



## Policy Board Members:

Victoria Reinhardt,  
Chairperson  
Ramsey County

Jim Kordiak,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Anoka County

Tom Egan,  
Dakota County

Gary M. Delaney,  
Carver County

Conrad Fiskness,  
MAWD

Dennis Hegberg,  
Washington County

Dan Cook,  
TIES

Randy Johnson,  
Hennepin County

*vacant,*  
(Large Cities)  
AMM

Terry Schneider,  
City of Minnetonka  
AMM

Joseph Wagner,  
Scott County

Tony Pistilli,  
Metropolitan Council

## Coordinating Committee

Nancy Read,  
Chairperson  
MMCD

Randy Knippel,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Dakota County

## Staff Coordinator

Randall Johnson,  
Metropolitan Council

**Wednesday, January 18, 2006**

**6:30 p.m.**

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

## Agenda

	<u>Page</u>
<b>1. Call to Order</b>	
<b>2. Accept Agenda</b>	
<b>3. Accept October 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summary</b>	<i>action</i> 1
<b>4. GIS Technology Demonstration:</b> <i>(Evacuation Planning for Homeland Defense - U of M Project)</i>	6
<b>5. Action/Discussion Items</b>	
a) 2005 Accomplishments and Annual Report Theme	<i>action</i> 9
b) 2005 Annual Performance Measurement Report	<i>action</i> 11
c) Update on Council Consideration of MetroGIS Governance and Funding Questions	<i>action</i> 14
d) Non-Government Forum Results & Partnering Guidelines	<i>action</i> 26
e) Strategic Directions Workshop and Business Plan Update	<i>action</i> 27
f) Letter of Support Requested for Federal Grant Application	<i>action</i> 29
<b>6. Major Activity Update</b>	32
a) Modification of Operating Guidelines – Between Meeting Decision Procedures	
b) Status of 2005 Regional GIS Project Proposals	
c) Critique 2005 Regional GIS Project Program / Prepare 2006 Guidelines	
d) Priority Business Information Need Solutions and User Satisfaction Forums	
e) Pilot Project – Policy Investigation for Access to Parcel Data by Non-Profits Entities	
f) Pilot Project - View-Only, Web-based Access Policy Investigation for Parcel Data	
<b>7. Information Sharing</b>	42
a) Thank you letter to Dr. Zorica Nedovic-Budic	
b) Coordinating Committee Officers for 2006	
c) Presentations / Outreach / Studies	
d) Metro and State Geospatial Initiatives Update	
e) National/Federal Geospatial Initiatives Update	
f) December 14, 2005 Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary	
<b>8. Next Meeting</b> April 19, 2006	
<b>9. Adjourn</b>	

### *Mission Statement*

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

**Meeting Summary  
MetroGIS Policy Board  
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices  
October 19, 2005**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

Members Present: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Gary Delaney (Carver County), Tom Egan (Dakota County), Scott Simmer for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Joseph Wagner (Scott County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES), Terry Schneider (AMM- City of Minnetonka), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: None

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Nancy Read (Chairperson), Will Craig, Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper, Brad Henry, Randy Knippel, and Steve Lorbach.

Visitors: Mark Vander Schaaf (Metropolitan Council), Debra Ehret (MN Dept. of Health), and Carla Coates (Ramsey County).

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Michael Dolbow, and Steve Fester.

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

Member Fiskness moved and Member Pistilli seconded to approve the meeting agenda, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**3. MEETING SUMMARY**

Member O'Rourke moved and Member Kordiak seconded to accept the July 27, 2005 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION**

Chairperson Reinhardt presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Michael Dolbow for his significant contributions to MetroGIS over the past five years. Mr. Dolbow is member of the Metropolitan Council's GIS Unit and has been of a member of the MetroGIS staff support team for the past five years. He has accepted the position of GIS Coordinator for the Minnesota Dept. of Agriculture and will be leaving the Council and MetroGIS on October 28. In his comments, Mr. Dolbow noted that it has been a pleasure to work for MetroGIS because it is providing nationally recognized leadership to accomplish collaborative solutions to information needs shared by government interests that serve the Twin Cities. He wished the Policy Board well in its future efforts.

**4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION**

Rick Gelbmann, GIS Manager for the Metropolitan Council, demonstrated a natural resources planning application that the Council's GIS Unit is in the process of developing, entitled "Natural Resources Atlas Application". It runs on ArcReader software, which can be downloaded free of charge. The Council's GIS Unit is creating value by making it easy for the user to obtain a variety of data, which are produced by several organizations, by organizing and bundling it, and creating an easy means to access the it via the ArcReader software. This application is tentatively planned for release next spring.

Board members asked a number of questions ranging from who will have access to the application, how to add additional datasets, what triggers adding a specific property to a designated natural resources/park area, and value to the effort of investments made by counties and others to improving the spatial accuracy and completeness of their base map data, such as parcel boundaries. The latter investments were acknowledged as having substantial value. It was also noted that it is too early in the process to objectively respond to the other questions that were raised.

## **5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **a) Emergency Preparedness – Proposed Interim Regional Solution Report**

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Read introduced the need for regional interoperability of emergency preparedness-related data with the following scenario. A jet aircraft is having difficulty and dumps fuel before landing. The fuel falls across a three county area. Emergency responders need to assess the impact on water intakes.

She then introduced Randy Knippel, Dakota County GIS Coordinator and Chair of the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, noting that the Coordinating Committee had endorsed the proposed collaborative solution presented in the agenda materials at its September 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. The presentation slides can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/05\\_1019/slides.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/05_1019/slides.pdf).

Knippel summarized the collaborative vision, noting that the seven counties are to be the core participants and that officials affiliated with each of the counties had been actively involved in the development of the vision. He commented that the initial focus is on public health related topics such as data related to the Strategic National Stockpile initiative and that a major benefit is provision of a common operating picture for how the GIS and Emergency Preparedness/Management communities can collaborate. The key is recognizing that all disasters are local and that local officials possess the detailed knowledge needed to quickly respond. Moreover, to apply outside resources – nearby communities, state, federal assistance – quickly and effectively, there is a compelling need to create systems that facilitate easy and comprehensive access to data about the specific locality involved. In short, the protocols proposed by the Workgroup are designed to capture a host of data important to effectively respond to emergencies and create a sustainable mechanism with defined organizational roles and responsibilities to keep these data current and readily accessible. He also noted that a website has been created to improve communication with and understanding by the emergency preparedness community.

Before concluding his presentation, Knippel invited Debra Ehert of the Minnesota Department of Health to comment from the perspective of a benefactor of the proposed vision. Ms. Ehert spoke strongly in favor of the proposal, noting that the efforts of the Workgroup have been critical to their ability to effectively integrate GIS technology into their day-to-day business functions. She emphasized that the existence of cross-jurisdictionally compliant data are critical to achieving the Department of Health's mandates, as there is a major spatial dynamic to their work.

Knippel concluded his presentation by summarizing the components of the recommendation. In response to a question from Member Delaney, Knippel commented that the Workgroup is asking if the Board concurs that the vision has political legitimacy before further testing is initiated. Policy Board members then suggested that in addition to seeking a finding of legitimacy from the Policy Board, the Workgroup should be seeking the desired acknowledgement from the Pawlenty Administration, in particular the Department of Public Safety, as well as from the Legislature, League of Cities, and Association of Minnesota (and Metropolitan) Counties. At the county level, Board members concurred that the focus should be on seeking legitimacy from the Emergency Management Coordinators (EMC), as opposed to directly from the County Boards, noting that if the EMC's are sold on the idea, they will recommend it to their respective county boards. Member Delaney noted that each of the county EMCs is responsible for

detailed plans to satisfy FEMA compliance standards and that access to accurate data is critical to their ability to effectively carry out this planning requirement.

Member Schneider commented that he supports the vision concept as most cities and counties have detailed plans that call for a high level of coordination. He concurred with other members that the plan should seek to obtain recognition at the state level sooner rather than later. He also offered constructive criticism concerning the graphic that illustrates the process, which is included in the agenda materials. The Board concurred with Member Schneider that the graphic needs to focus on demonstrable program-related outcomes familiar and important to policy makers and that the terminology needs to be more aligned with their worlds.

Vice-Chair Kordiak asked for clarification about how the Workgroup expects the Emergency Management community to use GIS technology. Knippel responded that the goal is to raise awareness of the value that the GIS professional can bring to a disaster response effort and include them on the team. No one is expecting the Emergency Managers to use the technology themselves in the time of a crisis.

Member Schneider noted that the presence of accurate data maintained in a system that permits analysis of “what if” scenarios would provide an enormously valuable training tool.

**Motion:** Member Egan moved and Member Delaney seconded, with the understanding that the process graphic will be improved to illustrate program rather than process outcomes, that the Policy Board and, in particular, each county representative:

- 1) Advocate among the leadership of their respective organizations for the next phase of testing and further refinement.
- 2) Offer suggestions for how the proposed roles and responsibilities might work better in their respective organization.
- 3) Authorize Chairperson Reinhardt to sign a letter inviting members of the EP community to attend an outreach event(s) at which the subject interim strategy will be explained and next steps discussed.

Motion carried, ayes all.

**b) Strategic Directions Workgroup and 2006 MetroGIS Work Plan**

Chairperson Reinhardt informed the Board members that she had added this topic to the agenda. The purpose of this item is to suggest that the Board set a target of February 2006 to host the Strategic Directions Workshop that has been postponed to allow the Metropolitan Council to evaluate the value of MetroGIS to its internal operations. She then recognized Member Pistilli, who provided a copy of the Metropolitan Council’s internal evaluation of the MetroGIS initiative to each of the Policy Board members, noting that the document had been printed the day before and had not yet been seen by members of the Metropolitan Council.

Member Pistilli characterized the findings set forth in the evaluation as complimentary to the products of MetroGIS’s efforts. He also noted that the evaluation raises some questions about MetroGIS’s reporting and organizational structures, commenting that, in his opinion, what seems to make MetroGIS work also raises these questions. He commented that he believes that discussion of the cited issues may lead to improvements. Mark Vander Schaaf, Director of Planning and Growth Management for the Metropolitan Council, briefly commented that the Council’s Audit Committee is scheduled to consider the document on November 2 and that the Council’s Community Development Committee is scheduled to consider it on November 7.

The sentiment expressed by Policy Board members was support for Council’s program evaluation process acknowledging that sufficient public value must be received in return for support of initiatives. In

response to a question from Chairperson Reinhardt, which was echoed by other Board members, Member Pistilli commented that he supports providing Policy Board members an opportunity to provide substantive input into the Council's process from this point on. Member Schneider asked for clarification about how these discussions might affect MetroGIS's 2006 budget. In response, Vander Schaaf and Member Pistilli commented that the Council's proposed 2006 budget maintains at MetroGIS's 2005 funding level, as had been requested by the Policy Board. Member Pistilli and Chairperson Reinhardt agreed to discuss options following the meeting for providing input from the Policy Board to the Council concerning the findings and recommendations presented in its Program Evaluation Report for MetroGIS.

**Motion:** Member Pistilli moved and Member Egan seconded the following actions:

1. That the Policy Board at its January 2006 meeting, set a target date for hosting MetroGIS's Strategic Directions Workshop.
2. Continue the work in progress for 2006, place on hold initiatives that are planned but not yet commenced, and include initiatives that are identified at the Strategic Directions Workshop as part of the Business Plan Update project.

### **c) 2006 Meeting Schedule**

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized the meeting schedule as proposed in the agenda materials.

**Motion:** Member Schneider moved and Member Fiskness seconded to set the 2006 Policy Board meetings dates as January 18, April 19, July 19, and October 18, with the understanding that the Board may elect to meet more often for a particular purpose. The 6:30 p.m. start time was maintained:

Motion carried, ayes all.

## **6. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES**

**a1-3):** Regional GIS Project Proposals: The Staff Coordinator provided a status update on each of the subject proposals from the materials included in the agenda packet (common web application design, DataFinder Café Upgrade, and fill in incomplete parcel data attributes).

Steve Lorbach, representing St. Paul and the Ramsey County GIS Users Group, noted that he and his constituents support the concept of exploring opportunities to collaborate on common web application needs. He commented, however, that the project should encourage bids for varying systems architectures involving central server designs in addition to distributed server architectures. (*Editor's note: the commentor's reference to a "distributed server architecture" was in response to an application developed for a South Carolina community that the MetroGIS Workgroup had expressed interest in.*) Chairperson Reinhardt instructed staff to pass these comments along to the Workgroup and the Coordinating Committee for their consideration. She also commented that the Policy Board's role had been to affirm the general political legitimacy of the subject project, which is designed to investigate public value that can be achieved if multiple organizations collaborate on a common web application design, and that this affirmation had been granted at the July Board meeting and that design specifications are now under the purview of the Coordinating Committee.

The Staff Coordinator commented that the intent of this project is to seek bids for a variety of systems options to compare and contrast relative to the purposes sought and that to his knowledge the proposed bid specifications are consistent with this objective, but that he would look into the matter before the bid process is initiated.

### **c) Non-Government Perspective Forum**

Member Schneider and the Staff Coordinator updated the Board on preparations in progress for the November 15<sup>th</sup> forum, noting that 19 individuals from 8 targeted interest groups had thus far RSVPed

from a group of 90 individuals who had been targeted as candidate participants. Staff noted that a reminder would be sent on Monday, October 24<sup>th</sup> in hopes of increasing participation of around 30 individuals from as many of the 16 target interest groups as possible. Member Schneider reiterated that the objective of the Forum is to facilitate a combination of brainstorming and education on possibilities for non-government collaboration with government interests to address common information needs.

## **7. INFORMATION SHARING**

Chairperson Reinhardt called attention to three of the Information Sharing Items provided and encouraged the members to review the others on their own. The three items called out were as follows:

### **C) 7: Polaris Mid-Career Achievement Awards**

Chairperson Reinhardt called attention to Rick Gelbmann and Randy Knippel, both members of the Coordinating Committee, having been recently honored at the State GIS/LIS Conference with presentation of this prestigious award. Board members congratulated both and gave them a round of applause.

### **D) 3: Staff Coordinator to Attend Innovations in Governance Program at Harvard**

Chairperson Reinhardt called the Board's attention to the Staff Coordinator having been accepted to attend a one-week program, the beginning of November, at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. The program is entitled "Innovations of Governance" and the focus is on regional collaboration to address important public issues. She noted that the case study proposed by the Staff Coordinator focuses on MetroGIS's collaborative organizational structure and, specifically, benefits that have been attained through its presence, as well as, challenges due to its uniqueness. She commented that from her experience this is not an easy program to be accepted into and that she appreciates the Staff Coordinator's dedication and commitment expressed in pursuing the challenge of participating.

### **D) 6: MetroGIS Leaders Cited in Article about "White Knights"**

Chairperson Reinhardt introduced Will Craig, member of the Coordinating Committee, to talk about an article that he wrote entitled "The White Knights of Spatial Data Infrastructure". He commented that his reason for writing the articles was to explore the internal motivation of several individuals, including the Staff Coordinator and members of the Coordinating Committee, who have provided substantive leadership to MetroGIS and the Minnesota geospatial community. The three common motivating factors identified are idealism, enlightened self-interest, and peer support. He noted that the article has been published in national and local journals, including the summer issue of the CURA Reporter, which he handed out copies of at the meeting.

## **8. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 18, 2006.

## **9. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Prepared by,  
Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** GIS Technology Demonstration  
*Evacuation Planning for Homeland Defense – U of M Project*

**DATE:** December 27, 2005  
*(For the January 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

### **INTRODUCTION**

For the Board's January 2006 meeting, the Coordinating Committee has selected a research project led by Professor Shashi Shekhar with the University of Minnesota. Professor Shekhar will be talking about a project that he has been working on entitled, "Evacuation Planning for Homeland Defense: A Capacity Constrained Routing Approach". (See the attached Presentation Fact Sheet for more information about the subject research project and Professor Shekhar.)

### **BACKGROUND**

An early test case included the evacuation zone around the nuclear power plant located at Monticello. Results from this test case were presented in a congressional breakfast on GIS and Homeland Security in February 2004. General results are applicable to emergency planning activity in the Twin Cities. Mn/DOT used those in a recent project to develop evacuation plans for many scenarios located in the Twin Cities.

The Coordinating Committee has asked Professor Shekhar to talk about how his research might apply to the work of the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup and how regional data solutions available in the Twin Cities as a result of MetroGIS's efforts (e.g., parcels and street centerlines) that are of better accuracy than available for the Monticello project might enhance the application if used in the Twin Cities.

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

The Policy Board has asked for a demonstration of GIS technology to be a regular component of each of its meetings. Refer to the listing on the next page of the previous demonstration topics.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

No action requested.

## REFERENCE SECTION

- Oct. 2005 Natural Resources Atlas Made Possible Via Data Sharing
- July 2005: Ramsey County GIS User Group's Internet Mapping Service (IMS) site
- Apr. 2005: How Watershed Districts Are Benefiting from MetroGIS's Efforts
- Jan. 2005: Regional Mailing Application
- Oct. 2004: Improving Operational Effectiveness with GIS - Dakota County's Experience
- Jul. 2004: City of Roseville's Combined Use of Socioeconomic Data and GIS Technology to Improve Decision Making and Service Delivery
- Apr. 2004: Metro 911 Board initiative to integrate GIS into day-to-day operations of 27 Metro Area PSAP's
- Jan. 2004: Scott County's Use of GIS technology to improve intra-department efficiencies
- Oct. 2003: GASB34 – GIS Technology's Relevance
- Jul. 2003 Minneapolis Neighborhood Information System use of GIS and data sharing activities
- Apr. 2003 Metropolitan Mosquito Control District use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jan. 2003: Emergency Management Response applications developed by Carver and Washington Counties.
- Oct. 2002: Metropolitan Airports Commission use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jul. 2002: MetroGIS DataFinder Café Rollout
- Mar. 2002: Presentations from each metro county regarding their respective GIS programs
- Jan. 2002: GIS's role in responding to the World Trade Center tragedy – Mapping Ground Zero (*Paul Olson, Grand Rapids Office of the Minnesota DNR - Division of Forestry*)
- Oct. 2001: TIES – Benefits to School Districts as a result of MetroGIS
- Jul. 2001: DataFinder And Functionality Sought Via Proposed Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism (*since named DataFinder Café*)
- Apr. 2001: LMIC's Metro viewer software: A Mapping Tool for the Public
- Jan. 2001: Regional Census Geography and Legislative Redistricting Software/Process
- Oct. 2000: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition's Socio-Demographic Database Development
- Jul. 2000: DataFinder and Council's Internet-based Existing Land Use Application
- Apr. 2000: Regional Parcel Dataset (Version 1)
- Jul. 1999: Presentation to House of Representatives Subcommittee on June 9th
- Apr. 1999: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition GIS Capabilities
- Nov. 1998: Orthoimagery and its Uses
- Sep. 1998: DataFinder and Dakota County's Parcel Query Application
- Jan. 1997: Benefits from GIS in general and uses being made by all classes of stakeholders represented on the Policy Board

## January 18, 2006 Presentation Fact Sheet

### **A. Research Project**

**TITLE:** Evacuation planning for homeland defense: A capacity constrained routing approach

**LEAD PRESENTER:** Prof. Shashi Shekhar  
Computer Science Department, University of Minnesota  
200 Union Street SE #4192, Minneapolis, MN 55455  
(612) 624-8307, fax: (612) 625-0572, email: shekhar@cs.umn.edu

#### **SHORT DESCRIPTION:**

Evacuation route-schedule planning identifies paths and schedules to move at-risk population out to safe areas in the event of terrorist attacks, catastrophes, or natural disasters. Its goal is to identify near-optimal evacuation routes and schedules to minimize evacuation time despite limited transportation network capacity and the possibly large at-risk population. Finding the optimal solution is computationally exorbitant due to the extremely large size of the transportation networks (million nodes and edges) and the limited capacities. We propose novel geo-spatial algorithms to determine competent evacuation plans. Evaluation of our methods for evacuation planning for a disaster at the Monticello nuclear power plant near Minneapolis/St. Paul Twin Cities metropolitan area shows that the new methods lowered evacuation time relative to existing plans by providing higher capacities near the destination and by choosing shorter routes.

#### **FUNDING SOURCES:**

US Army Research Lab (AHPCRC/ARL) is sponsoring the work on use of high performance computing techniques to reduce computation time to produce evacuation plans quickly. Minnesota Department of Transportation sponsored follow-on work to determine contra-flow configurations of the transportation networks to increase outbound capacities and reduce total evacuation time.

#### **COLLABORATORS:**

Collaborators include Mr. QingSong Lu, Mr. Sangho Kim, Ms. Betsy George (all University of Minnesota), Ms. Sonia Pitt, Mr. Robert Vasek, Dr. Eil Kwon, Mr. Mike Sobolesky (all Mn/DOT), and Mr. Daryl Taavola (URS).

### **B. Professor Shashi Shekhar**

Professor Shekhar has recently been named a Distinguished McKnight University Professor at the University of Minnesota. (This is rare honor and comes with a grant of \$100,000 to be expended on their research over the next five years.) He is a professor of Computer Science and Engineering and a world leader in the area of spatial databases, an interdisciplinary area at the intersection of computer science and geographic information science (GIS). Professor Shekhar has a distinguished academic record that includes two books and over 160 refereed papers. He is widely sought after by policy makers in the United States and abroad for his expertise in spatial databases and spatial data mining. Earlier his research developed core technologies behind in-vehicle navigation devices as well as web-based routing services, which revolutionized outdoor navigation in the urban environment in the last decade. See <http://www-users.cs.umn.edu/~shekhar/> and [http://www.grad.umn.edu/faculty-staff/mcknight/distinguished\\_recipients.html](http://www.grad.umn.edu/faculty-staff/mcknight/distinguished_recipients.html)



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson – Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Major Accomplishments in 2005 and Annual Report Theme

**DATE:** December 27, 2005  
(For the Jan 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Coordinating Committee respectfully requests the Policy Board’s acceptance of:

- A listing of MetroGIS’s most significant accomplishments during 2005, and
- A theme for the 2005 annual report of “how the existence of MetroGIS is making a difference and facilitating improvements via e-government while doing so”.

## **COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

At its December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting the Coordinating Committee unanimously accepted the listing of major accomplishments and the annual report theme as presented in this report.

## **MAJOR 2005 ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

2005 was a productive year in terms of fostering collaboration to address common geospatial needs, notwithstanding the decision to postpone the pending Strategic Directions Workshop. The most significant accomplishments were as follows (*the order is not intended to imply relative importance*):

- Address Standard: Address data standards developed by MetroGIS were used as a prototype for development of a national standard, which have remained largely unchanged.
- Addresses for Occupiable Units: The Policy Board endorsed a vision statement to guide implementation of a regional “addresses of occupiable units” dataset.
- DataFinder Café: Agreement was reached on a technical design and funding to upgrade DataFinder Café.
- E911- Compliant Street Centerlines: The Policy Board endorsed a vision statement to guide implementation of a regional “E911-compliant street centerline dataset”.
- Emergency Preparedness: The Policy Board endorsed an solution for further testing to establish a mechanism for coordinated assembly across the seven county region of a variety of datasets critical to Emergency Preparedness efforts.
- Non-Government Interests: An initiative was launched to explore partnering opportunities with non-government interests to achieve common needs.
- Testimonial: An eighth testimonial to the benefits of MetroGIS’s efforts – City of Roseville/Ramsey County GIS Users Group – was produced.
- U.S. Census Bureau: Agreement was reached with U.S. Census Bureau to use MetroGIS’s regionally-endorsed street centerline data in 2010 Census products.
- Data Distribution and Knowledge Sharing: Performance measures documented continued growth in data distribution activity via DataFinder and use of MetroGIS’s general information website.
- Recognitions: Three substantive recognitions were received from national and international interests:
  - Selected by the Open Geographical Consortium as its top U.S. example of a local/regional geospatial data distribution architecture compatible with achieving the NSDI vision. This recognition is described in a publication entitled “Server Architecture Models for the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI)”.

- Selected as the only collaborative governance structure in the United States that exhibited “new policy options and institutional structures associated with the formulation and implementation of successful SDI (spatial data infrastructure) initiatives” by Ian Masser, an internationally acknowledged expert in the field in his book “*GIS Worlds – Creating Spatial Data Infrastructures*”, published by ESRI Press.
- Selected by URISA as among its top 6 Exemplary Systems in Government (ESIG) Award recipients.

A detailing listing of year-end project status information, outreach activities, major documents produced, and workgroup and committee meetings conducted is available upon request.

### **2005 ANNUAL REPORT**

The main theme proposed for the 2005 annual report insert is the same as last year: “how the existence of MetroGIS is making a difference and facilitating improvements via e-government while doing so”. In particular, this past year MetroGIS’s impacts were demonstrated through continued access improvements to data produced by others, in the form needed, and by continuing to leverage resources through partnerships fostered through MetroGIS’s efforts. Jeanne Landkamer has again agreed to produce the MetroGIS 2005 Annual Report, as she has done for the past several years.

As has been the case for the past three annual reports, the single page, double-sided format, written from Chairperson Reinhardt’s perspective, is proposed. The report would again be distributed in combination with an informational brochure designed to have a shelf life of 2-3 years. A new brochure was produced in 2005. It can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual\\_reports/05brochure.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/about/annual_reports/05brochure.pdf).

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board accept, subject to any desired additions or modifications, the:

- 1) Listing herein of major MetroGIS accomplishments during 2005.
- 2) Proposed theme for the 2005 annual report of “how MetroGIS’s efforts are making a difference and facilitating improvements via e-government while doing so”.



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control  
Staff Contact Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** 2005 Performance Measurement Report

**DATE:** December 27, 2005  
(For the Jan 18<sup>th</sup> Mtg.)

## INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee respectively requests Policy Board approval of the 2005 MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report (separate document).

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On December 14, 2005, the Coordinating Committee reviewed the major conclusions presented in a draft version of the subject Report. No additions or modifications were offered. (See the Reference Section for authorizing actions by the Policy Board.)

## MAJOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The following findings and conclusions represent highlights from more complete descriptions presented in the accompanying 2005 MetroGIS Performance Measurement Report. The four outcome categories presented below are defined in the Performance Measurement Plan, which was adopted in 2002. Metrics for ten individual measures are captured monthly and comprise the data foundation for evaluating progress toward achieving desired outcomes.

The 2005 report presents metrics for comparable data for the ten measures over a three-year timeframe. A sufficient data history is now available to consider setting targets for some or all of the ten measures. If targets are to be set, the exercise should be a component of the Business Plan Update process anticipated to begin mid-to late 2006.

### 1. Ease of Data Discovery and Access

Use of DataFinder, as both an **online data discovery and data delivery tool, continued an upward trend** in 2005. A trend in **preference for online geospatial information queries**, in addition to downloads of data for manipulation on one's own system, is also beginning to emerge. Enactment of an unprecedented, single licensing agreement by the seven metropolitan area counties, which governs access to the regional parcel dataset, resulted in a 65 percent increase in licenses and a corresponding 52 percent increase in parcel data downloads.

Comments: 1) Continued progress needs to be made to accurately account for access to information via Internet-based queries, in addition to data downloads. Improvements planned for DataFinder in 2006 are expected to provide substantially better information for such queries than has been previously available. 2) Additional outreach efforts should be made to encourage data producers, who are not currently using DataFinder, to consider using it to share knowledge of their data holdings and to expedite distribution.

### 2. Data Currency

Each of the **eight endorsed regional data solutions** (see below) was **maintained to the specifications** established by the community. While these solutions only comprise 4.6 percent of the 136 datasets available via DataFinder, they continue to be the most popular data downloaded, comprising over 31 percent of the total downloads. Endorsed regional datasets for which metrics are maintained are as follows (listed in order of popularity in 2005):

<b>Dataset<sup>(1)</sup></b>	<b>Downloads</b>
<b>Parcels</b>	576
<b>Census Demographic Profiles</b>	516
<b>County &amp; Municipal Boundaries</b>	479
<b>Street Centerlines</b>	322
<b>Census Geography</b> (e.g. tracts and blocks)	228
<b>Planned Land Use</b>	208

(1) Eight regional solutions have been enacted by MetroGIS but only six are tracked for purposes of Performance Measurement Reporting. Land Cover is distributed by DNR, its custodian. The Land Cover metadata record is posted on DataFinder but directs the user to DNR's website. The Unique Parcel ID solution is a component of the Regional Parcel Dataset and, thus, not tracked separately.)

Comment: Performance measurement results confirm that MetroGIS's efforts to create sustainable regional solutions to common information needs are improving organizational efficiencies and effectiveness. A topic at the pending Strategic Directions Workshop should address whether additional regional solutions should be investigated.

### **3. Internal Efficiencies, Level of Cooperation**

**Ten stakeholder organizations are now performing 23 distinct primary and regional custodian roles** in support of eight endorsed regional solutions to common information needs, a one-stop, Web-based data discovery and distribution mechanism (DataFinder), and a forum to foster collaboration.

Comment: Sustaining long-term solutions to common information needs requires all parties to attain a level of comfort that their respective contributions are less than the cost of pursuing solutions on their own and a level comfort with one and other's contributions. The Metropolitan Council's 2005 Evaluation and Audit of MetroGIS raised questions in these regards. These questions must be resolved to the satisfaction of all core stakeholders to sustain the solutions that are currently in place and before any additional solutions are contemplated.

### **4. Decision Making, Service Delivery**

Currently, the only means measure this outcome is via qualitative stakeholder testimonials. An eighth such testimonial, from the City of Roseville, was produced in 2005. Like the seven organizations that have been past subjects, the City of Roseville **attributes efficiency improvements** in its internal decision support and **service delivery enhancements to MetroGIS's efforts**. The Metropolitan Council's 2005 independent evaluation of MetroGIS's efforts corroborated internal efficiencies that other organizations have reported in their testimonials.

As in the past, those entities using DataFinder the most were academic institutions of higher learning and state, regional, and local government interests. Dakota County and Hennepin County are again listed among the top 25 download recipients, with activity at essentially the same level as in 2004.

Comment: User testimonials should continue to be developed.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board accept, subject to any desired additions or modifications, the MetroGIS 2005 Performance Measurement Report, dated December 23, 2005.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### **PAST POLICY BOARD ACTIONS**

- 1) April 10, 2002: The Policy Board adopted a Performance Measurement Plan ([www.metrogis.org/benefits/perf\\_measure](http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/perf_measure)) to more clearly state expected accomplishments, demonstrate accountability for results, and support continuous organizational improvement.
- 2) January 29, 2003: The Policy Board asked staff to prepare an annual performance measures report to share with it along with recommendations for any suggested changes in policy or procedures to address needs identified via analysis of performance measures data.



**To:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**From:** Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt (651-266-8363)  
Policy Board Member Pistilli (763-493-9071)

**Subject:** Update on Council Consideration of MetroGIS Governance and Funding Questions

**Date:** January 11, 2006  
(For Jan. 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

This report was added to the agenda at our request, as members of the Policy Board. Its purpose is to share information with the Policy Board about MetroGIS's involvement in the Metropolitan Council's process to address recommendations presented in the recent MetroGIS Program Evaluation and Audit Report. [A copy of the report can be reviewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/05\\_1214/mc\\_eval.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/05_1214/mc_eval.pdf). A brief summary of major topics addressed in the report is also provided in the Reference Section, Item 1.]

In our capacities as Policy Board Chairperson and the Metropolitan Council's representative to the Policy Board, we jointly support the Council's position that we (core stakeholders) need to ensure that the community concurs on future directions for MetroGIS and on the manner in which MetroGIS conducts its business. The former (future directions) is the purpose of the Strategic Directions Workshop that is tentatively scheduled for later this year (see Agenda Item 5e). The latter is the subject of this report.

The Council's Program Evaluation of MetroGIS raises several governance-related questions for further investigation. It is our belief that these questions must be resolved before the Strategic Directions Workshop is held, as the Workshop's purpose is about accomplishments and outcomes not process and governance. It is also our continuing belief that through MetroGIS's efforts, several effective regional solutions to common geospatial needs have been realized, providing evidence that current MetroGIS core functions are working.

## PREVIOUS ACTIONS

At the Policy Board's October 2005 meeting, Member Pistilli, acting in his capacity as the Council's representative to the Policy Board, briefly summarized the findings presented in the Report. Since the Report had not been available prior to the meeting, the findings and recommendations were not discussed in any detail. Member Pistilli made a point, however, of stating that the document was complimentary to MetroGIS, in that the overall conclusion is that MetroGIS is benefiting the Council and the region. He also mentioned that several governance-related questions were raised in the Report for further investigation. Policy Board members were assured they would be involved in the decision making process to address these questions. (See Item 2 in the Reference Section for an excerpt from the Policy Board's meeting summary.)

At the direction of the Policy Board to remain involved in the developing process, Commissioner Reinhardt, in her capacity as Policy Board Chairperson, attended and briefly addressed the Metropolitan Council's Community Development Committee (CDC) on December 19, 2005. Her impression of the discussion by the Councilmembers was a positive one. The CDC Chair and other Committee members reinforced their intent to involve the MetroGIS Policy Board and other interested stakeholders in the process. Discussion of specifics was deferred to the CDC's next meeting, which occurred on January 10<sup>th</sup>. Prior to the meeting, Commissioner Reinhardt submitted a written request to allow a member of the Coordinating Committee, to participate in the process as a technical resource. She also respectfully requested modification of the meeting schedule to accommodate existing commitments.

## **RESULTS OF JANUARY 10TH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**

The Community Development Committee of the Metropolitan Council met on January 10, 2006. Procedures recommended by Council management were discussed regarding resolution of governance and funding-related questions raised in the Program Evaluation and Audit Report. There was insufficient time to summarize the CDC's consideration of the recommended procedures, so Commissioner Reinhardt and Councilmember Pistilli intend to update the Policy Board at its January 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **PREPARATIONS FOR PENDING CDC WORKGROUP CONSIDERATION**

1. **Coordinating Committee Recommendation:** On December 14, 2005, Metropolitan Council management summarized the findings and recommendations presented in the Report to the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee. After a lengthy discussion, the Committee agreed to forward the following recommendations to the Policy Board for its consideration as it engages in discussions with Council representatives concerning governance and funding of MetroGIS (an excerpt from the Committee's meeting summary is provided in the Reference Section):
  - Accept the four (4) recommendations presented in the Metropolitan Council's Audit Report for MetroGIS, as described at this meeting (December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of Coordinating Committee) by Mark Vander Schaaf.
  - Recommend that the (MetroGIS's) current structure be maintained, and
  - Encourage the Metropolitan Council to involve MetroGIS stakeholders in the dialog as it examines options.

Several Committee members also submitted written comments directly to Policy Board member Pistilli following the Committee meeting. Member Pistilli asked Committee members to share their comments with him to help him prepare for discussions pending among Councilmembers.

2. **Evaluate Current MetroGIS Governance Characteristics.** In preparation for pending CDC Workgroup dialogue to address governance concerns raised in the Report, creation of a MetroGIS workgroup is suggested to evaluate any options to change the current MetroGIS governance characteristics (Appendix A). This workgroup should include policy makers and managers who have been active in MetroGIS efforts and who have a clear understanding of its objectives, functions, accomplishments, and challenges. This group should convene as quickly as possible and identify current characteristics that should remain intact.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Authorize creation of a MetroGIS workgroup, as defined herein, to evaluate current MetroGIS governance characteristics and offer its recommendations to MetroGIS's representative to the CDC workgroup as quickly as possible.
- 2) Be provided with e-mail updates through MetroGIS's representative(s) to the CDC workgroup as its work progresses. The updates should also be sent to the Coordinating Committee.

## REFERENCE SECTION

### *1. Excerpt from December 14, 2005 Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary*

#### **5b) Metropolitan Council's Program Evaluation and Audit of MetroGIS**

Mark Vander Schaaf, Director of Planning and Growth Management for the Metropolitan Council, introduced himself and commented on his ties to the GIS community while with the City of St. Paul, which included holding the position of GIS Coordinator and serving as chair of the Ramsey County GIS Users Group. He also noted that he had participated in MetroGIS forums and had served as a member of the Coordinating Committee, representing large cities. He then prefaced his remarks by noting that the Council's Evaluation and Audit Report was the source of most of the comments that he would be making and that much of the slide presentation had been created by the Director of the Council's Audit and Evaluation Unit for a presentation on November 7<sup>th</sup> to the Council's Community Development Committee. ([Click here](#) for the presentation slides and [click here](#) to review the Audit Report.)

The presentation began with an overview of the origins of MetroGIS, from the Council's perspective, and a summary of value received by the Council from MetroGIS's efforts. Vander Schaaf then commented on several "potential scenarios" identified in the Report regarding the future of MetroGIS:

- Maintain The Current Structure,
- Cost Sharing For MetroGIS Data,
- Withdrawal Of Council Funding,
- Policy Board As Advisory To The Council, and
- Create A Fee Structure (Non-Government Access) For MetroGIS.

Vander Schaaf then summarized four recommendations presented in the Report:

1. Assess the positive and negative attributes of the options and determine the optimal placement of MetroGIS and its relationship and reportability to the Council.
2. Financial accountability measures for MetroGIS should be established and practiced.
3. The Council should continue to evaluate its role, products and cost-effectiveness of MetroGIS on an ongoing basis.
4. A clear delineation of roles and responsibilities between the Council and the parties involved in MetroGIS should be documented to ensure that all parties understand their role in MetroGIS.

Vander Schaaf concluded his presentation by commenting on proposed immediate next steps, which includes discussion by the Council's Community Development Committee on Monday, December 19, of a roadmap and timeline for acting on the cited recommendations.

Committee members were asked if they had any questions or comments.

Vice Chairperson Knippel asked for clarification of Council's philosophy about providing leadership and fostering collaboration toward regional solutions that benefit the region as a whole. Knippel encouraged the Council to address this question before launching into a discussion of specifics about MetroGIS. He also noted that he believes that the Audit Report tries to describe MetroGIS in black and white terms and in so doing does not account for the significant benefit from gray areas (intangibles) that are not easily quantified. He offered the example of the Council's current support of a forum to foster regional debate and agreement among all key stakeholders on standards and best practices, noting that this forum has established a trusted cooperative environment that, in turn, is paying dividends beyond the data involved. He also noted that knowledge sharing, which is a core function of MetroGIS, stimulates technology innovations that are resulting in improved effectiveness and efficiencies, also not easily captured in a black and white format (quantifiable inputs and benefits).

Craig agreed, but added comments about the value of MetroGIS to the image of the Metropolitan Council. His survey work, cited in the Audit Report, documented the value that MetroGIS participants placed on the

process of being involved in these collaborative activities. Through MetroGIS activities they have come to know and respect others across the region, something that has been invaluable in their own work. They know that MetroGIS is supported by the Metropolitan Council and their image of the Council has improved greatly as a result of MetroGIS activities.

Claypool concurred that the region is a big winner, greatly benefiting from the standards that have been enacted and the duplication of effort that has been eliminated through collaboration to address mutual needs. He also made a point of stressing that the counties have made larger investments than the Council for development of geospatial data.

Claypool then called attention to a few conclusions presented in the Audit Report that he believes demonstrate that the author(s) does not understand MetroGIS well enough to make such statements. He also noted his disappointment that the Scenarios had a negative tone, given the vast benefits to the region and the Council over the past ten years that can be attributed to MetroGIS's efforts. He concurred with Craig that the Council's image has greatly improved over the past ten years among local units of government, due in large part, to the collaborative environment fostered via MetroGIS's efforts; efforts which most stakeholders associate with the Council's support to foster the desired collaboration. He emphasized that ten years ago local government generally viewed the Council as bothersome, but that the situation is much different today. Not only are inter-organizational relationships vastly improved but also is the availability of data critical to effectively planning and operating regional systems. He stated that he is especially troubled by the reference in the Report that the Council might not be part of solutions that evolve through MetroGIS's efforts. He suggested that those responsible for this observation need to educate themselves on how decision making is actually conducted within the MetroGIS community. The Council has always been and is expected to remain a respected key stakeholder along with several others. Claypool concluded his remarks by offering a solution to keep the spirit of regional collaboration alive, should the Council decide its participation is no longer desirable. He believes that if such a situation were to arise that the counties would likely create a consortium with which the Council could negotiate to obtain the data they need from the counties.

Laumeyer commented that accomplishments of MetroGIS make his job much easier and speaking generally on behalf of other users, stated these accomplishment are resulting in a huge benefits to the region. He also noted that the Council should take pride in the cutting edge efforts of MetroGIS, efforts that have received national and international attention and awards.

Chairperson Read commented that one of the reasons MetroGIS has been successful is that the participants are doing things they have to do anyway but realized they can be more effective over the long term through collaborative solutions. As a result, she believes it is difficult to separate her work in MetroGIS initiatives from her work on related internal projects. She questioned how the Council's GIS staff were going to be able to accomplish the recommendation to segregate and track financial information regarding support of MetroGIS. She also noted that at the November 15 forum "Beyond Government Users: Future Directions for MetroGIS" she had recognized a reoccurring theme that the non-government community is mobilizing more and more to integrate GIS technology into their respective operations and, as such, are looking for more sources of reliable geospatial data.

Knippel reemphasized that applying a traditional business analysis model to government is flawed because the entities involved are not independent, competing against one another. Rather, government interests that serve the Twin Cities all have the same clients/stakeholders – the taxpayer - and all have a stake in the successfulness of the region. He emphasized that a structure/philosophy is needed that can achieve and sustain inter-governmental cooperation that, in turn, produces benefits for the whole by looking beyond the interests of individual organizations. He closed by reiterating an earlier observation that the Report seems to be very narrowly defined and ignores intangibles (gray areas) whose benefits are sizable.

Wencl stated that from the perspective of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and its primary sponsor, the Federal Geographic Data Committee, MetroGIS is a working example of the type of successful regional mechanism needed to achieve the vision of the NSDI. He concurred with Craig and Knippel that the

Council is receiving a good deal of credit for its investment to support MetroGIS's efforts to foster collaboration. He also noted that NSDI proponents view the existence of the Policy Board as a major reason for MetroGIS's success. Wencil concluded his remarks by stating that the State of Minnesota should follow MetroGIS's lead and create a complementary mechanism capable of creating and sustaining statewide solutions to common information needs.

Craig commented that in some respects this Report is inconclusive in that it does not take into account intangibles, in particular, benefits to the region as a whole. He also noted that it is difficult to clearly articulate a response to the Council's question "where do we go from here" because the Strategic Directions Workshop has not been held.

Henry postulated that if the Council were to withdraw its funding that the collaborative environment would diminish. He asked the Council representatives if the Council wants the community to revert to the situation that existed when MetroGIS launched, no standards and significant duplication of effort. Vander Schaaf affirmed that the Council does not want the community to revert to the pre-MetroGIS environment. Henry followed with a statement that he believes that the cost to the Council to obtain data it needs from others and put it to use on its own would be more expensive than its cost to support MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" function.

Knippel followed with a question about how MetroGIS can best provide formal feedback to the Council's Evaluation and Audit Report, noting that he believes MetroGIS leadership should pursue an active role in the pending discussions about the recommendations and next steps outlined in the Report. He asked again that before dialogue is initiated on the Report's recommendations, that the Council reach agreement, at a policy level, regarding its interest and willingness to foster a collaborative environment to address common needs important to the region. Claypool emphasized that all affected parties need to be part of the discussions and that the current philosophy of an equal voice among the parties is critical to sustaining effective solutions.

**Motion:** Craig moved and Givens seconded to encourage the MetroGIS Policy Board to:

- Accept the four (4) recommendations presented in the Metropolitan Council's Audit Report for MetroGIS, as described at this meeting by Vander Schaaf.
- Recommend that the current structure be maintained, and
- Encourage the Metropolitan Council to involve MetroGIS stakeholders in the dialog as it examines options.

Motion carried: Nays-0, Ayes-13, Abstain-2 (Gelbmann and Vander Schaaf to avoid conflict of interest)

## ***2. Excerpt from October 29, 2005 Policy Board Meeting Summary***

### **5b) Strategic Directions Workgroup and 2006 MetroGIS Work Plan**

Chairperson Reinhardt informed the Board members that she had added this topic to the agenda. The purpose of this item is to suggest that the Board set a target of February 2006 to host the Strategic Directions Workshop that has been postponed to allow the Metropolitan Council to evaluate the value of MetroGIS to its internal operations. She then recognized Member Pistilli, who provided a copy of the Metropolitan Council's internal evaluation of the MetroGIS initiative to each of the Policy Board members, noting that the document had been printed the day before and had not yet been seen by members of the Metropolitan Council.

Member Pistilli characterized the findings set forth in the evaluation as complimentary to the products of MetroGIS's efforts. He also noted that the evaluation raises some questions about MetroGIS's reporting and organizational structures, commenting that, in his opinion, what seems to make MetroGIS work also raises these questions. He commented that he believes that discussion of the cited issues may lead to improvements. Mark Vander Schaaf, Director of Planning and Growth Management for the Metropolitan

Council, briefly commented that the Council's Audit Committee is scheduled to consider the document on November 2 and that the Council's Community Development Committee is scheduled to consider it on November 7.

The sentiment expressed by Policy Board members was support for Council's program evaluation process acknowledging that sufficient public value must be received in return for support of initiatives. In response to a question from Chairperson Reinhardt, which was echoed by other Board members, Member Pistilli commented that he supports providing Policy Board members an opportunity to provide substantive input into the Council's process from this point on. Member Schneider asked for clarification about how these discussions might affect MetroGIS's 2006 budget. In response, Vander Schaaf and Member Pistilli commented that the Council's proposed 2006 budget maintains at MetroGIS's 2005 funding level, as had been requested by the Policy Board. Member Pistilli and Chairperson Reinhardt agreed to discuss options following the meeting for providing input from the Policy Board to the Council concerning the findings and recommendations presented in its Program Evaluation Report for MetroGIS.

**Motion:** Member Pistilli moved and Member Egan seconded the following actions:

1. That the Policy Board at its January 2006 meeting, set a target date for hosting MetroGIS's Strategic Directions Workshop.
2. Continue the work in progress for 2006, place on hold initiatives that are planned but not yet commenced, and include initiatives that are identified at the Strategic Directions Workshop as part of the Business Plan Update project.

## ATTACHMENT A

December 1, 2005

### COLLABORATIVE (GOVERNANCE) CHARACTERISTICS THAT CREATE PUBLIC VALUE (Collaboration To Address Common Geospatial Needs)

	<b>CHARACTERISTIC</b>	<b>CURRENT STRUCTURE</b>	<b>OPTION X</b>
<b>Outcome / Value Proposition</b>			
	<b>Improved efficiency of stakeholder operations</b> (decision-making, service delivery, and infrastructure management) through use of community-defined regional solutions to common geospatial needs, that substantially reduce time and effort required to discover existing data, obtain data from others, manipulate data obtained from others prior to use, and move the dialogue from debate over data sources to substantive policy needs and opportunities.	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Minimized duplication of effort among stakeholder interests</b> and lowest cost for the taxpayer by leveraging investments in geospatial technology, data, and application development of others. <i>Build once, share many times.</i>	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Improved trust and mutual understanding</b> among government interests serving the Twin Cities through frequent opportunities to collectively define regional solutions to common geospatial needs and share knowledge with colleagues and peers.	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Enhanced stakeholder GIS-related programs</b> and capabilities through sharing of technology, data, and proven practices.	<b>X</b>	

<b>CHARACTERISTIC</b>		<b>CURRENT STRUCTURE</b>	<b>OPTION X</b>
	<b>Local geospatial needs</b> , best practices, and data resources are reflected in state and national geospatial initiatives through involvement in policy and program development with similar objectives beyond the Twin Cities.	<b>X</b>	
	<b>Improved responsiveness of participant operations to changing expectations</b> of their clients through support of an environment that encourages knowledge sharing and innovation.	<b>X</b>	
<b>Authorizing Environment</b>			
	Common priority information needs (at minimum for essential stakeholders) are defined by the community, not any particular interest(s).	<b>X</b>	
	Policy makers (from all essential participants) are the keepers of a widely participatory process, ensuring all relevant and affected parties are involved in decision making, dominated by none.	<b>X</b>	
	A favorable “political reality check” is obtained from all affected interests when endorsing common geospatial priorities, related organizational policy, and regional solutions to address priority needs.	<b>X</b>	
	Policy makers, representing all essential stakeholders, establish regional geospatial and related organizational policy needed to address common priority needs. Policy making critical to achieve long-term objectives is consensus-based e.g., custodial roles and responsibilities, desired best practices, data standards.	<b>X</b>	
	Existing investments are leveraged to measurably improve service provisions and decision making community-wide.	<b>X</b>	
	Effective inter-organizational relationships are nurtured at the policy, management, and technical levels critical to sustaining long-term collaborative solutions.	<b>X</b>	

<b>CHARACTERISTIC</b>		<b>CURRENT STRUCTURE</b>	<b>OPTION X</b>
	Policymakers advocate (champion) regional geospatial policy within their respective organizations and among their peers.	<b>X</b>	
	Champions at the policy, management, and technical levels are nurtured within essential stakeholder organizations by sharing benefits possible through participating in collaborative solutions to achieve common needs.	<b>X</b>	
	A Performance Measurement Program is supported to ensure that performance toward established public value-based outcomes is continually monitored and modifications are made, as needed, to maintain relevancy to essential stakeholders.	<b>X</b>	
<b>Operating Capacity</b>			
	Regional geospatial solutions effectively bundle and coordinate operational capacity across multiple organizations, as if a single enterprise, to collaboratively meet common needs that can not be met by any single organization. <i>(See Attachment B for 23 roles shared by ten MetroGIS stakeholders as of November 2005.)</i>	<b>X</b>	
	Coordinated regional geospatial solutions effectively increase access to, and use of, trusted, reliable and current geospatial data needed to support a wide variety of stakeholders' internal business needs.	<b>X</b>	
	Widely supported solutions to priority common geospatial needs of all essential stakeholders are efficiently and effectively sustained through institutionalizing custodian roles and responsibilities pertaining to geospatial data capture, maintenance, documentation and distribution.	<b>X</b>	
	Voluntary acceptance of community-defined custodial roles and responsibilities fosters an ethic of interdependence and cooperation, as well as, results in the best available data practices at the least cost to the taxpayer.	<b>X</b>	

<b>CHARACTERISTIC</b>		<b>CURRENT STRUCTURE</b>	<b>OPTION X</b>
	Organizations with the greatest internal need voluntarily support custodian roles and responsibilities for endorsed regional solutions.	<b>X</b>	
	Collaboration to support custodian roles must cost the host organization(s) less than satisfying the particular information need in a non-collaborative environment.	<b>X</b>	
	Contributions to sustaining regional solutions include funding, human resources, data, equipment or combination thereof	<b>X</b>	
	Custodian organizations are free to achieve regionally-endorsed solutions (community endorsed deliverables) in a manner consistent with their internal needs.	<b>X</b>	
	Equity of contribution (to sustain a regional solution to a common geospatial need) is measured relative to internal benefit to the particular custodian, not organization to organization. (E.g., if a collaborative solution is less expensive than accomplishing an internal need on one's own, equity is achieved).	<b>X</b>	
	No organization is expected to perform a custodial role for the community for which they do not have an internally acknowledged business need or do not have sufficient resources.	<b>X</b>	
	<u>Point of note and topic for policy discussion:</u> Positive feedback from the participants of the forum hosted by MetroGIS on November 15, 2005 to seek partnering suggestions from non-government entities is a sign of MetroGIS's maturity and a realization that further effectiveness to achieve common needs may be possible by partnering beyond the government community.		

## ATTACHMENT B

### Contributions to Support MetroGIS Endorsed Regional Solutions (Last Updated: November 17, 2005)

<b>Established Partnerships</b>	<b>Summary of Collaborative Roles</b> (Bundling Operational Capacity Across Organizations to Address Common Priority Needs)
<i>10 organizations have assumed a total of 23 roles in support of endorsed regional solutions to common geospatial related needs of the community.</i>	
(2 roles) <b>County: Anoka</b> Parcels	Produce and maintain parcel data in consistent format. Submit quarterly updates to regional custodian (Council) in regional format. (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/history_pub/policy_sumv2.0.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/history_pub/policy_sumv2.0.pdf</a> )
County/MCD Boundaries)	Produce and maintain boundary data, submit quarterly updates to regional custodian (Council) in regional format. For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/county_mcd/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/county_mcd/policy_summary.pdf</a> )
(2 roles) <b>County: Carver</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)	(All seven counties have agreed to assume responsibility for the same roles and responsibilities concerning the region parcel and city/county boundaries datasets. Their combined level of support is estimated to involve <b>20+ FTE</b> . This effort includes surveyors, assessors, and GIS staff.)
(2 roles) <b>County: Dakota</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)	(Counties use these data to manage property-related records and to support their tax collection responsibilities.)
(2 roles) <b>County: Hennepin</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)	
(2 roles) <b>County: Ramsey</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)	
(2 roles) <b>County: Scott</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)	
(2 roles) <b>County: Washington</b> (Parcels, County/MCD Boundaries)	
(1 role) <b>DNR - Land Cover</b>	Manage regional database and collaborative process to acquire land cover data compatible with agreed upon data content standards. DNR uses this database to support a number of its metro area natural resources and wildlife management programs. Annual support is about <b>.5 FTE</b> . (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/land_cover/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/land_cover/policy_summary.pdf</a> )

(1 role) <b>University of Minnesota Population Center</b> (Socioeconomic Characteristics)	Manage content of Socioeconomic Resources Website at <a href="http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp">www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp</a> . Annual support is about <b>.2 FTE</b> . (For detailed roles <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/socioeconomic_characteristics/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/socioeconomic_characteristics/policy_summary.pdf</a> )
(7 roles) <b>Metropolitan Council</b> (Three categories: data management, data distribution, and fostering regional collaboration)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Annual support for <b>DataFinder and regional data custodian roles, combined about 1.25 FTE</b>.</li> <li>▪ 2005 budget to support <b>Foster Collaborative Environment: 1.75 FTE and \$86,000</b>.</li> </ul>
⇒ Census Geography data	Produce census geography data at time of decennial census that align with other locally produced foundation geospatial data.  (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/census/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/census/policy_summary.pdf</a> )
⇒ County/MCD Boundary data	Assemble boundary data produced by counties into regional dataset.  (See County Boundaries above for the specific roles)
⇒ Planned Land Use data	Develop and manage regional dataset.  (For detailed roles see <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/planned_land_use/policy_summary.pdf">www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/planned_land_use/policy_summary.pdf</a> )
⇒ Parcel data	Assemble parcel data produced by counties into regional dataset.  (See County Parcels above for the specific roles.)
⇒ Street Centerline data	Contract with The Lawrence Group to maintain data to desired specifics.  (For detailed roles see <a href="http://metrogis.org/data/datasets/street_centerlines/roles_respon_specs.pdf">metrogis.org/data/datasets/street_centerlines/roles_respon_specs.pdf</a> )
⇒ DataFinder (one-stop, Web-based, data distribution portal)	Maintain DataFinder and DataFinder Café's hardware and software platform and update metadata posted on DataFinder.  (For details see Section 1.3.2 - <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf">www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf</a> )
⇒ Foster Collaborative Environment ( <i>regional solutions to common geospatial needs</i> )	Facilitate collaborative decision-making structure, including business planning, performance measures activities, and agreements, as well as, outreach and advocacy efforts to encourage use of and feedback about adopted solutions and best practices.  (For details see Section 1.3.2 - <a href="http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf">www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/bplan_0305.pdf</a> )
<b>(Total of 23 roles supported by 10 different organizations)</b>	



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board  
**FROM:** Policy Board Member Schneider  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)  
**SUBJECT:** Non Government Forum Results and Partnering Guidelines  
**DATE:** December 30, 2005 (For the January 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

### **INTRODUCTION**

Based on the identification of a number of meaningful collaborative opportunities that were identified at the November 15<sup>th</sup> “Beyond Government Users” forum, the Policy Board is respectfully requested to support the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee to host a “Geospatial Technology Possibilities” forum and approve principles to guide future discussions to investigate collaborative opportunities with non-government interests in addressing common geospatial needs.

### **BACKGROUND**

On November 15<sup>th</sup>, MetroGIS hosted the “Beyond Government Users: Future Directions for MetroGIS”. The Policy Board requested the hosting of this forum at its April 2005 meeting. The results of this forum and a proposed “Geospatial Technology Possibilities” Forum, recommended by the Coordinating Committee at its December 2005 meeting, are intended to provide important foundation information for the pending MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop (Agenda Item 5e).

The Forum summary report can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06\\_0118/forum\\_summary.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06_0118/forum_summary.pdf). Twenty-nine individuals attended, representing 27 for-profit and 2 non-profit interests. The attendees concluded that collaborative opportunities with government interests should be investigated in three topical areas:

- How can we work together to reduce costs?
- What innovations can we work together to develop?
- How can we promote a statewide GIS cooperative effort?

Forty-five candidate ideas were identified for consideration within these three topical areas.

### **DISCUSSION**

The proposed next step is to engage the Coordinating Committee and participants of the November 15<sup>th</sup> forum to define and carry out a process to decide which of the 45 identified ideas have the most promise and evaluate the creation of an ongoing joint committee to flush out in more detail future cooperative efforts. However, before discussions begin, agreement is sought from the Policy Board on a few guiding principles to manage expectations. They are as follows:

- 1) Value-added to public sector assets is encouraged provided it does not detract from the public sector objective.
- 2) Contribution of assets to a collaborative solution assumes all parties view the transaction as equitable and relevant to their needs.
- 3) Contributions can comprise of funds, data, equipment and/or people.
- 4) Equity is defined on an organization-by-organization basis and exists if the collaborative solution is more efficient than pursuing the solution on one's own.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Support the recommendation of the Coordinating Committee to host a “Geospatial Technology Possibilities” forum, and
- 2) Approve the above-cited principles, subject to any desired additions or modifications, to guide pending talks with non-government interests who wish to further investigate collaborative opportunities with government interests in addressing common geospatial needs.



**To:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**From:** Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**Subject:** Strategic Directions Workshop / MetroGIS Business Plan Update

**Date:** January 4, 2006  
(For Jan. 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

Acting in my capacity as Policy Board Chairperson, I am requesting Policy Board affirmation of the following proposals regarding preparations for the MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop and Business Plan Update initiatives:

- Set a tentative target timeframe of fall 2006 for the MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop.
- Resolve questions raised about MetroGIS's governance (in the Council's October 2005 Program Evaluation and Audit Report) before hosting the MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop.
- Investigate the realm of geospatial technology possibilities in preparation for the Strategic Directions Workshop at the same time that MetroGIS governance preferences are being discussed.
- Set a tentative target of the Policy Board's April 2007 meeting to receive an updated MetroGIS Business Plan.

## PREVIOUS POLICY BOARD CONSIDERATION

At its October 2005 meeting, the Policy Board decided to defer to its January 2006 meeting the setting of a date for the MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop. The members wanted to better understand implications of the Metropolitan Council's Program Evaluation and Audit Report regarding MetroGIS before it set a date for the Strategic Directions Workshop. (See Agenda Item 5c for more information.)

## "GEOSPATIAL TECHNOLOGY POSSIBILITIES" FORUM SUBSEQUENTLY PROPOSED

At its December 2005 meeting, the Coordinating Committee concluded that MetroGIS should investigate the realm of geospatial technology possibilities prior to hosting the subject Strategic Directions Workshop. This "possibilities" forum is tentatively targeted for April or May 2006. (See Agenda Item 5d in which Board acceptance of this concept is requested). The current concept involves inviting 2-3 national/internationally-respected geospatial visionaries to offer their perspectives and then break into theme-based groups to ask questions to gain a better understanding of cited possibilities. All agreed that up-to-date knowledge of geospatial technical possibilities and where the geospatial industry is generally headed are critical to achieving a successful Strategic Directions Workshop.

## TIMING OF STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS WORKSHOP

Following the determination that a Geospatial Technology Possibilities Forum should be hosted before the Strategy Directions Workshop, staff evaluated hosting the latter in May 2006. The conclusion was that regardless of whether it is held in late spring or fall 2006, the subsequent Business Plan Update process will not be complete until after core stakeholders have completed their respective 2007 budget preparation processes. Therefore, setting a target of fall 2006 for the Strategy Directions Workshop is suggested to give staff a couple of additional months to synthesize the results of the "Possibilities" Forum prior hosting the Strategy Directions Workshop.

## DISCUSSION

In my discussions with MetroGIS leadership and staff over the past few months, there appears to be general acknowledgement that governance and organizational questions raised in the Metropolitan

Council's recent Program Evaluation and Audit Report about MetroGIS should be resolved before hosting the Strategic Directions Workshop. They also acknowledge that the focus of the Strategic Directions Workshop is intended to be on geospatial program outcomes, not governance aspects of MetroGIS. Finally, there also appears to be general acknowledgement that investigation of geospatial possibilities should proceed simultaneously with dialogue on organizational/governance preferences for MetroGIS.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board affirm the four proposals outlined in the Introduction to this report pertaining to preparations for MetroGIS's Strategic Directions Workshop and Business Plan Update initiatives.



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Letter of Support Requested for Federal Grant Application

**DATE:** January 9, 2006  
(For the January 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

### INTRODUCTION

Several MetroGIS stakeholder organizations respectfully request the Policy Board to authorize Chairperson Reinhardt to sign a letter of support for a federal geospatial technology grant application that they are developing. MetroGIS's role would be limited to assisting with communication needs and providing a forum for the vetting of any policy decision making necessary to achieve the desired outcome – both consistent with MetroGIS's core functions. No project funding from MetroGIS's resources is requested.

The written request submitted seeking MetroGIS's support is attached. The letter of support that would be signed by Chairperson Reinhardt will be draft once the application is nearer to completion.

### PROPOSAL INFORMATION

**Proposal Objectives:** The subject proposal would serve two primary purposes:

1. Several metro area counties, the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, and the Metropolitan Airports Commission are interested in exploring whether they can cooperatively develop and support a common web-based application, using open-source software, that initially would be used to query parcel related data, along with other agency-specific data. The project concept is similar to that proposed last year for a Regional GIS Project funding via MetroGIS. However, since no MetroGIS funds are required, the problems encountered with the previous proposal have been overcome.
2. A partnership, with a geospatial data collaborative that serves the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area, is also proposed.

**Granting Agency:** The subject grant competition is funded by the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) for projects that further the vision of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI). The maximum amount available is \$75,000. MetroGIS-related projects have been the recipients of three previous FGDC grants for a total award of in excess of \$166,000.

### Application Specifics

1. The application submittal deadline is February 1, 2006.
2. As of this writing, the applicants had not finalized their project specifications and budget. MetroGIS staff have been assured that the required local funding match will be provided by the organizations that will be directly involved in the project. One of the proposers will also serve as the responsible unit of government.

### BENEFITS TO THE METROGIS COMMUNITY

Award of this grant would be valuable to the MetroGIS community from at least four perspectives:

- 1) The applicants are proposing to use "open source" technology, in particular Minnesota MapServer that was initially developed at the University of Minnesota, to provide the desired Internet-based application capability. This project would provide valuable research and development experience for the MetroGIS community.
- 2) The grant application requirements mandate that Web Feature Service (WFS) technology must be a component of all proposals. WFS technology is expected to play an increasing important role in

application development to address common needs. E.g., achieving the Board's adopted vision for the Addresses of Occupiable Units Regional Dataset requires use of WFS technology. As such, this project would provide valuable research and development experience for the MetroGIS community.

- 3) One of the key elements of the proposal involves the on-line viewing and querying of GIS data. MetroGIS has previously identified a need for unified policy in this regard. The vetting of these issues among the agencies directly involved in the grant project should provide valuable information toward addressing the matter on a regional basis.
- 4) This proposal provides a somewhat rare and important opportunity to collaborate with another region to share expertise and resources. MetroGIS staff reached conceptual agreement in 2001 with the State of New York to collaborate on the development of what became DataFinder Café. Unfortunately, that partnership never materialized given the changes in priorities following 9/11. Other partnership opportunities that are consistent with the vision of the NSDI (e.g., with counties in western Wisconsin) are being cultivated. The proposed "collaboration of collaboratives" is important for two reasons: cooperation among regional geospatial collaboratives is a fundamental need to achieve the vision of the NSDI. Such partnerships also expand the pool of resources available to the partnering organizations, improving efficiencies through the leveraging of existing resources and reducing duplication of effort. Knowledge gained from this experience is expected to provide valuable insight, important to not only MetroGIS but also to other proponents of the NSDI vision.

#### **DISCUSSION**

As of this writing, the application specifics were still evolving. The decision to apply for the grant was made following the Coordinating Committee's December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. As such, the preliminary concept is still being shared among the Coordinating Committee members for comment. The proposers have been asked to be prepared to provide an update on the status of the proposal at the Board meeting.

Signing of the requested letter of support by the MetroGIS Policy Board Chair assumes that any and all substantive concerns raised by Committee and or Policy Board members are resolved to the satisfaction of all affected parties.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board authorize Chairperson Reinhardt to sign a letter in support of the subject FGDC grant application with the understanding that any and all concerns raised are resolved to the satisfaction of all affected parties.

## Written Request for Support

**From:** "Knippel, Randy" <Randy.Knippel@CO.DAKOTA.MN.US>  
**To:** "Randall Johnson" <randy.johnson@metc.state.mn.us>  
**Date:** 1/5/06 8:37AM  
**Subject:** Request for MetroGIS support for FGDC grant application

Randy,

I am respectfully asking for approval to use the MetroGIS name in an application for an FGDC grant for a project that would include the development of software to help cities and counties create web applications. This is a spin-off from the MetroGIS regional project formerly known as "Common Web Application".

Following the canceling of the MetroGIS project, several counties continued to have conversations about the potential for pursuing such a project on our own. This led to discovering similar interest by the Community GIS Technical Committee (CGISTC), a GIS collaborative that includes Richland County, ND and Wilkin County, MN, among others in the southern Red River Basin. The Governor's Council on Geographic Information provided a letter of support to this organization for another FGDC grant in June, 2005. I have had numerous conversations with Doug Bartels, Richland County GIS Coordinator and CGISTC representative about the potential of this project. He is preparing the grant application.

The scope of this project will involve developing an open source user interface for web-based GIS applications suitable for county and city use. The server component of this application will be Mapserver, an open source product originally developed at the University of Minnesota and heavily used and supported by the Mn DNR (and other agencies). Since both the application and server components will be open source, the result will allow web applications to be developed and deployed with minimal cost. Also, as more cities and counties adopt this application, it will lead to greater consistency and commonality between those cities' and counties' web sites with respect to interactive mapping functionality and capabilities.

The ideal scenario would be for MetroGIS and the CGISTC to jointly apply for the grant. This would represent a strong image of collaboration since it demonstrates collaboration across local government jurisdictions as well as regions and states. The FGDC grant requires matching funds; however, no funds will be required of MetroGIS. We expect to be able to satisfy that requirement through in-kind matches provided by member organizations of both MetroGIS and CGISTC that have the desire to participate in this project. While we are still working out the details of this project, the expectation is that it will be administered jointly through a combined workgroup formed from members of both regional collaborative organizations.

The grant application must be submitted by February 1, therefore we will need properly authorized official notice from MetroGIS prior to that. Please contact me immediately if you have any questions. I have conferred with Nancy Read on this request.

-Randy K.

Randy Knippel  
GIS Manager  
Dakota County Office of GIS  
randy.knippel@co.dakota.mn.us  
phone: 952-891-7080

**CC:** "Rick Gelbmann" <rick.gelbmann@metc.state.mn.us>, "Nancy Read" <nancread@visi.com>



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638) and Steve Fester (651-602-1363)

**SUBJECT:** Project Updates

**DATE:** January 10, 2005  
(For the Jan. 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

Information provided by persons other than the Staff Coordinator is noted.

**A) MODIFICATION OF OPERATING GUIDELINES – BETWEEN MEETING DECISION PROCEDURES**

The Coordinating Committee granted first reading to a proposed amendment to MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines to authorize between-meeting decision making by the Committee as well as the Policy Board. See Attachment A for the language accepted by the Committee and an excerpt from the Committee's meeting summary. Second reading is scheduled for the Committee's March 2006 meeting.

**B) STATUS OF 2005 REGIONAL GIS PROJECT**

**(1) MetroGIS DataFinder Café – Upgrade Proposal (In progress)**

A project architecture that utilizes GeoCortex software (British Columbia, Canada), in combination with ArcIMS, has been found to be the most cost-effective way to achieve the functionality desired by the community. Funding has been arranged, with \$14,500 of the \$21,700 project cost being covered by a federal NSDI grant. The GeoCortex software licenses are currently under review. Once any concerns with the licenses are resolved, the project is expected to move forward quickly.

**(2) Common Application Design for Web-based Data Queries (Ceased)**

A mutual decision by all affected parties was made in November to cease this project. Committee and Policy Board members should have each received a letter via email confirming the decision to cease further consideration of this project (Attachment B). It is important to note that each of the parties concurs with this decision and believes that from a research perspective, this pilot project has served a useful purpose in that it has demonstrated the complexities that must be effectively addressed to collaboratively implement a geospatial application(s). Staff intends to document this experience, as a 2006 task, for future reference. The experience also has raised the need to rethink the guidelines for future Regional GIS (Pilot) Projects, in particular, when intellectual property rights are involved. (See Item B, below.)

**(3) Fill in Incomplete Attribute Fields in Regional Parcel Dataset (Indefinitely Postponed)**

The strategy reported at the September Committee meeting had been to conduct interviews one-on-one with county staff who are responsible for managing parcel data, specifically data associated with fields that are not fully populated. Michael Dolbow was to have served as the Project Manager. With Michael's announcement in October that he would be leaving the Council (to become the GIS Coordinator for the MN Department of Agriculture), work on this initiative ceased and no decision has been made as to whether or not it will continue to be pursued. An update will be provided at the Committee meeting as requested at the September meeting.

**C) CRITIQUE 2005 REGIONAL GIS PROJECT PROGRAM / PREPARE 2006 GUIDELINES**

The Coordinating Committee has created a workgroup to evaluate the criteria used to govern this program. The goal is to submit recommendations to the Committee at its March meeting. At that time decisions as to appropriate next steps pertaining to the 2006 program will be discussed.

**D) PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEEDS SOLUTIONS** (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 (Occupiable Units) Workgroup**

*(Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, Workgroup Chair)*

Mark Kotz, staff to the Workgroup, presented a white paper at the State GIS/LIS Conference in October. He described the major components of the regional vision endorsed by the Policy Board last April (e.g., rationale, need for local government involvement and implementation concepts). The white paper can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/street\\_addresses/Occupiable\\_Units\\_Dataset\\_Vision.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/street_addresses/Occupiable_Units_Dataset_Vision.pdf).

The Workgroup last met in December to refine a workplan for next phase of this project. A pilot project was defined at a conceptual level to refine technical and organizational components of the regional solution defined in the vision adopted by the Policy Board in April 2005. The group concurred that the next phase efforts should be categorized and addresses from three perspectives: Data Flow, Standards, and Web Application Proof of Concept.

Gordon Chinander, GIS Coordinator for the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board [MESB; formerly Metropolitan 911 Board] and member of the Coordinating Committee, anticipates sharing the MetroGIS-endorsed vision for this regional solution with the MESB once a regional street centerline dataset is established that meets their needs. The MESB unanimously endorsed a GIS data management system last summer that has the potential of managing this dataset.

**(2) Existing Land Use**

Preparations for a user satisfaction forum remain on hold until following the Strategic Directions Workshop. See Agenda Item 5e. The Coordinating Committee decided at its March 2005 meeting that the Existing Land Use Forum should follow the Workshop, as topics discussed at the Workshop could influence the topics discussed at the land use forum.

**(3) Emergency Preparedness Workgroup**

A summary of the Workgroup's activities follows. *(Submitted by Randy Knippel, Dakota County, Workgroup Chair)*

**a) Data Development and Standards**

At its October meeting, the Policy Board endorsed, for further testing in a full production environment, the interim regional Emergency Preparedness solution approved by the Committee at its September 2005 meeting. The Board's endorsement imposed a condition that the Workgroup modify its program illustration diagram to reflect program, as opposed to process, outcomes in addition to the following items called for in the Committee's endorsement:

- 1) Modifying the label "Owner" to "Regional Theme Manager" in the matrix of data listings,
- 2) Taking appropriate measures to ensure that the list of endorsements from the Emergency Management community expands quickly,
- 3) Taking appropriate measures to ensure a transition begins as soon as practical whereby the leadership positions currently held by workgroup members are filled by members of the Emergency Management community, and
- 4) Providing the Coordinating Committee with periodic updates as the interim solutions is tested and refined.

Workgroup Update – submitted by Randy Knippel, Workgroup Chairperson:

1. Modify Diagram: *See below*

- 2. Owner – Theme Manager Change: *Pending*
- 3. Expand endorsements: *See below*
- 4. Leadership transition: *See below*
- 5. Updates as the interim solution is tested and refined:

The Emergency Preparedness Workgroup Steering Committee believes that the following strategic move is the most effective way to address concerns raised by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee at the September meeting.....

The Emergency Preparedness Workgroup Steering Committee has determined that our mission can be best served by joining forces with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information Emergency Preparedness Committee. The GCGI Committee has organized itself in the same manner as our workgroup providing direct alignment with our focus areas and is now co-chaired by Dan Johnson, former MN Executive Director of Homeland Security. Also, Committee member Judson Freed, Ramsey County Emergency Manager, will assume the position of Chair of the Minnesota Emergency Manager Association for 2006. These factors combined provide strong potential for the coming year. Our direct involvement and influence will increase that potential.

Each member of our workgroup will join a GCGI EP Committee focus group. We will continue to maintain our Metro focus but eliminate any redundancy between our efforts and the statewide efforts. We will meet as needed to keep each other updated on Metro activities and provide regular updates as we have previously. We consider this move temporary, until such time as we determine that this approach is no longer more effective than conducting independent meetings.

**b) Public Health - SNS/BT**

The Minnesota Department of Health is coming to closure on their bio-terrorism and mass dispensing site project. This project is driven by the County Health Departments. The makeup of this team is very similar to the makeup of the Emergency Preparedness data group. They require base map templates for consistent output from county to county. This will be an ongoing process for the next 3-4 months.

**c) Organizing GIS Resources**

A detailed GIS contact list covering 70 cities over 7 counties was compiled for a mailing to encourage GIS people to register on the Contact Database at the Governors Council GIS page. This is the beginning of getting a network of GIS users working in EM across the region.

**d) Outreach to Emergency Management Community**

A representative from the Workgroup is scheduled to attend and present at the Association of Minnesota Emergency Managers (AMEM) annual conference in partnership with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information Emergency Preparedness Committee.

**e) Governor's Council on Geographic Information – Coordination**

The GIS EP Contact website is operational ([http://gis.metc.state.mn.us/ep\\_status\\_map/](http://gis.metc.state.mn.us/ep_status_map/)) and available to promote. Others at the GCGI EP committee are working on a series of slide shows to convey the EM message.

**(4) Highway and Road Networks (Gordon Chinander, Metropolitan Emergency Services Board [formerly Metropolitan 911 Board], Workgroup Chair)**

- a) **The “E911 Address and Street Centerline Workgroup”** had suspended its work on a regional addressable street centerline solution until the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) had completed procurement of software designed to maintain consistency between the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) and street centerline geography (regional

street centerline dataset). The procurement was essentially complete at the time of this writing. The Workgroup is scheduled to meet on January 12 to begin work on the next phase - development/acquisition of a regional street centerline dataset that satisfies E911 needs. The software system installed by MESB will serve as a foundation for metropolitan 911 response efforts and, in particular, serve as a means to efficiently maintain interoperable street centerline data for the entire region. The intent for Phase II is to work in concert with MetroGIS to pursue a regional solution that leverages resources from both communities, insuring that it meets the needs of both existing users of the TLG street centerline dataset, as well as, the additional needs of the E911 community. The workgroup is also charged with defining a set of business rules, roles and responsibilities for maintaining the regional street centerline product. The goal is to have one set of geometry for all users, but the attributes used by the E911 community may be in a separate, linked database to avoid confusion. Details of these rules and processes have not been finalized.

The MESB is responsible for defining the E911 related needs, business rules, and identifying local address authorities by working with representatives from the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board, LOGIS, and the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). The specifications for the current TLG Street Centerline dataset would provide the standard for the non-911 user community. For those local government (e.g., counties and cities) entities that want to support primary street centerline data capture and transaction management, a survey will be conducted to determine which, if any, of the desired standards they will not be able to support. An RFP is then planned to secure a 3<sup>rd</sup> party to provide these data. A plan for achieving the initial conversion/enhancement would then be formulated, which would likely include a pilot product to serve as guide for the remainder of the data producers.

More information on this workgroup's efforts can be found at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/workgroups/e911\\_streets/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/workgroups/e911_streets/index.shtml).

- b) There are currently **169 licenses** issued to access and use The Lawrence Group's (TLG) Street Centerline Dataset, MetroGIS's currently endorsed regional solution for address matching. As of January 10<sup>th</sup>, the types of organizations licensed were as follows:
- Local gov't: **90**
  - Regional gov't: **11**
  - State/Federal gov't: **22**
  - Academic: **46**
- c) The **MetroGIS Roads & Highways Technical Workgroup** was inactive during 2005 due to organizational changes at MnDOT and complications with the software that is the foundation for this project. A proposal for the goals and procedures for a pilot project in the Metro Area to integrate local datasets with Mn/DOT's LDM was drafted by MetroGIS staff and forwarded to the workgroup group in January 2005. However, due to delays with the software development, efforts to establish a pilot area were postponed. The strategy had been to work together to see if MnDOT could transfer some of the attributes Mn/DOT carries (\*e.g. traffic volumes) to the local road geometries from a local agency (pilot area in Metro Area). However, the vendor that Mn/DOT is using is behind and that has caused a delay in the pilot moving forward. There is work that could be done in defining a core set of transportation features and attributes needed by all organizations, but there is currently no staff support to lead the effort as Michael Dolbow, who served as he lead staff for MetroGIS on this project, left MetroGIS in October to accept the GIS Coordinator position at the Department of Agriculture. No decision has been made as to whether someone with Mr. Dolbow's skills will be hired to replace him. Information about agreed upon goals, expectations, and participant roles can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/highway\\_roads/index.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/highway_roads/index.shtml).

(5) **Lakes, Wetlands, etc.** (*Nancy Read, Coordinating Committee Chairperson and Workgroup Member*)

The Hydrology Workgroup has not met for some time. A pilot project, to work through partnerships and organizational roles needed to help facilitate the updating of the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) for the Twin Cities metropolitan area, was delayed until for some time and is just now reengaging due to late delivery of required imagery. This pilot is viewed as a component of a broader Metro Area hydrologic solution that is anticipated once the statewide strategic planning effort is complete. The initial components of the proposed pilot can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/info\\_needs/lakes\\_wetlands/workgroup/04\\_0929min.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/lakes_wetlands/workgroup/04_0929min.pdf) under the Lakes & Wetlands Workgroup. The pilot project partners include the Metropolitan Council, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District (MMCD), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the Ramsey Co. Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD).

From an overall project management perspective, it appears to be time to reassess gaps between the hydrology-related information needs identified in 1997 and those that can be met with currently developed (or developing) data. The concept of hosting a strategy session will be vetted shortly among the workgroup members to determine if there is support to reaffirm the user needs and discuss a strategy(ies) to address any gaps relevant to defining a Regional solution.

(6) **Land Cover** (*Bart Richardson, MN DNR, Regional Custodian*)

The extent of coverage is now up to 75 percent of the seven-county region, with Anoka and Dakota counties completely done. Work is currently in progress to extend the coverage another 5 percent in 2006. DNR, the regional custodian, is looking into creating tools to improve standardization of the data before delivery. DNR also held a technical forum on December 16<sup>th</sup> for individuals who have some MLCCS experience to review technical methodologies and standards, as well as, obtain thoughts about the future direction of the MLCCS. The DNR Natural Heritage has revised their native plant community classification system and, as such, there is need to start the public discussion whether to migrate to that new community classification. Finally, DNR is tentatively planning on hosting a user forum in the first half of 2006 to identify other desired improvements.

(7) **Parcels** (*Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council, Regional Custodian*)

There are currently **67 licenses** issued to access and use the Regional Parcel Dataset. As of **January 10<sup>th</sup>**, the types of organizations licensed were as follows:

- Local gov't: **29** (8 added 3<sup>rd</sup> Party licenses)
- Regional gov't: **5** (1 added 3<sup>rd</sup> Party licenses)
- State/Federal gov't: **14** (2 added 3<sup>rd</sup> Party licenses)
- Academic: **19** (2 added 3<sup>rd</sup> Party licenses)

(8) **Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas** (*Amy West, U of M Population Center, Regional Custodian*)

- a) The University of Minnesota Population Center staff, aided by Will Craig (CURA), oversees management of the content of the Socioeconomic Resources Page ([www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic\\_resources/index.asp](http://www.datafinder.org/mg/socioeconomic_resources/index.asp)), fix broken links, and coordinate efforts to add new data sources.
- b) In accordance with a MetroGIS Policy Board request, the Metro Public Health GIS Users Group (Tim Zimmerman, Hennepin County, Chair) has secured agreement from the metro area counties for new ways to publish vital statistics (birth and death data) that present more small area information in formats compatible with GIS, while preserving confidentiality of individuals. Such information (the attributes associated with births and deaths, such as the number of low birth-weight births, births to teenage mothers, etc.) can serve as useful

indicators of community well-being. Due to competing priorities, this proposal has not yet been shared with the MN Department of Health for sanctioning, but the Users Group hopes to do so by the end of January 2006. For more information contact Tim Zimmerman at [tim.zimmerman@co.hennepin.mn.us](mailto:tim.zimmerman@co.hennepin.mn.us) or 612-348-0307.

**E) COUNTY DATA PRODUCER WORKGROUP ACTIVITIES** *(Submitted by Dave Drealan, Carver County, Workgroup Chair)*

▪ **Hennepin County Pilot Project: Regional Parcel Dataset Policy Investigation - Access by Non-Profit Interests:**

Hennepin County has instituted a policy permitting qualified non-profit interests to access its parcel data free of charge, subject to licensure that prohibits redistribution. This policy was enacted in cooperation with the M3D project. The results of this access trial are intended to serve as a pilot for possible consideration of a regional policy. M3D is a dynamic GIS-based Internet application that brings together labor market, housing and development information and analysis for the Twin Cities metro area into a single tool for economic and community developers. Neighborhood organization and non-profit interests are playing a central role in the M3D project. This Hennepin County access policy requires non-profits to be legally constituted, community-based, and working on a mission that benefits the public including: promoting jobs, economic development, affordable housing, environmental improvements, or community development in order to qualify for free access. Licensed data also must be secure and password-protected. Hennepin County retains the right to evaluate requests and approve or deny them on a case-by-case basis.

• **Pilot Project: View-Only, Web-based Access Policy Investigated for Parcel Data**

On September 30, Hennepin County officials agreed to consider a proposal from Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, to aid in evaluation of policy implications regarding a community desire to view parcel boundaries and limited attribute data online without the ability to download the source data. The idea is that once an agreement-in-principle is reached with Hennepin County, that agreement-in-principle would be vetted through the County Data Producers Workgroup to negotiate a recommendation acceptable to each of the other six Metro Area counties. An update on the anticipated schedule for this proposal has been requested to share with the Board at the January meeting.

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Proposed Amendment to MetroGIS Operating Guidelines**  
**Between Meeting Decision-Making**

*Excerpt from December 14, 2005 Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary.*

**5a) Modification of Operating Guidelines – Decision Making Between Meetings**

... After a brief discussion, the group elected to modify the proposed language (*next page*) to allow the possibility of either the Chair or the Vice Chair appointing a designee if they will be out of the touch who can act in their behalf to initiate and act on proposals for decision-making between meetings.

**Motion:** Claypool moved and Givens seconded to grant first reading to the modify MetroGIS's Operating Guidelines and authorize "between meeting decision-making", as set forth in the amendment dated November 27, 2005, subject to modifying the first bullet in Article II, Section 5b and Article III, Section 9b as follows: The Chairperson and Vice-chairperson, or their respective designee(s), both conclude that the situation is urgent.

Motion carried, ayes all.

---

**The proposal contained in the materials for the December 14, 2005  
Coordinating Committee agenda packet follows on the next page:**

## **PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

### **MetroGIS Operating Guidelines (Rules for Decision Making Between Meetings)**

**(~~Language crossed out to be deleted and~~ language underline to be added)**

#### **Article II Policy Board**

##### Section 5. Voting and Decision Making

a) At Meetings: Each organization represented on the Policy Board shall have one vote, unless authorized in Section 2 of this Article to have more than one representative on the Policy Board. In the latter case, each duly appointed member shall have one vote. A motion supported by fifty percent of the duly appointed members or their designated alternates, plus one member, shall be the act of the Policy Board, unless a greater number is required by law or by another provision of these guidelines. Notwithstanding, a consensus process involving all Policy Board members is encouraged for matters fundamental to the long-term success of MetroGIS.

b) Between Meetings

To maintain flexibility to address issues and opportunities in a timely manner, the Policy Board may make decisions between meetings, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

- The Chairperson and Vice-chairperson both conclude that the situation is urgent.
- The call for a vote is made via email and the subject line states “E-Vote Requested – Urgent MetroGIS Business”
- Members are provided with at least five (5) working days to respond.
- The rules set forth in Sections 8 and 9a in this Article, governing the Committee’s quorum and decision-making rules, shall be satisfied.
- The Committee is apprised of the results and the course of action to follow, immediately following conclusion of the voting.

##### Section 7. Quorum

A quorum shall be present to take action on a business item. Fifty percent of the duly appointed members or their designated alternates, plus one, shall constitute a quorum. Fifty percent of the members present, plus one, even if less than a quorum, may adjourn a meeting.

#### **Article III Coordinating Committee**

##### Section 8. Quorum

A quorum shall be present to act on a business item. A quorum shall consist of fifty percent of the full voting membership, plus one member. Fifty percent of the members present, plus one, even if less than a quorum, may adjourn a meeting.

##### Section 9. Voting and Decision Making

Each organization represented on the Coordinating Committee shall have one vote, except where organizations are approved to be represented by more than one person.

a) At Meetings

(1) Recommendations to the Policy Board: A motion for a recommendation to the Policy Board must be supported by at least 75 percent of the members present to be approved, unless a greater number is required by law or by another provision of these guidelines. If other than unanimous support, the differing opinion(s) must be carried forward with the recommendation.

Situations where issues of policy arise that are beyond the Committee's scope or where additional direction is needed to resolve a matter shall be passed to the Policy Board for consideration and direction.

(2) Other Motions: A motion that will not result in a recommendation to the Policy Board must be supported by at least 50 percent of the members present, plus one, to be approved, unless a greater number is required by law or by another provision of these guidelines.

b) Between Meetings

To maintain flexibility to address issues and opportunities in a timely manner, the Committee may make decisions between meetings, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

- The Chairperson and Co-chairperson both conclude that the situation is urgent.
- The call for a vote is made via email and the subject line states "E-Vote Requested – Urgent MetroGIS Business".
- Members are provided with at least five (5) working days to respond.
- The rules set forth in Sections 8 and 9a in this Article, governing the Committee's quorum and decision-making rules, shall be satisfied.
- The Committee is apprised of the results and the course of action to follow, immediately following conclusion of the voting.

Section 11. Meetings

The Coordinating Committee shall meet as necessary to carry out its duties. The time and place of the meetings shall be at the discretion of the Committee membership.

Written notice (mail, facsimile, email) of the regular meetings of the Coordinating Committee shall be given to each member at least five (5) days prior to such meetings, and shall comply with the provisions of the open meeting law. Special meetings of the Coordinating Committee may be called by the Chair, provided that at least three (3) days written notice is given to each member and otherwise comply with the provisions of the open meeting law.

# ATTACHMENT B



## *MetroGIS*

*Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data*

---

Date: November 23, 2005

To: MetroGIS Policy Board and Coordinating Committee members

From: Victoria Reinhardt, Policy Board Chairperson  
Randy Knippel, Common Web-based Application Project Leader  
Mark Vander Schaaf, Metropolitan Council

**Subject: Regional GIS Pilot Program – Common Web-based Application Proposal**

This letter is to inform you that a mutual decision has been made to no longer pursue the “Common Application Design for Web-based Data Queries” that had been granted concept approval, as a Regional GIS Project, by the MetroGIS Policy Board at its July 2005 meeting.

It is very important to us that this decision is clearly understood to be mutually supported. A number of challenges have been encountered with this project leading to our decision. They include the need for special authorization to purchase software that would not be owned by the funding organization and accompanying interagency agreements. At best, these requirements would take several more months to accomplish and involve substantial legal expense compared to the value of the project. That said, the experience has been enlightening as it revealed the complexities of attempting to address common geospatial application needs. These lessons will serve the MetroGIS community well in future endeavors.

Even though the project as originally conceived has ceased, the parties who have championed this project continue to be committed to sharing the knowledge they gain in pursuing similar endeavors. MetroGIS Staff intend to document the experience thus far and is willing to assist with documentation of lessons learned from any subsequent related projects. We hope that MetroGIS will continue to be a forum for such collaboration.

cc: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Rick Gelbmann, GIS Manager, Metropolitan Council



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Thank You to Dr. Zorica Nedovic-Budic

**DATE:** January 9, 2006  
(For the January 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

Chairperson Reinhardt wanted to share with the Policy Board a letter of thank you she recently sent to Dr. Zorica Nedovic-Budic, on behalf of the MetroGIS community. This report provides context for the thank you.

## BACKGROUND

The subjects of Chairperson Reinhardt's letter of thank you are a book written by Ian Masser, which was published March 2005, and a review of that book written by Zorica Nedovic-Budic and published last month. Dr. Masser is an internationally respected authority on Spatial Data Infrastructures from technical as well as organizational perspectives. Dr. Budic is recognized as one of the top academic researchers in the U.S. and beyond, who specializes in multi-party partnerships established to create and manage Spatial Data Infrastructures. Her research and expertise are helping proponents of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) for the United States better understand the organizational side of successful geospatial collaborations and challenges that must be overcome to fully achieve the vision of the NSDI.

The book, entitled "*GIS Worlds –Creating Spatial Data Infrastructures*", cites MetroGIS's efforts as among the most successful Spatial Data Infrastructure initiatives from an international perspective. Dr. Masser's purpose for writing this book was to compare and contrast efforts worldwide that have successfully developed Spatial Data Infrastructures consistent with their respective national visions and to use the results of this research to accelerate efforts to achieve the vision of a global spatial data infrastructure. MetroGIS was the only entity cited within the U. S. for this purpose.

As if being identified by Dr. Masser's as the only U.S example suitable for his research was not high enough praise of MetroGIS's accomplishments, the following quote from Dr. Budic's review of Dr. Masser's book goes to another level in complimenting MetroGIS on its accomplishments:

"In the U.S. case, the author (Ian Masser) zeros in on one of the most successful (if not the most successful) examples of joint multiparty ventures in sharing core data sets – MetroGIS, a stakeholder-governed cooperation among seven counties in Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area."

The full article can be reviewed at <http://www.urisa.org/Journal/Vol17No2/BudicReview.pdf>. (The quote is from the second page, near the top of the left column in the printed version.)

# ***MetroGIS***

*Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data*

---



January 9, 2006

Zorica Nedovic-Budic, Ph.D.  
Department of Urban and Regional Planning,  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
111 Temple Hoyne Buell Hall  
611 East Lorado Taft Drive  
Champaign, IL 61820

**RE: *High Praise Paid to MetroGIS's Accomplishments***

Dear Dr. Budic,

Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, recently informed me and others on the MetroGIS Policy Board of the high praise you bestowed on MetroGIS in your review of Ian Masser's book "*GIS Worlds – Creating Spatial Data Infrastructures*". We were extremely flattered to learn that Dr. Masser had selected MetroGIS as among the best Spatial Data Infrastructure programs that he investigated among an international field, but we were surprised when he selected MetroGIS as his lone U.S. example. Words cannot fully express our profound gratitude for your statement in your review of Dr. Masser's book that MetroGIS "...is one of the most (if not the most successful) examples of multiparty ventures in sharing core data sets....".

On behalf of MetroGIS's leadership and all of the individual and organizational contributions that it takes to maintain effective collaborative policies and relationships, I would like to thank you for your high praise of MetroGIS's efforts. We have worked hard to create and maintain an effective forum through which we can address common geospatial information needs in a manner that moves the entire community forward as if a single enterprise and to simultaneously embed the philosophy of the NSDI vision into our policies. The work of overcoming organizational obstacles and keeping pace with rapidly changing technology is endless and at times trying even after ten years of success. Praise of the type bestowed on our efforts by Dr. Masser and you make the journey all the more satisfying.

Again, thank you very much for your kind words. They mean a great deal coming from a person with knowledge and expertise of the magnitude that you possess.

Respectfully,

Victoria A. Reinhardt, Chairperson  
MetroGIS Policy Board *and*  
Ramsey County Commissioner

cc: MetroGIS Policy Board  
MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

**TO:** Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Information Sharing

**DATE:** December 30, 2005  
(For the Jan. 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)

Announcements and information provided by persons other than the Staff Coordinator are so noted.

## **B COORDINATING COMMITTEE OFFICERS FOR 2006**

At its December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Coordinating Committee elected Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District) and Randy Knippel (Dakota County) to serve a second term as its Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for 2006.

## **C. PRESENTATIONS / OUTREACH / STUDIES** (not mentioned elsewhere)

### **1. Submitted Articles for winter 2005 Issue of GIS/LIS Newsletter**

An article was submitted for the winter 2005 issue. It talks about the forum hosted on November 15<sup>th</sup> for private and non-profit interests entitled "Beyond Government Users: New Directions for MetroGIS". The Newsletter is expected to be published early January and can be viewed at <http://www.mngisli.org/newsletter/>.

### **2. Presentation at State GIS/LIS Conference**

None since last Policy Board meeting.

### **3. Staff Coordinator Attended Innovations in Governance Program at Harvard**

The Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University offers a one-week program each fall, entitled "Innovations in Governance". The program's purpose is to explore innovations in governance, in particular, for collaborative initiatives designed to address important public problems through a case study format.

The program proved to be a valuable opportunity to share MetroGIS's experience as a case study for constructive criticism. This opportunity was also timely, given governance-related questions raised in the Council's recent Program Evaluation and Audit Report about MetroGIS. A short paper, which documents information learned during this program relevant to MetroGIS's efforts, has been shared with individuals who expressed an interest. This paper is available to others upon request.

## **D) RELATED METRO AND STATE GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE**

### **1. Minnesota 3D Project – Needs Assessment Underway / Website Testing**

M3D consortium partners, including neighborhood and community organizations serving Minneapolis and several Twin Cities suburban municipalities, have been asked to respond to a community development/GIS-related needs assessment. The results will be used to help the M3D project team refine an Internet-based application that is the centerpiece of the M3D project. An alpha version was launched this past September (<http://map.deed.state.mn.us/m3d> - User Name: M3D / Password: test). A beta site should be ready for testing by February 2006 and is a candidate for the GIS Demonstration at the Board's April meeting. The results of the M3D Web application experience will likely be valuable to MetroGIS as investigations proceed into development of commonly needed geospatial-based applications.

An excerpt from the M3D Project Application's Executive Summary states: "Building on the existing GIS infrastructure, M3D is an Internet-accessible and integrated system of employment, housing and development information and analysis tools for neighborhoods, community development corporations, employment trainers, businesses, central cities, suburbs, counties of the Twin Cities metropolitan region, and the State of Minnesota....By combining new statewide data on employment and demographics through an agreement with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Social Security Administration, and the Census Bureau with the existing region-wide parcel level housing data, Minnesota 3-D will be a "first-of-its-kind" system.....M3D is a scalable, standards-based system that can accommodate expanded data layers and geographic coverage. "... With emerging Internet-based mapping technologies, this is the most cost-effective way to maximize access, analytical capacity, and user-to-user information sharing." (Submitted by Will Craig, U of M CURA)

## **2. Regional Web Portal Could Provide Proof-of-Concept for State GIS Enterprise Architecture**

The Governors Council has endorsed the paper "MN State GIS Enterprise Conceptual Architecture Design" prepared by the Geospatial Architecture Committee (GAC). This document (<http://www.gis.state.mn.us/pdf/MNGISConceptualArchitectureDesign.pdf>) proposes a new delivery model for GIS in the State that consists in-part of a centralized "broker" that manages sanctioned mapping service providers. (Submitted by Will Craig, U of M CURA)

(Note from Staff Coordinator: MetroGIS's ApplicationFinder concept, which was accepted by the Coordinating Committee in December 2004, is an example of the type of service envisioned. Creation of a MetroGIS workgroup to further develop the ApplicationFinder concept has been on hold since December 2004, awaiting the results of the pending Strategic Directions Workshop that was initially proposed for February 2005 but subsequently postponed. The current target timeframe for the workshop is late spring 2006. In the meantime, the ApplicationFinder concept has been offered to the Governors Council as a resource for their work.)

## **3. Minnesota's Strategic Plan for GIS**

The Governor's Council on Geographic Information has recently adopted a strategic plan in three parts: organizational, technical, and data. In sum, these plans address Governor Pawlenty's goals in his Drive to Excellence initiative as well as the IT profession's goals of building a sound Enterprise Architecture.

Presently, the Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure (MSDI) is in fairly good shape, but it could be better. Most of what is in place today is the result of hard work by a few organizations and a cooperative spirit within the state. The new plan provides a more comprehensive strategy for moving forward.

Organization: The state needs fresh thinking about roles, responsibilities, and organizational relationships. The plan calls for designation and funding of a recognized authority that would oversee the development and implementation of the MSDI. Among other things that authority would be responsible for:

- Coordinating work across state agencies.
- Working with state and local stakeholders to identify GIS needs and priorities.
- Maintaining and expanding the MN Geographic Data Clearinghouse.

The full plan, A Foundation for Coordinated GIS, Minnesota's Spatial Data Infrastructure, is available at <http://server.admin.state.mn.us/resource.html?Id=9084>

Technology: An enterprise architecture is needed to support sharing of data and application resources. The Council has developed a conceptual plan for this. The envisioned system would promote interoperability among providers, reducing long-term costs in data and software development. Among other things, the plan calls for:

- A catalog of data and application resources that are available in real time.
- Resource providers: public and private, state and local.
- A centralized “Broker,” responsible for the catalog, standards, security, and resource integrity, and growth of the system.

The full report, Minnesota State GIS Enterprise Conceptual Architecture Design, is available at <http://server.admin.state.mn.us/resource.html?Id=17091>

*Data:* The Council is focusing on eight thematic areas identified as high priority in surveys of the state GIS community. For each, the Council has a team working to document current status, costs of improvement, and strategies for advancement. The list includes the seven framework themes of national priority, plus soils which is particularly important for Minnesota: Cadastral (parcels), Elevation, Geodetic Control, Governmental Boundaries, Hydrology, Imagery, Soils, and Transportation.

The status of each theme is documented in Appendix B of A Foundation for Coordinated GIS listed above, but also on <http://www.gis.state.mn.us/MSDI>. For more information, including key contacts, see the websites listed above. (*Submitted by Will Craig, U of M CURA*)

(Note: David Arbeit and Rick Gelbmann, members of the Coordinating Committee, and the MetroGIS Staff Coordinator are members of the GCGI Strategic Planning Workgroup.)

#### **E) RELATED FEDERAL/NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE**

##### **1. URISA Selects MetroGIS as Among the Best of Its ESIG Award Recipients.**

For many years, the Urban and Regional Information System Association (URISA) has annually recognized outstanding achievement in the successful development and application of spatial systems and technologies around the world with its Exemplary Systems in Government (ESIG) Awards. MetroGIS received this prestigious award in October 2002. URISA has recently recognized MetroGIS as among the best of the initiatives that it recognized in 2000-2004 in a special publication that can be viewed at <http://www.urisa.org/Journal/JrnlContents17-2.htm>. In the foreword, the editor states the following about MetroGIS:

“... the Minnesota MetroGIS Geodata Collaborative has allowed over 300 local and regional government units serving the seven-county Minneapolis - St Paul metropolitan area to access and share geospatial data. The MetroGIS, together with the institutional arrangements and coordination efforts that underpin it, have had a positive impact on improving the efficiency of government in the Twin Cities area, and it serves as an outstanding example of the type of geospatial data collaborative envisaged in the original NSDI Executive Order delivered by President Clinton in April, 2004.”

The publication includes a detailed explanation of each for six showcased award recipients. These explanations are essentially the same the narrative submitted for the initial award. The last section provides an update on accomplishments since 2002 and current challenges.

Quote from William Craig, U of M CURA: I just received the current issue of the URISA Journal, 17(2). This issue "showcases some of the best award recipients from the years 2000-2004." An international panel was organized to do this work. I'm happy and proud to see that MetroGIS appears in the publication. Congratulations.

##### **2. MetroGIS Recognized as U.S. Example of a Successful Spatial Data Infrastructure**

Last March, MetroGIS was recognized in a book written by Dr. Ian Masser, an internationally respected expert on spatial data infrastructures - technical and organizational aspects. Dr. Zorica Budic recently reviewed this book. Dr. Budic is considered to be one of, if not the top, academic researcher in the U.S. regarding collaboration/partnering to address common geospatial needs.

In her review, Dr. Budic states - "In the U.S. case, the author (Ian Masser) zeros in on one of the most successful (if not the most successful) examples of joint multiparty ventures in sharing core data sets – MetroGIS, a stakeholder-governed cooperation among seven counties in Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area." The full article can be reviewed at <http://www.urisa.org/Journal/Vol17No2/BudicReview.pdf>. (The quote is from the second page, near the top of the left column of the printed version.) See Agenda Item 7a for a thank you letter sent to Dr. Budic by Chairperson Reinhardt for her high praise of MetroGIS's accomplishments.

### **3. Draft National Street Address Data Standard in Second Review Phase**

MetroGIS's Address Workgroup's efforts to define workable address standards for a regional Occupiable Units Address Dataset played a substantial role in the recently released draft national standards that are being developed through the URISA under the auspices of the FGDC. Supporting organizations are NENA and the U.S. Census Bureau. The comment period for the first public review of the standard ended October 3rd. The standard is now open for comments in its second and final review period. Mark Kotz, staff to the MetroGIS Workgroup, monitored the national discussion and all changes to the language initially submitted by MetroGIS. None of the changes had a significant effect on the needs of the MetroGIS community.

The national street address data standard consists of four parts: content, classification, quality, and transfer. The final review period for the standard ends in January. The standard is expected to be finalized in May of 2006. This standard will be evaluated for use with the proposed regional occupiable units address dataset and the E-911 compatible street centerlines dataset.

### **4. Agreement Reached with U.S. Census Bureau to Use Regional Dataset**

MetroGIS staff have successfully brokered an agreement between the U.S. Census Bureau and The Lawrence Group (TLG) to incorporate the TLG regional street centerline dataset into the 2010 Census geography. Accuracy testing was completed mid-December with all data meeting or exceeding accuracy standards set by the Bureau. This agreement has been sought for several years, as Bureau use of locally-endorsed data is expected to result in substantial time and cost savings for local governments. Municipalities and counties will be able to "redistrict" new Census boundaries using centerline data that aligns very closely with their own. Similarly, the Metropolitan Council will not have to realign the final census products with accurate geospatial data, a project that cost over \$72,000 for the 1990 and 2000 Census boundaries.

Mike Dolbow and Rick Gelbmann of the Metropolitan Council's GIS Unit and Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, were instrumental in achieving this accomplishment.

### **5. USGS Cooperative Agreements with Hennepin and Ramsey Counties**

The US Geological Survey (USGS) has signed Cooperative Agreements with both Hennepin County and Ramsey County to support the acquisition of high resolution digital orthoimagery for the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. The Cooperative Agreements provide supplemental funding for the collection of orthophotos in spring 2006. The agreements will enable the sharing of locally-obtained imagery with Federal agencies involved with homeland security and homeland defense. Technical points of contact for the agreements include Hennepin County Surveyor Bill Brown and Ramsey County Surveyor David Claypool.

## **F) DECEMBER 14, 2005 COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

See [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/05\\_1214/min.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/05_1214/min.pdf).