



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, April 28, 2004

6:30 p.m.

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

Agenda

- | | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Call to Order | |
| 2. Accept Agenda | |
| 3. Accept Meeting Summary | |
| a) January 28, 2004 | action 1 |
| 4. Metropolitan 911 Board / MetroGIS Collaboration | 6 |
| <i>GIS Initiative To Integrate GIS Into Day-To-Day Operations Of
27 Metro Area Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs)</i> | |
| 5. Action/Discussion Items | |
| a) Election of Officers | action 7 |
| b) 2005 MetroGIS Funding Request and Budget | action 9 |
| 6. Major Activity Update | 19 |
| a) County Data Producer Workgroup | |
| • Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy – Non-Government Access | |
| • Regional Mailing Label Application | |
| • Data Sharing Initiative With Utilities | |
| b) Priority Common Information Need Solutions | |
| c) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Coordination with MN GeoIntegrator | |
| d) GIS Data Sharing Agreements with Counties –Adoption Status | |
| 7. Information Sharing | 23 |
| a) 2004 TOP Grant – Letter of Support and Assistance with Grant Writing Fee | |
| b) Fall 2004 Strategic Planning Workshop | |
| c) Outreach Activities | |
| d) Related State Geospatial Data Initiatives Update | |
| e) Related Federal/National Geospatial Data Initiatives Update | |
| f) March 31 st Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes | 29 |
| 8. Next Meeting | |
| July 28, 2004 | |
| 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
January 28, 2004

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Members Present: Gary Delaney (Carver County), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), 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: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County) and Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis).

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann, Randy Knippel, and David Claypool.

Visitors: Curt Peterson (Ramsey County), Carla Coates (Ramsey County), Bernadette Lantz (Washington County), Dorothy McClung (Ramsey County), Chris Samuel (Ramsey County), Frank Zobitz (Ramsey County), Pat Boeckman (Scott County), and Dan Pfeffer (Scott County).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Kathie Doty (Richardson, Richter & Associates, Inc.) and Steve Fester.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Johns moved and Member Fiskness seconded to accept the agenda as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all. (*Note: During the meeting, Item 5e was moved up to follow 5a.*)

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Bataglia moved and Member Harper seconded to approve the summary of the October 29, 2003 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION: Improving Information Access Efficiencies with GIS - Scott County's Story

Member Vogel introduced Pat Boeckman, Scott County Recorder, and Dan Pfeffer, Scott County GIS Manager, to explain how Scott County has used GIS technology to improve its internal processes related to how the Recorder, Assessor and Surveyor offices manage maintenance and distribution of data, as well as, the efficiencies the county has realized, and improved service its customers are realizing due to these improvements. (An Adobe PDF version of the PowerPoint presentation can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/012804/index.shtml>.)

Prior to 2000, none of the county's core data management systems were integrated. Now, data from these 15 or so systems can be obtained via a single web-based application – the user no longer has to request the information (if they even knew who to ask) from multiple departments. It was noted that the current one-stop application was implemented without changing any current data management practices other than adding a PIN to documents (plats, deeds, etc.) that are currently being scanned as matter of standard practice. The speakers estimated that it now takes about 2 weeks for the time a land records document, such as a plat, is recorded until it can be accessed via this web application. The County's next step will be take an enterprise approach to evaluating its data holdings and assigning roles to specific departments to management specific data to eliminate as many of the current duplicative management practices as possible.

Member Vogel commented that the availability of this application is greatly streamlining the county's development review process, the keys being that developers are now required to submit their plans in electronic form and in county coordinates and the integrating power of GIS technology is used to quickly evaluate major deficiencies/issues with proposed plans.

The speakers noted that the Scott County GIS Users Group played a significant role in providing a vehicle to communicate the availability of this application to government users and, just as importantly, to the real estate/appraiser community as well. As a result, the number of calls fielded by county staff has dropped, even though the County is experiencing rapid growth. In addition, calls that are fielded can usually be dealt with more efficiently by staff using the web site as a resource.

In response to a question from a manager with another county, the speakers shared that Scott County does not have a history of significant revenue from data sales. About \$10,000 is the maximum that has been realized, so it was not a difficult sell to obtain Board permission to implement policies that emphasized improved customer service as opposed to generating revenue. Their experience, thus far, is that sales have remained essentially the same but that the staff resources to respond to data questions have dropped substantially.

Another question about how Scott County deals with property-related searches/queries by property owner name spawned a discussion of options and appropriate policy. Scott County's current policy is to permit searches by name, and although they have had few complaints, are considering a reporting scheme that would list the name only under specified circumstances.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked the speakers for sharing Scott County's experience with the Board.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 2003 Accomplishments and Annual Report

Staff Coordinator Johnson summarized the materials provided in the agenda packet. A few minor modifications were offered concerning syntax matters in the Milestones article and to correct an incorrect reference to a member's organizational affiliation, which staff agreed to pass along the editor.

Schneider moved and Johns seconded to approve the 2003 Annual Report with the cited modifications. Motion carried, ayes all.

d) 2003 Performance Measurement Report and Recommendations

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Harper summarized the Committee's recommendation that the Policy Board approve the proposed 2003 MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report and introduced Kathie Doty, MetroGIS staff consultant with Richardson, Richter & Associates, Inc., to summarize the findings and recommendations.

Ms. Doty reminded the Board that this is the second such report since it adopted a Performance Measurement Plan in April 2002 and summarized the major findings. She reiterated that the goal is to monitor results and adjust policies and procedures as necessary to successfully achieve endorsed objectives.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented on the importance of the baseline information contained in this report to monitoring trends important to MetroGIS's success and thanked staff for producing this report. She commented that some of these measures are not easy to calculate, but nevertheless are important to understanding dynamics needed to effectively achieve desired outcomes.

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Harper commented on the importance of testimonials to gain a better understanding about how organizations are benefiting from MetroGIS's efforts. She used the example of how the existence of the Regional Planned Land Use dataset made it possible for her to

respond quickly to a request earlier in the week that would not have been possible in its absence, providing a substantive benefit not only to her but also to the requester. She encouraged others to think about similar experiences where MetroGIS's existence is making a difference.

Chairperson Reinhardt, recounted a major benefit that occurred a few years ago involving the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District and its need to rapidly notify property owners of a LaCrosse Encephalitis outbreak. The notification took 4 hours, instead of a week or more, due to the availability of the regional parcel dataset.

Fiskness moved and Delaney seconded to accept the findings and conclusions presented in the 2003 MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report and approve the 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.

b) 2004 Budget

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Harper summarized the Committee's recommendation to approve the 2004 MetroGIS budget allocations as presented in the Board's agenda materials. She noted that the proposed allocations had not changed since a draft was shared with the Board in October. She also noted that the detailed budget allocations were included in the packet for the Board's information.

Member Delaney noted that the largest change from 2003 to 2004 was in the funds targeted for support of DataFinder and asked for clarification. The Staff Coordinator commented that the reduction is due to the pending partnership with the Mn Land Management Information Center to integrate DataFinder with the State's GeoIntegrator and share the support costs.

Bataglia moved and Vogel seconded to approve the 2004 MetroGIS budget allocation document included in the agenda materials and dated December 18, 2003. Motion carried, ayes all.

c) 2004 Major Program Objectives

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Harper summarized the Committee's recommendation to approve the 2004 Major Program Objectives presented in the agenda materials. She noted that they had not changed since a draft was shared with the Board in October. She noted that the detailed work plan to achieve these objectives was included in the packet for the Board's information. No comments were offered.

Johns moved and Fiskness seconded to approve the Major 2004 MetroGIS Program Objectives as presented in the agenda materials, subject to receiving the funding requested of the Metropolitan Council. Motion carried, ayes all.

e) Socioeconomic Information Need Regional Solution - Phase I

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Harper summarized the Committee's recommendation to endorse the Phase I Socioeconomic Information Need Regional strategy as presented in the agenda materials and introduced Will Craig who chaired the Workgroup that crafted the recommendation. An Adobe PDF version of Mr. Craig's PowerPoint presentation can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/012804/craig_socio.pdf.

Craig emphasized that the Phase I Workgroup started its efforts with the priority socioeconomic information needs that were identified in 1996 through a highly participatory process and briefly summarized the workgroup's process that led its recommendation. He mentioned that the group

identified three data characteristics necessary to successfully address these information needs – subcity scale, annual updates, and 10 year times series. The members identified existing sources of data that meet or exceed the desired data characteristics. The results of their research were then input into a web-based resources page, developed by MetroGIS staff, to offer the user an easy and intuitive way to access this “catalogue” of existing socioeconomic data sources that meet or exceed desired characteristics. Craig then demonstrated the prototype web-based resources page that is proposed for testing by actual users of socioeconomic data.

Craig concluded his remarks with a recommendation that MetroGIS work with the producers of three datasets – county birth and death records, United Way’s First Call For Help, and county social services records – to determine the feasibility of implementing a few one-time data reporting changes that could markedly improve the data’s usability to address cited priority information needs. Special reports are currently being generated that include the formats sought by the workgroup. The goal would be to “hard code” these formats through a one-time project which would result in times savings for all affected parties.

Member Bataglia mentioned that she is aware of a couple data sources that are not listed in the workgroup’s Phase I report. Craig responded that the workgroup, although its members brought quite diverse expertise and knowledge to the project, admitted they were concerned that some sources of data could have been missed and for this reason proposed testing the resources page and seeking constructive feedback before offering it as an endorsed regional solution. Staff noted that they would follow-up with Member Bataglia and forward the sources along to the workgroup to consider as they refine the site.

A question from Member Bataglia, asking for clarification about the connection between MetroGIS and socioeconomic data, resulted in a wide ranging discussion about how MetroGIS initially established the common information needs of the broad MetroGIS community; the role of summary geography to map and analyze socioeconomic data in conjunction with other geospatial data, such as parcels and jurisdictional boundaries; MetroGIS’s workgroup staffing model that leverages the talents of motivated people within organizations that have a business need to address initiatives launched by MetroGIS to address recognized common priority needs; how priorities are set for allocating MetroGIS’s available resources, and the Staff Coordinator’s role as principally a project manager relative to support of workgroup activities as opposed to a content lead.

Member Schneider commented that the traditional priority setting process works when staffing is clearly defined. MetroGIS, by necessity, uses a different model because of the need to facilitate a coordinated approach, which he supports. He also commented that the process is not linear as it might be in a more traditional setting, in that, as protocols are worked out by one workgroup benefits are often realized in other areas.

Member Johns noted that she strongly supported the recommendation because school, as service provides, have been waiting a long time for this type of one-stop tool to readily access socioeconomic data. She commented that the investment of time that is currently required to gather this information on their own is often times not justified so they go without. Member Vogel asked for clarification that the recommendation will not effectively set scale of summary geographies expectations that are inconsistent with Data Practices policies. Craig stated that the recommendation would not set such expectations.

Schneider moved and Fiskness seconded to ratify the following actions pertaining to MetroGIS’s solution for its Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas Information Need:

- 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.

Motion carried, ayes all.

f) GIS Data Sharing Agreements with Counties – Adoption Status

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the current expectations for the agreements. She proceeded to ask if there were any items in the proposed agreements that are causing any concerns. Brown replied that there is a license-related issue at Hennepin County that should be resolved within the next week. No other concerns were raised.

6. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES (See the agenda materials for more information)

Randy Knippel updated the Board on the activities of the Emergency Preparedness workgroup. He reported that a duplication of data capture methods has already been found that will soon be eliminated. The prototype Emergency Preparedness Internet data distribution website is ready to "go live" soon. The group will also be submitting an article for the next Emergency Preparedness newsletter.

Knippel also mentioned that outreach efforts are planned, including a recent presence at a Governor's Symposium, with an opportunity to coordinate with Minnesota Public Safety Commissioner Rich Stanek. Furthermore, the National Stockpile program was noted as a convenient way to organize the GIS community to assist in these efforts.

Member Schneider asked about tapping into federal funding for work on Emergency Preparedness activities. He suggested that once the availability of the data is recognized, we should be well-positioned to obtain funding due to the organization that is in place, and our ability to demonstrate GIS capabilities.

Member Bataglia stated that she attended a Governor's Symposium on Emergency Preparedness in January. She noted that discussion about GIS's role was missing and that she will encourage participation next year to encourage collaboration. The Emergency Preparedness workgroup, in conjunction with the Governor's Council Emergency Preparedness workgroup, will be hosting a booth and presenting a 90-minute session at the 39th Annual Governor's Conference on Homeland Security, March 2-4.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

Chairperson Reinhardt asked the members to review on their own the information items presented in the agenda packet.

8. NEXT MEETING

April 28, 2004. Chairperson Reinhardt reminded the group that the election of officers would be held at that time. She also suggested that the elections be moved to the January meeting beginning in 2005. There were no objections.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting concluded at 9:15 p.m.

Prepared by,
Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



TO: Policy Board

FROM: Nancy Pollock - Executive Director, Metropolitan 911 Board
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

SUBJECT: **Metropolitan 911 Board / MetroGIS Collaboration**
Initiative To Integrate GIS Into Day-to-Day Operations Of 27 Metro Area PSAPs

DATE: April 14, 2004
(For the April 28th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

Nancy Pollock, Executive Director for the Metropolitan 911 Board, and Pete Eggimann, the Board's Technical Operations Director, have accepted an invitation to update the Policy Board on an ambitious initiative to integrate, in a coordinated manner, GIS technology into the day-to-day operations of the 27 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) that serve the seven-county, Twin Cities Metropolitan Area and the role they envision MetroGIS playing in this exciting initiative.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

On March 10th, the Metropolitan 911 Board authorized the project. This GIS-based project is necessary to effectively dispatch emergency services where wireless communications devices are involved.

The key components of the Board's project are as follows (*a detailed report is available as a separate document*):

1. Create an E911 GIS Coordinator position within the Metropolitan 911 Board. (*Advertised the week of April 19.*)
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 an E911 dataset error correction process.
 - d. Establish a standard E911 dataset update procedure and 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 MSAG Coordinator responsibilities.
6. Establish a standard method of E911 dataset error reporting for the PSAPs.

The immediate next steps involve hiring the E911 GIS Coordinator and providing the PSAPs with E911 GIS datasets that can be used to locate all types of 911 callers, regardless of the technology used to make the call. This involves the creation of new GIS datasets that match the traditional regional Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) and E911 location database maintained by the telephone companies.

IMPACT

When fully implemented, all of the metropolitan area PSAPs will be able to accurately locate 911 callers, incident locations, and emergency responders (when properly equipped). The PSAPs will have this ability even when the location in question is outside of their immediate jurisdictional boundary. This ability will allow for faster, more accurate emergency responses than are currently possible, making better use of the limited public safety resources and the associated tax dollars. This ability will make multi-jurisdictional incidents easier to identify and manage. Regional coordination and maintenance of the E911 datasets will be significantly less expensive than if each individual PSAP jurisdiction maintained the same level of detail and accuracy on their own.

LEVERAGING METROGIS'S EFFORTS

The speakers were instrumental in shaping a policy that allows the Metropolitan 911 Board to leverage the collaborative achievements MetroGIS has made in meeting common information needs with regional data solutions, and supporting a forum for knowledge sharing among interests, both of which are important to the success of its new GIS initiative. MetroGIS staff assisted the Board with its Request for Information and participated on its workgroup that formulated the approved strategy. Board staff are likewise participating on MetroGIS's Address Workgroup, whose work has substantial implications for both the Board and MetroGIS.

RECOMMENDATION

No action requested.



TO: MetroGIS Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Election of Policy Board Officers

DATE: April 8, 2004
(For the Apr 28th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Policy Board's operating guidelines call for the annual election of a chair and vice-chair. Commissioners Victoria Reinhardt and Jim Kordiak were elected as chair and vice-chair, respectively, on April 30, 2003. Both have indicated they are open to continuing to serve if that is the preference of the Board.

The Board is respectfully requested to elect its officers for 2004. A roster of the current Policy Board membership is attached.

BACKGROUND

1. Member Reinhardt has served as chair since May 28, 1997. Member Kordiak has served as vice-chair since April 2001.
2. The operating guidelines do not impose a term limit.
3. The roles and responsibilities of the MetroGIS chair and vice-chair are as follows:
 - a) Article II; Section 8 states "The Board shall annually elect a Chairperson from its membership. The Chair shall preside at the meetings of the Board and perform the usual duties of Chair and such other duties as may be described by the Board from time to time. The Chair shall serve until his or her successor is duly elected".
 - b) Article II; Section 9 states "The Board shall annually elect a Vice-Chairperson from its membership. The Vice Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair in the absence of the Chair or in the event of his or her inability or refusal to act and shall serve until his or her successor is duly elected".

RECOMMENDATION

That the MetroGIS Policy Board elect a chair and vice-chair for 2004.

Policy Board Members
April 2004

Member last	Member first	Represents	Begin date
Bataglia	Patrice	Dakota Co.	January 2003
Delaney	Gary	Carver Co.	January 2003
Fiskness	Conrad	MAWD	January 1997
Hegberg	Dennis	Wash. Co.	January 2003
Johns	Toni	TIES	September 1998
Johnson	Randy	Hennepin Co.	January 1997
Kordiak	Jim	Anoka Co.	January 2000
Pistilli	Tony	Metropolitan Council	April 2003
Reinhardt	Victoria	Ramsey Co.	January 1997
Schiff	Gary	AMM (Minneapolis)	March 2002
Schneider	Terry	AMM (Minnetonka)	January 1997
Vogel	Bob	Scott Co.	January 2003



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: 2005 MetroGIS Funding Request and Budget

DATE: April 15, 2004
 (For the Apr. 15th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee is seeking Policy Board approval of the preliminary 2005 MetroGIS funding proposal presented below for submission to the Metropolitan Council to consider as a component of its 2005 budget. These support resources would sustain the three current core services provided by MetroGIS (Attachment A) and should be sufficient to satisfactorily address anticipated project needs in 2005. In short, 3 FTEs for staff support and \$86,000 in non-staff project funding are requested.

Given the current atmosphere of fiscal austerity, Council management is unlikely to approve an increase in total resources allotted to any Council-supported program, hence this proposal seeks to continue the current level of support for MetroGIS. The manner in which the approved resources are allocated among specific MetroGIS budget line items remains the Policy Board's decision.

An overview of anticipated 2005 project expenses is provided in the Reference Section and the assumptions used to construct this proposal are outlined on the following page. Attachment B provides the proposed 2005 line item allocations for the \$86,000 in requested non-staff project funding.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On March 31st, the Coordinating Committee unanimously accepted the preliminary 2005 MetroGIS budget presented in Attachment B and unanimously recommended that the Policy Board approve it for submission to the Metropolitan Council to consider as part of its 2005 budget deliberations.

Note: To comply with the Metropolitan Council's internal budget preparation deadlines, staff forwarded the proposed preliminary budget request to Council management following acceptance by the Coordinating Committee.

2005 METROGIS BUDGET PROPOSAL

The information presented in the following table is a generalized summary of the budget specifics presented in Attachment B.

MetroGIS Funding Sources	2003 Approved		2004 Approved		2005 Requested	
Metropolitan Council						
Staff (3.0 FTE)		213,000		\$200,000		\$206,000
Non—staff project support funding		100,500		\$86,000		\$86,000
<i>Data Maintenance Agreements and Data Quality/Access Enhancements</i>	\$50,000		\$50,000		\$50,000	
<i>DataFinder Enhancements/Support</i>	\$24,750		\$12,500		\$7,500	
<i>Other Non-Staff Operating Expenses</i>	\$25,750		\$23,500		\$28,500	
Subtotal		\$313,500		\$286,000		\$292,000
Other		\$22,000		\$16,000		\$0
Grand Total		\$335,500		\$302,000		\$292,000

METROGIS BUDGET LINE ITEM CHANGES FROM 2004 TO 2005

Major changes from the 2004 budget line items include:

- 1) An increase of \$21,000, to a total of \$22,000, for currently undesignated projects to address common information needs. These funds were allocated to the counties in 2004 for improvements to the Regional Parcel Dataset.
- 2) An increase of \$7,000, to a total of \$26,500, for outsourced professional services – performance measures analysis and reporting, participant satisfaction monitoring, strategic planning, outreach/communications.
- 3) A reduction of \$4,500, to a total of \$8,000, to support ongoing maintenance and improvements to DataFinder.
- 4) A reduction of \$1,500, to a total of \$500, to facilitate regionwide users groups/forums.

MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS

1. The Metropolitan Council will approve project funding adequate to support MetroGIS's core functions.
2. Any substantive changes in policy that involve additional resources agreed upon as part of the Business Plan Update process slated to begin in fall 2004 would need to be addressed in future budget proposals and/or through partnerships or grants.
3. An agreement will be in place with each of the seven counties to maintain access, without fee, by government and academic interests to parcel data.
4. 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.
5. A partnership with LMIC will be in place to share the expenses associated with supporting DataFinder. If not, funds allocated for improvements in DataFinder functionality would be kept in reserve in the event assistance is required to fix any problems that may arise.

Other pertinent information that guided this proposal, together with these assumptions, are presented in the Reference Section.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Review and comment on the MetroGIS core functions/services proposed for 2005 (Attachment A).
- 2) Review and comment on the proposed preliminary budget allocations for 2005 (Attachment B).
- 3) Direct staff to forward MetroGIS's 2005 budget request – 3 FTEs and \$86,000 in non-staff project funding -- to the Metropolitan for its approval.

REFERENCE SECTION

Assumptions and background information used to craft MetroGIS's 2005 budget proposal are as follows:

1. Regional Data Solutions:

- Implementation of regional data solutions for the Highway and Road Networks, Existing Land Use, Lakes and Wetlands, Watershed and School District Jurisdictional Boundaries, Emergency Preparedness, and Phase I-Socioeconomic Information Needs should be completed in 2004 and, if not, these solutions are expected to require staff resources, as opposed to out-of-pocket expenses, to complete.
- Any funding that might be needed to implement enhancements to the Regional Parcel Dataset, as identified in spring 2004, will be financed via the 2004-2008 GIS Data Sharing Agreement with the counties.
- A peer review forum is planned for fall 2004 to identify desired enhancements to the TLG Street Centerline dataset. If any of these enhancements are deemed to be priorities for the MetroGIS community but are outside of the TLG's internal business need and/or their available resources, funding as a regional GIS project in 2005 would be an option (see item 6 below).

2. DataFinder:

- A partnership is expected to be in place with LMIC in 2004 to share the costs of implementing several enhancements to DataFinder and sharing its support.
- \$5,000 is allocated for enhancements to DataFinder. If a partnership with LMIC is not in place, these funds would be held in reserve to pay for known and unexpected maintenance expenses.
- A forum is planned for fall 2004 to encourage increased use of DataFinder by users and producers. Identification of any desired enhancements will not be a purpose of this forum, as the enhancements obtained through the partnership with LMIC likely will have just been implemented.

3. Forum for Sharing Knowledge and Promoting Use of Best Practices:

- Maintain the same level of support as planned for 2004.

4. Business Planning and Performance Monitoring

MetroGIS's Business Plan is proposed to be updated in 2005. The Coordinating Committee workshop scheduled for fall 2004 will serve as the official beginning of the effort. A Business Plan Update is needed to guide MetroGIS's efforts as it transitions from building regional solutions to primarily managing policies and programs that it has promoted. The professional services contract in place with Richardson, Richter and Associates, Inc. (RRA) assumes \$5,000 additional funding in 2005 than in 2004 to compensate for this proposed additional effort.

5. Regional GIS Projects – Priority Data Quality and Access Enhancements:

- **General:** Item I-2(a) in the adopted MetroGIS budget provides \$50,000 in 2004 to foster collaborative solutions to priority common information needs. Since 1996, the Metropolitan Council has agreed to permit MetroGIS to budget from \$50,000 to \$75,000, annually, for such projects even though in most cases the specifics were unknown at the time of budget approval. In 2004, all but \$1,000 of the \$50,000 available has been allocated to implementing enhancements to the regional parcel dataset via the GIS Data Sharing Agreements with the seven counties.
- **Parcel Data Stewardship:** In 2005-2008, the GIS data sharing agreements with the seven counties account for a total of \$28,000; funding that will come from this line item, resulting in \$22,000 per year for yet to be defined projects.
- **Other Possible Projects:**
 - The Address Workgroup is expected to identify a preferred data content standard as well as desired custodian roles and responsibilities to minimize redundancies that are currently occurring across the Metro Area regarding assignment and maintenance of address data. The Metropolitan 911 Board has approved a project that has, at its core, the objectives of improved consistency and access to current, complete address data. As address data are also key components to the solutions of several of MetroGIS's priority information needs, MetroGIS should consider providing funding to leverage and supplement the 911 Board's resources, as necessary, to address-related needs of the broader MetroGIS community. *Discussion topic as the issues and opportunities are better understood.*
 - The Phase II Socioeconomic Information Need solution might involve acquisition of data from non-government sources that could involve a fee. If such a solution is found to be in the best interests of MetroGIS's participants, funds to pilot and/or foster a cost share effort with others should be among the options considered. *Discussion topic as the issues and opportunities are better understood*
 - Enhancements to the TLG Street Centerline Dataset (see 3rd bullet under Item 1). *Discussion topic as the issues and opportunities are better understood*

ATTACHMENT A

METROGIS'S Core Services, Component Functions, and Operational Status (Proposed language updates – 2004-2005 Strategic Planning Update)

As a component of the pending MetroGIS Business Plan Update project, reorganization of MetroGIS's currently supported functions is proposed to intuitively align them with the currently acknowledged three core MetroGIS functions. **This activity does not assume any changes to current policy, just an update of service descriptions and manner in which organized.**

Core Services ¹ (Component Functions ²)	Current Priority Category ³	2004 Work Plan Status	2005 Budget Line Item
1. Facilitate Regional Solutions (Data, Applications & Best Management Practices) To Common Information Needs			Yes
Promote and endorse voluntary policies, which foster coordination of GIS among the region's organizations. WHERE DOES THIS BEST FIT – CAPTURE IN THIS CORE SERVICE STATEMENT OR 3a?	Mission Critical	Ongoing	?
a Identify unmet GIS needs with regional significance and act on these needs.	Mission Critical	Partially complete and ongoing	yes
b Develop and endorse standards for GIS data content, data documentation, and data management for regional datasets (Policy).	Mission Critical	Partially complete and ongoing	yes
c Promote collaborative funding of pilot projects that meet regional needs.	Funded Support - Important but not critical	Ongoing	yes
d Create and maintain datasets for MetroGIS based on identified priorities (i.e., to address the 13 priority information needs endorsed by the Policy Board as having regional significance). (Implementation-data)	Partnered Support:	Partially complete and ongoing	yes
Conduct research to meet common regional GIS needs (i.e., data policy, distribution, etc).	Selectively Desirable:	Component of 1(d)	no
e Facilitate data sharing agreements and licensing among MetroGIS stakeholders. (Implementation-data)	Mission Critical	Ongoing	yes
f Help promote development and exchange of GIS applications and procedures that serve GIS needs. (Implementation-applications) (?Clarify to apply to "common" GIS needs?)	Partnered Support:	Ongoing	yes

Core Services ¹ (Component Functions ²)		Current Priority Category ³	2004 Work Plan Status	2005 Budget Line Item
	Develop master contracts for regional GIS projects, when appropriate.	Selectively Desirable:	No activity	No – component of 1 (d-f)
	Endorse standards for telecommunication protocol and networks. (a.k.a.: Create guidelines for getting electronic access to the information that is being shared)	Selectively Desirable:	No activity	No – component of 1(d-f)
2. Maintain Data Search and Retrieval Mechanism (DataFinder)				Yes
a	Provide a directory of regionally endorsed geospatial data (<i>and other GIS data available</i>) within region and a mechanism for search and retrieval of GIS (these) data (a.k.a.: maintain and enhance DataFinder). The goal is to provide a single Internet point of contact to search and retrieve geospatial data.	Mission Critical	Operational and ongoing	Yes
b	Promote filling gaps in metadata based on identified regionally significant data priorities.	Funded Support - Important but not critical	Ongoing	yes
c	Provide technical assistance to participants to retrieve, translate, and use data developed and maintained on behalf of MetroGIS.	Selectively Desirable:	Minimal activity	yes
3. Maintain A Forum For Sharing Knowledge & Foster Collaboration/Partnering Opportunities In The Area Of GIS				Yes
	Market MetroGIS data and products. REPLACE WITH THE NEXT ITEM?	See note ⁴	Ongoing	No – propose to combine with 3(a)
a	Promote and endorse voluntary policies, which foster coordination of GIS among the region's organizations. (??REPHRASE to “Foster coordination of GIS activities among the region's organizations through promoting understanding and use of data, applications, and best practices endorsed by MetroGIS”.)	Mission Critical	Ongoing	yes
b	Promote forums for MetroGIS stakeholders to discuss common GIS needs and opportunities.	Funded Support - Important but not critical	Ongoing	yes
c	Maintain MetroGIS website (http://www.metrogis.org).	Funded Support - Important but not critical.	Operational and ongoing	yes
d	Publish MetroGIS newsletter. ⁵	Selectively Desirable:	Annual Report & GIS/LIS Newsletter	yes

Core Services¹ (Component Functions ²)		Current Priority Category³	2004 Work Plan Status	2005 Budget Line Item
e	Maintain liaison relationships with committees / organizations with similar and/or complimentary objectives to MetroGIS (i.e., Governor's Council on Geographic Information, GIS/LIS Consortium, NSDI/FGDC) (revise to add " <u>and advocate for MetroGIS's needs and desires</u> ").	Funded Support - Important but not critical	Ongoing	yes
	Advocate for MetroGIS needs and desires with state and federal policy makers	Funded Support - Important but not critical	Ongoing	No – propose to combine with 3(e)
Inappropriate Functions For MetroGIS⁶				
	Identify GIS training and continuing education needs and encourage participation.	Low Priority: Postpone funding.	N/A	
	Provide a repository of GIS human resources information (centralized job posting/position descriptions)	Low Priority: Postpone funding.	N/A	

¹ The concept of "core service" was introduced with the 2003-2005 Business Plan to better communicate MetroGIS's purpose than possible with the functions established in 1999.

² In 1999, 21 functions were identified as possibilities for MetroGIS. The 2000-2003 Business Plan set priorities for these functions based upon two criteria: Is a particular function appropriate for MetroGIS? If so, how important is it core stakeholder operations?

³ The function (service) priority categories established with the 2000-2003 Business Plan are as follows. See Appendix A of the Business Plan at http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf for more information. The same functions and priority categories were continued in the 2003-2005 Plan.

- Mission Critical: MetroGIS's mission cannot be achieved without supporting these functions.
- Funded Support: Important but not critical. MetroGIS should take responsibility to invest resources and make sure these functions are supported.
- Partnered Support: High importance to achieving the MetroGIS mission but require partnering to achieve.
- Selectively Desirable: Decisions on a case-by-case basis.
- Low Priority: Postpone funding.

⁴ During development of the 2003-2005 Business Plan, this function was clarified to mean outreach to foster use of endorsed regional solutions and practices as opposed to marketing in competition with independent stakeholder programs – a possible reason for the initial "low priority" ranking responses in 1999.

⁵ MetroGIS distributes an annual report in February or March to around 1800 individuals, representing a wide-variety of interests. An article is also submitted to the GIS/LIS Consortium for their in spring, summer, and fall newsletters.

⁶ This determination was made in 1999, as a result of the broadly participatory ranking exercise referenced in Note #2.

ATTACHMENT B

**MetroGIS Detailed 2005 Preliminary Budget Allocation Estimates
(Accepted by Coordinating Committee on March 31, 2004)**

	A	B	C	E	F	G
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	Several explanatory Notes, by cell, are provided following the table					
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function Category	MetroGIS Coordination Function	Sub Function / Description	2003	2004	2005
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Authorized	Preliminary Estimates
7						
8	I. MISSION CRITICAL					
9		1. Promote and endorse voluntary policies which foster coordination of GIS among the region's organizations				
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	\$20,000
13			b) Participant appreciation function	N/A	N/A	N/A
14			c) Outreach			
15			i. Printing - Annual Report/Promotional Brochure. Assume no other printed materials for handouts.	\$3,000	\$500	\$1,500
16			ii. Communications Outsourcing/Supplemental Staff Support	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$5,000
17			iii. Copying, postage, local travel			See I-1(a)
18		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				
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	\$50,000
20		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.)				

ATTACHMENT B

**MetroGIS Detailed 2005 Preliminary Budget Allocation Estimates
(Accepted by Coordinating Committee on March 31, 2004)**

	A	B	C	E	F	G
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function Category	MetroGIS Coordination Function	Sub Function / Description	2003	2004	2005
6	(Categories and first level) functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Authorized	Preliminary Estimates
21			a) Project Funds to enhance DataFinder functionality (<i>Expand geographic search capability, develop applications/scripts, etc. to enhance & improve on-line access, support/outsource technical and administrative services to distribute regional datasets (may include hardware and software), etc.</i> \$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. Assumes a partnership beginning 2004 with LMIC to host DataFinder on state system and share cost of improvements and ongoing maintenance.	\$12,750	\$10,000	\$5,000
22			b) Contractor and software maintenance contracts & related certificates to support the Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism (DataFinder)	\$12,000	\$2,500	\$2,500
23		4. Identify unmet GIS needs with regional significance and act on these needs				
24			a) MetroGIS data users forums and Business Information Need Peer Review Forums	\$1,000	\$500	\$500
25			b) Participant satisfaction survey	\$0	\$1,000	\$500
26			c) Seed \$'s for regionally significant projects	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)
27			d) Identify Second Generation Business Information Need Priorities		\$500	\$500
28		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).				
29			a) Negotiate agreements	(See I-2)	[Refer to III 1(a)]	[Refer to III 1(a)]
30			b) Facilitate compliance (training sessions, sharing best practices, etc)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)
31			SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$96,250	\$83,000	\$85,500
32						
33	II. FUNDED SUPPORT: IMPORTANT BUT NOT CRITICAL					
34		1. Maintain MetroGIS world wide web site (not DataFinder)		\$0	\$0	\$0
35		2. Promote collaborative funding of pilot projects that meet regional needs		See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)
36		3. Fill gaps in metadata based on identified priorities				
37			a) Promote/facilitate development and maintenance of metadata & posting with DataFinder (including education forums and one-on-one contact)	\$0	\$250	See II-5 (c)
38		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.				
39		5. Promote forums for MetroGIS stakeholders to discuss common GIS needs and opportunities				

ATTACHMENT B

**MetroGIS Detailed 2005 Preliminary Budget Allocation Estimates
(Accepted by Coordinating Committee on March 31, 2004)**

	A	B	C	E	F	G
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function Category	MetroGIS Coordination Function	Sub Function / Description	2003	2004	2005
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Authorized	Preliminary Estimates
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	N/A
41			b) Assist County User Groups with special functions that promote the principles of MetroGIS	\$0	See II-5 (c)	See II-5 (c)
42			c) Facilitate regionwide users groups/forums for knowledge sharing	\$2,500	\$2,000	\$500
43		6. Advocate for MetroGIS needs and desires with state and federal policy makers				
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	N/A
45			b) Participate in non-local Workshops/Activities			
46			i) GDA Membership Dues (authorized by Board July 11, 2001)	\$250	\$0	\$0
47			ii) NSDI / I-Team etc. related activities not paid by host.	\$1,500	\$750	\$0
48			SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$4,250	\$3,000	\$500
49						
50	III. PARTNERED SUPPORT: HIGH IMPORTANCE BUT REQUIRE PARTNERING TO ACHIEVE					
51		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)				
52			a) Develop regional data sets	See Assumption	See Assumption	See Assumption
53			Business Plan Assumption: 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	See Assumption
55			Business Plan Assumption: Maintained by org/partnership with business need			
56		2. Help promote development and exchange of GIS applications and procedures that serve MetroGIS needs		See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)	See I-2 and I-3(a)
57			SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$0	\$0	\$0
58						
59	IV. CASE BY CASE					
60		1. Develop master contracts for regional GIS projects, when appropriate		[See I(1), I(2) & I(3)]	See I(1), I(2) & I(3)	[See I(1) and I(2)]
61		2. Endorse standards for telecommunication protocol and networks (AKA: create guidelines for getting electronic access to the information that is being shared)		\$0	\$0	\$0
62		3. Provide technical assistance to participants to retrieve, translate, and use data developed and maintained on behalf of MetroGIS		(Staff function) See II(3) & (5)	(Staff function) See II(3) & (5)	(Staff function)

ATTACHMENT B

**MetroGIS Detailed 2005 Preliminary Budget Allocation Estimates
(Accepted by Coordinating Committee on March 31, 2004)**

	A	B	C	E	F	G
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function Category	MetroGIS Coordination Function	Sub Function / Description	2003	2004	2005
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)			Authorized	Authorized	Preliminary Estimates
63		4. Undertake research to meet common regional GIS needs		(See I-4)	(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)	[See I(1)(a)(ii)]
65			SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$0	\$0	\$0
66						
67	V. LOW PRIORITY					
68		1. Identify GIS training and continuing education needs and encourage participation		(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)
69		2. Provide a repository of GIS human resources information (centralized job posting/position descriptions)		(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)
70		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)		(See I-1)	(See I-1)	(See I-1 and note)
71			SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$0	\$0	\$0
72						
73		ADMINISTRATIVE				
74			a) GIS/Professional Development Conferences	N/A	N/A	N/A
75			b) Performance Measures Reporting	I-1a(ii)	I-1a(ii)	I-1a(ii)
76			SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$0	\$0	\$0
77						
78			YEAR	2003	2004	2005
79						
80			METROPOLITAN COUNCIL			
81			NON-STAFF - EXCEPT DATA/ACCESS ENHANCEMENTS	\$25,750	\$23,500	\$28,500
82			DATA QUALITY & ACCESS ENHANCEMENTS [I-2]	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
83			DATAFINDER ENHANCEMENTS/SUPPORT	\$24,750	\$12,500	\$7,500
84			TOTAL NON-STAFF	\$100,500	\$86,000	\$86,000
85			STAFF (3.0 FTE Dedicated to MetroGIS)*	\$213,000	\$200,000	\$206,000
86			SUBTOTAL	\$313,500	\$286,000	\$292,000
87						
88			OTHER FUNDING SOURCES			
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			GRAND TOTAL			
93				\$335,500	\$302,000	\$292,000



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Major Activity Update

DATE: April 20, 2004
(For the Apr. 28th Meeting)

A) COUNTY DATA PRODUCER WORKGROUP ACTIVITIES

(1) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy - Non-Government Access

The County Data Producer Workgroup (of the Coordinating Committee) has made progress to reach agreement among all counties on a collaborative solution to distribute the same parcel data (parcel boundaries plus 25 normalized attributes) to non-government interests that is currently being distributed to government interests.

- A website for 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.
- The Workgroup developed a prototype common fee schedule, led by Dakota County's GIS Coordinator, that has been implemented by each county with the exception of Ramsey County, which is in the process of doing so. It incorporates significant price reductions from the current \$0.05/parcel through subscriptions and volume purchases and accommodates subsetting of the regional dataset.
- The components of a common license document, including the shrink-wrap concept to streamline execution, have been agreed upon by the workgroup members. However, work on this agreement by county legal staff ceased when attention was shifted to modifying a license for the government and academic version of the regional parcel dataset (see Item D).

(2) 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. As soon as the Next Generation Data Sharing Agreement (Item D) is in place, the application will be deployed.

(3) Investigation of Data Sharing with Utilities Explored

Two samples of the regional parcel dataset have been delivered (November and February) 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.

B) 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 Metropolitan 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. The last article on the following web-page talks about this project <http://www.mngis.org/newsletter/issue35/MetroGIS.htm>.

(2) **Emergency Preparedness Workgroup**

Rick Gelbmann and Randy Knippel met with the Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium Board. They are very supportive of our efforts and will provide access to Consortium members through their website, E-news service, and quarterly newsletter.

According to Gelbmann, "Members of MetroGIS and the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) attended the 39th Annual Governor's Homeland Security and Emergency Management Conference. We worked very closely with Kim Ketterhagen of the HSEM who provided us with a booth in the vendor demonstration area at no charge. This booth was staffed by various people for two days. Randy Knippel and David Windle also gave a presentation on GIS for Homeland Security. The one-hour presentation was given twice during an afternoon of concurrent sessions. It was attended by over 70 people and was well received.

A prototype interactive web-based GIS application for emergency preparedness is running on the Metropolitan Council web server used to support DataFinder. Although this will be further refined, it provides a useful tool to demonstrate basic GIS functionality and data layers for emergency preparedness. Parcels are an important dataset for emergency management planning and response activities; however, requiring a license for every emergency manager may be an obstacle. Preliminary approval has been granted by the county data producer workgroup to pursue policy that would grant limited use of parcels for emergency preparedness through the web-based interactive mapping application without licensing. Current layers available include: hospitals, pharmacies, Red Cross facilities, wastewater treatment plants, water treatment plants, nursing homes, MPCA MES sites, functional class roads, MPCA LUST sites, E911 PSAP & ESN boundaries, and 2000 aerial photography. A demonstration and recommendation as to data themes and custodian roles and responsibilities associated with maintaining the currency of this web-based application are tentatively scheduled for the Coordinating Committee consideration in June and Policy Board action at the July meeting.

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

The workgroup has asked staff to seek out comments from various stakeholders as to the suitability of the APA's Land-Based Classification Standard as a basis for MetroGIS's regional solution. The first meeting, with St. Paul's planning staff on March 18th went well. Subsequent meetings are in process of being set up. Also under consideration are enhancement of the MetroGIS Planned Land Use coding scheme, and 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 Metropolitan Council GIS staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities. A recommendation to the Committee is anticipated at the June 2004 meeting.

(4) **Highway and Road Networks**

The Highways and Road Networks Technical Workgroup has taken a break since the first of the year to allow MnDOT to obtain software updates (due at the end of April) that are necessary to implement the full functionality of their Location Data Manager (LDM). The Workgroup expects to meet with MnDOT shortly after that software update to discuss the possibility of initiating a pilot project in one community, which will attempt to integrate the Lawrence Group (TLG) Street Centerline file 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.

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

No activity has occurred since direction was received from the Coordinating Committee at its September 17th meeting regarding this information need. At that time, the Committee authorized creation of a work group 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. Currently, a draft of the state-level standards for Hydrography Reach/Watercourse is being reviewed. The Hydrology Committee of the Governor's Council is scheduled to meet for the first time

since the Fall of 2003 on May 6, 2004. The MetroGIS Lakes, Wetlands workgroup will be responsible to develop strategies to accommodate any desired modifications and assure that any changes will integrate with State data. The 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.

(5) Regional Parcel Dataset Enhancements

On March 31st, the Coordinating Committee gave preliminary approval to several enhancements to the regional parcel dataset and directed staff to suggest modifications to the official policy statement necessary to implement the desired changes. The proposed modifications would implement several desired enhancements identified by the participants of the Parcel Data Users Forum held in September 2003, including: clarification of existing attribute meaning (completed), modification of existing parcel attributes, adding new attributes (mostly housing characteristics that were the top ranked enhancement preferences) and officially adding parcel points as a component of the regionally endorsed solution. The new set of attributes would be available with the January 2005 release.

In addition, the County Data Producers Workgroup has agreed-in-principle to pursue formal policy changes concerning unlicensed access to the Regional Parcel Dataset as follows: a) historical versions of the dataset (2-3+ years old) less the address and name attributes and b) browsing parcel data that is a component of the Emergency Management application that is currently being tested.

A Coordinating Committee recommendation to the Policy Board will be sought at the Committee's June meeting, with Policy Board consideration anticipated in July.

(6) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas:

Following endorsement from the Policy Board on January 28th, a Socioeconomic Resources Webpage (http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/) is now operational. Use statistics are being collected that will be incorporated into MetroGIS's formal Performance Measure statistics. The only remaining task, other than to monitor user satisfaction over the next 6-9 months, is to identify a willing entity, with appropriate resources to accept responsibility for managing the site content. A recommendation is expected to be submitted to the Board for consideration no later than the Board's October 2004 meeting.

The Phase II workgroup (solutions to Socioeconomic information needs that can not be achieved with existing published data) is expected to launch in the latter part of 2004. The Phase II effort will be coordinated with the Address Workgroup's efforts and not launch until more is known about how the Address Workgroup will proceed and possibly not until related solutions are defined by the Address Workgroup.

C) 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. \$15,000 of the \$18,700 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.

D) NEXT GENERATION DATA SHARING AGREEMENTS

The financial terms associated with the Next Generation Agreements have been shared with the seven counties last December and with the Policy Board for comment at the January meeting. No objections were raised. Work is currently in progress to reach agreement on the non-financial language for both the agreement and the data license, which is a component of the agreement. The concept of a single point of licensure has not been previously addressed in previous agreements to the satisfaction of all and is legally complex given that all seven counties have an ownership position with regard to the Regional Parcel

Dataset. Once the new procedures and policies are in place, each user of the regional database will need to execute the new license. Organizations that were licensed, prior to December 31, 2003, to use the regional parcel dataset may continue to use data received prior to that time. No new licensees are being added until the new license and agreement are in effect. Deployment of the proposed Regional Mailing Label Application (Item 6D(1) below) is also being delayed until the new agreement is in place.



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Information Sharing

DATE: April 15, 2004
(For the Apr 28th Meeting)

a) 2004 TOP Grant – Letter of Support and Assistance with Grant Writing Fee

On March 31st, with the approval of Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt, the Coordinating Committee authorized a \$500 MetroGIS donation towards a total of \$3,000 in grant writing expenses to apply for a TOP Grant. A consortium including the CURA, several non-profit community groups, the Minneapolis Neighborhood Information Network, the Ramsey County GIS Users Group, and Ramsey County are primary sponsors of the application. The Committee's action also authorized its Chairperson to sign a letter in support of awarding the application to the consortium and pledged up to \$100,000 in in-kind resources to the effort – resources that would be present whether or not the application were made and part of MetroGIS's current efforts. The application deadline is April 27th. The letter of support is attached (Attachment A). Copies of the actual application are available upon request.

The Department of Commerce's Technology Opportunities Program (TOP) promotes the widespread availability and use of digital network technologies in the public and non-profit sectors. TOP gives grants for model projects demonstrating innovative uses of network technologies. Over the years, TOP has awarded 583 grants, totaling \$218.9 million and leveraging \$297 million in local matching funds.

b) Fall 2004 Strategic Direction Check-In Workshop Planned

The Coordinating Committee is planning a fall workshop to launch discussion on several strategic issues and opportunities that have arisen since the current MetroGIS Business Plan was adopted in 2002. The date and other agenda components will be determined once the discussion issues are settled on. A preliminary listing of proposed issues was accepted at the March 31st meeting and an oversight workgroup was created to refine them. The Committee is planning to share the proposed discussion statements with the Policy Board at the July meeting to confirm they are issues that the Board believes are the most compelling to address in the next cycle of Business Planning, tentatively planned for 2005.

c) Presentations / Outreach / Studies (not mentioned elsewhere)

The following activities occurred since the Policy Board last met.

- 2003 MetroGIS Annual Report
- Article Published in Spring Issue of Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium Newsletter
- Keynote – Western Michigan GIS Conference – June 10th.
- Metropolitan 911 Board Initiative - Integrate GIS Technology into PSAP Operations
- MetroGIS Subject of Ph.D. Research - Delft University, Netherlands

2003 MetroGIS Annual Report

During the first week in March, notice of MetroGIS's 2003 Annual Report was distributed to approximately 1900 persons – 900 by email notice (300 more than last year) and 950 by mail. Another 50 printed copies were hand delivered or mailed to members of the Policy Board, Coordinating Committee and Metropolitan Council. Beginning with last year's report, distribution switched from mailing the report to relying on the Internet, substantially reducing distribution and printing costs. Extra

printed copies of the report and brochure are available upon request. They can also be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual_reports/ar03.pdf.

MetroGIS News in the Minnesota GIS/LIS Newsletter

Three articles summarizing major MetroGIS activities, since the fall newsletter, were submitted for the Spring 2004 issue. They can be viewed: <http://www.mngis.org/newsletter/issue36/issue36toc.htm>.

Keynote Speaker – Western Michigan Regional GIS Conference.

The Staff Coordinator has agreed to present the keynote address at a June 10th conference hosted by REGIS (<http://www.gvmc-regis.org>), an Agency of the Grand Valley Metropolitan Council (GVMC). GVMC is located in western Michigan. REGIS, an acronym for "Regional Geographic Information System," provides a common database, infrastructure, and suite of applications used for spatial data management for its members. The conference theme is how GIS technology can be used to effectively facilitate collaboration necessary to address regional/issues that cross county boundaries related to growth and development, improving the quality of life, and coordinating governmental services.

Metropolitan 911 Board Initiative - Integrate GIS Technology into PSAP Operations

On March 10th, the Metropolitan 911 Board adopted a strategy to proceed with integrating GIS technology into the day-to-day work of PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Points). See Agenda Item 4 for more about this exciting initiative and how the effort will leverage MetroGIS's efforts.

MetroGIS Subject of Ph.D. Research - Delft University, Netherlands

On April 12th, Bastiaan van Loenen, a Ph.D. candidate from Delft University (Netherlands), interviewed the Staff Coordinator. Last fall, he contacted several geospatial collaboratives by email requesting information about several aspects of each organization's respective operations. He then selected three candidates for in depth interviews in person— 2 in the United States (MetroGIS and MassGIS) and 1 in Europe (Denmark). He agreed to share his findings and conclusions with us. He was particularly interested in MetroGIS's philosophy and actions to continually look for ways to connect with larger area geography's – MSDI and NSDI – and with our efforts to clearly defined document roles and responsibilities and our success at seeking out entities to voluntarily carry out these responsibilities.

d) State Geospatial Initiatives Update

1) Project Pending to Expand DataFinder Café Functionality Statewide

See Agenda Item 6C.

2) GCGI Updating Website - The Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) is updating its website at www.gis.state.mn.us. According to GCGI staff, "The look of the site has changed already and our intention is to make it more useful to users. Current users are the general public and the GIS professional. We want to add IT professionals as a major client, to help build GIS/IT relations."

3) MSDI – Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure

See Item E4 below.

e) Federal/National Geospatial Initiatives Update

1) SALIS Journal Article - The December 2003 SALIS Journal (Surveying & Land Information Science) was a special issue on "Cadastral Development and Issues in the U.S." The issue shows the importance of parcel mapping and makes it clear that MetroGIS is on the cutting edge of this area. The lead article was co-authored by Will Craig, immediate past chair of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. For a full list of articles, along with abstracts, see <http://www.acsm.net/salisdec03.html>.

2) Congressional Breakfast - The University Consortium for GIS held its annual Congressional Breakfast on February 5 in Washington, D.C. Seven speakers presented research results showing the value of GIS for Homeland Security. Shashi Shekhar, Computer Science at the University of Minnesota, showed a real-time system for managing evacuation -- with the example of the

Monticello nuclear power plant. Thirty congressional staff people were in attendance, including those from Minnesota. For more details, see <http://www.ucgis.org/winter2004/program.htm>.

- 3) **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. USGS’s Cooperative Topographic Mapping (CTM) Program has asked MetroGIS staff to complete a survey, along with many other state/local contacts throughout the country, to provide input regarding The National Map.
 - 4) **I-Teams** - The Staff Coordinator and David Arbeit, with LMIC, are serving on a Minnesota Governor’s Council 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 the 8 data themes are in various stages of completion. A draft “wrapper” document is being drafted by the workgroup. 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 by mid-2004. The document will also include a strategy for next steps by Minnesota interests necessary to achieve the vision.
 - 5) **Grant Announcement For Geospatial Data Activities**- A new grant program announcement will combine ongoing efforts of the FGDC GeoSpatial One Stop (GOS) and the USGS. Components of the announcement will include FGDC Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP) funding for "traditional" metadata activities and new web mapping services, GOS efforts related to Framework data services, and USGS implementation efforts for The National Map. The grant announcement can be viewed online at www.grants.gov.
 - 6) **2004 USGS Central Region State Mapping Workshop** - This biennial workshop is designed to provide information about USGS mapping-related activities and programs. It will be held in conjunction with the Mid-America GIS Consortium Symposium April 18-22 in Kansas City, MO.
- f) **Summary for March 31st Coordinating Committee Meeting**
This meeting summary is posted at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/033104/min.pdf> .
- g) **University of Minnesota – Humphrey Institute GIS Course Offering**
On May 26th, a one-day course, taught by John Carpenter, is offered entitled “GIS for Advanced Demographic Planning”. See Attachment B for more information.

ATTACHMENT A

MetroGIS Letter of Support – TOP Grant Application

MetroGIS

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data



April 6, 2004

Kris Nelson
Center for Urban & Regional Affairs
University of Minnesota
330 HHH Center
301 – 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55455

2004 TOP GRANT APPLICATION – LETTER OF SUPPORT

Dear Mr. Nelson:

MetroGIS is pleased to partner with CURA and its community partners in its TOP proposal. We support the grant request and are willing to assist in its success.

MetroGIS is an innovative, regional geographic information systems initiative serving the seven-county Minneapolis-St. Paul (Minnesota) Metropolitan Area. It provides a regional forum to promote and facilitate widespread sharing of geospatial data. MetroGIS is a voluntary collaboration of local and regional governments, with partners in state and federal government, academic institutions, nonprofit organizations and businesses. MetroGIS continues to make huge strides each year. In recognition of the organization's success, MetroGIS received URISA's coveted Exemplary Systems in Government Award in 2002.

We understand that TOP grants are intended to assist community-based non-profits with access to GIS and geographic information for the purpose of supporting their efforts in community development. This mission is congruent with that of MetroGIS. In recognition of the value of community GIS, at its December 17, 2003 meeting, MetroGIS agreed to pursue the following activities:

- Investigate providing access to parcel data to non-profit community-based entities without a fee.
- Involve community-based GIS interests in developing strategies related to web-based geospatial applications that address priority information needs of the MetroGIS community.
- Continue to foster understanding among elected officials of the benefits of using GIS technology, sharing related resources, and the importance of their active participation in evolving sustainable best practices.
- Participate in deliberations to define an official spokesperson and intermediary for the non-profit community-based organizations.
- Develop an efficient communication network to expand communication between MetroGIS and community-based organizations.
- Share MetroGIS's successful methodology to gain consensus and overcome obstacles to implementing regional solutions to common geospatial needs.

We believe that these activities will have significant value to the proposed community-based GIS initiative. Some indicators of that value are:

1. A MetroGIS workgroup of the seven counties has agreed to work on defining criteria that could potentially allow free access for these groups. Data on parcels, geometry and 25 attributes, is sold at \$.05/parcel. There are over 900,000 parcels in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Access to all this data for a single entity would cost \$45,000 per year. Given the number of community-based non-profits in the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metro Area, this value could be sizable.
2. MetroGIS invests \$50,000 annually in a site license for street centerline data kept current by a private firm, The Lawrence Group. This data could be made available through membership in MetroGIS.
3. Representatives of MetroGIS member organizations are contributing a significant amount of time in identifying strategies to meet the common information needs of GIS users in the region. Currently, seven workgroups, including a pair of groups working on socioeconomic data, are working on issues that would provide new applications or new data to stakeholders. These efforts would provide critical data to community-based non-profits. A typical workgroup might have a dozen people, meeting six times per year for 2 hours at a time. Each member is required to spend additional time on homework and travel. Each member's time is valued at \$50/hour.

We believe that the value of these activities will amount to as much as \$100,000 for the community-based non-profit organizations involved in your TOP proposal. MetroGIS has a system of performance measurement in place that can determine, in part, the actual value of MetroGIS resources used for the benefit of those organizations. The quantity of data parcel downloads will be used to determine the value from #1 above. Some portion of investments #2 and #3 can be assigned to the TOP community as well. We suspect that these numbers will easily sum to \$100,000 over the three years of the award and offer this as partial match for the TOP funds.

MetroGIS is committed to the success of this project. Through its success, MetroGIS will also grow and become stronger.

Sincerely yours,

Jane Harper, Chair
Coordinating Committee

ATTACHMENT B

One Day Course: Wednesday, May 26, 8:30am–3:00pm **Humphrey Institute – University of Minnesota**

(Excerpt form: http://www.hhh.umn.edu/pe/urp_gis_demographic.htm)

A. GIS for Advanced Demographic Planning

Working with the Minnesota Chapter of the American Planning Association, the Humphrey Institute's nationally recognized urban and regional planning program presents 12 brief programs to provide urban and regional planners—and other professionals involved in planning—with up-to-date research and creative techniques for handling the everyday challenges planners face.

The American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) will award Continuing Professional Development Program (CPDP) credits to participants in this and all other Humphrey Institute urban and regional planning programs. CPDP credits are provided for programs that qualify for members of the American Planning Association/American Institute of Certified Planners (APA/AICP), with each hour of training qualified as one (1) CPDP credit.

FACULTY: JOHN CARPENTER

Use GIS to layer and analyze several dimensions of demographic data over time in small geographic areas.

Discover new concepts and techniques to identify and track community demographic changes, forecast small-area growth, measure neighborhood turnover, and assess the interdependencies between where people live and where they work. Use GIS to tie demographic data to physical features, map home and workplace relationships, and display sensitive demographic data in a way that protects the privacy of residents while revealing important community issues. Participants should enter the program with some knowledge of how GIS systems work and how information is used in GIS applications. Participation in the first GIS program is sufficient preparation for this program.

WHO SHOULD ATTEND: urban and regional planners, planning commission members, architects, engineers, A&E staff, developers, attorneys, other professionals engaged in urban and regional planning, and citizens interested in urban and regional planning.

DATE: Wednesday, May 26, 8:30am–3:00pm (lunch break)

FEE: \$245 [registration code 0408]

FEE FOR BOTH GIS PROGRAMS: \$395 [registration code 0409]

JOHN CARPENTER: Considered one of our region's foremost experts on small-area GIS planning and analysis, Carpenter is president of Excensus LLC. He has more than 30 years of experience in the use of demographic databases for integrated community planning and analysis and 15 years of experience in the development of innovative GIS techniques and applications. Carpenter is principal demographic consultant to a number of Twin Cities organizations and planning collaboratives. He has been senior economic/market analyst of Midwest Research Institute's Center of Economic Studies and senior vice president of Economic Research Corporation. Carpenter has taught in Hamline University's Graduate School of Public Administration and Management.

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
MN Counties Insurance Trust Bldg. – Room 313
March 31, 2004

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Harper called the meeting to order at 1:33 PM, introduced the newest member, Ned Phillips, with the Rice Creek Watershed District, and asked all present to state their name and the organization they represent. Ned replaces Cliff Aichinger, who resigned from the Committee in December. Harper then presented Aichinger, who had been an active participant in MetroGIS from its beginnings in 1995, with a Certificate of Recognition for his contributions to the Committee.

Members Present: *Academics:* Will Craig (U of M); *Business Geographics:* Chet Harrison (CB Richard Ellis); *Cities:* Bob Cockriel (AMM: suburban cities - City of Bloomington); *Counties:* Gary Swenson (Anoka), Bill Brown (Hennepin); David Claypool (Ramsey), Dave Drealan (Carver), Jane Harper (Washington), and Randy Knippel (Dakota); *Federal:* Ron Wencl (USGS); *Metropolitan:* David Bitner (Metropolitan Airports Commission), Rick Gelbmann (Metropolitan Council), Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District), and Nancy Pollock, Metropolitan 911 Board; *Non-Profits:* Sandra Paddock (Wilder Research Center); *State:* David Arbeit (LMIC), Joella Givens (Mn/DOT), and Robert Maki (DNR); *Watershed/Water Management Organizations:* Ned Phillips (Rice Creek Watershed District).

Members Absent: *Cities:* Karen Johnson (AMM: core cities - City of St. Paul), *Counties:* Jim Hentges (Scott); *GIS Consultants:* Larry Charboneau (The Lawrence Group); *Schools:* Lee Whitcraft (TIES); *Special Expertise:* Brad Henry (URS Corp.); *Utilities:* Al Laumeyer (CenterPoint Energy Minnegasco).

Support Staff: Mark Kotz, Steve Fester, Randall Johnson, and Kathie Doty (Richardson, Richter & Associates, Inc.)

Visitors: Pete Eggimann (Metropolitan 911 Board) and Scott Simmer (Hennepin County GIS Coordinator).

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Gelbmann moved and Givens seconded to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried ayes, all.

3. ACCEPT MEETING SUMMARY

Craig moved and Bitner seconded to approve the summary for the Committee's December 17th meeting, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. SUMMARY OF JANUARY 28 POLICY BOARD MEETING

Staff Coordinator Johnson and Chairperson Harper summarized the major topics considered by the Policy Board at its January 28th meeting. The main item of discussion surrounded comments from Board members that indicated a lack of understanding of the breadth of common information needs that have been previously acknowledged as priorities for MetroGIS. It was noted that only 4 of the 12 members have any substantive longevity on the Board and, as such, Chairperson Reinhardt has encouraged a presentation at the next meeting to expand their understanding of established priorities, regional solutions in place and benefits attributable to those solutions.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Update on the Metropolitan 911 Board's GIS Project

Nancy Pollock, Director of the Metropolitan 911 Board, provided a context for the Board's GIS Project with its Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and introduced Pete Eggimann, Technical Operations Director for the Board summarized the Board's ambitious project to integrate use of GIS technology into the daily operations of the 27 PSAPs that serve the seven county area. The presentation slides can be

viewed at www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/033104/911.pdf. In early March the 911 Board concluded that GIS technology is crucial to its ability to effectively dispatch emergency services in a wireless world. Components of the Board's strategy include:

- a) Hiring a GIS Coordinator who will work for the Board and be responsible for coordinating standards, data management, etc. among the 27 PSAPs, and
- b) Avoiding duplication of effort by leveraging MetroGIS's regional data solutions and standards and best practice development processes, as well as, the investments in GIS technology and related data management that have been made by the seven counties.

Eggimann closed by stating that if MetroGIS had not existed, a more expensive strategy would be under consideration.

Knippel encouraged the 911 Board to coordinate its data needs with the efforts of MetroGIS's Emergency Preparedness Workgroup. Staff commented that they are watching for such opportunities and making sure all possible affected parties are aware of what the others are doing. The Address Workgroup was offered as a case in point, which includes representatives from several workgroups and key interests.

Craig and Arbeit encouraged Pollock and Eggimann to be clear in their presentation to the Policy Board why MetroGIS's efforts are important to their project by citing specific examples of the datasets developed via MetroGIS's efforts that are valuable, how the workgroups in progress will be leveraged (i.e., Address Workgroup), and how they will be leveraging GIS technology investments that have been made by the counties. Pollock thanked the group for feedback.

b) Operating Guidelines – Modifications - THIRD READING

Chairperson Harper summarized the changes that had been accepted at the December 17th meeting and the changes proposed to provide rules for addressing member removal in cases when a member is not engaged in the affairs of the Committee. Staff noted that Chairperson Reinhardt is not in favor of a strict policy stated in the rules for fear that such a policy will result in more harm than good.

Read and Givens commented that, in deference to Chairperson Reinhardt, a clear policy of expectations and consequences is preferred, but agreed that softer language than that proposed would be acceptable.

Motions:

1. Cockriel moved and Read seconded to direct the Committee Chair and Staff to soften the language proposed in Section III (10) - Member Removal - of the modifications to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines, dated February 11, 2004 and forward them to the Policy Board for approval. Motion carried, ayes all.
2. Arbeit moved and Cockriel seconded to approve the proposed modifications to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines, dated February 11, 2004, with the exception of Section III (10) -Member Removal, and forward them to the Policy Board for approval. Motion carried, ayes all

c) Preliminary 2005 Budget

Staff commented that budget requests for 2005 programs need to be submitted to Council management no later than this May. As such, a preliminary 2005 budget for MetroGIS and associated listing of core services was shared with the Committee by staff. Staff noted that no changes are proposed from the 2004 budget (\$86,000 in non-staff expenses and 3 FTE in staff support) and that this level of support should be sufficient to support all core services. No comments were received regarding the budget or the functions/services proposed to be supported in 2005.

Motion:

Claypool moved and Read seconded to direct staff to forward to the Policy Board for its review and comment the 2005 preliminary MetroGIS budget and accompanying listing of functions that were included in the Committee's agenda materials. Motion carried, ayes all.

d) Enhancements to Regional Parcel Dataset – 2004 Funding Priorities

Swenson, a member of the Parcel Data Enhancement Workgroup, summarized the recommendation and introduced Mark Kotz, staff lead for the Workgroup, to explain the recommendations in more detail. Kotz summarized the process by which the proposed enhancements had been identified and design specifications agreed upon, noting that all seven counties are comfortable with the recommendation and requested Committee comment and direction. Once the proposal is acceptable to the Committee, the Workgroup will formalize its proposal in the form of a modified Regional Policy Statement for the Committee's approval at the June meeting and consideration by the Policy Board in July.

The target for distributing the modified version of the regional parcel dataset is January 2005. There are four general modifications proposed: clarification of existing attribute meaning (completed), modification of existing attributes, adding new attributes (mostly housing characteristics that were the top ranked enhancement preferences) and officially adding parcel points as a component of the regionally endorsed solution. He noted that two counties currently provide parcel points on their own. Kotz summarized each of the proposed changes.

No comments were offered regarding the specifics of the proposed changes, other than Knippel stating that he agrees that MetroGIS can not mandate compliance but would prefer a stronger statement of intent to encourage the counties to strive to do as much as possible to achieve and maintain the desired regional parcel data to agreed-upon specifications. Staff noted that they would look into possible modifications to the preamble language and share any proposed changes with the counties prior to the June Coordinating Committee meeting.

The consensus was to direct the Parcel Workgroup to propose modifications to the adopted regional parcel dataset roles, responsibilities and specifications document (Regional Policy Statement), as necessary, to implement the recommended enhancements for approval at the next Coordinating Committee meeting and Policy Board consideration in July.

e) Business Plan Update Preparations – (Fall Workshop)

Kathie Doty, MetroGIS Strategic Planning Consultant, summarized the preparations that staff have made to date for the fall workshop, including six draft issue statements.

Arbeit suggested that before the specific issue statements are addressed that a more general dialogue related to the broad vision might be in order. The group concurred.

Gelbmann noted that one of the reasons that the workshop was proposed in the first place is because the "low hanging fruit" in terms of regional data solutions have in most part been accomplished. His hope is that the group will be able to identify ideas for how to best go about defining regional solutions that will likely require multiple leaders in a collaborative setting.

Harper commented that a topic that has been raised in the past and that should be incorporated into the discussion is whether MetroGIS continue to seek out collaborative solutions to additional needs or focus on maintaining what is already in place.

Maki noted that MetroGIS has achieved a good deal of maturity in terms of regional data solutions, best practices and policies and that a good deal of trust has been established. He believes a next step worth serious consideration is looking into how the constituent organizations might move closer to integrated business processes. He cited MetroGIS's regional mailing label application as an example, and speculated on how many more such applications might be out there.

Read suggested that outreach and increasing understanding of access opportunities among stakeholders should be added to the list of discussion points at the workshop.

At Chairperson Harper's invitation, the following members volunteered to assist her and staff with further preparations for the fall workshop: Bitner, Gelbmann, Harrison, and Maki.

f) GIS Demonstration for April Policy Board meeting

The Staff Coordinator summarized Chairperson Reinhardt's intent for the April Policy Board GIS Demonstration to clearly illustrate the breadth of data themes that comprise solutions to priority common information needs and how organizations represented by the Policy Board are benefiting from MetroGIS's efforts. Staff noted that following this statement by Chairperson Reinhardt, a invitation was made to Bob Diedrich, with SRF Consulting, to share some of the material included in the testimonial he participated in last fall for MetroGIS; material that speaks directly to Chairperson Reinhardt's intent for the April presentation.

Staff asked if the proposal to utilize a 3rd party to communicate benefits to government entities caused anyone any pause. No one objected and several believed that it was a good idea to bring a non-government entity before the Board to clearly communicate the breadth of benefit attributable to MetroGIS's efforts.

The consensus was to direct staff to invite Bob Diedrich with SRF to share with the Board several examples of how their government clients are benefiting from MetroGIS's efforts.

g) DataFinder – Review Outreach Presentation

Postponed to the June meeting due to lack of time.

h) Performance Measures Reporting Update

Kathie Doty, MetroGIS Strategic Planning Consultant, asked if the group had any thoughts that might explain the 15 percent increase in DataFinder activity from January to February. No theories were offered.

Doty also recommended that the Committee postpone to the fall workshop action on two changes to the actual Performance Measures that have been proposed by Committee members: tracking use of applications and tracking volunteer time. The group concurred that it is appropriate to defer discussion of these topics to the fall workshop when a detailed discussion of benefit versus investment is anticipated.

i) TOP Grant – Grant Writer Funding Request and Letter of Support

Craig and Paddock explained the intent of the grant proposal and the request of MetroGIS to donate \$500 to the grant writing as well as to submit a letter of support. They conceded that the current reference in the letter of support to providing access to data by the non-profit community needs some work and that they will rely upon Chairperson Harper's advice to refine this statement. Staff Coordinator Johnson commented that the application deadline is before the next Policy Board meeting but that Chairperson Reinhardt was okay with deferring to the Coordinating Committee to act on this request.

Gelbmann commented that core functions of MetroGIS are to foster broad-based sharing of geospatial data and knowledge, as necessary, to fully address priority information needs of the community and that this proposal is consistent with these functions. Craig acknowledged that MetroGIS's principles are embedded in the application and noted that non-profits might also be in the position to provide data needed by others on an ongoing basis if the grant is awarded.

Motions:

Gelbmann moved and Givens seconded to:

- 1) Authorize staff to draft a check from MetroGIS funds in the amount of \$500 to be used toward the development of the proposed Technology Opportunities Program grant application, upon receipt of an invoice along with evidence that the grant application was submitted to the US Department of

Commerce according to all requirements and is a candidate for consideration by the funding authority; and

- 2) Authorize the Coordinating Committee Chair to sign a letter of support for this initiative. This letter will state general support for the concept of community GIS and commit to up to \$100,000 in matching value derived from activities and investments that are part of the MetroGIS's ongoing activities (the only out-of-pocket expense related to the grant on MetroGIS's part will be the \$500 donation to the grant writing fee).

Motion carried, ayes all.

6. PROJECT UPDATES

No presentations or discussion due to lack of time. Chairperson Harper encouraged the members to review the information provided in the agenda packet.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

Chairperson Harper encouraged the members to review the information provided in the agenda packet.

8. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

June 30, 2004 – 1:00 p.m. start. (*Editor's note: Following the meeting, the date was changed to June 22 to accommodate vacation schedules.*)

9. ADJOURN

Givens moved and Maki seconded to adjourn at 3:45 p.m. Motion carried, ayes all.

It was agreed that future meetings should begin at 1:00 p.m., as opposed to 1:30 p.m., and that with advance notice to the membership it is okay to plan on meetings of 2-1/2 to 3 hours as opposed to 2 hours if the Chair believes the additional time is warranted.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson and Steve Fester
MetroGIS Staff