

Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Metropolitan Mosquito Control District Offices
April 19, 2006

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Gary Delaney (Carver County), Joseph Wagner (Scott County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Nancy Read (Chairperson), Dave Drealan, Jane Harper, David Claypool, Will Craig, Mark Vander Schaaf, and Rick Gelbmann.

Visitors: Prof. Shashi Shekhar (University of Minnesota)

Support Staff: Randall Johnson.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

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

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Pistilli moved and Member Schneider seconded to accept the January 19, 2006 meeting summary, subject to correcting. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Will Craig introduced Prof. Shashi Shekhar, noting that in the previous week the subject research project had received the Research Partners Award for the Most Valuable Research Project in the past year. Prof. Shekhar then reported on a web-based software tool, which utilizes GIS technology, which he and his team developed to improve the evaluation planning in conjunction with emergency preparedness responsibilities. He also commented that access to standardized data for the region, made available through MetroGIS's efforts, is very important to reaping the full benefit from the use of the tool.

He shared two tests of the software, which in both cases outperformed manual methods regarding both goals – substantially reduce the time to prepare planned evacuation routes and reduce the actual time that it takes complete the evacuation. The greatest time reduction during the actual evacuation comes from the software's ability to recognize bottlenecks and to generate new routes to reduce congestion.

The members asked several questions to clarify various capabilities of the software (e.g., ability to eliminate road segments from otherwise acceptable evacuation routes that would be within a plume associated with a chemical spill; rationale for routing evacuees past a problem area as opposed to directly away from it might be due to medical considerations; ability to deal with outward evacuation as the same time that first responders are heading into the area.). Board members acknowledged the importance of this and similar tools to educating the Emergency Preparedness Community on the benefits of collaborating with the geospatial community.

Prof. Shashi Shekhar was thanked for sharing his innovative work with the Board. A copy of his presentation can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06_0419/Shekhar_presentation.pdf.

5. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) Election of Officers

Chairperson Reinhardt turned the meeting over to Vice Chairperson Kordiak to conduct the election for Chairperson. Vice Chairperson Kordiak called for nominations. Member Schneider moved and Member Pistilli seconded to nominate Member Reinhardt for Chairperson and Member Kordiak for Vice Chairperson for the coming year. Vice Chairperson Kordiak called for further nominations three times. Hearing none, he closed the nominations. Motion passed, ayes all, to re-elect Member Reinhardt for Chairperson and Member Kordiak for Vice Chairperson for the coming year.

b) Draft Report – Metropolitan Council Evaluation of MetroGIS

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that from her perspective the evaluation conducted by the Metropolitan Council was well run and that she is happy with the outcome. She then invited Mark Vander Schaaf, Director of the Department of Data Resources at the Metropolitan Council, to summarize the draft Final Report and Recommendations of the Community Development Committee MetroGIS Workgroup.

Vander Schaaf began his comments by stating that the message from the evaluation is good news. He commented that through the evaluation process Council management and Councilmembers learned of the MetroGIS's value to its operations and were generally impressed with the accomplishments and manner in which MetroGIS conducts its business.

He summarized the findings presented in the report in the context of four major themes:

- Governance and Funding – No major changes.
- Encourage a Statewide Equivalent to MetroGIS
- Accountability – Improve understanding among senior management and Councilmembers of MetroGIS's efforts. Vander Schaaf commented that the recent creation of the Department of Data Resources within the Council represents a change to accomplish this goal. MetroGIS is now separated from the Regional Administrator by 1 level of management (himself) as opposed to 3, as had been the case going into the evaluation.
- Memorialize/Certify Relationship to the Current MetroGIS Organization – Act on a preference for sustaining the current MetroGIS organization as a critical component to the Council's ability to cost effectively obtain the data it needs from others to accomplish its responsibilities.

Vander Schaaf then summarized the process that will be followed to act on the recommendations presented in the report, noting that the goal is for formal Council consideration to occur in May.

Pistilli, Metropolitan Council representative to the Policy Board and member of the Metropolitan Council's Workgroup whose deliberations are summarized in the subject report, commented that the evaluation process, although difficult at times, ultimately affirmed the value of MetroGIS to the Council and the region. He concluded his comments by stating the outcome is positive for all parties.

Schneider commented that he is pleased with the outcome. He offered an observation that quarterly reporting to the Council might be better served if illustrations of the benefits are provided as opposed to standard written reports. Pistilli concurred that viewing practical applications made possible through collaboration would greatly help policy makers understand the value of the efforts behind the scenes to implement collaborative solutions. No other comments were offered.

Vander Schaaf thanked Member Pistilli and Chairperson Reinhardt for their leadership during the process which made it possible to get past differences and achieve consensus.

c) June 1 Geospatial Technology Possibilities Forum

Coordinating Committee Chair Read summarized progress to prepare for the June 1st forum that MetroGIS is co-hosting entitled Imagining Possibilities: the Next Frontier for Geographic Information Technology. She also commented that this forum is one of three major initiatives designed to support preparations for the Strategic Directions Workshop planned for this fall. Board members were encouraged to register for the morning session, which will be designed to be of interest to policy makers and senior managers.

A copy of the forum brochure was handed out (an email had also been sent the week prior to Board members and all committee members). In response to a question, staff provided an explanation for limiting the capacity to 250 individuals, which was acceptable to the Board.

d) Use of Funds Donated to MetroGIS for June 1 Forum (Ratify Acceptance Received Between Meetings)

Chairperson Reinhardt summarized this item, as outlined in the agenda materials.

Motion: Egan moved and Pistilli seconded that the MetroGIS Policy Board ratify the use of up to \$2,000 in funds donated to MetroGIS as a contingency for the expenses to be incurred in connection with hosting the June 1, 2006 forum, entitled Imagining Possibilities: The Next Frontier for Geographic Information Technology. Motion carried, ayes all.

6. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES

Staff distributed the 2005 MetroGIS Annual Report to Board members and provided an overview of the 2006 Regional GIS Projects Proposals that were reviewed at the concept phase by the Coordinating Committee. No other topics were discussed.

7. INFORMATION SHARING

Staff commented on the two federal grants outlined in the agenda report that have been awarded to stakeholders who named MetroGIS as a cooperating entity.

Chairperson Reinhardt reported on a presentation she made at the national NACO conference in March. The focus was the role that GIS technology plays in wetlands preservation efforts.

Vice Chairperson Kordiak asked what is happening at the state level to accomplish collaboration needs that has been achieved through MetroGIS's efforts. Gelbmann, Chair of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) and a member of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, commented that although there is a great deal of support for more collaboration, resources to implement the various mechanisms are lacking. He commented that much of the success in the Metro Area is a result of having full time staff (MetroGIS Staff Coordinator) assigned to foster the means to attain the desired collaboration. Gelbmann noted that the good news is that this organizational constraint has been identified in the Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure (MSDI) Strategic Plan that was adopted by the GCGI last year. He also noted that acknowledgement for a similar entity to MetroGIS at the state level is gaining and that the Council's recommendation (Agenda Item 5b) could help this momentum reach the critical mass needed for serious dialogue on resource needs.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 19, 2006.

9. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 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
"What does MetroGIS Mean to Minnesota Geospatial Architecture Plan?"

DATE: July 11, 2006
(For the July 19th meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The topic for the GIS Technology Demonstration at the July Policy Board meeting will be the recently adopted Minnesota Geospatial Architecture Plan, specifically what the existence of MetroGIS means to realizing its vision.

A team of individuals affiliated with Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) has accepted an invitation to present this topic at the July Policy Board meeting. The members are David Arbeit, Director of the Mn Department of Geographic and Demographic Analysis, Robert Maki, GIS Manager, Department of Natural Resources, and Fred Logman, GCGI staff.

PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

This presentation will center on a strategy for improving sharing of geospatial information and related business integration across organizations that builds on government's past, current and planned investments. This approach enables voluntary participation in a collaborative system where organizations can leverage each other's software and database development work, and in the process, avoid costly redundant efforts. The technological challenges to collaborating at this level can be overcome. In some respects, the administrative/organizational obstacles are the greater challenge, as government entities learn to collaborate within the context of an organized system.

The Policy Board may have a role in identifying desired and appropriate roles and responsibilities and/or influencing other policy makers such as the Legislature. In order for this concept to be successful, some organizations will need to be willing to make what they are doing for themselves available to others. Resources will also be needed to support the "service broker" function, again within the domain of the Policy Board to work through related policy and resource needs.

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

- Apr. 2006 Evacuation Planning for Homeland Defense – U of M Research Project
- Jan. 2006 (*No presentation*)
- 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



TO: Policy Board

FROM: Mark Vander Schaaf, Director
Department of Data Resources, Metropolitan Council (651-602-1441)

SUBJECT: Final Action - Metropolitan Council Evaluation of MetroGIS

DATE: July 10, 2006
(For the July 19th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to communicate to the Policy Board that on June 28, 2006, the Metropolitan Council unanimously:

- 1) Adopted a resolution (Attachment A) reconfirming the Council's commitment to participating in MetroGIS and stating its expectations regarding ongoing participation in MetroGIS activities.
- 2) Accepted the "Final Report and Recommendations of the Community Development Committee MetroGIS Workgroup" and directed Council staff to inform appropriate state agencies about MetroGIS and to encourage ongoing communication and long-term collaboration with the State. (See the Major Documentation Produced section below for information about the report.)

SUMMARY OF PROCESS

The Council's evaluation was comprised of two major components – a program evaluation and audit conducted by the Council's Program Audit Unit from April to October 2005 and an examination of the recommendations presented in the Program Evaluation and Audit Report conducted from October 2005 to June 2006 by a workgroup of the Council's Community Development Committee. This workgroup was comprised of four members of the Metropolitan Council and Chairperson Reinhardt. Council member Pistilli, the Council's representative to the MetroGIS Policy Board, was a member of this five-person workgroup. The Workgroup was staffed by Blair Tremere, Director of Community Development, and Mark Vander Schaaf, Director of the Department of Data Resources.

MAJOR DOCUMENTATION PRODUCED

- 1) Metropolitan Council Auditor's Report: The primary conclusion presented in this document is that MetroGIS's existence is a very cost-effective means for the Council to obtain data it needs from others. (A copy of this report can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/CDC_MC_Resolution_MetroGIS/Workgroup_Report051017_Link2AppA.pdf)
- 2) Workgroup Report to the Community Development Committee of Council: This report documents 11 topics identified for further discussion in the Auditor's Report, together with 28 questions posed by the Workgroup, and the responses to these topics and questions; responses which ultimately satisfied the Workgroup that the governance structure established by the MetroGIS community is sound and that no changes are warranted. With respect to funding, the funding requested by the Policy Board for 2006, and approved by the Council in December 2005, also remains unchanged. With regard to future funding, the June 28, 2006 action states that the Council should continue funding MetroGIS with the amount of funding, as in the past, subject to Council evaluation during its annual budget review and reflective of programs and activities that are commensurate with the Council's mission. (A copy of this report can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/CDC_MC_Resolution_MetroGIS/WorkgroupFinalReport060501_Link2.pdf)

DIRECTIVE TO COMMUNICATE WITH STATE AGENCIES

In addition to concluding that MetroGIS is benefiting the Council, the June 28 Council action also directs Council management to encourage state agency leadership to support and encourage efforts to improve statewide collaboration on GIS related matters in ways that involve the State and other relevant partners.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is requested.

Attachment A

Resolution Supporting MetroGIS

(Adopted June 28, 2006)

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
390 North Robert Street · Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

RESOLUTION NO. 2006-__

RECONFIRMING THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL'S COMMITMENT TO PARTICIPATING IN THE METROGIS INITIATIVE AND STATING ITS EXPECTATIONS REGARDING ONGOING PARTICIPATION IN METROGIS ACTIVITIES

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Council's Community Development Division in 2005 requested that the Council's Program Evaluation and Audit Department perform a program evaluation of the Council's involvement in MetroGIS; and

WHEREAS, the *MetroGIS Program Evaluation and Audit Report* (the *Report*) was completed and issued on October 17, 2005; and

WHEREAS, Council staff presented the findings and recommendations of the *Report* to the Council's Audit Committee and to its Community Development Committee which accepted the *Report*; and

WHEREAS, the *Report* presented five scenarios regarding the future of MetroGIS: (1) maintain the current structure with no major changes; (2) cost sharing; (3) the withdrawal of Council funding; (4) the Policy Board as advisory to the Council; and (5) create a fee structure; and

WHEREAS, the *Report* presented four recommendations, which were endorsed by Council management: (1) The Council should assess the positive and negative attributes of the options presented and determine the optimal placements 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 the role, products and cost-effectiveness of MetroGIS on an ongoing basis; and (4) A clear delineation of roles and responsibilities among the Council, the MetroGIS Policy Board, Liaison, and Coordinating Committee should be developed to support communication and coordination and ensure that all parties have a clear idea of their role in the MetroGIS program; and

WHEREAS, in order to address the *Report* recommendations, the Community Development Committee created a workgroup consisting of Council Members Annette Meeks (Chair), Tony Pistilli (Vice Chair), Kris Sanda, and Julius Smith; and Ramsey County Commissioner Victoria Reinhardt, Chair of the MetroGIS Policy Board; and

WHEREAS, the workgroup met five times during the period, February through May, 2006, and identified numerous issues under the topics of Funding, Governance and Accountability; and

WHEREAS, the workgroup concluded that MetroGIS provides clear benefit to the Council, and that the current funding and governance arrangements are fundamentally sound; but that these arrangements would benefit from a formal action by the Council stating the Council's desire to continue participating in the MetroGIS initiative, and that certain accountability measures should be implemented; and

WHEREAS, MetroGIS is a voluntary organization which lacks legal standing, cannot mandate compliance with any of its agreed upon policies or procedures, lacks authority to receive, manage, or spend funds, and cannot own data or property; and

WHEREAS, MetroGIS has provided a cost-effective way to develop and manage GIS data in accordance with standards which have been accepted by all relevant parties and provides a valuable forum for those parties to plan collaboratively to take advantage of future developments in GIS and related technologies.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Council designate a Council Member as a representative on the MetroGIS Policy Board, and direct the Regional Administrator to assign senior Council management representation on the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee.
2. The Council continue to provide staff and physical resources to help foster MetroGIS collaboration.
3. Council management shall indicate annually to the MetroGIS Policy Board what services the Council can provide to foster such collaboration, and how the Council and MetroGIS should be mutually accountable to ensure that agreed-upon services meet their needs.
4. The Council will examine, at least annually, proposals for Council involvement as a MetroGIS participant, to fund or otherwise provide resources to support specific projects and priorities above and beyond the Council's responsibility to foster collaboration.
5. Senior Council management will coordinate with the Council's member-representative to the MetroGIS Policy Board, to ensure that the Council's position on relevant MetroGIS issues is consistently and accurately represented.
6. The Council expects that the MetroGIS Operating Guidelines, Strategic Plans, Business Plans and related materials will be kept current and will be provided to the Council and other stakeholders.
7. The Council expects that, as a primary funding sponsor and as a major source of staff support and technical overhead, all plans, programs, staff, and overhead resources funded by the Council will be reviewed and approved by the Council at least annually through the Council's budget preparation, review and approval process.
8. Assignment and direction of Council personnel for MetroGIS activities, determined, in large part, through participation in MetroGIS's collaborative business and work planning processes, shall rest exclusively with Council management as authorized by the Regional Administrator.
9. Adopted this __ day of June 2006.

Peter Bell, Chair

Pat Curtiss, Recording Secretary



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: MetroGIS Major Program Objectives: Remainder of 2006

DATE: July 6, 2006
(For the July 19th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee respectfully requests the Policy Board to ratify the MetroGIS work priorities listed in Attachment A for the remainder of 2006 or until the Strategic Directions Workshop, should they be modified at that time.

BACKGROUND

Last October, the MetroGIS Policy Board concluded that MetroGIS's 2006 workplan should be limited to projects that were in process until the Metropolitan Council had completed its evaluation of MetroGIS. The Council completed its evaluation of MetroGIS on June 28 with the adoption of a resolution finding that MetroGIS is an effective means of obtaining geospatial data it needs from others and that MetroGIS is benefiting the community as a whole. (See Agenda Item 5a for more information on the Council's evaluation of MetroGIS.)

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

At its meeting on June 28th, the Coordinating Committee unanimously ratified the projects listed in Attachment A as its preferred work program priorities for the remainder of 2006, unless otherwise modified at the pending Strategic Directions Workshop later this fall.

MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS

1. An agreement will remain in place among the seven counties and the Council to provide access to the regional parcel dataset, without fee, by government and academic interests.
2. Agreed-upon custodial roles and responsibilities for support of MetroGIS endorsed regional solutions, which have been accepted by the respective stakeholder organizations, will continue to be performed in accordance with endorsed expectations.
3. No unforeseen serious software issues will arise during the conversion of DataFinder Café to the new GeoCortex platform.

BREADTH OF RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES

These topics comprise a mix of completing regional solutions for several priority common information needs, completing the update of DataFinder Café, launching business and strategic planning for the next three to five years, fostering pilot projects to refine solutions to regional geospatial policy needs, sustaining MetroGIS's performance measurement program, and continuing outreach efforts.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board ratifies the major work priorities presented in Attachment A for the remainder of 2006 or until the Strategic Directions Workshop, should they be modified at that time

Attachment A

Major MetroGIS Program Objectives July – December 2006

Note to the reader: Items 1-4 are all of similar high priority and are intended to be worked on simultaneously, to the extent that support resources are available.

- 1) Strategic Directions Workshop (*Lead support - Staff Coordinator*)
 - Prepare summary for the June 1 “Imagining Possibilities” Forum. Workgroup (*Document the “big ideas”/opportunities cited that are relevant to the needs of the MetroGIS community.*)
 - Complete Non-Government Collaboration Opportunities Project initiated on November 15th. Workgroup (*Identify best possibilities for collaboration with non-government interests from candidates identified at the initial forum.*)
 - Define desired outcomes and logistics for the actual workshop. Workgroup (e.g., workshop format, data and place, facilitation needs and options, participants of the event planning workgroup, need for any pre-event surveys, etc.)
- 2) Complete DataFinder Café Upgrade (*Lead support- Alison Slaats*)
(*Must be completed by July 30th to qualify for remainder of federal grant funds in our account- \$941*)
- 3) Regional Solutions to Common Information Needs Projects (workgroups)
 - Achieve April 2004 vision for Next Generation Street Centerlines (foundation for next-generation agreement with TLG)
 - Achieve April 2004 vision for Addresses of Occupiable Units
 - Jurisdictional Boundaries - Water Management Organizations
 - Emergency Preparedness – Document Lessons Learned – Agree on a next steps plan
 - Peer Review Forums – none.
- 4) Next-Generation Agreement with TLG Project (*Lead support - Staff Coordinator*)
(*Data content requirements and custodial capabilities to be defined by the Street Centerline Workgroup. Goal to reach an agreement-in-principle by August*)
- 5) Access Policies Related To Regional Parcel Dataset – (*County Data Producers Workgroup*)
(*Conclude evaluations and decide regional policies concerning: 1) “view-only” access via Internet to general public and 2) whether non-profit interests can have access other than as a 3rd party.*)
- 6) Regional GIS Projects (*Lead support – As defined in the proposals*)
(*By August 4th, authorize projects that meet funding criteria and provide oversight/direction as appropriate.*)
- 7) Performance Measures Program (*Lead support – MetroGIS staff*)
(*Reinstate as soon as possible. A quarterly report has not been produced since December 2005 as a result of Steve Fester leaving. Many components to the data assembly and analysis processes. Need a permanent support person before reinstating.*)
- 8) Benefits Testimonial (*Lead support – Staff Coordinator*)
(*Seek out 1-2 additional stakeholder testimonials to the benefits of MetroGIS’s efforts.*)
- 9) Outreach (*Lead support – Staff Coordinator*)
(*Continue to provide a liaison function with a variety of local, regional, state, national, and international interests that have similar objectives to MetroGIS.*)
- 10) Business Plan Update Project – (*To begin immediately following the Strategic Directions Workshop*)



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: 2006 Regional GIS Project Proposals

DATE: July 7, 2006
(For the July 5th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Metropolitan Council, as the funding authority, respectfully requests the Policy Board to comment on two Regional GIS Project proposals (Attachment A), in particular, regarding their respective anticipated importance and value to the MetroGIS community relative to their respective project costs. The Council anticipates making a final funding decision by August 4th.

The Coordinating Committee’s findings and comments are provided below for the Board’s information. The Committee considered and found acceptable two proposals totaling \$41,000 of the \$44,000 available funding in 2006 for Regional GIS Projects. A representative from each proposal team has agreed to summarize their proposal at the Board meeting.

In addition, during the agenda setting meeting for the Policy Board’s July 19th meeting, Chairperson Reinhardt encouraged investigation of options to utilize the remaining \$3,000 in the budgeted funds to leverage participation by Hennepin County in Project D, which is recommended for funding by the Coordinating Committee. Hennepin County is expected to launch a project involving development of automated methods for assembly of address data from multiple sources in multiple formats. These methods could be valuable to achieving the Board’s endorsed vision for a regional occupiable units database. The results of the investigation requested by Chairperson Reinhardt will be shared at the Board meeting.

SUMMARY OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On June 28th, the Committee completed its consideration of the 2006 candidate projects, which began with concept review at the Committee’s March meeting. The Committee’s process involved a Project Review Workgroup, whose members developed a series of questions at both the concept and final review phases to which the applicants were asked to respond during their presentation to the Committee.

Four concept proposals were initially submitted, two of which the Committee has recommended for funding (Proposals B and D). Prior to concept review, (Project C - enhancements to TLG Street Centerline database) was found to be more appropriate to address through negotiations pending later this year to extend an existing contract with TLG. A fourth proposal received concept approval but was withdrawn prior to the Committee’s final review. It was proposed by Hennepin County (Project A – Multi-Address Building Mapping). The request was for the entire \$44,000. The Project Review Workgroup asked the proposers to consider a reduced amount. The project team elected to withdraw their proposal.

Proposals Projects B and D (Attachment A) are the subjects of the remainder of this report. Both have been found by the Coordinating Committee to be fully consistent with all program guidelines and worthy of funding as Regional GIS Projects. The Committee’s detailed comments are presented in the Reference Section for the Policy Board’s consideration.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Theme/Name</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Funds Requested</u>
B	Architecture to support an “ApplicationFinder”	David Bitner, MAC & David Arbeit, Mn Land Management Information Center	\$20,000
D	Needs Assessment for Regional Occupiable Units Web Editing Application	Mark Kotz, Lead Staff, MetroGIS Address Workgroup	\$21,000

OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS

Project B builds upon an existing approved MetroGIS project concept (ApplicationFinder) and an enterprise systems architecture model developed by the Governors Council on Geographic Information (GCGI). It would provide benefit from a regional perspective as well as define a path for integration of MetroGIS's architecture with the emerging State geospatial systems architecture. See Attachment A for the actual proposal.

Projects D focuses on a critical need to achieving the adopted MetroGIS vision for a Regional Occupiable Units Address Database. To achieve the full potential of this vision, local units of government, who are the producers of address data, must be involved. This project seeks to create an incentive for local government participation by creating a web-based address data capture tool that possesses additional functionality desired by local government. The MetroGIS Address Workgroup, oversight group for this project, currently has members from approximately 20 units of government including an assortment of cities, counties, and local/regional emergency services providers. Although, the Metropolitan Council is providing the lead staff support this is a MetroGIS, not a Council project. See Attachment A for the actual proposal.

Both projects would have the substantive funding-to-leveraged resources ratios.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board consider the findings offered by the Coordinating Committee and share its preferences with the Metropolitan Council for funding proposals via the 2006 Regional GIS Projects Program.

REFERENCE SECTION

1. Coordinating Committee Consideration

The Coordinating Committee has found Projects B and D to have value to the MetroGIS community. The following are excerpts from the March and June Committee meeting summaries regarding its review of these projects. Links to the full summaries can be found at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/index.shtml#agendas_minutes. Review comments regarding the other two project proposals can also be found at this URL.

Proposal B: Architecture to Support an “ApplicationFinder”

Concept Review – March 29, 2006:Logman (visitor with LMIC & Governor’s Council on Geographic Information) spoke in favor of the proposal as a valuable initiative to help define an efficient path as the community moves beyond collaboration to address common data needs. Maki concurred, noting that he is excited to see this proposal, as there is clear need for prototypes to move the community forward in the realm of collaboration on tools/applications of common need.

Craig commented that he supports the proposal at a conceptual level but is concerned that the proposer is at a disadvantage because he was unable to obtain feedback from the Committee at this meeting. He also argued that if this proposal is to be favorably considered at the next phase of review, the proposer will need to seek out feedback from committee members on his own and define who will be involved and who will do the work.

Motion: Craig moved and Chinander seconded to find that pursuance of Project B would have value to the MetroGIS community but that to receive favorable consideration at the next phase of review the proposer must seek out comment on the concept proposal from Committee members on his own and clearly define who would be involved and who would do the work. Motion carried, ayes all.

Final Review – June 28, 2006

Arbeit noted that LMIC stepped forward to play a key role in this project because it aligned well with a vision which has been endorsed by the Governor’s Council on Geographic for a Minnesota Geospatial Architecture that is service-oriented. The goal is to enable services created and hosted by a variety of organizations to be located and utilized on an ongoing basis by other organizations in their day to day operations. To accomplish this vision, a “broker” is required, which would “certify” “best of breed” service availability and through both manual and automated means link available services with users desiring a particular service. The current proposal seeks to develop this “brokering” mechanism. Arbeit noted that the current proposal is more aligned with the vision for a statewide MN service-oriented architecture than the initial concept offered by Bitner but explained that adjustments have been made to the previously defined vision to provide the functionality outlined by the concept proposal and, in general, needs important to the MetroGIS community. He then explained the specific functions as stated in the proposal, noting that the goal is that the broker mechanism is to include at least two operational services in addition to an image service that has been developed by LMIC, and explained that the requested \$20,000 in funding would leverage around \$30,000 in resources from others.

Arbeit concluded his comments by emphasizing that the project team views this project as a valuable demonstration for a strategic component of the statewide vision for a services oriented geospatial architecture

... Arbeit commented that LMIC will manage the project and Bitner will be a main contact for insuring that the MetroGIS community’s needs are clearly understood and a means of regular feedback is sustained. He also commented that regular reporting to the Committee would be a priority. He also emphasized that for the broker mechanism to be successful, stakeholder participation is essential, just as stakeholder participation has been essential to the success of DataFinder and the state’s geospatial data clearinghouse.

In response to a question from Vander Schaaf, regarding the need for relevance to the MetroGIS community for the web services that would be supported, Arbeit explained that this proposal involves development of the service discovery and access mechanism and not the services themselves. The Staff Coordinator offered a suggestion that if the “broker” mechanism is created, an activity of MetroGIS, possibly for discussion at the Strategic Directions Workshop, could be to foster web services that run in conjunction with endorsed regional datasets to address priority common information needs yet to be fully addressed. Maki concurred noting that the goal is to create an environment to enable leveraging of existing resources in a robust way that does currently exist in the application world and that builds upon the successes that MetroGIS has had to date in the

data sharing world. He concluded his comments by stating he is excited about this opportunity for MetroGIS to play a substantive role in the evolution of a statewide service-oriented architecture given the mature collaborative environment that exists in the MetroGIS community.

... Arbeit clarified that the individual web services will remain the property of the organizations that create them and that they will retain control over access rights and policies, just as data producers currently maintain control over access rights for geospatial data for which metadata are posted on DataFinder and other data clearinghouse/distribution mechanisms. All interests who produce geospatial web service will be welcome to advertise their services via the proposed broker, as is the current policy regarding data searchable via DataFinder. As for the “broker” mechanism itself, Arbeit stated there will be no fees for searching or obtaining access to service through it. LMIC, serving in its role as the “broker” custodian, will also encourage no charge for services.

Chairperson Read commented that at last November’s forum non-government interests were excited to learn they could publish data via DataFinder. She offered that extension of this policy to the proposed “broker” mechanism will be another important step towards fostering partnering opportunities valuable to addressing common information needs not yet addressed.

Chinander asked if the project team had a sense of the number of interests that use the “broker”. Five of the Committee members indicated they each currently have services that they would contribute. Arbeit briefly summarized a survey that is in progress to define the current landscape of services and to document those underdeveloped and planned. Chairperson Read commented that the proposal is consistent with “big ideas” heard at the June 1 forum and commented that the existence of the proposed broker is necessary to realize the possibilities shared at the forum. The group concurred.

Motion: Chinander moved and Givens seconded to recommend that the Policy Board find that this project has merit as a Regional GIS project, satisfies each of the established criteria, and that the requested \$20,000 is reasonable and justified. Motion carried, ayes all.

Proposal D: Needs Assessment for Regional Occupiable Units Web Editing Application - Address Workgroup

Concept Review – March 29, 2006: .. The key objective is to better understand what is needed to motivate local producers of address data to participate in the ongoing maintenance of data that are assembled into a regional occupiable unit database. The proposal may include development of examples of web interface options to help prospective local government participants articulate their needs.

...Harper further commented that different producer/custodian models will likely be needed to support updating of the resulting dataset as communities have different support capabilities. Chinander commented that testing and refining the custodian roles and responsibilities needed to attain the regional vision should be a component of both of these address related proposals but acknowledged that the envisioned regional solutions are likely to be broader than the either of the proposed pilots.

Motion: Givens moved and Wencl seconded to find that pursuance of Project D would have value to the MetroGIS community and that its similarities with Project A require a clear delineation of the boundaries of each and a need for ongoing coordination (as above). The projected cost also needs to be more specific. Motion carried, ayes all.

Final Review – June 28, 2006

Mark Kotz, lead staff for the Address Workgroup, began his comments by noting that the vision for a regional occupiable units database was adopted by the Policy Board in April 2005 and that since that time the Workgroup has facilitated the development of addressing standards consistent with the emerging national standards. A pilot was conducted to test the effort needed to convert stakeholder address databases to standards proposed for the regional database and the results showed the process is sustainable. The issue is what about the smaller communities which do have the support resources of the larger communities? Kotz stated it is these communities that are the focus of the this proposal, as the Workgroup has recognized that a key challenge to realizing the vision will be to establish a cost-efficient means to capture address data at the time of its creation by these smaller communities.

Kotz noted the Workgroup's current thinking is that a direct (web-based) data capture tool is the most promising option but the Workgroup would prefer to conduct an analysis to clearly define functionality that would be valuable to the producer to incentivize their participation. Kotz provided an example that many of the smaller communities often do not have the capacity to create and maintain address maps so they outsource or rely upon paper working maps maintained individually by multiple departments. He noted that if the proposed web based data capture application included a utility to easily create address maps and other products they identify in the proposed study, which the smaller communities would elect to integrate the proposed tool into their daily operations.

Kotz then commented on the application itself and the questions posed by the Application Review Workgroup:

- \$21,000 is requested to hire a consultant; the methods would be defined by the consultant in collaboration with the Address Workgroup,
- Value of leveraged resources is difficult to estimate because many interests will contribute and/or benefit – time contributed by 21 workgroup members, staff time, time contributed by individuals involved in the formulation of the National Address Standards, organizational efficiencies gained as the result of the application one implemented, etc.
- Compliance with the regional address standard will ensure that data captured by means other than the subject web-based application will be interoperable with address data captured via the proposed application.

Harper suggested, and the Committee concurred, that the deliverable should be expected to suggest other options to capture address data from small communities if the proposed web-based application is determined to be unrealistic.

Harper also asked if it would be viable to skip the proposed needs assessment and go directly to application development. After some discussion, the group concurred with Maki's comment that a "needs assessment" is important to identifying the benefits important to the business case and to establishing a viable project scope. The group also concurred that some form of prototyping was desirable to demonstrate capability and facilitate identification of additional functions desired by small communities. It was agreed that the demonstrating of capability is important and that the evaluation should include some form of visualization mechanism but not necessarily a functioning web interface.

Harper and Rowekamp encouraged the project team to utilize the proposed assessment as an outreach opportunity to build enthusiasm for the product but also cautioned not to build false expectations. Harper noted that the focus is on "inputs" and asked if the user's needs are understood. Kotz responded that the user's needs were the focus of the standards development process.

Wakefield spoke in favor of the needs assessment proposal, noting that from her experience working with small communities, that even with limited staff if the benefit/internal need (e.g., public safety) is well understood, time will be made to participate.

Motion: Craig moved and Givens seconded to recommend that the Policy Board find that his project has merit as a Regional GIS project, satisfies each of the established criteria, and that the requested \$21,000 is reasonable and justified. Motion carried, ayes all.

2. 2006 Regional GIS Project Proposal Guidelines

See the attached "Call for Proposals" (Attachment B) for answers to the following questions:

- What Projects are Eligible for Funding?
- What Criteria Will Be Used To Decide Which Project(s) Are Funded?
- Who Will Decide and When?
- Who is Eligible to Submit a Proposal?

ATTACHMENT A
CANDIDATE PROPOSALS
(CONCEPT AND FINAL)

The following proposals are attached on the following pages:

Candidate	Project Theme/Name	Contact
B	Architecture to support an “Application Finder”	David Bitner, MAC & David Arbeit, MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC)
D	Needs Assessment for Regional Occupiable Units Web Editing Application	Mark Kotz, Lead Staff, MetroGIS Occupiable Unit Address Workgroup

Proposal B – MAC & LMIC

(Concept)

TO: MetroGIS

FROM: David Bitner, Metropolitan Airports Commission

SUBJECT: 2006 Regional GIS Projects Proposal

DATE: March 15, 2006

This document lays out the concept for an “Application Finder” as the next logical step to the “DataFinder” already in use by MetroGIS. This concept strives to create a forum for the technical users of MetroGIS datasets by providing a repository of applications and services (software code) that utilize MetroGIS endorsed datasets in order to reduce duplication of effort across the Metro area.

This concept is made up of three parts that can be incrementally implemented in order.

1. Create a centralized repository of code.
 - a. Create a standard for metadata and documentation for code to allow for easier reuse.
 - b. Setup an area to store code (i.e. FTP server)
 - c. Setup index to code/metadata (i.e. Web Site)
2. Create running instances of code on central server.
 - a. Setup server to host services/applications.
 - b. Setup all prerequisite data/software for services/applications.
 - c. Create catalog of services/applications.
 - d. Create framework for secured/limited access data services.
3. Create infrastructure for collaborative development of code.
 - a. Setup versioning system (i.e. CVS or Subversion).
 - b. Create rules for write access to different pieces of code.

The importance of having both numbers 1 and 2 is that for many services/applications that become part of a workflow, speed can be very important and it is much better to run a piece of software locally. On the other hand, when speed is not important or infrastructure is lacking, it may be desirable to access a service/application from a central location.

Code written in any language for any platform will be accepted into the repository. Services, however, will necessarily be limited to those that work off of infrastructure that is already available or could be made available to the service host.

This concept could plug into other broader initiatives. This concept could act as a host for the recently awarded FGDC grant awarded to a multi-state group including several members of MetroGIS. This concept could act as a test bed for the service model being put forth by the Governor’s Council on GIS Geospatial Architecture Committee.

Following are responses to criteria to be used for this funding.

1. Statement of project objective and why the requested funding is needed.

The objective of this project is to create a repository for applications which add value to the work and datasets of MetroGIS. Funding is requested to jumpstart this process and provide for the staff time and resources necessary to create this repository.

2. How the proposed project conforms with a Regional GIS Project objective(s).

This project seeks to enhance the utility of existing and future MetroGIS endorsed datasets.

3. Importance of the proposed project to implement a sustainable solution to a defined priority geospatial community need(s).

This project seeks to reduce the efforts across the region in creating applications to interact with common data used across the region.

4. Activities necessary to achieve the project objective and relationship of the requested funds.
Create standards for code documentation/metadata.
Create server space for hosting code.
Create catalog to assist in finding code.
Create server space to run code as services.
Create catalog to assist in finding services.
Create collaborative development infrastructure.
5. Readiness for funding and status of any prerequisites (e.g., another software component, license agreement, etc.) that must be in place to proceed and their status.

This project would be ready to fund immediately upon identification of suitable host.

6. Description of the benefit to the MetroGIS community and those stakeholders that would be expected to realize the greatest benefit.

Application developers will be able to pick and choose components that have already been created to dramatically reduce development time.

7. Total value and description of required resources that would be leveraged if funding is awarded.

To be determined upon full scope of project

8. Effect of receiving funding approval if for less than the full amount requested.

Reduced ability to provide running examples of services

9. Time frame for project completion.

Setup should begin as soon as suitable host is found. Maintenance would be ongoing.

Proposal B – MAC & LMIC

(Final)

GEOSPATIAL SERVICES DIRECTORY AND BROKER A Proposal to MetroGIS

Submitted by: Land Management Information Center

**Project Sponsors: David Arbeit, MN Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis
David Bitner, Metropolitan Airports Commission**

Project Summary

LMIC proposes to develop and implement a directory of shared geospatial web services and software components and tools for MetroGIS members to search that directory for those shared resources. It also will demonstrate the effectiveness of a broker function that can directly link GIS applications to “best of breed” geospatial services offered from a single hosted location.

The project will implement many of the functions proposed for the MetroGIS Applications Finder in 2004 and will support the GIS Enterprise Architecture design developed with participation of MetroGIS stakeholders and endorsed by the Governor’s Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) for the state. At least one shared application will be supported, LMIC’s open source web service that provides imagery directly to GIS applications. LMIC also proposes to provide application hosting and download services for MetroGIS shared applications, including those resulting from the FGDC CAP grant to the North Dakota - Minnesota Application Development Collaboration that involves several MetroGIS members.

LMIC is requesting \$20,000 for this project, which will leverage more than \$30,000 from LMIC supporting related activities of the Minnesota Geographic Data Clearinghouse and a statewide Shared GeoSpatial Services survey for the GCGI. David Bitner of the Metropolitan Airports Commission and other MetroGIS stakeholders also will contribute time and expertise to the project.

1. Project Objective and Need for Funding. The principal purpose of this project is to develop first-generation versions of services directory and brokering functions described in the GCGI Conceptual Enterprise Architecture model for the state, focusing specifically upon objectives of the MetroGIS Application Finder described in 2004. Funding is needed at this time to extend the scope of a more limited current effort to identify opportunities for shared services. Without additional funds, this project will identify shared service opportunities for a statewide GIS strategy, but will not directly address MetroGIS needs. The funding will provide:

- **A Catalog of Geospatial Services.** The catalog will be initialized with data produced from the GCGI Shared Geospatial Services survey.
- **Catalog Maintenance, Query and Search Tools.** A user interface that provides catalog maintenance, query, and search functions similar to those developed for the MN Geographic Data Clearinghouse.
- **Shared Service Use Demonstration.** An application broker that demonstrates the interactive use of LMIC’s OGC-compliant WMS Imager Server as an example of a hosted shared service that directly supports applications meeting MetroGIS business needs.
- **Geospatial Toolkit Library.** An on-line repository for applications and software code that is available to MetroGIS member organizations.

2. Regional GIS Project Objectives. This project extends the historical focus of a “Regional GIS Project” by providing enhanced access to shared geospatial services and applications, not just enhanced access to data. Extending benefits to shared applications has been informally supported by the MetroGIS Policy Board, although “Regional GIS Project” has not been redefined. The project will provide direct access to a LMIC service that provides efficient access to imagery data from a shared server.

3. Implementing a Sustainable Solution to a Priority Need. The MetroGIS Coordinating Committee has identified application sharing as an important “next step” for several years, expressed in 2004 as ApplicationFinder. This project will implement much of ApplicationFinder’s core functionality, but within the context of a “Services Broker” as a critical piece of a GeoSpatial Enterprise Architecture. As an important element of the state’s Enterprise Architecture framework, LMIC advocates implementing the Broker as a core Clearinghouse service funded by the state.

4. Activities to Achieve Project Objective and Relationship of Requested Funds. The total funds needed to complete this project is \$20,000. In addition, an estimated \$30,000 in LMIC resources will be devoted to administration, infrastructure maintenance, and technical services related to the project. Project activities and estimates of MetroGIS funds needed for the activities are provided below.

A. Complete Initial Design of GeoSpatial Services Inventory	\$0
B. Design and Implement Editing Module	\$2,500
C. Design and Implement Query and Reporting Modules	\$2,500
D. Training/Support for Documentation for Shared Services and Applications	\$2,500
E. Implement Application Hosting Environment	\$2,500
F. Develop, Test and Implement Services Broker Capability	\$6,000
G. Test and Implement Functioning Application-to-Application Service Connector	\$3,000
H. Project Documentation	\$1,000

5. Readiness. LMIC maintains staff and computer facilities required to implement this project, is authorized to receive funds from other government entities, and has extensive experience managing complex projects on behalf of Minnesota’s GIS community.

6. Benefit to MetroGIS Community. This project will allow MetroGIS member application developers to identify geospatial services and applications developed by others, determine applicability to their needs, and select shared components that have been created, tested and implemented. Benefits included reduced applications development time, improved standardization among developers, increased knowledge, and enhanced software reliability. Over time, the public will see improved and expanded functionality and greater uniformity among MetroGIS organizations. This project will help MetroGIS members meet the growing demand for geospatial services without a corresponding increase in resources.

7. Total Value and Description of Leveraged Resources. The “Shared Services”, “Web Toolkit” and “Image Service” projects that will be leveraged have a combined value conservatively estimated to be greater than \$75,000. The long-term value to MetroGIS will be considerable higher. This project is estimated to require 500 to 600 dedicated staff hours to complete. LMIC anticipates contributing more than half of these hours as in-kind services. In addition, all hardware, software, networking, and system support costs will be absorbed by LMIC as part of its Clearinghouse functions.

8. Impact of Partial Funding. Unless other sources of funding can be found, some project elements would be scaled back or eliminated. The searchable catalog and the brokering function are considered the highest priorities, but any adjustments to scope will be made in consultation with MetroGIS stakeholders.

9. Project Time Frame. Most project deliverables can be completed, tested, and implemented by March 2007. The project could begin in August or September 2006 and would be fully completed by the end of April 2007. Loading of products of the Web Toolkit Project into the repository cannot be completed until that project has finished its work, which should be in March 2007.

Proposal D – MetroGIS Address Workgroup

(Concept)

MetroGIS Regional GIS Project Proposal

Needs Assessment for Regional Occupiable Units Web Editing Application

Proposed by:

Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

With support of the MetroGIS Address Workgroup

03/15/2006

Revised 3/21/2006

Project Description

The MetroGIS Policy Board has endorsed the vision of a regional occupiable units address dataset that would be created by local addressing authorities. This dataset is widely needed by government agencies at many levels in the metro area, including emergency responders, school districts, counties, cities and regional agencies that currently have no spatial data at the occupiable unit level. The vision calls for creating a standardized, single official source for this data to meet this need and to avoid redundant data development efforts. The detailed MetroGIS Regional Occupiable Units Address Dataset Vision document calls for the development of an online editing application to help facilitate the development of a regional dataset. (p. 19)

http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/street_addresses/Occupiable_Units_Dataset_Vision.pdf

Perhaps the largest roadblock to the creation of local occupiable units point datasets is the fact that many cities simply do not have in-house resources, specifically staff time, GIS software and expertise, to be able to maintain their own dataset.

The Workgroup is recommending the creation of a secure online application that addressing authorities could use to create and maintain their own occupiable units point dataset.

...the workgroup is further recommending that additional features be included with the application that would be designed to meet some of the other business needs of the local addressing authorities

The next step is to clearly define the benefits that those data producers will receive from participating in an occupiable units information system by maintaining the data for all to use. Defining those benefits requires a close examination of the data producers needs. This project proposes a needs assessment to more specifically determine the requirements and viability of such an online editing application for cities that do not have their own GIS with which to maintain this type of data. The needs assessment would answer three key questions:

1. What functionality is necessary for city staff to create and maintain the occupiable units data in a way that would meet the MetroGIS regional dataset needs?
2. What incentives would increase the likelihood that local address authorities would use this application to contribute to the regional dataset, and what additional functionality within the editing application would provide that incentive (e.g. ability to print certain types of address maps)?
3. How many local address authorities are likely to use this application, given the specific functionality?

The needs assessment may include mockups or depictions (existing examples) of what such an application might look like and how it might be used so that the city staff being interviewed will understand what is being asked of them. The results of the needs assessment should include descriptions of the functionality and interface needs of city staff that would use this application. If the needs assessment indicates that many cities would truly use the application, the next step would be to create a proof-of-concept that can be tested in the MetroGIS community.

Cost

The project is very roughly estimated to cost between \$10,000 and \$25,000 depending on the methods used. Development of a proof-of-concept application would require additional cost and/or Metropolitan Council staff resources.

Responses to Evaluation Criteria

1. Project Objectives and Need for Funding

Project objectives are outlined above. Funding would be used to hire a consultant to define the needs of key occupiable units data producers. The needs would be defined through a needs assessment process.

2. Conformance with Regional GIS Project Objectives

The project would take the next step in refining the vision to develop a regional dataset to address a Policy Board-endorsed priority common information need (addresses and occupiable units). It would supplement the work and vision of the MetroGIS Address Workgroup. The MetroGIS community would benefit by having a clear understanding of the needs for this application/information system, which will facilitate its development. The application itself would then facilitate the development of occupiable units data. These project funds would not be used to develop the applications, but to focus on completing a needs assessment. Decisions about software, hardware and licensing would come later. The goal is to ultimately have an editing application that any metro address authority could use free of charge.

3. Importance to a Sustainable Solution to a Priority Need

The Address Workgroup believes that such an editing application is critical to the creation and maintenance of a regional occupiable units dataset. This needs assessment would objectively evaluate that belief and provide the details necessary to make decisions about how or if the application should be built.

4. Activities and Relationship of Funds

A consultant would be hired to conduct the needs assessment and prepare a report. This would include interviews with a representative number of address authorities in the region. The requested funding would be used to pay for the consultant.

5. Readiness for Funding and Prerequisites

The Address Workgroup has a clearly documented vision for the occupiable units dataset. It defines the need for the editing application. No prerequisites exist. The project is ready to proceed pending staff time to manage the project.

6. Benefit to MetroGIS Community

This needs assessment is a prerequisite to creating a successful online editing application. That application is believed to be a prerequisite to the creation of the regional occupiable units dataset. It is believed that nearly all MetroGIS participants would benefit from such a regional dataset. Organizations that have expressed the most interest in the dataset include regional government organizations, counties and the emergency services community. Many cities have also expressed interest in using such a regional dataset. The regional dataset is believed to be unattainable without the editing application.

7. Value and Description of Resources Leveraged

If the funding is awarded, Metropolitan Council staff time would be leveraged to manage the project.

8. Effect of Partial Funding

With partial funding, the needs assessment could be scaled back to answer one or two of the three key question areas, but that is not anticipated to be a significant cost savings.

9. Time Frame

Assuming the funding is approved in August of 2006, it is anticipated that the project could be completed by the end of 2006. This will dovetail with a pilot project to assess the issues with creating a regional dataset from the data of cities that do have their own GIS data creation capabilities. The pilot project will attempt to pull data from those cities into a regional database format, defining and attempting to resolve any issue that arise from the effort.

Proposal D – MetroGIS Address Workgroup **(Final)**

MetroGIS Regional GIS Project Proposal

Needs Assessment for Regional Occupiable Units Web Editing Application

Proposed by:

Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

With support of the MetroGIS Address Workgroup

03/15/2006

Revised 03/21/2006

Final Proposal 06/06/2006

Project Description

The MetroGIS Policy Board has endorsed the vision of a regional occupiable units address dataset that would be created by local addressing authorities. This dataset is widely needed by government agencies at many levels in the metro area, including emergency responders, school districts, counties, cities and regional agencies that currently have no spatial data at the occupiable unit level. The vision calls for creating a standardized, single official source for this data to meet this need and to avoid redundant data development efforts. The detailed MetroGIS Regional Occupiable Units Address Dataset Vision document calls for the development of an online editing application to help facilitate the development of a regional dataset. (p. 19 http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/street_addresses/Occupiable_Units_Dataset_Vision.pdf)

Perhaps the largest roadblock to the creation of local occupiable units point datasets is the fact that many cities simply do not have in-house resources, specifically staff time, GIS software and expertise, to be able to maintain their own dataset.

The Workgroup is recommending the creation of a secure online application that addressing authorities could use to create and maintain their own occupiable units point dataset.

...the workgroup is further recommending that additional features be included with the application that would be designed to meet some of the other business needs of the local addressing authorities

Before MetroGIS can move forward with an occupiable unit web editing application, an assessment must be made as to how viable such an application would be – in essence to validate the assumptions of the Workgroup. Would the application be useful to many cities or only a few? What functionality or features would make it the most useful?

This project proposes a needs assessment to more specifically determine the requirements and viability of such an online editing application for cities that do not have their own GIS with which to maintain this type of data. The needs assessment would analyze the business needs and practices of potential users related to occupiable unit address data and answer four key questions:

1. What benefits would address authorities receive from participating in an occupiable units information system by maintaining the data for all to use?
2. What functionality in a web editing application is necessary for city staff to create and maintain the occupiable units data in a way that would meet the MetroGIS regional dataset needs?
3. What incentives would increase the likelihood that local address authorities would use this application to contribute to the regional dataset, and what additional functionality within the editing application would provide that incentive (e.g. ability to print certain types of address maps)?
4. How many local address authorities are likely to use this application, given the specific functionality?

The results of the needs assessment should include descriptions of the functionality and interface needs of city staff that would use this application. A key outcome of the project would be a conceptual design for such an occupiable units web editing application, assuming it is determined to be viable.

Cost:

The project is roughly estimated to cost \$21,000. This could vary depending on the interview methods used. A breakdown of the estimated costs is provided below. An RFP process is anticipated to determine the actual methods and costs of the project.

Estimated Cost Breakdown

Task	Estimated Hours	Max Est. Cost per Hour	Cost
Develop and test survey/interview procedures and methods	40	150	6000
Interview 15 cities	60	150	9000
Analysis and report	40	150	6000
			\$21,000

Development of a preliminary proof-of-concept application, or an actual production application would require additional cost and/or Metropolitan Council staff resources that are not included here.

Relationship to Other MetroGIS Efforts**MetroGIS Address Workgroup**

This project is endorsed by the MetroGIS Address Workgroup and is directly inline with its workplan and vision. A draft database standard has been created by the Workgroup and is being tested in a pilot project to be completed in July. The proposed project would assume using the database elements defined by the workgroup in its assessment of the viability of a web editing application.

Relationship to Hennepin County Regional Project Proposal

One important difference between the two proposals is that they target different groups of address authorities. The Hennepin County proposal appears to be focused on counties and cities with significant existing internal GIS capabilities. This proposal focuses on those address authorities that do not have such expertise and resources. In this way the two proposals are very complementary.

It is agreed that communication and coordination among the two projects and the MetroGIS Address Workgroup is important.

Responses to Evaluation Criteria**1. Project Objectives and Need for Funding**

Project objectives are outlined above. Funding would be used to hire a consultant to define the needs of key occupiable units data producers. The needs would be defined through a needs assessment process.

2. Conformance with Regional GIS Project Objectives

The project would take the next step in refining the vision to develop a regional dataset to address a Policy Board-endorsed priority common information need (addresses and occupiable units). It would supplement the work and vision of the MetroGIS Address Workgroup. The MetroGIS community would benefit by having a clear understanding of the needs for this application/information system, which will facilitate its development. The application itself would then facilitate the development of occupiable units data. These project funds would not be used to develop the applications, but to focus on completing a needs assessment. Decisions about software, hardware and licensing would come later. The goal is to ultimately have an editing application that any metro address authority could use free of charge.

3. Importance to a Sustainable Solution to a Priority Need

The Address Workgroup believes that such an editing application is critical to the creation and maintenance of a regional occupiable units dataset. This needs assessment would objectively evaluate that belief and provide the details necessary to make decisions about how or if the application should be built.

4. Activities and Relationship of Funds

A consultant would be hired to conduct the needs assessment and prepare a report. This would include interviews with a representative number of address authorities in the region. The requested funding would be used to pay for the consultant.

5. Readiness for Funding and Prerequisites

The Address Workgroup has a clearly documented vision for the occupiable units dataset. It defines the need for the editing application. No prerequisites exist. The project is ready to proceed pending staff time to manage the project.

6. Benefit to MetroGIS Community

This needs assessment is a prerequisite to creating a successful online editing application. That application is believed to be a prerequisite to the creation of the regional occupiable units dataset. It is believed that nearly all MetroGIS participants would benefit from such a regional dataset. Organizations that have expressed the most interest in the dataset include regional government organizations, counties and the emergency services community. Many cities have also expressed interest in using such a regional dataset. The regional dataset is believed to be unattainable without the editing application.

7. Value and Description of Resources Leveraged

If the funding is awarded, Metropolitan Council staff time would be leveraged to manage the project.

8. Effect of Partial Funding

With partial funding, the needs assessment could be scaled back to answer one or two of the three key question areas, but that is not anticipated to be a significant cost savings. Additionally, a smaller number of cities could be interviewed, which may reduce costs somewhat.

9. Time Frame

Assuming the funding is approved in August of 2006, it is anticipated that the project could be completed by the end of 2006. This will dovetail with a pilot project to assess the issues with creating a regional dataset from the data of cities that do have their own GIS data creation capabilities. The pilot project will attempt to pull data from those cities into a regional database format, defining and attempting to resolve any issue that arise from the effort.

ATTACHMENT B

MetroGIS

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data



CALL FOR PROPOSALS -2006 REGIONAL GIS PROJECTS-

Introduction

The 2006 MetroGIS budget includes \$44,000 for Regional GIS Projects. This program is not intended to be a competition but rather a process by which ideas, which have promise as solutions to geospatial needs and opportunities of regional importance, are matured.

The source of these funds is the Metropolitan Council. The Council is, therefore, the final decision-maker as to whether a proposed project is funded and for how much, as it is accountable for the appropriate use of these funds. MetroGIS's role is to advise the Council as to whether a candidate project merits funding. The deadline for submittal of a one-page concept description is **Wednesday, March 15, 2006**.

What Projects are Eligible for Funding?

Only those projects which satisfy all of the following criteria are eligible for consideration:

1) Each proposal must be consistent with one or more objectives of a Regional GIS Project, which are defined as:

"... a MetroGIS project to enhance the completeness, documentation, or accuracy of an Endorsed Regional Dataset, develop a regional dataset to address a Policy Board-endorsed priority common information need, or develop or enhance a geospatial application¹ that enhances access to data that addresses a priority information need endorsed by MetroGIS."

- 2) The proposed project must supplement activity that is a component of authorized MetroGIS activity or a MetroGIS-defined common priority need.
- 3) The proposal must provide clear benefit to the MetroGIS community, whether via research or development of a product. The funding organization must be able to recognize a benefit to itself, which depending upon the nature of the proposal may be tangible and/or intangible. (e.g., the Metropolitan Council, as the funding organization in 2006, is especially interested in geospatial technology projects that would help local communities prepare for comprehensive plan updates due in 2008².)
- 4) For projects that involve development of software (applications and/or services), whether stand-alone or an extension:
 - a) Such projects must include an objective which promotes interoperability with other existing or anticipated system architectures/platforms. Projects that promote a similar user experience for metro-area users are preferred.
 - b) Although the funding organization would own the product, it must be open-source or licensed so that other MetroGIS participants can access and modify the source code without additional fees.

Note: The above-stated criteria are intended to supplement, not supersede, the guidelines which established this program (Attachment B).

What Criteria Will Be Used To Decide Which Project(s) Are Funded?

The applicant's written responses to each of the following evaluation criteria will be used to decide if a project warrants funding. (The concept description should not exceed one (1) page. The full submission should not exceed two pages, less any supplemental material.)

¹ The term "application" means web-based and other software services, which support functionality important to processing, querying, analyzing, sharing, and distributing of geospatial information.

² For example, the Metropolitan Council intends to create a web-based interactive map that provides communities throughout the region with information about Council systems and activities relevant to local comprehensive planning. The Council would be interested in applications that enable communities to add their local data to the map.

- 1) Statement of project objective and why the requested funding is needed.
- 2) How the proposed project conforms with a Regional GIS Project objective(s).
- 3) Importance of the proposed project to implement a sustainable solution to a defined priority geospatial community need(s).
- 4) Activities necessary to achieve the project objective and relationship of the requested funds.
- 5) Readiness for funding and status of any prerequisites (e.g., another software component, license agreement, etc.) that must be in place to proceed and their status.
- 6) Description of the benefit to the MetroGIS community and those stakeholders that would be expected to realize the greatest benefit.
- 7) Total value and description of required resources that would be leveraged if funding is awarded.
- 8) Effect of receiving funding approval if for less than the full amount requested.
- 9) Time frame for project completion.

Who Will Decide and When?

The MetroGIS Coordinating Committee will select project priorities, work with project proposers to make any adjustments, and forward a prioritized list to the MetroGIS Policy Board for review. The Policy Board then forwards recommendations to the Metropolitan Council, which will make the final decision and administer award of funds. Refer to Attachment A for the schedule and a brief description of the entity responsible and the desired outcome for each element of the process.

Who is Eligible to Submit a Proposal?

Any individual(s) affiliated with an authorized MetroGIS project, committee and workgroup.

What is the Deadline for Submission of a Concept Proposal?

Applications must be received by **Wednesday, March 15, 2006**. Proposals should be submitted to the Staff Coordinator at randy.johnson@metc.state.mn.us.

Questions

Contact Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator (651-602-1638), or Nancy Read, MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Chairperson (651-643-8386), with any questions.

EXHIBIT 1
(ATTACHMENT E)

Proposed 2006 Program Schedule

1. Call for Concept Proposals: February 27, 2006
2. Concept Proposal Submission Deadline: March 15, 2006
3. Workgroup and Council Screening: March 16 or 17, 2006
The Workgroup will review the concepts for gaps in procedures and for missing information. The Council will decide if a concept is out of scope for funding under this program. If such a finding is made, this finding will be shared with the Coordinating Committee. The Workgroup will also consider desired changes to the suggested rules for the 2006 program based upon review of concept proposals.
4. Initial Coordinating Committee Consideration: March 29, 2006
Review concept proposals relative to the suggested program guidelines and comment on potential benefit to cost. In addition, identify any desired additional information and/or project modifications that would improve the proposal(s). (If necessary, the Committee would create a workgroup to assist applicants address outstanding questions and, in general, make the proposal(s) the best it/they can be.)
5. Initial Policy Board Consideration: April 19, 2006
Review the proposals from the perspectives of: appropriate use of public funding and importance of policy issues involved. Identify any desired additional information.
6. Final Proposal Submission: June 9, 2006
7. Coordinating Committee Consideration: June 28, 2006
(Same criteria as identified in Step 4, above.)
8. Policy Board Consideration: July 19, 2006
(Same criteria as identified in Step 5, above.) The Policy Board forwards its advice, along with that of the Coordinating Committee, to the Council.
9. Metropolitan Council Decision: August 4, 2006
Initiate Council procurement requirements, required agreements, etc.

EXHIBIT 2 (ATTACHMENT E)

Principles for Allocating MetroGIS's Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funds (Adopted October 29, 2003)

Introduction

The following principles are to serve as the basis for allocating a portion of the MetroGIS budget to data producers, serving in their role as primary custodians for data that comprise regional data solutions (e.g., counties related to parcel data). They are intended to supplement and expand upon, not supersede, the more general principles³ that have governed MetroGIS's efforts for some time.

Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funding Principles

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

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

Note: On December 22, 2004, the seven metro area counties and the Metropolitan Council executed the third generation parcel data sharing agreement. The concept of "Regional GIS Project" is embedded in the policy defined by this agreement. The definition being as follows:

"Regional GIS Project" means a MetroGIS project to enhance the completeness, documentation, or accuracy of an Endorsed Regional Dataset, develop a regional dataset to address a Policy Board endorsed priority common information need, or develop or enhance a geospatial application that enhances access to data which addresses a priority information need endorsed by MetroGIS."

³ The following principles govern MetroGIS's efforts. They have evolved over time as a product of decision-making and desired outcomes.

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



TO: Policy Board

FROM: Randall Johnson,
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator (651-602-1638)

SUBJECT: Regional Parcel Dataset – Policy for Unlicensed, View-Only Access

DATE: July 7, 2006
(For the July 19th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

A one-year time extension is requested to the July 27, 2006 sunset provision previously set by the Policy Board for submission of a proposed policy involving authorization for unlicensed, view-only, access to parcel data via Internet-based applications.

(Refer to the Reference Section for the Board’s July 2004 and 2005 actions on this topic. Note: Work on this proposal did not progress for the past year while the Metropolitan Council was conducting its evaluation of MetroGIS, resulting in the need for the requested time extension. See Agenda Item 5a.)

COUNTY DATA PRODUCERS WORKGROUP AFFIRMATION

At its meeting on June 22, 2006 the County Data Producers Workgroup affirmed that the subject policy clarification is desirable, given the variety of web-based applications under consideration by the a host of MetroGIS stakeholders. Its members, who represent all seven counties, agreed to vet the proposed clarification among their respective administrations to determine how to best implement the change, with most believing formal amendment of the Regional Parcel Data Sharing Agreement will not be necessary. Rather, the group believes that a statement of clarification added to the regional policy statement will suffice to declare that “view-only” access does not constitute “distribution” of data governed by the Parcel Data Sharing Agreement and, therefore, is not subject to the licensing provisions in the agreement.

Further, the group cites the existence of unlicensed, view-only access to parcel data that is currently permitted via Internet-based applications supported by Dakota, Hennepin, Scott, and Washington counties as further justification to consider a policy clarification to permit unlicensed, view only access to the Regional Parcel Dataset.

BACKGROUND

The impetus for this policy clarification came from a realization by the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup that viewing of parcel data, via an Emergency Preparedness Application, would be necessary to achieve the full potential of the proposed Internet-based application. (See http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/emergency_prep/epbro05.pdf for more information about the web-based application. The URL to the actual web site is currently password protected, and access is managed by the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup.)

The purpose for developing the Emergency Preparedness Application is to provide emergency managers with quick access to a wide range of geospatial information relevant to their daily needs and activities – parcel data being one of the more important information elements. The application is designed to run on the same Web server used to host the Regional Parcel Dataset to enable it to incorporate the Regional Parcel Dataset. The web server is owned by the Metropolitan Council and the Council’s authority to “redistribute” parcel data is governed by the Regional Parcel Data Sharing Agreement. Since the Agreement is silent on whether or not “view-only access” constitutes “redistribution” of data, use of the application is currently restricted to only those licensed to access the Regional Parcel Dataset.

Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, which is comprised of representatives from each of the counties and several other local, regional and state interests, believes the requirement for prior licensing to view parcel data via this application is overly restrictive and negatively affects its ability to demonstrate the application and capabilities of GIS technology in general to emergency managers.

EXPANSION OF THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL

The originally proposed policy clarification/authorization applied to just the Metropolitan Council relative to its obligations via the Regional Parcel Data Sharing Agreement and its hosting of the Regional Emergency Preparedness Website. In the two years since the original request was brought to the Policy Board for consideration, recognition of the value of geospatial-based Internet applications has taken hold. As a result, the currently proposed policy clarification would apply to any licensed user of the regional parcel dataset who wishes to host a web application that includes parcel data, not just the Metropolitan Council.

For instance, in addition to applications defined by the MetroGIS community as a component of regional solution to a common information need, the Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, a licensed user of the Regional Parcel Dataset, is awaiting the outcome of his clarification to implement a web application to enable property owners to quickly and accurately identify areas proposed for spraying. Property lines would be used to facilitate accurate locations.

Another instance involves the Minnesota 3D Project (<http://map.deed.state.mn.us/m3d> - User Name: M3D / Password: test), through which a web-based application provides the user with robust tools for analyzing online population characteristics important to connecting jobs with workers. Parcel data would be used to improve the mapping capabilities.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Affirm its July 28, 2004 finding that a policy of unlicensed, view-only access to parcel data has merit for further consideration as a regional best practice.
- 2) Extend to July 19, 2006 its sunset provision to achieve county affirmation that the subject proposal is consistent with their respective requirements and needs.

REFERENCE SECTION

PREVIOUS POLICY BOARD ACTION

1. July 28, 2004: Excerpt from Policy Board meeting summary:

5b) Regional Parcel Dataset: View-Only Access Policy For Emergency Preparedness Application

Randy Knippel, Chair of the Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, explained the Coordinating Committee's recommendation that the counties consider authorizing view-only access to the regional parcel dataset via the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Internet application. He also explained that the primary purposes of this application are as an outreach and education tool to help emergency managers better understand how GIS technology can benefit their operations and to aid in building relationships between the GIS and emergency management communities. Knippel also noted that the functionality has been purposely limited to keep the application simple to use. Finally, he stated that Policy Board endorsement of a policy to support view-only access to parcel data via this application would be helpful to point to as specific approval is sought from each county.

Member Schneider expressed support for the application, in general, but cautioned that if it lacks functionality, it may be counterproductive.

Member Fiskness moved and Member Schneider seconded that the Policy Board:

- a) Find that a policy of view-only access to parcel data via the prototype MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources Application has merit for further consideration and refinement as a regional best practice.
- b) Defer to the seven counties to decide if this policy is appropriate and that the current application provides sufficient protection for their data.
- c) If the counties acknowledge their approval of this policy via the attached letter or resolution dated May 18, 2004, the Policy Board hereby requests the Metropolitan Council to begin support of this DataFinder-related responsibility upon receiving affirmative acknowledgement from the counties in this regard.
- d) If the Policy Board elects not to authorize the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Resources application to move from prototype to operational status by July 28, 2005, this endorsement of view-only access of parcel data via Emergency Preparedness Resources Application shall become null and void, unless renewed by all affected parties.

Motion carried, ayes all.

The understanding was that if the Policy Board endorsed this proposal policy, implementation would be subject to prior approval by the individual counties, as they are the producers of the subject parcel data. A sample approval letter and resolution (whichever a county prefers) were attached to the July 2004 staff report and are also attached to this report. They are here only as a reference, as the currently proposed policy clarification is intended to apply to any licensed user of the regional parcel dataset who wishes to host a web application that includes parcel data.

2. July 27, 2005: Excerpt from Policy Board meeting summary:

5b) Regional Parcel Dataset – Policy for Unlicensed, View-Only Access

The Staff Coordinator briefly summarized the reason for requesting a one-year time extension for this policy proposal, as outlined in the agenda materials.

Member Egan moved and Member Fiskness seconded that the Policy Board:

- 1) Affirm its July 2004 finding that a policy of unlicensed, view-only access to parcel data has merit for further consideration as a regional best practice.
- 2) Extend to July 2006 its sunset provision to achieve county affirmation that the subject proposal is consistent with their respective needs.

Chairperson Reinhardt commented on the importance of continuing to support the collaborative progress that has been demonstrated. Motion carried, ayes all.

Version: May 18, 2004

**EXAMPLE
COUNTY LETTER HEAD**

(Date)

MetroGIS Policy Board
c/o Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator
Metropolitan Council
Mears Park Centre
230 East Fifth Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1633

**Regional Parcel Dataset --
Unlicensed View-Only Access Via Web Application**

Dear Randall:

The purpose of this letter is to inform the MetroGIS Policy Board that *(insert County name)* concurs with its proposed regional policy endorsed July 28, 2004 concerning view-only access to the Regional Parcel Dataset without the need for prior licensure. It is our understanding that implementation of this policy would permit anyone interested in viewing the MetroGIS-endorsed Regional Parcel Dataset, via the MetroGIS-endorsed Emergency Preparedness web-based application *(insert URL)*, to do so but that their access will be limited to a view-only capability. That is, the actual parcel data is not intended to be downloadable for their use beyond the web application.

In accordance with the MetroGIS Policy Board's request on July 28th, *(insert County name)* hereby:

1. Acknowledges it has reviewed and agrees with the technical manner in which MetroGIS's endorsed Emergency Preparedness web-based application would implement the proposed view-only access capability,
2. Authorizes the Metropolitan Council, in accordance with its role as host of the referenced Emergency Preparedness application, to make *(insert County name's)* parcel data accessible via the referenced application without prior licensure, and
3. Agrees not to hold the Council responsible in any way if an unauthorized entity subsequently identifies a means to access the actual parcel data via this application. In such case, *(insert County name)* acknowledges that the only remedy shall be to request the Council to remove its parcel data from the subject application.

(insert County name)'s contact person concerning administration of the Emergency Preparedness web-based application is *(insert name)*. They can be reached at xxx-xxx-xxxx if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

(person authorized to sign)



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Major Activity Updates

DATE: July 11, 2006
(For the July 19th meeting)

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

A) PREPARATIONS FOR STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS WORKSHOP

- 1) Workshop Planning Group: On June 28th the Coordinating Committee created a workgroup to guide preparations for the Workshop and provide general direction for desired focuses/outcomes. The goal is to refine desired outcomes for the pending Workshop in the next several weeks to preserve as many options as possible for facilitators, with appropriate competencies, and facilities compatible with the need.
- 2) June 1 Imagining Possibilities Forum: The summary of the forum is available for comment http://www.metrogis.org/specialevents/techpossibilities/Draft_Summary_Report.pdf. Participants are invited to offer suggestions regarding any missing “big ideas” that should be documented for further consideration at the Strategic Direction Workshop.

Highlights, from the perspective of those who attended, indicate that the event achieved its objective – to paint a picture of what the geographic information technology landscape will look like in the next five years. 234 individuals attended. The preliminary numbers indicate that revenues slightly exceeded expenses, and the satisfaction ratings were outstanding. On a scale of 1 to 4, all aspects of the forum were rated in excess of 3, among the highest overall ratings for any event that MetroGIS has hosted. Michael Liebhold’s keynote session received an unprecedented rating of 3.88.

- 3) Non-Government Perspective – Partnering Opportunities. On November 15, 2005, MetroGIS hosted a forum to better understand possible partnering opportunities with non-government interests. Forty-five candidate ideas for potential collaboration between government and non-government interests were identified in three broad 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?

(The summary document can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/06_0118/forum_summary.pdf.)

The next step will be to define and execute a process to decide which of the 45 identified ideas have the most promise, define in more detail top priority candidate opportunities, and pursue implementation. The goal is to assemble a workgroup comprised of forum participants and complete this effort by early fall. To guide the workgroup’s discussions, the MetroGIS Policy Board endorsed the following principles at its January 2006 meeting:

- Value added to public sector assets is encouraged provided it does not detract from the public sector objective.

- Contribution of assets to a collaborative solution assumes all parties view the transaction as equitable and relevant to their needs.
- Contributions can be comprised of funds, data, equipment and/or people.
- 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.

B) METROGIS DATAFINDER CAFÉ – EXPANDED UPGRADE PROJECT UNDERWAY

Work is underway to upgrade DataFinder Café in cooperation with Latitude Geographics (British Columbia, Canada), the owners of GeoCortex software which will be the core of the new DataFinder Cafe. The current project is more robust than originally thought possible. In April, during the initial project coordination meetings, MetroGIS staff learned that Latitude Geographics was prepared to develop an off-the-shelf extension to GeoCortex that would include all of functionality sought in the project initial contract and for an additional \$1,250 (as opposed to the original \$4,350 bid cost) provide additional functionality that had been designated for a future phase when sufficient funding was available. All but \$231 of the additional expense will be covered by NSDI grant funds that had not been encumbered to that point. The remaining \$231 will come from funds allocated to MetroGIS by the Council.

A contract amendment was executed in May to participate in the development of the software extension in addition to other functionality sought in the initial project contract. The revised detailed specifications are available upon request. Project completion is anticipated by late July. Alison Slaats is the Project Lead.

C) 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, Liaison to the Coordinating Committee)

The Workgroup last met in January to synchronize its pilot project database design with the draft national street address standard. Several workgroup members are currently testing the amount of effort needed to achieve compliance between local address authority organization (cities and some counties) databases and the national standards. The expectation is that this testing will be essentially complete by mid July. The group plans to meet once the pilot is complete. 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) are in a white paper which can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/street_addresses/Occupiable_Units_Dataset_Vision.pdf.

(2) Existing Land Use

Preparations for a user satisfaction forum remain on hold until following the Strategic Directions Workshop anticipated to occur in fall 2006. 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

(Randy Knippel, Dakota County, Workgroup Chair)

No update information was submitted.

(4) Highway and Road Networks

(Gordon Chinander, Metropolitan Emergency Services Board [formerly Metropolitan 911 Board], Liaison to Coordinating Committee)

(a) The “E911 Address and Street Centerline Workgroup” is scheduled to meet on June 30.

Preliminary specifications have been defined for a next-generation dataset. The workgroup is currently surveying potential data producers to see to what extent they can meet these

specifications. At the next workgroup meeting, scheduled for June 30, the survey results will be reviewed and a set of final specifications defined.

More information on this workgroup's efforts can be found at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/workgroups/e911_streets/index.shtml.

- (b) There are currently **185 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 **June 15th**, the types of organizations licensed were as follows:
- Local gov't: **99**
 - Regional gov't: **11**
 - State/Federal gov't: **23**
 - Academic: **52**

The agreement between the Metropolitan Council and The Lawrence Group (TLG), through which the above licensees receive access to this dataset, expires at the end of this year. Council management have authorized MetroGIS/Council staff to negotiate a new agreement as a sole source procurement. Negotiations were initiated on March 9th at a meeting to clarify expectations and share the data content standards preferences that have been/will be defined by the "E911 Address and Street Centerline Workgroup". Once the survey referenced in "(a)", above, is complete, sufficient information should be available to move forward with the pending negotiations with TLG.

- (c) The **MetroGIS Roads & Highways Technical Workgroup**
This Work group was established Fall 2004 to foster a partnership between MnDOT and MetroGIS, whereby MetroGIS would provide a mechanism for the local government community serving the seven-county, Twin Cities community to collectively test an application designed by MnDOT to integrate local datasets with Mn/DOT's LDM. The lead staff for MetroGIS's component of the partnership, Mike Dolbow, changed jobs Fall 2005 and staff support ceased at that time for this workgroup. Information about goals, expectations, and participant roles, agreed upon prior to Dolbow's departure, can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/highway_roads/index.shtml.

As far as progress on development of the actual application, Dan Ross, who heads up the project for MnDOT, provided the following information: "The vendor will provide what they believe to be production ready software to Mn/DOT at the end of July 2006. Mn/DOT staff will be doing a "Proof of Concept" with the software against identified business flows on a representative sample of the Mn/DOT business data. Ratings of the software should be complete in September. At that point a decision will be made regarding how to move forward. The statewide data is also undergoing a major update at this time. The BaseMap data is being synchronized with the current Transportation Information System (TIS) and road status updates are being completed as well. Successful approval of the software and data updates are required to allow Mn/DOT to effectively share TIS data (*e.g. traffic volumes) with other organizations desiring to use their own roadway geometries."

(5) Jurisdictional Boundaries – Water Management Organizations

A regional solution recommendation is nearing completion and is expected to be submitted to the Coordinating Committee for consideration at the September 2006 meeting. Jane Harper, Principal Planner for Washington County and member of the Committee, is the project manager for a pilot project conducted on behalf of the MetroGIS community by Washington County. The recommendations will include data content standards as well as identification of organizations to serve in the roles of primary producer and regional custodian. Washington County conducted a

similar pilot project in the late 1990's that led to adoption of the policies that govern the endorsed regional solution for the city/county jurisdictional boundary dataset.

(6) Lakes, Wetlands, etc.

(Nancy Read, Coordinating Committee Chairperson and Workgroup Member)

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 which 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.

(7) 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 five percent in 2006. DNR, the regional custodian, is looking into creating tools to improve standardization of the data before delivery. DNR is tentatively planning on hosting a user forum later this year to identify desired improvements.

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

There are currently **81 licenses** issued to access and use the Regional Parcel Dataset. As of **June 15th**, the types of organizations licensed were as follows:

- Local gov't: **35**
- Regional gov't: **3**
- State/Federal gov't: **16**
- Academic: **27**

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

- (a) West is looking at various ways to provide users with local access to HMDA data (data about home mortgages). Options seem to include the University of Minnesota, the Minneapolis Public Library, and the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. Along with acquiring the data, she is looking at data documentation with an eye to improving our description of this data source.
- (b) We have discovered DataPlace (<http://www.dataplace.org/>), a new comprehensive source of online socioeconomic data being developed by the Fannie Mae Foundation with significant input from the Urban Institute. Eventually data will be available at the tract level and will be useful to the MetroGIS community. We will continue to monitor this.
- (c) Laura Smith at Macalester has been accessing and mapping property foreclosures in North Minneapolis. She has gotten this data in electronic form from both Hennepin and Ramsey counties. Craig will ask the County Data Producers Workgroup about foreclosure data from the other five counties. This could be a useful addition to DataFinder.
- (d) 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. **No update was submitted as to whether or not this proposal has been shared with the MN Department of Health for sanctioning.** For more

information contact Tim Zimmerman at tim.zimmerman@co.hennepin.mn.us or 612-348-0307.

D) MODIFICATION TO OPERATING GUIDELINES – DECISIONS BETWEEN MEETINGS

The Coordinating Committee unanimously agreed upon recommended changes to the Operating Guidelines at its June 28th meeting. Due to the July 4th Holiday, the required 15-day notice of the proposed amendment to the guidelines could not be met. As such the proposal will be forwarded to the Policy Board for consideration at its October meeting. A copy of the proposed changes was emailed to the Board on July 5. If Board members have any comments about the proposed changes, please submit them so the Coordinating Committee can consider them at its September meeting.

E) COUNTY DATA PRODUCER WORKGROUP ACTIVITIES - PARCEL DATA ACCESS POLICY

(Submitted by Dave Drealan, Carver County, Workgroup Chair)

This Workgroup met on June 22nd. Five of the counties were represented – the Anoka and Scott representatives did not attend. The following agreements were reached and the member members in turn agreed to vet these matters among their respective administrations. The concept of including examples/explanations in the metadata/policy statement for the regional parcel dataset was discussed as options to inform the data user of these policy clarifications.

(1) Regional Parcel Dataset Policy Investigation - Access by Non-Profit Interests:

Ten criteria have been created by Hennepin County to determine whether a particular non-profit institution qualifies to receive access to parcel data without fee. The underlying concept is that non-profits that promote and foster economic development activity as an adjunct of government should qualify for a fee waiver. Implementation will be on a county-by-county basis.

(2) Authorize Redistribution of Parcel Data Summarized to a Larger Geography

It was agreed the summarizing parcel attribute data and reporting it higher level geographies (block groups, tracts, etc.) does not constitute redistribution of the source parcel data. and, therefore, is not covered by the license agreement prohibiting redistribution of parcel data in the from received.

(3) Pilot Project: View-Only, Web-based Access Policy Investigated for Parcel Data

See Agenda Item 5d.



Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data

TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Information Sharing

DATE: July 6, 2006
(For the July 19th meeting)

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

A) CHISAGO COUNTY – REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE IN METROGIS INVESTIGATED

Chisago County is considering becoming a member of Metropolitan Emergency Service Board (MESB). Gordon Chinander, GIS Coordinator for the MESB, has asked if Chisago County can be included in policies and guidelines established by MetroGIS, which impact the operations of the MESB.

Since the Staff Coordinator received this request, direction as to appropriate next steps has been sought from the Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt, the Coordinating Committee, and Mark Vander Schaaf, Director of the Department of Data Resource, Metropolitan Council, the primary funder of MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" function.

All encouraged the Staff Coordinator to meet with Chisago County staff (and MESB staff) to their clarify needs and preferences regarding participation in the data and knowledge sharing environment that has been established by MetroGIS. A report of staff's findings is anticipated at the Board's October meeting.

B) PRESENTATIONS / OUTREACH / STUDIES *(not mentioned elsewhere)*

1. Articles Submitted for the Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium Newsletter

No articles were submitted for the Spring 2006 issue. However, several e-announcements for the June 1st forum, "Imagining Possibilities: The Next Frontier for Geographic Information Technology" were distributed via the GIS/LIS Consortium network.

2. Presentations

None

C) RELATED METRO AND STATE GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE

- 1. MnDOT has launched a new web-based Interactive BaseMap.** It can be accessed at <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/maps/gisweb/>. Contact Joella Givens at 651-582-1730 or joella.givens@dot.state.mn.us.

D) RELATED FEDERAL/NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INITIATIVES UPDATE

1. Digital Elevation Model (DEM) Presentation at NACO National Conference

Chairperson Reinhardt, in cooperation with David Claypool, Ramsey County Surveyor, made a presentation at the National Conference of the National Association of Counties. The title was "Partnerships in Action" and the topic was Minnesota's statewide DEM initiative. For more information and a copy of the presentation, contact David Claypool (651-266-7170 or david.claypool@co.ramsey.state.mn).

2. 2006 Doctoral Dissertation entitled “Developing Geographic Information Infrastructures: The Role of Information Policies”

The author, Bastiaan van Loenen, utilized MetroGIS as one of five international case studies to compare and contrast their respective efforts with regard the answering his research question “What role do access policies play in the development of a geographic information infrastructure?” The author concludes that geographic information infrastructures mature through a four phase process: Stand alone/initiation, Exchange/ standardization, Intermediary, and Network. A rubric is provided that defines the characteristics associated with seven maturity “issues” (p. 300). MetroGIS’s characteristics fall mostly into the “intermediate” phase, as its standing is not formalized in legislation. The author offers insight into the consequences of fee for access policies, alternative fee models that focus on value added approaches, and public value possible if all producers, public and non-public, could reach agreement to coordinate production of commonly needed data. The author’s research appears to offer valuable food for thought for the MetroGIS next Business Plan Update process and possibly for the Council’s evaluation of MetroGIS (Agenda Item 7a).

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

The MetroGIS Address Workgroup’s efforts to define a data standard for a regional Occupiable Units Address Dataset has played a substantial role in the national street address data standard that is being developed through the URISA (Urban and Regional Information Systems Association) under the auspices of the FGDC (Federal Geographic Data Committee). Supporting organizations are NENA (National Emergency Numbers Association) and the U.S. Census Bureau. The national standard completed its second review period in January. Mark Kotz, staff to the MetroGIS Workgroup, has participated on the development team for the content portion of the national standard. Kotz monitored the national discussion and comments from the second review period. In conjunction with the Address Workgroup, Kotz proposed some minor modifications to the standard. These changes are being accepted and will be incorporated in the next draft.

The national street address data standard consists of four parts: content, classification, quality, and transfer. The standard is expected to be adopted by the FGDC by end of summer 2006, after which it will be made available for a broader FGDC national review. This standard will be used with the proposed regional occupiable units address dataset and the E-911 compatible street centerlines dataset. Specific E-911 and USPS profiles of the standard are under consideration. *(Submitted by Mark Kotz)*

4. McMaster Appointed to National Research Council (NRC) Mapping Science Committee

Bob McMaster has been appointed to the Mapping Science Committee at the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. McMaster is chair of the Geography Department at the University of Minnesota and a frequent workshop instructor at GIS/LIS Conferences. His background is in cartography and he is a recognized leader on the topic of generalization. His current research is focused on providing online access to and analysis of historical Census data; the \$5 million NSF-funded National Historical Geographic Information System project. He has been active in UCGIS, the International Cartographic Association, and the Cartography and Geographic Information Society (CaGIS). For more information, see <http://www.geog.umn.edu/Faculty/McMaster.html>.

The Mapping Science Committee has the responsibility for furthering knowledge and advising the federal government on matters related to GIS. It has produced a series of useful reports that included establishing the NSDI and critiquing the "The National Map". McMaster joins Shashi Shekhar (Computer Science) as a second member from the University of Minnesota. This is quite unusual, since there are only 14 members and only half from academia. This large representation from Minnesota is testimony to the strength of GIS at our local institution.

E) JUNE 28, 2006 COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

The full text of the summary can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/index.shtml#agendas_minutes.