



**Policy Board Members:**

Victoria Reinhardt,  
Chairperson  
Ramsey County

Jim Kordiak,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Anoka County

Tom Egan,  
Dakota County

Randy Maluchnik,  
Carver County

Roger Lake,  
MAWD

Dennis Hegberg,  
Washington County

Dan Cook,  
TIES

Randy Johnson,  
Hennepin County

Steve Elkins,  
City of Bloomington  
Metro Cities

Terry Schneider,  
City of Minnetonka  
Metro Cities

Joseph Wagner,  
Scott County

Tony Pistilli,  
Metropolitan Council

**Coordinating Committee**

Sally Wakefield,  
Chairperson  
1000 Friends of MN

Peter Henschel,  
Vice-Chairperson  
Carver County

**Staff Coordinator**

Randall Johnson

**Wednesday, April 29, 2009**

**6:00 p.m.**

**Metropolitan County Government Offices**

**2099 University Avenue, St. Paul**

(Go to <http://www.mmcd.org/directions.html> for a map and directions)

## Agenda

	<u>Page</u>
<b>1. Call to Order</b>	
<b>2. Accept Agenda</b>	
<b>3. Accept January 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summary</b>	<i>action</i>
<b>4. GIS Technology Demonstration:</b> <i>Safe Road Map Project – University of Minnesota Connection</i>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. Action/Discussion Items</b>	
a) Election of Officers for 2009	<i>action</i> <b>7</b>
b) Mn Drive Excellence Initiative Update: <i>Legislation to Create a “Minnesota Geospatial Information Office” (MGIO)</i>	<b>9</b>
c) GCGI Strategic Planning Committee Considerations: <i>Governance Recommendations for the MGIO</i>	<b>10</b>
d) GCGI Response to Two Recent Recommendations from MetroGIS	<b>11</b>
<b>6. Major Activity Update</b>	<b>15</b>
a) Preparations for Mid-Year Priority Adjustments – Resource Constraints	
b) 2008 Annual Report	
c) Regional Web Service/Application Solution Workgroup Efforts	
d) Streamlining Data Access for Emergency Responders	
e) Next-Generation Regional Street Centerline Solution	
f) 2008 Regional GIS Projects: <i>Address Editing Tool, Landmarks Extension to Regional Geocoder Service and Mailing Label Service</i>	
g) Performance Measurement Plan Update	
h) Organizational Structure for Cross Sector, Shared Power Environment	
i) Leadership Development Plan	
<b>7. Information Sharing</b>	<b>27</b>
a) Ben Verbick, GIS Manager for LOGIS, appointed to Coordinating Committee	
b) Will Craig -- NSGIC President-Elect	
c) National Geospatial Advisory Committee: February Meeting Results/May Agenda	
d) Presentations / Outreach / Studies	
e) Metro and State Geospatial Initiatives Update	
f) Federal and National Geospatial Initiatives Update	
g) March 2009 Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary	

**8. Next Meeting**  
Wednesday, July 29, 2009

**9. Adjourn**

**Mission Statement:** "....to expand stakeholders' capacity to address shared geographic information needs through a collaboration of organizations that serve the Twin Cities metropolitan area."



**Meeting Summary  
MetroGIS Policy Board  
Metropolitan Counties Government Center  
2099 University Avenue, St. Paul  
January 28, 2009**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and asked each of the members and visitors to introduced themselves.

Members Present: Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), Gary Swenson for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Jim Kordiak (Anoka County), Tom Egan (Dakota County), and Randy Maluchnik (Carver County), Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council), Steve Elkins (Metro Cities – City of Bloomington), Terry Schneider (Metro Cities - City of Minnetonka), Dan Cook (School Districts - TIES), and Roger Lake (Metro Watershed Districts).

Members Absent: Jim Joseph Wagner (Scott County)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: Rick Gelbmann, Randy Knippel, Nancy Read, Mark Vander Schaaf, Gordy Chinander, David Claypool, Sally Wakefield, William Brown.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson and Mark Kotz (MetroGIS Staff Support Team)

Visitors: Dave Hinrichs (Metropolitan Council), Janna King and Todd Klingel (Regional Chamber of Commerce)

**2. ACCEPT AGENDA**

Member Schneider moved and Member Egan seconded to approve the proposed agenda with one modification, hear Item 4c before 4a. Motion carried, ayes all.

**3. MEETING SUMMARY**

Member Kordiak moved and Member Lake seconded to approve the October 22, 2008 meeting summary, as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

**4. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**c) Streamlining Data Access for Emergency Responders**

Gordon Chinander, GIS Coordinator for the Metropolitan Emergence Service Board and member of the Coordinating Committee, summarized the project status information presented in the agenda report. He emphasized the effort is not limited to parcel data produced by the counties, noting that consideration will also be given to data produced by the private sector and other government entities.

He concluded his remarks by stating that he is nearly finished drafting a white paper that will be used to facilitate agreement on the problem statement and that once the workgroup members have concurred on the problem statement and hopefully in the next few weeks that work will begin on developing recommendations for the Board's consideration.

**a) 2008 Accomplishments**

The Staff Coordinator summarized major accomplishments made through MetroGIS's efforts in 2008, including executing the 4<sup>th</sup> generation parcel data sharing agreement, implementing a regional geocoder service, and developing a data synchronization mechanism that is a prerequisite to achieving the vision for a Regional Address Points Dataset. He thanked the representatives from the seven counties for their willingness to experiment with the concept of "view –only" access to parcel data by non-licensees, Nancy Read for her leadership on the geocoder project, Peter Henschel for his leadership on the synchronizer project, and the members of the Technical Leadership Workgroup for agreeing to serve in the role of a surrogate Technical Coordinator.

**Motion:** Member Elkins moved and Member Egan seconded to accept the suggested listing of major accomplishments in 2008, as presented in the agenda report. Motion carried, ayes all.

**b) Regional Solutions to Shared Application Needs**

Mark Kotz, Chairperson of the MetroGIS's Technical Leadership Workgroup (TLW), began by explaining the process that the TLW used to identify priority shared application and web service needs/opportunities and then summarized recommended next steps endorsed by the Coordinating Committee at its December 10 meeting. Coordinating Committee Read, speaking as the project manager for the Regional Geocoder Project, helped Board members better understand the concept of a web service using the geocoder as an example. Read also explained how MetroGIS's investment had catalyzed significantly more investment from others which together were needed to accomplish the project.

Kotz continued his presentation noting that he was pleased to report that 25 individuals had volunteered to participate on five workgroups created by the Coordinating Committee on Dec 10<sup>th</sup> and tasked with developing specific courses of action for the 5 highest priority shared application/web service needs. More importantly, he emphasized that the volunteers expressed a willingness to participate even though no staff support would be provided. Member Kordiak asked for clarification about the organizations represented by the 25 volunteers and was pleased to learn that the volunteers represent all three sectors and all forms of government that serve the metro area. Kotz's presentation slides can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/09\\_0128/4b\\_Shared\\_Apps\\_Presentation.ppt](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/09_0128/4b_Shared_Apps_Presentation.ppt).

Member Schneider commented that the lack of staff support for these work groups might have a positive outcome, assuming the participants will also be willing to serve as champions for the recommended courses of action. It was agreed that it is a risk worth taking, in particular, given there is no other option for the near term to move forward on these important projects. The Staff Coordinator also commented that there is little likelihood that a Technical Coordinator can be added to the MetroGIS support team, if the only funding source is the Council. Finally, there was general concurrence of the value gained from the TLW stepping up and filling the roll of a Technical Coordinator and that without them doing so substantive progress could not be made to move forward on proposed projects.

Coordinating Committee Chairperson Wakefield continued the presentation by summarizing four recommendations of the Committee that require action from the Board, noting that two of them had been dealt with earlier in the month via a letter from Chairperson Reinhardt to the Governors Council on Geographic Information, as described in the agenda packet. She then explained the remaining two items: 1) call for broader free access parcel data and 2) need for identify support resources for workgroups.

Member Pistilli commented that he believes Recommendation A would not be needed if a policy change were to be implemented acknowledging that data developed with public funding should be made available, without fee, to anyone who wishes access. Chairperson Reinhardt noted that the recommendation before the Board (Recommendation A) acknowledges that state law permits counties to impose a cost recovery fee, and that Recommendation A is an appropriate course of action under current law.

Member Egan commented that to get to a solution acceptable to both sides of this data access issue, the true value received from participation by both the producers and those asking for free access must be established. Vice Chairman Kordiak concurred and encouraged that as part of the evaluation including reporting of the revenue received by the counties from cost recovery policies for parcel data.

Member Schneider spoke in favor of Recommendation A, in principle, as a means to create a test environment through which to define mutual benefit and generally explore the viability of partnering across sectors to address shared application needs. If the test environment works, which he termed a "defined waiver of license", he believes that additional value will be recognized. He concurred with

others that language of Recommendation A, as proposed in the agenda report, was needed clarification.

Member Pistilli urged the members to be mindful of the value of data as an economic engine for access. Alternate Member Swenson concurred, adding that he believes opening up access to parcel data would provide great value to the state. He also believes a carrot is needed to encourage the producers to participate in the proposed “Cross Sector Partnering” initiative approved by the Board at its October meeting. He closed by stating that research is needed to document the tangible benefits that would accrue to the producer if they were to offer access, without fee, to parcel data.

Chairperson Reinhardt accepted a proposal from Randy Knippel, Chairperson of the County Data Producers Workgroup, to clarify the intent Recommendation A. The following language was accepted by the Board for Recommendation A (page 10 of the agenda packet):

“A: That the Policy Board concur that:

1. Modifications to the policy related to non-government access to parcel data should be defined through the “Cross Sector Partnering” initiative (Attachment B) that the Policy Board authorized at its October 2008 meeting ~~in cooperation with the County Data Producers Workgroup.~~
2. Desired modifications to parcel data access policies must comply with the equity principles adopted by the Board at its January 2006 meeting (Attachment C).
3. To direct the County Data Producers Workgroup to consider the implications of the recommendations of the Cross-Sector Partnering initiative relative to the Parcel Data Sharing Agreement and report its findings to the Board.”

**Motion:**

Member Schneider moved and Member Egan seconded to approve Recommendation A, as modified. Motion carried, ayes all.

The members also concurred that action called for in Recommendation B is premature (investigate the potential of staff support funding model that seeks partners in addition to the Metropolitan Council) until more is known about how the actions called for in Recommendation A will play out. Member Schneider added that if non-government interests are willing to coordinate among themselves and share project costs, the objectives sought in Recommendation B should take care of themselves.

**d) 2009 “Foster Collaboration” Major Work Objectives and Budget**

Chairperson Reinhardt commented that the proposed modifications represent refinements to the preliminary work program and budget approved in April 2008 and involved reallocating \$15,000 to activities that had been previously included in the budget.

**Motion:** Member Pistilli moved and Member O’Rourke seconded to approve the:

- 1) Major program objectives for MetroGIS’s 2009 “Fostering Collaboration” function, as presented on page 29 (Attachment A to report 4c) of the agenda packet.
- 2) Budget for MetroGIS’s 2009 “Fostering Collaboration” function, as presented on page 35 (Attachment D to report 4c) of the agenda packet.

Motion carried, ayes all.

**e) Modify July Meeting Date and Explore Interest in Afternoon Meetings**

Chairperson Reinhardt suggested that the Board consider rescheduling the July 29 meeting to July 22 to avoid a conflict that was not known when the scheduled was adopted in October 2008.

She also asked the members if they would be interested in meeting in the afternoon. After some discussion it was agreed to move the start time to 6 p.m.

**Motion:** Member Egan moved and Member Pistilli seconded to change the July 2009 meeting date from the 29<sup>th</sup> to the 22<sup>nd</sup> and, effective with the April 2009 meeting, change the meeting start time for all meetings to 6 p.m. Motion carried ayes all.

**5. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION**

Todd Klingel, President of the Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Janna King, project manager for the subject Twin Cities Economic Development Website, explained the purpose of the website is to grow jobs in the Twin Cities Market. The then provided an overview of how the site is financed and overview of the sponsors/funders , download activity, general functionality, data sources (Claritos and Applied Geographic Solutions) used, and the host/developer (GIS Planning). A copy if their slide presentation can be viewed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/09\\_0128/5\\_MetroMSP\\_forMetroGIS.ppt](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/09_0128/5_MetroMSP_forMetroGIS.ppt).

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked the presenters and commented the Policy Board was interested in learning more about Twin Cities Economic Development Website and is willing to assist with improvement of the data utilized by the site.

Member Pistilli asked of the private sector partners are as satisfied with the site as the public sector users that were mentioned in the presentation. Ms. King noted that real estate and utility interests have acknowledged the most benefit but the private sector community, as a whole, understands their role is to grow jobs and that this site is a valuable tool to do so.

Chairperson Reinhardt reiterated that MetroGIS is prepared to help with data to support the site, noting that with MetroGIS's assistance she believes accuracy can be improved and expenses can be reduced. Ms. King responded that they are aware of data resources available through MetroGIS but thus far the currently use data is working well to support user preferences for apples-to-apples comparisons with other metro areas and for areas that adjoin the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. She closed by noting that MnCAR may be interested in working with the MetroGIS community and, if so, that they will follow MnCAR's lead.

**6. MAJOR ACTIVITY UPDATES**

There was no discussion of the items in this section of the agenda

**7. INFORMATION SHARING**

Chairperson Reinhardt encouraged the members to review the letter in Item 7a about the Mn Drive to Excellence initiative recommendations and the document entitled "The Changing Geospatial Landscape" published the National Geospatial Advisory Committee in December 2008 which is included in Item 7f.

Member Cook announced that this would likely be his last meeting as he is no longer a member of the Anoka Hennepin School District.

**8. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Policy Board is scheduled for April 29, 2009. Chairperson Reinhardt reminded the members that beginning with the April meeting, the start time will be 6:00 p.m. and that election of new officers is scheduled to occur at the April meeting.

**9. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

**FROM:** Coordinating Committee  
Chairperson: Sally Wakefield, 1000 Friends of Minnesota  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** GIS Technology Demonstration:  
*Safe Road Map Project – University of Minnesota Connection*

**DATE:** April 6, 2009  
(For the Apr. 29<sup>th</sup> meeting)

### **INTRODUCTION**

The topic for the GIS Technology Demonstration at the April Policy Board meeting will be the *Safe Road Map Project* (<http://www.saferoadmaps.org/home/index.htm>).

Lee Munnich, Director of the University of Minnesota Humphrey Center's State and Local Policy Program and manager for this project, has agreed to share it with the Board. A significant portion of the Humphrey Center's State and Local Policy Program's funding is to explore solutions to state transportation and economic development issues. Mr. Munich is a former member of the Minneapolis City Council and assistant director of the old Department of Economic Development. He also co-led the startup of the state's Economic Research Group.

### **BOARD INTEREST EXPRESSED**

In July 2008, at the suggestion of member Elkins, the Policy Board previously expressed interest in a briefing about the **Safe Road Map Project**. Member Elkins shared that this project demonstrates the concept of "mashup" in a way that would be helpful to assist Board members understand how relatively independent application components/web services can be mixed and matched to create a complete online application. This comment was made in conjunction with a Board discussion about the need to better understand how stakeholders are leveraging the presence of Google Maps and mash-up technology to improve communication with citizens and the cost-effectiveness of their business functions.

### **OVERVIEW OF THE SAFE ROAD MAP PROJECT AND WEBSITE**

*From Project Website:* "This website is a ground-breaking tool that combines information from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System with Google Maps to give you a visual representation of traffic safety across the entire nation. With this system, you can enter an address and view the roads that have the highest number of traffic fatalities in a specified area. You can also view dynamically generated maps that show how public policy has been implemented to improve transportation safety by region. Our hope is that this site brings both increased safety and awareness to transportation policy makers and private citizens..."

Safe Road Maps is a GIS-based, [Mashup](#) (*see Reference Section for definition*) to communicate public health issues related to rural and urban road transportation safety through a publicly accessible website. This GIS integrates a range of spatial data regarding motor vehicle crashes, transportation policy legislation, and driver behavioral data. It is anticipated that this GIS will help raise awareness and change fundamental perceptions regarding the magnitude, risk factors, and impacts of motor vehicle crashes."

### **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

### MASHUP DEFINED (FROM LINK ON SAFE ROAD MAPS WEBSITE):

In [web development](#), a **mashup** is a [Web application](#) that combines data from one or more sources into a single integrated tool. The term **Mashup** implies easy, fast integration, frequently done by access to open [APIs](#) and data sources to produce results that were not the original reason for producing the raw source data. An example of a mashup is the use of cartographic data from [Google Maps](#) to add location information to [real estate](#) data, thereby creating a new and distinct Web service that was not originally provided by either source.

### PREVIOUS GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS

- Oct. 2008 Regional Datasets and Analysis of School District Housing Stock
- July. 2008 Twin Cities Regional Parcel Data and Community Revitalization: Highlights of National Report By Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
- Apr. 2008 Mapping Minnesota Emergency Response Structures: An Initiative to Support the National Map and National Spatial Data Infrastructure
- Jan. 2008: GIS's Role in Response to the I-35W Bridge Collapse
- Oct. 2007: Web maps open government to citizens - Metropolitan Mosquito Control District
- Jul. 2007: Metropolitan Council new "Maps" mini website
- Apr. 2007: Efficiencies Realized Through Coordinated Application Development: Lessons Learned From The OpenMNND Project
- Jan. 2007: Effective Decisions Through Effective Data Distribution
- Oct. 2006: Minnesota 3-D: An Online Mapping System Designed Close the Spatial Mismatch Between Affordable Housing And Living Wage Jobs
- Jul. 2006: What does MetroGIS Mean to Minnesota Geospatial Architecture Plan?
- 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
- Jul. 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)



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Election of Policy Board Officers

**DATE:** April 9, 2009  
(For the Apr. 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Policy Board is respectfully requested to elect its officers for 2009. A roster of current Board members is attached.

## **CHANGE IN LEADERSHIP SOUGHT**

Last April, Members Reinhardt and Kordiak were reelected as chair and vice-chair, respectively. Following the election, both expressed their preference for other Board members to assume these leadership responsibilities, beginning with the April 2009 election. Member Reinhardt has served as chair since May 1997. Member Kordiak has served as vice-chair since April 2001.

In an email message to the members on April 8th, Chairperson Reinhardt noted that:

*“Terry Schneider had expressed a willingness to serve as Chair and Tom Eagan is willing to serve as Vice-chair. Other nominations are welcome either before or at the meeting.”*

## **BACKGROUND**

1. The operating guidelines call for the annual election of a chair and vice-chair.
2. The operating guidelines do not impose a term limit.
3. The roles and responsibilities of the MetroGIS chair and vice-chair are as follows:
  - a) Article II; Section 8 states “The Board shall annually elect a Chairperson from its membership. The Chair shall preside at the meetings of the Board and perform the usual duties of Chair and such other duties as may be described by the Board from time to time. The Chair shall serve until his or her successor is duly elected”.
  - b) Article II; Section 9 states “The Board shall annually elect a Vice-Chairperson from its membership. The Vice Chair shall perform the duties of the Chair in the absence of the Chair or in the event of his or her inability or refusal to act and shall serve until his or her successor is duly elected”.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the MetroGIS Policy Board elect a chair and vice-chair for 2009.

Policy Board Members  
April 2009

<b>Member last</b>	<b>Member first</b>	<b>Represents</b>	<b>Begin date</b>
Cook	Dan	TIES	September 1998
Egan	Tom	Dakota Co.	January 2005
Elkins	Steve	AMM (Bloomington)	October 2007
Hegberg	Dennis	Wash. Co.	January 2003
Johnson	Randy	Hennepin Co.	January 1997
Kordiak	Jim	Anoka Co.	January 2000
Lake	Roger	MAWD	October 2006
Maluchnik	Randy	Carver Co.	January 2009
Pistilli	Tony	Metropolitan Council	April 2003
Reinhardt	Victoria	Ramsey Co.	January 1997
Schneider	Terry	AMM (Minnetonka)	January 1997
Wagner	Joseph	Scott Co.	January 2005



**TO:** Policy Board  
**FROM:** David Arbeit, Director, Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)  
**SUBJECT:** Mn Drive to Excellence: Legislative Proposal for GIS Coordination  
**DATE:** April 7, 2009  
(For April 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

## **INTRODUCTION**

Legislation was introduced this session to create a Minnesota Geospatial Information Office (MGIO) as an outcome of the Mn Drive to Excellence: State Agency GIS Coordination initiative.

Chairperson Reinhardt invited leadership of this initiative to update Board members on the status of legislation at the April Board meeting. David Arbeit, Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis, and Fred Logman, Mn Land Management Information Center, are the project managers. One or both will attend the April Board meeting to provide an update.

## **BACKGROUND**

In February 2009, the final report for this Drive to Excellence initiative was published. Immediately following publication of the report, Governor Pawlenty endorsed the recommendation to create a Minnesota Geospatial Information Office to ensure that state agencies coordinate on matters related to use of GIS technology, specifically with responsibility and authority to plan, coordinate, and guide the implementation of the state's geospatial information technology. Legislation was subsequently introduced in both houses to achieve this end.

No agency is currently responsible for coordinating GIS activities within state government, although LMIC and other organizations somewhat fill this void. The purpose of this initiative was to develop, recommend and implement an organizational and governance framework to coordinate and support GIS as an "enterprise" activity of state government. The principal project focus is state government, with the understanding that local and regional governments and other stakeholders are partners and customers.

The one-page handout at [http://www.gis.state.mn.us/committee/MSDI/dte/MGIO\\_handout.pdf](http://www.gis.state.mn.us/committee/MSDI/dte/MGIO_handout.pdf) provides an overview of the proposed MGIO. The complete final report can be viewed at [http://www.gis.state.mn.us/committee/MSDI/dte/ProgramDesign\\_FinalFeb09\\_V21.pdf](http://www.gis.state.mn.us/committee/MSDI/dte/ProgramDesign_FinalFeb09_V21.pdf).

## **SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 2008 POLICY BOARD UPDATE**

At its October meeting, the Policy Board received a progress update about this initiative from Fred Logman, a member of the project support team. Logman shared results of a workshop held in June 2007 through which input was obtained from non-state agency stakeholders to incorporate into the proposal (see [http://www.gis.state.mn.us/committee/MSDI/dte/D2E\\_stakeholder\\_nonstate\\_turnaround.pdf](http://www.gis.state.mn.us/committee/MSDI/dte/D2E_stakeholder_nonstate_turnaround.pdf) for the complete report). Chairperson Reinhardt, Co-chair of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information, informed the Board members that she personally had ensured that lessons learned through MetroGIS's experience were being taken into consideration.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That Policy Board members take this opportunity to learn more about this important state initiative and, if implemented, how it can catalyze improved coordination among state agencies, as well as, non-state agency interests.



**TO:** Policy Board

**FROM:** Mike Dolbow, GIS Coordinator, Mn Dept of Agriculture **and**  
Co-Chair, Strategic Planning Committee,  
Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI)  
Staff Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)

**SUBJECT:** Mn Drive to Excellence: Improving Statewide GIS Coordination

**DATE:** April 7, 2009  
(For April 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

### **INTRODUCTION**

Chairperson Reinhardt invited Mike Dolbow, with whom she co-chairs the GCGI Strategic Planning Committee, to share with Board members efforts in progress to improve statewide coordination of GIS activities among all stakeholders. This presentation is intended to supplement and expand upon the information provided for Agenda Item 5b.

In particular, Mr. Dolbow has been asked to comment on how the recommended courses of action proposed by the Drive to Excellence initiative (as explained in Agenda Item 5b) might catalyze or otherwise assist MetroGIS's ability to achieve its objectives through improved coordination with jurisdictions that adjoin the seven-county, Twin Cities metropolitan area.

### **BACKGROUND ON THE MN DRIVE TO EXCELLENCE INITIATIVE**

*See Agenda Item 5b.*

### **DISCUSSION/CONTEXT**

Since September 2007, the Strategic Planning Committee has focused the GCGI on adopting a statewide governance model for GIS, which has evolved into governance recommendations for the proposed MGIO. The experience of MetroGIS has been a key influence on this process, and the Strategic Planning Committee envisions a significant role for MetroGIS stakeholders in future governance models.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Policy Board members take this opportunity to learn more about this important initiative and how it can catalyze improved cross sector, cross region coordination on GIS related needs of shared interest.



**TO:** MetroGIS Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** GCGI Response to Two Recent Recommendations from MetroGIS

**DATE:** April 7, 2009  
(For the Apr. 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting)

## INTRODUCTION

Policy Board members are encouraged to take this opportunity to clarify expectations concerning the two geospatial program needs explained herein that it previously asked the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) to address. The Board felt these topics were better addressed via a statewide rather than a regional context.

The GCGI's intentions, as endorsed at the GCGI's March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, are explained in Attachment A. Rick Gelbmann, Chairperson of the GCGI, will explain these intentions at the April Policy Board meeting.

## PAST POLICY BOARD ACTION

- 1) On December 10<sup>th</sup>, the Coordinating Committee identified two geospatial needs that it believed would be better addressed via a statewide effort rather than a metro effort.
- 2) On December 17<sup>th</sup>, this proposal was shared with Chairperson Reinhardt. Given that the GCGI's next met before the Policy Board, Chairperson Reinhardt accepted a draft letter (Attachment B) to the GCGI and shared it with Board members via email, noting that she intended to forward it to the GCGI the week of January 12<sup>th</sup>, unless a member objected. No objections or suggested modifications were received. The letter was sent to the GCGI on January 12, 2009. The two needs identified in the letter were as follows:
  - **Implement a state-wide geocoder service.** A metro web service already exists and could be leverage to expand to a state-wide web service.
  - **Recommend a solution to the need for a storm & surface water tracing tool.** It is thought that the GCGI Hydrography Committee would be the best entity to address this need.

## RECOMMENDATION

No action is requested other than to clarify expectations, as the need may exist.

# ATTACHMENT A

MINNESOTA GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL ON GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION



Victoria Reinhardt, Chairperson  
MetroGIS Policy Board  
15 West Kellogg Blvd. #220  
St. Paul, MN 55102

March 26, 2009

## **RE: Action requested of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information by MetroGIS**

Dear Victoria,

Thank you for passing on the geospatial application and web services needs that have been articulated by MetroGIS. The 2 issues you have brought to the attention of the council, implementing a state-wide geocoder service and recommending a solution to the need for a storm and surface water tracing tool have application statewide and may best be addressed once for the whole state rather than piecemeal in many parts of the state. Coordination is critical to ensure that GIS capabilities are developed in an efficient manner that meet local and state needs. As you know statewide coordination depends on the goodwill of volunteers taking on responsibilities that extend beyond their individual job and organizational responsibilities to benefit the Minnesota GIS community as a whole. As such 2 groups have been asked to formulate responses to your request, Land Management Information Center (LMIC) and the Hydrography Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. The following strategies were developed:

### **Implementing a state-wide geocoder service**

LMIC is pleased to host the current MetroGIS Geocoder service. In response to the suggestion that this service be considered for an expansion that would ultimately include state-wide coverage, LMIC will work with its partners to investigate options that may be implemented to extend the current service, as well as those that might supersede the service with an off-the-shelf replacement. Our concise investigation will provide options (software and databases), costs and include recommendations, if clearly apparent.

### **Recommending a solution to the need for a storm and surface water tracing tool**

The Hydrography Committee of the Governors Council on Geographic Information will research the opportunities for developing a statewide "storm water/hydrographic" network tracing tool. Initial efforts will be guided by the following questions: 1) Are existing desktop tracing tools adequate if you have existing data? 2) Is a web application needed and how can it be implemented? 3) If the storm water data existed statewide would that be enough? 4) Are the requirements of the draft storm water standard sufficient to create data that would work with the existing tools? 5) How well do State wide business needs and Regional/Local business needs for this tool match?

LMIC and the Hydrography Committee will periodically report to MetroGIS on its findings and progress.

Sincerely

Rick Gelbmann, Chairperson  
Governor's Council on Geographic Information

## ATTACHMENT B

# *MetroGIS*

*Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data*

---



January 12, 2009

Rick Gelbmann, Chairperson  
Governor's Council on Geographic Information  
c/o Land Management Information Center  
658 Cedar Street, Room 300  
St. Paul, MN 55155

RE: Action Requested of GCGI by MetroGIS

Dear Mr. Gelbmann,

On behalf of the MetroGIS Policy Board and Coordinating Committee, the purpose of this letter is to encourage the MN Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) to consider addressing two project needs that MetroGIS has concluded are much better addressed by a state wide effort than a metro effort. They are:

- **Implement a state-wide geocoder service.** A metro web service already exists and could be leverage to expand to a state-wide web service.
- **Recommend a solution to the need for a storm & surface water tracing tool.** It is thought that the GCGI Hydrography Committee would be the best entity to address this need.

These project needs were among several priorities identified at a forum hosted by MetroGIS on November 20, entitled *Geospatial Applications and Web Services Needs*. Please note that several state agency representatives participated in this forum, as the purpose was to define geospatial application needs shared across sectors. (For more information about the forum results and next steps endorsed by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, go to Item 5d of the document at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/08\\_1210/08\\_1210m\\_draft.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/08_1210/08_1210m_draft.pdf)).

Respectfully,

Victoria Reinhardt, Chairperson  
MetroGIS Policy Board

cc: Sally Wakefield, Chair - MetroGIS Coordinating Committee  
Mark Kotz, Chair - MetroGIS Technical Leadership Workgroup  
Randall Johnson – MetroGIS Staff Coordinator





**TO:** Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Major Activity Update

**DATE:** April 17, 2009  
(For the Apr 29<sup>th</sup> mtg.)

### INTRODUCTION

Since the Policy Board last met, progress has been made in the following areas, in addition to the projects presented in Section 5 of this agenda packet. Any information provided by persons other than the Staff Coordinator is noted.

### PROJECT SPECIFICS

#### **A) PREPARATIONS FOR MID-YEAR PRIORITY ADJUSTMENTS – RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS**

In Attachment A, a detailed explanation of the status of work on each of the objectives endorsed by Policy Board for 2009, along with the status of work on a few of the stretch objectives, is provided. This document was prepared in preparation for considering reevaluation of priorities once proposals are received in May for use of MetroGIS project funding (**The numbers in “( )” following the project titles below correspond to the item numbers in Attachment A.**) Also, see Agenda Item 5g for a discussion about objectives for which work is on hold.

#### OVERVIEW

Work is in progress on 7 objectives set as priorities for MetroGIS’s attention in 2009 (Items # 1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #11, and #14 - see Attachment A). The vast majority of the support for these projects is being provided by volunteers. The members of the Technical Leadership Workgroup (Reference Section) also deserve a large thank you for assuming the role of a surrogate Technical Coordinator, without which MetroGIS could not possibly maintain relevance to changing stakeholder needs.

Although important work is being accomplished, equally important work is also on hold for 7 objectives also set as priorities for 2009. The reasons are generally as follows (the numbers correspond with the project listing provided in Attachment A):

- |   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| 5 – Lack of sufficient support resources                  | (#7, #8, #9, #12 and #13) |
| 1 – Drafting of the required contract is held up in legal | (#10)                     |
| 1 – Requires the results of a project that is in process  | (#2) (#6)                 |

#### **B) 2008 ANNUAL REPORT (Component of Item #1)**

See Attachment B for the actual report. Due to support constraints, the report will be distributed only via email. In the past, it was mailed to over 800 chief elected and chief administrative officials of local and regional government interests that serve the seven county area.

#### **C) REGIONAL WEB SERVICE/APPLICATION WORKGROUP EFFORTS**

Four new workgroups were created by the Coordinating Committee last December in response to the results of a forum held in November to define application needs shared across sectors: Best image service, Feature services for all data, Jurisdictions at point / Government service finder, and USPS address verifier. Each has been asked to submit a recommendation by the end of May for consideration by the Committee at its June meeting.

#### **D) STREAMLINING DATA ACCESS FOR EMERGENCY RESPONDERS (ITEM #5)**

The Workgroup created by the Committee at its December meeting has identified 3 questions for which it needs legal direction.

1. **Conventional Data Distribution Rules (CDDR)**
  - a. Define special circumstances where CDDR do not apply
2. **“Good Samaritan Law “**
  - a. Does this law apply to data distribution (liabilities)
3. **Liability issues**
  - a. How can they be addressed

The Workgroup is in the process of seeking approval to ask the attorney who represents the Metropolitan Emergency Management; an appointee from the Hennepin County legal staff, for advice on options to address these questions.

**E) NEXT GENERATION REGIONAL STREET CENTERLINE SOLUTION (ITEM #4)**

This is a top priority work objective for 2009 because at the end of 2009, the Council’s current street centerline data access contract with NCompass (TLG) will expire. The current contract, is the third in a series with TLG dating back to 1997. The current agreement authorized two, one-year extensions (2008 and 2009) in the event a suitable public sector solution became available during the contract period. Since a publicly-produced solution, which meets or exceeds the functionality provide by the TLG/NCompass solution, still does not exist, a public-private relationship will once again be sought. Work on the specifications began the week of March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**F) 2008 REGIONAL GIS PROJECTS**

- Address Editing Tool (Technical Leadership Workgroup, Project Lead) (Phase 1 Item #10)  
Applied Geographics (Boston) was selected in October 2008 to develop the proposed Address Editing Tool. The funding agreement had not been drafted as of this writing. Agreement has been reached with the contractor to permit collar counties to host the application if they choose to do so. This provision was sought to act on the goal to improve interoperability with jurisdictions that adjoin the metro area. Successful completion of this project, together with the result of the 2007 Data Synchronization Mechanism project, provide the foundation needed to began development of a regional address points dataset. Both tools are required to engage local units of government, the primary producers of address data.
- Landmark Names Extension to Geocoder Service (Mosquito Control District, Project Lead)  
The funding agreement was executed in December 2008. A workgroup is in the process of overseeing development of this extension to the foundation regional geocoding service.
- Mailing Label Web Service (Dakota County, Project Lead)  
The project is approved but the funding agreement had not been drafted as of this writing.

**G) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PLAN UPDATE (ITEM #11)**

A Request for Proposals was authorized by the Policy Board last October and a qualifying bid was received and accepted in November. The funding for this project will not impact the 2009 approved project budget. A project launch meeting was held on March 31. The project is expected to be complete by early fall.

**H) ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR CROSS-SECTOR, SHARED POWER ENVIRONMENT (ITEM #14)**

The Staff Coordinator is exploring interest among U of M faculty to foster exploration organizational/governance structures appropriate for a cross-sector, shared power environments by the academic community. Groundwork was laid for request during interviews of MetroGIS leadership conducted by Professor John Bryson (see Agenda Item 7. E3). Two exploratory meetings were held on March 3 and March 31). Those present agreed that a practical way within a relatively short time frame would be to host a workshop for several individuals active in this area from around the country to explore options. A follow-up meeting is scheduled for April 28<sup>th</sup>.

Information shared during Professor Bryson’s interviews and at the March 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting that set the context for this activity included the following statements.

- The National Geospatial Advisory Committee has recognized that a new form of

organizational structure will be needed to achieve the vision of the NSDI; a structure consistent with governing in a cross-sector, shared power environment. A subcommittee of the NGAC has been tasked with investigating options to address this need.

- The Staff Coordinator serves on this subcommittee because this need is relevant to addressing support issues faced by MetroGIS. Although reliance upon the Council to support MetroGIS's "foster collaboration" function has worked well for some time, the current situation is one where the opportunities for collaboration have expanded and become more complex (i.e., service oriented architectures), while support resources to act on them have diminished. These resource constraints, manifested in the inability to secure a Technical Coordinator and the general lack of resources needed to accomplish priority work objectives, have been recognized by MetroGIS leadership as a concern for over a year. A broader support base has been encouraged by the Board through adoption of the strategy to seek out partnerships with non-government interests. Such additional resources are needed to ensure that collaborative opportunities are acted on in a timely fashion and in ways relevant to changing stakeholder needs.
- Addressing the need for additional support resources may also require modifications in the current organizational structure. Working through the unique organizational/governance structure that was created by MetroGIS to foster and support cross-sector collaboration has resulted in substantial gains in efficiencies and improved working relationships. Notwithstanding these significant achievements and the accompanying public value created, the current structure has weaknesses that must be resolved to sustain and build upon the collaborative solutions that are in place.

For instance, solutions to shared needs that rely upon service oriented architectures will require inter-organizational dependencies that the current voluntarily organizational structure will not be able to effectively manage. Addressing this constraint is a national need fundamental to achieving the vision of the NSDI. Addressing this constraint will also hold promise for MetroGIS's efforts to attain greater efficiencies than currently possible.

**I) LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PLAN (#7)**

A Request for Bids was published in November for consultant assistance to develop a Leadership Development Plan. No bids were received, so the project has been postponed until sufficient resources are available. Completion of this plan is a priority for 2009.

The plan is include this project in the scope of work for a pending Request for Proposals to secure supplement professional services for a variety of MetroGIS support needs. These services had been provided for several years by the firm of Richardson Richter Associates (RRA), prior to their contract expiring on December 31, 2008. RRA provided supplemental support for a number of organizational development projects over the past 5 years. A scope of work for a new contract is under development. The goal is publish the Request for Proposals later this spring.

**J) PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEEDS AND USER SATISFACTION FORUMS (SUPPLEMENT ITEM #1)**

1) Solutions to Shared Application Needs (See 5, below)

2) Regional Address Points Dataset: (See Agenda Item 6d, over)

3) Emergency Preparedness – Joint MetroGIS and GCGI efforts (See Attachment C)

4) Regional Street Centerline Dataset

The March 2009 quarterly update of street centerlines and landmarks data is now available on the MetroGIS ftp site for download. Instructions for downloading the datasets can be found at [http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/street\\_centerlines/order\\_info/download\\_ftp.shtml](http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/street_centerlines/order_info/download_ftp.shtml)

5) Four New Workgroups Created by Coordinating Committee (12/10/08). (See Item 6C, above)

6) Streamlining Access for Emergency Responders Workgroup - (See Item 6D, above)

## Attachment A

### 2009 Major Program Objectives

(Adopted by the Policy Board – January 28, 2009)

**(\*\*Indicates an activity that is at least in part dependent upon securing additional technical leadership and coordination resources).**

Objective (Numbers intended to designate relative importance)	Priority for 2009	Timeframe	Comments (Objectives shown in <i>italics</i> and preceded with “**” can not be fully achieved without full time support of a Technical Coordinator.)	Lead Responsibility
1. Sustain traditional “foster collaboration” support activities <sup>(1)</sup>	<b>Very High</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>	User and producer satisfaction monitoring to be pursued in 2009 to the extent resources are available. An RFP is under development to secure needed supplemental professional services for this and other projects (Items #7 and 12)	Designated Custodians and Staff Coordinator
2. <b>** Pursue implementation of solutions to priority shared needs for applications and web services as appropriate for MetroGIS</b>	<b>Very High</b>	<b>In progress</b>	Priorities set by the Committee at its December 10, 2008 meeting. Four new workgroups were also authorized and are defining implementation strategies with a May 2009 reporting deadline. This objective is a principal means to act on the Business Plan directive to seek out partnering opportunities with non-government interests.	Technical Leadership Workgroup - Mark Kotz, Chair
3. Continue to seek addition of a Technical Coordinator and technical administrative resources to the MetroGIS support team sufficient to carry out the 2009 program objectives defined herein	<b>Very High</b>	<b>Talks with Metropolitan Council Suspended</b>	Given the state’s budget crisis it is highly unlikely that these resources will be funded by the Metropolitan Council. In the short term, the Technical Leadership Workgroup has agreed to act as surrogate Technical Coordinator to ensure progress continues to be made to address needs important to the community. Additional administrative support has been procured through the “90-temp” process. Opportunities to procure additional resources also being investigated as a component of defining solutions to shared application needs.	Staff Coordinator and Technical Leadership Workgroup - Mark Kotz, Chair
4 Execute the Next-Generation Street Centerline Data Access Agreement	<b>Very High</b>	<b>In progress</b>	A meeting tentatively scheduled for the first week in April to define designed specifications. The goal is to publish the RFP in May.	Staff Coordinator
5. Streamline Data Access for Emergency Responders	<b>Very High</b>	<b>In progress</b>	The newly formed workgroup met in February. Several questions were defined for which legal advice is needed before attempting to define options. The goal is to complete by May.	Workgroup and Staff Coordinator
6. <b>**Establish and leverage working relationships with jurisdictions adjoining the Twin Cities metropolitan area to improve data interoperability with those jurisdictions</b>	<b>Very High</b>	<b>On hold</b>  <i>Estimated Start: Summer 2009</i>	Begin once specifics for shared application needs are known (Item 2, above). Awaiting ideas anticipated to be offered by the four new application related workgroups created by the Committee this past December (see Agenda Item 5a.)	Staff Coordinator and Technical Coordinator when available
7. Building upon the key elements defined for a Leadership Development Plan in 2008, agree on specific strategies to achieve each of the outcomes called for via in the approved key elements.	<b>Very High</b>	<b>On hold</b>  <i>Fall 2009 start, if support resources are available.</i>	Insufficient resources to work on this activity at this time. An attempt was made November 2008 to retain a consultant to assist with this project did not produce any bid proposals. No bid proposals were received. An RFP is under development to secure needed supplemental professional services for this and other projects (Items #7, 12, and 16) for which supplemental support is needed.	Staff Coordinator and TBD consultant

Objective (Numbers intended to designate relative importance)	Priority for 2009	Timeframe	Comments (Objectives shown in <i>italics</i> and preceded with “**” can not be fully achieved without full time support of a Technical Coordinator.)	Lead Responsibility
8. <i>**Define outcomes desired for a more fully developed geographic data, applications and service broker and pursue implementation of a more fully developed geographic data, applications and service broker</i>	High	On Hold	Insufficient resources to work on this activity at this time. 1 of 4 tasks assigned to the Technical Leadership Workgroup in June 2008. (#2, #8, #9 and this #13).	Technical Leadership Workgroup - Mark Kotz, Chair
9. <i>**Explore methods for Enhancing Trust in reliability of shared services (e.g., multi-nodal systems, Service Level Agreements, etc.) and define appropriate roles for MetroGIS in establishing that trust.</i>	High	On Hold	Insufficient resources to work on this activity at this time. 1 of 4 tasks assigned to the Technical Leadership Workgroup in June 2008. (#2, #8, #9 and this #13).	Technical Leadership Workgroup - Mark Kotz, Chair
10. <i>**Implement a Regional Address Points Dataset (previously referred to as Occupiable Units) and Web-Editing Application to assist smaller producers of address data participate in the regional solution</i>	High	<b>Phase I:</b> On Hold  <b>Phase II: Est. begin dataset development late summer 2009</b>	A contractor was selected for the Phase I project ( <i>Development of Web based Address Editing Tool</i> ) in October 2008. The project is on hold awaiting the Council’s legal staff to draft the funding agreement. Phase I was originally planned to begin in Jan and end in August. Phase II can begin before Phase I is totally complete, provided the required functionality is for sure possible and the operational timing is clearly understood.  This activity is expected to serve as a prototype to assist with the outcomes defined in Item 9 (Enhancing trust)	Address Workgroup Mark Kotz, Chair, Nancy Read (TLW), and Staff Coordinator
11. Update Performance Measurement Plan (measures of public value) to align with the 2008-2011 Business Plan and pursue implementation	High	In progress	Consultant contract executed March 6, 2009 to secure required supplemental support resources. The project launch meeting with the consultant is scheduled for March 31. The goal is to complete this work by August 2009.	Staff Coordinator and consultant.
12. Initiate and complete development of a plan to ensure obstacles to data sharing do not materialize (see 01/24/08 workshop proceedings), including evaluation of the “organizational competencies” concept to identifying strategic capabilities not identified during development of the 2008-2011 Business Plan	High	On hold	Insufficient resources to work on this activity at this time. An RFP is under development to secure needed supplemental professional services for this and other projects (Items #7 and 12) for which supplemental support is needed. MetroGIS has had access to such resources for nearly a decade prior to expiration of the most recent contract with of Richardson and Richter (RRA), which expired December 31, 2008. The goal is to publish the RFP by May 2009.	Staff Coordinator and consultant TBD.
<b>Stretch Objectives – Time and Resources Permitting</b>				
13. <i>**Populate metadata for GeoServices Finder, including creation of a template to promote standardization</i>	High	On hold	Insufficient resources to work on this activity at this time.  Related to and potential a testbed component for Item 7. 1 of 4 tasks assigned to the Technical Leadership Workgroup in June 2008. (#2, #8, #9 and this #13).	Technical Leadership Workgroup - Mark Kotz, Chair

Objective (Numbers intended to designate relative importance)	Priority for 2009	Timeframe	Comments (Objectives shown in <i>italics</i> and preceded with “***” can not be fully achieved without full time support of a Technical Coordinator.)	Lead Responsibility
14. Investigate need for creation of a new organizational/ governance structure to address priority shared geospatial needs (in conjunction with Item #4 – to extent necessary to achieve goal of partnering with non-government interests.)	<b>High</b>	<b>Intermittent, as time permits</b>	In conjunction with his role as a member of the Governance Workgroup of the National Geospatial Advisory Committee, the Staff Coordinator is encouraging the academic community aid in defining appropriate governance structures for cross-sector, shared power environments; environment fundamental to achieving the vision of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure and to sustain MetroGIS’s effectiveness  This activity is related to exploring partnering opportunities with non-government interests (#4 above), which is expected to provide the context for this activity.	Staff Coordinator
15. <i>**Conduct Peer Review Forums for endorsed regional solutions to shared information needs</i>	<b>High</b>		Insufficient technical and administrative support resources to work on this activity at this time.	
16. Initiate updating of the MetroGIS Outreach Plan to emphasize ways to identify opportunities and ensure stakeholder awareness of regional datasets, DataFinder, pending solutions related to shared application needs	<b>Medium</b>		Supplemental professional support resources are needed. An RFP is under development to secure needed supplemental professional services for this and other projects (Items #7 and 12) for which supplemental support is needed.  Initiate once shared application need priorities are defined (Item #2). The processes used to accomplish Item #2 will be broadly participatory, addressing the intent of the call for an updated outreach plan.	
17. <i>**Develop support Plan for DataFinder, which incorporates tactics listed in the Business Plan (a component of the plan to ensure obstacles to sharing do not materialize – Item 11, above)</i>	<b>Medium</b>		If DataFinder is proposed to remain a freestanding application (component of Item #8), pursue the preliminarily cited 2009 objective to “Prepare a support Plan for DataFinder”. Otherwise, consolidate with a plan for the replacement application.	
18. <i>**Make substantive progress to achieve vision for next generation (E911-compatible) Street Centerline Dataset</i>	<b>Medium</b>	Part of Item #4	Invite E911 officials to participate in the specifications for RFP under development for the next generation Regional Street Centerline Dataset.	
19. Refresh design of MetroGIS website	<b>Medium</b>		Supplemental professional and technical support resources will be needed.	
20. <i>**Create a forum for visioning, coordinating, finding, and funding technical resources for the development and testing of applications and web services.</i>	<b>Low</b>		Insufficient technical and administrative support resources to work on this activity at this time.	
21. <i>**Explore Geospatial Marketplace – (Collaboration Registry/Portal)</i>	<b>Low</b>		The TAT considered this idea at its April 17, 2008 meeting (Item 4c) and did believe it to be a good use of resources, given other higher priorities at this time.	
22. Expand Outreach Plan to include a marketing component	<b>Low</b>		Policy Board directive July 2007 distinguishes marketing from outreach	
23. Investigate impact of cost recovery on ability to achieve desired data sharing	<b>Low</b>		Identified as a need in Appendix K to the 2008-2011 Business Plan	

(1) Traditional activities that comprise the MetroGIS “foster collaboration” function include:

- Identifying and defining shared geospatial information needs. Includes seeking out partnerships with non-government entities that share information needs with government entities that serve the Twin Cities metropolitan area
- Implementing and maintaining relevance of collaborative regional solutions to address shared information needs

- Fostering widespread access and sharing of geospatial data, principally via the [www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org) web site
- Facilitating sharing of knowledge relevant to the advancement of GIS technology among stakeholders (*ongoing*)
- Monitoring activities related to performance measures, reporting findings and adjusting policies as needed (*ongoing*)
- Ensuring decision-making processes are meaningful, productive, and a good use of participants' time (*ongoing*)
- Engaging policy-makers to provide a political reality check and to maintain political legitimacy (*ongoing*)
- Advocating for MetroGIS's efforts in development of statewide geospatial policies (*ongoing*)
- Seeking opportunities to learn from efforts with similar objectives – statewide, national, and internationally (*ongoing*)
- Fostering awareness of MetroGIS's accomplishments and the public value created via its efforts (*ongoing*)
- Documenting benefits associated with MetroGIS's efforts via stakeholder testimonials (ongoing, 1-2 per year)

**ATTACHMENT B**

**2008 ANNUAL REPORT**

**(SEE NEXT PAGE)**

# MetroGIS

*Collaboration: Never a better time*

The current economic landscape is requiring everyone – families, businesses and government alike – to figure out ways to trim budgets, and deliver products and services ever more efficiently. One way for government agencies to do that is by joining forces with each other, creating synergy for better, more cost-effective solutions.



Chair, MetroGIS Policy Board  
Victoria Reinhardt  
Ramsey County Commissioner

That's exactly what MetroGIS has been doing since its inception nearly 15 years ago – bringing together multiple governmental, private sector and nonprofit interests to identify shared information needs and develop regional solutions to meet those needs. "Build it once and use many times" continues to be our motto.

Despite resource cuts, our collaboration continues to seek solutions for the needs of our respective participants. In 2008, as you will read below, we began to identify shared needs for applications and web services that will help our stakeholders meet real-world needs – like emergency preparedness and response, economic development, and drinking-water protection, to name only a few.

Geographic information is most often behind the scenes in public policy and service delivery, but it is absolutely critical nonetheless. I'm very proud of the GIS professionals and other government employees and elected officials who have devoted so much of their time to the MetroGIS collaboration. Our work is more important than ever.

## *Investigating shared needs beyond data*

In order to stay relevant and meet the evolving needs of participating organizations, MetroGIS must widen its scope to seek solutions to shared needs for applications and web services, according to the 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan. MetroGIS kicked off 2008 by hosting a workshop to explore this expansion of activities.

**Key roles for MetroGIS.** Participants at the workshop determined four key roles for MetroGIS in pursuing solutions to shared needs for applications and web services. They include leadership, coordination, policy/procedures and seed funding for projects.

**Activities to pursue.** Participants ranked potential application-sharing activities for their importance to each participant's organization and for their appropriateness for promotion by MetroGIS. The top four ranked activities include:

- Writing web-based services that can be used regardless of the development environment (i.e., the kind of software you use)
- Sharing expertise and best practices in writing and implementing applications
- Hosting applications and services for others to use and/or using same from others
- Hosting data services

Participants were clear that in order to fully pursue the activities outlined in the business plan and affirmed at the workshop, additional technical leadership support is needed in the form of a Technical Coordinator.

**Next steps.** Based on the workshop results, the MetroGIS Policy Board endorsed the key roles and following highest priority next steps:

- Define a strategy to secure a Technical Coordinator and initiate negotiations
- Define priorities and shared needs for applications and web services
- Populate metadata for GeoServices Finder, a web services and applications search tool and catalog
- Define a more fully developed geographic data, applications and services broker
- Explore methods for establishing trust in the reliability of shared services.

**Note:** The state's budget challenges and subsequent hiring freeze has hindered efforts to establish a Technical Coordinator position funded by the Metropolitan Council (the primary financial sponsor of MetroGIS). In the meantime, the Technical Leadership Workgroup and other volunteers are moving forward, as time permits, on prioritized projects.

## *Sharing parcel data*

All seven counties participating in MetroGIS adopted the latest parcel data sharing agreements, which allow MetroGIS to distribute the regional parcel dataset. The agreements also authorize a new opportunity referred to as "view-only" access. Licensed organizations may now host web-based applications designed for access by general public viewing that incorporate the parcel data, provided the source data cannot be downloaded.

## *Developing solutions*

**Regional geocoder service.** MetroGIS helped fund the development of a regional geocoding service. A geocoder connects an address with its exact geographic coordinates,

and is used in mapping applications. The regional geocoder is open source and available for use on any server.

In 2008, the Policy Board approved spending an additional \$5,000 to make the geocoder web service recognize landmarks, so that a person may also type in the name of a landmark and map the location.

**Synchronizing data from different sources.** With MetroGIS pilot project funding, Carver County developed a tool needed to establish a regional address points dataset. The tool will allow address points data created at a city or county to be synchronized with a regional database at a central location on a nightly basis.

In 2008, the Policy Board approved funding to develop an online address points editing tool to make it easier for small cities with little or no GIS resources to create and update address points data. A prototype tool is in development.

**Mailing label web service.** The Policy Board approved funding to help develop a mailing label web service. The service will not require users to have regional parcel data on their desktops, and will provide a web-based tool for producing a custom set of mailing labels.

## *Leveraging the MetroGIS model*

MetroGIS leaders played important roles in shaping recommendations for an initiative called "Minnesota Drive to Excellence: Functional Transformation." A key component of the initiative is creating a statewide GIS coordinating council.

Networking to expand data-sharing activity with counties adjacent to the seven-county metro area was initiated, as called for in the MetroGIS business plan.

### **MetroGIS Policy Board Members – 2008**

Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County, Chair  
Jim Kordiak, Anoka County, Vice Chair  
Tom Workman, Carver County  
Tom Egan, Dakota County  
Randy Johnson, Hennepin County  
Joseph Wagner, Scott County

Dennis Hegberg, Washington County  
Tony Pistilli, Metropolitan Council  
Steve Elkins, Large Metro Area Cities  
Terry Schneider, Smaller Metro Area Cities  
Roger Lake, Metro Area Watersheds  
Dan Cook, School Districts

Primary Sponsor: Metropolitan Council  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator: Randall Johnson, 651-602-1638  
390 Robert Street North, St. Paul, MN 55101  
Fax 651-602-1674 TTY 651-291-0904

[www.metrogis.org](http://www.metrogis.org) – For current information on MetroGIS activities  
[www.datafinder.org](http://www.datafinder.org) – For a directory of available geographic data in the region

# ATTACHMENT C

## Statewide Emergency Preparedness Data Project

**From - John Hoshal, Project Manager, LMIC**

12/3/08

Below are some of the highlights I prepared for an interim report to the FGDC.

### Meetings:

1. Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information – Emergency Preparedness Committee – CAP grant sub-committee met in mid-September to discuss project, identify procedures for collecting and verifying data, discussed data model, data sources, etc.
2. At the request of the MetroGIS Policy Board, Randall Johnson (MetroGIS), Laurie Beyer-Kropuenske (State of Minnesota – Information Policy Analysis Division) and John Hoshal (LMIC) met in late October to discuss barriers to sharing emergency management data. Barriers include data pricing, restrictive license agreements, etc. These barriers may impact the collection and distribution structures data.
3. Minnesota Governor's Council on Geographic Information – Emergency Preparedness Committee members - Steve Swazee (co-chair GCGI-EPC), Randy Knippel (Dakota County) and John Hoshal (LMIC) met in late November with Kris Eide, Director, Department of Public Safety's Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division (HSEM) to discuss the CAP grant and HSEM's role. Kris agreed to ask HSEM regional managers to promote the project and work with the GCGI-EPC to ensure its success. HSEM regional managers work closely with city and county emergency management officials and public safety officers. Knippel and Hoshal will plan on attending quarterly meetings of the regional managers. Kris will also ask HSEM's Critical Infrastructure team to work with the GCGI-EPC.

### CAP Grant Presentations:

10/03/08 – Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium Annual Conference – Session 27

12/18/08 – Minnesota Government Information Technology Symposium

### Other:

1. Continue to discuss possible collaboration with TechniGraphicS (TGS). TGS has worked with LMIC and other GIS contacts in Minnesota to collect structures data for HSIP Freedom. Freedom data may serve as foundational data for the CAP project with subsequent review, augmentation and enhancement by local authorities. For more information about HSIP Freedom see: [http://www.nsgic.org/hottopics/hsip\\_ci\\_geospatial\\_data\\_sharing\\_program\\_121806.pdf](http://www.nsgic.org/hottopics/hsip_ci_geospatial_data_sharing_program_121806.pdf)
2. In mid-September Randy Knippel (Dakota County) asked members of the MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Committee to update their existing emergency preparedness data layers in preparation for aggregating them for the region. The MetroGIS EPC collaborative model for data aggregation and refinement was highlighted in the CAP grant application.
3. Exploring the possibility of publishing - statewide - the best available structures data in the form of digital maps that would be given to emergency managers for review. These maps would be based on the 10K prototypes being developed by Dakota County which incorporate the US National Grid (USNG) and best available imagery including 2008 NAIP photography now available from LMIC's web services. Examples from Dakota County can be found at:  
10K Sample: [http://gis.co.dakota.mn.us/content/dakco/USNG/10kTopo/10KM\\_VK85.pdf](http://gis.co.dakota.mn.us/content/dakco/USNG/10kTopo/10KM_VK85.pdf)  
1K Sample: <http://gis.co.dakota.mn.us/content/dakco/USNG/1KNeighborhood/15TVK8353.pdf>





**TO:** Policy Board  
**FROM:** MetroGIS Staff Support Team  
Contact: Randall Johnson (651-602-1638)  
**SUBJECT:** Information Sharing  
**DATE:** April 17, 2009  
(For the Apr 29<sup>th</sup> meeting)

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

**A) BEN VERBICK, GIS MANAGER AT LOGIS, APPOINTED TO COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

On March 26<sup>th</sup>, the Coordinating Committee appointed Ben Verbick to its membership serve under the “special expertise” membership category. Mr. Verbick has substantial experience with city government operations, which possess a wide range of GIS capacities (sophisticated to non existent), and a wide range of content expertise including emergency response, a current priority of MetroGIS’s efforts. Welcome aboard Ben.

**B) WILL CRAIG -- PRESIDENT ELECT OF NSGIC**

NSGIC stands for National States Geographic Information Council; it represents the GIS Councils and / or centers of the 50 states. More about NSGIC at <http://www.nsgic.org/leadership/index.cfm> . Congratulations Will.

**C) NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (NGAC) - FEBRUARY AND MAY MEETINGS**

The complete summary for the February 2009 meeting can be viewed at [http://www.fgdc.gov/ngac/meetings/February2009meeting/index\\_html](http://www.fgdc.gov/ngac/meetings/February2009meeting/index_html). Highlights of the discussion and action are as follows:

- Approved a two-part recommendation to the FGDC regarding Economic Recovery funding calling for : 1) Implementation of policies to ensure transparency and accountability and 2) Support of investments in nationally important geospatial data, in particular, for imagery, parcel and elevation data.
- Approved a Strategic Geospatial Vision statement (Attachment A).
- Approved a recommendation in the form of a resolution (Attachment B) was made to the FGDC concerning the need for improved coordination and accountability for responsibilities critical to achieving the vision of the NSDI.
- Launched an initiative to document best practices for public private partnerships. The Staff Coordinator requested the call to be published an e-announcement by the MN GIS/LIS Consortium and passed it along to numerous contacts within MetroGIS, across the country and Europe. This topic will be a primary item of discussion at the next meeting (May 12-13). The call has been extended to March 27.
- Created a new subcommittee to identify lessons learned from the four independent economic stimulus proposals submitted by the geospatial community and develop longer-term strategy for more effective cross-sector coordination.
- Authorized a call for suggested enhancements to The National Map. This topic will be a primary item of discussion at the next meeting (May 12-13).

The next meeting of the NGAC is scheduled for May 12-13 in Washington D.C. The preliminary agenda is presented in Attachment C. Hennepin County Commissioner Johnson and the Staff Coordinator serve on this 28-person committee.

#### **D) PRESENTATIONS / OUTREACH / STUDIES (not mentioned elsewhere)**

**1. Article Submitted for the Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium Newsletter:**

An article was submitted for the winter issue of the GIS/LIS Newsletter entitled “MetroGIS Applications and Web Services Needs Forum”. It can be viewed at <http://www.mngislis.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=415>

**2. Presentations/Meetings:**

April 21, 2009: The Staff Coordinator has been invited to keynote the Iowa State GIS Conference. The theme of the conference is making collaboration work.

**3. Publications:**

January 2009: MetroGIS is used as a principal case study in an article written by Professor John Bryson, entitled Understanding Strategic Planning and the Formulation and Implementation of Strategic Plans as a Way of Knowing. The article has been approved for publication in the International Public Management Journal (IPMJ). According to Professor Bryson, IPMJ is a top of the line public management journal with an international audience. He conducted a series of interviews with MetroGIS leadership to prepare for this article. It can be accessed at [http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/09\\_0326/BrysonCrosbyBryson-UnderstandingStrategicPlanning\\_0302-09.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/09_0326/BrysonCrosbyBryson-UnderstandingStrategicPlanning_0302-09.pdf).

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

1. *(See the report for Agenda Items 5b, c, and d)*

**2. Cycloplan project to begin this summer**

The Metropolitan Council is partnering with Focus Lens, a group associated with the University of Minnesota, to develop a web based bicycle planning application. This application will allow planners to share spatial and attribute information about bike trails in the 7 county region. The application will use a Geo-wiki which allows registered users (bikeway planners) to enter and edit spatial and attribute information about bike trails much as other wikis allow users to share and edit text and images on the web. Cycloplan builds on an existing Geo-wiki called Cyclopath – <http://cyclopath.org> – (developed by Focus Lens) which is used by bikers create, edit and annotate regional bikeway information, as well as plan and rate their personal bike routes. The combination of Cycloplan and Cyclopath will permit planners to have access to the public user data in order to better inform them of how the system is being used and which enhancements would be most valuable when developing trails.

The Cycloplan project will test the use of another kind of web application (geo-wiki) as a means to share geographic information in the region. The project will also test methods for collaboratively collecting linear data just as the address points project tests collaboratively collecting point data. Future geo-wikis could be used to gather information on other linear features such as functional class roadways.

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

**1. OGC Forms a Spatial Law and Policy Committee ([www.opengeospatial.org](http://www.opengeospatial.org))**

The Board of Directors of the Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) has chartered a committee of the Board to specifically address the “spatial law and policy issues” which will influence development requirements of the Consortium's technology process. The Spatial Law and Policy Committee (SLPC) will be chaired by OGC director and Executive Committee member, Kevin Pomfret, and will be organized under board leadership as an educational forum to include both select member and community participation.

In the past, legal issues associated with spatial data and technology were primarily a concern for lawyers that worked with or for the government. Now, both public sector and private sector users and providers of geospatial data and technologies face a wide range of legal issues associated with growth in consumer and business applications for spatial technology. Such applications include Earth browsers, satellite navigation devices in cars and PDA's, location-based services associated

with cell phones, business intelligence, social networking and satellite tracking of vehicles and equipment. All of these applications raise issues that involve intellectual property rights, liability, privacy, and national security. In many cases, the existing legal and policy framework is inadequate to provide governments, businesses and consumers clear guidance on these issues

**2. National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) – March Conference**

A summary of the highlights, drafted by Will Craig and David Arbeit, is presented in Attachment D

**3. Where And How Is Policy And Governance Connecting To The Geospatial Community And What Are The Challenges?”**

<http://vector1media.com/vectorone/?p=530>

**G) MARCH 2009 COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY**

The summary of the March 26, 2009 Coordinating Committee meeting can be viewed at

[http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/09\\_0326/09\\_0326mp.pdf](http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/meetings/09_0326/09_0326mp.pdf)

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **NGAC STRATEGIC GEOSPATIAL VISION STATEMENT**

***(SEE NEXT PAGE)***

(Source: <http://www.fgdc.gov/ngac/meetings/February2009meeting/ngac-geospatial-vision-adopted-2-4-09.pdf>)

**National Geospatial Advisory Committee**  
**National Geospatial Strategy – *Strategic Vision***  
*Adopted February 4, 2009*

**Vision of the Desired Future State**

"The Nation and its citizens value and are empowered by geospatial resources"

**Vivid description of the Desired Future State**

Implementing the National Geospatial Strategy will result in a future state where:

- Citizens take for granted the geospatial infrastructure that serves to foster economic vitality, manage resources, advance health initiatives, protect the homeland, support science, govern the Nation, and otherwise enrich the lives of all Americans;
- Authoritative and interoperable geospatial information and tools are available, accessible, and routinely used;
- Citizens rely on the availability of pervasive and ubiquitous geospatial information from the public domain and a thriving geospatial marketplace;
- The value of national geospatial resources is so well understood by Americans that its ongoing development is easily and continuously sustained;
- Commercial, academic, nonprofit organizations, and all levels of government operate under a shared governance structure, share a common set of goals and objectives, coordinate and leverage their efforts;
- Partners from all sectors work collaboratively with a common set of policies, procedures, standards, and data models;
- Roles and responsibilities for all partners are well defined and participants have incentives and are accountable for producing results;
- Coordinated policies ensure enhanced access to current data as well as enduring access to historic content valued by the nation;
- Development of the national geospatial infrastructure is supported by sustained and equitable cost sharing among partners;
- Incentives are in place to ensure cost-effective initiatives, continuous progress, and innovation;
- A skilled and educated work force is in place to exploit the full potential of geospatial resources to benefit society;
- The United States provides international leadership in the global geospatial community; and
- Emerging business technologies embrace the concept of place.

*“Get Place - Get Geospatial - Get It! for a Nationwide Community”*

# **ATTACHMENT B**

## **NGAC RECOMMENDATION TO FGDC FEBRUARY 5, 2009**

### **MODIFICATIONS TO CIRCULAR A-16 (NSDI GOVERNANCE)**

**RECOMMENDATION:** The NGAC approved the following recommendation to the FGDC regarding Governance:

- Whereas Executive Order 12906 and OMB Circular A-16 designate geospatial data themes and assign federal agency stewards for those themes;
- Whereas most agencies have not been provided designated resources to meet stewardship responsibilities;
- Whereas some agencies have not produced plans to accomplish stewardship responsibilities;
- Whereas OMB has not been able to assemble consistent and accurate budgetary crosscuts for geospatial activities to implement stewardship responsibilities;
- Whereas agencies have not been held accountable for meeting stewardship responsibilities; and
- Whereas the coordination, duplication avoidance, and partnering requirements of Executive Order 12906 and OMB Circular A16 remain unsatisfied not only among Federal agencies, but also with non-Federal stakeholders:

Now Therefore; Be It Resolved:

- That the NGAC recommends that the FGDC encourages and supports the Administration in the use of geospatial data and technologies to transform government operations and provide accountability and savings across geospatial activities, by:
- Reaffirming Executive Order 12906 and revising it to increase accountability;
- Strengthening direct OMB enforcement of the reporting requirements in Circular A-16;
- Implementing performance measures;
- Coordinating and working in partnership with Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies and the private sector, and building upon non-Federal data wherever practical; and
- Strongly considering the role of geospatial data and technology in transforming government operations while implementing the President's management agenda and formulating and executing the President's Budget.

# ATTACHMENT C

## National Geospatial Advisory Committee Meeting GWU Cafritz Conference Center, Washington, DC, May 12-13, 2009

### DRAFT Agenda v2

(See <http://www.fgdc.gov/ngac> for the final agenda, meeting summaries and agenda materials.)

#### TUESDAY, May 12: NGAC Public Meeting

- 8:30 – 8:45**      **Welcome & Opening** – *Anne Miglarese (Chair) & Steve Wallach (Vice Chair)*
- Roll call/introductions
  - Review and adoption of minutes from February NGAC meeting
  - Objectives and purpose of this meeting
  - Announcements/logistics
- 8:45 – 9:15**      **FGDC Briefing** – *Ivan DeLoatch (FGDC)*
- Update on recent FGDC activities
  - NGAC Membership – Appointments/Terms
- 9:15– 10:00**      **State of the NGAC** – *Anne Miglarese*
- Discussion of the activities, status, and future role of the NGAC
- 10:00 – 10:30**      **BREAK**
- 10:30 – 11:45**      **Keynote Discussion**
- Overview of Administration priorities/activities
  - Discussion and feedback
- 11:45 – 1:00**      **LUNCH**
- 1:00 – 2:30**      **Presentation/Panel Discussion – Developing a National Geospatial Policy and Strategic Plan** – *Dan Cotter (DHS), Karen Siderelis, Steve Wallach, Jerry Johnston*
- Overview and discussion of draft proposal and approach for developing a National Geospatial Policy and Strategic Plan
  - Dialogue and feedback
- 2:30 – 3:00**      **BREAK**
- 3:00 – 5:00**      **National Geospatial Policy and Strategic Plan**
- Facilitated NGAC discussion
- 5:00**              **ADJOURN**

**WEDNESDAY, May 13: NGAC Public Meeting**

**8:30 – 8:45**      **Welcome, Summary of Day 1, Overview of Agenda** – *Chair/Vice-Chair*

**8:45 – 10:00**    **National Geospatial Policy and Strategic Plan**

- Facilitated NGAC discussion, continued

**10:00 – 10:30**            **BREAK**

**10:30 – 11:00**    **National Geospatial Policy and Strategic Plan**

- Facilitated NGAC discussion, continued

**11:00 – 11:30**            **Public Comment Period** – *Sign up in advance*

**11:30 – 1:00**              **LUNCH**

**1:00 – 3:00**              **Status of NGAC Subcommittees and Initiatives**

- Parcel Data – Dave Cowen
- The National Map – Allen Carroll
- Partnerships – Jerry Johnston/Gene Schiller
- Communications – Kass Green
- Governance – Dennis Goreham
- Economic Recovery – Kim Nelson

**3:00 – 3:30**              **BREAK**

**3:30 – 4:00**              **News and Notes Forum** – *NGAC Members (sign up in advance)*

**4:00 – 4:30**    **Meeting Summary/Wrap-up** – *Chair/Vice-Chair/Committee*

- Actions & next steps
- Agenda items for next meeting
- Announcements

**4:30**                      **Adjourn**

# **ATTACHMENT D**

## **NATIONAL STATES GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION COUNCIL (NSGIC)**

### **HIGHLIGHTS - MARCH 2009 CONFERENCE**

*(See next page)*

**NSGIC 2009 Midyear Conference Highlights<sup>1</sup>**  
**Annapolis MD; February 22-25, 2009**  
(David Arbeit and Will Craig)

Google Content Expanding Google is adding historical photos and other new data. This could provide an opportunity for more people to view archival material. For more information, see [www.google.com/mapcontent](http://www.google.com/mapcontent). They require old photos to be scanned and georeferenced. Because of speed issues, they cannot work with WMS or WFS.

Increase FGDC Responsibility? The National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) and others are calling for a more aggressive role for the Federal Geographic Data Committee in coordinating national efforts. NSGIC endorsed this move and has revised its Advocacy Agenda so new funds flow through FGDC.

Funds to Document Data Roll-Up Efforts. A new category of CAP grants, category 7, is available to develop and document best practices in incorporating data from local government into region or statewide layers, ultimately to *The National Map*. The category is labeled: Demonstration of Geospatial Data Partnerships across Local, State and Federal Government. CAP is the Cooperative Agreements Program of FDDC. Up to \$75,000 is available, but 2009 awards have already been made.

IFTN Status. States see aerial photography as our number 1 issue. This means stabilizing the NAIP program and adding cover frequency. The private companies that do this work have joined to form the Agriculture Geospatial Coalition LLC to lobby for this program, but are still looking for a Congressional champion to carry the program. Will Craig visited with staff from the House Agriculture Committee, along with Jim Lacy from Wisconsin and two of the private firms, getting a very positive response. NSGIC 6" leaf-off program has been rolled into a buy-up option for the 1' program; we are still looking for a lead agency to lead that program.

Broadband Coverage in Minnesota. Connected Nations, a non-profit organization, was hired by the Mn Department of Commerce to map broadband availability in Minnesota. An early version of their results is online at [www.connectmn.org](http://www.connectmn.org). Besides statewide maps of availability and speed, users can drill down to see the carriers and speeds available at an individual address.

USGS Budget Includes Plan to Publish New Generation Quads. USGS's mapping budget for 2009 is \$15 million. It will begin producing new quad sheets using NSDI framework data – using NAIP photography as a base. Minnesota is planned for 2010. Some states are questioning the value of traditional quad sheets and *The National Map* and have suggested that data development priorities may be more important.

---

<sup>1</sup> Conference Archive. The conference agenda, list of participants, and most PowerPoint presentations have been posted on the NSGIC Conference Archive: [http://www.nsgic.org/events/2009\\_midyear.cfm](http://www.nsgic.org/events/2009_midyear.cfm). Also see notes and Blogs at <http://www.nsgic.org/blog/>.

SmartBuy Software Licensing. FGDC is negotiating SmartBuy contracts with various GIS vendors, including ESRI. Discounts would be greater than current GSA discounts and, unlike GSA pricing, state and local governments will be eligible to buy off of the SmartBuy schedule.

Stimulus Package Responses. Some states have requested stimulus funds to support GIS data development, but none have yet received any. Most states consider the prospects for stimulus funding to be minimal, but many feel that there is value in promoting the use of GIS to monitor the use of stimulus funds within their states and as a policy and evaluation tool. State CIO Khanna introduced a similar idea at the National Governor's Association Conference.

Quotes of note (original and historical)

- They are not stove pipes. They are cylinders of excellence (Steve Lewis, US DOT, with a smile)
- Facts are stubborn things (John Adams)
- Information is the currency of democracy (Thomas Jefferson)
- If you don't have time to do it right, how are you going to find time to do it over (Learnon Dalby, state of Arkansas and NSGIC president)
- Never confuse movement with action (Ernest Hemingway)