improvements and ongoing maintenance.</b>	\$12,750	\$10,000
22			b) Contractor and software maintenance contracts & related certificates to support the Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism (DataFinder)	\$12,000	\$2,500
23		<b>4. Identify unmet GIS needs with regional significance and act on these needs</b>			
24			a) MetroGIS data users forums and Business Information Need Peer Review Forums	\$1,000	\$500
25			b) Participant satisfaction survey	\$0	\$1,000
26			c) Seed \$'s for regionally significant projects	(See I-2)	(See I-2)
27			d) Identify Second Generation Business Information Need Priorities		\$500
28		<b>5) Develop and endorse standards for GIS content, data documentation, and data management for regional data sets. (In addition to normal operating expenses covered as committee expenses ).</b>			[Refer to III 1(a)]
29			a) Negotiate agreements	(See I-2)	(See I-2)
30			b) Facilitate compliance (training sessions, sharing best practices, etc)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)
31			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$96,250</b>	<b>\$83,000</b>
32					
33	<b>II. FUNDED SUPPORT: IMPORTANT BUT NOT CRITICAL</b>				
34		<b>1. Maintain MetroGIS world wide web site (not DataFinder)</b>		\$0	\$0
35		<b>2. Promote collaborative funding of pilot projects that meet regional needs</b>		See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)
36		<b>3. Fill gaps in metadata based on identified priorities</b>			
37			a) Promote/facilitate development and maintenance of metadata & posting with DataFinder (including education forums and one-on-one contact)	\$0	\$250
38		<b>4. Maintain liaison relationships with committees/organizations with similar objectives to MetroGIS (e.g., Governor's Council on GI, county GIS user groups, MACO, NACO). See 6b for NSDI/GDA expenses.</b>			
39		<b>5. Promote forums for MetroGIS stakeholders to discuss common GIS needs and opportunities</b>			

### MetroGIS Detailed 2004 Budget Allocations

	A	B	C	E	F
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function Category	MetroGIS Coordination Function	Sub Function / Description	2003	2004
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Proposed
40			a) Workshops for managers/policy makers to prepare for upcoming legislative session, training related to endorsed regional data solutions, etc.	N/A	N/A
41			b) Assist County User Groups with special functions that promote the principles of MetroGIS	\$0	See II-5 (c)
42			c) Facilitate regionwide users groups/forums for knowledge sharing	\$2,500	\$2,000
43		<b>6. Advocate for MetroGIS needs and desires with state and federal policy makers</b>			
44			a) Pursue authorities (legislation)/policies necessary to achieve MetroGIS objectives (organizational/data access & privacy/long term financing/etc.) (Decision in 1998 to rely upon in-house legal staff/grants)		N/A
45			b) Participate in non-local Workshops/Activities		
46			i) GDA Membership Dues (authorized by Board July 11, 2001)	\$250	\$0
47			ii) NSDI / I-Team etc. related activities not paid by host.	\$1,500	\$750
48			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$4,250</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>
49					
50	<b>III. PARTNERED SUPPORT: HIGH IMPORTANCE BUT REQUIRE PARTNERING TO ACHIEVE</b>				
51		<b>1. Create and maintain datasets for MetroGIS based upon identified priorities (i.e., to address 13 priority information needs endorsed by the Policy Board 5/97 as having regional significance. (All expenses covered in I-2. See work plans for specifics)</b>			
52			a) Develop regional data sets	See Assumption	See Assumption
53			<b>Business Plan Assumption:</b> MetroGIS endorsed datasets are to be developed by stakeholder organizations with business need & in some cases TBD joint ventures		
54			b) Maintenance of Regional Datasets	See Assumption	See Assumption
55			<b>Business Plan Assumption:</b> Maintained by org/partnership with business need		
56		<b>2. Help promote development and exchange of GIS applications and procedures that serve MetroGIS needs</b>		See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)
57			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
58					
59	<b>IV. CASE BY CASE</b>				
60		<b>1. Develop master contracts for regional GIS projects, when appropriate</b>		[See I(1), I(2) & I(3)]	[See I(1), I(2) & I(3)]
61		<b>2. Endorse standards for telecommunication protocol and networks (AKA: create guidelines for getting electronic access to the information that is being shared)</b>		\$0	\$0
62		<b>3. Provide technical assistance to participants to retrieve, translate, and use data developed and maintained on behalf of MetroGIS</b>		(Staff function) See II(3) & (5)	(Staff function) See II(3) & (5)

### MetroGIS Detailed 2004 Budget Allocations

	A	B	C	E	F
5	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function Category</b>	<b>MetroGIS Coordination Function</b>	<b>Sub Function / Description</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Proposed
63		<b>4. Undertake research to meet common regional GIS needs</b>		(See I-4)	(See I-4)
64			a) Benefits of Data Sharing/Collaboration (component of outsourced activities pertaining to Performance Measures )	See I(1)(a)(ii) & I(4)	See I(1)(a)(ii) & I(4)
65			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
66					
67	<b>V. LOW PRIORITY</b>				
68		<b>1. Identify GIS training and continuing education needs and encourage participation</b>		(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)
69		<b>2. Provide a repository of GIS human resources information (centralized job posting/position descriptions)</b>		(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)
70		<b>3. Actively Market MetroGIS data and products. (Low priority ranking is a result of year 2000 survey when still in the midst of building functionality )</b>		(See I-1)	(See I-1)
71			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
72					
73		<b>ADMINISTRATIVE</b>			
74			a) GIS/Professional Development Conferences	N/A	N/A
75			b) Performance Measures Reporting	I-1a(ii)	I-1a(ii)
76			<b>SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
77					
78			<b>YEAR</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
79					
80			<b>METROPOLITAN COUNCIL</b>		
81			NON-STAFF - EXCEPT DATA/ACCESS ENHANCEMENTS	\$25,750	\$23,500
82			DATA QUALITY & ACCESS ENHANCEMENTS [I-2]	\$50,000	\$50,000
83			DATAFINDER ENHANCEMENTS/SUPPORT	<u>\$24,750</u>	<u>\$12,500</u>
84			TOTAL NON-STAFF	\$100,500	\$86,000
85			STAFF (3.0 FTE Dedicated to MetroGIS )*	<u>\$213,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>
86			<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$313,500</b>	<b>\$286,000</b>
87					
88			<b>OTHER FUNDING SOURCES</b>		
89			NSDI Web Services Grant (Total award \$18,700) - Assign to LMIC		\$15,000
90			LMIC Partnership - DataFinder Enhancement (Estimate)	\$22,000	
91			Custodial fund - Unused funds		\$1,000
92			<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$335,500</b>	<b>\$302,000</b>
93					
94			*Oct 1, 2003 salaries assumed		



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Jane Harper  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** 2004 MetroGIS Work Plan

**DATE:** January 14, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

### INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee requests the Policy Board's approval of the major program objectives it has identified for MetroGIS in 2004. A detailed 2004 work plan, to implement the proposed major program objectives, is attached for the Policy Board's information.

### PAST ACTION

October 29, 2003: The Policy Board was asked to review and comment on the attached initial draft of the one-page summary of major objectives. A draft of the detailed workplan for 2004 was also provided for the Board's information. No comments were received.

December 17, 2003: The Coordinating Committee recommended that the Policy Board approve the 2004 major objectives that were shared with the Board for comment at the October meeting.

### KEY OBJECTIVES

Major focuses proposed for 2004 include:

- Launch a new "Address Workgroup" to deal with address-related information needs that have been identified by the existing Parcels, Socioeconomic, and Existing Land Use workgroups but beyond the scope of their efforts, as well as, by an emerging major Metro 911 Board initiative.
- Make substantial progress toward comprehensive regional solutions for **seven** additional common information needs that are currently in various stages of completion: emergency preparedness, existing land use, highway and road networks, hydrology, jurisdictional boundaries (school and watershed districts) and socioeconomic characteristics of areas.
- Work in partnership with the State to enhance the functionality of DataFinder.
- Formulate a strategy for how to proceed with those priority common information needs for which an entity has not been identified, but that has a business need for facilitating a regional solution (e.g., Land Regulations and Rights to Property).

### MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS

1. The Metropolitan Council will maintain the level of funding approved in December 2003 for support of MetroGIS's core functions.
2. An agreement will soon be in place with each of the seven counties, retroactive to January 1, 2004, to maintain access to parcel data, without fee, by government and academic interests.
3. Agreed upon roles and responsibilities for support of MetroGIS endorsed regional solutions, which have been accepted by stakeholder organizations, will continue to be performed in accordance with expectations.
4. A partnership with LMIC will be in place to share the expenses and support of DataFinder.
5. Outsourced supplemental professional services (communications, performance measures, business strategies, etc.) will remain within the amounts budgeted.

### RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board approve the attached Major 2004 MetroGIS Program Objectives, subject to receiving the funding requested of the Metropolitan Council.

## **MetroGIS Mission Statement**

*(Adopted February 1996)*

“Provide an ongoing, stakeholder governed, metro-wide mechanism through which participants easily and equitably share geographically referenced data that are accurate, current, secure, of common benefit and readily usable.”

### **Major 2004 MetroGIS Program Objectives**

- Make substantive progress toward comprehensive regional solutions for the following common priority information needs and decide how to address the Land Regulation and Rights to Property Information Needs (for which an entity has not been identified with a business need to facilitate a regional solution):
  - 1) Emergency preparedness
  - 2) Existing land use
  - 3) Highways and roads
  - 4) Jurisdictional boundaries – school districts
  - 5) Jurisdictional boundaries – watershed districts
  - 6) Lakes and wetlands
  - 7) Socioeconomic characteristics of areas
- In partnership with the State of Minnesota, support MetroGIS DataFinder as part of the State’s geospatial data infrastructure and jointly pursue desired improvements important to the MetroGIS community.
- Implement strategies to achieve desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset, regional street centerline dataset, and DataFinder, including investigating access by non-profits/community groups whose functions complement government functions.
- Identify commonly needed geospatial applications appropriate for regional solutions and MetroGIS’s resources.
- Execute activities defined in the Performance Measures Plan to monitor effectiveness of MetroGIS efforts – user satisfaction with solutions and custodian conformance with expectations; document the benefits of MetroGIS’s efforts; and modify activities and policies as appropriate.
- Monitor market interest and satisfaction with the collaborative mechanism implemented in Fall 2003 by the seven metro counties to collaboratively distribute parcel data to non-government interests via a common set of procedures and a centralized method to receive data requests and implement policy and procedure modifications as appropriate.
- Continue a strong emphasis on outreach activities with MetroGIS stakeholders and related efforts beyond the Metro Area.
- Maintain currency of [www.metrogis.org](http://www.metrogis.org) website for organizational information about MetroGIS.
- Maintain currency of [www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org) website for access to over 100 GIS data files.

## MetroGIS Coordinating Committee **Purpose Statement and 2004 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 Responsibilities<sup>1</sup>

- Advise the Policy Board on matters concerning the design, implementation, and operations of MetroGIS, to include, but not be limited to: 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.

### 2004 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
<b>1. Regional Highway and Road Networks Information Need</b> <i>a) Participate with MnDOT to explore the LRM (Linear Referencing Model) project as a possible a regional solution(s) that addresses the desired data specifications identified by the community and identify custodial roles and responsibilities.</i> <i>b) Coordinate with MnDOT regarding assigning of Regional custodian roles, access policy</i>	Mike Dolbow (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator	MetroGIS Workgroup	<b>In progress</b> Aug 02 – ?  <i>(start when “a” completed)</i>

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for further information regarding general expectations and responsibilities

<p><b>2. Regional Lakes, Wetlands Information Need</b>  <i>a) Assess applicability of state standards and guidelines for lakes and streams.</i>  <i>b) Secure a lead agency to address other hydrological components of common need.</i>  <i>c) Identify a regional custodian(s), access policy - endorsement of a custodian(s) to implement roles and responsibilities defined by the workgroup.</i></p>	<p>Paul Hanson (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p><b>In progress</b> May 99 --?  <i>(postpone further work on "b" and "c" until decisions on start policy decided.)</i></p>
<p><b>3. Regional Parcel Dataset</b>  <b>Public Sector / Academic Version:</b> <i>Define next steps to accomplish priority, desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset, along with related roles and responsibilities, identified at 9/25/03 Parcel Data Forum.</i>   <b>Neighborhood Groups/Specified Non-Profits:</b> <i>Evaluate appropriateness of expanding no-fee access by these groups. (Note: a carry over from 2003 workplan and identified Fall 03 by PolicyLink as a desired action. Assumes a coordinated proposal is received from the Twin Cities' Neighborhood Group interests.</i>   <b>Private Sector Version:</b>  <i>a) Finalize license issues.</i>  <i>b) Monitor market interest and user satisfaction with the newly implemented Collaborative Mechanism to distribute parcel data to non-government interests. Recommend any desired policy changes to the Coordinating Committee Dec 04.</i></p>	<p>Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council)  Staff Coordinator and County Data Producer Workgroup  Staff Coordinator and County Data Producer Workgroup</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p><b>In progress</b> Oct 03 – Dec 04 Policy Board decision not later than July 04. County one-time programming complete Dec 04  <b>New</b> Winter 04 - ?  <b>In progress</b> Aug 02 – ??</p>
<p><b>4. Regional Existing Land Use Information Need</b>  <i>a) Reach agreement on a regional solution(s) that addresses the desired data specifications identified by the community and on appropriate roles and responsibilities</i>  <i>b) Identify regional custodian, access policy and tie to Land Regulations with decision rules for buildable/not buildable</i></p>	<p>Paul Hanson (Metropolitan Council) / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p><b>In progress</b> Jan 03 – Jun 04</p>
<p><b>5. Regional Emergency Preparedness Information Need</b>  <i>a) Identify collaborative solutions for assembly and distribution of locally-produced data, from disparate sources, important to emergency response and, to the extent practical, meet National HSIP (Homeland Security Infrastructure Protection) needs.</i>  <i>b) Define a strategy in conjunction with the Gov. Council on Geographic Information to ensure MetroGIS's efforts are coordinated with those of the Council's, including expand the workgroup through a coordinated outreach effort to include individuals with key expertise critical to implementing sustainable and effective solutions to priority common needs.</i>  <i>c) Assemble a prototype regional dataset(s) that addresses known emergency management needs and make it available for widespread use/testing.</i>  <i>d) Develop an evaluation process to identify desired enhancements to the prototype data/application and associated roles and responsibilities, including evaluation criteria and perspectives (organizational and professional) that need to be involved. (The evaluation process to be implemented about 1 year after the prototype is launched.)</i></p>	<p>Randy Knippel (<i>Dakota County</i>) / Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council)</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p><b>In progress</b> Jan 03 - ?</p>

<p><b>5. Regional Watershed District Jurisdictional Boundaries Dataset</b>  <i>a) Define data characteristics of desired regional solution and appropriate roles and responsibilities. (Completed 2003)</i>  <i>b) Identify a regional custodian, access policy &amp; coordinate with the state to the extent applicable.</i></p>	<p>Jane Harper, Washington County / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>County Workgroup (Possibility Peer Review Forum)</p>	<p><b>In progress</b> Jan 03 – Mar 04</p>
<p><b>6. Regional Socioeconomic Characteristics Of Areas Information Need (Phase II)</b>  <i>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.</i>  <i>b) Identify regional custodian(s), access policy - endorsement of a custodian(s) to implement roles and responsibilities defined by the workgroup.</i></p>	<p>Mark VanderShaff / Staff Coordinator  TBD</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p><b>New</b> Spr 04? - ??  Coordinate with Address Information Need Workgroup – Item 7</p>
<p><b>7. Address Information Need Enhancement</b>  <i>Devise a sustainable strategy to resolve the need for household and non-residential unit addresses needs that go beyond data available via parcel and street centerline datasets (apartment units, mobile home units, strip centers suites, office suites, etc.)</i>   <i>Phase I: Document the business needs (911 dispatching, addresses for mailing labels for units not in tax data, day time populations, monitor business types, small area geographic analysis, etc.), identify organizational and technical needs to accomplish collaborative solution, summarize potential benefits if a collaborative solution were implemented, identify potential partners, and undertake a cursory investigation of data sources including 3<sup>rd</sup> party options – city licensing/permitting, InfoUSA, iBlocks, etc.</i></p>	<p>Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council) &amp; Staff Coordinator (Phase I)  Leadership from Emergency Management, Existing Land Use, Parcels Socioeconomic, Workgroups, LMIC, RC User Group enterprise address project, city and county data producers, and Metro 911 GIS project w/PSAPs</p>	<p>MetroGIS Workgroup</p>	<p><b>New</b> Jan 04 - ?</p>
<p><b>8 Regional School District Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset –</b>  <i>a) Define data characteristics of desired regional solution and appropriate roles and responsibilities. (Completed 2001)</i>  <i>b) Identify a regional custodian, access policy &amp; coordinate with state to the extent applicable.</i></p>	<p>Staff Coordinator, David Arbeit (LMIC) and Jane Harper (Washington County)</p>	<p>County Workgroup</p>	<p><b>In progress</b> May 04 (Following Legislative session)</p>
<p><b>9. Data Users Forum – Regional Street Centerline Dataset Enhancements</b>  <i>Identify desired enhancements to TLG Street Centerline Dataset. Coordinate with collaborative initiative with MnDOT related to LRM development.</i></p>	<p>Mike Dolbow (Metropolitan Council – regional custodian) / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>Peer Review Forum</p>	<p><b>New</b> Jul 04-Sep04 Host in September</p>
<p><b>10. Land Regulations and Rights to Property Priority Information Needs –</b>  <i>A topic for the Fall 2004 Retreat-Item D6 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></p>	<p>Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Contractor</p>	<p>Retreat of Coordinating Committee – discuss paradigm shift that may be needed</p>	<p><b>New</b> Fall 04</p>

<p><b>11. Identify “Second Generation” Common Priority Information (Data and/or Application) Needs.</b> <i>Initiate once regional solutions are essentially complete for all 1<sup>st</sup> 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 Regulation and Rights to Property decision called for above</i></p>	<p>Staff Coordinator / Prof. Services Contractor</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>Fall 04 –? (Design only)</p>
<p><b>12. Define a strategy/procedure to consider requests for regional endorsement of dataset developed by others</b> (Sect 3.1.2 Item 6 Business Plan) <i>(Note: Postpone until a prototype opportunity presents itself to avoid a theoretical process that does not work efficiently in practice)</i></p>	<p>TBD Subject Matter Expert / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>TBD- See Note</p>

**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
<p><b>1. Collaborate with LMIC</b> to implement ways to improve cost-effectiveness of supporting their respective DataFinder and GeoIntegrator applications.</p>	<p>DataFinder and GeoIntegrator Managers</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p><b>2. Continue to promote use of standardized metadata and common tools for distribution of data</b></p>	<p>Mark Kotz (Metropolitan. Council) in conjunction with (LMIC)</p>	<p>Exists</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p><b>3. Host a DataFinder Informational Forum</b> to inform data producers of opportunities to distribute data via DataFinder and satisfy an outreach requirement of MetroGIS’s 2001 NSDI WMS Grant.</p>	<p>DataFinder and GeoIntegrator Managers / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Spring 04 (or once the contractor for LMIC’s GeoIntegrator improvements in place)</p>
<p><b>4. Evaluate user satisfaction</b>, in conjunction with LMIC, to identify desired enhancements to DataFinder Café and evaluate breadth of support for adding a projection conversion capability to the downloading wizard, which was previously identified as a desired capability by a few interests. <i>(Note: Assumes Version 2 of DataFinder Café application has been operational for at least a year by Winter 2005.)</i></p>	<p>DataFinder and GeoIntegrator Managers / Staff Coordinator</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>Fall 04 <i>Only define how – implement early 2005</i></p>

**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
<b>Identify and prioritize geospatial applications</b> that address regionally significant common information needs of local and regional government interests that are not identified as part of the Common Information Need workgroup process. <i>(Note: In 2003 – the only priority identified was a regional mailing label application. In 2004, an effort will be made to broaden the focus beyond the needs of the producer community.)</i>	Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Contractor	TBD	Fall 04 (coordinate with effort to identify 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation priority information needs)

#### 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
<b>1. Produce the 2003 Annual Report</b>	Communications Consultant	Staff	Jan 04-Mar 04
<b>2. Outreach</b> to promote awareness of regional geospatial data solutions and opportunities	Staff Coordinator	Staff	Ongoing
<b>3. Prepare MetroGIS Benefits Testimonials</b> for 1-2 Additional Stakeholders	Communications Consultant	Staff	Ongoing
<b>4. Oversee performance of adopted Performance Measure activities</b> , evaluate results of performance measurement and refine MetroGIS activities and procedures, as needed.	Staff Coordinator / Professional Services Consultant	<i>Depends on the measure</i>  <i>(i.e., for evaluation of producer satisfaction and compliance with responsibilities &amp; user satisfaction with data quality and access policies.</i>	Ongoing
<b>5. Administer tasks and activities set forth in the Business Plan</b> , not specifically identified in his workplan.	Staff Coordinator/ Professional Services Consultant	Staff	Ongoing
<b>6. Host a Special Meeting (Retreat) of the Coordinating Committee fall 2004.</b> The purpose is, through a facilitated discussion, reach agreement on desired outcomes concerning emerging needs in preparation for the 2005 Business Plan Update Project. The agenda will be a discussion item at the Coordinating Committee's March, June and Sept meetings.	Staff Coordinator/ Professional Services Consultant	Group Discussion	Jan 04 – Nov 04

#### E. Coordination with Related Initiatives

Monitor activity 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.

#### 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 needs. 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(s)** 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 increased 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



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Contacts: Kathie Doty and Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** 2003 Annual Performance Measurement Report

**DATE:** January 21, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Mtg.)

## INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee requests Policy Board acceptance of the 2003 Annual MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report (separate enclosure) and the related recommendations for follow-up actions that are explained in this report.

The period of the 2003 report is from January 1 to December 31, 2003. This second annual report on MetroGIS's organizational performance builds on the initial 2002 report that was largely descriptive and established baselines.

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Key findings in the 2003 MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report are as follows:

- **“Visits” to DataFinder (PM #1):** Measures that reflect the value of DataFinder, including the Café function, were refined to more accurately reflect traffic to these sites. Site visit activity includes discovering data through searching metadata records, reviewing data characteristics provided in the metadata, and viewing the actual data online. Combined visits to DataFinder and DataFinder Café averaged 1,184 visits per month during this reporting period. The activity varied from month to month, and staff continue to work on determining whether predictable patterns exist in the traffic to these sites. Due to the change in this measure, there is no way to compare 2003 data with those for 2002.
- **Data Downloading (PM #2):** Another significant benefit of DataFinder is that it provides a centralized location from which to obtain geospatial datasets. Data users downloaded a total of 7,696 datasets from DataFinder in 2003, compared to 5,007 in 2002, or an average of 641 per month in 2003. Eighteen percent of these downloads were through DataFinder Café, which supports subsetting and multiple data formats. This 53% increase over 2002 likely indicates increasing awareness of the value of the data and DataFinder.
- **Popular Datasets (PM #2):** The most frequently downloaded datasets in 2003 were (endorsed regional datasets are **bolded**):

Dataset	# of downloads
<b>County &amp; Municipal Boundaries</b>	460
<b>Parcels</b>	380
<b>TLG Street Centerlines</b>	312
<b>Planned Land Use</b>	253
ZIP Code Boundaries	248
Generalized Land Use 2000	227
<b>Census 2000</b>	213

The percent of downloads of endorsed datasets is increasing as a percent of the total downloads. In 2003, 27% of the downloaded data involved regionally endorsed data. This finding is not surprising, since the number of endorsed datasets has grown; by definition, the datasets are commonly needed for a variety of GIS applications; and downloading frequency is related to the frequency of updates to datasets (e.g. census data is updated only every ten years, whereas the top three downloaded datasets are updated quarterly).

- **Who is downloading data? (PM#3):** From Oct. 1, 2002 to Sept. 30, 2003 period, 77% of the download activity was by entities located in the greater Minneapolis-St Paul Area – generally an area that includes the collar counties and a few counties beyond the region. The entities with the most downloading activity are: academic institutions of higher learning, state and regional government, and local planning and engineering firms that work extensively with local government.

Dakota County, Hennepin County and the City of St. Paul are listed among the top 20 download recipients. This information was obtained from a report generated for MetroGIS by Quova, a web-tracking firm, at a cost of \$250. Although some questions remain with certain aspects of the methodology used, the Quova report represents the best information available.

- **Increasing DataFinder Publishers (PM #4, #8, and #9).** In 2002, six entities chose to join the list of DataFinder metadata and datasets publishers, but this trend slowed in 2003. Two new publishers were added in 2003, bringing the total publishers to 18 and the total number of metadata records to 161. In accordance with its policy to promote leveraging of investments within the community, MetroGIS should continue to encourage data producers to publish metadata, as well as their actual data holdings, via the DataFinder tool in an effort to continue to improve user and producer efficiencies related to discovery and distribution of geospatial data.
- **Benefits to Data Producers (PM #6 and #7):** The 2003 Performance Measurement Report does not include quantitative measurement of efficiencies gained by data producers through tools and processes developed and supported by MetroGIS. The primary reason is that quantifying this benefit is complicated due to the variety of business models used by various producers. MetroGIS should continue to seek ways to document efficiencies gained by data producers, and should add this issue to the agenda for a proposed special meeting to discuss strategic issues in fall 2004. Benefits related to leveraging existing resources for internal GIS related needs, such as Washington County’s use of the DataFinder Internet server to save significant hardware and software startup costs as well as monthly Internet Service Provider (ISP) expenses to host an ArcIMS application, should be included in these evaluations.
- **Non-quantitative Measures (PM#10):** Testimonials from data users continue to indicate a high level of satisfaction and perceived value associated with processes and tools developed through MetroGIS. MetroGIS should continue to document benefits of MetroGIS’s efforts through testimonials.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Accept the findings and conclusions presented in the 2003 MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report.
- 2) Approve these follow-up actions:
  - a) Continue outreach activities to increase awareness and understanding of tools and processes available through MetroGIS; in particular, the availability of DataFinder as a “one-stop” tool for producers to advertise and disseminate geospatial data .
  - b) Continue to investigate ways to measure efficiencies gained by data producers from MetroGIS tools and processes.
  - c) Continue to work with GIS stakeholders to assess the net benefit of the MetroGIS approach to coordination and collaboration.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### RELEVANT PAST ACTIONS

- 1) Apr. 10, 2002: The Policy Board adopted a Performance Measurement Plan ([www.metrogis.org/benefits/perf\\_measure](http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/perf_measure)) to more clearly state expected accomplishments, demonstrate accountability for results, and support continuous organizational improvement.
- 2) Jan. 29, 2003: The Policy Board asked staff to prepare an annual performance Measurement report to share with the Board along with recommendations for any suggested changes in policy or procedures to address needs identified via analysis of performance Measurement data.
- 3) Sept. 17, 2003: The Coordinating Committee recommended that the Policy Board modify Performance Measures 6 and 7, to move from quantitative to qualitative and descriptive measures due to the cost in time and effort of collecting comparative measurement data from producers. Staff reported to the Coordinating Committee that, after discussing preliminary models with the County Data Producers Workgroup, it was found that there is not strong consensus on how best to quantify staff time-savings, and further research be needed to learn more about this benefit. Due to a full agenda for the Board's October 2003 meeting, Chairperson Reinhardt decided to postpone Board consideration of this item to a subsequent meeting. A summary of the research conducted in 2003, as presented to the Coordinating Committee, is available upon request along with the findings that inadequate information is available to currently support a quantitative approach.
- 4) Dec. 17, 2003: During its discussion of the subject 2003 MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report, the Coordinating Committee concluded that further discussion is needed regarding documentation of benefits derived from MetroGIS, in particular, a need to further document the costs vs. benefits (net value). The Committee agreed that this discussion should be added to the agenda of its Special Meeting, tentatively scheduled for fall 2004, to discuss strategic issues in preparation for the 2005 Business Plan Update project.



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Socioeconomic Information Needs Workgroup - (Phase I Regional Solution)

**DATE:** January 16, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee is requesting Policy Board ratification of its proposed Phase I regional solution for the MetroGIS community's Socioeconomic Characteristics of Area Information Need.

In brief, the components of the proposed Phase I solution are as follows:

- 1) Expand MetroGIS's websites to include a web-based resources page to help users more easily discover and obtain EXISTING DATA that address identified priority common socioeconomic information needs,
- 2) Monitor progress of two new US Census programs – ACS and LED.
- 3) Facilitate minimal enhancements to three existing datasets.

The basis for these recommendations is explained in the Phase I report. Refer to the Reference Section for more information about the Phase I Report, the Phase I workgroup, and the processes it used.

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

At its December 17, 2003 meeting, the Coordinating Committee unanimously recommended that the Policy Board ratify the three Phase I actions listed in the Recommendation Section.

The Coordinating Committee also:

- a) Authorized the Phase I workgroup to reconvene, at a time it determines appropriate during 2004, to evaluate desired enhancements to the recommended web-based resources identified and monitor funding progress for the federal ACS and LED programs, as well as, bring forth a recommendation for action as appropriate.
- b) Created a Phase II workgroup and delegated to it two principal objectives related to identifying data sources for socioeconomic information needs that are not met with existing data sources:
  - (1) Explore new GIS-based solutions that can provide more current and more frequently updated socioeconomic information, more geographic detail and coverage, and more flexible cross-tabular reporting; and
  - (2) Review and recommend emerging technologies capable of better aligning socioeconomic data with GIS parcel, dwelling and land use boundary files and attributes.

## GENERAL FINDINGS

A significant portion of MetroGIS stakeholder socioeconomic information needs can be met with existing data sources, new programs being proposed by the US Census, or existing data sources with minor improvements. Notwithstanding, there remain significant gaps in many of the socioeconomic priority need areas; gaps that are manifested in out-of-date information, lack of geographic detail, lack of cross-tabulation options, and generally poor geographic alignment with primary parcel and land use boundary layers.

In an attempt to address as many as these unmet priority information needs, as practical, a Phase II Workgroup has been authorized by the Coordinating Committee and tasked with the two objectives listed in Item b of the previous section.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Policy Board ratify the following actions:

- a) Authorize, as a Phase I regional solution, implementing the prototype web-based resources page developed by the Phase I workgroup, direct staff to advertise its existence, and direct identification of a custodian and responsibilities to ensure the currency of the information presented on this site.
- b) Pursue modifications to existing datasets related to *County social service records, First Call for Help, and county birth and death records* to enhance their usability and better address priority common socioeconomic information needs identified by the MetroGIS community, and
- c) Direct the Coordinating Committee to pursue negotiations with the respective producers of the three named existing datasets to achieve the desired enhancements.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### **PURPOSE OF PHASE I WORKGROUP:**

The purpose of the Phase I workgroup was to recommend ways of meeting priority common socioeconomic information needs of the MetroGIS community using published data that are freely available – or data which could be made available with a minimum of additional effort. Specifically:

1. Clarify the socioeconomic information needs of the MetroGIS community.
2. Identify data sources that could potentially meet those information needs.
3. Propose a strategy for making those data sources available to the MetroGIS community.
4. Identify gaps between information needs and available data sources.
5. Recommend policies and actions that help fill gaps with minimal effort.
6. Refer tasks to a Phase II committee that would investigate ways more intensive efforts to fill the data gap in meeting information needs.

The group met from April to December 2003. Will Craig, member of the Coordinating Committee, chaired the Phase I workgroup. Its members comprised diverse organizational and professional backgrounds.

The workgroup's Phase I Report is attached. It can also be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/12\\_17\\_03/socio\\_craig.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/12_17_03/socio_craig.pdf). It summarizes the workgroup's tasks, membership, methods used to prioritize previously identified common socioeconomic information needs, sources of existing data that best address priority needs, and deficiencies with existing sources in addition to the identifying the next steps accepted by the Coordinating Committee and the subject of this report.

Several members of the Phase I workgroup have agreed to participate in the Phase II effort to provide continuity with the Phase I effort in terms of evaluating desired improvements to the prototype web-based resources page, securing a custodian to ensure that the resources page content is kept up to date, and understanding the work completed to date as it relates to identifying solutions for information needs that can not be adequately addressed with existing data.

Once the custodian topics related to maintenance of the web resource page are addressed, a Regional Policy Summary Statement will be proposed for Policy Board approval. The Metropolitan Council GIS Unit would support the web resources page as a component of the current MetroGIS web resources. Yet to be decided is the responsibility for maintaining the content currency. An example of a Regional Policy Summary statement is provided at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/census/policy\\_summary.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/census/policy_summary.pdf). Such a statement, which set forth agreed upon data characteristics as well as custodial responsibilities, exists for all of MetroGIS's endorsed regional data solutions.

### **PROTOTYPE WEB RESOURCES PAGE**

MetroGIS support staff developed a web-based socioeconomic resources page in conjunction with the Phase I Socioeconomic Work Group. Its purpose is to help users locate data sources that meet or exceed a broad range of common socioeconomic information needs identified by the MetroGIS community. It can be viewed at [http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic\\_resources/index.asp](http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp). A custodian to manage the site's content is yet to be identified.

This interactive webpage allows the user to search by data source or by ten major socioeconomic related data themes. The results of the initial query are presented to the user in a table format. The data sources listed in the table provide links to metadata on DataFinder that describes the characteristics of the data. The page also provides a space to add comments related any special information that should be taken in to account about a particular data source.

This webpage is currently accessible from the text that explains the Socioeconomic Information Need at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/socioeconomic\\_characteristics/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/socioeconomic_characteristics/index.shtml) and it will be linkable to upon Board ratification from the "socioeconomic characteristics of areas" listing in the matrix at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml>. The data source listings are also integrated with the metadata listings posted on MetroGIS DataFinder at <http://www.datafinder.org/catalog.asp>.

Finally, the users are encouraged to provide feedback about how well this resource works to help them readily find the data they need. A link from the home page takes the user to an online survey form. Once this resources page is operational for a few months, the Phase I Workgroup has proposed to reconvene to evaluate any desired modifications to improve the functionality and quality of the site.

## Report of the Socioeconomic Information Needs Workgroup (Phase I)

**Purpose:** The purpose of the group was to find ways of meeting the socioeconomic information needs of the MetroGIS community using published data that is freely available – or data which could be made available with a minimum of additional effort.

**Tasks:** To fulfill its purpose, the committee undertook a variety of tasks. These are documented in this report and in the accompanying spreadsheet.

1. Clarify the socioeconomic information needs of the MetroGIS community
2. Identify data sources that could potentially meet those information needs
3. Propose a strategy for making those data sources available to the MetroGIS community
4. Identify gaps between information needs and available data sources.
5. Recommend policies and actions that help fill gaps with minimal effort.
6. Refer tasks to a Phase II committee that would investigate ways more intensive efforts to fill the data gap in meeting information needs.

**Membership:** The following people served on the Workgroup

Will Craig, UofM, chair	Mary Karcz, Ramsey County
Heather Britt, Urban Coalition	Sandra Paddock, Wilder Research Center
Paul Buschmann, Hennepin County	Barbara Ronningen, State Demographic Center
Dick Carlstrom, TIES	Heidi Welsch, Dakota County
John Carpenter, Excensus LLC	Mark VanderSchaaf, City of St. Paul
Amy Fisher, MN Dept. of Employment and Economic Development	Tim Zimmerman, Hennepin County
Kathy Johnson, Metropolitan Council	

### 1. Socioeconomic Information Needs:

The committee reviewed some 182 statements about information needs made at the original Needs Forum held by MetroGIS in 1996. We studied the list, rated the priority of each need, and summarized them into six major areas listed below, not all usually associated with socioeconomic interests. We also discussed the characteristics one would like these data to have:

In general, the workgroup felt the information needs could be characterized as follows:

**Sub-city scale.** Sometimes to the block level, but most often at the tract or neighborhood level (equivalents would be school attendance area or Traffic Assignment Zone – TAZ). Service centers should be known to the site/address.

**Annual updates.**

**Ten year time series.**

The details of desired data items and characteristics are documented in the accompanying spreadsheet. That spreadsheet also documents the votes of individual committee members to see variation of individual specifications and possibly the needs of the sectors they represent. What follows is a summary of that information.

Demographic Information for daytime (work/school) and nighttime (residence) populations.

Some of these measures are only appropriate for home-based information.

- |                    |                         |                    |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| - number of people | - age                   | - day care needs   |
| - population       | - education             | - births/deaths    |
| - projections      | - school performance    | - disease/injuries |
| - density          | - disability            | - retirement plans |
| - race/ethnicity   | - hhld. characteristics |                    |
| - new immigrants   | - migration patterns    |                    |

**Phase I Workgroup Report**  
**12/10/03**

Economic Information for daytime and nighttime populations; some measures more appropriate for home-based information.

- income
- poverty
- # employed
- employment status
- occupation
- industry
- sales / revenues
- wage distribution
- # entry level jobs
- jobs forecast
- health insurance
- other benefits
- use of public services
- undocumented workers

Housing Information

- number of units
- density
- # bedrooms
- age
- cost
- affordability
- turnover rate

Transportation Information related to home/work trips.

- commute mode
- work/home locations
- transit needs

Facilities Information. Location of institutions and services.

- schools
- social services
- government services
- business type

Crime Information. Numerous requests (e.g. location of people on probation), but the committee focused on one.

- type by location

**2. Data Sources:**

The committee identified the following data sources as potential vehicles to meet the information needs. Each has specifications for mapping resolution, frequency of reporting, and time series that has implications for value to the MetroGIS community.

- a. **Existing Census Bureau Programs.** The Census has a variety of programs that could meet the information needs.
  - i. Decennial Census (Census of Population and Housing). Taken every 10 years since 1790. Minimum mapping resolution is the city block for (100%) count data, groups of blocks for sample social and economic data.
  - ii. Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP). Spin-off from decennial Census, providing additional data about place of employment. Data reported for TAZ – Travel Assignment Zone.
  - iii. Economic Census. Taken every 5 years since 1972 by industry. Minimum mapping resolution is zip code. Data on jobs, payroll, sales, etc. The related County Business Patterns provides annual data down to a zip code level for establishments, employment and payroll by NAICS.
  - iv. Current Population Survey. Provides many state level measures, including annual estimates of the percent of people without health insurance.
- b. **Proposed Census Programs.** These two programs re-engineer the Census programs. Both have received extensive review and will probably be part of the Bush Administration's proposed budget.
  - i. American Community Survey (ACS). Would replace sample questions on decennial census and be conducted continuously. Data for larger places (65,000+) would be published annually; smaller places would present 3-5 years averages. Census tract data would be available annually, but reporting a 5-year rolling average.

- ii. Local Employment Dynamics (LED). Combines confidential state and federal administrative records with Census survey data to yield current data on jobs, new hires, earnings, age, gender, etc. Will yield quarterly indicators by county. Annual reports of work/home locations will available at the block level to assist transportation planners. (*formerly called LEHD*)
- c. **State/Regional Agency Reports.**
  - i. Department of Employment and Economic Security (DEED). Annual employment and wage data since 1980 by industry at the county level, plus all cities with sufficient numbers of employers to avoid disclosure; this includes most cities in the metropolitan area. Occupational data available from survey, but with planning regions as the minimum mapping unit. Detailed wage data, including new hires, useful only the state level.
  - ii. Department of Education. Publishes annual summary data for all districts and schools in the state, most since 1988. Includes enrollment; grade, gender, racial, and language characteristics, test scores, graduation rate, dropout rate.
  - iii. Travel Behavior Inventory. Joint effort of MnDOT and the Metropolitan Council. Survey conducted about all local trips at roughly 10-year interval to assist with travel forecasting. No sub-regional data.
  - iv. Revenue Department, Sales and Use Tax Statistics. City-level data is available online, reporting industry-specific sales and taxes. Data available by zip code area as a special run.
  - v. Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Department of Public Safety. Criminal Justice Information System. Summary data on crimes reported by local law enforcement agencies – typically city level – though with county sheriffs completing the picture.
  - vi. Health Department. Annual data on births, deaths, disease and injuries by most cities (>2500). The department also provides periodic county-level health insurance estimates.
  - vii. Metropolitan Council. Forecasts of four factors to 2030 at the TAZ level: population, households, employment, and retail employment. Work done in cooperation with municipalities.
- d. **Other Potential Sources**
  - i. County social service records. Counties collect data on the nature and location of families participating in MFIP, food stamps, etc. This data could be geocoded and published by summary area, provided care was taken to protect confidentiality.
  - ii. County parcel records. This data is already made available through MetroGIS. Tax classification of parcels, if added, could provide a general level of land-use identification. Sales prices of parcels is one of the attributes provided, but this information is not available for all counties.
  - iii. Social service locations. A few clearinghouses can provide information about the location of particular services; e.g., Hungry Solutions maintains a list of all food shelves. The United Way's *First Call for Help* program covers a broader range of services, but their data is not ready for use by GIS.

### **3. Strategy for Accessing Data**

Data and documentation mostly exist on departmental websites. Rather than copy and publish this information on DataFinder, MetroGIS should simply direct users to those websites.

**Phase I Workgroup Report**  
**12/10/03**

The following existing sources of data are recommended to meet the information needs of the MetroGIS community. The datasets at these sources may not adequately meet those needs (see below), but they are the best available. Data sources listed above are not included if the geographic level does not go below the county level.

Decennial Census ([www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov))

CTPP (<http://transportation.org/ctpp/home/default.htm>)

Economic Census (<http://www.census.gov/epcd/www/econ97.html>) and County Business Patterns (<http://www.census.gov/epcd/cbp/view/cbpview.html>)

DEED (<http://www.mnwfc.org/lmi/lmi4.htm>)

Department of Revenue

[http://www.taxes.state.mn.us/taxes/legal\\_policy/research\\_reports/content/sales\\_use\\_reports.shtml](http://www.taxes.state.mn.us/taxes/legal_policy/research_reports/content/sales_use_reports.shtml))

Department of Education ([www.education.state.mn.us/html/intro\\_data\\_center.htm](http://www.education.state.mn.us/html/intro_data_center.htm))

Department of Health (<http://www.health.state.mn.us/stats.html>)

Bureau of Criminal Apprehension

([www.dps.state.mn.us/bca/CJIS/Documents/Crime2002/Page-24.html](http://www.dps.state.mn.us/bca/CJIS/Documents/Crime2002/Page-24.html), Machine readable data available from <http://www.mnplan.state.mn.us/cj/offense.html>)

Metropolitan Council (<http://www.metrocouncil.org/resources/resources.htm>)

Three strategies exist for accessing existing data region-wide that is not provided on a departmental website. Sometimes that data is provided in PDF or other formats that:

- Refer people to the appropriate departmental contact person. Requests can be filled as needed. If those requests become frequent, the department may decide to publish their data in a more accessible form.
- Discuss in a MetroGIS user forum. If need is sufficiently high, MetroGIS may invest resources to bring help publish the data.
- Some needed data is available locally, but not regionally. For example, the Minneapolis Police Department has crime data at the block level; school districts have data on enrollment projections. Referring people to local sources may be useful if their area of interest is restricted to a portion of the metro area.

Based upon direction received in previous discussions with workgroup, MetroGIS staff have prototyped a new resources webpage at ([http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic\\_resources/index.asp](http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp)) to assist users find socioeconomic data that are priorities for the MetroGIS community. An umbrella metadata record has also been prototyped to post on MetroGIS DataFinder (<http://www.datafinder.org/xxx>). It will point to the new resources page. The user will be able to search by the six topical data themes listed in Item 1, above, and by data source. The characteristics documented the workgroup for each priority data element (map resolution, time series, and time frequency) will be provided as will links/contacts to obtain the data. Once accepted by the Workgroup and Coordinating Committee, these web resources will be advertised and integrated with the other priority information need solutions located at [www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/socioeconomic\\_characteristics/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/socioeconomic_characteristics/index.shtml).

#### **4. Filling Gaps in the Data.**

Information needs were compared to potential data sources. The accompanying spreadsheet is the basis for the gap analysis. Many information needs can be met with an existing or proposed data source, but the characteristics of those sources are not always ideal. Some of those deficiencies are documented; others may be less obvious, e.g. reported categories or geographic may not meet the needs of specific users. Suggestions are made for filling some of the gaps in each of the information need areas. Some additional gaps could be filled by expending additional

**Phase I Workgroup Report**  
**12/10/03**

resources; such issues will be addressed in phase II (see section 6 below). A few of the information needs cannot be filled with known any known data sources.

Demographic Information

Adequate Decennial Census and the related CTTTP provide a broad range of demographic information that covers a very long time series – down to block and tract level. School data provides current information on race, home language, and economic status for individual schools and districts. Sub-city population and household forecasts are available from the Metropolitan Council.

Deficient Census data is updated only once per decade. School data is restricted to children in school and geography of reporting units does not meets of others. Also missing is school data that may be held by individual districts, but which is not available across the region: projected enrollment and college matriculation.

Potential for Filling Gaps ACS and LED could provide more current data at the sub-city level. Even then, current block level data will be missing for issues the committee feels are important: number of people, density, race/ethnicity, and age.

Economic Information

Adequate Census and DEED data fill part of this need. School data on free and reduced lunch provides a current surrogate for small area poverty rates.

Deficient Reporting frequency of Census of Population is once per decade. Economic Census are more frequent, but only to ZIP code level. DEED data is available at city and county level, nothing finer. School data is useful only for estimating poverty of families with young children in the public schools.

Potential for Filling Gaps ACS and LED could be solutions here. Critical current block level data would be missing for the following items: poverty, number of workers. Also missing are indicators of the use of public services – which could be provided if county social service records could be summarized and published region-wide.

Housing Information

Adequate The decennial Census has much good housing data. The group felt the “affordable housing” information need should focus on rental property affordable to very low-income households; e.g., rents of that cost no more than \$250/month, thereby consuming less than 30% of the income of households with incomes of \$10,000. Rent (and income) data to meet this need is available in the Census. The Metro Regional Parcel data provides much current data on value, plus recent sales prices in many counties.

Deficient Rent information is reported too infrequently and not for areas as small as blocks. Sale prices missing from some counties.

Potential for Filling Gaps ACS could provide more current rent data, but not at the block level.

Land Use Information

Adequate Metro regional parcel files identify homesteaded residential property. Ramsey County has CAMA codes. Very general use information is available from the Metropolitan Council.

Deficient No good information about what types of businesses exist at a given location; e.g. a hardware store.

**Phase I Workgroup Report**  
**12/10/03**

Potential for Filling Gaps A MetroGIS workgroup (e.g. Existing Land Use) should be directed to insure this information need is adequately addressed.

Transportation Information

Adequate Census and CTPP fill most needs.

Deficient These resources are available only once per decade.

Potential for Filling Gaps LED would fill many needs.

Facilities Information

Adequate Information about specific issues are often maintained by an umbrella organization; e.g. food shelf information by Hungry Solutions. School building locations are documented by the Department of Education and converted to GIS files by LMIC.

Deficient Scattered sources. Data not ready for use in a GIS.

Potential for Filling Gaps The United Way's *First Call for Help* could fill much of this void. Private and charter school building location data is not current and complete.

Crime Information

Adequate Criminal Justice Information System data from the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension will meet most information needs at the municipal level

Deficient Sub-city is not available centrally.

Potential for Filling Gaps Local police have sub-city information, sometimes already summarized to blocks and neighborhoods; the city of Minneapolis, for example, has monthly crime statistics by neighborhood on its CODFOR website. No organization is collecting sub-city data across the region.

No Known Data Solution

- undocumented workers
- wealth
- retirement plans
- travel routes

5. **Recommended Policies and Actions.** These policies and actions are meant to complete the work of Phase I of the Socioeconomic Workgroup, the phase focused on identifying published, or easily accessible, free or low cost government data – and developing strategies for making that data accessible to the MetroGIS community.

a. Promote and facilitate access to existing sources of socioeconomic data.

Details are presented in section 3 above.

b. Investigate ways to improve existing data with minimal additional work.

Many existing datasets seem to require minimal work to make them available and useful to the MetroGIS community. Members of the Phase I workgroup are talking with local data custodians to determine whether that work is possible:

- i. *County social service records.* Might the counties or the state Department of Human Services be willing to geocode, summarize, and publish data at some sub-city level? Disclosure rules will need to be developed to protect privacy. Counties often get requests for this information and publishing a core set would reduce staff time devoted to meeting these requests.
- ii. *First Call for Help.* Is there any interest at the United Way in geocoding and mapping the location of service providers? Such a service, if provided on-

**Phase I Workgroup Report**  
**12/10/03**

line would meet the needs of their constituents as well as those of the MetroGIS Community.

iii. *Births and Deaths*. Data could be reported at the neighborhood or tract level by the Department of Health. Effort and benefits need to be determined.

c. Monitor and evaluate the proposed solutions.

The resources webpage should provide a means for people to comment and make recommendations for improvement. Members of the Phase I workgroup have agreed to reconvene in 2004 to evaluate suggested modifications to the resources. Possibly a user forum could provide another mechanism for determining the suitability of the proposed solution.

d. Support the development of ACS and LED.

Members of the Phase I workgroup have agreed to monitor the progress of new programs under development at the US Census Bureau: the American Community Survey (ACS) and the Local Employment Dynamics (LED) program. These programs fill critical gaps in the data available to meet the socioeconomic information needs of the MetroGIS community. It is possible that the workgroup may recommend that MetroGIS and its stakeholders be asked go on record as supporting the two new programs. Much will depend on whether the programs receive support from the Bush Administration and the initial response to them by members of Congress.

**6. Items referred to the Phase 2 Workgroup**

The Phase I Workgroup looked for publicly available data sets that were already published or could be published with little additional effort. While several sources were identified, the workgroup concluded that significant gaps still remain in many of the socioeconomic priority need areas; gaps that are manifested in out-of-date information, lack of geographic detail, lack of cross-tabulation options, and generally poor geographic alignment with primary parcel and land use boundary layers.

The Phase II Socioeconomic Information Needs Workgroup should have two principal objectives: 1) explore new GIS-based solutions that can provide more current and more frequently updated socioeconomic information, more geographic detail and coverage, and more flexible cross-tabular reporting; and 2) review and recommend emerging technologies capable of better aligning socioeconomic data with GIS parcel, dwelling and land use boundary files and attributes.

Since Phase II solutions will involve supporting new technologies or purchasing new databases, the Phase II Workgroup will look at the cost-effectiveness of these options in meeting the needs of the MetroGIS communities. In some cases, this may mean researching technical options for streamlining the use or implementation of the database or technology. In other cases, it may mean developing an implementation strategy phased in over time.

a. New technologies

Included among the data solutions to be examined in Phase II will be a technology developed and already implemented across much of the Twin Cities by Excensus LLC, a Twin Cities geo-demographic services firm. Excensus' approach involves the development of small-area demographic profiles derived by combining a variety of administrative data sources from local and state government. The Excensus model groups residential and employer profiles in small clusters based on parcel and land

**Phase I Workgroup Report**  
**12/10/03**

use geographies. The resulting profiles align precisely with parcel and land use base layers.

b. New summary databases

Options to be explored include the development of new summary data from local government. For example, police, municipal government, and school districts have neighborhood-level data that they do not report to the state, but which could be gathered and published to meet MetroGIS user needs. The Workgroup may also need to look at opportunities to free up non-confidential summary data contained in otherwise restricted data sets.

c. Other commercially available solutions

Examples of commercially available options include estimates of demographic and economic data from Claritas or commercial establishment data from Dun & Bradstreet. Local options could include working with local realtors to provide enhanced access to real estate sales data.

Several members of the Phase I Socioeconomic Workgroup will remain on to provide continuity to the Phase II Workgroup. At completion of Phase II, a report will be prepared outlining opportunities to develop or enhance access to priority GIS-based socioeconomic data sets. Recommendations will be provided for better aligning these new data solutions with other current and emerging MetroGIS databases to support integrated planning and policy making across a range of governmental and community need areas including: community growth planning, housing and economic development planning, health and human service program design and development, emergency management capacity planning, crime analysis, E-911 dispatching, housing and economic development, school enrollment planning, and many others.



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Next Generation Data Sharing Agreements – Status Update

**DATE:** January 13, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

Chairperson Reinhardt has requested a status report from each county at the Board's January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting as to where they are in the process of approving the proposed Next Generation GIS Data Sharing Agreement.

The main purpose for this agreement is to authorize the Metropolitan Council to continue to assemble parcel data produced by each county and redistribute it via DataFinder as components of the Regional Parcel Dataset.

The previous agreement expired December 31, 2003 and at Chairperson Reinhardt's suggestion, temporary extensions have been received from each of the seven counties. These extensions permit the Regional Parcel Dataset to continue to be available via DataFinder until the new agreement is in place. Deployment of the proposed Regional Mailing Label Application (Agenda Item 6D) will be delayed until the new agreement is in place.

## BACKGROUND

The proposed Next Generation GIS Data Sharing Agreement was forwarded to each of the seven counties on November 26<sup>th</sup> for approval. Chairperson Reinhardt led the negotiations regarding the financial aspects, on behalf of the counties. The specifics will be shared once each of the parties approves the agreement. In general, major changes from the previous agreements include:

- a) The term has been extended from 2 to 5 years, retroactive to January 1, 2004. (*Note: temporary time extensions have been granted by each county to allow the regional parcel dataset to continue to be assembled and distributed until the new agreement is in place.*)
- b) The counties will receive a fixed amount to compensate them for the 1st time for custodial roles and responsibilities related to support of regional data solutions.
- c) After 2004, data enhancement/regional GIS projects, that would involve counties, would be financed through separate agreements specific to that project in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the Policy Board on October 29<sup>th</sup>. (Attached)
- d) A single licensing process for all seven counties. (*Currently, two licenses are required.*)

## DISCUSSION

As of this writing, staff is unaware of any concerns with any aspects of the agreement other than the license concerning access and use of parcel data. Concerns with various aspects of this license document have been raised by Hennepin County and negotiations are in progress to resolve them. The main objective for the proposed license is to greatly simplify the current licensure process. It would eliminate the need for the producer to sign the document and permit the user to access a portion of or the entire regional parcel dataset, which is composed of parcel data produced by each of the seven metro area counties, through use of a single license document and via a single point of contact.

Once each of the respective county boards has approved the agreement, it will be forwarded to the Metropolitan Council for approval. Council committee consideration is tentatively scheduled for February 17, depending on the results of this status update. At this point, the intention is to make the agreement retroactive to January 1, 2004.

## RECOMMENDATION

No action requested



**TO:** Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Major Activity Update

**DATE:** January 13, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

**A) PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEEDS** (See <http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml> for complete information about the status of solutions for each of MetroGIS's common information needs.)

**(1) Address Workgroup**

A major new initiative proposed for 2004 involves defining a regional solution for capturing addresses (all residential and non-residents unit/suites) in a common manner and streamlining management of these data to eliminate duplication of effort, improve the quality, and improve sharing of the data. The Metro 911 Board will be a major participant in this initiative, along with leading edge work of the Ramsey County GIS User Group, which is investigating the possibility of a county-wide enterprise database that would be remotely populated as addresses are assigned by various local government authorities. An article related to this effort can be viewed at <http://www.mngislis.org/newsletter/issue35/MetroGIS.htm>.

**(2) Emergency Preparedness Workgroup**

Three subgroups are currently addressing the following topic areas:

GIS Outreach Group -

- Finalize a GIS Skills Resource Database in MSAccess and Web enable
- Study and accrue information on Mutual Aide Support
- Study and accrue information of Speaker and Authoring resources

Emergency Management Outreach Group -

- Study and accrue information on future EM Events (Gov. Conf in March, MG Rotary Club, Simulations, etc)
- Determine Who/What organizations/Info we need to partner with.
- Study and accrue information on Funding.
- Continue outreach efforts via the GIS/LIS conference and establishment of contacts within the Emergency Management community.

Data Group -

- Implement, as soon as possible, a prototype ArcIMS website that would run on the DataFinder web server to improve access to data needed by the emergency management community in a readily mapable format. (See the attached letter, dated Jan 12<sup>th</sup>, authorizing use of the DataFinder server.)
- Identify data sources and requirements.
- Identify by whom, how and when data will be compiled for the EM Group.

Randy Knippel, Dakota County's GIS Manager, and Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council's GIS Manager, are co-chairing this workgroup.

**(3) Existing Land Use Workgroup:**

The workgroup last met on December 10<sup>th</sup> to discuss the results of a series of pilot projects to determine a data model will work best for MetroGIS. The group decided that the APA's Land-Based Classification Standard was a better fit than pursuing enhancement of the MetroGIS Planned Land Use coding scheme or a "Built Environment" database. Current workgroup members represent city, county, school district, watershed district, metropolitan, and state interests. This workgroup is being facilitated by Paul Hanson with the Metropolitan Council GIS staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities. A recommendation to the Coordinating Committee is anticipated at either the March or June 2004 meeting.

(4) **Highway and Road Networks**

The Highways and Road Networks Technical Workgroup met on December 2nd to discuss workflows for updating and enhancing MnDOT's Location Data Manager (LDM). From this discussion, several questions for MnDOT emerged, which have since been sent to MnDOT for review. A core set of attributes was given preliminary approval, along with some common definitions for a model of street segmentation and attribution. The next step will be to work with MnDOT on answering the questions that arose from this meeting, and finding common ground for the segmentation and attribution model.

In May 2004, the Technical Workgroup will initiate a Pilot Project for one community in the metropolitan area. For this pilot, TLG street centerlines will be synchronized with the LDM using the models and processes given preliminary approval this spring. Under current plans, TLG will use the pilot project to determine the cost-effectiveness of synchronizing its entire dataset with the LDM.

Information about previous aspects of the project, including agreed upon goals, expectations, and participant roles can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/highway\\_roads/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/highway_roads/index.shtml). An article about this effort can also be viewed at <http://www.mngisllis.org/newsletter/issue35/MetroGIS.htm>.

(5) **Lakes, Wetlands, etc.:**

No activity has occurred since direction was received from the Coordinating Committee at its September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding this information need. At that time, the Committee authorized creation of a workgroup to assess the applicability of currently proposed state-level standards by the Hydrology Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information for potential MetroGIS solutions. The person staffing this effort, Paul Hanson, is also the lead staff for the Existing Land Use Information Need. Once that effort is essentially complete, work on this information need will again gear up. This group will be responsible to develop strategies to accommodate any desired modifications and assure that any changes will integrate with State data. In September, the Coordinating Committee also authorized separating the substance of the hydrologic information need into 4 to 5 sub-components that can be provided to users in a more timely and efficient manner than is currently in place.

(6) **Regional Parcel Dataset Enhancements**

A Regional Parcel Data Users Forum was held on September 25<sup>th</sup>. The purpose was to engage a group of individuals who use the regional parcel dataset and who are representative of the broad community to identify desired enhancements to the dataset. The forum summary is posted at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/0903\\_forum.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/0903_forum.pdf). A number of desired enhancements to this dataset were identified and ranked in order of highest priority. A workgroup is evaluating the practicality of pursuing each of the identified enhancements and the resources that would be necessary to accomplish them. The workgroup's recommendation is tentatively scheduled to be presented to the Coordinating Committee in March 2004. Funding associated with the pending next generation data sharing agreements (See Agenda Item 5e) with the seven metro area counties would be used to accomplish the selected enhancements.

(7) **Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas:**

*(See Agenda Item 5d).*

**(B) ENHANCEMENTS TO DATAFINDER CAFÉ / MN GEOINTEGRATOR PROJECT**

The MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC) has been working with MetroGIS staff to develop GeoIntegrator, a statewide web service similar to the MetroGIS DataFinder Café, including new functional features that also would support an enhanced Café. Most of the project's funding was received from a state Technology Enterprise Board grant. A small portion of a National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NDSI) Web Mapping Services grant received by MetroGIS in 2001 has been set aside for this collaborative effort. Work on the project was suspended in October, when LMIC's contractor, Syncline, which also developed Café, declared bankruptcy. LMIC is currently negotiating a settlement that will result in completion of the project by a third party in early 2004. No MetroGIS funds will be spent if an acceptable settlement cannot be reached.

**(C) COLLABORATIVE PARCEL DATA DISTRIBUTION STRATEGY - NON-GOVERNMENT ACCESS**

The County Data Producer Workgroup (of the Coordinating Committee) suspended its work last fall on this project until the Hennepin County Attorney completes their review of the proposed license. The Hennepin County Attorney suspended work on this license last fall to turn their attention to the more pressing review of the proposed modifications to the public sector version that is part of the proposed Next Generation GIS Data Sharing License (see Agenda Item 5e). Once the public sector version is in place, the objective will be to begin work on implementing a single license that would be used for both government and non-government access.

Prior to suspending its work, the group had made substantial progress to reach agreement among all counties on a collaborative solution to distribute the same parcel data (currently parcel boundaries plus 25 normalized attributes) to non-government interests that is currently being distributed to government interests.

- A website to support streamlined, one-stop orders was built by the Metropolitan Council staff who support MetroGIS and is ready for operation once the licensing and fee policies are finalized.
- Agreement was reached by the workgroup on a prototype common fee schedule, led by Dakota County's GIS Coordinator, and has subsequently been implemented by all counties, except Ramsey County, which is in the process of doing so. The revised fee schedule incorporates significant price reductions from the previous \$0.05/parcel to as low as \$0.01/parcel through volume purchases. It also accommodates subsetting of the regional dataset.
- A prototype streamlined common license document that would provide access to parcel data from all seven counties has been accepted by each of the counties, except Hennepin County, as noted above. The document is significantly shorter than previous versions and incorporates the concept of shrink-wrapped execution to greatly expedite and simplify the process. This prototype is intended to be a starting place to merging the public and non-public versions. Before it can be used by public organizations, modifications to the indemnification, an possibility other sections, will need to be agreed upon.

**(D) REGIONAL MAILING LABEL APPLICATION**

Alison Slaats, MetroGIS DataFinder Manager, is in the final stages of developing a prototype regional mailing label application that will run on top of the regional parcel dataset. The regional prototype is based upon an application initially developed by Carver County. Access to the application via the Internet will be limited to organizations that have current licenses to access the underlying parcel data. Dave Drealan, Carver County Planning Director, chairs this Workgroup. The goal is to go live with the application as soon as the Next Generation Data Sharing Agreement is in place.

**(E) INVESTIGATION OF DATA SHARING WITH UTILITIES EXPLORED**

A sample of the regional parcel dataset was delivered in early November to representatives of Xcel Energy, CenterPoint Energy Minnegasco, and the Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative. If they agree there is merit in continuing discussion, the County Data Producer Workgroup will oversee an investigation of uses that local government might make of infrastructure data maintained by the utilities. If the conclusion is that an exchange of data would be of mutual benefit, a policy change will be pursued to allow utilities to access county produced parcel data, without fee, in return for sharing their utility facility locations aligned with the county-produced parcel data.

January 12, 2004

MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup  
c/o Randy Knippel  
Dakota County  
14955 Galaxie Avenue West  
Apple Valley, MN 55124

**Re: Use of MetroGIS Internet server to Host GIS Emergency Preparedness Test Site.**

Dear Mr. Knippel:

The Metropolitan Council is pleased with the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness (EP) Workgroup's development of a prototype EP Internet application to serve the seven-county metro area and, hereby, grants the Workgroup's request to run this application from the server used to support MetroGIS DataFinder. This approval is granted in accordance with the Metropolitan Council's role as primary sponsor of MetroGIS and MetroGIS's policies encouraging sharing of GIS-related resources and exploring efficient and effective ways to distribute data and applications through leveraging of related investments.

I understand that the purpose of this application is to present critical information that is in a uniform structure across the Metro Area and that aligns with other regionally-endorsed data from Emergency Preparedness professionals outside the GIS domain. In addition, I understand that the initial installation of the application will be a proof of concept, with the ultimate goal to evaluate and refine it so that its update and maintenance requirements can be integrated into the standard procedures for supporting the MetroGIS DataFinder site.

The Council will not impose a fee for this service but expects the EP Workgroup to abide by the following understandings:

1. The MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup test site may be hosted on the DataFinder server hardware as long as the server capacity and bandwidth are not negatively affected beyond acceptable levels.
2. Limited technical support will be provided during normal business hours (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday – Friday).
3. Programs and data will be loaded by Council staff. The application and all its elements (including data, AXL files, HTML and other web files, etc), as well as relevant documentation will be provided to the Metropolitan Council. The Council staff will maintain a document describing details on this application including installation procedures followed.
4. The application will use MetroGIS DataFinder datasets wherever possible and appropriate to reduce data redundancy on the MetroGIS server, and to ensure the use of the most recent data.
5. After the application has been running for 6 to 9 months, the Workgroup will co-host a forum with MetroGIS to evaluate the EP application. The forum is intended to identify desired enhancements to the underlying data and application functionality. The forum is to be attended by emergency

management content experts familiar with the application and representing all seven counties together with other individuals important to sustaining an effective solution.

6. In accordance with MetroGIS procedures for pilot projects, the Workgroup will prepare and present a written report to the Coordinating Committee, not later than the Committee's December 2004 meeting. Through this report, the EP Workgroup will document what was learned through this proof of concept effort and put forth recommendations for next steps, including but not limited to roles and responsibilities for maintenance of the website's functionality as well as currency of information content. This documentation will be posted on the MetroGIS general information website, as well as, used by the Workgroup for outreach with the EP community.
7. This arrangement will remain in effect until December 31, 2004 or until such time as the Council or the Emergency Preparedness Team terminates it, whichever comes first. Termination must be preceded by 60 (sixty) days written notice.
8. Security issues concerning access to licensed and/or "sensitive" data will be addressed as needed by Council staff with the assistance of the EP team and Dakota county staff. Requirements of the appropriate licensing agreements for licensed data used by the application will be followed. In addition, it is anticipated that evaluation of security will be part of the ongoing evaluation process and may be modified over time if necessary.
9. Dakota's and other counties' EP GIS experiences and developments and the state's "all hazard" data matrix will be utilized as a guide to help identify critical EP information needs and best known sources of reliable data to address each need.
10. To the extent permitted by applicable law, members of the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, users of the application, and the Council agree they are responsible for their own acts and omissions arising from the provision or use of the referenced EP application. The parties understand that no warranties implied or expressed are made with respect to the availability and functionality of the site.

In the event that any issues or concerns arise, it is the Council's understanding that you are the primary contact. If you have any issues or concerns, please contact Alison Slaats, MetroGIS DataFinder Manager at 651-601-1561 or at [alison.slaats@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:alison.slaats@metc.state.mn.us).

Respectfully,

Rick Gelbmann  
GIS Manager, Metropolitan Council

cc:  
MetroGIS Policy Board  
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Keith Anderson, LOGIS  
Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator  
Alison Slaats, MetroGIS DataFinder Manager  
Todd Lusk, Dakota County  
Dave Brandt, Washington County  
Carla Coates, Ramsey County



**TO:** Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Information Sharing

**DATE:** January 12, 2004  
(For the Jan 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

**a) Professional Services Contracts – Communications and Business Planning**

- Jeanne Landkamer, a self-employed journalist, has been selected to assist MetroGIS with its communications projects in 2004, possibly through 2008. Ms. Landkamer has assisted MetroGIS in this capacity for the past three years.
- Three proposals were received in response to Request For Proposals that was published in September concerning professional services related to business and policy planning, performance measures reporting, and several special projects. As of this writing, a contract has been offered to one of the bidders.

Each of the selected proposals is consistent with the 2004 budget shared with the Policy Board at its October 2003 meeting and meets or exceeds all expectations, as outlined in the related request for proposals. MetroGIS has outsourced these and related professional services since 1998.

**b) Gopher State One Call – Concerns for New Fee Increases**

Gopher State One Call (<http://www.gopherstateonecall.org/default.asp>) (GSOC) is the one-call notification system established to inform all Minnesota underground facility operators of intended excavations. GSOC implemented a new policy of charging for all notification tickets issued, effective January 1, 2004. The networking infrastructure nurtured and maintained by MetroGIS was leveraged to identify organizations negatively affected by the changes and develop a coordinated voice to bring these concerns to the to GSCO's attention on Wednesday, January 14. A total of 22 organizations participated in this collaborative effort. The concern with new fee policy by many municipal, county, and regional government entities, is that the large majority of tickets they receive describe excavations that are nowhere near their facilities. One of the problems that leads to this over-notification is inaccurate base map data, an issue that MetroGIS could help resolve with data sharing agreements. The GSOC Board spent more than an hour discussing, with Metropolitan Council staff, billing policy changes and possible expanded use of GIS resources available in the Metro Area. The value of this information was recognized and further discussions were encouraged.

**c) Operational and Procedural Guideline Clarifications – Regional Parcel Dataset**

At its December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting the Coordinating Committee authorized modification of Item 2 in the Operational and Procedural Clarifications section of the Regional Policy Statement to clarify intent. No substantive change was involved, therefore, action is not required by the Policy Board. The original language (below) was created based on the assumption that all counties could submit updated assessment values by April of each year. Also, there would have been no updates of those assessments until the following April. As it turns out, some counties are able to provide new assessments by the April update and other counties are not. So the original language indicated that even new values are received in May, the producer should not provide them until the following April. This was not the intention. The new language clarifies the guidelines as follows:

"The quarterly update schedule will be April 1, July 1, October 1 and January 1. ~~Valuation and tax information in the Regional Parcel Dataset will be updated with the April 1 release, and will not be updated again until the following April.~~ **Valuation and tax information in the Regional Parcel Dataset will generally be updated with the April release. Counties that do not have the new assessments available by April should provide them with the next quarterly release after they are available.** Parcel geography and other attributes will be updated with each quarterly release." The complete policy statement is at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/specs\\_roles\\_resp.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/specs_roles_resp.pdf).

- d) **Matrix for Status of Priority Information Needs Modified: “Looking for Stewardship” Added**  
In accordance with direction received from the Coordinating Committee at its September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, the statement “looking for stewardship” has been added, along with a text hyperlink, at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml> for each of the priority information needs for which work has not begun or has stalled for lack of an organization with a regional need to lead the discussions necessary to define a regional solution.
- e) **Presentations / Outreach / Studies** (*not mentioned elsewhere*)  
The following activities occurred since the Policy Board last met.
- Article Published in Fall Issue of GIS/LIS Newsletter
  - Metro 911 Board Initiative – Integrating GIS Technology into PSAP Operations
  - PolicyLink Forum and Recommendations – *Towards a Regional Strategy for Sustaining Community Focused GIS in the Twin Cities Metro*
  - Presentation made to Hennepin County GIS User Group about MetroGIS DataFinder

#### **Article Published in Fall Issue of GIS/LIS Newsletter**

An article summarizing MetroGIS accomplishments since the last newsletter was published in December. It can be viewed at <http://www.mngislis.org/newsletter/issue35/issue35toc.htm>.

#### **Metro 911 Board Initiative - Integrate GIS Technology into PSAP Operations**

This past fall, Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, and Mark Kotz, a member of the MetroGIS staff support team, participated in a workgroup of the Metro 911 Board’s Technical Operations Committee. The group was charged with recommending a strategy for how the Metro 911 Board should proceed with integrating GIS technology into the day-to-day work of PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Points). Refer to the attached memorandum from Nancy Pollock, Executive Director of the Metro 911 Board, for further details.

#### **PolicyLink Forum and Recommendations – Towards a Regional Strategy for Sustaining Community Focused GIS in the Twin Cities Metro**

PolicyLink, a California-based nonprofit, was retained in Spring 2003 by the Minneapolis Foundation to identify strategies to improve the GIS capacity of community-focused organizations that serve the seven-county Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. A detailed explanation of PolicyLink, their findings, and each recommendation can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/recommendation.pdf>. MetroGIS is named in several of the recommendations.

The Coordinating Committee, at its December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, considered the findings of this study. The Committee concurred that the recommendations are not asking MetroGIS or its stakeholders for anything that is not currently in MetroGIS’s work plan but also concurred that the recommendations are premature to share with the Policy Board until the specifics are more clear; in particular, those that involve access to parcel data. The Staff Coordinator was authorized to share with the Minneapolis Foundation (funded the PolicyLink project) the actions listed in the Committee’s agenda materials (Item 5j at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/12\\_17\\_03/a\\_12\\_17\\_03\\_full.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/12_17_03/a_12_17_03_full.pdf)), as currently being appropriate for MetroGIS.

**Presentation made to the Hennepin County GIS Users Group about MetroGIS DataFinder.**

On January 8<sup>th</sup>, Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, and Mark Kotz, member of the MetroGIS staff support team, presented an overview of MetroGIS's functions and explained in detail those of DataFinder to the Hennepin County GIS Users Group. This presentation was in response to an inquiry from MetroGIS to each user group last summer at the request of the Policy Board. After the presentation, representatives from four local units of government in Hennepin County expressed interest in using DataFinder as a tool to advertise and distribute their geospatial data.

**f) State Geospatial Initiatives Update**

**1) Contract with Transverse Technologies (formerly Syncline) to Expand DataFinder Café Statewide**

See Agenda Item 6e. In addition, LMIC has also submitted a grant application to NASA in December seeking funds to develop a Web Coverage Service (WCS) capability that would permit clipping of raster data. This capability would expand upon the current capabilities of GeoIntegrator and MetroGIS DataFinder.

**g) Federal/National Geospatial Initiatives Update**

**1) The National Map (TNM)** – TNM is currently using four Web Mapping Services distributed via MetroGIS DataFinder. They are: Functional Class Roads, Major Highways, Hiawatha Corridor Light Rail Line, and County Boundaries.

**2) I-Teams** - The Staff Coordinator and David Arbeit, with LMIC, are serving on a MN Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) committee responsible for consolidating all of Minnesota's individual, theme-based I-Plans in a document that sets forth a cohesive strategy to guide investments in geospatial technology and data within Minnesota. Plans for 8 data themes are in various stages of completion. A "wrapper" is also under development that provides context for the 8 individual theme plans, as well as, a framework for an organizational mechanism to coordinate among the individual thematic plans and pursue implementation of policy and procedural modifications necessary to sustain collaboration. The target is to consolidate all of the individual I-Plans into a single document for submission to the federal Office of Management and Budget in early 2004.

**h) Summary for December 17<sup>th</sup> Coordinating Committee Meeting**

This meeting summary is posted at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/m\\_12\\_17\\_03.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/m_12_17_03.pdf). Jane Harper, Washington County, and Dave Drealan, Carver County, were reelected to serve as Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, respectively, for the coming year.

## **Update - Metropolitan 911 Board Regional GIS Project January 23, 2004**

Approximately a year ago the Metropolitan 911 Board began work on the creation and coordination of a metro area regional GIS dataset(s) that could be used to support the needs of the metro area PSAPs and the public safety agencies they serve. With the dramatic increase in wireless 911 calls it became apparent that the PSAPs need better location tools in order to properly locate all 911 callers.

Early in the process the Board identified MetroGIS as a key player in the implementation and on-going maintenance of these datasets. Several meetings were held with the MetroGIS staff. As a result of those meetings and at the direction of the Metropolitan 911 Board's Technical Operations Committee (TOC), the Board staff prepared a Request for Information (RFI) asking for recommendations from vendors and individuals who had experience in E911 GIS projects. Much of the information the Board was looking for revolved on how to leverage the regional work already done by MetroGIS and the local GIS data creators.

Based on the information received from the RFI responses, the Board staff prepared preliminary recommendations for the TOC. The TOC appointed a sub-committee to work on final recommendations for the Board. Representatives from some of the city and county government GIS departments, MetroGIS, and LOGIS were invited to be part of the sub-committee. The sub-committee met four times over a two-month period working on a final recommendation for the TOC and ultimately, the Board. The Board staff is now preparing the final recommendation documentation, which will cover these six recommendations:

1. Create a GIS Coordinator position within the Metropolitan 911 Board.
2. Work with MetroGIS, local / state government, and private GIS data providers to:
  - a. Establish E911 GIS dataset standards.
  - b. Leverage GIS work that is already being done and avoid duplication of effort whenever possible.
  - c. Establish a E911 GIS dataset error correction process.
  - d. Establish a standard E911 GIS dataset update procedure and distribution schedule.
3. Create a PSAP map display functionality standard.
4. Assist PSAPs in acquiring map display software / hardware that can utilize the standardized E911 GIS datasets.
5. Establish a GIS liaison structure at the PSAP level, similar to the current 911 Database Coordinator responsibilities.
6. Establish a standard method of error reporting for the PSAPs.

These recommendations were presented to the TOC in December. The TOC approved the recommendations for presentation to the Board. The recommendations will now be presented to the Board's Executive Committee in February and to the full Board in March.